Preservice History Teachers' Attitudes towards Identity Differences

Fatih Yazıcı [1]

[1] Faculty of Education, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat, Turkey

Correspondence: Fatih Yazıcı, Faculty of Education, Gaziosmanpaşa University, Tokat, 60250, Turkey. Tel: 90-356-252-1616. E-mail: fatih.yazici@gop.edu.tr

Abstract

The ongoing changes in history education in support of diversity have an effect on Turkey even if on a limited scale. Although the current history curriculum in Turkey promotes the identity transmission instead of respecting different identities, it also has some goals such as "teaching the students about basic values including peace, tolerance, mutual understanding, democracy, and human rights, and making them sensitive about maintaining and improving these values", which is compatible with the contemporary understanding of history education. However, it must be noted that the attitudes and perceptions of teachers are as important as their presence in curriculum in terms of reaching the aims of history education. The aim of this study was to reveal preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences. Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS), which was developed by Yazıcı (2016) to measure the attitudes towards identity differences, was conducted on 314 preservice history teachers. Preservice teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of gender, and their ethnic, religious and political identities were examined using t-test and one-way variance analysis. As a result, it was found that the variables had effect on preservice teachers' attitudes at varying rates.

Keywords: history education, identity, diversity, attitude, pre-service teachers

1. Introduction

As a part of the social and political change since the World War II, the concepts of identity and diversity have become the focus of politics as a result of globalization and demands for local/cultural rights. "Ethnic and cultural diversity is a fact of life in societies around the world. In many of these societies, there are challenging societal issues that stem from ethnic and cultural diversity" (Hamamura, 2017). Identity debates through ethnic and cultural diversity has led the concept of identity to become one of the primary research fields of social sciences since the beginning of 1990s. Beyond the studies in social sciences, identity has become a concept that we encounter in a variety of fields from media to daily politics, and constitutional discussions to daily social relations.

Hall and Gieben (1991) state that identity is "too complex, too under-developed, and too little understanding in contemporary social science to be definitely tested". This is because "identity is an ever changing concept and it is constantly being shaped and conditioned by the environment and culture one is born into, which means one's identity is not fixed at any time in any circumstances" (Ang, 2001). Despite the difficulty in defining the term, identity can be interpreted as "who we are", including education that we have received, culture that we have been taught, and society that we have lived in, which has an important role in the development of our identity. Moreover, in this social world, individuals' identities play key roles in their development and formation of relationships with themselves and with others (Idrus & Nazri, 2016).

Baumann and Gingrich (2004) have tried to single out the different "grammars" through which this structure takes place. They focused on three points. The first point is orientalism, through which self and other are reciprocally essentialised. The second one is segmentation, through which processes of group fusion and fission emerge in relation to strategy and context. The last one is encompassment, through which "otherness" is co-opted as a form of sameness.

As can be understood from all of definition attempts, identity refers to the overall character or personality of an individual or group (Brinthaupt, 2008). Therefore, the concept of identity has occupied a central place in both psychological and sociological theorizing (Brown, 2005). These disciplines have devoted a great deal of attention to identity. Sociologists generally define the overall self as consisting of multiple identities tied to the

different roles a person plays in the social world (Brinthaupt, 2008). On the other hand, in psychosocial theory of development, Erikson focuses on the relationship between society and the individual. It is a theory that connects personal development (psycho) to the social environment (social) (Kasinath, 2013).

In psychology and social psychology studies, three different identity categories, which are in a relationship with each other and sometimes overlapping, are mentioned; individual identity, social identity, and collective identity (Snow, Oselin, & Corrigal-Brown, 2005). Individual identity is defined as a sum of characteristics peculiar to the individual such as individual values, thoughts, and emotions (Coşkun, 2004), and it generally includes the subjective answers given to the question of who I am. Social identity, which is mostly owed to Tajfel and Turner (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, 1985), is a category involving the organizational identity, which is based on social roles (Snow, Oselin, & Corrigal-Brown, 2005). Social identity may source from the self-definition, or the roles adapted, played and taken seriously over time about a social status (Bilgin, 2007, p. 69). The profession (doctor, engineer, salesperson, teacher, student, etc.) or the position in a family (father, mother, child) determines the social identity. In other words, social identity draws attention to the impact of social groups, to which we feel belonged and identify ourselves with, on our behaviors or opinions (Coşkun, 2004). The attachments such as ethnicity, nation, or religion under the category of social identity create a feeling of "us"; therefore, they can be classified in a different category, which is called as collective identity (Snow, 2001; Snow, Oselin, & Corrigal-Brown, 2005).

A collective identity is a sense of recognition and attachment to certain groups of people (Idrus & Nazri, 2016; Ogbu, 2004). Therefore, it is possible to define collective identity as "a shared sense of 'we-ness' or 'one-ness' that derives from shared statues, attributes, or relations, which may be experienced directly or imagined, and which distinguishes those who comprise the collectivity from one or more perceived sets of others" (Polletta & Jasper, 2001). Melucci (1995) calls collective identity as a process of "constructing" an action system. "Collective identity is an interactive and shared definition produced by several individuals (or groups at a more complex level) and concerned with the orientations of action and the field of opportunities and constraints in which the action takes place". By "interactive and shared", Melucci means "a definition that must be conceived as a process because it is constructed and negotiated through a repeated activation of the relationships that link individuals (or groups)". Similarly, Snow (2001) emphasizes that identity is "an interactive and shared definition, which is evocative of 'a sense of we', but then he highlights the process through which social actors recognize themselves as a collectivity, contending that this process is more vital to conceptualizing collective identity than any resultant product or property".

When compared to individual identity, the changes in the formation and structure of collective identity require much longer process. Within this process, collective identity develops the limits of the group by determining the conditions required to take part in the group and the criteria of self-definition for its members (Mellucci, 2013). This situation brings with a tendency to diversify in collective identities because it is defined in contrast and as the difference from others; therefore, the groups demand for demonstrating their differences from other groups (Bilgin, 2007, p. 13). As a result, collective identities create a partnership among the ones sharing the references on which the groups depend on while they also create a difference among the one who don't. While the ones within the boundaries defined by a collective identity define themselves as "us", the ones outside these boundaries are announced as the "others".

The relationship between us and the others is an important factor in the evolution of collective identities. The identity of a community develops in time through interactions with other communities. No community has a single and substantive identity out of time-space. The formation of collective identities can be possible within the context of intergroup relations, just as the formation of individual identities is possible within the context of interpersonal relations (Bilgin, 2007, p. 14). Each individual or community recalls its identity when it encounter with the others. This recall brings with a questioning or a sense of ownership. Thus, identities are rebuilt each time they encounter with each other. This process progress faster in individual identities while it is much slower in collective identities and takes more time.

1.1 History Education and Identity

As can be interpreted from the discussion in the earlier part, identity is a form of construction because the references that we use while defining the identity—especially the collective identity—are cultural concepts, that is produced concepts. For example, people use cultural or historical foundations but not the biological or anthropological foundations in order to mention that they come from the same blood. Similarly, ethnic groups need to "share historical memories" in order to maintain their existence (Smith, 1991). When looked in terms of

gender, which is another category of collective identity, the common cultural accumulation—that is history—is effective in the determination of gender roles (Clarke & Braun, 2012).

Organizations, communities or individuals look back on their history in order to define their identities or make sense of their existence (Aslan & Akçalı, 2007). Therefore, collective identity has a historical side since the construction of collective identity depends on a variety of symbols, memories, artworks, traditions, habits, values, beliefs and knowledge; in short, it depends on collective memory (Bilgin, 1999; Korostelina, 2008).

As a result of the relation between history and identity, "in a wide range of modern societies, history has been pressed into service by politicians and scholars eager to bolster or, sometimes, to invent a national identity for the inhabitants of their states, and to foster among their populations a sense of patriotic loyalty" (Vickers, 2003). History sometimes plays a role to create symbols in the construction collective identity. It is sometimes used as a function to tell the people sharing the same identity how old and rooted that collective identity is. History education facilitates the dissemination of "us", which is constructed via a common memory (Pamuk, 2014). Therefore, history education aims at equipping the students with the skills of a historian so that they could create their own understandings of history while it also aims at equipping the students with moral and cultural values needed by the society as a part of the traditional side of history education (Dilek, 2007). Social and civic side of history education is about the "training good citizens who know and embrace their history, society, values, and culture". Thus, the development of identity is facilitated by transferring the identity of the society to students (Demircioğlu, 2007).

The developments in the field of history education in Turkey after republic are among the examples of the situation explained in the previous paragraph. The history was considered as an educational tool with political purpose significantly after the proclamation of republic. Active politicians wrote and taught history since it was seen as a political mission (Ersanlı, 2006). With the fundamental change in history education in 1931, history education was reorganized in a way to emphasize roots of Turkish history in the pre-Islamic era and Central Asia with a secular nationalist approach (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2015). Within this scope, history course books were rewritten according to official history understanding, which was conceptualized as the Turkish History Thesis (Kabapınar, 1992; Oral, 2015). This change aimed at disseminating the ethnic/national identity determined by the government through history education. The traditional identity full of religious emphaseswas marginalized and rebuilt within the framework of secular thought in order to develop anovel identity (Yıldırım, 2014). With the Turkish-Islamic synthesis dominating the history education since 1976, this secular approach was abandoned and more emphasis was given to the period of Turkish history after Islam (Copeaux, 1998). Thus, history education in Turkey gained a religious aspect in addition to ethnic/national side. After September 12, 1980, Kemalism was added to Turkish-Islamic synthesis and an approach depending on the transfer of ethnic, national, religious and political identity was embraced (Yazıcı, 2011).

As can be seen in Turkish sample and emphasized by a variety of authors, teaching about the history plays an important role in the formation of ethnic, national, and religious roles and the relationship among them (Anderson, 2011; Korosteline, 2008; Pamuk, 2014; Yıldırım, 2016). However, the attempt of creating the feeling of "us" among the individuals sharing the same identity legitimate and disseminate the "other" as a result of the paradoxical nature of collective identities. As expressed by Slater (1989), history "cannot guarantee tolerance, though it can give it some intellectual weapons. It cannot keep open closed minds, although it may sometimes leave a nagging grain of doubt in them".

Nation-states are tend to ignore the diversity in society in order to control this diversification and create a feeling of national identity (Stradling, 2003). This aspect of history education is still valid for societies following nation-building policies although it has been losing its effectiveness as a result of the general tendency after World War II (Aslan & Akçalı, 2007) because "teaching about history not only provides information about the collective past, it also develops the meanings of current situations and affairs, and plays the major role in the formation of the concepts of the society. The content of history in school curricula usually supports the legitimacy of regimes and the power of ruling parties, and it articulates their respective points of view and positions" (Korosteline, 2008). In other words, history textbooks are "the key pedagogic vehicle for transforming official knowledge" (Boon & Gopinathan, 2005).

Although nation-building reflexes still effects the history curriculums of countries, different priorities are brought to agenda now. It is possible to encounter some topics such as multicultural approaches, the recognition of gender, national, and ethnic differences, and plurality of voices and viewpoints in historical narratives of the nation in history courses. Today, history education not only aims at making the students be familiar with their own society, but also tries to "contribute to pupils' knowledge and understanding of other countries and other

cultures in the modern world". Education in a multicultural society should be rooted in toleration and respect for cultural variety (Grosvenor, 2000). The issue that gender differences don't take sufficient place in history education is seriously questioned. Adams (1983) criticizes this issue by expressing that "ignoring women's experiences textbooks were seriously distorting the past and that history is about understanding the past in all its diversity". He adds that history which ignores one half of the human race is unacceptable (Adams, 1983).

The ongoing changes in history education in support of diversity have an effect on Turkey even if on a limited scale. Although the current history curriculum in Turkey promotes the identity transmission instead of respecting different identities, it also has some goals such as "teaching the students about basic values including peace, tolerance, mutual understanding, democracy, and human rights, and making them sensitive about maintaining and improving these values", which is compatible with the contemporary understanding of history education (TCMEB TTKB, 2007). For the last decade, a variety of changes on behalf of the diversity both in history education and in the general education policy of Turkey have been observed. Within this process, some demands for ethnic and religious rights were met. Moreover, it can be stated that some improvements on discrimination and violation of rights are made compared to earlier periods although some issues such as ignoring the diversity and gender discrimination are still present in course books (Çayır, 2014). However, it must be noted that the attitudes and perceptions of teachers are as important as their presence in curriculum in terms of reaching the aims of history education (Yazıcı, Pamuk, & Yıldırım, 2016). In other words, training individuals who respect for identity differences through history education is only possible by teachers who respect for these differences.

The aim of this study was to reveal preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences. Within this scope, the research questions were as follows:

• Do preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences differ significantly in terms of gender?

• Do preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences differ significantly in terms of the geographic region they study in?

• Do preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences differ significantly in terms of their ethnic, religious, and political identities?

2. Method

A relational screening model was used in this study, which aims at investigating preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of different variables. Relational screening models are the research models used to find the existence and/or the degree of covariance between two or more number of variables (Karasar, 2005).

2.1 Participants

The participants of this study were composed of 314 preservice history teachers, who were receiving pedagogical formation education in four different universities during 2016-2017 academic years. 184 participants were female (58.6%), and 130 were male (41.4%). The participants studied/have been studying in different regions, namely, Black Sea (n=195, 62.10%), Marmara (n=57, 18.15%), Eastern Anatolia (n=51, 16.24%), other regions (n=11, 3.50%). The majority of participants described themselves as Turkish (n=270, 86%), 31 as Kurdish (10%), and 13 participants were from different nationalities (4.20%). 283 (91%) participants identified themselves as Sunni/Muslim, 11 (3.5%) as Alawites, and 17 (5.4%) as other religious beliefs. It was also observed that 108 (34.7%) participants defined themselves as nationalist, 76 (24.2%) as conservative, 56 (17.8%) as neutral, 16 (5.1%) as conservative/nationalist, 15 (4.8%) as social democrat, 13 (4.4%) as leftist, and 4 (1.3%) as liberal.

2.2 Instruments

Demographics information form and the Identity Attitudes Scale (IAS) were used to gather data.

Demographic Information Form: Demographic information form was prepared for this study, and it includes personal information such as university, gender, ethnic, religious politic identity.

The Identity Attitudes Scale: Developed by Yazıcı (2016), IAS measures attitudes towards collective identity differences. Within this scope, it is composed of five subscales; gender identity, national identity, ethnic identity, political identity, and religious identity. The scale is composed of 28 items. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Exploratory factor analysis was conducted in order examine the construct validity of the scale. The KMO value was found to be .822 and Bartlett sphericity test found values of x^2=2594,816, df=378 and p=.00, which confirmed that the data were suitable for EFA. Principal components analysis and varimax rotation techniques were used in EFA. The results showed that 5 factor

construct explained 50.51% of the variance. The factor loadings ranged between: .59 and .76 in national identity subscale; .53 and .80 in gender identity subscale; .40 and .79 in ethnic identity subscale; .44 and .73 in political identity subscale; and .45 and .81 in religious identity subscale. To further examine the construct validity of IAS, confirmatory factor analysis was run. The general adaptability parameters for the evaluation model are χ^2=515.33, df=336, p=.00 (χ^2/df=1.53, RMSEA=.041, GFI=.89, CFI=.95, NFI=.89, RFI=.87, AGFI=.87, IFI=.95 and NNFI=.95). The findings validated the five factor construct (Kline, 2011; Şimşek, 2007). In addition, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the IAS was found to be .83.

2.3 Data Analysis

The data of the study were analyzed using SPSS 20 and LISREL 8.80 software. T-test was performed in order to determine significant differences in participants' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of gender identity, religious identity, and ethnic identity. Also, One-way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) was performed in order to determine differences in participants' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of university and political identity. Additionally, mean and standard deviations were also used.

3. Results

First of all, preservice history teachers' mean scores of each subscale related to their attitudes towards identity differences were estimated. The data can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences

Subscales	$\bar{X}$	Sd	Min.	Max.
National Identity Differences	2,55	,92	1	5
Gender Identity Differences	2,57	,94	1	5
Ethnic Identity Differences	2,94	1,02	1	5
Political Identity Differences	3,68	,73	1	5
Religious Identity Differences	3,88	,71	1	5
Total	3,15	,54	1,25	4,61

As can be seen in Table 1, preservice history teachers' attitude scores were highest in religious identity differences while lowest in national and gender identity differences. One-way variance analysis was performed in order to reveal whether the participants' attitudes towards identity differences differed in terms of the region of their university. The findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Differences in preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of the region of their university

Subscales	University	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	F	P	Difference (Scheffe)
National Identity Differences	Black Sea Region	195	2,43	,85	5,107	,007*	
	Marmara Region	63	2,81	1,05			Marmara>Black Sea
	Eastern Anatolia Region	56	2,69	,91			
Gender Identity Differences	Black Sea Region		2,52	,86			
	Marmara Region		3,02	1,00	10,737	,000*	Marmara>Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia
	Eastern Anatolia Region		2,28	,97			
Ethnic Identity Differences	Black Sea Region		2,81	,96			
	Marmara Region		3,01	1,06	5,343	,005*	Eastern Anatolia>Black Sea
	Eastern Anatolia Region		3,29	1,13			
Political Identity	Black Sea Region		3,72	,65	1,174	,311	

Differences	Marmara Region	3,56	,93			
	Eastern Anatolia Region	3,65	,76			
	Black Sea Region	3,82	,66	3,742	,025*	
Religious Identity Differences	Marmara Region	4,10	,78			Marmara>Black Sea
	Eastern Anatolia Region	3,85	,76			
	Black Sea Region	3,09	,46	4,846	,008*	
Total	Marmara Region	3,33	,64			Marmara>Black Sea
	Eastern Anatolia Region	3,15	,62			

*$p<.05$.

As can be seen in Table 2, participants' scores obtained from 4 subscales and the total scale differed significantly in terms of the regions of their university. According to Scheffe test result, which was conducted to determine the scores of which groups differed significantly, participants from Marmara Region had more positive attitudes towards gender identity differences than the participants from Black Sea and Eastern Anatolia Regions. Moreover, their attitudes towards national and religious identity differences were more positive and their total scores were higher than the participants from Black Sea Region. Additionally, participants from Eastern Anatolia Region had more positive attitudes towards ethnic identity differences than the ones from Black Sea Region.

Independent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether participants' attitudes towards identity differences differed in terms of their gender. The findings are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Differences in preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of their gender

Subscales	Gender	n	$\bar{X}$	Sd	t Test		
					t	df	p
National Identity Differences	Female	184	2,55	,89			
	Male	130	2,55	,96	,083	312	,934
Gender Identity Differences	Female		2,80	,86			
	Male		2,26	,96	5,100		,000
Ethnic Identity Differences	Female		2,96	,99			
	Male		2,91	1,07	,402		,688
Political Identity Differences	Female		3,61	,73			
	Male		3,78	,73	-2,045		,042
Religious Identity Differences	Female		3,87	,66			
	Male		3,90	,77	-,400		,689
Total	Female		3,18	,50			
	Male		3,11	,58	1,243		,215

*$p<.05$.

As can be seen in Table 3, participants' attitudes towards gender and political identity differences significantly differed in terms of gender at $p<.05$ level. Thus, female participants had more positive attitudes towards gender and political identity differences than male participants, and the difference is statistically significant.

The participants were asked to express their ethnic identities in order to reveal the effect of their ethnic identities on their attitudes towards identity differences. The replies given to this question were so diverse, so they were categorized as "Turkish" and "different ethnic identity". Independent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences differed in terms of their ethnic identities. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Differences in preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of their ethnic identities

Subscales	Ethnic Identity	N	X̄	Sd	t Test		
					t	df	P
National Identity Differences	Turkish	270	2,50	,88	-2,221	312	,031
	Different Ethnic Identity	44	2,88	1,07			
Gender Identity Differences	Turkish		2,56	,99	-,670		,506
	Different Ethnic Identity		2,68	1,10			
Ethnic Identity Differences	Turkish		2,81	,98	-5,561		,000
	Different Ethnic Identity		3,70	,99			
Political Identity Differences	Turkish		3,62	,75	-4,539		,000
	Different Ethnic Identity		4,03	,53			
Religious Identity Differences	Turkish		3,84	,71	-3,074		,003*
	Different Ethnic Identity		4,16	,64			
Total	Turkish		3,09	,52	-4,910		,000*
	Different Ethnic Identity		3,51	,51			

*p<.05.

As can be seen in Table 4, participants' total scores didn't significantly differ; however, their scores of national identity, ethnic identity, political identity, and religious identity differences significantly differed in terms of their ethnic identities at p<.05 level. Although it isn't significant, there is a similar difference in participants' total scores. In all of the subscales and total, the attitude scores of participants from different identities were higher than the participants from Turkish origins.

The participants were asked to express their religious identities in order to reveal the effect of their religious identities on their attitudes towards identity differences. The replies given to this question were so diverse, so they were categorized as "Sunni Islam" and "different religious identity". Independent samples t-test was conducted in order to determine whether preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences differed in terms of their religious identities. The findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Differences in preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences in terms of their religious identities

Subscales	Religious Identity	n	X̄	Sd	t Test		
					t	df	p
National Identity Differences	Sunni Islam	283	2,52	,90	-1,720	312	,094
	Different Religious Identity	31	2,86	1,06			
Gender Identity Differences	Sunni Islam		2,48	,89	-5,487		,000
	Different Religious Identity		3,43	,92			
Ethnic Identity Differences	Sunni Islam		2,89	,99	-2,089		,044
	Different Religious Identity		3,36	1,21			
Political Identity Differences	Sunni Islam		3,68	,73	,166		,869
	Different Religious Identity		3,66	,80			
Religious Identity Differences	Sunni Islam		3,84	,71	-4,663		,000
	Different Religious Identity		4,33	,55			
Total	Sunni Islam		3,11	,51	-3,887		,000
	Different Religious Identity		3,56	,62			

*p<.05.

As can be seen in Table 5, participants' scores obtained from gender identity differences, ethnic identity differences, religious identity differences, and total scale differed significantly in terms of their religious identities at p<.05 level. Thus, participants sharing identity of Sunni Islam had lower score scores than participants having different religious identities.

The results of One-Way Variance Analysis, which was conducted in order to determine whether participants' scores significantly differed in terms of their political identities, are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of variance analysis related to political identity differences

Subscales	Political Identity	n	x̄	Sd	F	P	Difference (Games-Howell)
National Identity Differences	Conservative	80	2,88	,93	7,209	,000	
	Nationalist	108	2,18	,78			
	Social Democrat	15	2,51	,85			Conservative >Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
	Leftist	14	2,81	1,19			
	Neutral	56	2,71	,93			Neutral >Nationalist
	Nationalist/Conservative	16	2,21	,67			
Gender Identity Differences	Conservative		2,20	,76	18,579	,000	Social Democrat >Conservative, Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
	Nationalist		2,54	,86			
	Social Democrat		3,59	1,07			
	Leftist		4,06	,66			Leftist >Conservative, Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative, Neutral
	Neutral		2,71	,86			
	Nationalist/Conservative		2,00	,64			Neutral >Conservative
Ethnic Identity Differences	Conservative		3,20	,96	8,319	,000	Conservative > Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
	Nationalist		2,56	,91			
	Social Democrat		3,40	1,24			Leftist >Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
	Leftist		3,69	1,17			
	Neutral		3,09	1,03			Neutral >Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
	Nationalist/Conservative		2,31	,84			
Political Identity Differences	Conservative		3,57	,78	2,862	,015	
	Nationalist		3,63	,66			
	Social Democrat		4,12	,58			Social Democrat >Conservative, Nationalist/Conservative
	Leftist		3,86	,69			
	Neutral		3,81	,75			
	Nationalist/Conservative		3,33	,83			
Religious Identity Differences	Conservative		3,83	,62	3,322	,006	
	Nationalist		3,79	,68			
	Social Democrat		4,28	,57			
	Leftist		4,34	,64			
	Neutral		3,92	,86			
	Nationalist/Conservative		3,55	,79			
Total	Conservative		3,14	,46	13,279	,000	Leftist >Nationalist, Conservative, Nationalist/Conservative
	Nationalist		3,98	,45			

Social Democrat	3,62	,55	Social Democrat >Nationalist, Conservative, Nationalist/Conservative
Leftist	3,78	,58	
Neutral	3,27	,55	Neutral >Nationalist, Nationalist/Conservative
Nationalist/Conservative	2,71	,54	

*P<.05.

According to ANOVA results, participants' scores obtained from all of the subscales and total scale significantly differed in terms of their political identities. The results of Games-Howell test, which was conducted in order to determine which groups had differences, revealed that conservatives' attitudes towards national identity differences were higher than nationalists and nationalist/conservatives. Neutral participants' scores of national identity differences were significantly higher than nationalist participants. Social democrats and leftist participants obtained significantly higher scores from gender identity differences than conservative, nationalist, and nationalist/conservative participants. Similarly, neutral participants had higher scores from gender identity differences than conservative participants.

In terms of ethnic identity differences, leftist, conservative and neutral participants had higher scores than nationalist and nationalist/conservative participants. Social democrats had more positive attitudes towards political identity differences than conservative and nationalist/conservative participants.

When the attitude towards identity differences were examined, it was observed that nationalist/conservative participants had the lowest score ($\bar{X}$=2,76) while leftist participants had the highest score ($\bar{X}$=3,81). Moreover, leftist and social democrat participants had significantly higher scores than nationalist, conservative, and nationalist/conservative participants. Similarly, neutral participants had higher scores than nationalist and nationalist/conservative participants.

4. Discussion

In this study, preservice history teachers' attitudes towards collective identity differences were investigated in terms of some variables. Within this scope, the effects of variables of gender, university, ethnic identity, religious identity, and political identity on participants' attitudes towards identity differences were examined. As a result of this study, it was concluded that all of these variables had varying effects on formation of attitudes towards identity differences.

When the variables effecting preservice history teachers' attitudes towards identity differences, it was observed that the region of the university had an effect on attitude. Participants from Marmara Region had more positive attitude towards identity differences than the participants from other regions. This finding complies with the findings of a study conducted by Çoban, Karaman and Doğan (2010). In their study, they found that individuals living in bigger cities were more sensitive about identity differences.

Another variable effecting the attitude towards identity differences is gender identity. According to results, female participants had more positive attitudes towards gender identity differences than male participants. This result seems reasonable since the women are the subject of gender discussions and they are defined as a secondary position by this category which is socially built. A variety of studies showed that male participants had more traditional understanding of gender roles than female participants (Ataklı, Yertutan, & Ekinci, 2004; Herek, 1988; Kahraman, Tunçdemir, Kekillioğlu, Özcan, & Kahraman, 2015; Seçgin & Tural, 2011). Sexual orientation is another factor determining attitude towards gender differences in addition to the secondary position of women. The research showed that female preservice teachers were more tolerant to sexual orientation differences than male participants (Duyan & Duyan, 2005; Gelbal & Duyan, 2006; Sakallı, 2002; Şah, 2012).

The results showed that female participants had more positive attitudes towards political identity differences in addition to gender identity differences. This finding is consistent with the results of a study conducted by Çoban, Karaman and Doğan (2010), which concluded that women were more tolerant to political view differences compared to men. Moreover, the literature show that women are more sensitive to differences in general (Harbaugh & Lindsey, 2015; Holladay, Knight, Paige, & Quiñones, 2003; Whitt, Edison, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Nora, 2001). At the same time, this finding is also related to the findings indicating that female teachers had higher democratic attitudes than male teachers (Aydemir & Aksoy, 2010; Çermik, 2013; Genç & Kalafat, 2007; Gömleksiz & Kan, 2008; Saracaloğlu, Evin, & Varol, 2004; Voutsas, 1998). The disadvantaged position of women proposed by gender roles can cause women to develop democratic attitudes towards other disadvantaged

groups like themselves. Moreover, as other requirements of women's gender role proposed by the society, sensibility and tenderness may be other causes of being more tolerant to differences.

Ethnic identities of preservice history teachers is another distinguishing variable that had an effect on their attitudes towards differences. Participants with different ethnic identities other than Turkish origins had more positive attitudes towards ethnic, political and religious identity differences. Additionally, the same difference was observed in total scores of IAS. These results are consistent with the results of a study conducted by Yazıcı, Pamuk and Yıldırım (2016), which concluded that preservice teachers from different ethnic/cultural groups had more positive attitudes towards cultural differences. Similarly, Voutsas (1998) found that participants sharing the major ethnic identity approached differences more adversely than the participants from minority groups. This result isn't surprising since participants from minority groups are the direct subjects of discrimination or respect for identity differences. However, it can also be stated that they developed empathy towards other minority groups better than participants from majority group.

According the results, participants' religious identities had a significant impact on their attitudes towards gender, ethnic, and religious identity differences. Attitude scores of participants sharing Sunni Islam identity towards gender, ethnic, and religious identity differences were significantly lower than other groups. Previous research concluded that religious beliefs were effective on attitudes towards gender identity (Gelbal & Duyan, 2006; Harbaugh & Lindsey, 2015).

Another result of the study is that preservice history teachers' political identities were the most significant variable in determination of their attitudes towards identity differences. Participants defining themselves as conservative, nationalist, and nationalist/conservative had lower attitude scores from gender identity differences subscale than leftist, social democrat, and neutral participants. Gender categories are determined by the expectations of society from these categories, not by the inborn biological characteristics (Clarke & Braun, 2012). The society creates the gender roles through values and traditions in a historical process, which is called culture. Conservative and nationalist individuals respect for this cultural structure, and they define themselves with this culture mostly. Therefore, it is not unusual for them to have biases against differences beyond the cultural structure.

Participants' political identity is a variable effecting their attitudes towards ethnic identity differences. Participants defining themselves as leftist, conservative, and neutral had significantly more positive attitudes towards ethnic identity differences than nationalist and nationalist/conservative participants. A study conducted by Güldü (2010) found that the necessity of granting cultural rights to different ethnic groups in Turkey positively predicted conservative, social democrat, and socialist political identity groups except for nationalists. Leftist and conservative participants demonstrated similar attitude, which is a significant result of this study. Leftist and conservative identities, which were different from each other in terms of gender identity difference, share a similar opinion about ethnic identity differences. This situation can be an example of a common notion in literature, which is that each identity reconstrues itself when encountered with the "other" (Pamuk, 2014).

The attitudes of social democrat participants towards political identity differences were more positive than conservative and nationalist/conservative participants. When the total scores obtained from IAS were examined, it was observed that leftist and social democrat participants obtained significantly higher scores than conservative, nationalist, and nationalist/conservative participants.

The mean score of preservice history teachers obtained from IAS was 3.15, which shows that their attitudes towards identity differences are below the desired level. The lowest mean score obtained from the subscales was the attitude towards national identity differences, which can be explained by the high number of Syrian refugees in Turkey. Studies showing that uncontrolled migration wave and problems encountered during immigrant integration adversely effected the attitude towards immigrants (Güney & Konak, 2016; Topkaya & Akdağ, 2016) give us clues about the reason behind the low mean score obtained from national identity differences.

Another subscale from which preservice history teachers got lower mean score is gender identity differences, which involve gender and sexual orientation differences. Participants' negative attitudes towards gender identity differences can be explained by general prejudices about homosexuality and female roles in Turkey. Esmer (2012) conducted a study aiming at determining the values of Turkey with 1605 participants. The researcher found that homosexual individuals are the group who were shown the least tolerant at a rate of 84%. The same study also concluded that gender roles based on inequality were widely accepted by the participants.

Preservice history teachers' attitudes towards differences are a part of the usual approach of society. But they also have their own dimensions. For example, Yazıcı and Budak (2017) conducted a study using the same data collection tool with participants studying at faculty of education. They found that the mean scores obtained from

IAS ranged between 3.29 and 3.56 among different departments; however, preservice history teachers' mean score was 3.15 in this study. This situation requires a comprehensive questioning of both undergraduate curriculums and history teaching approach in Turkey. History teaching is a field which is expected to teach being respectful for differences. However, it can be stated that preservice teachers' qualities about respecting differences aren't at desired level.

References

Adams, C. (1983). Off the record. *Teaching History*, *36*, 9-11.

Anderson, B. (2011). *Hayali cemaatler [Imaginary communities]*. Metis Yayınları, İstanbul.

Ang, I. (2001). *On not speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London and New York: Routledge.

Aslan, E., & Akçalı, A. A. (2007). Kimlik sunumu olarak tarih eğitimi [History education as an identity presentation]. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *22*, 125-132.

Ataklı, A., Yertutan, C., & Ekinci, A. G. S. (2004). Bir grup üniversite öğrencisinin "çağdaş kadın" üzerine görüşleri [A group of undergraduates' opinions about "contemporary woman"]. *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *7*(7), 43-56.

Aydemir, H., & Aksoy, N. D. (2010). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin demokratik tutumlarının bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisi: Malatya örneği [The relationship between education faculty students' democratic attitudes and some variables: Malatya sample]. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *12*(1), 265-279.

Baumann, G., & Gingrich, A. (2004). *Grammars of identity/alterity: A structural approach*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Bilgin, N. (1999). *Kolektif kimlik [Collective identity]*. İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Bilgin, N. (2007). *Kimliğin inşası [Construction of identity]*. Ankara: Aşina Kitap.

Boon, G. C., & Gopinathan, S. (2005). History education and the construction of national identity in Singapore, 1945-2000. In E. Vickers, & A. Jones (Eds.), *History education and national identity in East Asia* (pp. 203-227). New York: Routledge.

Brinthaupt, T. M. (2008). Identity. In W. A. Darity Jr. (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 551-555). Detreoit: Macmillan Reference.

Brown, R. (2005). Social Identity. In A. Kuper, & J. Kuper (Eds.), *The Social Science Encyclopedia* (2nd ed., pp. 1356-1358). London and NewYork: Rotledge.

Çayır, K. (2014).*"Biz" kimiz? Ders kitaplarında kimlik, yurttaşlık, haklar [Who are "we"? Identity, citizenship, rights in textbooks]*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Çermik, H. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik değerleri ve bu değerlerin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Preservice teachers' democratic values and their relationships with some variables]. *NWSA-Education Sciences*, *8*(2), 261-274.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2012). Toplumsal cinsiyet [Gender]. In D. Fox, I. Prilleltensky, & S. Austin (Eds.), *Eleştirel Psikoloji [Critical Psychology]* (pp. 306-328). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Çoban, A. E., Karaman, N. G., & Doğan, T. (2010). Öğretmen adaylarının kültürel farklılıklara yönelik bakış açılarının çeşitli demografik değişkenlere göre incelenmesi [Investigation of preservice teachers' views about cultural differences in terms of some demographics]. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *10*(1), 125-131.

Copeaux, E. (1998). *Tarih ders kitaplarında (1931-1993) Türk tarih tezinden Türk İslam sentezine [From Turkish history thesis to Turkish Islam thesis in histort textbooks]*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt.

Demircioğlu, İ. H. (2007). *Tarih öğretiminde öğrenci merkezli yaklaşımlar [Student-centered approaches in history teaching]*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Dilek, D. (2007). *Tarih derslerinde öğrenme ve düşünce gelişimi [Learning and thought development in history courses]*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Duyan, V., & Duyan, G. (2005). Turkish social work students' attitudes toward sexuality. *Sex Roles*, *52*(9-10), 697-706. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-3736-4

Ersanlı, B. (2006). *İktidar ve tarih, Türkiye'de "Resmi Tarih" tezinin oluşumu (1929-1937) [Power and history, the formation of "Official History" thesis in Turkey]*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınlar.

Esmer, Y. (2012). *Türkiye değerler atlası 2012* [Turkey's Value Atlas 2012]. Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Gelbal, S., & Duyan, V. (2006). Attitudes of university students toward lesbians and gay men in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, *55*(7-8), 573-579. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9112-1

Genç, S. Z., & Kalafat, T. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları ile problem çözme becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Investigation of preservice teachers' democratic attitudes and problem solving skills in terms of some variables]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *22*(2), 10-22.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Kan, A. Ü. (2008). Eğitim fakültesi ve tezsiz yüksek lisans programlarına kayıtlı öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi (Fırat Üniversitesi örneği) [Investigation of democratic attitudes of preservice teachers in faculty of education and non-thesis master program (Fırat University sample)]. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, *178*(1), 44-64.

Grosvenor, I. (2000). "History for the nation" Multiculturalism and the teaching of history. In J. Arthur, & R. Phillips (Eds.), *Issues in history teaching* (pp. 148-158). Rotledge: London.

Güldü, Ö. (2010). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde siyasal kimlik [Political identity of undergraduates]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey.

Güney, Ü., & Konak, N. (2016). Syrian and Iraqi refugees in Bolu: Perceptıon of the other based on nationalism, masculınity and citizenshıp. *Alternatif Politika*, *8*(3), 505-535.

Hall, S., & Gieben, B. (1991). *The Formations of modern society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hamamura, T. (2017). Social identity and attitudes toward cultural diversity: A cultural psychological analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *48*(2), 184-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116681845

Harbaugh, E., & Lindsey, E. W. (2015). Attitudes toward homosexuality among young adults: Connections to gender role identity, gender-typed activities, and religiosity. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *62*(8), 1098-1125. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2015.1021635

Herek, G. M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *Journal of sex research*, *25*(4), 451-477. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224498809551476

Holladay, C. L., Knight, J. L., Paige, D. L., & Quiñones, M. A. (2003). The influence of framing on attitudes toward diversity training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *14*(3), 245-263. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1065

Idrus, F., & Nazri, N. I. M. (2016). The construction of collective identity in Malaysian ESL secondary classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(10), 101-110. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n10p101

Kabapınar, Y. (1992). Başlangıcından Günümüze Türk Tarih Tezi ve Lise Tarih Kitaplarına Etkisi [Turkish history thesis from beginning to today and its impact on high school history textbooks]. *Çağdaş Türkiye Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *1*(2), 143-177.

Kahraman, A. B., Tunçdemir, N. O., Kekillioğlu, A., Özcan, A., & Kahraman, L. (2015). Üniversite öğrencilerinin toplumsal cinsiyet algıları [Undergraduates' gender role perceptions]. *Sobider Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *2*(4), 304-322. https://doi.org/10.16990/sobider.83

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi [Scientific research model]*. Ankara: Nobel.

Kasinath, H. M. (2013). Adolescence: Search for an identity. *I-Manager's Journal on Educational Psychology*, *7*(1), 1-6.

Kılıçbay, M. A. (2003). Kimlikler okyanusu [Ocean of identities]. *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, *23*, 155-159.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York: Guilford publications.

Korostelina, K. (2008). History education and social identity. *Identity*, *8*(1), 25-45, https://doi.org/10.1080/15283480701787327

Mellucci, A. (2013). *Oyuncu Benlik [The playing self]*. İstanbul: Sel Yayıncılık.

Melucci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. In H. Johnston, & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture* (pp. 41-63). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of "acting White" in Black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review*, *36*(1), 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6

Oral, M. (2015). *Türk ulusunun inşası ortak tarih söylemi [The construction of Turkish nation; Common history discourse]*. İstanbul: Yeni İnsan yayınevi.

Pamuk, A. (2014). *Kimlik ve tarih kimliğin inşasında tarihin kullanımı [The use of history in identity and history identity construction]*. İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 283-305. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.283

Şah, U. (2012). Eşcinselliğe, biseksüelliğe ve transseksüelliğe ilişkin tanımlamaların homofobi ve LGBT bireylere tanışıklık düzeyi ile ilişkisi [The relationship of the descriptions of homosexuality, bisexuality and transsexuality with levels of homophobia and acquaintanceship with LGBT people]. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları Dergisi*, *32*(2), 23-49.

Sakallı, N. (2002). The relationship between sexism and attitudes toward homosexuality in a sample of Turkish college students. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *42*(3), 53-64. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v42n03_04

Saracaloğlu, A. S., Evin, İ., & Varol, S. R. (2004). İzmir ilinde çeşitli kurumlarda görev yapan öğretmenler ile öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları üzerine karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma [A comparative research on the democratic attitudes of the teachers and the prospective teachers]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *4*(2), 335-363.

Seçgin, F., & Tural, A. (2011). Sınıf öğretmenliği bölümü öğretmen adaylarının toplumsal cinsiyet rollerine ilişkin tutumları [Attitudes on gender roles of primary school teacher candidates]. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, *6*(4), 2446-2458.

Şimşek, Ö. F. (2007). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesine giriş [Introduction to structural equation modelling]*. Ankara: Ekinoks.

Slater, J. (1989). *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanized?* London: Institute of Education, University of London.

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity* (1st ed.). London and New York: Penguin Books.

Snow, D. A. (2001). Collective identity and expressive forms. In N. J. Smelser, & P. B. Baltes (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 2212-2219). Londra: Elsevier Science. https://doi.org/10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/04094-8

Snow, D., Oselin, S., & Corrigal-Brown, C. (2005). Identity. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* I (pp. 390-393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952552.n149

Stradling, R. (2003). *20. Yüzyıl Avrupa tarihi nasıl öğretilmeli [Teaching 20th-century European history]*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Tajfel, H. (1982). Social psychology of intergroup relations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *33*, 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.33.020182.000245

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worschel, & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Talim ve Terbiye Kurulu Başkanlığı. (2007). *Tarih dersi öğretim programı (9.Sınıf) [Curriculum of History Course (9th grade)]*. Retrieved from http://ogm.meb.gov.tr/belgeler/tarih9.pdfadresinden 10.01.2017tarihinde edinilmiştir

Topkaya, Y., & Akdağ, H. (2016). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının Suriyeli sığınmacılar hakkındaki görüşleri (Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi örneği) [Prospective social studies teachers' views about Syrian defector (Kilis 7 Aralık University sample)]. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *7*(1), 767-786.

Turner, J. C. (1978). Social comparison, similarity and ingroup-favoritism. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.

Vickers, E. (2003). *In search of an identity: The politics of history as a school subject in Hong Kong, 1960's-2002*. New York: Routledge.

Voutsas, K. (1998). *Assessing business students' attitudes towards diversity* (Unpublished master dissertation). Eastern Michigan University, Michigan, USA.

Whitt, E. J., Edison, M. I., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Nora, A. (2001). Influences on students' openness to diversity and challenge in the second and third years of college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *72*(2), 172-204. https://doi.org/10.2307/2649321

Yazıcı, F. (2011). Cumhuriyet Dönemi Tarih Ders Kitaplarında Tarih Yazımı [History writing in textbooks during early republican period]. In V. Engin, & A. Şimşek (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Tarih Yazımı [History writing in Turkey]*. İstanbul: Yeditepe Yayınları.

Yazıcı, F. (2016). Kimlik tutumları ölçeği: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Identity attitudes scale: A scale development study]. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, *5*(4), 41-54.

Yazıcı, F., & Budak, F. (2017). The investigation of the students' attitudes toward identity differences in faculty of education. *International Online Jurnal of Educational Sciences*, *4*(4).

Yazıcı, F., Pamuk, A., & Yıldırım, T. (2016). Tarih öğretmen adaylarının çokkültürlülük ve yurtseverlik tutumları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between attitudes of pre-service history teachers toward multiculturalism and patriotism]. *Turkish Studies*, *11*(9), 947-964. https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.9510

Yıldırım, T. (2014). Tarih ders kitaplarında "öteki" kurgusu: 1930'lu yıllar üzerine bir değerlendirme [The "others" in history textbooks: An assessment of 1930s]. *Türk Tarih Eğitimi Dergisi*, *3*(1), 62-89. https://doi.org/10.17497/tuhed.185590

Yıldırım, T. (2016). *Tarih ders kitaplarında kimlik söylemi [Identity discourse in history textbooks]*. İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

Yıldırım, T., & Şimşek, A. (2015). "The narrative of religion" in the high school textbooks of the early republican period in Turkey. *Education and Science*, *40*(179), 323-340. https://doi.org/10.15390/eb.2015.4246

Copyrights