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ABSTRACT

The concept of cultural heritage is a concept increasingly important in recent years. Many international institutions have been worked for long time for the protection of cultural heritage. At the same time to preserve their cultural heritage in many countries are taking various measures. Among these measures the role of education has come to the fore in recent years. Various agencies and authorities emphasized that to educate awareness individuals about protection of cultural heritage is one of the most important ways. In this regard cultural heritage issues have been put up to the school curriculums. Social studies lesson is one of these curriculums. One of the goals of the Social Studies courses is to educate conscious citizens about cultural heritage. In this respect, it is seeing important that pre-service social studies’ attitudes heritage education because whit their views they will affect future generations. The purpose of the current study is to compare the attitudes of Turkish and American pre-service social studies teachers’ toward heritage education. In this study, the authors collected the data from both quantitative and qualitative instruments, including attitude surveys completed before and after classroom activities and a field trip. We found that both Turkish and American pre-service social studies teachers already had highly positive attitudes toward inclusion of heritage education. Therefore, there was not statistically meaningful difference between pretest and posttest. When we compared quantitative results both American and Turkish pre-service social studies reported that they found the historical places to be valuable teaching and learning tools. Both Turkish and American pre-service social studies teachers indicated that preserving historical places is important.
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TÜRK VE AMERİKAN SOSYAL BİLGİLER ÖĞRETMEN ADAYLARININ KÜLTÜREL MIRAS EğİTİMİNE YÖNELİK TUTUMLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI
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Introduction

Cultural heritage is described as ‘the traces and expressions of human behavior and communication, that we inherited from our forefathers, which we choose to, keep because we attach value to them as individuals and as a society’ (Hereduc 2005, 12). Cultural heritage is a dynamic concept and its scope is constantly changing. The concept of cultural heritage initially were including only protection of the great monuments of artistic and historical value, in a broader sense today; people can include everything from a certain sense of cultural community (Ashworth 1994; Aslan & Ardemagni 2006; Howard 2003; Hereduc 2005). Accordingly, Heritage education (hereafter HE) is teaching about the cultural heritage and the cultural heritage consists of tangible and intangible human works. In the current study, we addressed cultural heritage as tangible assets so as to limit the research.

The Council of Europe (1998) defines HE as ‘a teaching approach based on cultural heritage, incorporating active educational methods, cross-curricular approaches, a partnership
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between the fields of education and culture and employing the widest variety of modes of communication and expression’ (1998, 31). Similarly, Hunter (1988) defines HE as ‘an approach to teaching and learning about history and culture that uses information available from the material culture and the human and built environments as primary instructional resources’ (1988, 2). HE encourages students to see their environment as a lifelong source, which can reach information, personal success and define social issues (Hatch 1988). HE helps students focus on the understanding of heritage sites and traditions as well as the protection of these places (Copeland 2004). HE identifies, documents, analyzes, and interprets historical places in order to expand and enrich the public’s understanding and appreciation of the ideas, themes, issues, events, and people that constitute the historical experiences and cultural expressions of heritage (Hunter 1992). HE provides many benefits to school age children through different curricula. It primarily, increases the children’s knowledge and understanding about the history and value of the built and natural environment that they live in. HE also encourages children to be actively involved in its protection and conservation as active citizens (Europa Nostra 2004). HE is not a curriculum subject or an academic discipline, but rather an approach to teaching subjects or studying academic disciplines (Hunter 1992). The Europa Nostra (2004) emphasizes that HE has a cross-cultural nature. ‘History, geography, languages and geometry are but some of the disciplines that can greatly benefit from the historic and spatial dimensions of our tangible heritage’ (2004, 62). Hunter (1992) addresses that HE integrates the information that obtained from various disciplines with other source materials, and consider this information from an interdisciplinary perspective on the humanities, arts, social, and natural sciences.

The task of teaching about cultural heritage in Turkey in primary and middle schools takes place mostly in the social studies courses. The term cultural heritage also takes place in social studies curriculum. “Culture and Heritage” is one of the social studies curriculum themes. Social studies course is taught from grade fourth to grade eight in Turkey. During these four years under this theme, students learn different topics that include culture and heritage. One of the aims of social studies curriculum in Turkey is to provide students with the sense of preserving and developing cultural heritage (MEB 2005).

**Why Heritage education?**

Assets of cultural heritage to which human beings attach importance and want to protect and pass on to future generations are facing issues of defect, wear and tear, and extinction. Destruction of cultural heritage is an irreversible process. Because cultural heritage has existed hundreds or even thousands of years, people may think that these assets will live forever. In fact, either an object or a monument, indeed all tangible assets have been deteriorating in time because of chemical, biological and physical changes (Aslan & Ardemagni 2006). The threats can be divided into two natural factors such as earthquake, volcanic eruption, lightning, hail, storms, flood, climate, humidity, corrosion, and human factors such as war, fire, clandestine diggers, illegal trade, urban development, vandalism, theft, fanaticism, heavy traffic, abrasion, vibration, tourism, graffiti, ignorance, lack of adequate legislation (Aslan & Ardemagni 2006).

Due to the threats described above, cultural heritage is in need of protection. Protection and sustainability of cultural heritage are on the agenda of many countries. UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) has been carrying out significant work in the area of protection for many years. Similarly, European Council has been working on the protection of cultural heritage as well. Besides these two organizations, many other organizations and associations have been working on the issue such as ICOM (International Council on Museums), ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites), ICCROM (International Centre for the Study of Preservation and Restoration of Cultural), Europa Nostra (Pan-Europa Federation for
Despite the efforts of the international organizations, national and international laws designed to preserve the cultural heritage, all these efforts have been insufficient. Studies show that people’s awareness at the conservation of cultural heritage is essential (e.g., Patrick 1988; Hunter 1988; Huhta, and Hankins 1988; Hunter 1992; Curtis & Seymour 2004; Corbishley 2004; Henson 2004; Europa Nostra 2004; Hereduc 2005; Copeland 2006; Stone & Planel 1999). Bonebright and Schindler (2011) express, ‘as the world’s cultural heritage is increasingly threatened by looting, military action, and modern development, the education of the public and, in particular, our students is critical if we are to work towards preserving that heritage’ (2011, 1). Stone (2004) states that ‘if people are taught the value of the historic environment, they will be learning about the importance of the environment and they will endeavor to maintain’ (2004, 2). In order to raise public awareness about the conservation of heritage, ‘it is important to educate citizens at all grades starting from elementary school to higher education and generate public opinion’ (Uçankuş 2000, 760). At this point, issues regarding the methods and approaches to teach cultural heritage to the students need to be addressed.

Method and approaches in Heritage Education

Heritage education aims to develop students’ concepts, skills and attitudes toward cultural heritage (Hereduc 2005). As Ferguson and Pye (2004) point outs, it is important to understand that students learn actively from different ways, because learning style of each student is different. Some students are visual, some are auditory, others learn by touching. Children learn in an active way by using all the senses such as touching, testing, tasting, monitoring, listening and questioning. In order to make students learn actively in HE, it is necessary to implement methods and techniques that would engage the students actively. In this sense, UNESCO (2002) recommends methods and techniques such as lecturing, questioning and answering, discussion, drama and games, problem-based learning, reading, writing, research, practice (exercise), material-based learning, such as field trips and museum visits. In addition, the internet, video programs and simulations, objects, documents, images, photographs, plans, maps, brochures, newspapers, magazines, visual and written materials are also suitable media for heritage education. To summarize teachers are expected to teach students about cultural heritage including historic buildings and monuments, historic towns and cultural landscapes, archeological sites and objects, ethnographic artifacts, historical documents by using these methods, techniques and materials. At this point, whether they are willing to teach cultural heritage and their attitudes toward cultural heritage are important.

Research on Educator’s Attitudes toward Heritage Education

There have been studies about the protection and the management of cultural heritage. Although it is essential to generate an awareness of cultural heritage, to date there has been little research conducted on heritage education.

In a study that was aimed to reconcile the world heritage education with school curricula, new educational approaches, methods and materials and create collaboration between cultural heritage managers and schools, Aslan and Ardemagni (2006) conducted a case study with a group
of 16 students aged between 14-16 from Jordan, Lebanon and Syria and five teachers about the ancient city of Petra which is included in the World Heritage list. As part of the study, the students visited the city and carried out a variety of educational activities. Students participated in conservation and reconstruction activities with the cultural heritage experts. According to the results of the study, HE can be an important educational tool and can contribute to the development of the students' analytical capacities and the powers of observation in addition to supporting class discussions and providing solutions on core issues. The students were also aware of their responsibility to protect the cultural heritage. Finally, if students are trained enough, they will become most effective advocates of their own cultural heritage.

In the research of Europa Nostra (2004) conducted with European History teachers, HE is of great importance (80% positive response), and the majority of students (80% positive response) to visit heritage places gave a positive reaction. According to results of the research, heritage education in Europe is used to strengthen national identity and national pride on a regular basis. Some problems prevent on-site training (field trips) opportunities. Authorities on education need more support about teacher education and a better quality of training materials. European history teachers want to participate in heritage projects within the framework of a multi-cultural approach and the European dimension.

In their research, Curtis and Seymour (2004) used a quasi-experimental research design worked with 226 students from grades 4-8 to explore students’ attitudes toward cultural heritage. They expressed that heritage in the classroom consisted of workshops designed to assist teachers in developing lesson plans that use Louisiana cultural resources as content to address curriculum standards. Teachers created lesson plans and activities that were piloted during the 2001-02 school year. The Cultural Heritage Attitude Survey measured students’ attitudes toward cultural resources before and after these lessons. Their findings showed that those who received Heritage in the classroom lessons maintained high positive attitudes towards cultural resources while controls did not.

Using the survey method, Gimenez, Guize and Lista (2008) worked with 49 primary school teachers and 77 secondary school teachers including history and geography, biology-geology and physics-chemistry to explore primary and secondary school teachers’ conceptions of heritage and its teaching and learning. The results showed a high degree of homogeneity in pedagogic content knowledge, in contrast to the heterogeneity of the conceptions with respect to purely content knowledge. They addressed that heritage education could be integrated into all educational processes and could encourage critical thinking about the socio-natural environment.

In their research, with college students, Bonebright and Schindler (2011) presented an analysis of two years of survey data on student attitudes towards cultural heritage from DePauw University in Indiana. The survey focused on two points. The first was about the ownership or the stewardship of the cultural heritage. The second was about the complex ethical issues of the value of scientific research versus the rights of cultural groups. The results showed that students’ background and experience affected their attitudes about ethical issues related to cultural heritage and that they have underlying principles that inform their values about these issues (2011, 1).

The current study is a continuation of the first author’s earlier study (Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011). It aims to explore the Turkish pre-service social studies teachers’ attitudes toward heritage education and to compare Turkish and American pre-service teachers’ who are going to teach social studies in elementary and middle school attitudes toward heritage education.
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Method

This is a mixed method study. We used sequential explanatory design. In this design, first quantitative data is collected then the qualitative is data collected. Qualitative data is used to support the explanation and interpretation of quantitative data (Creswell 2003).

Participants

Participants included pre-service social studies teachers at a large state-run university in the Central Anatolian region of Turkey in their final year. There were 32 pre-service teachers who took the pretest, and at posttest. We also collected written responses from 32 pre-service teachers. We chose the senior students because they attended “special teaching method” course in their last year. This choice allowed us to apply the heritage education within the course.

Materials, Task and Process

The research conducted in Turkey followed the same procedure as that conducted in the U.S (see Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011). More specifically, pre-service social studies teachers took two main activities. The first took place in the classroom and involved analysis of historic artifacts, documents, photographs, and images of buildings. We asked pre-service teachers to analyze and interpret the documents, artifacts and photographs. These materials were about the old city of Ankara. The second activity took place in a national archeology museum, which is the largest museum of ancient Anatolian civilizations in Turkey. The pre-service teachers were divided into groups and we gave worksheets to help them explore and identify the museum materials. At the end of the visit, researchers conducted a meeting, during which students shared their findings and opinions.

Data Collection Techniques

The current research relied on both quantitative and qualitative data collected in two steps. In the first step, the Heritage Education Attitude Survey (Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011), which consists of 26 5-point Likert-type items, was applied as both a pretest and a posttest. On the original Heritage Education Attitude Survey the Cronbach’s α was .89. In the Turkish version of the survey Cronbach’s α was .84, which indicates that the Heritage Education Attitude Survey is a highly reliable instrument. In the second step, at the end of the course, we asked students to answer questions about historic places on a written survey. There were four questions and 32 pre-service teachers responded the questions.

Data Analysis Procedures

We used SPSS packet program to analyze quantitative data. Pretests and posttests were analyzed in terms of means. We also used content and descriptive strategies to analyze qualitative data. After transcription, we coded responses using open-coding procedure. In the open-coding procedure, the researcher examines the text for salient categories of information supported by the text (Creswell 2007).

Results and Discussion

Results from the US study

Quantitative Results

According to the results from the US study (Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011), there was no significant difference between the results of the pretest (M=4.10) and posttest (M=4.16) in the attitudes of pre-service teachers after learning heritage education in the classroom and in the
museum. This was explained by noting that pre-service teachers already had highly positive initial attitudes towards heritage education, leaving less room for a positive impact as a result of instruction.

**Qualitative results**

According to the results of the US study (Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011), the researchers found that all the pre-service teachers (27 in attendance) agreed that they were interested in historic artifacts, photographs, and so on, as teaching tools, and they all agreed that they would use these as teachers, either in the classroom or on field trips. However, some thought that visiting historic places would not be necessary because they could use materials such as photographs, pictures, artifacts, or heritage-related internet sites, within the classroom.

In responses to open-ended, written surveys at the end of class, these pre-service teachers’ indicated a sense of nature and range of heritage sites, and of their purpose in teaching, that was in keeping with current scholarship on heritage education. They identified a range of different kinds of historic sites, for example, they identified a variety of reasons why historic places are preserved, and they gave numerous reasons why such preservation is important. Their answers to each question are summarized below (Yeşilbursa & Barton 2011):

**Question 1: Other than homes, what are other historic places?**

Pre-service teachers indicated 37 different kinds of historic places. It was interesting that the most common answer was “battlefields,” even though respondents’ attitudes toward battlefields were relatively low. Other common responses were farms, factories, towns, schools and museums.

**Question 2: Why do people preserve historic places?**

Pre-service teachers emphasized that people preserve historic places to learn and understand past, to appreciate the past; the places are important and valuable, they indicate change in time and so that new generations can see or experience these places firsthand.

**Question 3: Do you think it is important to preserve historic sites? Why or Why not?**

All the pre-service teachers indicated that preserving historic sites is important. The most common reasons they gave that these sites are great teaching and learning tool, these sites are much more effective than textbooks or lectures, these sites show students what life was like in the past, or what the past was like, these places provide firsthand experiences, the need to appreciate what we have, knowing where we came from, honoring our culture, remembering good things and avoiding the bad, it is important to see how time has changed.

**Question 4. What is the value of using historic sites?**

Pre-service teachers described the value of historic sites that these places are concrete examples, students can engage in their lesson more actively, these places make history real, students can compare periods between the present and the past, these places spark students’ interest and attention, these places provide firsthand / real life experiences, they would be valuable ways of learning rather than texts and lectures.

**Results from Turkish study**

**Quantitative Results**

In the quantitative step of the study we investigated whether significant difference between mean scores research group obtained pretest and posttest. To answer this question we applied t-test and found no significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest (M=114.15) and posttest (114.25) \((t_{(31)}=-.035; p>.05)\). This would suggest that the activities that were applied to the
research group did not increase the attitudes toward heritage education. This may be because the pre-service teachers already had highly positive initial attitudes towards heritage education, and so there was not enough space for a positive impact result of instruction.

**Qualitative results**

In this step of the research, we explore the pre-service social studies teachers’ views toward heritage and heritage education. The qualitative results are summarized below:

**Question 1: Other than homes, what are other historic places?**

Pre-service social studies teachers indicated 21 different kinds of historic sites. We presented the most common responses in (Figure 1). We gave multiple codes to individual responses that expressed multiple categories, therefore the total frequencies reflected in (Figure 1) (f=80) is greater than the number of participants (N=32).

**Figure 1. Students’ views on kinds of historic places**

![Figure 1](image)

As we see in the (Figure 1), most repeated response (f=15) was the mosque. It is usual because Turkey has many historic mosques. Historical castles come in second place (f=12). Historical Turkish baths follow it (f=11). Nine respondents mentioned ancient sites and other nine respondents mentioned historic inns. Respondents relatively mentioned less museums and battlefields. In addition to these historic places respondents mentioned temples, churches, palaces, historical graveyards and cemeteries, pre-historic caves, historical towns and gardens, old factories, railways, fountains, madrasah, mound and caravansary.

**Question 2: Why do people preserve historic places?**

We gave multiple codes to individual responses that expressed multiple categories, therefore the total frequencies reflected in (Table 1) (f=43) is greater than the number of participants (N=32). Analysis results are summarized (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help us understand the past</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmit to next generations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To appreciate the past</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving culture</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep alive the historical consciousness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National unity and solidarity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Students’ views on why people preserve historic places**
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Eleven respondents (34.3%) addressed that people preserve historic places to gain knowledge about past. Another eleven respondents (34.3%) stated that people preserve historic places to transmit to the next generations. Eight respondents (25%) expressed that people preserve historic places to appreciate the past. In addition, other eight respondents (25%) mentioned that people preserve historic places to preserve culture. Three respondents (9.3%) addressed that people preserve historic places because they want to keep alive the historical consciousness. Two respondents (6.2%) mentioned that the reason why people preserve historic places is to provide national unity and solidarity.

Question 3: Do you think it is important to preserve historic sites? Why or Why not?

All the Turkish pre-service social studies teachers in the study group indicated that preserving historic sites is important. We gave multiple codes to individual responses that expressed multiple categories, therefore the total frequencies reflected in (Table 2) \((f=41)\) is greater than the number of participants \((N=32)\). Analysis results are summarized (Table 2).

Table 2. Students’ views on why it is important to preserve historical sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference for the future</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of pride</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving culture</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect the past to the future</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve respondents (37.5%) addressed that historic sites are source of knowledge about the past. Eight respondents (25%) stated that historic sites are reference for the future. By looking at the works, people can do better in the future. Eight respondents (25%) expressed that historic sites are source of pride. In addition, another eight respondents (25%) mentioned that preserving historic sites is important in terms of preserving culture because they believed that they reflect the nations’ culture. Seven respondents (21.9%) addressed that because historic sites connect the past to the future it is important to preserve them.

Question 4. What is the value of using historic sites?

We gave multiple codes to individual responses that expressed multiple categories, therefore the total frequencies reflected in (Table 3) \((f=46)\) is greater than the number of participants \((N=32)\). Pre-service social studies teachers’ views on value of using historic sites are summarized (Table 3).

Table 3. Students’ views on what the value of using historic sites is.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Categories</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students learn by seeing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent learning</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete examples</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firsthand / real life experiences</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spark student’s interest and attention</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist textbooks and lectures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourteen respondents (43.75%) emphasized learning by seeing. They think learning by seeing is valuable. Ten respondents (31.25%) stated that historic sites provide permanent learning. Eight respondents (25%) expressed that historic sites are concrete examples. Six respondents (18.75%) mentioned that historic sites provide firsthand and real life experiences. Four respondents (12.5%) addressed that historic sites spark students’ interest and attention. Other four respondents (12.5) stated that historic sites assist textbooks and lectures.
The qualitative findings also supported quantitative findings. The results of the museum interview and document analysis showed that all Turkish social studies pre-service teachers in this study found HE valuable, and they stated that they were going to use heritage places or cultural assets as teaching tools.

When we compare the first qualitative question, we see American and Turkish pre-service teachers reflect their culture in their answers. Turkish students mentioned mosques, castles, inns, historic baths, and ancient sites in their responses. You can see these places almost every city in Turkey. American pre-service teachers mentioned battlefields, museums, old schools, factories, town/court houses, and farms mostly in their responses. While Turkish pre-service social studies addressed mosques mostly, their American colleagues mentioned battlefield the most. Battlefields are in the seventh place in Turkish students’ answers. While museums come second place in American students’ responses, in Turkish students’ responses come sixth. Ancient sites and old farms were completely different in responses of American and Turkish teacher candidates. While Turkish students did not mention old farms Americans did not mention ancient sites. There are relatively few ancient ruins in eastern North America because Native Americans did not build in stone; also, early white settlers did not build in stone either, so there are relatively few old churches or similar buildings. However, historic farms are found in many places, and one of the most famous, Conner Prairie, is in the students’ state of Indiana. On the contrary, one can see ancient sites almost everywhere in Turkey, but can hardly see old farms.

When we compare the second qualitative question, American students mentioned learning and understanding the past, appreciating the past, the places are important and valuable, comparison of the past and the present, the places change in time, new generations can experience these places firsthand. Turkish students mentioned understanding the past, transmitting to next generations, appreciating the past, preserving culture, historical consciousness and national unity and solidarity. Turkish and American students’ responses are relatively different from each other. Turkish students’ responses are differentiating in preserving culture, historical consciousness and national unity and solidarity.

When we compare the third qualitative question, all the American and Turkish pre-service teachers indicated that preserving historic sites is important. American students mentioned mostly that these sites are great teaching and learning tools, much more effective than textbooks or lectures, show students what life was like in the past, or what the past was like, provide firsthand experiences, the need to appreciate what we have, knowing where we came from, honoring our culture. Turkish students mentioned mostly these sites are source of knowledge, reference for the future, source of pride, preserving culture and they connect the past to the future. While American pre-service teachers emphasized more teaching and learning, Turkish pre-service teachers did not put much emphasis on this side. It seems that the common thread is that the Americans were interested in teaching methods, and the Turks were interested in cultural heritage. Why was heritage more important to Turks and why was not it important to Americans? We might say that because Americans’ national identity is very closely tied to national ideas, as expressed in narratives, rather than in symbols of material culture. The reason why the cultural heritage is more important for the Turkish students might be the characteristic of Turkey’s being a nation-state. As the monuments of cultural heritage show the fundamentals dating back to the past of a newly-built nation-state and, in addition, transmit the knowledge about the past of a nation to the future, they are preserved and attributed value (Aksoy and Enil 2012). We can conclude from Turkish students’ responses that they think cultural heritage assets represent the national unity and the solidarity.
When we compare the fourth qualitative question, American pre-service teachers described the value of historic sites as concrete examples such as sparking students’ interest and attention, making history real, providing firsthand/real life experiences. They are valuable ways of learning rather than texts and lectures. Students can engage in their lesson more actively and compare periods between the present and the past. Turkish pre-service teachers emphasized learning by seeing, permanent learning, firsthand/real life experiences, concrete examples, sparking students’ interest and attention, assisting textbooks and lectures. Turkish and American pre-service social studies teachers’ responses are quite close to each other. We can conclude that both Turkish and American pre-service teachers emphasized the value of the historic places in terms of teaching and learning. We can understand from the results that both American and Turkish pre-service teachers who are going to teach social studies elementary and middle school find the historic places are valuable teaching and learning tools.

**Conclusion**

In the current study, we aimed to explore Turkish pre-service social studies teachers’ attitudes toward heritage education, which includes activities about historic places, buildings, museums, and artifacts. We were interested in two issues: The first related to students’ attitudes toward heritage places, and the second related to their intention to use such places as a teaching tool. Turkish pre-service teachers already had highly positive attitudes towards heritage education as their colleagues in US. Therefore, it was difficult to increase attitudes much beyond their initial point. This finding shows that both American and Turkish pre-service teachers are likely to think heritage places are important and valuable to preserve, and they have positive intention to use such places as teaching and learning tools. This is important because as future social studies teachers they will influence the next generations.

The current study is limited to the views and the attitudes of the pre-service social studies towards heritage education. However, we need to explore whether or not pre-service social studies are efficient at using heritage places or cultural materials as teaching and learning tools. In other words, for example, can they plan and conduct a field trip? Do they know what kind of activities they can do during a museum visit? Do they know how to use cultural artifacts and objects in the classroom? Moreover, do they know how to integrate all these activities with social studies curriculum? Studies state that an effective field trip, for example, requires a good planning, collaboration, and integration with the curriculum (Noel and Colopy 2006; Noel 2007; Coughlin 2010; Baron 2010). We believe that exploring the answers to these questions will contribute to the field of heritage education.
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