

Nationalism Perceptions of Pre-Service Social Studies Teachers in Turkey

Ali Altıkulaç^{1*} Osman Sabancı²

1. Faculty of Education, Çukurova University, Balcalı, Adana, Turkey
2. Faculty of Education, Gazi University, Teknikokullar, Ankara, Turkey

* E-mail of the corresponding author: aaltikulac@yahoo.com

This article was presented at IV. International Symposium on History Education (1-3 September 2016) held in Muğla, Turkey.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to reveal the perception of nationalism of pre-service teachers who will teach Social Studies course in a multidimensional manner. In the study, a total of 381 pre-service teachers who study in department of Social Studies from different universities located in different regions of Turkey was defined as the study group and a descriptive model was used as the basis of the research design. The data include both quantitative and qualitative dimensions. In the scope of the research, a questionnaire was created to determine pre-service teachers' perception of nationalism. This form consists of three sections. The participants' demographic data, opinion questions and the nationalism perception scale are presented in the sections, respectively. The questionnaire was applied to the pre-service teachers studying in different regions of Turkey. At the end of the research, various results were obtained regarding the nationalism perceptions of pre-service social studies teachers.

Keywords: Education, Social studies, Nationalism

1. Introduction

When teaching programs are studied, it is remarkably realized that the concepts such as motherland, ideals, nation, national consciousness, patriotism and nationalism are often given place. The desired aim is to make students love, protect and value their country and nation. Social Studies is one of the most effective and functional courses in the teaching of these values. Thus, how should the concept of nationalism be within the education system that we develop?

Nationalism, one of the most controversial debates of the recent history, has a great power considering the impact it has on transforming and guiding large masses of people. Throughout the period in which it emerged, nationalism possesses an inciting power. Simultaneously with the rise of political nationalism, history has acquired an identity of a scientific discipline and begun to be put into curriculums as a course necessary to be taught (Safran, 2008). From this period onwards, in the process of education, it is this course that to a great extent fulfils the responsibilities of constructing a national identity and raising good citizens. The most commonly known expectation from a History course or Social Studies for lower grades is to raise good citizens. However, the duty of raising "good citizens" is becoming more and more complicated. This is due to the constantly changing societal dynamics necessitating a constant revising in the programs of instruction. Furthermore, the acceptance of history as a -discipline of science- and the emergence of nation-states are simultaneous. In the formation of new states, the support of the governments towards the new history discourse through which nationalism can be taught faster and easier is the most important factor (Safran, 2008). According to Tom Nairn, nationalism is the pathology of modern development history; it is inevitable just like neurosis in individuals (Anderson, 2015).

When defining "nationality" it would be useful first to focus on the term "nation". Guibernau (2007) maintains that the national identity can be defined as a collective feeling based on the belief of belonging the same nation and sharing the qualities that separate them from other nations. National identity, with fluid and dynamic aspects, is a modern notion. While the period of creating national consciousness requires a long time, the elements that are built upon such a feeling might vary. For Guibernau nation has five dimensions, these are: Psychological (A group consciousness), cultural, territorial, political and historical dimensions. According to Smith (1991), "nation" can be defined as a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical

memories, a mass public culture, common economy, and common legal rights and duties for all members. One of the striking qualities here, is the sharing of a territory, which Smith also gives importance to and places in the first place in his definition. This is not just any territory, this is the territory that makes a homogenous society a nation, thus a country/a home. For this reason, “nation” can be expressed as a population that exists on a clearly defined piece of land, and has an allegiance to an internal state apparatus and a unitary government that is checked and observed by foreign states.

French philosopher Ernest Renan is one of the first to put down the notion of nation with most strength. In his 1882 conference “What is a Nation?” he states that nation is based on “feeling of living together, a common culture and a spiritual unity”. Renan in this conference touches upon the subject of country and explains that a nation is not a group based on territorial determination. He gives the definition of “nation” as “a spiritual principle resulting from the profound complexities of history, a spiritual family”. Another definition made by Joseph Stalin (2012) states that “nation is a community that consists of a consistent language, territory, economic life and a psychological structure that expresses itself in the form of a shared culture”. This definition faces us as the best known example for identifying objective criteria for being a nation, or attempting to explain why some groups “nationalize” and some “cannot nationalize” based on a single criterion such as language and ethnic origin, or on a cluster of criteria such as language, shared territory, shared history and cultural qualities (Hobsbawm, 2006). However, another point that needs to be indicated is the expressive differences between nationality, which is expressed as being a part of a nation and the case being affiliated with a nation, and the nationalism, which is expressed as the feelings of affiliation and consciousness the members exhibit towards the nation that they are a part of (Eroğlu, 1995). Besides, when one talks about the formation and the integration of large community which is called a “nation”, the ideology here is “nationalism” (Ataman, 1977). According to Stalin, none of the qualities that is counted is not enough to define a nation when considered individually (Özkırımlı, 2005).

The birth of nationalism notion is in parallel with the creation of a middle-class in Europe. It will be easier to understand the concept of country and nation if how this birth occurred and its general qualities are studied. Traditionally, “Nationalism” has been a disturbing topic for social scientists. An endless array of examples to this situation can be seen, as in the 19th and the at beginning of the 20th century, the great philosophers of their times showed an insufficient interest in clarifying one of the most important political force of their age. For example, Max Weber, known as a German nationalist, in fact does not put forward any systematic theory of nationalism. Weber puts forward his own nationalism through his opposition against the Polish immigration in East Germany, his support of German nationalism during First World War and his reaction against the Treaty of Versailles. On the other hand, Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx predict that nationalism would cease to exist soon, and that it is an ideological trend that needs to be overcome. The attitudes of Durkheim and Marx, however, differ slightly in certain aspects. The position that Durkheim takes can be explained as “pan-nationalism”. What is meant by that is that the “humane” purposes are to be held above “national” purposes. According to Durkheim “country” has a key role in the moralization process for it organizes the human society in the highest level (Guibernau, 2007). Let aside the fact that the prediction of the “end of the age of nationalism” not taking place and “nationalism playing an important role in the supplying of the myths and societal symbols that organize the politics and communal behaviors” (Torfing, 1999), the nationalism is currently regarded as the most universal and valid aspect of societal/political life (Anderson, 2015). From another perspective, nationalistic discourse has transformed the ethnicity and cultural patterns within a global cultural flow and has shaped the spontaneous creation of the state (Calhoun, 2007). According to Gellner (2012) people whose first aim in the political field is to describe a way of defining themselves, must be a part of political unity which aims to provide a continuity and protection to this “defining” process. This is what nationalism is.

According to Hobsbawm, just as the poppy is the main ingredient for heroin addicts, history is the main resource for nationalistic, ethnic or fundamentalist ideologies. Past is likely to be one of the main components of these ideologies, and maybe “is” the main component. Bayraktutan (1996) meanwhile, states that nationalistic discourse is the reason behind the emergence of bourgeoisie and the ordinary man:

“As the influence zone of the Western world expands, two important components of the nationalistic discourse rises alongside, these are: The dissolution of the old social order and the ways of old social life, and the emergence of the bourgeoisie and the ‘ordinary man’. For reasons not completely explicable, a strong feeling of nationality was born from the interaction of these two components and in a short notice this feeling takes the shape of a political movement.”

The emergence of nationalism in Turkey takes place in the late 19th and the early 20th century, following the movements of “Ottomanism” and “Islamism” which were seen as a solution to keep the different ethnic and

religious communities in the empire together. Following the Constitution period, Turkish nationalism movement gets further expanded and deepened. The most important name in the movement of “Turkism” is Ziya Gökalp. Gökalp who states “Turkism is the ennobling of the Turkish nation” in his work *The Foundations of Turkism*, aims at transforming the Turkism into not just a political program but also into a philosophy of life. According to Koç (2007) Turkish nation today comprises of a society that is a member of the Ural-Altai Family, Islamic ummah and European internationality.

It is necessary to remind people the important role of the imperialistic economic system and policies in the formation of nationalism. The system/policy that aspires to establish an overseas “national economy” with an aim of improving internal markets and productions along with division of labor creates a “consciousness of unity” emerging from a common hatred towards a pressure of foreign elements.

According to Wiggin (1962) the education of a nation-state is a part of the process by which the youth are adapted to societal life. It is not possible to understand the different character of the education practiced in the name of nationalism without seeing the reference of the school as the primary institution of socialization. The loyalty education for a child begins, even before the school age. They recognize the flag and the national anthem when they are very young. From very early ages on, they begin to learn national heroes and certain myths related to their nations. During the primary school years which carry the weight of the nationalistic education, they learn national history and geography and celebrate national holidays. During middle school, they become scouts. In their high school years, they begin to gain political consciousness about the importance of participating in the administration, and begin to choose their representatives with free or guided consciousness. During the young adulthood, they perform their military duties which they are educated to adore. Thus socially, politically and economically they become fully integrated members of the society. For the continuity of the nation-state, this half realistic half mystic loyalty and allegiance is something that is expected to be developed in individuals. According to Tagore (1921) a nation, in terms of the political and economic union of citizens, is the aspect which whole populations expect when they are organized for a mechanical purpose (p. 9).

Nationalism and patriotism both reflect the relationship of the individuals with their nation. It is often seen that these two terms are confused with the assumption that they both refer to the same thing. However, there is a great difference between nationalism and patriotism. Whereas nationalism emphasizes a unified cultural past including legacy and language, patriotism emphasizes the values and beliefs more and bases itself on a love of the nation. Orwell (1945) explains patriotism as an attachment to a place that is believed to be the best in the world and a lifestyle, without any compulsive wish on the people. Patriotism has a defensive nature both in the military and cultural sense. On the other side, nationalism cannot be thought of as separate from the wish for power. The constant aim of all the nationalists is to provide their nations, more than themselves, with more power and dignity. Nationalism, when the term is sociologically studied, is based on the understanding that national cultures would benefit the world civilization, become source for it, and save it from the monotony and make it more colorful (Kösoğlu, 2002). According to Akşin (2006) nationalism means patriotism. A patriot besides being respectful to other nations, works for the welfare of one’s own nation, its improvement, and chooses it over the other nations.

Patriotism cannot exist without a frame of a state or a nation-state. Unlike nationalism, territorialism, tribalism or localism, patriotism is always towards a political community and the embodiment of this community is the nation or the state. Being a social institution and limited politically and socially at its heart, the image of the nation only exists within the thoughts of its members (Anderson, 2015). Nationalism may have played a vital role in the first steps of the construction of a nation, but due to the idea of distinctness from the birth in its nature, nationalism can be destructive for especially nation-states with multi-ethnic structures. Different from nationalism, patriotism provides a perfect and visible reason for the nation to unite for its own wellbeing. Ontologically, patriotism is a social construction that gradually develops as a result of the human’s social activity (Berger & Luckman, 1966). It is natural that humans feel love and affection to the places they love. It is also natural for them to love their parents or the communities of which they are members and that support them. However, during the development of a nation-state, people were constantly convinced that they were parts of a larger community. Thus, a natural attachment to a community whose members build a sense of loyalty to the ideal community of the nation: Principedom, Kingdom, Empire, or in other words the state (Rapoport, 2009). Another point that needs to be made is that while nationality is a state of being part of a nation, nationality is a feeling of loyalty and consciousness that people experience towards the nation that they are member of (Eroğlu, 1995).

Many theorists argue that there is more than one type of nationalism. They are among such as Racial Nationalism, Traditional Nationalism, Humanitarian Nationalism, Liberal Nationalism, Territorial Nationalism

and in addition Atatürk's Nationalism. In Atatürk's nationalism there is a respect towards the nationalism and the rights of other nations. Atatürk perceives the nations of the world as a family and therefore, values freedoms and individual identities, and his idea of nationalism is based on the idea of equality and opposes a cast system (Turan, 2005). For him, nation is a political and social unity which consists of citizens who are connected to each other with a unity of language, culture and ideal. The Turkish nationalism for Atatürk is protecting the special character of Turkish social community and first and foremost its independent identity as well as walking along in parallel with all the modern nations in international relations and follow the advancements in the world (Afetinan, 2000). According to Eroğlu and Yılmaz (1995,2012) what makes the conceptual main base of Atatürk's nationalism is briefly a unifying, constructive, ennobling, humane, peaceful and holistic understanding. Ethnic or racial nationalism, on the other hand; defends that an individual's deepest affiliations are not the result of choice, but they are hereditary. For this reason, the membership of a nation is not a matter of will but it can only be acquired by blood links through birth (Özkırmılı, 2005). However, in the 19th century another form of nationalism, the liberal nationalism, the ideals of which are the basis of a diversity of movements such as radical liberalism, nationalism, romanticism and historicism emerged following the French Revolution (Delanthy and O'Mahony, 2002). The emergence point of the liberal nationalist project is the need to differentiate the types of nationalism that are ethically defensible, and those that are not (Özkırmılı, 2005). In this sense, there is a tone of optimism in the liberal nationalism as it assumes that each nations has a part to enact in the history. Another type of nationalism is called humanitarian nationalism. Enlightenment philosophers labeled it as Jacobin nationalism which drew its strength from the unbridled force of democracy merged with militarism set loose by the French Revolution. Therefore, traditional nationalism emerged as a reaction to the violence and war of the Jacobin and Bonapartist eras (Hayes, 2016).

The purpose of this study is to identify the nationalism perception of pre-service teachers of Social Studies in a multi-dimensional point of view. The aim in making such an identification is to see whether pre-service teachers in the study group have the nation and nationality relationship, and know the definitions of nationality and theories that are in the theoretical part of the study, and if so to what extend they exhibit it. To make this identification, the relationship between such variables as university, grade, sex, age, place of birth, and certain conditions such as the main components of Turkish nation were presented. Besides, the connection between these variables and the definition of the notion of nationalism, and pre-service teachers' metaphors, and associations regarding nationalism were analyzed. The main question concerning this study is "how do nationalism perceptions in pre-service teachers of Social Studies who take part in the study vary in terms of different variables".

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The research technique, which aims to collect the data of a group's specific characteristics, is called as survey research type (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012). To put it differently, the survey research type is a method which is not experimental and depends on surveys and interview protocols. The major principal of this kind of research is 'if you want to know what people think, ask them' (Gümüş, 2015). For understanding people's thoughts and actions, survey research designs are applied to a specific sample group or a huge population through conducting a quantitative research in the model of survey which is controlled by researchers (Creswell, 2012). By adding effective measurement procedures, a survey will help with exploring, when the belief, attitude and opinions are measured, the relations between variables, and how sub-groups are effected and what the estimations are, will also be determined them. (Christensen, Burke Johnson and Turner, 2015).

2.2. Study Group

The study group consists of 381 pre-service social studies teachers who were in their 2015-2016 academic term in the education faculties of state universities, which were chosen from four different geographical region of Turkey. When the descriptive statistics of the participants are taken into consideration, there are a total of 381 participants %47.8 of whom are "women" (182 individual) and %52,2 of whom are "men" (199 individual). Considering the age distribution of the participants, %40,9 consists of "18-20 age group" (156 individual), %49.3 consists of "21-23 age group" (188 individual), %6.8 consists of "24-26 age group" and %2.9 "+27 age group". The university variables show that the participant's majority %61,2 (233 individual) were chosen from the University A in Central Anatolia Region, %21 (80 individual) were chosen from the University B in the Mediterranean Region, %8,7 were chosen from the University C in the Black Sea Region, and

lastly %9,2 (35 individual) were chosen from the University D in Eastern Anatolia Region. Another variable regarding grade which shows that the participants' %36,5 (139 individual) consists of "freshmen", %27,6 (105 individual) consists of "sophomores", %23,1 (88 individual) consists of "juniors" and lastly %12,9 (49 individual) consists of "seniors". The participants' distribution in terms of the places they live before the university variable shows that %44,1 (168 individual) comes from "metropolitan cities", %33,6 (128 individual) comes from "small cities", %10 (38 individual) comes from "towns" and %12,1 (46 individual) comes from "villages". The participants' distribution concerning their places of birth shows that Ankara (% 20,5), Adana (% 11,3), Kars (% 4,7), İstanbul (% 3,4), Kahramanmaraş (% 3,1) and Hatay (% 2,6), Şanlıurfa (% 2,6), Van (% 2,6), Konya (% 2,4) and other provinces (% 46,8) are the cities they come from.

2.3. Data Collection Tool

To identify the nationalism perception of pre-service teachers, a survey form was created in the scope of this research. This survey form consists of 3 segments. The first of it includes questions such as demographical information and closed-end questions which are appropriate to collect qualitative data. The second segment of the survey form includes closed-ended, open-ended, AR-Assertion and Reason type of questions that the participants can comment on. The third segment includes triple Likert type nationalism perception scale which was developed by Şen (2008). To develop a "Nationalism Perception Scale", Şen (2008) prepared 60 questions but considering the answerability of the questions, this number was decreased to 45. The last section that consists of 25 questions of this scale was used in this research. In addition to this, to help pre-service teachers remember the types of nationalism, an additional information note was added to the survey form. The reliability co-efficient number of this scale (Cronbach Alpha) is .82,7.

The qualitative data collected in the research was evaluated by content analysis and interpreted in the form of tables. In the tables, the answers and the reasons were given in percentages. The opinions of the participants were investigated by two field's experts besides the researchers. The matters designated by both experts and the researchers were evaluated considering the "Consensus" and "Divergence". For the reliability calculation of the data, the formulation of reliability that is suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used. Reliability = "Consensus" / ("Divergence" + "Consensus"). As a result of the calculation, the reliability of the content analysis is %89,79 for justification and ratio. That the reliability calculation is over %70 makes this study reliable.

We can interpret metaphors as the reflections of what we do, think and understand (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). To put it differently, metaphor is identified to be "a strong mental mapping and modelling mechanism that help individual's understanding and shaping their microcosm" (Arslan and Bayrakçı, 2006, p. 103). Thinking through metaphors is an integral part of scientific process (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). Metaphors change the usual meaning of words and adapt them into a new context only when there is a literary consensus. (Draaisma, 2000). The process of the analysis of the participants' use of metaphor was conducted in 5 stages benefitted from the view of Saban (2009): (1) The coding and decoding stage, (2) Example metaphor compilation stage, (3) Category development stage, (4) Providing the reliability and validity stage and (5) Transferring to SPSS package for the data analysis of the quantitative data.

2.4. Data Analysis

The quantitative data of the analysis of the research was conducted by a computer-supported analysis program and the analysis of the qualitative data was conducted through content analysis method. The purpose of the content analysis method is to put together similar data through a common theme and concept and interpreting the codes for the understanding of the reader (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). The tests which seek for the appropriateness of a qualitative (categorical) variable's actual and expected distribution are named as "Good fit" tests (Can, 2016). Chi-square Independence test was utilized to designate if there are significant differences on the variables that the participants pay attention to the relations related to social studies teaching and nationalism, between pre-service social studies teachers' nationality perception regarding the university they attend and their own perception of the concept (whether they define themselves as nationalist) and what type of nationalist they think they are. Besides, Chi-square Independence test was also used to find out if there is a significant difference in the case that the participants who define themselves as nationalist and the associations between social studies teaching and nationalism variables. Chi-square Independence test is used to find out if there is a relation between two or more variable groups. This test is especially used in the situations when the observation results are categorized or grouped in combined series (Kalaycı 2006). The general distribution of the frequencies and percentages of the questions of the "Nationalism Perception Scale" were discussed. The percentage of "negative"

and “positive” answers to the scale was mutually interpreted.

3. Findings and Interpretations

Table 1. The regions with intense nationalism, considering the study groups

Geographical Region/Regions	Region	
	Frequency	Percentage
Preference Central Anatolia Region	183	34,2
Black Sea Region	144	27
The Mediterranean Region	59	11
Aegean Region	48	9
Eastern Anatolia Region	28	5,2
Empty	23	4,3
Southeastern Anatolia Region	22	4,1
Marmara Region	13	2,5
All Regions	10	2
It is not regional	3	0,5
All Regions except Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	1	0,2
Total (n=381)	534	100,0

*The reason behind why “n” number is different from f value is that a participant gives more than one answer.

Considering Table 1, Central Anatolia Region is the most intense region in terms of nationalism (%34,2). The order of the regions in which the nationalism is intense is as follows: Black Sea Region (%27), The Mediterranean Region (%11), Aegean Region (%9) and Eastern Anatolia (%5,2).

Table 2. Participants’ views about “Fundamental Element of Turkish Nation”

Answers	Frequency	Percentage
Motherland	212	29,3
Turkish Race	123	17
Language	117	16,2
History	98	13,5
Ideal	73	10,1
Religion	65	9
Only Citizenship	23	3,3
Humanity	11	1,5
Empty	1	0,1
Total (n=381)	723	100,0

* The reason behind why “n” number is different from f value is that a participant gives more than one answer.

In Table 2, pre-service social studies teachers’ answers on the fundamental element of Turkish Nation were given. According to this table the most common answer is “motherland” (%29,3). The other answers in order of their percentages are Turkish race (%17), Language (%16,2), History (%13,5), Ideal (%10,1) and Religion (%9). When the answers are taken into consideration, it is concluded that participants used “motherland” to express the fundamental element of the “Turkish Nation” concept.

Table 3. Chi-square test results considering the university variable and the participants' who define themselves as nationalists.

Universities	N	Preference	%	Types of Nationalism of those who said "Yes"		
A University	233	Yes	86,2	Racial Nationalism (% 15,9)	Traditional Nationalism (% 15,9)	Others (% 1,9)
		No	12,9	Humanitarian Nationalism (% 4,8)	Liberal Nationalism (% 3,8)	
		No answer	0,9	Territorial Nationalism (% 4,8)	Atatürk's Nationalism (% 52,9)	
B University	80	Yes	55,0	Racial Nationalism (% 18,3)	Traditional Nationalism (% 8,2)	Others (% 0)
		No	42,5	Humanitarian Nationalism (% 8,2)	Liberal Nationalism (% 8,2)	
		No answer	2,5	Territorial Nationalism (% 6,1)	Atatürk's Nationalism (% 51,0)	
C University	33	Yes	90,9	Racial Nationalism (% 16,8)	Liberal Nationalism (% 13,3)	Others (% 3,3)
		No	9,1	Traditional Nationalism (% 23,3)	Atatürk's Nationalism (% 43,3)	
D University	35	Yes	62,8	Racial Nationalism (% 22,7)	Traditional Nationalism (% 13,7)	
		No	37,2	Humanitarian Nationalism (% 40,9)	Atatürk's Nationalism (% 22,7)	

Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	43,113 ^a	6	,000	88,163 ^a	21	,000
Likelihood Ratio	40,874	6	,000	82,769	21	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11,071	1	,001	20,237	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	381			381		

Table 3 shows the Chi-Square test results of whether or not the participants' view on nationalism differs depending on their universities. When Table 3 was analyzed, it was concluded that people who define themselves as nationalist at the university A is % 86,2 and who doesn't is % 12,9. Whereas these percentages decrease at the University B, those who define themselves decreased to %55 but who don't increased to %42,5. The university C shows that those who define themselves nationalist %90,9 and those who don't %9,1. For the University D, those who answered "yes" was %62,8 and those who answered "no" was %37,2. It was found significant that the pre-service teachers from different universities show different results on defining themselves as nationalist [$\chi^2_{(6)} = 43,11, p < .05$]. To put it differently, a significant relation between the pre-service teachers' universities and their view on defining themselves as nationalist was found. Considering another variable that is on the table, "types of nationalities", University A (%52,9), University B (%51) and University C (%43,3) the answer with the highest rate is "Atatürk's Nationalism". At the University D, the highest rate is "Humanitarian Nationalism"

(%40,9). The least preferred nationality type considering the study groups is Liberal nationalism (%3,8), at the university A, at the university B it is Territorial nationalism (%6,1), at the university C it is Liberal nationalism (%13,3) and at the university D it is traditional nationalism (%13,7). Pre service teachers from different universities, who define themselves as nationalists whose preference in “nationalism types” show difference which was found to be significant [$\chi^2_{(21)} = 88,16, p < .05$]. To put it differently, there is a significant relation between pre-service teachers who define themselves nationalists and their preferences in “nationalism types”.

Table 4. Chi-square test results on university variable and the participants’ view on whether there is a relation between social studies teaching and nationalism.

Universities	n	Preference	%	Full Description	f	%
University A	233	Yes	88,4	Nationalism should be included in the curriculum	111	29,1
				The relation between syllabus and nationalism	96	25,2
				No answer	59	15,5
		No	10,7	Nationalism should be included in social studies teaching	34	8,9
				Helping students to find their own identity and their national identity	30	7,9
				The nationalism-teacher relation	12	3,1
University B	80	Yes	81,3	The situation in which social studies, society and nationalism are concentric	8	2,1
				The situation in which one remain neutral in the existence of different nations	7	1,8
				No	18,7	I don’t think that there is a relation
		No	18,7	Racism is the result of nationalism (-)	5	1,3
				University C	33	Yes
University C	33	Yes	87,9	The necessity of Social studies being universal	4	1,0
				No	12,1	The necessity of students serving to the nation
		No	12,1	Independence-Nationalism Relation	2	,5
				University D	35	Yes
University D	35	Yes	62,9	Total	381	100,0
				No	37,1	

Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	108,817 ^a	45	,000
Likelihood Ratio	106,406	45	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	12,780	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	381		

Considering Chi-square results of the university variable, the participants view on whether there is a relation

between social studies teaching and nationalism were given in the Table 4. When table 4 was analyzed, it can be concluded that the participants who defend that there is a relation between social studies teaching and nationalism were %88,4 at the University A, %81,3 at the University B, %87,9 at the University C and %62,9 at the University D. Participants who think that there is no relation between them were %10,7 at the University A, %18,7 at the University B, %12,1 at the University C and %37,1 at the University D. The difference of the participants' view on the relation between social studies teaching and nationalism, considering the university variable were found to be significant [$\chi^2_{(45)}= 108,81, p<.05$]. In other words, there is a meaningful relation between the social studies teaching and nationalism views of pre-service teachers who study at different universities.

The explanations of the participants on the relation between social studies teaching and nationalism were collected under 15 categories which include both alternatives. The most repeated category was “nationalism should be included in the curriculums”:

PT128, AU, E: “Yes”, “Not Nationalist”, “The aim of social studies teaching is to bring up nationalist citizens.”

PT247, DU, E: “Yes”, “Racist Nationalist”, “It is a mission of the social studies to give people love of nation, commonwealth and motherland.”

PT329, BU, K: “Yes”, “Atatürk’s Nationalist”, “Social studies and nationalism is a whole in that social studies include history and this history explains the history of the nation.”

PT317, BU, E: “No”, “Not Nationalist”, “You might be explaining the past but not like as it is in nationalism, it is more like where you came from and where you are going.”

The second most repeated category was “The relation between syllabus and nationalism”:

PT64, AU, K: “Yes”, “Racist Nationalist”, “Social studies courses prepare and shape an individual for different moments of life. If our principles are to be national then the people we shape will be nationalists.”

PT234, DU, E: “No”, “Humanitarian Nationalist”, “Actually while explaining the history, nationalism should be excluded. Because, if you are to move with this concept you cannot be objective towards the history. You will just pick up what is good for you and defend it.”

Table 5. Chi-square test results on the situations in which the participants who define themselves as nationalists and their views on the relation between social studies teaching and nationalism

Value	Are you nationalist?		The Relation between Social Studies Teaching and Nationalism	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Yes	297	78,0	322	84,5
No	80	21,0	57	15,0
Empty	4	1,0	2	,5
Total	381	100,0	381	100,0

Chi-Square Tests	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45,600 ^a	4	,000
Likelihood Ratio	39,174	4	,000
Linear-by-Linear Association	43,368	1	,000
N of Valid Cases	381		

When Table 5 was analyzed it is concluded that the participants' answers to “Are you a nationalist?” the percentage of “yes” is %78 whereas the percentage of “no” is %21. On other hand, the participants' answer on whether there is a relation between “social studies and nationalism” the percentage of “yes” is %84,5 and “no” %15. The difference between study group's defining themselves as nationalists and their views on nationalism and social studies teaching shows significance [$\chi^2_{(4)}= 45,6 p<.05$]. To put it differently, there is a

relation between the participants' being nationalist and their views on the relation between social studies teaching and nationalism.

Table 6. The percentage of pre-service social studies teachers' answers on Nationalist Perception Scale

Matters	I Agree	I Disagree	No Answer/No Idea	Empty
1. Turkish race is the supreme race.	34,6	52,0	12,1	1,3
2. Being Muslim is an indispensable part of being Turk.	44,9	46,2	8,4	0,5
3. Nationalism is neither in the hands of an individual nor a political party .	80,1	16,0	2,9	1,0
4. Nationalism is killing and dying for the welfare of the motherland.	54,1	37,0	8,1	0,8
5. All the Turks around the world should unite under a single roof.	52,8	31,5	14,2	1,6
6. Greatest nationalism means doing your job in a best way.	85,3	8,1	5,8	0,8
7. I am against all kinds of nationalism.	19,7	65,4	13,9	1,0
8. Nationalism has always been a term that is wrongly interpreted.	71,4	18,1	10,0	0,5
9. We are all Muslims which come before being Turk.	57,0	27,0	15,2	0,8
10. I am against the marriages between races.	17,1	73,5	8,7	0,8
11. I would never trade with a merchant that is not Turk.	7,9	83,2	8,4	0,5
12. Nationalism is racism.	23,1	67,7	8,1	1,0
13. I am a nationalist but not a racist.	70,3	21,3	7,6	0,8
14. Nationalism is being proud of being Turk.	66,1	26,5	6,3	1,0
15. The concept of being Turk is not something to be shy about but something to be proud of.	75,9	16,3	7,1	0,8
16. Nationalists are more attached to the government.	62,2	28,1	9,2	0,5
17. A strong government strengthens nationalism.	68,8	23,9	6,8	0,5
18. Turkish nationalism is used as a device to suppress people.	34,6	51,7	12,1	1,6
19. Military is a holly place	70,3	18,4	10,5	0,8
20. Paying taxes is sacred.	61,7	25,5	11,8	1,0
21. If I had chance, I would not send my child to do the military service.	19,4	71,9	7,9	0,8
22. I would die if necessary for the welfare of the motherland.	80,3	11,0	8,1	0,5
23. This government does not deserve taxes.	14,7	74,8	10,0	0,5
24. Nationalism causes violence.	24,1	65,1	9,7	1,0
25. Nationalism divides the society.	26,8	62,7	9,7	0,8

When table 6 was analyzed, the answers which claim "I agree" in Nationalism Perception Scale were 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23th matters. The answers which claim "I disagree" were 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 18, 21,

22, 24, 25th matters. The highest rate which was “agreed” by the majority of pre-service social studies teachers was “Greatest nationalism means doing your job in a best way.” (85,3); “I would die if necessary for the welfare of the motherland.” (%80,3) and “Nationalism is neither in the hands of an individual nor a political party.” (%80,1). When the study group’s most “disagreed” matters were considered, it can be concluded that the first one is “I would never trade with a merchant that is not Turk” (%83,2), the second one is “This government does not deserve taxes.” (%74,8) and the last one is “I am against the marriages between races.” (%73,5).

The study group’s metaphors that were used to define nationalism was given in table 7 and the metaphor categories created accordingly with these given metaphors were shown in table 8.

Table 7. Pre-service social studies teachers’ metaphors that were used to define nationalism

Sequence No	Metaphor	(f)	%	Sequence No	Metaphor	(f)	%
1	Water	9	4,09	56	Milk	1	0.45
2	Family	9	4,09	57	Equality	1	0.45
3	Body of a Human	9	4,09	58	Rooster	1	0.45
4	Flag	8	3,63	59	Teacher	1	0.45
5	Tree	7	3,18	60	Migratory Birds	1	0.45
6	Blood	7	3,18	61	Rainbow	1	0.45
7	Affinity	7	3,18	62	Hellion of the house	1	0.45
8	Brotherhood	7	3,18	63	Life	1	0.45
9	Love	6	2,72	64	Magnet	1	0.45
10	Light	4	1,81	65	Matryoshka Doll	1	0.45
11	Rings of a chain	4	1,81	66	A Fist	1	0.45
12	Interlock	4	1,81	67	Flower	1	0.45
13	Fanaticism	4	1,81	68	Lock	1	0.45
14	House	4	1,81	69	Glue	1	0.45
15	Mother	3	1,36	70	Prime Number	1	0.45
16	Fire	3	1,36	71	Supporting a team	1	0.45
17	Fire	3	1,36	72	Football	1	0.45
18	Spirit	3	1,36	73	Hobbies	1	0.45
19	Glass	3	1,36	74	Supported party	1	0.45
20	Motherland	2	0.90	75	River	1	0.45
21	Sickness	2	0.90	76	Sky	1	0.45
22	Racism	2	0.90	77	Ant Colony	1	0.45
23	Knife	2	0.90	78	Target	1	0.45
24	Ideal	2	0.90	79	War	1	0.45
25	Bee Hive	2	0.90	80	Freedom	1	0.45
26	Wolf	2	0.90	81	Book	1	0.45
27	Breathing	2	0.90	82	Philosophy	1	0.45
28	Religion	2	0.90	83	Pole Star	1	0.45
29	Culture	2	0.90	84	A Thrown Arrow	1	0.45
30	Turkism	2	0.90	85	Adolf Hitler	1	0.45
31	Knot	2	0.90	86	A Poisonous Snake	1	0.45

32	Forest	2	0.90	87	Utopia	1	0.45
33	Puzzle	2	0.90	88	Masculine	1	0.45
34	Adhesive	2	0.90	89	Having blinders on	1	0.45
35	Soldier	2	0.90	90	Yeast	1	0.45
36	Ship	2	0.90	91	Honor of a person	1	0.45
37	Stone	2	0.90	92	Rain	1	0.45
38	Brain	2	0.90	93	Lion	1	0.45
39	Worship	2	0.90	94	Pride	1	0.45
40	Sun	2	0.90	95	Money	1	0.45
41	Gun	2	0.90	96	Scales	1	0.45
42	Earth	2	0.90	97	Sea	1	0.45
43	Poison	2	0.90	98	Iron	1	0.45
44	A Great Leader	2	0.90	99	Sword	1	0.45
45	Eating	2	0.90	100	Internet	1	0.45
46	Dough	2	0.90	101	Morning and Night	1	0.45
47	Human	2	0.90	102	A Valuable Mine	1	0.45
48	National ID Card	1	0.45	103	Baby food	1	0.45
49	Language	1	0.45	104	Pomegranate	1	0.45
50	Motor (Dynamo)	1	0.45	105	Oxygen	1	0.45
51	Lake	1	0.45	106	Source of Life	1	0.45
52	Slum in the shadow of skyscrapers	1	0.45	107	Personality	1	0.45
53	A Dark Well	1	0.45	108	Self-Sacrifice	1	0.45
54	Book	1	0.45	109	Mirror	1	0.45
55	Candle	1	0.45		Total	220	100

According to table 7, 109 metaphors were used for defining “nationalism” by pre-service social studies teachers. Each frequency number of the developed metaphors is represented by a participant. When the frequency distribution of the metaphors used for defining nationalism analyzed, the most common ones were “water” (f:9), “family” (f:9=), “body of a human” (f:9), “flag” (f:8), “tree” (f:7), “blood” (f:7), “affinity” (f:7) and “brotherhood” (f:7). Generally the analysis of the metaphors shows that the content [nationalism] was materialized and associated with the elements of nature.

Table 8. The categories of the metaphors used by pre-service social studies teachers to define nationalism

Sequence No	Category	Metaphors	Number of Metaphors	Number of Students
1	Unity and Solidarity	Migratory Birds, Hellion of the house, Life, Body of a human, Wolf, Interlock, Rainbow, Forest, Fanaticism, Family, Rings of a chain, Flower, Brotherhood, Ideal, Matryoshka doll, A Fist, Knot, Lock, Bee Hive, Adhesive, Puzzle, Religion, Prime Number, Soldier, Magnet, Ship, Glass, Supporting a team, Football, Hobbies, Supported Party, Tree	32	52

2	Indispensable	Spirit, Honor of a person, Religion, Earth, A human Body, Mother, Water, Breath, Rain, Family, A Thrown Arrow, Oxygen, Flag, Blood, Source of Life, Breathing, A Great Leader, Motherland, Love, Eating, Homeland, House, Tree, Human, Brain, Racism, Lion, Pride	29	47
3	Benefits depends on the purpose of use	Knife, Eating, Money, Scales, Blood, Brain, Fire, Ship, Sea, Gun, Iron, Sword, Sun, Internet, Glass, Morning and Night, A Valuable Mine, Fire, Poison, Dough, Baby Food, Pomegranate	22	23
4	Result leads to the undesirable	A Poisonous Snake, Fire, Knife, A Dark Well, Gun, Earth, Flank Guard, Slum in the shadow of skyscrapers, A Poison, Racism, Utopia, An empty glass, Masculine, Having blinders on, Sickness, Yeast	16	18
5	Requires effort and protection	Ant Colony, Tree, Target, War, Family, Interlock, Touchstone, Freedom, Self-sacrifice, Worship, A human Body, House, Wolf, Working bees	14	18
6	Enhances, Illuminates, Improves and leads	Sun, Light, Human, Tree, Book, Juice of a herb, Philosophy, Pole star, Candle, Lighthouse, A Thrown Arrow, Turkism, Adolf Hitler	13	16
7	Attachment, explanation	National ID card, Family, Blood, Lake, Language, Culture, A mirror, Motor (dynamo), Knot, Milk, Spirit	11	12
8	Sharing similar emotions	Love, Affinity, Mother, Equality, Rooster, Humanist person, Teacher	7	18
9	Sign-symbol	Flag in the sky, Ideal, Tree, Turkism	4	11
10	Unending, Boundless Effector	River, Culture, Stone, Brain, Sky	5	5

The metaphors that the participants developed about the concept of “nationalism” were divided into ten based on their common characteristics. The names of the categories are as follows: “Unity and Solidarity”, “Indispensable”, “Benefits depends on the purpose of use”, “Result leads to the undesirable”, “Requires effort and protection”, “Enhances Illuminates”, “Improves and leads”, “Attachment, explanation”, “Sharing similar emotions”, “Sign-symbol”, “Unending Boundless Effector”.

Examples of the metaphors:

Category 1: Unity and Solidarity

PT65, AU, K, “Atatürk’s Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like an interlock. Because it is an asset that connects people together.” Category 2: Indispensable

PT33, AU, K, “Yes”, “Atatürk’s Nationalist”: Nationalism is like water. Because just as water is an irreplaceable need for humans, so as the nationality and the feeling of nationalism is important for a human.”

Category 3: Benefits depend on the purpose of use

PT339, BU, K, “Yes”, “Atatürk’s Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like fire. If you support a nationalist person, he will exuberate further and further, hurts and breaks the ones facing him. If you do not support him, he will be calm and benign.”

Category 4: Result leads to the undesirable

PT246, DU, E, “Yes”, “Humanitarian Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like a poisonous snake. Because whoever it bites, it will make those people blind, make them take wrong paths, and lead to discrimination.”

Category 5: Requires effort and protection

PT227, AU, E, “Yes”, “Atatürk’s Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like a family. Because you love your family members, respect them, protect them, and sacrifice for them.”

Category 6: Enhances Illuminates

PT176, AU, K, “Yes”, “Racial Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like the sun. Because it further enlightens everywhere it is present.”

Category 7: Attachment, explanation

PT208, AU, K, “Yes”, “Territorial Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like a family. Because it requires a loyalty to each other, any and all the time.”

Category 8: Sharing similar emotions

PT295, CU, E, “Yes”, “Traditional Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like love. Because it is a connection with love to the piece of country that you live in.”

Category 9: Sign-symbol

PT215, AU, K, “Yes”, “Atatürk’s Nationalism”: “Nationalism is like a flag. Because without a flag the country has no symbol, without nationalism the country is not independent.”

Category 10: Unending Boundless Effector

PT69, AU, K, “Yes”, “Liberal Nationalist”: “Nationalism is like a stone. Because it is heavy in weight. It can corrode and crumble, but never ends.”

Pre-service social studies teachers in the study group see nationalism more as “unity and solidarity”. In general, the metaphors that the participants generated display a difference from one another. This may be due to the pre-service teachers’ nationalism perception in relation to the nationalism type they prefer. Besides, it can be thought that this difference is to the variance with the cultural environment in which they were brought up.

Table 9. The definitions of nationalism for pre-service social studies teachers

Themes	Codes	%
Humanist approach (% 20,29)	It is not racism (segregation). Respect for other races	11,09
	The wish to live with common values	3,33
	Respect towards other nations	2,35
	Following the path of Atatürk (Principles and ideals)	1,84
	Sharing same feelings (Belonging)	1,68
Love for the country and nation (% 28,06)	Loving one’s country	9,24
	Unity, solidarity, loyalty	6,89
	Protecting the country and the nation (Defense)	6,39
	Looking after one’s country (Piece of Land)	5,21
	Driving force of a nation	0,33
Benefits of the country (% 11,75)	Working for the benefits, interests and the people of the country	5,71
	Working to elevate the country and the nation	4,70
	Defending the interests of the country	0,84
	Raising conscious generations	0,50
The fundamental elements of a nation	Unity of ideals	4,53
	Unity of language	3,86

(% 17,1)	Unity of religion	3,02
	Sharing the same history (Unity of history)	2,85
	Unity of culture	1,84
	Unity of flag	1,00
Traditional nationalism (% 19,29)	Loving one's nation/race/lineage	6,55
	The community of people deriving from the same nation (race/lineage)	4,03
	Privileging one's own nation (race)	3,69
	Dying if necessary for one's country (giving up one's life)	3,19
	Having a consciousness of identity	0,67
	Fighting against traitors	0,50
	Being native	0,50
	The ideal of Turan	0,16
Against nationalism (% 2,17)	It is a way of discriminating people	1,00
	It is fascism	0,84
	It is narrow-mindedness	0,33
Empty	No answer	1,34
Total (n=381)		100

The "Nationalism" definitions targeted towards the pre-service social studies teachers and the formed common themes were presented in Table 9. According to this, the answers of the pre-service teachers were grouped under five themes. The theme where the most definitions converge was "Love for the country and the nation" (28,06 %). The most commonly made definitions manifest themselves as: "It is not racism (segregation). Respect for other races" (11,09 %), "Loving one's country" (9,24 %), "Unity, solidarity, loyalty" 86,89 %). Examples of the definitions of the study group for the definition of nationalism was given below.

PT136, AU, K, "Yes", "Liberal Nationalist": "to me nationalism is the condition of being united around common national values for one's country. Tolerance should be the basis. It is living together with respect and not exclusion or discrimination. (Unity and solidarity)"

PT141, AU, K, "Yes", "Racial Nationalist": "Turkish nationalism is being proud to see all the kin under one flag, privileging the love for the country and nation above everything, keeping the interests of the Turkish race above one's own"

PT166, AU, K, "Not Nationalist": "It does not mean racism. It is just people sharing the same feelings living in a shared country"

PT176, AU, K, "Yes", "Racial Nationalist": "Loving the nations is what makes a nation "nation". Nationalism is an element that strengthens the bonds between the citizens."

PT181, AU, E, "Yes", "Humanitarian Nationalist": "to me nationalism is the people of Turkey living together without a harm to the country, and protecting Turkey's prestige against the foreign countries."

PT209, AU, K, "Yes", "Traditional Nationalist": "A nation's defense of its own race and working always to elevate it to the plain of advanced civilizations." (Unity of Ideals)

PT242, CU, E, "Not Nationalist": "Seeing one's race above other races, the policy of assimilations and othering."

PT246, DU, E, "Yes", "Humanitarian Nationalist": "Knowing one's own identity. It is not racism, or fascism. It is not segregation of humans." (Not racist)

PT270, CU, E, "Yes", "Traditional Nationalist": "Nationality is being just among ourselves, and standing upright against other states and not getting oppressed."

PT296, CU, E, "Yes", "Racial Nationalist": "Going to the front with the knowledge of death. Forgetting all that you love and fighting for the country. As these conditions do not exist today it is being able keep these feelings intact within ourselves." (Giving up one's life)

PT325, BU, E, “Not Nationalist”: “The common values in the people who share the same language, race and culture.” (Common national values)

PT331, BU, K, “Territorial Nationalist”: “It is individual’s perceiving of his/her original race superior to other races. It is defending and protecting one’s traditions, language and life style as seeing them important and valuable. It is rising against the insults, humiliations and misconducts that are directed to one’s race. It is seeing one’s motherland and nationality as superior.

Table 10. The thoughts of the pre-service social studies teachers on how they would teach nationalism in their courses

Themes	Codes	%
Humanist Approach (% 36,05)	Teach them not to be racists and not make discrimination	13,36
	Teach Atatürk’s nationalism (Principles and Reforms)	7,14
	Teach respect towards other races	6,22
	Teach shared humanistic values. (love, respect, conscious, tolerance, humanism)	5,86
	A sense of nationalism that is equalitarian, peaceful and with no privileging	3,47
Traditional Nationalism (% 23,4)	I would like them to adopt nationalism and national consciousness	6,95
	Teach them historical achievements (heroisms)	6,77
	Teach them common national values (Traditions and customs)	4,94
	Raise individuals loyal to their flag	2,01
	Raise individuals who would sacrifice their lives to their country	1,46
	Raise individuals who would not betray their country	1,09
	Explain the treasons committed by other races	0,18
Love for the country and nation (% 22,13)	Raise individuals who love their country	12,08
	I would like them to learn the value of unity, solidarity and loyalty.	5,31
	The necessity to protect the country	1,64
	Teach them to watch the values and the interest of the country	1,64
	Teach them the indivisible unity (Independence) of the country	1,46
Educational Dimension (% 10,93)	I would teach by using different methods of instruction (through experience, drama, historical sights, museum trips, poetry, anthems, memoirs, literary works)	4,94
	Teach them the difference between racism and nationalism	2,01
	Introduce them our ancestors	1,09
	Teach them the unity of ideals	0,91
	Make sure students learn the topics by making research and asking questions	0,73
	Teach them lineages, origins and identities	0,73
	Raise individuals who have responsibilities for their country	0,52
Interests of the country (% 4,20)	Raise individuals who seek the welfare of their country	3,29
	Raise individuals who would serve their country	0,91
Empty	No Answer	3,29
Total (n=381)		100

The answers to the question of how to teach nationalism targeted at the pre-service social studies teachers were given along with the formed common themes in Table 10. According to the table, the answers of the pre-service teachers were grouped into five themes. The theme with the most answers was “Humanist Approach” (36,05 %). The most commonly given answers were as follows: “Teach them not to be racists and not make discrimination”

(13,36%), “Raise individuals who love their country” (12,08 %), “Teach Atatürk’s nationalism (Principles and Reforms)” (7,14 %)

The examples of the ideas of the pre-service teachers that are part of the study group on how to teach the concept of nationalism was given below.

PT13, AU, K, “Yes”, “Traditional Nationalist”: “I would inscribe to their minds the concept of nationalism by telling the deeds of the ancestors of the Turkish nation. I would differentiate between racism and nationalism while teaching.”

PT16, AU, K, “Yes”, “Racial Nationalist”: “Nationalism is giving up of one’s life for the sake of the country without thinking. But anything that would look down on one’s race should be avoided.”

PT84, AU, K, “Not Nationalist”: “If they are to defend an ideology, I would want them to be informed with the consciousness that just as they respect their own nation and country that there exist other ideas and that different nations are equal”

PT187, AU, K, “Yes”: “Humanitarian Nationalist”: “They need to learn without zealotry and racism. Nationalism cannot be thought as independent of Atatürk. We need to do this with an awareness.”

PT200, AU, E, “Yes”, “Traditional Nationalist”: “Individuals who love their country, flag, land, attached to their national values, those who would not betray or rebel against their country.”

PT204, AU, E, “Yes”. “Traditional Nationalist”: “I would like them to know that nationalism and racism should not at all be confused, and that the concepts of race and nation have different definitions.”

PT229, AU, K, “Not a Nationalist”: “I would not dwell on it much. For me, being a nationalist does not mean anything. It is enough to teach being a human and looking after the nature in which we live.”

PT334, BU, E, “Yes”: “Atatürk’s Nationalist”: “When nationalism is concerned especially for young individuals, the racial nationalism comes to mind. I would like to teach them Atatürk’s nationalism.”

PT368, BU, E, “Yes”, “Traditional Nationalist”: “Just as one loves and values his or her nation, honor and race, one should respect all other races and people and should not disdain them.”

Conclusions

According to the findings of this study regarding the pre-service social studies teachers, the regions with the highest concentration of nationalism are Central Anatolia and Black Sea Regions and the most fundamental element of Turkish nation is “country”. This is followed by “Turkish race”, “language”, “history”, “ideals” and “religion”. According to Köseoğlu (2002) in the understanding of nation or nationality, among the elements that make a society a nation such as language, religion, state, and geography; one or a few may be foregrounded depending on the susceptibilities at the moment and the effect of the expectations about the future. In other words, nationalism is a cultural phenomenon based on language, emotions. Therefore, it can not be defined as an ideology or a political movement (Uzer, 2016).

In the study, the participants from different universities in different regions view themselves as more nationalistic when they were asked to make a comparison between themselves and the other regions. While this ratio is higher in “Central Anatolia”, Black Sea Region” and “Mediterranean Region”, it remains “medium” in “Eastern Anatolia”. When the nationalism types of the participants are taken into consideration, those from “Central Anatolia”, “Black Sea Region” and “Mediterranean Region” include themselves in the category of “Atatürk’s Nationalist”, the university students selected from “Eastern Anatolia” categorized themselves more often as “Humanitarian Nationalist”. Those who remained outside of this classification at a great ratio made preferences towards “Traditional Nationalism”, “Racial Nationalism” and “Humanitarian Nationalism”. According to Ortaylı and Küçükkaya (2012) the idea that the nationalism is being tied to the values of small towns and the rules taught by the elders should be questioned. In today’s world, it is possible to talk about an “economic nationalism” that allows different identities to live together and preserve the economical inputs of the global powers. The link between the economic nationalism and the socialization, emerges clearly with the historically important and determining step - the closure of the borders to all large scale immigrations- taken by all the major industrial states in 1919 (Carr, 2012)

Most of the participants believe that there is a link between the Social Studies education and nationalism. The highest rate of the associations made by the participants was in the categories of “Nationalism should be included in the curriculum” and “The relation between syllabus and nationalism”. A similar association to the

one done in the study overlaps with the curriculum is supported by the statement that “It gives priority to the adoption of the universal values by taking national identity at the center” (MEB, 2005). There is a parallelism between the course associations and the type of the nationalism of the pre-service teachers that they include themselves. It is believed that the formation of this relationship is influenced by the fact that nationalism, in Turkey, is able to express any problem that a society in transition can encounter, as well as serve to mask the old empiricism, habits and ideas (Karpas, 2010). In other words, nation-building continues with state-sponsored educational, cultural, and national-service programs (Calhoun, 1997).

In the “Nationalist Perception Scale” the article that the participants shared was “Greatest nationalism means doing your job in the best way” while the one that is most commonly disagreed with was “I would never trade with a merchant that is not Turk”. This situation exhibits parallelism with the pre-service teachers preferring “Atatürk’s Nationalism” and “Humanitarian Nationalism”. “Atatürk’s Nationalism” emphasized by the pre-service teachers who regard themselves nationalist in qualitative data also shows itself in the quantitative data as well.

It is observed that the pre-service social studies teachers most often generate metaphors in the categories of “unity and solidarity” and “irreplaceable”. The concepts that were most likened to nationalism by the participants were “water”, “family”, “human body”, “flag”, “tree”, “blood”, “love”, and “brotherhood”. When the metaphors of the pre-service teachers about the concept of “nationalism” were analyzed, it was revealed that despite the fact that the concept of nationalism is an abstraction, they used concrete concepts. The concepts chosen when metaphors were built are connecting and unifying in quality. Nationalism, then, is the use of the category “nation” to organize perceptions of basic human identities, grouping people together with fellow nationals and distinguishing them from members of other nations (Calhoun, 2007). Daily, the nation is indicated, or ‘flagged’, in the lives of its citizenry. Nationalism, far from being an intermittent mood in established nations, is the endemic condition (Billig, 1995). According to Carr (1945) the nation is not a “natural” or “biological” group in the sense for example, of the family. According to Sönmez Selçuk (2012), a member of modern society owes his / her cultural heritage, citizenship ethics, business skills and the ability to develop a bond of attachment to pass through a widespread education system (Altun, 2016). This makes nationalism a part of the social studies curriculum.

When the definitions of “nationality” among the participants were observed, it was identified that most of the definitions were around theme of “humanist approach”. A similar result was observed also about the ideas of the study group participants on how the nationalism should be taught in social studies course. The ideas about no racism/discrimination that showed up in the definitions of pre-service teachers were similarly observed in “teaching nationalism”. In the stated observation, it was found out that the pre-service teachers exhibited data that were in close proximity. According to Calhoun (2007) it is not easy to define nationalism. There are important variations where different cultures are at issue, where conquest has subordinated one group of people to another, where older ethnic groupings are being recast in terms of the idea of nation, and where an attempt is being made to forge a new unity out of previous diversity. Culturally, the most decisive idea behind nationalism (or national identity) is the modern notion of the individual. National culture becomes over-shadowed by the traditions of international civilization. That civilization is taught to children through books and teachers (Berkes, 1959).

When the pre-service teachers’ opinions on how to teach nationalism was analyzed, it was observed that the educational dimension was low in ratio. This situation can be interpreted as those pre-service social studies teachers have insufficient information about how to teach nationalism in a class atmosphere. According to Karpas (2011) the political regimes and education in Turkey, along with the information, taboos and values shaped in the minds of the humans, has not managed to accept such a broad and multidimensional understanding of nation and nationalism.

According to the results of the study, it is advised that an environment be provided for pre-service teachers to improve themselves both in educational and informational dimensions about “nationalism” in their bachelor education. Karpas (2011) indicates that while doing so one should be open to the world, to other ideas but should not cast aside, forget or be alienated towards the identity and culture that is bestowed by his history and origins.

References

Afetinan, A. (2000). Medeni Bilgiler: Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’ün El Yazıları. A. Sevim, A. Süslü, M. A. Tural (Yay. Haz.). Ankara: AKDITYK, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.

- Akşin, S. (2006). Milliyetçilik nedir? Ç. Yetkin (Haz.). *Milliyetçilik: Neden Şimdi? Aydınlar Açıklıyor* içinde (s. 9-14). Antalya: Yeniden Anadolu ve Rumeli Müdafaa-i Hukuk Yayınları.
- Altun, A. (2016). Küreselleşme Çağında Milliyetçilik ve Ulus-Devlet. *International Journal of Academic Value Studies*, 2 (4), 145-160.
- Anderson, B. (2015). *Hayali Cemaatler: Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması*, (Çev. I. Savaşır) İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Arslan, M. M. & Bayrakçı, M. (2006). Metaforik düşünme ve öğrenme yaklaşımının eğitim-öğretim açısından incelenmesi. *Milli Eğitim*, 35(171), 100–108.
- Ataman, S. (1977). *Milliyetçilik ve Türkiye*. İstanbul: Kervan.
- Bayraktutan, Y. (1996). *Türk Fikir Tarihinde Modernleşme Milliyetçilik ve Türk Ocakları: 1912-1996*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckman, Th. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Berkes, N. (1959). *Turkish nationalism and western civilization: selected essays of Ziya Gökalp*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Calhoun, C. (2007). *Milliyetçilik*. B. Sütçüoğlu (Çev.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Can, A. (2016). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi* (Dördüncü baskı). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Carr, E. H. (1945). *Nationalism and after*. London: Macmillan Co. Ltd
- Carr, E. H. (2012). *Milliyetçilik ve sonrası* [Nationalism and after]. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Christensen, L. B., Burke Johnson, R. and Turner, L. A. (2015). *Research methods design and analysis*. A. Aypay (Çev.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research : planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Delanty, G. and O'Mahony, P. (2002). *Nationalism and social theory: Modernity and the recalcitrance of the nation*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Draaisma, D. (2000). *Metaphors of memory: a history of ideas about the mind*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Eroğlu, H. (1995). Atatürk'e göre millet ve milliyetçilik. T. Feyzioğlu (Ed.). *Atatürk yolu* içinde (s. 131-167). Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Gellner, E. (2012). *Milliyetçiliğe bakmak* (Encounters with nationalism). S. Coşar, S. Özertürk ve N. Soyarı (Çev.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gökalp, Z. (1994). *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. (Haz. M. Ünlü, Y. Çotuksöken). İstanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi.
- Guibernau, M. (2007). *The Identity of Nations*. UK: Polity Press.
- Gümüş, E. (2015). Tarama araştırması. Christensen, L. B., Johnson, R. B. and Turner, L. A. *Research methods design and analysis*. (Çev. Ed. Ahmet Aypay). (pp. 367–399). Ankara: Anı.
- Hayes, C. J. H. (2016). *Nationalism: A religion*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (1999). *Tarih Üzerine*. (çev. O. Akınhay). Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. (2006). *1780'den günümüze milletler ve milliyetçilik: Program, mit, gerçeklik* (Üçüncü basım). İstanbul: Ayrıntı.
- Kalaycı, Ş. (2006). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil.
- Karpat, K. H. (2010). *Türk demokrasi tarihi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Karpat, K. H. (2011). *Osmanlı'dan günümüze Ortadoğu'da millet, milliyet ve milliyetçilik* (Birinci baskı). (Çev. R. Boztemur). İstanbul: Timaş.
- Koç, M. (2007). Türkleşmek, İslamlaşmak, Muasırlaşmak [Üç Cereyan]. Ş. Beysanoğlu, Y. Çotuksöken, M. F. Kırzioğlu, M. Koç ve M. S. Koz (Haz.). *Ziya Gökalp Kitapları I* içinde (s. 45-49). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Kültür Sanat Yayıncılık.
- Kösoğlu, N. (2002). *Küreselleşme ve milli hayat* (Birinci basım). İstanbul: Ötüken.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we lived by*. University of Chicago Press.

- MEB. (2005). *Sosyal bilgiler 6.-7. sınıf programı*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Ortaylı, İ. ve Küçükaya, İ. (2012). *Cumhuriyet'in ilk yüzyılı: 1923-2023*. İstanbul: Timaş.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Notes on Nationalism*. First published: Polemic. GB, London. May 1945. Reprinted: 'England Your England and Other Essays'. 1953.
- Özkırmı, U. (2005). *Milliyetçilik üzerine güncel tartışmalar: Eleştirel bir müdahale*. Y. Başkavak (Çev.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Rapoport, A. (2009). Patriotic education in Russia: Stylistic move or the sign of substantive counter-reform? *The Educational Forum* 73 (1), 141-153.
- Saban, A. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öğrenci kavramına ilişkin sahip oldukları zihinsel imgeler. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(2), 281-326.
- Safran, M. (2008). Türkiye'de tarih eğitimi ve öğretimi. M. Safran & D. Dilek (Ed.). *21. yüzyılda kimlik, vatandaşlık ve tarih eğitimi* içinde (s. 13-20). İstanbul: Yeni İnsan.
- Şen, Y. F. (2008). *Türk siyasal kültüründe millet algısı ve milliyetçilik*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora tezi, Ankara: Sosyal Bilimler Dalı, Kamu Yönetimi Ana bilim Dalı.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. New York, London: Penguin Books.
- Smith, A. D. (2010). *Nationalism*. 2nd edition. Polity.
- Sönmez Selçuk, S. (2012). Düünden Bugüne Milliyetçilik: Küresel Dünyada Yükselen Sesler (Nationalism Through the Ages: Rising Voices in the Global World). *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (3), s. 117-136.
- Stalin, J. V. (2012). *Marxism and the National Question*.
- Tagore, R. (1921). *Nationalism*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Torfin, J (1999). *New Theories of Discourse; Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turan, R. (2005). Cumhuriyetin Temel İlkeleri. D. Yalçın (Ed.). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi II*. Ankara: AKDYYK, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi.
- Wiggin, A. G. (1962). *Education and Nationalism, An Historical Interpretation of American Education*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (Genişletilmiş dokuzuncu baskı). Ankara: Seçkin.
- Yılmaz, F. (2012). *Türk anayasa tarihi 1808-2010*. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.