

## **Heritage Language Maintenance and Cultural Identity Formation: The Case of a Turkish Saturday School in New York City**

Bahar Otcu, Mercy College

### **Abstract**

This paper investigates the role of a Turkish Saturday school in the United States in helping students maintain the Turkish language and form a sense of Turkish cultural identity. This case study of one Turkish Saturday school in New York City builds on research in language maintenance and shift, and in language ideologies and linguistic identity to explore the school's administrators', teachers', students' and parents' beliefs and practices. The data were analyzed using Gee's Discourse analysis framework, specifically his six building tasks. Findings showed that the Turkish language is the primary means to construct a Turkish cultural identity in the U.S. Five overarching goals of the Turkish school emerged: (1) connection building: the school as a bridge to Turkish heritage, (2) collectivity building: bringing together the Turkish speech community, (3) contentment building: the school as a venue for the adults to feel moral satisfaction, (4) identity building: building a Turkish American identity in the U.S., and (5) diversity indicating: enabling the school clientele to see themselves as one of many other ethnolinguistic groups in the United States.

### **Introduction**

New York City is one of the most ethnolinguistically diverse cities in the world. Unfortunately, this richness is not incorporated into the curriculum in most mainstream education; many of the city's languages are not taught in its public schools. To bridge this gap, most English-speaking immigrant communities have ways of maintaining their original languages and cultures, key among them community-based supplementary schools. Despite the importance of these schools in shaping the identities of children from different ethnic backgrounds, their prevalence, and the significant enrollments (Fishman, 1980), little research has been conducted on them. Language use and instruction, as well as other components of social practices in these institutions, merit closer study.

This paper is part of a larger case study on the Turkish immigrant population in New York City (Otcu, 2009), a growing but understudied ethnic group in the U.S. The research question that the present research addresses is: What is the role and function of a Turkish Saturday school in the United States in helping students develop and maintain the Turkish language and form a Turkish cultural identity? The paper comprises six sections: first, background on Turkish immigrant population and literature review; second, a description of the research site, the Turkish School; third, methodology; fourth, data analysis; fifth, the findings of the study; and finally, the conclusion.

### **Background**

Historically, there have been three waves of immigration from Turkey to the U.S.: at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, after World War II, and in the late 1980s (Kaya, 2004). Between 1820 and 1920, during the first wave, 291,435 people came to the United States, representing the

largest immigration from the Ottoman Empire. The majority of these immigrants were from non-Muslim groups - Armenians, Greeks, and Jews under the Ottoman rule – who also spoke Turkish, whereas only 50,000 of them were Muslim Turks (Ahmed, 1986). For these first-generation Turkish immigrants, religion (being Muslim or Ottoman) rather than ethnicity was the primary marker of their identity. The second wave, which arrived between the 1950s and early 1980s, brought highly educated professionals, such as doctors, engineers, academics, and graduate students who came for training purposes. In contrast to the previous group, these immigrants were quite nationalistic and secular in their views. They had been raised in the modern Turkish Republic founded in 1923 under the leadership of Ataturk, and their primary marker of identity was no longer religion. During this second wave, the Turkish Women's League of America (TWLA) was established in 1958. It was this non-profit organization that in 1971 founded Ataturk School, which is the site of the present research. The latest immigration wave, spurred on by globalization, arrived between the mid 1980s and the 1990s. This was the most diverse group of Turkish immigrants including not only professionals and students, but also businessmen and blue-collar workers.

Today the largest Turkish community in the U.S. is concentrated in and around New York City (NYC). Results of the 2000 Census and the 2005 American Community Survey (ACS) indicate an increase in the size of the Turkish population both in the U.S. and in NYC. According to the 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2001), there were 117,575 people with Turkish ancestry in the U.S., which increased to 164,945 according to the 2005 ACS (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). According to the census data, Turkish is used in 59,407 households within the entire U.S. population, 12,409 of which are bilingual families with Turkish ancestry in NYC (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). There may be several explanations as to why so many bilingual speakers with Turkish origins continue speaking the language in their homes instead of completely switching to English. Clearly, there is an effort to maintain Turkish within these communities, and community-based schools play an important role in this. The Turkish School has a special importance; having been established in 1971, it is the oldest continuously operating school among those that serve the Turkish community in the U.S.

Community-based schools such as the Turkish School are important sites to observe in language contact situations. These schools have been referred to as *ethnic mother tongue schools* (Fishman, 1980), *complementary schools* (Creese et. al., 2008; Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Martin, 2008; Creese, Bhatt, Bhojani, & Martin, 2006), *supplementary schools*, and recently as *heritage language schools* even though the concepts of *heritage language* and *heritage language learner* are still being disputed<sup>1</sup> (Carreira, 2004; Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003). In 1985, Fishman (2001) identified 6553 heritage language<sup>2</sup> schools in the U.S. attended by more than 600,000 children. It is likely that these numbers have increased by now, but the latest numbers are not available as Fishman's 1985 study "was the last nationwide study of heritage language schools in the U.S." (Fishman, 2001, p. 89).

The most important goal of heritage language schools is maintenance and development of immigrant and indigenous languages. Establishment and support of these schools' mission depends "in large part on the communities where the languages are spoken" (Peyton, Ranard, &

McGinnis, 2001). Research on language maintenance and language shift has shown that, when immigrants adopt a host language as a second language in language contact situations, it is inevitable for the second language to become the first language of the second generation (Fishman, 1972). Assimilationist language policies in U.S. public education including “No Child Left Behind, mandating students’ annual progress reports that are based on written standard English assessments” (Menken as cited in García, 2009, p. 86) mean that English is emphasized in mainstream education at the expense of students’ home languages. Thus, when carrying out heritage language maintenance, ethnic communities encounter considerable difficulties, including resistance of young heritage language learners, funding, quality of instructors and teaching. Nevertheless, their schools constitute one of the stages in Fishman’s framework (1991, p. 395) for reversing language shift, because they are “substantially under Xish [in this context, Turkish] control.”

Heritage language schools are significant as language ideological sites. Martínez-Roldán and Malavé (2004) define language ideology “as a set of ‘core’ beliefs and attitudes shared by individuals, as members of groups, regarding the use of a particular language in both oral and written forms” (p. 161). Language ideology is a bridge connecting linguistic practices (on a micro level) to broader socio-political structures (on a macro level) (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; García, 2009; Kroskrity, 2000; Woolard, 1998), the constant interplay of which creates identities (Reyes, 2007) and develops in groups of people certain beliefs and attitudes toward languages. The Turkish School is considered as such a venue where language ideologies, which are apparent in the school’s discourses, shape and create identities.

### **Research Site**

The Turkish School where the present research was conducted is located on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the 10-floor building of the Turkish Consulate in Manhattan. The second floor is a large hall, and on any day other than Saturday, it does not look like a school. This hall can be reserved by anybody from the Turkish community for parties, conferences, or other social events. On Saturdays, however, the hall is divided into six parts by room dividers, each part constituting a classroom with a portable blackboard and portable chairs. Since there are no concrete walls between classes, the voices of teachers or sounds of the activities in classes can be easily heard from one classroom to another.

The school operates on Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. from October to June. It does not observe any official holidays, and therefore, there are no breaks throughout the year.

Children aged 4 to 14 from first-generation Turkish families are placed in classrooms based on their proficiency in Turkish. The curriculum is the same as the current one implemented in the elementary schools in Turkey. Therefore, the graduates receive a certificate equivalent to a Turkish elementary school diploma. They can also satisfy the foreign language requirement in their regular schools, receiving 3.5 credit points upon graduation from this school.

The textbooks are imported from Turkey, and the school teaches all subjects covered in the textbooks<sup>3</sup> (see the findings section for further information on topics). The school is not funded

by the Turkish Government. It operates completely on a voluntary basis through donations from the Turkish Women's League of America as well as from parents and philanthropists.

### **Methodology**

Methods of linguistic ethnography (Creese, 2005, 2008; Heller, 1999) were used throughout the present case study. Linguistic ethnography holds that "language and the social world are mutually shaping, and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity" (Rampton et al., 2004, p. 2). The ethnographic methods used to collect data in the present study included participant observation (audio or video-recorded) and semi-structured interviews. In total, all of the observations produced 49 sets of field notes, nearly 22 hours of audio-recordings, and 8 hours of video-recordings.

All of the data were collected within eight months throughout the 2007-2008 academic year, from October 2007 to June 2008. Since it would be hard to provide an in-depth analysis and "thick description" (Geertz, 1973; Canagarajah, 2006; Hadi-Tabassum, 2006) of all the school members, focal participants were selected as the research sample. These focal participants were seven students, their parents and teachers, and the school administrators. The students were selected from the Pre-kindergarten, the first, third, and fifth grade. From each of these grade levels, a male and a female student were selected except for the fifth grade, from which only one student (a female) could be included. All of these students were U.S.-born, second generation Americans with a Turkish parent born in Turkey. Together with the focal students, parents, teachers, and administrators, the study involved 23 focal participants in total.

### *Data Analysis*

All field notes and transcriptions of relevant audio/video-taped data were analyzed using Gee's discourse approach (1999, 2005). According to Gee's model, all discourses are ideological. Gee makes a distinction between "Discourse" with a "capital D" and "discourse" with a "little d." "Discourse" with a "little d" is language in use, or the way language is used on site to enact activities and identities. Gee argues, however, that "activities and identities are rarely ever enacted through language alone" (1999, pp. 6-7). It is when "little d" discourse (language-in-use) integrates with non-language components to enact specific identities and activities that "big D" Discourses are involved. Gee's Discourse with a big "D" brings together both language and non-language elements to explain how language is situated in and influenced by the context in which it is used or the activity it is used to accomplish.

According to Gee, "Capital D" Discourses carry out six "building tasks" (1999, p. 6-7) or areas of reality we construct when we use language. Building Task 1, semiotic building, is the way in which language is used to signal what kinds of knowledge are prized. Building Task 2, world building, is the way we use language to attach meanings and values to certain concepts. Building Task 3, activity building, describes the language we use to perform certain activities. Building Task 4 focuses on the language we use to form our socio-culturally situated identity and to signal relationships. Building Task 5 is called political building and refers to language used to

communicate our perspective on politics and how social goods are distributed. Finally, Building Task 6, connection building, refers to the language used to connect ideas and things (1999).

Gee's method of discourse analysis requires asking specific questions for each of these building tasks. The answers to these questions revealed the situated meanings – i.e., patterns – and cultural models within each block (see [Appendix](#)). The specific answers were categorized into larger themes in order to address the main research question: What is the role and function of a Turkish Saturday school in the United States in maintaining and developing the Turkish language and forming a Turkish cultural identity?

### *Findings and Discussion*

Some of the questions under the six building tasks were not relevant and did not produce revealing answers regarding the study's research question. In accordance with the data, these six building tasks (see [Appendix](#)) were reorganized into four: activity/semiotic building, relationship building, world building, and political building. The findings are presented in four sections, each corresponding to the discourses of one of the above-mentioned building tasks.

### **The Semiotics of Educational Activities, Routines, and Cultural Rituals: Discourses of Activity/Semiotic Building**

The Discourses of activity/semiotic building were instances in the data that signaled the kinds of knowledge that were prized and the activities that were performed. The analysis revealed three main kinds of activities in the Saturday school that reflected the language ideologies regarding Turkish language maintenance and development and cultural formation: educational practices, routines, and rituals. Before discussing these two activity types, a depiction of a typical day in the school will be helpful.

Each school day starts with a ritualistic event, in which the children recite a piece of verse called "Andımız" (Our Pledge) in Turkish. This verse is similar to the Pledge of Allegiance in American public schools. Afterwards, the students disperse to their classrooms until lunchtime. While they are in class, a parent is on duty and waits outside the hall in case her help is needed. Other parents either wait in the school and socialize by talking and drinking tea or go shopping and sightseeing. They come back for lunchtime at 12.30 p.m. with food for their children and socialize with other parents during that time. On the first and second floors, there is homemade Turkish food, pizza and drinks available for the school's members. All of the food available is sold to the school clientele for low prices and proceeds go to supplement the school budget. This is the only break that the students take throughout the entire day. They unwind with activities like playing and running on the second floor, which gets overcrowded during lunchtime. At around 2 p.m. music education starts. Here, the room dividers are opened and the five grade levels come together to sing Turkish songs accompanied on piano by the music teacher. They sing marches, patriotic songs, and folk songs from Turkey. All classes last until 4 p.m. The children's parents or relatives come to get them after school. If the students are members of the folk dance group or if they need to attend rehearsal for an upcoming show, they stay at school and practice until 6 p.m. Teachers hold their weekly meeting after school, staying until 6 p.m. or later.

The educational practices themselves reveal cultural models and situated meanings. As stated earlier, the school implements the Turkish elementary school curriculum. Education is secular and religious education sessions are kept at a minimum as is the case in mainstream elementary education in Turkey. The lessons in Table 1 are taught in each grade level.

**Table 1**

*Lessons Taught in Each Grade Level at the Turkish School*

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Language Lessons</b>	<b>Culture Lessons</b>
Pre-K	Turkish alphabet, vocabulary (synonyms, antonyms), numbers, colors, shapes, directions (left, right), parts of the body, Turkish songs	Ataturk, Turkish flag, Turkish national and religious holidays, respect, hygiene information
1 <sup>st</sup>	Turkish sounds, grammar (sentence structure), reading, vocabulary, tongue-twisters	Life studies: Ataturk, national and religious holidays, family structure, traditions
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Grammar, reading, vocabulary	Life studies: history, national and religious holidays, family structure, traditions, parts of the body, germination
5 <sup>th</sup>	Grammar, reading, vocabulary, summarizing, composition writing	Social studies: history, geography, Islam religious education
Music (all)	Patriotic and school songs in Turkish	Patriotic and school songs in Turkish
Folkdance (all)	Folkdances from different geographical regions of Turkey	Folkdances from different geographical regions of Turkey

In this content-based curriculum, topics related to language and culture overlap. Cultural information is provided in content, namely in life studies or social studies as well as in Turkish lessons, rather than in separate culture-focused lessons. Since all lessons also include language skills such as detailed analyses of texts via reading and answering questions, the students are constantly exposed to Turkish.

The pedagogical techniques used follow traditional methods in the following order of frequency: rote memorization and recitation, writing, dictation, read-alouds, summarizing, language games and tests (written and oral), and essay writing. From among these methods, rote memorization and writing need further exemplification. Students needed to memorize material such as *Andımız* (Our Pledge), important dates, and poems about national holidays (e.g., about teachers on Teachers' Day) because they were assigned to recite this information in an oral test or at a ceremony. My observations indicated that, in time, memorization became a habit, particularly for the first-grade children. Sometimes they memorized everything, even when they were not assigned to. For instance, if students were asked to read or relate their ideas about a subject, they

had a tendency instead to recite what they had memorized earlier. In such cases, their teacher directed them not to produce from memory but to read or speak freely.

Writing is one of the frequently used sign systems during lessons. Students are supposed to copy everything on the board to their notebooks. While doing this, they tend to read the words on the board letter by letter rather than as a whole because of their low literacy levels. This often caused them to have difficulty keeping pace with the flow of the lesson and, thus, to be reprimanded by the teacher. The third grade teacher, in particular, used writing frequently as a technique to teach vocabulary. However, during our interview, a focal student from her class shared his concerns about writing. In response to my question regarding what he did not like in the school, he replied: "I don't like Turkish [the lesson] because we write a lot there in Turkish." The same student also added that, if he were to change one thing, he would wish to be a faster and more efficient writer. The student's parent indicated the same concerns during our interview. She was concerned that the written topics should be covered orally as well.

In addition to educational practices, certain routines were followed, the most striking of which is the teachers' greeting students the first thing in the morning in class. The students are required to stand up as the teacher enters the room and are reminded to stand if they fail to do so. In the first weeks of school, lower-grade students, Pre-K and first graders, do not conform to this rule, but by the end of the year, they do.

In contrast to the routines discussed above, rituals are "made up of routines, but ... are given far greater cultural significance for being part of a ritual context, rather than everyday encounters" (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 36). Two kinds of rituals were observed: 1) *Andımız* (Our Pledge), which is a verse similar to the Pledge of Allegiance said at the beginning of each school day, and 2) national and religious holiday ceremonies. The latter will be discussed in relation to the Discourses of activity/semiotic building.

The school celebrates all Turkish national and religious holidays, as well as other days noted in Turkey, with a ceremony. Ten ceremonies are held during the school year, and the students perform in each of them. About three weeks before each ceremony, the teachers allocate considerable amount of class time to preparing for student performances. They also frequently talk in classes about the approaching holiday, what it means, how it has started to be observed in Turkey. Right after one holiday is celebrated, preparations for the next holiday start. In this way, the students get used to the frequency of ceremonies.

What are the sub-activities of a ceremony? To illustrate, on November 10, the commemoration of Ataturk, a joint ceremony with the Consulate members was held. Chairs for the audience were set up in the second floor hall. In front of the audience was a podium for speakers. Behind the podium hung a large portrait of Ataturk. To the left of the podium stood the U.S. flag, to the right the Turkish flag. All the audience wore Ataturk's pictures or brooches on their collars. The ceremony started with the playing of an audio-taped recording of Ataturk's speech on the occasion of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the modern Turkish Republic. Then a moment of silence was observed in memory of Ataturk and all the Turkish soldiers who fought for Turkey's

independence from 1919-1923. After singing the Turkish national anthem, consulate members and school administrators made speeches. It is important to note here that the order of speeches followed a hierarchy starting from the highest-ranking speaker, i. e. the consul. The last speech was made by the principal, followed by student performances including reading classic poems and essays written by the students themselves. In this specific event, all the speeches and student performances were about Atatürk, his character, success and principles. Some of the titles of poems read by the students were: Atatürk'ü Anış [Remembering Atatürk], Çok Teşekkürler Atatürk'üm [Thank You Very Much My Atatürk], On Kasım [November 10], Atatürk Olmak [Being Atatürk], Mustafa Kemal'i Anlamak [Understanding Mustafa Kemal]. Afterwards, school songs about Atatürk were sung by the school choir. At other celebrations, the flow of the ceremony would be similar but also include dance performances such as folkdances or group dance shows. The children and audience would be dressed in red and white, the colors of the Turkish flag. Since the November 10 event was a memorial event, no dances were performed.

In the Turkish school, the Discourses of activity/semiotic building were created through a combination of teacher-centered and traditional teaching methods, daily routines that reinforced the importance of using Turkish, and overt cultural rituals, which were designed to reinforce Turkish cultural identity.

#### *Language Choices, Identities, and Self-Esteem: Discourses of Relationship Building*

The Discourses of relationship building reflect the beliefs, feelings, and values of the research participants. The main foci of these Discourses included language proficiency and language choice, student identities, the relationship between the Saturday school and regular school, and family involvement.

Analysis of language proficiency and choice Discourses revealed that the children were English dominant. Only when an adult reminded them to speak Turkish did the children change their choice. For instance, during lunchtime, the male Pre-K student was talking to his friends in English while playing. His father heard him and warned him immediately:

- |   |                   |                     |
|---|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | F: Türkçe konuş   | Speak Turkish       |
| 2 | İngilizce konuşma | Don't speak English |
| 3 | S: Arkadaşlarımla | With my friends     |

The child indicated that English was the language used to talk to friends (line 3). However, he also made sure to respond to his father's warning in Turkish. Because the children had sufficient *linguistic repertoire* (Gumperz, 1964), they were able to make choices as to which language to use and with whom. Except for the children with a non-Turkish parent, all students chose Turkish when talking to me, the researcher. In some instances, if they had started saying something in English, they immediately translated it into Turkish, knowing that I was a Turkish-speaking adult. For the children, speaking more than one language meant being "involved in a

continuous process of decision-making, although not necessarily a conscious one” (Duranti, 1997, p. 71).

In addition to parents, administrators and teachers also encouraged children to use Turkish. This was observed on all grade levels. Especially lower grade teachers, while they sometimes needed to use English for pedagogical purposes, frequently warned students not to speak English. Students using Turkish were praised. The following excerpt is from the first grades when the teacher reviews the newly learned terms to describe relatives:

- |    |    |                      |                               |
|----|----|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 4  | T  | Teyze kim?           | Who is aunt?                  |
| 5  | S  | Your mom’s sister    |                               |
| 6  | T  | Türkçe söyliycez ama | But we will say it in Turkish |
| 7  | S2 | Annenin kızkardeşi   | Mother’s sister               |
| 8a | T  | Aferin               | Well-done                     |
| 8b |    | Annenin kızkardeşi   | Mother’s sister               |

Besides language choice, *codeswitching*,<sup>4</sup> a “change in languages within a single speech event” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 48), was another phenomenon observed. The focal students who had little or no command of Turkish communicated with their teacher either using only English or through codeswitching. For instance, the first graders were learning how to write new sentences in Turkish. They had learned two or three sentences, and the focal student with a non-Turkish mother wrote a sentence on the board. He was able to write it from memory without looking at his notebook, and the teacher praised him. He then immediately asked the teacher:

- 9 S: You want me to write ‘Anne yemek yap’?

[Mother cook]

- 10 T Okay, write it too.

Teachers themselves used codeswitching as a pedagogical strategy in two cases: when giving instructions and when talking about numbers. In giving instructions, codeswitching was used in the form of translation for efficiency’s sake. In the following example, the first grade teacher gives instructions first in Turkish and then translates those same instructions into English:

- |     |    |                                |                                    |
|-----|----|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 11a | T: | Şimdi çocuklar                 | Now children                       |
| 11b |    | kitaplarındaki resimlere bakın | look at the pictures in your books |

12 Look at the pictures in your book

Teachers also codeswitched when referring to numbers. Since math was not taught in the school and students were assumed not to know the Turkish numbers very well, the teachers used both Turkish and English so that all students could understand. The following is an excerpt from the first grade students:

13 Evet e sesini artık öğrendik      Alright we learned the /e/ sound

14 Şimdi sayfa yirmiüç      Now page twenty three

15 Page twenty three

16 Ne diyoruz biz ona Türkçe?      What do we call it in Turkish?

17 Yirmiüç      Twenty three

The students often codeswitched in their replies to teachers' questions, and when they could not think of the Turkish equivalent of a word that they wanted to use. During the interview, the fifth-grade focal student reported that she found this strategy very beneficial for learning more Turkish words:

18a R: Peki burdaki öğretmenle      All right with your teacher here

18b Türkçe konuşuyorsun      you speak Turkish

18c değil mi?      don't you?

19a S: Türkçe ve bazen şey      Turkish and sometimes err

19b bilmediğimiz zaman      when we don't know

19c İngilizce söylüyoruz      we say in English

20 R: Söylüyorsunuz      You say

21 Napıyo o anlıyo mu sizi?      What does she do, understand you?

22 S: Evet çok iyi anlıyo      Yes she understands us very well

23a Sadece böyle diyelim ki (...)      Only let's suppose that (...)

23b öğretmenim ben gidip      my teacher can I go

23c	water alabilir miyim	get water
23d	diycem diyelim	I want to say let's suppose
24 R:	Uh uh	
25 S:	Water değil su der	She says not water su
26	It's water değil su	It's not water su
27	Sonra öğreniyosun	Then you learn

These examples illustrate that, the adults, as the first generation immigrants to the U.S., believe in the continuity of Turkish and encourage its use. However, since the children are second generation Americans, their behavior when speaking English to each other reflects who they feel they are. This supports Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) notion that language behavior is "a series of *acts of identity* in which people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social roles" (1985, p. 14). All school members engage in these acts of identity when performing any language act. The language choice and codeswitching discussed above can also be explained by what Pennycook (2003) refers to as *performativity*, which questions pre-given identities and indicates performing identities via the use of language. In continuing to use English with their peers and even with teachers in some classroom context despite the adults' warnings, Turkish heritage school children are not conforming to the Turkish identities pre-given by their parents. Instead, they perform their American identity by speaking English to each other. But why do the children use Turkish with adults? This can be explained by language ideology, which posits, "ideology and social relations are mutually constitutive" (Woolard, 1998). The adults' attitude towards Turkish teaches the children what is expected of them regarding language use - i.e. "Speak Turkish!" The children's response seems to be: "Speak Turkish to adults!"

A second focus of the relationship building Discourses is related to student ethnic identity, both self-defined and defined by adults. The adults described student identities as bilingual/bicultural. One administrator indicated that the Turkish School's education helped children position themselves in a healthier way in the American society:

Çok baskın bir kültür içinde, kendi ailesinin geldiği kültürü, öğrenmeyip de ilerde problemleri bir insan olmaktansa, asıl geldiği kültürü de bilen bu kültürle de uyuşabilen ve iki ülkeyi de öğrenip iki ülkede de yaşamayı becerebilen gençler yetiştiriyoruz gibi geliyor bana.

[It seems to me that in a very dominant culture, we raise young people, who know the original culture that they come from, who can also be integrated into this culture, and who can manage to live in both countries by learning about these two countries, instead of becoming a person with problems in the future because of not learning about the culture that their family come from.]

Parents also pointed to bilingual/bicultural/multilingual student identities as follows:

- a. A Turk but raised in the U.S. (first grader, Italian father)
- b. Not 100% Turkish, not 100% American, neither in between (fifth grader)
- c. American with an American, Turkish with a Turk (Pre-K, American father)
- d. Somewhere in between (third grader)
- e. Predominantly American (Pre-K, third grader)
- f. Certainly American with a predominant Hispanic side, and a less dominant Turkish side (first grader, Dominican mother)

Children's own descriptions of themselves likewise point to their bilingual/bicultural identities. They define themselves through similarity to or difference from their peers on the basis of interests and clothing styles, whether in America or in Turkey. Here is the 1st grade female student's response to the question "Do you think sometimes you are different from your American friends?" The interview was held in English as she preferred:

28 S I'm kind of same

29 R You're kind of same with them

30 S Yeah, coz we do the same stuff

Doing "the same stuff", having similar interests, and wearing similar clothes seem sufficient for children to identify with each other in either country. Only the fifth-grade focal student emphasized race and religion as important factors in her choice of friendships. The same student expressed a keen love for and interest in the Saturday school:

31 Yani arkadaşlarınla konuşuyosun I mean you talk with your friends

32 Daha çok iyi arkadaş oluyo Türk insanları Turkish people make much better friends

33 Daha çok iyi oluyo They are much better

34a Böyle amerikan okulunda iyi olmuyo It's kinda not good in American school

34b İngilizce falan English and such

- |    |                                    |   |
|----|------------------------------------|---|
| 35 | Bazı insanlar Müslümanları sevmiyo | Some people don't like Muslims          |
| 36 | Ondan da sıkıntı oluyo             | There's trouble because of that as well |
| 37 | Daha çok böyle siyah insanlar var  | There are kinda more black people       |
| 38 | Onlar da sevmiyo beyaz insanları   | They don't like white people            |

The student's response juxtaposes the Saturday school against her regular school, *the American school*. This response and her other comments indicated that she was conscious of religion and race in her daily life away from the Turkish school. She comes from a Muslim Turkish family and finds that the Turkish school students have the most in common with her and make better friends as lines 31 to 33 indicate. Line 35 shows that she positions herself among the Muslim students in her regular school. Both comments indicate that the student finds it difficult to make friends with non-Muslim as well as with non-white students. According to line 36, she feels troubled at school because she experiences prejudice against Muslims: some non-Muslim students are not friendly to Muslim students. Lines 37 and 38 show the student's understanding that skin color determines race, and that Turkish people, who have white skin, are positioned among white people. She describes the non-white students, referred to as "they" in line 38, as unfriendly because of differences in skin color.

This student's descriptions of her relationships may be described as "ethnocentric," which denotes "an exaggerated preference for one's own group and concomitant dislike of other groups" (LeVine & Campbell as cited in Aboud, 1987, p. 39). The theory of attitude development that rises from this definition "proposes that negative attitudes toward others stem from a need to maintain self-esteem by projecting one's own negative attributes on to others" (Aboud, 1987, p. 39). This student's mother emphasized her hardships in adjusting to U.S. society when she came to the country as a teenager. Her experiences and stories of adjustment may be a cause of her daughter's ethnocentric behavior and may have led her to focus on her Turkish ethnic background. In fact, Rosenthal (1987) states that "parents, siblings, and other family members provide a cultural context that becomes for the child a lens through which to view the world. The 'correctness' of these values, their representations of objective reality, are unquestioned and become integral aspects of the child's life" (p. 160).

Nevertheless, this student's keen expression of love for the Turkish School and her experiences there point to an important finding. She makes friends and socializes with children like herself in the school. In fact, neither of the focal children indicated feeling any different from the Turkish School students, not even with regard to interests and clothing style. This may suggest that the students automatically assume a similarity between themselves and the other children at the school in terms of their ethnic backgrounds. That is, the school is a community where the children of the same ethnic background, with similar likes and interests, come together. This emerges as an important function of the school considering Rosenthal (1987): "The ethnic consciousness that arises from socialization experiences not only within the family but also as a

member of a distinctive and strong community ... will be translated into an integral part of one's self definition" (p. 161).

Another finding in this section, the Discourse of relationship building, focused on an important difference between Saturday School and regular school: building self-esteem. The adults and students mentioned many differences between the two schools ranging from pedagogies to the physical setting. However, the main difference indicated was that the Turkish School helped build self-esteem for the children and emphasized their Turkish ethnic background. The last finding with regard to the Discourses of relationship building concerns the need to improve family involvement. The administrators and teachers consider parental involvement important for the school both in terms of their children's success in Turkish education and the school's improvement logistically and economically. Although the school has a system in place for involving parents, it has not been regularized. Establishing a well-functioning Parents Association seems to be a dream of the administrators. The teachers frequently hold parent-teacher conferences to actively involve the parents. The children know that parental involvement is an important factor for their regular attendance at school (in terms of transportation and motivation) and their developing Turkish knowledge. Finally, the teachers' and -families' accounts reveal that both parties set expectations of each other related to the students' performance at school.

### *Three C's: Discourses of World Building*

Analysis of the Discourses of world building revealed the situated meanings and values attached to certain concepts within the school's Discourses. The analysis yielded three cultural models "at play in connecting and integrating these situated meanings to each other" (Gee, 1999, p. 92), namely connection, collectivity, and contentment.

*Connection.* The cultural model of connection was emphasized and prevalent within the Discourses of the adult school clientele. The excerpt below illustrates how the principal describes the school's goals and expectations regarding the children during our interview:

- |   |                                       |  |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Bilgiler bir şekilde tazelenmeyebilir | Knowledge may not always be refreshed              |
| 2 | Zamanla unutulabilir                  | It may be forgotten in time                        |
| 3 | Ama türk olduklarını unutmasınlar     | But I wish that they won't forget they are Turkish |
| 4 | Bir şekilde bağlantılarını sağlayalım | I wish we somehow provide their connection         |

As mentioned in line 4 above, the adults view the school as a bridge to their Turkish roots. The principal often emphasized, when she addressed the students, that learning Turkish was an obligation for them, almost like "a debt" that all Turkish children had to pay back to their homeland, Turkey. Parents indicated similar opinions by focusing on the necessity of children's knowing their original roots and language, largely in order to keep contact relatives in Turkey who did not speak English. The parents also indicated that they did not have enough time, knowledge, and patience to teach the language and culture to their children; therefore, they

brought their children to school. The Turkish School connected the Turkish American children to their heritage, especially via a focus on Atatürk, and to social and academic life in Turkey, via the Turkish elementary school curriculum.

*Collectivity.* Gumperz (1982) introduced the notion of “we-code” vs. “they-code” to explain code-switching. Gumperz’s following comment points to the fact that this dichotomy can explain group identity relationships:

The tendency is for the ethnically specific, minority language to be regarded as the ‘we-code’ and become associated with in-group and informal activities, and for the majority language to serve as the ‘they-code’ associated with the more formal, stiffer and less personal out-group relations. (Gumperz, 1982, p. 66)

The situated meanings of certain words and phrases used in the interviews by the school’s adult clientele also reflected this dichotomy. All the administrators, teachers, and parents used the “we-code” by using the words “we, us, our” in their speech. For instance, the principal offered the following answer in her response to the interview question “what are the aims and goals of this school?”

1a	Amaç burda	The purpose here is
1b	haftanın beş günü	five days a week
1c	İngilizce okuyan öğrencilerimize	for <i>our</i> students who read in English
1d	haftanın bir gününde	in one day a week
1e	anadili olan	so they won’t forget
1f	Türkçe’yi unutmamaları,	the mother tongue Turkish
1g	<i>anadil ve vatanımızla</i>	with <i>our</i> mother tongue and <i>our</i> homeland
1h	bağlantılarının güçlenmesi	so their ties will strengthen
1i	kopmaması için yapılan	and won’t break
1j	güzel bir program	a nice program being implemented

[The purpose here is to have a nice program held one day a week for our students who read in English five days a week so they won’t forget the mother tongue, Turkish, so their ties with our mother tongue and homeland will strengthen and won’t break.]

The principal refers to the students as “our” students (1c), to Turkish as “our” mother tongue (1g), and to Turkey as “our” homeland (1g). While the adults’ Discourses collectively embraced Turkishness as such, they frequently “other-ed” non-Turkish entities. The “they-code” in the adults’ language was associated with the “foreignness” of the dominant culture; this manifested itself in words such as “foreign” and “abroad”. The following is an extract from the interview with the principal regarding the importance of parental involvement:

2	Bu <i>yurtdışında</i> çok çok daha önemli	This is even more important <i>abroad</i>
3a	Türkiye’de olduğumuz zaman	When we’re in Turkey
3b	daha farklı	it is more different
4	Bütün çevre Türk	All the neighborhood is Turkish
5	Komşu Türk	The neighbor is Turkish
6	Herşey Türk	Everything is Turkish

The principal refers to the U.S. as “abroad” in this excerpt (line 2). This word means “in or to a foreign country” and its use indicates that the U.S. is a foreign country for her even though she has been living here for many years and is an American citizen. Another example is from the Pre-K teacher:

7	Bir de şu var	There is also this
8a	Benim bütün velilerim	<i>Not</i> all of my parents
8b	<i>Türk</i> veli <i>değil</i>	are <i>Turkish</i> parents
9	<i>Yabancı</i> velilerim de var ee	I have <i>foreign</i> parents too err
10a	<i>Yabancı</i> velilere de	To the <i>foreign</i> parents also
10b	<i>özellikle</i> göstererek	I teach this <i>especially</i>
10c	bunu öğretiyorum	by demonstrating

Here the Pre-K teacher emphasizes her special attention to the non-Turkish parents. She has her own system of showing the parents the things that she teaches their children. The non-Turkish parents are “foreigners” (8b, 9, 10a), and do not have the same cultural background as Turks. Hence they need special attention as the word “especially” in line 10b indicates.

Turkish collective identity is reinforced in several other contexts. The importance of the modern Turkish Republic is praised over the fallen Ottoman Empire. The Turkish Language Revolution in 1928 and the acceptance of Latin script for Turkish is taught and praised over the old system of writing in Arabic letters. Among the vocabulary taught were the following words related to the War of Independence between 1919 and 1923: *sovereignty, independence, martyr, invasion, war, wounded, peace, homeland, nation*. Being Muslims and having various beliefs about religious education constituted another context. While some parents believed in the need for teaching more about Islam, some considered it as a family responsibility to teach it. Those did

not share these features (e.g. the U.S., non-Turkish spouses, non-Muslim religious groups) were “other-ed” by the use of the “they-code.”

*Contentment.* Turkish School is a venue for the first-generation adults to feel contentment. The words and phrases within the adults’ Discourses that signaled such satisfaction were “happy, happiness, going on successfully, wonders created, very good teachers, very beautiful thing, big surprise” when expressing opinions about the school’s education. The administrators’ satisfaction is related to the expectations met by the students and the general quality of education and the teachers. The teachers’ contentment about their work stems from the positive results they receive, i.e., because their students learn the Turkish language and culture. The parents also feel contentment with their children’s identity as shaped in the school. Specifically, the reasons for this satisfaction include the large scope of Turkish cultural education that the school offers, the children’s ability to perform in Turkish language as a future “investment” (Norton, 2000), and their growing up as healthy individuals with a balanced ethnic and cultural identity.

*Discipline, Status and Challenges: Discourses of Political Building*

The last block of the discourse analysis framework was that of political building, or language used to communicate perspectives on social goods. Discourses operative here were discipline, status and challenges.

*Discipline.* The school tries to inculcate Turkish traditions, the most visible of which is *respectfulness*. Students were taught and observed to show respectfulness in the following ways: standing up when the teacher entered class, not chewing gum, not wearing baseball caps in class, and not eating or drinking during class time. Students are taught to stand straight with their head high when saying “Andımız” (Our Pledge) or singing the Turkish national anthem. To help students visualize this way of standing, teachers and administrators referred to it as “asker gibi” [like a soldier].

*Silence* is also highlighted as an attribute of a good student. The teachers and the administrators frequently warn students not to talk for several reasons: cultural emphasis on silence, the school’s limited and shared space with the Turkish Consulate where noise is unwelcome, and the lack of thick walls. If students do not obey warnings and continue talking, they are punished in various ways: by separation from their friend’s desk, writing a sentence (e.g., “I didn’t listen to my teacher”) in Turkish a hundred times, sitting at the principal’s desk with her, and collecting litter.

The general classroom interaction pattern, Initiation-Response-Feedback/Follow-up (IRF), also reveals the Discourses of discipline. Here, the teacher initiates interaction by asking a question, then students respond, and the teacher provides feedback to the students’ response (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). The following are two excerpts that exemplify this sequence. The third-grade lesson took place on the day of the Ataturk commemoration. The students were reading and analyzing a text on Ataturk’s life:

1a	T: Sonra annesi yaptı	Then what did his mother do	I
1b	babasını kaybedince?	when they lost his father?	
2	S1: Dayısının çiftliğine gitti.	She went to his uncle's farm.	R
3a	T: Dayısının çiftliğinde	In his uncle's farm	F, I
3b	niye okula gidemedi?	why couldn't he go to school?	
4	S2: Köydü ve okul yoktu.	It was a village and there was no school.	R
5	T: Sonra annesi ne yaptı?	Then what did his mother do?	F, I
6	S2: Teyzesinin yanına gitti.	She went to his aunt's.	R
7a	T: Çocuklar	Children	I
7b	Kemal'in anlamı neydi?	What was the meaning of Kemal?	
7c	(self-replies immediately)		
8	Olgunluk anlamına geliyor.	It means maturity.	R

As in lines 3a and 5, the follow-up itself could become a new initiation rather than feedback. Teachers did not always provide the students with feedback if the response was correct. Instead, they continued with a new initiation. However, feedback was certainly made available when the response called for correction or praise. In the teacher's last sentence (line 8), she provides the response to her own question (line 7a-c). This was a common practice by the most experienced teachers. Perhaps because they did not expect to receive a correct response, they answered their own question without providing enough thinking time for students.

The literature on language learning criticizes the IRF sequence as "an unproductive interactional format" (Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 40) especially in the learning of pragmatics and "little d" discourse. Kasper and Rose (2002) point to Hall's research which found that, through IRF, "students were not provided opportunities to develop the complex interactional, linguistic and cognitive knowledge required in ordinary conversation" (Hall as cited in Kasper & Rose, 2002, p. 40). In the Turkish School context, however, this interaction is used to reinforce teachers' authority. The excerpt from the music class below points to this use:

9	T: İstiklal Marşını öğrendiniz mi?	Did you learn the National Anthem?	I
10	Ss: Evet (they yell)	Yes	R

- |    |                               |                         |      |
|----|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------|
| 11 | T: Ben size bağırın dedim mi? | Did I tell you to yell? | F, I |
| 12 | Ss: Demedin.                  | You didn't tell.        | R    |
| 13 | T: E o zaman?                 | So then?                | F    |
| 14 | (Starts to play the anthem)   |                         |      |

The teacher's first question in line 9 refers to the ceremony held earlier that day for the commemoration of Atatürk. He asks if the children learned the anthem during the ceremony. With excitement, the children yell "yes." The yelling makes the teacher feel the need to remind them of his authority and ask his second question: Did I tell you to yell? (line 11). This is significant as the teacher is claiming his own authority in a subtle manner to mean "students do as teachers want; students can only yell as long as teachers tell them to." As a follow-up to students' response, his last question (line 13) underlines the redundancy and inappropriateness of students' yelling. The way he immediately starts to play the Turkish national anthem subtly puts an end to the conversation and students are drawn into singing along. Hence, even though this question/response pattern might look conversational, such interactions drawing on the IRF structure subtly signal the teacher's authority.

The issue of discipline was an important one for administrators and teachers. When asked about what has not worked in the school's administration and education, all the administrators and teachers pointed to students' behavior problems. To them, some students "behave differently" – i.e., in the American way - in ways that are not expected from Turkish children in Turkey. The principal heard student reactions to punishment that included "I'll call the police if you treat me like this!" A Pre-K parent said that, on a day he wanted to talk to his 4 year-old son, his son said he was busy and added, "Please respect my privacy!" The concepts of *children's rights* and *privacy* appear as American identity attributes that upset the adults when teaching the Turkish way of discipline to students. Although in general the administrators and teachers were satisfied with the outcomes, their contentment was accompanied by a tug-of-war with "some" students if not all. The focal children, on the other hand, generally responded positively to the teaching of respectfulness and teacher authority in class. They knew they were expected to respect their teachers. Yet still, in certain ways they contested this authority whenever they could by talking to each other when the teacher's attention was elsewhere, not completing their homework, or simply speaking English when they were supposed to speak Turkish in the school.

*Status and challenges.* The adults' Discourses on the school's status and challenges were marked by the following words and phrases: "impossibilities," "lack of opportunities," "these conditions," "once a week," "only one day a week," and "noisy environment." Among the challenges listed, having no actual classrooms was mentioned most often. The school's noisy environment was linked to such *impossibilities* as mixing of voices between classes and the parents' going in and out of the hall. Among other challenges emphasized were having no playground where students could go for recess, to relax or spend their energy, a lack of up-to-date educational materials, and professional development opportunities for the teachers.

Another common Discourse concerned the school's location in the Consulate building. Referred to as "being under the Consulate," the school's location was found both advantageous and disadvantageous. It is advantageous as there is no need to pay rent and there is a close relationship with the consul, important in holding activities for the benefit of the school in the building. It is disadvantageous because only one floor is available to the school, which is not a child-friendly physical setting. Both the teachers and the administration want to teach in a real school building in real classrooms, but it is not possible "under these conditions." It is often mentioned that the results would be better if they were located in a school building and had regular classrooms. Despite these challenges, the adults keep positive and believe that the school will continue for many years. Among other wishes are creating a graduate union, holding workshops with recent graduates, providing outside opportunities of maintaining and developing Turkish language and culture, finding opportunities for teacher development, improved fund-raising, and keeping in contact with people affiliated with the school. Although some of these are already evident, many have not been realized – for instance, updating the teaching materials. One reason is that the administrators are multi-tasking, and they do not have enough time left for school administration. The principal is responsible for everything related to the school, from hiring new teachers<sup>5</sup> to other decision-making processes. All of these challenges are accepted as inevitable facts, and everyone tries to do their best in order to sustain the school's educational mission.

### **Conclusion**

This paper investigated the role of a Turkish Saturday school in the United States in maintaining the Turkish language and forming a Turkish cultural identity. Five roles for the school have emerged:

- a. *Connection building*: the school connects the Turkish American children to their heritage, especially via the Turkish language, Ataturk, and the social and academic ways of Turkey.
- b. *Collectivity building*: the school brings together the Turkish speech community and builds a collective identity which is reflected through the use of Turkish language and "we-code", a love and respect for Ataturk, the shared history of Ottoman Empire, the values of modern Turkey such as the Latin script, through being Muslims, and the shared homeland. While they achieve such a unification via the use of "we-code," they "other" those entities that do not share their common features through the use of "they" code.
- c. *Contentment building*: the school is a venue for the adults to feel moral satisfaction for the following reasons: the positive outcomes of Turkish language and cultural education, the children's being able to perform in Turkish language, their growing up as healthy individuals with high self-esteem, and their being proficient in Turkish, alongside English, as a future investment.

d. *Identity building*: the school helps to build a Turkish identity that is shaped by living in the United States. It is a community where the students meet other children like themselves - i.e., born in the U.S. to Turkish parents, doing the same things, and sharing interests. This enables the construction of the Turkish American identity of the children, impossible to achieve without the presence of a Turkish school.

e. *Diversity indicating*: The school is an indicator of the cultural and linguistic diversity in the U.S. and of the Turkish community as one of many who have weekend schools in NYC. It enables the Turkish community and the children to see themselves as one of many ethnolinguistic groups in the United States.

By using Gee's Discourse framework as an analytical tool, this paper showed how "*language has meaning only in and through practices*" (1999, p.8), how language is used to integrate with other non-language stuff - i.e., the capital "D" discourses - and how discourses are inherently ideological (Gee, 1996). The participants' situated meanings - i.e., cues or clues in context such as the use of specific words, phrases, grammars, and sign systems (writing, music, clothing etc.) - produced the Discourses discussed previously. There are no clear-cut boundaries between them. Some of the Discourses emerge in the context of others as the participants continually revise their situated meanings. For instance, the Discourse of "respect for teachers" is emphasized via routines and rituals in the Discourses of activity/semiotic building. The same Discourse occurs in the context of political building through IRF classroom interaction, which signals the teacher's authority. Such repetition of Discourses points to the production and reproduction of ideologies inherent in them. It is through these ideologies that the Turkish school is created as an institutionalized language ideological site (Kroskrity, 2000). It is again through these ideologies that the Turkish school ensures "the repetition and ritualization of the situations that sustain" it (Gee, 1999, p.83).

According to Norton (2000), learners must see the return on their investment as worth the effort made. On the surface, receiving 3.5 foreign language credit points upon completion of the school can be considered as the only material return for the students. In a deeper sense, however, the notion of investment presupposes that:

when language learners speak, they are not only exchanging information with target language speakers, but they are constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world. Thus an investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner's own identity, an identity which is constantly changing across time and place. (Norton, 2000, p. 11)

The language choices and boundaries in the school point to this presupposition since Turkishness and Americanness go hand in hand and at the same time challenge each other. The adults - as first-generation immigrants holding on to their essential values and ideas - see the U.S. as a foreign country and refer to English as a foreign language. Their overall beliefs converge in the

desire that their children know and be attached to their Turkish background. The children, on the other hand, display fluid and hybrid identities. They reject the adults' Discourses by speaking English to their peers in the school, but they also speak Turkish to adults and accept their Discourses. These observations parallel Fishman's (1980, p. 243) argument: an ethnic mother tongue school moderates and modulates "ethnic uniqueness at the same time that it channels Americanness via the community's own institutions." In an era when bilingual education is silenced (García, 2005, 2009), this overall function of ethnic mother tongue schools such as the Turkish school is worth highlighting. These complementary schools certainly fill gaps in the current educational system by promoting the home languages of bilingual students. As Wang and Green (2001) suggest, instead of the mainstream K-12 school system trying to identify students as belonging to a certain heritage, the community-based schools provide a natural environment so that the learners can connect with their home language, its speakers, and culture.

### References

- About, F. E. (1987). The development of ethnic self-identification and attitudes. In M. J. Rotheram & J. S. Phinney (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 32-56). Newbury Park, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Ahmed, F. (1986). *Turks in America: The Ottoman Turk's immigrant experience*. Greenwich, CT: Columbia International.
- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 5, 243-259.
- Canagarajah, S. (2006). Ethnographic methods in language policy. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *An introduction to language policy: Theory and method* (pp. 153-169). London: Blackwell
- Carreira, Maria (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner." *Heritage Language Journal*, 2,1.
- Creese, A. (2005). *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms*. Clevedon, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, heritage, and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education*, 20, 23-43.
- Creese, A. (2008). Linguistic ethnography. In K. A. King and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Volume 10: *Research Methods in Language and Education* (pp. 229-241). New York, NY: Springer.
- Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2008). Fieldnotes in team ethnography: Researching complementary schools. *Qualitative Research*, 8, 223-242.
- Creese, A., Baraç, T., Bhatt, A., Blackledge, A., Hamid, S., Wei, L., Lytra, V., Martin, P., Yağcıoğlu-Ali, D., & Wu, C-J. (2008). Investigating multilingualism in complementary schools in four communities. *Final Report for the ESCR for Project No: RES-000-23-1180*. Retrieved at <http://www.naldic.org.uk/docs/members/documents/NQ5.1.6.pdf>
- Duranti, A. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The sociology of language: An interdisciplinary social science approach to language in society*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

- Fishman, J. A. (1980). Ethnic community mother tongue schools in the USA: Dynamics and distributions. *International Migration Review*, 14, 235-247.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001). 300-plus years of heritage language education in the U.S. In J.K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard and S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 81-99). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, 601-605.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Wiley – Blackwell Publishing.
- Gee, J. P. (1999, 2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London & Philadelphia: Routledge/Falmer.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In Clifford Geertz (Ed.), *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.
- Gumperz, J. (1964). Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. *American Anthropologist*, 66, 137-153.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadi-Tabassum, S. (2006). *Language, space, and power: A critical look at bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Heller, M. (1999). *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London, New York: Longman.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Language learning: Pragmatic development in a second language*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Kaya, İ. (2004). Turkish-American immigration history and identity formations. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 24, 295-308.
- Kroskrity, P. V. (2000). Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 1-34). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research.
- Le Page, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge, London, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martínez-Roldán, C. M., & Malavé, G. (2004). Language ideologies mediating literacy and identity in bilingual contexts. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 4, 155-180.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity, and educational change*. London: Longman.
- Otcu, G. B. (2009). *Language maintenance and cultural identity construction in a Turkish Saturday School in New York City* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Pennycook, A. (2003) Global Englishes, Rip Slyme, and performativity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7, 513-533.
- Peyton, J. K., Ranard, D. A., & McGinnis, S. (2001). Charting a new course: Heritage language education in the U.S. In J.K. Peyton, D.A. Ranard & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages*

- in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 3-29). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co.
- Rampton, B., Tusting, K., Maybin, J., Barwell, R., Creese, A., & Lytra, V. (2004). UK linguistic ethnography: A discussion paper. UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum. Retrieved from [www.ling-ethnog.org.uk](http://www.ling-ethnog.org.uk)
- Reyes, A. (2007). *Language, identity, and stereotype among southeast Asian American youth: The other Asian*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rosenthal, D. A. (1987). Ethnic identity development in adolescents. In M. J. Rotheram & J. S. Phinney (Eds.), *Children's ethnic socialization: Pluralism and development* (pp. 156-180). Newbury Park, Beverly Hills, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2003). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The language of teachers and pupil*. London: Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2001). *U.S. Census 2000: Summary file 4* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *American Community Survey, 2005* [data file]. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2, 211-230.
- Wang, S. C., & Green, N. (2001). Heritage language students in the K-12 education system. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 167-196). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Appendix (back)

*Questions to Ask About Building Tasks in Discourse Analysis*

Questions to Ask About Building Tasks	
Semiotic building	1. What sign systems are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation (e. g. speech, writing, images, and gestures)? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways? 2. What systems of knowledge and ways of knowing are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways? 3. What social languages are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways?
World building	4. What are the situated meanings of some of the words and phrases that seem important in the situation? 5. What situated meanings and values seem to be attached to places, times, bodies, objects, artifacts, and institutions relevant in this situation? 6. What cultural models and networks of models (master models) seem to be at play in connecting and integrating these situated meanings to each other? 7. What institutions and/ or Discourses are being (re-)produced in this situation and how are they being stabilized or transformed in the act?
Activity building	8. What is the larger or main activity (or set of activities) going on in the situation? 9. What sub-activities compose this activity (or these activities)? 10. What actions (down to the level of things like “requests for reasons”) compose these sub-activities and activities?
Socioculturally-situated identity and relationship building	11. What relationships and identities (roles, positions), with their concomitant personal, social, and cultural knowledge and beliefs (cognition), feelings (affect), and values, seem to be relevant to the situation? 12. How are these relationships and identities stabilized or transformed in the situation? 13. In terms of identities, activities, and relationships, what Discourses are relevant (and irrelevant) in the situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways?
Political building	14. What social goods (e. g. status, power, aspects of gender, race, religion, and class, or more narrowly defined social networks and identities) are relevant (and irrelevant) in this situation? How are they made relevant (and irrelevant), and in what ways? 15. How are these social goods connected to the cultural models and Discourses operative in the situation?
Connection building	16. What sorts of connections – looking backward and/ or forward – are made within and across utterances and large stretches of the interaction? 17. What sorts of connections are made to previous or future interactions, to other people, ideas, texts, things, institutions, and Discourses outside the current situation (this has to do with “intertextuality” and “inter-Discursivity”)? 18. How do connections of both the sort in 16 and 17 help (together with situated meanings and cultural models) to constitute “coherence” – and what sort of “coherence” – in the situation? (p 92-94).

*Adapted from “An introduction to discourse analysis,” by J.P. Gee (1999), pp. 92-94. London and New York: Routledge.*

**Notes**

1. I will be using these terms interchangeably throughout the text.
2. A heritage language can be defined as a language with which individuals have a personal connection (Fishman, 2001).
3. Mathematics has been taught since fall 2008 when school administrators realized the need to teach it, in part as a result of this study.
4. A recent term that would be more suitable here is “translanguaging” (see García, 2009 for further information). Nevertheless, I will use “codeswitching” since it is a more established term in the field.
5. All teachers need to be educated in and have elementary-school teaching certification from Turkey.

The cultural identity reveals the person's heritage, as well as help identify with others who have the same traditions or similar belief structures. Importance of cultural identity. It is more of a foundation or foreground on which every other boundary is established. Starting at a very young age, we embrace the traditions and norms of our parents and grandparents and hold on to them as we grow older. We continue to practice them as it becomes a source of identity for us and helps us better understand the people who share these common aspects of culture with us. This not only broadens up our r Heritage language maintenance and cultural identity formation: The case of a Turkish Saturday School in New York City. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7 (02), (112-137).Google Scholar. Panagiotopoulou, A., & Rosen, L. (2015). Professionalism and multilingualism in Greece and Canada: An international comparison of (minority) teachers' views on linguistic diversity and language practices in monolingual vs. multilingual educational systems. *Constructing cultural and academic identities in community schools: A socio-cultural and dialogical approach*. In V. Lytra & P. Martin (Eds.), *Sites of Multilingualism: Complementary schools in Britain today* (pp. 71-83). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.Google Scholar.