The Role of Education in Shaping National Identities of Secondary School Children
In Turkey and Greece

by

Sedef Turper

A Thesis Submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

International Relations

Istanbul Bilgi University

June 2008

Istanbul Bilgi University

Institute of Social Sciences

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

Sedef Turper

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,

and that any and all revisions required by the final

examining committee have been made.

Committee Members:

_____

Umut Özkırımlı, Ph. D. (Advisor)

_____

Harry-Zachary G. Tzimitras, Ph. D.

_____

Pınar Uyan Semerci, Ph. D.

_____

Institute of Social Sciences, Director

Date: _____

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for any award or any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution. It is affirmed by the candidate that, to the best of his(or her) knowledge, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the thesis.

Signed   Sedef Turper

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, within Turkish and Greek educational systems the reproduction of nationalist attitudes are investigated with a focus on the (I) National Identity and (II) Attitudes towards Others. The participants were 203 Greek Secondary School children and 150 Turkish Secondary School children. Both in the Greek and Turkish samples, results showed that education, especially the history teaching plays a crucial role in shaping the attitudes of children towards their fellow nationals and the "others".

Keywords: Education, Nationalism, National Identity, Perceptions of "Others", Xenophobia

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada, (I) Milli kimlik ve (II) "Diğer"lerine karşı tutum, milliyetçi tutumların yeniden üretilmesini açıklamak amacıyla Türk ve Yunan eğitim sistemleri bağlamında araştırılmıştır. Çalışma 203 Yunan Ortaokul öğrencisinden ve 150 Türk İlköğretim okulu öğrencisinden oluşan iki örneklem kullanılarak yapılmıştır. Her iki örneklem grubu içinde, sonuçlar bireylerin aldıkları eğitim ile kendi yurtdaşlarına ve "Diğer" milletlere karşı tutumları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki göstermiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Eğitim, Milliyetçilik, Milli Kimlik, "Diğer" Algısı, Yabancı Düşmanlığı

DEDICATION

To hope…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 General

> "Two men are of the same nation if and
> only if they recognize each other as
> belonging to the same nation. In other
> words, *nations maketh man*: nations are
> the artifacts of men's convictions and
> loyalties and solidarities." (Gellner,
> 1988: 9)

Nations are relatively new phenomena, emerging in the last two centuries as
by-products of the Industrial Revolution and spread of mass literacy. As Anderson
calls it, "print capitalism" provided changing conceptions of time and space together
with a new sense of simultaneity, which in turn made possible national imaginings
(Anderson, 1991). The imagined communities, however, established a concrete
existence in the mindsets of individuals, dividing them along the lines of 'us' versus
'them'. As Gellner suggests, "having a nation is not an inherent attribute of
humanity, but it has now come to appear as such" (1988:6). These imagined bonds,
in turn, have real consequences. To quote a famous aphorism by W.I. Thomas, "If
men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Cited in Spencer
and Wollman, 2003:83), which is best exemplified in the case of nationalism.

The feeling of belonging to an originally imagined community ends in up attempts
for homogenizing originally multiethnic and multicultural societies, and creates a

destructive potential that can be manipulated at any time towards the 'others', inside and outside the nation. "Nationalism is an ideology that places the nation at the center of its concerns and seeks to promote its well-being" as Gellner puts it, and the well-being of individuals are subordinated for the sake of so-called national well-being. This, in turn, leaves individuals with other nationalities or those in-group members who are not accepted as members of the nation by their fellow nationals, in a very vulnerable position. The Rwandan genocide and the Kosovo War are the most cited examples of the destructive power of the nationalist discourses, yet more recent and frequently observed examples can also be derived from everyday news. The assassination of Hrant Dink, a renowned journalist of Armenian origin, in Turkey, and the glorification of his murderers, not to mention the maltreatment of the immigrants in almost all countries, can be set forth as vivid examples.

1.1 The Framework and the Purpose of the Study

In the present thesis, it is argued that the nationalistic conceptualizations of Turkish and Greek students are affected to a great extent by the schooling, and more specifically the history teaching they receive during the early years of their education. The research contends that those nationalistic values hold permanent affect on their attitudes toward their national identity constructs, and their images regarding the national 'others'.

The necessity of eliminating chauvinistic and xenophobic statements from the school textbooks is already recognized by the UNESCO Constitution, which starts with the axiom that "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men

that the defenses of peace must be constructed" (1945, Preamble Section). Accordingly, many steps have been taken to review the school textbooks in various countries including Greece and Turkey. Nevertheless, in the absence of the studies on the nationalistic attitudes of the students, it is almost impossible to follow the track of the changes in the mindsets of the students that are exposed to revised textbooks.

The purpose behind this study is to gauge the expected scientific and practical contributions of the current discussions on the Turkish and Greek schooling practices, in relation to the formation of national identity and the national 'others' of the students. It is hoped that, such an analysis of images of the 'self' and the 'others' of the Turkish and Greek students would draw the attention of researchers on the issue, which is very salient but understudied. By contributing to the literature on the nationalistic attitudes of Turkish and Greek students as regards schooling practices, especially the national historiographies employed in the schools, this study aspires at contributing to the writing of a peaceful historiography by pointing at the deficiencies observed at the practical level.

In the next chapter, first, the literature on the impact of schooling on nationalistic attitudes is reviewed. Then, previous findings on the role of the education on the nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes are examined. In the following chapters, the design and findings of the current study are discussed.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 General

There has accumulated an extensive literature on nationalism in the last few decades. Although there has been no consensus on the definition of the key concepts, there seems to be an implicit agreement on the divisive nature of nationalism. All nationalist discourses are based on the separation of *us* from *others*. These divisions are not only reproduced through state institutions like the central education system and bureaucracy, but also reinforced by everyday practices (Billig, 1995).

In this study, I intend to analyze the role of central educational systems on the creation and reproduction of nationalist sentiments. I seek to revisit the theories of nationalism in the context of the formation and reproduction of nationalist sentiments and xenophobic attitudes through educational systems, and then question their validity in light of the comparative quantitative studies conducted on the subject matter. To this end, the theories on the role of educational institutions as socializing agents of national identity, and the extent they can account for the internalization of the nationalistic sentiments will be discussed. In the second part, these theories will be evaluated in the light of a survey demonstrating the explanatory power of the educational attainment variable in explaining the nationalist sentiment levels of individuals. In the third part, the arguments on the

nature of educational impact on nationalistic values will be introduced, and the possible causes of the observed variance of the impact of different educational systems will be discussed.

2.2 Education: Limits to its Function of Creating and Reproducing National Identity

The relationship between nationalist and xenophobic values and the education system is of a complex nature, and requires a closer look at the internal dynamics of the education system. The discussion regarding the relationship between the two revolves around two basic questions. The first question is on the magnitude of the relationship, and concerns with whether or not the level of educational attainment of the individual is a significant determinant of the nationalist and ethnic attitudes that one holds. In other words, it refers to the assessment of to what extent the education can transform individuals into citizens with a sense of national belonging and national pride.

The second question, on the other hand, is posed only after validating the existence of such a significant relationship between the two. It asks whether the education level and the national sentiments are positively or negatively correlated. Put differently, if education level is a good predictor of the nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes of the individual, then what is the pattern of the relationship between our variables? Does an increase in the education level of the individual lead to a decrease of national pride and xenophobia, or does the latter increase in proportion to the former?

As regards to the first question, the reproduction literature represented by authors like Michael Apple (1990 and 1995), suggests that education is a minor contributor of the socialization of the national and ethnic elements. It rather suggests that the larger economic and political system plays a crucial role on the socialization of the individual in this respect. To this account, education system constitutes only a small part of the larger system; therefore any reformative change within the education system can cause only a very limited difference in the mindsets of the individuals.[1] As Schleicher puts it, 'At best, they (educational systems) have limited influence on the nationalistic or ethnic behavior.' (Schleicher, 1993: 39). Proponents of this view claim that education system is not an input in itself, but it is a product of larger political and economic system working in the socialization process. Hence, it is not feasible to transform the educational system without deconstructing the mechanisms that reproduce a particular educational system.

According to a second view, on the other hand, educational institutions are defined as the main domains of cultural reproduction, and it has long been illustrated that they play a crucial role in constructing and reproducing the national identity (Calhoun, 1997; Gellner, 1988). Centrally planned school system is an indispensible part of the nation-state, and their concurrent emergence is by no means a mere coincidence. The nation states, in a sense, owe their existence to the nation building function that the educational systems serve. As Smith remarked, in order to create a nation "a population must be taught who they are, where they come from and where they are going" (1995, p. 148). Hence, the modern educational system has been

---

[1] For detailed discussion of the view please see Apple, Michael W. (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*, New York: Routledge and Apple, Michael W. (1995) *Education and Power*, New York: Routledge

gradually established as the basic mechanism for forming, consolidating and reproducing nations, through which the individuals are socialized into citizens (Schleicher, 1993).

2.3 Theories Challenged By Quantitative Studies

The quantitative studies on the effect of education in shaping nationalistic and xenophobic values support the second view, and reveal that educational attainment is an important determinant in predicting the level of nationalist and xenophobic attitudes an individual holds. One of the most consistent findings in quantitative research on ethnic attitudes is the association between educational attainment and ethnic prejudice and national pride.

Analysis of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) National Identity Survey datasets from 1995/1996 and 2003/2004 constitutes the most frequently employed cross-country data in this regard. The results concerning the magnitude of the relationship between education and the national sentiments, national pride and xenophobia vary slightly among the studies conducted with ISSP datasets, depending on the operationalization of the concepts together with the selection of the cases for the analyses. Yet, in all the studies, the educational attainment variable emerges as the most significant determinant of national pride and xenophobia. The only exception of this account is presented in Tom Smith and Lars Jarkko's study, where the education level of the individuals are found to be the second most important factor in explaining the national pride level they hold. In their study the age-cohort is reported as the best explanatory variable. Nevertheless, since they do

not elaborate on the statistical tools they employ in their analysis; it is not possible to cross-check the results of this study with the other studies conducted on the same data (2001). The explanatory power of educational attainment in predicting the levels of national pride and xenophobic attitudes of individuals are reaffirmed in all the other empirical studies on the subject. Findings of the two studies among several cross-country analyses with the same ISSP data are especially significant in this sense, and they clearly designate the extent to which education can explain the variation in the levels of national pride and xenophobia.

According to Mikael Hjerm's analyses of the 1995/1996 ISSP data of ten countries, namely Australia, Canada, Austria, Germany, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, Sweden, the Czech Republic and Hungary, the relationship between national pride and education is significant even when it is controlled for the independent variables of age, social class, citizenship and cosmopolitanism, which refers to the dummy variable of living abroad experience (2001:53). According to findings of this study, although the explanatory power of the education level variable differs among countries, R^2 values for countries can go as high as .15 for xenophobia and .11 for national pride. In other words, the education level of the individual accounts for the 15% of the total variation in the xenophobia variable and 11% of the national pride variable. It is especially significant when it is compared to the explanatory power of other plausible independent variables like age, social class and income. The explained percentage of the variation slightly increases, more specifically 3% at most, as these variables are added to regression analysis.

A more encompassing study on the subject has been conducted by Kim and Smith, and their analysis also reveals similar findings concerning the relationship between national pride and education level. Unlike Hjerm's study, they include ISSP National Identity dataset from 2003/2004 in addition to the dataset from 1995/96 in their analysis, and also broaden the scope of the analysis to all of the 34 countries[2] that the ISSP National Identity survey was conducted in. The findings of their study reaffirm the effect of educational attainment on individuals' nationalistic and ethnic exclusionist values. Their conclusions clearly present that education level is strongly related to national pride in all of the 34 countries even when it is controlled for the age cohort (2006:132-133).

Although the strong association between education and nationalistic and xenophobic values are established and proved to hold true regardless of the cross-cultural differences as shown by the abovementioned analyses on cross-country empirical datasets, there still remains a further question to be answered. This second question, as previously mentioned, refers to the direction of the correlation between education and the nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes. The literature on educational sociology points at different and, in fact, contradictory impacts of education on the socialization of the individuals.

Being the main socializing agents of the modern nation states, educational institutions systematically promote certain value orientations, common cultural features and a common language or a certain linguistic variation. These are, all in

---

[2] Participant countries are: Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, South Africa, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Uruguay, USA, and Venezuela.

all, considered to be the distinguishing characteristics of a nation, together with the common national myths regarding the origin and the history of the nation. Especially the reproduction of national identity on the basis of *imagined* history is one of the most pressing missions of education as Post puts it (1995, p. 211), and it helps to construct an understanding of "us" versus "them". Through the representations of the "self" and the "other" that permeate the curriculum, as well as the dominant rhetoric, the discourse and the school setting, the education system as a whole contributes to production and reproduction of nationalism through legitimating the "nation's rights" (Dragonas & Bar-On, 2000:337).

On the other hand, education has often been considered as an antidote for values of nationalistic and xenophobic kind, diminishing the possibility of displaying racist and chauvinist attitudes. This line of thinking has its roots either in the *Socialization Theory* or the *Cognitive Approach.* From the Socialization Theory's point of view, the negative association between education and nationalism and ethnic exclusionism can be attributed to the transmission of democratic value orientations through the educational institutions since they are deemed appropriate by the educational systems. Supporters of this idea base their claims on the intrinsic value of education as a socializing agent, through which people acquire democratic principles and adopt multicultural thinking.

The Cognitive Approach also suggests there to be a negative correlation between the level of educational attainment and the nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes an individual holds. Yet, it introduces another account for this association. Cognitive approach stresses that prejudiced beliefs are intellectually unenlightened beliefs,

which are deemed to disappear as the individual gets acquainted with critical thinking through education (Selznick and Steinberg, 1985). The underlying assumption here is that people will be more skeptic and less prone to accept the simplifications inherent in ethnic stereotypes. In other words, along this line of thinking, education is praised as a social setting where the critical thinking skills are enhanced, reducing the likelihood of people to internalize and act in accordance with the nationalistic discourse that is basically grounded on the imagined history.

Accordingly, there seems to be two rival roles of the educational system: one as the mediator of the dominant culture and commemoration of imagined nationality on the one hand, and as promoter of democratic values and critical thinking on the other. Empirical studies, on the other hand, suggest that the effect of education as an agent of cultivating democratic values and acquainting individuals with critical and multicultural thinking overrides its impact as the disseminator of nationalist discourse. The dominant research finding over the years has been that educational attainment is associated with increasing tolerance towards ethnic out-groups, yet at the same time with decreasing belief in in-group superiority. This general conclusion is also proved not to be an empirical artifact stemming from a possible predisposition of the respondents with higher education to give socially desirable answers (Wagner & Zick, 1995).

The negative association between education and xenophobic attitudes are first illustrated in the anti-Semitism studies. Analyses of the American data reveal that people with higher education are less likely to hold anti-Semitic views (Selznick & Steinberg, 1969; Martire & Clark, 1982). The association pattern is also confirmed

to hold true for treatment of other ethnic groups in other social contexts as well. The study of Coenders and Scheepers indicate that disadvantageous treatment of ethnic minorities in housing and labor market is more likely to be found among Dutch people with lower levels of education (1998).

Recent empirical studies on the subject in the literature are largely based on the analyses of ISSP National Identity Survey datasets. Although the operationalization of the key concepts and the cases chosen for the analysis vary to a great extent among those studies, the negative associations between educational attainment and national pride, chauvinism together with ethnic exclusionism remain persistent.

One such study on the first wave data of National Identity Survey has been conducted by Mikael Hjerm. In his analyses of ten countries, Hjerm demonstrates that increased levels of education are associated with decreased xenophobia and national sentiment in all ten countries, albeit with only small divergences from the general pattern. According to his findings, in all countries the college educated people have lower levels of nationalist sentiment and xenophobia as compared to those with elementary level of education. However, there does not seem to be a clear cut linear relationship between those variables. Put differently, the level of nationalist sentiment and xenophobia does not decrease on a strictly systematic basis as the education level increases and some fluctuations are observed in the middle educational categories with regard to those values. For instance, while there is a general decreasing trend in nationalistic sentiments of Czech respondents as their level of education increased, this regularity is disturbed by a slight increase in the

national sentiments of the college educated with regard to the previous educational category, namely incomplete college graduates (Hjerm, 2001).

Similarly Reeskens, in his multilevel post explanation analysis on the 2003 ISSP National Identity dataset, illustrates that those individuals with higher levels of educational attainment are less strict about their citizenship criteria, which means that they hold less exclusionist views compared to those with lesser education (2006:13).

2.4 Educational Impact: Is It Universal?

However, exploration of the data in a more comparative perspective reveals some cross-country differences, which means that the effect of education on interethnic attitudes and nationalistic sentiments is not universal. For instance, in their analysis of datasets from 1995/96 and 2003/04 with a comparative outlook, Kim & Smith report that those with less than high-school education have the highest levels of national pride, whereas the college educated have the least in almost all countries included in their analysis. Yet, they also reported that the statement does not hold true in four countries, namely Bulgaria, Hungary, Switzerland and the USA (2006); but they do not suggest any explanation for the varying effect of education.

Since such an explanation, which will account for the varying influence of education on the nationalist and xenophobic attitudes of individuals requires a detailed examination of the content of the education like the teaching policies, curricula and teaching materials employed across countries, it is difficult to come up with a

plausible explanation. Deriving their hypothesis from the Socialization Theory, Coenders and Scheepers try to establish the regularities that cause the effect of education vary from country to country. They suggest that the positive effect of democracy would be strongest in societies with more religious heterogeneity and in prolonged democracies, since they are expected to be disseminating democratic and multicultural values through their educational systems. Following the assumption, they also expected the positive effect of education to diminish if the society is religiously more homogenous and if the country has limited experience in democracy. As they reported their findings, the hypothesis regarding stronger educational effects on religiously more heterogeneous societies was not supported, and the positive effect of education on ethnic exclusionism is found to be greater in established democracies in line with the expectations (2003).

The method and content of history teaching can offer a plausible explanation for the varying effect of education on the reproduction of nationalist sentiments. One such study has been conducted by Barton, where the history teaching practices of the United States of America have been analyzed in comparison to the Irish system. His conclusions suggest that the American civilization centered history teaching culminated in raising pupils holding higher levels of national identity awareness as compared to the Irish students, where the world history constituted a considerable part of the history curriculum (Barton, 2001). However, since Ireland and the USA constitute two different cases in terms of their historical developments, there is a need for further comparative research to validate the findings of this study.

Scholars analyzing the data from Youth and History Survey, which was carried out among almost 32000 young Europeans, age 14 and 15, from 26 different countries in 1994/95, draw attention to similarities between the national historiographies employed in history textbooks and the opinions expressed by the students on national identity and on the image of 'others'. In their analysis on Turkey and Greece, Dragonas, Ersanlı and Frangoudaki report that the responses of the Turkish and Greek participants reflect the same characteristics with the national historiographies employed in the educational systems of these countries. They point that the perception of nation as a natural entity, identification of religion with nation and ethnocentrism are predominantly observed both in history textbook narratives and the students' responses (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 183-184).

Chapter 3

Method

3.1 Participants

The participants of the current study consist of two groups. The first group, the Turkish sample, includes Turkish primary school students, and the second group, the Greek sample, includes Greek secondary school (*γυμνασίο*) students. The total sample comprises data from 421 participants.

The target group of this study had been the 7th grade primary school children in Turkey, and equivalently the 2nd grade secondary school students in Greece. For the feasibility concerns however, the research field was limited to one city from each country. On the basis of the size of their population, Istanbul and Athens were selected as the two cities where the study would be conducted.

Representative samples were designed for gathering both Istanbul and Athens student samples in such a way as to avoid any bias with regard to the independent variables such as wealth, religious attitudes, urbanization level of residence area, which are found to be related with the political and nationalistic attitudes of individuals (Reeskens, 2006). However, due to difficulties related to research permission encountered in both countries, the planned and ideal representative samples were unattainable. As it will be discussed in detail in the following parts, the rules and regulations regarding social research with students in public schools is

an onerous bureaucratic task. There exists an overwhelming scrutiny on the research questions, and the school managers are endowed with extensive powers to decline any requests for cooperation by researchers, and often on very vague grounds. Consequently, a smaller representative sample of Greek students than it had been previously planned was surveyed in Athens. In the Turkish student sample, on the other hand, an availability sampling method had to be introduced.

3.1.1 Recruitment of the Turkish Student Sample

In order to obtain a representative sample of Istanbul primary school children, a random sampling method was initially designed for the recruitment of Turkish student sample. Accordingly, following a multi-stage random sampling method, 6 districts, namely Adalar, Bakırköy, Beyoğlu, Beşiktaş, Fatih and Ümraniye, were randomly selected from the full list of 32 districts of Istanbul. In the second stage, the full lists of primary schools located in these districts were obtained, and again, employing a random sampling method, one principal school and two alternate schools were selected for each district. There was no further selection on the basis of classes where the survey would be conducted, and all the secondary class students in these schools were to be surveyed.

In the Turkish education system, regulations regarding the conduct of research in public schools require the permission of the Ministry of Education. However, studies of political kind are strictly scrutinized and often censored by the Ministry of Education during the application period. This process mostly ends up in extracting some questions of vital importance out of the questionnaire form. There are many

examples of blue penciling of the questionnaire form even in the multinational comparative studies conducted by very prestigious institutions such as the Youth and History Survey conducted by Turkish Economic and Social History Foundation (Tekeli, 1998).

For the current study, the application for the permission returned no results within the limited time period that this study was conducted. As it became obvious that it would not be possible to conduct the survey otherwise, the schools in the representative sample list were visited and asked for permission of the school headmasters themselves to let this survey to be conducted with their students. On the practical level, however, the permission is a *de jure* prerogative and, in fact, the school headmasters are given *de facto* authority to accept or decline to cooperate with the researchers and allow them to conduct their study regardless of the permission granted by the Ministry of Education. Among the schools randomly selected, only two schools located in Beşiktaş and Beyoğlu agreed to take part in this study, while in Adalar, Bakırköy, Fatih and Ümraniye all the schools selected as principle and alternate schools declined to participate.

Due to these inconveniencies, this random sample could not be employed in this study. Consequently, an availability sample was recruited with the selection of primary schools that are willing to cooperate and take part in the study through personal and institutional networks.

3.1.1.1 The Turkish Student Sample

The student sample consisted of 214 seventh grade primary school students who were recruited from 5 primary schools that were located in 4 different municipalities of Istanbul (see Table 1). Their age ranged from 12 to 16 with an average of 13.27 (SD = 0.61). There were 96 females and 114 males, whereas sex information of 4 students was missing.

Table 1

The Turkish Sample Properties

Primary School	District	Date	Number of Students
Abdurrahman Köksal	Şişli	24/05/2008	23
Büyük Esma Sultan	Beşiktaş	20-27/03/2008	66
Firuzağa	Beyoğlu	04/03/2008	24
Handan Ziya Öniş	Şişli	24/05/2008	61
Türkan Şoray	Sarıyer	26/05/2008	33

3.1.2 Recruitment of the Greek Student Sample

A similar random sampling procedure was applied to identify the schools that were going to be surveyed in Greece. For the representative sample of Athens, 6 municipalities among the full list of 48 municipalities of the Athens district were picked by using random numbers table. Accordingly Glyfada, Kaisariani, Kifisia, Nea Smyrni, Petroupoli and Psichio municipalities were selected in the primary stage of the selection process.

In the Greek education system, the researchers are obliged to get an official permission of the Pedagogical Institute in order to enter the public schools. However, this permission is only a necessary but not a sufficient condition, and the rules and regulations regarding research in public schools grant an extensive authority to school managers regarding the decision to take part in a study. Therefore, since the turnout rate is very low, on the advice of the Pedagogical Institute, the second stage of sampling procedure was cancelled and all the schools that were willing to take part in the study were included in the sample. Accordingly, among the full list of 28 secondary schools located in these 6 municipalities, 4 schools agreed to cooperate and took part in the study. Again, there was no further selection on the basis of classes where the survey would be conducted, and all the secondary class students in these schools were surveyed.

Although a random sampling procedure had been applied in the first stage to determine the municipalities where this study would be conducted, representativeness of the sample was traded off in order to realize this survey. This was the case in the Turkish student sample, and in the selection of the schools there emerged the need to employ more than two back up schools.

3.1.2.1 The Greek Student Sample

The student sample consisted of 207 second grade secondary school students recruited from 4 secondary schools that were located in 3 different municipalities of Athens (see Table 2). Their age ranged from 12 to 17 with an average of 13.96 (SD=

0.60). There were 90 females and 111 males in the sample whereas the sex information of 6 students was missing.

Table 2

The Greek Sample Properties

Primary School	*District*	*Date*	*Number of Students*
1ᵒ Γυμνασίο Νεα Σμύρνης	Nea Smyrni	13/05/2008	76
2ᵒ Γυμνασίο Νεα Σμύρνης	Nea Smyrni	14/05/2008	43
2ᵒ Γυμνασίο Κάτω Κηφισσιάσ	Kifisia	15/05/2008	37
6ᵒ Γυμνασίο Πετρούπολης	Petroupoli	15/05/2008	51

3.2 Questionnaire Form

In this study, self administered-questionnaire method was employed. Accordingly, the questionnaire forms were delivered to the Turkish and Greek students in their classrooms, and they were asked to fill in the questionnaire form on their own. As the forms were passed to the students they were informed about the purpose of the study. Since the target group of this study was aged between 12 and16, and it was their first time participating in a social survey as respondents, they were also informed about the nature of the survey. It was emphasized that, unlike the ordinary examination tests they were taking in their classes, the questions that they were going to reply did not have a single correct answer, and hence, they should reply in line with their own views. They were also asked not to communicate with their friends during the survey in order to eliminate the peer-group pressure in their answers.

In order to cope with the social desirability effect, they were told not to write their names on their questionnaire forms, and the study was conducted without the surveillance of their teachers. They were given 45 minutes to complete the form and were requested to leave their forms to a box that had been placed on one of the desks.

Turkish students received a questionnaire form written in Turkish, whereas the Greek students received it in Greek. In order to obtain two equivalent datasets, double-translation procedure was employed during which the Turkish form of the questionnaire was translated into Greek and re-translated into Turkish by bilingual speakers. As for the purpose of obtaining two comparable datasets, the format and the content of the questionnaire forms were designed almost identically for the two groups with minor changes to adopt the questions to the social contexts of the respective countries. For instance, with regard to national identity, Turkish students were asked whether they would call a non-Muslim as 'Turk', whereas the corresponding question in the Greek version was worded as whether they would consider a non-Orthodox Christian as 'Greek'. The only exception of this rule can be considered as the question related with the attitudes towards ethnic and religious groups in Greece and Turkey, which asked the students to express their attitudes towards different ethnic and religious group sets.

The questionnaire form is composed of 14 questions ending up in 38 and 42 variables in the Turkish and Greek versions respectively. Following the arguments introduced in the literature on the relationship between education and nationalism in

general, and the literature on history teaching in Turkey and Greece in relation to the nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes of school children, the questionnaire form focuses on three basic concepts, namely national identity, national 'others', and the content and context of the history education they receive. The operationalization of these concepts will be evaluated in the following section.

3.3 Operationalization of the Concepts

The questions regarding the citizenship perceptions of the students were originally derived from the 1995 and 2003 International Social Survey Program study; yet, some minor changes were done as regards the wording of the questions in order to facilitate the understanding of the question by the school children. Questions on the educational setting and the content of the education, on the other hand, replicated the Youth History Survey, which was conducted in Greece as well.

3.3.1 National Identity - Citizenship criteria

Questions attaining to identify the criteria through which the students assess the citizenship were originally derived from the ISSP National Identity Surveys. The questions attempting to assess students' views on whom to call a fellow citizen, in other words one of 'us', are basically covered in two forms. In the first part, students are asked whether they can concieve of a Turk or Greek citizen, who is differentiated on the basis of their religion or mother tongue, from the mainstream stereotypical image of the citizenship values in both countries. In this part, students are asked whether there can be a non-Muslim Turk, or non-Orthodox Christian

Greek, or similarly, a Turk who cannot speak Turkish and a Greek who cannot speak Greek respectively. In the second part, however, they are asked to articulate how much they agree with the statements claiming that, in order to call a person a fellow citizen i) he or she has to be of Turkish/Greek descendant, ii) has to be born in Turkey/Greece, iii) lived in Turkey/Greece, and finally iv) has to be legally granted citizenship by laws.

With regard to national identity, on the other hand, in addition to those questions mentioned above, an open ended form of question is employed and the students are asked to reflect on the word 'Turk'/'Greek', and express whatever comes to their mind.

3.3.2 National Others -Turks / Greeks as National Others

The concept of national others are evaluated on two diffent levels, namely the international relations level and the interpersonal relations level. The questions regarding the perceptions of the national 'others' of Turkish and Greek students are designed as to identify the national 'others' on state level. These are formulated in open ended question format where students are asked about which states their own state has friendly/cooperative and unfriendly/uncooperative relations with.

On the interpersonal relations level on the other hand, a set of questions are derived from the "neighbor question" in order to assess the students' perceptions of others. Like the "neighbor index" that is utilized by most social science field researchers with an aim to assess the attitudes towards various social groups, the "friendship

index" set seeks to measure the level of prejudice and hostilities held against various nations. The students participating in this study are given a list of national and ethnic groups, and they are asked to state their willingness to have friends from that community on a three scale measure. Turkish and Greek students are also asked to reflect on the words 'Greek' and 'Turk' respectively, and state their opinions on those words and their connotations in an open ended question format.

3.3.3 History Education: Historiography and Classroom Setting

In order to evaluate the content of history teaching in Turkish and Greek schools, students are asked a set of questions related to the perceived objectives of history teaching, and the historical subjects they are interested in. Accordingly, students are asked in an open ended question format, to state the reasons why they think they are taught history as part of the curriculum. They are also asked to comment on the degree of interest they have in different types of history. The types of history are listed as 'Ottoman History', 'European History', 'History of the Turkish Republic', 'History of the Turkic States', 'World History' and finally, 'History of the Balkans' in the Turkish version of the questionnaire. In the Greek version, the Greek students are asked to state their interests in 'Ancient Greek History', 'History of the Balkans', 'Ottoman History', 'History of Modern Greece', 'European History' and 'World History'.

The questions on the perceived classroom setting and the method employed in history teaching, on the other hand, are worded in line with the 'Youth and History Survey'. Questions regarding history teaching include a diversity of variables

including the conduct of a regular history class, the attitudes of the history instructor and the general setting of the classroom.

3.4 Analysis Procedure

In the analysis of Turkish and Greek datasets, both qualitative and quantitative techniques are employed. To evaluate the responses to the open-ended questions regarding the connotations of the words "Turkish" and "Greek" (see Appendix A and Appendix B, questions 3 and 12) qualitative methods are utilized. Content analysis on the basis of words and themes is employed to summarize the findings to these questions.

To evaluate the close-ended questions included in the analysis, on the other hand, explanatory statistical methods, namely frequency distribution and correspondence analysis with clustering[1] are utilized. In the correspondence analysis with clustering, hierarchical clustering with Ward's method is employed.

---

[1] The correspondence analysis is a multivariate statistical technique that primarily aims at transforming a table of numerical information into a graphical display, facilitating the interpretation of this information. It allows one to explore the structure of categorical variables included in the table. The correspondence analysis technique is based on identifying the profile points of each single observational category on a multidimensional space. Correspondence analysis is often run with clustering in order to group those observations that have similar profile points together. In this way it is possible to reduce the data into more easily comprehensible form without any *a priori* assumptions. The final permuted correspondence table is basically based on chi square calculations of the expected values in each cell of the crosstabulation of the variables. (for further information see Greenacre & Blasius, 1994).

Chapter 4

Results

4.1 The Reflections of Educational Goals on Individual Aspirations of Students

4.1.1 Objectives of Turkish and Greek Education Systems

Education is among the most important institutions that shape the citizenship values of individuals, i.e. socializing them into ideal citizens of the national community. Each and every single constituent of the educational system is planned with a focus on stated primary goals. Curriculum, textbooks, school setting and method of instruction are all coherently designed to serve the stated objectives of the educational systems. These ideals, however, dominate not only political attitudes of students as citizens but their mind sets as individuals since they have been internalized into specific social norms defined by the aspired aims of the educational system with which they are brought up from very early ages and throughout all their educational lives. These social norms are often reflected on every aspect of their life.

The stated aims of the Turkish educational system has been bringing up individuals devoted to Atatürk's principles of nationalism, as it can be traced from party programs and laws regulating the Turkish educational system. Training highly republican, nationalist and secular citizens in the 1931 Educational Program of the

27

Republican People's Party (Parla, 1992: 71-72) has remained almost unchanged[1] until today despite the political changes in terms of ruling ideologies. The fundamental aim of Turkish education to bring up citizens devoted to the principles of Atatürk nationalism, who adopt the values of the Turkish nation and know the duties and responsibilities to their country remained intact and has been worded as follows in the current Basic Law of Education which was enacted in 1973:

To bring up citizens who are loyal to reforms and principles of Atatürk together with the Atatürk's principles of nationalism; who internalize, protect and develop the national, moral, humane and cultural values of Turkish Nation and respect and enhance his/her family, motherland and nation; who comprehend and realize his/her duties towards The Republic of Turkey which is a democratic, secular, social state of law based on human rights and principles stated in the preamble of the Constitution.
(National Education Law article 2.1)

In the Greek educational system, on the other hand, the objectives of the education are defined for each level of education separately. As mentioned in the Law 1566/85, education at gymnasium/secondary school level is designed to broaden the moral, religious, national, humanitarian and other value systems of the pupils, their all-round development with reference to the abilities which they have at that age and the demands which life puts on them, to cultivate powers of verbal expression, to promote normal physical development, to acquaint them with the various forms of art, to develop aesthetic judgment, and raise

---

[1] There had been only very slight changes such as the introduction of clauses identifying "seeking happiness only in serving the nation" as an additional objective in educational progam of RPP. (Parla, 1992; 83). As Keyder mentions, the Turkish educational system has always been dedicated to bring up nationalist citizens and even the Nationalist Movement Party when it gained power did not need to make much of a change in the educational program (Keyder, 1992:70).

awareness of their abilities and skills, inclinations and interests (IACM/FORTH, 2003: 6). Primary objectives of the secondary/gymnasio level history education, on the other hand, are stated to be designed for developing an 'awareness of Hellenic continuity'; 'familiarizing students with democracy'; and finally 'cultivating genuine national pride' (Avdela, 2000: 242).

4.1.2 Analysis of the Turkish and Greek Data

In the current study, in order to observe whether the primary objectives of the educational systems they are brought up in affect the personal aspirations of students as individuals, participants are asked to state their primary motivation to be successful in their lives. They are asked to choose between four answers: pleasing their parents, serving the nation, making money, and helping other people (see Appendix A and Appendix B, Question 2).

As the tables below suggest, serving the nation is the most frequently given answer to this question among Turkish students. While 114 (53.3%) students went along with serving the nation choice, 58 (27.1%) of them stated that they would like to be successful so that their parents would be happy. Helping other people and making money choices were chosen only by 27 (12.6%) and 13 (6.1%) students respectively.

Table- 3

Frequency distributions of the Turkish students according to their motivations to be successful

	Frequency	Percent
My parents would be happy	58	27,1
I can serve my nation	**114**	53,3
I can make more money	13	6,1
I can help other people	27	12,6
System missing	2	,9
Total	214	100

In the Greek sample, the answers given to this question are more evenly distributed as compared to the Turkish sample results. Helping other people is observed as the dominating motivation of the students with 82 students (39.9%) giving this answer. The other three choices are more or less evenly distributed. Making money is chosen by 44 students (21.3%), serving the nation is chosen by 41 students (19.8%) and finally pleasing parents is chosen by 32 students (15.5%).

Table- 4

Frequency distributions of the Greek students according to their motivations to be successful

	Frequency	Percent
My parents would be happy	32	15,5
I can serve my nation	41	19,8
I can make more money	44	21,3
I can help other people	82	39,6
System missing	8	3,9
Total	207	100

The correspondence analysis of the motivation for success with the occupations that the students would like to be employed in the future suggests that there is a relationship between the type of occupation they aspire to be engaged in and their motives for success in life. In the table below, the numbers indicated in bold on the right column suggest the expected percentages to be observed in all occupational categories unless there is a relationship between the two variables. Accordingly if there were no correlation between the motivation for success and future occupation of the students, then we would observe approximately 12.9% of the Turkish students in each occupational category going along with the 'helping other people' option. Yet the table below suggests that there is a strong relationship between these two variables. The numbers marked in bold in each row indicates the observations that are significantly above the expected frequency revealing the relationship between the occupational categories and the motivations for success.

As illustrated below, serving the nation is the most stated answer by Turkish students in each of these occupational categories except the arts related jobs category (see Table-5). However, as interesting and unexpected finding that is, helping other people is more widely chosen by those who are willing to become a member of police and armed forces as high as almost two times of the expected frequency, while serving the nation is more frequently observed than the average in the occupational category which includes health, education, engineering and sports related jobs.

The correspondence analysis of the Greek data, on the other hand, reveals a stronger relationship between the motivation for success and intended occupational

categories (see Table-6). Yet, the pattern of the relationship between these two variables is quite different than that observed in the Turkish case. The results of the Greek sample suggests that helping other people is the dominant motive for success of those who are planning to be employed in the health services whereas serving the nation is the primary motive of those who are intending to attend armed and police forces, in line with the initial assumption in the design of this questionnaire.

Table- 5

Correspondence Analysis of Motivation for Success and Future Occupation of Turkish Students

	Military and police force	Arts	Other	Health/ Education/ Engineering/ Sports	
Helping other people	**21,7**	0,0	5,3	13,6	**12,9**
Pleasing parents	34,8	**58,3**	42,1	21,1	**26,9**
Serving nation	43,5	41,7	47,4	**57,1**	**53,7**
Making money	0	0	5,3	**8,2**	**6,5**
Active Margin	100	100	100	100	100
Active Margin	23	12	19	147	201

Table- 6

Correspondence Analysis of Motivation for Success and Future Occupation of Greek Students

	Health Sevices	Arts	Engineering	Sports/ Education / Other	Military and Police Forces	
Helping other people	**77,8**	41,7	42,9	35,4	31,6	**42,1**
Making money	14,8	**37,5**	4,8	22,9	15,8	**21,1**
Pleasing parents	3,7	4,2	**33,3**	21,9	10,5	**16,8**
Serving nation	3,7	16,7	19,0	19,8	**42,1**	**20**
Active Margin	100	100	100	100	100	100
Active Margin	27	24	21	96	19	190

The findings of the study reflect the primary goals of the Turkish and Greek educational systems. The great emphasis put on the goal of 'serving the nation' in the Turkish education system can be traced in Turkish students' motivation for success as it is the dominant motivation for almost all occupational categories. As regards the Greek educational system the broad range of stated aims are reflected on the motivations for success of the Greek students and the responses are observed to be more in line with the nature of the occupation as expected.

4.2 National Identity and National Pride

History education is definitely not the sole source of the national constructs of Turkish and Greek students, yet it is quite essential in shaping the views of students with regard to their national identity. With history teaching and employment of history textbooks, school children are imbued with romantic presentations of the nation (Stojanovic, 2001: 27). History courses taught in Turkish and Greek school systems well illustrate this case and they are devoted mostly to the narratives on the Turkish and Greek nations respectively, describing them as continuous, everlasting natural entities (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 167,177; Avdela, 2000: 245). The other states, empires and communities appear in history teaching only in relation with Turkish and Greek national history (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 184) in such a manner that glorify the 'self' as an able *subject* of history while downgrading the 'others' in their moral values and political wills as the *objects* of their own national history. Benevolent ancestry image is also a persistent characteristic of the history textbook narratives in both countries (Millas, 1991: 28). The only exception to this benevolent ancestry image has been observed in Greek

history textbooks after revision of the history books in 1991 where the concept of benevolent ancestry image has been significantly modified in Greek history books with regard to motives for the conquests by the Greek state (Millas, 1991: 28).

In history teaching in Turkey, Turkish national identity is constructed in relation to two main aspects namely, military and moral values. The militaristic narrative of history dominates Turkish history teaching. As Bora notes, the second most frequently used word in high school history textbooks is 'military' in three of four books whereas in the fourth book the second most frequently used word is 'war' (2004: 67-68). In history books, independence is frequently emphasized as being of primary importance (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 173) and Turks are depicted as self sacrificing war heroes. The everlasting moral characteristics of the Turkish nation that are emphasized in Turkish history textbooks are listed as: "Turks keep their promises; they are loyal to their friends, relatives and family; they never humiliate people who are temporarily under the protection of the Turkish state; they treasure honor and honesty; they show great hospitality; they are civilized and peaceful; they never resolve their disputes by going to war unless they are under serious pressure; they never torture people even the enemy" (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 173). The role of Islam in Turkish national identity construct presented in history textbooks, however, is rather ambiguous. While Dragonas, Ersanli and Frangoudaki argue that in Turkish schools, religion is not a subject aimed at shaping national identity (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 173), the existence of compulsory religious courses over-dominated by Islamic teaching and the history textbook narratives on the Asia Hun Turks as losing their Turkish identity since they converted to Christianity can be considered as examples of

deployment of Islam as supplementary element of the Turkish national identity in Turkish schooling. Etienne Copeaux also points out that Islam has been constantly presented as the common religion of Turkish people with frequent employment of possessive pronouns such as 'we' and 'our' as it is exemplified in the narratives such as '*our* duties towards God' and '*our* Holy book Koran' in religion courses (Copeaux, 2002: 308). He further notes that in history narratives, by using loaded words such as 'enemies of Mohammed' and 'martyrs' , students are led to take the camp of the Mohammed in narratives of battles fought between Mohammed and Arabs, implicating an Islamic national identity (Copeaux, 2002: 309).

In Greek history teaching, on the other hand, the Greek national identity is constructed to a great extent in relation to the intellectual significance and continuation of the Ancient Greek civilization and Christian Orthodoxy. The national self is portrayed as superior, unchanging and continuous in history textbooks (Avdela, 2000: 245) and "the intellectual superiority ascribed by the school historical narrative to the Greek people is directly underlined through emphasis on uninterrupted millenary continuity, resistance to influences and supremacy of the ancient Greek civilization" (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 185). Christian Orthodoxy is also used as a generic term to define Greek nation and presented in a direct and constant way in almost every school book as one of the two main facets of national identity alongside a-historic, diachronic Greekness (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 179).

With the objective to understand their perceptions of their own national identity, Turkish and Greek students are asked a series of questions on associations of the

words 'Turk' and 'Greek' and whom they would call a 'Turk' and 'Greek' in the current study. The results of this study suggest that the Turkish and Greek students do not name everyone living in Turkey and Greece as Turks and Greeks respectively. There were only 9 students (4.2%) who think that anyone living in Turkey is a Turk, whereas the number of students who thinks that anyone living in Greece is a Greek was 13 (6.3%).

Table- 7

Frequency distributions of Turkish and Greek students according to their answers to the question 'Is anyone living in Turkey/ Greece is "Turk"/ "Greek"?

	Turkey		Greece	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	4,2	13	6,3
No	196	91,6	181	87,4
Don't know	7	3,3	12	5,8
N/A	2	0,9	1	,5
Total	214	100	207	100

The findings of the study illustrate that the word 'Turkish' is most frequently associated with Mustafa Kemal Ataturk by the Turkish students. While 29 students mentioned Ataturk in their answers, it is followed by the word 'war' stated by 22 of the students in the Turkish sample, which actually reflects the impact of history textbook narratives on national identity constructions of the students. The third mostly associated word with 'Turkish' is the flag. Reflecting again the historical narratives in schoolbooks, students gave detailed account of the flag as inspired by the reflections of the crescent and the star on the blood pond of the Turkish soldiers.

When the results are analyzed on the basis of the general themes of the accounts of national identity, the militaristic character of the Turkish nation has been the most frequently mentioned aspect of the Turkish national identity. 48 students attributed militaristic characteristics to Turkish nation either in the form of words related to military such as war (22 students), soldier (14 students), martyr (11 students) or the narratives such as 'Turk is a man who sacrifices his life for his motherland' and 'I recall how our ancestors shed their blood for the sake of our nation and for us'.

The second mostly recalled aspect of the Turkish identity by the students has been the good ethical and moral characteristics associated with the Turkish people. While the desirable characteristics of the Turkish nation has been stated by 37 of the students, the list of the good characteristics are listed as follows: hospitality, philanthropy, tolerance, acting in good faith, courage, mercy even for the enemy; being honorable, honest, ambitious and strong.

The moralistic aspect is closely followed by the association of the Islam with Turkish national identity by 34 of the participant students. While 20 of them stated that being Muslim is the first thing that comes to their mind when they think of Turkish, five of them stated that Muslim is the only thing that they associate with the word 'Turkish'. However the analysis of answers given to the question asking whether they think there can be non-Muslim Turks, it is observed that more students think of religion as an indispensible constituent of the Turkish national identity. As the table below indicates, 42.5% of the students stated that in their opinion, for a person to be called 'Turk', he or she must hold Islamic beliefs.

Table- 8

Frequency distribution of the Turkish students according to their views on whether there can be a non-Muslim Turk

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	77	36,0
No	91	42,5
Don't know	42	19,6
N/A	4	1,9
Total	214	100,0

In the Greek case, the content analysis of the answers given to the question asking what they recall when they think of the word 'Greek' (see Appendix B, question 3) points that 'pride' is the most frequently used word in Greek students' replies. The word 'pride' and the phrase 'I am proud of' have been employed by 49 of the students while they are stating the first thing that comes to their mind when they hear the word. The second most frequently used word in their answers has been identified as 'history' in different contexts such as 'Greece has a great history' and 'I recall the Greek history and ancient Greeks when I hear the word Greek'.

When the answers are analyzed theme-wise, on the other hand, the Ancient Greek history and the Greek civilization dominated the answers of the Greek students. 57 of the students referred to Greek history and civilization in their responses by either using words such as 'history' (34 students) which is most of the time accompanied by the adjectives such as 'great' and 'magnificent', 'Ancient Greece/ Greeks' (9 students) and 'Greek civilization' (9 students) or phrases such as 'what our ancestors did for us to be free' and 'we contributed to the world a lot once'.

The second most frequently emphasized subject by Greek students has been the ethical and moral values that they associate with Greek people. 42 of the students participated in this study indicated that Greek people have good characteristic features such as hospitality, philanthropy, wisdom, trustworthiness, courage and kindness. What is interesting and not observed in the Turkish sample is that 25 Greek students attributed negative characteristics to Greeks. While 5 of the students attributed only undesirable features to Greek people such as selfishness, carelessness and rudeness, 20 of them attributed both good and bad characteristics to Greek people. Among those 20 students, some stated that Greek people have both desirable and undesirable features at the same time, while others refused to generalize their comments to Greek people as a whole and indicated that are some good and some bad people in Greek society as it is the case in every society.

The analysis of the question with regard to religion indicates that Orthodox Christianity is not a frequently recalled constituent of Greek students' national identity constructs. There were only 3 students who mentioned religion as one of the things that comes to their mind when they think about the word 'Greek'. Again, however, as it was the case in the Turkish data, the percentage of those who think that Orthodox Christianity is a defining characteristic of Greek national identity is higher. As the table below shows, those who think that "in order to call a person as 'Greek' he or she needs to be Orthodox Christian" constitute the 22.7% of the Greek sample. Compared to Turkish results this is an interesting and unexpected finding as far as the role attributed to religion in Turkish and Greek textbooks are concerned.

Table- 9

Frequency distribution of the Greek students according to their views on whether there can be a non-Orthodox Christian Greek

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	117	56,5
No	47	22,7
Don't know	41	19,8
N/A	2	1,0
Total	207	100

As far as the roles of having a command of Turkish and Greek languages in national identity constructs of the students are concerned, Turkish and Greek students display similar attitudes. As illustrated in the table below, those who think that command of Turkish language is a requirement for calling a person 'Turk' constitutes 38.8 percent of the Turkish students, whereas 31.9 percent of the Greek students think that in order to call a person Greek, he or she must have a command of Greek language. 44% of the Turkish sample and 43% of the Greek sample stated that command of the official language of their country is not a *sine qua non* constituent of their national identity.

Table- 10

Frequency distributions of Turkish and Greek students according to their answers to the question 'Do you think there are any Turks/ Greeks who cannot speak Turkish/ Greek?'

	Turkey		Greece	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	92	43,0	91	44
No	83	38,8	66	31,9
Don't know	31	14,5	49	23,7
N/A	8	3,8	1	0,5
Total	214	100	207	100

With regards to the criteria that the Turkish and Greek students have in their minds to name a person Turkish and Greek respectively, they are asked to state how much importance they attach to each of the following in naming a person truly Turkish/ Greek: to be born in Turkey/ Greece, to have lived most of one's life in Turkey/ Greece, to have Turkish/ Greek ancestry and to have Turkish/ Greek citizenship.

Turkish students were found to be putting more emphasis on having Turkish citizenship in naming a person Turkish. 158 of the Turkish students (73,8%) stated that it is very important that the person has Turkish citizenship, while only 16 of them (7,5%) stated that it is not important at all. To have Turkish ancestry is stated as very important by 97 of the Turkish sample (45,3%) in order a person to be truly Turkish. To be born in Turkey and to live in Turkey are expressed to be very important by 45 (21%), and 43 (20,1%) of the students. However the percentages of the students who stated that these two are not important at all suggest that they put slightly more emphasis on living in Turkey than being born in Turkey.

The Greek students, however, emphasized having Greek ancestry as the most significant criteria in naming a person truly Greek. While 116 students (56 %) stated that in order to call a person truly Greek, it is very important that he or she has Greek ancestry, 61 of them (29,5 %) stated that it is somewhat important and only 27 of them (13 %) stated that it is not important at all.

The second most important thing in naming a person truly Greek is observed as having Greek citizenship. Holding Greek citizenship is expressed to be very important to name a person Greek by 52 students (25,1%); yet another 72 (34,8 %) claimed it is not important at all. Findings of the study suggest that Greek students put more emphasis on being born in Greece than living most of one's life in Greece.

Table- 11

Frequency distributions of Turkish students according to their answers to the questions 'How important do you think 'to be born in Turkey', 'to live in Turkey', 'to have Turkish ancestry' and 'to have Turkish citizenship' to be truly Turkish?

	To be born in Turkey		To live in Turkey		To have Turkish ancestry		To have Turkish citizenship	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not important at all	97	45,3	81	37,9	52	24,3	16	7,5
Somewhat important	68	31,8	88	41,1	60	28,0	37	17,3
Very Important	45	21,0	43	20,1	97	45,3	158	73,8
System missing	4	1,9	2	,9	5	2,4	3	1,4
Total	214	100,0	214	100,0	214	100,0	214	100,0

Table- 12

Frequency distributions of Greek students according to their answers to the questions 'How important do you think 'to be born in Greece', 'to live in Greece', 'to have Greek ancestry' and 'to have Greek citizenship' to be truly Greek?

	To be born in Greece		To live in Greece		To have Greek ancestry		To have Greek citizenship	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Not important at all	76	36,7	87	42,0	27	13,0	72	34,8
Somewhat important	81	39,1	81	39,1	61	29,5	80	38,6
Very Important	49	23,7	37	17,9	116	56,0	52	25,1
System missing	1	,5	2	1,0	3	1,4	3	1,4
Total	207	100,0	207	100,0	207	100,0	207	100,0

4.3 National 'Others'

The 'others' in Turkish and Greek schooling have been employed as supplementary constituents of the Turkish and Greek history narratives and only in relation to the national history of 'us'. In the narratives regarding 'others' an antagonistic language has been adopted in the school books of both countries .In Turkish history textbooks, with a focus on territory, the surrounding civilizations are indirectly presented as Turkish 'spheres of influence' (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 174), whereas historical information on other cultures and countries are marginal in the Greek history teaching as well (Dragonas, Ersanli, & Frangoudaki, 2005: 184). Employment of a double standard of values is a common characteristic of both educational systems and the same nationalistic characteristics depending on their reference to Turks/Greeks or others are presented differently, leaving out 'our' unpleasant deeds and 'their' praiseworthy actions (Millas, 1991: 27). In the narratives of the national histories of both countries, mirror images of the 'others' are depicted by asserting the superiority of 'us' over 'them'. With regard to religious groups, hostile images of Christians and Muslims have their places in history textbooks of Turkey and Greece respectively.

While history teaching in both countries implicitly serves the function of creating images of malevolent and inferior 'others', Greek history teaching practices further encouraged students to develop simplistic and rigid stereotypes through the questions on what the national traits of certain other populations are at the end of each chapter in history textbooks (Avdela, 2000: 246).

In the current study, in order to shade light on 'national others' of Turkish and Greek students, participants are asked to evaluate the nationals of various countries other than their own together with some religious groups as far as interpersonal relations are concerned. They are also asked to state how they perceive the relations between various countries and their own.

As far as the interpersonal relations are concerned, a friendship index is utilized to explore students' perceptions of 'others'. In the analysis of the current data, average willingness of the Turkish students to be friends with a person belonging to different national and religious groups, namely Armenian, Azerbaijani, Christian, English, German, Greek, Jewish, Russian and Turcoman people, is computed as 1.90 (standard deviation is 0.41) on a 3 scale measure where 1 signifies 'I wouldn't like to be friends at all' and 3 designating 'I would very much like to be friends' (see Appendix A, Question 11). The average willingness of the Greek students on the same index composed by different groups namely, Albanian, Armenian, Bulgarian, Cypriot, English, German, Jewish, Macedonian/FYROM, Muslim, Russian and Turkish, is noted as 2.17 with a standard deviation of 0.5 (see Appendix B, Question 11). The comparison of the Turkish and Greek mean scores on friendship index suggests that on average Greek students hold less xenophobic attitudes towards other groups than their Turkish counterparts. Although the average scores of Turkish and Greek students on the friendship index points to a significant difference between the two samples, the significance of the difference between the average willingness of the Turkish and Greek students is better illustrated in the frequency distributions of the friendship index.

As the tables below suggest, the percentage of Turkish students willing to be friends with different national and ethnic groups vary between 26.1 and 83.7 whereas the lowest percentage of Greek students on a similar scale is observed as 60.4 and the highest percentage is as high as 97.1. Turkish students are more willing to have English (83.7%), German (82.7%) and Turcoman (79.5%) friends when their results are coded into a binary variable of 'willing to be friends' and 'not willing to be friends'. The most positively evaluated groups by the Greek students are noted as Cypriots, English and Germans. The positive evaluation of the English and German people accompanied by Turcoman people in the Turkish case and Cypriots in the Greek case, are quite consistent with the presentations of the mentioned groups in textbook historiographies of these two countries and in line with the expectations.

What is unexpected for the Turkish case, however, is the scores regarding the Azerbaijanis, since in school history textbooks Azerbaijan is frequently cited and evaluated in positive terms as one of the Turkic states and defined as one of the countries that Turkey has friendly relations with. However, although Azerbaijanis followed the three groups mentioned above, the percentage of those who stated that they would like to have an Azerbaijani friend is significantly lower than those (57%). These four categories are followed by Greeks (46.8%), Armenians (32.8%); Christians in general (32.2%) together with Jewish people (26.1%) are identified as the least welcomed group as a friend by the Turkish students.

The answers of the Greek students, on the other hand, are distributed as Russian (82.1%), Armenia (76,3%), Bulgaria (74.9%) and Albanian and Macedonian/FYROM (66.2%) following the three groups towards which Greek

students hold most positive attitudes. The two groups that ranked lowest in this index are Muslims (64.3%) and Turks (60.4%).

The comparison of student answers with the average of their answers of the overall index is more revealing however since it enables one to identify which groups are preferred over the others. To analyze the positioning of each group within the answer set of each student, a computed variable is created by calculating the average mean for each student. In other words an average score is calculated for each student by adding up the numerical values of their answers for the friendship question set and dividing it with the number of groups named in the question. Accordingly the average scores ranged between 1 and 3, where 1 indicates that the students is willing to be friends with none of the groups stated in the list and 3 indicates that the student is willing to be friends with every group listed in the question. Then their answers for each single stated group in the friendship index is compared to student's average score and coded below, equal to or above this calculated mean. Through this analysis it is possible to identify block answer sets, in other words to treat separately those students who replied each item in the index with the same answer. It is also possible to observe the preferences of students of some groups over the others.

Accordingly, those who had a preference to have English, Turcoman, German, Russian, Azerbaijani, Greek, Armenian, Christian and Jewish friends more than their average willingness to have a friend from all the groups listed in the index, constitute the 67.3, 59.3, 57.9, 51.4, 36.9, 24.8, 12.6, 11.7 and 5.1 percent of the Turkish student sample respectively. Whereas, the analysis illustrates that 77.3% of the Greek students prefer a Cypriot friend over the other groups stated in the

friendship question. It is followed by English, German, Russian, Armenian, Jewish, Bulgarian, Albanian, Macedonian/FYROM, Muslim and Turkish with the percentages of 66.7, 49.8, 42.5, 37.2, 33.3, 26.6, 24.2, 22.2, 29.8 and 17.9, respectively.

Table- 13

Frequency distributions of Turkish students according to their willingness to have friends from various national and religious groups

	Armenian			Azerbaijani			Christian			English			German			Greek			Jewish			Turcoman		
Very much	20	9,3		57	26,6		25	11,7		123	57,5		95	44,4		38	17,8		14	6,5		111	51,9	
Somewhat	49	22,9	**32,2**	65	30,4	**57**	45	21	**32,8**	56	26,2	**83,7**	82	38,3	**82,7**	62	29	**46,8**	42	19,6	**26,1**	59	27,6	**79,5**
Not at all	143	66,8		82	38,3		142	66,4		30	14		34	15,9		111	51,9		154	72		38	17,8	
Missing	2	0,9		10	4,7		2	0,9		5	2,3		3	1,4		3	1,4		4	1,9		6	2,8	
Total	214	100		214	100		214	100		214	100		214	100		214	100		214	100		214	100	

Table- 14

Frequency distributions of Turkish students according to their willingness to have friends from various national and religious groups compared to their average willingness to have friends from these communities

	Armenian		Azerbaijani		Christian		English		German		Greek		Jewish		Russian		Turcoman	
Below the mean	170	79,4	106	49,5	170	79,4	51	23,8	67	31,3	138	64,5	184	86,0	77	36,0	64	29,9
Equal to mean	15	7,0	19	8,9	17	7,9	14	6,5	20	9,3	20	9,3	15	7,0	20	9,3	17	7,9
Above the mean	27	**12,6**	79	**36,9**	25	**11,7**	144	**67,3**	124	**57,9**	53	**24,8**	11	**5,1**	110	**51,4**	127	**59,3**
System missing	2	,9	10	4,7	2	,9	5	2,3	3	1,4	3	1,4	4	1,9	7	3,3	6	2,8
Total	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100	214	100

Table- 15

Frequency distributions of Greek students according to their willingness to have friends from various national and religious groups

	Albanian			Armenian			Bulgarian			Cypriot			English			German			Jewish			Macedonian		
Very much	55	26,6		82	39,6		53	25,6		174	84,1		134	64,7		101	48,8		73	35,3		55	26,6	
Somewhat	82	39,6	**66,2**	76	36,7	**76,3**	102	49,3	**74,9**	27	13	**97,1**	58	28	**92,7**	78	37,7	**86,5**	80	38,6	**73,9**	82	39,6	**66,2**
Not at all	70	33,8		49	23,7		49	23,7		6	2,9		15	7,2		27	13		53	25,6		68	32,9	
Missing	0	0		0	0		0	0		2	1		0	0		1	0,5		1	0,5		2	0,9	
Total	207	100		207	100		207	100		207	100		207	100		207	100		207	100		207	100	

	Muslim			Russian			Turkish		
Very much	54	26,1		83	40,1		53	25,6	
Somewhat	79	38,2	**64,3**	87	42	**82,1**	72	34,8	**60,4**
Not at all	73	35,3		37	17,9		82	39,6	
Missing	1	0,5		0	0		0	0	
Total	207	100		207	100		207	100	

Table- 16

Frequency distributions of Greek students according to their willingness to have friends from various national and religious groups compared to their average willingness to have friends from these communities

	Albanian		Armenian		Bulgarian		Cypriot		English		German		Jewish		Macedonia		Muslim		Russian		Turkish	
Below the mean	122	58,9	92	44,4	112	54,1	18	8,7	36	17,4	66	31,9	100	48,3	129	62,3	130	62,8	83	40,1	137	66,2
Equal to mean	35	16,9	38	18,4	38	18,4	29	14,0	33	15,9	37	17,9	37	17,9	30	14,5	35	16,9	36	17,4	33	15,9
Above the mean	50	**24,2**	77	**37,2**	55	**26,6**	160	**77,3**	138	**66,7**	103	**49,8**	69	**33,3**	46	**22,2**	41	**19,8**	88	**42,5**	37	**17,9**
System missing	0	0	0	0	2	1,0	0	0	0	0	1	,5	1	,5	2	1,0	1	,5	0	0	0	0
Total	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100	207	100

On the international relations level, on the other hand, the analysis of the responses to the questions asking which countries their own country has friendly or hostile relations with, if they think there are any countries as such, yields that students' views for countries in terms of international relations differ from their views on those country nationals.(see Appendix A and Appendix B, questions 13 and 14).

As the frequency distribution below shows, the most cited country as an ally of Turkey is Azerbaijan. 53 of the Turkish students named Azerbaijan as an ally of Turkey, whereas Turkmenistan is cited by 33 students in the second place. Although Greece is located in the third place of the allies of Turkey list, it is necessary to be aware of the social desirability effect that might have intervened as far as the focus point of the questionnaire is concerned. The perceptions of the Turkish students on Greece and Greek people will be examined closely and cross-check by other questions in the following section. As far as the perceived enemies of Turkey are concerned, the United States of America being the mostly cited one, a wide range of countries are named by Turkish students. While 38 students named the USA, 34 of them mentioned Iraq as the enemies of Turkey.

It is also significant to note that there are 17 students stating that there is no country that Turkey has friendly relations with. Similarly in the listing of enemies of Turkey, 34 of the students stated that all the countries are enemies of Turkey. Those comments are observed frequently in the form of 'Turks have no friends other than Turks", reflecting the xenophobic discourse of the school textbooks.

Table- 17

Frequency distributions of the countries named as allies and enemies of Turkey by the Turkish students

Allies of Turkey		Enemies of Turkey	
Azerbaijan	53	USA	38
Turkmenistan	33	Iraq	34
Greece	29	All the countries	34
Germany	22	Greece	31
None of the countries	17	England	19
USA	16	Germany	12
Iraq	10	Armenia	10
Muslim Countries	9	Russia	9
European Countries	8	France	9
England	7	European Countries	8
All the countries	5	None of the countries	6
Armenia	4	Azerbaijan	2
France	3	Syria	1
Russia	3		
Syria	2		

Greek students, on the other hand, most frequently named Cyprus (72 students) and Russia (60 students) as the allies of Greece. While France (33 students) and Germany (27 students) followed these first two countries, there were only 6 students stating that there are not any allies of Greece. As far as the perceived enemies of Greece are concerned, Turkey headed the list of Greek students. Turkey is mentioned as an enemy by 38 of the students, whereas FYROM/Macedonia is named 35 times and USA is named 30 times in the list.

Table- 18

Frequency distributions of the countries named as allies and enemies of Greece by the Greek students

Allies of Greece		Enemies of Greece	
Cyprus	72	Turkey	38
Russia	60	FYROM/ Macedonia	35
France	33	USA	30
Germany	27	None of the countries	27
USA	14	Albania	22
England	14	Bulgaria	8
Bulgaria	14	Germany	6
Turkey	13	England	4
European Countries	12	All of the countries	2
Albania	10		
None of the countries	6		
All of the countries	4		
FYROM/ Macedonia	3		
Italia	2		
Spain	1		

The statistical analyses of the Turkish and Greek results are also significant. The average scores of the Turkish and Greek samples in naming friendly countries are calculated by counting the number of countries mentioned as friendly by the Turkish and Greek samples, and dividing it into their sample size. The same procedure is repeated for calculating the average scores of Turkish and Greek students in naming hostile countries. Accordingly, it is revealed that the number of enemies named per person is almost the same for Turkish and Greek samples. Greek students named 0.83 enemies per person, whereas Turkish students named 0.81 enemies per person. However, there is a significant difference between the two groups of students with regard to the average number of friendly countries named. While the number of the countries named as friendly per Greek student is 1.02, it is 0.78 for a Turkish

student. The significant difference is that the number of friendly countries per person is higher than the number of the enemies per person cited by Greek students, whereas the Turkish students cited more enemies than allies on the average. These findings reveal that although Turkish and Greek students name approximately the same number of hostile countries per person, Turkish students hold more hostile image of 'others' in international relations since unlike their Greek counterparts, they name less number of friendly countries than the hostile ones.

4.3.1 Greeks and Turks as National Others

The general characteristics of the historical narratives on 'others' mentioned in the previous section holds true for the Greek image that is constantly reproduced in the Turkish education system and the image of the Turk in Greek history teaching. The main difference between Greek and Turkish history textbooks, however, is that the Turkish texts make limited reference to Greeks, whereas in the Greek ones Turks are predominant (Millas, 1991: 23).

Turkish mainstream historiography, especially the textbooks, 'confronts' the Greek accusations with various counter-arguments. A Turkish-Greek quarrel on history can be observed where Greeks pose their arguments and Turks develop counter-arguments to them (Millas, 2002: 58). For instance, the image of Greek in Turkish history textbooks denies the link between the ancient Greek civilization and the contemporary Greek nation, claiming that Greeks are a mixed nation and have nothing in common with ancient Greek civilization except some customs and language. 'Infidelity' and 'pitilessness' are very frequently referred themes in

Turkish history textbooks' narratives on Greeks (Millas, 1991: 27). For instance, phrases such as "Greeks attacked Ottoman Empire in its weakest time despite our friendly offers" (Cited in Millas, 1991:27; Sanir, Asal, & Akþit, 1974: 152) and "Greeks showed by their actions that they are capable of killing without mercy even the babies in their cradles" (Cited in Millas, 1991:27;Sanir, Asal, & Akþit, 1974: 64) are employed in Turkish history textbooks, contributing to malevolent image of Greeks as the 'other'.

The 'Turkish' image presented in Greek schoolbooks, on the other hand, mainly revolves around two themes, namely, the brutality and inferiority of Turkish civilization. In accordance with the founding myth of the Greek national history, *Turkokratia* (Turkish rule) is presented as the period of 'darkness' and of existential threat (Millas, 2002: 51-52). Moreover, Turks in the Greek history are presented not only as the old historical oppressor, but also as the *present*-day invader who still occupies 'our lands' (Millas, 2002: 52). In the narratives on the capture/fall of Istanbul/Constantinople, Turks are referred as barbarians and in the narrative, negatively loaded words such as 'terror', 'horror', 'massacre', 'plunder', 'enslavement' and 'vandalism' are employed (Millas, 1991: 26). In the history textbook for sixth grade students, the Ottoman rule has been described as follows: "It is impossible to imagine a greater catastrophe for our nation than our enslavement to the Turks. "The Turks, being savages and without civilization were disastrous in their impact, and did not grant a single right to the enslaved nation" (Cited in Millas, 1991:26; Diamantopoulos & Kiriazopoulos: 8).

The findings of the current study indicates that a greater percentage of the Greek students hold a negative image of Turks than their counterparts do so for the Greeks.

When the answers given to the question what they recall when they hear the words 'Greek' and 'Turk' by the Turkish and Greek students respectively are examined, it is revealed that most of the Turkish students took a neutral stand towards the word 'Greek', whereas the Greek students' answers are dominated by negatively loaded expressions.

Most of the Turkish students replied to this question (97 students) by defining the word 'Greek' through neither negatively nor positively loaded terms, such as 'people who are living Greece' and 'neighboring country' and 'a foreign country'. 48 of them, however, expressed their dislike either through expressions like 'I do not like them at all' and 'they did harm/ are doing harm to us' or through negatively loaded words such as 'enemy', 'war' and 'infidels'. Only 13 students stated that they have a positive image of the Greek through the words 'friend' and 'friendship'.

In the Greek sample, on the other hand, 82 of the students expressed their dislike for the Turks either through the employment of words such as 'enmity' (15 students), 'hatred/anger' (18 students) and 'barbaric/war-loving' (14 students) or through expressions such as 'I have hostile/negative feelings towards them' (28 students) and 'The best Turk is a dead Turk' (4 students). While 29 students used neutral expressions in their answers, only 12 students' answers had positive connotations. However, it is interesting to note here that 13 of those who did not express negative attitudes towards Turks stated that they 'do not hate Turks' and most of them feeling the urge to justify their position suggested that the contemporary Turkish people are not responsible for the sufferings of the Greek people in the past. This however indicates that the feeling of hatred is the norm even for those who diverge from it.

Distinction between the historical image of the Turks and the contemporary image of Turkish people is made by 14 Greek students by indicating that they are consciously avoiding deriving value judgments on contemporary Turkish people in the light of unpleasant historical events that occurred between Greece and Turkey in the past.

Content analysis of the answers given by Turkish students discloses that the most frequently associated word with Greek is 'Greece' (35 students), either denoting the country itself or in the contexts such as 'people living in Greece', 'citizens of Greece'. The second most frequently used word is identified as 'neighbor'. In line with the positive connotations that this word has in the Turkish language, all except two of the 23 students who included the word 'neighbor' in their answers expressed either positive or neutral attitudes towards Greek people. In one of the two exceptional cases, on the other hand, the student stated that "despite the fact that they seem to be our neighbor, they are deceiving us", which actually illustrates that the students attribute positive meanings to the word itself. The third and fourth most frequently used words, however, are 'enemy' (14 students) and 'war' (14 students).

The most frequently expressed word by Greek students while stating their opinions on Turks is identified as 'bad'. While 27 students used this word in their responses, the context of the word varied significantly. 16 of the students used it in a context suggesting a negative attribute such as 'Turks are bad people' and 'the word Turk arouses bad feelings', 8 of them employed the word in a positive manner like 'I cannot say Turks are bad people'; the remaining 3 students, on the other hand, used it in the form of 'neither good nor bad'. The second most frequently observed word

is 'hatred/anger' (18 students) in Greek students' answer and it is followed by '400 years of captivity' that was mentioned by 12 students.

Theme-wise analysis of the responses reveals that the mental picture of Greek people in the minds of Turkish students is based mainly on the differences between 'us' and 'them'. While 34 students referred to religious differences with statements such as 'those who are not Muslims', 'Christians' and 'those who believe in some other religion', 22 students mentioned that Greek people speak a different language than their own; 14 students mentioned that they are not Turks through statements like 'I think of their not being Turks' and 'they are foreigners'; and 9 students mentioned the cultural differences between the two societies. Stressing those differences, they made a clear distinction between 'them' and their own community. While there were 6 students who derived a commonality between the Greeks and themselves on the basis of humanity, 11 of the students attributed undesirable characteristics to the Greek people such as infidelity, non-hospitality and pitilessness, reflecting a mirror image of their own. There were 11 students who mentioned about contemporary public figures such as Tugce Kazaz, Niko Politis and Greek singers who contested in Eurovision together with the television series and films in relation to Greece and Greek people.

Among Greek students, on the other hand, the most frequently raised subject was past events related to Turkish-Greek relations. While 66 students mentioned historical events in their accounts of the image of the Turks they have in their minds, more specifically 12 of them referred to captivity of Greeks by the Ottoman Empire, 8 of them mentioned about the 1821 Revolution, whereas the rest of them used

sentences such as 'I remember what they (Turks) have done to us' and 'They have taken our territory/Constantinople away from us'. The second most frequently touched upon theme was the hostile feelings aroused when they think of Turks. While 18 students stated that they hate the Turkish people, 26 of them expressed their dislike by statements such as 'I don't like them' and 'I have negative feelings for them' and another 15 stated that they have hostile feelings towards Turkish people. With regards to contemporary public images, there observed to be only 3 Greek students who mentioned about the Turkish serial which is broadcasted on Greek televisions, namely Yabancı Damat (Foreign Bridegroom)/Τα Σύνορα της Αγάπης (The Borders of Love).

<center>**Chapter 5**</center>

<center>**CONCLUSION**</center>

5.1 Conclusion

Scholars examining the relationship between nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes and education point to two different roles of the educational system: as the mediator of the dominant culture and commemoration of imagined nationality and stereotypic images of 'others' on the one hand, and as promoter of democratic values and critical thinking which in turn challenges the existence of reductionist accounts of the nation and the 'others' on the other. Depending on which of these functions dominate, the impact of education on nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes is found to be varying significantly across educational systems.

However, the underlying causes of the variation in the educational impact on nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes require closer attention. Studies conducted on the subject matter so far validate the existence of a strong relationship between education and national constructs, yet they fall short of suggesting a plausible explanation for the varying effect of education since only a few of them focus on the content of schooling.

In the current study, national identity constructs and perceptions of 'others' of Turkish primary school children and Greek secondary school children are examined in relation to the content of schooling, especially history teaching, in an attempt to

<center>62</center>

explain how different teaching practices cultivate national identity constructs and images of 'others' of school children.

History teaching in Turkish and Greek educational systems aims at raising national awareness and national pride. As the analyses of Turkish and Greek school textbooks reveal, in history courses in both countries the nation is presented as a natural entity; mirror images of 'others' are employed frequently and one-sided accounts of historical events are presented as objective truths in order to cultivate a positive image of the nation.

The findings of the current study suggest that Turkish and Greek students' views on their national identity and their perceptions of others are highly influenced by the education they receive. In their accounts of the 'nation' and the 'others', students are observed to quote the phrases, descriptions and themes that are repeatedly employed in history textbooks. History teaching also seems to set the norm for proper national identity construction and perceptions of 'others' even for those who diverge from it. Greek students holding a positive image of Turks, unlike the malevolent image frequently employed in Greek school books, for instance, often state that they *don't hate* the Turks and continue with a justification for not doing so, in their accounts of 'Turk'.

There was a significant correlation between student responses and school teaching. Accordingly, in line with the stated objectives of both educational systems, Turkish students' dominant motivation for success is found to be 'serving the nation', even

for those occupational categories related to health services, whereas the motivations for success are more evenly distributed among Greek students.

With regard to the identity constructs of Turkish and Greek students, they reflect the history teaching of the educational systems in these countries. Turkish students define 'Turkish' mostly in militaristic and religious terms and they consider holding Turkish citizenship together with having Turkish ancestry as important criteria in naming a person truly Turkish. Greek students, on the other hand, emphasize the continuity between modern Greece and the Ancient Greek civilization as an important element of their identity construct, together with the good moral characteristics that they associate with Greek people. The majority of Greek students posited Greek ancestry as a very important element in naming a person truly Greek.

As to 'national others', on the interpersonal relations level, Greek students scored higher on the average willingness to have friends from other nations and religious groups than their Turkish counterparts. Turkish students are willing to have friends from advanced European countries and Turkic States more than other countries, whereas Turkic states are replaced with Cyprus in the Greek case. On the international relations level, Turkish and Greek students' score on the average number of countries named as enemies per person are calculated to be very close, while they differ significantly on the average number of friendly countries named per person.

Turkish students' perceptions of Greek people and Greek students' perceptions of Turks reflect the dominant history narratives of the two countries and constitute

mirror images. While 'hospitality', 'philanthropy' and 'courage' are associated with their own nation by both Turkish and Greek students, they attributed undesirable characteristics to the 'other'. While Turkish students define 'Greek' as non-Turk and non-Muslim most of the time, Greek students' accounts of 'Turkish' mainly revolve around historical disputes.

5.2 Limitations and Future Direction

One of the limitations of the current study is the generalizability of the findings. In the initial design of the current study, representative samples of Turkish seventh grade primary schoolchildren of Istanbul and second grade secondary school children of Athens were planned to be surveyed. However, due to bureaucratic inconveniences encountered during Turkish and Greek sample recruitment processes, the representative samples could not be attained. Although when the schools are introduced as control variable to the analyses no significant variation is observed in the current samples of Turkish and Greek students, still one needs to hesitate to generalize the findings of the current study to the student population of Istanbul and Athens. Therefore future studies can be conducted by representative samples of the target student groups. Also data on individual demographics such as family income and educational status of parents can be collected and introduced as control variables to analyses.

It is also necessary to note that the social desirability effect might have inevitably intervened in the students' responses. In order to overcome the social desirability effect, students are informed about the nature of the social research and they are not

asked to reveal their identities in the questionnaire form, and also asked to leave their questionnaire forms to a box located on a table. Yet the presence of a Turkish researcher might have affected Turkish and Greek students differently. To overcome this problem, Greek students were planned to be surveyed by a Greek researcher. But the regulations regarding the conduct of research in public schools do not allow the survey to be conducted by someone else other than the researcher. Therefore the findings of the Greek sample of this study need to be cross-checked and validated by a research conducted by a Greek researcher.

In the current study, in addition to a student questionnaire, the regulations on educational systems and school textbook analyses of both countries are utilized in the analysis of the relationship between schooling and nationalistic and xenophobic attitudes. Yet, for future research, impact of the way history teaching courses are conducted and teacher attitudes can also be included in the study; either in the form of participant observation or concurrent surveys on teacher attitudes.

Moreover, a larger scale cross-country analysis would provide new openings regarding the understanding of the nature of the relationship between education and nationalism. Therefore future research should be conducted on a wide cross-country basis.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities.* London: Verso.

Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and Power.* New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and Cirriculum.* New York: Routledge.

Avdela, E. (2000). The Teaching of History in Greece. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*. 18, 239-253.

Barton, K. C. (2001). A Sociocultural Perspective on Children's Understanding of Historical Change: Comparative Findings from Northern Ireland and the United States. *American Educational Research Journal , 38* (4), 881-913.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Thousand Oaks.

Bora, T. (2004). Nationalism in Textbooks. In D. T. Ceylan, & G. Irzık, *Human Rights Issues in Textbooks: The Turkish Case* (49-75). Istanbul: The History Foundation of Turkey.

Bourdieu, P. &. (1996). *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture.* Lodon: Sage Publications.

Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (1998). Support for ethnic Discrimination in the Netherlands 1979-1993: Effects of Period, Cohort and Individual Characteristics. *European Sociological Review* (14), 405-422.

References

Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (2003). The Effect of Education on Nationalism and Ethnic Exclusionism: An International Comparison. *Political Psychology , 24* (2), 313-343.

Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1945).

Copeaux, E. (2002). Religious Identities in Turkish Textbooks. In Kolouri, C. (ed.) *Clio in the Balkans: The Politics of History Education*. Thessaloniki: Center for Democracy and Reconcialiation in Southeatern Europe, 300-312.

Dragonas, T., & Bar-On, D. (2000). National Identity Among a Neighboring Quartet: The Case of Greeks, Turks, Israelis and Palestinians. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies , 18*, 335-353.

Dragonas, T., Ersanli, B., & Frangoudaki, A. (2005). Greek and Turkish Students' Views on History, the Nation and Democracy. In F. Birtek, & T. Dragonas, Citizenship and the Nation-State in Greece and Turkey. London: Routledge.

Diamantopoulos, H., & Kiriazopoulos, A. *Elliniki Istoria ton Neoteron Hronon* (Greek History of Recent Times).

Gellner, E. (1988). *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Basil Balckwell.

Greenacre, M., & Blasius, J. (1994). *Correspondence Analysis in the Scoial Sciences.* London: Elsevier Academic Press.

Hjerm, M. (2001). Education, Xenophobia and Nationalism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies , 27* (1), 37-60.

IACM/FORTH. (2003). Greek Educational System: The Implementation of ICT in the Greek Curriculum in Compulsory Education.

References _____

Kim, S. (2006). World Opinion: National Pride in Comparative Perspective 1995/96 and 2003/04. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research , 18* (1), 127-136.

Martire, G., & Clark, R. (1982). *Anti-Semitism in United States: a Study of Prejudice in 1980s.* New York: Praeger.

Millas, H. (1991). History Textbooks in Greece and Turkey. History Workshop (31), 21-33.

Millas, H. (2002). *The Imagined 'Other' as National Identity: Greeks and Turks*. Ankara: CSDP.

Parla, T. (1992). *Türkiye'de Siyasal Kültürün Resmi Kaynakları: Kemalist Tek-Parti İdeolojisi ve CHP'nin Altı Oku* (volume 3). İstanbul: İletişim.

Post, D. (1995, May). Review : Education and the National Question Today. *Comparative Education Review , 39 (2)* , 211-218.

Reeskens, T. (2006). Globalization and National Identity: A Multilevel Analysis on the 2003 ISSP Data. (s. 1-21). The Hague, The Netherlands: Dutch/ Belgian Politicologenetmaal Workshop7: "Methodology Matters".

Sanir, F., Asal, T., & Akşit, N. (1974). *5. Sınıflar İçin Sosyal Bilgiler* (Social Sciences for Fifth Grade). Istanbul: M.E.B. Yayınları.

Schleicher, K. (1993). The Context of Educational Nationalism: Points of Orientation. K. Schleicher içinde, *Nationalism in Education* (s. 39-40). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

References

Selznick, G. J., & Steinberg, S. (1969). *The Tenacity of Prejudice: Anti-Semitism in Contemporary America.* New York: Harper and Row.

Smith, A. (1995). *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era.* Cambridge: Polity.

Smith, T. W., & Jarkko, L. (2001, April). *National Pride in Cross-National Perspective.* November 28, 2007 tarihinde ISSP Official website: www.issp.org/Documents/natpride.doc adresinden alındı

Stojanovic, D. (2001). History Textbooks and the Creation of National Identity. In C. Koulouri (ed.), *Teaching the History of Southeastern Europe.* Thessaloniki: Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe.

Tekeli, I. (1998). *Tarih Bilinci ve Gençlik: Karşılaştırmalı Avrupa ve Türkiye Araştırması.* Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2005). When, What and How is the Nation: Lessons from Greece. A. Ichıjo, & G. Uzelac içinde, *When is the Nation: Towards and Understanding of Theories of Nationalism* (s. 177-195). New York: Routledge.

Wagner, U., & Zick, A. (1995). The Relation of Formal Education to Ethnic Prejudice: Its Reliability, Validity and Explanation. *European Journal of Social Psychology* (25), 41-56.

Appendix A
Questionnaire for Turkish Students

ARAŞTIRMA FORMU

Yaşınız:
Okulunuz:
Cinsiyetiniz: □Kız   □Erkek
Oturduğunuz semt:

Bu araştırma formunu İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi'nde yapmakta olduğum yüksek lisans programının bitirme çalışması kapsamında bazı konularda sizin ne düşündüğünüzü öğrenmek için hazırladım. Okulda olduğunuz sınavlardan farklı olarak bu elinizdeki soru formunda yer alan soruların birer doğru cevabı yok. O yüzden, soruları yanıtlarken sadece kendi düşüncenizi ifade etmeniz bana çok yardımcı olacak. Lütfen soruları yanıtlarken arkadaşlarınızın cevaplarına bakmadan tüm sorular için kendi düşündüklerinizi yazınız. Kolay gelsin☺

1.İleride yapmak istediğiniz meslek nedir?

2. İleride başarılı bir insan olmak isterdim çünkü böylece... (Sadece 1 seçenek işarateleyiniz)

    □ Annem ve babam çok mutlu olurdu
    □ Böylece milletime faydalı bir insan olabilirim
    □ Çok para kazanabilirim
    □ Diğer insanlara yardım edebilirim

3.'Türk' deyince aklınıza neler geliyor? Lütfen 'Türk' kelimesinin size çağrıştırdığı herşeyi yazınız.
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

4. Kimlere 'Türk' denir? Lütfen aşağıda belirtilen her bir fikre ne kadar katıldığınızı 'çok katılıyorum', 'biraz katılıyorum' ve ya 'hiç katılmıyorum' seçeneklerinden birini işaretleyerek cevaplandırınız.

	Çok	Biraz	Hiç
a.Bir insana Türk diyebilmek için onun Türkiye'de doğmuş olması gerekir.	□	□	□
b.Bir insana Türk diyebilmek için onun hayatının büyük bir kısmını Türkiye'de geçirmiş olması gerekir.	□	□	□
c.Bir insana Türk diyebilmek için onun Türk anne ve/ veya babaya sahip olması gerekir.	□	□	□
d.Bir insana Türk diyebilmek için onun Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı olması gerekir.	□	□	□

5. Türkiye'de yaşayan herkes Türk müdür?
   ☐ Evet
   ☐ Hayır
   ☐ Bilmiyorum

6.Sizce Türkçe bilmeyen Türk olabilir mi?
   ☐ Evet
   ☐ Hayır
   ☐ Bilmiyorum

7.Sizce Müslüman olmayan Türk olur mu?
   ☐ Evet
   ☐ Hayır
   ☐ Bilmiyorum

8.Tarih bize ne öğretir? Tarihi öğrenmemiz neden gereklidir?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

9. Tarih dersleriniz genelde nasıl geçer?

	Herzaman	Genellikle	Bazen	Hiçbir zaman
a. Öğretmenin geçmişle iligili anlattığı öyküleri dinleriz.	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Tarihte neyin iyi ya da kötü, neyin doğru ya da yanlış olduğu konusunda bilgilendiriliriz.	☐	☐	☐	☐
c.Geçmişte olanların farklı açıklamalarını tartışırız.	☐	☐	☐	☐
d.Tarihi yeniden konuşup kendi yorumlarımızı yaparız.	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Derslerde öğretmenimiz onun fikrine aykırı şeyler söylediğimizde bizi dinler ve fikirlerimize saygı duyar.	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Tarih derslerinde anlatılan konulardan hangileri sizin ne kadar ilginizi çekmektedir? Lütfen her bir konu için 'çok ilgileniyorum', ' biraz ilgileniyorum', 'az ilgileniyorum', 'hiç ilgilenmiyorum' seçeneklerinden birini işaretleyiniz.

	Çok	Biraz	Az	Hiç
Osmanlı tarihi				
Avrupa tarihi				
Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Tarihi				
İlk Türk Devletlerinin tarihi				
Dünya tarihi				
Balkan tarihi				

11.Aşağıdaki gruplardan hangilerinin arkadaşınız olmasını isterdiniz hangilerinin arkadaşınız olmasını istemezdiniz? Lütfen hepsi için tek tek 'çok isterdim', ' biraz isterdim've ya 'hiç istemezdim' seçeneklerinden birini işaretleyiniz.

Alman	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Yunanlı	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
İngiliz	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Türkmen	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Rus	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Azeri	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Yahudi / Musevi	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Hıristiyan	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç
Ermeni	☐ Çok	☐ Biraz	☐ Hiç

12. 'Yunan' deyince aklınıza neler geliyor? Lütfen 'Yunan' kelimesinin size çağrıştırdığı herşeyi yazınız.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

13.Türkiye'nin dostu/ müttefiki olan Ülkeler var mı? Varsa hangileri?

14.Türkiye'nin düşman olduğu ülkeler var mı? Varsa hangileri?

Appendix B
Questionnaire for Greek Students

ΈΡΕΥΝΑ (ΕΡΩΤΗΣΕΙΣ)

Ηλικία:
Σχολή:
Φύλο: □ Θηλυκό   □ Αρσενικό
Εθνικότητα:
Υπηκοότητα: □ Ελληνική   □ Άλλη
Διευθυνσή Κατοικίας:

Στο πλαίσιο της έρευνας που κάνω στο πανεπηστήμιο της Κωνσταντινούπολης «Bilgi» και στο κλείσιμο αυτού του προγράμματος, θα με ενδιέφερε και θα με βοηθούσε να μάθω την γνώμη σας, απαντώντας με βάση το παρακάτω ερωτηματολόγιο. Μη βλέπετε το ερωτηματολόγιο σαν ένα διαγώνισμα.Αυτές οι ερωτήσεις δεν έχουν σωστές ή λανθασμένες απαντήσεις και για αυτό, θα σας παρακαλούσα να διατυπώσετε τη γνώμη σας για όλες τις ερωτήσεις, χωρίς να αντιγράψετε από τον διπλανό σας.
                              Σας Ευχαριστώ για την υπομονή σας.

1.Τι επάγγελμα θα θέλατε να κάνετε στο μέλλον;

2.Θα ήθελα στο μέλλον να γίνω πετυχημένος, γιατί... (Κάντε μόνο μια επιλογή)
        □ Θα ευχαριστούσε τους γονείς μου
        □ Θα είμαι χρήσιμος για την πατρίδα μου
        □ Θα κερδίσω πολλά χρήματα
        □ Θα βοηθήσω πολλούς ανθρώπους

3.Όταν λέτε « Έλληνας», τι σκέπτεστε; Παρακαλώ, να σημειώσετε ποια συναισθήματα σάς δημιουργεί η λέξη «Έλληνας».
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

4. Ποιοι λέγονται; «Έλληνες»; Για τις παρακάτω απαντήσεις επιλέξτε:
Α = «συμφωνώ πολύ», Β = « συμφωνώ λίγο», Γ = «δε συμφωνώ καθόλου».

		Α	Β	Γ
1.	Για να λέγεται κάποιος Έλληνας πρέπει να έχει γεννήθη στην Ελλάδα.			
2.	Ένας άνθρωπος για να λέγεται Έλληνας πρέπει να έχει ζήσει μεγάλο χρονικό διάστημα στην Ελλάδα.			
3.	Ένας άνθρωπος για να λέγεται ΄Έλληνας΄ πρέπει η μητέρα ή ο πατέρας να είναι ελληνικής καταγωγής.			
4.	Ένας άνθρωπος για να λέγεται Έλληνας πρέπει να είναι υποίκοος της Ελληνικής δημοκρατίας.			

5. Όλοι όσοι ζουν στην Ελλάδα είναι Έλληνες;
    ☐ Ναι
    ☐ Όχι
    ☐ Δεν ξέρω

6.Κατά τη γνώμη σας, όσοι δεν μιλούν την Έλληνική γλώσσα μπορούμε να λέμε ότι είναι Έλληνες;
    ☐ Ναι
    ☐ Όχι
    ☐ Δεν ξέρω

7.Κατά τη γνώμη σας, όσοι δεν είναι χριστιανοί ορθόδοξοι μπορούμε να λέμε ότι είναι Έλληνες;
    ☐ Ναι
    ☐ Όχι
    ☐ Δεν ξέρω

8.Τι μας μαθαίνει η ιστορία; Γιατί πρέπει να μαθαίνουμε την ελληνική ιστορία;
....
....
....
....
....

9. Πώς περνάνε οι ώρες των μαθημάτων της ιστορίας;

		Πάντα	Γενικά	Κάποιες φορές	Ποτέ
1.	Παρακολουθούμε με ενδιαφέρον τις παραδόσεις του καθηγητή για όσα έχουν να κάνουν με το παρελθόν;				
2.	Η ιστορία με θέμα καλό κακό, σωστό λάθος μας πληροφορεί.				
3.	Συζητάμε τις διαφορετικές προσεγγίσεις του παρελθόντος.				
4.	Μιλόντας ξανά για την ιστορία κάνουμε τη κριτική μας.				
5.	Ο καθηγητής στα μαθήματα όταν έχουμε αντίθετη άποψη απο την δική του μας ακουεί και δίχνει σεβασμό.				

10. Κατά τη διδασκαλία του μαθήματα της ιστορίας ποια θέματα από αυτά που συζητούνται σας τραβούν την προσοχή και κατά πόσο; Παρακαλώ, για κάθε θέμα από τα παρακάτω διαλέξτε «ενδιαφέρομαι πολύ», «ενδιαφέρομαι λίγο», «ενδιαφέρομαι πολή λίγο», «δεν ενδιαφέρομαι καθόλου».

		Πολύ	Λίγο	Πολύ λίγο	Καθόλου
1.	Ιστορία της Ρωμαϊκης αυτοκρατορίας				
2.	Ιστορία των Βαλκανίων				
3.	Ιστορία της Οθωμανικής αυτοκρατορίας				
4.	Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Δημοκρατίας				
5.	Ευρωπαϊκή ιστορία				
6.	Παγκόσμια ιστορία				

11.Απ τις παρακάτω ομάδες με ποιες ομάδες θέλεται να είσται φίλοι και σε πιο βαθμό.(πολή, λίγο,καθόλου).Παρακαλώ απ το παρακάτω επιλέξται για κάθε ομάδα το αντίστιχο τετραγωνάκι που δηλώνη την απαντήση σας.

Γερμανός	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Τούρκος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Άγγλος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Αλβανός	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Ρώσος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Βούλγαρος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Κύπριος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Σκοπιανός	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Μουσουλμάνος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Εβραίος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου
Αρμένιος	☐ Πολύ	☐ Λίγο	☐ Καθόλου

12. Όταν λέτε « Τούρκος», τι σκέπτεστε; Παρακαλώ, να σημειώσετε ποια συναισθήματα σάς, δημιουγεί η λέξη «Τούρκος».
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

13.Υπάρχουν χώρες που θεωρείτε ότι συνεργάζονται και ότι έχουν φιλικές σχέσεις με την Ελλάδα; Αν ναι, ποίες είναι;

....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

14. Υπάρχουν χώρες που θεωρείται ότι έχουν εχθρικές σχέσεις με την Ελλάδα; Αν ναι, ποίες είναι;

....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

Appendix C
Full List of Adjectives Utilized to Define 'Turkish' by Turkish Students

Agile	Merciful
Altruistic	Muslim**
Ambitious	Nationalist
Conscious	Noble
Fearless	Patriotic*
Friendly*	Peace-loving
Good moral character*	Philanthropic**
Happy	Smart
Hardy	Strong
Honor	Successful
Hospitality*	Tolerant
Independent*	Respectful to the order
Kemalist	Well-intentioned

*Adjectives that are observed more than 5 times
** Adjectives that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix D
Full List of Words Utilized to Define 'Turkish' by Turkish Students

81 cities of Turkey	One of us
Ancient Turkic States	Osman Bey
Ataturk**	Ottoman Empire
Baklava	Patriotism**
Blood of Turk	Republic
Civilization	Soldier**
Conquests	Sports
Constantinopolis	Tayyip Erdoğan
	The Grand National Assembly of Turkey
Fatih Sultan Mehmet	
Gallipoli	Those beated the Greek
Glorious history	Those believe in Turkish beliefs
Good people	Those born in Turkey
Happy is a man who can say I am a Turk	Those died/would die for their country
History*	Those living in Turkey
Honesty*	Those who love their country
Independence war	Those who migrated to turkey
Independence**	Tradition**
Martyr**	Turkey*
Me**	Turkish citizenship**
Mosques	Turkish cultural values*
Motherland**	Turkish Flag/ our flag**
My country	Turkish language**
My family	Turkish national anthem
My friends	Turkish national football team*
My nation**	Turkish parents*
National duty	Turkish Republic*
Nice cities	War**
Nice country	

*Words that are observed more than 5 times
** Words that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix E
Full List of Adjectives Utilized to Define 'Greek' by Turkish Students

Almost friendly

Amenable (Uysal)

Betrayer

Christian**

Dishonorable

Independent

non-believer

non-hospitable

non-Muslim

non-philantropic

non-Turk

Pitiless

Selfish

Sneaky

*Adjectives that are observed more than 5 times
** Adjectives that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix F
Full List of Words Utilized to Define 'Greek' by Turkish Students

A country	History
Atatürk's birth place	Hostile towards Turks*
Athens	Human being like us*
Bad people	Island
Baklava	Kenan Doğulu
Beauty of Greek people	Malignancy
Christianity	Neighbor**
Different from us*	Nikopolidis
Enemy**	Our victory
Eurovision	Our victory in the football game
Foreigner**	People of another country
Forest fire	Philantrophic
Friend*	Racism
Friendship	Sakız/ Chios Island
Fun	Satanists
Good and bad people	Sea
good people	Sirtaki
Greece**	Some other religion
Greek citizen	Stealing our cultural elements
Greek flag	Thessaloniki
Greek history	Those born in Greece
Greek Language**	Those living in Greece*
Greek music	Tuğçe Kazaz
Greek National Football team	War*
Greek State	War of Nations
Hatred	Yabancı Damat*

*Words that are observed more than 5 times
** Words that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix G
Full List of Adjectives Utilized to Define 'Greek' by Greek Students

Altruistic	Hospitable*
Beautiful	Innovative
Blue nosed	Intellectual
Capable of problem solving	Lucky
Christian	Open-minded*
Courageous*	Polite
Egoist	Proud**
Fair	Racist
Friendly *	Selfish
Fun-loving*	Sincere
Funny	Smart
Good*	Stubborn
Grateful*	Succesful
Handsome men	Sympathic
Happy*	Trust-worthy
Heartless	Well-intention
Hedonist	Wise

*Adjectives that are observed more than 5 times
** Adjectives that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix H
Full List of Words Utilized to Define 'Greek' by Greek Students

1821	Love for Greece
Admiration	Low wages
Akropolis	Me*
Ancient Greece*	Money oriented
Bad management	Motherland**
Bad people	My family
Beatiful country*	My friend
Brotherhood	My nation
Caciki	Nationality
Christianity	Nice food
Civilization*	Oil
Clumsiness	Olympics
Contantinople	Open-mindedness
Contemporary problems	Our mistakes
Courage*	Paramountcy
Cultural interaction	Patience
Democratic country	Patriotic*
Dissapointment	Patriotism
EU	Philanthropic
Euro	Pride**
Eurobasket	Rationality
	Rebelled against every tyrant (Που επαναστατησε ενάντια σε κάθε
Family	τύραννα)
Famous country	Rebellion
Fellow citizens	Regret
Flag	Respect
Football	Revolution
Good and bad people*	Rude people
Good character	Science
Good people	Sea

*Words that are observed more than 5 times
** Words that are observed more than 10 times

Full List of Words Utilized to Define 'Greek' by Greek Students-continued

Greece	Shame for contemporary situation
Greek alphabet	Strength
Greek citizenship	Those born as Greek
Greek education	Those born in Greece*
Greek history	Those feeling as Greek*
Greek language	Those who fought for Greece
Greek State	Those who have Greek parents*
Happiness*	Those living in Greece**
Heroism*	Those related to Greece
History**	Those willing to become rich
Honour	Tourism
Hope	War against Turks
Hospitality*	Warrior when needed
Independence*	Watching the order
Laziness	Wisdom

*Words that are observed more than 5 times
** Words that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix I
Full List of Adjectives Utilized to Define 'Turkish' by Greek Students

Aggressive

Annoying

Barbarous**

Egoist

Fear

Friendly

Heartless

Interesting

Liar

Muslim

non-hospitable

non-human

Religious

Rude

Sneaky

Ugly

Uncivilized

Unrespectful

War-loving

*Adjectives that are observed more than 5 times
** Adjectives that are observed more than 10 times

Appendix J
Full List of Words Utilized to Define 'Turkish' by Greek Students

1821 *	Happiness
400 Years of captivation**	Hatred**
a nation	History
Aegean	Hostility
Anatolia / Asia minor	Hostility towards Greeks*
Antipathy	Humiliation
Asia Minor Catastrophy	Invasion
Bad feelings	Killing without pity
Bad people	Led by USA
Baklava	Neighbor
Beautiful people	Normal people*
Byzantium	Ottoman
Border of Love / Yabancı Damat	Our victory in football game
Captivity*	Regret
Carpet	Sorrow
Constantinople*	Smyrni/ İzmir
Enemy	Sympathy
Enmity	The best Turk is Dead Turk
European Turk	Those born in Turkey
Fear*	Those feeling as Turk
Foreigner	Those living in Turkey*
Freiendly feelings	Turkish citizens
Friend	Turkish dance
Good and bad feelings	Turkish language
Good and bad people*	Turkish State
Good People	War*
Gypsy	

*Words that are observed more than 5 times
** Words that are observed more than 10 times