

Introduction

MARIE CARLSON & ANNIKA RABO

'All are Different, All are the Same'. This motto, from a Berlin Youth Forum discussed by Levent Soysal in his contribution to this book, can be used also for this volume. However trite this kind of expression, we want to reflect on the articulations and expressions of 'difference' and 'sameness' of education in national yet 'multicultural' contexts – the Turkish and the Swedish – that are both similar and different.

For more than a century education has been considered the linchpin of modernity and intimately linked to the development of both the nation and the individual citizen in that nation. Education is both a universal duty and a universal right. For more than a century educational debates have also underlined the crisis and obstacles in organising and transmitting the 'right' kind of education. In both these aspects Turkey and Sweden are very similar, even if the ideological struggles surrounding education differ. Since the 1980s, the term 'multicultural' or 'multiculturalism' has increasingly been used normatively to express important liberal and humanitarian values where 'difference' is celebrated and seen to contribute to the richness of society and even to the development of global understanding. 'Multicultural' is also used descriptively by stressing that all countries are culturally diverse, and that societies are increasingly multicultural through, for example, an increased flow of goods, ideas and people across national borders. Some see the 'multicultural society' as a threat to the unity and cohesion of the nation, while others see 'multiculturalism' as a recipe for solving various problems in societies. Thus 'multicultural' and 'multiculturalism' are vague terms which may obscure important theoretical and empirical distinctions.

Current debates and struggles over similarities and differences and the meaning of 'multiculturalism' can be used to reflect on exclusions and inclusions in other periods as well. 'Multicultural' is often attributed, or projected historically, to societies populated with groups with a variety of religious, linguistic and ethnic belongings. Most organised political communities have been, or are, multiethnic. Kymlicka (1995) distinguishes between multinational states with previously self-governing national minorities, which have been subjugated, or incorporated, into the state, and polyethnic states where diversity is based on the inflow of immigrants forming ethnic groups. Contem-

porary Sweden and Turkey do not fit either category neatly, but this conceptualisation draws attention to differences between minorities, like the Sami in Sweden and the Kurds in Turkey, with a territorial 'homeland' within the modern state, and more recent immigrant groups, like the Turks in Sweden and immigrants from the East European and former Soviet countries in Turkey. Debates about political rights, for what Kymlicka sees as national minorities or ethnic groups, differ too. National minorities may demand rights of self-government, immigrant groups may demand support and protection for certain practices important for the group. Both may demand earmarked seats in political assemblies (ibid.: 6-7). In Sweden, for example, the Sami have been given specific linguistic rights following the ratification of the Convention of the European Council for the protection of national minorities.¹ On the other hand, Sweden has not accepted that Muslim immigrants, for example, have a right to govern themselves through a separate family law. In Turkey, non-Muslim minorities (Greek, Jewish and Armenian) can have their own schools, but Muslim minorities, such as the Kurds, are not recognised as 'minorities' and are subject to standard Turkish education. Drawing on liberalism, Kymlicka (ibid.: 8) demonstrates that it is possible to support group-rights with overlapping equity-based arguments, history-based arguments or arguments where cultural diversity is seen as an intrinsic value.

This discussion is very interesting and important, just like other debates concerning the content, expressions, or 'true essence' of 'multiculturalism' or different 'multiculturalism-s' (Appiah 1994, Gutmann 1994, Taylor 1994). In this volume, however, these discussions are not our main concern. Our aim is rather to contribute to the discussions of the complex meanings of education and learning from a variety of methodological and theoretical perspectives with material from Turkey and Sweden, which we consider 'multicultural', i.e. where people articulate a plurality of identities and belongings and where, as stressed by Benhabib (2002), a shift of perspective to the right of cultural self-ascription leads to more fragmented, narrative descriptions of human action and culture. In our discussion of the 'multicultural' in this volume, we regard the debates on ethnicity and culture as being closely linked to those on class and gender, and we engage them together. The material in the essays covers contemporary as well as historical contexts. The contributors critically discuss both the ideology and praxis of education, and the ideology and praxis in educational institutions and settings.

Conducting research in different national contexts implies that concepts and notions are embedded in specific socio-cultural practices with their own history. They are also embedded in a wider context outside national borders. Categorisations and conceptions are, furthermore, not fixed and stable within various contexts. In a Turkish setting 'modernity' has different connotations from Sweden, for example. 'Secularisation' is perceived and debated differently in the two countries, and so on. We also differ in the kind of topics and issues we focus on. The contributors to this volume can be used as illustrations of this argument. The Turkish researchers are very much

¹ Sweden has recognised five national minorities: the Sami, who are an indigenous people, the Swedish Finns, the Tornedalers, the Roma and the Jews.

concerned with the historical national context when discussing social mobility and gender issues. They also scrutinise the making of ‘the Turkish self’ and question centralised and nationalist education. Likewise, the relation between ‘religion’ and ‘the secular’ state is important. The Swedish researchers focus less on history. They are more concerned with the discussion on ethnicity within the Swedish contemporary ‘multicultural’ society, also intersected with gender. This discussion is closely related to the concept of immigrant² in Swedish culture, creating ‘Swedish-ness’ as a norm. The Swedish contributors are also engaged in questioning the Swedish consequences of the current decentralisation of education. We thus reflect on the national contexts of which we are a part. However, Turkey and Sweden are not mainly used for a comparison where different factors and variables concerning education are systematically analysed.

Education for the good of.....whom?

The belief that formal and compulsory education was necessary to strengthen the nation spread over the globe with quite amazing speed in the 19th century (cf. Boli 1989, Meyer et al. 1992). In the Ottoman reform period a General Education Regulation was passed in 1869. Although it was not fully realised, as discussed by Fatma Gök in this volume, it was part of a general modernising effort in the empire. Instead it was the young Turkish Republic, which in 1924 set the parameters for a unified non-religious and compulsory five-year education system in the country.³ In Sweden, a Bill to establish basic, free and universal education was passed in 1842. It was slow to take root, as discussed in this volume by Sven Hartman and Annika Rabo. Many conservative political leaders and clergy were opposed to the reform because parishes would have to bear the cost. Nor could they see the benefits of such a reform. Others thought that it would only lead to social upheaval. In Sweden, unlike Turkey and many other countries, literacy was already widespread when the Bill of 1842 was passed. Informal schooling took place in the home, and literacy was

² The concept of ‘immigrant’ has been used by Swedish authorities since the end of the 1960s. It was chosen to replace the term ‘foreigner’ in order to give a more positive connotation. The government’s contemporary definition and use of the concept ‘immigrant’ vary. Different authorities and reports may use different definitions. A common definition of ‘immigrant’ is that it refers to persons who live in Sweden but were born abroad. In the population in Sweden in 2005, 12.2 percent were born abroad and 15.8 percent have a ‘foreign background’. To be labelled as of ‘foreign background’ for the second generation, the latest official definition is: ‘born in Sweden with two biological parents born abroad. If only one parent is born abroad this will be considered as Swedish background’ (<http://www.integrationsverket.se>). However, it is still very common to talk about ‘second-generation immigrants’ in a more general way. ‘Swedish’ refers to persons born in Sweden to Swedish-born parents. The government considers that the concept ‘immigrant’ should only be used to denote persons who were born abroad, and in a very ‘sensitive’ way. Categorisation of persons according to country of origin, religion or language should only be used after due consideration. Since 1945, mother tongue and ethnic or confessional belonging have not been registered in censuses. For a broader discussion, see the Swedish Ministry of Culture’s report *Begreppet invandrare – användning i myndigheters verksamhet*, Ds 2000: 43.

³ In 1997 compulsory education was extended to eight years. Özdalga (1999) discusses this reform in the light of efforts on the part of the state to block the influence of religious education.

very much linked to the reading of religious texts. It took almost a century before a unified, uniform, universal and compulsory six-year school system, controlled by the state authorities, rather than the church, was established.

In the late Ottoman Empire lively pedagogical debates took place in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (see Somel 2001). Barak Salmoni (2004: 40) stresses the continuity of these debates into the first decades of the Turkish Republic. The individual in relation to the collective, the role of religion, the status of women, the relation between teachers and pupils were all important issues in these debates. Also in Sweden these were important topics. In both Sweden and the late Ottoman Empire and the young Turkish Republic, thinkers reflected on national or imperial education by pondering on and comparing with other countries and settings. For some the true purpose of education was to liberate the individual from oppressive social rules and regulations, while for others it was to discipline the backward people. Some claimed that parents posed a danger to children and that education must compensate for a backward or spoilt family life, while others stressed that the family was an important ally in the development of education. These themes are still at the heart of pedagogical debates in the two countries.⁴ Sweden and Turkey differ, however, on three important issues with significant educational implications. The first concerns nationalism and self-image.

The young Turkish Republic was chiselled out after the havoc of World War I and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. The Educational Bill of 1924 was thus infused with nationalist aspirations, epitomised by the founding father of the republic, Kemal Atatürk.⁵ The educational institutions came to contribute to developing a self-image of Turkey as a military nation and the Turks as a military people, as discussed in this volume by Tuba Kancı and Ayşe Gül Altınay. By the early 19th century, Sweden, on the other hand, had made peace with its neighbours and long-standing enemies. Swedish nationalism was nourished by other sources than war and the need to create or defend one's national borders. In Swedish textbooks it was the historical heroic kings of the past, rather than the heroes and sacrifices of the soldiers of today, which fostered generations. Since World War II, furthermore, Swedish political leaders have cultivated a national image based on a commitment to international peace and demilitarisation. Turkey, as discussed by Altınay and Kancı, is struggling to 'civilianise' its nationalist curricula, with fewer references to the military and soldiering in the new textbooks. In contemporary Sweden, as shown by Marie Carlson in her chapter, norms and values in a 'Swedish' sense are propagated in textbooks and various policy documents, not least for 'immigrant' students in order to foster new national images. This fostering is also related to gender equality within a Swedish framework.⁶

⁴ It is also noticeable that important pedagogical writers like John Dewey and Michael Apple have been influential in both countries.

⁵ The literature on Kemal Atatürk and 'Kemalism', and its enormous importance for Turkey since the inception of the republic, is prolific. For interesting discussion on Kemalism and education see e.g. Winter (1984). See also Ahmad (1993) and Ceylan and Irzik (2004) for related issues.

⁶ Sweden as a haven of gender equality can be questioned, not least because of the consensual nature of policy-making. The labour market is highly gender-segregated while Sweden scores high on the number of women in Parliament (cf. Rabo 1997: 111-115).

The second issue concerns language. The Ottoman Empire had been polyglot and the imperial administrative language incorporated many elements from Persian and Arabic. From the middle of the 19th century ‘foreign’ schools were established in the larger cities where the medium of instruction was French, English or German, catering especially to the Christian minorities. Concomitantly the Greek Orthodox, the Armenians and the Jews set up their own schools. In the new republic, this polyglot situation was viewed with suspicion and disliked because it was a symbol of the ‘weakness’ of the empire (cf. Somel 2005: 269). A radical language reform was adopted, symbolically representing the birth of the new – yet ancient – nation. The aim was to ‘return’ to a pure Turkish language; the Arabic script was exchanged for the Latin one, and a new vocabulary was developed. The compulsory school system developed in tandem with the language reform. The ‘new’ people had to unlearn old vernaculars and learn new ‘correct’ ways of talking, reading and writing. The linguistic minorities of the republic also had to adapt to the new homogeneity and their schools became heavily supervised by the state (Sarioğlu 2004: 91ff).

Sweden, in contrast, had no historical recognition of linguistic plurality. By the late 19th century there was amnesia on the part of the authorities that languages other than Swedish had been – and still were – important in the country. Latin, of course, had for centuries been the language of instruction for a career in administration, science or religion. In the Middle Ages German was more commonly spoken than Swedish in Stockholm, the capital. From the middle of the 18th to the middle of the 19th centuries French, rather than Swedish, was used in the royal court. The Swedish army, recruiting soldiers from the various parts of northern Europe, was polyglot. But, as in Turkey, compulsory education came to be based on a monolingual school. The Sami people and the sizeable Finnish-speaking minority in the north were not allowed to speak their own languages in school. These groups were too small and powerless to threaten the unity of the nation, but they were repressed because they were ‘different’ and could only become civilised through the medium of Swedish.

In both Sweden and Turkey, language debates are highly sensitive. In Turkey the languages spoken by the ‘minorities’ recognised in the Lausanne treaty of 1923 – Armenian and Greek – are protected by the state. But the Kurds are not recognised as a national minority, and the use of Kurdish has been suppressed and seen as a symbol of separatist claims. In Sweden, since the late 1980s, the sensitivities concern the immigrants’ use of Swedish. Stroud, for example, analyses the concept of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’, a suburban variety of Swedish, as essentially serving ‘to position immigrants in public linguistic markets as non-proficient speakers of Swedish, through tapping into cultural constructs associated with immigrants such as contagion, transgression, change and the like’ (2004: 197). The concept of ‘Rinkeby Swedish’ can be seen as a metaphor for representations of ‘the Swedish self’ and ‘the ethnic Other’ and juxtaposed in ideological debates (ibid., see also Milani 2006a, 2006b).

The third issue where Turkey and Sweden differ concerns the relationship between state and religion. In the young Turkish Republic a radical policy of separating state and religion was imposed, and religious education was banned

for all public schools. The training of religious functionaries was very closely supervised in the so-called Imam Hatip schools. This was a radical break from the imperial tradition, which had leaned heavily on religious legitimacy, since the caliphate was upheld and protected by the sultan. Religious training, carefully controlled, became largely cut off from its intellectual and cultural roots. In Sweden, the relationship between state and religion was – and is – totally different. After the Lutheran Reformation, Sweden developed into a religiously homogeneous state. No other Christian sects were allowed, and Swedish subjects were all born into the Lutheran (State) Church. In the 19th century, movements to ease the grip of the State Church and introduce more ‘popular’ forms of worship were important in spreading new ideas, not only about Protestantism, but also about education. Gradually education for the ordinary people became based less on the Scriptures and more on the idea of the modern citizen, as discussed above. But it was only in 1951 that it became possible to leave the Swedish State Church without entering into another Christian community, and only in 2000 that Church and State were finally separated. Since the 1950s a so-called non-confessional and ‘objective’ mandatory religious education has developed, but it is still very much rooted in the historical tradition of Swedish Lutheranism, (as mentioned by Kerstin von Brömssen in her chapter; see also Gerle 1999). Swedish ‘secularism’ is thus different from Turkish. Although the vast majority has stayed in the formerly State Church following the separation, and although most parents baptise their children and more than half of all couples marry in church, Swedes, in general, still talk of themselves as secular.

These three issues, national self-image, language questions and the relationship between state and religion, highlight various aspects of ‘multiculturalism’ and education at different points in time. In Turkey debates concern both the recapturing of a ‘multicultural’ past and the re-evaluation of the national curriculum on the basis of human rights criteria (see Ceylan and Irzik 2004). Sweden, on the other hand, many say, has to include its immigrants and new citizens in the national family and in the national history. There is an ongoing debate on institutional discrimination in various contexts, where it is claimed that the ‘Swedish’ majority always has the right to decide what is ‘right’ or ‘wrong’. In both countries we find a strong link between the languages of the majority – Turkish and Swedish – and ideas of the ideal citizen. However, ‘national’ linguistic minorities have recently been recognised in Sweden⁷ and some minority languages also receive support to be taught in schools (see Inger Lindberg’s chapter). In Turkey, concerns about minorities and minority languages are very complex, especially regarding Kurds and Kurdish. Although Kurdish was officially recognised in 2002 as a language in which instruction may take place, the development of education in Kurdish has been slow. The

⁷ The minority languages are Sami, Finnish, Meänkieli (Tornedal Finnish), Romany Chib and Yiddish. Swedish minority policy is to strengthen the national minorities and provide the support needed to keep their languages alive. The government has ratified the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages. Special laws have been adopted which entitle individuals to use Sami, Finnish and Meänkieli in dealings with the administrative authorities and courts of law in the geographical administrative areas in which these languages have traditionally been used and are still widely used today.

relationship between state and religion and its link to education is also a very sensitive issue. The ideological struggle in contemporary Turkey between proponents of radical secularism and Islamic movements may become extremely divisive. In Sweden the majority's myth of its own secularity makes for classifying Middle Eastern immigrants and new citizens as 'religious'. In both countries schools and curricula have to develop not only to become more sensitive to the lived realities of citizens and permanent residents, but also to find bridges across the potentially dangerous divides. In Sweden and Turkey, the organisation of 'similarities' and 'differences' is thus crucial both for and in education.

This volume

We have organised this volume in three thematic sections. In the first section, *Challenges in 'Multicultural' Education*, the chapters illuminate in different ways a great complexity in social and cultural practices and interpretations. The gap between policies and how these are realised in educational settings is brought out.

In 'Historical Ethnography of a Multicultural Education: A Critical Memory of the 1970s-80s', Arzu Öztürkmen positions herself within a narrative tradition. The chapter explores the author's own exposure to 'multicultural' education in an Istanbul secondary girls' school, Notre Dame de Sion. The personal memories are analysed with reference to the political context of Turkey in this period and explore communal tensions about different ways of approaching 'multiculturalism'.

Annika Rabo's 'Reorganising Teacher Education in Sweden: Paradoxes of Diversity' is based on ethnographic fieldwork and the study of documents. Education, including teacher training, is analysed in this chapter as a field with strong symbolic value, and one where political competitors express their views. The focus in the chapter is on the latest reform in teacher-training education in Sweden whereby differences between the twenty odd teacher-training colleges have become more apparent than before. At the same time, there is much talk of a unified 'professional' teacher role. The professional competence of the new teachers, however, is based on their ability to reflect on themselves.

'Educating Little Soldiers and Little Ayses: Militarised and Gendered Citizenship in Turkish Textbooks', Tuba Kancı's and Ayşe Gül Altınay's contribution, is based on analyses of educational texts related to national documents and policies in a historical perspective. Their chapter explores the creation and the continuous reinforcement of the intricate link between the nation and the military in the Turkish nationalist project, by focusing on education and the different roles assigned to women and men in this endeavour. There have been both continuities and changes in how the 'military-nation' has been constructed from the 1920s until the turn of the century. Material concerning the national curricula and textbooks is analysed in the chapter, with special emphasis on a mandatory high school course dealing with military issues.

Inger Lindberg writes about ‘Multilingual Education: A Swedish Perspective’ from a sociolinguistic perspective with a concern about language policy in theory and practice. She explores the situation in Sweden where there is an official policy of embracing multilingualism, but where schools quite often retain a practice of monolingualism. The chapter argues that, as long as issues related to the language and learning of bilingual students are not considered the responsibility of all teachers, we cannot hope for any extensive improvement in the academic success of bilingual students.

In the second section, *Educational Institutions and Identity Formations*, all the contributors have conducted interviews but also utilised a variety of documents. Fatma Gök’s ‘Girls’ Institutes in the Early Period of the Turkish Republic’, scrutinises the well-known and influential, but neglected in research, ‘Girls’ Institutes’. They were established in the late 1920s as vocational schools for girls, and they have been very important for the formation of a new women’s identity in the process of the ‘modernisation’ and ‘Westernisation’ of Turkish women.

Mine Göğüş Tan’s ‘Women, Education and Development in Turkey’, deals with women and development in a broad social and economic perspective. It is also related to national policies. Ever since the Ottoman period, education has been one of the most important aims of women’s movements. Despite the gains made for women’s education, the relationship between the educational system and other institutions is highly complex and reflects gender disparities. The chapter provides a critical overview to the present situation concerning gender and education in Turkey.

The next contribution, ‘Images and Values in Textbooks and Practice: Language Courses for Immigrants in Sweden’ by Marie Carlson, not only uses interviews but also makes an analysis of textbooks and policy documents. The analysis shows how textbooks and other material are positioned in a grid of discursive practices, expressing and interacting with dominant – but changing – values, norms and ways of thinking in Swedish society. In the 1960s and 1970s the texts dealt with immigrants becoming good workers or students. In the texts from the 1990s onwards, Swedish official gender equality is evoked, and both teachers and students reflect and act upon this.

Kerstin von Brömssen’s ‘Reflections on Pupils’ Talk about Religion in Sweden’ and Aylin Akpınar’s ‘The Making of a Good Citizen and Conscious Muslim through Public Education: The Case of Imam Hatip Schools’ both interview young people about religion and education. While von Brömssen focuses on young teenagers in Swedish public schools, Akpınar has met students who have graduated from the secondary religious Imam Hatip schools. These contributions show the interrelationship between values and norms in society at large and in educational institutions. They also highlight how actors within these institutions act, react and reflect upon these values and norms.

In the third section, *Strategies for Empowerment*, the contributors devote attention to how individuals negotiate and develop strategies to survive, or succeed, within formal and informal institutions. In discursive spaces identity is seen as constituted by a process of becoming rather than as a final product.

Ann-Sofie Holm's and Elisabet Öhrn's chapter, 'Crossing boundaries? Complexities and Drawbacks to Gendered Success Stories', is based on interviews and classroom observations. This chapter draws on a study that explores the range of femininities and masculinities articulated in school settings, and the ways various groups of boys and girls are positioned. Observations and interviews have been carried out with pupils aged 15-16 from two very different local communities. In particular, the chapter explores two groups of pupils who seem to 'do' gender successfully, a group of popular girls with skills in sports, and a group of boys from an immigrant background, stressing their 'mature' interest in schoolwork. Through these examples an in-depth discussion of the complexities of doing gender in Swedish schools is brought out.

Meral Apak describes her own journey into 'IMECE: A Women's Self-Empowerment Practice in a Shantytown of Istanbul'. The chapter analyses the activities of a women's solidarity cooperative engaged in informal education in an area of Istanbul with many internal⁸ migrants. How the women participating in IMECE educational activities perceive of themselves and each other in a context of cultural, ethnic and social diversity is depicted. The chapter also depicts how literacy courses within the cooperative are given in Turkish, which is not the mother tongue of most of the participants.

Levent Soysal's '(In)formal Institution, Culture and Educating Migrant Girls: The View from Berlin' is an ethnographic study. In this chapter, migrant youth culture is examined through the lens of gender in public settings in Berlin. Two different discourses of culture are analysed. One espouses a particularistic, ethnically bounded vision in the form of timeless Turkish or Muslim traditions, while the other embraces a humanistic interpretation with a universalistic content. By focusing on how Turkish girls in public settings speak about their 'problems as women', the chapter stresses that publicly available discourses provide these young women with a language to articulate issues otherwise not spoken about.

Ove Sernhede's – 'Microphone Prophets and Schooling Outside School: The Global Tribe of Hip Hop and Immigrant Youth in "the New Sweden"' – focuses on young people with an immigrant background in a suburb of Göteborg engaged in local and cosmopolitan expressions of hip hop culture. The chapter is based on a long-term engagement and observation of about 60 young people who define themselves as a 'new underclass'. This group, it is argued, can be seen as a kind of alternative school or as an arena for informal learning, and the members can be analysed as 'organic' intellectuals, developing a critical theory of the street.

Appendices 1 and 2, finally, are short accounts of the particular problematic issues in Turkish and Swedish educational histories, respectively.

⁸ In Turkish contexts a distinction is made between internal and external migration. However, when talking about 'migrants' in a general way, especially in the big cities, one often actually refers to 'internal' migration. These internal migrants in Apak's case, as she writes in her contribution, were, for example, from a Kurdish, Alevi or conservative Sunni background as well as Roma and Bulgarian immigrants.

Intersecting perspectives

The debates about universal, free and unified formal education in Turkey and Sweden in the early decades of the 19th century were set against the backdrop of a very heterogeneous educational situation. Now we are again in this volume facing that educational heterogeneity in the two countries. In Turkey private schools are (re-)appearing at an increasing speed (Acar and Ayata 2002), and in Sweden the number of publicly funded, but privately run, so-called ‘free schools’ is increasing (cf. Gerle 1999, Kjellman 2001, Gustafsson 2004). The restructuring of education is often discussed as a response to, or as part of the preparation for, an inevitable ‘global competition’, and the shift towards neo-liberal economic policies, as discussed by Gök and Rabo in their contributions.⁹ In Sweden the restructuring is also discussed in terms of ‘better quality’, but also strongly linked to a discourse of ‘efficiency’. In many ways we find ourselves facing similar problems and debating similar issues as the pedagogues, intellectuals and politicians of the 19th century. What is the purpose of basic education? Should we liberate the individual for the good of herself/himself or for the betterment of society? What is the betterment of society? Should schools have maximum mix and heterogeneity or should ‘minorities’ be protected in their own educational institutions? Should girls and boys receive the same education in the same schools? What is the role of the family in education? What is the role of informal education in societies where formal credentials are of the utmost importance?

Education is still, even in this ‘global’ era, formed in very national contexts. The actors appearing in our various contributions – school pupils, young and adult course-participants, teenagers in and out of school, women and men, teachers and educational administrators – are part of, and articulate, discourses within the ‘Turkish’ and ‘Swedish’ contexts described above. Even if educational issues are spread through international pedagogical debates, as was the case a century and a half ago, or through transnational migration, they are still locally and nationally interpreted and applied. Education is still a highly morally charged endeavour. We do not see ourselves as neutral observers, but rather, through our research, want to contribute to the discussion on the shaping of and the change in education. In the following we utilise class, gender and ethnicity as analytical tools in our endeavour to sort and tease out the gist of the arguments in the various chapters.

Class

In both Turkey and Sweden, researchers, politicians and citizens at large are concerned about inequalities in basic education. The century-old visions of equal access to basic education on the part of citizens, and the ideal of equal quality of education, seem as radical today as when they were first presented. According to some, the visions were never realised, while for others the

⁹ See Mitchell (2003) for an interesting analysis of the relationship between neo-liberalism and educational changes in England, Canada and the United States. See also Apple (2005) and Carlson (2004) for a discussion on franchising /market mechanisms with respect to ‘democratic’ values in education.

inequalities of contemporary societies are qualitatively different from those found a century ago. The great homogenising and equalising school reform of the late 1950s in Sweden, for example, made nine years of formal education mandatory for all pupils within a united, common school. Education was quite similar in urban centres and rural areas. The ruling Social Democratic party saw this reform as essential to enhance the social mobility of children from working-class families. The reform was framed within strongly egalitarian ideals. But there is still a concern in Sweden that class – typically classified according to the education of one’s parents – continues to play a major role in the educational choices of teenagers during secondary and tertiary education. As noted above, however, ‘ethnicity’ has become the lens through which educational inequalities are both looked at and explained, in contemporary Sweden. Ove Sernhede places his informants from the ‘tribe’ of hip hop in a Swedish suburb, firmly in a context of increased economic inequalities in Europe. But the ‘tribesmen’ he describes and analyses articulate a belonging not to a Swedish working-class, but rather to an immigrant semi-proletariat within a ‘global’ framework. In Ann-Sofie Holm’s and Elisabet Öhrn’s chapter, the ‘immigrant’ boys and middle-class girls are contrasted with each other in providing educational success stories. The latter described how they behaved rather ‘like boys’ in being competitive in sports but also successful in schoolwork, while the former stressed that they had distanced themselves from their old friends in the suburb populated by immigrants. Instead, they tried to follow the advice of their parents by taking formal education seriously.

In the Turkish contributions, class differences are more directly in focus. Meral Apak describes her own involvement in a women’s cooperative in a shantytown of Istanbul. This grew out of a class- and gender-based concern with the inequalities facing many female migrants from rural districts in Turkey, who often work as maids in the homes of others, in unregulated workshops, or doing piecework in their own homes. In this cooperative, ‘education’ encompasses both formal and informal aspects, with courses in literacy, health and job-training. In her chapter Aylin Akpınar discusses Imam Hatip schools as especially recruiting teenagers with a rural or working-class background (cf. Acar and Ayata 2002). A totally different class context is given by Arzu Öztürkmen, who describes and analyses her own education in Notre Dame de Sion, a private school where the main medium of instruction was French. Although gender is the salient variable in their chapters, both Mine Göğüş Tan and Fatma Gök stress the importance of education as an instrument of, and a means towards, social mobility.

Gender

In both Sweden and Turkey, girls and boys have the same right to basic education. In Sweden, however, girls and women are, as discussed by Rabo, Holm and Öhrn, more (formally) educated than boys. In Turkey, there are a large number of well qualified women who have found their way into professions that are often difficult for women to enter in many other European countries. However, on the mandatory level girls are not fully participating. Tan shows that rural girls do not attend school to the same extent as boys, and

explains this in terms of structural obstacles and cultural ideals. To improve the educational situation for women generally in Turkey, she stresses that power relations between men and women, among other things, need to be changed and she asks for educational reforms.

In the republican Kemalist ideology, differences between women and men/girls and boys were downplayed in certain circumstances, not least the educational. Similar ideas were found in Sweden in this period. Girls and boys had similar intellectual capabilities and capacities, it was said, and girls and women were typically seen as an untapped resource. In Turkey, as in many other countries, women were regarded as the symbols of the underdevelopment of the nation. In order for the nation to become 'modern' and 'healthy', women had to be emancipated and educated (cf. Kandiyoti 1991). The young Turkish Republic established special Girls' Institutes as a vanguard institution to cultivate the 'new' Turkish woman who was to act as a role model for the 'secularised and Westernised' woman of the Kemalist era. In Fatma Gök's chapter about the history and development of these institutes, she claims that graduates through their 'new' identity came to legitimise state power. Similarities between women and men, however, had a limit. Women were supposed to support the change of locus of patriarchy from the family to the state.¹⁰ Women were prised out of their families and homes, and asked to serve the nation, but mainly as 'new and modern' mothers and wives who knew how to be clean, orderly, neat and organised, and who knew how to lay a table and cook a French dinner!

But not all in Turkey became inoculated with the values of this 'new modern woman'. Throughout the history of the modern republic other women and men have stressed the very different 'natures' of girls and boys.¹¹ In the Imam Hatip schools, dealt with in Aylin Akpınar's chapter, women and men are trained to have different roles in society. It is highly interesting, therefore, that many girls from a so-called 'traditional family background' choose these schools in order to further their educational opportunities, and enable them to enter university. These girls phrase their educational commitment in terms of a 'superior' morality based on Islam, where the family is always their priority. Acar and Ayata (2002: 108) argue, in a comparison between a private and an Imam Hatip secondary school, that the gender-segregated education in the latter may liberate the female students within the confines of religiously sanctioned tradition, while in the private school the competitive atmosphere in reality makes male values the norm.¹² Tuba Kancı and Ayşe Gül Altınay scrutinise ideas and formations of masculinities and femininities in Turkey through an analysis of textbooks. Their chapter shows the processes through which citizenship becomes gendered in educational discourses.

¹⁰ See Hirdman (1989) for an analysis of the early Social Democratic views on gender equality and its limits, Bäck-Wiklund (2002) for an analysis of the complex relationship between the Swedish state and Swedish families, and Rabo (1996) for a comparison between 'state feminism' and 'state patriarchy' in Syria and Jordan.

¹¹ The stress on the different natures of girls and boys also came out in a Swedish government report in 1993. Within the parameters of official gender equality policy, the report leaned on biological models. For critique and discussion see Rabo (1997) and Öhrn (2000).

¹² The article actually compares three secondary schools, a private, an Imam Hatip and an 'ordinary' public school, where each exhibits a different gender regime.

Sweden, like Turkey, officially espouses gender equality, and in Sweden it has become an important, hard-to-question, ideology. In the 1980s researchers stressed that, although girls and boys were equal, girls were disadvantaged due to biased gender patterns in school. Remedies were discussed and projects were instigated in order to redress perceived imbalances. Research from the early 21st century, however, has made this picture more complicated. Now there is talk of ‘the new girl’. This girl is self-confident, ‘takes what she wants’ and is academically ‘more successful’ than the boy. Elisabet Öhrn’s and Ann-Sofie Holm’s chapter is situated in this debate. They, however, underline that there is no single femininity in Swedish schools, just as there is no single masculinity. The idea of a very Swedish gender equality is highlighted in Marie Carlson’s chapter on the encounters within Swedish language courses for immigrants. There are pictures of ‘the ideal’ Swedish man, dressed in an apron and doing the dishes, in textbooks for immigrants. With the help of such images and textual material as well as educational practices, the Swedish educators articulate the need for course participants to embrace ‘Swedish’ gender equality. Carlson, however, argues that the Turkish women in her study object to these preconceived notions. Although they take these pictures as true representations of Swedish gender relations, they do not talk of themselves as traditional and in need of ‘Swedish’ liberation. Actually they see themselves as both ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ bearers of the values of ‘their own’ tradition (cf. Carlson 2006). Hence, both Turkey and Sweden have national masculine ideals and myths – one based on the idealised military man, the other on the idealised house-cleaning man!

Another paradox of Swedish gender equality is brought out by Annika Rabo in her chapter on teacher education in Sweden. Men and women are supposedly equal, and merit, rather than sex, should govern entry into university education. But in teacher-training colleges, for example, ‘too many’ women cause great worry and alarm. The vast majority in the teaching profession and in teacher-training colleges are women. At the same time, educationalists and politicians claim that boys in school need male role models. Some claim that boys perform less well in schools today because education has become a female arena.¹³ The idea that only men can properly represent boys in school is voiced not only by men but also by women. Many female teachers also claim that their professional status has decreased because of the lack of men. In teacher-training colleges, Rabo points out, women educators demean their own professional capabilities by claiming that they need more male colleagues. In Imam Hatip schools, as described by Aylin Akpınar, female teachers are as essential as male, but although they perform similar tasks in schools, the natures of women and men are considered to be very different.

Ethnicity

Gender intersects with ethnicity in Levent Soysal’s account of young Turkish immigrant women in Berlin. He has followed them into informal educational

¹³ See Björnsson (2005) for discussion in Sweden and Phoenix (2003) for a discussion about Britain. Both authors problematise the issue of gender and performance.

settings provided by different non-governmental organisations. One organisation aimed to raise gender consciousness and encouraged the young women to narrate their particular experiences of patriarchal family life among Turkish immigrants. There was a strong and preconceived notion, comparable to that described by Carlson for Sweden, that women in the Turkish family needed to be 'saved' by notions of healthy gender relations 'propagated' by the majority. Interestingly, dominant ideologies in Sweden, Germany and Turkey are similar, with a preoccupation with a healthy family life. In contemporary Turkey the object of this preoccupation is the (rural) internal migrants, while in Sweden it is the 'immigrant', and in Germany it is typically the immigrant Turk. The avenues for communal organisation and informal education, described by Soysal, occur within a Berlin context where Turkish migrants often live in geographically and ethnically homogeneous quarters. These migrants, making up more than two million, constitute the single most important 'foreign' category in Germany.

Until the late 1990s Germany was officially not a country of immigration (Castles and Miller 2003: 199), and it was exceedingly difficult for a person of Turkish origin to become a German citizen, even if she or he had been born in Germany. Sweden has had policies which differ from those of Germany in that migrants – whether as workers as in the 1960s and early 1970s, as refugees as in the 1980s and 1990s, or for purposes of family reunification – obtain citizenship quite easily. Even as permanent residents they share most basic rights with Swedish citizens. Housing in Sweden is also much less 'ethnically'/nationally homogeneous than in Germany, with one exception. Many suburbs surrounding the larger cities are populated by people with highly heterogeneous backgrounds in terms of languages spoken, faiths and countries of birth. But the 'native Swedes' often live in 'ethnically segregated' areas. The heterogeneous suburbs are talked about as 'immigrant-thick' in Swedish, although others – as a counter-discourse – try to put forward 'Swedish-thin' as a more appropriate label. It is in such a locality that the young people in Ove Sernhede's chapter live and act out their hop-hop lifestyle. This is their turf, where a particular kind of heterogeneous non-Swedish 'immigrant' ethnicity emerges.

Sernhede mainly depicts the world of boys and young men and how they articulate global links and local concerns. Formal school education is superfluous, or uninteresting, but a sense of responsibility is expressed among the older boys towards the younger. The older teach the younger history, religious values and morality connected with the backgrounds of their families. In doing so, they express their lack of faith in the formal education in the suburb, yet a faith in learning and in knowledge as such. Although the hip hop groups see themselves, and are seen, as a rebellious counter-culture, the social relations developed seem closely patterned on the values of the 'good family'.

In Sweden there is a worry in public debates that 'immigrant boys' are unruly and anti-social, and that neither school nor their families can discipline them. In the material presented by Ann-Sofie Holm and Elisabet Öhrn another picture emerges. They analyse the talk of 'immigrant boys' who state that they have changed from being here-and-now-oriented to a future-and-school orientation.

These boys of Middle Eastern background express very strong bonds with their families and describe their new efforts in school as a way of ‘paying back’ what their families sacrificed for them by migrating to Sweden.

Kancı and Altınay scrutinise the history thesis developed in the early 1930s, whereby Turks were privileged as agents of civilisation. This thesis was very important in shaping a particular kind of ethnicity and nationality. With this idea, exclusion from and inclusion in the nation were developed. The new republic was, however, multiethnic and multilingual, creating a lack of ‘perfect’ fit between citizenship and nationality/ethnicity. Up to the present, Turkey has been plagued by the unresolved tension between who to include and exclude in the body national. Kancı and Altınay argue that, in the mandatory military course outlined above, this lack of fit is particularly problematic. There is no place for the non-(ethnic) Turk in this curriculum. Notre Dame de Sion, the school where Öztürkmen was a pupil in the 1970s and 1980s, had, as described earlier, students from a variety of linguistic and religious backgrounds. She depicts how her own understanding of girls speaking different languages at home and celebrating different religious holidays, emerges through interaction in school. These differences were not brought out in the curricula or by the teachers or school leaders. Instead, the pupils experienced differences and similarities in their daily practices. The picture given by Kancı and Altınay is rather bleak, stressing the obstacles to an all-inclusive education on a national policy level. In Öztürkmen’s narration, on the other hand, while not idealising the circumstances in this elite girls’ school, a daily *de facto* ‘multicultural’ co-existence emerges.

The intersection between class, gender and ethnicity in educational settings varies in the different contributions. But there are still, as already mentioned, clear patterns depending on the national context. The Turkish contributors highlight the large differences between rural and urban education and the need to develop education for rural internal migrants in the large cities. In the Swedish contributions it is rather the non-Swedish migrants who are faced with difficulties or deprivations in the educational system. In the Turkish contributions the rural-urban division also has a strong class aspect, where rural inhabitants and rural migrants to the cities are almost by definition working class or semi-proletariat. In Sweden, it is the immigrant who fills this position.

The Swedish contributions emphasise that ‘multiculturalism’ is an official ideology also within education. This ideology, however, is typically perceived as causing problems and difficulties when interpreted in schools. How can teachers learn to be sensitive towards the great variety in faiths and national feelings found in many classrooms? (cf. Sleeter and McLaren 1995, Feinberg 1998, Roth 1999). How, for example, should mother tongue instruction be organised when there can be fifty different languages in one school? Multilingualism as a challenge to the educational system is brought out by Inger Lindberg in her contribution. Although mother tongue instruction is a right, almost half of the pupils entitled to it do not, in fact, follow such courses. There is criticism in Sweden concerning the ways and means of instruction, and in media debates there are many politicians and experts who claim that ‘good and

proper Swedish' is the only way for immigrant children with other mother tongues to succeed in the Swedish school system, and later in society (cf. Milani 2006b). On the part of many educationalists, politicians and citizens at large, attitudes towards language in Sweden today are intimately linked to perceptions and understandings of the Swedish self. This national self often becomes pitted against 'the Other'; the immigrant. The course participants with a Turkish background in Carlson's chapter, for example, are not viewed as modern and critically reflecting individuals. Kerstin von Brömssen also brings up this theme in her discussion about 'immigrant' children in Swedish schools.

Education within the national context and beyond

When mandatory education was spread around the globe, as an idea and as practice, this was a revolutionary invention. Universal education became the means of liberating the individual, but at the same time the means of preparing her for a suitable and distinctly modern life within the nation-state; a nation-state which was developing concomitantly with the modern citizen. But just as the 'right' kind of pupil has to be moulded in the school, the 'right' kind of education has to be constructed. Modern formal education within the nation-state reflects the complex interrelations between the individual citizen and the state. We are formed by national policies concerning education, by curricula and textbooks, and by the daily interaction in classrooms and schools (cf. Schiffauer et al. 2004). As individuals attending school, we are formed by these experiences, but we also take part in forming and shaping this setting.

A recurring theme in the pedagogical debates and in policy documents in Turkey and Sweden is 'to place the pupil at the centre of attention'. However, in both countries, there has been and still is a tension in formal education between the promises of personal liberation and the ongoing exclusionary processes. In this volume we point to this in terms of class, gender and ethnicity. We also stress the unequal access to the arenas where policies are formulated and the arenas where they are realised and interpreted. Despite often good intentions, unequal power relations within education have been hard to eradicate. In Sweden the education system from pre-school to university is permeated by the ideal of 'a critical and reflecting individual'. This discourse, however, cannot be questioned in a critical and reflecting way, as shown in some of the contributions in this volume. If you do not articulate views in the correct 'Swedish' way you may be excluded and stigmatised. In Turkish debates, on the contrary, there is a critique of the lack of critical reflections in educational settings (Salmoni 2004).

However, despite misgivings and shortcomings, both countries can still be characterised by a common belief in 'more and better' education, which is still seen as a remedy for many social and economic problems. In Sweden national education is set in the global market. Within the neo-liberal discourse, citizens have to be competitive in order for the country to survive in the 'new competitive' world. In such an atmosphere, 'global' skills – the ability to speak many languages, the ability to mix and mingle in a variety of social and

cultural settings, and the ability to be flexible and constantly learn anew – are highly valued. But these abilities are defined in a rather narrow manner. Multilingual immigrants speaking, for example, Swedish, Turkish and Arabic are not considered as able as those speaking only Swedish and English. Nor are they considered particularly ‘globally’ connected despite their often extensive transnational connections. In contemporary Turkey, there are private educational institutions preparing students for the Anglophone ‘global’ market (cf. Acar and Ayata 2002), but there are also Turkish educational institutions based on Islamic ideals, which are exported to Central Asia, for example (cf. Turam 2005). Global education, global values and global connections thus come in various shapes. As we see it, there are two great challenges to contemporary national education. The first is to grasp that all students are not globally connected in similar ways, and the second is to elaborate and support our motto of ‘All are Different, All are the Same’. We hope this volume can sustain these challenges.

References

- Acar, Feride and Ayata, Ayşe. 2002. ‘Discipline, success and stability. The reproduction of gender and class in Turkish secondary education’. In: D. Kandiyoti & A. Saktanber (eds), *Fragments of Culture. The Everyday of Modern Turkey*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp. 90-111.
- Ahmad, Feroz. 1993/1996 *The Making of Modern Turkey*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Appiah, Kwame, A. 1994. ‘Identity, authenticity, survival: Multicultural societies and social reproduction’. In: A. Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Apple, Michael W. 2005. ‘Are markets in education democratic? Neoliberal globalism, vouchers and the politics of choice’. In: M. W. Apple, J. Kenway & M. Singh, *Globalizing Education – Policies, Pedagogies, & Politics*. Studies in the Postmodern Theory of Education. New York, Washington, DC and Baltimore: Peter Lang.
- Bäck-Wiklund, Margareta. 2002. ‘The family and the welfare state. A route to defamilialization’. In: Rita Liljeström & Elisabeth Özdalga (ed.), *Autonomy and Dependence in the Family. Turkey and Sweden in Critical Perspective*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, Vol. 11, pp. 157-175.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2002 *The Claims of Culture. Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Björnsson, Mats. 2005. *Kön och skolframgång: tolkningar och perspektiv*. Myndigheten för skolutveckling. www.skolutveckling.se/publikationer
- Boli, John. 1989. *New Citizens for a New Society. The Institutional Origins of Mass Schooling in Sweden*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel and Kasaba, Resat. 1997. *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Carlson, Marie. 2004. ‘The Restructuring of Swedish Adult Education: The involvement of economists and politicians in education policy’. In: G. Troman, B. Jeffrey & G. Walford (eds), *Identity, Agency and Social Institutions in Educational Ethnography*. Studies in Educational Ethnography, Vol 10. Oxford: Elsevier JAI.
- Carlson, Marie. 2006. ‘Immigrant Women within Swedish language instruction: Contradictions and transgressions’. In: Justyna Sempruch, Katharina Willems & Laura Shook (eds), *Multiple Marginalities: An Intercultural Dialogue on Gender in Education*. Königstein: Helmer Verlag.

- Castles, Stephen and Miller, Mark. J. 2003. *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*. 3rd edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ceylan, Deniz Tarba and Irzık, Gürol (eds), 2004. *Human Rights in Textbooks: The Turkish Case*. Istanbul: The History Foundation of Turkey.
- Ds 2000: 43. *Begreppet invandrare – användning i myndigheters verksamhet*.
- Feinberg, Walter. 1998. *Common Schools, Uncommon Identities*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gerle, Elisabeth. 1999. *Mångkulturalism – för vem? Debatten om muslimska och kristna friskolor blottlägger värdekonflikter i det svenska samhället: om Sverige i förändring*. Nora: Nya Doxa.
- Gustafsson, Kristina. 2004. *Muslimsk skola, svenska villkor. Konflikt, identitet och förhandling*. Umeå: Boréa.
- Gutmann, Amy (ed.). 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hirdman, Yvonne. 1989. *Att lägga livet tillrätta. Studier i svensk folkhemspolitik*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Kandiyoti, Deniz. 1991. *Women, Islam and the State*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Kjellman, Ann-Christin. 2001. "Hurra för valfriheten"... Men vad skall vi välja? *Val av grundskola i Stockholm åren 1994-96*. Stockholm: HLS förlag.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship. A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, John. W. et al. 1992. *School Knowledge for the Masses. World Models and National Primary Curricular Categories in the Twentieth Century*. Washington DC: The Falmer Press.
- Milani, Thommaso. 2006a. 'Language planning and national identity in Sweden: A performativity approach'. In: C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (eds), *Language Ideologies, Policies and Practices: Language and the Future of Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 104-117.
- Milani, Thommaso. 2006b. 'Voices of endangerment: A language ideological debate on the Swedish language'. In: M. Heller & A. Duchêne (eds), *Discourses of Endangerment: Ideology and Interest in the Defence of Languages*. London: Continuum.
- Mitchell, Katharyne. 2003. 'Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* NS 28, pp. 387-403.
- Öhrn, Elisabet. 2000. 'Changing patterns? Reflections on contemporary Swedish research and debate on gender and education'. *NORA* Vol. 8, No 3, pp. 128-136.
- Özdalga, Elisabeth. 1999. 'Education in the name of "Order and Progress": Reflections on the Recent Eight Year Obligatory School Reform in Turkey', *The Muslim World*, Vol. 89, pp. 414-438.
- Phoenix, Anne. 2003. 'Neoliberalism and masculinity', *Youth and Society*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 227-246.
- Rabo, Annika. 1996. 'Gender, state and civil society in Jordan and Syria'. In: C. Hann & E. Dunn (eds), *Civil Society. Challenging Western Models*. London: Routledge, pp. 155-177.
- Rabo, Annika. 1997. 'Free to make the right choice? Gender equality policy in post-welfare Sweden'. In: C. Shore & S. Wright (eds), *Anthropology of Policy. Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. London: Routledge, pp. 107-135.
- Roth, Hans-Ingvar. 1999. *The Multicultural Park. A Study of Common values at School and in Society*. Stockholm: Skolverket.

- Salmoni, Barak. 2004. 'Turkish nationalist educational thinking in the last Ottoman decade: Run-up to Republican pedagogy', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, No. 31, Fall, pp. 39-70.
- Sarioğlu, Irini. 2004. *Turkish Policy towards Greek Education in Istanbul 1923-1974. Secondary Education and Cultural Identity*. Athens: The Hellenic Literary and Historical Archive.
- Schiffauer, Werner, G. Baumann, R. Kastoryano & S. Vertovec (eds). 2004. *Civil Enculturation – Nation-State, School and Ethnic Difference in The Netherlands, Britain, Germany and France*. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Sleeter, Christine E. & Peter L. McLaren (eds). 1995. *Multicultural Education, Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Difference*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin. 2001. *The modernization of public education in the Ottoman Empire, 1839-1908: Islamization, autocracy, and discipline*. Leiden: Brill.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin. 2005. 'Christian community schools during the Ottoman reform period'. In: Elisabeth Özdalga (ed.), *Late Ottoman Society. The Intellectual Legacy*. London: Routledge Curzon, pp. 254-273.
- Stroud, Christopher. 2004. 'Rinkeby Swedish and semilingualism in language ideological debates: A Bourdieuan perspective'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 196-214.
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. 'The Politics of Recognition'. In: A. Gutmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Turam, Berna. 2005. 'What does the secular state have to do with revivalist Islam? The Turkish case and the Gülen movement.' In: A. Rabo & B. Utaş (eds), *The Role of the State in West Asia*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, Vol. 14 I, pp. 49-61.
- Üsdiken, Behlül. 2004. 'The French, the German and the American: Higher education for business in Turkey, 1883-2003', *New Perspectives on Turkey*, No. 31, pp. 5-38.
- Winter, Michael. 1984. 'The modernization of education in Kemalist Turkey'. In: Jacob M. Landau (ed.), *Ataturk and the Modernization of Turkey*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 183-194.
- Yapp, M.E. 1987. *The Making of the Modern Near East 1792-1923*. London: Longman.