



A Turkish Intellectual Between Marxist Politics and Durkheim's Pedagogy: Sadrettin Celâl Antel and History Teaching *

Bahri Ata ¹

Abstract

Sadrettin Celâl Antel is one of the important pedagogues of the Turkish education history. He lived between 1890 and 1954. This study aimed to reveal the pedagogical mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel and his contributions to history teaching. Survey method and document analysis to analyze the data was employed in the study. In this context, the present study examined the undergraduate thesis entitled "*Liselerde Tarih Randımanı (1949-1950) [Productivity of History in High Schools]*" prepared by Refref Çelebioğlu under the advisement of Sadrettin Celâl Antel in Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Institute of Pedagogy. The research data were analyzed through descriptive analysis. It was found out that Sadrettin Celâl, who had a progressive and polytechnic pedagogical mentality, closely followed the contemporary developments in pedagogy in Europe and the USA. It was also understood that while he adopted an approach supporting Durkheim in his works about the teaching of the history course in schools in accordance with the objectives of the national history, he partly employed the Marxist perspective in the creation of the content of the history course. It was determined that he not only developed an enjoyable game named "History Raffle" for the history course, but also made an important contribution to discussions about the productivity of history teaching in high schools in terms of the classical theory with the undergraduate thesis he supervised.

Key Words

Sadrettin Celâl Antel
Pedagogy
History teaching
Productivity

Article Info

Received: 08.10.2014
Accepted: 10.04.2014
Online Published: 11.10.2014

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2014.3849

Introduction

Sadrettin Celâl (1890-1954) was one of the important pedagogues of the Second Constitutional Period and the Early Republican Period. He was awarded the foreign education scholarship of the Ottoman Empire in 1909 and was graduated from 'École Normale Supérieure de Saint Cloud'. He attended the lessons of Durkheim in Sorbonne University. In 1911, he translated, together with Fuad Köprülü, Gustave Le Bon's *Psychologie des foules [The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind]* into Turkish under the title "*Ruh-ül cemaat*". When he returned to Turkey in 1913, he was appointed as the director of Adana Darülmüallim [Teacher Training School].

* This study is the extended version of the paper entitled "Sadrettin Celâl Antel'in Danışmanlığında Hazırlanan Liselerde Tarih Dersinin Verimliliği Üzerine Bir Lisans Tezi Üzerine Düşünceler [Thoughts on an Undergraduate Thesis on the Productivity of the History Course in High Schools Prepared Under the Advisement of Sadrettin Celâl Antel] presented at the 3rd International Symposium on History Education held by Sakarya University in 2014.

¹ Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of History Education, Turkey, bahriata@gazi.edu.tr

He served as a principal, as a French teacher, as a pedagogy (children's training) teacher, and as a philosophy teacher in various schools in Istanbul. In 1919, he became a member of Turkey Socialist Party. According to Tunçay (1979), he became a candidate for the last Ottoman Chamber of Deputies, but he was not elected for it. He was in the writing staff of *Kurtuluş [Liberation]* journal whose director in charge was Ethem Nejat in 1919. The writing staff started to publish *Aydınlık [Illumination]* journal after the fifth issue (Erkek, 2012: 39).

In 1920, Sadrettin Celâl became a member to Dr. Şefik Hüsnü Değmer's Workers' and Farmers' Socialist Party of Turkey. He served as the director in charge of *Aydınlık Mecmuası [Illumination Journal]* that was published between 1921 and 1925 in 31 issues (Sadi, 1994: 641). He signed the text of protest against the closing of the People's Participation Party of Turkey on the 12th of September 1922. He was in the seven-person committee from Turkey participating in the 4th World Congress of the Comintern held in St. Petersburg and Moscow on the 20th November of 1922 (Tunçay, 1979: 57). He spoke under the nickname "Orhan" in the 17th and the 20th sessions of the congress, gave extensive information about Turkey, and stated that his party decided to support Ankara Government as long as they fought against imperialism (Riddell, 2012: 30).

Sadrettin Celâl was arrested pursuant to the Law on Treason in 1923, but he was acquitted by the court as the law was not put into action duly in Istanbul (Tunçay, 1979: 58). In February 1925, he was arrested as per the Law on the Maintenance of Order due to his political writings and ideas. As a result, he was condemned to seven years prison. He tried to defend himself by saying "*I am republican. I have defended republicanism in all teachers' meetings. All statements we provide in our journals and newspapers are for making workers adopt republic.*" in the Independence Court (Tevetoğlu, 1967: 398). After he was kept in detention for 18 months, he enjoyed the Amnesty Law introduced for political detainees because of the Republic Day on the 29th of October 1926 and left the party. He worked as a translator in the Department of Education and Morality for one year. He served as a civics teacher and as a psychology teacher in Istanbul Female Teachers' Training School in 1927. After he held office as a psychology teacher and as a pedagogy teacher in Istanbul Male Teachers' Training School, he was appointed as a professor to the Institute of Pedagogy set up within the body of Istanbul University Faculty of Letters for awarding a certificate to those who were to teach in high schools on the 29th of December 1936. He wrote against Nazism and in favor of Soviet foreign policy in Zekeriya Sertel's *Tan [Dawn]* newspaper during the World War II. He was discharged from office in 1944, but he returned to his office pursuant to the decision of the State Council dated the 5th of April 1945. He continued to work in the above-mentioned position until his death on the 12th of February 1954.

As is seen, Sadrettin Celâl is one of our unfortunate intellectuals who mainly stood out due to his political activities in his 30s, but whose pedagogical thoughts were not evaluated with a holistic view. The related literature contains some studies about Sadrettin Celâl and his educational mentality. It can be said that Şemin (1987), Berkol (2000), Berkol (2004), and Batur and Aslıtürk (2004) stand as preliminary studies indicating the place of Sadrettin Celâl in the Turkish education history. Thus, it was considered that there was a need for a study that would reveal Sadrettin Celâl's pedagogical mentality in general and his outlook on history teaching in particular in an in-depth and scientific manner. The present study aimed to make up this deficiency and be a source of inspiration for the future works on Sadrettin Celâl in terms of data.

Aim

This study aimed to reveal the pedagogical mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel and his contributions to history teaching. The study made an attempt to answer the below-mentioned questions:

1. What is the pedagogical mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel?
2. What are the contributions of Sadrettin Celâl Antel to history teaching?
3. What is the place and importance of the undergraduate thesis supervised by Sadrettin Celâl Antel in the Institute of Pedagogy in/for history teaching?

Method

The qualitative research method was employed in the study. As is known, qualitative research is a research type that is based on induction and tries to describe phenomena and events in their own natural environments and reflect the points of view of participants through data collection tools such as observation, interview, and document analysis (Merriam, 2001; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2005). In the present study, the data obtained by survey method and also the document analysis to examine an existing document (a thesis) based on various criteria was employed (Çepni, 2010).

Bu araştırmada tarama yöntemi ile elde edilen veriler ve mevcut bir dokümanın (tezin) çeşitli ölçütler ışığında incelenmesi amaçlandığından doküman inceleme kullanılmıştır (Çepni, 2010).

Data Source and Data Collection

The data source of the study was an undergraduate thesis supervised by Sadrettin Celâl Antel in Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Institute of Pedagogy. The details of the thesis are as follows:

- Çelebioğlu, R. (1950). Liselerde tarih randmanı [Productivity of History in High Schools] (1949-1950). Unpublished undergraduate thesis, Istanbul University Faculty of Letters, Institute of Pedagogy, Istanbul.

The thesis whose details are provided above and which is registered in Istanbul University Hasan Ali Yücel Faculty of Education Library under the location number "e0037ls" was examined by the researcher in the spring semester of the 2013-2014 academic year. The contextual structure of the thesis is discussed in terms of its purpose, its method, its findings and its results.

Data Analysis

The document analysis was employed for analyzing the research data. At the first stage of the research data, the criteria to be used during document analysis (i.e. themes) were determined. At the second stage, the researcher organized the data by examining the document based on the themes. At the third stage, systematically and coherently organized data were explained along with direct quotations. At the last stage, cause and effect relationships between the findings were interpreted.

Findings

The current study, which was conducted to reveal the pedagogical mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel and his contributions to history teaching, reached the following findings:

-The Pedagogical Mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel: This section focuses on the findings concerning the pedagogical mentality of Sadrettin Celâl Antel.

Sadrettin Celâl made important contributions to Turkish education with his textbooks for teacher training schools, primary school textbooks, scientific research, translations, course materials, intelligence and knowledge tests he developed for various purposes, and his writings in journals. He wrote his thoughts on education in many journals including *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası* [Primary Education Journal], *Yaşamak İçin* [For Life], *Sınıf Muallimi* [Class Teacher], *Bizim Mecmua* [Our Journal], *Muallimler Mecmuası* [Teachers' Journal], *Terbiye* [Education], and *Aydınlık* [Illumination]. As it is understood from the above-mentioned writings, Sadrettin Celâl adopted a progressive and polytechnic mentality in education (Şemin,1987; Berkol, 2004). His writings indicate that he closely followed the contemporary educational practices in Europe and tried to carry out similar practices in Turkey.

One of the first writings of Sadrettin Celâl (1917a) on education was about the importance of the "Things Course". In his writing dealing with the benefits of the "Things Course", Sadrettin Celâl argued that the course would improve children's skills to express their observations, feelings, and thoughts clearly and correctly as well as skills to observe, investigate, research, and discuss, and thus children could acquire mental skills (Karagöz, 2014: 238).

In his writings entitled *Asri Terbiye 1-2* [Contemporary Education 1-2], Sadrettin Celâl (1917b) argued that home might have a negative impact on modern education in schools, and thus schools had

to be far from the environments where individuals lived. Essentially, one of the first introducers of this idea in Europe was German philosopher Fichte (Ata, 2009: 3-4). This idea emerged as “Country Boarding Schools” in the last quarter of the 19th century and gained wide currency in Germany and other countries with the efforts of Hermann Lietz (1868-1919) (Aytaç, 2006:74).

According to Sadrettin Celâl (1923ab), public education cannot be evaluated based on the country’s political and economic systems. Good results cannot be obtained as long as methods and institutions of other countries are adopted blindly. There are some mechanisms that prevent intelligent and talented children of the common people from receiving secondary education and higher education. On the other hand, many schools and official duties are open to incompetent and incapable children of rich families. In the system envisaged by Sadrettin Celâl, those who do not exert an effort and are incompetent cannot proceed to secondary education and higher education even if they are rich. Thus, basic education must be compulsory and free for every child in the country (Karagöz, 2014: 278).

Sadrettin Celâl (1924a) wrote about *Darülmüallimin* [Teacher Training School], too. He stated that quality and capacity of teachers were as important as their quantity. He also emphasized that skillful and competent young people had to be selected for *Darülmüallimin* [Teacher Training School].

According to Cırtlı (2002: 267), when intelligence tests were a current issue, a child whose father was a deputy said to his father, “My teacher measured my intelligence today” with reference to the intelligence test practice of Sadrettin Celâl in schools, and thus the father made a complaint to the Minister of National Education by saying, “What shall I do if my child is found to have some poorer intelligence?”. Therefore, the Minister put an end to such practices through issuing a circular.

Sadrettin Celâl participated in Istanbul Teachers’ Association Congress in the last week of July 1924. During negotiations on the association’s regulations, Sadrettin Celâl suggested removing the expression “religious and patriotic” from the objectives of the association. That was reflected in the newspapers of the period, led to discussions about the objectives of primary education, and gave rise to claims that Sadrettin Celâl made communism propaganda (cited by Ergün, 1982: 69). Teacher Cevdet İnançalp suggested Sadrettin Celâl to read the works and translations of Europe’s great pedagogues more carefully and denoted that absolute Westernism would not be achieved if the moral refinement of religion was not announced conscientiously (Ergin, 2005:234).

His writing entitled “*Maarif Teşkilatı Hakkında Bir Layiha [An Explanatory Document on the Organization of Education]*” (Antel, 1926: 135-246) was published anonymously in *Maarif Vekâleti Mecmuası [Journal of the Ministry of Education]* in May 1926 as he was in prison then. This writing shows better what kind of a National Education System he envisaged. This report contained the saying, “*The Chinese Wall between school and life must be eliminated.*” The report also highlighted that high school teachers neglected their educating missions.

After group teaching was adopted in primary education, the Ministry of Education had a book entitled ‘*Decroly Method*’ translated from French to Turkish in 1926 for it to be understood by teachers better. He classified teachers based on their acts in view of group teaching: optimists, extremist pessimists, group teaching supporters, conditioners, skeptics and reformers, evolution supporters). This writing of Sadrettin Celâl, which grouped teachers in terms of their attitudes towards a new curriculum, was significant in that it demonstrated that he had a scientific approach (Antel, 1931: 85-87).

In 1927, Sadrettin Celâl published his book entitled *Cumhuriyet Çocuklarına Sevimli Kıraat [Pleasing Reading for Republic Children]*. In 1929, he published his book entitled *Pedagoji [Pedagogy]* while he was the Istanbul Higher and Male Teachers’ Schools Teaching Method and Education Teacher. With many editions in 1931 and 1936, this book functioned as a reference book for new generation teachers. According to Sadrettin Celâl (1929: 58), “A teacher needs to have a good command of the newest scientific methods and techniques in teaching activities.” Sadrettin Celâl argued that the findings of the research on child psychology and the new teaching methods and techniques tried in pilot schools necessitated changing the current school environment. In this regard, he (1929: 59-69) thought that principles of teaching in schools had to be changed. He listed the new principles as follows:

1. Active school based on working principles that ensure children’s activity

2. Teaching through penetrating; meaningful and purposeful activity
3. Teaching in an interest- and problem-centered fashion in school rather than use of a single textbook
4. Education for and through life; the relation of teaching to immediate environment
5. Social activity in school; participation of students in school life
6. Taking into consideration children's personality; individualization of education

The Decroly System was implemented in the 44th primary school which was made a pilot school in Sultanahmet (Istanbul) in 1929. He presented his practices in the above-mentioned school in international meetings as a research topic (Berkol, 2000). He also made mention of the Dalton Plan and the Winnetka System implemented in the USA and Europe for individualized teaching (Antel, 1929: 71).

In his conference themed "*Tedris Tekniğinin Esasları [The Fundamentals of Teaching Technique]*" held in the 1936-37 academic year, he stated that all teachers including history teachers had to have a record and document envelope for every topic. To Sadrettin Celâl, such envelope had to contain the following: (Antel, 1937: 15).

1. Basic information about the topic collected by teachers from various sources
2. The sketches and diagrams of experiences to be undergone
3. Pictures, sketches, statistics, maps, and various documents about the topic
4. Observation questions, problems, and exercises
5. Texts to be studied
6. Institutions and monuments to be visited as well as explanations about them
7. Lesson plans, etc.

After he was appointed as a professor to the Institute of Pedagogy established within the body of Istanbul University Faculty of Letters in 1936, he gave the *General Didactics* course to prospective high school teachers. Then he published his lecture notes under the title *Umumi Didaktik [General Didactics]* between 1948 and 1952. This course, which was opened within the scope of the pedagogical certificate programme, aimed at informing prospective high school teachers of the main problems of teaching and introducing the most productive teaching methods and techniques that were impossible to be acquired through personal experiences (Antel, 1952: 2). In the introduction of the book, he emphasized that pedagogy and didactics as part of it were necessary for not only primary school teachers but also high school teachers. He stressed that high school teachers also had to learn how to use scientific, rational, and more productive techniques. The book also included a noteworthy chapter about the nature of humanism (Antel, 1952: 33-43).

Hüseyin Hüsni Cırtlı, who was a pedagogy teacher in Gazi Institute of Education, states that Hasan Ali Yücel (the Minister of National Education) who was not satisfied with his teaching during an inspection sent him to Istanbul to meet Sadrettin Celâl and Prof. Peters (Cırtlı, 2002: 135-136). This event is quite important in that it shows the relations of Sadrettin Celâl with the Minister of National Education of the single-party period.

-The Contributions of Sadrettin Celâl Antel to History Teaching: This section covers the findings concerning the contributions of Sadrettin Celâl Antel to history teaching.

The first writing of Sadrettin Celâl Antel on history teaching was published in the 25th issue of *Aydınlık [Illumination]* journal between the pages 644 and 647. The topic of the writing was "*Teachers' International and History Education*". This writing indicates that the Federation of Teachers' Association (Education Workers' International) gathering in Brussels in 1924 handled two subjects: humanistic and rational education and history teaching in primary schools. Sadrettin Celâl brought forward some criticisms of the French Secular Teachers' Union that was annoyed of hostility towards Germany and insulting statements included in the French textbooks following the First World War. It was said that the French textbooks of the 1920s incorporated the idea that the French people were superior to other nations and contained statements arousing hatred and hostility towards other nations (Germans in particular). According to Sadrettin Celâl, the essential history to be taught to children is the history of civilization (i.e. the history of tradition, industry, craft, labor, and human intelligence). When

commitment to such great senses as pacifism, respect for labor and human, freedom, justice, and cooperation, rather than xenophobia, is penetrated into children's minds and hearts, a serious step is taken for ensuring peace and union of people in the world.

In his *Maarif Teşkilatı Hakkında Bir Layiha [An Explanatory Document on the Organization of Education]*" dated 1926, Sadrettin Celâl emphasized that textbooks were one of the obstacles between children and nature. He wrote as follows: "Young high school graduates who have been studying history and geography for many years have definitely no correct and clear idea about the features of Greek and Roman civilizations, fundamental differences between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the characteristics of feudalism, the development of industry and means of transport, and living conditions and mode of production at various stages of civilization. Historical events, wars, commanders, sultans, kings, and treaties have been all mixed up in their minds. They are completely incapable of visualizing any historic period. They are also completely uninformed of their own environments and the economic activities conducted in the city or district where they live." In this regard, Sadrettin Celâl argued in 1926 that high school and teacher training school graduates did not have basic and wide information about the activity history of humanity as well as its general situation and lines of development (Antel, 1926: 44-65). The above-mentioned writing also contained information about the place of history in Decroly's group teaching (Antel, 1926: 80-81). In this report, Sadrettin Celâl also reached the concept *scientific and literary feast*. These activities would be very different from common shows. Students would stage plays to perform a historic period or a revolution which they searched and investigated personally. They would display the teaching tools and tasks they made and performed together. Sadrettin Celâl's non-use of the concept *project* is open to comment. At the present time, such activities are referred to as *history project fair or feast*.

In 1931, he examined in detail the thoughts of the historian Jules Michelet about citizenship education besides his educational mentality in his book entitled *Yeni Terbiye ve Tedris Tekniği [New Education and Teaching Technique]*. Based on Michelet's thoughts, he highlighted the importance of secular feasts in public education (Antel, 1931: 217-218). Sadrettin Celâl wrote in 1931, "Coup d'état dismissed him from the university and archives, thereby destroying and depriving him of the fruits of his 35-year efforts." (Antel, 1931: 208). According to Sadrettin Celâl, Michelet attached a big importance to personality and wanted to introduce it to all citizens, but Ziya Gökalp had a weak concept of personality, and it was restricted to a limited number of national geniuses to which some extraordinary circumstances gave birth. This being the case, individuals would get lost in the community (Antel, 1931: 210).

Sadrettin Celâl made contributions to history teaching with the speeches he delivered in council meetings, too. He was criticized by leading administrators as he made mention of pacifist history mentality in the 2nd Education Council meeting held in 1943 (Safran and Ata, 1996: 14). Three years later, Hasan Âli Yücel, who was the minister at that time, undersigned the UNESCO Constitution.

One of the first people who drew attention to his works on history teaching was Fuat Baymur. "*Tarih Ders Materyali: Tarih tombalası [A History Course Material: History raffle]*" (9 pages) which was published in the autodidactic course materials series was one of the important works of Sadrettin Celâl (1940: 1-4). After Sadrettin Celâl stressed the importance of chronology and space in historical events, he developed the above-mentioned raffle to enable students to internalize the concept *chronology* better. The game includes five paperboards (2 white and 3 colored). The white paperboard number 1 and the white paperboard number 2 involve twenty-century and synchronic history tables. These are the main cards of the game. Other cards involve the names of important events, people, and works in the history. For example, the pink paperboard number 3 shows the turning points in the history. The yellow paperboard number 4 incorporates historical events with a second-degree importance. The yellow paperboard number 5 contains important discoveries, inventions, art works, and technical works. The stamps on which the historical information existing on the paperboards number 3, number 4, and number 5 are written are cut and put in relevant envelopes. The backsides of the paperboards contain their dates. The student puts the stamp on the paperboard number 1 based on the century it belongs to by looking at the date on the backside. Then s/he tries to put it without looking at it. The paperboards number 3, number 4, and number 5 can be used in middle schools and high schools. The teacher may

remove or add events. This game can be played as a raffle, too. In such a case, the person who puts the historical event stamps on the paperboard number 1 and the paperboard number 2 without looking at the backsides with the smallest number of errors wins the game. According to Sadrettin Celâl, such games are quite useful for individualizing the teaching. Unfortunately, Sadrettin Celâl was not able to reach the concept *historical significance* in his efforts aimed at constituting the framework of history.

Sadrettin Celâl discussed the place of history and geography in general culture (general knowledge) in the 1952 edition of his book entitled *Umumî Didaktik [General Didactics]*. He stated that high school curricula, besides primary school and middle school curricula, did not provide any clue about the objectives and targets of history education. He (1952: 52-53) wrote, "History gives the feeling of solidarity of people in time and space. National history strengthens the feeling of national solidarity by reporting how the national asset has come about through mutual efforts and sacrifices of successive generations throughout the centuries. It is necessary to know lives, efforts, sacrifices, and pains of the mass of common people besides geniuses and heroes in order to be precisely knowledgeable about the collective efforts exerted by people to create their material and spiritual civilization assets." That shows that while Sadrettin Celâl had an approach supporting Durkheim in terms of the objectives of the history course in schools, he partly employed the Marxist perspective in the creation of the content of the history course. To Durkheim, history must provide the child with the consciousness that s/he is a member of the society s/he lives in (i.e. collectivity) (Ata, 2013: 46). Details about the wars, special conditions, and acts of kings must be shortened; a big importance must be attached to the history of nation and national sociology; and such history must be provided in detail (Ata, 2013: 40).

In his early 20s, Durkheim came to have a solidarist attitude rather than a conflictual one as he was under the influence of the 1871 Paris Commune. As Jean Claude Filloux states, "He decided that if he were ever to teach, his mission would be to help his compatriots forge a path towards a society which, in unity and solidarity, would transcend its own conflicts, and to foster changes in society that would lead to cohesion, enabling his fellow-citizens to experience what he called 'the ultimate good' communion with others." (Timur, 2014, 273) Sadrettin Celâl underwent this change in his middle ages. In the Morals Council meeting held in 1943, he was accused of being leftist by Sadri Maksudi and attacked by Muzaffer Şerif Başoğlu for being conservative and in favor of Durkheim in pedagogy (Ülken, 1992: 457).

Antel (1952: 275-282) attached a big importance to history materials, too. He suggested the use of foreign and domestic picture books, pictures, historical maps, dictionaries, and encyclopedias, calendars and chronological tables, synoptic and synchronic tables, picture maps, and picture cards besides history textbooks. Like many historians, he was in favor of animated films functioning as historical documentaries rather than fictional historical films. On the other hand, he thought that films such as *The Private Life of Henry VIII*, *Ben-Hur*, and *Carnival in Flanders [La Kermesse héroïque]* could provide students with more information about the past in comparison to textbooks.

-The Place of the Undergraduate Thesis Supervised by Sadrettin Celâl Antel in History Teaching: This section presents the findings concerning the place and importance of the undergraduate thesis entitled "*Liselerde tarih randımanı (1949-1950) [Productivity of history in high schools (1949-1950)]*" prepared by Refref Çelebioğlu under the advisement of Sadrettin Celâl Antel in Istanbul University Faculty of Education Institute of Pedagogy in/for history teaching.

Found in 1936, the Institute of Pedagogy gave a set of courses to those students of Istanbul University Faculty of Letters and Faculty of Science who wanted to become a teacher under the title *teaching license*. The second group consisted of students with thesis. The students with thesis received such courses as *Educational Guidance*, *Educational Statistics*, and *Assessment in Education* from Sadrettin Celâl. Sadrettin Celâl supervised the pedagogical research of such students, too.

The undergraduate thesis entitled "*Liselerde tarih randımanı (1949-1950) [Productivity of history in high schools (1949-1950)]*" prepared by Refref Çelebioğlu under the advisement of Sadrettin Celâl Antel was a survey study focusing on the productivity of schools in terms of history teaching. The thesis consisted of 36 pages written in a typewriter. Sadrettin Celâl, Dr. W. Peters, and Mustafa Şekip

Tunç had signs on the cover page. It is understood from the thesis' introduction that it was part of a project dealing with the productivity of various courses conducted by the Institute of Pedagogy.

The thesis is composed of two chapters and appendices. The first chapter includes the research topic, the check of the productivity of history teaching in schools, and the objectives and targets of history teaching in high school. Whether or not classic exams can serve the purpose of determining the productivity of history teaching is discussed. 46+46 history questions asked to literature and science branches in the state maturity exams conducted between 1940 and 1948 are also presented (Çelebioğlu, 1950: 9-14). Some of the questions asked for the branch of literature are as follows:

1. Explain the politics and actions of Sokollu Mehmed Pasha as well as his importance in the Ottoman history (September, 1942, Question 1).
2. When and how did the Ottoman Empire seize Crimea? What administration style was Crimea subjected to by the Ottoman Empire? When and how did it lose it? (June 1943, Question 1).

Some of the questions not in full sentence format asked for the branch of science are as follows:

1. The capture of Istanbul by Turks (September 1940, Question 1)
2. The development of economy in the Republic period (September 1948, Question 3)

The second chapter involves the administration of the test, the evaluation of answers, the reactions of students and teachers, comparisons between high school students and university students, the difficulty levels of questions, the correlation between success in test and success in school, general result, the reasons for failure, and suggestions. Appendices include the history test prepared by Sadrettin Celâl Antel, answer key of the test, instructions about the test, tables, and graphs. The books used in the study are listed at the beginning of the thesis (2nd page).

Table 1. The Names of the High Schools Where the Thesis Study Was Conducted

Item No	School Type	Name
1.	Public	Beyoğlu Girls' High School
2.	Private	Boğaziçi High School
3.	Private	Dame de Sion High School
4.	Public	Istanbul Males' High School
5.	Public	Istanbul Girls' High School
6.	Public	Kabataş Males' High School
7.	Private	Saint Benoit High School
8.	Public	Vefa High School

As is seen in the table 1, the thesis study was carried out in eight different high schools: Beyoğlu Females' High School, Boğaziçi High School, Dame de Sion High School, Istanbul Males' High School, Istanbul Females' High School, Kabataş Males' High School, Saint Benoit High School, and Vefa High School. Of these high schools, 5 were public schools, and 3 were private schools.

Table 2. The Distribution of the Study Group by Branch

Branch of Education	The Number of Students	
	Frequency	Percentage
	f	%
Literature	265	64.16
Science	148	35.84
Total	413	100

The Table 2 presents the distribution of the individuals in the study group by branch of education. Majority the participants (64.16%) studied in the branch of literature, and the rest (35.84%) studied in the branch of science.

Table 3. The Distribution of the Study Group by Gender

Gender	The Number of Students	
	Frequency f	Percentage %
Male	237	57.38
Female	176	42.62
Total	413	100

The table 3 gives the distribution of the individuals in the study group by gender. While 57.38% of the participants were male, 42.62% were female.

Table 4. The Distribution of the History Test Questions Administered to the Students by Topic

Topics	The Number of Questions	
	Frequency f	Percentage %
The periods, identifications, and works of great philosophers, artists, and scholars	19	28.36
Historical reasoning capability	14	20.90
Important political, military, and historical events standing as the turning points of history	12	17.91
The history of great discoveries, inventions, art works, and technical works	11	16.42
Events providing key information about the history	6	8.96
Sample questions	3	4.47
Synchronic historical events	2	2.98
Total	67	100

The table 4 presents the distribution of the history test questions prepared by Sadrettin Celâl and administered to high school students by topic. According to the table, the test contained 75 questions within the framework of the textbooks and the history curriculum implemented between 1949 and 1950. Of these questions, 23 were about the history of Turkey, and 52 were about the history of world. The research preparing the thesis provided a distribution of 67 questions by topic. No explanation was made in regard to the topics of the remaining 8 questions. Of these 67 questions, 28.36% were about the periods, identifications, and works of great philosophers, artists, and scholars; 20.90% were about historical reasoning capability; 17.91% were about important political, military, and historical events standing as the turning points of history; 16.42% were about the history of great discoveries, inventions, art works, and technical works; 8.96% were about the events providing key information about the history; 4.47% were about the sample questions; and 2.98% were about synchronic historical events.

It was stated in the thesis that 29 questions were intended for primary school graduates, and 25 questions were intended for middle school graduates. Some of these questions are as follows:

1. What was the most important result of the Battle of Manzikert? (question 8)
2. The proclamation date of the Tanzimât [Reorganization] (question 17)
3. In what century did Sinan the Architect live? What is his most important work? (question 30)
4. The names of a great Turkish poet, a great English poet, a great French poet, and a great Spanish novelist who lived in the 17th century (question 32 – a synchronous question example)
5. Who is Beethoven? In what century did he live? (question 37)
6. Who are the first four Caliphs? (question 62)
7. When (in what century) did the first steamer start to operate? (question 43)

8. What are the Orkhon inscriptions? In what century were they created? (question 71).

As is seen in the examples, some questions were not in full sentence format. However, no explanation was made about that. Though it was stated in the thesis that expert opinion was taken in regard to the questions, the number of teachers whose opinions were taken in that respect was not indicated. On the other hand, the opinions of some teachers about the test questions were provided. Some teacher opinions included in the thesis are as follows (Çelebioğlu, 1950: 16):

- *“Questions requiring expertness.*
- *General questions.*
- *They require high-level world knowledge.*
- *They are so difficult that even teachers cannot answer them.”*

Various statistics were used for analyzing the data collected in the study (i.e. median, quartile deviations, Gavs and Galton contours, and frequency polygon). The findings were presented in tables and graphs.

The results of the thesis study can be summarized as follows:

- The female students, the science students, and the public school students showed higher-level success in comparison to the male students, the literature students, and the private school teachers respectively though the difference between such student groups was small.
- The correlation between success in school and success in test was also investigated among 206 of 413 students. The most successful school was Istanbul Females' High School; the most unsuccessful public school was Kabataş Males' High School; and the most unsuccessful private school was Boğaziçi High School (Çelebioğlu, 1950: 17). No information was given in regard to the most successful private school. It is not possible to understand it from the Graph 5 given in the thesis.
- Though the students received the history course for a total of 520 course hours (2 course hours per week) from primary school 4th grade to the 11th grade and read a total of 1582 pages of history textbook, the results of the test were not satisfactory and parallel with the time spent and efforts exerted. Thus, it was concluded that the history teaching conducted in high schools was unproductive.
- The reasons for the failure were as follows: the curriculum was heavy; the teachers did not have any clear idea about history teaching; history teaching was based on only memorizing textbooks; textbooks were long, overloaded, detailed, and disordered; exams forced teachers to keep up with the curricula; and the students were prepared for only exams.
- Sadrettin Celal administered the same test to 312 university students, and found out that high school students were more successful than university students (Çelebioğlu, 1950: 17-18).

The suggestions of the study are as follows:

- The curricula should be lightened in terms of content.
- Teachers should be informed of the objective of history teaching.
- A history method appropriate to the objectives should be employed.
- History textbooks should be arranged in accordance with pedagogical principles.
- Exams should be turned into objective assessment tools.

Discussion and Conclusion

The works of Sadrettin Celâl on education are worthy of a deeper examination. According to the account of Gündüzalp (1951: IX), the writer of *Öğretmen Meslek Kitapları Kılavuzu [Guide for Teachers' Books]* (Volume:1), the pedagogy authors of the 1928-1938 period by the total page numbers of books are as the following: Halil Fikret Kanad (2830 pages), İsmail Hakkı Tonguç (2600 pages), Hasip Ahmet Aytuna (2520 pages), İsmayıl Hakkı Baltacıoğlu (2420 pages), Sadrettin Celâl Antel (1600 pages), and Hıfzırrahman Raşit Öymen (1550 pages). As is seen, Sadrettin Celâl ranked 5th. His "*Maarif Teşkilatı Hakkında Bir Layiha [An Explanatory Document on the Organization of Education]*" published in *Maarif Vekâleti Mecmuası [Journal of the Ministry of Education]* in 1926 will always maintain its important place in the Turkish education history.

Sadrettin Celâl Antel was not a history educator. However, he had important works for the improvement of history education among his pedagogical works. The thoughts of Sadrettin Celâl Antel about history education are seen in his writing dated 1924 and entitled "*Muallimler Enternasyoneli ve Tarih Tedrisatı [Teachers' International and History Education]*", his explanatory document dated 1926, his writing focusing on the educational mentality of Jules Michelet dated 1931, his short book dated 1940 and entitled "*Tarih Ders Materyali: Tarih Tombalası [A History Course Material: History raffle]*", the speech delivered in the 2nd National Education Council meeting in 1943, and his book entitled *Umumi Didaktik [General Didactics]* dated 1948. The thoughts of Sadrettin Celâl about history and its teaching expressed in his maturity period writings bear the traces of Durkheim's ideas.

The first article of Sadrettin Celâl Antel (1924) related to history education in Europe was about the reconstruction plan of the school history by the socialist intellectuals. On the 17 years later, he mentioned the recommendations for school history for the sake of peace at the Second Educational Council.

In 1952, in his *Umumi Didaktik [General Didactics]*, it seems that he adopted Durkheimian understanding in terms of the aims loaded in the national history. When it came to its content, Marxist understanding was held. In the official documents, he used more more subtle and balanced language in his writings. In 1926, he claimed that high school and university graduates were ignorant of economic activities of humanity and general information. Sadrettin Celâl had got a sense of history in which the lives of ordinary individuals were also mentioned.

His work, namely *Tarih tombalası [History raffle]* was the answer to the problem of presenting history to the students in a fun way. Moreover, he grasped the importance of teaching history by the films, but he has got no in-depth study on how to use it. He achieved the notion of history project fair or festival in which the students will exhibit their own products.

Since Sadrettin Celâl left his position in 1954, this thesis supervised by him in 1950 can be considered a work of his perfection period. This undergraduate thesis is significant as it enabled a prospective teacher receiving pedagogical formation education to prepare an undergraduate thesis in his own field and recalled that good practices had to be maintained. This thesis can be discussed in terms of two basic concepts in his understanding: general culture (general knowledge) and productivity.

The examination of the questions in the thesis in terms of general culture (general knowledge) indicates that such questions show parallelism with the culture and the general culture (general knowledge) conceived by Sadrettin Celâl as well as with the history curriculum.

While Sadrettin Celâl (1944) was indicating his own understanding of culture in a university conference entitled *What Is Culture?* he argued with the ideas of Ziya Gökalp. To Antel (1944: 193), culture is a spiritual maturity that advances a person to a level where s/he can appraise and make more accurate sense of life and social events and feel pleasure and excitement about art works, approximates him/her to beautiful, right, and bad gradually, and allows him to create new values. That is exactly the culture which the current high schools must introduce.

To Gökalp, a revolution to be realized in education means abandoning civilization and turning to culture, and thus science sections had to be abolished in high schools, and all courses taught in school had to be restricted to cultural education. According to Antel, various nations that have reached a particular level of civilization have something in common in other terms (Antel, 1944: 182-183).

Antel (1944: 190) stated, "Sinan belongs to the entire world as much as it belongs to us. Michelangelo, Rembrandt, Cervantes, Shakespeare, and Beethoven belong to everybody, to all of us. These springs should be quaffed". In other words, Sadrettin Celâl considers it necessary to learn the Greek history and the Roman history for Turkish nation to be included in the Western civilization. On the other hand, the examination of the education records of some teachers included in teachers' personal files shows that the teachers of that period thought very differently from Sadrettin Celâl. History teachers thought that national history, rather than the Greek history and the Roman history, had to be taught. It can be said that the Greek history and the Roman history topics continued to be dominant in high school history teaching until the 1970s.

The second issue is the way of assessing the productivity of the history course. As of the early years of his career as a pedagogue, Sadrettin Celâl often highlighted the concept *product*. He introduced knowledge tests which he thought could assess product best. In 1932, he published his book entitled *İlk Tahsil Randıman Testi [The First Learning Product Test]*. In the book entitled *Umumi Didaktik [General Didactics]* which he wrote in 1952 for prospective high school teachers, he defined learning product in detail in the chapter entitled *Tahsil Verimin Kontrolü-Teftiş [Check (Inspection) of Learning Product]*. To him, learning product is the ratio of material sacrifices for teaching (i.e. school buildings, furniture, teaching materials, teachers' wages, etc.) and spiritual efforts (teachers' and students' works) to the quantitative and the qualitative results obtained (Antel, 1952: 295). This definition points out that Sadrettin Celâl adopted the concept *product* accepted by the classical theory (Sarpkaya,1997: 45-46). On the other hand, it should be remembered that very famous people who would leave their marks in the Turkish history were trained in the schools which were found to be unsuccessful in the aforementioned thesis study. For instance, Hasan Puler, Adnan Kahveci, Naim Talu, Bozkurt Güvenç, Hilmi Yavuz, Hakkı Devrim, and many other famous people were graduated from Kabataş Males' High School (Odabaşı, 2003: 139-140). That shows that other conditions need to be fulfilled to be successful in real life. Today, it is very difficult to conduct a similar study in private schools and to report the results to public.

Sadrettin Celâl, who indicated the deficiencies of oral and written exams, thought that knowledge tests would allow determining schools' products, the value of teaching methods, teachers' professional competences and achievements, and students' knowledge objectively. Sadrettin Celâl (1952: 315) stated that such knowledge tests checking the general culture (general knowledge) of young people more effectively than classic exams were for all courses and were currently used in the USA. His book entitled *Terbiyede Ölçü (Bilgi Testleri) [Assessment in Education (Knowledge Tests)]* was published by Istanbul University in 1955 after he died. As is understood from the information given above, Sadrettin Celâl focused on assessment, product, knowledge tests, statistical accounts, the graphical representation of test results, standardized knowledge tests, etc. in the last years of his life.

As stated by Sadrettin Celâl, while some questions in the knowledge tests were memory questions, some others were reasoning questions. Skills or historical thinking skills were not included. They were mostly considered to be incorporated in reasoning questions.

It can be said that the works of Sadrettin Celâl paved the way for the establishment of *Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi [National Productivity Center]* (1965). 1-7 June is celebrated as the Productivity Week. This center launched a writing competition entitled "How to achieve productivity in primary education or secondary education?: The perspectives of primary education and secondary education administrators and teachers" as a productivity week event in 1995 when credit system, mixed system, and passing the course system were in effect in the Turkish education system. As is known, this center was closed in 2011 pursuant to the relevant decree law. Instead of it, the Directorate General for Productivity was set up within the body of the Ministry of Science, Industry, and Technology. Writing and film competitions about productivity still continue. Though new theories having a quite a big influence on productivity mentality have been introduced in the course of time, today's productivity projector cannot focus on schools, courses, teachers, and students on the stage. That may be because of the tiredness of the projects and efforts that have been conducted/made but not put into practice within the framework of the classical theory as of the 1950s. The present study will be considered to be successful in fulfilling its mission if it can launch productivity discussions in education in general and in history education in particular based on the new theories. It goes without saying that new history course productivity tests should involve historical thinking skills beyond the history knowledge.

Acknowledgements: I owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Ömer Özcan (Former Member of the Board of Education) who helped me access many sources in the process of writing this paper.

References

- Antel, S. C. (1917a). Eşya derslerinin önemi ve tedrisat tarzı üzerine. *Tedrisat Mecmuası*, 6 (3-4), 314-323.
- Antel, S. C. (1917b). Asri terbiye 1. *Muallim Mecmuası*, 1 (4), 122-130.
- Antel, S. C. (1917c). Asri terbiye 2. *Muallim Mecmuası*, 1 (5), 153-157.
- Antel, S. C. (1923a). Halk hükümetinde maarif teşkilatı 2. *Muallimler Mecmuası*, (16), 349-356.
- Antel, S. C. (1923b). Halk hükümetinde maarif teşkilatı. *Muallimler Mecmuası*, (13), 254-260.
- Antel, S. C. (1924a). Darülmualiminin meselesi. *Muallimler Mecmuası*, (19), 450-462.
- Antel, S. C. (1924b). Muallimler enternasyoneli ve tarih tedrisatı. *Aydınlık*, (25), 644-647.
- Antel, S. C. (1926). Maarif teşkilatı hakkında bir layiha. N. Altunya (Aktaran), *Maarif Vekaleti Mecmuası*, (7), 135-246.
- Antel, S. C. (1929). *Pedagoji: Muallim mekteplerinin son sınıfları için*. İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi.
- Antel, S. C. (1931). *Yeni terbiye ve tedris tekniği*. İstanbul: Kanaat Kütüphanesi.
- Antel, S. C. (1932). *Test usulü*. İstanbul: Türkiye Matbaası.
- Antel, S. C. (1937). *Tedris tekniğinin esasları: Konferanslar 1936-1937 ders yılı*. İstanbul: Ülkü Basımevi.
- Antel, S. C. (1939). *Maarifimiz ve meseleleri*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Antel, S. C. (1940). *Tarih ders materyali: Tarih tombalası*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Antel, S. C. (1944). *Kültür nedir?* İstanbul: Kenan Matbaası.
- Antel, S. C. (1952). *Umumî didaktik*. İstanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınları.
- Ata, B. (2009). (Ed). *Fichte'nin eğitim üzerine düşünceleri ve türkiye'deki yansımaları*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Ata, B. (2013) Emile Durkheim ve Tarih Eğitimi. İçinde Bahri Ata (Ed.), *Emile Durkheim; Üçüncü Fransa Cumhuriyeti'nde Öğretmenlerin Eğitimcisi ve Eğitim Görüşleri*, (ss. 35-50). Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Aytaç, K. (2006) . *Çağdaş eğitim akımları (yabancı ülkelerde)*. Ankara: Mevsimsiz Yayınları.
- Batur, S. ve Aslıtürk, E. (2004). Sakıncalı psikoloji: Muzaffer şerif başoğlu ve sadrettin celal antel'in görevlerinden uzaklaştırılmaları örneğinde politika ve psikoloji ilişkisi. *13. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi*, 7-11 Eylül, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.
- Berkol, B. (2000). 44'üncü ilkokul. *M. Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, (12), 53-58.
- Berkol, B. (2004). Bilimsel eğitimde öncüydü. *Cumhuriyet*, 12.02.2004, 14.
- Cırtlı, H. H. (2002). *Güneşli mektep: Kamunun eğitimi*. Ankara: Karatepe Yayıncılık.
- Çelebioğlu, R. (1950). *Liselerde tarih randımanı tezi (1949-1950)*. Yayımlanmamış lisans tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi, Pedagoji Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çepni, S. (2010). *Araştırma ve proje çalışmalarına giriş*. Trabzon: Celepler Matbaacılık.
- Ergin, O. (2005). Muallim m. cevdet'in hayatı, eserleri ve kütüphanesi. İstanbul: İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kütüphane ve Müzeler Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Ergün, M. (1982). *Atatürk devri türk eğitimi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Erkek, M. S. (2012). *Bir meşrutiyet aydını ethem nejat (1887-1921)*. İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.
- Gündüzalp, F. (1951). *Öğretmen meslek kitapları kılavuzu*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Karagöz, S. (2014). *İkinci meşrutiyetten harf inkılâbına kadar süreli yayınlarda yer alan eğitim görüşleri ve cumhuriyet eğitimine yansımaları (1908-1928)*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Le Bon, G. (1911[1327]). F. Köprülü ve S. C. Antel (Çev.), *Ruh-ül cemaat*. İstanbul: Uhuvvet Matbaası.

- Merriam, S. B. (2001). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Odabaşı, H. (2003). *Her okuldan adam çıkmaz*. İstanbul: Zamankitap.
- Oğuzkan, A. F. (1974). *Eğitim terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Riddell, J. (2012). *Toward the united front: Proceedings of the Fourth Congress of Communist International 1922*. Leiden: Brill.
- Sadi, K. (1994). *Türkiye’de sosyalizm tarihine katkı*. İstanbul: İletişim
- Safran, M. & Ata, B. (1996). Barışçı tarih öğretimi üzerine çalışmalar: Türkiye’de tarih ders kitaplarında yunanlılara ilişkin kullanılan dil ve yunanlılara ilişkin öğrenci görüşleri. *G.Ü. Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1, 11-26.
- Sarpkaya, R. (1997). Ortaöğretimde verimlilik. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, (1), 45-58.
- Şemin, R. (1987). *Sadrettin celâl antel*. Ankara: UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu.
- Tevetoğlu, F. (1967). *Türkiye’de sosyalist ve komünist faaliyetler*. Ankara: Yayl.y.
- Timur, T. (2014). Durkheim: Sosyoloji, bilim ve tarihçi. İçinde Mehmet Ö. Alkan (Haz.), *Yakın Türkiye Tarihinden Sayfalar Sina Akşin’e Armağan* (s.255-277). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Tunçay, M. (1979). Sadrettin celâl antel. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 1 (8), 57-84.
- Ülken, H. Z. (1992). *Türkiye’de çağdaş düşünce tarihi*. İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.