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ABSTRACT The present study aimed to investigate pre-service teachers’ attitudes towards oral history methods. The research was conducted at a public university in Turkey’s Mugla province. A total of 322 pre-service teachers constituted the research sample. For this study a five-level Likert scale was used to collect the data. Within the overall aim of the study, the collected data was analyzed by using SPSS. The result showed that there was a significant difference among the pre-service teachers studying Social Studies in their attitudes for Oral History studies. In addition, it was concluded that when the time allocated to media tools for Oral History studies increased, the attitude to Oral History studies became more positive. Moreover, a comment was made as when the level of interest in Oral History studies rose, the attitudes to Oral History studies also became more positive. Some suggestions are given at the end of the study.

INTRODUCTION

The History of Science is also one of the Social Sciences contained in Social Studies (Kece and Meren 2011) which is defined as the transfer of information of Citizenship and Social Sciences (Aydemir and Akpinar 2012). History defined as the science that aims at recognizing of human beings’ oneselves, abilities, interests, attitudes, beliefs and values as well as adopts the method of scientific thinking and studies the behaviour and life of human as a social being, has a very important place in Social Studies program through 20th century (Kaya and Guven 2012; Paykoc 1991). Social Studies benefits significantly from the field of History on the issues such as growing as a good citizen, selection of subjects, comprehension of scientific understanding and teaching of immediate environment to the children (Bilgili 2013).

History course was seen as a uniform lesson taught by the teacher and processed considering textbooks in traditional education system. That uniformity experienced in the teaching of History subjects led the educators to new pursuits. Both, with those pursuits and constructivist perception, with a new understanding of education, were implemented in 2005-2006 academic year, student-centric teaching has emerged (Yesilbursa 2008). In student-centered approach, the student configures the knowledge himself and directs his own learning (Celik 2006). The purpose of teaching of History subjects in Social Studies at primary education created with that perception includes the education of individuals who can question, criticise, analyze history as well as constitute historical empathy (Dogan 2007). Thanks to these skills, students not only learn historical chronology but also learn to discover why events occurred by using the information and evidence (Kece and Meren 2011). Thus, the student complies with the principle, ‘active learner’, that constructivist approach requires (Yesilyurt and Gul 2011).

Oral History also constitutes one of the areas that students are active into while learning History subjects in Social Studies lessons (Akcali and Arslan 2012). Many definitions of Oral History, which means recording and analysing of oral evidences and proofs of the past, have been made until now (Bilgili 2013). A few of these definitions are as follows:

Oral History is a history derived from listening and using their memories (Thompson 1978).

Oral History is the systematic interview method made in order to protect the memories of ordinary people, who got opportunities to see events with historical significance, for future generations (Lehane and Goldman 1977). Oral History is the recordings of the evidences told from the narrators’ first-hand knowledge (Baum 1987). Oral History is a way of recording of the information obtained from the people with first-hand knowledge about historical events as well as adding this to the total historical information (Kyvig and Marty 2011). In brief, Oral History means communicative memory (Assmann 1999).
It can be understood from the descriptions, Oral History is the alive memory of the past. Before the invention of writing, all the knowledge of the society was transmitted from ear to ear. Over the time, it has become a tradition and this knowledge has been inherited from generation to generation. Having such features, it can be said that Oral History is the first History that has existed (Akbaba and Kilcan 2014). Through Oral History studies, it is contributed to the construction of history of societies by removing the remaining memories in the memory of the past to the surface (Akcali and Arslan 2012).

According to Uygun (2010), who referenced the study of Hayrettin Uysal in which approach to history education was discussed, as in each method also in Oral History method besides positive sides, limited, incomplete, biased parts are possible. If positive aspects of the Oral History studies are itemized, it can be said that;
1. Oral History is not a history in which only kings, sultans, wars and treaties are described. It is a history method where all societies’ as well as individuals’ lives and life stories are cared and taken into account.
2. Oral History studies are in accordance with today’s technology by its used method.
3. The information obtained from Oral History studies is not censored but original data.
4. Oral History removes students from history textbooks, let them look at from another angle to the history, detect a subject that come to no one’s mind and teach them to explore totally new world (Danacioglu 2011; Sari 2007).
5. Oral History contributes both to the researchers and the person providing material. It is a two-way process getting information not only from the speakers but from the spoken words, as well (Caunce 2001).

Some possible limitations, deficiencies and biased sides of Oral History are:
1. Those obtained through Oral History research may be the emotional remains of the experiments of the next period.
2. Those obtained through Oral History research, can lose its normalcy by assimilated elements, be over whelmed by nostalgia and be distorted with deprivation of life which show up later.
3. Reasons such as the interview format, the interviewee’s going back in time while telling the events, loss of memory make the defence of Oral History studies difficult (Uygun 2010).
4. Since Oral History studies and the activities carried out during these studies take time, it may result in incompleteness of the subjects that are in the curriculum in time.
5. The visit of students to the people whom they make an interview with may cause administrative and financial difficulties (Demircioglu 2005).

Although its limitations, deficiencies, Oral History is a method, based on constructivist approach, for the teaching of history subjects in Social Studies course. Through Oral History applications including various learner-centered activities which are organized by the teacher regarding time and conditions that may disrupt the curriculum; a permanent learning can be achieved. Given the literature on oral history methods, while there is a growing attention on using oral history methods in classroom activities, there is not enough research exploring teachers’ attitudes on oral history events and using them effectively in classroom settings. There is a need for research to determine pre-service teachers’ attitudes about oral history. This study attempts to fill this gap in the literature because Pajares (1992) states that Research on the entering beliefs of pre-service teachers would provide teacher educators with important information to help determine curricula and program direction. Additionally, there is one research exploring the attitudes of the pre-service teachers on oral history in Turkey. In this research, only pre-service teachers’ attitudes were investigated (Akbaba and Kilcan 2014). Not only the present study focused on both pre-service and social studies teachers’ attitudes, it attempted to extend the perspective on oral history as well.

**Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study is to determine the Oral History perceptions of Social Studies and classroom pre-service teachers. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were searched.

Whether the attitudes of the participants to Oral History perception changes according to;
1. Gender
2. The department they are studying
3. Oral History knowledge acquisition received from the family members
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4. Oral History studies done during undergraduate education
5. The place they were living before their undergraduate education
6. The level of interest in Oral History
7. The number of literary works they have read about Oral History
8. The devoted time to the media tools

METHODOLOGY

In accordance with the purpose of the study and sub-problems, descriptive research method was applied. There are two main reasons to select descriptive method in this study. The first reason is it aims at the data collection to determine certain characteristics of a group. According to Buyukozturk et al. (2009), descriptive research is a data collection process to determine the current situation. The second reason is descriptive research provides the opportunity to analyze in detail the current situation with its reasons. For Karasar (2002) and Kaptan (1998), descriptive research aims to explain the interaction between situations by considering the relationship of the current situation with previous situations and conditions.

Subjects

The research sample was constituted with easily accessible 322 pre-service teachers who were studying at Mugla Sitki Kocman University Education Faculty in 2013-2014 in spring semester. Among those 322 pre-service teachers, 210 of them were students of Classroom Teaching and 112 students were at Social Science Teaching.

Instrumentation

The measuring tool designed by Akbaba and Kilcan (2012) ‘Development of Attitude Scale towards Oral History Studies: Validity and Reliability Studies’ constituted the instrument of the study. The tool is five-level Likert Scale with 2 sub-dimension and 26 items. As related measuring tool had applied to a different study groups, the reliability and validity levels were examined. For that examination, a pilot study was conducted with 110 students. It was found that the instrument is one-dimensional. As a result of KMO and Bartlett’s Test, 940, it was determined that the measurement tool was demonstrating 63.348 % of total variance. Besides, Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be 0.843. According to obtained results, it was observed that the construct validity and reliability of the instrument was high.

RESULTS

In this section, in line with the purpose of the research, whether the participants’ attitudes regarding Oral History studies differed in terms of several variables or not were presented and evaluated below in the light of the findings obtained as a result of performed analysis.

Research Results for the First Sub-problem

The t-test findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to their gender are shown in Table 1. According to the analysis results of Table 1, the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies considering gender displayed no significant difference $t_{(320)} = .313; p > .05$. While arithmetic mean of total attitude scores of females to Oral History studies was $(M=75.84)$, the males’ was $(M=75.54)$. The numeric difference between them did not create statistically a significant difference. This finding can be interpreted as; gender factor does not affect the participants’ attitudes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>75.84</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75.54</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Degree of freedom, SD: Standard deviation
not cause any difference in the attitudes of participants related to Oral History studies.

Research Results for the Second Sub-problem

The t-test findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to their departments at the university are shown in Table 2. According to the analysis results of Table 2, the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies considering department variable showed a significant difference [\( t_{320} = .564; p < .05 \)]. While arithmetic mean of total attitude scores of participants studying at Classroom Teaching to Oral History was \( M=75.53 \), the participants studying at Social Studies Teaching was \( M=81.09 \). The numeric difference between them generated statistically a significant difference. This finding can be interpreted as; department variable causes a significant difference in the attitudes of participants related to Oral History studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teaching</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>75.53</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies teaching</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>81.09</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Degree of freedom, SD: Standard deviation

Research Results for the Third Sub-problem

The t-test findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to learning oral history from their family members are shown in Table 3. According to the analysis results of Table 3, the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies considering acquisition of Oral History knowledge regarding past from family members via Oral History variable did not show a significant difference [\( t_{320} = .297; p > .05 \)]. While arithmetic mean of total attitude scores of the participants who got historical information regarding past from family members through Oral History was \( M=75.63 \), the ones’ who did not get was \( M=75.93 \). The numeric difference between them did not present statistically a significant difference. This finding can be interpreted as; there is not a significant difference between the total attitude scores of the ones who get historical information regarding past from family members through Oral History and who did not.

Research Results for the Fourth Sub-problem

The t-test findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to taking courses related to oral history at university are shown in Table 4. According to the analysis results of Table 4, the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies considering doing Oral History studies in the courses during the undergraduate education informed a significant difference [\( t_{320} = 2.327; p < .05 \)]. While arithmetic mean of total attitude scores of the participants who did Oral History studies during their undergraduate education was \( M=76.80 \), the ones’ who did not do was \( M=74.63 \). The numeric difference between them demonstrated statistically a significant difference. This finding can be interpreted as; doing Oral History studies in the courses during the undergraduate education increases the attitudes of the participants related to Oral History studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting history information regarding past from family members</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>75.93</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df: Degree of freedom, SD: Standard deviation

Research Results for the Fifth Sub-problem

The One-Way ANOVA findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to the places where they live are shown in Table 5.
According to the analysis results of Table 5, no significant differences were observed between the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies and the place they were living before starting their undergraduate education \( F(3,318) = .367; p > .05 \). This finding can be interpreted as; there is no effect of the place of residence on the attitudes of participants related to Oral History studies.

**Research Results for the Sixth Sub-problem**

The One-Way ANOVA findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to their curiosities on oral history studies are shown in Table 6. According to the analysis results of Table 6, a significant difference was observed between the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies and the level of interest in Oral History studies variable \( F(2,319) = 3.041; p < .05 \). In order to find out between which groups that difference occurred, LSD multiple comparison test was performed. A significant difference was found in favour of the participants very interested in Oral History studies whose mean of total attitude scores to Oral History was \( (M = 77.19) \) when compared with the ones a bit interested in Oral History whose mean of total attitude scores to Oral History was \( (M = 74.79) \). This finding can be interpreted as; when the participants’ level of interest in Oral History studies increases, the attitudes to Oral History studies becomes positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation of doing oral history studies in the courses during the undergraduate education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>76.80</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>74.63</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results of participants’ total attitude scores to oral history by the place of residence before the undergraduate education variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Place of Residence before the Undergraduate Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74.83</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country seat</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>75.70</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centrum</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>76.26</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results of participants’ total attitude scores to oral history by the level of interest in Oral History studies variable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Interest in Oral History Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) I am not interested in</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) I am a bit interested in</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>74.79</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) I am very interested in</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77.19</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: Standard deviation, MS: Mean of square, df: Degree of freedom, SS: Sum of square
Research Results for the Seventh Sub-problem

The Welch Test findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to genres of literature, which they read, are shown in Table 7. According to the analysis results of Table 7, no significant differences were observed between the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies and the number of historical novel, story, memoir reading variable \(F_{(4,318)} = 1.904; p > .05\). This finding can be interpreted as; the number of historical novel, story, and memoir reading has no effect on the attitudes of participants related to Oral History studies.

Research Results for the Eighth Sub-problem

The One-Way ANOVA findings about the pre-service teachers’ attitudes with regard to the time, which they use for media, are shown in Table 8. According to the analysis results of Table 8, a significant difference was seen between the participants’ total attitude scores related to Oral History studies and the devoted time per a day to media tools for Oral History variable \(F_{(4,317)} = 2.455; p < .05\). In order to find out between which groups that difference occurred, LSD multiple comparison test was done. Seeing these results, a significant difference was observed in favour of the participants devoting 7 hours per a day to media tools for Oral History studies whose mean of total attitude scores to Oral History was \((M=86.00)\) when compared with the ones devoting less than 1 hour and between 5-7 hours and whose mean of total attitude scores to Oral History respectively were \((M=74.97)\) \((M=72.80)\). On the other hand, a significant difference was also occurred in favour of the participants devoting between 1-3 hours per a day to media tools for Oral History studies whose mean of total attitude scores to Oral History was \((M=86.00)\) when compared with the ones devoting less than 1 hour. This finding can be interpreted as, when the devoted time to media tools for Oral History studies increases, the attitude to Oral History studies becomes positive.

Table 7: Welch test results of participants’ attitudes to oral history by the number of historical novel/story/memoir reading variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Novel/Story/Memoir Reading Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) 5 or more than 5 pcs</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>75.18</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 6-10 pcs</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75.38</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 11-15 pcs</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79.14</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 16 or more than 16 pcs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76.11</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Source  MS  df  SS  F  p  Difference

Between groups 401.247 3 133.749 1.904 .129
Intra groups 22342.704 318 70.260
Total 22743.950 321

SD: Standard deviation, MS: Mean of square, df: Degree of freedom, SS: Sum of square

Table 8: One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results of participants’ total attitude scores to oral history by the devoted time to media tools per a day for Oral history studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDevoted Time Per Day to Media Tools for Oral History Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) less than 1 hour</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>74.97</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) between 1-3 hours</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77.13</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) between 3-5 hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.21</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) between 5-7 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72.80</td>
<td>10.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) more than 7 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Source  MS  df  SS  F  p  Difference

Between Groups 683.338 4 170.834 2.455 .046 1-54-51-2
Intra Groups 22060.612 317 69.592
Total 22743.950 321

SD: Standard deviation, MS: Mean of square, df: Degree of freedom, SS: Sum of square
DISCUSSION

Oral History teaching and activities are recreational alternative educational processes which, in a physical sense, can pull the students out from classroom environment and, in a mental sense, from the narrow and boring activities found in History textbooks. For Ata (2007), these types of activities are as important as removing the Great Wall between school and life for students. In order to get full and real accomplishment in these alternative educational activities which are crucial for both students and future generation, firstly, the teachers who undertake the role of a chef in the kitchen of teaching job should become conscious about these kinds of activities and be provided awareness. It is clear that the portrayal of History courses as ‘boring’, ‘narrow stack of information’, ‘detached from life’ in every level of education in Turkey (Safran 1993) necessitates a revision of the program, textbooks, teachers’ perspectives on the issue as well as it requires a reformation which can hold the interest of individuals who participate teaching/learning process. Since in modern education approach it is emphasized that a teaching process, where individual’ participation cannot be ensured, cannot be successful. In this regard, an abstract course like History in which hegemony of verbal expressions in no way be broken, planned goals will remain as written in the pages of the teaching program as long as the teaching activities are not enriched sufficiently and the opportunities to portray the information individuals face in his imagination by associating now and past are not given.

Oral History research is a relatively new field in our country in terms of the literature and wealth of resources when we look at its experiences and examples in the world. In this sense, the working groups that have set up by various associations, organizations and universities are still very new. From this point, a qualified academic education, which would teach techniques such as making compilation, analysis, classification, assessment, interview in the field, is needed (Akbaba and Kilcan 2012; Uşuncu 2011).

It is very important to determine the perceptions or attitudes of not only teachers but also pre-service teachers before this education in order to provide resource. Since ‘attitude is an effective state of readiness or tendency which is observed as rejection or acceptations of a particular person, group, institution or idea by the individuals’ (Ozguven 2011). In addition, attitudes are organized with experience and life and may show variability in a sudden or certain period of time (Arslan 2006; Tavşancıl 2010). This research on the Oral History perceptions of pre-service teachers of Classroom Teaching and Social Sciences Teaching Departments yielded the following results. Despite the small number of participants, the variable of department that the pre-service teachers study at showed a difference in favour of students at Social Sciences Teaching Department having more History course hours as well as the participants’ historical literacy levels and historical thinking skills being higher. The same situation can also be explained by the preparation process for teaching Social Sciences to students in which they are given exposure of History lessons more effectively than Classroom Teaching Department Students. In this respect, it proves to be an expected result.

The third sub-problem of the research based on the knowledge taken from family members did not have a significant difference. Oral History tradition, a teaching approach, is scheduled to begin firstly in the family. According to Sarý (2007), the first Oral History activities of the individuals have to be provided through meeting with family elders like grandfather, grandmother which is just as in American and British families. Also, for Lehane and Goldman (1977), Oral History is a systematic interview method in which the memories of ordinary people, getting the chance to see the significant historical events, transfers to future generations.

Oral History also lets the students gain important skills while doing all of them. These skills are; listening, observing, asking questions, editing the data, separating the cases from the ideas, finding relevant and irrelevant information, recognizing and appreciating of previous generation, understanding alteration and continuity (Safran and Ata 1998; Sari 2007; Welton and Mallan 1999). Brook (1997) especially, in a study made in a primary school of England, revealed that besides cognitive skills, Oral History activities develop research and analysis skill, as well.

In the fourth sub-problem of the research, it was observed that commissioned Oral History activities had positive effects on students’ atti-
tudes. This case has become a clear indicator of the importance of including historical out of school activities, particularly Oral History, into education life. These types of activities are planned to move education beyond the wall of schools and remove the obstacles between school and life. Thus, the teacher gets the students to know the surrounding institutions via going out of the class. These study visits are visits to places as follows; marketplaces, government agencies, factories, exhibitions, archaeological sites, workshops, museums and historical places (Ata 2007; MEB 2005; Sari 2007). With this aspect, it is shown that a prepared Oral History activity increases student achievement and provides a long lasting learning. Especially, the studies of Shopes (2008) and Sari (2007) revealed that through History Teaching based on the method of Oral History, History and Social Sciences courses can be more interesting and permanent in the minds besides students’ success can also be enhanced. Fell-Eisenlaft (2006) examining Oral History, an ageless historical tradition, with current dimension, presented very important data about the critical dimension of the events of 11 September on students at Secondary Schools. On the other hand, Evans’ (2003) study also is very crucial in the way of reviewing how Oral History is used in the growing of pre-service teachers to develop understanding against racism in American society as well as in terms of raising-awareness of Oral History on current events by applying to per-service teacher as in the present study. Shopes’s research done in 2008 showed qualification of being a resource book for teachers and students. The research revealed an overall perspective about Oral History as well as on how to use Oral History as a course activity or method in schools by the historians.

The fifth sub-problem of the research based on the variable about the place that participants were living before their undergraduate education, did not show a difference which was an expected result. Because Oral History events are as old as the history of human being, it is clear evidence that in the this region, which is considered to be the cradle of civilization without any village, town and city discriminations, every place that people live definitely has a material that can be a resource to Oral History. In a region where such a lot of civilizations, wars, immigrations and so on events have occurred, a different outcome could not be expected.

The literary literacy on Oral History variable, the seventh sub-problem of this research, had no impact on the attitudes of the participants. Here, an important part of participants’ devoting time less than an hour per a day for literary works is also another thought-provoking result. However, the effectiveness of literary works on Oral History activities is undeniable. In 1996, Baykara divided available resources on Oral History into eight as; live witnesses- living history, poems, epics, legends, stories, tales, clauses, quips or anecdotes, proverbs, dictums, sagas and the others as found in the studies of Ozcelik (2011) and Kutukoglu (1990).

When looked at the media literacy variable, which was the eight sub-problem of our research, it was shown that when the time allocated to media tools increased, the attitudes related to Oral History studies became more positive. In particular, when the works, newspaper articles, interviews and documentaries and film events about historical and socio-cultural events concerns the society are enhanced by the mainstream media, a definite increase can be observed in the performance of historical activities and participation levels.

Overall, albeit being limited, this study is done on pre-service teachers who, personally, will be the practitioner of the work has become a starting point in order to identify the present situation existing in Oral History. Becoming conscious and raising awareness as teachers who, personally, will prepare and practice activities for the future is extremely important. In our country, Oral History with educational purposes is found in articles written by history educators. However, it does not seem to have much opportunity to practice (Sari 2007).

CONCLUSION

Results from the present study indicate that attitudes on oral history are indeed an important factor in social studies. Curriculum developers and instructional designers, and also teacher and educators need to consider how to insert effective oral history method and activities into curricula and plan and execute teachers’ teacher education programs in Turkey.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Hereby, the following recommendations can be made to the researchers;
ANALYSIS ON ORAL HISTORY ATTITUDES OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

- The number of study groupscan be increased.
- During the in-service training, teachers can be given examples of activities on Oral History. These activities can be put into the program and the teachers provided convenience in terms of practices.
- For pre-service teachers, at least at undergraduate level, Oral History or Local History courses may be put or their numbers can be increased.
- By saving Oral History activities done in the past to electronic media, both a rich archive and useful course material for teachers can be created.
- By acting in concert with Communication Faculties, scientific studies and mainstream media tools related to Oral History can be put into place.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

In this research, the researcher did not consider adding more pre-service teachers studying different departments when the researcher measured the students’ attitudes on oral history. However, future research should consider differentiating undergraduate departments. The researcher limited the research subjects to the pre-service teachers studying at classroom teaching and social studies. Different department and also graduate students should be incorporated into future research and different variables affecting pre-service teachers’ attitudes on oral history should be studied. Additionally, the researcher collected my data from a total of 322 pre-service teachers. Future studies can enroll more pre-service teacher to increase reliability an validity of research and extend generalizability of research.
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