

Citizenship and Citizenship Education According to the Perspective of Non-Muslim Minorities in Turkey*

Zafer İbrahimođlu^a

Marmara University

Ali Yılmaz^b

Marmara University

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to put forth the opinions and expectations of non-Muslim minorities concerning citizenship and citizenship education in Turkey. The research included three minority groups that have been officially recognized in Turkey: Orthodox Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. The qualitative method was adopted and the snowball sampling technique was used to select the participants. Semi-structured interviews were used as a data collection tool, and discussions based on the research questions were held during face-to-face interviews with the participants. The data accumulated during the semi-structured interviews was transcribed. After all the interviews had been written down, the texts were checked more than once and a holistic view was targeted concerning the issue. In the study, the content analysis method was used as a data analysis tool while notes from the interviews were analyzed categorically together with the questions that the participants had been asked. Considering the data gathered in this study, although the non-Muslim minorities had a certain number of suggestions and criticisms regarding citizenship and citizenship education policies that have been implemented in Turkey, these policies can be said to have generally reached a more positive point compared to the situation in the past.

Keywords: Citizenship • Citizenship education • Coursebook • Minority

* This study was produced from the primary author's doctoral thesis

a Corresponding author

Zafer İbrahimođlu (PhD), Social Studies Education Department, Ataturk Faculty of Education, Marmara University, Istanbul 34722 Turkey

Email: zafer.ibrahimoglu@marmara.edu.tr

b Ali Yılmaz (PhD), Social Studies Education Department, Ataturk Faculty of Education, Marmara University, Istanbul 34722 Turkey

Email: ayilmaz@marmara.edu.tr

The concept of citizenship, which has come to the foreground as a significant part of political and social life, has been the focal point of many discussions which consider this concept to be important. Citizenship became a debated subject in the process of history after factors affecting the relationship between governments and individuals diversified, and these diversifications have been the main topic debated all around the world. Within this framework, one of the most important developments concerning citizenship is undoubtedly the formation of nation states. This formation has come to the forefront almost simultaneously with the institutionalization of citizenship, and has brought a brand new understanding to political life. The political world that was previously acquainted with imperialism, city-states, and feudalism, has now become acquainted with a new political understanding constructed around nations that had already existed or those that were formed later on (Şener, 2014). The concept of a nation state first came forward in Western Europe, and then spread quickly all over the world. In the present day, most countries that are members of the United Nations have a nation-state structure.

The issue of minorities has a special place in history, while the nation-state structure has created many discussions concerning the issue of citizenship. Nation states, which came into existence in countries that had been deeply affected by the nationalist movement, especially after the French Revolution, use the concept of minorities to describe “other natives” whose origins remain outside the borders drawn by a nation. In this process, the concepts of “us” and “the others” have gained new meaning in which groups that don’t belong to the nation state have been given the status of minority.

One of the countries that experienced the process of nation building is Turkey. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, the War of Independence ended up victorious and a new state was formed on the land that had been acquired from the war. The founders of the new state were inspired with the new nation-state system of its age and decided to adopt this system, unlike their ancestors who had adopted emperorship (Güldiken, 2006). The Turkish Republic tried to form its citizenship policy according to the concept of a nation state. Within this framework, the homogenization of society and gathering everybody around the Turk nation became the main purpose for the founders of the Republic of Turkey (Özdoğan, 2015; Polat, 2011). Many instruments were used to homogenize society and gather people around Turk culture, education

being one of the most significant instruments (İnce, 2012, p. 119). Within the framework of citizenship education, students are expected to acclimate to Turkish national culture in courses such as civics and history (from the Curriculum of the First School in the Republic of Turkey [Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Maarif Vekâleti], 1930).

The attitude towards minorities in Turkey during the process of building a nation state actually was not very clear. The French understanding of nation state was generally adopted, while the German model was sometimes implemented. However, in both practices, many debates and discussions occurred, and the place and status of minorities within the Turkish nation state were not clarified. As a result of this uncertainty, for the minorities living in the Turkish nation state, the adventure has been witness to a period full of ups and downs. Within this scope, although all constitutions that have been created since 1923 emphasize equality between all citizens without any mention of discrimination, within some acts and defacto practices are some cases against minorities (Smith, 2005, p. 449). The population of minorities that have contributed much to the country during the formation of the Turkish Republic has gradually been decreasing up to the present as a result of mass external migrations.

Minorities continue to live in Turkey as a part of the current country even though their population and influence on social and economic life have decreased. Three groups of minorities have been officially recognized: Orthodox Greeks, Armenians, and Jews. Among these groups, Greeks constitute the lowest percentage of the minority population. Around 2,000 Greeks are thought to be in Turkey, mostly living in İstanbul’s Balat, Fener, and Kumkapı neighborhoods (Vasiliadis, 2005). The population of the other minority group, the Jews, is approximately 20,000 in Turkey. Most of them live in İstanbul, while small groups of Jews also live in other provinces such as Bursa. The largest minority group that lives in Turkey are the Armenians (Özdoğan & Kılıçdağı, 2012). Almost 60,000 Armenians are thought to currently live in Turkey. Like other minority groups, the Armenian community mostly lives in İstanbul, but Armenian communities are also found in other cities across Turkey.¹

With their current presence and historical background, minorities are a social reality of Turkey. According to the current Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, all citizens of the Turkish

¹ Turkey: A Minority Policy of Systematic Negation. International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights. 2006.

Republic are equal before the law and nobody can be subjected to any discriminatory treatment based on individual differences.² The principle of equality between citizens guaranteed under the constitution is also an important factor that affects the way citizens feel in relation to the country. Individuals who think they are being subjected to discriminatory treatment because of different religious or ethnic backgrounds can have difficulty feeling that they belong to their country. However, the concept of belonging is one of the main topics related to discussions about citizenship. States try to educate students from early childhood through higher grade levels with citizenship education courses in schools in order for them to gain this sense of belonging (Osler & Starkey, 2001; Philippou, 2007). Not only students who belong to the majority but also those who belong to minority groups are acquainted with this kind of citizenship and citizenship education policy, which includes amendments especially in curriculum and coursebooks.³ The following question comes to mind here. Do the policies concerning citizenship and citizenship education as adopted by the state really appeal to citizens who are considered to be minorities? To be more precise, does the state accept minorities as official citizens and design their educational goals accordingly?

If one wants to analyze the policies of citizenship and citizenship education in Turkey concerning citizens who are recognized as minorities, one should first seek answers to these questions and then establish whether or not minorities are taken into consideration in the policies implemented in Turkey regarding citizenship and citizenship education. This will also provide significant data for describing the attitudes toward minorities as maintained by the political system in Turkey.

Even though much research has been conducted in Turkey concerning policies on citizenship and citizenship education, that there have been very few books dealing with policies concerning non-Muslim minorities is clear. Within this scope, research in this field generally deals with minorities as a historical image by examining important events that have influenced each minority group in

the past. In this context, Armenians can be said to have been relatively more discussed in researches than other minority communities. One of the most extensive studies on Armenians was a study titled "Armenians in Turkey: Community, Individual, Citizen" conducted by Özdoğan, Üstel, Karakaşlı, and Kentel (2009). This research focused on the political and cultural history of Turkish Armenians and questioned their experiences related to religion, language, and other cultural elements. The citizenship aspect of the research was constructed on two basic foundations. Firstly, Armenian attitudes toward the state were described based on military service and choice of profession. Secondly, the majority attitude towards Armenians was described through a number of variables. Özdoğan et al.'s research, which portrayed the current Armenian community in Turkey based on cultural existence and intercultural dialogue, is considered significant even though it barely touched the issue of citizenship. It lacked sufficient content in terms of citizenship and citizenship education, putting emphasis on cultural existence. Another substantial research about Armenians was "Armenians in Turkey Today," a postgraduate thesis written by Ergüney (2009). In this study, the writer attempted to describe the minority community in question via sociological and cultural terms; it provided some statistical data and information about the current situation of institutions. Although it included significant data, it did not have detailed content about the aspects of citizenship and citizenship education. One of the rare studies that have examined Turkey's Armenians in terms of citizenship was a field study led by Norzartok (2007).⁴ The survey method was used in this study as a data collection tool. In the first stage, it presented the opinions of Armenian participants as citizens of the Turkish Republic on contemporary problems in Turkey and in the second stage it put forth the cultural aspect of living in Turkey as an Armenian. However, the fact that the survey method had been adopted as a data collection tool made this research superficial in revealing the participants' experiences. It also could not present strong data concerning the aspect of citizenship education. Yet another research dealing with the demands of Armenians concerning citizenship policies in Turkey was conducted by Erdoğan and Kılıçdağı (2012). This research, "Hearing Out Turkey's Armenians: Problems, Demands, and Suggestions for Solutions," addressed the problems of Armenians in Turkey regarding cultural and

2 Turkish Republic Constitution, Article 10.

3 Some Armenian students have met with former Education Minister Ömer DİNÇER to request the removal of discriminatory and racist remarks in some coursebooks that are studied in schools in Turkey. In his statement, the minister said that coursebooks would be thoroughly scanned, and if detected, these remarks would be removed from the books. <http://ns1.agos.com.tr/haber.php?seo=ders-kitaplarindaki-dusman-ifadeleri-dincere-verdiler&haberid=445>; www.aksam.com.tr/siyaset/ders-kitaplarindan-irkci-ifadeler-ayiklanacak.

4 <http://www.norzartok.org/?p=69>

political citizenship and suggested solutions to these problems. The study touched on the daily activities of Turkey's Armenians and presented suggestions for solving the existing problems. Although there was a part regarding the educational aspect of citizenship, it superficially talked about the opinions and expectations concerning citizenship education, mainly describing problems in minority schools. Another survey portraying the socio-cultural state of Turkey's Armenians as a minority group was performed by Hofmann (2002). Hofmann first provided readers with historical background information about Turkish Armenians and then talked about problems faced by Armenians, mentioning the contemporary issues of 2002 with a focus on solutions to these problems. The writer, who dealt with this topic under three general headings, discussed the problems experienced by Armenians in religious, educational, and financial fields, as well as discussing suitable solutions to these problems in her own way. The findings gathered in her research from 13 years ago were found to be important, especially because it had compared today with the past and these findings were comparatively analyzed with the findings obtained in the discussion and conclusion sections of the research. Apart from these studies that had briefly touched on the aspect of citizenship, there have been some other researches indirectly related to citizenship. In one such study by Derkarabetian and Balian (1992) titled "Ingroup, Outgroup, and Global-Human Identities of Turkish-Armenians," 70 Armenian participants stated their opinion on Armenian's perception of identity in Turkey. Considering the results obtained in the study, it is thought that some deductions could be reached regarding citizenship policies in Turkey. After all, when the literature concerning the issue in question is analyzed as a whole, the opinions and expectations about citizenship and citizenship education policies practiced in Turkey as far as Armenians were not found to have been sufficiently expressed by the participants in researches that partially touch on the aspect of citizenship (Komşuoğlu, 2007; Matevosyan, 2010; Metin, 2007; Muratyan, 2011; Örs, 2010; Tansel, 2009; Yeşiltepe, 2008).⁵

When the literature is analyzed regarding Greeks, another minority group officially recognized in Turkey, the studies were seen to mainly be about the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, the Greek Orthodox Halki Seminary, and the Sept. 6th and 7th events of

1955. When the position of Greeks in studies related to citizenship and citizenship education in Turkey are looked at, they can be said to be far more behind Armenians concerning the same issue. Very few studies on citizenship touch upon Greeks, while fewer studies touch upon this group of minorities concerning citizenship education. Within this framework, a research titled "The Minority Regime Implemented in Turkey Particularly in the Case of the Greek Minority" was performed by Duran and Ardemir (2005). This research provided a portrayal of the journey towards citizenship for Turkey's Greeks, yet it fell short of expectations as it was only about certain historical events in the Republic Era. Tarhan (2006) performed another study on Turkey's Greeks entitled "Problems for the Greek Minority from 1950 to the Present and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate." This research also did not provide sufficient data about the current presence of the Greeks of Turkey and did not extend beyond historical information. One of the most extensive studies about Turkish Greeks was "The Greeks of Turkey," written by researcher Samim Akgönül (2007). While this study discussed the historical development of Turkish Greeks and the reasons for the substantial decrease in their population in Turkey, like other studies, it did not provide details about the opinions or expectations of Greeks in Turkey concerning citizenship and their current presence in Turkey. Apart from these, there have been some other studies dealing with the Greeks of Turkey (Atılgan, 2010; Bozis, 2011), but scarcely any research can be said to deal with citizenship and citizenship education in regard to this minority community.

Studies concerning Jews, yet another minority group in Turkey, have mostly been about architectural, political, and cultural history, as well as religion. The number of studies that have dealt with citizenship and citizenship education within the scope of this minority group is again very low, just as with the other minority groups. One of these researches is titled "Jewish Community in the Past and Present Day" by Tokel (2010). It only provided statistical data about the Jewish community in Edirne, describing institutions owned by Jews. A similar study was performed by Demirel (2010) entitled "Tracing non-Muslim Policies through the Jewish Community of Çanakkale." In this study, the writer presented historical information related to the Republic Era, associating this information with important events related to minorities. There have been two other significant studies which analyzed citizenship policies in Turkey based on non-Muslim minorities, particularly the Jewish community. These studies were performed by Toktaş (2005; 2006). In her study from 2005, "Citizenship and Minorities:

⁵ The researches mentioned here have their own specific purposes and usefulness. The fact that they don't present enough data on citizenship or citizenship education in Turkey does not cast doubt on their usefulness.

A Historical Overview of Turkey's Jewish Minority," Toktaş analyzed citizenship policies that had been adopted especially during the Republic Era regarding minorities and tried to give background information about significant political turning points concerning the minority group in question. Following this historical and theoretical study, the same researcher published another article in 2006, "The Conduct of Citizenship in the Case of Turkey's Jewish Minority: Legal Status, Identity, and Civic Virtue Aspects." In this article, the writer tried to establish the perceptions, experiences, and expectations of Turkey's Jewish community regarding citizenship. In her study, which used the semi-structured interview technique, Toktaş provided substantial findings on the citizenship experiences of Turkey's Jews who are identified under the status of minority, but her article was insufficient in giving details about citizenship education, an important component of citizenship policies. Apart from the studies mentioned here, there have been various other researches about Turkey's Jewish community (Aytav, 2011; Güven, 2009; Onur, 2005; Toktaş, 2004). However, they also do not reflect an extensive or holistic point of view based on citizenship and citizenship education. These researches are certainly significant when their own aims are taken into consideration. It is not possible to consider contemporary issues by isolating them from their historical development. However, the main problem here is that there have not been any proper studies on the current presence of members of minority communities in Turkey who are citizens of the Turkish Republic. Studies that already exist have only dealt with minority communities, who currently constitute a real part of Turkish society, merely as historic groups. Even though their population has drastically decreased compared to the past, a certain number of these minority members continue to live in Turkey. As citizens of the Turkish Republic, the presence of these minority members should be referenced in researches and discussions on citizenship. However, taking the existing studies based on citizenship into consideration, one can say that the opinions, experiences, and suggestions of minorities have not been sufficiently discussed. The same situation is faced when one considers the theoretical and field studies that have dealt with citizenship education, which is an important part of citizenship policies as these studies, too, cannot thoroughly analyze the views or expectations of minorities on citizenship and citizenship education. From this point of view, the purpose of this article is to fill in the gap mentioned above by establishing the opinions of non-Muslim minority members concerning citizenship

and citizenship education policies as practiced in Turkey. In line with this purpose, the problem stated in this article can be put forth as follows: What are the opinions of non-Muslim minority members about Turkey's policies regarding citizenship and citizenship education that have been practiced in the past and that are being practiced now?

Method

Research Methodology

Qualitative and quantitative research methods were compared in order to establish the best research method for finding out the opinions and expectations of members from the Armenian, Greek, and Jewish minority communities regarding citizenship and citizenship education. The quantitative research method was determined to not be very suitable for this study. A method that aims to provide digital data, has generalizability, and is based on mathematical logic acceptedly cannot provide detailed information based on individual experiences and perceptions (Kümbetoğlu, 2005). In order for the participants to answer the research questions, they have to express themselves properly through their own individual experiences. Aside from this, the quantitative method was not chosen in order to avoid potential problems that can be encountered during the process of data accumulation. As individual experiences and perceptions are considered to affect their opinions and expectations, there should be deep sharing of information between the participant and researcher. The qualitative research method is one of the most important research methods that can be used to put forth individual experiences and perceptions (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Mertens, 2005). This method, which is used especially to reveal individual perceptions and facts, enables researchers to collect information with data collection techniques (İbrahimoğlu, 2011; Snape & Spencer, 2003). In the light of these evaluations, the research has been planned accordingly with the qualitative method.

Research Participants

The purposive sampling method was used as a qualitative method for choosing the research participants. With qualitative methods, there is a tendency to use the purposive sampling method to select participants (Glesne, 2011). The purposive sampling method includes more than one sampling type. Snowball and chain sampling techniques have been used from among these sampling techniques.

Snowball sampling aims to select suitable people that would be able to answer the research questions and each participant suggests another participant. The researcher tries to create a group of participants in this way (Patton, 1990). Snowball sampling is one of the most effective techniques used to select participants that are not easy to contact (Atkinson & Flint, 2001; Frank & Snijders, 1994). Minorities, who are the target group of this research, are a relatively closed group in nature. These groups, identified under the status of minority, generally prefer to live an intragroup lifestyle to preserve their distinguishing features and be able to transfer these features to future generations. Additionally, some individuals with this status may not want to be included in studies; they express this opinion because of certain problems that may occur over time. Participants can also have some inner hesitations apart from these external problems (Lee, 1993). Therefore, relying on the participants to ensure voluntary participation from the target group is a must for the research. One strategy that can be applied to ensure this trust undoubtedly is to contact participants through references. This strategy has been frequently used in the current research. Within this framework, the study was conducted with a total of 34 participants, 12 from the Armenian community and 11 each from the Greek and Jewish communities.

Even though many minorities have lived in numerous parts of the country in the past, this has greatly changed currently. In the present, the city that is most densely-populated by minorities in Turkey is Istanbul. The number of people from Jewish and Greek communities is especially low in cities other than Istanbul. The Armenian community also mostly lives in Istanbul but also has members in other regions across the country, contrary to the other minority groups. The religious headquarters of each group are located in Istanbul; the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, the Armenian Patriarchate, and the Chief Rabbinate are in Istanbul. Istanbul is also a center for social and cultural activities for these minority groups. Newspapers from these three minority groups are published in Istanbul, while artistic activities such as theaters, exhibitions, and conferences are mostly held in Istanbul. Minority schools also operate there. Within the scope of these social realities, Istanbul is central to their living space.

Data Collection Tools

A semi-structured interview was used in this research as a data collection tool. There are many structures that can be used in collecting data (Blaxter, Hughes, & Tight, 2001; Bloom & Grabtree, 2006). Among these

structures, the semi-structured interview is seen as a technique suitable for the researcher when personal experiences are important. With this technique, which is used in qualitative researches to obtain detailed information, the researcher can put forth in detail the participants' answers to the research questions. Participants also have the opportunity to give examples concerning their experiences with this technique (Lewis, 2003). This study attempted to examine the opinions and expectations of participants regarding citizenship and citizenship education in Turkey. This style of research directed the researcher to use the semi-structured interview technique. Besides this, the fact that each participant has distinctive experiences and perceptions provides the researcher with the opportunity to unearth different points of view about the issue during interviews. A question that had not been thought of before can be asked to a participant during the interview, thus enabling a detailed discussion and examination of the problem in question. For all these reasons, the semi-structured interview method has been used as the data collection tool.

The literature of the field in question was examined in order to determine what questions to ask the participants during the interviews. Within this framework, the study attempted to find different aspects about citizenship and citizenship education concerning minorities. As a reminder, the minority groups being discussed here, however, are only Jews, Greeks and Armenians, and the question of whether other groups should also be included is not the subject of this study. This fact was emphasized during the participant interviews in order to avoid the likelihood of misunderstanding (Arthur & Nazroo, 2003).

Interview questions were identified under four main topics in line with the literature of the field in question. The first topic was social life. Under this topic, participants were asked about their schools, the factors that had made them choose these schools, and whether they had faced any problems because of their identity in military service, school life, career, or social life in their neighborhoods. The second topic was citizenship policies. Under this topic, participants were asked their opinions concerning citizenship policies practiced in the Republic Era and how these policies had affected the social life of minorities. The third topic was about citizenship education. These questions consisted of how participants perceived their identities when looking at their schools, coursebooks, and course content. More accurately, they were asked whether they had faced any discrimination or insults at school because of their identities, whether any insulting remarks or statements had been made in

their coursebooks, and how they had felt and reacted in such situations. The last part was about their expectations for the future. In this part, the aim was to establish the participants' opinions and expectations concerning the near and distant future.

There were 19 interview questions, but many other questions were asked during the participant interviews because the survey form was semi-structured. For this reason, 19 questions were used to initiate the interview. These detailed interviews enabled discussions on many points based on the experiences and perceptions about the issue in question.

Data Collection

After deciding on the methodology to be used in the research and the technique for determining participants, the target group was contacted. An intellectual was chosen from each minority group. These intellectuals had various articles on citizenship and citizenship education in Turkey. The researcher discussed the issue based on the interview questions with these intellectuals. They were asked their opinions on whether the interview questions would bother the participants. These intellectuals were the first three participants interviewed. After that, each participant referred another participant. Participants were also found by the researcher. Each participant was sent an e-mail introducing the research in order for them to have an idea about the topic. Afterwards, the participants met at a previously decided time and place. Before the interviews, the participants were told that it was being held strictly for scientific purposes, that their remarks would not be used other than in this research, and that their names would not be revealed in order to create an environment where they could provide answers comfortably and honestly (Knox & Burkard, 2009).

Interviews conducted as part of this research were recorded with a tape recorder and later put down on paper. Even though there are some disadvantages from using a recorder (some researchers spend too much time analyzing the interviews, which prevents participants from feeling comfortable while answering the questions [May, 2001]), the technique of using a tape recorder has been suggested by social scientists as useful (Oppenheim, 2000; Silverman, 2000).

Data Analysis

Data obtained from the interviews was first written down. After all the interviews that had been

conducted with the participants were written down, a holistic point-of-view concerning the issue was targeted by reading the interview notes (Patton, 1990). For the first phase of coding, data from these reading sessions were compiled for descriptive coding. The participants' answers were compared to establish different and similar points, which revealed the descriptive codes. In the descriptive coding, the general and tangible opinions of the participants concerning the issue were categorized. Afterwards, the researcher moved to pattern coding, the second general phase of coding. The intention at this stage was to discover the abstract meanings behind their concrete remarks and statements as revealed by the descriptive coding from the first stage. The second coding that was found for thoroughly understanding the background of the attitudes embodied by the descriptive coding was targeted to reveal the attitudes of the participants concerning the issue in depth and detail (Punch, 2005). However, this procedure was applied when the acquired findings were suitable for categorization; if the findings were not sufficient to form a higher category, the findings accumulated by descriptive coding were interpreted in detail during the second analysis. The categories that came out after the two coding processes have been listed below under headings based on the research questions. To present and interpret the acquired findings, participants' quotations were written down to support the reliability of the findings (Lewis & Ritche, 2003, p. 242).

Findings

Opinions of Armenian Minorities on Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Turkey

Most of the Armenians that were interviewed put forth that they had completed their primary education in Armenian schools. They stated that they had studied at Armenian schools for cultural transmission. Their parents had decided which schools the children would go to due to the young age of pre- and elementary school students. They also wanted their children to learn Armenian and grow up in accordance with their own cultural values. The choice of high school also favored Armenian schools for mostly the same reasons. These students started to study in state schools during their university years from a sense of obligation. The research participants mentioned this many times in their interviews. Participant AP1 said, "You don't choose which primary school to study in. It is your mother and father's choice. The primary school I attended was a popular Armenian school back then. It was so crowded and

successful at the same time. It was close to our home in Kurtuluş. They most likely made this decision because I was their first child and they wanted me to learn Armenian.” Participant AP2 stated:

“My family had no other options in mind other than sending me to an Armenian school when I first started. I don’t think they ever thought to send me to a state school, and I still don’t. When I was thinking of which secondary school to attend after elementary school, it honestly never occurred to me to attend a state school. It was actually kind of our natural preference.”

Most of the other participants made similar remarks talking about their preference concerning primary school.

Being seen as a foreigner
Being insulted
Being excluded
Being disdained
Being questioned out of curiosity
Adaptation problem

Within the scope of this research, each participant developed various points of view with reference to their personal experiences as they talked about their opinions and expectations of citizenship education. Participants tried to develop various perspectives with reference to their school lives, the coursebooks they had studied, and the attitudes of their teachers. However, the point that almost all participants laid great stress on was coursebooks. They all agreed that there were problematic remarks in coursebooks against their identity. However, almost all participants said that there had been improvements and amendments in coursebooks concerning this issue compared to the past. In particular, the classes and coursebooks for history, Citizenship, and National Security were at the receiving end of these criticisms.

The National Security course, which has recently been abolished, was criticized by the participants for referring to all Armenians as “enemies and traitors.” Participants stated that aside from the coursebooks, they also faced some problems during the lessons with the lecturing military personnel due to their identities. AP6 shared memories from their school years as follows:

“National Security course was my biggest problem. I was a good student and the teacher loved me, we

got along well. One day, all the students gathered in the theater hall where the students were made to watch a video called enemies within our borders. They first showed the Turkish map, then Greece, then of course Armenia and what Armenians had done in the past. I was old enough at that time to be effected by this video...”

Apart from the National Security course, the most often mentioned course and coursebook was for the history course. In particular, the pages about World War I and the War of Independence always referred to Armenians as “traitors and co-conspirators.” Participants stated that this labeling implicated all Armenians without discrimination. AP8 made the following remarks while talking about their experiences:

“It is already a problem when you feel that you have to suppress your identity and keep it a secret, even though it is not being looked down upon. The fact that there is always an emphasis on just one ethnic origin impresses on you from a young age, the idea that you cannot be a part of this country...”

Most of the research participants agreed on the fact that the Independence War had created a traumatic effect for the Turkish public. Concerning this issue, AP8 put forward: “I know and understand the kind of influence the War of Independence had on Turkish Muslim identity.” Another participant, AP7, stated with similar remarks:

“...but the reactions were very harsh. If the same events happened in a place where Turks were the minority, wouldn’t they experience the same? Of course, I don’t say that minorities were completely right or that they didn’t make any mistakes. Of course they wouldn’t reward them for their mistakes; they are in the right, but this is a world where anything can happen.”

They also stated that this point of view should yet be applied to all incidents that were experienced during the war years.

The general demand concerning the statements about the War of Independence was that the incidents should be presented to students from all aspects without distortion and without departing from historical reality. According to the participants, instead of assessing incidents from a one-sided point of view, coursebooks should be prepared objectively from different perspectives. At this point, one of the most important suggestions is that the fact that there have also been “Armenians who were attached to the state and worked for the

survival of the state” as well as Armenian who were traitors should be written in the coursebooks when mentioning the War of Independence. AP8 put forward the following statements about this issue:

“...It should be done by being as truthful as possible. Of course they should be taken into consideration along with their differences, but there were also many Armenians faithful to the Ottoman Empire; this is never mentioned. During my post-graduate years, I examined an Armenian who lived during the Ottoman Empire and was loyal to the Ottomans. Every perspective should be mentioned.”

In the end, it can be said that the main descriptions and demands were positive when the opinions and expectations of Armenian participants concerning citizenship education were categorized.

Opinions of Jewish Minorities concerning Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Turkey

When examining the information the participants gave, Jews were seen to prefer studying in state and private schools in Turkey. Jewish minorities, who have just one minority school in Turkey, either go to a private school or a state school depending on their financial situation. Some of the members of this minority group stated that they or their children had gone to private Jewish schools for cultural transmission and to help form their Jewish identity. JP5 who went to a state primary school and French high school stated:

“Commenting on my student life, I completed my primary education at a state school. Then I went to a French high school. It never occurred to me to go to a Jewish school as my mother and father sent me to the French school because they could speak French. Back then, French was such an important language.”

As seen in this example, the general tendency in the educational life of participants was to attend a state school for primary education and a private or Jewish school for higher education. JP8 who said they had studied at a state school to complete their primary education and later went to a Jewish high school gave the following reason for this: “Of course my family’s guidance determined my choice. They thought a Jewish school would be better for me as I would be happy there, better able to express myself, and I would develop an understanding of Jewish culture.” When the reasons for the participants’ school preferences were analyzed, no problem was

seen concerning identity in state schools as having had an effect on their preferences. A great majority of the participants stated that they had not faced any problem based on their identities in state or private schools. JP10 stated that they had never experienced any problem in their educational life due to identity:

“First I completed a technical school then I started to study at a French school. In all the schools I attended up to my university, a third of the students in my classroom were Jews, another third were Christians, and the rest of the students were Muslims. Of course this situation stemmed from the region where the schools were located; it isn’t like that in other parts of Turkey. In such an environment, I have never experienced any discrimination in class and there has never been any discrimination because students with names like Ahmed, Krikor or Moşe were believers of different religions.”

Two participants said, based on their experiences, that they didn’t agree with most of the participants who said they had never faced discrimination in schools because of their Jewish identity. These participants said that they and their friends had experienced various problems in schools due to their identities. JP2 shared one of their memories in school as follows:

“Of course I experienced (problems). Let me talk about it untheoretically with an example. I faced problems especially in high school. My school was a mixed one; there were Armenians, Greeks, Jews, and all. However, the majority of the students consisted of Muslims. One day, I witnessed a surprising incident. We were in a literature class in second grade in high school. Our teacher had told us a week earlier to memorize for the oral examination all the stanzas of İstiklal Marşı, the Turkish National Anthem. Anyway, they picked me. I recited all the stanzas without any problem, but some of my Muslim friends who the teacher had picked couldn’t recite the poem as well as I did. Then the teacher said to the class, ‘What a shame that a Jew recites the İstiklal Marşı better than you.’ Then you start to feel that you are different and you are the ‘other.’ I wondered, ‘Why should I not be better than a Muslim in reciting the Turkish national anthem because I am Jewish?’”

Coursebooks were emphasized first concerning citizenship education. Participants of various ages provided answers to questions about their opinions based on their experiences at school, about how they evaluated coursebooks in terms of their Jewish identity. The general view put forward by

the participants was that even though there had been problems in the coursebooks concerning this issue in the past, these problems currently have decreased and almost vanished. Some problematic parts were said to exist that would disturb Jewish minorities in the coursebooks, especially from the National Security, history, and Revolution History courses; these problematic parts have currently been removed to a large extent. At this point, there is a Jewish group that, instead of demanding the removal of remarks degrading their identity, wants to be more visible in coursebooks. JP6 stated the following remarks concerning this demand: "In education, it is more important to hide something rather than show it. Jews and Christians, who have lived on this land for centuries, are always ignored. The fact that you don't mention them means a lot; you don't just have to say they are bad."

Concerning the content of curricula, the main subject emphasized within the scope of this research was the history of the War of Independence. This subject constitutes one of the main subjects in Social Sciences, history, and Revolution History courses; it can also be found in the Turkish and literature courses, and the way this subject has been discussed in these courses is one of the main subjects that had disturbed participants. How, then, can the Independence War be discussed? What kind of a language should be used? When analyzing the participants' answers to these questions, their main objection was observed to be that only one side of the incidents that took place during the Independence War was brought to the forefront. On the other hand, the fact that some experiences had been generalized and attributed to all minorities was also criticized by the participants who thought this kind of viewpoint should be changed. Concerning this, JP6 stated the following:

"Okay, let's admit that the Greeks cooperated with the occupying forces, but the Jews didn't. A great empire collapsed; it cannot be denied that this was a big trauma. But they made these people; I mean Armenians, Greeks, and Jews, dozens of people who died and were buried in martyrs' cemeteries. This would have been a different history as well."

When analyzing these remarks, some minority groups can be said to object to the fact that Greeks, Jews, and Armenians were all described as traitors and co-conspirators in the historical narration of the War of Independence; they were presented as if their activities were all the same at that time. A second objection was about minority groups dealing with just a single dimension of understanding. It is an indisputable fact

that dozens of non-Muslim soldiers fought in the War of Independence against enemies in Çanakkale and lost their lives, even though during that period there had been some individuals and groups of minorities who had given the country a rough time. Although this is a historical reality, there hasn't been any such information concerning this issue in the content of the curricula. The participants stated that the problem could be solved by narrating what was experienced multi-dimensionally, without distorting reality.

Opinions of Greeks about Citizenship and Citizenship Education in Turkey

When analyzing the statements put forth by the participants, they can clearly be said to mostly prefer attending Greek schools. Almost all participants said that they and their acquaintances had been educated in a Greek or foreign schools up to entering a university, and they had gone to state universities strictly out of obligation. Concerning their choice of school, one participant, GP2, stated, "Our parents decided on our schools and it was out of the question for children with Greek parents to attend Turkish schools. Actually, I myself sent my daughter to a foreign school that was taught in English." Another participant, GP1, stated similar remarks on this issue: "...we did not attend state schools. Some attended foreign schools such as the French High School, but that was not so common. Our first choice favored Greek schools." What were the reasons for these perceptions and practices in the Greek group? Why would a Greek be so unwilling to send their children to a state school? Why would a Greek not even consider this? When analyzing the participants' answers to these questions, it is clear this is not just particular to the present day. This had also been the general practice before and after the Republic Era. There have been two main reasons for this: the desire for cultural transmission and the fear of being alienated.

Table 2
Factors Affecting Greek Participants' School Preferences

Learning language
Learning religion
Concern about being alienated
Habits
Learning customs and traditions
Family guidance

When analyzing the descriptive categories created from the research's gathered findings as a whole, the participants can be said to have faced some

problems throughout the history of the Republic and that mass migrations took place because of these problems. However, there still remained untold stories of trouble in various fields, even as they had experienced some problems in their social life. After all, the Greeks in Turkey identify themselves under two categories: one of these is undoubtedly the Greek identity. No matter what, they want to preserve their identity by transferring Greek culture, language, customs, and traditions to future generations, considering education as the most important determinant in accordance with this purpose. Within this framework, the upper category that came to light after analyzing the entirety of descriptive categories based on social life was cultural transmission through education; the second category was the demand for social existence based on integration. Findings especially on neighborhood life and choice of profession were very important within this scope. As citizens of the Turkish Republic, they asked for security under the constitution without losing their Greek identity, having equal rights and responsibilities as citizens of this country in every aspect of their social life. They want equal citizenship not in theory but in practice. This demand provided the second upper category, equal citizenship.

Participants laid great stress especially on the two main courses based on citizenship education: National Security and history. Even though the National Security course has recently been abolished, when it was taught in schools this course inflicted deep wounds on minority individuals, as was told by the participants. The history course on the other hand was often criticized by the participants, especially because of the narration of the period during and after the War of Independence. Not only history, but also other courses such as Social Sciences and Revolution History that include historical accounts also received criticisms. As part of citizenship education, the Social Sciences course has a special importance because of its historical content.

GP1, a participant who is also a teacher, made the following comments about the National Security course:

“The National Security course has been abolished. The coursebook often referred to enemies and problems with Greece. It was usually in reference to the Megali Idea, a concept that nobody mentions today. Anybody who talks about this idea today has lost their mind. It is not something that could take place in the 20th or 21st century.

Actually, some teachers who were also officers skipped those parts in our schools, but these parts existed and we read them. It was weird to me. Of course the attitude of the teacher was significant.”

When examining the opinions mentioned above by the participants concerning the National Security Course, the participants can be said to think that bearing enmity against Greeks based on the Megali Idea is simply wrong, and even mentioning this idea in the present day is nonsense and doesn't comply with the realities of the time. Besides this, the personal characteristics of the officers that taught this course were also important. The participants put forth that some officers were comfortable with hurting students' feelings, while others were careful not to do this by skipping certain parts of the coursebooks.

The participants also frequently mentioned the history course as one of the main topics. The participants reacted to the wording of incidents that took place during or after the War of Independence. They demanded a more peaceful and objective narration in the coursebooks that had been accused of instilling enmity into people while describing the war between Turks and Greeks.

Concerning the teaching of history and the history course, GP2 stated the following:

“In the past, nobody cared about it. We studied ordinary Turkish history in Greek schools and it was so difficult. For example, if the subject was the Greco-Turkish war and the teacher was a nationalist, they made us write down the whole story. Even though we were children back then, we didn't feel good. According to those coursebooks, Greeks were always bad and guilty; Turks were always right and heroic. There were most likely similar coursebooks in Greece, but I wish the accounts had been more objective.”

Therefore, how should the War of Independence be written? What kind of a language should be used to achieve peaceful narration of the War of Independence in the coursebooks which receive so much criticism from the participants for instilling hostility into people? Participant GP3 was asked this question. GP3 first said that historical realities cannot be ignored and everything should be written objectively as they had taken place. However, while being written, these events should be considered within the scope of the historical and sociological relationship of cause and effect. The participant, GP3, stated the following:

“In my opinion, everything should be narrated as it is without hiding anything within historical or

social frameworks. For example, the Greeks did this and that, and these can be the reasons. This can create some common points even out of the biggest disasters.”

When opinions of the participants concerning coursebooks and curricula were analyzed, most of them were seen to be about enmity. In addition to this point of view, one of the participants, GPK, commented on the issue of togetherness in society and said that coursebooks and curricula didn't introduce students to the culture of living together, saying “Apart from enmity, we can say that there are some deficiencies in the coursebooks and curricula concerning the culture of living together.”

Discussion and Conclusion

In this part of the study, deductions made from the findings concerning the subproblems of the research were comparatively analyzed and discussed based on their meanings in the literature about the field in question.

As part of the first subproblem, the study attempted to establish the opinions and expectations of minorities in Turkey concerning social life. Considering the findings acquired in the research, minorities in Turkey can be said to have not faced very big problems in their social lives; even though they rarely experience certain problems, there has been a generally trouble-free profile.

One of the main topics frequently discoursed upon concerning social life has been choice of schools and the reasons behind these choices. The findings accumulated in the research showed that a great majority of minorities in Turkey have received education in their own community schools and currently send their children to these schools. Concerning this issue, the Armenian and Greek communities are stricter than the Jews as they remain more distant from the idea of sending their children to state schools. Unlike Armenians and Greeks, the Jewish community sometimes prefers state and private schools, although the priority has been to favor their own community schools. The main factor that has affected the decisions on schools has been the idea of cultural transmission for all the minority groups in question. Parents prefer to send their children to their community schools as they want their children to grow up in accordance with their own culture; learning their language and religion are considered important parts of their identities. This conclusion which has been drawn as a result of the research matches up with

the findings revealed in the research conducted by Özdoğan et al. (2009). In this research, writers came to the conclusion that Armenians in Turkey want to send their children to their own community's institutions to enhance intercommunity relations and transmit their own culture. Data accumulated in a survey with Istanbul Armenians titled “Being a Minority in Turkey” (Norzartok, 2007), also supports this conclusion. According to this survey, 80% of Armenian participants stated that they had received education in Armenian schools, but this percentage changed at different levels of education. 93.5% of Armenians went to Armenian schools for primary education, while 73.4% went to Armenian schools for secondary education. This percentage decreased to 57.5% for high school education. According to another finding presented in the same survey, individuals who had studied at Armenian schools defined themselves as Armenians more than those who hadn't. Another research made by Tunç and Ferentinou (2011) found that the perception of identity for Greek women living in Istanbul was shaped mainly under the two categories of the Patriarchate and the Greek language. This finding also supports the findings of this research. However, as mentioned above, there are some different attitudes among Jews. Of course the Jewish participants also gave importance to having their children acquire a Jewish identity. Aside from this was also the factor of academic success as a reality of life; parents demanded an education oriented toward success together with their children's cultural development. According to the statements of the participants, some Jewish people had decided to send their children to state and private schools as the academic success of Jewish schools had begun to decrease.

The finding that minorities wanted to study at their own schools because of their concerns for language and religion had similarly appeared in the social and educational history of other countries. One such country is Albania, where Greek and Roma minorities had begun establishing their own schools since the beginning of 20th century to have their children learn their languages and religions; they were partially able to find positive answers to their demands (Kostelancik, 1996). Iran on the other hand granted non-Muslim groups with official minority status (Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians, Chaldeans, & Assyrians) permission to establish their own schools taught in their native language (Saraçlı, 2008). This made it easier for minorities to learn their mother tongues. Additionally, however, some minorities in certain countries preferred sending their children to

state schools rather than minority schools in order for them to speak fluently the official language of the country they lived in, so as not to be at a disadvantage given the current circumstances of their countries. In the Ukraine, one of these countries, some parents among the minorities stated that they had sent their children to Ukraine's official state schools in order for them to learn the official language and have a more comfortable career (Ulasaik, 2011). In one study about minorities and national integrity in China, Wilson (2007, p. 76) drew attention to the disadvantages of an individual learning only the minority's language.

In the end, different practices can be said to exist in the world, including problematic ones, concerning the education of minorities and learning their mother tongue during this process. Some of those practices made it easier for minorities to learn their mother tongues, while other practices in some countries made it difficult. That a minority should learn the official language along with their mother tongue is an indisputed fact for better integration with society. These practices concerning language training affect parents' choice of schools for their children who are under the status of minority. On one hand, parents want their children to learn their mother tongue for cultural transmission; on the other, they think their children should also learn the official language for a successful academic life and career. Minorities in Turkey also send their children to their own community schools for cultural transmission. However, one thing to take into consideration here is that the official language should also be learned thoroughly by students along with their mother tongues. Learning the official language helps minority students easily get a job and provides better communication with the rest of society.

In regard to educational life, after the choice of school, participants who had studied at state or private schools were asked whether they had faced any kind of problem due to their identities during their schooling. Participants who had attended community schools naturally hadn't experienced any problem based on their identities. Those who had attended state or private schools said that they also hadn't faced any big problems in those schools. Minorities studying at schools other than minority schools had questions directed to themselves just out of curiosity, but these questions and attitudes rarely reached the dimension of insults. However, even though there was no concrete defamation directly against minority students from their friends or teachers, it is a fact that some attitudes and behaviors adopted by teachers and administrators

led to the perception of being a foreigner or the "other" for the minorities. Many examples that support this idea have been mentioned under the heading of findings in this research. According to the participants' statements, minority students had faced discrimination because of their different ethnic and religious backgrounds during some ceremonies where the Turkish national anthem had been recited. Because there have been no universities established by minorities in Turkey, there was no choice other than to go to a state university. The statements of participants who had attended state universities showed parallels with the statements of participants who had attended state schools for primary, secondary, or high school education. Minority students didn't face any big problems based on their identity in universities. Participants said that their circle of friends was very important, and that they had chosen their friends from among people "who would accept them for who they are." In a study conducted by Özdoğan et al. (2009), they came to the conclusion that Armenians who studied at state schools had not faced big problems in general even though they had sometimes faced problems. Gökçe (2013), on the other hand, came to the conclusion in her study that university students had experienced discrimination in campus life based on their different ethnic and religious backgrounds. The conclusions differed because participants of the studies were different. This means that their personal experiences were also different. However, it can be clearly stated at this point that non-Muslim minorities haven't face big problems, considering the findings of the research. In conclusion, minorities in Turkey have mostly studied at their own community schools for cultural transmission; aside from this, some students from the Jewish community have gone to state or private schools. Minority students who had studied at state schools for primary, high school, or university education hadn't face big identity-based problems, even though there had been some rare exceptions of facing discriminatory remarks and attitudes. A positive atmosphere can be stated to exist in general, considering the process of the historical development of minority education in Turkey. When taking a look at the situation in the world concerning minority education, various practices are seen in each country based on its socio-cultural and political history. For example, when taking into consideration Japan, which is on the leading edge technologically, minorities of Korean origin, who constitute a considerable amount of the entire population, were found to be

practically denied access to formal education until the 1950s, and very few of these minorities had had the chance to receive education (Bayliss, 2008). In Turkey, even though minorities have experienced some difficulties from the Ottoman era until the present day, they can be said to have broad rights and opportunities in regard to education. These rights and opportunities have enabled minorities to receive education in their own institution, while minorities that had chosen to study at state schools hadn't face big problems based on their identities. Of course, it may not be good to make generalizations on such a subject. Minorities can face some problems in their social and educational lives, but the findings accumulated in this research show that even during the hard times for minorities, they had not experienced any seriously great difficulties or pressure.

Considering the second subproblem of the research, what were the opinions and expectations of minorities concerning citizenship policies? When the findings concerning this question were analyzed, minorities were seen to have various different thoughts. One group of participants thought that citizenship policies had not changed since the establishment of the Turkish Republic and that minorities in Turkey had been otherized and alienated as a result of these policies. Another group of participants also stated that there had been some citizenship policies during the Republic Era that affected minorities badly, but they also said that there had been great revolutionary improvements and changes in attitudes toward minorities, especially in the past decade. This point of view as stated by participants of the second group was stated similarly in a study titled "The Justice and Development Party's Policies Towards non-Muslim Minorities in Turkey," (Soner, 2010). According to this study, within the past decade in particular, there have been substantial improvements in policies concerning non-Muslim minorities in Turkey. Yıldız (2007) also said that there had been great improvements in recent years as far as policies regarding minority groups in Turkey, supporting the idea put forth above. Many factors affecting this improvement concerning minority policies can be said to exist in recent years, but Mills (2005, p. 249) emphasized that one of the main factors about this issue is that there has been a growth of interest in social and political history concerning minorities in Turkey.

For the third subproblem of the research, when analyzing the findings on the opinions and expectations of minorities concerning citizenship education in Turkey, minorities in Turkey can

be said to have some awareness of citizenship education. Improvements, especially in coursebooks, were mentioned in detail by a great majority of the participants; examples of developments and transformations within the past years were discussed chronologically. In this sense, coursebooks were seen to be discussed firstly within the scope of citizenship education. According to the participants' answers regarding their perceptions of the way minorities had been dealt with in coursebooks, improvements on this issue, just as the other topic regarding citizenship and social life, are seen to exist. Participants from the three minority groups said that there had been certain negative remarks about minorities in coursebooks, especially for the history, National Security, and Social Sciences courses in the past, and this was also very common during their schooling. The statements in the coursebooks are the reason they have periodically experienced various problems in their educational life. In a research about the perception of identity of non-Muslim youth, Kurban (2009) specified that minorities in Turkey had experienced a variety of problems, especially in the National Security and history courses. Participants especially criticized the way the Independence War was narrated in coursebooks. According to the participants, the attitude and behavior of minorities during the years of the War of Independence were criticized in the coursebooks that described minorities as "native foreigners" who had cooperated with enemies. At this point, the suggestion of the participants was that, rather than deal with this issue by making generalizations, the coursebooks should talk about all of the attitudes adopted by minorities during the years of the Independence War based on the circumstances of that time. This demand as put forward by the participants shows parallels with establishing healthy communications in social relations. The demands from different groups that constitute a society concerning mutual living space can only be realized through mutual relationships and interactions. As a matter of fact, in a study by Apsel (2011), Armenian and Turkish youth were gathered to talk about incidents in 1915, and they stated that based on the 1915 incidents there had been some changes in viewpoints as well as strategies to understand and assess these incidents. The same type of gathering could take place among this study's participants concerning the War of Independence. If the participants come together around the same table and shared their perceptions and expectations about this historical event, creating a style of language in coursebooks agreed upon by the majority of people is thought to be more possible.

Beyond all these discussions about coursebook content, another point that grabs the attention is the reference to a hidden curriculum. The attitudes of teachers and administration as well as school atmosphere are also important within this scope, besides the information provided by coursebooks concerning citizenship education. From this perspective, when examining the issue of citizenship education, participants stated that the attitudes of teachers had great effect on students. They also stated that if the teacher had an attitude of exclusionism or otherization, the content of coursebooks became more otherizing, while if the teacher was sensitive about these issues, the negative remarks in coursebooks weren't allowed to create an unfavorable atmosphere for minorities in schools and classrooms.

This aspect concerning citizenship education indicates that coursebooks are presently in a better condition compared to the past, based on their description of minorities. In the past, some coursebooks described minority groups as enemies. The participants additionally also frequently mentioned that minorities, who also comprise social life, should be positively referred to in coursebooks. When similar researches regarding the representation of minorities are looked at, a research conducted by Trebbe and Schoenhagen (2011) was seen to search for an answer to the question of how minorities in Switzerland perceived their presence on television. The research eventually found that minorities of African or Turkish origin were represented badly on television. Other minorities having their origins in EU member countries were also stated to have come to a better point compared to the past. There are many similar studies. However, the most important thing to stress here is that, concerning socio-cultural and education life, minorities should have equal rights and circumstances just like other individuals and groups in

society. On the other hand, the demand to be visible in coursebooks to formalize a "positive presence" should also be heard as part of the trials of active citizenship.

Parallel to the research questions, the results concerning the three main headings of social life, citizenship, and citizenship education have been discussed above. When the obtained results and discussions on the way these issues have been handled in coursebooks and other published materials are examined as a whole, minorities were seen to have experienced policies with ups and downs throughout the Republic Era. Concerning this issue, however, many improvements can be said to have happened over the past decade that are considered revolutionary when compared to the past. At this point, it can also be said that the problems faced by minorities in various fields, such as social life and citizenship education, are being solved; many steps are being taken to solve these problems. The improvements and transformations concerning minorities have not been completed yet. Within this framework, there are many duties and responsibilities that fall on both minorities and the rest of society. As put forth by the participants, minorities in Turkey are more optimistic about their future and can say "we also exist." As Ghanea (2004, p. 729) stated, these improvements are actually very important for attaining a better situation where minorities can say "we exist" and feel a sense of attachment to the countries they live in as citizens. Of course, minorities cannot exceed the boundaries established by the government. After a certain point, the government should take steps to help reinforce minorities' existence as citizens. Meanwhile, the reforms mentioned as part of European Union accession negotiations help us to be hopeful about the future regarding this issue (İçduygu, Toktaş, & Soner, 2008, p. 382).

References

- Akgönül, S. (2007). *Türkiye Rumları, ulus devlet çağından küreselleşme çağına bir azınlığın yok oluş süreci*. İstanbul, Turkey: İletişim.
- Apfel, J. (2011). Educating a new generation: The model of the "genocide and human rights university program. *Human Rights Review*, 12, 465-486. doi:10.1007/s12142-011-0198-7
- Atılğan, O. (2010). *Türkiye- Avrupa birliği ilişkilerinde Rum azınlıklar* (Master's thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, Social Sciences Institute, İzmir, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Atkinson, R., & Flint, J. (2001). Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social Research Update*, 33. Retrieved from <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU33.pdf>
- Aytav, E. T. (2011). *Türkiye'de öteki olmak*. İstanbul, Turkey: Mavi Ufuklar Yayınları.
- Bayliss, J. (2007). Minority success, assimilation, and identity in prewar Japan: Pak Chungüm and the Korean middle class. *Journal of Japanese Studies*, 34(1), 33-68.
- Blaxter, L., Hughes, C., & Tight, M. (2001). *How to research*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Bloom, B. D., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40, 314-321.
- Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education*. London, UK: Sage.
- Bozıs, S. (2011). *İstanbul Rumları*. İstanbul, Turkey: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Demirel, F. (2010). Çanakkale Yahudi cemaati ile gayrimüslim politikalarının izinde (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Derkarabetian, A., & Balian, N. (1992). Ingroup, outgroup, and global-human identities of Turkish-Armenians. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 132(4), 497-504.
- Duran, H., & Arıdemir, H. (2005). Rum azınlık özelinde Türkiye'de uygulanan azınlık rejimi. *Uluslararası Hukuk ve Politika*, 1(4), 1-16.
- Ergüney, Ö. A. (2007). *Günümüzde Türkiye Ermenileri* (Master's thesis, İstanbul University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Frank, O., & Snijders, T. (1994). Estimating the size of hidden populations using snowball sampling. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 10(1), 53-67.
- Ghanea, N. (2004). Human rights of religious minorities and of women in the Middle East. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 26(3), 705-729.
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gökçe, A. T. (2013). University students' perception of discrimination on campus in Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), 72-84.
- Gökçe, A. T. (2013). University students' perception of discrimination on campus in Turkey. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), 72-84.
- Güldiken, N. (2006). Ulus, ulus-devlet ve uluslaşma kavramlarına ilişkin tartışmalar ve Türkiye. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 157-168.
- Güven, E. (2009). *Türk-Yahudi günlük yaşamında dönemsel ve mekânsal değişimler: Kuzguncuk örneği* (Doctoral dissertation, İstanbul University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Hofmann, T. (2002). *Armenians in Turkey today*. Bruxelles, Belgium: The EU Office of Armenian Associations of Europe.
- İbrahimoğlu, Z. (2010). Değişen paradigmalardan dünyasından nitel ve nicel araştırmalara bakmak: Felsefi yaklaşımlardaki dönüşümleri anlamak. Çukurova Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 40(1), 44-52.
- İçduygu, A., Toktaş, Ş., & Soner, B. A. (2008). The politics of population in a nation-building process: Emigration of non-Muslims from Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(2), 358-389.
- İnce, B. (2012). Citizenship education in Turkey: Inclusive or exclusive. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(2), 115-131.
- Komşuoğlu, A. (2007). Türkiye Ermenilerinin siyasi tutum ve davranışları üzerine notlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 62(1), 149-164.
- Kostelancık, D. (1996). Minorities and minority language education in inter-war Albania. *East European Quarterly*, 30(1), 75-96.
- Kurban, Ö. E. (2009). *Gayrimüslim gençlerin kimlik kurguları* (Master's thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Kurban, Ö. E. (2010). *Gayrimüslim gençlerin kimlik kurguları* (Master's thesis, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Kümbetoğlu, B. (2005). *Sosyolojide ve antropolojide niteliksel yöntem ve araştırma*. İstanbul, Turkey: Bağlam Yayınları.
- Lee, R. (1993). *Doing research on sensitive topics*. London, UK: Sage.
- Lewis, J. (2003). Design issues. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 48-71). London, UK: Sage.
- Lewis, J., & Ritchie, J. (2003). Generalising from qualitative research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 264-277). London, UK: Sage.
- Matevosyan, V. (2010). The Armenian community and the AK Party: Finding trust under the crescent. *Insight Turkey*, 12(4), 93-111.
- May, T. (2001). *Social research, issues, methods and process*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Mertens, D. (2005). *Research and evaluation education and psychology*. London, UK: Sage.
- Metin, E. (2007). *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti inkılap tarihi ve Atatürkçülük derslerinde Ermeni meselesinin öğretimi (mevcut ders kitapları, öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri ve çağdaş yayınlar ışığında yeni bir ünite tasarımı)* (Master's thesis, Gazi University, Institution of Education Sciences, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Mills, A. (2005). Narratives in city landscapes: Cultural identity in İstanbul. *Geographical Review*, 95(3), 441-462.
- Muratyan, N. (2011). *Türkiyeli Ermenilerde kolektif korku gündelik korku altında var olma pratikleri* (Master's thesis, İstanbul Bilgi University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Onur, O. (2005). *1492'den günümüze Edirne Yahudi cemaati*. İstanbul, Turkey: Dinç Ofset.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (2000). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2001). Citizenship education and national identities in France and England: Inclusive or exclusive? *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(2), 287-305.

- Örs, H. B. (2010). The perception of the army by Armenian minorities living in Turkey. *Armed Forces & Society*, 36, 604-626.
- Özdoğan, G. G., & Kılıçdağı, O. (2012). *Türkiye Ermenilerini duymak: Sorunlar, talepler ve çözüm önerileri*. İstanbul, Turkey: TESEV.
- Özdoğan, G. G., Üstel, F., Karakaşlı, K., & Kenteş, F. (2009). *Türkiye'de Ermeniler cemaat-birey-yurttaş*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Özdoğan, M. (2015). Türkiye'de ulus inşası ve dil devrimi. *Akademik Hassasiyetler Dergisi*, 2(3), 227-262.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Philippou, S. (2007). On the borders of Europe: Citizenship education and identity in Cyprus. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 6(1), 68-79.
- Polat, E. G. (2011). Osmanlıdan günümüze vatandaşlık anlayışı. *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, 3, 127-157.
- Punch, K. F. (2005). *Sosyal araştırmalara giriş: Nicel ve nitel yaklaşımlar* (Çev. D. Bayrak, H. Bader Arslan, Z. Akyüz). Ankara, Turkey: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Saraçlı, M. (2008). İnançta azınlıklar. *Akademik Ortadoğu*, 4, 141-160.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Smith, T. (2005). Civic nationalism and ethnocultural justice in Turkey. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 27(2), 436-471.
- Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 2-18). London, UK: Sage.
- Soner, B. A. (2010). The Justice and Development Party's policies towards non-Muslim minorities in Turkey. *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 12(1), 23-40.
- Şener, B. (2014). Küreselleşme sürecinde ulus-devlet ve egemenlik olguları. *Journal of History School*, 7(18), 51-77.
- Tansel, B. (2009). *Türkiyeli Ermeniler ve Ermeni sorunu* (Master's thesis, Ankara University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Tarhan, S. (2006). *1950'den günümüze Rum azınlık sorunları ve Fener Rum patrikhanesi* (Master's thesis, Marmara University, Turkic Studies Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Tokel, M. (2010). *Tarihte ve günümüzde Edirne Yahudi cemaati* (Master's thesis, Marmara University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Toktaş, Ş. (2005). Citizenship and minorities: A historical overview of Turkey's Jewish minority. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 18(4), 394-429.
- Toktaş, Ş. (2005). Türk vatandaşlığının gayrimüslim yorumları: Vatandaşlık kurgusu ve Türkiye'deki Yahudi azınlık. In G. Pultar & T. Erman (Eds.), *Türkiye Kültürleri* (pp. 125-145). İstanbul, Turkey: Tetragon İletişim Hizmetleri.
- Toktaş, Ş. (2006). The conduct of citizenship in the case of Turkey's Jewish minority: Legal status, identity, and civic virtue aspects. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 26(1), 121-133.
- Toktaş, Ş., & Aras, B. (2009). The EU and minority rights in Turkey. *Political Science Quarterly*, 124(4), 697-720.
- Trebb, J., & Schoenhagen, P. (2011). Ethnic minorities in the mass media: How migrants perceive their representation in Swiss public television. *International Migration & Integration*, 12, 411-428.
- Tunç, A., & Ferentinou, A. (2011). Identities in-between: The impact of satellite broadcasting on Greek Orthodox minority (Rum Polites) women's perception of their identities in Turkey. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(5), 906-923.
- Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Maarif Vekâleti. (1930). İlk mektep müfredat programı. İstanbul, Turkey: Devlet Matbaası.
- Ulasaik, I. (2011). *Minority languages in education in Ukraine: Legal perspectives*. Barcelona, Spain: Ciemen.
- Vasiliadis, M. (2005, December). Türkiye'de -Dün, bugün, yarın (?) - Rum olmak. Paper presented at the Türkiye'de Azınlık Hakları Sorunu: Vatandaşlık ve Demokrasi Eksenli Bir Yaklaşım Uluslararası Konferans Tebliğler, İstanbul, Turkey.
- Wilson, A. C. (2007). *Minorities and national integration in China: The case of Xinjiang Uygur autonomous region (XUAR)* (Master of arts, University of Regina, Canada).
- Yeşiltepe, M. (2008). *Azınlık ermeni, resmi ve özel anaokulu, ilköğretim, ortaöğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmen ve yöneticilerin performans değerlendirmesine ilişkin görüşlerinin karşılaştırması* (Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, Social Sciences Institute, İstanbul, Turkey). Retrieved from <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/>
- Yıldız, İ. (2007). Minority rights in Turkey. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 3, Article 10. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2323&context=lawreview>