

AN ANALYSIS OF THE EMOTIONAL AND SCHOLASTIC EFFECTS OF
SUBTRACTIVE EDUCATIONAL POLICY AMONG KURDISH STUDENTS IN
TURKEY

By:

Jessica Snider

Capstone submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Arts in English as a Second Language

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

March 2013

Committee Members:

Carstens Smith: Primary Advisor

Patsy Vinogradov: Secondary Advisor

Megan Seydow: Peer Reader

Copyright by
JESSICA HOLLAN SNIDER, 2013
All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Turkey’s Kurds	2
The Turkish Constitution	2
The Context of School for Kurds.....	3
Language as a Human Right.....	4
U.N. Declaration of Language Minority Children’s Rights Worldwide.....	4
Laws Affecting the Education of Non-Turkish Speaking Children.....	6
My Experiences with the Kurds.....	7
Goals of the Community Center	7
Stated Need for Scholastic Confidence.....	9
Disclaimer of Research Terms.....	10
Language Loss as Potential Unintended Outcome	10
Continuum within the Labels ‘Additive’ and ‘Subtractive’	10
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
Prior Research On Language, Power And Identity in Schools.....	12
Potential Lack of Human Needs Fulfillment	14
Differing Policy Perspectives Regarding Language Learning.....	15
Subtractive Policy Perspective.....	15
Additive Policy Perspective.....	16
Recent Lift on the Law against Kurdish in the Classroom.....	18
The Burakumin Minority Example.....	20

Education Gap in Japan	21
Success and Relationship to Dominant Culture.....	22
Dropout Rates of Kurdish and Burakumin Students.....	22
Language, Proficiency And Academic Success.....	23
Inuit Language in Canadian Schools Example	24
Current ‘Early-Exit Transitional Model’ of Education.....	25
Results of Self-Assessment by Students	26
Study Recommendations	28
Spanish-Only VS. Bilingual Preschool Programs	29
Characteristics of Spanish-only Preschool.....	31
Results of the Spanish-only Vs. Bilingual Preschools.....	32
Educational Practices in Additive vs. Subtractive Environments.....	34
Differing Scholastic Emphasis.....	34
Teacher Elisa’s Educational Beliefs and Practices	36
Teacher Connie’s Educational Beliefs and Practices.....	37
Gap in Research	40
Chapter Summary	41
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	42
Qualitative Research Paradigm and Rationale.....	42
Case Study as Design.....	42
Data Collection	44
Participants.....	44
Semi-Structured Interviews as Method.....	45
Data Analysis Technique.....	47

Theoretical Triangulation.....	48
Interview Questions.....	49
Chapter Summary	52
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	53
Control of Kurdish Language	54
Punishments for Speaking Kurdish.....	56
Effects of Language Barrier on Teacher-Student Interactions	56
Pattern One: Blaming Students and Low Expectations	56
Pattern Two: Exclusion.....	58
Pattern Three: Anger and Frustration	68
Emotional Consequences among Participants	62
Pattern One: Shame and Guilt.....	63
Pattern Two: Exclusion.....	64
Pattern Three: Frustration and Anger	65
Chapter Summary	68
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION	69
Summary of Findings.....	69
Teacher Control of Kurdish Language Usage	69
Delay in Scholastic Achievement.....	69
Difficult Teacher-Student Interactions	71
Emotional Consequences	71
Implications for Educators	72
Limitations of the Study	74
Further Areas of Research.....	74

Chapter Summary.....	77
REFERENCES.....	78

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The focus of my thesis evolved from my teaching experiences with the ethnic minority known as the *Kurds* living in Turkey. I worked with the ethnic minority known as the Kurds when I lived in Istanbul, Turkey from 2011-2012. I grew interested in this population's scholastic experiences because I learned that teachers do not allow Kurdish to be spoken in the Turkish schools. I also noticed that the Kurds I worked with differed from my Turkish students in terms of exhibiting insecure behaviors regarding their learning. I grew interested in what their educational experiences were like, as ethnolinguistic minorities. I also wondered how language barriers affected teacher-student relationships. I grew curious about the emotional and academic consequences among students when they are told they cannot speak their mother tongue in schools. My investigation revolved around these questions. I composed research and conducted a study in order to gain insight into answers to these questions.

To begin, a discussion of the background to the issue of who the Kurds are and how their position in Turkey relates to their educational experiences is necessary. Prior to the creation of country boundaries, the Middle East was composed of tribes. At this time, the Kurds were living in an area that was eventually split into parts of several countries: Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Turkey (Brenneman, 2007). This occurred as the result of the Treaty of Versailles, which was implemented on January 10, 1920 (Encyclopedia Britannica, 2012).

Thus, the Kurds have never had their own country throughout history but share the remote borders of Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Turkey (Brenneman, 2007). Some people label this area *Kurdistan* although the term Kurdistan is not used on any official political

maps (Brenneman, 2007). However, it refers to the area where the majority population is made up of Kurds who reside in the four previously mentioned nation-states (Brenneman, 2007).

Twenty percent of Turkey's population is estimated to be Kurdish with the majority living in Istanbul (Brenneman, 2007). The founder of the Republic of Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, pushed to unite the people of Turkey (Hakan, 1998). The shared language of Turkish served this unification in the building of a Turkish nation-state (Hakan, 1998).

Turkey's Kurds

The overall situation of the Kurds in Turkey is politically complex, nuanced, and there is a great separation between rhetoric and realities (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2005). The policies regarding Kurdish language issues in schools are no exception. In the past, and some still argue today, the Turkish government has embraced assimilationist policies toward the Kurds. Under the Ozal administration, in the 1980s, speaking Kurdish in public was illegal (Krajeski, 2012). While this is no longer the case, some argue that Kurdish language oppression continues in other forms today (Skutnabb-Kanags, 2005).

The Turkish Constitution

The central government's Turkish constitution deems Turkish as the official language of Turkey as written in Article III (Turkish constitution, 1982). It also states that 'Turkish' should be the official language of instruction in schools as written in Article LVIII (Turkish constitution, 1982). The Kurds are not recognized as an ethnic identity in the Turkish constitution. Instead, they are defined as 'Turks.' One of the stated reasons being that if Kurds were recognized it could be an impetus for independent

states (Tavernise, 2009). The goal is to have a single Turkish culture. Through the 1980s, the ‘sun language theory’ was taught in universities, which positioned Kurds as ‘mountain Turks’ who spoke a mishmash of a trade language (Bruinessen, 1997). According to this theory, there were no Kurds. Sociologists such as Ismail Besikci spent decades in prison for disagreeing with this policy (Bruinessen, 1997).

In my time in Istanbul during 2011-2012, I observed statements from well-educated and professional Turkish citizens about the Kurds. Some people would deny the ethnicity of Kurds; instead referring to them as ‘Turks.’ Still others would say that the Kurds sole objective was to divide Turkey through terrorist means. Even more specifically, when there was an earthquake in Eastern Turkey in the city of Van, I heard people say that God was rightfully punishing them because they said Van is Kurdish and a place of terrorists. Last, many people told me that the root of the Kurds’ insufficient education stems from their ‘laziness’ and ‘wildness.’ These remarks indicate that some Turks carry a predominately negative perception of the Kurds.

The Context of School For Kurds

The Ministry of National Education created a student oath that all students in Turkey are required to say daily (Letsch, 2011). I believe this is evidence of an assimilationist overlay in schools with the goal to create one single Turkish entity at the expense of allegiance to other ethnic identities. This is one of the researcher biases that I bring to this study. Various lines in the oath say “I am a Turk and I am proud to be a Turk,” and “Happy is he who calls himself a Turk” (Lule, 2009). A person might question how this is different from having immigrant children say The Pledge of Allegiance. In the Pledge of Allegiance, we are asking students to claim their allegiance

to the nation but not to claim a particular ethnicity. Asking Kurdish children to say that they are Turkish would be comparable to Americans asking immigrant children to say “I am a Norwegian. I am proud to a Norwegian. Happy is he who calls himself a Norwegian.” A Kurdish friend of mine told me that he used to substitute ‘Turk’ with ‘Kurd’ when they were reciting the student oath and never got in trouble for it because the classroom was too loud for the teacher to hear him. This Kurdish friend said that he felt excluded in his educational experiences and imagined that many Kurds leave school because of this feeling.

During informal conversations, I asked many Kurdish people what their educational experiences were like. Many responded that they initially felt shamed and excluded when their Turkish skills were weak. A teacher from Eastern Turkey gave me one specific example of Kurdish students being shamed in their school experiences. He said that sometimes young students are not able to ask if they can use the bathroom because the teachers do not allow them to speak Kurdish in the school. As a result, they wet themselves and experience this humiliation in the classroom. The Kurds I have talked with in casual conversation believe their experiences are by no means exceptional. Instead, they estimate that most Kurdish children in Turkey experience hardships that have led many to quit school.

Language as a Human Right

U.N. Declaration of Language Minority Children’s Rights Worldwide

Along with gender, race, and religion, language has a place in human rights with the goal to prevent discrimination within states (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006). The purpose behind linguistic human rights is for minority groups to be able to reproduce themselves as a minority or be given the choice to integrate. This is to prevent the default

from occurring: forced assimilation (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006). Kurdish children are considered ‘language minority children’ and it is, therefore, pertinent to give a general overview of language policy in education with language minority children (Skutnabb-Kangas & Fernandes, 2008). Section 1.3 of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities from 1991 reads “states should take appropriate measures so that, wherever possible, persons belonging to minorities have adequate opportunities to learn their mother tongue or to have instruction in their mother tongue” (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006, p. 276).

Minority children also have the right to learn the official/dominant language (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006). The goals of linguistic human rights are “to prevent linguistic genocide, promote integration, defend minorities against forced assimilation, conflict prevention, and promote self-determination” (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006, p. 285). However, this is not always achieved.

Linguistic human rights are not always legally binding, which accounts for why they are not upheld in many cases. As a result, “subtractive education through the medium of a dominant/majority language ensues” (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006, p. 282). *Subtractive* education is broadly defined as any educational system where students may learn society’s dominant language at the expense of their mother tongue. The opposite approach is termed *additive*; this is broadly defined as the educational system where the development of both the mother tongue *and* society’s dominant language are encouraged and valued (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006).

Some language scholars view education as the most ‘direct agent’ in *linguistic and cultural* genocide (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006). According to the UN

International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (E793) (1948), there are five methods of genocide (Skutnabb-Kangas in Ricento, 2006).

It is argued that two of these definitions align with first language Kurdish students in Turkey's schools with regards to their language and culture. One is Article II (b) "causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group" and the other is Article II (e), "forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." In Turkey, Kurdish children are forced to transfer linguistically from Kurdish to Turkish. The goal of my research is to shed some light on the mental consequences of this linguistic transfer.

Turkey is one of many countries that are not upholding the ideal from the U.N.

Declaration regarding the right to mother tongue education for ethnic minorities.

Laws Affecting the Education of Non-Turkish Speaking Children

This study begs the question of what laws the Turkish government actually has that affect the education of non-Turkish speaking children. Today it is not illegal to teach the Kurdish language; however, the obstacles and fear of punishment are so severe that it very rarely occurs (Skutnabb-Kangas & Fernandes, 2008). This fear is well founded because engaging in any Kurdish language 'promotion' can be labeled as 'separatism' or 'terrorism' by the Turkish government. The punishments for these unjust accusations are severe, well documented, and continue to occur to teachers today (Skutnabb-Kangas & Fernandes, 2008).

In a conversation with Middle Eastern expert and Director of Mideast Development Program, Matthew Hand explained to me the laws regarding non-Turkish speaking children, "This isn't simple. The problem is this: Some things are legal. Things that are not specifically legal are often deemed illegal even if there is no law against it.

They are illegal under broad laws against sedition and separatism with a void in facts. The actual application of prohibition on a language in Turkey ebbs and flows with the political culture” (Hand, personal communication, 10/1/2012).

My Experiences with the Kurds

My initial interest in this marginalized ethnic group arose when I began to volunteer for a non-profit that does work with Kurdish people in Turkey. One summer, I taught English to a few scholarship recipients of this program. I was immediately impressed by their enthusiasm, energy, and aptitude for learning English. Since that time, my work with Kurdish people through this organization has expanded. In 2011, I moved to Istanbul, Turkey to contribute to other scholarship recipients’ goals to learn English. People in Turkey are motivated to learn English so that they can go to a good university, achieve promising careers and improve their overall status in Turkish society

Goals of the Community Center

The mission of the Community Center is to foster the artistic abilities of low-income young people. The goal is to help people reach their full potential through culture and art. An unstated mission of the organization is to empower Kurdish youth. They provide after school enrichment programs such as English classes. These children would most likely not have access to English lessons or other enrichment activities by way of their families. The majority of the children at this center came from families so poor that the parents had them work in factories because they were unable to provide the necessities required for school in Turkey: a uniform, book bag, and school supplies. The community center provides children with scholarships so that they can go to school instead of working in factories. In addition to the poverty, the families are considered

forced migrants. This means that they were forced to move to Istanbul after the Turkish army burned down their villages and destroyed livelihoods out of the fear they were harboring members of a Kurdish guerrilla army/movement (the P.K.K.) in eastern Turkey. Some Kurds refer to this as the *secret war* because many people in Turkey do not know that the burning of Kurdish villages takes place. The community center was located in a slum of Istanbul where the students lived.

The students at the Community Center were incredibly motivated to learn English, a motivation unparalleled in my previous teaching experiences. They would cheerfully come to class after long days at school or on the weekends. They would often remark how happy their progress in English was making them. The students were curious and thoughtful individuals who were working toward having the opportunities afforded to their more socially mobile Turkish counterparts. Their consistent attendance, questions, and participation in forums provided evidence for their motivation.

Despite their motivation, I saw some ways that they differed from my upper class Turkish students in terms of classroom behaviors. They were significantly less confident in their learning. This lack of confidence was exhibited in different ways depending on the student. However, some patterns existed. For example, some students would stutter and struggle to speak in class even when their English was perfect and their answers correct. Other students' eyes would widen upon answering a question with a look of fearful anticipation while waiting to see if they had the right answer. A great number of students remained very shy in the classroom learning process and would not want to speak at all. For example, even when I called on them they reacted with hesitation. For the majority of students, when they did answer incorrectly, their faces would turn to

looking crushed and embarrassed—sometimes observed through frowns and lowered eyes. I theorize that this crushed look is a result of having such a small reserve of confidence to begin with that even one wrong answer had the power to deflate them completely. In addition, almost all students displayed varying degrees of disbelief when they were succeeding. They seemed equally ‘caught off guard’ when I would complement them on their language learning abilities.

I was perplexed by their insecurity because the students learned English very quickly. For example, I would teach them a new word or phrase and they would effortlessly use it weeks later in casual conversation. Therefore, I had to wonder where this insecurity came from when it was so obviously not correlated with their academic abilities.

Stated Need for Scholastic Confidence

As I said goodbye to my students for the summer, many of them wrote me thank you letters indicating that they were most grateful that I gave them confidence in their ability to learn English. This theme emerged in every letter I received. For example, one letter stated, “Because I hadn’t self-confidence, excited and forget. I want to succeed and thanks to you I succeed and I have got confidence to succeed. I like speak English. I am not sad now. (sad face now). I do speak English. I am happy now. (happy face now).” A different example read, “I will say one thing. Before you I was soooooo ashamed because wrong words and mistake sentences for me is so bad but after I am comfortable. You are very special for me. I didn’t have self-confidence before you but now I have. . . . I will learn English and I will speak with you long time. . . .” Why was there no confidence within them from the beginning? While I acknowledge that there can be

many reasons for their insecurity as individuals and/or a group that is an ethnic minority, I had to wonder whether one contributing factor could be their educational experience as Kurds within a ‘majority-language only’ classroom context. These wonderings led me to this project and form the foundation of my interest in this topic.

Disclaimer of Research Terms

Language Loss as Potential Unintended Outcome

It is important to clarify that although Turkey’s educational policy could be considered subtractive this is not to say that all Turkish teachers want their Kurdish students to lose their mother tongues. Nor do all Turkish teachers want their Kurdish students to assimilate. Rather, the subtraction of Kurdish can be an outcome but not necessarily a conscious intention among all of the Turkish teachers who work with Kurdish students. Moreover, I believe that the attitudes towards ethnic Kurds has become ingrained in the educational system in a way that may be undetectable to individual participants. In other words, I believe this subtraction has become institutionalized in that setting.

Continuum Within The Labels Additive And Subtractive

In reality, there is a continuum between the two labels of additive and subtractive orientations. This study is not an attempt to assert that all teachers or schools are either one hundred percent subtractive or additive in their orientations. However, to understand these dynamics, the use of these terms in a way that may seem rather dichotomous is inevitable. Moreover, the use of these terms dichotomously also is helpful in producing clear explanations of them. Lastly, the terms ‘subtractive’ and ‘majority-language only’ will be used interchangeably throughout the paper.

Guiding Questions

My goal in this study is to find answers to the following questions: 1) As a marginalized ethnolinguistic minority, what are the self-reported experiences of my Kurdish contacts in Turkish schools?; 2) How do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships?; 3) What are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued?; and 4) What is the perceived relationship of the Turkish school approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners?

Chapter Summary

This capstone is focused on the experiences of Kurdish students in Turkish schools. How do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships? What are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued? What is the perceived relationship of Turkish schools' approach to teaching Kurdish on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners? There is a gap in research regarding in depth examples from the perspectives of ethnolinguistic minority students regarding their scholastic and emotional experiences resulting from majority-language only school contexts. I hope to fill this gap in research. In my next chapter, I will provide explanations supported by previous research for the key terms used in this study: subtractive and additive. In addition, reasons for particular scholastic and emotional outcomes will be analyzed. Following this chapter, the methods, data, and results of this study will be examined.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

First, this chapter contains a theoretical framework for research involving four minority student groups. This theoretical framework can best be described as the lens through which prior research examines issues relating to minority student populations. These issues are language, power, and identity in schools for marginalized groups.

The two Non-North American minority student groups are: the Kurds in Turkey and the Burakumin in Japan. The two North American student minority groups are the Inuit in Canada and the Latinos in the United States. This chapter also contains an explanation of the emotional and academic outcomes of these four minority populations' scholastic experiences. An outline of the major research in additive versus subtractive policies involving these groups will be explained in both their differing emphasis and accompanying educational philosophies. This research study is an attempt to shed light on how language barriers among L1 Kurdish minority speakers in Turkish schools affect scholastic achievement, teacher/student relationships and what emotional consequences have ensued.

Prior Research on Language, Power, and Identity in Schools

All of the aforementioned minority groups could be viewed as inferior by some people in their respective countries. Their scholastic environments have been characterized as 'disempowering' and 'excluding' (Auerbach & Cummins, 1995). A stated result of this is low self-esteem regarding their scholastic abilities (Park, 2008, p. 6). With the exception of the Burakumin, all of these minority groups are in scholastic settings that have been labeled 'subtractive.' This 'majority-language only' environment could put society's dominant language in competition with students' mother tongues (

Ricento, 2006). The students are forced to learn society's dominant language and sometimes this happens at the expense of their first language (i.e., subtraction occurs). A brief outline of the various emotional dynamics the aforementioned minority student populations may face in 'majority-language only' schools is helpful for understanding educational outcomes (Cummins, 2001). Potential consequences among minority students in 'majority-language only policy' settings could be disempowerment, lack of cultural representation, and low self-esteem regarding scholastic abilities.

Within the 'majority-language only' approach, students can be seen as put in a "disempowering" environment (Cummins, 2001, p. 653). Students' power is taken away from them through their inability to use the linguistic resource they bring to school. The linguistic resource they bring to school is not valued, as a result they are excluded (Auerbach, 1995). Any form of exclusion may be characterized as disempowering.

Perhaps because of the close relationship between language and identity, 'cultural identity' is considered a part of minority students' linguistic human rights. In a 'majority-language only' policy, the minority students' identity is not reflected in school. Some say that this lack of reflection can separate students from their heritage (Park, 2008, p. 16).

The lack of reflection may even lead students to believe their identity is devalued (Cummins, 2001). This perceived devaluation could lead to an internalized view of inferiority. Some theorize that internalized views of inferiority may be a contributing factor in academic failure (Cummins, 2000).

Self-esteem is considered another part of minority students' linguistic human rights (Park, 2008, p. 6). Because of the potential lack of inclusion, empowerment, and

cultural mirroring in schools, minority students may experience a lack of self-confidence about their academic abilities (Cummins, 2000; Park, 2008, p. 6). More concretely, they may feel incompetent to handle their academic tasks in a language they do not recognize. This could potentially lead to insecurity (Cummins, 2000). A brief discussion of human needs can provide reasons for why the previously outlined emotional dynamics may occur among ethnolinguistic minorities. The broad needs that will be discussed are the needs for mutual understanding, connection and meaning.

Potential Lack of Human Needs

Human needs theory is the notion that humans have certain emotional, spiritual, and intellectual needs. When these needs are not met, particular unpleasant emotions may result. It becomes clearer why the previously briefed emotional outcomes may exist in the subtractive context when human needs are examined. For example, because of language barriers, the human need ‘to understand and be understood’ is not met. As with any unmet need, fear and shame can be emotional consequences (The Center for Nonviolent Communication, 2005).

Under the broad human need for connection: acceptance and belonging are cited (Center for Nonviolent Communication, 2005). Because of the close relationship between language and culture, to disregard a student’s language may also convey the message that the student as a person is not accepted. This could lead to feelings of shame in school.

In one significant study composed of 24,000 pages of interviews in multicultural schools, the minority students articulated that they felt shame because of their differentness in school. One student poignantly stated “this place hurts my spirit” (Park,

2008; Poplin & Weers, 1992). In addition, it was noted that the schools had a sad and hopeless feeling to them (Park, 2008). It could be difficult for students to feel like they belong when the language of instruction and their peers differ from their own (Fillmore, 1991). For this reason, children may be motivated to learn the language of school at the expense of their first language. Hence, ‘subtraction’ of native language could be an outcome of this policy among some students.

Additionally, under the broad category of connection are: communication, to understand and be understood, and to see and be seen. To aid in the fulfillment of these needs, self-expression is vital. How can children express themselves when they are not allowed to speak the language they bring from home into the classroom?

Another broad need is meaning. Under the need for meaning are: competence, contribution, and participation. The feeling of competence is more likely to be gained when students’ scholastic tasks are in a language they recognize (Cummins, 2000). Lastly, the need to ‘contribute’ is more likely to be met in a non-majority-language only setting because language comprehension aids students in their ability to participate.

Differing Policy Perspectives Regarding Language Learning

Subtractive Policy Perspective

The term ‘subtractive’ was coined by Wallace Lambert when he observed that Canadian immigrant children were learning English in school while simultaneously losing their mother tongue of French (Fillmore, 1991). The term ‘subtractive’ seems most appropriate because one of the outcomes of this approach can be the weakening or even subtraction of the first language with society’s dominant language. Relevant literature has defined Turkey’s education system as having a subtractive policy

orientation (Haroon & Soto, 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2005). Perhaps it is labeled subtractive because a weakening or subtraction of the Kurdish language occurs among some students.

The subtractive approach to linguistic diversity is to treat it as a problem (even viewed as ‘subordinate’ languages in some cases) that can be fixed through the *replacement* of it with society’s majority language (Stritikus, 2006; Park, 2008). The theory that proficiency in society’s dominant language will result in academic success that is more efficient used as evidence to support the subtractive method (Stritikus, 2006). From this point of view, mother tongue education could serve as an unnecessary barrier in the process of learning society’s dominant language (Stritikus, 2006). Moreover, it can be seen as problematic for the attainment of overall academic success (Stritikus, 2006).

Some researchers argue that one of the motivations behind the *policy* of the subtractive approach is assimilation to the dominant culture (Stritikus, 2006). Language researchers argue that the educational policy in Turkey has an assimilationist overlay (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1999). Moreover, relevant literature suggests that this assimilationist system has the power not only to subtract language but also its interrelated components: culture and identity (Park, 2008). In contrast to this approach is the ‘additive’ approach where one goal is for teachers to affirm minority students’ identities and cultures.

Additive Policy Perspective

Teachers do not need to know their students’ first languages for the context to be considered additive (Cummins, 2001). This is simply not realistic in many cases. Rather, if two criteria are met it can be considered additive. The first criterion is that students can

use their mother tongues as resources for their acquisition of the dominant language (Cummins, 2001). More specifically, they are asked to build upon their first language knowledge to assist them in learning society's dominant language (Stritikus, 2003). The second criterion is that teachers convey that there is *value* in the students' mother tongues (Cummins, 2001). Value can be conveyed through teachers becoming aware of students' cultural background and integrating it in the classroom (Stritikus, 2006). It then follows that assimilation is less likely to be the outcome (Stritikus, 2006).

From the additive perspective, academic proficiency in the mother tongue is considered to enhance academic success in society's dominant language (Stritikus, 2003). In the extreme implementations of additive orientations, it is argued that first language instruction should occur before the second language is introduced (Cloud, Genesee, & Hayman, 2000). According to Cloud, Genesee, and Hayman:

For speakers of a minority language, we recommend several years of uninterrupted reading and writing instruction in the primary language. This should last from three to five years depending on whether the program begins in Pre-K, K or 1. Around the third grade, *formal* reading/writing instruction in the second language can be introduced. (2000, p.60)

These experts connect their rationale with Cummins' assertion that this approach builds necessary feelings of competency, which aid in the learning process (Cloud, Genesee & Hamayan, 2000). Experts argue that Turkey's educational system could not be labeled as 'additive' because generally teachers do not allow their students to use Kurdish nor is value in the language communicated (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 1999).

Recent Lift on the Law against Kurdish in the Classroom

As previously mentioned in the introduction, it previously was illegal to speak Kurdish in Turkey but today this is no longer the case. Nevertheless, the Kurdish language remains an issue in Turkey. A recent article entitled “Turkey: Meet the 12-Year-Old-Girl Who Risked Prison To Revive Her People’s Language” was published on June 21, 2012 in *The Atlantic* magazine by Istanbul-based journalist Jenna Krajeski. The article begins by describing the utmost importance the language issue holds in Kurdish consciousness. According to Krajeski:

Though that violent struggle (the PKK Kurdish separatist guerrilla movement) has come to embody the Kurdish issue in Turkey, to most Kurds, language remains at the heart of the dispute. Speaking Kurdish was illegal until 1991 and, until Erdogan’s announcement, was still illegal in Turkish schools, part of a larger effort to downplay Kurdish culture. Most Kurds, defying the ban, have had to either flee to the mountains or languish in prison. For them, the right to speak Kurdish is more than just language. (Krajeski, 2012)

It is surprising that the language issue is not more widely discussed because it indeed bears so much weight among Kurds regarding their rights in Turkey. However, perhaps because of the dramatic nature of the PKK Kurdish terrorist group, this has become the focal point of Turkey’s Kurdish awareness. The previous quote provides evidence that the topic of this study, the Kurdish language in Turkish schools, is considered most relevant among Kurds in Turkey.

The article also states that the Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan has lifted the ban on speaking Kurdish in school. Teachers sympathetic to the Kurdish language are deeply

mistrustful of the actual implementation of Erdogan's recent amendment. Kasim Birtek, the local teacher's union chair in the Eastern city of Diyarbakir, viewed its purpose as actually to undermine rather than empower Kurdish rights because he states it could "defuse the larger Kurdish push for full rights." Additionally, he remarked, "if it isn't covered in the constitution it won't stand on its feet." Moreover, if there was a real opening for the Kurdish language in the Turkish education system, then hundreds of members of Birtek's union were ready. "But teachers can't adapt to the changing system" (Krajeski, 2012).

This teacher's words echo Matthew Hand's analysis that the language issue is always changing under the moment's political culture and is less than straightforward in implementation. Thus, there is historical evidence to support teachers' mistrust of the realistic application of Erdogan's modification. Although the ban on speaking Kurdish has been lifted, the fact remains that Kurds do not have the right to receive education in their mother tongue. This policy has been labeled "subtractive language learning" and "genocidal" (Ricento, 2006, p. 277). A genocidal language policy could lead to emotional consequences among Kurdish minority students.

Lastly, the article describes the reflections of a current Kurdish schoolgirl. "My first day of school was very scary," 12-year-old Medya said. She did not know any Turkish and was not allowed to speak Kurdish (Krajeski, 2012). Medya reported, "I would cry every day." She could not understand the reasoning behind being punished for using the language she and her family spoke at home. She was frightened that she was going to fail the Turkish-taught classes. Additionally, she worried about being punished by her teachers (Krajeski, 2012). Her emotions could be theorized as resulting from the

previously discussed disempowering nature of majority-language only instruction.

Perhaps the recent announcement that it no longer is illegal to speak Kurdish in school has not assuaged the issue for this Kurdish-speaking student.

Though assimilation is not stated directly by the Turkish government as one of the goals in Turkey's schools for Kurds, it could be an unstated one. In fact, various governments around the world may or may not acknowledge assimilation as an objective of the school system in dealing with their ethnic minorities. For example, in Japan, assimilation is stated by the government as one of their goals regarding the Burakumin group (Ogbu, 1981, p. 315).

The Burakumin Minority Example

Like the Kurds, the Burakumin are an ethnic minority in Japan who perhaps are disempowered because of their position as ethnic minorities (Ogbu, 1981). They are an outcaste minority group that resides in Japan. They were previously known as "Eta," which literally means "full of filth" (Ogbu, p. 307). Today, the term "Burakumin" means "people of special or unliberated communities" (Ogbu, 1981, p. 307). Similarly, there is a term for the Kurds in Turkish called "pis Kurt," which means "dirty Kurd." In premodern Japanese society, the Burakumin people were considered the lowest of all outcastes. In these times, popular stereotypes about the Buraku are that they are "lazy, lacking in persistent efforts, unreliable, and dependent" (Ogbu, 1981, p. 314). Incidentally, the same prevalent stereotypes are used to explain the low school completion rate of Kurds in Turkey. One difference between the Burakumin and the Kurds is that the Burakumin speak Japanese and therefore recognize the language of the classroom. However, an education gap persists. This could indicate that perhaps as

ethnic minorities they have received a message that they are inferior leading to powerful effects on their schooling.

Education Gap in Japan

There is a noteworthy ‘education gap’ between the Buraku outcasts and their non-Buraku classmates. This education gap manifests in major discrepancies in the areas of “literacy rates, truancy rates, school dropout rates, and performance on standardized tests of scholastic achievement and IQ” (Ogbu, 1981, p. 313). Furthermore, Buraku students were overrepresented in junior high *prevocational* rather than *academic* courses. They also are overrepresented in special education classes for slow learners (Brameld, 1968, p. 101). De Vos and Wagatsuma (1967, pp. 260-263) cite several studies where the Buraku students scored lower than other students on scholastic achievement tests created by the Ministry of Education. In addition, these researchers point out that the Burakumin scored lower than other students did on standardized intelligence tests as well (Ogbu, 1981, p. 313). Studies show that these discrepancies between the Buraku and non-Buraku persist in Japan to this day but do not hold true in America.

These discrepancies between the Buraku and non-Buraku do not remain between Japanese immigrants in America. In the Japanese language schools in America, the outcaste children were rated ahead of the children of non-outcast immigrants (De Vos & Wagatsuma, 1967, p. 210). One reason proposed by their teachers is that the Buraku children put greater effort toward their studies. They also participated more in student programs (De Vos & Wagatsuma, 1967, p. 320). Not only do the Buraku seem to outperform the non-Buraku but they also tend to enjoy greater economic success when

compared with other Japanese immigrants in America (De Vos & Wagatsuma, 1967, p. 319).

Success and Relationship to Dominant Culture

Many Americans would not even be aware of the separate ethnicities and accompanying status of Burakumin and non-Burakumin immigrants from Japan. Therefore, perhaps certain messages of inferiority are absent for the Burakumin in America that may exist for them in Japan given their differential and inferior status there. Cummins has asserted that mass scholastic failure does not occur among minority groups who have positive feelings toward themselves and the dominant culture. They have not developed internalized views of inferiority stemming from their excluded minority status (Cummins, 1986). Perhaps in Japan, because of their inferior status, they have developed these internalized views of inferiority, which may account for their academic failure. However, when this internalized view of inferiority is not a part of the context, as is the case in America, they seem to do well.

Dropout Rates of Kurdish And Burakumin Students

Both the Kurds and Burakumin have higher dropout rates when compared with the majority populations in their countries. In fact, studies have concluded “the probability of not completing the first year of school is 8.7 times higher for male ethnic Kurds when compared to Turks” (Kirdar, 2007, p. 10). There is an even greater disparity between Kurdish girls and Turkish girls: 25% of Kurdish girls do not finish first grade while only 1.4% of ethnic Turkish girls leave (Kirdar, 2007, p. 10).¹ There are varied

¹ This trend of notably higher dropout rates among Kurdish students continues in grades 1-4 (Kirdar, 2007, p. 10). The dropout statistics for Turkish boys in grades 1-4 is 0.7%

reasons why Kurdish children drop out of school apart from the ‘majority-language only policy’ teaching methods. For example, economic challenges, and a pressure for females to adhere to traditional gender roles are factors (Kirdar, 2007). Regardless, experiences as ethnolinguistic minorities in the ‘majority-language only’ school policy could also be a contributing factor in the decision to leave.

It is helpful to also examine the previously mentioned minority group of the Burakumin in Japan in terms of their dropout rates. There is an even greater discrepancy, more so than compared with Kurds vs. Turks, between the ethnic minority Burakumin students and their Ippan counterparts in school in relation to dropout rates in Japan. For example, Brameld’s study (1968, p. 101) found that in one community, although the Buraku represented 35% of the primary school enrollment (105 out of 300), their proportion dwindled to a mere 5% in junior high school. Moreover, in general, only 10% of Buraku students in junior high made the choice to go to high school (Brameld, 1968, p. 101). In turn, 85% of their Ippan counterparts continued on to high school (Brameld, 1968, p. 101). As can be the case with some Kurds, it is important to note that poverty may be a factor in the high dropout rates as well.

Language Proficiency and Academic Success

Now a shift will be made to an examination of an interdependence hypothesis. The relationship between this hypothesis and North American minority students’ academic success will follow. There is a positive correlation between first language literacy and second language academic achievement (Thomas & Collier, 1997/1998).

compared to 5.8% among Kurdish boys. The dropout rate for Turkish girls is 1.6% compared to 11.3% for Kurdish girls (Kirdar, 2007, p. 10).

This connection of first language literacy aiding in second language academic achievement is possible in the additive context. However, in the subtractive context, a lack of development or conceptual basis in the first language means that there is not a proper foundation of skills to transfer to their second language (Liddicoat, 1991). In fact, the importance of this first language literacy and second language achievement phenomenon is the *interdependence hypothesis*.

Coined by Cummins, the interdependence hypothesis is the theory that first language literacy skills can easily transfer to the second language (Cummins, 1986). The implication is that the development of first language is crucial to success in school. This should be in place before entry into first grade (Cummins, 1986). The power of the interdependence hypothesis is evidenced by the fact that this theory holds even when the L1 is a non-Roman alphabet language and the L2 is English because the skills still transfer. Additionally, contextual research has been conducted comparing the educational outcomes between contexts that capitalize on the interdependence hypothesis (i.e., additive) and those that do not (i.e., subtractive). There are parts of North America, particular places in Canada and the US, where majority-language only is the policy. Language minority groups lag behind non-language minority students in these contexts.

Inuit Language in Canadian Schools Example

Published in 2000, one study sponsored for the Department of Education and completed by Ian Martin provides evidence of an interdependence hypothesis. The investigation was among Inuit students. These students live in seven small Nunavut communities in Canada. They learn Inuktitut in the dialect of their parents and or community (Martin, 2000, p. 2). Hence, Inuktitut is considered their first language.

This demographic is known to have “extremely low graduation rates and a general lack of academic achievement” (Martin, 2002, p. 7). Because of this problem, in early 2000, The Department of Education commissioned papers to “outline the possible directions that the new government of Nunavut might take regarding language of instruction policy” (Martin, 2000, p. 7). The report stated that there had been a long debate about what would constitute the most effective language of instruction for Inuit students (Martin, 2002, p. 7). One camp supported the idea that additional English language instruction would aid in academic achievement. The other camp believed that a school system that mirrors the culture and environment of the Inuit would enable students to succeed. The researchers from Martin’s study believe in the latter.

The researchers were interested in whether language was a factor in the low rate of high school completion and problems in academia (Martin, 2000, p. 7). To answer this question, the researchers used semi-structured interviews to assess language attitudes from different community actors, open questions on questionnaires, statistical data, and written comments from high school students and parents within the communities.

Current ‘Early-Exit Transitional Model’ of Education

Today, the form of language instruction for Inuit students is categorized as an early-exit transitional model. Students begin with Inuit in school until grades 5-6 during which time they begin the “transition phase,” meaning that Inuktitut is used for 50% of the school day (Martin, 2000, i). After this phase, the language of instruction is strictly English for the rest of the students’ time in school (Martin, 2000, p. 3). The overall system is considered bilingual because there are two languages used for instruction in the school (Martin, 2000, p. 4). Martin does not think this label is accurate because English

eventually replaces the student's first language. Martin and colleagues concluded that the early-exit transitional bilingual model is problematic.

Teachers mentioned to the research team that when the language of instruction is Inuktitut children achieve at an appropriate level for their grade (Martin, 2000, p. 22). However, after they begin the transition years, their achievement begins to decline (Martin, 2000, p. 22). In fact, the study determined that in high school, when students are switched to English, most students find themselves falling behind in grade level by four or five years (Martin, 2000, p. 22). In addition, many parents and teachers have stated that students' abilities in L1 stop growing after they are "dumped" into English, a term used by one teacher (Martin, 2000, p. 5).

Results of Self-Assessment by Students

In this same study, a self-assessment test was given to high school students in five communities regarding their relative abilities in English and Inuktitut. The statistics are based on the analysis of the student questionnaires from high school students in Kangiqiniq, Kangiatugaapik, Iqaluit, Panguirung, and Qurluqtuuq. The results are presented in Table 1. Table 1 shows the negative correlation between Inuit language and English ability (Martin, 2000, p. 14).

Table 1.

Negative Correlation between Inuit Language and English Abilities

	Fluency in English	Literacy in English
Fluency in Inuktitut	-.327	
Literacy in Inuktitut		-.314

Note. As self-assessed by high school students in Kangiqiniq, Kangiatugaapik, Iqaluit, Panguirung, and Qurluqtuuq; N = 256)

Martin determined that both scores are negative, which indicates that high scores in English are correlated to low scores in the Inuit language (2000, p. 14). The scores are negative in fluency, which was defined as speaking and listening. Additionally, the scores are negative in literacy, which was defined as reading and writing. Instead of the potential for these Nunavut high school students to be making gains in both languages simultaneously, the exact opposite is happening: ‘subtractive bilingualism is a reoccurring theme’ (Martin, 2000, p. 14). When these students make gains in English, their native language skills decline (Martin, 2000, p. 14). Moreover, parents, students, teachers, and others have commented that Inuit students become semilingual, defined as weak fluency and literacy skills in both languages (Martin, 2000, p. 15). While additive language learning does not seem to be taking place for students in this context, Martin explains that this ideal scenario is possible in different educational contexts. For example, when English-speaking children learn French in school their English is not compromised.

Therefore, the researchers believe that the weak model of bilingual education is a hindrance to the students’ academic success. This hindrance is perceived as being true on

both a linguistic and cognitive level (Martin, 2000, p. 15). They take issue with exiting students from their native language to English only. Rather, they would prefer the continuation of ‘support, cherish, and value’ placed on students’ first languages as the most valuable way to learn (Martin, 2000, p. 5).

It is significant to note that these students begin to fall behind only after they transition to English as the language of instruction. This is an indication that the change of languages could be a factor in the academic failure (Martin, 2000, p. 22). This fact provides evidence to support the interdependence hypothesis because the first language was not developed academically by the fourth grade, which accounts for the students’ sudden academic failure.

Study Recommendations

Martin’s study of Inuit speakers recommended that Nunavut could have a school system “where the majority of students become confidently fluent and literate in both Inuktitut and English” (Martin, 2000, p. 27). They offer various suggestions regarding how this could be accomplished. The first recommendation is that Inuktitut classes be offered from kindergarten through grade twelve (Martin, 2000, p. 27). Additionally, a new generation with 80% Inuit teachers is requested (Martin, 2000, iii). Last, they would also like to see “a five-to-seven year ESL/Sheltered English/ESL-sympathetic instructional program” (Martin, 2000, p. 6). They believe that this would avoid a “sink-or-swim system” because the ESL teachers would be aware of language development. The researchers believe that Inuit students will stay in school longer if changes around the language of instruction are followed. As a result, they predict that students will be exposed to more English and have strong bilingualism and biliteracy in both languages

(Martin, 2000, p. 7). Such proficiency in both languages is desirable because it could aid students in their academic success and provide the confidence needed to continue their education.

Spanish-Only Vs. Bilingual Preschool Programs

An additional study that provides evidence of an interdependence hypothesis compared Latino students in terms of their kindergarten readiness based on the language of instruction used in the preschool they attended. These preschool students were in the Carpinteria School District, near Santa Barbara, California. The study, completed by Campos and Keatinge in 1984, is a comparison of two groups of first language Spanish speaking children. The first group was enrolled in a bilingual (slightly English heavy) pre-school program run by Head Start or Community Day Care. The experimental group was enrolled in an exclusively Spanish preschool program. Both groups were from families of low socioeconomic status (> 90%) working in agriculture with the average parental education level of sixth grade (Martin, 2000, p. 670). Therefore, different socioeconomic status can be disregarded as a potential factor in achievement differentials between the groups.

The impetus for beginning an experimental Spanish-only preschool came from the reality that year after year many students from the *bilingual preschool* were not kindergarten ready. This conclusion was based on the School Readiness Inventory, a district-wide screening measure administered to all incoming kindergarten students. The following information presents details directly from the study of how the Instrumentation-School Readiness Inventory evaluation tool was comprised. According to author James Campos, “An evaluation of program outcomes was conducted to measure

student progress in school readiness, academic skills in language and math, and oral English proficiency” (1985, p. 5).

Instrumentation-School Readiness Inventory. The SRI is a criterion-referenced test designed to assess a child’s readiness for school in the areas of fine motor abilities, attending skills, and concept development. The SRI is administered in either Spanish or English depending on the student’s language dominance. The Carpinteria School district has used the SRI for the past 12 years (Campos, 1985).

The sample. In addition to students who participated in the Carpinteria Spanish language preschool, three other groups of students were identified for comparison purposes:

- Spanish dominant students attending any other preschool,
- Spanish dominant students who did not attend preschool, and
- English dominant students.

The test was administered in the students’ dominant language (Campos, 1985, p. 670). In this study, using the School Readiness Inventory, the researchers found that English-speaking students tended to average approximately eight points higher than Spanish-speaking children enrolled in the bilingual preschool program did. The L1 English students averaged 23.0 while the Spanish-speaking children from the bilingual preschool program averaged approximately 14.5. Scores of 20 or higher were thought to be a prediction of a successful kindergarten year (Campos, 1985, p. 670). This was averaged over four years from 1979-1982. Although the Latino students had received pre-kindergarten education, the numbers made it clear that they were behind their Anglo

classmates even before they began kindergarten. In efforts to break this cycle, researchers decided to try a new approach: an experimental Spanish-only preschool.

Characteristics of Spanish-only Preschool

The Spanish-only preschool program in Carpinteria is identified by Cummins as one of the few program that empowers minority students (2001, p. 669). In fact, one of the program's stated goals is to afford students' self-esteem through providing a positive emotional and social environment (Campos, 1985, p. 3). In-class activities were planned in accordance with the promotion of these goals (Campos, 1985, p. 83). Additionally, community involvement is valued greatly and encouraged in this program (Campos, 1985, p. 669).

According to the developers of the Spanish-Only preschool program, meaningful interaction is viewed as the best educational philosophy and should be exclusively in Spanish (Campos, 1985, p. 669). The development of Spanish language skills was viewed as the highest priority in every activity; even those designed with the additional goals to help students learn new ideas, think creatively, and solve problems (Campos & Keatinge, 1984, p. 17). In addition, the activities were multicultural and the students' shared cultural heritage was valued (Campos, 1985, p. 85). It is important also to note that at the end of the year, usually in April, limited English language time is introduced to these children and they may experience English on some field trips (Campos, 1985, p. 5). One could conclude that the students' sociolinguistic identity was affirmed in this setting. In this additive context, self-expression was not only possible but also encouraged by their teachers. Lastly, the researchers did not detail the bilingual program. Therefore, an

in-depth description of it is not possible; however, the researchers indicated that it differs greatly from the Spanish-only preschool.

Results of the Spanish-Only vs. Bilingual Preschools

According to the results of the previously detailed 'Instrumentation-School Readiness Inventory, the children enrolled in the Spanish-only preschool program outperformed those enrolled in the bilingual preschool between the years 1982-1983. Students in the Spanish-only preschool received an average score of 21.6. However, their fellow L1 Spanish speakers in the bilingual preschool received 14.6. The L1 English students score was 23.2. Therefore, the mean score for children coming out of the Spanish-only preschool almost equals that of the first language English children.

Additionally, the researchers administered the state designed bilingual syntax measure test. The scores on this test are defined as "a test of oral syntax development" (Campos, 1985, p. 87). In other words, it was created to test oral English language proficiency. Although the L1 Spanish speakers in the exclusively Spanish program were not exposed to as much English as those in the bilingual program, they still outperformed those students in *English* and Spanish abilities upon entering kindergarten. Before the Spanish-only preschool began, only 42% of L1 Spanish speakers scored at or above Level 3 (survival English) on the BSM. In the fall of 1982, numbers rose to 76% for students who had been enrolled in the Spanish-only preschool. At the same time, only 35% of students enrolled in the bilingual preschool arrived at that level (Campos, 1985, p. 87). Lastly, it is significant to note that coming into grade one in 1983, five times as many of the Spanish-only preschool students scored at Level Five (fluent English) as those enrolled in the bilingual program at 47% vs. 10% (Campos & Keatinge, 1984).

As the statistics would indicate, the students who went through the Spanish-only preschool were able to comprehend more English when compared to those who came out of the bilingual preschool. Teachers stated, “project participants appear more aware of what is happening around them in the classroom” (Campos & Keatinge, 1984, p. 41). In addition, “they are able to focus on the task at hand better” (Campos & Keatinge, 1984, p. 41). Perhaps partly because of their language comprehension, the students were said to exhibit greater confidence.

The evaluation of the Spanish-only experimental preschool illustrated that these students demonstrated more confidence for school tasks than those from the bilingual school group (Cummins, 2008). Kindergarten teachers in the district made comments such as, “they demonstrate greater self-confidence in learning situations.” Just as an internalized view of inferiority can inhibit the learning process, many researchers have concluded that self-confidence can enhance the language acquisition process (Campos & Keatinge, 1984, p. 41). Lastly, the authors suggested that perhaps through the students’ ability to communicate with their teachers in their first languages they were able to gain confidence and cultural identity affirmation.

Cummins wrote, “the major relevance of these findings for educators and policymakers derives from their demonstration that educational programs *can* succeed in preventing the academic failure experienced by many minority students. The corollary is that failure to provide this type of program constitutes the disabling of minority students by the school system” (2001, p. 671). Cummins seems to conclude that a questioning of the educational system is more appropriate than attributing scholastic failure to students’ innate abilities. The reason for this assertion lies in that those children who came from

the bilingual program still experienced overwhelming academic failure. Cummins hypothesized that these children would most likely be targets for psychological assessment during their time in school. Perhaps they will even be diagnosed as having 'learning disabilities' and be put into special education courses.

Educational Practices in Additive vs. Subtractive Environments

Differing Scholastic Emphasis

In a literacy curriculum, in subtractive teaching, greater value and instruction time is placed on mechanics (via correct pronunciation, phonetics, and grammar) rather than meaning (Stritikus, 2006). Studies have shown that focus on mechanics can come at the expense of meaning among students. For example, one study soon to be detailed showed students in the subtractive contexts had no idea of the meaning of what they read. Rather, they were so focused on trying to get the mechanics right to gain the teacher's approval that they did not simultaneously focus on meaning (Stitikus, 2003).

The opportunity for students to use their prior knowledge is argued to enhance the learning process. In other words, learning becomes easier for students when the context is cognitively, linguistically, and socio-culturally meaningful to the learner (Stritikus, 2006; Garcia, 1995, Moll, 1994). When prior knowledge is utilized, students also are more likely to feel confident about the tasks that lay ahead of them. The activation of prior knowledge occurs naturally within the additive approach. This confidence can be a contributing factor in greater academic success (Cummins, 1986). A closer examination of how these two different orientations manifest in classroom practices can be illuminating for understanding their differences.

It is helpful to scrutinize the study previously cited by Stritikus in greater depth to examine examples of additive versus subtractive classroom contexts more closely. The context of this study is California (beginning in 1998 and ending in 2000) during Proposition 227, known by its supporters as the “English for the Children Initiative.” It passed by the majority of California voters on June 2, 1998. The purpose of this initiative was to end bilingual education. The rationale behind the initiative was that if teachers continued to use Spanish in their instruction it would serve as a barrier to students’ acquisition of English. Therefore, their academic success would be derailed. Both studies indicate that teacher beliefs and policies have direct consequences for teacher practices.

Stritikus examined teacher practices after this initiative passed to attain a better understanding of how embodiments of additive versus subtractive teacher beliefs played out in the ELL classroom. Research took place at Westway Elementary and Open Valley Elementary, the two largest schools in the small rural district of Walton Unified in California.

Teacher Elisa’s Beliefs And Practices

The first teacher he examined, Elisa, embraced an additive approach to language learning. As a child, she worked in the fields of Central Valley as a member of an immigrant family. She believed that her language and culture were devalued within her school experiences. Because of her similar background to her immigrant students, Elisa believed that she had special insight into their social and instructional needs. According to Stritikus, “She believed that native instruction provided significant academic, cognitive, social, and cultural benefits for her students” (2003, p. 221). She wanted her

students to maintain their cultural identities while participating in American society.

Thus, she disagreed with the assimilationist implications of Proposition 227. She said that she became more rebellious after Proposition 227 by incorporating an even greater amount of Spanish in her classroom.

Elisa's Classroom Practices And Practices

Elisa led her students through activities in Spanish before English. She explained to the students that if they did the activity in Spanish first, it would be easier to do it after in English. To give a specific example, Elsa showed the class drawings with Spanish names listed under each drawing. She asked them what English names she could put in the places of the Spanish ones. For example, she said, "What can I put in place of 'arbol'?" The students participated by excitedly shouting out English words. The following is a brief dialogue that took place in one of her classes:

Elisa: Cuando estamos con un dibujo, y tenemos palabras, y de la palabras que hacemos (When we are working with a picture, and we have words, from the words what do we make)?

Daniel: Oraciones (Sentences)!

(At this point, the pace of the discussion quickens.)

Elisa: De estas oraciones que podemos hace (From these sentences what can we do)?

Students: Parrafo (paragraph).

Elisa: Que tiene que ver esto con el ingles (What does all this have to do with English)?

Daniel: Yo voy a saber las palabras que tiene que responder (I'll know the words I need to know to answer the questions).

Betty: (pointing at the white board where Elisa had written some of the sentences students had generated.) Puedes poner 'tree' en vez de arbol (You can put "tree in place of arbol").

Betty's unsolicited suggestion could be an indication that she felt confidence for the academic task. Stritikus described the students in the class as being "eager" and "energetic to explore the ways they would be able to use English" (2003, p. 223). Another piece of evidence for academic empowerment within this additive classroom orientation is exhibited in Daniel's remark. "I'll know the words I need to know to answer the questions." His statement may convey a sense of security in his ability to answer questions in English when the time comes (Stritikus, 2003).

Stritikus described that the message Elisa gave the students was Spanish as a language learning resource. In addition, because of the close relationship between language and culture Elisa is not only affirming Spanish but also the message may be conveyed to her students' that their cultural background is valued. To illustrate the contrasting approach, an example of a classroom where the teacher embraces English only as the best way to learn also is illuminating.

Teacher Connie's Beliefs And Practices

The next case Stritikus examined was that of Connie. She is a third grade teacher in a school within the same district as Elisa, but she switched to English only after Proposition 227. Connie's ideology stems from the belief that English only is better because it can "unify the US" in a way that multilingualism does not make possible

(2003, p. 224). She is quoted as saying “I totally agree that English should be the language of this country. You need to have some base and I think English needs to be the base here.” Additionally, Connie viewed Spanish not as a resource but as a hurdle toward her students’ achieving English language acquisition (Stritikus, 2003, p. 224).

A great deal of time in Connie’s class was exerted on “phonetic exactness” meaning that her emphasis was on correct pronunciation and “strict adherence to teacher directions” (Stritikus, 2003, p. 224). According to Stritikus, “During these interactions Connie’s emphasis was on correct pronunciation and phonology, strict adherence to directions, and grammar” (2003, p. 224). Unlike in Elisa’s approach, value was not placed on meaning. This was exhibited by a lack of questions regarding story events or plots. She would ask students to find compound words or circle long vowels. Stritikus stated, “texts were viewed as little more than the subtotal of their phonetic or grammatical values” (2003, p. 224). Additionally, Stritikus points out that the following event captures the subtractive nature of her literacy instruction:

Connie stood at the front of the class and had just read the first problem of the worksheet. She instructed students that they were supposed to circle each long vowel sound in each of the sentences and write the word in the long vowel column. This was the third in a series of worksheets the class had done that day. Connie completed the first three sentences with the students. In each sentence, her pattern was fairly consistent. She read the sentences and asked students which words in the sentence had a long vowel sound. Students were not allowed to pick up their pencils until the class had identified all the long vowel sounds. During the first three sentences, a few students called out answers without being officially

recognized. When this happened on the fourth sentence, Connie said, “Since you seem to have no problem with this activity, you can do it on your own.” Ruben and Miguel excitedly rubbed their hands together. Miguel read a sentence in a flat tone with no questioning intonation, “Will Pat go to the store.” He paused for a moment and read it again in a flat tone, “Will Pat go to the store. Will Pat . . . Pat go to the store? That doesn’t make any sense. Don’t matter.” He picked up his pencil and wrote the words “go” and “store” in the “Long O” column.

This example shows greater value placed on skills as opposed to meaning.

Miguel seems to have noticed this message with his conclusion “Will Pat . . . Pat go to the store? That doesn’t make any sense. Don’t matter.” Stritikus and colleagues question the usefulness of such literacy practices (Gutierrez, Baquendano-Lopez, & Asato, 2000). Rather, they propose that a meaning-based curriculum is a more conducive method for learning among ELL students (Franquiz & Reyes, 1998; Hudelson, 1994; Moll, 1994). Additionally, Stritikus explains that Proposition 227 gave Connie the liberty to restrict the use of Spanish in her classroom.

At the same time, Stritikus does not want to imply that Connie’s case is representative of all programs’ usage of the open court literacy series. However, it does convey possible ways teachers may “utilize and implement aspects of similar skill-based scripted literacy programs” (Stritikus, 2003, p. 225). Subtractive teaching methodology has been imposed in not only California but also Arizona and Massachusetts as their official language policy. These three states serve as evidence that this issue has relevance among language minority students in America as well as with Turkey’s Kurds.

Many studies, such as those outlined in this chapter, have focused on why language barriers can cause scholastic difficulties within subtractive teaching methodologies. However, the effects language barriers have on teacher-student relationships and emotional consequences are incomplete and should be examined in greater depth. The information that does exist is largely from the perspectives of scholars. However, I have yet to encounter any in-depth examples from the perspectives of students. I plan to go about finding the answers to my questions through asking open-ended questions to Kurdish people who have experience within the Turkish education system. More specifically, I will ask them to reflect upon their first five years of school when they were the least familiar with the Turkish language. The questions I ask will surround the topics of academic achievement, teacher/student interactions, and emotional consequences.

Gap in Research

There are certain things the literature discussion does not detail concerning additive versus subtractive methodology. For example, it does not offer in-depth stories, memories, and reflections from students about their scholastic and emotional experiences resulting from majority-language only classroom policies. More specifically, there is not specific information directly from Kurdish students' perspectives. This is surprising because the educational setting for Kurdish children in Turkey is considered one of the clearest examples of subtractive education in the world (Haroon, & Diaz Soto, 2006; Skutnabb-Kanags, 2005). As a result, the context of Turkey can be used to analyze the subject further. This inquiry explores the lived educational experience of Kurdish

children in Turkey via their stories, emotions, and experiences in the context of a discussion surrounding human needs, emotions, and scholastic achievement.

Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has been a review of research surrounding additive versus subtractive approaches to language learning. It also has given evidence of why particular scholastic and emotional consequences may result from the subtractive approach. The gap in research has been defined. I have shown where there is room for additional research concerning these issues. In Chapter Three, I will detail the procedures used in this research project.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This study was designed as an examination of the lived experiences of Kurdish students in the Turkish school system. My research questions remain: 1) What are the self-reported experiences of my Kurdish contacts in Turkish schools, as a marginalized ethnolinguistic minority? 2) How do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships? 3) What are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued? and 4) What is the perceived relationship of Turkish schools' approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners? The research methods will be explained in this chapter.

Qualitative Research Paradigm and Rationale

Qualitative research is a natural fit for my research questions because I want data that is descriptive as opposed to quantitative (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 162). I choose to use the qualitative research paradigm because this avenue allows people to express themselves in their own words. It also allows their stories to be told in-depth, revealing nuances and details of individual stories that a quantitative approach would not likely uncover. As previously mentioned in my literature review, the niche this study fills concerns the lived experience of Kurdish children in Turkey via their stories, emotions, and experiences in school.

While qualitative research varies greatly, it generally contains these characteristics, "rich description, natural and holistic representation, emic perspectives, few participants, cyclical and open-ended processes, possible ideological orientations, and general/open-ended research" (Mackey, et al., 2005, p. 163). Of greatest relevance to my study is the "natural and holistic representation," which means that both the "broader

sociocultural context” and “micro-level phenomena” (i.e., classroom interactions) are considered (Mackey, et al., 2005, p. 163). This is most relevant because embedded within the very nature of my research question is the sociocultural context of the Kurdish people. Therefore, the “broader sociocultural context” is inherently taken into consideration. Some may even argue in a causal relationship in the sense that the sociocultural context dictates my participants’ scholastic interactions and spaces. A Middle East scholar could tell one generally about the sociocultural context of the Kurdish people living in Turkey. However, they may not be able to provide the micro-level phenomena that my participants have experienced in the classroom as ethnolinguistic minorities. A part of my goal was to gain access to these micro-level phenomena from my participants.

Case Study as Design

There are five forms of qualitative data collection methods: ethnographies, interviews, diaries/journals, case studies and observational techniques. I chose the case study method, which is suitable for several reasons. One, my open-ended questions allowed me to have access to my participants’ experiences through giving them an opportunity to share their personal memories. This approach presents the goal of case study: to obtain a deeper sense of the participants and the issues involved. Additionally, the goal is to provide a holistic description of the learner (Mackey et al., 2005). I asked questions regarding many different yet interrelated issues (e.g., scholastic achievements, teacher/student interactions, emotions in school, current Kurdish language abilities). Given the study’s multi-dimensional nature, my investigation is indeed holistic. Case studies also allow the complexities of individuals’ perceptions and experiences to come forth. This is argued as occurring more naturally in this form of research as opposed to

other forms (e.g., experimental research, correlational, survey; Mackey et al., 2005, p. 172).

Data Collection

Participants

I chose to use a “convenience sample” for obtaining my six participants because I only had connections to a limited number of L1 Kurdish speakers whom I know personally. It was important that the participants trusted the interviewer for them to feel comfortable speaking candidly and truthfully about such personal topics. My research criteria involved the participants all being first language Kurdish speakers (i.e., spoke Kurdish in the home) who then went to Turkish schools. All of my participants are originally from Eastern Turkey. My youngest participant was 24 and my oldest was 53 years old at the time of data collection. There was a wide age range of participants between these two (to be more specific: 27, 28, 42, and 48). There were three females and three males. Their English proficiency levels ranged from beginner to advanced. Their educational backgrounds differed. However, all of them have completed high school. Three of my participants have not gone to university. The participants were all informed of the questions I would be asking them as well because I sent them the interview questions verbatim beforehand. Additionally, prior to their interviews, they were informed of the purpose of the study. They signed informed consent forms to ensure that they understood that their participation was voluntary, the goals of my research clear, and that their anonymity would be protected. I gave each participant a number instead of using their names to protect their anonymity. Participants were not compensated. However, I have asked them if they would like me to send them my thesis when finished. The majority of my participants displayed interest.

I had varied relationships with my participants. One was simply a friend I had made while I was living in Istanbul and participating in a Spanish language club. Another participant was someone I had given English classes to at the Community Center in a slum of Istanbul where I am no longer volunteering. Two others were volunteers of different capacities. I had met them while working at the Center. While another one is a current volunteer for the non-profit that I have done work with in the past. The only participant I could have potentially had a power differential with was the participant I taught English to at the Community Center but I no longer volunteer there nor do I live in Turkey. I have good relationships with the participants and I have known them all minimally for eight months so I believe they trust me. This is very important because as a marginalized ethnic minority, without this trust it can be difficult for people to open up in an interview. To illustrate this, two participants did drop out of the study despite my reassurance that their answers would be kept confidential, they were afraid that their participation could lead to negative ramifications. My participants were recruited based on the previously explained criteria of me having known them long enough to form trusting relationships with them.

The setting was both in Minnesota and Turkey. Most of my participants lived in Istanbul, Turkey. However, one lived in Ankara and another person lived in Mersin. I had the great fortune to interview the participant who lived in Mersin in person while she was visiting Minnesota. She also translated a number of telephone interviews with some of the low-level English-speaking participants as well here in Minnesota.

Semi-Structured Interviews as Method

I used semi-structured interviews for the gathering of data. Semi-structured interviews take place when “the researcher uses a written list of questions as a guide,

while still having the freedom to digress and probe for more information” (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 173). Interviews enable researchers to enter the worldview of their participants (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 173). For example, I could never obtain the kind of information I was seeking from simply observing Kurdish students in the Turkish classroom because I would not have access to their inner landscapes simply from observing them in class. For my participants with lower English language ability, I was able to have a native Turkish speaker ask them the questions and then translate their responses into English. Another benefit to this approach was that there was less concern about cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Another advantage to interviews is that they give the ability to probe and monitor comprehension, both of which I did.

I also took field notes. One reason was to have something to refer to regarding what was going through my mind during the course of the interview. Sometimes I would write questions, points of clarification and things that caught my off guard that I thought could apply to others as well. In two interview cases, there was ambiguity regarding the participants’ answers to questions. I noticed these ambiguities upon review of my field notes. After the ambiguities were noted, I got in touch with the participant via e-mail or Skype for confirmation in order to ask for clarification as needed. I would confirm with them by telling them what specifically had confused me and then ask them a question about it. This allowed me to reflect on them later.

While there was great variation regarding the amount of time participants’ interviews lasted, the average was forty minutes to an hour. The shortest case was a half hour and the longest was two hours. The interviews were conducted over the month of

August in 2012. I believe personality (introversion vs. extroversion to name one) accounted for such variations in time.

I implemented the method through verbally asking the students the questions and recording their answers. I accomplished this through Skype so that I could remain in Minnesota and still interview my participants. Additionally, I sent them a Turkish translation of the survey to ensure that there would not be any miscommunication because of language barriers. I recorded the interviews on my iPad so that I could refer to everything that was said and analyze them for emerging themes. In addition to this, I transcribed them as well. The unit of analysis is both the individual and the group. Group unit of analysis is defined as a comparison of my subjects' responses to each other.

Data Analysis

Qualitative research can also be described as “open-ended” because researchers can allow categories to emerge based on the data (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 163). Taking this approach made the data more representative of how participants remember their time in school. The process of the initial categorization of data based on what the interviewer receives is sometimes called “open coding” (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 241). As recommended by interview experts, I organized my data around a chart of emerging patterns. Oral data were coded based on identifying patterns and I put them into different categories (open coding). These patterns were identified with the use of highlighting pens while working directly with the transcript. The categories I coded were: emotions (answers the research question: what emotional consequences have ensued?), familial support, teacher/student interactions (answers the research question: how do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships?), Kurdish skills and scholastic experiences

(answers the research question: what is the perceived relationship of Turkish schools' approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners?).

Theoretical Triangulation

According to Mackey et al., theoretical triangulation can be thought of as “using multiple perspectives to analyze the same set of data” (Mackey et al., p. 181). Because of my understanding of the importance of theoretical triangulation, my peer reader and primary advisor both reviewed the data and coding as *raters*. It is important for the researcher to have other people look at transcriptions because coding means classifying data. Readers can gain more confidence in a study when others have looked at the data and agreed with the researcher's choices. This process is termed *peer examination*. Additionally, I also confirmed my interpretations of the interviews with the participants via e-mail so that they could add or change any potential misinterpretations. This is referred to as *participant concurrence* or *member checking*. Both participant concurrence and peer examination serve the purpose of achieving triangulation of data because they enhance validity and lessen the influence of researcher bias (Mackey et al., 2005, p. 181).

The following portion of this chapter is a presentation of the questions asked during the interview. As noted in the following interview script, the categories I used to ensure that the data I collected answered my questions were: academia with language barrier, interactions with Turkish teachers and classmates, and feelings in schools. In the cases of my advanced English speaking interviews, I conducted the interview in English. In the cases of lower level English speakers, I had an interpreter conduct the interview who was fluent in both Turkish and English. The following table illustrates the details:

Table 2. Language and medium

Age	Language Used	Medium Of Interview
24	English	Skype
27	English	Skype
28	English	In Person
42	Turkish	Skype
48	Turkish	Skype
53	Turkish	Skype

Interview Questions

Note to participants: I am mainly interested in the first years of your school experience. To be more specific, I am interested in your first five years of school when you were most unfamiliar with the Turkish language.

Katılımcılara not; Esas olarak Türkçe'yi bilmediğiniz ilk okul yıllarıyla ilgileniyorum.

Warm Up Questions

Başlangıç Soruları:

- Where did you grow up?
Nerede büyüdün?
- How old are you?
Kaç yaşındasın?
- Where are you in terms of age in your family (oldest, middle, youngest)?
Ailenin en büyük, ortanca ya da en küçük ferdi misin?
- What language did you speak at home?
Evde hangi dilde konuşuyorsunuz?
- What is your first memory of school?
Okulla ilgili ilk hatırladığımız şey ne?
- Do you think you speak Turkish with a Kurdish accent?
Konuşurken Türkçe aksanla mı yoksa Kürtçe aksanla mı konuşuyorsunuz?
- Can you currently speak Kurdish? Yes/No.
Şu anda Kürtçe konuşabiliyor musunuz? Evet/Hayır.

If yes, how would you describe your current speaking skills in Kurdish? For example, have they increased or decreased since your time in school? Do you feel comfortable speaking Kurdish?

Eğer cevabınız Evet ise; Şu anda Kürtçe konuşma düzeyiniz nasıl? Örneğin, okulu bitirdikten sonra iyileşti mi yoksa daha mı kötüleşti? Kürtçe'yi rahat konuşabiliyor musunuz?

Can you currently understand spoken Kurdish? Yes/No.

Şu anda Kürtçe konuşmaları anlıyor musunuz? Evet/Hayır

If yes, how would you describe your current Kurdish listening skills? For example, have they increased or decreased since your time in school? Do you feel comfortable with your Kurdish listening skills?

Eğer Evet ise; şu anda Kürtçe'yi ne düzeyde anlıyorsunuz? Örneğin, okulu bitirdikten sonra anlamanız iyileşti mi yoksa daha da mı kötüleşti? Kürtçe konuşulanları anlama düzeyinizden memnun musunuz?

- What is your highest level of educational achievement (e.g., high school, university, Master's)?

Eğitim düzeyiniz nedir? (lise, üniversite, yüksek lisans gibi)

Rough category #1: Academia and Language Barrier (provides answers to the research question: what is the perceived relationship of Turkish schools' approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners?)

- Please tell me about your time in school during the first five years when your Turkish language skills were the most limited.

En az Türkçe bildiğiniz ilk okul dönemi hakkında biraz bahseder misiniz?

- Part One (Yes/No Question): Was there a time when it was difficult for you to understand the content of the lesson (k-3)? Please answer yes or no.

(Evet/Hayır Soruları): Derslerin içeriklerini anlamakta zorlandığınız dönem oldu mu? Lütfen evet hayır olarak cevaplayın.

Part Two: If yes why was that so?

Eğer cevabınız Evet ise; anlamamanızın nedeninin ne olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

If no why was that so?

Eğer cevabınız Hayır ise; nedenini açıklar mısınız?

- In your beginning years of school (defined as around kindergarten through third grade) how were your grades (e.g., test scores, homework)?

Okula ilk başladığınızda (eğer ana okula gittiyseniz, ana okuldan üçüncü sınıfa kadar olan dönem) notlarınız nasıldı? (yani imtihan sonuçlarınız, ev ödevlerinizden aldığınız notlar)

Rough category #2: Interactions with Turkish Teachers and Classmates (provides answers to the research question: how do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships?)

Türk öğretmenler ve sınıf arkadaşlarıyla ilişkiler

- 4) Part One (Yes/No Question): Did you participate in class? Please answer yes or no.

If yes, what were your experiences when participating in class?

(Evet /Hayır soruları); Derslere iştirak ediyor muydunuz? Evet /Hayır olarak cevaplayın lütfen.

Eğer cevabınız evet ise; Derslere katıldığınızda neler yaşadınız?

5) What were your interactions with your Turkish classmates like?

Türk olan sınıf arkadaşlarınızla ilişkileriniz nasıldı?

6) What did your teachers convey to you about the Kurdish language?

öğretmenleriniz Kürtçe hakkında bir şey söyledi mi?

Rough category #3: Feelings in School (provides answers to the research question: what are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued?)

Okuldayken hissettikleriniz

- Part One (Yes/No Question): Were there times when you could not understand your teacher and your teacher could not understand you?
Birinci Bölüm (evet /hayır soruları) ,öğretmeninizi anlamadığınız ya da onun sizi anlamadığı zaman oldu mu?
- Part Two: If yes, how did you feel when communication between you and your teachers was difficult?
İkinci Bölüm; Eğer cevabınız evet ise; öğretmeninizle aranızdaki iletişimin kötü olması sizi nasıl etkiledi? Ne hissettiniz?
- Part One (Yes/No Question): Was school ever uncomfortable?
Birinci Bölüm; (Evet/hayır sorusu) okul sizin için rahatsız edici bir yer oldu mu?
- Part Two: If yes, how did you manage that?
Eğer evet ise, bununla nasıl başa çıktın/yaptın?

Open-Ended Questions Regarding What Helped You Get Through School In Relation To Fulfillment of Human Needs:

Açık uçlu sorular; İnsani ihtiyaçlarınızın karşılanması bağlamında okulu bitirmenizde etken olan şey neydi, size ne yardım etti

Part One: Yes/No Question: Did your family offer you SUPPORT in your education?

Please answer yes/no.

Birinci Bölüm; Evet/Hayır soruları: Aileniz eğitiminizde size yardım etti mi? evet/hayır diye cevap verin?

Part Two: If yes, did your parents offer to help you with homework?

İkinci Bölüm; Eğer cevabınız evet ise; size ev ödevlerinizde yardımcı olmak istediler mi?

If yes, did they request that your siblings help you with homework?

Eğer cevabınız Evet ise; evdeki diğer kardeşleriniz mi sizin mi yardımcı olmasını istediler?

If yes or no: What are the specific ways they showed support or lack of support?

Her iki koşulda da yani yardım ettiler ise nasıl yardım ettiler, eğer etmedilerse etmemeleri siz nasıl yaşadınız?

If yes or no: How would you describe your family's attitude towards your schooling?

Ailenizin okul döneminde size karşı tavrını nasıl tanımlıyorsunuz?

Did your family give you hope or give you inspiration that you could indeed get through school?

Aileniz okulu bitirmenizde size bir umut ya da ilham Kaynağı oldu mu?

- For example, did they say things like “it was hard for us to, but we did and so can you” or, say things like “don’t worry; you can do this and have a good life in the future if you do.”

Örneğin, “Bizim için de okul zordu ama biz başardık onun için sen de yapabilirsin,” ya da “üzülme, başarabilirsin ve başarılırsan iyi bir geleceğin olur” gibi şeyler söylediler mi?

- What are the ways you remember?
Siz olanları nasıl hatırlıyorsunuz?

Did your family communicate to you that school was important?
Aileniz okulun önemini size vurguladı mı?

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the researcher detailed the qualitative research paradigm. I also gave information regarding case study as my design, a description of the participants, and my role as researcher. In addition, I detailed how I gathered my qualitative data, which was through semi-structured interviews. I also explained how I analyzed the data through the emergence of patterns. In all matters regarding data, I explained how I did so within the boundaries of ethical guidelines required by Hamline University. Each interview helped answer my research inquiries because each question was linked to categories that provided answers to my research questions. The next chapter will be a discussion of the results of this study.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter is a summary of the results from the qualitative data collection method of semi-structured interviews. As previously discussed, I followed ‘case study’ as the design for my interviews. The guiding research questions in this study were: 1) As a marginalized ethnolinguistic minority, are the self-reported experiences of my Kurdish contacts in Turkish schools?; 2) How do language barriers affect teacher/student relationships?; 3) What are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued?; and 4) What is the perceived relationship of the Turkish school approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners? In this chapter, answers are provided to these questions.

During our interviews, my participants exhibited strong emotions as they remembered their time in school as ethnolinguistic minorities. This stemmed from the fact that it was against the rules to speak their mother tongue of Kurdish in school. When they did speak it, they were punished. Additionally, language barriers put a strain on teacher-student interactions because students felt blamed and excluded because of the way that the majority-language only policy was handled. Moreover, students and teachers both expressed anger and frustration because of the language barrier. These feelings seemed to arise most frequently in times when communication was difficult. The most commonly cited emotions my participants remember feeling in school were a mixture of shame, guilt, frustration, anger, and ‘feeling stupid.’ In terms of scholastic progress, an initial academic achievement delay existed for Kurdish students because of the ‘Turkish Only’ policy. I have organized this chapter around these patterns and their relationship to my research questions.

Control of Kurdish Language

One of the guiding questions in this research was, ‘as a marginalized ethnolinguistic minority, what is the experience of Kurdish students in Turkish schools?’ I wanted an overview of how students remembered their teachers’ reactions to speaking Kurdish in school. The pattern that emerged was that Kurdish was explicitly controlled by the teachers. While participants described varied ways teachers approached controlling the language, they all received the very clear message that Kurdish was not meant for school.

In one case, the reality of Kurdish as a language was denied. My oldest participant (age fifty-two) had attended a boarding school similar to those to which the American government sent Native American children. One of the questions I asked him (and all of my participants) was ‘what did your teachers convey to you about the Kurdish language?’ He responded, “They said there was no such thing as Kurdish.” The teacher’s statement that there was “no such thing as Kurdish” could have an assimilationist implication.

Other participants had the opposite experience: Kurdish as a language was directly acknowledged by the teacher; however, the use of it was indeed controlled. Based on the following statement from a participant, the message of Kurdish as not being allowed in school was clear. For example, Student Six reported, “The teacher said Kurdish was forbidden and we were never to speak it. While speaking Kurdish our friends complained of us to the teacher.” This student’s classmate also participated in the attempt to limit Kurdish usage in school by reporting classmates to the teacher. Perhaps

the fact that students felt comfortable enough to tell on their classmates for speaking Kurdish is an indication that the message of ‘Kurdish as a problem’ was very clear.

The educational belief that underlies the ‘majority-language only’ policy orientation is that proficiency in society’s dominant language will result in academic success that is more efficient (Stritikus, 2006). In fact, students’ mother tongues may be viewed as problematic for the attainment of overall academic success (Stritikus, 2006). Therefore, the teachers who have tried to control Kurdish may simply be operating out of this belief. Perhaps they view themselves as helping their students by trying to make them forget Kurdish. I do not wish to demonize them for trying to control Kurdish, as I cannot know their experiences, their beliefs, or the internal and external factors involved in their approaches to instruction. Lastly, it is important to recall that the cause of national unity in Turkey could be another reason for teachers’ desire to control Kurdish.

It is pertinent to acknowledge the psychological effect that this prohibition of Kurdish had on students in school. I wondered ‘what affect does forbidding a language have on students’ emotional connection to the language?’ Although I did not ask about this, one participant hinted about this on her own. Her response to my question “what did your teachers convey to you about the Kurdish language?” indicates that an evaluative statement about Kurdish was conveyed. She answered, “the message I got was that Kurdish was not a good thing, not something you were supposed to do.” One of the field notes I wrote in the margin next to this statement was ‘said with a conflicted tone.’ Perhaps because of the connection between language and identity, the negative message that she received about Kurdish had direct emotional consequences.

Punishments for Speaking Kurdish

I did not ask participants any questions regarding whether they, or anyone else they knew, had been punished for speaking Kurdish. However, four out of six participants brought up punishments on their own. Three of the four relayed stories of people they knew who received corporal punishment for speaking Kurdish in school. In the fourth case, the participant himself was punished. In each case, the teachers hit or slapped students. For example, student two reported, “One teacher shouted and hit my brother for speaking Kurdish.” Another participant said that if teachers heard children speaking Kurdish they would hit them. Student Six reported, “because Turkish made my work much more difficult to be successful and in the end I was punished. I ate blows.” This phrase translates to “strikes with the fist or slaps on the face.” I believe that physically punishing students for speaking Kurdish, may send an unforgettable majority-language only policy message to Turkey’s students.

Effects of Language Barrier on Teacher-Student Interactions

The second research question was ‘how do language barriers affect teacher-student relationships?’ There were several patterns I observed among my participants regarding their interactions with their teachers when their Turkish skills were most limited. The data revealed the following commonalities: blame, exclusion, and displays of anger/frustration.

Pattern One: Blaming Students and Low Expectations

The first pattern I noticed was teachers casting blame on the students for their difficulties. The teachers never acknowledged that Turkish was a new language for them. Therefore, this was not stated as a potential reason for their difficulty.

Student One reported: they (teachers) say, “you are at the age of five. Here is Turkey and the official language is Turkish. How do you not know Turkish?”

This participant noted that she felt shamed by these questions. Shame seems to be an understandable emotional response. There is no acknowledgement that the student came from a Kurdish-speaking household and is now learning Turkish in school. Instead, the implication could be that there is something wrong with the student.

Another way in which blame was cast was by calling students “lazy.” This laziness was identified as a reason that the students “did not have a lot of knowledge.” The following student relayed to me that she went to the library every day in an effort to become better at school. Therefore, this student’s report is ironic.

Student Three reported:

When our teacher got angry, she would say bad words to us. For example, “you are lazy and you don’t know anything.” A big part of the reason I dropped out of school for a long time was because the teacher was mean.

In this example, the teacher is blaming the Kurdish students’ academic delay on the students by calling them “lazy.” For a teacher, it could be hard to feel at ease when one is the linguistic outsider in one’s own classroom.

Another potential reason this teacher called the students “lazy” could be attributed to a stereotype about the Kurds. As previously mentioned in my literature review, one popular stereotype about the Kurds is that they are lazy. Perhaps in Turkey this attitude is popularly accepted, as evidenced by the statements of my participants. This stereotype offers another explanation about why teachers may view their Kurdish students as lazy.

Another belief about Kurdish students may be that they are less capable by nature. This could lead to blaming students instead of questioning the system. If they are indeed “less capable” then when they are not doing well it is their own fault. There is then no need to look at the majority-language only policy as a potential cause. This belief about Kurdish students as less capable is reflected in the next example. Student Four reported:

In university, one friend got good marks and the instructor said to the class, “see, even your friend from the East part could do this.” My friend said that her teacher’s statement was a form of “othering” her. The teacher appears to be perpetuating the stereotype that you can’t be Kurdish and get good marks.

A reminder that the eastern part of Turkey is primarily Kurdish is necessary for understanding the meaning of the teacher’s remark. It is important to note how blanketing the teacher’s remark really is and how clearly it exposes her belief. For a teacher to say, “see even your friend from the East part could do this” is not hiding this teacher’s prejudicial stance regarding the Kurds’ scholastic capabilities.

Pattern Two: Exclusion

The second pattern in the participants’ memories was feeling excluded because of the language barrier. As previously mentioned in the literature review, the scholastic environment of the Kurds in a ‘majority-language only’ policy setting has been characterized as ‘disempowering’ and ‘excluding’ by researchers (Auerbach & Cummins, 1995). The stories I gathered from my participants reflected these specific characterizations (disempowerment and exclusion). Sometimes this exclusion could be characterized as direct and other times indirect. One indirect example is in the form of ignoring students:

Nobody cares about you. With their words and sentences, you can feel in their eyes that they don't like you. The teacher behaves as if you are not there. He ignores you. It's still the same. Students say that Turkish teachers don't like us. Teachers say "you don't have to learn more." They don't put forth effort.

This participant is a current teacher in Turkey. It is clear from her remark that the cause of this exclusion stems from the fact that this participant's language was not valued. A different student's remark illustrated what she perceived as an apathetic attitude on the part of the teacher regarding the teachers' communication with her students. This example is particularly interesting because in her case the whole class was Kurdish. The participant reported:

The teacher wasn't close with us and now I think it is because our class was mostly Kurdish. She didn't have good communication with us and she should have because she is a teacher. As a teacher, she didn't help. She didn't care about us. The teacher never told us about the importance of education. Now I would have a lot of things to say to that teacher if I saw her again.

This participant's report of the lack of effort the teacher put forth to educate them could lead students to believe that education is not for them (i.e. to feel excluded from receiving education). I perceived a tone of resentment in the last statement, "I would have a lot of things to say to that teacher if I saw her again."

Moreover, overt exclusion was another commonality expressed among participants. When I asked one of the participants what her first memory in school was, she responded:

When I started school, I didn't know Turkish and Kurdish was forbidden at school. My teacher went to the head teacher and said, "this girl doesn't understand me so I don't want this student." My father went to the school and told the teacher that she must be patient and let me stay in the class because one day I would learn Turkish. My father was upset when communicating with this teacher and the teachers called the police and they told us we had to go home.

I asked if anything ever changed for her or if the teacher always displayed this kind of exclusionary attitude towards her. She responded:

The teacher's attitude never changed. Nobody cares about you. The attitude of the teacher is that he behaves as if you are not there. He ignored you. With their words and sentences, you feel in their eyes that they don't like you. It's still the same. Kurdish students think that Turkish teachers don't like us. The teachers don't put forth effort. They say to their students, "you don't have to learn more."

For this participant, to have felt excluded and ignored in this way throughout her educational experience had an emotional effect that will be discussed later. In fact, when she told me her stories she became a little teary-eyed but was eager to continue the interview and said that she was grateful that someone was interested in this topic.

Another example of showing an exclusionary attitude toward students was in the form of calling them racist names because of their Kurdish ethnicity. It could be difficult to feel included when your teacher calls you a racist name. A participant reported:

One time at school, one of the teachers called the student a racist name for being a Kurd. The child's father brought a gun to school and asked which teacher said that to his child. I believe teachers never dared to say mean things to Kurdish

kids at my school because it was Batman (a city where Kurds have more power than others due to their large numbers and a lot of Kurdish pride/resistance exists there). In Batman, there is a very strong Kurdish environment and some Kurdish parents would have beaten the teachers if they had dared to be mean to us.

This finding is important on many levels. First, it shows that the region of Turkey is a factor in teacher-student interactions. Second, the parent who brought a gun to school perhaps did not feel equipped for the task of dealing with the school system from within the system. This could perhaps indicate that the majority-language only system does not feel inviting or even accessible to Kurds. Any form of exclusion may be characterized as disempowering. Perhaps this parent felt disempowered as a Kurd trying to face the Turkish school system, which accounts for why he saw violence as the solution.

Pattern Three: Anger and Frustration

The third pattern was displays of anger and frustration. It is understandable that teachers could feel frustrated in this context. Anyone can become frustrated when communication is not occurring easily. The following example from Student Six illustrates this:

My first memory is my teacher getting mad at me because I did not understand the question she asked, and my pulling her hair and running away from class. I did not go back to school this year.

Student Six's first experience of school indicates several things. First, this participant could feel his teacher 'getting mad,' which resulted from him not understanding her question (again communication difficulties as a cause). He retaliated against the teacher's anger by pulling her hair, which probably indicates some level of

frustration or anger on his part. The last sentence, “I did not go back to school this year” could indicate a causal relationship between that interaction and his decision not to go back to school.

In another case, one participant said he could sense frustration on the part of his teachers. However, he never saw his teachers act out this emotion. He reported:

I could feel and see in her eye that she was frustrated with the language barrier between her and the students. However, she had to be patient. She had to work hard to communicate. The teachers would have been scared to say or show negativity towards the Kurds at school.

I asked this participant why the teacher would have been scared. He responded that because they were in Batman, a city known for its Kurdish resistance and power. He explained that the teachers “had to be careful” because they may have been beaten by Kurdish parents if they were not respectful. His statement also shows that frustration can be felt by others without any words or actions to make it concrete. In addition, it is important to note that not all teachers acted out their feelings of frustration when they had them.

Emotional Consequences among Participants

The third research question was ‘what are some of the emotional consequences that have ensued?’ The following patterns of emotions were reported by participants: shame, guilt, frustration, anger, and ‘feeling stupid.’ I have grouped participants’ reports accordingly.

Pattern One: Shame and Guilt

The majority of participants commented that they felt shame and guilt in school because of the way Kurdish was handled. Four out of six participants said that they felt either shame or guilt. In many cases, they reported feeling both emotions. One participant dropped out of the study when her friend told her the sorts of questions I asked in the interview. She said she would feel too much shame bringing back painful memories as a Kurd in school. She was no longer comfortable with participating. Unfortunately, she is not the only one who has residual feelings of shame from scholastic experiences.

One participant gave a response that indicated a connection between his emotions and an unwillingness to participate in class. More specifically, he cited shame as the emotion he felt that inhibited him from participation. He reported, “most of the time I was ashamed of saying anything even I have the knowledge about the subject. I have a fear that somebody will laugh at me. I still have that fear.” It seems likely this fear of being laughed at may have developed because of the previously mentioned complications that accompany being a Kurd in the Turkish school system. I also believe that this participant’s response shows there is a lasting impact on what he experienced emotionally in school on his feelings today as evidenced by the fact that he still feels fear. The strength is evidenced by the fact that they remain to this day.

Another potential reason for his feeling of shame could be that his human need for ‘meaning’ was not met in school. Under the broad need for meaning are: ‘contribution,’ ‘participation,’ and ‘competence’ (The Center for Nonviolent Communication, 2005). His lack of participation could manifest in an unmet need for meaning because of a lack

of contribution, participation, and competence (only because of the language barrier). As with any unmet need, fear and shame can be consequences. This participant cited both of these emotions in his quote (“too *ashamed* to say anything” and “a *fear* that somebody will laugh at me”).

Pattern Two: Exclusion

The pattern of ‘exclusion’ appears again. As previously described in my literature review, ‘acceptance’ and ‘belonging’ are cited as universal human needs and are very important to feeling good (The Center for Nonviolent Communication, 2005). Because of the close relationship between language and culture, to disregard a student’s language may also convey the message that the student as a person is not accepted (Fillmore, 1991). Naturally, this could lead to feelings of shame in school. Perhaps for this reason, another participant said that she believed the emotions of shame and guilt can be very strong in Kurdish students, causing many even to leave school. This participant has been a full time teacher in Turkey for a number of years. She reported:

I felt sad. Many students gave up because of negative emotions. You always feel yourself guilty. I felt shame and would then shame my family by asking them “why didn’t you learn Turkish?” I believe that many Kurdish students feel shame and then shame their families.

Let us examine her statement: ‘you *always* feel yourself guilty.’ The pervasiveness of the word ‘always’ is striking. Perhaps “always feeling guilty” is one explanation about why many Kurdish students choose to leave school and have significantly higher dropout rates than Turkish students. While none of the participants in this study quite school

indefinitely, some had gaps in their education. Moreover, many expressed a desire to leave school.

Pattern Three: Frustration and Anger

The next pattern I noticed were emotions of anger and frustration. Five out of six participants said that they felt either anger or frustration. Some of them said they felt both emotions. The most common denominator for when students cited these emotions was when there were communication difficulties. For example, one participant reported, “I felt frustrated but kept trying at the library. I felt angry because I did not have good communication with my teacher.” This participant does not correlate her frustration with giving up in school. Rather, she said that despite her anger and frustration, she continued to try. Perhaps anger and frustration were even motivating emotions in her case. This participant was also the one to say “as a teacher she didn’t try to communicate with us. If I saw her today I would have a lot of things to say to her.” I sensed both frustration and anger in her voice when she reported that.

In other cases, this frustration/anger seemed to play a debilitating role for students. It appeared that all of the participants who cited frustration and anger sometimes felt it toward their teachers, sometimes toward themselves, and sometimes with their inability to complete their homework. The following case is an example of anger directed inward. One participant reported, “I felt frustration and anger. Also, because I couldn’t answer the teacher’s questions I was angry at myself.” He directly followed this quote by saying that he made the decision not to return to school for that year. In this case, his frustration/anger appears to have played a debilitating role.

My last research question was ‘what is the perceived relationship of the Turkish school’s approach to teaching Kurds on the academic achievement of Kurdish learners? There is a delay in scholastic achievement among Kurdish students because of the majority-language only policy. All participants said that they experienced a delay in their scholastic achievement. Based on participant interviews, the earliest age of understanding the content of the lesson was third grade. The latest was after eighth grade. The following quotation from a participant illustrates exactly how this delay simply stands to reason. To achieve the goal of “unbiased language” in my questions I asked participants “In your first five years of school were there times when you couldn’t understand the content of the lesson. If yes, why was this so?” One participant, Student Five, poignantly responded “How could I understand in the language that I do not know?”

All participants stated that they had low test scores when they were first beginning their time in school. Additionally, all but one participant said that they received poor grades on homework. The participant who said that he did not receive poor grades attributed it to the great amount of help his older sister gave him on his homework. The majority of participants mentioned that they had older siblings help them with their homework. Everyone stated that their parents could not help them. The following is a particularly telling example about how one participant’s inability to do homework made it difficult for him to continue with his schooling. It also provides evidence for Cummins’ theory that students may feel incompetent to handle their academic task in a language that they do not recognize, potentially leading to feelings of insecurity. Student Three remarked:

I had no idea about how to do my math homework and I didn't want to go to school without having it done. This made me feel frustrated to the point of thinking about giving up on school. However, then I asked my Kurdish friends if they could do it. They couldn't. So, I thought 'Okay the problem is not only me.' This made me continue.

The knowledge that other students also were struggling gave this participant the desire to continue in his schooling is significant. Perhaps because this broke through the illusion that there was something wrong with him as to why he could not understand the material. His statement that he was going to give up because of the frustration is important to consider. The feeling of frustration seems to be a contributing factor among some students' considerations to leave school.

An additional way to analyze this participant's story is to look at it through the lens of a theory mentioned in the literature review. This theory was that minority students in majority-language only settings might develop low self-esteem about their scholastic abilities because of a lack of inclusion, empowerment, and cultural representation (Cummins, 2000; Park, 2008, p. 6). This participant seemed to have questioned whether it was 'just him,' which probably indicates that he was insecure about his scholastic ability. Only after he found out he did not need to feel insecure because he was not alone, did he find the will to continue.

Last, this participant also commented, "you always feel stupid because the teacher keeps telling you the same thing over and over again and you still can't understand it. All of us Kurdish felt stupid." This statement may provide additional evidence of Cummins' theory that majority-language only policy settings can be environments where students

tend to have low self-esteem regarding their scholastic abilities (Cummins, 2000; Park 2008, p. 6). This participant kept incessantly smoking cigarettes and ordering chai tea while we spoke over Skype.

Chapter Summary

This chapter was a presentation of the results of my interviews with Kurds who have gone through the Turkish school system. From questions regarding their experiences, it became clear that this ethnolinguistic minority faces some challenges that their Turkish counterparts may not face. It was reported that their language was forbidden and punished when used. In addition, teacher-student relationships were strained because of the language barrier. Moreover, many Kurdish students remembered their time in school with vividly undesirable emotions. Lastly, there was indeed an academic achievement delay among Kurdish students resulting from the initial language barrier. In the following chapter, major findings will be discussed and the literature review will be revisited in relation to these findings. Additionally, implications of how the study may be used to benefit teacher practices will be provided. I will also acknowledge the limitations of the study. Last, I will outline potential areas of further research resulting from my data collection.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

My research study was an attempt to shed light on how language barriers among L1 Kurdish minority speakers in Turkish schools affect scholastic achievement and teacher-student relationships and what emotional consequences have ensued. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize my findings in connection with prior research. It also is a discussion of the implications for educators. In the last section, I will comment on the limitations of the study and suggest further areas of research.

Summary of Findings

Teacher Control of Kurdish Language Usage

The participants' experiences with the Kurdish language in school could be characterized as controlling and punishing. Many participants said that their teachers told them Kurdish was forbidden. Additionally, corporal punishments were given for the speaking of Kurdish in the form of hitting, or slapping of the face. Clearly, this evidence confirms that Turkey does not uphold the United Nation's Declaration of Language Minority Children's Rights Worldwide concerning minority children's linguistic rights (Ricento, p. 285). Instead, Turkey utilizes a nationwide majority-language only policy (Skutnabb-Kangas & Fernandes, 2008).

Delay in Scholastic Achievement

All participants said that they experienced scholastic achievement delays. To be more specific, the earliest reported time for having begun to understand the content of the lesson was third grade with the latest being after the eighth year. This would stand to reason according to Cummins' interdependence hypothesis, which theorizes that first language literacy skills can aid in second language learning. This is possible because

these skills can transfer languages. However, in the context of schools in Turkey, the interdependence hypothesis is not built on because Kurdish students do not have the opportunity to build literacy in their first language.

Another example regarding scholastic delays was found in the Campos and Keatinge study regarding the two different preschool programs for L1 Spanish speaking students. The first preschool program was bilingual (slightly English heavy). The other was an exclusively Spanish preschool program. The result was that the children enrolled in the Spanish-only preschool program outperformed those enrolled in the bilingual preschool program. In fact, testing determined that these students were found to be significantly more 'kindergarten ready.' Conversely, scholastic delays remained for students who went through the bilingual preschool program. This Spanish only program utilized the interdependence hypothesis, which perhaps accounted for its higher degree of success. Surprisingly, students from this program also understood a greater amount of English even though they were exposed to significantly less of it.

I believe a connection between scholastic delay and the self-reported feelings of being "stupid" are clear. It is natural for students to question their intelligence when they do not understand something; this is especially likely when the challenge of them being second language learners is sometimes unacknowledged in school. As a result, the problem can be internalized. The term for this, coined by Cummins, is *internalized views of inferiority*. An example of this internalization is found in one participant's statement concerning his inability to comprehend the lesson: "Well there must be something wrong with me." Many other Kurdish participants told me this as well.

Even more dramatically, some Kurdish people have told me that in their very beginning years of school they did not even realize that the language of instruction was different from their mother tongues because it was never acknowledged as such. Therefore, they felt profoundly stupid. Self-esteem is considered part of minority students' linguistic human rights. Scholastic self-esteem did not seem to be present for the majority of the Kurdish students interviewed.

Difficult Teacher-Student Interactions

Difficult teacher-student interactions are an understandable byproduct of the majority-language only policy. For example, one teacher said, "you are lazy and you don't know anything" to her Kurdish students. Some may label this remark as 'blaming.' Once again, I am not trying to make a generalization or judgment about Turkish teachers as a whole. Rather, I am asserting that with the majority-language only teaching system, it would be very difficult for both teachers and students to interact easily. In fact, the students themselves reported feeling frustrated and angry when asked about their interactions with their teachers. One even went so far as to pull his teacher's hair. The results of my data overwhelming show this: most of the interactions were indeed challenging.

Emotional Consequences

When I inquired about the emotions students experienced in school, the most commonly cited ones were: shame and guilt. As previously stated, many participants questioned if there was something wrong with them as to why they could not complete the academic tasks that were put before them. In a different context where minority students have received education in a language they know, they appear to feel confidence

as opposed to shame and incompetence. This pattern also was echoed in the Campos and Keatinge study that compared the two different preschool programs for L1 Spanish students. The students who came from the exclusively Spanish preschool program were noted by their teachers as exhibiting more confidence for academic tasks (when compared to those from the bilingual program). A deeper explanation for the shame and insecurity some minority students may feel in school could be explained by the Center for Nonviolent Communication.

As previously noted in the Center for Nonviolent Communication, one of the consequences when the human need 'to understand and be understood' is not met can be fear and shame. Shame was referenced when my participants talked about their inability to understand what the teacher was saying. In addition, because of the close nature between language and identity, many students believed that when the teacher does not accept the student's language, the student does not feel accepted by the teacher. This is theorized as leading to low self-esteem (Park, 2008).

Implications for Educators

I believe that this research has practical implications for ESL teachers in the US and others who work with linguistic minorities. It is important for us to be aware that some of our students may come from majority-language only scholastic settings in their countries of origin. As a result, we can be aware that these students may have some emotional residue in relation to school and may have expectations or attitudes about school that may form barriers to academic success. We can be additionally sensitive in our work with them. For example, we may provide empowerment for students with these

kinds of backgrounds by showing additional encouragement in our interactions with them.

This work can help teachers be aware of some of the uncomfortable emotions that may be occurring within our students while they face the challenge of trying to learn a new language. Teachers can make empowering statements to their students to help counteract potential uncomfortable emotions. For example, teachers can acknowledge their students' effort and congratulate them for it. They may also point out specific strengths they notice the students have. Simply making encouraging statements such as 'good job', or 'you've got it' can make a world of difference in lowering students' affective filters.

These emotions could occur regardless of the teaching methodology. It is important to keep the classroom energy positive and make every effort for students to understand the content of the lesson. This could lower students' affective filters.

Teachers also can make overt demonstrations that their students' first languages are valued. The importance of this is echoed by Cloud, Genesse, and Hayman:

a second issue concerning the primary language development of language minority students concerns the status of their language in the larger society. It is advisable for monolingual teachers to enroll in second language classes for adults in the school community. This will not only send a strong message about the value of that language, but it will also make teachers more sensitive to normal difficulties and useful strategies in second language learning. (2000, p. 67)

The importance of teachers demonstrating value in their students' first languages and cultures, particularly if their students are from oppressed minority groups, has been echoed throughout this work. It is important because of the close nature between language and identity. Through enrolling in second language classes, teachers can empathize with their students. If teachers do not have time to enroll in second language courses, perhaps they may attend workshops on these issues instead.

Limitations of the Study

One obvious limitation of the study is that I did not have access to a great number of first language Kurdish speakers. It would be informative to hear more stories and memories. For example, I did not hear any overwhelmingly positive scholastic experience shared from Kurdish students. However, if I did, it would be intriguing to look at what made the difference.

Another limitation is that I did not explore alternative points of view, such as that of Turkish teachers or administrators. We cannot know what policies, procedures, or attitudes are at work in their decision-making. This colors the outcome of my study.

Additionally, it is important to note that the findings in this study are not generalizable even within the shared country of Turkey. My interviews showed great regional variation regarding how teachers and students interacted. This was based on whether the region had strong Kurdish representation or not. Therefore, this study cannot be seen as representative of the whole country.

Further Areas of Research

While this was not the focus of my investigation, it is informative that Kurdish language loss emerged as prevalent. In fact, six out of seven participants reported that

their Kurdish language skills declined after their time in school. As they learned more Turkish, their Kurdish skills seemed to be in competition, and they declined. It is thought provoking to note that this pattern of language loss among minority students was previously noted in the literature review in the Ian Martin study. This example was an investigation of language issues for the L1 Inuktitut students from the Nunavut communities in Canada. After sixth grade, the language of instruction is 100% English for the remainder of these students' time in school. A self-assessment test was given to Nunavut students in five communities regarding their English and Inuktitut skills. The results indicated that high scores in English were correlated with low scores in the Inuit language. In general, the minority students are known to have low levels of academic achievement after the language of instruction switches to English. It would be useful to investigate if when students' heritage language failed to meet their human needs, students can develop negative feelings toward it in the 'majority-language only' context, which could be a contributing factor in its loss. Further research could be explored investigating the various causes of language loss for other minority populations, as well as consequences culturally, socially, politically, and economically to this prevalent loss of language proficiency.

It could be useful to complete an in-depth comparison of human needs in relation to an explanation of minority students' scholastic experiences. For example, to have a study that framed questions specifically around human needs and their relationship to scholastic experiences would be interesting. An investigation of what makes the difference between minority students who stay in school and those who drop out could

occur from this. It could be fascinating to see if there is any connection between decisions to stay in school and whether human needs were met.

Additionally, to investigate further one of my participant's remarks about the educational philosophy of Turkey could be illuminating. She said, "the education system thinks that some students need to fail. We have thirty students; ten are enough for us. We don't need all thirty to succeed. If ten succeed, that is enough." The educational philosophy seems to be geared to weeding students out. It would be useful to see what the correlation is between this attitude and the failing of Kurdish students. Obviously, if the education system's mentality were that it is okay for students to fail, then why would teachers make special effort to help their Kurdish students? Would their status as ethnolinguistic minorities not lend itself to failure naturally? If failure is not considered a problem, why try to help them? It would be useful to do more research on the educational philosophy of Turkey and see how that correlates with other ethnolinguistic minority students such as the Armenians as well. Perhaps in some cases it is less about being Kurdish and more about the educational philosophy of the Turkish school system. Further research may be able to distinguish this.

I have gained two major personal leanings from this study. First, I came into this process carrying some judgment about the teachers in Turkey. However, through research I realized that the underlying educational belief behind the subtractive model is that proficiency in society's dominant language will enhance academic success. On some level this seems like a rather intuitive notion therefore, it is understandable that people believe that. As a result, I realized that perhaps some of the way Kurdish is dealt with in schools by teachers is actually well meaning. Personally, this served as a

good reminder for me to work on seeing the innocence in educators' behavior.

Additionally, the extra time and research necessary to understand the issue in order to avoid making a snap judgment is worth the effort.

I also learned that in some cases anger and frustration were actually motivating emotions for my participants. This surprised me greatly because I had wrongly assumed that it would always be de-motivating. As was true for the previous learning, I had to challenge my own assumptions and stay open-minded. The realization that anger and frustration could be motivating forces gave me hope for ethnolinguistic minority students. It also opens up the possibility in my mind that when teachers create situations that can be frustrating for students, all is not necessarily lost. I am relieved to know that these emotions do not have to be a cause in students giving up in school.

Chapter Summary

This chapter included connections between this study's results and the previously detailed literature. It was an outline of how this study's results could be utilized to help educators' better work with their L1 minority students by understanding where these students situations. The limitations of the study were provided. Last, suggestions for future research were given.

References

- Auerbach, E. (1995). The politics of the ESL classroom: Issues of power in pedagogical choices. In J. Tollefson (Eds.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 9-33). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brameld, T. (1968). *Japan: Culture, education, and change in two communities*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Brenneman, B. (2007). *The Kurds have no friends but the mountains: A cultural journey from Noah's ark to post-Saddam Hussein*. Long Grove Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Brenneman, B. (2007). *Storytelling to television- Kurdish oral culture: A cultural journey from Noah's ark to post-Saddam Hussein*. Long Grove Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Bruinessen, M. (1997). *Ismail Besikci: Turkish sociologist, critic of Kemalism, and Kurdologist* Paper retrieved from http://www.hum.uu.nl/medewerkers/m.vanbruinessen/.../ismail_besikci.htm
- Campos, J. & Keatinge, B. (1984). *The Carpinteria preschool program: Title VII second year evaluation report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Campos, J. (1985). *A Spanish-language preschool program* . ERIC Digest. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for ESL Literacy Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 369.)
- Feelings Inventory*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 5, 2012 from The Center For Nonviolent Communication www.cnvc.org/training/feelings-inventory
- Cloud, N., Genesse, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston: MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). Bilingualism without the tears. In *Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of theory, research & practice* (pp. 99-111). University of Michigan: Longman Pub Group.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *This place nurtures my spirit: Creating contexts of empowerment in linguistically-diverse schools*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cummins, J. (2001). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(4), 649-676.
- De Vos, G. A. & H. Wagatsuma, (Eds.). (1967a). *Japan's invisible race*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- De Vos, G. A. & H. Wagatsuma, (Eds.). (1967b). Group solidarity and individual mobility. In *Japan's invisible race*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- De Vos, G. A. & H. Wagatsuma, (Eds.). (1967c). Minority status and attitudes toward authority. In *Japan's invisible race*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. (2012). Treaty of Versailles. *Encyclopedia Britannica Online Library Edition*. Retrieved 26 Nov. 2012 from Encyclopedia Britannica <http://0-library.eb.com.alpha.stpaul.lib.mn.us/eb/article-9075152>
- Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 6, 323-346.
- Franquiz, M. E. & Reyes, M. de la Luz. (1998). Creating inclusive learning communities through English language arts: From chancas to canicas. *Language Arts*, 75(3), 211-220.
- Garcia E. & Gonzalez R. (1995). Issues in systemic reform for culturally and linguistically diverse students. *College Record*, 96(3), 418-31.

- Gutierrez, B.-L. & Asato J., (2000). English for the children: The new literacy of the old world order, language policy and educational reform. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 24(1-2), 87-105.
- Hand, Matthew, Personal Communication, October 1, 2013.
- Haroon, K. & Diaz Soto L. (2006). A post-monolingual education. *International Journal of Education Policy, Research & Practice: Reconceptualizing Childhood Studies*, 7, 21-34.
- Hernandez-Chavez, D. & Dulay, B. (1976). *The bilingual syntax measure*. New York, NY: The Psychological Corporation.
- Hudelson, S. (1994). Literacy development of second language children. In F. Genessee (Ed.). *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 129-157). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Hassanpour, A (1992). *Nationalism and language in Kurdistan*. Boston, MA: Edwin Mellon Press.
- Krajewski, J. (2012). *Meet the 12-year-old girl who risked prison to revive her people's language*. Retrieved from the Pulitzer Center website <http://pulitzercenter.org/reporting/turkey-kurdish-language-education-schools-assimilation-erdogan>
- Kirdar, M. (2007). *Explaining ethnic disparities in school enrollment in Turkey*, (Paper Number 2649). Munich, De: University of Chicago Press.
- Lavadenz, M. (2010). From theory to practice for teachers of English learners. *The CATESOL Journal*, 22, 18-47.

- Letsch, C. (2011, December 28). Mandatory Turkish puts Kurdish pupils at disadvantage. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/28/mandatory-turkish-kurdish-pupils-disadvantage>.
- Liddicoat, A. (1991). Bilingualism: An introduction. *NLIA Occasional Paper No. 2*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC report no. ED- 404 847).
- Lule, Z. (2009). *Student oath is 'ethnic discrimination,' says human rights commissioner*. Brussels, Belgium: Hurriyet. Retrieved from <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/default.aspx?pageid=438&n=8216happy-is-he-who-calls-himself-a-turk8217-is-8216ethnical-discrimination8217-2009-10-01>.
- Mackey, A. & Gass S. M. (2005). *Second language research methodology and design*. Mahwah, New Jersey. Routledge.
- Martin, I. (2000). Aajiqatingiingniq language of instruction research paper. *Report to the government of Nunavut, Iqaliut, Nunavut, Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Department of Education.
- Menken, K. & Menken, K. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 399-417, 640
- Moll, L. C. (Ed.). (1994). *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

- Padilla, A. M. (1991). The English-only movement: Myths, realities and implications for psychology. *American Psychologist*, 46(2), 120-130.
- Park, H.-Y. (2008). *Linguistic minority children's heritage language learning and identity struggle*. (Published doctoral dissertation). Proquest.
- Krajeski, J. (2012, June 12). Turkey: Meet the 12-year-old girl who risked prison to revive her people's language. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved September, 7 2012 from the Pulitzer Center <http://pulitzercenter.org/reporting/turkey-Kurdish-language-education-schools-assimilation>.
- Ricento, T. (Ed.). (2006). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2005). Cultural diversity and linguistic diversity. *The Internet endangered linguistic and cultural diversities and endangered biodiversity—The role of educational linguistic human rights in diversity maintenance*. Retrieved January 2, 2010 from <http://www.pen-kurd.org/Diyabakir-seminar/>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Fernandes, D. (2008). Kurds in Turkey and in (Iraqi) Kurdistan: A comparison of Kurdish educational language policy in two situations of occupation. *Journal of Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 3(1), 43-73.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Fernandes, D. (2006). Language Policy and Linguistic Human Rights. In Ricento, T. (Ed). (2006). *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Phillipson, R. (1999). Linguistic genocide and human rights—Kurdish considerations. In P. Sundqvist (Ed.). *The Kurds. Perspectives on a*

unique culture, 25-48. Helsinki, Finland: Suomen Rauhanliitto YK-YDHDISTYS.

- Stritikus, T. (2003). The role of theory and policy in the educational treatment of language minority students: Competitive structures in California. *Education Policy Analysis, 11*(26), 1-30.
- Stritikus, T. (2006). Making meaning matter: A look at instructional practice in additive and subtractive contexts. *Bilingual Research Journal, 1*, 219-227.
- Tavernise, S. (2009, Feb. 25). Turkish official breaks language taboo. *The New York Times*. 6. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/25/world/europe/25turkey.html>
- Turkish Constitution*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 25, 2012 from <http://www.anayasa.gov.tr>
- UN declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities*. (1992). Retrieved April 19, 2004 from www.unhcr.ch/html/menu6/2/fs18.htm#ANNEXI
- Thomas, W. P. Collier, V. P. (1997, December). School effectiveness for language minority students. *National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) No. 9*. (S & I, pp. 21, 38, 66).
- Yavuz, M. (1998). A preamble to the Kurdish question: The politics of Kurdish identity. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs, 18*(1), 9-10.