DOES THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF IMMIGRANTS CHANGE THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS IN TÜRKİYE?

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

ÖZGÜN ÖZAKAY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2022

Approval of the thesis:

DOES THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF IMMIGRANTS CHANGS THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS IN TÜRKİYE?

submitted by **ÖZGÜN ÖZAKAY** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Science in Psychology, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences _____

Prof. Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY
Head of Department
Department of Psychology _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu CİNGÖZ ULU
Supervisor
Department of Psychology _____

Examining Committee Members:

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur SOYLU YALÇINKAYA (Head of the Examining Committee)
Boğaziçi University
Department of Psychology _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu CİNGÖZ ULU (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology _____

Prof. Dr. Bengi ÖNER ÖZKAN
Middle East Technical University
Department of Psychology _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Özgün ÖZAKAY

Signature:

ABSTRACT

DOES THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF IMMIGRANTS CHANGE THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS IN TÜRKİYE?

ÖZAKAY, Özgün
M.S., The Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu CİNGÖZ ULU

September 2022, 92 pages

The present study aimed to investigate whether the individuals changed their criteria of being Turkish and whether their prejudice was changed when they encountered immigrants from different backgrounds. Participants read two vignettes that were identical except for the immigrant's country of origin, which were Syria or Britain. They were randomly assigned to read one of two versions in the first session. A week later, they re-participated and read the other version, and then their attitudes toward these immigrants, their national identification, and demographic information were collected. Participants' criteria of being Turkish were measured with national identity markers, meaning what characteristics people find important to come someone as Turkish (for instance, civic markers as common rules and land, ethnocultural markers as ancestral origin and culture). Individuals ranked nine markers of being Turkish according to the their importance. The study was conducted with 122 participants, the findings showed that the ranking of Turkish national identity markers did not change according to different immigrants. However, despite this, the participants showed more prejudice toward Syrian immigrant and identified a higher

level of commitment to national identity after reading about the Syrian immigrant. The findings also indicated that attitudes toward target immigrant and national identification predicted the ranking of ethnocultural and civic national identity markers. The results of the ranking of national identity markers have been discussed within the social desirability bias. The differentiation of attitudes towards Syrian immigrants from attitudes towards British immigrants is also discussed in the context of threat, optimal distinctiveness, and status difference.

Keywords: national identity, acceptance of immigrants, prejudice, Social Identity Theory.

ÖZ

TÜRKİYEDE GÖÇMENLERİN MENŞE ÜLKESİ ULUSAL KİMLİK BELİRTEÇLERİNİN ÖNEMİNİ DEĞİŞTİRİR Mİ?

ÖZAKAY, Özgün
Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Banu CİNGÖZ ULU

Eylül 2022, 92 sayfa

Bu çalışma, insanların farklı arka planlara sahip göçmenlerle karşılaştıklarında Türk olma kriterlerini değiştirip değiştirmediklerini ve önyargılarının değişip değişmediğini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Katılımcılar, sadece göçmenin menşei ülkesinin Suriye veya İngiliz olması dışında tamamen aynı olan iki metin okudular. Katılımcılar ilk aşamada iki metinden birine rastgele olarak atandılar ve bir hafta sonra ikinci aşamada diğer metni gördüler. Daha sonra katılımcıların göçmenlere yönelik tutumları, ulusal kimlikle özdeşleşmeleri ve demografik bilgiler toplanmıştır. Katılımcıların Türk olma kriterleri, Türk olmak için hangi özelliklerin önemli olduğunu ölçen (Örneğin, ortak kurallar ve toprağı belirten yurttaşlık belirteçleri ve atasal kökenler ve kültürü belirten etnokültürel belirteçler) ulusal kimlik belirteçleri ile ölçülmüştür. Bireyler Türk ulusal kimliğinin belirteçlerini onlara atfettikleri öneme göre sıralamıştır. Çalışma 122 katılımcı ile gerçekleştirilmiştir ve bulgular Türk ulusal kimlik belirteçlerinin sıralamasının farklı göçmenlere göre değişmediğini göstermiştir. Ancak buna rağmen, katılımcılar Suriyeli göçmene karşı daha fazla önyargı gösterdiler ve Suriyeli göçmen hakkındaki metni okuduktan sonra ulusal özdeşimleri daha yüksek düzeydeydi. Bulgular ayrıca, hedef göçmene yönelik

tutumların ve ulusal özdeşimin etnokültürel ve yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik belirteçlerinin sıralamasını yordadığını göstermiştir. Ulusal kimlik belirteçlerinin sıralamasına ilişkin sonuçlar sosyal arzulanırlık yanlılığı kapsamına tartışılmıştır. Bireylerin tutumlarının Suriyeli ve İngiliz göçmene göre değişmesi de tehdit, optimal ayırt edicilik ve statü farkları kapsamında tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: ulusal kimlik, göçmenlerin kabulü, önyargı, Sosyal Kimlik Teorisi.

To Hülya, Mustafa, and Gizem

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank my advisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Banu Cingöz Ulu for her guidance, inspirational thoughts, and supporting me throughout my thesis. Also, I would like to thank the Examining Committee Members, Prof. Dr. Bengi Öner Özkan, and Assist. Prof. Dr. Nur Soylu Yalçınkaya for their valuable notes and feedback.

My dear participants, thank you for your dedication to time and energy. This thesis would not have been possible without your contributions.

I would like to thank my dear professors, Prof. Dr. Sonia Amado, Prof. Dr. Aysun Doğan, Assoc. Dr. Mediha Korkmaz, and Assoc. Dr. Mehmet Koyuncu, who have sparked my passion for academic life in my bachelor's. I would also like to thank Prof. Dr. Melek Göregenli for introducing me to social psychology and broadening my horizons.

My friends from Metu, Defne Alkan, Ezgi Taşyürek, İrem Ayar, Ruşen Ali Sayat, and Şule Demir supported me both scientifically and emotionally throughout my master's. My thesis process would have been much more difficult and stressful without you. I would like to thank Hilal Ersoy and İrem Ayar, who reviewed my thesis and gave me valuable suggestions. İrem offered very constructive recommendations. Hilal provided me with solutions to every detail of my thesis, in addition to her precious friendship.

I would like to thank my mother, Hülya Özakay, and my father, Mustafa Özakay, for their understanding, encouragement, and support. I have always taken strength from knowing that you are with me. Also, I would like to thank my lovely sister, Gizem Hazal Özakay, for her joyful presence. I would also like to thank my dear grandfather Mehmet Şimşek for always inspiring my academic career.

Even though we are all in different places, I would like to thank Sena Arıcı Kaçmaz, Ahmet Başkut, Berke Karagöz, Musa Kaçmaz, and Eren Pekşenoğlu, who have been my second family for years, for always being there for me and motivating

me. I want to express my sincere thanks again to Sena, the unconditional friend behind me, especially during difficult times.

Finally, dearest Ekin Köklü, thank you for fighting with me against the windmills. Dealing with challenges has become easier, and life has become more enjoyable with your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii

ABSTRACT iv

ÖZ vi

DEDICATION viii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

TABLE OF CONTENTS xi

LIST OF TABLES xiii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xiv

CHAPTERS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

1.1. Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory 2

1.2. Nation, National Identity and National Identity Markers 5

1.3. National Identity and Prejudice 12

1.4. Turkish National Identity 14

1.5. Aim of the Current Research 19

2. METHOD 22

2.1. Measurements 22

2.1.1. Procedure 22

2.1.2. National Identity Markers 23

2.1.3. Experimental Manipulation Vignette 24

2.1.4. Prejudice 24

2.1.5. Turkish Identification 25

2.1.6. Interpersonal Attraction 25

2.1.7. Demographics....26
2.2. Sample....26
2.2.1. Sample Size Rationale....26
2.2.2. Participants....26
2.2.3. Participants of Additional Analyses in Between Subject Design....29
3. RESULTS....31
3.1. Additional Analyses....41
3.1.1. Between Subject Design Analysis....41
3.1.2. Factor Analysis of Interpersonal Attractiveness Scale....45
4. DISCUSSION....49
REFERENCES....56
APPENDICES
A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE....71
B. NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS....72
C. EXPERIMENTAL MANIPULATION VIGNETTES....73
D. SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE....75
E. TURKISH IDENTIFICATION SCALE....76
F. INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION SCALE....77
G. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM....78
H. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET....79
I. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU....93

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of the Participants 27
Table 2 Correlation Matrix of Variables 33
Table 3 Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results for the order of Ethnocultural and Civic National Identity Markers Syrian condition and British condition 34
Table 4 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition 35
Table 5 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in British condition 36
Table 6 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Civic Markers in Syrian condition 37
Table 7 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Civic Markers in British condition 38
Table 8 Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results for Prejudice to Syrian and British and National Identification in Syrian condition and British condition 38
Table 9 Descriptive values and Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results of Identity Markers 40
Table 10 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition 42
Table 11 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Civic Markers in the Syrian condition 43
Table 12 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in the British condition 44
Table 13 Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Civic Markers in the British condition 45
Table 14 Results for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Attraction Scale in Syrian condition 46
Table 15 Results for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Attraction Scale in British condition 48

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
SIT	Social Identity Theory
SCT	Social Categorization Theory
IOM	International Organization for Migration
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
PMM	Turkish Presidency of Migration Management

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since human communities have existed, besides who will be a member of the community, one of the fundamental problems has been who they will exclude. Social identity theory revealed that even membership in minimally constituted group produces outgroup exclusion and ingroup favoritism (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). A national identity is also a particular form of social identity, and today it is one of the most prominent identities that affect daily life with a historical and institutional power behind it (David & Bar-Tal, 2009). National identity has gained importance worldwide with the nationalist movements that have continued since the French Revolution and the collapses of empires, and it has created a new unification and separation practice (Hobsbawm, 2013). However, national identity is much more complicated nowadays because it puts enormous groups of people within imaginary boundaries and excludes vast others.

According to the latest data published by the International Organization for Migration ([IOM], 2022), 281 million people are migrants, which constitutes 3.6% of the world's population. In other words, if these immigrants united and formed a country, this country would be one of the five countries with the largest population in the world, according to the Worldometer (n.d.) 13.04.2022 data. Especially, Türkiye is a hot port for asylum seekers, refugees, and immigrants because of the endless war and uncertainty in the region since 2012. According to the data published by The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR] in mid-2021, there are 3.7 million refugees in Türkiye; thus, it is home to the most significant number of refugees globally. Therefore, examining the dimensions of Turkish national identity gains particular importance compared to previous years. Although the Turkish national identity is defined as not including any discrimination based on religion and race in the constitutions, this is not the case in real life (Cagaptay, 2006; Maksudyan,

2005). Yeğen (2017) also emphasized that "...Turkish nationhood has been quite flexible in deciding who may or may not become Turkish." (p. 331).

In this study, I examined whether individuals rank different national identity criteria for being Turkish when immigrants with different origins. For this purpose, participants read vignettes about two immigrants, one Syrian and the other British, and it was investigated whether ranking of Turkish national identity markers, their prejudice toward these immigrants, national identification, and approval of Turkish citizenship attitudes changed. My hypothesis is that depending on the national origin of an immigrant, people's definition of who may be considered Turkish and the importance they attribute to different Turkish identity markers (such as ethnicity, language, religion, or civic qualities) would change. Also, national identity markers were measured using the ranking method with experimental design. In this way, not only a different perspective was brought to the research field of national identity but also contributed to the literature regarding Turkish national identity and immigration.

1.1. Social Identity Theory and Social Categorization Theory

It might be beneficial to mention the leading theory of identity since inclusion-exclusion is examined in the context of immigration and national identity. Social identity theory (SIT) was introduced in the 1970s by Tajfel and Turner, and it examined the effect of being a member of a group to understand intergroup relations (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Individuals develop a social identity by categorizing themselves according to their groups (Turner, 1982). Unlike their personal identities, this identity is formed within the framework of an ingroup whose norms and values they adopt (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In this context, Tajfel and Turner (1979) emphasize that groups have an "emotional" aspect in addition to having social aspect. On the other hand, when individuals identify with the ingroup, they define other groups as outgroups and see their distinctive features. Therefore, the SIT revealed that even belonging to a group only at the cognitive level triggers discrimination against the outgroup and leads to ingroup favoritism (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). For example, Tajfel et al. (1971) designed a study that placed participants in a group based on their choice of Klee and Kandinsky paintings. Participants did not know the participants in the opposite group and were completely anonymous. After the task was performed, the

participants were asked to reward their ingroup and outgroup members. It was found that 72.5% of the participants gave more rewards to their ingroups, even though these groups were only minimally established in the experimental environment. In addition, the participants tended to create a maximum difference between their group and the other group rather than their group's maximum profit. Many studies (Billig & Tajfel, 1973; Brewer & Silver, 1978; Locksley et al., 1980; Tajfel & Billig, 1974) conducted with this paradigm, find that even artificial groups trigger ingroup favoritism and discrimination towards outgroups.

Primarily, individuals engage in ingroup favoritism to gain or maintain a positive social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). On the other hand, individuals want to build a positive identity through social comparisons (Tajfel, 1981). In other words, we can state that the social comparisons that individuals make between their ingroups, and other groups are essential in constructing their positive social identities in daily life. Tajfel and Turner (1979) describe this process as "…they define the individual as similar to or different from, as 'better' or 'worse' than, members of other groups." (p. 283). From this point of view, it can be said that individuals use outgroups as reference groups to evaluate their position and, therefore, their groups' positions cognitively. However, as might be expected, comparisons in favor of the ingroup are not always available. SIT reveals that when individuals' social identities are "unsatisfactory," they either leave their ingroup and join a new group or try to make that ingroup more positive (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). More specifically, an individual can compare two groups on a new dimension, positively evaluate an old negative value, or choose a new outgroup as the reference group.

The self-categorization theory (SCT) was developed by Turner (1987) and made vital contributions to the cognitive aspect of categorization in social identity theory. SCT has more clearly demonstrated the relationship between personal identity and social identity (Turner & Reynolds, 2012). Moreover, the distinctiveness of these identities may vary depending on the context and state of arousal (Turner, 1987). The concepts of accessibility and fit, as specified in the perception studies, are effective in this context. Accessibility refers to how ready the category is to be prominent, whereas fit indicates the match between the observed stimulus and the category's features. In this context, group behavior emerges when social identity is prominent and personal identity shifts to social (Turner & Reynolds, 2012). SCT describes this situation as

"...this process is dynamic, varying according to the context, and always defined relative to the perceiver." (Hornsey, 2008, p. 208).

However, SIT and SCT received some criticisms because they did not address individual differences in group membership about category definitions and emphasized only making the group salience. Huddy (2001) emphasizes that, individual has their own choice over their identity. For example, it was found that when an individual chose the group itself had different effects than being assigned to the group (Turner et al., 1984; Perreault & Bourhuis, 1999). As a result, it has been found that individuals who determine their groups by their own choices exhibit higher self-esteem and group cohesion when they lose (Turner et al., 1984), and they discriminate more against the outgroup and have a higher identification with their group (Perreault & Bourhuis, 1999). In other words, SIT and SCT emphasize self and context but ignore the dynamic relationship between them, and so overlook how the individual understands that category, despite mentioning categories (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001a).

Therefore, Huddy (2001) stated that the early social identity theorists ignored the subjective meaning of identity and concerned themselves with the boundaries of groups. However, for example, American identity may not have the same meaning for all Americans. In this context, Reicher (2004) stated that who are seen as ingroup or outgroup, ally or foe is not associated with given social identities but rather with the definition of identities. Also, it was argued that these category definitions have an argumentative structure in discourse (Hopkins et al., 1997; Reicher & Hopkins, 1996). For example, Reicher and Hopkins (2001a) revealed that Scottish leaders from different political views have different definitions of Scottish identity, and as a result, several Scott pictures may emerge. Therefore, national identity may have different definitions according to individuals, resulting in other portraits of the nation regarding inclusion and exclusion. Reicher and Hopkins (2001b) also mention the "being" aspect of these category definitions, which includes the present, but also the "becoming" aspect that provides for the future. Hence, categories do not just say "what it is" but also "what it should be." While according to the critics, identities may differ according to the meaning that individuals internalize that identity. Therefore, the perception of group's boundaries may change according to the understanding that individuals internalize.

Consequently, the investigation of the content of national identity is critical because the cognitive value of taking a positive social identity is very high, and outgroups include huge populations inside and outside the country. Besides, internalized definitions of national identity also contain essential distinctions regarding the inclusion and exclusion of this identity. Therefore, what nation and national identity are will be explained in more detail in the following pages.

1.2. Nation, National Identity and National Identity Markers

National identity is also a unique form of social identity and simply refers to individuals' attachment to their nation. National identity occupies a massive place in the lives of individuals starting from childhood (Barrett & Oppenheimer, 2011). Verkuyten (2001) found that when the national identification of Dutch children increases, their self-esteem also increases; and high national identification leads to less social distance towards the ingroup, while it leads to more social distance towards the outgroup. As the study shows, national identity plays a vital role in individuals' self-confidence and relationships with others. Also, significant ingroup bias and national autostereotype have been observed when people identified with national identity highly (Nigbur & Cinnirella, 2007). Similarly, Mummendey et al. (2001) found a high correlation between strong national identification and positive ingroup evaluation. As can be seen, national identity and attachment with it affect individuals' positive self-development and attachment to their country.

However, unlike other social identities, national identity unites a significant number of people and is often supported by the state with institutional support. In this context, it contains unifying and separating factors in many respects. Accordingly, when we consider the nation as a large social group, there is a "collective prototypic" Turkish, Italian, German, etc., which fits the national identity in the minds of individuals (David & Bar-Tal, 2009). However, these prototypes may differ according to the diverse meanings of national identity. Therefore, the origin of the concept of the nation should be described before making a detailed introduction to national identity. Because who the nations see from themselves or exclude is directly related to how they form the concept of nation. In the literature on nationalism and nations, three main

approaches can be mentioned: the primordial approach, which assumes the nation as essentialist and argues that the nation has always existed; and the modernist approach, which argues that the nation is built out of necessity; and the ethno-symbolism approach, which combines these two views (Özkırımlı, 2000). Therefore, the modernist approach and the ethno-symbolism approach, which are related to the subject of this thesis, will be explained in more detail.

The modernist theory states that the nation, and thus national identity, is built by the political and economic changes that have occurred since the 18th century. Anderson (2006) argued that nation, nationality, and nationalism are of cultural origin. In this context, he defines the nation as an "imagined political community." Besides, the nation is imagined because no nation, no matter how small, knows all its members personally; however, everyone has a mental picture of the community. Also, Hobsbawm (2000) argues is that nationalism comes before nations. In this context, his unique contribution to the literature explains the invented traditions used to build nations. These invented traditions are formalized and ritualized, based on a historical origin, unlike the customs, bureaucratic routines, and orders in society (Hobsbawm, 2013). Also, Hobsbawm (2013) argues that the institutional gaps that emerged during the significant social change after the 19th century was filled with these traditions. For instance, he reveals that national flags, national anthems, national symbols, and even national languages are institutionalized and ritualized in this process.

Gellner (1983) also examines the transition from an agricultural society to an industrial society to explain the building of the nation. Mainly this transition has described the dominance of a single culture as high culture in the general population and the spread of formal education and written language. In this context, Gellner (1983) argues that "…nationalism, which sometimes takes pre-existing cultures and myth; turns them into nations, sometimes invents them, and often obliterates pre-existing cultures." (p. 48). Furthermore, he emphasized that the nation created the historicity with its "own amnesias and selections." As a result, when we look at these modernist theories about the nation's construction, we see that the nation has a flexible and time-formed structure. In this respect, we can state that national identities do not always have a fixed structure for whom to include and who to exclude.

On the other hand, Smith (1991) approached the nation as an ethno-symbolist, unlike these modernist theorists. The groups he calls "ethnie" as ethnic communities

have existed since ancient times, and these ethnies are essential in the birth of today's nations. According to Smith (1991), the characteristics of an ethnic community; are; "a collective proper name, a myth of common ancestry, shared historical memories, one or more differentiating elements of common culture, an association with a specific 'homeland,' a sense of solidarity for significant sectors of the population." (p. 14). However, although Smith (1991) states that ethnies have existed for a long time, he argues that the nation and some myths are contemporary concepts as modernists. From this point of view, although we state that some ethnic groups have existed since ancient times, we see that it took a long time for them to transform into today's nation concept.

Taken together, the present concept of the nation changed according to the political and economic conditions in the 19th century. Indeed, we cannot claim that the concepts of races and nations came in a spaceship in the 1800s, but it is safe to assume that a nation and nationalism in the current sense were built mainly from the 19th century. According to the simple allegory, if we had a time machine and brought someone from the 16th century to the present, there would be significant differences between the Turkish, French, Italian, etc., in terms of the imagination and traditions in their mind and the current one. From this point of view, nations do not have a single and strict definition. Different definitions have been made from the past to the present, and there are reflections of that on the identities of individuals. For example, if a nation is built on primordial thought, it is almost impossible to join it. From this point of view, the nation and thus national identity can be changed by society or the state. In brief, national identity can be constructed differently depending on the context and the target person, like the central hypothesis of this thesis. Last, national identity can be missing if this historical and theoretical perspective is not given. Therefore, national identity can be examined more deeply now.

Therefore, the different definitions of national identity affect the identification and the criteria for inclusion of others in national identity. According to this, the idea of a nation behind the national identity is a more significant predictor of explaining attitudes toward others rather than the level of identification (Pehrson et al., 2009b; Pehrson & Green, 2010; Maddens et al., 2000; Meeus et al., 2010; Yogeeswaran et al., 2012). In this context, national identity has been defined in the literature within different dimensions such as Ascriptive vs. Voluntaristic, Objectivist vs. Voluntaristic, and Ethnic-cultural vs. Civic (Billiet et al., 2003; Jones & Smith, 2001). In this context,

we can express the definition as a collective definition that first emerged by the state, based on the statements of modernist and ethno-symbolist theorists, and becomes personal. Besides, Kohn (2005) implied the most common classification of national identity is the two forms introduced, civic versus ethnic. In this context, national identity markers can be considered important dimensions that define a national identity. While the civic markers of national identity or civic nationalism expresses citizenship with common rules and territory in the Western sense, the ethnic markers of national identity or ethnic nationalism expresses citizenship based on blood ties and is more common in Eastern European and Asian countries (Kohn,2005).

First, if national identity is a civic, it refers to people living in particular geography within common rules. Civic national identity is similar to a social contract; therefore, it has been described in a Western way (Kohn, 2005; Smith, 1991). Accordingly, individuals who comply with the regulations and laws of the state and actively participate in the state from the national ingroup and the state is established based on "jus soli" (Brubaker, 1990). Kohn (2005) associated civic nationalism with the French type of citizenship that emerged after the Revolution of 1789 in this respect. Furthermore, anyone who meets the civic markers can be included in this national identity. Therefore, such identities were seen as more liberal and inclusive.

Second, the ethnic national identity refers to individuals with common blood ties and origins. Therefore, if the individual has ancestral heritage, they may have this national identity directly. Since not everyone can obtain this kinship, it can also be expressed as an ascribed identity by birth. The states where the national identity is defined in this way were established based on "jus sanguinis," and national identity was created depending on the ethnicity of the dominant group (Brubaker, 1990). Hence, ethnic national identity was seen as the product of romantic thought, and reference was made to Volkgeist and the German type of citizenship (Bilgin, 2014; Kohn, 2005). Therefore, national identity based on ethnicity leads to xenophobic and discriminatory attitudes (Hjerm, 1998; Maddens et al., 2000; Wright, 2011). For instance, Pehrson et al. (2009b) found that individuals who see national identity as essentialist have more harmful and discriminatory attitudes towards asylum seekers. As a result, it is challenging to get involved in an ethnic national identity from the outside.

Defining national identity by two poles as identity ethnic and civic has been criticized. One of them is the criticism made within the framework of multiculturalism, which asserts that the cultural aspect of national identity is not included in this classification. Therefore, it is not correct to evaluate the cultural factors of national identity depending solely on ethnic or civic. Kymlicka (2001) implied that there are also national groups defined culturally, such as Quebec in Canada and Catalonia in Spain. The cultural markers of national identity unites such groups around shared cultural values. Accordingly, anyone who adopts this culture can be included in the national identity, which is much more inclusive (Kymlicka, 2012). However, this view has received significant criticism because adopting another culture need distance from own culture to a certain extent.

Therefore, adopting another culture means moving away from its own culture, and thus it was concluded with assimilation even though it is much more inclusive than an ethnic representation (Kadianaki & Andreouli, 2015). Moreover, Reijerse et al. (2013) found that cultural identity has negative attitudes towards immigrants in parallel with ethnic identity because, according to the results, cultural identity contains blatant racism. Therefore, while ethnic and cultural identities are seen as essentialist and exclusionary, civic identity is included in the literature as a more unifying concept (Reijerse et al., 2013). In this regard, Pakulski (1997) mentioned that it is challenging to establish cultural citizenship. For this reason, ethnic and cultural markers are taken together under a single dimension of ethno-cultural in this study.

On the other hand, the idea that civic nationalism is more inclusive and liberal towards immigrants and minorities has also been criticized. For example, Devos et al. (2020) found that individuals who think New Zealand's national identity is civic are more opposed to resource policies towards minorities and, therefore, have a more significant stake in legitimizing inequalities. Also, Leong et al. (2020) conducted a cross-cultural study in which they found that when national identity was defined as civic, it was positively correlated with perceived immigrant threats among the Western samples, e.q., Finland, Canada, and Australia. Besides, the research suggested that civic representation is not always inclusive, according to their discourse analysis study on essentialism and citizenship representations (Kadianaki &Andreouli, 2015). In addition, Simonsen and Bonikowski (2019) found that although ethnic nationalism and prejudice against Muslims correlate positively in most countries and negatively in

civic, this relationship has changed in Northwest countries. Accordingly, civic nationalism and anti-Muslim attitudes were positively related in these countries. Simonsen and Bonikowski (2019) interpreted that ethnic nationalism may be hidden under civic because it is not very welcome in these countries. For example, Billig (1995) describes this situation as "banal nationalism" that is hidden to emerge at any moment and is repeated day to day with certain national symbols (e.q. sports events, money).

Another criticism of ethnic and civic national identity definitions is the prejudice against non-Western societies and the portrayal of Western countries as pure civic. First, Kuzio (2002) states that having purely ethnic or civic national identity can only be found in theory and also says that Western states are established ethnically and then have acquired a civic character. Furthermore, Bjorklund (2006) found no valid ethnic nation definition in Eastern Europe. For instance, both ethnic and civic scale items were rated highly in Poland, and low ratings were found for both ethnic and civic items in Lithuania. Nowadays, these Western civic nations have shifted to ethnic nationalism and racism during crises (Kuzio, 2002). In addition, Yack (1996) states that the ethnic and civic distinction also supports many prejudice regarding Western and Eastern states in individuals' minds, such as Westerners are rational while Easterners are more emotional. Also, it is wrong to define countries as ethnic or civic because it is more accurate to evaluate these definitions within the country rather than between countries (Pehrson, 2019; Komisarof & Leong, 2020).

Also, it is a problematic method to directly measure the rating of the dimensions of national identity as civic and ethnic in the light of such criticisms; therefore, researchers have resorted to different methods to measure content of national identity in recent years. Pehrson (2019) used the latent class analysis method because although the factors are separated as ethnic and civic, individuals can simultaneously score high in both elements. It could also be emphasized that an individual can simultaneously have national identity dimensions as high or low ethnic, civic, and cultural (Kadianakis & Andreoli, 2015; Komisarof & Leong, 2020). Phua et al. (2020) also examined national identity using network and latent class analysis methods. In another study, Wright et al. (2012) measured content of national identity with both rating and ranking methods and found that ranking better predicted the views of American citizens about immigrant policy. Therefore, in the current study, the

ranking method will be used to measure national identity to decrease ethnic and civic dichotomy.

Last, national identity has a flexible and changeable, sometimes even contradictory, structure and, as a result, consistently exhibits both inclusive and exclusionary features (Perkins et al., 2019). Bechhofer et al. (1999) also stated that national identities are not fixed and given structures but are constructed by individuals interactively according to context and time. In this respect, Leong et al. (2020) found that despite the dual distribution of ethnic and civic markers, different items were predicated on various factors in each society. Indeed, the items loaded on the dimensions of national identity change according to variables such as age and educational status within society (Pehrson, 2019; Phua et al., 2020). Furthermore, Komisarof and Leong (2020) state that national identity definitions may change depending on the status of the target person. Komisarof et al. (2020) found in their study with Japanese university students that while low-status immigrants are expected to adapt to sociolinguistic and ethnic markers that are difficult to meet, adaptation to socioeconomic features is expected from high-status immigrants. Similarly, the attitudes of individuals towards immigrants from different statuses and backgrounds are examined in this thesis. It was expected that when individuals read a vignette about an immigrant from Syrian, they would rank ethnocultural national identity markers, which had more difficult expectancies, as more important for being Turkish. On the other hand, when they read a vignette about a British immigrant, it was expected that they would rank the civic national identity marker as more important. Because according to Harlak (1998), Turkish people have better attitudes to Western people, and Syrian people have been at the center of many negative attitudes lately (Efe, 2019; Kardeş et al., 2017; Pandır et al., 2015).

Taken together, nations and national identities are concepts that have entered life mainly since the 19th century and can change according to the context. In particular, the definition of national identities as ethnic or civic affects attitudes towards others. However, seeing national identity as pure ethnic or pure civic with all its components leads to missing its changeable structure. Today, these socially constructed structures can change shape very quickly, and previously inclusive identities can become more exclusionary or exclusionary identities more inclusive. Therefore, I examined the variability of national identity markers when encountering

immigrants from different countries in this study. It might be essential to mention prejudice while examining national identity and attitudes towards immigrants. Because while prejudice is an essential variable of attitudes towards immigrants, it is also vital to integrate immigrants into the host country.

1.3. National Identity and Prejudice

This section examines the inclusiveness of national identity, especially for minorities and immigrants, and the effects of prejudice on this. In this context, both the integration of immigrants with national identity and the attitudes of others towards immigrants in the context of this national identity are reciprocally crucial in this process. Therefore, the integration of others into national identity is linked to conflicts between their ethnic and religious identity and national identity. Hence, the inclusiveness of national identity for minorities has also been an essential topic of discussion because when individuals belonging to minority groups establish high identification with their group, their national identity becomes weaker (Sidanius & Petrocik, 2001; Martiny et al., 2017; Martiny et al., 2019; Molina et al., 2015; Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). For example, Verkuyten and Yildiz (2007) investigated the identification of Turkish-Dutch Muslims in the Netherlands, and they found that individuals with high identification with Turkish and Muslim identity show lower identification with Dutch identity. In another study, Sidanius and Petrocik (2001) examined the identification of blacks and whites with USA identity and their ethnic identity. The results showed that Blacks' USA national identification decreased when their ethnic identity increased, but this was not the case for whites. Gong (2007) found that American-born Asian Americans had a high positive correlation between ethnic identity and American national identity, but this relationship was not observed for non-American-born Asians. Also, Devos et al. (2010) found a positive correlation between ethnic identification and national identification for Caucasian Americans, but there was a negative correlation between ethnic and national identifications of Latin Americans. From this point of view, it is seen that sometimes there are differences between the national and ethnic identifications of the majority and minority groups; as a result of this, minorities may be subject to prejudice.

Mainly even if individuals are minorities who are citizens of the country, the conflict between these identities makes their adaptation very difficult. Indeed, Martiny et al. (2017) revealed that as the ethnic identification increases in German students of Turkish origin, national identity belonging decreases. Furthermore, Fleischmann and Phalet (2017) found that Muslim youth in five major European countries (Belgium, England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden) have less integration than other minorities and the majority. One of the most important reasons for this is discrimination against ethnic and religious identities. For instance, Fleischmann et al. (2019), in a longitudinal study, revealed that in German teenagers who reported high perceived discrimination due to their ethnic identity, identification with German identity decreased, and identification with minority ethnic identities increased. Furthermore, Molina et al. (2015) found that perceived discrimination decreases national identity endorsement and increases ethnic identity endorsement, especially in Latino and Black minority groups. In addition, Yogeeswaran et al. (2011) found that unconscious public disclosure of ethnic origin by non-White Americans lowered their perceived Americanness. According to this, although participants did not show discrimination against the conscious expression of ethnic origin, it has been found that they find it more legitimate for the whites to express their ethnic origins unconsciously in public. Also, Smeekes et al. (2011) found that inadequate investment in national identity in the Netherlands led to greater tolerance for Muslims to express their rights. Moreover, Velasco González et al. (2008) reported that individuals who identify highly with the Dutch national identity perceive more symbolic threats from Muslims and have more prejudice towards them. In essence, some definitions of national identity causes significant problems between majority and minority groups, even in Western countries which see themselves as more egalitarian and democratic.

On the other hand, a more complex process appears considering the issue of adaptation to national identity for immigrants. Moreover, the adaptation and integration of immigrants are currently contentious issues due to globalization and increased mobility. In particular, immigrants need to identify with the national identity of the host country (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012) because bonding with the host country's national identity could decrease the perception of group rejection (Verkuyten & Yildiz, 2007). Individuals who do not conform to host country values are exposed to more discrimination; therefore, they become more attached to their ethnic and

religious identities and distance themselves from the host national identity. Martiny et al. (2019) found that discrimination experience harms national identity. Also, according to Esses et al. (2001), there is a dilemma about immigrants because neither economically lower-level immigrants nor financially successful ones are welcome. Those who are economically low were not liked since they receive social welfare help, and those who are higher level were not liked because they create competition. Pehrson and his colleagues (2009a) found in their study on International Social Survey Programme (ISSP) 2003 data that the correlation between national identification and prejudice was weakly negative in only one country out of 31 countries (Venezuela = -0.06) but positive in 18 countries (the United States = 0.08 to Denmark = 0.37). In another study, Pettigrew et al. (2007) found that anti-immigration attitudes are strong, especially in elderly and uneducated individuals, and are associated with political conservatism, authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and perceived collective threat. However, the same attitudes are not exhibited towards every immigrant. Bourhis and Dayan (2004) examined the host country participants' acculturation attitudes towards Jewish Russian and Ethiopian refugees and Arab origin refugees, and they found that the participants displayed more discriminatory and exclusionary orientations towards Arabs rather than integration thoughts. From this point of view, it is seen that some immigrants are more acceptable because they have values closer to that nation.

Taken together, minorities and immigrants become the target of discrimination when not integrated into the national identity of host country. As a result of this discrimination, another dilemma arises, and individuals who are discriminated against are more attached to their ethnic or religious identities and less associated with the host country's national identity. Therefore, this thesis examined the relationship between discrimination and national identity in the context of immigrants. Especially in Turkey, where the number of immigrants, asylum seekers, and individuals with temporary protection status is increasing yearly, examining national identity is vital for integration into national identity and overcoming discrimination.

1.4. Turkish National Identity

This section explains the creation processes of Turkish national identity, its perspective toward others, and current problems. First, a section was started with the disintegration process of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic. Because many problems in today's Turkish national identity have emerged due to these two processes, their effects continue to increase from time to time. First, the Ottoman Empire had a multicultural structure spreading over three continents and containing communities of various languages, religions, and colors. The empire kept these differences together for many years with the form of self-government divided into provinces and the "Ottoman Millet System," which was formed by the authority to provide the religious groups with its law (Cagaptay, 2006). However, when the empire entered a period of stagnation and decline in connection with the social dynamics in Europe, different groups wanted to establish their independent states. Ottoman rulers and elites embarked on reform movements to keep the society together. Üstel (2019) states that the Ottomans tried to create a common Ottoman identity by holding back individuals' ethnic and religious backgrounds during the Constitutional Period. For example, citizenship was defined in Kanun-i Esasi, which was the first and last constitution of the Ottoman Empire, as "the sentence of the people who are under the citizenship of the Ottoman Empire is called Ottoman, no matter what religion or sect they belong to..." in a very inclusive way in 1876 (Killi & Gözübüyük, 2006, p. 36). However, this idea has been far removed mainly due to the differences caused by the nationalist movement in the Balkans. As stated by modernist theorists, a new nation must be built after the empire. With the establishment of the Republic of Türkiye, the Turkish nation and Turkish national identity have been turned into an axis.

The Republic of Türkiye also did not change the definition of inclusive citizenship from the Ottoman Empire. In this context, the criterion of being Turkish was defined as "The people of Türkiye would be accepted as Turkish in terms of citizenship regardless of religion or race" in the first constitution of the Republic of Türkiye in 1924 (Killi & Gözübüyük, 2006, p. 45). The definition of Turkish citizenship in the 1961 constitution and the 1982 constitution is not different from these founding elements (Killi & Gözübüyük, 2006, p. 50-70). Although an ancestral origin bonding with citizenship in law was not stated, there are some culturally emphasized points. For example, Gökalp (2019), who is one of the most critical ideologists of the republic, also said, "Nation; it is a group of people who have a

common language, religion, morality, and fine arts, that is, individuals who have received the same upbringing… A person wants to live with people with whom they have a common language and religion, rather than people with a common blood heritage." (p. 37). Kadıoğlu (1996) describes this situation as a paradox of Turkish national identity and argues that a situation includes both civic and cultural elements coexisting. Yeğen (2017) also emphasized that "..... Turkish nationhood has been quite flexible in deciding who may or may not become Turkish. In other words, Turkish nationhood seems to have been kaleidoscopic in nature, meaning it has been arbitrarily inclusive or exclusive depending on context." (p. 336). Therefore, although the national identity has been civically formed in the constitutions, it has many differences in practice.

Notwithstanding that there is no discrimination based on religion or race in legal written sources, minorities and non-Muslims have been subjected to inequity in different periods of history. Firstly, the young Turkish republic tried to build the Turkish identity as a common identity, bringing together groups of different ethnic and religious origins in the country (Cagaptay, 2006). For this purpose, organizations such as the Turkish Historical Society and the Turkish Language Society were established. They developed the Sun Language Theory, which claims that all languages originate from Turkish, and the Turkish History Thesis, which makes connections with ancient civilizations in Anatolia (such as Hitits and Sümers) to create a shared history and cultural origin (Cagaptay, 2004; Kirişçi, 1998). As Hobsbawm (2000) emphasized, a bond with the past was built for the newly established state, and new traditions were created. However, this single nation which was tried to be built contrasted with the multicultural structure of Anatolia and Thrace, so the differences were attempted to be minimized in this process since this geography was home to many different groups such as Arabs, Kurds, Greeks, Albanians, Laz, Bosnians, Armenians, Circassians, Pomaks, Abkhazians, Jews, and more (Cagaptay, 2004).

In this context, although the republican regime set out with the goal of being secular and Western, it gradually moved from this ideal to a more ethnic, cultural, and religious structure. Although non-Muslim minorities were the only group that received minority status with the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 and had the right to open their schools, they were exposed to severe discrimination for years (Çayır, 2015). These minorities were systematically prevented from taking office in the higher positions of

the state. For example, they could not hold superior positions in the army or foreign affairs (Yeğen, 2004). Similarly, their wealth has also been an essential topic of discussion both on public and political grounds (Goalwin, 2018). They were targeted increasingly as the country deteriorated economically, especially before and during World War II. As a result, they were exposed to very high taxes (Varlık Vergisi-The Wealth Tax) compared to Muslims, and even those who could not pay were sent to the labor camp in Aşkale on 11 November 1942 (İnce, 2012a). In the following decade, the people revolted and looted the shops and places of minorities in Istanbul on 6-7 September 1955 after dubious news (the bombing of Atatürk's house in Thessaloniki) spread (Kuyucu, 2005). On the other hand, this religious cement of national identity includes discrimination against non-Muslims and also against other non-Sunni Muslim sects. For instance, the "Cemevi," which is the place of worship of Alevis, is not given the official status of a religious institution, and therefore they cannot benefit from various rights (see also Borovalı & Boyraz, 2016 for depth information).

Moreover, Turkish was accepted as the national language, and preventive actions were taken against other languages to create a single identity in the country and bring all groups together within this framework. For example, in this respect, the names of places and regions in Kurdish were changed to Turkish (Kadıoglu, 2007; Yeğen, 2004). The state has tried to achieve unity on language through campaigns such as "Citizen Speak Turkish," even for minorities with a higher degree of adaptation, such as Jews (Cagaptay, 2004). At the same time, using languages other than Turkish is prohibited by law (Çayır, 2015). As Anderson (2006) states in nation building, Ottoman Turkish has been replaced by a more local language, Turkish, but other Anatolian languages have decreased "by unnatural ways" due to the construction based on this single language. Aydıngün and Aydıngün (2004) argued that the founders of the republic saw language as the most crucial element of unity of the state and used it as a unifying cultural element for a homogeneous society built with shared values. Therefore, education has played an essential role in creating this homogeneous and uniform nation (Çayır, 2015; İnce, 2012b; Üstel, 2019).

The founders of the Republic of Türkiye aimed to create a Western and secular citizen. Although this ideal does not have ethnic and racist foundations, the project of creating a uniform citizen has been fed from this direction. In this respect, Yeğen (2017) criticizes the view that Turkish national identity is civic in theory but ethnic in

practice and argues that it is civic, ancestral, and cultural and seems exclusionary and discriminatory in theory and practice. For example, The Turkish Review of Anthropology was established in 1925 and aimed to find anthropological evidence for the origin of the Turkish nation (Maksudyan, 2005). According to Yanarocak (2016), mainly the Kurds, who are the most significant ethnic minority in Türkiye, opposed this situation with revolts such as Koçgiri (1920), Sheikh Said (1925), and Ağrı (1927). This conflict between the Kurds and the state continues, especially after the establishment of the Kurdistan Workers Party (Partiya Karkeran Kurdistan – PKK) in the 1980s (McDowall, 2000). However, although this nation-building strategy includes assimilation, it consists of creating a shared cultural nation rather than an essentialist approach. Therefore, Cagaptay (2004) also argued that race had a cultural meaning rather than a biological meaning in the republic's founders. For example, Al (2015) also implies that this assimilation project carried out by the state is not only for ethnically non-Turkish minorities but also for all people who are not urban yet, as a nation-building activity. As a result, it can be seen that Kemalism did not aim to establish an ethnic hegemony but to transform the whole society.

Nevertheless, the republic's unified and contemporary citizen project suffered many wounds over time and went a different road. The idea of suppressing cultural differences and creating uniform citizenship has led to many problems. First, Kemalism tried to maintain its western and secular structure and attempted to build a democratic and multi-party life. Türkiye moved to a multi-party regime in the 1950s after the long-running Republican People's Party's (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi) sole rule (Tachau, 2000). However, it did not last long and was interrupted by the 1960 military coup. Although the country was opened to a more liberal and democratic environment with the 1961 constitution, it ended with political chaos (Daldal, 2004; Harris, 2011). Therefore, the generals who seized power with the 12 September 1980 military coup built citizenship in an ethnocultural context in the 1982 Constitution, and the "Turk-Islam Synthesis" project began (Yanarocak, 2016). After that, the march of "Post-Kemalism" to power started with the more visible Islamist-conservative and Kurdish opposition circles (Aytürk, 2015). Today, the Justice and Development Party (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi – [AKP]) government has been holding power since 2002 and has been displaying a nationalist, conservative, and autocratic administration increasingly since the 2013 "Gezi Parkı" Protests and the 15 July 2016 failed Military Coup.

Although many reform movements took place in the country in this process, they came into being as a religious and nationalist autocracy. For instance, although the National Security course and The Student Oath have been abolished from the education system and headscarved students have been allowed in universities, it also receives significant criticism for the secularity of education (Çayır, 2015). The dilemmas of the Turkish national identity seem to continue with the new ones.

Today, one of the most critical dilemmas in national identity is the population of immigrants and asylum seekers in Türkiye, which has increased tremendously with the Syrian Civil War and the Taliban's rise to power in Afghanistan. According to the latest data published on 31 March 2022 by the Turkish Presidency of Migration Management (Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Göç İdaresi Başkanlığı - [PMM], n.d.), there are 5,165,414 foreign nationals in Türkiye, of whom 1,401,849 have a residence permit. However, the majority of this number, approximately 4 million, is Syrians under temporary protection. According to Sunata's (2020) report, 50.9% of Syrian respondents do not consider returning to Syria when conditions are favorable. In addition, 46.4% of the Syrian participants do not intend to leave Türkiye. On the other hand, it is observed that there are increasing negative feelings towards refugees in the country. In the recent report published by Kentel (2022), the Syrians were found as the most marginalized group, and the participants expressed issues about them such as "Syrians being lazy," "receiving help from the state," "dressing up," and "having many children" about them. For instance, Yitmen and Verkuyten (2017) found that participants with a high national identification with Turkish national identity have a more negative attitude towards refugees. Therefore, a detailed examination of Turkish national identity is vital for establishing integration and multiculturalism.

1.5. Aim of the Current Research

In this study, I aimed to examine whether individuals' importance of being Turkish on national identity markers has changed towards different immigrants. First of all, although most studies in the literature treat national identity as ethnic and civic and as fixed within the country, it varies according to the context (Bechhofer et al.,1999; Komisarof et al., 2020; Komisarof & Leong, 2020; Perkins et al. 2019). Individuals make different evaluations of immigrants who are seen as "worthy" and

"worthless" (Montreuil & Bourhis, 2001). Also, Harlak (1998) found that while participants had more positive stereotypes toward Western nations, they had more negative stereotypes towards neighboring countries of Turkey. In this study, we wanted there to be a maximum difference between two immigrants to show that the markers of national identity will vary based on the willingness to accept immigrants from different backgrounds (national origins.). To put it slightly differently, prejudice towards some groups would lead people to accept the most stringent criteria (e.g., speaking Turkish, having a Turkish name, having parents of Turkish origin) as a precondition to "Turkishness" whereas liking or sympathy towards other national groups would make them appear more desirable and lead to more lenient criteria (e.g. citizenship status) to be adopted to be counted as Turkish. In other words, national origin of a target immigrant would lead to adoption of different criteria defining Turkishness (i.e., ranking of importance of different markers of Turkish identity). Therefore, we choose one of the protagonists from Britain and the other from Syria. Therefore, I aimed to demonstrate that individuals do not have a monolithic national identity concept, and it can change according to the target person. In this view, I wanted to reveal that they show different attitudes towards different immigrants. Also, as mentioned before, this study has relevance to Turkish national identity literature in two respects: First, the diverse nature of Turkish national identity in law and practice (Cagaptay, 2006; Yeğen, 2004); and -second, the growing immigrant population in Türkiye. In addition, Turkish national identity, like other national identities, is changeable in terms of who will be included and who will be excluded (Yeğen, 2017). Therefore, it is essential to research attitudes towards immigrants for Türkiye in the present and future. For this purpose, participants were given a vignette about a British and a Syrian immigrant and then asked to rank items related to Turkish national identity in order of importance. Thus, alternative measurement methods have been presented to the literature besides ethnic-civic measurement of national identity, and novel perspectives were brought into the issue of Turkish national identity and immigrants.

Hypotheses:

H1: The order of national identity markers for being Turkish will change according to the country of origin of the described immigrant. (Syrian and British).

H1.1: The average rank of ethnic markers will be lower (as more important) in the Syrian immigrant condition than the British condition.

H1.2: The average rank of civic markers will be lower (as more important) in the British immigrant condition than the Syrian condition.

H2: Prejudice toward Syrian immigrant and British and national identification of participants will predict the order of civic and ethnocultural national identity markers in Syrian immigrant and British conditions.

H3: Participants will show greater prejudice toward Syrian immigrant than toward British immigrant.

H4: Participants will give more approval to British immigrant for obtaining Turkish citizenship than Syrian immigrant.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

2.1. Measurements

2.1.1. Procedure

An approval from METU Human Subjects Ethics Committee (HSEC) was obtained to conduct the study before data collection (see Appendix A). The study was conducted through an online questionnaire created on Qualtrics. The convenience sampling method was used in the study, and the participants were reached through the METU SONA system for extra course credit and social media via links. The study had a repeated design and consisted of two stages. The order was counterbalanced. Therefore, participants were randomly assigned to one of the vignettes containing Syrian or British immigrants in the first stage. In the second stage, they saw the other vignette. For example, if the participant saw the Syrian immigrant vignette in the first stage, they saw the British immigrant vignette in the second stage.

The informed consent form took place at the beginning of the questionnaire. Participants were given detailed information about the scales used in the study and could get points if they participated in both studies. Participants were not aware of the actual hypotheses at the beginning; instead, they were told they were participating in a study "on interpersonal relations and political views." This deception was used to conceal the purpose of the research. After the demographic information form was collected, as mentioned the participants were given vignettes whose main character was an immigrant living in Turkey for some time. All other details were identical in both vignettes, except for the main character's ethnic background (Syrian vs. British). Participants were randomly assigned to one of these two vignettes and saw the other

vignette in the other session. Immediately after reading the vignette, a manipulation check was given with questions about the story's details; to see whether the participants had read the story. Afterward, the Attraction Scale was presented, and they were asked to evaluate the protagonist on this scale to further distract the participants from the actual hypotheses. Subsequently, the Social Distance, Turkish National Identity Markers, and Turkish Identification Scales were given, respectively. After the scales, whether they approved the granting of Turkish citizenship to the immigrant in the story was asked the participants with one question.

At the end of the first stage, participants were asked for their e-mail addresses. A week after participation in the first part, an automatic e-mail was sent to these e-mail addresses, and a reminder e-mail was sent two days after that. User codes automatically created by Qualtrics were used to match the data. A week time cap was used so the participants could not figure out the study's central hypothesis. In addition, it was used to prevent participants from remembering their answers and behaving consistently according to them and also overcome a response bias.

As mentioned, e-mail addresses were obtained from the participants to ensure their participation in the following study. The same procedure with the same scales was followed in the second stage; only the protagonist's ethnicity in the story was changed. Finally, the funnel debrief method was used to check whether the participants understood the experimental manipulation and thus the actual hypotheses of the study. In greater detail, participants were asked about the purpose of the study, whether they noticed anything peculiar in the study, and whether they had prior knowledge regarding the study in this funnel debrief. At the end of the second stage, a detailed debrief form was given to apologize to the participants for using deception, and the study's hypotheses were explained. The completion of two surveys took approximately 30 minutes.

2.1.2. National Identity Markers

National identity markers were measured by ranking nine items in order of personal importance for participants. These items were taken from the National Identity Markers Scale developed by Cingöz-Ulu (2008). In this scale, participants are asked to evaluate sentences related to definitions of Turkishness (on a Likert-point,

from 1 to 7, 1 being 'not at all,' and 7 being 'very important). The scale included three dimensions with seven items in the ethno-cultural dimension, nine in the civic dimension, and two in the affective dimension, making up a total of 18 items. To determine the marker items used in this study, Cingöz-Ulu and Özakay (2022) used five data sets to examine the consistently stable items. Therefore, this study's markers were determined according to their loading scores on these analyses. Although, the "Being Muslim" item had a low loading score, it was included in this study due to the theoretical framework. Four items from the ethno-cultural dimension (e.g., Coming from the Turkish race) and five from the civic dimension (e.g., Owning and respecting Turkish laws and institutions) were selected for this study (see Appendix B).

2.1.3. Experimental Manipulation Vignette

Following the demographic information form, each participant was given one of two versions of a story with the protagonist as an immigrant (Within-Subject Design). The main protagonists of these stories were Mahmoud from Damascus and James from London. Except for these two conditions, everything else about the story was the same. The target person in the story came to Turkey for college, started working there, and married a Turkish woman. Also, the hobbies of the protagonist were mentioned as music and football, and various aspects of his adaptation to Turkish culture (e.g., his food choices, proficiency in the Turkish language, knowledge about the Turkish political agenda) were highlighted. In the final paragraph of the story, it is stated that Mahmoud or James has applied for Turkish citizenship and was planning a future in Turkey with his wife (see Appendix C).

2.1.4. Prejudice

The 6-item Likert type Social Distance Scale developed by Bogardus (1967) was used to measure participants' prejudice against the story's protagonist (see Appendix D). Participants evaluated how comfortable they would be engaging in various social relationships with the target people in the story. Participants evaluated each item on a scale ranging from 1 (I would not feel uncomfortable at all) to 7 (I

would feel highly uncomfortable). The internal reliability scores were .937 in the Syrian immigrant condition and .881 in the British immigrant condition. All items were summed and then averaged. Higher scores indicate that participants would like to have a more social distance from the target person, thus showing more prejudice towards them. Balaban (2013) adapted the social distance scale to Turkish.

2.1.5. Turkish Identification

Turkish identification was measured by the 10-item Likert type scale developed by Leach et al. (2008). The Multi-Component In-Group Identification scale (MCI) was adapted to Turkish by Balaban (2013). Although MCI contains multiple dimensions, in this study, the group-level self-definition dimension with two different components: self-stereotyping and in-group homogeneity, was used for measuring identification (see Appendix E). The participants evaluated the statements on the extent they belonged to Turkishness. The internal reliability scores were .928 in the Syrian immigrant condition and .933 in the British immigrant condition. The scale was rated on a 7-point Likert type, all items were summed, and then averaged, and higher scores indicate more identification (1 = I strongly disagree, 7 = I strongly agree) (e.g., "I feel committed to Turks," and “I feel a bond with Turks").

2.1.6. Interpersonal Attraction

The inclusion of this scale aimed to hide the study's main hypotheses from the participants, so it just was used for distraction (see Appendix F). In this study, the attractiveness of the target person in the story was evaluated with the social attraction (e.g., I think he (she) could be a friend of mine) and task attraction (e.g., I have confidence in his (her) ability to get the job done) dimensions of the Interpersonal Attraction Scale developed by McCroskey and McCain (1974). The original scale also includes the physical attraction, which was not applied in the current study. Participants rated ten items on a 7-point scale (1 = I strongly disagree, 7 = I strongly agree).

2.1.7. Demographics

The participants were asked to indicate their gender, age, the city where they were born and lived, education level, socioeconomic status, education level of their mother and father, income, ethnicity, reliogisity, and conservativeness on the demographic information form (see Appendix G).

2.2. Sample

2.2.1. Sample Size Rationale

G*Power 3.1 (Faul et al., 2007) was used to calculate a required minimum sample size with power analysis. The number of participants was decided for the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test due to the power analysis for one tail, a minimally interesting effect size of 0.5, the α error probability of 0.1, and a minimum desired power of 0.95. As a result, the required sample size was sixty-nine for a Wilcoxon Signed-rank test. Besides, the required minimum sample size for ordinal logistic regression was calculated based on the rule of event per variable (EPV). Van Smeden et al. (2016) recommended an EPV of 10, and Austin and Steyerberg (2014) suggested an EPV of 20 instead. However, Bujang et al. (2018) recommended more conservatively the concept of EPV 50 and a minimum 100 sample size. Finally, the required sample size was a hundred because of two independent variables (prejudice toward target immigrant and national identification of participant) for ordinal logistic regression. Since the study had two phases, the number of participants in the second phase was expected to be at least 100. Therefore, more than a hundred participants participated in the first phase (total N = 272), and 127 participants participated in the second phase. Additional analyses were conducted with participants (N = 145) who only participated in the first phase and not the second phase.

2.2.2. Participants

A hundred and twenty-seven individuals participated in the study. The responses of the five participants were excluded because they anticipated the study's true purpose according to the funnel debrief. Therefore, a hundred and twenty-two participants (86 female, 36 male) consisted in the overall sample (see Table 1). Thirty-five participants participated in the study for extra class points through the SONA system. The other ninety-two participants participated in the study through links on social media. Age of participants ranged from 18 to 65 (M = 28.8, SD = 10.9). All participants had at least a high school degree (38 participants had a high school degree, 61 had a bachelor's degree, and 23 had a post-graduate degree). Most participants considered their socioeconomic status moderate (M = 2.92, SD = 0.78, on 1-5 five-point Likert), and their average income was 13 thousand 943 Turkish liras. In addition, %68.8 percent of the participants reported their religious group was Muslims (75 participants). Although 76 percent of the participants stated that they were members of a religious group, their level of religiosity (M = 4.34, SD = 3.44, on 0-10 eleven-point Likert) and their level of conservatism (M = 3.66, SD = 2.95, on 0-10 eleven-point Likert) were below midpoint. Participants placed their political ideologies near the left of the center (M = 4.07, SD = 2.31, on 1-11 eleven-point Likert). Most participants identified their ethnicity as Turk directly (82 participants / %71.3).

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants (n = 122)

Variables	Category	f	%
Gender	Female	86	70.5
	Male	36	29.5
Education	High School Degree	38	31.1
	Bachelor's Degree	61	50
	Post Graduate Degree	23	18.9
Ethnicity	Turkish	82	70.4
	Kurdish	4	3.4

Table 1 (Cont'd)	Other Minority	8	6.9
	Multiple Identity with Turkish	6	5.2
	None	16	13.8
Belief in Religion	Yes	76	62.3
	No	46	37.7
Religious Group	Muslim	75	68.2
	Atheist	6	5.5
	Deist	5	4.5
	None	24	21.8
The city where the participant mostly lives	Metropol	75	61.5
	City	29	23.8
	District	14	11.5
	Neighborhood	2	1.6
	Village	2	1.6
Socioeconomic Status	Lower	4	3.3
	Lower Middle	30	24.6
	Middle	61	50
	Higher Middle	26	21.3
	Higher	1	0.8
Participant's Mother's Education	Just literate	6	4.9
	Primary school degree	31	25.4
	Secondary school degree	8	6.6
	High School Degree	27	22.1
	Bachelor's Degree	46	37.7
	Post Graduate Degree	4	3.3

Table 1 (Cont'd)

Participant's Father's Education	Just literate	2	1.6
	Primary school degree	16	13.1
	Secondary school degree	14	11.5
	High School Degree	29	23.8
	Bachelor's Degree	49	40.2
	Post Graduate Degree	12	9.8

2.2.3. Participants of Additional Analyses in Between Subject Design

Additional analyses were made using the data of the participants who participated only in the first part of the study in order to prevent those responses from going to waste. Some participants joined the first part of the study but did not register mail addresses or failed to participate in the second part. Therefore, these participants were combined and analyzed with a between-subject design.

A total of 145 participants (80 females, 64 males, and one not specified) constitute this sample. From this sample, 33 participants did not give their e-mails, and 113 did not attend the second stage despite giving e-mails. Sixty-seven participants participated in the study for extra points through the SONA system. The other seventy-eight participants participated in the study through links on social media. Age of participants ranged from 19 to 62 (M = 27.6, SD = 10.8). All participants had at least a high school degree (74 participants had a high school degree, 55 had a bachelor's degree, and 16 had a post-graduate degree). Most participants considered their socioeconomic status to be middle class (M = 2.87, SD = 0.78, on 1-5 five-point Likert), and their average income was 10 thousand 205 Turkish liras. Seventy-three participants (51%) stated that they were members of a religious group, while seventy-one (49%) participants stated that they were not. Additionally, the impact of religion on their daily lives (M = 3.46, SD = 2.76, on 0-10 eleven-point Likert) and their level of conservatism (M = 2.82, SD = 2.49, on 0-10 eleven-point Likert) were below average. Also, the most prevalent religious group among the sample was Muslims (75

participants / 60.5%). Participants placed their political ideologies near the left of the central (M = 3.99, SD = 2.26, on 1-11 eleven-point Likert). Most participants identified their ethnicity as Turkish directly (106 participants / 78.5%).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

First, the order effect was controlled by conducting a one-way ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis tests. For this purpose, it was examined whether seeing British immigrant (James) or Syrian (Mahmoud) in the first part made any difference in the variables of prejudice toward target immigrants, national identification, and national identity markers. Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test results revealed that the normality assumption was violated for the variables of prejudice against Syrian immigrant ($W = 0.786$, $p < .001$), prejudice against British immigrant ($W = 0.816$, $p < .001$) and national identification of participant in Syrian condition ($W = 0.974$, $p = 0.018$), and the normality assumption was met for the national identification of participant in British condition ($W = 0.980$, $p = 0.063$) variable. Therefore, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted on prejudice against Syrian immigrant, prejudice against British immigrant, and national identification of participants in Syrian condition and found that there was not a significant difference between seeing Syrian or British in the first session for these variables (respectively; $p = 0.834$, $p = 0.114$, $p = 0.266$). Also, since the variables of ethnocultural national identity markers and civic national identity markers were ordinal, another Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted between participants who first saw Syrian and participants who first saw British. According to the results, there was not a significant difference between these variables according to seeing Syrian or British first (ethnocultural in Syrian; $p = 0.306$, civic in Syrian; $p = 0.306$, ethnocultural in British; $p = 0.509$, civic in British; $p = 0.509$). Further, a one-way ANOVA test was performed to examine the difference between encountering Syrian or James first on the national identification of participants in British condition. First, the homogeneity of variances assumption was

examined and found to have been met ($F\ (1,119)$ = 1.294, p = 0.258), and Fisher's parameters were reported. According to one-way ANOVA results, there was not a significant difference ($F\ (1,119)$ = 2.785, p = 0.098). As a result, it was determined that the order of seeing the vignettes among the variables had no effect

Table 2

Correlation Matrix of Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.National identification on British condition	—									
2.Prejudice toward British immigrant	0.252 **	—								
3. Approval of citizenship of British immigrant	0.111	0.491 ***	—							
4.Ethnocultural markers order in British condition	-0.427 ***	-0.250 **	-0.196 *	—						
5.Civic markers order in British condition	0.427 ***	0.250 **	0.196 *	-1.000 ***	—					
6.National identification on Syrian condition	0.908 ***	0.259 **	0.125	-0.419 ***	0.419 ***	—				
7.Prejudice toward Syrian immigrant	0.200 *	0.658 ***	0.501 ***	-0.255 **	0.255 **	0.189 *	—			
8. Approval of citizenship of Syrian immigrant	0.197 *	0.443 ***	0.622 ***	-0.202 *	0.202 *	0.184 *	0.599 ***	—		
9.Ethnocultural markers order in Syrian immigrant	-0.367 ***	-0.229 *	-0.178 **	0.766 ***	-0.766 ***	-0.379 ***	-0.291 **	-0.260 **	—	
10.Civic markers order in Syrian immigrant	0.367 ***	0.229 *	0.178 **	-0.766 ***	0.766 ***	0.379 ***	0.291 **	0.260 **	-1.000 ***	—
Mean	4.23	1.61	1.12	6.36	3.91	4.34	1.97	1.17	6.37	3.91
SD	1.43	0.75	0.33	1.21	0.97	1.44	1.17	0.38	1.19	0.95

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, Pearson r correlation was reported for variables 1,2,3,6,7,8, and Spearman r correlation was reported for variables 4,5,9, 10.

The difference between the ranking of ethnocultural markers in Syrian condition and British condition and the ranking of civic markers in Syrian condition and British condition was tested with the Wilcoxon Signed-rank test since the measurement of national identity markers was made with the ordinal variable. The Wilcoxon Signed-rank test's result reveals no significant difference between ethnocultural national identity markers in Syrian and British conditions (p = 0.796). Similarly, the difference between civic national identity markers in Syrian and British conditions was investigated with the Wilcoxon signed-rank test and was not significant (p = 0.675). Therefore, no evidence was not found to support Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, and Hypothesis 3. As a result, it was concluded that the ethnocultural and civic markers of national identity did not change significantly for the two target immigrants if the same markers were compared.

However, the result of the Wilcoxon Signed-rank test showed that there was a significant difference between ethnocultural and civic national identity markers in both Syrian condition (W = 5531, r = 0.88, p < .001) and in British condition (W = 5593, r = 0.87, p < .001). For the Syrian condition, the average rank of civic national identity markers (*Mdn* = 3.91) was higher than the average rank of ethnocultural national identity markers (*Mdn* = 6.37). Likewise, the average rank of civic national identity markers (*Mdn* = 3.91) was higher than the average rank of ethnocultural national identity markers (*Mdn* = 6.36) in the British condition.

Table 3

Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results for the order of Ethnocultural and Civic National Identity Markers Syrian condition and British condition

Ethnocultural	Civic	Wilcoxon W	p	Rank biserial correlation
Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition	Ethnocultural Markers in British condition	1758	0.796	0.0329
Civic Markers in Syrian condition	Civic Markers in British condition	1611	0.675	-0.0535
Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition	Civic Markers in Syrian condition	5531	< .001	0.8794
Ethnocultural Markers in British condition	Civic Markers in British condition	5593	< .001	0.8657

An ordinal logistic regression analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of prejudice toward target immigrants and the national identification of participants on ethnocultural national identity markers in the Syrian condition. According to the model fit to the data, prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in ethnocultural national identity markers (X2 = 25.7, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 524, AIC = 558). Hence, as the prejudice of the participants inferred by their social distance increased, the order of importance of the ethnocultural national identity marker for being Turkish decreased by a factor of .66, other factors being equal [(OR, .66; 95% CI, .50 - .87), p = .003]. Therefore, if the order of markers was decreased, the importance of being Turkish was increased. Accordingly, if the participants' prejudice was higher, ethnocultural items were evaluated as 34% more critical for being Turkish in the Syrian condition. Besides, the national identification level of participants rose, and the importance of the ethnocultural national identity marker for being Turkish decreased by a factor of .64; other factors equal [(OR, .64; 95% CI, .50 - .82), p < .001]. According to the result, as the participant identified on a nation higher level, they gave %36 times more importance to ethnocultural markers for being Turkish in Mahmoud's condition.

Table 4

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward Syrian	-0.419	0.141	-2.97	0.003	0.658	0.496	0.867
National Identification	-0.443	0.125	-3.54	< .001	0.642	0.500	0.818

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 25.7$, $p < .001$.

Another series of ordinal logistic regression analyses were conducted to examine the effect of prejudice toward target immigrants and the national identification of participants on ethnocultural national identity markers in the British

condition. The model fit to the data showed that prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in ethnocultural national identity markers (X2 = 28.3, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 532, AIC = 570). Therefore, if the participant had more prejudice toward the target immigrant, the order of importance of the ethnocultural national identity marker for being Turkish increased by a factor of .62, other factors being equal [(OR, .62; 95% CI, .39 - .98), p = .04]. Subsequently, when the participant showed more prejudice toward the target immigrant, ethnocultural national identity markers were ranked %38 times more important. In addition, when the national identification of participants was higher, the order of the ethnocultural national identity marker for being Turkish decreased by a factor of .56; other factors equal [(OR, .56; 95% CI, .43 - .72), p < .001]. Accordingly, as participants' national identification increased, ethnocultural national identity markers were considered %44 times more important for being Turkish.

Table 5

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in British condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward British	-0.481	0.236	-2.04	0.041	0.618	0.386	0.982
National Identification	-0.580	0.130	-4.47	< .001	0.560	0.432	0.720

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 28.3$, $p < .001$.

Next, an ordinal logistic regression analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of prejudice toward target immigrants and the national identification of participants on civic national identity markers in Syrian condition. The model fit to the data results revealed that prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in civic national identity markers (X2 = 25.7, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 524, AIC = 558). If participants had more prejudice toward the target

immigrant, civic national identity markers order increased by a factor of .52, other factors being equal [(OR, 1.52; 95% CI, 1.15 - 2.01), p = .003]. Accordingly, if participants' prejudice measured by their discomfort at social closeness was higher, civic national identity markers were put %52 times more in the back rows. Also, if participants identified more with Turkish national identity, civic markers order increased by a factor of .56, other factors being equal [(OR, 1.56; 95% CI, 1.22 - 2.0), p < .001]. Hence, when their national identification increased, they gave %56 times less importance to civic national identity markers.

Table 6

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Civic Markers in Syrian condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward Syrian	0.419	0.141	2.97	0.003	1.52	1.15	2.01
National Identification	0.443	0.125	3.54	< .001	1.56	1.22	2.00

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 25.7$, $p < .001$.

Further, ordinal logistic regression was conducted to examine the effect of prejudice toward target immigrants and the national identification of participants on civic national identity markers in the British condition. According to the model fit to the data, prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in civic national identity markers (X2 = 28.3, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 532, AIC = 570). If participants' prejudice toward James increased, civic national identity markers order increased by a factor of .62, other factors being equal [(OR, 1.62; 95% CI, 1.02 - 2.59), p = .04]. In other words, when the participant showed a more social distance to the target, civic national identity markers were ranked %62 times more back in terms of being Turkish. Besides, as participants identified with Turkish national identity more, civic national identity markers order rose by a factor of .79, other factors being equal [(OR, 1.79; 95% CI, 1.39 - 2.31), p < .001]. Subsequently,

when participants had more national identification, they considered civic national identity markers %79 times less important. Consequently, Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Table 7

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Civic Markers in British condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward British	0.481	0.236	2.04	0.041	1.62	1.02	2.59
National Identification	0.580	0.130	4.47	< .001	1.79	1.39	2.31

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 28.3$, $p < .001$.

A paired samples T-test was conducted to investigate whether participants' prejudice changed according to the different target immigrants. Although Shapiro-Wilk normality test results revealed that the normality assumption was violated (W = 0.775, p < .001); a non-parametric Wilcoxon rank test revealed a significant difference between prejudice against Syrian immigrant and British immigrant (W (121) = 2044, p < .001, r = 0.645). According to the results, prejudice toward Syrian immigrant (Mdn = 1.83, SD = 1.17) was greater than prejudice toward British immigrant (Mdn = 1.33, SD = 0.74). Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was supported. Another paired samples T-test was conducted to examine whether the national identification of participants changed according to the different target immigrants. Shapiro-Wilk normality test results showed that the normality assumption was violated (W = 0.976, p = 0.032). Hence, a non-parametric test was conducted, and the Wilcoxon rank test showed a significant difference between the national identification of participants in Syrian and British conditions (W (120) = 3860, p = 0.027, r = 0.242). According to the results, participants identified with Turkish national identity more in Syrian immigrant condition (Mdn = 4.40, SD = 1.44) than in British immigrant condition (Mdn = 4.30, SD = 1.42).

Table 8

Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results for Prejudice to Syrian and British and National Identification in Syrian condition and British condition

			Statistic	p		Effect Size
Prejudice toward Syrian	Prejudice toward British	Wilcoxon W	2044	< .001	Rank biserial correlation	0.645
National Identification in Syrian condition	National Identification in British condition	Wilcoxon W	3860	0.027	Rank biserial correlation	0.242

Moreover, the Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were conducted to examine whether all national identity marker item orders changed for the different target immigrants. The results showed no significant difference between items for different target immigrants (see Table 10).

Table 9

Descriptive values and Wilcoxon Signed-rank Tests Results of Identity Markers

Identity Marker	Immigrant	N	Mean	Median	SD	SE	Wilcoxon W	p
1. Coming from the Turkish race	Syrian	112	6.41	7.00	2.32	0.219	1646	0.594
	British	112	6.31	7.00	2.29	0.217		
2. Being a child of a Turkish mother or father	Syrian	112	5.57	6.00	1.96	0.185	1372	0.439
	British	112	5.46	6.00	2.16	0.204		
3. Having a mother tongue that is Turkish	Syrian	112	4.98	5.00	2.14	0.202	1571	0.332
	British	112	5.25	5.50	2.10	0.199		
4. Being a Muslim	Syrian	112	8.52	9.00	1.23	0.116	293	0.212
	British	112	8.42	9.00	1.31	0.123		
5. Owning and respecting Turkish laws and institutions	Syrian	112	2.91	2.00	1.83	0.173	1273	0.527
	British	112	3.03	2.00	2.14	0.202		
6. Believing in the democracy in Türkiye	Syrian	112	4.06	4.00	2.17	0.205	2417	0.367
	British	112	3.95	3.50	2.20	0.208		
7. Adhering to citizenship obligations such as voting and paying taxes	Syrian	112	3.43	3.00	1.91	0.180	1463	0.438
	British	112	3.50	3.00	1.87	0.177		
8. Being a Turkish citizen	Syrian	112	3.52	4.00	2.03	0.192	1636	0.368
	British	112	3.34	4.00	1.87	0.177		
9. Having been born in Türkiye	Syrian	112	5.60	6.00	2.07	0.196	1359	0.464
	British	112	5.75	6.00	1.90	0.180		

McNemar's Test for 2 x 2 contingency tables was conducted to examine differences in approving Mahmoud and James about obtaining citizenship. According to the results, there was no significant pattern in approval of citizenship ($X2 = 3$, $p = 0.083$). As a result, Hypothesis 6 was rejected.

Overall, Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 3, and Hypothesis 6 was rejected. However, Hypothesis 4 and Hypothesis 5 was supported.

3.1. Additional Analyses

3.1.1. Between Subject Design Analysis

These analyzes were conducted only with participants in the first session and not the second of the study. A Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to examine the difference between ethnocultural factors for Syrian vignette and British. According to the results, there was not a significant difference between seeing two different immigrants on ethnocultural national identity markers order ($p = 0.414$). Also, a Kruskal-Wallis test was conducted to investigate the difference between civic factors order for Syrian and British. The result of the test reveals that there is not a significant difference between civic national identity markers for Syrian and British ($p = 0.414$). According to these results, it was found that the ranking of national identity markers did not change according to different immigrants.

Moreover, ordinal logistic regression analysis was performed to examine the effect of participants' national identification and prejudice toward target immigrants on ethnocultural national identity markers order with only the participants in the Syrian condition by filtering. According to the model fit to the data, prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in ethnocultural national identity markers in Syrian condition ($X2 = 21.7$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$, $R2MCF = 0.07$, $-2LL = 297$, $AIC = 337$). However, it was found that the prejudice did not significantly predict the order of the ethnocultural markers [(OR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.70 - 1.32), $p = 0.85$]. The results revealed that as the national identification level of participants increased, the order of the ethnocultural national identity markers for

being Turkish was decreased by a factor of .46; other factors equal [(OR, .46; 95% CI, .31 - .65), p < .001]. Subsequently, if the national identification of participants increased, they gave 54% more importance to ethnocultural markers for being Turkish in Syrian condition.

Table 10

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian *and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in Syrian condition*

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward Syrian	-0.0299	0.158	-0.189	0.850	0.971	0.704	1.319
National Identification in Syrian condition	-0.7837	0.189	-4.138	< .001	0.457	0.310	0.654

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .07 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 21.7$, p < .001.

An ordinal logistic regression analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of participants' national identification and prejudice toward target immigrants on civic national identity markers order with only the participants in the Syrian condition by filtering. According to the model fit to the data, prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in civic national identity markers in Syrian condition (X2 = 21.7, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.07, -2LL = 297, AIC = 337). Again, results showed that the prejudice did not significantly predict the order of civic national identity markers [(OR, 1.03; 95% CI, 0.76 - 1.42), p = 0.85]. However, as the national identification level of participants increased, the order of the civic national identity markers for being Turkish was increased by a factor of 2.19, with other factors equal [(OR, 2.19; 95% CI, 1.53 - 3.22), p < .001]. According to the result, if the national identification of participants increased, they gave 129% less importance to civic markers for being Turkish in Mahmoud's condition.

Table 11

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward Syrian and National Identification on Civic Markers in the Syrian condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward Syrian	0.0299	0.158	0.189	0.850	1.03	0.758	1.42
National Identification in the Syrian	0.7837	0.189	4.138	< .001	2.19	1.528	3.22

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .07 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 21.7$, $p < .001$.

Another series of ordinal logistic regression analyses were conducted on only British condition to investigate the effect of prejudice on target immigrants and the national identification of participants on the order of the ethnocultural national identity markers. The model fit to the data revealed that prejudice and national identification explained significant variance in ethnocultural national identity markers in British condition (X2 = 15.1, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 289, AIC = 321). In line with other results, prejudice toward British did not significantly predict the order of ethnocultural markers [(OR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.35 - 1.60), p = 0.45]. But evidence illustrated that as the national identification level of participants rose, the order of the ethnocultural national identity markers for being Turkish was decreased by a factor of 0.54, other factors equal [(OR, .54; 95% CI, .39 - .74), p < .001]. Therefore, if the national identification of participants increased, they gave more importance 46% times to ethnocultural markers for being Turkish in British condition.

Table 12

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Ethnocultural Markers in the British condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward British	-0.288	0.382	-0.755	0.450	0.749	0.352	1.596
National Identification in the British condition	-0.620	0.165	-3.765	< .001	0.538	0.386	0.738

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 15.1$, $p < .001$.

Also, an ordinal logistic regression analysis was conducted to examine the effect of prejudice toward British and the national identification of participants on the order of the civic national identity markers. According to the model fit to the data, prejudice to British and national identification of participant explained significant variance in order of the civic national identity markers (X2 = 15.1, df = 2, p <.001, R2MCF = 0.05, -2LL = 289, AIC = 321). The results showed that prejudice toward British did not significantly predict the order of civic markers [(OR, 1.33; 95% CI, 0.63 - 2.84), p = 0.45]. Nevertheless, as the national identification level of participants increased, the order of the civic national identity markers was increased by a factor of 1.86, with other factors equal [(OR, 1.86; 95% CI, 1.35 - 2.59), p < .001]. Therefore, if the national identification of participants increased, they gave less importance %86 times to civic markers for being Turkish in British condition.

Table 13

Ordinal Logistic Regression Analysis Results for Prejudice toward British and National Identification on Civic Markers in the British condition

						95% Confidence Interval	
Predictor	**Estimate**	**SE**	**Z**	**p**	**Odds ratio**	**Lower**	**Upper**
Prejudice toward British	0.289	0.382	0.756	0.450	1.33	0.627	2.84
National Identification in the British condition	0.620	0.165	3.765	< .001	1.86	1.354	2.59

Note. R^2_{McFL} = .05 (McFadden's). Model $X^2(2) = 15.1$, $p < .001$.

A series of one-way ANOVA analyses were conducted to investigate whether participants' prejudice to target immigrants and the national identification level of participants changed according to the different target immigrants. According to the Shapiro-Wilk normality test results, the normality assumption was violated for prejudice (W = 0.831, p < .001) and national identification (W = 0.970, p = .005). Hence, a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was performed for both variables. The results revealed a significant difference between prejudice against Syrian and against British (X2 (1) = 9.27, p = 0.002, n2 = 0.07). According to the results, prejudice against Syrian (Mdn = 2, SD = 1.43) was greater than prejudice against British (Mdn = 1.17, SD = 0.57). Still, there was no significant difference in the national identification of participants between Syrian and British conditions (p = 0.109).

3.1.2. Factor Analysis of Interpersonal Attractiveness Scale

Since this scale was used for distraction, it was not included in the primary analysis. However, additional analyzes were made to see if there was a difference in the attractiveness scores given by the participants among immigrants. Exploratory Factor Analysis with Oblimin Rotation and Principal Axis Extraction was performed to determine the factor structures of the Attractiveness Scale in British and Syrian conditions.

For the Syrian condition, the score of the Kaise-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .90, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant ($X2$ (45) = 808, $p < .001$), reflecting that those assumptions were met, and items were appropriate for exploratory factor analysis. A parallel analysis indicated that two factors were extracted, and 62.9 % of the total variance was explained. The first factor loadings ranged from 0.432 to 0.933, and the second factor loadings ranged from 0.731 to 0.824. Eigenvalues implied that there is one factor over 1.00 and the scree plot showed two sharp break points. Therefore, the original two factors were more appropriate. Afterward, Item 6 and Item 10 were excluded because they theoretically loaded to the wrong factors.

Eventually, 64.6 % of the total variance was explained by two factors. The first factor included five items (1,2,3,4 and 5) and explained 37.5 % of the total variance with an eigenvalue of 4.50. This factor could be named Social Attractiveness as in the original scale. The second factor included three items (7,8, and 9) and explained 27.1 % of the total variance with an eigenvalue of 0.47. As in the original scale, this factor could be named Task Attractiveness like an original scale.

Table 14

Results for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Attraction Scale in Syrian condition

	M	SD	Social Attraction	Task Attraction	Uniqueness
4. We could never establish a personal friendship with each other	5.74	1.27	0.94	-	0.17
5. I would like to have a friendly chat with him (her)	5.37	1.52	0.76	-	0.47
3. He (she) just wouldn't fit into my circle of friends	5.81	1.30	0.73	-	0.54
1. I think he (she) could be a friend of mine	5.70	1.20	0.65	-	0.28
2. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him (her)	5.79	1.09	0.64	-	0.31
9. He (she) wouldn't be a poor problem solver	5.44	1.15	-	0.87	0.17
8. If I wanted to get things done I could probably depend on him (her)	5.26	1.14	-	0.76	0.41
7. I have confidence in his (her) ability to get the job done	5.89	1.17	-	0.74	0.49

Note. 'Minimum residual' extraction method was used in combination with a 'oblimin' rotation

For the British condition, the score of the Kaise-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was found to be .76, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was found to be significant ($X2$ (45) = 396, $p < .001$), meaning that those assumptions were met, and items were suitable for exploratory factor analysis. A parallel analysis indicated that four factors were extracted, and 60.2 % of the total variance was explained. The first factor loadings ranged from 0.495 to 0.914, the second factor loadings ranged from 0.687 to 0.935, the third factor loading was 1.06, and the fourth factor loadings ranged from 0.555 to 0.787. Eigenvalues implied that there is one factor over 1.00 and the scree plot showed three sharp break points. Item 3 was excluded because it was not loaded with any factor.

Therefore, the analysis was repeated; parallel analysis indicated that four factors were extracted again, and 64.0 % of the total variance was explained. Then, Item 8 was excluded because it was loaded on a single factor. Similarly, the analysis was repeated, showing that a parallel analysis indicated that three factors were extracted again, and 54.7 % of the total variance was explained. Afterward, Item 6 was excluded because it theoretically loaded to the wrong factor. The analysis was repeated again; the result of the parallel analysis now indicated that three factors were extracted again, and 58.4 %of the total variance was explained. However, items were forced to load on two factors and then theoretically loaded to the correct ones. Lastly, two factors were extracted, and 45.2 % of the total variance was explained; the first factor loadings ranged from 0.565 to 0.766, and the second factor loadings ranged from 0.490 to 0.740.

Consequently, 45.2 % of the total variance was explained by two factors. The first factor included five items (1,2,4 and 5) and explained 26.6 % of the total variance with an eigenvalue of 2.47. This factor could be named Social Attractiveness as in the original scale. The second factor included three items (7,9, and 10) and explained 18.6 % of the total variance with an eigenvalue of 0.46. Also, this factor could be named Task Attractiveness as in the original scale.

Table 15

Results for Exploratory Factor Analysis of Attraction Scale in British condition

	M	SD	Social Attraction	Task Attraction	Uniqueness
1. I think he (she) could be a friend of mine	5.89	0.874	0.77	-	0.36
2. It would be difficult to meet and talk with him (her)	6.07	0.736	0.74	-	0.48
4. We could never establish a personal friendship with each other	5.84	1.11	0.57	-	0.66
5. I would like to have a friendly chat with him (her)	5.59	1.29	0.57	-	0.72
7. I have confidence in his (her) ability to get the job done	5.83	1.05	-	0.74	0.50
10. He (she) wouldn't be a poor problem solver	5.71	1.17	-	0.68	0.52
9. I couldn't get anything accomplished with him (her)	5.35	1.07	-	0.49	0.61

Note. 'Minimum residual' extraction method was used in combination with an 'oblimin' rotation

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

This study aimed to explore the relationship between the desirability of immigrants and Turkish national identity markers, as well as how prejudice toward target immigrants and the national identification of participants change in this context. For this purpose, experimental design with two sessions repeated measures employed. The findings showed that participants did not change the ranking of Turkish national identity markers regarding their importance for being Turkish as a function of immigrant origin (Syrian or English). Therefore, the results implied that Turkish national identity markers did not vary as a function of target immigrant's nation of origin when all other variables were constant in their background.

National identities are flexible and can change depending on time and context (Bechhofer et al.,1999; Komisarof et al., 2020; Komisarof & Leong, 2020; Perkins et al., 2019). Individuals want immigrants, whom they see as lower status, to adapt to the more demanding conditions (for instance, sociolinguistic or ethnic, in Komisarof et al., 2020). Therefore, it was expected when participants encountered immigrants who are seen as higher status by society would be evaluated primarily by the civic factors since those factors are considered relatively easier to meet. However, when participants encountered other immigrants, they may be ranked more important as ethnic factors, which are difficult or impossible to meet. However, the findings of this study indicate that this difference was not significant.

Furthermore, the first hypothesis was not supported. One reason behind this may be due to social desirability. According to Paulhus (1991), people have tendencies to give responses that show them to be nice because of social desirability bias. In this study, the participants might have wanted to show themselves as democratic and egalitarian and that they do not judge people according to their country of origin. Indeed, participants were predominantly left-wing and from a less

conservative and religious sample; thus, this trend may have emerged in the results. However, there are also some contradictions in the context of political tolerance and democratic values related to left and right political ideologies and conservatism (Baron & Jost, 2019; Brandt et al., 2014; Crawford & Pilanski, 2012; Crawford, 2014). Therefore, it may not be sufficient to explain only with the sample characteristic. Besides, another possible explanation is that the participants may have preferred such a ranking to maintain consistency between the order of national identity markers in Mahmoud and James conditions. However, the order also did not change according to immigrants in the between-subject design, so this explanation did not find sufficient evidence and was weakened.

Besides, civic national identity markers were seen as more important for being Turkish than ethnocultural national identity markers in both conditions. Therefore, the findings aligned with the constitution's civic definition of the Turkish national identity (Killi & Gözübüyük, 2006). Based on the literature (Pehrson et al., 2009b; Pehrson & Green, 2010; Reijerse et al., 2013), it can be argued that a national identity where civic factors are more important is more inclusive for minorities and immigrants than ethnic factors. Still, these results may have emerged from the social desirability effect (Paulhus, 1991). On the other hand, although the participants consider civic factors more important, the fact that they are more prejudiced against Mahmoud than against James is similar to the legal and practical difference in Turkish national identity.

Indeed, the prejudice measured by social distance changed for two immigrants, who had no difference other than being one Syrian and the other British. Accordingly, participants showed more prejudice toward Syrian immigrant, although every aspect was the same as British except his nationality. Notwithstanding, the order of national identity markers was not changed. The evidence indicates that participants did not explicitly show any difference in the order of national identity markers; however, they significantly differ in the bias.

Consequently, results in the previous paragraph can be interpreted as the participants may find a Syrian immigrant who wants to obtain citizenship as more threatening in the context of Turkey's current political atmosphere. According to the Integrated Threat Theory by Stephan and Stephan (2000), people can perceive an intergroup threat when they encounter a member of another group, thinking that the

person will harm their group somehow. Moreover, owing to Turner (1987), SCT argues that people can be oversensitive when they feel a threat toward their ingroup. In this context, the issue of Syrian refugees is presented as an intense cultural and economic threat by both the media (Efe, 2019; Kardeş et al., 2017; Pandır et al., 2015) and political figures, especially in the last few years. For this reason, participants may have thought that Syrian would harm the mainstream Turkish culture because their population reached nearly 4 million due to a negative public impression. Again, the ongoing economic crisis in Turkey may have increased the perceived threat from Syrian immigrants since both parties need to share the same pool financially. This threat may have been caused by some assumptions among people, such as Syrians will get their jobs which would increase unemployment, and Syrians take social support from the state, which should have been provided to the public instead (Esses, 2020). In parallel, Yitmen and Verkuyten (2018) found that when Turkish individuals perceive a higher threat from Syrian immigrants, they show a solid national identification and negative intentions towards them. As a result of this perceived cultural and economic threat, individuals' negative attitudes towards Syrians, especially refugees, may have increased.

Moreover, the mentioned immigrants showed high adaptation to Turkey, and participants may not have so favorably received this adaptation. According to the optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991), individuals have two crucial and rival needs: inclusion from ingroup and differentiation from other groups. Therefore, it is important for this study that individuals try to achieve an optimal difference from other groups. Jetten et al. (2004) found that individuals negatively evaluate other groups when their need to be differentiated from them is threatened. There may be optimal distinctiveness for both immigrants in the study. However, it can be said that Turks do not like this similarity more because they see Arabs as inferior because of the current political atmosphere. Also, the number of Syrian immigrants in Turkey has been much higher, according to the British. Hence, encountering a Syrian who has adapted well to Turkey may have emerged negative attitudes toward them rather than British.

Furthermore, the national identification of participants varied according to different target immigrants. When participants encountered the Mahmoud vignette, their national identification level was stronger than James’s vignette. Again, people

may have perceived a threat toward their ingroup from Syrian immigrant and behaved to protect their groups with oversensitive feelings (Turner, 1987). In addition to the threat explanation above, other factors may have been influential. Ethier and Deaux (1994) investigated the Hispanic identification of Hispanic students and found that identification levels decreased when Hispanic students saw their Hispanic identity as lower status. In this study, the participants may have seen their national identity at a lower status and felt less identified when exposed to the British immigrant's vignette.

Furthermore, prejudice against Mahmoud and James and the national identification level of participants have predicted the ranking of national identity markers. Moreover, when prejudice toward target immigrant and the national identification level of participants increased, the importance of ethnocultural markers also increased, but this relationship is obviously the opposite for civic markers. Indeed, the importance of ethnocultural markers for being Turkish increased as the prejudice and national identification level of participants increased in both immigrant conditions. Conversely, when participants' prejudice and national identification level of participants decreased, they gave more importance to the civic markers. Hence, these results illustrate ethnocultural markers are related more essentialist and biased attitudes, consistent with the previous literature findings (Maddens et al., 2000; Pehrson et al., 2009b). Also, in the Türkiye context, Kurtiş et al. (2017) revealed that participants who saw Turkish national identity as ethno-cultural construction silence the past negative events about minorities and were against minority rights. In this study, participants who ranked important to ethnocultural markers showed more negative attitudes to immigrants can be evaluated in parallel with this. Although studies state that civic markers also contain significant discrimination in the literature (Devos et al., 2020; Kadianaki & Andreouli, 2015), our research found contradictory evidence. Because social desirability may have had an impact on the results, as mentioned before. However, it should be emphasized that this positive correlation between civic markers and negative attitudes toward immigrants is predominantly found in Western and Northern European cultures (Leong et al., 2020; Simonsen & Bonikowski, 2019). In addition, Rejierse et al. (2013) also implied cultural markers also contain negative attitudes toward others in this regard, and our results also follow this with ethnocultural markers. Thus, to summarize, the ranking of

ethnocultural markers was predicted positively by prejudice toward target immigrant and the national identification level of participants, and the contrary ranking of civic markers was predicted negatively by these variables.

Moreover, two significant differences were found between the within-subject and between-subject designs: First, the national identification level of participants did not vary for Mahmoud and James in the between design; and second, prejudice toward Mahmoud and James did not predict civic and ethnocultural national identity markers in the between design. When participants encountered only a Mahmoud or James story in between design, they did not make any comparison with another immigrant. Therefore, if they see only one immigrant, the perceived threat from Mahmoud may not have been triggered that much. This perceived threat could be found more robust in the within-subject design because participants may be compared two immigrants, one of whom poses a more significant threat to them while the other was considered more non-threatening. Thus, participants' prejudice may have impacted the ranking under the condition that they saw both immigrants because they may have increased the prejudice effect by resorting to social comparison.

While the study did provide evidence of essential points, it also had some limitations. Indeed, the study had five main limitations. First of all, the sample of the study has low conservatism and religiosity levels in general and is closer to the left political view. So it was not a representative sample. For this reason, the sample creates external validity problems for generalizing the data to the Turkish population; hence, it should be evaluated in own context. Another limitation of the study is that although the results were significant in ordinal logistic regression models, the effect sizes were smaller than excellent criteria (*R2* = between 0.2 and 0.4), according to Mcfadden (1973). Therefore, it is essential to replicate the findings with larger sample size and to evaluate the results in light of effect size information. Besides, this study assessed the ethnic and cultural markers of national identity as a single dimension that is ethnocultural. According to Kymlicka (2001), the cultural dimension should be considered separately from the ethnic and civic; however, it has also been found that the cultural dimension runs parallel to the ethnic dimension (Rejierse et al., 2013). Therefore, ethnic and cultural markers were evaluated together in this study, like Rejierse et al. (2013). But the reader also should be aware

of the theoretical criticisms regarding ethnic, civic, and cultural dimensions while considering the results of this study.

Fourth, the two immigrant profiles we selected were not typical. Especially the Syrian immigrant was far outside the profile common in Turkey. This may have had an positive impact on the participants. In future studies, examining the influence of immigrants, for whom statuses are more typical, would be fruitful. Finally, participants ranked the importance of national identity markers not considering target person; however, prejudice was measured against the target immigrant. In other studies, the question of what conditions are important for the target person to be Turkish can be answered. In this study, we asked about the importance of being Turkish as a general because participants should not understand the hypothesis according to the experimental paradigm. Consequently, limitations should not be overlooked when designing other studies and evaluating the results of this study. Therefore, the sample size can be chosen higher than the minimum required size when designing future studies. In addition, the different markers of national identity can be explored in greater depth, especially in the context of Turkey. The relationship between cultural, ethnic, and civic markers can be revealed more clearly.

Taken together, the migration problem is a hazardous and contentious topic considering Türkiye's current political climate. The rate of immigrants in the country is increasing yearly and attempts to integrate them are limited. Besides, negative attitudes towards them have been growing with the deepening of the cost of living and inflation. As this study shows, a Syrian immigrant with the same profile as the British one, no matter how well-educated, qualified, and integrated, encountered more prejudice than a British immigrant. Therefore, our results show that more integration projects should be conducted for immigrants and the community, and more realistic solutions are needed for the refugee problem. In this context, intergroup contact can be a good option to reduce prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006); thus, intervention programs can be developed to bring together Syrian refugees and Turks together (see Çırakoğlu et al., 2021; Ünver et al., 2021). On the other hand, it is promising in terms of the progressive line of thought that people advocated more democratic and civic principles for being Turk, regardless of any influence or bias.

Furthermore, this study contributes to the literature on how the markers of Turkish national identity and the relationship between national identity markers and prejudice and national identification vary according to immigrants from different backgrounds. Therefore, future studies should be solution oriented toward this relationship or elaborate on this relationship with different sociopsychological variables. For example, how much variance can be explained by variables such as social contact or social dominance orientation could be a research question for future studies. On the other hand, future studies should focus on the more practical aspects of the findings of this study. In this direction, the examination of interventions to reduce prejudice can be a fruitful approach. Positive results can be yielded by these kinds of intervention programs for media and individuals (for instance, the investigation of hate speech in the Turkish media (Hrant Dink Foundation, 2019, 2018, 2017) project was a good example).

REFERENCES

Al, S. (2015). An Anatomy of Nationhood and the Question of Assimilation: Debates on Turkishness Revisited. Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism, 15(1), 83–101. doi:10.1111/sena.12121

Anderson, B. (2006). Imagined communities. Verso Books.

Austin, P. C., & Steyerberg, E. W. (2014). Events per variable (EPV) and the relative performance of different strategies for estimating the out-of-sample validity of logistic regression models. Statistical Methods in Medical Research, 26(2), 796–808. doi:10.1177/0962280214558972

Aydıngün, A., & Aydıngün, İ. (2004). The Role of Language in the Formation of Turkish National Identity and Turkishness. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 10*(3), 415–432. doi:10.1080/13537110490518264

Aytürk, İ. (2015). Post-Post Kemalizm: Yeni bir Paradigmayı Beklerken. *Birikim, 319*, 34-48.

Balaban, Ç. D. (2013). *The roles of intergroup threat, social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism in predicting Turks' prejudice toward Kurds*. [Unpublished master's thesis].

Baron, J., & Jost, J. T. (2019). False equivalence: Are liberals and conservatives in the United States equally biased? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 14*(2), 292–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618788876

Barrett, M., & Oppenheimer, L. (2011). Findings, theories and methods in the study of children's national identifications and national attitudes. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8*(1), 5–24. doi:10.1080/17405629.2010.533955

Bechhofer, F., McCrone, D., Kiely, R., & Stewart, R. (1999). Constructing National Identity: Arts and Landed Elites in Scotland. *Sociology, 33*(3), 515–534. doi:10.1017/s0038038599000334

Bilgin, N. (2014). *Kimlik İnşası*. İzmir Büyükşehir Belediyesi Yayınları.

Billiet, J., Maddens, B., & Beerten, R. (2003). National Identity and Attitude Toward Foreigners in a Multinational State: A Replication. *Political Psychology, 24*(2), 241–257. doi:10.1111/0162-895x.00327

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. SAGE.

Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 3*(1), 27–52. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420030103

Bjorklund, F. (2006). The East European "ethnic nation"- Myth or reality? *European Journal of Political Research, 45*(1), 93–121. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2005.00292.x

Borovalı, M. & Boyraz, C. (2016). Türkiye'de Cemevleri Sorunu: Haklar ve Özgürlükler Bağlamında Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım. *Mülkiye Dergisi, 40*(3), 55-86.

Bourhis, R. V., & Dayan, J. (2004). Acculturation orientations towards Israeli Arabs and Jewish immigrants in Israel. *International Journal of Psychology*, *39*(2), 118–131. doi:10.1080/00207590344000358

Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). *The Ideological-Conflict Hypothesis. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23(1), 27–34.* doi:10.1177/0963721413510932

Brewer, M. B., & Silver, M. (1978). Ingroup bias as a function of task characteristics. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *8*(3), 393–400. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420080312

Brewer, M. B. (1991). The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17*(5), 475–482. doi:10.1177/0146167291175001

Brubaker, W. R. (1990). Immigration, Citizenship, And The Nation-State In France And Germany: A Comparative Historical Analysis. *International Sociology, 5*(4), 379–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/026858090005004003

Bujang, M. A., Sa'at, N., Tg Abu Bakar Sidik, T. M. I., … Chien Joo, L. (2018). Sample Size Guidelines for Logistic Regression from Observational Studies with Large Population: Emphasis on the Accuracy Between Statistics and Parameters Based on Real Life Clinical Data. *Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences, 25*(4), 122–130. doi:10.21315/mjms2018.25.4.12

Bogardus, E. S. (1967). *Measuring social distance*. In M. Fishbein (Ed.). Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement (p. 71-76). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Cagaptay, S. (2004). Race, assimilation and Kemalism: Turkish nationalism and the minorities in the 1930s. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*(3), 86–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/0026320042000213474

Cagaptay, S. (2006*). Islam, secularism and nationalism in modern Turkey: Who is a Turk?* Routledge.

Cingoz-Ulu, B. (2008). *Structure of Turkish national identity and attitudes towards ethno-cultural groups in Turkey.* (Doctoral dissertation).

Cingöz-Ulu, B., & Özakay, Ö. (2022). Development of the Turkish National Identity Representations Scale. Manuscript in preparation.

Crawford, J. T., & Pilanski, J. M. (2012). Political intolerance, right and left. *Political Psychology, 35*(6), 841–851. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00926.x

Crawford, J. T. (2014). Ideological symmetries and asymmetries in political intolerance and prejudice toward political activist groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 55, 284–298.* doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2014.08.002

Çayır, K. (2015). Citizenship, nationality and minorities in Turkey's textbooks: from politics of non-recognition to "difference multiculturalism." *Comparative Education, 51*(4), 519–536. doi:10.1080/03050068.2015.1088210

Çırakoğlu, O., C., Demirutku, K., & Karakaya, O. (2021). The Mediating Role of Perceived Threat in the Relationship between Casual Contact and Attitudes towards Syrian Refugees in Turkey. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 34*(3), 2984–2999.

Daldal, A. (2004). The new middle class as a progressive urban coalition: the 1960 coup d'etat in Turkey. *Turkish Studies, 5*(3), 75–102. doi:10.1080/1468384042000270335

David, O., & Bar-Tal, D. (2009). A sociopsychological conception of collective identity: The case of national identity as an example. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 13*(4), 354–379. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309344412

Devos, T., Gavin, K., & Quintana, F. J. (2010). Say "adios" to the American dream? The interplay between ethnic and national identity among Latino and Caucasian Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*(1), 37–49. doi:10.1037/a0015868

Devos, T., Yogeeswaran, K., Milojev, P., & Sibley, C. G. (2020). Conceptions of national identity and opposition to bicultural policies in New Zealand: A comparison of majority and minority perspectives. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 78*, 33–42. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.04.00

Efe, İ. (2018). A corpus-driven analysis of representations of Syrian asylum seekers in the Turkish press 2011–2016. *Discourse & Communication, 175048131880162.* doi:10.1177/1750481318801624

Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The Immigration Dilemma: The Role of Perceived Group Competition, Ethnic Prejudice, and National Identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 389–412. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00220

Ethier, K. A., & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 243–251. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.243

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191. Doi: 10.3758/BF03193146

Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2017). Religion and national identification in Europe: Comparing Muslim youth in Belgium, England, Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 49*(1), 44–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117741988

Fleischmann, F., Leszczensky, L., & Pink, S. (2019). Identity threat and identity multiplicity among minority youth: Longitudinal relations of perceived discrimination with ethnic, religious, and national identification in Germany. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 58,* 971-990. doi:10.1111/bjso.12324

Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press.

Goalwin, G. J. (2018). "Religion and Nation Are One": Social Identity Complexity and the Roots of Religious Intolerance in Turkish Nationalism. *Social Science History, 42*(02), 161–182. doi:10.1017/ssh.2018.6

Gong, L. (2007). Ethnic identity and identification with the majority group: Relations with national identity and self-esteem. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*(4), 503–523. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2007.03.00

Gökalp, Z. (2019). *Türkçülüğün Esasları* (8th ed.). Ötüken Neşriyat.

Harlak, H. (1998). *Stereotypes about various nations in our society.* (Doctoral dissertation).

Harris, G. S. (2011). Military Coups and Turkish Democracy, 1960–1980. *Turkish Studies, 12*(2), 203–213. doi:10.1080/14683849.2011.573181

Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2014). Dimensions of Social Dominance Orientation: The Roles of Legitimizing Myths and National Identification. *European Journal of Personality, 28*, 538-549. doi:10.1002/per.1955

Hjerm, M., Eger, M. A., Bohman, A., & Fors Connolly, F. (2019). A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance: Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance, Respect, and Appreciation of Difference. *Social Indicators Research, 147*(3), 897–919. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y

Hobsbawm, E. J. (2000). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (2013). Introduction: Inventing Tradition. In E. J., Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds). *The Invention of Tradition* (pp. 1-15). Cambridge University Press.

Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory: A Historical Review. Social and Personality Psychology *Compass*, *2*(1), 204–222. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00066.x

Hrant Dink Foundation (2017) Hate Speech and Discriminative Speech in Turkish Media. https://hrantdink.org/tr/asulis/yayinlar/72-medyada-nefret-soylemi-raporlari/1265-medyada-nefret-soylemi-ve-ayrimci-soylem-2017-raporu

Hrant Dink Foundation (2018) Hate Speech and Discriminative Speech in Turkish Media. https://hrantdink.org/tr/asulis/yayinlar/72-medyada-nefret-soylemi-raporlari/2003-medyada-nefret-soylemi-ve-ayrimci-soylem-2018-raporu

Hrant Dink Foundation (2019) Hate Speech and Discriminative Speech in Turkish Media. https://hrantdink.org/tr/asulis/yayinlar/72-medyada-nefret-soylemi-raporlari/2665-medyada-nefret-soylemi-ve-ayrimci-soylem-2019-raporu

Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, *22*(1), 127–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895x.00230

Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., & Levine, M. (1997). On the parallels between social cognition and the 'New Racism.' *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *36*(3), 305–329. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1997.tb01134.x

Ince, B. (2012a). *Citizenship and Identity in Turkey: From Atatürk's Republic to the Present Day*. I. B. Tauris.

International Organization for Migration. (2022). World Migration Report 2022. https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2022

İnce, B. (2012b). Citizenship education in Turkey: inclusive or exclusive. *Oxford Review of Education*, *38*(2), 115–131. doi:10.1080/03054985.2011.651314

Jetten, J., Spears, R., & Postmes, T. (2004). Intergroup Distinctiveness and Differentiation: A Meta-Analytic Integration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(6), 862–879. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.86.6.862

Jones, F. L., & Smith, P. (2001). Diversity and Commonality in National Identities: An Exploratory Analysis of Cross-National Patterns. *Journal of Sociology, 37*(1), 45–63. doi:10.1177/144078301128756193

Kadıoglu, A. (2007). Denationalization of Citizenship? The Turkish Experience. *Citizenship Studies, 11*(3), 283–299. doi:10.1080/17450100701381839

Kadıoğlu, A. (1996) The paradox of Turkish nationalism and the construction of national identity, *Middle Eastern Studies, 32*(2), pp. 177–194.

Kadianaki, I., & Andreouli, E. (2015). Essentialism in Social Representations of Citizenship: An Analysis of Greeks' and Migrants' Discourse. *Political Psychology, 38*(5), 833–848. doi:10.1111/pops.12271

Kardeş, S., Banko, Ç., & Akman, B. (2017). Sosyal medyada Suriye'li sığınmacılara yönelik algı: bir sözlük değerlendirmesi. *Göç Dergisi, 4*(2), 1185-200.

Kentel,F. (2022). Türkiye'de Bir Arada Yaşarız Araştırması. Bir Arada Yaşarız Eğitim ve Toplumsal Araştırmalar Vakfı (BAYETAV). https://bayetav.org/uploads/documents/BAY-rapor-son.pdf

Killi, S., Gözübüyük, A. S. (2006). *Türk Anayasa Metinleri (Sened-i İttifaktan Günümüze)* (3rd ed.). İş Bankası Yayınları.

Kirişçi, K. (1998). Minority/majority discourse: The case of the Kurds in Turkey. In D. C. Gladney (Ed.), *Making majorities: Constituting the nation in Japan, Korea, China, Malaysia, Fiji, Turkey, and the United States* (pp. 227-245). Stanford University Press.

Kohn, H. (2005). *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in its Origins and Background*. Transaction Publishers.

Komisarof, A., & Leong, C.-H. (2020). Viewing intercultural adaptation and social inclusion through constructs of national identity: An introduction. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 78,* 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.06.001

Komisarof, A., Leong, C.H., & Teng, E. (2020). Constructing who is Japanese: A study of social markers of acceptance in Japan. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 23*(2), 238–250. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12396.

Kurtiş, T., Yalçınkaya, N. S., & Adams, G. (2017). Silence in official representations of history: Implications for national identity and intergroup relations. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology, 5*(2), 608–629. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v5i2.714

Kuyucu, A.T. (2005). Ethno-religious 'unmixing' of Turkey: 6–7 September riots as a case in Turkish nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism, 11*(3), 361–80. doi:10.1111/j.1354-5078.2005.00209.x

Kuzio, T. (2002). The myth of the civic state: a critical survey of Hans Kohn's framework for understanding nationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25*(1), 20–39. doi:10.1080/01419870120112049

Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship.* Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, failure, and the future.* Migration Policy Institute.

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., … Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95(1), 144–165.* doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

Leong, C.-H., Komisarof, A., Dandy, J., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Safdar, S., Hanke, K., & Teng, E. (2020). What does it take to become "one of us?" Redefining ethnic-civic citizenship using markers of everyday nationhood. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. *78*, 10-19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.04.006

Locksley, A., Ortiz, V., & Hepburn, C. (1980). Social categorization and discriminatory behavior: Extinguishing the minimal intergroup discrimination effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(5), 773–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.5.773

Maddens, B., Billiet, J., & Beerten, R. (2000). National identity and the attitude towards foreigners in multi-national states: The case of Belgium. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 26*(1), 45–60. doi:10.1080/136918300115633

Maksudyan, N. (2005). The Turkish Review of Anthropology and the Racist Face of Turkish Nationalism. *Cultural Dynamics, 17*(3), 291–322. doi:10.1177/0921374005061992

Martiny, S. E., Froehlich, L., Deaux, K., & Mok, S. Y. (2017). Defining ethnic, national, and dual identities: Structure, antecedents, and consequences of multiple social identities of Turkish-origin high school students in Germany. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 27*(5), 400–410. doi:10.1002/casp.2318

Martiny, S. E., Froehlich, L., Soltanpanah, J., & Haugen, M. S. (2019). Young immigrants in Norway: The role of national and ethnic identity in immigrants' integration. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 61(2), 312–324. doi:10.1111/sjop.12594

McCroskey, J. C., & McCain, T. A. (1974). The measurement of interpersonal attraction. *Speech Monographs, 41*(3), 261–266. doi:10.1080/03637757409375845

McDowall, D. (2000). *A modern history of the Kurds*. I.B. Tauris.

McFadden, D. (1973). *Conditional logit analysis of qualitative choice behavior*. University of California.

Meeus, J., Duriez, B., Vanbeselaere, N., & Boen, F. (2010). The role of national identity representation in the relation between in-group identification and out-group derogation: Ethnic versus civic representation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(2), 305–320. doi:10.1348/014466609x451455

Molina, L. E., Phillips, N. L., & Sidanius, J. (2015). National and ethnic identity in the face of discrimination: Ethnic minority and majority perspectives. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*(2), 225–236. doi:10.1037/a0037880

Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 32*(6), 698–719. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022101032006004.

Mummendey, A., Klink, A., & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(2), 159–172. doi:10.1348/014466601164740

Nigbur, D., & Cinnirella, M. (2007). National identification, type and specificity of comparison and their effects on descriptions of national character. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*(4), 672–691. doi:10.1002/ejsp.382

Özkirimli Umut. (2000). *Theories of nationalism: A critical introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Pakulski, J. (1997). Cultural citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 1*(1), 73–86. doi:10.1080/13621029708420648

Pandır, M., Efe, İ., & Paksoy, A., F. (2015). Türk Basınında Suriyeli Sığınmacı Temsili Üzerine Bir İçerik Analizi. *Marmara Journal of Communication, 24*, 1-26.

Paulhus, D. L. (1991). *Measurement and Control of Response Bias. Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes,* 17–59. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-590241-0.50006-x

Pehrson, S. (2019). Argumentative Contexts of National Identity Definition: Getting Past the Failures of a Universal Ethnic–Civic Dichotomy. In G. Gustavsson & D. Miller (Eds.). *Liberal Nationalism and Its Critics: Normative and Empirical Questions* (pp. 135-147). Oxford University Press.

Pehrson, S., & Green, E. G. T. (2010). Who We Are and Who Can Join Us: National Identity Content and Entry Criteria for New Immigrants. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(4), 695–716. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01671.x

Pehrson, S., Brown, R., & Zagefka, H. (2009b). When does national identification lead to the rejection of immigrants? Cross-sectional and longitudinal evidence for the role of essentialist in-group definitions. *The British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 61–76.

Pehrson, S., Vignoles, V. L., & Brown, R. (2009a). National Identification And Anti-Immigrant Prejudice: Individual And Contextual Effects Of National Definitions. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 72*(1), 24–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/019027250907200104

Perkins, K. M., Kurtiş, T., & Velazquez, L. (2019). What it means to be “one of us”: Discourses of national identity in the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 78,* 43-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.12.003

Perreault, S., & Bourhis, R. Y. (1999). Ethnocentrism, Social Identification, and Discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(1), 92–103. doi:10.1177/0146167299025001008

Pettigrew, T., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2007). WHO OPPOSES IMMIGRATION?: Comparing German with North American Findings. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 4*(1), 19-39. doi:10.1017/S1742058X07070038

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751–783. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Phua, D. Y., Leong, C. H., & Hong, Y. (2020). Heterogeneity in national identity construct: Example of Singapore using network analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 78,* 20-32. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.05.010

Reijerse, A., Van Acker, K., Vanbeselaere, N., Phalet, K., & Duriez, B. (2013). Beyond the ethnic-civic dichotomy: Cultural citizenship as a new way of excluding immigrants: Representations of citizenship. *Political Psychology, 34,* 611-630. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00920.x

Reicher, S. (2004). The context of Social Identity: Domination, resistance, and change. *Political Psychology, 25*(6), 921–945. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00403.x

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (1996). Self-category constructions in political rhetoric; an analysis of Thatcher’s and Kinnock’s speeches concerning the British miners’ strike (1984–5). *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*(3), 353–371. doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-0992(199605)26:3<353::aid-ejsp757>3.0.co;2-o

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001a). Psychology and the End of History: A Critique and a Proposal for the Psychology of Social Categorization. *Political Psychology, 22*(2), 383–407. doi:10.1111/0162-895x.00246

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001b). *Self and nation: Categorization, contestation and mobilization*. SAGE.

Roccas, S., Schwartz, S. H., & Amit, A. (2010). Personal Value Priorities and National Identification. *Political Psychology, 31*(3), 393–419.

Sidanius, J., & Petrocik, J. R. (2001). Communal and national identity in a multiethnic state comparison of three perspectives. In R. D. Ashmore, L. Jussim & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction*. (pp. 101-129). New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

Simonsen, K. B., & Bonikowski, B. (2019). Is civic nationalism necessarily inclusive? Conceptions of nationhood and anti-Muslim attitudes in Europe. *European Journal of Political Research, 59*, 114-136. doi:10.1111/1475-6765.12337

Smeekes, A., Verkuyten, M., & Poppe, E. (2011). Mobilizing opposition towards Muslim immigrants: National identification and the representation of national history. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(2), 265–280. doi:10.1348/014466610x516235

Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. Penguin Books.

Stephan,W. G., & Stephan, C.W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In Oskamp(Ed.), *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination* (23–45). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sunata, U. (2020). Geçici Koruma Altındaki Suriyeli Gençlerin Geçim Kaynaklarına Erişimi Araştırması. Toplum Gönüllüleri Vakfı (TOG).

Tachau, F. (2000). Turkish political parties and elections: Half a century of multiparty democracy. *Turkish Studies, 1*(1), 128–148. doi:10.1080/14683840008721224

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict, W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.). *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Brooks-Cole.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Billig, M. (1974). Familiarity and categorization in intergroup behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 10*(2), 159–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(74)90064-X

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 1*(2), 149-178. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2420010202

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2021). Mid-year Trends 2021. https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/618ae4694/mid-year-trends-2021.html

Turkish Presidency of Migration Management (Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Göç İdaresi Başkanlığı). (n.d.). Retrieved March 31, 2022 from https://www.goc.gov.tr/guncel-veriler

Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefination of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identitiy and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J. C. (1987). A self-categorization theory. In J.C. Turner, M.A. Hogg, P.J. Oakes, S.D. Reicher, M.S. Wetherell (Eds.). *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory* (pp. 42–67). Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., & Reynolds, K. J. (2012). Self-Categorization Theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.). *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (pp. 399–417). Sage.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Turner, P. J., & Smith, P. M. (1984). Failure and defeat as determinants of group cohesiveness. British Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 97–111.

Ünver, H., Çakal, H., Güler, M., & Tropp, L. R. (2021). Support for rights of Syrian refugees in Turkey: The role of secondary transfer effects in intergroup contact. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology.* doi:10.1002/casp.2562

Üstel, F. (2019). *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde* (8th ed.) İletişim Yayınları.

Van Smeden, M., de Groot, J. A. H., Moons, K. G. M., Collins, G. S., Altman, D. G., Eijkemans, M. J. C., & Reitsma, J. B. (2016). No rationale for 1 variable per 10 events criterion for binary logistic regression analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 16(1).* doi:10.1186/s12874-016-0267-3

Velasco González, K., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in The Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*(4), 667–685. doi:10.1348/014466608x284443

Verkuyten, M. (2001). National identification and intergroup evaluations in Dutch children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 19*(4), 559–571. doi:10.1348/026151001166254

Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2012). Immigrants' National Identification: Meanings, Determinants, and Consequences. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 6*(1), 82–112. doi:10.1111/j.1751-2409.2011.01036.x

Verkuyten, M., & Yildiz, A. A. (2007). National (Dis)identification and Ethnic and Religious Identity: A Study Among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(10), 1448–1462. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207304276.

Worldometers. (n.d.). World Population. Retrieved April 13, 2022 from https://www.worldometers.info/world-population

Wright, M. (2011). Diversity and the Imagined Community: Immigrant Diversity and Conceptions of National Identity. *Political Psychology, 32*(5), 837–862. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00843.x

Wright, M., Citrin, J., & Wand, J. (2012). Alternative Measures of American National Identity: Implications for the Civic-Ethnic Distinction. *Political Psychology, 33*(4), 469–482. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00885.x

Yack, B. (1996). The myth of the civic nation. *Critical Review, 10*(2), 193–211. doi:10.1080/08913819608443417

Yanarocak, H. E. C. (2016). Turkish Staatsvolk vs. Kurdish identity: Denial of the Kurds in Turkish school textbooks. *The Journal of the Middle East and Africa, 7*(4), 405–419. doi:10.1080/21520844.2016.1239176

Yeğen, M. (2004). Citizenship and ethnicity in Turkey. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*, 51-66.

Yeğen, M. (2017). Turkish Nationhood: Civic and Ancestral and Cultural. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 23*(3), 318–339. doi:10.1080/13537113.2017.1344786

Yitmen, Ş., & Verkuyten, M. (2017). Feelings toward refugees and non-Muslims in Turkey: The roles of national and religious identifications, and multiculturalism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 48*(2), 90–100. doi:10.1111/jasp.12493

Yogeeswaran, K., Dasgupta, N., & Gomez, C. (2012). A new American dilemma? The effect of ethnic identification and public service on the national inclusion of ethnic minorities. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(6), 691–705. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1894

Yogeeswaran, K., Dasgupta, N., Adelman, L., Eccleston, A., & Parker, M. T. (2011). To be or not to be (ethnic): Public vs. Private expressions of ethnic identification differentially impact national inclusion of White and non-White groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(5), 908–914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.010

APPENDICES

A. APPROVAL OF THE METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER

ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 /

14 OCAK 2022

Konu : Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi : İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Banu Cingöz ULU

Danışmanlığını yürüttüğünüz Özgün ÖZAKAY'ın "Ulusal Kimlik Temsilleri ve Makbul Göçmenlik" başlıklı araştırmanız İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **0068-ODTUİAEK-2022** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.

Prof.Dr. Mine MISIRLISOY
İAEK Başkan

B. NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS

Bazı insanlar, gerçek anlamda **Türkiye Cumhuriyeti yurttaşı olmayı** aşağıdaki cümlelerde tanımlamışlardır. Sizce aşağıda verilen bu şartlar, gerçekten Türk olmak için ne kadar önemlidir? Lütfen, aşağıdaki ifadeleri **sizin verdiğiniz öneme göre, en önemli olandan önemsiz olana** doğru sıralayınız.

Etnokültürel (Ethnocultural)

Türk soyundan geliyor olmak

Türk ana veya babadan doğmuş olmak

Anadilinin Türkçe olması

Müslüman olmak

Yurttaşlık (Civic)

Türkiye yasalarını ve kurumlarını benimsemek

Türkiye'deki demokratik sisteme inanmak

Vatandaşlık görevlerini (oy vermek, vergilerini ödemek gibi) yerine getirmek

Türkiye Cumhuriyeti vatandaşı olmak

Türkiye'de doğmuş olmak

C. EXPERIMENTAL MANIPULATION VIGNETTES

Lütfen aşağıdaki metni dikkatli bir şekilde okuyun. Bu metinden sonra gelecek sorular, burada bahsedilen ana kahraman ile ilgili olacaktır. Bu metin Türkiye'ye başka bir ülkeden gelmiş ve burada uzun zamandır yaşayan birini anlatmaktadır.

James

James, Londra şehrinde doğmuş ve büyümüştür. Ailesi hâlâ Londra şehrinde yaşayan orta sınıf kişilerdir. Liseden sonra, İstanbul'da üniversiteyi kazanmış ve eğitim amacıyla Türkiye'ye gelmiştir. Daha sonra iş hayatına Türkiye'de başlamış ve üniversitede tanıştığı Yeliz ile evlenmiştir. James müzik ve futbola aşıktır. Çocukken en sevdiği şey, Londra'daki komşularıyla birlikte mahallede futbol oynamaktı. Hatta oradaki amatör kümede oynayacak kadar yükselmişti. Ancak yaşadığı sakatlıktan sonra artık sadece arkadaşlarıyla her cuma halı sahada oynamaktadır. Aynı zamanda, müzik onun diğer tutkusudur. Arkadaşlarıyla üniversitenin ilk yılında kurdukları grupta vokalistlik yapmakta ve birlikte yazdıkları şarkıları çıktıkları konserlerde söylemektedirler. Bazı müzik yarışmalarına bile katıldıkları olmuştur. James Türkiye'ye geldiğinden itibaren yemeklerine hayran olmuştur ve her fırsatta Türk yemeklerinin çok lezzetli olduğunu söylemektedir. Bunun yanında Türkçeyi üniversitenin ilk yılında öğrenmiş ve şimdi çok iyi derecede konuşmasının yanında roman ve şiirleri de ilgiyle okumaktadır. Ayrıca günlük gazeteleri ve haber bültenlerini takip ederek Türkiye'nin problemleri hakkında sık sık arkadaşlarıyla tartışmaktadır. James bütün bunların yanında Türkiye'nin yasalarına uymayı çok önemsemektedir. Yakın zamanda Türkiye vatandaşlığı almayı ve eşiyle sahibi olarak hayatını burada sürdürmeyi planlamaktadırlar. Arkadaşları ve eşi onu zeki, çalışkan ve dost canlısı olarak tanımlamaktadırlar.

Mahmoud

Mahmoud, Şam şehrinde doğmuş ve büyümüştür. Ailesi hâlâ Şam şehrinde yaşayan orta sınıf kişilerdir. Liseden sonra, İstanbul'da üniversiteyi kazanmış ve eğitim amacıyla Türkiye'ye gelmiştir. Daha sonra iş hayatına Türkiye'de başlamış ve üniversitede tanıştığı Yeliz ile evlenmiştir. Mahmoud müzik ve futbola aşıktır. Çocukken en sevdiği şey, Şam'daki komşularıyla birlikte mahallede futbol oynamaktı. Hatta oradaki amatör kümede oynayacak kadar yükselmişti. Ancak yaşadığı sakatlıktan sonra artık sadece arkadaşlarıyla her cuma halı sahada oynamaktadır. Aynı zamanda, müzik onun diğer tutkusudur. Arkadaşlarıyla üniversitenin ilk yılında kurdukları grupta vokalistlik yapmakta ve birlikte yazdıkları şarkıları çıktıkları konserlerde söylemektedirler. Bazı müzik yarışmalarına bile katıldıkları olmuştur. Mahmoud Türkiye'ye geldiğinden itibaren yemeklerine hayran olmuştur ve her fırsatta Türk yemeklerinin çok lezzetli olduğunu söylemektedir. Bunun yanında Türkçeyi üniversitenin ilk yılında öğrenmiş ve şimdi çok iyi derecede konuşmasının yanında roman ve şiirleri de ilgiyle okumaktadır. Ayrıca günlük gazeteleri ve haber bültenlerini takip ederek Türkiye'nin problemleri hakkında sık sık arkadaşlarıyla tartışmaktadır. Mahmoud bütün bunların yanında Türkiye'nin yasalarına uymayı çok önemsemektedir. Yakın zamanda Türkiye vatandaşlığı almayı ve eşiyle çocuk sahibi olarak hayatını burada sürdürmeyi planlamaktadırlar. Arkadaşları ve eşi onu zeki, çalışkan ve dost canlısı olarak tanımlamaktadırlar.

D. SOCIAL DISTANCE SCALE

Bu bölümde, daha önce okuduğunuz metindeki **James (Mahmoud)** ile ilgili çeşitli ifadeler verilmiştir. Lütfen **James (Mahmoud) ile ilgili metni** göz önünde bulundurarak bu ifadeleri değerlendiriniz.

1. Bence o benim arkadaşım olabilir.
2. Onunla arkadaşça sohbet etmek isterim.
3. Onunla tanışmak ve konuşmak zor olurdu.
4. Birbirimizle asla özel bir arkadaşlık kuramazdık.
5. O benim arkadaş çevreme tam olarak uygun değil.
6. Onunla hiçbir şey başaramazdım.
7. Ona bir iş verildiğinde aylaklık yapar.
8. Onun iş bitirebilme yeteneğine güvenim var.
9. İşleri halletmek isteseydim, muhtemelen ona güvenebilirdim.
10. O kötü bir problem çözücü olurdu.

E. TURKISH IDENTIFICATION SCALE

Aşağıda Türk olmaya dair duygu ve düşüncelerinizi yansıtabilecek birtakım ifadeler verilmiştir. Kendinizi bir Türk olarak düşündüğünüzde aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin görüşünüzü **ne kadar doğru ve iyi yansıtır?** Bu ifadelere ne kadar katıldığınızı bulmamız için lütfen gelecek sayfalardaki ölçeği doldurunuz.

1. Türklerle aramda bir bağ olduğunu hissediyorum.
2. Kendimi Türklerle dayanışma içinde hissediyorum.
3. Kendimi Türklere bağlı hissediyorum.
4. Türk olmaktan memnunum.
5. Türklerin gurur duyacak çok şeyi olduğunu düşünüyorum.
6. Türk olmak güzel bir şey.
7. Türk olmak bana iyi bir his veriyor.
8. Türk olduğum gerçeği hakkında sık sık düşünürüm.
9. Türk olduğum gerçeği kimliğimin önemli bir parçasıdır.
10. Türk olmam, kendimi nasıl gördüğümün önemli bir parçasıdır.

F. INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION SCALE

Bu bölümde, daha önce okuduğunuz metindeki **James (Mahmoud)** ile ilgili çeşitli ifadeler verilmiştir. Lütfen **James (Mahmoud) ile ilgili metni** göz önünde bulundurarak bu ifadeleri değerlendiriniz.

1. Bence o benim arkadaşım olabilir.
2. Onunla arkadaşça sohbet etmek isterim.
3. Onunla tanışmak ve konuşmak zor olurdu.
4. Birbirimizle asla özel bir arkadaşlık kuramazdık.
5. O benim arkadaş çevreme tam olarak uygun değil.
6. Onunla hiçbir şey başaramazdım.
7. Ona bir iş verildiğinde aylaklık yapar.
8. Onun iş bitirebilme yeteneğine güvenim var.
9. İşleri halletmek isteseydim, muhtemelen ona güvenebilirdim.
10. O kötü bir problem çözücü olurdu.

G. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Cinsiyetiniz:
2. Yaşınız:
3. Doğum Yeriniz:
4.Yaşamınızın büyük bölümünü geçirdiğiniz yer:
   - Büyükşehir
   - İl
   - İlçe
   - Semt
   - Köy
5. Eğitim Durumunuz:
   - Okuma yazma bilmiyor
   - İlkokul
   - Ortaokul
   - Lise
   - Üniversite
   - Y.lisans / Doktora
6. Toplumun geneline kıyasla kendinizi hangi gelir grubuna ait görüyorsunuz?
   - Alt
   - Alt-Orta
   - Orta
   - Orta-Üst
   - Üst
7. Hangi etnik kökene mensupsunuz? ……..
8. Herhangi bir dini gruba mensup musunuz?
   - Evet
   - Hayır
9. (Eğer evetse) Hangi dini gruba mensupsunuz?.....
10. Kendinizi ne kadar inançlı tanımlarsınız?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Hiç									Oldukça Fazla

11. Lütfen politik olarak yakın durduğunuz yeri aşağıda belirtilen aralıkta bir sayıyı işaretleyerek belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Sol				Merkez					Sağ

H. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

İnsan toplulukları var olduğundan beri, kimlerin topluluğa üye olacağının yanında, kimlerin dışlanacağı temel sorunlardan biri olmuştur. Sosyal kimlik teorisi, asgari düzeyde oluşturulmuş bir gruba üyeliğin bile dış grubu dışlama ve iç grup kayırmacılığını ürettiğini ortaya koydu (Tajfel ve Turner, 1979). Ulusal kimlik de aynı zamanda sosyal kimliğin özel bir biçimidir ve bugün arkasında tarihsel ve kurumsal bir güçle gündelik yaşamı etkileyen en önemli kimliklerden biridir (David ve Bar-Tal, 2009). Ulusal kimlik, Fransız İhtilali ve imparatorlukların çöküşünden bu yana devam eden milliyetçilik hareketleriyle dünya çapında önem kazanmış, yeni bir birleştirme ve ayırma pratiği oluşturmuştur (Hobsbawm, 2013). Bununla birlikte, ulusal kimlik, günümüzde çok daha karmaşıktır, çünkü muazzam insan gruplarını hayali sınırlar içine sokar ve çok sayıda diğer insanı da dışlar.

Uluslararası Göç Örgütü'nün ([IOM], 2022) yayınladığı son verilere göre 281 milyon kişi göçmen olup, dünya nüfusunun %3,6'sını oluşturmaktadır. Özellikle 2012 yılından bu yana bölgede yaşanan bitmeyen savaş ve belirsizlik nedeniyle Türkiye sığınmacılar, mülteciler ve göçmenler için sıcak bir liman konumundadır. Birleşmiş Milletler Mülteciler Yüksek Komiserliği [UNHCR] tarafından 2021 yılının ortalarında yayınlanan verilere göre, Türkiye'de 3,7 milyon mülteci var; bu nedenle, Türkiye dünyadaki en önemli sayıda mülteciye ev sahipliği yapmaktadır.
Bu çalışmada, bireylerin farklı göçmenlerle karşılaştıklarında farklı ulusal kimlik kriterlerini Türk olmak için önemli görüp görmedikleri incelenmiştir. Türk vatandaşlarının Suriyeli ve İngiliz göçmenlere tutumları ve ulusal kimliğin etkisi bu tezde konu edilmiştir. Bu amaçla ulusal kimlik literatüründeki yaygın derecelendirme yönteminden farklı olarak sıralama yöntemi kullanılarak ölçülmüştür. Bu sayede ulusal kimlik araştırma alanına farklı bir bakış açısı getirilmiş ve Türk ulusal kimliği ve göç ile ilgili literatüre deneysel bir çalışma da kazandırılmıştır.

Sosyal Kimlik Kuramı

Taijfel ve Turner gruplar arası ilişkileri anlamak için, bir gruba üye olmanın etkisini inceledikleri sosyal kimlik kuramını 1970lerde geliştirmişlerdir (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Bireyler dahil oldukları gruplarla kendilerini kategorize ederek bir sosyal kimlik geliştirirler (Turner, 1982). Bu kimlik, bireysel kimliklerinden farklı olarak normlarını ve değerlerini benimsedikleri bir iç-grubun çerçevesinde oluşur (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Bu bağlamda Taijfel ve Turner (1979) grupların sosyal olarak bir fikir birliği içermesinin yanında "duygusal" bir yönü olduğunu da vurgularlar. Diğer bir yandan, birey iç-grupla özdeşim kurduğunda diğer grupları da dış-grup olarak tanımlar ve onların ayırıcı özelliklerini görmeye başlar. Öyle ki Sosyal kimlik kuramı sadece bilişsel düzeyde kurulmuş bir grup aidiyetinin bile, bireylerde dış gruba yönelik ayrımcılığı tetiklediği ve iç grubunun faydasını gözetmeye yol açtığını ortaya koymuştur (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Bireyler olumlu bir sosyal kimlik kazanmak veya sahip oldukları bu kimliği korumak adına iç-grup kayırmacılığı yaparlar (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Diğer bir yandan, bireylerin sosyal kıyaslamalar sonucunda olumlu bir benlik inşa etmek istedikleri de görülür (Tajfel, 1981). Diğer bir deyişle, bireylerin günlük yaşamda olumlu sosyal kimliklerini inşa sürecinde, iç-grupları ve diğer gruplarla yaptıkları sosyal karşılaştırmaların önemli olduğunu ifade edebiliriz. Buradan hareketle, bireylerin bilişsel olarak kendilerinin ve dolayısıyla gruplarının konumlarının belirlemek için dış-grupları referans grubu olarak kullandıklarını söyleyebiliriz. Ancak tahmin edileceği üzere her zaman iç grubun lehine karşılaştırmalar mümkün değildir.

Kendini kategorilendirme teorisi (KKT) ise Turner (1987) tarafından geliştirilmiş ve sosyal kimlik kuramındaki kategorilendirmenin bilişsel yönüne önemli katkılarda bulunmuştur. Turner, kişisel kimlik ve sosyal kimlik arasındaki ilişkiyi daha net bir şekilde ortaya koymuştur (Turner & Reynolds, 2012). KKT göre teorik olarak, bireyin türler arası düzeydeki benliği olan insan kimliği, gruplar arası düzeydeki benliği olan sosyal kimlik ve kişiler arasındaki düzeydeki benliği olan kişisel kimiği olmak üzere üç farklı soyutlama düzeyinden bahseder (Hornsey, 2008). Ayrıca bu kimliklerin belirgin olması bağlama ve uyarılma durumuna göre değişkenlik gösterebilir (Turner, 1987). Burada algı literatüründen alınmış, erişilebilirlik ve uyum kavramları etkili olur. Erişilebilirlik kategorinin belirgin olmaya ne kadar hazır olduğunu, uyum ise gözlenen uyarıcı ile kategorinin

özelliklerinin uyuşmasını ifade eder. İşte bu bağlamda, kişisel kimliğin sosyal kimliğe kaydığı ve onun belirgin olduğu durumda grup davranışı ortaya çıkar (Turner & Reynolds, 2012).

Ulus ve Ulusal Kimlik

Ulusal kimlik de sosyal kimliğin özel bir halidir. Basit olarak ifade etmek gerekirse, bireylerin uluslarıyla kurdukları bağlanmayı ifade eder. Ancak diğer sosyal kimliklerden farklı olarak, çok büyük sayıda grupları, çoğu zaman arkasında kurumsal bir destek olan devlet aracılığıyla birleştirir. Bu bağlamda birçok bakımdan birleştirici ve ayırıcı faktörler içerir. SCT perspektifinden ifade etmek gerekirse, ulusu büyük bir sosyal grup olarak ele aldığımızda, bireylerin zihninde ulusal kimliğe uyan "kolektif protopitik" bir Türk, İtalyan, Alman vb. olduğunu söyleyebiliriz (David & Bar-Tal, 2009).

Ulusal kimlik, çocukluktan itibaren bireylerin yaşamında büyük bir yer tutmaktadır (Barrett ve Oppenheimer, 2011). Verkuyten (2001), Hollandalı çocukların ulusal kimliklenmeleri arttıkça benlik saygılarının da arttığını tespit etmiştir ve yüksek ulusal özdeşleşme, iç gruba karşı daha az sosyal mesafeye yol açarken, dış gruba karşı daha fazla sosyal mesafeye yol açmaktadır. Araştırmanın gösterdiği gibi, ulusal kimlik, bireylerin özgüvenlerinde ve başkalarıyla olan ilişkilerinde hayati bir rol oynamaktadır. Ayrıca, insanlar yüksek oranda ulusal kimlikle özdeşleştiklerinde, önemli bir iç grup yanlılığı ve ulusal kalıp yargılarında artış gözlemlenmiştir (Nigbur & Cinnirella, 2007). Benzer bir tarzda, Mummendey ve ark. (2001), güçlü ulusal özdeşleşme ile olumlu grup içi değerlendirme arasında yüksek bir ilişki bulmuştur.

Ayrıca, günümüzde ulusal kimlik bağlamında, küreselleşme ve artan hareketlilik nedeniyle göçmenlerin hem adaptasyonu hem de entegrasyonu tartışmalı konulardır. Özellikle göçmenlerin ev sahibi ülkenin ulusal kimliği ile özdeşleşmeleri gerekmektedir (Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012). Ev sahibi ülkenin ulusal kimliğiyle bağ kurmak, grup reddi algısını azaltabilir (Verkuyten ve Yıldız, 2007). Ev sahibi ülke değerlerine uymayan bireyler daha fazla ayrımcılığa maruz kalmaktadır; bu nedenle etnik ve dini kimliklerine daha fazla bağlanmakta ve kendilerini ev sahibi ulusal kimlikten uzaklaştırmaktadırlar. Martiny ve ark. (2019), ayrımcılık

deneyiminin ulusal kimliğe zarar verdiğini tespit etmiştir. Ancak her göçmene karşı aynı tavırlar sergilenmemektedir. Bourhis ve Dayan (2004), ev sahibi ülke katılımcılarının Yahudi Rus ve Etiyopyalı mültecilere ve Arap kökenli mültecilere yönelik kültürleşme tutumlarını incelemiş ve katılımcıların entegrasyon düşüncelerinden ziyade Araplara karşı daha ayrımcı ve dışlayıcı yönelimler sergilediklerini bulmuşlardır.

Öte yandan, ulusal kimliğin farklı tanımları, diğerlerinin ulusal kimliğe dahil edilme kriterlerini etkiler. Kohn (2005), ulusal kimliğin en yaygın iki sınıflandırmasının, yurttaşlık (civic) ve etnik (ethnic) olduğunu ifade etmiştir. Ulusal kimliğin yurttaşlık boyutu ya da yurttaşlık milliyetçiliği Batılı anlamda ortak kurallar ve ortak topraklar içeren yurttaşlığı ifade ederken, etnik boyutun ya da etnik milliyetçilik ise kan bağına dayalı milleti ifade eder ve Doğu Avrupa ve Asya ülkelerinde daha yaygındır. Yurttaşlık ulusal kimliğine göre, devletin düzenine ve yasalarına uyan ve devlete aktif olarak katılan bireyler ulusal iç grubu oluşturur ve devlet "jus soli" üzerine kurulur (Brubaker, 1990). Etnik ulusal kimlik ise, devletlerin "jus sanguinis" temelinde kurulduğu ve egemen grubun etnisitesine bağlı olarak ulusal kimliğin oluşturulduğu ülkeleri temsil eder (Brubaker, 1990).

Ulusal kimliğin etnik ve sivil kimlik olmak üzere iki kutupta tanımlanması eleştirilmiştir. Bunlardan biri de çok kültürlülük çerçevesinde yapılan ve milli kimliğin kültürel boyutunun bu sınıflandırmada yer almadığını ileri süren eleştirilerdir. Bu nedenle ulusal kimliğin kültürel unsurlarını sadece etnik veya yurttaşlık boyutlara göre değerlendirmek doğru değildir. Kymlicka (2001), Kanada'da Quebec ve İspanya'da Katalonya gibi kültürel olarak tanımlanmış ulusal grupların da olduğunu ima etmiştir. Öte yandan, yurttaşlık milliyetçiliğinin göçmenlere ve azınlıklara karşı daha kapsayıcı ve liberal olduğu fikri de eleştirilmiştir. Örneğin, Devos ve ark. (2020), Yeni Zelanda'nın ulusal kimliğinin yurttaşlık olduğunu düşünen bireylerin, azınlıklara yönelik kaynak politikalarına daha karşı olduklarını ve bu nedenle, eşitsizlikleri meşrulaştırmada daha önemli bir paya sahip olduklarını buldu. Etnik ve yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik tanımlarına yönelik bir başka eleştiri, Batılı olmayan toplumlara karşı önyargı ve Batılı ülkelerin saf yurttaş olarak tasvir edilmesidir. Öncelikle Kuzio (2002) salt etnik veya yurttaşlık ulusal kimliğe sahip olmanın ancak teoride bulunabileceğini belirtmekte ve Batılı devletlerin etnik bir tarzda kurulduğunu ve daha sonra sivil bir karakter kazandığını

söylemektedir. Son olarak, ulusal kimlik esnek ve değişken, hatta bazen çelişkili bir yapıya sahiptir ve sonuç olarak sürekli olarak hem kapsayıcı hem de dışlayıcı özellikler sergilemesi bakımından bu sınıflandırmayı dahil olamayacağı ifade edilmiştir (Perkins ark., 2019). Komisarof ve ark. (2020), Japon üniversite öğrencileri ile yaptıkları çalışmada, düşük statülü göçmenlerden, karşılanması zor olan dil ve etnik belirteçlere uyum sağlamaları beklenirken, yüksek statülü göçmenlerden sosyoekonomik özelliklere uyum sağlamanın beklendiğini bulmuşlardır.

Türk Ulusal Kimliği

Türk ulusal kimliği de anayasalarda yurttaşlık bağlamında oluşturulmuş olsa da uygulamada birçok farklılığa sahiptir. İlk olarak, genç Türkiye Cumhuriyeti, ülkedeki farklı etnik ve dini kökene sahip grupları bir araya getiren ortak bir kimlik olarak Türk kimliğini inşa etmeye çalışmıştır (Çağaptay, 2006).

Diğer bir yandan, bugün ulusal kimlik açısından en kritik ikilemlerden biri, son yıllarda hızla artan Türkiye'deki göçmen ve sığınmacı nüfusudur. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Göç İdaresi Başkanlığı (Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Göç İdaresi Başkanlığı - [PMM], t.d.) tarafından 31 Mart 2022 tarihinde yayınlanan son verilere göre, Türkiye'de 1.401.849'u oturma iznine sahip 5.165.414 yabancı uyruklu vatandaş bulunuyor. Ancak bu sayının yaklaşık 4 milyonunu geçici koruma altındaki Suriyeliler oluşturmaktadır. Sunata'nın (2020) raporuna göre, Suriyeli katılımcıların %50,9'u koşullar uygun olduğunda Suriye'ye dönmeyi düşünmüyor. Ayrıca Suriyeli katılımcıların %46,4'ü Türkiye'den ayrılmayı düşünmemektedir. Öte yandan, ülkede mültecilere yönelik olumsuz duyguların giderek arttığı gözlemlenmektedir. Yitmen ve Verkuyten (2017), Türk ulusal kimliği ile yüksek ulusal özdeşliğe sahip katılımcıların mültecilere karşı daha olumsuz bir tutuma sahip olduklarını bulmuşlardır. Bu nedenle Türk ulusal kimliğinin ayrıntılı bir şekilde incelenmesi, entegrasyonun ve çok kültürlülüğün tesisi için hayati önem taşımaktadır.

Çalışmanın Amacı

Bu çalışmada, bireylerin Türk milli kimliğine ilişkin fikirlerinin farklı göçmenlere karşı değişip değişmediğini incelemeyi amaçladım. Literatürdeki çoğu çalışma ulusal kimliği etnik ve yurttaşlık olarak ve ülke içinde sabit olarak ele alsa da bağlama göre değişmektedir (Bechhofer ve ark., 1999; Komisarof ve ark., 2020; Komisarof & Leong, 2020; Perkins ve ark., 2019). Bireyler, "değerli" ve "değersiz" olarak görülen göçmenler hakkında farklı değerlendirmeler yapmaktadırlar (Montreuil ve Bourhis, 2001). Ayrıca, bu çalışma Türk ulusal kimlik literatürü için iki açıdan büyük önem taşımaktadır: Birincisi, Türk ulusal kimliğinin yazılı ve uygulamadaki farklı doğası (Çağaptay, 2006; Yeğen, 2004); ve -ikincisi, Türkiye'de artan göçmen nüfusu. Ayrıca Türk ulusal kimliği de diğer ulusal kimlikler gibi kimlerin dahil edileceği ve kimlerin dışarıda bırakılacağına göre değişkenlik göstermektedir (Yeğen, 2017). Bu nedenle, bugün ve gelecekte Türkiye'de göçmeler yönelik tutumların araştırılması önemlidir. Bu amaçla, katılımcılara bir İngiliz ve bir Suriyeli göçmen hakkında bir metin verilmiş ve ardından Türk ulusal kimliği ile ilgili maddeleri önem sırasına göre sıralamaları istenmiştir. Böylece milli kimliğin etnik-sivil ölçümünün yanı sıra alternatif ölçüm yöntemleri literatüre sunulmuş, Türk ulusal kimliği ve göçmenler konusuna yeni bakış açıları kazandırılmıştır.

Yöntem

İşlem

Veri toplanmadan önce çalışmanın yapılabilmesi için ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu onay alınmıştır (bkz. Ek A). Çalışma Qualtrics'te oluşturulan çevrimiçi bir anket aracılığıyla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmada katılımcılar ODTÜ SONA sistemi üzerinden ekstra ders kredisi ve sosyal medya üzerinden linkler aracılığıyla ulaşılmıştır. Araştırma boylamsal desende olup iki aşamadan oluşmuştur. İlk oturumun sonunda katılımcılardan e-posta adresleri istenmiştir. İlk bölüme katılımdan bir hafta sonra e-posta adreslerine otomatik bir e-posta, iki gün sonra da bir hatırlatma e-postası gönderilmiştir. Verileri eşleştirmek için Qualtrics tarafından otomatik olarak oluşturulan kullanıcı kodları kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların çalışmanın ana hipotezini çözememeleri için iki aşama arasında bir haftalık zaman aralığı kullanılmıştır.

Çalışmanın başında bilgilendirilmiş onam formu yer aldı. Katılımcılara çalışmada kullanılan ölçekler hakkında detaylı bilgi verilmiş ve her iki çalışmaya da katılmaları halinde puan alabilecekleri belirtilmiştir. Katılımcılar başlangıçta gerçek hipotezlerin farkında değillerdi; bunun yerine, "kişiler arası ilişkiler ve siyasi görüşler üzerine" bir araştırmaya katıldıkları söylendi. Bu aldatma, araştırmanın amacını gizlemek için kullanılmıştır. Demografik bilgi formu toplandıktan sonra katılımcılara ana karakter olarak Türkiye'de bir süredir yaşayan bir göçmen olan hikayeler verildi. Ana karakterin etnik geçmişi dışında (Suriyeli ve İngiliz) diğer tüm detaylar her iki hikayede de aynıydı. Katılımcılar bu iki koşuldan birine rastgele olarak atandı ve ikinci aşamada diğer koşuldaki hikayeyi gördüler. Hikaye verildikten hemen sonra bunun ayrıntılarıyla ilgili sorularla katılımcıların hikayeyi okuyup okumadıklarını görmek için manipülasyon kontrolü yapıldı. Daha sonra Kişilerarası Çekicilik Ölçeği sunuldu ve katılımcıları gerçek hipotezlerden daha fazla uzaklaştırmak için kahramanı bu ölçekte değerlendirmeleri istendi. Ardından sırasıyla Sosyal Mesafe, Ulusal Kimlik Temsilleri ve Türklükle Özdeşim ölçekleri verilmiştir. Ölçeklerden sonra katılımcılara öyküde yer alan göçmene Türk vatandaşlığının verilmesini onaylayıp onaylamadıkları sorulmuştur. Bahsedildiği gibi, ikinci aşamaya katılımlarını sağlamak için katılımcılardan e-posta adresleri alınmıştır. İkinci aşamada sadece hikayenin kahramanının etnik kökeni değiştirilmiş olup, aynı prosedür izlenmiştir. Son olarak, katılımcıların deneysel manipülasyonu ve dolayısıyla çalışmanın gerçek hipotezlerini anlayıp anlamadıklarını kontrol etmek için huni bilgilendirme (funnel debrief) yöntemi kullanıldı. Daha ayrıntılı olarak, bu bilgilendirmede katılımcılara çalışmanın amacı, çalışmada tuhaf bir şey fark edip etmedikleri ve çalışma hakkında önceden bilgi sahibi olup olmadıkları sorulmuştur. İkinci çalışmanın sonunda katılımcılara aldatmadan dolayı özür dilemek için ayrıntılı bir katılım sonrası bilgilendirme formu verilmiş ve çalışmanın hipotezleri açıklanmıştır. İki anketin tamamlanması yaklaşık 30 dakika sürmüştür.

Ölçümler

Ulusal Kimlik Temsilleri

Ulusal kimlik temsilleri, katılımcılar için kişisel önem sırasına göre dokuz madde sıralanarak ölçülmüştür. Bu maddeler Cingöz-Ulu (2008) tarafından

geliştirilen Türk Ulusal Kimliği Belirteçleri Ölçeğinden alınmıştır. Bu ölçekte katılımcılardan Türklük tanımlarına ilişkin cümleleri (1'den 7'ye kadar Likert tipi, 1 'hiç', 7 'çok önemli') değerlendirmeleri istenmektedir. Etno-kültürel boyutta yedi, yurttaşlık boyutunda dokuz ve duygusal boyutta iki olmak üzere, ölçek toplamda üç boyuttan ve18 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Orijinal ölçeğin etno-kültürel, yurttaşlık ve duygusal boyutlar için iç tutarlılık değerleri sırasıyla .82, .86 ve.81'dir. Bu çalışma için etno-kültürel boyuttan dört madde (örneğin, Türk soyundan geliyor olmak) ve yurttaşlık boyutu da beş madde (örneğin, Türkiye yasalarını ve kurumlarını benimsemek) seçilmiştir (bkz. Ek B). Bu maddeler, yükleme puanlarına ve bu çalışmanın teorik çerçevesine uygunluğuna göre belirlenmiştir.

Deneysel Manipülasyon Hikayesi

Demografik bilgi formunun ardından her katılımcıya, kahramanın göçmen olduğu bir hikayenin iki versiyonundan biri verildi (Denekler Arası Desen). Bu hikayelerin ana kahramanları Şam'dan Mahmoud ve Londra'dan James idi. Bu iki koşul dışında, hikayeyle ilgili her şey aynıydı. Hikayedeki hedef kişi üniversite için Türkiye'ye gelmiştir, burada çalışmaya başlamıştır ve bir Türk kadınla evlenmiştir. Ayrıca, kahramanın hobileri müzik ve futbol olarak belirtilmiş ve Türk kültürüne uyumunun çeşitli yönleri (ör. yemek seçimleri, Türkçe dil yeterliliği, Türk siyasi gündemi hakkında bilgisi) vurgulanmıştır. Hikayenin son paragrafında ise Mahmoud veya James'in Türk vatandaşlığına başvurduğu ve eşiyle birlikte Türkiye'de bir gelecek planladığı belirtilmiştir (bkz. Ek C).

Sosyal Mesafe Ölçeği

Katılımcıların hikayenin kahramanı göçmene karşı önyargılarını ölçmek için Bogardus (1967) tarafından geliştirilen 6 maddelik 7'li Likert tipi ölçek kullanılmıştır (bkz. Ek D). Katılımcılar, hikayedeki hedef kişilerle çeşitli sosyal ilişkilerde ne kadar rahat olacaklarını değerlendirdiler. Katılımcılar her bir maddeyi 1 (Hiç Rahatsız Hissetmem) ile 7 (Çok Rahatsız Hissederim) arasında değişen bir ölçekte değerlendirdi. Yüksek puanlar, katılımcıların hedef kişiyle daha fazla sosyal mesafeye sahip olmak istediklerini ve bu nedenle onlara karşı daha fazla önyargı

sergilediklerini gösterir. Balaban (2013) sosyal mesafe ölçeğini Türkçe ‘ye uyarlamıştır (α = .93).

Türklükle Özdeşim

Türklükle özdeşim, Leach ve arkadaşları (2008) tarafından geliştirilen ve Balaban (2013) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan (α = .94) Çok Bileşenli Grup İçi Tanımlama Ölçeği’nin Grup düzeyinde kendini tanımlama boyutunun 10 maddesi ile ölçülmüştür (bkz. Ek F). Ölçek 7'li Likert tipinde derecelendirilmiştir ve yüksek puanlar daha fazla özdeşleşmeye işaret etmektedir (1 = Kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 7 = Kesinlikle katılıyorum, örneğin, "Türklere bağlı hissediyorum").

Kişilerarası Çekicilik Ölçeği

Bu çalışmada öyküdeki hedef kişinin çekiciliği, McCroskey ve McCain (1974) tarafından geliştirilen Kişilerarası Çekicilik Ölçeğinin, sosyal çekicilik ve görev çekiciliği boyutları ile değerlendirilmiştir (bkz. Ek G). Orijinal ölçek, mevcut çalışmada uygulanmayan fiziksel çekiciliği de içermektedir. Bu ölçeğin dahil edilmesi, çalışmanın ana hipotezlerini katılımcılardan gizlemeyi amaçlamaktadır ve bu yüzden bu ölçek sadece dikkat dağıtmak için kullanılmıştır. Katılımcılar, on maddeyi 7 puanlık bir ölçekte (1 = kesinlikle katılmıyorum, 7 = kesinlikle katılıyorum) derecelendirdi. İç güvenirlik puanları, sosyal çekicilik boyutu için .75'tir (örneğin, bence o benim arkadaşım olabilir) ve görev çekiciliği boyutu için .86'dır (örneğin, onun iş bitirebilme yeteneğine güvenim var).

Demografik Bilgi Formu

Katılımcılardan demografik bilgi formunda cinsiyet, yaş, doğdukları ve yaşamlarının çoğunu geçirdikleri şehir, eğitim durumu, sosyoekonomik durum, anne ve babasının eğitim durumu, gelir, etnik köken, dindarlık ve muhafazakarlık bilgilerini belirtmeleri istendi (bkz. Ek H).

Katılımcılar

Çalışmanın toplam örneklemi 122 katılımcıdan (86 kadın, 36 erkek) oluşmakta ve katılımcıların yaşları 18 ile 65 arasında değişmektedir (Ort. = 28.8, SS = 10.9). Otuz beş katılımcı SONA sistemi üzerinden ekstra sınıf puanları için çalışmaya katılmıştır. Diğer doksan iki katılımcı ise sosyal medyadan link ile çalışmaya katıldı.

Sonuçlar

İlk olarak, tek yönlü ANOVA ve Kruskal-Wallis testleri yapılarak öncelik etkisi kontrol edilmiştir. Bu nedenle, Mahmoud'a karşı önyargı, James'e karşı önyargı ve Mahmoud'taki katılımcıların ulusal kimlikleri, Mahmoud koşulunda etnokültürel temsiller, James koşulunda etnokültürel temsiler, Mahmoud koşulunda yurttaşlık temsilleri ve James koşulunda yurttaşlık temsilleri üzerine bir Kruskal-Wallis testi yapılmış ve bu değişkenler için ilk kez Mahmoud veya James'i görme arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı bulunmuştur (sırasıyla; $p = 0.834$, $p = 0.114$, $p = 0.266$, $p = 0.306$, $p = 0.509$, $p = 0.306$, $p = 0.509$). James'te koşulundaki Türklükle özdeşim değerleri için de tek yönlü bir ANOVA testi yapıldı ve anlamlı bir fark yoktu ($F(1,119) = 2.785$, $p = 0.098$). Sonuç olarak katılımcıların önce Mahmoud veya James ile ilgili hikayeyi görmelerinin sonuçlar üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığı bulunmuştur.

Wilcoxon işaretli-sıralar testinin sonucu, Mahmoud ve James'in koşullarında etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsilleri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığını ortaya koymaktadır ($p = 0.796$). Ayrıca, Wilcoxon işaretli-sıralar ile Mahmoud ve James'in koşullarındaki yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik belirteçleri arasındaki fark anlamlı değildi ($p = 0.675$). Ancak Wilcoxon İşaretli-Sıralar testinin sonucu Mahmoud 'un durumunda ($W = 5531$, $r = 0.88$, $p < .001$) ve James'in durumunda ($W = 5593$, $r = 0.87$, $p < .001$). Etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsilleri ile yurttaşlık temsilleri arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır.

Mahmoud 'un durumunda hedef göçmene yönelik önyargının ve katılımcının ulusal özdeşiminin etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralaması üzerindeki etkisini araştırmak için sıralı lojistik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Verilere uygun modele göre, önyargı ve ulusal kimlik, etnokültürel ulusal kimlik belirteçlerinde ($X^2 = 25.7$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$, $R^2_{MCF} = 0.05$, $-2LL = 524$, $AIC = 558$) anlamlı bir varyansı

açıklamıştır. James'in durumunda hedef göçmene yönelik önyargının ve katılımcının ulusal kimliğiyle özdeşimin etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralaması üzerindeki etkisini incelemek için bir başka sıralı lojistik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Verilere uygun model, önyargı ve ulusal kimlikle özdeşimin etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsillerinde anlamlı bir varyansı açıkladığını göstermiştir (X^2 = 28.3, df = 2, p <.001, R^2_{MCF} = 0.05, -2LL = 532, AIC = 570).

Ayrıca, Mahmoud ‘un durumunda hedef göçmene yönelik önyargının ve katılımcının ulusal kimlikle özdeşiminin yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralaması üzerindeki etkisini araştırmak için sıralı lojistik regresyon analizi yapılmıştır. Veri sonuçlarına uygun model, önyargı ve ulusal kimlikle özdeşimin yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik temsillerinde (X^2 = 25.7, df = 2, p <.001, R^2_{MCF} = 0.05, -2LL = 524, AIC = 558) anlamlı bir varyansı açıkladığını ortaya koydu. James'in durumunda hedef göçmene yönelik önyargının ve katılımcının ulusal kimliğiyle özdeşiminin yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralaması üzerindeki etkisini incelemek için sıralı bir lojistik regresyon gerçekleştirilmiştir. Verilere uygun modele göre, önyargı ve ulusal kimlikle özdeşimin, yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik temsillerinde (X^2 = 28.3, df = 2, p <.001, R^2_{MCF} = 0.05, -2LL = 532, AIC = 570) anlamlı bir varyansı açıklamıştır.

Wilcoxon testi, Mahmoud ve James'e karşı önyargı arasında anlamlı bir fark ortaya çıkardı (W (121) = 2044, p <.001, r = 0.645). Sonuçlara göre, Mahmoud'a yönelik önyargı (Mdn = 1.83, SD = 1.17), James’e yönelik önyargıdan (Mdn = 1.33, SD = 0.74) daha fazlaydı. Wilcoxon testi, Mahmoud ve James'in koşullarındaki katılımcıların ulusal kimlikle özdeşimi arasında anlamlı bir fark ortaya koydu (W (120) = 3860, p = 0.027, r = 0.242). Sonuçlara göre, katılımcılar, Mahmoud ‘un durumunda (Mdn = 4.40, SD = 1.44), James'in (Mdn = 4.30, SD = 1.42) durumuna göre daha fazla Türklükle özdeşleşmiştir.

Tartışma

Giriş bölümünde belirtildiği gibi, ulusal kimlikler esnektir ve zamana ve bağlama göre değişebilir (Bechhofer vd., 1999; Komisarof vd., 2020; Komisarof & Leong, 2020; Perkins vd., 2019). Bireyler, daha düşük statü olarak gördükleri göçmenlerin daha zorlu koşullara (örneğin, sosyodilsel veya etnik, Komisarof ve

ark., 2020'de) uyum sağlamasını ister. Bu nedenle, toplum tarafından daha kabul edilebilir görülen göçmenlerin, öncelikle yurttaşlık faktörlerini yerine getirmeleri bekleniyordu çünkü bu faktörlerin karşılanması nispeten daha kolaydır. Diğer göçmenlerin, yerine getirilmeleri daha zor veya imkansız olan etnik faktörlerle değerlendirilmeleri beklenmekteydi. Ancak bu çalışmanın bulguları, bu hipotezin anlamlı bulunmadığını göstermektedir.

Çünkü, sosyal arzulanırlık etkisi sonuçları etkilemiş olabilir ve bundan dolayı ilk hipotezi kanıtlamak için yeterli kanıt bulunamamış olabilir. Paulhus'a (1991) göre, insanlar sosyal arzulanırlık yanlılığı nedeniyle kendilerini iyi gösteren tepkiler verme eğilimindedirler. Bu çalışmada katılımcılar kendilerini demokratik ve eşitlikçi olarak göstermek ve insanları etnik kökenlerine göre yargılamadıklarını göstermek istemiş olabilirler. Gerçekten de katılımcılar ağırlıklı olarak sol kanattan ve daha az muhafazakar ve dindar bir örneklemdendi; dolayısıyla bu eğilim sonuçlarda ortaya çıkmış olabilir. Ancak, sol ve sağ siyasi ideolojiler ve muhafazakarlıkla ilgili siyasi hoşgörü ve demokratik değerler bağlamında da bazı çelişkiler bulunmaktadır (Baron & Jost, 2019; Brandt ve diğerleri, 2013; Crawford & Pilanski, 2014; Crawford, 2014). Diğer olası bir açıklama, katılımcıların Mahmoud ve James koşullarındaki ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralaması arasındaki tutarlılığı korumak için böyle bir sıralamayı tercih etmiş olabileceğidir. Ancak denekler arası tasarımda göçmenlere göre sıralama da değişmediği için bu açıklama yeterli kanıt bulamamıştır.

Ayrıca, her iki durumda da yurttaşlık ulusal kimlik temsili, Türk olmak için etnokültürel ulusal kimlik temsillerinden daha önemli görülmüştür. Bu nedenle bulgular, anayasanın Türk ulusal kimliğinin yurttaşlık tanımıyla örtüşmektedir (Killi ve Gözübüyük, 2006). Literatüre dayanarak (Pehrson ve diğerleri, 2009b; Pehrson ve Green, 2010; Reijerse ve diğerleri, 2013), yurttaşlık faktörlerinin daha önemli olduğu bir ulusal kimliğin azınlıklar ve göçmenler için etnik faktörlerden daha kapsayıcı olduğu söylenebilir. Yine de bu sonuçlar sosyal arzulanırlık etkisinden ortaya çıkmış olabilir (Paulhus, 1991).

Diğer bir yandan, biri Suriyeli, diğeri İngiliz olmak dışında hiçbir farkı olmayan iki göçmen için önyargının değiştiği tespit edilmiştir. Bu bulgular katılımcıların Türkiye'nin mevcut siyasi atmosferi bağlamında vatandaşlık almak isteyen bir Suriyeli göçmeni daha tehditkar bulabilecekleri şeklinde yorumlanabilir. Stephan ve Stephan'ın (2000) Bütünleşik Tehdit Kuramına göre, insanlar başka bir

grubun üyesiyle karşılaştıklarında, o kişinin bir şekilde gruplarına zarar vereceğini düşünerek gruplar arası bir tehdit algılayabilirler. Dahası, KKT'ya göre, insanların kendi iç gruplarına yönelik bir tehdit hissettiklerinde aşırı duyarlı olabilirler (Turner,1987). Bu bağlamda Suriyeli mülteciler konusu özellikle son birkaç yıldır hem medya (Efe, 2019; Kardeş vd., 2017; Pandır vd., 2015) hem de siyasi figürler tarafından yoğun bir kültürel ve ekonomik tehdit olarak sunulmaktadır. Bu nedenle katılımcılar, kamuoyunda olumsuz bir izlenim oluşması nedeniyle nüfusu yaklaşık 4 milyona ulaşan Suriyelilerin baskın Türk kültürüne zarar vereceğini düşünmüş olabilirler. Yine, Türkiye'de devam eden ekonomik kriz, her iki tarafın da finansal olarak aynı havuzu paylaşması gerektiğinden, Suriyeli göçmenlere yönelik algılanan tehdidi artırmış olabilir. Bu tehdide, Suriyelilerin Türkiyelilerin işlerini elinden alacakları ve işsizliği artıracakları ve halka verilmesi gereken sosyal desteği, onların devletten alacakları gibi bazı varsayımlardan kaynaklanmış olabilir (Esses, 2020). Buna paralel olarak Yitmen ve Verkuyten (2018), Türklerin Suriyeli göçmenlerden daha yüksek bir tehdit algıladıklarında, ulusal kimliğiyle daha güçlü bir bağlanma ve onlara karşı olumsuz niyetler sergilediklerini bulmuşlardır. Algılanan bu kültürel ve ekonomik tehdit sonucunda bireylerin Suriyelilere yönelik olumsuz tutumları artmış olabilir.

Ayrıca Mahmoud ve James'e yönelik önyargı ve katılımcıların ulusal kimliklenme düzeyi, ulusal kimlik temsillerinin sıralamasını yordamıştır. Ayrıca, etnokültürel ve yurttaşlık temsilleri bu yordayıcılardan farklı şekilde etkilenmiştir. Her iki göçmen için de katılımcıların önyargıları ve ulusal özdeşimleri arttıkça, Türk olmak için etnokültürel temsillerin önemi artmıştır. Tersine, katılımcıların önyargıları ve ulusal kimliğe bağlılıkları azaldığında, yurttaşlık temsillerine daha fazla önem verdiler. Dolayısıyla, bu sonuçlar, önceki literatür bulgularıyla tutarlı olarak etnik temsillerin daha özcü ve önyargılı kullanıldığını göstermektedir (Maddens ve diğerleri, 2000; Pehrson ve diğerleri, 2009b). Çalışmalar, literatürde yurttaşlık temsillerinin de önemli düzeyde ayrımcılık içerdiğini belirtse de (Devos ve diğerleri, 2020; Kadianaki & Andreouli, 2015), araştırmamız buna karşıt kanıtlar buldu. Ancak yurttaşlık temsilleri ile göçmenlere yönelik olumsuz tutumlar arasındaki bu pozitif ilişkinin ağırlıklı olarak Batı ve Kuzey Avrupa kültürlerinde bulunduğu vurgulanmalıdır (Leong ve diğerleri, 2020; Simonsen & Bonikowski, 2019). Ayrıca, Rejierse ve ark. (2013) da kültürel temsillerin bu konuda masum

olmadığını ima etmiştir ve sonuçlarımız da buna benzerdir. Dolayısıyla özetlemek gerekirse, daha önyargılı ve daha güçlü ulusal kimlikle özdeşime sahip olan katılımcılar, göçmenlere Türk olmaları için daha zor şartlar koymaktadır.

Çalışma, bazı önemli kanıtlar sağlarken, üç ana sınırlaması vardı. Öncelikle, araştırmanın örneklemi sosyal medya ve SONA üzerinden rastgele seçilmiş olmasına rağmen genel olarak muhafazakarlık ve dindarlık düzeyleri düşük ve sol siyasi görüşe daha yakındır. Bu nedenle örneklem, verilerini Türk popülasyonuna genellenmesi dış geçerlik sorunları yaratmaktadır; bu nedenle, kendi bağlamında değerlendirilmelidir. Çalışmanın bir diğer sınırlılığı, sıralı lojistik regresyon modellerinde sonuçların anlamlı olmasına rağmen, etki büyüklüklerinin Mcfadden'e (1979) göre mükemmel kriterlerden ($R^2 = 0.2 – 0.4$) daha küçük olmasıdır. Bu nedenle bulguların daha büyük örneklemler ile tekrarlanması ve sonuçların etki büyüklüğü bilgisi ışığında değerlendirilmesi esastır. Son olarak, bu çalışma ulusal kimliğin etnik ve kültürel temsillerini etnokültürel olan tek bir boyut olarak değerlendirmiştir. Kymlicka'ya (2001) göre kültürel boyut, etnik ve sivil boyuttan ayrı düşünülmelidir; ancak kültürel boyutun etnik boyutla paralellik gösterdiği de tespit edilmiştir (Rejierse ve ark., 2013). Yine de okuyucu, bu çalışmanın sonuçlarını değerlendirirken etnik, sivil ve kültürel boyutlara ilişkin teorik eleştirilerin farkında olmalıdır. Sonuç olarak, diğer çalışmalar tasarlanırken ve bu çalışmanın sonuçları değerlendirilirken sınırlamalar göz ardı edilmemelidir.

I. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Özakay
Adı / Name : Özgün
Bölümü / Department : Psikoloji / Psychology

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English): DOES THE COUNTRY OF ORIGIN OF IMMIGRANTS CHANGE THE IMPORTANCE OF NATIONAL IDENTITY MARKERS IN TÜRKİYE?

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☒ **Doktora** / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature .....

Tarih / Date .....
(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.