

Patriotism and Global Citizenship as Values: A Research on Social Studies Teacher Candidates¹

Ali Altıkulaç

The Faculty of Education, Çukurova University, Adana, 01330, Turkey

Abstract

The ultimate aim of teaching Social Studies is to raise good citizens. However, raising “good” citizens has become a more complicated issue since the continuous change in social dynamics demands continual revisions on curriculums. Beyond the question of “Should the children be raised as patriot individuals?” a growing number of studies conducted on Education Science concentrate on the notion of Global Citizenship. The purpose of Social Studies’ education process is not bringing up students who are isolated from society and are blind patriots. Then the question arises, what type of citizenship should be developed within the education system? This research aims to put forward the notion of global citizenship and patriotism as each of them is a value within the Social Studies course that has the mission of bringing up good citizens. The research is the model case study. The data about patriotism is collected through the scale that are developed by Schatz, Staub and Levine (1999) which is called, Patriotism Attitude Scale (PAS), on the other side, the data about global citizenship is collected through the scale developed by Morais and Ogden (2011) which is called Global Citizen Scale (GCS) collected from the participants. The research study group consist of 144 Social Studies teacher candidates who are from two different state universities, who are in their senior grade. The research data includes quantitative and qualitative data. In the analysis of the quantitative data, a computer-aided statistic program is used and in the analysis of qualitative data, content-analysis method was used. The research’s conclusion shows that the participants prefer patriotism over global citizenship and constructive patriotism against blind patriotism.

Keywords: Social Studies, Values Education, Patriotism, Global Citizenship

1. Introduction

Social Studies deal with the development of individual in social context; this individual development as long as it is not damaging to the society that it has developed in, is supported by social studies. There are binding social boundaries that are designed by societies, which show appearance within a historical process (Armstrong, 1980). Values come on top of individual himself and the society that controls the individual (Yazıcı, 2006). According to John Dewey, the value means a concept that should be primarily respected, appreciated and admired. It also means reaching to something and an act of protecting it, also comparing its value with other things and an act of reasoning on its nature (Venkataiah, 2007). Values are motives that direct the behaviour of individual and motives that stay in individual’s consciousness (Özgüven 1999). Values are mental phenomena which reside in affective domain and which control and direct our actions. Basically, if the values are compared to beliefs and attitudes, values are more comprehensive than both of them (Demircioğlu and Tokdemir, 2008). The purpose of Values Education is to discover the child’s best side that comes from his/her birth; to ensure the total development of individuality of the child; to help him/her reach the human perfection; to save and protect the society and the individual from bad morality and ethics, besides that it has the aim of bedighting the society and individual with good morality and ethics thus providing a continuity for the society. According to Venkataiah (2007), Values of Education means trying to provide an emphasis on humanism and it aims to inculcate children to think about other individuals and the welfare of their country. The only way to achieve this goal is to make children feel a deep sense of the society’s values. It is expected to find solution to the gradual disappearance of spiritual, ethical, social and aesthetical values of the society through formal Values of Education. Education Values are not acts to manipulate or brain-wash. The aim of Values of Education is to inspire people to choose their own social, ethical and spiritual values and help them understand these values more deeply by providing them some practical methods of understanding the contrast (Balci, 2008).

The program that is applied for Social Studies in Turkey contains values such as, giving importance to the unity of the family, fairness, freedom, peace, liberty, being scientific, diligence, co-operation, sensitivity, honesty, aesthetic, tolerance, hospitality, giving importance to health, being respectful, affections, responsibility, being tidy, being helpful and being patriot. There are different approaches about how to apply these values. These values might be applied by following the traditional inculcation methods or through the method of explaining the values, students might be provided with their own way of recognizing the values. Furthermore, moral reasoning and value analysis method could also be benefited from, in order to provide students a better understanding of values through systematic analysis (MONE, 2006).

¹ This article was presented at International Conference on Quality in Higher Education (24-25 November 2016) held in Sakarya, Turkey.

The word “Patriotism” etymologically comes from Latin and can be characterized as being loyal to the sovereign. There are different perspectives towards the description of patriotism on its content and its distinctive characteristics. The most basic description of patriotism is defined as a group’s loyalty towards their members and the land they share in living (Bar-Tal and Staub, 1997). The researches about the idea of patriotism put forward different definitions, for example some specific beliefs on a country’s superiority through shared common national symbols and affection towards the country creates a rooted nation and plays a significant role on powering up the civilian bonds and national loyalty (Hurwitz & Peffley 1999; Spinner-Halevand Theiss-Morse 2003; Sullivan, Fried & Dietz 1992).

The researchers reached a common consensus on the idea of patriotism used on behalf of nationalism based on the idea of superiority and a concept against a foreign sovereignty (De Figueiredo and Elkins 2003; Karasawa 2002; Kosterman and Feshbach 1989; Mummendey, Klink & Brown, 2001; Sidanius vd., 1997). Social psychologists emphasize patriotism’s main characteristics as loyalty, love and individual’s desire of being a part of a community (Bar-Tal and Staub, 1997). Nathanson (1997) claims that patriotism consist of 4 main components which are, a special affection towards one’s country; defining himself or herself through his or her country; being interested in country’s welfare; and sacrificing for the sake of country’s welfare.

According to Durkheim, “homeland” plays a key-role on the moralization process since it controls an existing society from the highest level of organization (Guibernau, 2007). Patriotism can’t exist outside of a state or nation frame. Unlike nationalism, regionalism, tribalism and patriotism has always been about a political society which is the concrete evidence of a nation or a state. A nation which is a social construction and limited in its political and social values is a community that exists in the members of this community’s minds (Anderson, 1983). Nationalism might have played an important part on the construction of a nation but naturally, it has the element of innate pre-eminence in which nationalism might especially be destructive for multi-ethnic states. Unlike nationalism, patriotism provides a concrete evidence for the unity of nation for the sake of its welfare. Ontologically, patriotism is a social construct that develops gradually according to people’s cultural activity (Berger & Luckman, 1966). It is natural that people show affection and compassion towards the place they love and it is also natural that people show affection towards their parents and groups in which they take part. However, in the development process of states, people were made to believe they are being part of a bigger community. So the natural boundaries are replaced by a margin towards an imaginary society such as principedom, kingdom, and empire or state (Rapoport, 2009). Nationalism and patriotism both shows individual’s relation with the nation. It is common that these terms are jumbled up. People tend to believe that they mean the same thing but there is a huge difference between nationalism and patriotism. While nationalism puts emphasis on the heritage of language and cultural unity, patriotism puts more emphasis on values and beliefs and aims to achieve love for country and nation. Orwell (1945) defines patriotism as a term which has no intention of putting pressure on the other people, and it defines a place which is the best in the world and has the best life style and people’s boundary toward this idea. Patriotism has a nature of protection both militaristic and cultural. On the other hand, nationalism can’t be separated from the desire of authority. All nationalistic view has a common aim, that is, providing reputation and power for the nation is more important than the individual himself.

Although prior studies on patriotism (excluding: Sullivan, Fried & Dietz, 1992) commonly makes analysis of the subject from a one dimensional view, there have been numerous distinctive characteristics put forward. Curti (1946) makes a distinction between patriotism’s “militaristic” and “civil” side (see. Borune, 1977). Morray (1959) makes a comparison between obedient and imitational patriotism, and disobedient and innovator patriotism. Sommerville (1981) makes a distinction between ignorant and irrational patriotism and oppositional and rational patriotism. Also, Adorno (1950) puts forward the comparison of the idea of “supposed” patriotism (which means blind loyalty and dogmatic compatibility) and the idea of “genuine” patriotism (which is based on critical approach towards boundaries on national values and the love of a nation). cited. Schatz, Staub and Lavine (1999). Staub (1997) claims that there are two kinds of patriotism, the first one is “blind patriotism” and the second, “constructive patriotism”. According to Staub, these two patriotisms are different. Blind patriotism is characterized as showing dogmatic acceptance and loyalty towards country’s politics and actions (Schatz and Staub, 1997). This loyalty is valid although the national politics is against human rights and the rights of other nations (Bar-Tal and Staub, 1997). Blind patriotism’s loyalty differs from time to time and from society to society. According to Staub, this subject could be state, nation, view, or an ideology. However, the only thing that doesn’t change is the unconditional loyalty and service towards the subject. In blind patriotism, besides making a criticism of state’s politics, letting other people trying to make a criticism of it could be considered as treason towards the state. In this sense, blind patriotism shows a tendency on resistance against change which makes it a conservative thought and protector of status quo.

It could be said that blind and constructive patriotisms are kind of a distinction depending on the qualities of democratic citizens. Democratic values and ideals are related to cognitive values rather than what we are trying to define as affection values’ dimension of patriotism. It is an ideal situation that individuals put a critical approach towards each other’s groups in which they develop their capacity of loyalty and rationalism. Critical consciousness

means the perspective of authority or society, one's ability to freely evaluate the knowledge (Staub, 1997). In this sense, constructive patriotism goes against the protection of status quo. Patriotism is concerned with the emotion of loyalty that might prevent an active, critical citizen who is desired by a democratic state. However, the aforementioned basically described constructive patriotism with its critical consciousness and the concern of change are in the quality of compensating these concerns. A notion of patriotism that is enriched with democratic qualities is not an obstacle for an active and participative citizen, but it is rather supportive (Yazıcı and Yazıcı, 2010).

It doesn't matter what belief or ideology we have, there is no doubt that globalization has a warm side for all of us. The reason is that, all doctrines throughout history keep the idea of globalization in the foreground (Işıklı, 1999). Globalizing Education aims at raising people who would easily live in different places through inter-cultural interactions. The understanding of citizenship by the states at the beginning was raising responsible citizens that would behave according to system. Global developments enrich the dimensions of citizenship. It is no longer enough for a citizen to be responsible for his/her own country. There should be people who feel responsible for all the humankind who have universal consciousness. Those who have these qualities are called "Global Citizen" in literature.

Global citizenship is a problematic term for the scientific discourse and there have been many arguments and definitions about what global citizenship means. Some researchers name it as "citizenship beyond the borders" or "citizenship beyond the nation states". Some others, since the global society has the responsibility towards the planet, prefer to call it "Planet citizenship" and some others prefer the term "cosmopolitanism" since it covers a wider area (Oxfam, 2006).

According to Kan (2009), "Global Citizen" is a person who has responsibility not only to his/her own country but to the whole world. "Global Citizen" is a universal person who looks at the events from the perspective of the world and humankind and aims to provide a sustainable life for the next generations. Recently, there has been focus on omitting the wars from the syllabuses for a peaceful history education. Turkey signed an agreement prepared by UNESCO in 20 May 1946. The first sentence on the UNESCO agreement is "War starts within the minds of people". The notion of peace that should be established within the minds of people's understanding was accepted through Atatürk's principle of "Peace at home, Peace in the world". There have been studies that opine hostile expressions should also be removed from the textbooks. When the textbooks from the past and present are compared, expressions such as cutting, drinking blood, ruthlessly murdering, cowardly murdering, rascal and dishonourable enemy, Greek Palikar, Flock of Greek, has been removed.

The new approach in the world is not to allow youth to be blindly bounded as citizens. The new understanding of education aims to raise people that are democratic, respectful to human rights, peaceful, responsible to the society, capable of critically reasoning and people that could find solutions against the problems.

According to Osler and Starkey (2005), citizenship can no longer stay within the borders of a country. Globalization and international migrations can result in transnational and mixed cultures in societies. A global citizen will see the difference between people from a world-wide perspective and can easily welcome the thought that all humans are free and equal. According to Merryfield and Subedi (2001), Students should be taught that they are global citizens in their Social Studies lessons. In this sense, students would not see themselves as the centre of the world and that would enable them compare and contrast things from other people's perspectives. This is because individuals, while learning about other cultures should not approach and evaluate the subjects from the perspectives of "us" and "they".

According to Kan (2009) a global citizen would never underestimate national values. He or she is a citizen model that would respect national values and they would not have problem on adopting universal values.

Oxfam (2006) explains the global citizen as a person who is aware of the happenings in the world, who knows his/her own role as a global citizen; a person who shows respect to diversity; one that can understand how global economic, politics, social, cultural, technological, and environmental issues work; sensitive to social injustice; locally and universally active and participative; a volunteer in making the world a better place; and a person that can accept the responsibilities of his/her actions.

The global citizenship does not take place in Social Studies' syllabuses as a course which is provided directly. The patriotism subjects' constructive patriotism dimension agrees with the global citizenship qualities. In other words, people who support constructive patriotism are expected to be positive towards the idea of global citizenship.

In the declaration of NCSS, it is emphasized that Social Studies will be efficient when it is loaded with values (National Council for Social Studies [NCSS], 2003). The fundamental laws, regulations and the curriculum for Turkish National Education always claim that students should be taught the values of Turkish Society and the universal values of the world. Most of the values that are in the educational curriculum are related to Social Studies courses' main purpose. Among the values that should be taught directly, there is also the value of "patriotism". One of the purpose of social studies is claimed to be "putting the national identity to the centre, the adoption of universal values should also be given significance" (MONE, 2006).

Recently, radical expressions and national subjects in the educational systems happen to be one of the

most featured subjects in Turkey, Europe, USA and other countries in the world. The discourses in recent years such as radical nationalism, blind patriotism, islamophobia and xenophobia have influenced subjects of educational systems as well as politics. Within the scope of this research, opinions of social studies teacher candidates on patriotism and global citizenship as values will be revealed. The problem statement of the research has been defined as “What is the perception of teacher candidates about patriotism and global citizenship which takes part in applied Social Studies’ education process?”

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

The research is in the model of a case study. Case study is a research strategy that aims to understand a single or small groups’ social phenomenon in its own nature. Case studies are seen as distinct method to find solution to the scientific questions (Büyüköztürk et al., 2011). Mc Millan (2000) defines case study as a method that could deeply analyse an event, place, programs, social groups or systems that are bounded to each other. Case study is a research technique that defines an entity that is privatized considering its place and time.

2.2 Study Group

Convenience sampling method has been benefited from when determining the study group of the research. Convenience sampling, considering the time, money and work-force limitations, is to choose samples from the units that are easy to reach and easy to apply (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011). The sampling of the research consists of Social Studies Teacher Education’s students who are teacher candidates from two different state universities. In the academic year of 2015-2016, seniors from Social Studies’ Education students of which 88 males, 56 females and 144 teacher candidate volunteered for the study.

2.3 Data Collection

The data on the patriotism of Social Studies teacher candidates is collected through Patriotism Attitude Scale (PAS) developed by Schatz, Staub and Lavine (1999). The scale was used in USA and England before it was adapted to Turkish by Yazıcı and Yazıcı (2010). Validity and reliability studies were conducted. The scale consists of two sub-dimensions and to explain the validity factor analysis, factor load in the blind patriotism dimension is .331-.645, and for the constructive patriotism dimension it is in between .570-.792. The reliability factor analysis shows the goodness of fit as RMSEA=.078; RMR=.080; SRMR=.071; GFI=.90; AGFI=.87; CFI=.81. The coefficient number of Cronbach Alpha for internal consistency analysis is observed in blind patriotism as .76; constructive patriotism, .77; for the whole scale, .75.

The data collected shows the validity and reliability of the scale on analysing blind patriotism and constructive patriotism.

The data about global citizenship of Social Studies teacher candidates is collected through Global Citizen Scale (GCS) which is developed by Morais and Ogden (2011) which is originally in English. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Şahin and Çermik (2014) with the validity and reliability analysis conducted. For the scale validity of the language, expert gave their opinions which were beneficial. The scale that is applied on 429 university students, to determine its covered structure exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted. The result of exploratory factor analysis shows the total variance as %43.77 of which consists of three factor structure and the model fit index of three factor structure is found to be enough. The result of confirmatory factor analysis for internal consistency is two half, and a test and test-retest techniques. The reliability coefficient number Cronbach Alpha .76, Sperman Brown two half reliability coefficient number .75 and test-retest reliability coefficient number is found to be .75 were applied. The data collected might be interpreted as Global Citizen Scale’s being a reliable and a valid method of analysis scale to be applied in Turkish Culture.

The following questions “Do you define yourself as patriot or global citizen? Why?” were added to the survey

2.4 Data Analysis

In this study the relations between variables and their perception levels have been comparatively examined. Qualitative and quantitative analysis techniques have been applied to transform datasets into findings. The results of the survey and comparative analysis of the quantitative data analysis has been conducted by a computer-supported analysis program. For the quantitative data, t-test for the independent groups and descriptive statistics were also applied. Furthermore for the quantitative data, content analysis was applied. The findings collected from the datasets have been comparatively interpreted.

3. Findings

The work-groups’ qualitative and quantitative data on patriotism (blind patriotism, constructive patriotism) and global citizenship are shown below.

Chart 1 T-test Results on Gender Variables about Study Group's Attitude Points on Patriotism and Global Citizenship

Attitude	Gender	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Patriotism	Male	88	3,22	,42	.35	142	.725*
	Female	56	3,25	,43			
Global Citizenship	Male	88	3,42	,70	1.58	142	.115*
	Female	56	3,24	,55			

*P>.05

According to Chart 1, there is no considerable amount of difference between average patriotism attitude points, if the genders of Social Studies teacher candidates is taken into account [$t_{(142)}=.35$; $p>.725$]. The male social studies teacher candidates' average Patriotism Attitude Scale point is found to be ($X=3.22$), the female part's Patriotism Attitude Scale point is found to be ($X=3.25$). This difference statistically is not reasonable. Likewise, it was determined that there is no statistically considerable difference on social studies teacher candidates' global citizenship attitude points as regards genders [$t_{(142)}=1.58$; $p>.115$]. While the male social studies teacher candidates have average test point ($X=3.42$) from Global Citizen Scale, the female part of the study group takes average test point ($X=3.24$) from Global Citizen Scale. This difference statistically is not reasonable. In other words, it could be interpreted that both the male and female part of the study groups' patriotism and global citizenship attitude level is close to one another.

Chart 2 T-test results on Study Group's Patriotism and Global Citizenship Attitude Points

Attitude	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Patriotism	144	3.35	.65	2.09	143	.038*
Global Citizenship	144	3.23	.42			

*P<.05

According to Chart 2, it is determined that there is a statistically reasonable difference between Social Studies teacher candidates' global citizenship and patriotism attitude points [$t_{(143)}=2.09$; $p<.038$]. The study group in which social studies teacher candidates take part, has taken average ($X=3.35$) point from Patriotism Attitude Scale, while they got average ($X=3.23$) point from Global Citizen Scale. The difference is in the favor of patriotism points' of the participants and this difference is statistically reasonable. This situation could be interpreted as the participant social studies teacher candidates' patriotism attitude which is positively above the global citizenship attitude.

Chart 3 T-test results about Study Group's Attitude Points on Patriotism Types

Types of Patriotism	N	X	S	t	sd	p
Blind Patriotism	144	2.69	.93	18.44	143	.000*
Constructive Patriotism	144	4.30	.68			

*P<.05

According to Chart 3 it is determined that there is a statistically reasonable difference between Social Studies teacher candidates' blind patriotism and constructive patriotism attitude point [$t_{(143)}=18.44$; $p<.000$]. While the study group's blind patriotism point average as a factor is ($X=2.69$), their constructive patriotism point average is ($X=4.30$). The difference is in the favor of study groups' constructive patriotism points and this difference is statistically reasonable. This situation could be interpreted as the study groups' tendency towards constructive patriotism rather than blind patriotism.

Chart 4 Study Group’s Reasons and Perspectives for Seeing Themselves as Patriots or Global Citizens

Decision	f	Reasons	f
Patriot	90	I love my country, I value and protect her and would never my country to harm.	19
		I aim to be a beneficial individual for my country and serve it.	8
		I can do anything and everything for my country.	6
		I hold interests of my country above everything.	5
		I like my country.	4
		I would criticize if need be but would never harm.	4
		I love people from every race in my country.	4
		We must love our country.	4
		I’m a racist nationalist.	4
		I would think of my country’s interests.	4
		We must protect our country.	4
		Motherland is holy; it is watered with the blood of our ancestors.	4
		It is the necessity of being Turk.	3
		I care about the unity, history and language of my nation.	3
		We need to live in unity and solidarity.	3
		I would strive for the unity, solidarity and integrity of my country.	3
		I embrace and protect the Turkish Culture.	2
		I don’t care about other countries’ interests.	1
		Anyone who works for his/her nation is important.	1
		Even if I’m not from Turkish Race, I feel like a patriot.	1
Since there is variety of ethnicities in this country, we need to be patriots not nationalists.	1		
I am against the foreigners who occupy our country.	1		
I love this country even if I don’t like its people.	1		
Global Citizen	54	There should be no segregation in religion, language, sect and race.	12
		Not only my country but also the whole world is important.	10
		One should love human for being human, support and protect him/her.	9
		I don’t believe in the concept of nation and nationality.	6
		It would disturb me if any human being is in pain, no matter where she/he is in the world.	4
		Before the end of the world problems, the problems of our country would never end.	4
		I can see the positive and negative sides of my country.	2
		All humans must be equal.	2
		I care about the universal values.	2
		Humans can’t decide their own race.	1
		The mistakes of country managers can’t be the burden of the people	1
		Long live the world peace!	1

“Do you identify yourself as patriot or global citizen? Why?” These questions were directed to the social studies teacher candidates who are in the study group. Their responses and reasons are given in Chart 4. According to the results, 98% of teacher candidates define themselves as “patriots” whereas 2% describes themselves as “global citizens”. In other words, teacher candidates for the most part define themselves as “patriots”. When the reasons of teacher candidate who defined themselves as “patriots” were observed, perceptions such as “I love my country, I give value, I protect it and would never harm” (f=19), “I aim to be a beneficial individual for my country and serve for it” (f=8), “I can do anything and everything for my country” (f=6) etc were given.

People who call themselves as “global citizens” propose their identification through examples such as, “There should be no segregation in religion, language, sect and race” (f=12), “Not only my country but also the whole world is important” (f=10), “I don’t believe in the concept of nation and nationality” (f=6). When the answers of teacher candidates on both options are observed, it could be claimed that their reasons are appropriate for the concepts.

4. Conclusion

Patriotism generally can be defined as one’s feeling of love and loyalty towards his/her country. Every state would like to make their citizens feel patriotic and this situation would also be reflected in education policies. According to Staub (1997), there are two types of patriotisms, blind patriotism and constructive patriotism. For the blind patriotism, it could be said that in traditional societies, people would accept and show loyalty towards

the state without questioning its applications. Alternatively, in modern societies, reasonable people who embrace democracy usually are accepted as constructive patriots. The global citizen is beyond the two concepts. A global is one who seeks the good of all humanity. Either blind or constructive patriotism, the concept stays within the context of Social Studies' education program in which it is expected to be given directly. The teachers who are going to give the courses, the form of their patriotism and their perception on global citizenship would be effective on the values that their students will get.

The findings' results show that patriotism and global citizenship attitude of social studies teacher candidates show no difference considering genders. From this point of view, it could be said that female and male participants have similar notion on global citizenship and patriotism. Then again, comparing the patriotism and global citizenship, they are observed to prefer patriotism over global citizenship. The reason for this choice might be the general structure of Turkish Society, allegiance to historical values, education policies or orientation of family, society and media. According to Ersoy and Öztürk (2015), the patriotism notion of family and social circles and the patriotism messages that are given in education process through written and visual media are elements that are reflected in social studies teacher candidates' notion of patriotism.

The participants' constructive patriotism attitude is found to be higher than blind patriotism attitude. Being close to the constructive patriotism attitude, the social studies teacher candidates might be expected to show the patriotism value in their courses from the constructive patriotism perception. To Westheimer (2009), a democratic patriotism education can only be achieved by teachers who embrace the attitude of constructive patriotism.

The participant teacher candidates are asked to choose between global citizenship and patriotism and explain their reasons. The results and findings show that social studies teacher candidates define themselves as "patriots". Since they got higher point on Patriotism Attitude Scale it could be said that qualitative data supports the quantitative data. The most repeated answers from the participants who call themselves patriots are: loving the country, preventing damage to the country, working for the country, protecting the interests of the country. Parallel to the results of this research, Ersoy and Öztürk's (2015) findings show that social studies teacher candidates understand patriotism as primarily loving the country and showing loyalty. Secondly, some people emphasize responsibilities while others, democracy and working for human rights.

The participant social studies teacher candidates, who chose the global citizenship, emphasized the elements of the subject in their reasoning. Some of the examples are, believing that the whole world is important and not believing the concept of nation. These examples show that the teacher candidates have knowledge about the notion of "global citizenship".

"Patriotism" as a value which is a subject that will be given in the education of Social Studies should be democratically and constructively transferred to the students. To achieve this, every steps of education should encourage the democratic patriotism and its importance. For the social studies teacher candidates, during the undergraduate education, within the scope of appropriate courses there should be studies about constructive patriotism and global citizenship to increase teacher candidates' interests towards these attitudes. In this way, teacher candidates who are already related to Social Studies should be provided with patriotism education perception. It should not be forgotten that for a democratic society, individuals need an idea on democratic patriotism and the attitudes of citizens.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities*. London: Verso Books.
- Armstrong, D. G. (1980). *Social Studies in Secondary Education*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.
- Balcı, N. (2008). *The Effect of Value Education in the 6th Grade Social Studies Course (Unpublished master thesis)*. Marmara University, Istanbul.
- 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.
- Bourne, R. (1977). The state. In O. Hanson (Ed.), *The radical will: Randolph Bourne (selected writings 1911–1918)* (pp. 355–395). New York: Urizen. (Original work published 1919).
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. Kılıç, A., Özcan, E., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2011). *Scientific Research Methods*, Pegem Academy Publications, Ankara.
- Curti, M. (1946). *The roots of American loyalty*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- De Figueiredo, R. J. P., Elkins, Z. (2003). "Are Patriots Bigots? An Inquiry into the Vices of In-Group Pride." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(1), pp. 171–88.
- Demircioğlu, İ. H., Tokdemir, M. A. (2008). "History Education in the Value Creation Process: Aim, Function, Content." *Values Education Journal*, Volume 6, Nu. 15, pp. 69-88.

- Ersoy, A. F., Öztürk, F. (2015). Patriotism as a Citizenship Value: Perceptions of Social Studies Teacher Candidates. *Elementary Education Online*, 14(3), pp. 974-992.
- Guibernau, M. (2007). *The Identity of Nations*. UK: Polity Press.
- Hurwitz, J., Peffley, M. (1999). "International Attitudes." In *Measures of Political Attitudes*, ed. J. P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, and L. S. Wrightsman. San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 533-590.
- Işıklı, A. (1999). *Globalization in Education. Educational Policies of the Revolutionary Republic*. Istanbul: Analysis Publications.
- Kan, Ç. (2009). Global Citizenship in Social Studies Education. *Pamukkale University Education Faculty Journal*. Number 26, 2009, pp. 25-30.
- Karasawa, M. (2002). "Patriotism, Nationalism, and Internationalism among Japanese Citizens: An Etic-Emic Approach." *Political Psychology*, 23(4), pp. 645-666.
- Kosterman, R., Feshbach, S. (1989). Toward a measure of patriotic and nationalistic attitudes, *Political Psychology*, 10(2), pp. 257-274.
- McMillan, J. H. (2000). *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the consumer* (4. Press). 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 States of America: State University of New York Press.
- Ministry of National Education in Turkey (MONE). (2006). *Elementary social studies course 6-7 classes curriculum and guide*. Ankara.
- Morais, B. D. and Ogden C. A. (2011) Initial Development and Validation of the Global Citizenship Scale, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15(5), pp. 445-466.
- Murray, J. P. (1959). *Pride of state*. Boston: Beacon.
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., Brown, R. (2001). "Nationalism and Patriotism: National Identification and Out-Group Rejection." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(1), pp. 159-172.
- Nathanson, S. (1997). Should patriotism have a future, *Patriotism in The Lives of Individuals and Nations* (Ed. Bar-Tal, D. and Staub, E.), Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, pp. 311-326.
- National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), *National Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: A Framework for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment* (Silver Spring, MD: NCSS, 2010).
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Notes on Nationalism*. First published: Polemic. GB, London. May 1945. Reprinted: "England Your England and Other Essays". 1953.
- Osler, A., Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship-democracy and inclusion in education*. England: Open University Press. pp. 19-24.
- Oxfam (2006). *Education for global citizenship: A guide for schools*. <http://www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet/teachers/globciti/downloads/gcguide06.pdf>
- Özgülven, I. E. (1999). *Psychological Tests*. Ankara: Pdrem Publications.
- Rapoport, A. (2009). Patriotic education in Russia: Stylistic move or the sign of substantive counter-reform? *The Educational Forum* 73 (1), pp. 141-153.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., Lavine, H. (1999). On the Varieties of National Attachment: Blind Versus Constructive Patriotism. *Political Psychology*, Vol. 20, No.1, pp. 151-174.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism. In *Patriotism*, ed. Daniel Bar-Tal and Erving Staub. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S. And Pratto, F. (1997). "The Interface between Ethnic and National Attachment." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61(1), pp. 103-133.
- Sommerville, J. (1981). Patriotism and war. *Ethics*, 91, pp. 568-578.
- Spinner-Halev, J., Theiss-Morse, E.(2003). "National identity and Self-Esteem." *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(3), pp. 515-632.
- Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In *Patriotism*, ed. Daniel Bar-Tal and Erving Staub. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Sullivan, J. L., Fried, A., Dietz, M. G. 1992. "Patriotism, Politics, and the Presidential Election of 1988." *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(2), pp. 200-234.
- Şahin, İ. F., Çermik, F. (2014). Turkish adaptation of Global Citizenship Scale: Reliability and Validity . *Eastern Geographical Review*, 31, pp. 207-218.
- Venkataiah, N. (2007). *Value Education*. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation.
- Westheimer, J. (2009). Should social studies be patriotic? *Social Education*, 73(7), 316-20.
- Yazıcı, K. (2006). General View to the Values Education. *Turkishness Science Studies*, 19, 499-522.
- Yazıcı, S., Yazıcı, F. (2010). A study of the validity and reliability of the patriotism attitude scale. *Journal of Human Sciences*. 7 (2), pp. 901-918.
- Yıldırım, A., Şimşek, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences. 8th Edition*. Ankara: Seçkin Publications.