

ARTICLE

Childhood, Space and Nation: The Affective and Symbolic Construction of National Identity in Early Life

Hilal Mert  | Zafer Kuş 

Department of Social Studies, Faculty of Education, Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir, Turkey

Correspondence: Hilal Mert (h.mert@ahievran.edu.tr)

Received: 16 September 2025 | **Revised:** 22 January 2026 | **Accepted:** 6 February 2026

Keywords: identity construction | national identity | Q methodology | symbolic places

ABSTRACT

This study examines how monumental and symbolic spaces contribute to the affective and symbolic construction of national identity during childhood in Türkiye. This study employs Q methodology to examine teachers', parents' and children's perspectives on symbolic national sites in Türkiye—such as Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe Palace and Topkapı Palace—that play a central role in national identity construction. The findings indicate that these spaces are valued predominantly for their affective and ideological significance rather than for their formal educational functions. Teachers and parents highlighted themes of national sentiment, historical memory and iconic figures—particularly Atatürk—whereas children articulated affective attachments such as pride, admiration and respect. Nonetheless, abstract concepts such as solidarity were less comprehended by children, suggesting a gap between symbolic exposure and cognitive internalization. The study revealed that monumental spaces function as emotional-symbolic arenas in national socialization and reinforce historical narratives through rituals and interpretations.

1 | Introduction

Identity is not a fixed psychological or individual attribute but a dynamic, multilayered process shaped by cultural, spatial, political and social contexts (Hall 1998; Larrain 1995; Huntington 2004). Rather than being passively inherited, identities emerge through socially embedded practices through which representations, legitimacy and power relations are continuously produced and contested (Guibernau 1997). In this regard, national identity should be understood not as a static form of belonging, but as an ongoing process constructed through interactions with narratives, symbols, places, emotions and everyday experiences. Recent scholarship in nationalism studies has increasingly emphasized the affective, material and spatial dimensions of national belonging (Fox and Miller-Idriss 2008; Skey 2011). These studies underscore that nationhood is not

only narrated but also embodied—experienced through the senses, memories and interactions with symbolic spaces. Spaces, therefore, are not merely physical sites; they serve as ideological stages upon which national identity is performed, internalized and reproduced. This is particularly salient in the context of children's identity formation, where spaces such as monuments, museums and memorials act as pedagogical instruments of national socialization. Although Benedict Anderson's (2020) concept of 'imagined communities' has provided a foundational lens for analysing the role of collective imagination in nation-building, relatively less attention has been paid to the spatial and affective dimensions of national belonging during childhood. Monumental spaces, in particular, serve as powerful sites for cultivating affective attachments to the nation, yet the specific ways children interact with and interpret these spaces have remained underexplored. This article addresses this gap

This article is derived from the doctoral dissertation titled 'Place, Identity and the Child: The Impact of Place on Identity Development', completed by Hilal Mert at Ahi Evran University in 2024 under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Zafer Kuş.

by examining how children establish affective and symbolic connections with national spaces and how these experiences contribute to the formation of national identity. Although identity formation has often been examined through institutional narratives and social interaction (Tajfel and Turner 1986), the role of space as a medium for identity construction warrants closer attention. Drawing on theorists such as Lefebvre (2014) and Massey (1994), the article conceptualizes space not as a neutral backdrop but as a social structure saturated with meaning, memory and affect. National spaces, when intertwined with the practices of everyday life, cultural heritage and collective memory, offer a powerful symbolic framework that supports identity development (Morley and Robins 2011). For children, these spaces—when mediated through educational curricula, family discourse and the media—serve as formative sites where national identity is both learned and lived (Billig 1995; Nora 1989; Ashworth and Graham 2005).

In Türkiye, the Republic was founded upon a revolutionary and top-down modernization project designed to break with the Ottoman imperial past, a project that relied heavily on spatial symbolism to forge a cohesive national identity. Public monuments and figurative sculptures became central instruments in materializing the nation's historical narrative and cultivating national consciousness (Güçler and Gür 2021). These monumental and symbolic sites are not merely commemorative spaces; they actively contribute to the formation of children's collective identities by embedding national narratives into everyday practices. Through official ceremonies, school excursions and commemorative rituals, such spaces facilitate the integration of national belonging into children's daily lives. They operate as both pedagogical and ideological sites where national values are affectively and symbolically experienced rather than solely transmitted through abstract discourse.

This study investigates how children construct national identity through their interactions with monumental and symbolic spaces in Türkiye, focusing on how these sites are imbued with emotions, narratives and values. Employing Q methodology, the research explores children's interpretations of prominent national spaces and examines how these interpretations shape a collective sense of 'we' identity. The findings indicate that national identity is not only discursively articulated but also spatially and affectively embodied. By highlighting these dimensions, the study contributes to the growing literature on nationalism and spatiality while offering practical implications for educational policy, heritage management and the pedagogical role of national monuments. Research on educational visits to historical sites has often focused on learning outcomes or heritage appreciation (Carretero 2011; Dabamona et al. 2021). However, such an approach risks reducing these visits to technical or instrumental experiences, overlooking their broader role in the affective, symbolic and ideological construction of national identity. From a theoretical perspective, national identity is not formed solely through formal instruction but through embodied encounters with space, memory and emotion (Billig 1995; Fox and Miller-Idriss 2008). Monumental and symbolic sites operate as arenas where historical narratives are materialized, national values are ritualized, and collective belonging is affectively experienced (Nora 1989; Lefebvre 2014). Despite the growing literature on nationalism, memory and space, empirical research

examining how children interpret and internalize these spatial experiences remains limited, particularly beyond school-based settings (Carretero 2011). This study therefore moves beyond assessing the effects of site visits per se and instead investigates how such spaces function as mechanisms of national socialization and identity construction during childhood.

2 | Conceptual Framework

2.1 | Identity

Identity is a multidimensional and relational concept involving self-definition and self-understanding within social, cultural and political contexts. Whether individual or collective, identity emerges through the dynamic interplay between the 'I' and the 'we'. It is not merely about selfhood but about how the self is constructed in relation to others (Gutorov 2015). This dynamic can be likened to the weaving of fabric, shaped by culturally available discourses and interpersonal connections. Identity thus evolves through the interweaving of heterogeneous 'threads' (Burr 2012, 106).

The constituents of identity vary: For some, religion is central; for others, national or ethnic affiliation, family, region, shared disabilities or grievances shape identity (Maalouf 2000). This diversity shows that identity is not static but rhetorically and argumentatively constructed in discursive settings (González and Carretero 2013).

Individual and collective identities are cognitively and experientially intertwined. Individual identity involves personal traits shaped through internal differentiation and relational positioning (Deaux 1993; Fernández and González-Monfort 2021). Collective identity, by contrast, is sustained by shared traditions, historical narratives and social imaginaries and is spatially rooted—bounded by territorial and symbolic distinctions (Fearon 1999; Morley and Robins 2011). Defining identity solely as a psychological response to 'Who am I?' is insufficient. Identity gains meaning from its embeddedness in social, political and spatial contexts (Guibernau 1997, 127).

Identity is often forged in relation to an imagined 'other'. From critical perspectives, including critical race theory, othering is conceptualized as a historically situated and power-laden process shaped by social hierarchies and institutionalized relations, rather than as a universal or inherently negative mechanism (Delgado and Stefancic 2017). Such differentiation is central to collective identity formation, which commonly depends on symbolic boundaries that affirm and idealize the in-group ('us'). Across historical, social and political contexts, these boundaries can position the out-group ('them') in different ways—for instance, as inferior, deviant or threatening—thereby legitimizing particular narratives of belonging (Fernández and González-Monfort 2021). In this sense, identity construction is inseparable from power dynamics and from mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that regulate who is recognized as fully belonging (Castells 2006, 14).

With modernity, the nation-state became the primary framework for collective belonging. National identity is constructed

through collective memory and cultural narratives, becoming the dominant mode of social identity (Giddens 1994; Göka 2006). The desire to belong to a larger social structure beyond the family explains its appeal (Özkırmı 2010). National identity is deliberately crafted—by states seeking territorial control or by nationalist movements in exile (Bauman 2021). Through myths and narratives, states construct national imaginaries (Gür and Çalışkan 2025), reinforcing cultural continuity and legitimizing political orders. National identity transmits values, traditions and moral frameworks across generations (Smith 2022), fostering both social cohesion and individual self-conception.

2.2 | The Role of Place in the Construction of National Identity

The construction of national identity is not confined to abstract discourse or institutionalized education; it unfolds through spatially embedded practices and experiences. Education has long been used to promote national cohesion and legitimize authority (Russell 2015). Far from ideologically neutral, education systems reproduce hegemonic narratives via curricula, pedagogy and symbolic rituals (Gutek 2006). Schools thus become primary sites where national identity is codified and transmitted. As Althusser (2014, 45) asserts, schools function as ideological state apparatuses reproducing dominant ideologies. In Freire's (2003, 48) 'banking model', learners are passive recipients, facilitating uncritical internalization of national narratives. Hence, schools are not merely knowledge institutions but narrative arenas for shaping national identity (Black 1989). Yet identity formation extends beyond formal education.

Outside the classroom, museums, monuments and historical sites act as powerful pedagogical tools. These places offer material and symbolic environments where national identity is embodied and felt. As Carretero (2011) notes, although schools are 'temples of knowledge', extra-scholastic spaces transmit citizenship and identity through affective and symbolic engagement. Historical sites engage children cognitively and emotionally, fostering cultural belonging (Dabamona et al. 2021). School excursions and family visits cultivate attachments to national landscapes, reinforcing civic identity. Such places, embedded with narratives and collective symbols, invoke the 'we' of national belonging (Carretero 2011).

Place is not merely geographic—it is socially produced and imbued with affective, symbolic and mnemonic meaning (Urry 1999; Manzo 2003). Through memory, space becomes a site of identity and meaning. Drawing on Halbwachs' (2016, 64) framework, memory—and thus identity—is constituted within spatial and social structures.

Spatial belonging shapes how individuals imagine themselves within the nation. People often define themselves through spatial identifiers such as 'urban', 'rural', 'from Istanbul' or 'from Anatolia'. These designations do more than locate individuals geographically; they index social class, cultural affiliation and political identity (Penrose 2002; Easthope 2004; Giuliani 2003). These spatial self-definitions operate at both macro (nation, region) and micro (neighbourhood, home) levels, influencing how people position themselves socially.

In sum, identity construction is profoundly spatial. National identity is not just cognitively adopted; it is affectively and materially experienced through place. Spatial attachments—formed through symbols, memories and embodied presence—are essential to how individuals imagine and enact national belonging.

2.3 | National Identity in Türkiye

The construction of national identity in Türkiye has historically positioned children as key agents of ideological transmission. This can be traced to the mid-nineteenth century, when children began to be recognized not only as members of society but also as subjects of state formation and modernization (Onur 2007). During the Tanzimat and Second Constitutional periods, children were imagined as 'future citizens' and their education aimed to cultivate loyalty and civic virtues (Özta 2009). In this context, children embodied national ideals—as both the objects and carriers of reform. The phrase 'little Ottoman citizens' reflected the dual expectation that children internalize and uphold national values (Alabaş 2019). After the Ottoman Empire's collapse, the Republic launched a vigorous nation-building project as a post-imperial, post-colonial formation (Gür and Çalışkan 2025).

The founding of the Republic in 1923 marked a fundamental re-orientation of education, which was restructured to serve national goals and to cultivate a new generation of citizens aligned with the values of secularism, modernism and Turkish nationalism (Ustel 2016). Education became the primary mechanism through which the principles of Kemalism and loyalty to the Republic were disseminated (Tunçay 1981; Turanlı 2017; Şirin 2013).

This project of national consolidation was institutionalized through curricular reform and textbook production. One notable example is the introduction of the *Malumat-ı Vataniye* (citizenship education) course, which sought to instil affective attachment to national places and cultivate patriotic sentiment among children (Ustel 2016; Durgun 2018). Schools were tasked with nurturing healthy, self-sacrificing and loyal citizens, whereas families were also positioned as ideological agents in the reproduction of national values (Karpaz 2006; Ozan and Kuş 2021). Thus, identity formation became a coordinated enterprise between state institutions and social structures, wherein children were both subjects and instruments of nation-building. National identity construction in Türkiye is therefore best understood as a multidimensional process shaped by sociocultural, historical and spatial dynamics. Particularly during childhood, this process unfolds through the interaction of school curricula, family socialization and engagement with public and symbolic spaces. Although school-based education plays a foundational role, experiences outside the classroom, especially visits to monuments, museums and national heritage sites, offer powerful opportunities for embodied learning and identity formation. Although the relationship between space and identity has been theorized in sociology, geography and psychology, empirical research on how such spaces influence children's national consciousness remains limited. Recent contributions (e.g., Rabbanimoghadam et al. 2025; Nathan 2025; Hosen 2024; Hauge 2007; Hopkins and Dixon 2006) have begun to address this gap, but studies focusing on children's interpretations of national space remain scarce, particularly in the Turkish context.

This study aims to contribute to the growing body of research on the spatial dimensions of national identity by investigating how children in Türkiye engage with monumental and symbolic spaces. It specifically examines which spaces are prioritized by teachers and parents in the process of national identity formation, the underlying rationales for these choices, how children perceive and interpret such sites, and the extent to which these spaces influence the affective and symbolic construction of a national 'we' identity. In doing so, the study addresses the following overarching research question:

What are the spaces preferred by teachers and parents in the process of children's national identity construction, and how do these spaces shape children's sense of national belonging?

3 | Methodology

3.1 | Model

This study employs Q methodology to investigate how teachers and parents select national spaces for children and how these spaces contribute to the construction of national identity. It also examines how children perceive these site visits, aiming to reveal how spatial experiences shape the affective and symbolic dimensions of national belonging. The research focuses on nationally significant and memory-laden sites in Türkiye, including Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe Palace and Topkapı Palace.

Conventional methods such as surveys or structured interviews often fall short in capturing the subjective and emotional dimensions of identity formation. Q methodology addresses this limitation by analysing individual perspectives through by-person factor analysis (Davis and Michelle 2011), integrating qualitative depth with quantitative interpretation (Brown and Subjectivity 1980; Hayne 1998). It allows participants to express their viewpoints freely, without being confined to predefined categories (Wilson 2005).

In this study, a Q-set comprising 32 statements was developed. In the first stage, a comprehensive literature review on national identity and spatial belonging was conducted, followed by preliminary interviews with teachers, parents and children, resulting in an initial pool of 44 statements. These statements were based on six thematic dimensions: national sentiment, historical events, Atatürk and national heroes, unity and solidarity, myths and symbols and educational purposes (see Table 1).

3.2 | Places and Participants (P-Set)

To identify the most frequently visited national spaces in the context of identity construction, an online survey was conducted using data from the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Among 370 parents and 200 teachers, Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe Palace and Topkapı Palace emerged as the most preferred sites. These were selected for the main study due to their symbolic significance in producing and transmitting national memory across generations.

The P-set included teachers, parents and children—three key groups involved in the intergenerational transmission of national identity. Criterion sampling was employed to recruit participants who had recently visited at least one of the selected sites, with particular emphasis on children visiting for the first time. Prioritizing children accompanied by adults enabled a comparative, intergenerational perspective on how national spaces are experienced and interpreted.

Participants were recruited on a voluntary basis, and purposive diversification was applied to ensure variation in terms of educational level, socio-economic background and regional origin. All procedures adhered to ethical research standards, with written consent obtained from all participants (and guardians in the case of children).

In the preliminary phase of data collection, semistructured interviews were conducted with individuals from each participant group to explore their motivations for visiting national sites and their perceptions of identity formation. A total of 49 teachers, 67 parents and 68 children participated in these interviews, which were conducted on-site at Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe Palace and Topkapı Palace. A content analysis of the transcripts was conducted to identify common themes, which were later used to inform the construction of the Q-set statements.

In the second stage of data collection, participants were asked to rank 32 statements derived from the analysis of preliminary interview data using a quasi-normal distribution grid ranging from −5 (strongly disagree) to +5 (strongly agree), as shown in the quasi-normal distribution table in Figure 1.

Although a paper-based Q sort was planned, logistical challenges—such as weather and crowd density—led to the adoption of a digital platform developed with educational technology experts. Participants completed the ranking process on mobile devices or tablets, which facilitated real-time data collection and minimized environmental disruptions.

3.3 | Data Analysis

3.3.1 | Analysis of Preliminary Interview Data

The initial qualitative phase consisted of semistructured interviews at four national heritage sites. Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim and coded in MAXQDA 2020 using a framework designed to capture key dimensions of national identity. Emerging themes included national sentiment, historical memory, Atatürk and national heroes, solidarity, myths, rituals, object-symbols and historical events. During analysis, 'Atatürk and National Heroes' and 'Historical Events' were merged under historical memory, yielding seven main themes. In children's data, 'Solidarity' and 'Rituals' were less prominent, and coding was based on five themes. The thematic framework was informed by theoretical perspectives on space and memory (Schulz 1980; Augé 1995; Connerton 2014; Anderson 2020; Nora 2022) and on national identity formation (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Guibernau 1997; Smith 2022; Bilgin 2013).

TABLE 1 | Q method dimensions and statements.

Dimensions	Items
National sentiment	☐ To foster a sense of belonging to the homeland in which they live ☐ To develop a feeling of belonging to the nation they are a part of ☐ To help them build a connection with their historical past ☐ To strengthen their patriotic feelings ☐ To enhance their sense of nationalism ☐ To help them understand why they should work for their nation by learning lessons from historical events ☐ To allow them to witness the process of a country's liberation ☐ To contribute to the development of their national identity ☐ To assist them in gaining historical consciousness ☐ To help them understand and sustain the national spirit ☐ To help them feel pride in their heritage
Historical events	☐ To ensure that they learn the stages of the national struggle ☐ To familiarize them with the heroic stories of the Turkish nation
Atatürk and national heroes	☐ To help them recognize Atatürk's leadership qualities ☐ To show them Atatürk's leadership in the struggle for national independence ☐ To raise them as citizens committed to Atatürk's principles and reforms ☐ To nurture feelings of gratitude towards Atatürk ☐ To help them develop affection for Atatürk ☐ To enable them to witness the sacrifices made by their ancestors for the homeland ☐ To show that their ancestors endured great struggles in history ☐ To help them draw strength from their ancestors and deep-rooted heritage
Solidarity	☐ To allow them to observe the collective struggle of the nation for the homeland ☐ To strengthen their sense of solidarity with their nation ☐ To witness the traces of a total struggle carried out with limited resources
National myths and symbolic narratives	☐ To show them the strength that lies within themselves ☐ To help them see the greatness of the Turkish nation
Educational purposes	☐ To ensure that what they learn in school becomes more permanent ☐ To help them discover the historical richness of the country ☐ To contribute to the development of their general knowledge ☐ To help them gain different perspectives ☐ To reinforce their willingness to comply with social rules ☐ To help them discover that the knowledge they learn is related to real life

3.3.2 | Analysis of Q-Sort Data

The Q-sorting process was analysed following standard Q methodology procedures (Stephenson 1953). Sort data were exported as CSV files and processed in the KADE Q Analysis Program. PCA results identified three factors for teachers and parents and four for children, with retention based on the

eigenvalue-greater-than-one criterion (Guttman 1954; cited in Yoon 2023).

Factors were interpreted through discriminant statements determined by z-scores, which informed composite Q sorts representing shared viewpoints. Parent factors were labelled 'Kemalism and Nationalism', 'Nationalism' and 'Solidarity and

museum and library sections in conveying Atatürk's multifaceted personality. In Dolmabahçe, the room where he passed away elicited strong affective responses, reinforcing his symbolic significance. Teachers in Çanakkale emphasized that heroic figures were perceived as authentic, relatable national icons by children.

Parents visiting Anıtkabir sought to evoke respect and gratitude by showing their children Atatürk's tomb, whereas in Çanakkale, heroic stories were used to inspire admiration. Children described Atatürk as 'the leader who saved the country', often referring to his tomb as a sacred place that imbued them with strength and a sense of responsibility to be worthy of his legacy.

6.3 | Solidarity

Teachers and parents have stated that visits to historical sites develop values such as social unity, cooperation and solidarity in children. It has been emphasized that themes of sacrifice and joint struggle during times of war strengthen empathy and a sense of collective action. It has been stated that children develop a sense of solidarity by understanding that people fought for a single purpose at the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, whereas the ceremony and silence at Anıtkabir reinforce a sense of discipline and unity. Parents have reported that these experiences have made their children more willing to help their friends. Children did not make any direct comments on this theme.

6.4 | Symbols

Teachers and parents stated that the symbols in historical places (monuments, graves, statues, flags, sacred relics) attracted the attention of children and contributed to the development of historical awareness. It was emphasized that these symbols were engraved in the children's memories and made historical events more concrete. It was stated that Atatürk's mausoleum and Aslanlı Yol (Lion Road) at Anıtkabir create effective images in identity construction and that flags, monuments and grave-stones in Çanakkale reinforce feelings of patriotism. The sacred relics at Topkapı Palace were found to be educational in terms of historical and religious values, whereas the thrones and war artefacts evoked a sense of belonging.

Parents stated that symbols such as flags, statues and monuments attracted children's attention and that their desire to take photos in front of these elements reflected the meaning they attributed to the symbols. Children visiting Anıtkabir paid the most attention to the meaning of Aslanlı Yol, whereas in Çanakkale, they focused on the meaning of Abide. At Topkapı Palace, children attributed symbolic meaning to architectural details such as sacred relics, the golden road, tiles, the divan curtain, the entrance gate and the baths.

6.5 | Myths

Teachers and parents stated that the symbolic stories in historical places create historical admiration and a sense of a noble past in children and that these narratives contribute to the

development of collective consciousness. Teachers emphasized that Ottoman stories in Topkapı reinforce the idea of 'the continuation of a deep-rooted civilization', whereas stories of heroism in Çanakkale reinforce a sense of a powerful past. Parents also emphasized that these narratives feed children's imaginations, allowing them to perceive historical events as magical. The visiting children stated that they positioned themselves as 'descendants of a state that ruled the world' in Topkapı, whereas in Çanakkale, they were deeply affected by the image of the sea turning red with the blood shed by their ancestors.

6.6 | Rituals

Teachers and parents emphasized rituals in particular at these sites. It was noted that the siren, changing of the guard and moment of silence at Anıtkabir increased the children's sense of seriousness, respect and order. Parents stated that their children behaved quietly and appropriately in response to these rituals, whereas the children themselves approached these rituals with interest and amazement. The children did not make any direct comments on this theme.

6.7 | Educational Objectives

Participants pointed out that visiting these places made the information more concrete. Some teachers said that students learned by seeing and experiencing the theoretical information firsthand, whereas parents emphasized that the experiences they gained through touch and sight would be useful in class. The children also stated that the visits to the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe and Topkapı Palace contributed to their general culture, whereas some mentioned that they reinforced their historical knowledge and concretized the information they learned at school during their visits to Anıtkabir and Dolmabahçe.

6.8 | Q Methodological Findings on Symbolic National Sites

The Q methodological analysis, based on the factor loadings of 50 parents, 59 teachers and 61 children, revealed distinct patterns of interpretation among participants. Principal component analysis and subsequent rotation procedures identified three factors for both parents and teachers and four factors for children, each reflecting different orientations towards national symbols, places and values. Individual participant affiliations with these factors were determined by their highest factor loadings, which are highlighted in bold in Appendix 1.

Among parents, the first factor reflected a strong alignment with Kemalist and nationalist orientations, with Dolmabahçe Palace symbolizing Atatürk's legacy and Topkapı Palace representing the historical depth of Turkish nationalism. The second factor emphasized Çanakkale as a site of patriotic memory and national sacrifice, whereas the third factor integrated narratives of national sentiment and collective solidarity.

Teachers displayed similar yet distinct orientations. In their first factor, Anıtkabir and Çanakkale emerged as central sites,

signifying both Kemalism and nationalism. The second factor centred around Istanbul as a site of historical nationalism, whereas the third factor prioritized educational goals and pedagogical engagement with Atatürk's life and ideals.

Among children, the pattern was more nuanced. The first factor revealed a combined emphasis on Çanakkale and Istanbul, suggesting a dual focus on sacrifice and imperial heritage. The second factor highlighted Ankara, particularly Anıtkabir, with a strong connection to Atatürkist narratives. The third and fourth factors showed a balanced representation of Ankara, Çanakkale and Istanbul, indicating a more integrative perception of national identity across different historical sites.

The Q-sort scores provided further insight (see Appendix 2). For parents, themes such as Atatürk, national heroes and national sentiment scored highest in the first factor, whereas educational objectives consistently ranked lowest. In the second factor, national sentiment remained prominent, yet references to Atatürk received the lowest ratings. The third factor highlighted both national sentiment and solidarity, once again downplaying educational intent.

Teachers mirrored these tendencies. The first factor emphasized Atatürk, national heroes and affective attachment to the nation, whereas educational aims were deprioritized. The second factor maintained a high valuation of national sentiment but displayed limited engagement with Atatürk. In contrast, the third factor emphasized educational purposes and Atatürk's symbolic role, whereas solidarity and heroic figures were less emphasized.

Among children, the first two factors revealed strong affective and symbolic attachment to Atatürk and national heroes, whereas educational elements remained marginal. In the third factor, a distinct profile emerged, wherein Atatürk, national myths and educational aims were emphasized, but national sentiment was rated lowest. The fourth factor demonstrated a mixed orientation: Although Atatürk and national sentiment generally scored high, certain items within these themes received low evaluations—suggesting internal ambivalence or site-specific reinterpretations.

As shown in Table 2, an examination of the consensus statements among parents reveals a shared negative orientation towards instructional or pedagogical objectives, with all three perspectives consistently assigning low importance to items related to learning outcomes. In contrast, positive consensus was observed across the dimensions of national sentiment (Item 10), historical events (Item 12) and Atatürk and national heroes (Item 21), indicating a common valuation of affective and symbolic elements in the national narrative. Notably, divergence emerged most strongly in items related to Atatürk: Although the first factor demonstrated high positive alignment with Atatürk-centred statements, the second and third factors predominantly assigned negative scores, reflecting divergent ideological orientations and varying degrees of identification with the Kemalist legacy.

As shown in Table 3, the items on which teachers reached consensus are predominantly related to the dimension of national sentiment, and these items were generally assigned positive

TABLE 2 | Consensus and disagreement statements across the three parental perspectives.

Consensus	Disagreement			Disagreement		
	P1	P2	P3	P1	P2	P3
The purpose of visiting this site with my students/child is to ...						
12. To support students/children in understanding the stages of the national struggle	0	0	0	0	3	-2
21. To help them draw strength from their ancestors and deep-rooted heritage	0	0	1	3	-4	1
30. To enable them to gain different perspectives	-4	-3	-4	4	-2	3
10. To contribute to their understanding and internalization of the national spirit	0	2	0	3	-4	-1
27. To ensure the consolidation and retention of school-acquired knowledge	-3	-1	-3	5	-3	-1
32. To help them discover the relevance of acquired knowledge to real life	-3	-1	-3	4	-5	-1

TABLE 3 | Consensus and disagreement statements of teachers across three perspectives.

Consensus statements	P1	P2	P3	Disagreement statements	P1	P2	P3
The purpose of visiting this place for my students/child is to ...				The purpose of visiting this place for my students/child is to ...			
2. Develop their sense of belonging to the nation they are a member of	2	4	2	15. See Atatürk's leadership in the process of saving the homeland	3	-3	2
5. Strengthen their feelings of nationalism	0	1	0	29. Contribute to the development of their general knowledge	-4	3	1
6. Ensure that they understand why they should work for their nation by learning lessons from historical events	2	2	1	14. Recognize Atatürk's leadership qualities	3	-3	4
8. Contribute to the development of their national identity	0	1	0	16. Raise them as citizens committed to Atatürk's principles and reforms	5	-4	3
24. Witness the traces of the collective struggle carried out with limited means	-2	-2	-2	17. Develop feelings of gratitude towards Atatürk	4	-4	4
25. Show them that they can find the hidden strength within themselves	-3	-1	-1	18. Instil love for Atatürk in them	4	-5	5

TABLE 4 | Consensus and disagreement statements of children across three perspectives.

Consensus statements	P1	P2	P3	P4	Disagreement statements	P1	P2	P3	P4
My purpose of visiting this place ...					My purpose of visiting this place ...				
22. It is to see the struggle that was waged for the homeland as a whole nation in the past.	2	2	1	1	20. It is to show that my ancestors fought a difficult struggle in history.	5	-3	2	1
5. To strengthen my nationalist feelings	0	1	0	0	1. To develop a sense of belonging to the country in which I live	0	0	-4	3
6. To help me understand why I should work for the nation by learning from historical events	0	0	0	-1	2. To develop my sense of belonging to the nation I belong to	0	-3	-3	3
31. To reinforce my desire to comply with social rules	-4	-3	-3	-3	30. It helps me gain different perspectives.	-3	-4	3	-2

values. In contrast, in the dimensions of solidarity (m24) and myths (m25), consensus was reached across all three perspectives in the negative direction.

The items on which teachers expressed disagreement are mostly situated within the Atatürk and national heroes dimension, particularly in statements concerning Atatürk. Although the first and third perspectives assigned high positive values to these items, the second perspective diverged by assigning negative values. Another item showing disagreement is within the instructional purposes dimension (m29); this item was evaluated negatively in the first perspective, but positively in the second and third perspectives.

As shown in Table 4, the items on which children agreed predominantly concerned the national sentiment dimension, and these items were generally given negative or neutral values. On the item on the solidarity dimension (m24), positive consensus was achieved across all three perspectives.

7 | Conclusion and Discussion

This study examined how monumental and symbolic spaces contribute to children's national identity formation in Türkiye, showing that such environments operate not only as educational settings but also as ideological and affective infrastructures. Visits to sites such as Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Dolmabahçe Palace and Topkapı Palace are valued by parents and teachers less for formal learning outcomes than for their symbolic capacity to cultivate national sentiment and reproduce dominant historical narratives. In this sense, these spaces function as arenas where national memory is enacted and stabilized through guided interpretation and ritual practice. Shared affective experiences—moments of silence, commemoration and other embodied routines—help consolidate a sense of collective belonging and heighten national consciousness (Vukoičić 2014). At the same time, identity work in such settings is shaped by ideological selectivity: particular figures, episodes and meanings are foregrounded, whereas alternative histories

are marginalized or omitted. This aligns with arguments that identity narratives legitimize a selective past (Friedman 1992) and may serve broader projects of cultural and political hegemony (Saraçoğlu 2013). Accordingly, the ways national symbols are framed in these sites decisively influence how children engage with collective memory.

Our findings also underscore that exposure to historical places does not automatically yield democratic or inclusive identity development. For identity education to move beyond the cultivation of loyalty, it needs to foster historical consciousness, critical awareness and civic pluralism by creating space for multiple—and sometimes conflicting—perspectives rather than reinforcing monolithic heroic myths. This orientation is compatible with research suggesting that individuals can hold nationalist and cosmopolitan dispositions simultaneously, navigating these identifications through psychological integration and producing hybrid identity formations (Bayram 2019).

The affective dimension emerged as central across accounts. Participants described national sentiment not only in relation to concrete historical events but also through abstract feelings such as pride, peace and belonging. Rituals at sites such as Anıtkabir and the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial materialize these emotions and can cultivate historical empathy (Lu 2020), echoing conceptualisations of sacred space as symbolically owned and affectively charged (Smith 2022).

Importantly, different sites were associated with distinct symbolic repertoires: Çanakkale was linked to patriotism and sacrifice; Anıtkabir to reverence and admiration; and Topkapı/Dolmabahçe to unity, continuity and loyalty anchored in imperial grandeur (Yavuz 2023). Children's value judgements thus appear to be shaped through the interplay of adults' interpretive guidance and the atmosphere of place.

Finally, adults' narratives reveal that historical memory is frequently transmitted through heroic and militarized frames, particularly in relation to national struggle. In Çanakkale, these narratives are commonly conveyed through dramatized heroism and commemorative routines, whereas in Anıtkabir, symbolic representations often outweigh detailed historical explanation. Such spatial narratives operate not merely pedagogically but ideologically, shaping collective identity through affect, symbolism and curated storytelling (Copeaux 2016; Koyuncu 2014). Likewise, museum artefacts, architecture and audiovisual materials in Topkapı and Dolmabahçe contribute to a coherent national storyline in which Ottoman lineage is presented as continuity, enabling children to position themselves as heirs to a glorified imperial past (Edelman 1967).

The findings further suggest that national identity is produced not only through historical and cultural reference points but also through contemporary political projects. Following Brubaker (2020), nationalism and populism can be read as mutually reinforcing logics: nationalism reworks boundaries of belonging, whereas populism amplifies claims of 'the people' within them. In Türkiye, the resurgence of Ottoman imagery over the past two decades can thus be interpreted as a political rearticulation of identity narratives, shaping what is presented to children as 'national heritage'. This rearticulation may also

generate an implicit ideological tension in pedagogical storytelling—between secular Republican nationalism and the valorisation of Ottoman continuity—thereby orienting the content and tone of national identity frameworks conveyed through site visits. Relatedly, heritage sites such as Topkapı have been repositioned as performative arenas where historical grandeur is staged rather than merely displayed, underscoring the dynamic and contested character of identity formation (Tokdoğan 2018).

Leader figures occupy a central position in the ideological representation of nationhood. This research illustrates how Atatürk's leadership is sanctified through monumental spaces such as Anıtkabir and the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, where his image becomes a focal point in the performative reproduction of national identity. These spaces act as material anchors of collective memory, shaping public consciousness through the sacralization of Atatürk's legacy. As Kunze and Vogel (2016) argue, ideologies materialize and become institutionalized through the cult of personality, whereby the leader's historical role is transformed into a moral and ideological exemplar. In the case of Atatürk, monumental spaces symbolize unity, sacrifice and ideological continuity and serve to consolidate a national imaginary through spatial ritual and symbolic authority.

In Türkiye's collective memory, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk holds a foundational position as both the charismatic leader of the War of Independence and the architect of the Republic (Hunter 2012). The National Struggle, initiated on 19 May 1919, catalysed a transformation based on sovereignty and national self-determination. Milestones such as the establishment of the Grand National Assembly, the abolition of the sultanate and the proclamation of the Republic marked the transition from umma to nation and from subject to citizen (Tanör 1997; Alabaş 2019). This process paved the way for the emergence of a charismatic personality cult centered on Atatürk, which became emblematic of modernization and national victory (Glytys 2008).

During the early Republican period, Turkish nationalism was articulated through scientific and evolutionary frameworks, with secularism and social Darwinism functioning as ideological defences against Western hegemony (Karaömerlioğlu and Yölm 2020). Within this context, Atatürk's elevated historical position and his transformation into a cultic figure (Hunter 2012; Glytys 2008; Ünder and İnşel 2011) can be understood as part of a broader ideological strategy to consolidate national unity.

Beyond Atatürk, museum sites also foreground other iconic figures (e.g., Mahmud II in Topkapı; Abdülmecid and Abdülhamid in Dolmabahçe), yet children's references to these leaders were limited. This suggests that symbolic representation alone may not be sufficiently accessible for younger audiences without targeted interpretive scaffolding. A similar pattern was observed with abstract civic concepts. Solidarity, invoked most explicitly in relation to Çanakkale as a narrative of collective sacrifice and unity, was often difficult for children to articulate meaningfully. This is consistent with developmental accounts that abstract concepts are less readily internalized in early childhood without age-appropriate mediation (Barrett and Oppenheimer 2011).

Across sites, symbols and myths operated as powerful vehicles of national attachment. Participants repeatedly emphasized

national symbols and narrated mythic templates of heroic ancestors and sacrifice, which can consolidate collective memory and moralize national belonging (e.g., Yack 1996; Bell 2003; Kertzer 1988). Children often positioned themselves as inheritors of a glorified past, forging an affective bridge between historical narrative and present identity. Crucially, these attachments were sustained through sensory and embodied practices—touch, sight and sound—and through public rituals such as changing of the guard, sirens, wreath-laying and silent prayers. Such choreographed performances animate collective memory and can generate what has been described as ontological security, binding local micro-solidarities into wider national identification (Giddens 1994; Assmann 2015; Connerton 2014).

However, children's engagement with these rituals was frequently participatory yet shallow: They recognized and performed the actions but struggled to explain their symbolic meanings. The contrast between Dolmabahçe—where guided narration was limited—and sites such as Anıtkabir and Çanakkale—where interpretive guidance and performative storytelling were stronger—highlights the importance of mediation for symbolic meaning-making. Rather than assuming automatic internalization through exposure, national memory work with children requires age-appropriate interpretive supports that translate affective experience into comprehensible civic meaning.

8 | Conclusion and Implications

This study examined how teachers and parents attribute meaning to historically and symbolically salient sites—Anıtkabir, the Çanakkale Martyrs' Memorial, Topkapı Palace and Dolmabahçe Palace—in the broader process of national identity formation in Türkiye. Our findings indicate that these spaces are valued less as venues for transmitting historical knowledge and more as emotive-symbolic landscapes through which adults seek to cultivate belonging, reinforce national pride and sustain affective ties to an idealized past. Although teachers, parents and children were not matched as dyads, the convergence between adults' narratives and children's accounts suggests that children's emerging identity positions are largely shaped through externally provided interpretive frameworks, underscoring the pedagogical use of space as a medium of ideological transmission.

At the same time, children's accounts reveal a gap between symbolic exposure and cognitive internalization. Abstract civic notions such as solidarity or historical responsibility were weakly articulated, whereas affective responses (e.g., pride, admiration and serenity) were more salient, indicating that identity formation in these settings operates primarily through affect. The limited transfer of Atatürk-related narratives beyond Anıtkabir further points to the importance of structured mediation: without intentional scaffolding, symbols, myths and rituals risk remaining performative rather than becoming meaningful resources for historical understanding.

These findings call for a pedagogical reconfiguration of national identity education that moves beyond emotion-based attachment towards historical contextualisation, plural perspectives and critical engagement. Myths, rituals and iconic figures can remain part of place-based learning, but they require

developmentally appropriate interpretation that helps children translate affective experience into comprehensible civic meaning. Framing national identity as a dynamic and reflective form of belonging—rather than as a fixed inheritance—may support historical empathy, ethical discernment and a more nuanced sense of responsibility, enabling young learners to engage with national narratives through democratic inquiry and rearticulation.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

References

- Alabaş, R. 2019. *Cumhuriyet ve Çocuk*. Yeni İnsan.
- Althusser, L. 2014. *İdeoloji ve Devletin İdeolojik Aygıtları* A. Tümerterkin (Çev.). İthaki.
- Anderson, B. 2020. *Hayali Cemaatler Milliyetçiliğin Kökenleri ve Yayılması* İ. Savaşır (Çev.). 1. Baskı ed (1993). Metis.
- Ashworth, G. J., and B. Graham. 2005. *Senses of Place: Senses of Time*. Routledge.
- Assmann, J. 2015. *Kültürel Bellek: Eski Kültürlerde Yazı, Hatırlama ve Politik Kimlik*. A. Tekin (Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Augé, M. 1995. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*, trans. Howe, J. Verso.
- Barrett, M., and L. Oppenheimer. 2011. "Findings, Theories and Methods in the Study of Children's National Identifications and National Attitudes." *European Journal of Developmental Psychology* 8, no. 1: 5–24.
- Bauman, Z. 2021. In *Kimlik*, edited by M. Hazır. Heretik.
- Bayram, A. B. 2019. "Nationalist Cosmopolitanism: The Psychology of Cosmopolitanism, National Identity, and Going to War for the Country." *Nations and Nationalism* 25: 757–781. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12476>.
- Bell, D. S. 2003. "Mythscape: Memory, Mythology, and National Identity." *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 1: 63–81.
- Bilgin, N. 2013. *Tarih ve Kolektif Bellek*. Bağlam Yayıncılık.
- Billig, M. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. Sage.
- Black, C. E. 1989. *Çağdaşlaşmanın İtici Güçleri*, Fatih Gümüş (Çev.). Verso Yayınları.
- Brown, S. R., and P. Subjectivity. 1980. *Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science*. Yale University Press.
- Brubaker, R. 2020. "Populism and Nationalism." *Nations and Nationalism* 26, no. 1: 44–66.
- Burr, V. 2012. *Sosyal İnşacılık*. Sibel Arkonaç (Çev.). İkinci Baskı, Nobel Kitap.
- Carretero, M. 2011. *Constructing Patriotism: Teaching History and Memories in Global Worlds*. IAP.
- Castells, M. 2006. *Enformasyon Çağı: Ekonomi, Toplum ve Kültür. İkinci Cilt: Kimliğin Gücü*. Ebru Kılıç (Çev.). Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayın.
- Connerton, P. 2014. *Toplamlar Nasıl Anımsar?*, A. Şenel (Çev.). Kayhan.
- Copeaux, E. 2016. *Tarih Ders Kitaplarında (1931–1993) Türk Tarih Tezinden Türk İslam Sentezine*. Berkay, A. (Çev.). İletişim.
- Dabamona, S. A., C. Cater, J. Cave, and T. Low. 2021. "Cultural Identity Through an Educational School Trip: Voices of Native Papuan Students." *Tourism Management Perspectives* 38: 100807.

- Davis, C. H., and C. Michelle. 2011. "Q Methodology in Audience Research: Bridging the Qualitative/Quantitative 'Divide'." *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies* 8, no. 2: 559–593.
- Deaux, K. 1993. "Reconstructing Social Identity." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19, no. 1: 4–12.
- Delgado, R., and J. Stefancic. 2017. *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. New York: University Press.
- Durgun, S. 2018. *Memalik-i Şahane'den Vatan'a*. İletişim.
- Easthope, H. 2004. "A Place Called Home." *Housing, Theory and Society* 21, no. 3: 128–138.
- Edelman, M. 1967. "Myths, Metaphors, and Political Conformity." *Psychiatry* 30, no. 3: 217–228.
- Fearon, J. D. 1999. *What Is Identity (As We Now Use the Word)*. Unpublished Manuscript. Stanford University.
- Fernández, A. S., and N. González-Monfort. 2021. "Education for Citizenship and Identities." In *Research Anthology on Instilling Social Justice in the Classroom*, 77–93. IGI Global.
- Fox, J. E., and C. Miller-Idriss. 2008. "Everyday Nationhood." *Ethnicities* 8, no. 4: 536–563. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796808088925>.
- Freire, P. 2003. In *Ezilenlerin Pedagojisi*, edited by D. Hattatoğlu and E. Özbek. Ayrıntı.
- Friedman, J. 1992. "Myth, History, and Political Identity." *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 2: 194–210.
- Giddens, A. 1994. *Modernliğin Sonuçları*. Ayrıntı Yayıncılık.
- Giuliani, M. V. 2003. "Theory of Attachment and Place Attachment." *Na*. pp. 137–172.
- Glytips, L. 2008. "Living Up to the Father: The National Identity Prescription of Remembering Atatürk: His Home, His Grave, His Temple." *National Identities* 10, no. 4: 353–372.
- Göka, E. 2006. *İnsan Kısım Kısım: Topluluklar, Zihniyetler, Kimlikler*. Aşına Kitaplar.
- González, M. F., and M. Carretero. 2013. "Historical Narratives and Arguments in the Context of Identity Conflicts." *Estudios de Psicología* 34, no. 1: 73–82.
- Güçler, A., and F. Gür. 2021. "More Than a Sovereign Symbol? The Public Reception of the Early Monumental Statues of Atatürk in Turkey." *Nations and Nationalism* 27, no. 4: 1149–1164.
- Guibernau, M. 1997. *Milliyetçilikler: 20. Yüzyılda Ulusal Devlet ve Milliyetçilikler*. Sarmal.
- Gür, H., and G. Çalışkan. 2025. "Crafting a National Identity: The Role of Geography Textbooks in 1930s Turkey's Nation-Building Project." *Nations and Nationalism* 31, no. 1: 205–222.
- Gutok, G. 2006. *Eğitime Felsefi ve İdeolojik Yaklaşımlar* Nesrin Kale (Çev.). Ütopya Yayınları.
- Gutorov, V. 2015. "Citizenship, National Identity and Political Education: Some Disputable Questions." *Studies of Transition States and Societies* 7, no. 1: 77–92.
- Halbwachs, M. 2016. *Hafızanın Toplumsal Çerçeveleri* B. Uçar (Çev.). Heretik.
- Hall, S. 1998. In *Eski ve Yeni Kimlikler. Kültür, Küreselleşme ve Dünya Sistemi*, edited by A. D. King. Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Hauge, Å. L. 2007. "Identity and Place: A Critical Comparison of Three Identity Theories." *Architectural Science Review* 50, no. 1: 44–51.
- Hayne, A. 1998. "Choose Life. Choose a Perspective. A q-Methodological Analysis of Different Perceptions of Drug Education and Trainspotting in Small Town Scotland, Doctoral Diss., University of Manchester, Manchester."
- Hobsbawm, E., and T. Ranger. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hopkins, N., and J. Dixon. 2006. "Space, Place, and Identity: Issues for Political Psychology." *Political Psychology* 27, no. 2: 173–185.
- Hosen, B. 2024. "Philosophical Perspectives on Place and Space: Exploring the Geographical Dimensions of Ranchi, Jharkhand." *International Journal of Research on Social and Natural Sciences* 9, no. 2: 1–15.
- Hunter, S. G. 2012. "Love and Exploitation: Personality Cults, Their Characteristics, Their Creation and Modern Examples." Athens.
- Huntington, S. P. 2004. *Biz Kimiz? Amerika'nın Ulusal Kimlik Arayışı* A. Özer (Çev.). CSA Global.
- Karaömerlioğlu, M. A., and M. Yolun. 2020. "Turkish Nationalism and the Evolutionary Idea (1923–1938)." *Nations and Nationalism* 26, no. 3: 743–758. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12600>.
- Karpat, K. H. 2006. *Osmanlı'da Değişim, Modernleşme ve Uluslaşma* Özdemir, F. D. (Çev.). İmge.
- Kertzer, D. I. 1988. *Ritual, Politics and Power*. Yale University Press.
- Koyuncu, A. 2014. "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kilise ve Havra Politikasına Yeni bir Bakış: Çanakkale Örneği." *Çanakkale Araştırmaları Türk Yılı* 12, no. 16: 35–87.
- Kunze, T. T. ve Vogel. 2016. *Ey Sevgili Liderim 20 ve 21. Yüzyıllarda Kişi Kültü*. Tayla, Levent (Çev.). Paloma Yayınları.
- Larrai, J. 1995. *İdeoloji ve Kültürel Kimlik*. Domaniç, N. N. (Çev.). Sarmal.
- Lefebvre, H. 2014. *Mekânın Üretimi*. Ergüden, Işık (Çev.). Sel Yayıncılık.
- Lu, H. 2020. "Discussion on National Spirit Education." *Review of Educational Theory* 3, no. 4: 30–34.
- Maalouf, A. 2000. *Ölümçül Kimlikler* Aysel Bora (Çev.). YKY.
- Manzo, L. C. 2003. "Beyond House and Haven: Toward a Revisioning of Affective Relationships With Places." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 23, no. 1: 47–61.
- Massey, D. 1994. *Space, Place and Gender*. Polity Press.
- Morley, D., and K. Robins. 2011. *Kimlik Mekânları: Küresel Medya, Elektronik Ortamlar ve Kültürel Sınırlar*. Emrehan Zeybekoğlu (Çev.). Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Nathan, C. 2025. "Roots and Roofs; the Spaces Between (Doctoral Dissertation, Open Access Te Herenga Waka-Victoria University of Wellington)."
- Nora, P. 1989. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux De Mémoire." *Representations*, no. 26: 7–24.
- Nora, P. 2022. *Hafıza Mekânları*. Mehmet Emin Özcan (Çev.). Doğubatı.
- Onur, B. 2007. *Çocuk, Tarih ve Toplum*. İmge.
- Ozan, H., and Z. Kuş. 2021. "Meşrutiyet'ten Cumhuriyet'e Vatandaşlık Öğretim Programlarında Kimlik İnşası." *JRES* 8, no. 2: 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.51725/etad.954628>.
- Özkırımlı, U. 2010. *Milliyetçilik Üzerine Güncel Tartışmalar: Eleştirel bir Müdahale*. İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Öztan, G. G. 2009. "Türkiye'de Çocukluğun Politik İnşası. Doktora Tezi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İstanbul."
- Penrose, J. 2002. "Nations, States and Homelands: Territory and Territoriality in Nationalist Thought." *Nation and Nationalism* 8, no. 3: 277–298.
- Rabbanimoghdam, A., M. Nikpour, and H. Sotoudeh. 2025. "Examining How Effective Factors Affect Presence in Intermediate Spaces Such as the Market (Case Example: Traditional Market of Shiraz)." *Geography (Regional Planning)* 15, no. 58: 183–200.

- Russell, B. 2015. *Toplumsal Yeniden İnşanın İlkeleri*. Doğan, T., and Duran, Ş. (Çev.). Bgst Yayınları.
- Saraçoğlu, C. 2013. "Akp, Milliyetçilik ve dış Politika: Bir Milliyetçilik Doktrini Olarak Stratejik Derinlik." *Alternatif Politika* 5, no. 1: 52–68.
- Schulz, C. N. 1980. *Genius Loci: Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. Vol. 17, 22–23. Rizzoli.
- Şirin, F. S. 2013. "İktidar ve Çocuk." *Electronic Turkish Studies* 8, no. 8: 1275–1284.
- Skey, M. 2011. *National Belonging and Everyday Life: The Significance of Nationhood in an Uncertain World*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, A. D. 2022. *Milli Kimlik*. Şener, B. S. (Çev.). İletişim.
- Stephenson, W. 1953. "The Study of Behavior; Q-Technique and Its Methodology."
- Tajfel, H., and J. C. Turner. 1986. "The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior." In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, edited by S. Worchel and W. G. Austin, 7–24. Nelson-Hall.
- Tanör, B. 1997. *Türkiye'de Demokratikleşme Perspektifleri*. Tusiad Yayıncılık.
- Tokdoğan, N. 2018. *Yeni Osmanlıcılık: Hınç, Nostalji, Narsisizm*. 2.baskı ed. İletişim.
- Tunçay, M. 1981. *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti'nde Tek-Parti Yönetimi'nin Kurulması (1923–1931)*. Yurt Yayınları.
- Turanlı, E. 2017. "Cumhuriyet'in İlk Yıllarında Türk Ulus İnşası Sürecinde Türk Çocuğu Tasarımı: Çocuk Sesi Dergisi." *TRT Akademi* 2, no. 4: 486–504.
- Ünder, H., and A. İnsel. 2011. "Atatürk İmgesinin Siyasal Yaşamdaki Rolü." *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Kemalizm*. 2, 138–155. İletişim.
- Urry, J. 1999. *Mekânları Tüketmek*. R. G. Ögdül (Çev.). Ayrıntı.
- Ustel, F. 2016. *"Makbul Vatandaş"ın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*. İletişim.
- Vukoičić, J. 2014. "Myth, Identity and Ethnic Boundaries." *Sociološki Diskurs* 4, no. 8: 45–56.
- Wilson, I. B. 2005. "Person–Place Engagement Among Recreation Visitors: A Q-Method Inquiry." doctoral diss., Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK.
- Yack, B. 1996. "The Myth of the Civic Nation." *Critical Review* 10, no. 2: 193–211.
- Yavuz, Y. 2023. "Olimpiyatlar ve Ulusal Kimlik İnşası: Erken Cumhuriyet Türkiye'si Örneği.10." Ulusal sosyoloji kongresi (bildiri) İstanbul.
- Yoon, C. 2023 Stereotypes of US College Music Majors: An Exploratory Study With Q Methodology Teachers College, Columbia University.

Appendix 1

Factor Loadings of Participants.

	Parent				Teacher				Child				
	No.	F1	F2	F3	No.	F1	F2	F3	No.	F1	F2	F3	F4
Çanakkale	1	0.5038	0.4568	0.2046	1	0.6364	0.5018	−0.1926	1	0.3519	−0.0188	0.2415	0.43
	2	0.7189	−0.1306	0.3656	2	0.0743	0.1677	−0.4152	2	−0.1105	−0.0464	−0.0463	0.6313
	3	0.4642	−0.1322	0.5304	3	0.3545	0.166	0.0715	3	0.426	0.2833	0.0964	0.0302
	4	0.039	0.8092	0.1585	4	0.8483	−0.2893	0.1433	4	0.175	0.3202	−0.5149	−0.0837
	5	0.1458	0.4546	0.3984	5	0.7198	−0.201	0.1604	5	−0.0817	0.4191	−0.1326	0.0035
	6	−0.3161	0.5214	−0.0595	6	0.7274	−0.0928	0.0075	6	0.4533	0.4339	0.0984	0.1976
	7	0.378	0.1394	0.7321	7	0.5483	0.3183	0.2762	7	−0.4038	0.1098	0.5626	0.1762
	8	0.1858	0.7227	0.3853	8	0.3283	0.1748	−0.4486	8	0.3081	0.2288	0.4954	0.518
	9	0.3694	0.3629	0.4649	9	0.11	0.013	−0.3172	9	0.6383	0.1955	−0.1292	0.1983
	10	0.3851	0.3751	−0.3471	10	0.5893	0.1614	0.2311	10	0.3669	−0.0253	0.0635	0.0533
	11	0.0808	−0.4637	−0.1727	11	0.0019	−0.2127	0.0781	11	0.2539	−0.1289	0.3537	−0.5666
	12	0.5752	0.0564	0.4925	12	0.1576	0.0841	0.4526	12	0.7335	−0.1117	0.1397	0.182
	13	0.2561	0.6114	0.4485	13	0.6603	−0.0961	−0.2905	13	0.446	0.1867	−0.1783	0.3513
	14	0.2789	0.2372	0.6675	14	0.6255	0.0458	−0.0678	14	0.2017	0.7131	0.1378	0.2431
	15	0.2622	0.1385	0.7743	15	0.5578	−0.1059	0.1208	15	0.52	0.1696	−0.0878	−0.0009
					16	0.2047	−0.4098	0.6039	16	0.6013	−0.0377	0.1096	−0.0007
					17	0.2855	−0.1751	0.2465	17	0.5076	0.0138	0.3751	0.1903
					18	0.5122	−0.364	0.3474	18	0.1607	0.34	0.0054	0.2196
					19	0.7725	0.4189	−0.0349	19	0.234	0.4484	0.4612	0.0439
					20	0.4906	−0.2495	0.3215	20	0.0048	0.2148	−0.5788	0.3592
Ankara	1	0.8369	0.0663	0.188	1	0.4684	−0.3659	0.2876	1	−0.1642	0.592	0.0905	0.2461
	2	0.8625	0.0046	0.3144	2	0.4039	−0.6481	0.1972	2	0.0426	0.515	0.3754	0.2961
	3	0.7188	0.0056	0.3432	3	0.6906	−0.3813	0.1035	3	0.3996	0.4808	−0.0949	0.3692
	4	0.7674	−0.0635	0.1103	4	0.4419	−0.3479	−0.0601	4	0.1523	0.1458	0.6012	−0.0388
	5	0.2437	0.3003	−0.2432	5	0.7706	−0.3972	0.1789	5	−0.2663	0.375	0.3426	−0.0448
	6	0.0466	0.0461	−0.3724	6	0.5335	−0.4958	0.1282	6	0.4204	−0.3204	−0.0084	−0.3027
	7	0.8639	0.2708	0.0124	7	0.6078	−0.1912	0.1944	7	0.5685	−0.0831	0.1949	0.0404
	8	−0.0771	−0.2233	−0.6173	8	0.6181	−0.4207	−0.0308	8	0.324	0.2078	0.0294	0.6341
	9	0.1345	−0.8194	−0.053	9	0.7636	−0.3823	0.1451	9	0.3678	−0.0854	0.4833	0.1565
	10	−0.1871	−0.6525	0.2203	10	0.579	−0.2566	0.2394	10	0.0456	0.1545	0.4839	−0.2364
	11	0.7556	−0.0796	0.2809	11	0.1118	−0.4565	0.4262	11	0.1075	0.2923	−0.137	0.4298
	12	0.1543	−0.6461	−0.0179	12	0.8557	−0.008	0.174	12	0.0474	0.2756	0.0442	0.4871
	13	0.766	−0.0715	0.185	13	0.1999	−0.6424	0.0163	13	0.2852	−0.0013	0.5237	0.2059
	14	0.8176	0.3171	−0.0402	14	0.821	−0.0404	0.1186	14	0.2492	0.2799	0.24	0.5526
	15	0.7622	0.1182	−0.0817	15	0.3705	−0.0618	0.3179	15	0.138	0.7083	−0.0641	−0.0878
					16	0.8577	−0.1958	0.0748	16	−0.003	0.3794	0.0851	0.0895
					17	0.4626	−0.1069	0.6864	17	−0.0596	0.1119	−0.2894	0.3081
					18	0.5661	−0.5152	0.2646	18	0.5644	0.5146	0.0992	0.2748
					19	0.801	−0.2199	0.294	19	0.6391	0.296	0.1493	0.2053
					20	0.5543	−0.1939	0.5906					

	Parent				Teacher				Child				
	No.	F1	F2	F3	No.	F1	F2	F3	No.	F1	F2	F3	F4
İstanbul	1	0.59	−0.3344	−0.543	1	0.323	0.3055	0.4801	1	−0.1698	−0.023	0.3822	−0.2219
	2	−0.5658	0.2185	−0.4517	2	−0.369	0.367	0.6714	2	0.5082	0.0515	0.061	0.3355
	3	0.6612	0.256	0.1335	3	0.0209	0.8852	−0.0943	3	0.2573	0.0839	−0.1396	0.5763
	4	0.0705	0.781	−0.1659	4	−0.0605	0.869	0.0569	4	0.5021	0.122	0.0326	0.0382
	5	−0.4113	0.6109	−0.1717	5	0.0982	0.4986	0.3711	5	0.1567	0.5828	0.0416	0.2336
	6	0.5722	0.4287	0.145	6	−0.3789	0.4751	−0.2147	6	0.6253	0.1071	0.2843	0.3945
	7	0.6183	−0.0708	−0.099	7	0.6043	−0.4531	−0.1037	7	0.4769	0.4764	−0.204	−0.366
	8	0.1133	0.316	−0.5192	8	0.1348	−0.14	0.6951	8	0.3406	0.4593	0.5533	−0.0171
	9	0.3726	−0.5648	−0.2737	9	0.721	−0.2728	0.1022	9	0.1393	−0.0771	0.0492	0.5318
	10	0.3911	−0.0712	−0.3126	10	−0.3041	0.7224	0.0651	10	−0.2389	−0.1853	0.2656	0.3965
	11	0.6013	−0.1013	0.0589	11	0.5746	−0.031	−0.2457	11	0.4591	0.3002	0.3853	0.2654
	12	0.6359	−0.3859	−0.0088	12	0.7219	−0.1816	−0.149	12	0.065	0.4566	0.0063	0.0625
	13	0.3999	−0.0874	0.0833	13	−0.2911	0.5901	0.4507	13	0.1203	0.2234	0.4769	0.0895
	14	0.5755	0.2081	0.0823	14	0.6091	−0.0148	0.4929	14	−0.2845	−0.0489	0.1499	−0.0359
	15	−0.0953	−0.0617	−0.3075	15	−0.1819	0.5353	−0.3014	15	−0.1815	0.5119	0.0622	0.0187
	16	0.5107	−0.0821	0.0097	16	0.5539	0.2453	−0.0642	16	0.4443	0.0372	0.2759	−0.1253
	17	−0.2122	−0.4449	−0.6688	17	0.2147	−0.0071	0.6504	17	0.296	0.2529	0.2731	0.5496
	18	0.0195	−0.1187	0.3882	18	0.1057	0.7015	0.0102	18	0.5025	0.2422	0.2383	0.4494
	19	0.6026	0.1192	0.0104	19	−0.0359	−0.5224	0.4316	19	0.5778	−0.0713	−0.2549	−0.0298
	20	0.6253	−0.257	0.2361					20	0.1985	0.5297	0.1778	−0.1159
									21	−0.1425	−0.0703	0.1423	−0.7449
									22	0.092	0.5207	−0.3646	−0.0045
	e.v.	25	14	12	e.v.	27	14	10	e.v.	15	12	7	
	%				%				%				

Appendix 2

Q-Sort Values by Expressions and Factors.

No.	Expressions ^a	Q-sort values									
		Parent			Teacher			Child			
		f1	f2	f3	f1	f2	f3	f1	f2	f3	f4
	The purpose of visiting this place is for my students/children.										
1	To develop a sense of belonging to the homeland they live in	2	5	1	3	4	1	0	0	-4	3
2	To develop a sense of belonging to the nation they belong to	2	4	0	2	4	2	0	-3	-3	3
3	To enable them to establish a connection with their past	0	3	-2	-1	5	1	-1	-1	-4	-4
4	To strengthen their feelings of patriotism	3	4	-1	2	2	-1	1	1	-1	2
5	To strengthen their sense of nationalism	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
6	To help them understand why they should work for their nation by drawing lessons from historical events	0	3	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	-1
7	To enable them to see the liberation process of a country	2	0	1	1	-3	-1	2	0	-2	2
8	To contribute to the development of their national identity	1	2	0	0	1	0	-2	-1	-3	0
9	To help them gain historical consciousness	-1	1	-3	1	2	3	-1	2	1	-5
10	To contribute to their understanding and preservation of the national spirit	0	2	0	1	1	-1	-1	-2	-1	1
11	To enable them to feel proud of their past	-1	2	2	-2	3	-3	1	-1	0	-2
12	To enable them to learn the stages of the national struggle	0	0	0	0	-2	-2	-1	3	-1	-1
13	To ensure that they know the heroic stories of the Turkish nation	-1	0	3	0	0	-3	3	1	-2	-3
14	To enable them to recognize Atatürk's leadership qualities	4	-2	3	3	-3	4	0	4	1	3
15	To enable them to see Atatürk's leadership in the process of saving the homeland	3	-4	1	3	-3	2	4	2	3	2
16	To ensure that they grow up as citizens committed to Atatürk's principles and reforms	5	-3	-1	5	-4	3	1	5	-2	4
17	To develop their sense of gratitude towards Atatürk	3	-4	-1	4	-4	4	4	1	5	5
18	To enable them to gain love for Atatürk	4	-5	-1	4	-5	5	0	4	2	4
19	To enable them to see the sacrifices their ancestors made for the homeland	1	1	4	0	0	-4	3	-2	2	1
20	To show them that their ancestors waged a difficult struggle in history	-1	-2	2	-1	-1	-3	5	-3	2	1
21	To enable them to draw strength from their ancestors and deep-rooted past	0	0	1	-1	3	0	3	0	1	0
22	To enable them to see the struggle once given for the homeland as a united nation	1	1	5	1	-2	-4	2	2	1	1
23	To strengthen their feelings of solidarity with their nation	-2	0	2	-1	0	-5	-2	-1	0	0
24	To enable them to witness the traces of the all-out struggle fought with limited means	0	0	4	-2	-2	-2	1	3	0	-1

No.	Expressions ^a	Q-sort values									
		Parent			Teacher			Child			
		f1	f2	f3	f1	f2	f3	f1	f2	f3	f4
25	To show them that they can discover the strength hidden within themselves	-4	-1	-2	-3	-1	-1	-3	-4	-1	-1
26	To enable them to see the greatness of the Turkish nation	-2	1	3	0	0	-2	2	0	4	0
27	To ensure that the knowledge they learn at school becomes permanent	-3	-1	-3	-3	0	3	-5	-5	0	0
28	To enable them to discover the historical richness of the country	-3	-1	-5	-4	1	0	-2	0	3	-3
29	To contribute to the development of their general knowledge	-2	-3	-4	-4	3	1	-3	3	4	-4
30	To enable them to gain different perspectives	-4	-3	-4	-3	-1	0	-3	-4	3	-2
31	To reinforce their willingness to comply with social rules	-5	-2	-2	-5	-1	0	-4	-3	-3	-3
32	To enable them to discover that the knowledge they acquire is related to real life	-3	-1	-3	-2	0	2	-4	-2	-5	-2

^a The table contains common statements for comparing the perspectives of each study group. In the implementation phase of the study, the statements in the table were arranged separately in a way suitable for each study group.