

TURKEY'S CURRICULA FROM 2005 TO 2020 GENDER EQUALITY AND SECULARISM

REPORT SUMMARY

Dr. Sezen Bayhan



Karşılaştırmalı
Eğitim Derneği

Turkey's Curricula from 2005 to 2020
Gender Equality and Secularism
Report Summary

Author: Dr. Sezen Bayhan



Editing and proofreading: Dr. Canan Aratemur-Çimen

Design: Serbest Kitaplar (www.serbestkitaplar.com)



**FRIEDRICH NAUMANN
FOUNDATION** For Freedom.
Turkey

The research described in this report was conducted by Comparative Education Society in Turkey and published and funded by Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom Turkey. The foundation is not responsible for the content of this publication, or for any use that may be made of it. The views expressed herein are those of the author alone.



**Karşılaştırmalı
Eğitim Derneği**

Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim Derneği

www.ked.info.tr

ked@ked.info.tr

CONTENTS



1	INTRODUCTION
2	METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH
3	FINDINGS
3	Elimination of the Acquisitions on Women's Rights
3	The Exclusionary Notion of Culture
6	Relativity of Law
7	Islamic Notion of Science
7	Acquisitions on Secularism
8	Emphasis on Religion as an Organising Power
9	Gender and Gender Equality
10	CONCLUSION
13	REFERENCES



INTRODUCTION

Various changes have taken place over the past fifteen years in the Turkish education system. Among them, the changes in the school curricular programs in 2017 and 2018 have been one of the most important. Most changes in the education system become effective when they are incorporated into the curricular programs, which include objectives, principles developed to attain these objectives and methods to be utilised (Gözütok, 2003). Hence, changes in the curricular programs bear the potential to provide deep insights into the transformation occurring in the education system.

Turkey's Ministry of National Education (MoNE) introduced a set of new curricular programs in 2017, stating that the distinctive character of the new curriculum was its focus on values, and made amendments to some of the programs in 2018. Unlike what happened during the previous curricular reform process resulting in the introduction of what was called the constructivist curriculum in 2005, the 2017 curricula were introduced without discrediting or discarding the previous approaches that were in effect. Before the 2005 curriculum reform was introduced, official authorities had criticised the curricula of the time for being mechanical, fostering rote-learning, and failing to

adequately take into account student perspectives and individual differences (MoNE Life Knowledge Curricular Program, 2005). It was promised by the then Minister of Education, who also stated that the curricula had to be aligned with the European Union standards, that the new curriculum would be student-centred and emancipate students from rote-learning (see Çelik, 2004). The introduction of 2017 Curriculum, on the other hand, did not involve discrediting or scandalising the previous approaches. However, the guiding principles and pedagogical approaches governing the new curriculum have not been made explicit (Diker Coşkun, 2017, s.7). The most explicit information provided by the official authorities regarding the distinctive characteristics and novelty of the new curriculum is that the curriculum is centred on the notion of values. The Board of Training and Education expressed this as follows: "Different from the previous curricula, values and value education constitute the locus of the new curriculum" (Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı, 2017, p.7). The particular approach adopted by curriculum developers is in part rooted in how they define the problem to which they are addressing; hence the curricular emphasis placed on values emerges as a significant topic deserving research scrutiny. (Posner, 2004). Despite the stated emphasis of the



2017 curriculum on values, Diker Coşkun (2017) states that the new curricular programs fail to include a vision that is intended to promote gender equality and to create a culture of peaceful co-existence (p. 3). In addition, an increasingly voiced concern in relation to the education system in Turkey has been the violation of basic human rights such as freedom of belief (Norwegian Helsinki Committee, 2015, 2019). In the face of escalating concerns over freedom of belief as a human right and the perpetuation of problems rooted in gender inequalities, this research project aimed to address the lack of comparative studies focusing on the way issues related to gender equality and freedom of belief are dealt with by the curricular programs.

METHODOLOGY AND SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

This study aims to carry out a comparative analysis of the curricular programs published in 2005, 2015 and 2018¹ focusing on whether the pro-

grams differ in the way they approach gender equality and secularism. Comparing various versions of a particular document helps the researcher to identify change and development in a particular institution (Bowen, 2009). The selection of the above mentioned three curricular periods was informed by the assumption that each of them corresponds to an important period in the education system. This assumption was formed on the basis of review of literature and education policy discourses. 2005 curriculum, declared as a reform aiming to replace the dominant behaviourist approach to teaching and learning with a constructivist one, was introduced shortly after the Justice and Development Party came to power as the single ruling party. The European Union (EU) membership process of Turkey seemed to constitute an important part of the policy agenda of the time². 2015 curricular programs are assumed to represent the period initiated by Law no 6287, when primary school education was transformed to an intermittent 4+4 model in 2012 from the formerly 8-year uninterrupted one. 2018 curricular programs, which are currently in use and are

1 The publication date of the curricular programs for different grade levels and subjects are varied; hence not all the texts scrutinised within the scope of this research exactly correspond to the mentioned three years (2005, 2015, 2018). Detailed information related to curricular texts is provided in the footnotes throughout the report as well as

in the Appendice section of the report.

2 However, this research cautions against readily accepting the claims that 2005 curricular reform process was mainly guided by the constructivist approaches and EU membership process.



thought to represent the period initiated by 2017 Curriculum, which was defined by the Board of Training and Education as being value centred. The subjects whose curricular texts have been analysed are Life Knowledge, Social Studies, Turkish Language, History, and History of Turkish Republic and Atatürkism (hereafter HTR). The research deployed the tools offered by Critical Discourse Analysis, which is an interdisciplinary approach to textual analysis and helps to analyse social character of texts and takes a particular interest in revealing structures of power (Wodak & Meyer, 2016).

FINDINGS

While the curricular programs of the three periods under discussion are characterised by continuities, they display a number of differences in terms of the way they deal with the concepts of gender equality and secularism.

Elimination of the Acquisitions on Women's Rights

While 2005 Curriculum, 2005 Social Studies Curriculum³ in particular, in-

³ 2005 Social Studies curricular program for grades 4 and 5 was published as a single document in 2005. Grade 6 Social Studies program analysed in this research was published in 2006. The researcher utilized the electronic version of the Grade 7 curricular program of

cludes acquisitions on women's rights in Turkey, 2015 and 2018 curricular texts do not include acquisitions of a similar sort. 2005 Social Studies Curriculum includes these acquisitions mostly in the context of Atatürkism and deals with the historical development of women's rights in Turkey as a process largely initiated and promoted by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk. Although the acquisitions treat women's rights as a desirable concept, women's contribution to this process of gaining rights is not acknowledged and the role of women is reduced to, as Kandiyoti (1991) puts it, "passive onlookers" (p. 38). Complexities of women's relationships with nationalist movements have often been silenced in history books and other media (Enloe, 2014). However, removal of the acquisitions on women's rights means removal of discussions on the issue as well as the eviction of a vision that treats women's rights as a positive concept, which needs to be seen as a policy choice considering that various alternative ways of incorporating the issue of women's rights into the curricula are possible.

The Exclusionary Notion of Culture

All the curricular programs analysed in this study place special emphasis on the acquisitions related to culture.

the same subject, which was published in 2005.



Social Studies and Turkish Language curricula allocate to culture specific sections, which are called learning areas and themes respectively (similar to units). While the Social Studies curricula of all the periods are far from defining a pluralistic notion of culture, a detailed analysis of the programs shows that the conceptualisation of culture in 2018 curricula is more exclusionary and monolithic. 2015 and 2018 curricula emphasize the aspects of culture that differentiate a society from the others. 2005 Curriculum also mentions this aspect of culture but attenuates the sharp borders drawn around culture by including the idea that cultural properties add colour to world's cultural heritage. On the one hand, 2005 and 2018 Social Studies curricula have a lot in common in the learning area on culture since both are characterised by their emphasis on Turkish nationalism. On the other hand, 2005 Curriculum situates itself on a more balanced position as it covers in this learning area acquisitions on women's rights, secularism, and freedom of religion and conscience. Although 2005 Curriculum presents these acquisitions predominantly in the context of nation state building, compared to 2018 Social Studies Curriculum it fends off to a certain extent the negative implications that its exclusionary conceptualisation of culture would hold for gender equality

and rights related to freedom of belief. Exclusionary conceptualisation of culture in 2018 Social Studies Curriculum is also manifest in the learning area "Global Connections", which includes the following acquisition: "[Students] are made aware of how components that do not belong to our culture affect via media instruments the life of the society" (2018, s. 22).

The theme on culture is named differently in the Turkish Language curricular programs⁴, which is telling for the way culture is dealt with. Whereas the theme is entitled "National Culture" in the 2005 curriculum, it is entitled "Our National Culture" in the 2015 and 2019 curricular texts. According to Copeaux (2002), the use of possessive pronouns as "our" in educational discourse is a strong marker of identity and can be exclusive in a discourse on religion: "a non-believer, a secularist or a believer of another faith feels ousted from the community created by such linguistic modalities" (p. 302).

Another difference between the curricula in terms of culture is that the term jihad is included in the 2018 Social Studies Curriculum while it does not exist in the curricula of the pre-

⁴ Turkish language curricula analysed are dated 2005 for grades 1-5 of the first period and 2006 for grades 6-8 of the same period. The curricula of the other periods are dated 2015 and 2019.



vious periods. The learning area entitled “Culture and Heritage” includes the following sentence: “Emphasis is placed on the understanding of ghaza and jihad, *istimalet* policy and the *millet* system” (p. 23). Both *istimalet* and the *millet system*, the terms that are not included in the Social Studies curricula of the previous years, have to do with the organisation of the society along with religious lines. While the textbooks define *istimalet* as the Islamisation of the newly occupied lands, *millet system* is referred to as the organisation and governing of the population in accordance with religious affiliation (See Aratemur-Çimen & Bayhan, 2019). The relevance of these terms lies less in their religious connotations than in their contributing to a more exclusionary conceptualisation of culture.

Relying on the scholarship on culture and identity, it can be claimed that the relatively exclusionary and totalising approach to culture displayed by the 2018 Curriculum has a number of implications for gender equality and freedom of belief and conscience. Assumptions about cultural specificities may result in an unwillingness to reveal political mechanisms that strengthen certain practices under the rubric of culture (Altan-Olcay, 2015) and can pose risks to the protection of universal human rights (Zubaida, 2015). Moreover, the “cultural oth-

er”, who fails to belong to the myth of common origin, is seen as a stranger threatening the cultural purity and authenticity (Yuval-Davis, 1997). Wobbe (1995) points out that the sharp collectivity boundaries between “us” and “them” also signify the boundaries of social obligations and norms, which can help explain racist violence and violence against women. Lacking social obligation towards the “other”, according to Wobbe, implies the freedom to violate and attack the other.

Confining the issue of women's rights to the domain of culture during the nation-building process and seeing women as the origins and carriers of culture have resulted in unequal rights for men and women (Yuval-Davis, 1997). To give an example, at the beginning of the 20th century, proponents of women's rights and freedoms sought to legitimise them through a “modernist” interpretation of Islam whereas conservatives rejected them arguing that their acceptance was submission to Western cultural imperialism (Kandiyoti, 1996, p. 95). In the current conflicts over women's rights and rights related to gender identity, value-laden concepts such as family, culture, and religion are given as reference points that legitimise inequalities.



Relativity of Law

2015 History⁵ Curriculum presents a completely relativistic understanding of law devoid of particular shared universal values. While it is known that legal systems and practices are closely linked to power relations, the relativistic approach of 2015 History Curriculum is at odds with the non-critical and top-down understanding of history maintained throughout the curriculum. 2007-2008 History curricula do not include such an understanding of law whereas 2018 History Curriculum includes only a few statements that imply the relativity of law. 2015 Curriculum includes the aim of helping the students “understand that legal systems that might appear different in fact seek to preserve the same values (p. 27), without mentioning what these values are.

Presenting an understanding of law as a completely relative construct, without any mention of certain universal principles developed as a result of extensive consensus, might have negative implications for basic

women's rights guaranteed by legal systems that adhere to the principle of equal citizenship. For example, today women's equal access to property is guaranteed by international laws while discriminative laws and patriarchal traditions, customs, and practices act as barriers hindering women's equal access to their rights (Benschop, 2004). Similarly, cultural practices and beliefs might include principles that discriminate against women in the realm of marriage or sexual rights (Maluleke, 2012). It is seen that discrimination against women is more pronounced in countries where religion is the source of legislation (Gouda & Potrafke, 2016). An approach that reduces the function of law to preserving values fails to see the gender-based inequalities created by legal systems rooted in traditions.

The question as to the curriculum should be making normative judgments about the meaning and function of law or other political constructs is a contentious one. According to Seixas (2004), when curriculum applications are under discussion, scholars must undertake the burden of normative judgments because promoting an open and democratic society requires certain value commitments with regard to historical consciousness.

⁵ Grade 9 History Curriculum for the first period is dated 2007 while Grade 10 curriculum of the same subject is dated 2008. When referring to the two together, the expression 2007-2008 History curricula is used. The publication year of the History curricula for the second and 3rd period are 2015 and 2018 respectively.



Islamic Notion of Science

Islamic notion of science is foregrounded in the History curricula of 2015 and 2018 while no such concept exists in the 2007-2008 curricula of the subject. A distinction is drawn in 2015 Curriculum between “religious sciences” (*dini/nakli ilimler*) and “intellectual and philosophical sciences” (*akli ve felsefi ilimler*) (p. 43). Also an acquisition is included with the aim of enabling students to distinguish between “positivist understanding of science” and “pre-modern (*kadim*) understanding of science” (p. 52). 2018 History curriculum also allocates a considerable space to Islamic understanding of science and emphasizes the distinction between “religious (nakli) and intellectual (akli) sciences” (p. 27) whereas 2007-2008 History curricula do not include an Islamic understanding of science at all. The way 2015 and 2018 curricula draw a distinction between religious and intellectual sciences is very similar to the discourses of the Religious Culture and Morality textbooks. Also, the following acquisition in 2015 curriculum resonates with the totally relativist conceptualisation of law pervading the curriculum: “It is discussed that positivism, which was accepted as the dominant practice of doing science in XIXth century Europe and in the XIXth-century World is not the only method of science recorded in the World history

of science” (p. 53). In addition to the distinction drawn between different scientific paradigms, the production of scientific knowledge is constructed in the 2015 curriculum as a realm that is closely linked to faith. While the approaches of the 2015 and 2018 curricula to science can be made sense of in the context of historical struggles for hegemony rooted in the relationship between science and power, the implications of the changing understanding of science for science education need further exploration. During the 19th century Ottoman Empire, European influence in the scientific realm was inextricably linked to the maintenance of social order (Yalçınkaya, 2010). While the official approach to science in this period was the idea that knowledge alone would not make one virtuous (Yalçınkaya, 2010), students educated in Western missionary schools were seen to be under the risk of being led “astray” (Yalçınkaya, 2011, p.165)

Acquisitions on Secularism

Acquisitions on the principle of secularism⁶, which existed in 2005 Social Studies Curriculum, are not included in the 2015 and 2018 curricula of the same subject. These acquisitions emphasize the aspect of secularism that means being free from religious

⁶ The word *laicism* rather than *secularism* is used in the curricular texts.



pressure and provides a positive treatment of the concept of secularism by associating it with freedom of religion and conscience, democracy, and popular rule. However, concepts such as societal peace, human rights, and individual freedoms are not adequately emphasized and clarified through concrete examples while legitimising the principle of secularism. Instead, historical concepts are foregrounded and secularism tends to be legitimised with reference to Kemal Atatürk's authority. "National unity and cohesion" is another value deployed to legitimise secularism. That the acquisitions on secularism are largely placed under the learning area "Culture and Heritage" and the way they are dealt with differentiates the 2005 Social Studies Curriculum from its 2018 counterpart, to which it resembles in many respects such as the nationalist approach pervading this learning area.

Emphasis on Religion as an Organising Power

With 2015 History Curriculum, emphasis starts to be placed on the organising power of religion in social and political life. Reference to religious concepts in the explanations of the acquisitions is also discernible. While it may not be surprising to encounter such a pattern in a history curriculum, the way different curriculum

texts from different periods deal with religion is telling since, Seixas (2004) suggests, the way the past is made sense of has implications for one's understanding of the present and future.

2015 History Curriculum places a particular emphasis on religion while conceptualising the legitimisation of political power. 2018 Curriculum of the same subject is similar to 2015 in this respect, albeit with less emphasis and details. Islamisation of the annexed lands through manipulation of demographic characteristics is also accentuated in 2018 History Curriculum. Although the acquisitions related to this topic deal with the events that took place in the distant past, no attempt is made to clarify what such practices, which are unacceptable under present conditions, tell us about the present or what should be inferred from such controversial past experiences. Such a way of dealing with controversial historical practices runs the risk of acquisitions being translated into textbooks in a way that normalizes or romanticizes these practices.

Narratives on national history tend to be structured in accordance with the present and past needs of the nation (Lewis, 1975) and this process involves remembering and forgetting particular events (McCrone, 1998). Moreover, national history is reinvented through national myths and particular important events in order



to construct particular shared experiences and qualities as distinctive characteristics of a nation's identity (Nahmiyaz, 2018). Hence, the qualities and events emphasized by a history curriculum provide clues about curriculum development priorities.

Whereas 2005 Life Knowledge Curriculum emphasizes ethics in behaviour regulation, ethics is not among the topics covered in the 2015 and 2018 curricula of the same subject. In 2005 Curriculum, "behaving ethically" is given as part of the "self-regulation" skill. Also, the following acquisition involving ethical behaviour is included in the curriculum: "Observes how ethical behaviour is valued among the family members and relatives" (2005, p. 115). This acquisition is also linked to other acquisitions on family rules and duties and relationships with friends and others. Rather than ethics, 2015 and 2018 curricula place emphasis on values.

2019 Turkish Language Curriculum, which is similar to the curricula of the previous periods in many aspects, includes religious terms that are linked to behaviour regulation and given as part of recommended topics. Some of these terms, which do not exist in the 2005 and 2015 counterparts, are "haram" (forbidden by Islam), "halal" (acceptable according to Muslim law), "kul hakkı" (rights of a mortal)" (p. 15).

Gender and Gender Equality

Curricula of all the three periods are indifferent to the concepts related to gender and tend to avoid the term gender equality. Although 2005 Curriculum is the only one that includes acquisitions on women's rights and mentions gender-related social developments as one of the rationales for the curricular change, it also avoids the term gender equality. The curricular texts include such ambiguous phrases as "value attached to women" (Social Studies, 2018, p. 22), "the place of the Turkish women in our society" (Social Studies, 2005, p. 37), "the place of women in the society" (HTR, 2018, p. 2).

At a time when awareness on gender equality and gender-based rights has been raised worldwide and in Turkey, it would be reasonable to expect that 2005 Curriculum would constitute a small step forward for developing a gender-aware curriculum and the curricula of the later years would advance the preceding progressive steps. However, contrary to the expectations, 2015 Curriculum, which makes a claim to acquaint students with particular values, and 2018 Curriculum, which claims to have placed values in its core, are even behind the preceding curriculum since they removed acquisitions on women's rights.



The term “gender equality” is included only in 2019 Turkish Language curriculum, among the recommended topics in the on “Rights and Freedoms” (p. 15). There is no other mention of the term and no explanation on how “gender equality” as the recommended topic is to be dealt with in classroom context or in textbooks. Another term that accompanies “gender equality” in the same section is “gender justice”. When the dominant approach in the curriculum is taken into account, it seems highly unlikely to offer a nuanced discussion of gender justice as it is dealt with by gender theories. It would be worthwhile to remember the political and social context of gender justice discourse in Turkey. Gender justice in Turkey has recently been suggested by conservative groups as a replacement for the term gender equality (Baba, 2019; Özdek, 2016; Yarar, 2020). Conservatives supporting wider use of gender justice argue that caution needs to be taken in adopting the terms offered by modernity and recommend developing women-centred policies by taking into account the values and cultural dynamics of the society (See, Aydın Yılmaz, 2015). According to Özdek (1994), such culture-based approaches reject an understanding of universal human rights, hence women’s rights, and run the risk of legitimising gender inequalities. Gender justice approach,

which has been proposed by conservative non-governmental organisations, promotes “nature” based gendered division of labour and therefore contributes to the perpetuation of patriarchal social relationships (Özdek, 2016).

CONCLUSION

The research summarised in this report sought to carry out a comparative analysis of curricular texts belonging to the curricula of 2005, 2015, and 2018 with the aim of analysing the way they dealt with the concepts of gender equality and secularism. It can be argued that the patterns of change observed in the curricular programs align with the changing tendencies in Turkish politics.

The tendency to avoid using the term “gender equality” characterises all the curricula analysed within the scope of the research. However, the acquisitions on women’s rights that existed in 2005 Curriculum, albeit framed from a very limited perspective, have been removed from the curricula of the succeeding periods. The removal of these acquisitions can be explained to a certain extent by the changes occurring in the narration of national history but cannot be reduced to it since it would have been possible to include the issue of women’s rights by stripping it off its historically contested background and by foregrounding wom-



en's active involvement in the process of attainment of rights. Hence, the removal of the acquisitions that involve positive conceptualisation of women's rights instead of revisiting and keeping them can be seen as a policy choice made in accordance with the gender vision of the program developers and decision makers. Such a vision resonates with the currently hegemonic vision dominating Turkish policy. Women's rights and entitlements in current Turkish politics are being made an active subject of dispute at a time when young women's expectations concerning their life choices and prospects have been heightened by changing societal dynamics (Kandiyoti, 2016). However, it is worthwhile to remember that removal of women's rights from the recent curricula does not point to a smooth and linear process of transformation. Compared to the transformation of the curricula with respect to the way secularism is dealt with, the transformation of gender related issues is less conspicuous. Conflicts within the hegemonic political Islamist movement over the status of women (Yılmaz, 2015), the already-limited gender vision of the previous curricula, increasing public awareness on gender related issues, and societal transformation triggered by economic and technological developments might be among the factors contributing to this.

That 2018 Social Studies Curriculum offers a relatively more exclusionary conceptualisation of culture is also in agreement with the dominant tendencies in Turkish politics. As the ruling party turned in 2011 to authoritarian oppositional politics built on the binary of "us" versus "them", one of its central strategies has been to resuscitate the traditional understanding of femininity and female sexuality and to adopt a more hostile approach to seculars and non-Muslim Western World, constructing them as others (Yarar, 2020).

Similar to the changing curricular tendencies explained above, the treatment of law as a completely relative construct, which might hold negative implications for women's rights and human rights, resonates with the dominant policy approach aiming to circumscribe women's rights protected by the legal framework and international agreements. The recent dispute over the *Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence* is one among the many examples that demonstrate such attempts. The conservative press and organisations pressurized the government to withdraw from the convention, which offered gender-equality based solutions to domestic violence. The convention stipulates in one of its articles that "Parties shall ensure that culture, custom, religion, tradition or so-called "honour"



shall not be considered as justification for any acts of violence covered by the scope of this Convention” (Council of Europe, 2011, p.11, 19). Prominent political figures from the government spoke of plans for withdrawal as the convention was found to be antithetical to Turkish family values, which aroused public outcry in the society.

The removal of acquisitions on secularism can be considered as a backward step from the ideal of democratic education. Although the curricular changes in 2017 have largely been

associated with the Islamisation of the education system, the dominance of ethno-religious discourses, particularly in the history curricula, predate 2017 Curriculum and can be traced back to 2015.

The differences between the curricula of different periods can be explained by differing policy choices and curricular visions of the curriculum developers and policy makers rather than as unintended or overlooked outcomes of the curriculum development process.



REFERENCES

- Altan-Olcay, Ö. (2015). Politics of critique: Understanding gender in contemporary Middle East. *Geoforum*, 63, 9-13. Erişim, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.05.003>
- Aratemur-Çimen, C. & Bayhan, S. (2019). *Değişen ders kitaplarında toplumsal cinsiyet araştırması II – Sonuç raporu*. [Report]. Istanbul: Friedrich Naumann Stiftung.
- Aydın-Yılmaz, S. (2015). Kadın hareketinde yeni bir ivme: Toplumsal cinsiyet adaleti. *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, 13(4), 107-115. Retrieved from Turkish Policy Quarterly: <http://turkishpolicy.com/Files/ArticlePDF/a-new-momentum-gender-justice-in-the-womens-movement-winter-2015-tr.pdf>
- Baba, E. (2019). *From gender equality to gender justice: A critical discourse analysis in terms of gender equality in Turkey* (Unpublished MA Dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Benschop, M. (2004). *Women's rights to land and property*. UN-Habitat Commission on Sustainable Development, 22 April 2004. Retrieved November 1, 2019, from www.un.org: https://www.un.org/ruleoflaw/files/1556_72513_CSDWomen.pdf
- Bowen, A. G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40.
- Çelik, H. (2004, 25 May). Öğrenci merkezli çağdaş müfredat. Retrieved May 25, 2017, from www.yenisafak.com/gundem/ogrenci-merkezli-cagdas-mufredat-2683340
- Council of Europe (2011). *Concil of Europe convention on preventing and combatting violence against women and domestic violence*. Retrieved July 12, 2020, from <https://rm.coe.int/168046031c>
- Diker Coşkun, Y. (2017). *Öğretim Programları Arka Plan Raporu*, Retrieved March 20, 2020, from http://www.egitimreformugirisimi.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/Ogretim_Programlari_Arka_Plan_Raporu.pdf
- Enloe, C. (2014). *Bananas, beaches and bases*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gouda, M. & Potrafke, N. (2016). Gender equality in Muslim majority countries. *Economic Systems*. 40, 683-698. Erişim, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecosys.2016.04.002>
- Gözütok, D. (2003). Curriculum development in Turkey. W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curricu-*



- lum research. (s. 607-621). Londra: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1991). End of Empire: Islam, nationalism and women in Turkey. In D. Kandiyoti (Ed.), *Women, Islam, and the state* (p. 22-47). Londra: Mcmillan.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1996). *Cariyeler, bacılar, yurttaşlar*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Kandiyoti, D. (2016). Locating the politics of gender: Patriarchy, neoliberal governance and violence in Turkey. *Research and Policy on Turkey*, 1(2), 103-118, Doi: 10.1080/23760818.2016.1201242
- Maluleke, M. J. (2012). Culture, tradition, custom, law and gender equality. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*. 15(1), 1-22. Doi: 10.4314/pelj.v15i1.1
- Nahmiyaz, M. (2018). Turkey: Greeks and Armenians in history textbooks (1930-2010). In E. Podeh & S. Alayan (Eds.), *Multiple alterities: Views of others in textbooks of the Middle East* (pp. 333-353). Cham; İsviçre: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Norwegian Helsinki Committee (2015). *Türkiye'de inanç özgürlüğü hakkini izleme raporu Temmuz-2014-Haziran 2015*. Retrieved December 8, 2018, from <https://www.nhc.no/en/new-monitoring-report-on-the-right-to-freedom-of-religion-or-belief-in-turkey/>
- Norwegian Helsinki Committee (2019). *Pursuing rights and equality: Monitoring report on the right to freedom of religion or belief in Turkey*. Retrieved September 11, 2020, from <https://www.nhc.no/en/topic/forb/>
- Özdek, Y. (1994). Evrensellik/Kültürel Görecelik Geriliminde İnsan Hakları. *Birikim*, 65, 15-36.
- Özdek, Y. (2016). *Kadın hakları kuşatma altında*. Paper presented at the VIII. Sosyal İnsan Hakları Ulusal Sempozyumu. Kocaeli, December 10, 2016, İstanbul: DISK Publications.
- Posner, J (2004). *Analysing the curriculum*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Seixas, P. (2004). Introduction. In P. Seixas (Ed.), *Theorising historical consciousness* (pp. 3-20). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı (2017, 18 July). *Müfredatta yenileme ve değişiklik çalışmalarımız üzerine*. Retrieved from, https://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2017_07/18160003_basin_aciklamasi-program.pdf
- Yalçınkaya, M. A. (2010). "Their Science, Our Values": Science, state, and society in the 19th century Ottoman Empire (Unpublished Doc-



- toral Dissertation). University of California, San Diego, California.
- Yalçinkaya, M. A. (2011). Science as an ally of religion: A Muslim appropriation of “the conflict thesis”. *The British Journal for the History of Science*. 44(2), 161-181.
- Yuval-Davis, (1997). *Gender @ Nation*. Londra: Sage
- Wobbe, T. (1995). The boundaries of community: Gender relations and racial violence. In H. Lutz, A. Phoenix & N. Yuval-Davis (Eds.), *Crossfires: Nationalism, racism and gender in Europe* (pp. 88-104). Londra: Pluto.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies* (pp. 2-22). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Yarar, B. (2020). Neoliberal-neoconservative feminism(s) in Turkey: politics of female bodies/subjectivities and the Justice and Development Party's turn to authoritarianism. *New Perspectives on Turkey*. 1-25. doi:10.1017/npt.2020.18
- Yılmaz, Z. (2015). *Dişil dindarlık*. İstanbul: İletişim.
- Zubaida, S. (2015). Human rights and cultural difference: Middle Eastern perspectives. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 10, 1-12. doi:10.1017/S0896634600000819



APPENDICE: CURRICULAR PROGRAMS ANALYSED WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

2005 Period

İlköğretim 1, 2, 3. Sınıflar Hayat Bilgisi Dersi Programı ve Kılavuzu (2005). Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basım Evi

İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi Programı ve Kılavuzu (4-5. Sınıflar) (2005). Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü

İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi (1-5. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı ve Kılavuzu (2005). Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi

İlköğretim Türkçe Dersi (6, 7, 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı (2006). Erişim, http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/indir/ogretmen/programlar/program_son/turkce6_8_240820

Ortaöğretim 9. Sınıf tarih Dersi Programı (2007). Erişim, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/ogretmen/index.php>

Ortaöğretim 10. Sınıf Tarih Dersi Programı (2008). Erişim, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/ogretmen/index.php>

Ortaöğretim Türkiye Cumhuriyeti İnkılap Tarihi ve Atatürkçülük Dersi Öğretim Programı (2010). Erişim, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/ogretmen/>

Sosyal Bilgiler 6. Sınıf Programı (2006). Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü

Sosyal Bilgiler 7. Sınıf Programı (2005). Erişim, <http://ttbk.meb.gov.tr>

2015 Period

İlkokul Hayat Bilgisi Dersi (1, 2 ve 3. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı (2015). Erişim, 08 Aralık 2015, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx?islem=1&kno=244>

Ortaöğretim Tarih Dersi (9, 10, 11 ve 12. Sınıflar) (2015). Erişim, 8 Eylül 2016, <http://ttbk.meb.gov.tr>

Ortaöğretim Türkiye Cumhuriyet İnkılap tarihi ve Atatürkçülük Dersi Öğretim Programı (2012). Erişim, <http://ttbk.meb.gov.tr>

Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi 4, 5, 6 ve 7. Sınıflar Öğretim Programı (2015). Erişim, <http://ttbk.meb.gov.tr>

Türkçe Dersi (1-8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı (2015). Erişim, 22 Şubat 2016, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/www/ogretim-programlari/icerik/72>

2018 Period

Hayat Bilgisi Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul 1, 2 ve 3. Sınıflar) (2018). Erişim, 16 Haziran 2019, <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/2018122171428547-HA-YAT%20B%C4%BOLG%C4%BOS%20>



C4%B0%C3%96%C4%9ERET%-
C4%B0M%20PROGRAMI.pdf

Ortaöğretim Tarih Dersi 9, 10 ve 11.
Sınıflar Öğretim Programı (2018).
Erişim, 15 Ekim 2019, <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr>

Ortaöğretim TC İnkılap Tarihi ve Atatürkçülük Dersi Öğretim Programı (2018). Erişim, 20 Aralık 2018, <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201822142542859-T.C.%20%C4%B0nk%C4%B1lap%20Tarihi%20ve%20Atat%C3%BCrk%C3%A7%C3%BCI%C3%BCk%20d%C3%B6p.pdf>

Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi Öğretim Programı İlkokul ve Ortaokul 4, 5, 6 ve 7. Sınıflar (2018). Erişim 7 Eylül 2019, <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/201812103847686-SOSYAL%20B%C4%B0LG%C4%B-OLER%20%C3%96%C4%9ERET%-C4%B0M%20PROGRAMI%20.pdf>

Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı (İlkokul ve Ortaokul 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) (2019). Erişim, 20 Temmuz 2019, <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Dosyalar/20195716392253-02-T%C3%BCrk%C3%A7e%20%C3%96%C4%9Fretim%20Program%C4%B1%202019.pdf>