

Review of Village Institutions from the Aspect of Instructional Technology*

Öğretim Teknolojisi Bağlamında Köy Enstitüleri Hareketinin İncelenmesi

Seçil TISOĞLU**, Kadir Yücel KAYA***, Kürşat ÇAĞILTAY****

Abstract: The Village Institutions was an educational movement that was constituted in the early 20th century in Turkey (Türkoğlu, 2004). Village Institutions' main idea was to grow peasant children with learning within work method to make them work as teachers or qualified professionals or personnel in their village. While this unique attempt was practically applied between the years of 1940-1954, this movement provided a significant educational, social and political change in Turkey. The major instructional method in these institutions was built on learning within work method which aimed to raise children as socially and culturally educated individuals. Within this context, this study is intended to examine the instructional method, courses, and tools and environment of Village Institutions within the aspect of Instructional Technology. Moreover, this study seeks to provide an understanding for the correspondence of this method with the contemporary educational strategies and approaches.

Keywords: village institutions, instructional technology, learning within work

Öz: Köy Enstitüleri, 20 yüzyılın başlarında Türkiye’de kurulan eğitsel bir seferberlik hareketidir (Türkoğlu, 2004). Köy Enstitüleri’nin temel amacı, iş içinde öğrenme metodu kullanılarak köylü çocuklarının kendi köylerinde öğretmen veya deneyimli bir meslek sahibi ve personel olarak çalışabilmeleri amacıyla yetiştirilmeleridir. Bu özgün yaklaşım, aktif olarak 1940-1954 yılları arasında uygulanmış olmasına rağmen, bu uygulama Türkiye’de önemli eğitsel, sosyal ve politik değişimlere yol açmıştır. Bu enstitülerde uygulanan temel öğretimsel metod iş içinde öğrenme yaklaşımına dayandırılmış olup, çocukların sosyal ve kültürel olarak yetiştirilmesi amaçlanmıştır. Tüm bu bağlamlar dahilinde, bu çalışmanın amacı, Köy Enstitüleri’nin öğretimsel metodolojisi, dersleri, araçları ve ortamının öğretim teknolojisi bağlamında incelenmesidir. Ayrıca bu çalışma, iş içinde öğrenme metodunun güncel eğitsel stratejiler ve yönelimler ile olan ilişkisi ile ilgili bir anlayış sunabilmeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: köy enstitüleri, öğretim teknolojisi, iş içinde öğrenme

Introduction

Seels and Richey (1994) defined the instructional technology as “the theory and practice of design, development, utilization, management, and evaluation of processes and resources for learning” (p. 1). Instructional technology supports educational system from national educational setting to classroom setting for every instructional discipline in order to find new solutions for learning or instructional problems to facilitate learning and to improve new methods for different learning environments and people.

Village Institutions that were developed in 1940’s conditions have unique characteristics regarding instructional technology. For that reason, this literature review aimed to provide some information about the village institutions’ organization regarding their aims and establishment process in addition to instructional technology components. This study may help to clarify recognizing and analyzing instructional methods, strategies and environments and the

*This paper was presented at 7th International Computer & Instructional Technologies Symposium, Erzurum, 2013.

**Research Assistant Dr., Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Kastamonu-Türkiye, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5668-3769>, e-mail: skaya@kastamonu.edu.tr

***Research Assistant, Kastamonu University, Faculty of Education, Kastamonu-Türkiye, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7561-980X>, e-mail: kadirkaya@kastamonu.edu.tr

****Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Ankara-Türkiye, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1973-7056>, e-mail: kursat@metu.edu.tr

students, teachers, directors' roles in their learning by presenting a successful case, Village Institutions. These characteristics of Village Institutions may help to consider improving or redesigning the current educational system in Turkey.

Village Institutions

This section provides information about the establishment of the Village Institutions and their missions. The institutions provided education for K-8 level, except Hasanoglan Village institution which was the only institution offer high school education.

Establishment of Village Institutions

Village Institutions were established in 1940 considering the experiences in ifteler trial village institution (built in 1937) within the purposes of educating the peasant children as teachers, and qualified personnel for villages in order to find solutions for villages' cultural, social, agricultural and economic problems (Türkođlu, 2004). Also, the students were supposed to be educated as sensitive, practical, intellectual, creative, and democratic to be adaptive for the new environments. Village Institutions were established in non-centrally places and each institution would have been responsible for several cities around themselves. "Village Institutions' different characteristics than other formal educational institutions did not infer separate village life from the cities" (Kirby, 2000, p. 143), rather they were supposed to enliven the location and villages' cultural life around them that they would have been cultural centers for villages with their theatres, cooperation, entertainment and shows and libraries (Akam, 2010).

Before Village Institution project, in 1936, corporals and sergeants were sent to the villages in order to meet the educational needs after a short training (educator course). Then, in 1937-1938, four trial village schools were opened in Eskişehir (ifteler/1937), İzmir (Kızılullu/1937), Edirne (Kepirtepe/1938) and Kastamonu (Gölköy/1938) (Arslan, 2004). Educator course experience provided a convenient environment for village institutions (Uygun, 2010) but according to Tongu, their mechanism was different from each other in terms of their environment, purposes and instructional activities (Şeren, 2008). Between these four schools, Kızılullu followed different characteristics than village institution project (Kirby, 2000) while the other three schools' mission, management and instructional strategies shaped the village institutions' structure. In 1940, ten institutions were also established and this number increased to 21 institutions in 1948 (Türkođlu, 2004).

Village Institutions' missions were explained regarding integrality, relation to children, relation to environment and time, freedom and democracy, sociality, individualism, co-education and lifelong learning missions (Tuncel & Öztürk, 2004). Similarly, Ertuđrul (2002) mentioned the characteristics of village institutions as:

- Work instruction's purpose was productive, creative and socially beneficial work instruction so that the production was done firstly for needs, then for markets.
- Mental and physical activities were harmonized and preceded in production and activity fields within work instruction so that sophisticated and qualified teachers could be educated.
- Both individual and collaborative team working were aimed to support students' attitudes, abilities and responsibilities.

Engin Tongu (1962) clarified the village institutions' system as "variable and renewed system that village institutions were organized according to the conclusions of the applications and experiences and their mission was determined considering the social, economic and cultural conditions of society" (cited in Kaya, 2001, p. 235). Students were selected according to these characteristics: graduated from primary education, being healthy and smart peasant children (Şeren, 2008). Besides, practical teachers and profession experts were selected from educator practice course and schools for as a qualified instructor and guide for children and peasants for cultural, technical, agricultural and educational aspects of life.

The Village Institution's content and characteristic were changed in 1946, and they were totally closed in 1954. For that reason, this unique and successful educational movement's instructional aspect was analyzed through their original structure within the years of 1940-1946.

Hasanođlan High Village Institution

This institution was established in 1942 and was aimed to give three-year education. This institutions' aim was the same with other institutions but it gave an education similar to high school standards (Tongu, 1970). Tongu defined the teachers' characteristic as an instructor for themselves and other people, instructor for planning, managing and evaluating the instructional process, instructor for generating information with scientific base (Türkođlu, 2004) so that in Hasanođlan High Village Institution, the teachers and experts with these characteristics were aimed to educate.

Institution's program was based on group discussion, learning by themselves strategy, individual reading sessions and scientific research and publications. The students in this institution were supposed to select an expertise branch (fine arts, animal husbandry, agriculture, building, etc.) and attributed their researches and activities on scientific base so that students could publish in Village Institutions Journal, and they could share their experiences and scientific information from the literature in different topics such as sericulture, potable water supply, conservation, or soil reclamation (Kirby, 2000; Keser, 2010) and excavation works (Türkođlu, 2004) in order to raise the awareness of people for these topics. The contents of the journal were divided into three parts: village observations, institution's studies and news including students' surveys, research, observations and experiences (Yalın, 2010). Also, students were taken to national journeys (for 20 days) to observe and investigate the characteristics of cities regarding their field of interests and they reported these observations in journals and their writings (Türkođlu, 2004). In addition, the characteristic of distance education system was seen in Village Institutions as sending the books. Ersoy (1991) stated that distribution of books through posting was achieved by Ministry of National Education and Village Institutions because every institution had a library for their students and teachers (cited in Keserođlu, 2005).

First-year students stayed in Village Institutions for two months and second-year students went to villages as intern teachers for two months in order to support the relationship between village institutions and to prepare and enable students to see their actual working environment (Kirby, 2000). Also, the sample village schools were aimed to establish in village institutions' boundaries to provide an exemplary environment for students. The first sample village school was established in Hasanođlan High Village Institution as a kindergarten. This kindergarten provides a place for psychology and health science students to implement their knowledge and profession (Türkođlu, 2004).

Review of Instructional Aspects of Institutions

This section provides a critical review of the purposes of this study related with the instructional aspects of the applications in the village institutions. Through this perspective, instructional objectives, instructional method, programs/courses/activities, instructional tools and environment were analyzed. In the end, in the summary section, the significant and unique characteristic of this movement was criticized based on the contemporary educational approaches.

Instructional Objectives

Kirby (2000) stated that "the primary purpose of education was to change the communities' economic and cultural life and background together with contemporary and modernized ways" (p. 307). Accordingly, purpose of village institutions derived from the idea of providing modern and qualified life standards for peasants (Karaömerliođlu, 1998). In addition, Erdem, Kiran and Kırmızı (2011) stated that "education could be successful when it meets the needs of individuals and society" (p. 482). Similarly, within village institutions, it was aimed to meet the need of

schools and villages, through the students raised as teacher, health professional and agriculturalist (Türkođlu, 2004). Similarly, Sebhattin Eyübođlu explained the real educational system as “saving the peoples from hard conditions, saving the animals from squalidity, preventing the earth from corruption and primitiveness” (cited in Kaya, 2001, p. 137). Thus, as an educational system, village institutions’ mission was aligned with the cultural, educational and economical problems in the villages. Also, the purpose of village institutions was to train not only teachers but also artisans and intellectuals for the development of village and society life (Ertugrul, 2002). Therefore, Tongu explained the different characteristics and needs of the village life as: the social and cultural elements of village life require the qualified and sophisticated teachers that have teaching and working abilities because the life standards in villages differentiate from the country life in terms of education level, tradition, fields of work, and legal, financial corporations (Bařgöz, 1995).

Tongu’s educational philosophy was based on developing knowledge, conscious and activity together, associating knowledge with communities’ problems and solving this practical knowledge (Polat & Ođuz, 2010). He was interested in actual and concrete problems and their solutions of society rather than theory (Özsoy, 2011), because as Cücelođlu (2008) stated, educational system should be considered as awareness maker rather than information transmitter (cited in İmer & Uz, 2010). In these years, there were great educational and economic problems especially in villages, therefore the purposes of Village Institutions were to remove these problems by enabling students to construct their knowledge about nature, country and world facts and increasing the literacy rate (Ertuđrul, 2002). In these years (1937-1938), according to State Institute of Statistics (Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü, 1973), 91.8% of women and 76.7% of men did not have the ability to read and write and 80% of the population was constituted of peasants (Şeren, 2008; Özdemir, 2004). In addition, the craft, art, tool or technology and also the intellectual ability or knowledge did not exist in villages (Dündar, 2006). Tongu’s purpose of village institutions as creating a cultural and social environment in the villages around the village institutions by building cultivated area, associations, open-air theatre, sport and playing areas (Türkođlu, 2004) seemed to be an ideal purpose to improve the conditions of villages. Similarly, Kirby (2000) stated that Tongu’s perception about the relation between economic and educational system is that the societies’ economic system’s organizational form and type determine to organize and spread the quality and the content of the information. Education policy should obtain, develop and facilitate agricultural economy mainly in developing countries (Kirby, 2000). For that reason, village institutions can be considered as “development and reconstruction of organizations that focused on changes in social, cultural, human relationships, and instructional life as a whole” (Bařgöz, 1995, p. 229). For example, Şahhüseyinođlu (1993) stated that apricot production was more than 700-800 thousand kilogram in Akadađ Institution (Malatya) and they made a contribution to themselves and villages economically (cited in Kartal, 2008).

Instructional Method: Learning within work “İř İinde Öđrenme”

According to Tongu, education’s missions included the purpose of the instruction and professional education that “instruction had to cope with the difficulties and primitive physical conditions in the environment, therefore instruction had to eliminate these physical conditions itself. Also, technical and professional education had to support the students to set up and organize well-working economical system” (Kirby, 2000, p. 90), thus Village Institutions aimed to educate the peasant students considering the village’s economic, cultural and social conditions. Tongu’s main principle was to embed practice into theory because theories could be meaningful when they were fed with real life practice and activities (Özsoy, 2011). Moreover, Binbařiođlu (1995) stated that “people shaped their activities within work and also activity or work shaped the people” (p. 216). Therefore, learning within work became a meaningful and beneficial method for instruction because Kirby (2000) stated that education should support workforce need and also social and cultural needs within the learner’s creative learning process.

Learning within work method was the main idea behind the village institutions. The purpose was to make the children active and cultivated through agriculture, health education and technical works. Tonguç stated that “Village Institutions’ students were educated in work, through work and for work” (Kirby, 2000, p. 95). The “work” was considered as a tool, purpose and method in Village Institutions (Türkoğlu, 2004) because, as Kirby (2000) stated, according to Tonguç, individual’s primary needs, purposes and expectations from life were shaped with work and professional knowledge, therefore the education should give the opportunities to support rationalistic work and environments for learners. Similarly, Türkoğlu (2004) stated that Tonguç’s perception of work instruction consisted of both presenting a job education and production considering producing and creating things, idea, culture, aesthetics and information. Besides the work instruction for community aspect, its effects on individual’s creativity and abilities were diverse. Tonguç stated that “the children that do not meet the interesting fields as like “work” lose their creative ability because the work is a system directing the world” (Türkoğlu, 2004, p. 173). For that reason, Başgöz (1995) defined benefits and advantages of the working experience that students who were molded within the working experience constructed and regulated more coordinated, healthier, consistent, creative, and practical knowledge for their physical and mental development.

Learning by doing, learning by experiencing or through action approaches were embedded into Village Institutions’ instructional process which resembles learning within work method. Binbaşıoğlu (1995) explained this method’s characteristic that “the finest learning method occurred by doing the work rather than seeing. Work distributed the opinions both to mind and hands” (cited in Gökteş, Temur, Kocaman & Çağiltay, 2009, p. 87). This method could have changed the students’ passive and memorizer habits that came from the Ottoman Empire with their cooperative learning and working through authority and responsibility principle (Türkoğlu, 2004). Direct and purposeful experiences leave meaningful, concrete and rich memories for learning (Dale, 1946). Also, the need for qualified workforce was perfectly aligned with village institutions’ education for work and production principles (Karaomerlioglu, 1998). According to Kartal (2008), the students in village institutions learned by living and implementing theory and practices together in villages (cited in Erdem, Kıran & Kırmızı, 2011). Ertuğrul (2002) stated that classical methods and concepts were not placed in Village Institutions. Their purpose and method were shaped by actual village problems and working environments, every idea and information were based on work and territory. As the learning process of students were examined in village institutions, it could be seen that students were learning by associating the information with real-life settings precisely. They learnt the physical works for their future village life and got structured information that makes work more meaningful and simple.

Some examples could enlighten the application of learning method in Village Institutions. Türkoğlu (2004) stated that using the Pythagorean theorem while building the roofs, using the horsepower learned in machine course in real life setting or using the lever information in a physics course in real machines enable students to learn and construct the information and knowledge within real-life events and settings. For example, in the memories of Emin Güney, the right triangle concept was absorbed by using Pythagorean relation for the construction of building foundation (Dündar, 2006). Using a mathematical relation in a real-life situation can be more effective than learning this relation from books and learning the lectures with real life situations can improve their problem-solving technics and creativity. In addition, Şimşek (2010) stated that students leaned the meter or centimeter concepts, humidity rate and kinds of territory while planting potato or onion and following the territory and while building and plastering a wall, they learned mathematical and geometrical concepts such as angle, shapes and 3D objects. Moreover, Binbaşıoğlu (1995) stated that while constructing a pool; space, dimension and length concepts and problems could be solved through learning by doing method (cited in Apaydın & Sönmez, 2004). In addition, playing an instrument and musical note instruction should be carried out together (Çokgürses & Arık, 2010) because when musical note was learned by singing or playing songs, it would be more concrete and permanent. Besides

making the relation of knowledge from one course with work, they also combine their knowledge and information from several courses in order to implement a work. For example, counting the farm products' prices, defining and measuring the plantation areas and learning the features of farm products, territory and environment enable students to cooperate and combine their knowledge both using their information about mathematics and geography courses (Türkođlu, 2004). On the contrary, the knowledge and information from one course could be implemented in several works. For example, geography courses' plan, map and sketch terms were instructed and implemented in structures and agriculture fields. Also, in the mathematic course, concrete and applicable concepts like the numerical calculations in structure and agriculture fields were handled (Sazak, 2010).

Students had practical and vital knowledge that enables them to find concrete and applicable solutions for the instructional problems (Kirby, 2000). Institutions had to find solutions for both agricultural production and technical issues within creating their technology because of setting up far locations from the cities. In the Village Institutions, every student was challenged with the difficulties in the real-life conditions and made to create new solutions for the problems. Facing several problems and difficulties and being responsible for their works made them strong, self-confident and conscious for the future. For example, Kaya (2001) stated that students and physic teachers in Cilavuz Institution changed the riverbed and water was turned to the electric canal in order to set up hydroelectric station. Moreover, students in Arifiye Institution built their bakery and fish repository near the Sapanca Lake in order to provide their bread and fish need (Aydođan, 2004.). They found the solutions for the problems themselves and they became self-sufficient. Moreover, Kirby (2000) stated that village institutions cared about individual' habits that were especially got in childhood period. For example, the students internalized converting the activity of planting a tree to the forest because they comprehended the importance of trees to themselves and nature. Similarly, students were both learning to plant and got the habit of afforesting (Kanalıcı, 2010). Also, the habit of cleaning was aimed to be gained by students because according to Tongu, cleaning was not only a primary need for living but also a source for providing individual's physical, mental health development (Türkođlu, 2004) because people could be educated in this convenient and healthy environment (Arslan, 2004). Therefore, while students were learning and solving instructional or environmental problems, they also learned to make these activities or works as habits in order to implement these solutions for their future village life.

Rauf İnan explained the instructional method for preventing the students from tedium and reluctance as: "formal courses were given within exercises and applications, explaining the importance of the applications and exercises to the students frequently, associating and evaluating the applications and exercises with the mathematic courses, living up applications with singing songs, folk songs, and plays, working together with students, teachers and experts, raising students' awareness by giving up purposes and outcomes of the applications and exercises and also organizing competitions to encourage the students' applications and exercises" (Kirby, 2000, p. 161). Similarly, Süleyman Üstün mentioned and divided the instructional principles and methods in village institutions into eight parts: "discussion, synchronous production-learning, interpretation and observation, integrity and neutrality, lifelong learning and education, understanding and analyzing, collaborative and cooperative learning, and observation-experience-investigation" methods (Ertuđrul, 2002, p. 139). The instructional method in village institutions was associated with active learning method that was defined as students' active participation in learning process. Also learning by doing approach could be considered to include active learning (Bařtımır & Parlakyıldız, 2010).

Works were usually done with collective labor method (imece) in institutions. Students, teachers and master trainers were working collaboratively in any kind of work (řimřek, 2010). For example, řakir Kaya (Pazarören Institution) mentioned imece as they worked collaboratively with students from other institutions to build Hasanođlan Institution (Uygun, 2004). Therefore, Aıkđöz (1992) stated that helping students with each other and guidance activities for their courses and works and their stack working environments could be considered

as examples for cooperative learning (cited in Arslan, 2004). Heinich, Molenda, Russell and Smaldino (2002) stated that “students work together or in collaboration with teachers in cooperative learning that can be considered to be related with self-instruction” (p. 12). In village institutions, students were aimed to learn the information and solve the problems by themselves or in group working by their teachers or expert’s guidance because as we looked at the Tonguç’s perception of education, we considered that education should support to work collaborative and coordinative with workfellow in the case of unity rather than constituting superior or dominant people (Kirby, 2000). Therefore, students were aimed to learn to work collaboratively and cooperatively with each other in society.

Institutions were always open and their production and education continued through the years (Altunya, 2010). Students and teachers had 45 days for holiday but their relation was not broken with village institution’s purpose in this period so that village institution’s continuity and diversity in cultural and social activities were continued and fed from students’ collections of plant or animal species, handmade patterns and folk song examples that they got from their villages in their holiday times (Kirby, 2000). Students’ observations and researches were kept in village observation files (Kartal, 2008). Moreover, students’ awareness about collection and photography were developed by gathering objects, getting information about these objects and recognizing and classification of these objects (İmer & Uz, 2010). Thus, students could have the ability to recognize and comprehend their environment’s cultural and social characteristics.

Journeys with constructor teams (teams that were charged with the establishing process of other institutions) as across the country were prepared and purposed support for not only other institutions’ setup processes but also disseminating the social, cultural and pedagogical elements such as folk songs, dances, knowledge and lifestyle (Türkoğlu, 2004). For example, Şimşek (2010) mentioned his memory about the collaborative working between different institutions: Düziçi Institution sent grain to İvriz Institution in order to help them to meet the needs of grain. Also, students could have a chance to investigate the cultural differences, environments and instructional systems. For example, Kirby (2000) stated that in Pamukpınar, İvriz, Pazarören, and Dicle Institutions, the cultural and social repertoires were little compared to other institutions because of the regional environment but in these institutions, social and cultural activities were performed within the other institution’s contributions by students. Talip Apaydın mentioned the relationship and incorporation in terms of socially and culturally between the village institutions as: “Kars’s folk songs in Antalya, Ege region’s zeibek in Hasanoğlu Institution, Sivas’s Anatolian folk dances in Kesirtepe Institution, Karadeniz region’s horon was played and sung so that the cultural repertoire around the country came together in Village Institutions” (Salman, 2010, p. 68). Similarly, Başaran (2001) stated that “every institution was the collation of folk dancing and society’s culture” (cited in Özdemir, 2004, p. 54).

Fifth-year students were sent to villages as a trainee for a month by giving them their books, beds, stuff and stores in order to see their activities and performances in villages (Kirby, 2000). Students were aimed to had experience in order to recognize, see and analyze the village life from the teacher’s perspective because even they were used to the characteristic of village life, their purposes and tasks within teacher life would have been differentiated from their students’ life. According to Erdem, Kıran and Kırmızı’s (2011) research, graduate students mentioned their activities in institution and villages. For example, they taught reading-writing to peasants, they repaired the schools in villages, they made a stove for peasants and made a fence, garden walls for schools. They all had the abilities to provide their and village’s needs.

Yıldız (2005) stated that the art education in village institutions was gathering branches of art in order to enable the students to clarify and evaluate observations, expressions, to make and interpret the associations between the elements and to use their sensational organs by using their value coming from nature and art education (cited in Ülkü, 2008). For example, in village institutions, every student could have the ability to express themselves through musical activities. “The musical instruments: mandolin and harmonica (accordion) were selected because of their coherence with Eastern and Western music, availability for playing as an

individual or with an orchestra, and easiness for learning and playing” (Kirby, 2000, p. 286). For example, in Arifiye Institution, they have 120 people in their orchestra and choir (Aydođan, 2004). Therefore, diverse cultural characteristics of these musical instruments could have provided a wide range of musical and universal culture. Kaya (2001) stated that a German engineer explained his feels and opinions that “in village institutions, they grew up their trees with music by singing songs and playing mandolin or harmonica near them” (p. 125).

Programs, Courses and Activities

According to Tongu, education was considered as lifelong learning process that gave the chance to the students to select their profession according to their abilities and interests by providing actual and rationalistic working and learning environments (Kirby, 2000). The institutions’ programs were beneficial as work and production program from the aspect of social and cultural rather than an instructional program (Ertuđrul, 2002). In village institutions, different course, activity and application opportunities were aimed to facilitate students’ multiple intelligence and to prepare them culturally, socially and intellectually for society. Courses were divided into three categories as cultural, agricultural and technical course and studies.

Until 1943, every institution’s special instructional programs were analyzed and evaluated at the beginning of the year so that according to these investigations the Village Institutions Instructional Program was prepared (Şeren, 2008). These unique programs were based on the essence of resources and power (Tuncel & Öztürk, 2004). Tongu clarified the village institutions instructional program that it was constituted of the conclusions of analyzing, designing and evaluating the instructional process and students and this program could be redesigned through the new research and findings (Instructional Program was constituted in 1943) (Altunya, 2010). Similarly, Türkođlu (2004) stated that each institution’s programs were designed and analyzed considering institutions’ characteristics, work variety and load, work tools, animals’ counts and quantity as weekly, monthly or seasonal. These programs should be designed considering the total course times. For example, while cultural courses were given in winter term, agriculture and work courses could be focused on in summer or spring terms (Sazak, 2010; Şeren, 2008). These courses and works were aimed to develop students in a sophisticated way by comprehending social, cultural and agricultural conditions of the society (Arslan, Ayyıldız, Öncül & İliker, 2004).

Şeren (2008) stated that the teachers in village institutions were in different branches and fields of interest so that this situation resulted in diversity in the instructional system. Having several fields and works in Institutions (multi-programmed education), students were canalized to the field that they were capable and talented despite having some financial problems and deficiencies. For example, Kocabaş (2010) associated activities in village institutions with types of intelligence regarding reading practices-linguistic, production activities and funds in agriculture or culture courses-logical_mathematical, artistic productions and studies (sculpture, image, painting, handmade and ornamentation)-spatial, musical instruments, folk songs and musical notes-musical, daily works, traditional dances, plays and sport activities-bodily kinesthetic, theatres, dances, cooperation activities-interpersonal, responsibilities, discussion group sessions-intrapersonal and agriculture, fishing, animal husbandry, or beekeeping-naturalistic. Therefore, these diverse courses and activities could have helped the students’ mental and intellectual development.

Şimşek (2010) stated that annual course plan was formed within 50% cultural courses, 25% technical courses (metalworking, building, joinery, weaving, handmade activities etc.) and 25% agriculture courses (farming, planting, animal husbandry, etc.) (Arslan, 2004, p. 60; Kartal, 2008, p. 86). Arif Gelen mentioned village institutions’ specific programs as “until the noon, students were given formal courses such as physics, mathematics, chemistry and after the noon, they were educated in natural environments regarding lands, barns, gardens, coops by absorbing, following, analyzing natural, vegetative and animal events and examining their interactions with each other and students themselves” (Ertuđrul, 2002, p. 123).

Şimşek (2010) mentioned the institution's programs, activities and educational branches through regulating and facilitating the learning process. He stated that half of the student groups were selected for every educational branches in order to regulate and do the activities and works (Educational branches were identified educational, cultural, social and routine activities, e.g. cooperative, education, sport, publication and journal, music, dormitory branches) and rest of the students had a class, which means students that work in educational branches during a week began to have a class in another week. For that reason, stacks were constituted in order to organize to perform the tasks and to manage the fields such as agriculture, art or sport. Organizational tasks of staffs were regulated according to their course times so that their courses, activities and tasks were organized and balanced in regular and programmed way (Kirby, 2000). Students were divided into stacks for their daily works and also, they belonged to an educational branch according to their personal interests besides their culture, agriculture and art courses (Yalçın, 2010; K. Kaya, personal communication, December 25, 2011). Every stack or student should have to solve problems by themselves. In addition, students had chances to determine and select their branches through their field of interest with their actual participation in educational branches and different works. Similarly, Kirby (2000) defined the institutions' programs respectively: waking up at 6 am, doing physical activities like playing traditional dance or walking around the institution (For example, in Akçadağ Institution, students walked around to gather some stones in order to build a power station.). After the physical activities, students had breakfast and then cleaned the classes and dormitories during one hour. Three hours for morning and afternoon session, students were distributed both for formal courses and organizational works. Between afternoon session and dinner, sports, music, literature, theatre, spectacle, choir practices, individual or group studies and activities were performed (K. Kaya, personal communication, December 25, 2011). Also, the stacks meetings and discussions about the books, articles, activities, programs, teachers and organizational problems were organized and analyzed. After the dinner, students studied individually or in groups.

Tonguç stated that students should be informed about the needs of daily life such as salt's nutritional value or usage in the industry (Türkoğlu, 2004). For example, in a chemistry course, "practical chemistry information" list showed the relationship between the daily activities and course information regarding preservative dying, lights in photography, disinfection, adhesives, agrarian struggle, and making marmalades (Türkoğlu, 2004). Similarly, in handmade artifacts course, students were supposed to sew real and needed objects such as bedcover, curtain, clothes rather than sewing on a sample clothe with sewing machines (Türkoğlu, 2004).

In physical education course, Bilir (2008) stated that physical education for first, second and third year students were formed with gymnastic and essential acts and activities in athleticism. For fourth and last year students, climbing, horse or motorcycle, bicycle, skiing, hunting, fishing, shooting, or boxing were physical activities. Four kinds of physical education activities were applied as morning gym, traditional plays, physical branches education and sports competitions. Bilir (2008) stated that physical activities would increase the students' motivation and facilitate their mental and psychological development. Also, Şanoğlu (1948) stated that sports competitions were organized through the participation of different institutions for some branches: athleticism, volleyball and basketball. The first competition was held in Hasanoğlan Institution in 1947 (Özbek, 2010), so that talented students were determined and educated as sportsman on Saturday and Sunday.

Demircan and İnandı (2008) stated that "Turkish course was divided into three parts as reading (text-based reading, leisure time reading and extracurricular reading), writing (curricular and extracurricular) and speaking (curricular and extracurricular)" (p. 5). Reading was a soothing and pleasant activity for students in village institutions and in the library approximately 4000 books were placed (Aksu & Tan, 2010). Keseroğlu (2005) stated that "students were learning to read nature, art, agriculture, farm and tree through reading activities in village institutions" (p. 32). Every student should have read at least 24-25 classics in a year (K. Kaya, personal communication, December 25, 2011; Kaştan, 2004). Students were supposed

to read a book, journal, magazine or newspaper and these documents were criticized and summarized to internalize them into significant and meaningful knowledge. (Keserođlu, 2005).

Evaluation

In village institutions, students were evaluated through their activities, works and behaviors. According to Tongu, evaluation is a tool rather than a purpose that enables to examine the students as a whole and students were evaluated according to their creative and constructive abilities in diverse educational environment rather than measurement and evaluation tools (Türkođlu, 2004). Similarly, Sönmez (1998) stated that students should be analyzed and evaluated as a whole regarding their sense of responsibility and works, relationship with their friends, abilities and attitudes (cited in Mutlu, 2010). The purpose was to direct the students to other fields rather than eliminating them with lower marks; therefore, the training courses was opened to guide and help students' problems (Türkođlu, 2004).

Applications and productions as textural and pictorial had more valuable materials than exam papers. Their book summaries, poems, village and geographic observations, collections, and working plans enabled them to see their learning and production process more clearly and comprehensibly (Türkođlu, 2004). In addition, Kirby (2000) stated that the stack system gave a chance to stack leaders to fairly observe, evaluate and encourage their students because of their intimate and consistent relationships. The students were evaluated in control and observation notebook. Teachers filled in these notebooks regarding students' behaviors and activities and then students examined these notes (Türkođlu, 2004).

Also, students were given some exams in order to pass the class or to be succeeding in a course. For example, the entrance exam for Hasanođlan High Village Institution covered students' learning, comprehension and creative thinking by writing an essay. In addition, they were evaluated at work within an expert-novice relationship (K. Kaya, personal communication, December 25, 2011). In Hasanođlan High Village Institution, the evaluation was done regarding students' behaviors and intern activities activities when they failed to succeed, they were given extra homework. In addition, the third-year students were given final project; for example, "the students were given to set up a zoo in 1946" (Türkođlu, 2004, p. 451).

Teachers and Students' Roles

Türkođlu (2004) stated that the directors of the village institutions were to prepare their settlement and plans and projects, in fact a competition was organized to select the architects in order to form the instructional environment; therefore, the organizational process gave the directors some responsibilities for determining the purposes and objectives. Including the directors in settlement and creation process made them select their colleagues and implement their ideas.

Türkođlu (2004) defined the teachers' roles as guiding, interacting, leading and working a cooperative and collaborative way with students. For example, ŐimŐek (2010) mentioned his memories in İvriz Institution regarding their teachers' attitudes and roles as that teachers behaved as their brothers, friends and they were informative, contributing and didactic rather than controlling and commanding.

Demir (2004) stated that Instructional Guides for Village Teachers were prepared to provide essential information for teachers in terms of their instructional methods, guidance and behaviors to students. This information enabled teachers to cope with instructional and students' developmental problems and attitudes. Also, teachers were free to select their method and content with flexible understanding (Ülkü, 2008) but they were supposed to implement the activities and courses according to learning by doing method. Moreover, teachers had roles working with students in the same conditions in order to come through. Therefore, in instructional technology, identifying teachers' roles is important and, in this situation, like in every step of instruction, teachers' roles have an accurate and precise definition.

Türkođlu (2004) stated that Tongu defines the teachers and students' role as equal with each other that enables to interact, learn, design and create their instructional technology

together within the work method. In village institutions, teachers worked with other students so that this situation can be considered as instructor-independent instruction (Heinich, Molenda, Russell & Smaldino, 2002). In addition, Tonguç stated that carrying out the agricultural activities in instructional process; teachers should work with students because agrarian activities were one of the primary survival and subsistence resource (Ertuğrul, 2002).

Esenoğlu (1990) stated art teachers should encourage and facilitate students by exhibiting their creations, showing different visuals and visiting museums and art galleries (cited in İmer & Uz, 2010). In addition, teachers were supposed to read books, articles, magazines exceedingly. (Başgöz, 1995). They were supposed to develop their intellectual development and to serve as a model for students. Therefore, reading and writing activities in village institutions resulted in revealing village literature by peasant intellectuals (Keseroğlu, 2005).

Students were supposed to accomplish their works and activities. They should solve their personal or working problems by themselves or other students in their stack. This situation was valid for teachers or directors because everyone had an equal position in this environment (Türkoğlu, 2004). Also, students were supposed to read books (at least 24-25 in a year), observe the environment, to be clean, responsible, self-director, democratic, powerful, to have the abilities to observe, analyze, comprehend, associate and evaluate the phenomena and events.

Teachers' and students' responsibilities, activities and works were analyzed through the discussion sessions. Teachers' attitudes, working characteristics, and responsibilities could be criticized in the review time within the students' participation twice a month (Başgöz, 1995). This situation could motivate and change the teachers' responsibility and working abilities according to students, their peers and master trainers' explanations and critiques. In addition, besides teachers, students and master trainer's works and responsibilities, organizational problems, instructional methods were criticized and solved in a democratic discussion environment. (Başgöz, 1995).

Instructional Tools

There were many instructional tools in village institutions' diverse environment with courses, activities and applications. "Technological tools such as a bicycle, motorcycle, farm vehicles, truck, and sewing machine enable students to use and learn them within the work" (Türkoğlu, 2004, p. 237). For example, an amplifier, speakers for working areas and western music records were provided and used for playing a song while working and applied for reciting a poem, narratives or anecdotes and singing songs (İmer & Uz, 2010).

In every institution, students should play a musical instrument (mandolin and harmonica) (Arslan, 2004) and sing their cultural and traditional songs and folk songs with these instruments in order to spread this musical culture to their students and villages in the future (Kaya, 2001). Also, these folk songs could be considered as instructional tools (Türkoğlu, 2004).

A teacher had approximately 150 devices (Kaştan, 2004). Besides these devices (e.g. maps, measuring instruments, agricultural machines or chemicals), animals, trees, structures, pools also helped their learning process. While they were building a structure, they learned mathematical length and space concepts; they discovered the region's seasonal and earth characteristic in geography course while they were planting the trees. Therefore, in every activity and experience, they reserved instructional tools from the environment.

The instructional tools regarding regional characteristic were used for the learning process. For example, Nevide Gökaydın (picture and writing teacher in Savaştepe Institution) found clay and she used it as an instructional tool because she explained the clay's benefits for students enabling to work the brain and feeding their creative abilities. For example, she made students write Atatürk's statements on the walls with clay and they hold an exhibition for their creations with clay (İmer & Uz, 2010).

Instructional Environment

Türkođlu (2004) stated that Tongu's work instruction, "a philosophy unifying the real-life settings with educational science, combines and collates the individual's education, creation, production and individual's interaction within the real-life settings". (p. 175). Also, Tongu explained his education perception clearly as the individuals should be educated in a convenient and natural environment (Bařgöz, 1995). Tongu explained his perception about an instructional environment that "the reason for the great difference between schools and workplaces is that schools do not appreciate the cultivating role of work and have not been able to embrace all members in society yet" (Özsoy, 2011, p. 263).

Every village institution was established in a wide area with its farm, barn, and places for physical activities, libraries, or gardens. Also, institutions' buildings such as dormitories, dining halls, libraries, sports and playing areas were constituted in wide (for example, ifteler, Akadađ and Pamukpınar respectively had 5000, 3000 and 4000 decare land), and natural environment in public lands (Bařgöz, 1995). Tongu stated that "the courses such as mathematics, biology, chemistry should be designed and taught within the work method between this environmental atmosphere with field, gardens, barns, animals and crops" (Türkođlu, 2004, p. 217). Similarly, Kanalıcı (2010) stated that "cultural courses were required to give in the farm, garden, near the sea or lake, historical artifacts, power station or during repairing a motor" (p. 527). For example, Türkođlu (2004) stated that they were doing their history courses in historical places as Perga that they found a tomb during excavation. In addition, some group of students in Gönen Institution participated in excavation works within Őevket Aziz Kansu's team so that they had a chance to examine the historical structures and villages around them. Therefore, the courses and activities were determined to be applied in these places in convenient weather conditions and characteristics of environment.

Türkođlu (2004) stated that instructional environment was designed according to the environmental and regional characteristics. For example, fishing in Beřikdüzü (Trabzon) and Arifiye Village Institutions, animal husbandry in Cılavuz (Kars) Village Institution and apricot gardening in Akadađ (Malatya) were preceding activities. For example, in the interview with Kadir Kaya (2011) who was a village institute alumnus explained his institution's (Düzici Institution) agricultural and economic activities that they created their apricot vineyard and they produced their food and sold them to villages. Also, they obtained timber from their forest by carrying them on a strain. Therefore, each institution created their self-sufficient system and they helped the villages or society's economic system. The dormitories for fifty or hundred students, working room, library, dining hall, farm, garden, coop, laboratories, and some rooms for cultural and artistic activities were designed and built for students' different works, activities and courses. For example, in Düzici Institution, the fishing cooperation was established and they both supported their need for fish and also regulate the market and earned their own money by selling their fish cheaply for villages (Bařgöz, 1995).

Summary

In this paper, the Village Institutions were analyzed and interpreted through the aspect of instructional technology. Their unique mission, organization and instructional method, environment and course designs showed that Village Institutions created their theory with unique purposes, facts and resources. Their education philosophy and applications were very different from the educational system in nowadays. Learning within work was implemented successfully in those years as we cannot provide such a significant implication nowadays. While strategies and methods such as active learning and cooperative learning were common strategies in 1940's and nowadays, their outcomes differentiated in these institutions. The students needed to apply their strategies/policies and information given by the institutions when they went to their villages after they graduated from the institutions. As a matter of fact, while the contemporary instructional methods of strategies related with the cooperative learning and learning by doing (or similar approach as situated learning) aimed to use the information in the

real world, these acts could not be possibly visible. However, village institutions act provided more visible outcomes for the students' learning and activities.

The instructional environment in village institutions was diverse rather than the schools now. They had real laboratories and environment to apply the information in different areas like manufacturing, building, farming, etc. The students were also encouraged by various cultural and social activities. Also, the courses and organizational problems were carefully analyzed and they were shaped according to the outcomes. Moreover, the perspectives of students and teachers' roles were significant. They were both considered as equal and responsible. Therefore, these institutions were designed as a whole living mechanism which mainly focused on the development of the children in different aspects of life.

The mission, structure and policy in Village Institutions were successfully held and they provided an educational reform in Turkey. The primary success of this movement was to critically analyze the current problems in the country and to assemble the economic and educational approaches to improve the development of the country through this direction. The second success was to define the group of people who were in the non-educated group and to establish the institutes in rural areas. The third success was the flexible curriculum which shaped by the regions' expectations, needs and resources. Beside these applications, diverse cultural, social, technical courses enabled children to transform the knowledge through the children to peasants. This success story could provide a path for the contemporary educational approaches. As the proportion of educated people has increased in years, the quality of the education is still a matter of debate. First, the educational purposes could be reshaped by the contemporary human profile that can be adaptable to new cultural, social, technological knowledge, ability and technology. Second, the curriculum could be redesigned to educate people to critically observe, investigate, analyze and evaluate the events, situations or problems. In Village Institutions, learning within work was successfully unified the work (the problems in the villages) with instructional purposes so that the current curriculum should point the knowledge and information for real-life and its problems. Third, the curriculum could be redesigned to encourage educators as being flexible and creative for the situations and context in their environments. Also, the quality of educators and their roles in education could be evaluated as successful and qualified educators.

To conclude, in the short term (within the educator training course project: 1935-1946), 17.000 teachers graduated and affected the educational system through many years. This movement has still been discussed on how to reshape and improve the current education system based on its mission, applications and features.

References

- Açıkğöz, K. Ü. (1992). *İşbirlikli öğrenme teknikleri [Collaborative learning technics]*. Malatya: Uğurel Matbaası.
- Akçam, A. (2010). Anadolu rönesansı'nda Köy Enstitüleri [Village Institutions in Anatolian renaissance]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 286-311). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Aksu, M. B., & Tan, O. (2010). Köy Enstitülerinde demokrasi eğitimi ve liderlik [Democracy education and leadership in Village Institutions]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 488-501). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Altunya, N. (2010). Köy Enstitüsü sistemine genel bir bakış [An overview of Village Institutions system]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 343-368). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Apaydın, Ç., & Sönmez, M. A. (2004). Köy Enstitülerinde "yaparken öğrenme" ["Learning by doing" in Village Institutions]. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 46-51.

- Arslan M. (2004). Cumhuriyet donemi aydınlanma hareketi ve Koy Enstituleri [Republic period enlightenment act and Village Institutions]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 57-66.
- Arslan, H., Ayyıldız, ., ncl, H., & İlker, M. (2004). Toplumun yeniden inřaası: Koy Enstituleri [Society rebuilt: Village Institutions]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 31-35.
- Aydođan, K. (2004). Arifiye Koy Enstitüsü [Arifiye Village Institution]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 67-72.
- Başaran, M. (2001). Koy Enstituleri ve halkbilimi [Village Institutions and folklore]. *İ Folklor/Edebiyat*, 28(4).
- Başgoz, İ. (1995). *Turkiye'nin eđitim ıkılmazı ve Ataturk* [Turkish education dilemma and Ataturk]. Ankara: Bařbakanlık Basımevi.
- Bařtınar, A. İ., & Parlakyıldız, A. (2010). Koy Enstituleri eđitim programında etkin đrenme yonteminin izleri [Efficient learning method tracks in Village Institutions' education programme]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Koy Enstituleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 420-433). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Bilir, P. (2008). Yeni beden eđitimi đretim programı ve Koy Enstitulerinde beden eđitimi derslerinin yapılandırılmacı đretim yaklařımı aısından deđerlendirilmesi [The new physical education curriculum and the evaluation of physical education courses in Village Institutions regarding constructivist approach]. *Sportmetre Beden Eđitimi ve Spor Dergisi*, 6(3), 145-150.
- Binbařođlu, C. (1995). *Turkiye'de eđitim bilimleri tarihi* [Educational science history in Turkey]. Ankara: Milli Eđitim Bakanlıđı Yayınları.
- Cucelođlu, D. (2008). *Korku kulturu: Niin 'miř gibi' yařıyoruz?* [Horror culture: Why we live like "as if"?]. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- okgurses, A., & Arık, E. (2010). Kastamonu Golkoy Enstitüsü zelinden Koy Enstitüsü sistemine bir bakıř [An overview of Village Institutions system regarding Kastamonu Golkoy institution]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Koy Enstituleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 122-136). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Dale, E. (1946). *The "cone of experience", audio visual method in teaching*. NY: Dryden Press.
- Demir, A. (2004). Koy Enstituleri deneyiminden gunumuz eđitim-đretimi iin ıkarımlar [Inferences for current education system by Village Institutions experience]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 43-45.
- Demircan, C., & İnandı, Y. (2008). Koy Enstituleri programlarında anadilinin nemi ve Turke eđitimi [Importance of mother tongue in Village Institutions curriculum and Turkish language education]. *Mersin niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 1-13.
- Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü. (1973). *Turkiye'de toplumsal ve ekonomik geliřmenin 50. yılı* [50 years of social and economic development in Turkey]. Ankara: D.İ.E. Yayınları.
- Dundar, C. (2006). *Koy Enstituleri* [Village Institutions]. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Erdem, A. R., Kıran, H., & Kırmızı, F. S. (2011). Koy Enstituleri mezunlarının đretmen yeterliklerine iliřkin nitel bir arařtırma [A qualitative research of Village Institution graduates' teaching qualifications]. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(1), 477-489.
- Ersoy, O. (1991). Gezici kutüphaneler I-II [Mobile library I-II]. In Keserođlu, H. S. (Ed.), *Mustafa Guzelgoz ve eřekli kutüphane*. İstanbul: Turk Kutüphaneeciler Derneđi.
- Ertuđrul, F. (2002). *Koy Enstituleri sistemi ve duřundurdukleri* [Village Institution system and its results] (2nd ed.). Ankara: Guldikeni Yayınları.
- Esenođlu, N. (1990). *Resim-İř đretmeni Nasıl Geliřtirilebilir? Orta đretim Kurumlarında Resim-İř đretimi ve Sorunları* [How can art/craft teacher be developed? Art-craft education and problems in secondary education institutions], 10-11 Mayıs. Paper presented at the Turk Eđitim Derneđi VIII đretim Toplantısı, Ankara.

- Göktaş, Y., Temur, N., Kocaman, A. & Çağiltay, K. (2009). Öğretim teknolojilerinin Osmanlı İmparatorluğu dönemindeki tarihsel gelişimi [Historical improvement of instructional technology in Ottoman Empire period]. *Gazi Üniversitesi Endüstriyel Sanatlar Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24, 81-92.
- Heinich, R., Molenda, M., Russell, J. D., & Smaldino, S. E. (2002). *Instructional media and technologies for learning* (7th ed.). NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- İmer, Z., & Uz, A. (2010). Köy Enstitülerinde verilen sanat-görsel sanatlar ve iş eğitimi günümüz sanat eğitimi çerçevesinden bakmak [Looking of art/visual art and craft education in Village Institutions through current art education]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 656-677). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Kanalıcı, Z. (2010). Köy Enstitülerinde iş eğitimi [Craft education in Village Institutions]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 527-541). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. A., (1998). The village institutes experience in Turkey. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 25(1), 47-73.
- Kartal, S. (2008). Toplum kalkınmasında farklı bir eğitim kurumu: Köy Enstitüleri [A different institution in community development: Village Institutions]. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 23-36.
- Kaştan, Y. (2004). Aydınlanmada Köy Enstitülerinin yeri [The place of Village Institutions in enlightenment]. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 22-30.
- Kaya, Y. (2001). *Köy Enstitüleri: "Antigone'den Mızraklı İlmihal'e"* [From Antigone to Mızraklı İlmihal] (2nd ed.). İstanbul: Tıglat Matbaacılık A.Ş.
- Keser, U. (2010). Hasanoğlan, Savaştepe, Kızılçullu Köy Enstitüleri bağlamında enstitülü çocukların köy incelemeleri, halkbilim, kültür ve sanat çalışmalarına kesitsel bir bakış [Village Institutions' students' village investigation, folklore, culture and art studies from the context of Hasanoğlan, Savaştepe, Kızılçullu Village Institutions]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 638-655). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Keseroğlu, H. S. (2005). Köy Enstitülerinde okuma ve kütüphane [Reading and library in Village Institutions]. *Türk Kütüphaneciliği*, 19(1), 25-40.
- Kirby, F. (2000). *Türkiye'de Köy Enstitüleri [Village Institutions in Turkey]* (2nd ed.). Ankara: Güldiken Yayınları.
- Kocabaş, A. (2010). Köy Enstitülü öğretmenlerin, şimdiki öğretmenlerin ve sınıf öğretmenliği öğretmen adaylarının çoklu zeka düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması [Comparison of multiple intelligence levels of teaching candidates in Village Institutions, current education institutions and classroom teachers]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 440-451). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Mutlu, A. (2010). Köy Enstitüsü eğitim sistemi çevre eğitimi için model olabilir mi? [Could Village Institutions' education system be a model for environment education?]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 400-419). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Özbek, O. (2010). Köy Enstitülerinde beden eğitimi ve spor [Physical education and sports in Village Institutions]. In H. Biçicioğlu, B. Gülsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Değişim Projesi Olarak Köy Enstitüleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 739-747). İstanbul: Çapa Matbaacılık.
- Özdemir, O. (2004). Türk eğitim tarihinde aydınlanma ile coşumculuğu birleştiren kurumlar: Köy Enstitüleri [The institutions that combine the enlightenment and the romanticism in

- the Turkish education history: Village Institutions]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 52-56.
- zsoy, S. (2011). A utopian educator from Turkey: İsmail Hakkı Tongu (1893-1960). *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 7(2), 250-278.
- Polat, S., & Ođuz, K. (2010). İsmail Hakkı Tongu ve Ky Enstitleri [İsmail Hakkı Tongu and Village Institutions]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Ky Enstitleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 93-101). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Salman, A. (2010). Tongu ve Ky Enstitleri [Tongu and Village Institutions]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Ky Enstitleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 53-70). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Sazak, M. (2010). Ky Enstitlerinin evreleri [Village Institutions' phases]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Ky Enstitleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 208-224). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Seels, B. & Richey, R. C. (1994). *Instructional technology: the definition and domains of the field*. Washington DC: Association for Educational Communications and Technology.
- Snmez, V. (1998). *Eđitim felsefesi [Educational Philosophy]* (5th ed.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Şahhseyinođlu, H. N. (1993). Ky Enstitleri: 53. yıl; nereden nereye [Village Institutions: 53rd year; from whence to where]. *đretmen Dnyası*, 160, 19-20.
- Şanođlu, S. (1948). *Ky Enstitleri spor yarışmaları [Village Institutions' sports competitions]*. Ankara: Hasanođlan Ky Enstits Yayınları.
- Şeren, M. (2008). Kye đretmen yetiştirme yntyle Ky Enstitleri [Village Institutions for raising teacher for village]. *Gazi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 28(1), 203-226.
- Şimşek, İ. (2010). *Neden Ky Enstitleri (Atatrk'n đretmenleri) [Why Village Institutions? (Atatrk's teachers)]*. İstanbul: zgr Yayınları.
- Tongu, E. (1962). Dnn ve yarının Ky Enstitleri [Village Institutions for yesterday and tomorrow]. *Yn Dergisi*, 38.
- Tongu, E. (1970). *Devrim aısından Ky Enstitleri ve Tongu [Village Institutions by revolution and Tongu]*. İstanbul: Ant Yayınları.
- Tuncel, G., & ztrk, C. (2004). Ky Enstitleri modelinin eđitim felsefesi zerine bir deđerlendirme [An evaluation of educational philosophy in model of Village Institutions]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 36-42.
- Trkođlu, P. (2004). *Tongu ve enstitleri [Tongu and his institutions]* (2nd ed.). İstanbul: İř Bankası Kltr Yayınları.
- Uygun, S. (2004). Szl tanıkların dilinden Ky Enstitlerinde okul atmosferi [School atmosphere in Village Institutions from the words of eyewitnesses]. *ukurova niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 2(26), 1-16.
- Uygun, S. (2010). M. Emin Soysal'ın hayatı ve Ky Enstitleri tarihindeki yeri [The life of M. Emin Soysal and his place in the Village Institutions' history]. *Milli Eđitim Dergisi*, 185.
- lk, C. (2008). Sanat eđitimi, sanat ve Ky Enstitleri [Art education, art and Village Institutions]. *Mersin niversitesi Eđitim Fakltesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 37-45.
- Yalın, G. (2010). Ky Enstitleri orta kısım ve yksek kısım da demokrasi eđitimi (Democracy education in secondary and high school education in Village Institutions]. In H. Biiciođlu, B. Glsoy, & H. Hancı (Eds.), *Kuruluşunun 70. Yılında Bir Toplumsal Deđişim Projesi Olarak Ky Enstitleri Sempozyumu* (pp. 322-342). İstanbul: apa Matbaacılık.
- Yıldız, G. (2005). Gzel sanatlar eđitimi ve Ky Enstitleri [Fine arts education and Village Institutions]. *Yeniden İmece*, 4, 46-48.

Uzun Öz

Türkiye’de 1940-1954 yılları arasında faaliyet gösteren Köy Enstitüleri hareketi, o zamandan bu yana ülkenin eğitsel, sosyal ve politik uygulamalarını etkilemiştir. Hareketin başlangıcı 1940 yılından daha öncelere dayansa da, 14 yıllık süreçteki yaklaşımıyla eğitim alanına getirdiği yeni uygulamaların yanısıra, köylerdeki kültürel ve sosyo ekonomik uygulamalara getirdiği yenilikçi ve uygulama bazlı çözümler ile günümüz araştırmalarındaki yerini korumuştur. Bu çalışma ile Köy Enstitüleri’nin kurumsal, tarihi, kültürel, politik ve sosyal etkilerinden ziyade, eğitim alanına getirdiği yenilikleri öğretim teknolojileri bağlamında sunmak amaçlanmıştır. Bu çalışma esnasında bu konu ile ilgili yazılmış kitap, makale ve derlemelerin yanısıra Köy Enstitüsü mezunu bir öğrenci ile de görüşme yapılmıştır. Bu veriler ışığında, okullardaki eğitsel, sosyal ve kültürel faaliyetler öğretim teknolojisi çerçevesinden değerlendirilmiştir.

1940 yılında resmi olarak eğitime başlayan Köy Enstitüleri süreci aslında 1936 yılındaki denemelerden (bazı askerlerin kısa bir eğitimden sonra köylere yollanması) ve 1937-1938 yılları arasında 4 öncül enstitünün kurulması sürecini de içine almaktadır. 1946 yılına kadar kurulma aşamasında belirlenen yaklaşım ve uygulamalarla devam eden enstitülerin içeriği, politik nedenler dolayısıyla bu yıldan itibaren değişime uğramaya başlamış, 1954 yılında da tamamen kapatılmıştır.

Köy Enstitüleri’nin mimarlarından biri olan İsmail Hakkı Tonguç’un eğitsel yaklaşımı, bu okulların amaçları ve uygulamaları hakkında detaylı bilgi edinilmesinde önemli bir yere sahiptir. Özellikle, bilgilerin gerçek hayatta uygulanabilir olması yaklaşımı ile yoğrulan iş içinde öğrenme metodunu benimseyen Tonguç, aynı zamanda soyut kavramlardan çok var olan problemlere pratik çözümler getirebilmenin önemini benimsemiştir. Buradaki temel amaç, enstitülerin bulunduğu coğrafi bölgenin, köylerin ihtiyaçlarını ve problemlerini çözmeye yönelik çözümler üretebilmek ve uygulamaya koyabilmektir. Bu ihtiyaçtan yola çıkan bu yaklaşımla beraber, öğrencileri gerçek hayat deneyimlerinin ve becerilerinin artırılması amaçlanmıştır. Öğrencilerin mezun olduktan sonra kendi köylerine gittiklerinde karşılaşılabilecekleri problemleri çözmeye yardımcı olabilecek bu uygulama ile, öğrencilerin bir çok yönden problem çözme becerisi kazanması, enstitülerin amacına uygun bir yaklaşım olarak öne çıkmaktadır. Problem çözme becerisinin aynı zamanda günümüzdeki eğitsel yaklaşımlarda da benimsenen, bilginin aktif olarak kullanılması ve uygulanabilmesi felsefesine de yardımcı olduğu anlayışı bu sistemde yerinin almıştır. İş içinde öğrenmenin özellikle gözlemlenebildiği alanlardan olan matematiğin bina yapımında veya tarım faaliyetlerinde kullanılması, su kanallarının oluşturulması ve elektrik sağlanması gibi uygulamalar bunlardan birkaçıdır. Bölgesel problemleri azaltma yaklaşımının yanısıra verilen derslerle beraber öğrencilerin buldukları ortamların kültürel ve sosyal yapısına da etkili olabilmeleri amaçlanmıştır. Mezun olduktan sonra gidilen köylerdeki fiziksel faaliyetlerin yanısıra kültürel faaliyetler ve aktivitelerin canlandırılması ve öğrencilerin eğitiminin tamamlanması da bu yaklaşımın sadece enstitülerde okuyan öğrencileri değil, ülke genelindeki bölgelerde yaşayan bireyleri etkileyebileceği öne sürülmüştür.

Temel olarak faydalanılan öğretim metodu ile, tüm derslerde uygulanmak suretiyle öğrencilerin yeteneklerini arttırabilmek amaçlanmıştır. Okullarda verilen dersler temel olarak iki kısma ayrılmış olup ilk kısım öğretimsel dersler ikinci kısım ise yapılacak fiziksel işlerle ilgili olan derslerden oluşmaktadır. Bu derslerin sıralaması haftalık olup her bir grup haftalık olarak farklı derslere yönlendirilmektedir. Her bir okul bulunduğu coğrafi ve kültürel ortamın ihtiyaçlarına göre programını belirleyebilmektedir. Örneğin, Sapanca Gölü’ne yakın olan Arifiye Enstitüsü’nde balıkçılık öne çıkarken, Malatya da bulunan Akçadağ Enstitüsü’nde kayısı yetiştiriciliği ön plandadır. Buldukları coğrafi konum ve olanakların yetersizliği nedeniyle bazı aktivitelerde geri kalan okullara ise diğer okullardan yardım yapılmaktadır. Geniş bir çeşitlilikte sunulan dersler öğrencilerin kültürel ve sosyal amaçla gelişimlerini sağlamak amacıyla tasarlanmış olup öğrencilerin bu kültürü de gittikleri yerlerde yayabilmeleri amaçlanmıştır. Çeşitli aktiviteler ile desteklenen dersler (Örneğin fiziksel aktivite dersinde 4 farklı aktivitenin uygulanması, müzik dersi kapsamında en az bir müzik aletinin çalınması, Türkçe dersinde yılda 24-25 kitap okunması, dans dersleri kapsamında farklı kültürel dansların

öđretilmesi gibi). Dersler kapsamında sunulan aletlerin olabildiđinde eřitli olduđu okullarda öđrencilerin aynı zamanda kendi alatlerinin yapımı da öđretilmiřtir. Öđrencilerin bu derslerden alacakları notlar da, öđrencilerin derslerdeki fiziksel aktivitelerdeki performansına ve davranıřlarına göre deđerlendirilmiřtir.

Birok okulun fiziksel ortamları da öđrenci öđretmen iřbirliđi ile yapılmıřtır. Örneđin Hasanođlan Yüksek Köy Enstitüsü'nün kurulması diđer enstitülerden gelen öđrencilerin ortak alıřması sonucunda ortaya ıkmıřtır. Bu iřbirliđi imece denilen ortak alıřma mantıđı benimsenerek tüm uygulamalarda öne ıkmıřtır. Öđrencilerin kendi arasında ve öđretmenlerle iřbirliđi içinde olan alıřmaları okullardaki çođu uygulamada ön plana ıkmıřtır. Bunun yanısıra öđrenci ile öđretmen arasındaki iletiřim ve dayanıřma dikkat ekicidir. Öđretmenlerin nasıl davranabileceklerine dair hazırlanan kılavuzda da öđretmenlerin öđrencilerin problem özme sürecinde yol gösterici olmaları ve iřbirlikli öđrenmeyi destekler nitelikte davranılabileceđi ile ilgili öneriler sunulmaktadır. Aynı zamanda öđretmenlerin de kültürel ve sosyal becerilerinin geliřtirilmesi ve öđrencilerin bu duruma uygun yetiřtirilebilmesi için öneriler de sunulmuřtur.

Teoride uygulanabilir ama pratikte uygulamada zorlanılan bilginin gerek hayatta kullanılabilir olması felsefesinden yola ıkan Köy Enstitüleri hareketi, ortaya ıktıđı dönem ve getirdiđi yeni bakıř açısı sayesinde öđretimsel yaklařımların uygulanabilir olduđunun altını izmektedir. Türkiye'de o dönemdeki sosyo-kültürel, ekonomik ve politik problemlerin etkili bir řekilde özöme kavuřturulması amacıyla ortaya ıkan bu uygulama, aynı zamanda eđitsel alandaki yenilikleri ile de göz önünde olmuřtur. Enstitülerin bulunduđu cođrafı bölgelerin kalkındırılması amalanırken bir yandan da öđrenciler vasıtasıyla verilen eđitimin geniř apta yayılabilmesi ve aktarılabilmesi amalanmıřtır. Eđitim perspektifinden bakıldıđında ise, iřbirlikli öđrenme, iř içinde öđrenme, probleme dayalı öđrenme metodlarının harmanlandıđı bu uygulama ile, günümüz eđitim sistemine yönelik geliřtirilebilecek yeni uygulamalar ve yaklařımların ortaya ıkabileceđi de önerilmektedir.