

## **Nationalism, Patriotism and Global Citizenship: A Comparison in between the Social Studies Teacher Candidates in the US and Turkey<sup>#</sup>**

Ali Altıkulaç, Alper Yontar\*

*Çukurova University, Turkey*

**Corresponding author:** Alper Yontar, E-mail: yolcu598@gmail.com

<sup>#</sup>This study was supported by the Scientific Research Projects Unit of Çukurova University within the scope of SBA-2018-10783 project

### **ARTICLE INFO**

#### *Article history*

Received: July 23, 2019

Accepted: October 21, 2019

Published: October 31, 2019

Volume: 7 Issue: 4

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

### **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this research is to introduce the opinions of the social studies teachers who receive education in USA and Turkey in relation to the concepts of nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship comparatively. The basic research design belonging to the research is of a case study model. The multiple techniques have been used to transform the data sets to findings. According to the results of the research, it becomes evident that the constructive patriotism attitudes that belong to the participants from both countries are high and if comparison is made, the blind patriotism attitudes that belong to the participants from Turkey are higher than the participants from USA. On the other hand, if the global citizenship attitudes are taken as a basis, the participants from USA are more prone to global citizenship in comparison to the participants from Turkey.

**Key words:** Global Citizenship, Nationalism, Patriotism, Social Studies, Teacher Training

### **INTRODUCTION**

Every single country makes an effort to instill a national consciousness and patriotism to its own citizens. The most efficient method that is put to use by them on the way to this target is the system of education. Within the course of Social Studies, matters relating to nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship are often met within the scope of the target of bringing up good citizens. However, the duty of bringing up “good” citizens becomes complicated on a gradual basis because the social dynamics that are continuously changing require that the education programs are handled again and in a continuous manner. In a world where nationalism gradually escalates, let alone the question “Should we bring up the children as patriots?”, an increasing number of researches that are being done in the field of pedagogy focus on the concept of global citizenship.

Before defining “nationalism”, it will be useful to focus on the concepts of “people” or “nation”. Guibernau (2007) states that the national identity is a collective feeling that is based on the belief of belonging to the same nation and it could be defined as the sharing of the qualities that separate them from the other nations. The national identity is a contemporary phenomenon when its fluid and dynamic structure is taken into consideration. While establishing a consciousness of nation requires a long period of time, the matters that are based on such a sentiment may differ. According to Guibernau (2007), the nation comprises five

dimensions, which are: psychological (the consciousness to constitute a group), cultural, territorial, political and historical dimensions. Smith (1991) defines “Nation” as a mass that shares a historical piece of land, common myths and historical memories, public culture, a common culture and statutory rights and duties for all its members, a named human population. What is conspicuous at this point is the peculiarity of belonging to a land that is also cared by Smith (1991) and apportioned the first rank within his special ranking. This is not an ordinary land but the land which turns a society of the same kind to a nation, a native country. Therefore, “a Nation” may be referred to as a community that exists on a piece of land whose borders have been clearly drawn, that is inspected and monitored by the hand of an internal state apparatus and foreign states, that obeys a unitary administration. A definition by Joseph Stalin (2013) is as below: “A community of people is a group that is made up of psychological structure that reveals itself through cultural sharing on the basis of a steady language that has evolved historically, land, economic life”.

“Nationalism” has been a disturbing matter for social scientists traditionally. Not to mention the fact that the forecast of “the ending of the age of nationalism” which became predominant for a long time in the social sciences literature on nationalism did not come through, the nationalist/and racist discourses “continue to play a significant part in actualization of the myths and social images that make up the political and social action” (Torfing, 1999) and nationalism

is described as the value deemed as the one that is the most universal and legitimate that belongs to the social/political life of today (Anderson, 2006).

Both nationalism and patriotism indicate the relationship of the individual with his community of people. It becomes evident that both concepts are confused with one other with the thinking that they both express the same thing. However, there is a considerable difference between nationalism and patriotism. While nationalism emphasizes a unity of cultural past with inclusion of the language and heritage, patriotism is based on love towards people with a greater emphasis on values and beliefs. Orwell (1945) makes an explanation regarding patriotism saying that it is a belonging to a specific place and way of life that are believed to be the best part of the world without a wish of pushing other people. Patriotism has a defensive nature both militarily and culturally. On the other hand, nationalism may not be held separate from the wish of ruling. The unchanging purpose of every single nationalist is to provide more power and reputation for his nation rather than himself. Nationalism may have played a crucial part at the initial stages of construction of the nation, but, with the innate selectness being inherent to it, nationalism may be destructive for particularly the nation states of a multiple-ethnic structure in the end. As different from nationalism, patriotism provides an excellent and conspicuous ground for unification of the nation for the nation's own good. Patriotism on an ontological basis is a social structure which develops gradually as a result of the cultural activity of the person (Berger & Luckman, 1966). It is natural that people have the feelings of love and compassion towards the place being liked by them. It is also natural that they like their parents or the community supporting them of which they are a member. However, at the time of the process of development of the nation-state, the members were being convinced that they become a member of a community growing increasingly. As a result, natural belonging to the community of which they are a member turned to a sense of belonging being structured towards the imaginary community of the people: principedom, kingdom, empire or in other words, state (Rapoport, 2009).

If the Latin roots of the word "patriotism" are examined, it may be characterized as loyalty to the ruler. Authors have differing opinions relating to the definition, content and distinctive properties of patriotism. Patriotism, in the most general sense, is defined as the loyalty of the members of the group to their own group and the land on which they live (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). Researches that have been done on patriotism reveal differing definitions such as love for national symbols, specific beliefs as to the superiority of a country, a very important component for the strengthening of the civil bonds of a mature community of people and the national loyalty sentiment (Hurwitz & Peffley, 1999; Spinner-Halev and Theiss-Morse 2003; Sullivan, Fried & Dietz 1992). On the other hand, Nathanson (1997) explains that patriotism is made up of four main components: a special love for one's own country, the sentiment to define oneself with one's country, being concerned with the welfare of one's country, to make sacrifices to the favor of one's country.

Basically, two forms of patriotism are being mentioned. While the first one is named as "blind patriotism", the second one is named as "constructive patriotism". According to it, the two forms of patriotism that constitute the two main dimensions of patriotism are different from one another. Blind patriotism as a type of belonging has been characterized as acceptance of the policies and actions of one's country without questioning and an unquestioning loyalty (Schatz, Staub & Lavine, 1999). The said loyalty and belonging have a role even in the event that the national policies are discriminatory, damaging to other people or despite their violation of human rights (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). The object of blind patriotism on which it has such dependency may change from one society to another and one time to another. According to Staub, this object may be the country, people, state, opinion, ideology or concept. But what remains as fixed is the unconditional loyalty to this object or the actions implying giving service for it. In case of blind patriotism, let alone the non-criticism of the country or the country policies, there is intolerance to such an attempt of others and even accepting it as a betrayal. Blind patriotism, which would be expected to be pretty conservative in a political sense and to be the protector of the status quo from this perspective, has the tendency to oppose change.

The globalizing education aims at bringing up people who could live in differing environments with ease via intercultural interaction. The mentality of citizenship belonging to countries was initially to bring up responsible citizens showing conforming behaviors. The global developments have diversified the dimensions of citizenship to a further degree. Being aware of one's responsibilities to their country does not suffice. Citizens who feel themselves responsible to the entirety of humanity and who possess a universal consciousness have to be brought up. A citizen who possesses such particularities is called "a global citizen" in the related literature.

Global citizenship is a concept that is a matter of discussion within the scientific discourse and many definitions as to the meaning of global citizenship are in place. Some researchers give the names "citizenship beyond borders" or "citizenship beyond nation-state" to it. While some of them prefer the term "planetary citizenship" that is focused on the responsibility of the global society to protect the planet earth, others have said that "cosmopolitanism" may be more expansive and comprehensive as a term. The new approach being adopted around the world is not to bring up youngsters as standard patriots who are blindfolded attached to their country. The new mentality in education aims at bringing up youngsters who are democratic, respectful to human rights, peaceful, able to bear social responsibility, possessing the ability of critical thinking, able to bring solutions for problems.

According to Osler and Starkey (2005), citizenship may not remain within the borders of a single country anymore. Globalization and international immigrations constitute societies that differ from one another transnationally and culturally. A global citizen may see the human differences with a worldly perspective; is of the opinion that all people are free, equal and owners of specific rights. From the point

of view of Merryfield and Subedi (2001), the social studies course should be teaching that students have the identity of global citizens each. As a result, they will be away from being egoists and could assess what is going on with a multiple perspective instead of being stuck to a single one and could make comparisons and could learn how to make assessments from the perspective of others. Because, while individuals are getting informed on cultures and complex cultures differing from theirs, they should not be making an assessment with a “we” and “they” perspective.

Oxfam (2006) defines a global citizen as one that is aware of what is going on around the world, cognizant of his role as a global citizen, respecting diversity, comprehending how the world is functioning economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally, susceptible to social injustice, partaking in and contributing to the society in a local and global context, volunteering to take action in order to make the world a fair and bearable place, able to bear the responsibility for their actions.

The nationalist elements and extremist discourses comprised by the education systems are one of the matters that become prominent in recent years in Turkey, Europe, USA and the other countries of the world. Particularly, the extremist nationalist movements, islamophobia and xenophobia that escalate in recent years around the world have been impacting the instructional programs as much as the political discourses. It is a must to get informed on how nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship are perceived by the instructors as particular values to be transmitted to future generations. The opinions held by the teachers in the field of social studies relating to nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship bear significance. Therefore, what has been aimed with this research is to reveal the opinions of the teachers in USA and Turkey that have been selected as a working group on the concepts of nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship comparatively.

### Research Questions

The basic question of the research is: “What kind of a nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship perception do the social studies teachers who receive an education in the USA and Turkey possess?” The research questions are listed below:

1. What are the expressions by the participants as to the kind of nationality to which they belong?
2. What are the expressions of the participants as to how they would prefer to introduce themselves?
3. What are the preferences from among the three options (Nationalist, Patriotism, Global Citizen) and definitions relating to the preferences belonging to the participants?
4. What are the preferences of the participants as to what kind of individuals the participants are willing to bring up their students from among the three options (nationalist, patriot, global citizen)?
5. What are the justifications indicated by the participants from Turkey?
6. What are the justifications indicated by the participants from the USA?
7. Is there a significant difference between the scores between the attitude scores relating to the types of citizenship belonging to the participants from Turkey and the USA?
8. Is there a significant difference between the attitude scores relating to the types of citizenship in consideration of the country variables?
9. Is there a significant difference between the attitude scores relating to global citizenship belonging to the participants from Turkey and the USA?

### METHOD

The basic research design of the research is of a case study model. A case study is a research strategy that aims at comprehending the social phenomenon concerning a single or small group in their natural environment. McMillan (2000) gives the definition being a method by way of which one or more than one incidents, environments, programs, social groups or other interconnected systems are being subject to an in-depth examination for the case studies. From the point of view of the author, the case studies are the kind of researches in which a being is described and customized as depending on a space and time.

### Sampling

As the working group of the research, 60 teachers have been established as 30 per USA and Turkey on a voluntary basis. If the genders of the participants are examined, 18 women 12 men from USA, 16 women 14 men from Turkey have taken place in the research. The entirety of the participants from both countries is social studies teaching department students in the relevant universities.

### Instruments

For measuring the patriotism perceptions belonging to the social studies teachers, the relevant data have been collected using the Patriotism Attitude Scale (PAS) that has been developed by Schatz et al. (1999). The scale that had been transferred into practice before in USA and the United Kingdom, has been tried in terms of validity and reliability after being adapted to Turkish by Yazıcı and Yazıcı (2010). It turned out with the explanatory factor analysis being applied for the validity of the scale consisting of two sub-dimensions the factor loads changed at .331-.645 for blind patriotism; whereas, at .570-.792 for constructive patriotism. The goodness of fit values that have been obtained after the confirmatory factor analysis being performed have been calculated to be RMSEA=.078; RMR=.080; SRMR=.071; GFI=.90; AGFI=.87; CFI=.81. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient being calculated for the internal consistency analysis has been calculated to be .76 for blind patriotism, .77 for constructive patriotism; on the other hand, .75 for the entirety of the scale. The data that have been obtained have revealed that the scale is a valid and reliable measurement instrument in measuring the blind and constructive patriotism attitudes. Some items belonging to the scale are as below: “People who do not

sincerely support Turkey (USA) should be living in somewhere else.”, “Turkey (USA) is rightful almost at any time.”, “I would support my country anyway without taking into consideration that it is right or wrong.”, “People should work very hard to advance their country favorably.”...

The data relating to the perception belonging to the social studies teachers on global citizenship being another sub problem of the research have been collected using the Global Citizenship Scale (GCS) that was developed by Morais and Ogden (2011) and the original of which is in English. It has been adapted to Turkish by Ölçek, Şahin and Çermik (2014); besides, the relevant validity-reliability analyses have been done. The expert opinions have been taken as a basis as far as the language validity of the scale is concerned. An exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis have been done with the purpose of determining the closed structure of the scale being applied on 429 students. After the exploratory factor analysis, a three-factor structure giving account for 43.77 % of the total variance has been obtained; additionally, it has turned out that the model fit indexes belonging to the three factor structure are adequate. Internal consistency, split half and test-retest techniques have been put to use for reliability and when it comes to reliability coefficients, Cronbach alpha has been found to be .76, Spearman Brown split half reliability coefficient .75 and test retest reliability coefficient .75. If the findings having been obtained are taken into consideration, we can say that the Global Citizenship Scale is a measurement instrument with a reliability and validity possible to be put to use in the Turkish culture. Some items of the scale are as below: “It would not be bothering if some people in the world possess more opportunities at hand than the others.” “I am of the opinion that many people in the world have poverty or not putting in enough effort.”, “I am sure of the fact that I could accomplish in any culture or country.”...

In addition to the items taking place in the scales, the participants have been directed definitive open end questions in relation to “Nationalism, Patriotism and Global Citizenship” to support the quantitative data with the qualitative data.

### Data Analysis

In this study, the relations in between the variables and the perception levels have been examined comparatively. The quantitative and qualitative (multiple) techniques have been made use of in order to obtain findings from the data sets. For the survey results and the comparative analyses required

for them, the quantitative data analysis will be done using IBM SPSS 20.00 programme. In case of quantitative data, t-test for independent samples and descriptive statistics have been made use of. On the other hand, for qualitative data, a content analysis has been applied. The findings being obtained from the two data sets will be interpreted on a comparative basis.

## RESULTS

### Qualitative Results

The responses being given by the participants from the two different countries being included in the working group to the questions on the kind of nationality they belong have been given place in the Table 1. If the expressions of the participants are examined, it becomes evident that 67 % of the participants from USA are “White (Non-Spanish)” (20 people), 10 % of them are “Black (American with African origin)” (3 people), 10 % of them “Asian” (3 people), 10 % of them “White (Spanish)” (3 people) and 3 % of them “Native Americans or Alaska Local Inhabitants” (1 person). It is understood that 60 % of the participants from Turkey are “Turkish” (18 people), 17 % of them are “Kurdish” (5 people), 13 % of them are “Arabian” (4 people), 7 % of them are “Zaza” (2 people) and 3 % of them are “Tatarian” (1 person).

The responses of the participants from the two different countries being included in the working group to the question as to how they would prefer to introduce themselves have been given place in the Table 2. If the expressions belonging to the participants are examined, it becomes evident that 90 % of the participants from USA introduce themselves using the title of nationality and citizenship (27 people), 10 % of them introduce themselves using their cultural or ethical origin (3 people). On the other hand, 70 % of the participants introduce themselves using their title of nationality and citizenship (21 people), 30 % of them introduce themselves using their cultural or ethnical origin (9 people).

If the Table 3 is examined, 18 of the participants from USA have defined themselves as global citizens, 11 of them as patriots, one of them as a nationalist. On the other hand, 16 of the participants from Turkey have defined themselves as patriots, 9 of them as global citizens and 5 of them as nationalist. Within this framework, it becomes evident that the participants from USA regard themselves as more of

**Table 1.** Expressions by the participants as to the kind of nationality to which they belong

Expressions	USA		Expressions	Turkey	
	F	%		F	%
White (Non-Spanish)	20	67	Turkish	18	60
Black (American with an African origin)	3	10	Kurdish	5	17
Asian	3	10	Arabian	4	13
White (Spanish)	3	10	Zaza	2	7
Native American or Alaska Local Inhabitants	1	3	Tatarian	1	3
Total	30	100		30	100

**Table 2.** Expressions of the participants as to how they would prefer to introduce themselves

Expressions	USA		Turkey	
	F	%	F	%
By use of the title of nationality or citizenship	27	90	21	70
By use of the cultural or ethnic origin	3	10	9	30

a global citizen; on the other hand, the participants from Turkey as more of a patriot. According to the definitions, while the participants from USA define the global citizen as “the person who defines himself as a part of the world” at the very most, it is being observed that the participants from Turkey define it as “to regard everyone as equal without discriminating on the basis of nation and race”. If the definitions for a patriot are examined, the participants from USA have defined it as “the person who truly loves the country

**Table 3.** Preferences from among the Three Options (Nationalist, Patriotism, Global Citizen) and Definitions relating to the Preferences belonging to the Participants

Preferences	USA		Preferences	Turkey	
	Definitions	f		Definitions	f
Global Citizen (18 people)	The person defining himself as a part of the world	8	Global Citizen (9 people)	To regard everyone as equal to one another without discriminating on the basis of nationality and race	8
	Common mentality belonging to many differing countries, cultures and political systems	7		Being a citizen of the world	6
	World citizenship without taking into consideration his country of origin	5		An individual adopting the values prevalent around the world as a result of which who develops a mentality of common citizenship	5
	The person who regards the lives belonging to people from differing nations equal to their own citizens	4		To have consciousness relating to universal responsibilities	4
	International cooperation and communication	3		The person who feels every single nation as close to himself equally	4
	Citizen who is supporting the global world as a whole	3		A citizen who is in interaction with the events occurring in the world	3
Patriot (11 people)	The person who truly loves the country he is living in and who is willing to defend it	9	Patriot (16 people)	The individual loving and protecting his own country	10
	The person who is supporting his country and who is protecting the interests belonging to America	8		He is the person who works and fulfills his responsibilities	8
	The person who cares about the well-being of his own country	6		The person who could sacrifice his life for his own country	6
	The person who is supporting his own country from any country	5		To care about the interest of the country	4
	The person who wants the best for his own country	2		The person to make effort for the territorial integrity	2
Nationalist (1 person)	The person who adopts racism	9	Nationalist (5 people)	To keep the Turkish nation as superior	9
	The people who has blind and deep bonds with their countries	8		To love, adopt and possess the country of which he is a citizen.	8
	The person who only cares about the interest that belongs to his own country	6		To discriminate on the basis of race	6
	The person who loves his country and who is of the opinion that the country in which he lives is the best country	5		To act in line with the national interests	5
	Comes to the meaning that my country is better than your country.	2		To adopt the way of thinking that the country to which he belongs possesses	2

in which he lives and willing to defend it” at the very most. On the other hand, the participants from Turkey have made the definition “The individual who will love and protect his own country”. If the definitions of nationalism are examined, while the participants from USA mainly regard this concept as racism, the participants from Turkey regard nationalism as keeping the Turkish nation as superior.

“What kind of individuals would you be willing to bring up from among the given three options?” that was posed to the participants made up of the social studies teachers have been given in the Table 4. Besides, the justifications for their preferences have been shown below with direct quotations. If the Table 4 is examined, it becomes evident that the social studies teachers from USA prefer to bring up their students as more of a global citizen; nevertheless, the social studies teachers as participants from Turkey as more of a patriot. Besides, while none of the participants from USA would be willing to bring up their students as nationalists, the three of the participants from Turkey have indicated that they would prefer to bring up their students as nationalist individuals. The justifications being shown by the participants from USA and Turkey for their preferences are as below:

#### *Justifications indicated by the participants from Turkey*

Justifications Indicated by the Participants Preferring Global Citizenship:

“Solely to remain as an introvert will bring no benefit to anyone. The global values will help you to make your way far better.”

“All the people in the world are precious. No country, religion, race, sect is superior to one another.”

“Patriotism could be already grasped within the society. Global citizenship is better from all respects. You cannot stay away from the world agenda.”

“I wish to bring up contemporary people who will not discriminate for religions, languages, races.”

“I wish that not only the people living in their own countries but also those living all around the world would be attached value.”

“I wish that he would be a senior citizen who is cognizant of all the world views and having mastery of the global issues.”

“The children belonging to the future should be those who are fond of their countries.”

“Nationalism is discriminating among people but a global citizen defends that people are equal.”

**Table 4.** Preferences of the participants as to what kind of individuals the participants are willing to bring up their students from among the three options (nationalist, patriot, global citizen)

Expressions	USA		Turkey	
	F	%	F	%
As a global citizen	19	64	12	40
As a patriot	11	36	15	50
As a nationalist	0	0	3	10

“No race, language, religion is superior to one another. What matters is to bring up individuals paying respect to the humanitarian values.”

Justifications of the Participants Preferring Patriotism:

“A person should love his own country in the first place. A person who is a patriot already would be aware of his obligation to his country and will try to discharge this obligation being useful.”

“A global citizen will hold a broader perspective. But this will not be possible without patriotism.”

“The patriot students brought up by us will play a part in the country development on a direct basis.”

“Bringing up individuals who have grasped the importance of a country and placing importance to this country is fundamental for the future of a country. Bring a global citizen is not possible without being a good patriot.”

“I would be willing to bring up patriots to ensure that the students have a liking towards their country, peoples, to be useful for the state, love, protect, possess, elevate and advance their countries.”

“To bring up individuals who value the country in which they are living, who look after the interests of the country in which they are living not only for the sake of themselves.”

“A society who is not a patriot will be bound to be a captive but an individual bringing up patriots without considering their races will not betray their country”.

“To bring up individuals who have a fonding for their countries and who will shed a light for the future of the country. One who has a fonding for his own history and culture will not be admiring the history and culture of other countries and will not feel inferior.”

Justifications of the Participants who Prefer Nationalism:

“We need a nationalist tradition to understand how and in what way our ancestors acquired these lands and bearing the fact that the Turkish nation is the most superior race of all in mind.”

“The individuals who are aware of their essence and who have grasped a national consciousness may contribute to their countries in every single field, would hold the ideal to further their peoples. Nationalism will unify, integrate, will result in the consciousness of citizenship.”

#### *Justifications indicated by the participants from the USA*

Justifications of the Participants Preferring Global Citizenship:

“I want to bring up students who are concerned with many issues prevalent around the world and who care about such issues.”

“I wish that my students become aware of the fact that they are not obliged to give support to the actions belonging to the country in which they are living. I encourage them to stand for the things which they believe to be incorrect ethically for them in person and their countries and to protest against them. I want them to make this world a better place.”

“I want my students to comprehend and be respectful to all people, countries and cultures no matter how different or foreign they are.”

“Borders do not define people. The geography in which they are living does not matter, all the people should possess some kind of rights. This will additionally come to the meaning that people are treated equally and we should make effort as a whole in order to develop the planet entirely for everyone.”

“The global citizens are those who are proud of their countries and who wish its advancement. A positive change meets the global borders after starting with small steps”.

“I want them to be cognizant of the fact that their bonds to the world are near.”

“The health and welfare of the world matters for the future of humankind and global citizenship”.

“I wish that they would be giving a thought on the impact of the things they are doing on others.”

“I wish that my students possess a working capacity together with those who differ both in a physical and cultural sense.”

“I wish that my students become global citizens. I want them to get interested in other countries and be open to different ideals. I want them to feel strong to love their countries but to get informed on the matter of the possibility of becoming a part of the relevant kind of change.”

Justifications of the Participants who Prefer Patriotism:

“I wish that my students grasp the world as a whole let alone the support they will be giving to their countries.”

“I try for the families to see their families, we have not preferred it. But we have to love everything too much and be proud of them and this will not come to the meaning that we will skip their mistakes.”

“Love for one’s country highly matters”.

“I wish that my students become proud of their countries and develop their countries by use of civilian and political processes”.

“The fact that they adore your country matters but they should not have a superiority complex.”

If the justifications belonging to the participants from both countries are examined, it becomes evident that the participants from Turkey have absorbed the value of patriotism better; on the other hand, the participants from USA are placing a higher importance on the value of global citizenship. When it comes to the issue of patriotism, while the participants from USA regard it as more of racism, the Turkish participants deem it as a kind of patriotism.

**Quantitative Results**

According to the Table 5, a statistically significant difference has been established in between the attitude score averag-

es of blind patriotism and constructive patriotism being from among the types of patriotism applying for the social studies teachers from Turkey within the working group [ $t_{(29)}=35.53$ ;  $p<.000$ ]. Likewise, a statistically significant difference has been established in between the attitude score averages of blind patriotism and constructive patriotism being from among the types of patriotism applying for the social studies teachers from USA within the working group [ $t_{(29)}=14.05$ ;  $p<.000$ ]. The difference in between the blind patriotism score averages as a factor and the constructive patriotism score averages belonging to the participants from both countries that take place in the working group supports the constructive patriotism scores with this difference being statistically significant. For this, the interpretation that the teachers taking place in the working group are better prone to constructive patriotism being from among the types of patriotism together with blind patriotism may be brought.

According to the Table 6, a statistically significant difference has been established in between the attitude score averages of blind patriotism being from among the types of patriotism applying for the participants from Turkey and USA within the working group [ $t_{(58)}=2.53$ ;  $p<.000$ ]. However, no statistically significant difference has been established in between the attitude score averages of constructive patriotism as applying for the participants from Turkey and USA within the working group [ $t_{(58)}=.92$ ;  $p>.000$ ]. The difference in between the blind patriotism score averages of the participants from Turkey and the blind patriotism score averages belonging to the participants from USA within the working group supports the participants from Turkey and this difference is statistically significant. The difference between the constructive patriotism score averages belonging to the participants from Turkey and the constructive patriotism score averages belonging to the participants from USA within the work group is not statistically significant. For this, the interpretation that the participants from Turkey are better prone to blind patriotism than the participants from USA within the working group may be brought.

For this, the interpretation that the teachers taking place in the working group are better prone to constructive patriotism being from among the types of patriotism together with blind patriotism may be brought.

According to the Table 7, a statistically significant difference has been established in between the attitude score averages of global citizenship belonging to the participants from Turkey and USA [ $t_{(58)}=7.74$ ;  $p<.000$ ]. The difference in between the global citizenship attitude score averages of the participants from Turkey and the global citizenship attitude

**Table 5.** The t-test results for the attitude scores relating to the types of citizenship belonging to the participants from Turkey and USA

Participants	Types of citizenship	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Turkey	Blind Patriotism	30	2,75	0,93	35.53	29	000*
	Constructive Patriotism	30	4,02	0,61			
USA	Blind Patriotism	30	2,16	0,68	14.05	29	000*
	Constructive Patriotism	30	3,88	0,49			

\* $p<.05$

**Table 6.** The t-test results for the attitude scores relating to the types of citizenship in consideration of the country variables

Types of citizenship	Participants	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Blind Patriotism	Turkey	30	2,75	0,93	2.72	58	0.004*
	USA	30	2,16	0,68			
Constructive Patriotism	Turkey	30	4,02	0,61	0.92	58	0.37**
	USA	30	3,88	0,49			

\*p<.05, \*\*p>.05

**Table 7.** The t-test results for the attitude scores relating to global citizenship belonging to the participants from Turkey and USA

Participants	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Turkey	30	3,05	0,44	7.74	58	000*
USA	30	3,87	0,41			

\*p<.05

score averages belonging to the participants from USA within the working group supports the participants from USA and this difference is statistically significant. For this, the interpretation that the participants from USA are better prone to global citizenship than the participants from Turkey within the working group may be brought.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The concepts of nationalism and patriotism are those which are generally being confused with one another and both of which could be defined as love for one's country and the sentiment of attachment to a country. On the other hand, a perspective as to the concepts of nationalism and patriotism as an attitude may differ in between the societies. Every single state wishes to instill the sentiment of patriotism to its citizens which shows itself with the education policies.

According to Staub (1997), the patriotism shows itself in two forms: blind patriotism and constructive patriotism. In case of blind patriotism, what we observe is an unconditional acceptance of all public practices as well as loyalty to it in a conventional society. On the other hand, within a modern community, the sensible citizens having adopted democracy are better regarded as constructive patriots. On the other hand, a global citizen is a person who observes the goodness of the entire humankind being a world citizen remaining beyond the two concepts. The value of "patriotism" has a place from among the values to be directly taught with the social studies instruction schedule be it blind or constructive. The opinions and the perspective as to the global citizenship belonging to the social studies teachers to be teaching the course will have an impact on how they will be growing their students.

According to the quantitative findings of the research, it has appeared that the constructive patriotism attitudes proved higher than blind patriotism attitudes being from among the types of patriotism that belong to the social studies teachers having participated in the research from Turkey and USA. If the two countries are assessed comparatively, it becomes evident that the blind patriotism

attitudes belonging to the participants from Turkey are higher than that of the participants from USA. When the global citizenship attitudes are examined, it is supporting the participants from USA. Within this framework, it may be said that the participants from USA are better prone to global citizenship if compared with the participants from Turkey. The general structure of the USA and Turkish society, their attachment to the historical values, the educational policies being conducted, family, press and society instructions may be indicated as the relevant grounds. According to Ersoy and Öztürk (2015), the patriotism perception belonging to the family and social environment, the patriotism messages given place in the printed and visual press in the course of the studies make up the elements that reflect on the patriotism perception belonging to the social studies teachers.

The fact that the constructive patriotism attitudes belonging to the social studies teachers of the two countries having participated in the research is of a higher value may indicate that they could teach the value of patriotism as such in their courses. Westheimer (2009) has indicated that the democratic patriotism education to be given in the social studies course could only be put to use with the instructor possessing constructive patriotism attitudes.

If the qualitative findings of the research are examined, it becomes evident that the participants from USA with various ethnic origins are better introducing themselves using the titles nationalism and citizenship if compared with the participants from Turkey. On the other hand, the participants from Turkey have been better introducing themselves using the cultural or ethnic origin if compared with the participants from USA.

The participant teachers from the two countries have been asked about which one from among nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship they are finding as close to themselves and to define such concepts. The participants from USA have better introduced themselves as global citizens; whereas, the participants from Turkey have better introduced themselves as patriots. This finding indicates that the quantitative and qualitative findings are in alignment to one another. While the participants from USA have defined a global citizen as "a person defining himself as a part of the world, the participants from Turkey have given the definition "to regard everyone as equal to one another without discriminating on the basis of nationality and race." If the definitions of a patriot are examined, the participants from USA have better defined it as "The individual who truly loves the country he is living in and who is willing to protect it"; whereas, the participants from Turkey as "The individual loving and protecting his own country". If the definitions of nationalism



are examined, while the participants from USA have better regarded the concept as racism, the participants from Turkey have regarded nationalism as keeping the Turkish nation as superior. In parallel with the conclusions that this research have produced, the findings belonging to Ersoy and Öztürk (2015) have indicated that the social studies teachers perceive patriotism primarily as a love for one's country and attachment; secondarily, while some have emphasized fulfillment of one's responsibilities subsequent to the said love and attachment, others have made the struggle for democracy and human rights prominent.

If the results belonging to the participants from both countries on how they want to bring up their students are examined, it becomes evident that the social studies teachers from USA better prefer to bring up their students as global citizens; on the other hand, the social studies teachers participating from Turkey better prefer to bring up their students as patriots. Besides, while none of the participants from USA were willing to bring up their students as nationalists, the three of the participants from Turkey have said that they would prefer to bring up their students as nationalist individuals.

Nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship that appear as the values to be taught in the course of the social studies have to be conveyed to the students using a democratic and constructive approach. It is important to encourage democratic (constructive) patriotism at every single phase of education matter. Studies aiming at growing the constructive patriotism and global citizenship attitudes with appropriate courses at the time of the undergraduate studies may be actualized as far as the social studies teachers are concerned. As a result, it may be ensured that the teachers grasp a proper distinction of nationalism – patriotism – global citizenship concerning social studies being a working area that is drawing their interest. It should be borne in mind that the individuals possess democratic patriotism and citizenship attitudes for the sake of a democratic society; besides, they should not detach themselves from the global issues. Nationalism, patriotism and global citizenship that appear as the values to be taught in the course of the social studies have to be conveyed to the students using a democratic and constructive approach. It is important to encourage democratic (constructive) patriotism at every single phase of education matter. Studies aiming at growing the constructive patriotism and global citizenship attitudes with appropriate courses at the time of the undergraduate studies may be actualized as far as the social studies teachers are concerned. As a result, it may be ensured that the teachers grasp a proper distinction of nationalism – patriotism – global citizenship concerning social studies being a working area that is drawing their interest. It should be borne in mind that the individuals possess democratic patriotism and citizenship attitudes for the sake of a democratic society; besides, they should not detach themselves from the global issues.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Staub, E. (1997). Introduction: patriotism: its scope and meaning, *Patriotism in The Lives of Individuals and Nations* (Ed. Bar-Tal, D. and Staub, E.), Chicago: Nelson- Hall Publishers, 1-19.
- Berger, P. L. & Luckman, Th. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Ersoy, A. F. & Öztürk, F. (2015). Patriotism as a Citizenship Value: Perceptions of Social Studies Teacher Candidates. *Elementary Education Online*, 14(3), 974-992.
- Guibernau, M. (2007). *The Identity of Nations*. UK: Polity Press.
- Hurwitz, J. & Peffley, M. (1999). International Attitudes. In J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.). *Measures of Political Attitudes* (pp. 533–590), San Diego: Academic Press.
- McMillan, J. H. (2000). *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Merryfield, M. M. & Subedi, B. (2001). The social studies curriculum. Wayne Ross (Ed.), *Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education*. United Satete of America: State University of New York Press.
- Morais, B. D. & Ogden C. A. (2011). Initial Development and Validation of the Global Citizenship Scale, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), 445–466.
- Nathanson, S. (1997). Should patriotism have a future? In Bar-Tal, D. & Staub, E. (Eds.), *Patriotism in The Lives of Individuals and Nations* (pp. 311-326), Chicago: Nelson-HallPublishers.
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Notes on Nationalism*. London: Polemic GB.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship-democracy and inclusion in education*. London: Open University Press.
- Oxfam (2006). Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools. <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/teachers/globciti/downloads/gcguide06.pdf>
- Rapoport, A. (2009). Patriotic education in Russia: Stylistic move or the sign of substantive counter-reform? *The Educational Forum*, 73(1), 141-153.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the Varieties of National Attachment: Blind Versus Constructive Patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 151-174.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National Identity*. New York, London: Penguin Books.
- Spinner-Halev, J. & Theiss-Morse, E. (2003). National identity and Self-Esteem. *Perspectives on Politics* 1(3), 515–632.
- Stalin, J. V. (2013). *Marxism and the National Question*. New York, NY: Prism Key Press.
- Sullivan, J. L., Fried, A., & Dietz, M. G. (1992). Patriotism, Politics, and the Presidential Election of 1988. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(2), 200–234.
- Şahin, İ. F. & Çermik, F. (2014). Turkish adaptation of Global Citizenship Scale: Reliability and Validity. *Eastern Geographical Review*, 31, 207-218.
- Torring, J. (1999). *New Theories of Discourse; Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Westheimer, J. (2009). Should social studies be patriotic? *Social Education*, 73(7), 316–20.
- Yazıcı, S. & Yazıcı, F. (2010). A study of the validity and reliability of the patriotism attitude scale A study of the validity and reliability of the patriotism attitude scale. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 7(2), 901-918.