

Reimagining raciolinguistic ideologies through an analysis of localized language-in-education policies in Turkey and Korea

Hyunjin Jinna Kim, Tuba Yilmaz & Yong-Jik Lee

To cite this article: Hyunjin Jinna Kim, Tuba Yilmaz & Yong-Jik Lee (09 Feb 2024): Reimagining raciolinguistic ideologies through an analysis of localized language-in-education policies in Turkey and Korea, *Current Issues in Language Planning*, DOI: [10.1080/14664208.2024.2315682](https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2315682)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2315682>



Published online: 09 Feb 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Reimagining raciolinguistic ideologies through an analysis of localized language-in-education policies in Turkey and Korea

Hyunjin Jinna Kim ^a, Tuba Yilmaz ^b and Yong-Jik Lee ^c

^aCenter for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY, USA; ^bEducation, Culture and Society, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, USA; ^cInstitute of Educational Research, Chonnam National University, Gwangju, South Korea

ABSTRACT

As global migration and transnational mobility have increased steadily in the recent few decades, interests in equity-based theories and pedagogies have intensified to respond to racially and linguistically diverse student needs in today's classrooms. Raciolinguistic ideology is a theoretical framework challenging monoglossic language ideologies and the 'White gaze' that privileges White speaking and listening subjects (Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>). While raciolinguistic ideologies aim to critically examine the idealized monolingualism, the framework is typically adopted to analyze racial realities in Western or European educational contexts. In this study, we intend to (re)imagine raciolinguistic ideologies situated in non-Western educational contexts by examining language-in-education policies in Turkey and South Korea. Using raciolinguistic ideologies and Kaplan and Baldauf's (Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013–1034). Lawrence Erlbaum) language-in-education planning framework as our analytical lenses, we interrogate raciolinguistic ideologies manifested through language-in-education policy and planning in Turkey and South Korea, where transnational mobility and diversity are drastically increasing to shape language education. The analyses suggest broadening the definition and viewpoint of race to understand space-specific and localized interpretations of raciolinguistic ideologies while dismantling new contemporary racism in non-Western educational contexts. Recommendations and implications for future critical examinations of racial regimes and educational policies are discussed.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 6 July 2023
Accepted 2 February 2024

KEYWORDS

Raciolinguistic ideology; global education; racial regime; language education; language planning

Introduction

The advent of technology, transportation, and economic growth has accelerated global mobility over the past five decades. The World Migration Report stated an increase in

CONTACT Hyunjin Jinna Kim  hyunjinjinnak@gmail.com  Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, Stony Brook University, 100 Nicolls Rd., Stony Brook, NY, USA

© 2024 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

global migration remittances from \$120 billion in 2000 to \$702 billion in 2020 (McAuliffe & Triandafyllidou, 2022). It is estimated that there are about 281 million international migrants worldwide as of 2020, which amounts to 3.6% of the population. This means about one in 30 is a migrant around the world. The increased global mobility has impacted education in general, specifically the discussions and debates around language education. In spaces where globalization, transnational migration, and neoliberal profit-making manifest in our contemporary global society, more attention is paid to the shifts in language policy and planning, education, and language assessments (Canagarajah, 2017; Hamid et al., 2019; Robertson, 2011).

Immigration and education policies determine educational access and equity for those crossing national borders (Spijkerboer, 2018). While individuals are putting forth the effort to support today's diverse student populations, inequitable power distribution and education policies that reflect colonial history pose challenges to racially and linguistically minoritized students. As colonial and neoliberal ideologies are rooted in embodied subjective experiences, they seem natural in our contemporary educational policies, contexts, and interactions (J. S. Park, 2022). A plethora of research centering on race and language education remains Eurocentric, in which the discussions and critiques of race, culture, language, and education in non-Western contexts are grounded in and interpreted through Western ideologies and Eurocentric critical categories (Asante, 2008). As we interrogate through raciolinguistic ideologies, an opportune framework to guide us in dismantling the intersection of race and language, we intend to critique and reflect on neoliberalism and colonialism in Turkish and South Korean (Korean hereafter) language education contexts to reimagine an alternative future centering localized knowledge, history, and philosophies (Miike, 2014; J. S. Park, 2022).

Given the researchers' local knowledge in Turkey and Korea and the recent influx of transnational migration against their extensive histories over centuries, we believe the time is ripe for interrogating localized raciolinguistic ideologies in these non-Western contexts. Previous research interrogating raciolinguistic ideologies in non-Western contexts primarily focused on idealized native English speakerism (e.g. Henry, 2020; J. S. Park, 2022; Wong et al., 2021). While both Turkey and Korea share such trends in raciolinguistic ideologies, the recent high influx of diverse student populations urged the need to examine how language policy and planning are shaped by raciolinguistic ideologies, specifically as a reaction to the drastic diversification of student demography. Research suggests that discourses and ideas are attributed to lived experiences of language policies, and therefore, knowledge and beliefs are formulated through language policy (Albury, 2021). Thus, this article aims to examine the intersection of race and language-in-education policy and planning (LIEPP) in Turkey and Korea to gain a deeper insight into the constructions of racial regimes in a global educational context. We attempt to answer the following questions: (a) How are raciolinguistic ideologies constructed in the non-Western educational contexts of Turkey and Korea? And (b) How are raciolinguistic ideologies manifested and perpetuated through LIEPP in Turkey and Korea? Through an in-depth analysis of educational policies and the researchers' local knowledge, this study aims to situate raciolinguistic ideologies in a transnational context and encourage localized interpretations in future raciolinguistic research, policies, and implementation practices.

Raciolinguistic ideology: race, language, and policies

Raciolinguistic ideology as a theoretical lens is gaining more scholarly attention in education research as researchers connect race and language more explicitly and seek equities in education (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Raciolinguistic ideologies can be defined as ‘the embedded ideological construction and value of standardized language practices,’ which often converge ‘certain racialized bodies with linguistic deficiency’ without the objective observation of language practices (Flores & Rosa, 2015, p. 151). Flores and Rosa (2015) stated that raciolinguistic ideologies are intended to challenge the ‘White gaze’ and the orientation of the White gaze as a mode of perception. Raciolinguistic ideology provided a pertinent theoretical lens through which we could critically examine idealized monolingualism, standardized national language norms, and the intersections of language, race, ethnicity, and power dynamics across diverse contexts (Alim, 2016).

Rosa and Flores (2017) outlined five key components of raciolinguistic perspectives to frame the theory. These concepts include (a) historical colonialism, (b) perception of racial and linguistic difference, (c) regimentations of racial and linguistic categories, (d) racial and linguistic intersections and assemblages, and (e) contestation of racial and linguistic power formation. Historical colonialism highlights the context in which raciolinguistic ideologies are situated. Contemporary raciolinguistic ideologies are constructed by colonial history, which shaped the co-naturalization of race and language. This historical colonialism creates linguistic differences and deficiencies against racialized-speaking subjects. The hegemonic perceptions of language are shaped by racialized speaking and listening subjects. According to Flores and Rosa (2015), the so-called ‘White gaze’ privileges certain linguistic and cultural practices that are idealized and standardized by the White listening and speaking subjects.

The process of raciolinguistic enregisterment stresses the regimentations of ethnoracial categories. Framed by the co-naturalization of language and race, raciolinguistic enregisterment emphasizes the process of certain linguistic and racial forms being constructed and recognized as a set. These racial and linguistic forms intersect with other constructions of power, such as gender, religion, and class, in which these categories are assembled and communicatively co-constituted. Rosa and Flores (2017) emphasized how racial and linguistic stereotypes co-articulate and re-produce perceptions of inferiority in certain contexts and forms. Lastly, the theorization of raciolinguistic ideology is grounded in the asset- and inclusion-based models to challenge White supremacy and racial capitalism.

Corona and Block (2020) defined ‘race’ as a historically-situated social construction. Garner (2007) also contested that race is time- and place-specific and is always part of each national racial regime. Thus, to analyze constructions of raciolinguistic ideologies in Turkey and Korea, we acknowledge the racial, linguistic, social, historical, and political differences in Turkey and Korea. To better understand these contexts and adopt time- and place-specific analytical lenses, we intend to understand the intricacy of raciolinguistic ideologies in these non-Western contexts by examining LIEPP that functioned as mechanisms of oppression.

Language-in-education policy and planning

Language policy refers to the mechanisms determining the ‘structure, function, use, or acquisition of languages in broader society (Johnson, 2013, p. 9)’ while language-in-

education policy and planning indicates the attempts and implementation processes to achieve the acquisition plans and changes, within official and unofficial capacities (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997; Rahman, 2010). As globalization engenders *de facto* or *de jure* multilingualism in societies, LIEPP began to address the ‘problems’ related to linguistic diversity in education. An analysis of LIEPP provides insights into understanding dominant attitudes and ideologies toward minoritized languages in each nation’s specific racial regime and multilingual context. Furthermore, exploring LIEPP allows us to gain an in-depth understanding of raciolinguistic realities in contexts other than the U.S. Kaplan and Baldauf’s (1997; 2005) language-in-education policy framework offers an apt tool to uncover the dynamic interrelationship between *de facto* and *de jure* LIEPP with particular attention to the implementation processes, thus allowing us to interrogate intricate raciolinguistic ideologies attributed to the long history and lived experiences in both countries. The language-in-education planning framework outlines seven inter-related policy areas and goals that influence language policy development: access, personnel, curriculum, evaluation, methodology, resource, and community policies.

As Kaplan and Baldauf (2005) emphasized, all policies are intertwined and typically not developed systematically, complicating the policy implementation processes. The access policy addresses the time, place, and population of students who can be introduced to the content. This is directly connected to the evaluation policy, which determines the objectives of language learning and the methods and materials used to teach students. The curriculum policy, influenced by the evaluation policy, refers to teaching and learning objectives. The personnel policy outlines the teacher preparation and training processes and the required credentials to become a teacher. Methodology and resource policies highlight the methodology, materials employed in education, and how these are paid. Community policy concerns all stakeholders involved and consulted with the language-in-education planning.

To understand areas closely related to raciolinguistic ideologies and based on publicly available data sources, we focused on analyzing LIEPP in the following policy areas: access policy, personnel policy, curriculum policy, and evaluation policy. In their theoretical assumptions, Kaplan and Baldauf (2005, p. 1014) highlighted policy goals striving to answer the following questions in each area:

- Access policy: *Who learns what and when?*
- Personnel policy: *Where do teachers come from, and how are they trained?*
- Curriculum policy: *What is the objective of language teaching and learning?*
- Evaluation policy: *What is the connection between assessment on the one hand and methods and materials that define the educational objectives on the other?*

In addition to the authors’ local knowledge of these countries as home countries, we used accessible and publicly available documents such as the constitutions, legislations, policy research studies, publicly available curriculum and policy documents, newspaper articles, and statistical reports as data to analyze LIEPP in Turkey and Korea.

Publicly available documents, such as accessible policy documents, published reports by national organizations, national statistics data, recent news and media, and published research articles and books, were utilized as data sources. Due to the different sociopolitical and historical contexts and recent events in the two countries, different types of

documents were selected as data sources. Most recent reports and policy documents, as well as scholarly articles published after 2002 and 2008 in Turkey and Korea, respectively, were selected to reflect LIEPP trends and processes after a significant influx of diverse student populations and policy shifts in both countries.

To analyze the data, we first scanned the documents to find statements related to the four policy areas we focused on in this study. As we were closely reading through relevant LIEPP data sources, *de facto* policies relevant to the key tenets of the raciolinguistic ideology framework were categorized into four policy areas. Next, using authors' local knowledge and news or scholarly articles, information regarding *de jure* LIEPP was added. Specific themes emerged from the initial review of policy documents. Next, we engaged in dialogues and discussions on raciolinguistic ideologies in our respective contexts. The authors' local knowledge and input that shaped the interpretation of the policies and practices were recorded, which occurred six times in four months, lasting approximately 60–80 min each time. Ideas and themes were merged and synthesized to establish the following initial themes: (a) decolonization and deimperialization process, (b) legal and economic settlement, (c) intersectionality of geographic spaces, (d) globalization and neoliberalism, (e) racialization and legal status, (f) colonization and raciolinguistic power construction.

Initial themes were further analyzed and coded to present the following sections. Given the contextual embeddedness of LIEPP in each nation's linguistic and political ecology, we start our discussion by first explaining Turkey's and Korea's linguistic and political backgrounds and situating LIEPP in these contexts. Next, we discuss raciolinguistic ideologies rooted in access, personnel, curriculum, and evaluation policies in Turkey and Korea with critical perspectives to understand the intricacy of LIEPP and power formations in these non-Western racial regimes.

Background: two stories, one raciolinguistic perspective

Historically, Turkey and Korea come from different backgrounds regarding their colonization history and the emergence of diversity as a social issue. However, the two historical backgrounds and lived experiences stretching across almost ten centuries merge as the two countries encounter an obstacle to their political discourse of unity and blood relations – thus, the prevalence of raciolinguistic ideologies that position racial and linguistic diversity as a problem.

Language and monolingualism for unification

The Turkish Republic was founded after the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in World War I in 1918 because some ethnic minorities speaking different languages started to rebel for independence. Thus, with the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, linguistic and cultural diversity was considered a risk to national unity, and monolingual policies became a tool to control rebellions and establish unity among Turkish citizens (Çelebi, 2006). One major policy in this process was the Language Revolution Act of 1932. With the Language Revolution, the Ottoman language (which involved linguistic features from Turkish, Arabic, and Farsi) was purified by eliminating Arabic and Farsi vocabulary and linguistic features and replacing the Arabic alphabet with the Latin alphabet. The purified Turkish language was declared the national language and the sole

medium of instruction in public schools (Tıraş & Ertürk, 2015). The Turkish language represented and acted as a tool to unite Turkish citizens, establishing Turkey as a monolingual country.

Unlike Turkey, Korea took a different historical path. The Korean peninsula has endured invasions and colonization by various kingdoms and countries since the tenth century when Korea was invaded by China and the Mongols, which contributed to the inherent Han culture embedded in Korean culture. The Han culture represents an 'essentialist Korean sociocultural concept' to describe the collective Korean feelings of 'unresolved resentment, pain, grief, and anger' (Kim, 2017, p. 254). The series of invasions and colonization by foreign forces permeated through the language, in which the ancient Chinese written systems were used among government personnel and royal families. In 1446, King Sejong invented a written system called the Korean Hangeul, providing a simpler written system based on the spoken Korean language to increase the literacy rate across the nation. After the invasion by Japan, Koreans were forced to speak and write in Japanese instead of Korean (Hangeul). During the Japanese colonization period between 1910 and 1945, Korean Hangeul played a significant role in uniting people and professing the Korean language, values, and beliefs through secret night schools. After World War II, the formation of the U.S. Military Government in South Korea imposed pro-Americanism, capitalism, and U.S. neoimperialism, which portrayed communists as evil forces (Chen, 2010). The history of such constant invasions and ideological shifts shaped language education, policies, and values in Korea, promoting the sole uniting value through language: Korean Hangeul.

Policies for othering

As diversity arose as a deterrent to unity, both Turkey and Korea sought policies, resulting in the dichotomy of 'us' versus 'the other.' In Turkey's case, purified Turkish was gradually accepted and widely spoken and written among the citizens as they received education in public schools. However, since the minoritized populations in rural areas had limited access to education, they could not learn pure Turkish well and continued using their heritage languages in their daily lives (Coşkun et al., 2010). Thus, the minority communities were considered a risk to linguistic unity and a threat to the nation's contemporary future. To eliminate the linguistic threat to national unity, monolingual ideologies were reinforced in Turkey with the military coup in the 1980s. During this time, the laws prohibited using Kurdish (the language spoken by the largest minority group in Turkey) in public areas, and violators were punished (Uçar & Akandere, 2017). Although the restrictions of these monolingual policies were softened with the new laws in 1994 and the 'peace process' initiatives between 2013 and 2015, the monoglossic ideologies withstood among the public and remained prevalent. These ideologies were strengthened in recent years, especially after the huge influx of Syrian refugees escaping from the civil war crossed the Turkish border (Ekici, 2019).

Ruled and colonized by various forces across ten centuries, Korean culture emerged to value unity, blood relations, and national heritage, thus, reinforcing raciolinguistic ideologies. The division between North and South Korea during the Korean War, caused by the U.S.-Soviet military dictatorship, bolstered Koreans' nationalism, seeking unity and resisting foreign forces. As a result, in the 1948 Nationality Act, Korea established the country as

a monoethnic nation with two overarching principles: *jus sanguinis* and patriarchy. Unlike some countries where nationality is based on *jus soli* (citizenship determined by place of birth), Korea and many European countries at the time imposed *jus sanguinis* (citizenship determined by blood), specifically based on paternal blood relations (Lim, 2021). The concept of Han and the Korean Han culture is indicative of the colonial history, political discourse, and imperialistic positioning of Korean culture that created the national ethos of Han. Now, Han as a socially constructed concept is perceived as a part of Korean's blood and genealogy (Cain, 2014; Kim, 2017). With the nationalist approach toward diversity in Korea, the policies and discourses were surrounded by a strong sense of blood-based, rooted in Han, unity, and an ideology of 'us' versus 'the others.'

With the onset of the twenty-first century, both Turkey and Korea experienced demographic changes, leading to reactive LIEPP to tackle the 'problem' against their long history of unification. Currently, Turkey hosts over five million foreign nationals, of which over four million are Syrian refugees or asylum seekers (MoNE, 2022). After the Syrian civil war in 2011, the survivors of the civil war refuged to Turkey because Turkey declared an open-door policy. The Syrian refugees were initially sheltered in refugee camps as temporary protection seekers, and their basic needs were satisfied. In 2016, it was determined that Syrian refuge was not temporary, and thus, the refugee population was allowed to exit refugee camps and live within Turkish neighborhoods with a policy change. The goal was to facilitate their integration into mainstream society and promote their Turkish language learning. However, their language acquisition remained low mainly because their interaction with the mainstream population was limited, as they generally resided in refugee neighborhoods and worked in groups (McCarthy, 2018). Syrian refugees' limited and 'broken' Turkish proficiency and 'foreign blood' were perceived as a deficiency and a practice to otherize or exclude refugees among mainstream Turkish and Kurdish people implying the presence of powerful raciolinguistic ideologies in Turkey (Doğanay & Çoban-Keneş, 2016; Ünal et al., 2018).

Although monoculturalism sustained its relevancy in Korea for decades after the Korean War, transnational mobilities and migrations in recent years have increased racial and ethnic diversity in Korea. Since 1990, the number of immigrants of foreign nationalities in Korea had doubled by 2010 (Kim et al., 2010). The foreign population in Korea grew from 210,000 in 2000 to over 1.5 million in 2019, making up approximately 5% of the total population (Korea Immigration Service, 2020). In rural areas where student diversity has drastically increased due to international marriages, students from diverse backgrounds may constitute over 30% of the student population in the entire school (Lee, 2022). In 1991, Korea joined as a member of the United Nations and joined OECD in 1996. The Korean government's membership in these supranational organizations influenced the overall policies in the country.

Education and LIEPP acted as a platform to establish language norms and ideologies as both nations encounter diversity unlike any other in the globalized twenty-first century. In Turkey, raciolinguistic ideologies are widely observed and practiced due to refugee students' limited and 'broken' Turkish proficiencies and foreign identities (Atalay et al., 2022; Kaysılı et al., 2019; Koçak et al., 2021). Previous research revealed different forms of discriminatory practices from mainstream students and teachers against refugee students in Turkish public schools and most of these practices were justified or supported by national policies (e.g. Ciğerci & Güngör, 2016; Doğanay &

Çoban-Keneş, 2016; Güngör & Şenel, 2018; Kılıç & Toker-Gökçe, 2018; Taşkın & Erdemli, 2018). In Korea, while policies and language education, indeed, focused on identifying linguistically and culturally diverse students in school, LIEPP norms and implementation processes reflect the assumption that there was no racial diversity in Korea. As both nations react to the changing demography and linguistic diversity in education, interrogation of raciolinguistic ideologies embedded in LIEPP was documented in the following section in order to present how the practice of ‘othering’ unfolded and merged into one raciolinguistic perspective.

Raciolinguistic ideologies in language-in-education policy and planning

In the midst of globalization and diversification of student demography in education, both Turkey and Korea began implementing policies to tackle the ‘language problem.’ While maintaining monoglossic ideologies with the goal of uniting their citizens as one monoethnic nation, raciolinguistic ideologies seep into the implementation of access, curriculum, evaluation, and personnel policies. In particular, capital- and neoliberal-driven markets, the formation of racial and linguistic categories, and the reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies in LIEPP emerged as both nations’ narratives in their racial regimes.

Unchecked global education market and access

The emergence of globalization, driven by capitalism and neoliberalism, opened a new era of free market, including the education market. While the era of colonization is behind us, the process of deimperialization and decolonization did not fully unfold as capital-driven forces established unequal power distribution through the free markets (Chen, 2010). Such unequal power distributions, informed by colonization and imperialism histories, were evident in both Turkish and Korean educational contexts, where access to certain language education was limited through the unchecked global free market.

Korea operates under the ideology that education and human resources are the nation’s driving forces. This human capital approach has made the education market grow drastically in Korea, which has endorsed neoliberal capitalism of viewing education as a symbol of wealth and status (Bak, 2019). While the education market grew and generated more profits, educational equity became less of a priority. The inequity in educational access can be strongly associated with the socioeconomic gap in Korea. The culturally and linguistically diverse population of Korea includes migrant workers and women immigrating to Korea through international marriages. While the national population growth was making less than a 1% increase annually since the mid-1980s, international marriages and childbirths from international marriages increased drastically between 2008 and 2014, mainly contributing to the popularity of bridal markets in rural areas (KOSIS, 2023; Lee, 2017).

Raciolinguistic ideologies in Korea emerged with the term ‘damunhwa’ (meaning multicultural in Korean) to label non-traditional families and children from international marriages and migrant workers. According to J. Kang (2020), damunhwa became a symbol of discrimination, referring to ‘foreign’ students, including those

who were born in Korea but not ‘pure blood’ Koreans. As indicated in the numbers of multicultural students by the Korean Educational Statistics, more than 80% of the identified multicultural students are children from international marriages, mainly concentrated in the rural areas outside of Seoul, the capital city (KESS, 2022; Lee, 2022; M. Park, 2022). While educational policies and curricular planning adapted to the changing student demography through the establishment of the National Center for Multicultural Education designated by the Ministry of Education in 2012, for example, the *de jure* policies embedded with raciolinguistic ideologies continue to separate ‘us’ versus ‘them.’

As a new form of the capital-driven educational market, international schools opened in affluent cities in Korea, where foreign workers in white-collar jobs and from Western backgrounds resided. Influenced by imperialistic ideologies and capital-driven globalization movements, a few public and private bilingual schools in the nation were gentrified to promote elite English-Korean bilingualism. Damunhwa students, who were commonly from low-income households and rural backgrounds, were left behind due to limited access. Specifically, educational systems were in place to exclude damunhwa students despite their right to receive non-discriminatory education according to the ‘Supportive Act for Multicultural Families’ (SAMF). The only access policy or educational support for damunhwa students includes after-school programs and language classes, which operate under the assimilation and non-inclusive framework and continue alienating bi-/multilingual students of other descent (Kang, 2008; Kang, 2010). While schools with a majority of damunhwa students opened separate classes for those with lower Korean proficiency levels or provide Korean as a Second Language (KSL) classes in addition to language specialist teachers who support them in content classes, rural and remote areas or schools where damunhwa students are scarcely populated are left with fewer options that embrace students’ backgrounds at a surface level (e.g. after school bilingual programs, student bilingual clubs, and district-wide bilingual contests) (Ministry of Education, 2023a).

Similar to Korea, Turkey identified Turkish as the sole educational language for teaching, learning, and assessment in public schools since the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923 and the adoption of the constitution, implying that access to formal learning and evaluation can be achieved only through Turkish (Turkish Cons. Item 10).

No language other than Turkish can be taught or taught as a mother tongue to Turkish citizens in education and training institutions. The foreign languages to be taught in education and training institutions and the principles to which the schools providing education and training in a foreign language will be regulated by law.

Turkish Constitution, item 42

The constitution also states that ‘The national education service shall be organized according to the wishes and abilities of *Turkish citizens* and the needs of Turkish society,’ implying that curricula were designed mainly for Turkish-speaking citizens under standard monolingual Turkish ideology (Turkish Cons, Item 5). On the other hand, Turkish educational policies allow some private schools to offer instruction in other languages, such as French or English. However, these policies do not equally support schools that offer instruction in minoritized languages. Shaped by colonial histories and global imperialism, while so-called Western or European languages are

encouraged to be taught bilingually, students speaking minoritized languages other than Turkish at home had restricted rights by law and access to resources or curricula that embraced their identities.

Elite bilingualism, referring to the advancement of specific prestigious international languages for upward social mobility (de Mejía, 2002), was notable in the language education access policies in Turkey as much as it was in Korea. Languages such as English, French, German, Arabic, and Russian have been taught as elective foreign languages in Turkish public schools for years (Genç, 2004). In 2012, with a new regulation of the Education Ministry, minoritized languages such as Kurdish or Lazuri also started to be offered in public schools as elective languages in lieu of promoting home language literacy among marginalized populations (Anatolian News Agency, 2012). This policy change allowed space for students of minoritized language and heritage backgrounds to advance their home language literacy skills. However, the policy change failed to fully give equitable rights to minoritized students because public schools were provided with limited personnel trained in teaching these minoritized languages and limited teaching materials in these languages. Moreover, the policy required schools to enroll a set number of students to offer elective courses in minoritized languages, and most schools failed to enroll a minimum of ten students to offer these courses (Karagöz, 2016). As a result, while the children of White Turks could receive education in their mother tongue and advance their elite bilingualism thanks to the foreign language courses in public schools, minoritized children had limited access to knowledge in their mother tongue and had twice as much linguistic burden on their shoulders since they had to acquire both the educational language and the foreign language. These foreign language policies in Turkish public schools implied raciolinguistic ideologies that devalue minoritized languages and discriminate against minoritized language speakers by providing limited access to resources and personnel.

The diversity label: intersections of racial and linguistic categories

Perceptions of racial and linguistic categories were reflected in the LIEPP in both Turkey and Korea, specifically in the personnel policies. While sufficient teacher training and certification requirements were not found in both contexts, course offerings related to multicultural education were found in teacher education programs at the surface level. These revealed raciolinguistic ideologies of perceiving and identifying students into certain racial and linguistic categories. At the intersection of racial and linguistic categories, an abstract label and definition of an outsider existed for students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Turkish personnel policies failed to develop minoritized students' bi/multilingualism through elective language courses and ensure their academic success in mainstream classrooms. As a result, the personnel policies contributed to the development of raciolinguistic ideologies and discrimination against diverse students in Turkish public schools. Although it had been over a decade since the arrival of millions of Syrian refugees to Turkey, the Turkish higher education system could not train teachers to teach this linguistically and culturally diverse population. Teacher candidates at Turkish universities received no specific multicultural or multilingual education training in their

teacher preparation programs, and the tests administered to assign them to public schools (called KPSS) rarely included questions about teaching diverse students. Thus, teachers with refugee students in their classrooms often fail to involve any linguistic or cultural accommodations to meet their needs. Furthermore, curricular content and materials in Turkish public schools portrayed refugees as ‘needy’ and ‘temporary,’ which fostered exclusion and discrimination of refugee students from Turkish peers (Güngör & Şenel, 2018; Öğretmen Ağı & SEÇBİR, 2022; Taşkın & Erdemli, 2018). As a result, refugee students showed low academic performances and experienced problems with socialization and integration due to insufficient personnel and curriculum policies (Gürel & Büyükušahin, 2020; İşigüzel & Baldık, 2019).

In Korea, personnel policies outline limited training and preparation for teaching students from diverse backgrounds. Although the teacher certification and preparation processes are quite rigorous and competitive in Korea, preparing teacher candidates for diverse students remains limited. Based on the 2015 data from the Ministry of Education, while 44 out of 46 teacher education programs offer one to two multicultural education-related courses on average (a total of 97 courses), only two programs require such a course, and the rest offer the courses as electives (Jeon et al., 2018). Even in these courses, Jeon et al. (2018) reported varying levels of course contents, including some courses focusing more on multiculturalism rather than multicultural education, depending on the program or department that offers the course. Without intensive curriculum review processes and advanced course requisites for teacher candidates at their initial preparation stage, holding a multicultural education contest for prospective teachers (Ministry of Education, 2021) only raises superficial awareness with limited opportunities to critically reflect on raciolinguistic ideologies and power structure inherent in the educational system and policies.

Furthermore, the teacher certification exam in Korea does not include questions specific to multicultural education, nor does the policy require these criteria. Instead, the teacher certification exam assesses teacher candidates’ general knowledge and skills in teaching methods, curriculum, foundations in education, and their respective subject/content area (Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation, 2021). According to the Constitution, ‘All citizens have the right to receive equal education according to their abilities’ (Korean Constitution, Article 31). In addition, the Basic Education Act outlines equal opportunity in education by stating that ‘All citizens shall not be discriminated against in education on the grounds of gender, religion, belief, race, social status, economic status, or physical condition’ (Korean Basic Education Act, Article 4). These specifically indicate educational opportunities and access to students identified as Korean citizens and promote meritocracy by declaring equal education opportunities according to one’s abilities.

As observed in the legal definitions as well as the implementation of the related legislation on personnel policies, culturally and linguistically diverse students are identified as one abstract multicultural or diverse group striving for equality rather than equity. While efforts are made to provide education for culturally and linguistically diverse students in Turkey and Korea, students’ linguistic and racial categories are molded into one group label of diverse students, thus resulting in surface-level accommodations and celebration of cultural artifacts instead of providing equitable learning opportunities to truly embrace their multicultural and multilingual assets.

Reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies

Curriculum and evaluation policies, especially in their implementation of LIEPP, reveal underlying values and beliefs that instill language ideologies in language education. Despite the attempts both countries made to remove barriers for culturally and linguistically diverse students, raciolinguistic ideologies, particularly monoglossic ideologies, were prevalent throughout the implementation of curriculum and evaluation policies – thus, repeating the cycle of oppression and reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies.

In Turkey, raciolinguistic ideologies dominating the monolingual teaching and evaluation policies have been a consistent barrier to Syrian refugee students' equal access to education. Although Syrian refugees were initially offered instruction in Arabic and followed the Syrian curriculum in the temporary education centers (TECs) in the refugee camps, they were then transferred to Turkish public schools in 2017 since their limited Turkish acquisition in these camps was considered a problem (Arık-Akyüz et al., 2018; Eryaman & Evran, 2019; Gümüş et al., 2020; Maadad & Yilmaz, 2021; McCarthy, 2018; Seydi, 2014; Usta et al., 2018). Upon enrollment in public schools, refugee students were first tested for their Turkish proficiencies, and students who scored above 60 (out of 100) were submersed in mainstream classrooms where the language of instruction was only Turkish (PIKTES, 2021). On the other hand, the students who scored below 60 were taken to the 'integration programs' where they were taught intensive Turkish (Bozan & Celik, 2021). Regardless of students' placement in mainstream classrooms or intensive programs, all refugee students were instructed and assessed only in Turkish. The only assessment available in different languages was the university entrance exam at the end of high school, and it was only offered to students from different nationalities, not to students of minoritized languages with Turkish nationalities. The dominant monolingual evaluation policies in Turkey supported raciolinguistic ideologies by contributing to the lower academic success of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

In Korea, compulsory education begins at grade 1, and the hidden curricular policy objective from that point is succeeding in the college entrance exam—therefore, entering one of the elite universities. The college entrance exam, administered only once a year at the end of students' final year in high school, assesses students' knowledge and proficiency in the following subject areas: (a) Korean, (b) English, (c) Mathematics, and (d) Science or Social Studies. Connecting to the sole objective of education, evaluation policies are strict, rigid, and competitive. The school curriculum and teaching methods are typically pre-determined to achieve one goal, which is ensuring the highest college admission rate. Students with access to high-quality and expensive after-school private tutoring programs tended to have more information and opportunities to enter more prestigious post-secondary institutions. All assessments, including the college entrance exam, are administered in Korean, except the English subject test, which acts as a method to promote standard English and monoglossic ideologies. While openings of KSL classes, as well as transitional programs, increased by approximately 35% since 2013 (Ministry of Education, 2023b), accurate data beyond year-to-year comparison are not available due to the changes in policy, implementation plans, program and initiative types, and data reporting criteria. Thus, whether changes in curriculum and evaluation policies are allowing equitable opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds is questionable.

The curriculum objectives and curricular organization stated in the national curriculum highlight monolingual and monoethnic Korean students' development of Korean language and cultural acquisition in elementary grade levels. After elementary school education (grades 1 through 6), the national curriculum shifts its focus from Korean language education to other subject areas, such as math, science, and English (Korean National Curriculum Information Center, 2015). Starting at the middle school grade level (grades 7 through 9), the curriculum is organized and sequenced to assign more credit hours to math, science, and English, while credit hours for Korean gradually decrease after grade 2. During this grades 1 through 9 education period, there is no separate set of curricula or objectives designed for multicultural or multilingual students except for the after-school programs, or separate KSL classes offered to students mainly based on the teacher's recommendation or referral. While the establishment and offering of separate KSL classes and transitional programs, as well as *damunhwa* student special college admission categories, allow some opportunities for students to succeed, curriculum and evaluation policies remain with the assumption of educating all students through monoglossic ideologies.

The raciolinguistic ideologies in Korea and Turkey stem from 'pure-blood' ideologies and a 'national-origin-based' hierarchy that distinguish those who are part of 'us' and 'them.' Shaped by neoimperialism and capital-driven globalization, the racial hierarchy is constructed to identify cultural and linguistic deficiencies in certain groups who belong to the 'other' group. Confined by geographic locations and legal statuses, students in rural areas or students coming from so-called 'less developed' territories or heritage backgrounds were implicitly assigned into a racial category as an illegitimate or foreign-speaking subject. Intersecting with the long and arduous process of obtaining citizenship or permanent legal statuses (Chung, 2020) and the inequitable distribution of educational resources, culturally and linguistically diverse students encounter academic, social, and emotional challenges with limited opportunities to succeed in school, let alone build a successful career.

Discussions

Through our analysis and examination of raciolinguistic ideologies reflected on LIEPP in Turkey and Korea, we (re)imagine raciolinguistic ideologies situated in non-Western socio-cultural, -historical, and -political contexts. Although bearing different historical narratives and political discourses, Turkey and Korea merged, mirroring similar raciolinguistic discourses in their LIEPP. In the transnational education contexts in Turkey and Korea, the cultural norms and sociohistorical discourses associated race with 'blood' and ancestry. These raciolinguistic perspectives indicate that educational policies have a tendency to assimilate minoritized students through monolingual policies and monoglossic ideologies. Although both Turkey and Korea enroll a considerable number of linguistically minoritized students in their public schools to offer them equal educational opportunities, the access, curriculum, evaluation, and personnel policies are constrained to providing truly equitable learning opportunities. In both countries' LIEPP, access to bilingual education is limited or absent, especially in areas where educational resources are scarce, perpetuating standardized monolingual norms while continuing to reflect imperialistic and capital-driven monoglossic language ideologies. Furthermore, teacher

training and personnel policies categorize culturally and linguistically diverse students as an abstract student body of diverse students who are deficient foreign-speaking subjects, requiring additional language education. The curriculum and evaluation policies remain stagnant, functioning as a tool to promote the social reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies despite the changes in student demography over the years.

Our analyses revealed that the form of raciolinguistic ideologies differed in various global educational spaces yet embodied the same perspectives through their legal systems and educational policies. In the Turkish context, Syrian refugees or minoritized language speakers (e.g. Kurdish, Lazuri, etc.) were labeled as racialized speaking subjects through access policies and legal statuses. In the Korean context, heritage backgrounds, specifically non-Western heritage backgrounds reflected in the access curriculum policies, created a category of *damunhwa* students as ‘others.’ In cultural anthropology, some intense scholarly discussions surrounded the definition and discourse on race. Harrison (1999) contended that postcolonial and postmodern racism persists in a new ‘framework of discursive practices’ (p. 49) that disguises cultural and racial hierarchies. Miles and Brown (2003) illustrated contextual racism since racialization and racism are believed to be historically developed under political and economic relations. Observing the post-war society in the United Kingdom, Barker (1981) suggested ‘new racism’ as a concept, which refers to people naturally preferring to be surrounded by their own ‘kind.’ In this concept of the new racism, Barker pointed out that immigration is one of the dimensions.

Previous analyses of raciolinguistic ideologies in Asian contexts emphasized how raciolinguistic ideologies are manifested beyond the Eurocentric articulation of racism in the forms of linguistic racism, biopolitical modern racism, or neoliberal language education (Dovchin, 2019; Nishiyama, 2015; J. S. Park, 2022). These studies indicate modern and contemporary ‘racisms without race’ that are socially constructed through political and neoliberal discourses beyond the ‘European taxonomy of race’ (Nishiyama, 2015, p. 341). The discussion surrounding the new and contemporary racism relates to culture and cultural essentialism that rose in the 1980s in political contexts to distinguish cultural grounds between European countries such as the United Kingdom or France and the immigrants (Grillo, 2003). As the resurgent nationalism emerges as a phenomenon to describe our current diverse society and its reaction (Koulis & van der Woude, 2020), the discussions surrounding raciolinguistic ideologies are observing similar discourses in the contemporary racism that are more space-, historically-, and politically-specific shaped by neoliberalism, capital-driven free education market, historical colonialism, and neoimperialism.

Furthermore, examining LIEPP through the lens of raciolinguistic ideologies revealed how language-in-education policies shaped by sociohistorical contexts and lived experiences construct concepts of social hierarchies and raciolinguistic categories. As ‘race’ is defined by blood, nationality, and socio-historical or sociopolitical genealogy, rather than apparent skin colors in Turkey and Korea, raciolinguistic ideologies are hidden and embodied in their LIEPP. Rosa and Flores (2017) highlighted that racial and linguistic hierarchies are institutionalized and legitimized through co-naturalization. The systems of access, curriculum, evaluation, and personnel policies in education embody the values, beliefs, knowledge, and lived experiences constructed in specific localized spaces (Albury, 2021). In critical theories, such as *RefugeeCrit*, the legal and economic

policies are the focus of the analysis as these mechanisms of oppression intersect with geographic spaces (Strekalova-Hughes, 2019). In both Turkish and Korean LIEPP, the policies assume a single racialized speaking subject as a 'problem' to correct, and the implementation and planning processes affirm social positions and power construction through legal statuses, space-based resource distribution, and racial and linguistic power formations in evaluation and curriculum policies. The sense of otherness or alterity is reconfigured in a local framework as values, moral constitutions, and subjectivities are products of local and historical semiotic processes (Henry, 2020; Liu, 2002). Our examination demonstrated how the nation's historical lived experiences and localized LIEPP constituted racializing linguistic practices of foreign-bodied speaking subjects.

Conclusion

In this article, context- and space-specific analysis was rendered to gain an in-depth understanding of raciolinguistic ideologies in non-Western educational contexts. Through examining LIEPP in Turkey and Korea, we recognize the importance of acknowledging each geographic context, including the colonial and imperial histories, sociocultural norms, and sociopolitical contexts. While this article shed light on the complex interconnectedness of LIEPP and raciolinguistic ideologies in non-Western educational contexts by examining national language education rather than English language education, there were some limitations. Due to the authors' limited access to publicly available data, the analyses may not reflect the most up-to-date language-in-education policies and implementation practices. Furthermore, while the authors' local knowledge informed the analyses of LIEPP, specific day-to-day policy implementations in certain localized contexts are limited to the authors' experience, knowledge, and reflection.

Despite the limitations, the analysis of LIEPP in transnational contexts indicates implications in both research and practice. First, the analysis suggests theoretical implications in terms of the conceptualization of raciolinguistic ideologies. Although raciolinguistic perspectives offer a broad theoretical lens to encompass racial, religious, or class differences as they intersect with perceptions of linguistic deficits, the definition of race is typically perceived and interpreted through a color-based lens. As Nishiyama (2015) suggested, the new contemporary racism is constructed beyond the Eurocentric view of racism shaped by sociopolitical and sociocultural histories. Analyzing and interpreting racial experience through a homogenous lens may not afford the opportunity to gain insights into other aspects of oppression (H. J. Kim, 2020). The evolving and localized conceptions of race in transnational education contexts need to be taken into consideration as legal or immigration status, religious backgrounds, national origins, and 'pure blood' ideologies function as mechanisms of oppression to perpetuate idealized monolingual and monoglossic ideologies in non-Western contexts.

Furthermore, as neoliberal imperialism impacts contemporary language and education policies as much as colonial histories, it is critical to unpack these concepts and distinguish the meaning of decolonization and deimperialization as we interpret raciolinguistic realities in global education contexts. Chen (2010) theorized an analytical tool, *Asia as Method*, to re-discover and re-analyze the geo-colonial history and materialism by centering the analysis on East Asia. In this theorization, Chen asserted that unequal

power relations and imperialism are enabled and intensified through globalization movements. While decolonization is carried out in the space of the colonized terrain, deimperialization is the process that needs to be carried out by the colonizers by critically examining the conduct, motive, and larger historical impacts of imperialist history. Chen highlighted that deimperialization and decolonization could not unfold without the emergence of globalization because, without globalized deimperialization movements, conflicts arising from unequal power distribution are bound to occur. The analyses of LIEPP in Turkey and Korea uncovered the remnant of imperialization and colonization histories intensified by globalization.

The analyses demonstrated that LIEPP, geopolitical contexts, and legal statuses perpetuate and reproduce raciolinguistic ideologies in transnational education contexts. Scholars emphasized the intersection of political economy, social class, and race in language policies, which constructs inequitable access to education for bi-/multilingual students (Block & Corona, 2022). Analyses of access, curriculum, evaluation, and personnel policies revealed deeply rooted monoglossic ideologies in Turkey and Korea that legitimize linguistic, cultural, religious, economic, and ancestral hierarchies. Language and language policies have functioned as a tool to advance socioeconomic opportunities in many countries (Albury, 2021). By putting forth the unification rationale, both nations utilized language-in-education policies and legal statuses as mechanisms to reproduce raciolinguistic ideologies in their racial regimes. These resulted in linguistically minoritized groups and communities remaining in lower socioeconomic statuses, thus repeating the cycle of oppression.

Lastly, critical reflection and examination of LIEPP are essential to disrupting the cycle of oppression and reproduction of raciolinguistic ideologies. Regarding access policy, implementing home language surveys could provide more access to asset-based bilingual education for students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Although curriculum and evaluation policies require radical changes at the administration and national curricular level, by critical re-interpretations of policies and implementation of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy or asset-based pedagogy, there are opportunities to make pedagogical innovations against raciolinguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Vanbuel & Van den Branden, 2022). Furthermore, at the level of curriculum and personnel policies, more investment and a separate allocation of budget are necessary for under-budgeted and underrepresented educational spaces to promote equitable education for bi-/multilingual students. Through a critical reflection and awareness of raciolinguistic realities embedded in seemingly homogenous racial contexts such as Turkey and Korea, we can remove our raciolinguistically blind gazes and take the next step to provide equitable and innovative education for all students.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Hyunjin Jinna Kim  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3977-8667>

Tuba Yilmaz  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2844-1230>

Yong-Jik Lee  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8783-2237>

Notes on contributors

Hyunjin Jinna Kim is a Postdoctoral Associate at Stony Brook University, coordinating and designing inclusive curriculum and instruction for diverse students in higher education. Her research broadly focuses on issues related to minoritized linguistic, cultural, ethnic, and racial identities in education and ways to provide equitable and inclusive education.

Tuba Yilmaz is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Education, Culture, and Society at the University of Utah. She has nine years of teaching experience at K-12 and tertiary-levels in Turkey and the USA. Her research studies focus on translanguaging, multilingual/multicultural education, refugee student education, and critical pedagogy.

Yong Jik Lee received his Ph.D. in ESOL/Bilingual Education at the University of Florida and his MA in TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) from Indiana State University. He is currently a research professor at Chonnam National University. His research and work focus on English language teaching with technology and incorporating AI in the ELT

References

- Albury, N. J. (2021). Language policy, ideological clarification, and theory of mind. *Language Policy*, 20(2), 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-020-09547-z>
- Alim, H. S. (2016). Introducing raciolinguistics: Racing language and languaging race in hyperracial times. In H. S. Alim, J. R. Rickford, & A. F. Ball (Eds.), *Raciolinguistics: How language shapes our ideas about race* (pp. 1–32). Oxford University Press.
- Anatolian News Agency. (2012, March 10). *Kürtçe seçmeli ders eğitimi başladı* [Kurdish elective courses started]. AA News. <https://www.sabah.com.tr/egitim/kurtce-secmeli-ders-egitimi-basladi-2255069>
- Arık-Akyüz, B. M., Aksoy, D., Madra, A., & Polat, E. (2018). *Evolution of national policy in Turkey on the integration of Syrian children into the national education system*. (Background paper for Global Education Monitoring Report 2018). <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0026/002660/266069e.pdf>
- Asante, M. K. (2008). The ideological significance of Afrocentricity in intercultural communication. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global intercultural communication reader* (pp. 47–55). Routledge.
- Atalay, N., Kılıç, Z., Anılan, B., Anılan, H., & Anagün, S. S. (2022). Syrian refugee children's education in Turkish public schools: Primary school teachers' experiences. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 22, 265–281. <https://doi.org/10.14689/enad.10>
- Bak, H. (2019). Beyond the economy: Education for development. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 40(2019), 751–755. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.06.001>
- Barker, M. (1981). *The new racism: Conservatives and the ideology of the tribe*. Junction Books.
- Block, D., & Corona, V. (2022). Critical LPP and the intersection of class, race and language policy and practice in twenty first century Catalonia. *Language Policy*, 21(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-09508-7>
- Bozan, M. A., & Celik, S. (2021). Mülteci eğitiminde “uyum sınıflarına” yönelik bir değerlendirme [An evaluation of “integration classes” for refugee children]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 36(2), 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2020060235>
- Cain, G. (2014, February 24). Kim Yuna and the art of suffering. *The World*. <https://theworld.org/stories/2014-02-24/kim-yuna-and-korean-art-suffering>
- Canagarajah, S. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of migration and language*. Routledge.
- Çelebi, M. D. (2006). Türkiye’de anadil eğitimi ve yabancı dil öğretimi [Mother tongue education and foreign language teaching in Turkey]. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21(2), 285–307. <https://dergipark.org.tr/download/article-file/219375>
- Chen, K. (2010). *Asia as method: Toward deimperialization*. Duke University Press.
- Chung, E. A. (2020). Creating hierarchies of noncitizens: Race, gender, and visa categories in South Korea. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(12), 2497–2514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1561061>

- Çiğerci, F. M., & Güngör, F. (2016). The problems encountered by the foreign primary school students from the perspectives of classroom teachers (Bilecik Sampling). *Journal of Education and Future*, 0(10), 137–164. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jef/issue/24512/259774>
- Corona, V., & Block, D. (2020). Raciolinguistic micro-aggressions in the school stories of immigrant adolescents in Barcelona: A challenge to the notion of Spanish exceptionalism? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(7), 778–788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1713046>
- Coşkun, V., Derince, M. S., & Uçarlar, N. (2010). *Dil Yarasi: Türkiye’de Eğitimde Anadilinin Kullanılmaması Sorunu ve Kurt Oğrencilerin Deneyimleri* [The provincial wound: The problem of not using the mother language in education in Turkey and the experiences of Kurdish students]. Disa Publications.
- de Mejía, A. (2002). *Power, prestige and bilingualism: International perspectives on elite bilingual education*. Multilingual Matters.
- Doğanay, Ü., & Çoban-Keneş, H. (2016). Yazılı basında Suriyeli ‘mülteciler’: Ayrımcı söylemlerin rasyonel ve duygusal gerekçelerinin inşası [Syrian ‘refugees’ in the print media: Constructing rational and emotional justifications for discriminatory discourses]. *Mülkiye Dergisi*, 40(1), 143–184. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/487464>
- Dovchin, S. (2019). Language crossing and linguistic racism: Mongolian immigrant women in Australia. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 14(4), 334–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2019.1566345>
- Ekici, H. (2019). Turk toplumunda Suriyeli’lere yönelik algılanan tehditler ve çözüm önerileri [Perceived threats to Syrians in Turkish society and solutions]. *Sosyal Politika Calismalari Dergisi*, 19(44), 2148–9424. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/819915>
- Eryaman, M. Y., & Evran, S. (2019). Syrian refugee students’ lived experiences at temporary education centers in Turkey. In K. Arar, J. S. Brooks, & I. Bogotch (Eds.), *Education, immigration and migration: Policy, leadership and praxis for a changing world* (pp. 131–143). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78756-044420191009>
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171. <https://doi.org/10.17763/0017-8055.85.2.149>
- Garner, S. (2007). *Whiteness: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Genç, A. (2004). Türkiye’de ilk ve ortaöğretim okullarında yabancı dil öğretimi [Foreign language teaching in primary and secondary schools in Turkey]. *Kırgızistan-Manas Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 10, 107–111. <https://docplayer.biz.tr/2322164-Turkiye-de-ilk-ve-ortaogretim-okullarinda-yabanci-dil-ogretimi.html>
- Grillo, R. D. (2003). Cultural essentialism and cultural anxiety. *Anthropological Theory*, 3(2), 157–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1463499603003002002>
- Gümüş, E., Kurnaz, Z., Eşici, H., & Gümüş, S. (2020). Current conditions and issues at Temporary Education Centres (TECs) for Syrian child refugees in Turkey. *Multicultural Education Review*, 12(2), 53–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2020.1756083>
- Güngör, F., & Şenel, E. (2018). Yabancı uyruklu ilkokul öğrencilerinin eğitim – öğretiminde yaşanan sorunlara ilişkin öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri [Opinions of teachers and students on the problems experienced in the education of foreign primary school students]. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 8(2), 124–173. <https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.454575>
- Gürel, D., & Büyükşahin, Y. (2020). Education of Syrian refugee children in Turkey: Reflections from the application. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 16(5), 426–442. <https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2020.277.26>
- Hamid, M. O., Hoang, N. T. H., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2019). Language tests, linguistic gatekeeping and global mobility. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 20(3), 226–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2018.1495371>
- Harrison, F. V. (1999). Introduction: Expanding the discourse on “race”. *American Anthropologist*, 100(3), 609–631. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1998.100.3.609>

- Henry, E. S. (2020). The otherness of talk: Raciolinguistics and the White foreign body of English in China. *Anthropological Forum*, 30(4), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2020.1851653>
- İşigüzel, B., & Baldık, Y. (2019). Göçmen Toplulukların Eğitim Sistemine Katılımı Sürecinde Uygulanan Eğitim ve Dil Politikalarının İncelenmesi [Investigation of education and language policies applied in the process of immigrant communities' participation in the education system]. *Neveşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 9(2), 487–503. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/nevsosbilen/issue/51363/601434>
- Jeon, S., Oh, S., Kim, J., & Jang, E. (2018). *Gyowoneui damunhwa gyoyuk yeokryang jaegoleul wihan gayideulayin gaebal yeongu* [Guideline development research to improve teachers' multicultural education capabilities]. National Center for Multicultural Education.
- Johnson, D. C. (2013). *Language policy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kang, J. (2020). Reconciling progressivism and xenophobia through scapegoating: Anti-multiculturalism in South Korea's online forums. *Critical Asian Studies*, 52(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14672715.2019.1689832>
- Kang, M. (2008). *Nationalism movement in Korea*. West Sea Academy Press.
- Kang, S. (2010). Multicultural education and the rights to education of migrant children in South Korea. *Educational Review*, 62(3), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2010.503599>
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (1997). *Language planning from practice to theory*. Multilingual Matters.
- Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005). Language-in-education policy and planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1013–1034). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Karagöz, N. (2016). *Secmeli Kurtce dersine karsin velilerin tutumlari* [Attitudes of parents against elective Kurdish lesson, Master's thesis, Dicle University]. <https://acikerisim.dicle.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11468/3116/Se%C3%A7meli%20K%C3%BCrt%C3%A7e%20dersine%20kar%C5%9F%C4%B1%20veli%20tutumlari%C4%B1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Kaysılı, A., Soylu, A., & Sever, M. (2019). Exploring major roadblocks on inclusive education of Syrian refugees in school settings. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 8(2), 109–128. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.496261>
- KESS (Korean Educational Statistics Service). (2022). *Educational statistics: Number of multicultural students by type*. https://kess.kedi.re.kr/eng/stats/school?menuCd=0101&cd=5452&survSeq=2022&itemCode=01&menuId=m_010109&uppCd1=010109&uppCd2=010109&flag=A
- Kim, H. J. (2020). 'Where are you from? Your English is so good': a Korean female scholar's auto-ethnography of academic imperialism in U.S. higher education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 33(5), 491–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1681551>
- Kim, J., Jeong, C., & Kim, S. (2010). *Damoonhwa gajok shiltaejosa* [Multicultural family survey]. Korean Multi-Culture Research Institute. http://www.kimcf.or.kr/bbs/board.php?bo_table=data_policy&page=2
- Kim, S. S. C. (2017). Korean “Han” and the postcolonial afterlives of “the beauty of sorrow”. *Korean Studies*, 41(1), 253–279. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ks.2017.0026>
- Kılıç, V. A., & Toker-Gökçe, A. (2018). The problems of Syrian students in the basic education in Turkey. *European Journal of Social Science Education and Research*, 5(1), 199–211. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejser.v12i1.p215-227>
- Koçak, O., Arifoğlu, A. T., & Younis, M. Z. (2021). Determination of social exclusion among young Syrian refugees living in Turkey. *European Journal of Environment and Public Health*, 5(2), em0076. <https://doi.org/10.21601/ejeph/10908>
- Korea Immigration Service. (2020). *K.I.S. Statistics 2019 (2019 Chulipguk Oegukin Tong'gye Yonbo)*. Korea Immigration Service, Ministry of Justice. <https://www.moj.go.kr/bbs/immigration/228/527712/artclView.do>
- Korean Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. (2021). *National exams*. <https://www.kice.re.kr/sub/info.do?m=010603&s=kice#tablink>

- Korean National Curriculum Information Center. (2015). *National curriculum of Korea: 2015 revision*. Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation. <http://ncic.re.kr/english.kri.org.inventoryList.do#>
- KOSIS. (2023). *Population dash board*. Korean Statistical Information Service. <https://kosis.kr/visual/populationKorea/populationIndex.do>
- Koulish, R., & van der Woude, M. (2020). *Crimmigrant nations: Resurgent nationalism and the closing of borders*. Fordham University Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146819509700104>
- Lee, C. S. (2017). Narratives of ‘mixed race’ youth in South Korea: Racial order and in-betweenness. *Asian Ethnicity*, 18(4), 522–542. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2016.1219940>
- Lee, J. (2022, February 7). Jeongyosaengeui 98.3%ga damunhwa haksaeung yigido [98.3% of all students are from multicultural families]. *Hangoonk NGO Shinmoon*. <http://www.ngonews.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=131970>
- Lim, T. C. (2021). *The road to multiculturalism in South Korea*. Routledge.
- Liu, X. (2002). *The otherness of self: A genealogy of the self in contemporary China*. University of Michigan Press.
- Maadad, N., & Yilmaz, M. (2021). Educational policies and schooling for Arabic speaking refugee children in Australia and Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 46(11), <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2021v46n11.2>
- McAuliffe, M., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). *World migration report 2022*. International Organization for Migration. <https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2022>
- McCarthy, A. T. (2018). Politics of refugee education: Educational administration of the Syrian refugee crisis in Turkey. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 50(3), 223–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2018.1440541>
- Miike, Y. (2014). The Asiancentric turn in Asian communication studies: Shifting paradigms and changing perspectives. In M. K. Asante, Y. Miike, & J. Yin (Eds.), *The global communication reader* (pp. 111–133). Routledge.
- Miles, R., & Brown, M. (2003). *Theories of race and racism: A reader*. Routledge.
- Ministry of Education. (2021, November 22). *Holding an international and multicultural education contest for prospective teachers*. <https://if-blog.tistory.com/12801>
- Ministry of Education. (2023a). *2023 damunhwa gyoyuk jeongchaekhakgyo woonyeong gayideu* [2023 multicultural education policy school guidelines]. Ministry of Education. <https://edu4mc.or.kr/edu/list.html#>
- Ministry of Education. (2023b). *2023nyeon damunhwa gyoyuk jiwongaehwaekan*. <https://edu4mc.or.kr/guide/laws/view.html>
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE). (2022). *T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Hayat Boyu Öğrenme Genel Müdürlüğü, Göç ve Acil Durum Daire Başkanlığı* [General directorate of lifelong learning, immigration and emergency department]. Ministry of National Education. http://hbogm.meb.gov.tr/meb_ays_dosyalar/2022_01/26165737_goc2022sunu.pdf
- Nishiyama, H. (2015). Towards a global genealogy of biopolitics: Race, colonialism, and biometrics beyond Europe. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 33, 331–346. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d19912>
- Öğretmen Ağı & SEÇBİR. (2022). *Refugees in school books* [Ders kitaplarında multeciler]. https://www.ogretmenagi.org/sites/www.ogretmenagi.org/files/publications/DersKitaplarindaMulteciler_07_04_2022.pdf
- Park, J. S. (2022). Foreign language education at the nexus of neoliberalism and coloniality: Subjectivity in south Korean discourses of education reform. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 19(4), 336–354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2022.2086553>
- Park, M. (2022, December 19). Jeongyosaeng julban damunhwa haksaeung ... matchumhyeong gyoyuk hwalseonghwa [Half of all students are multicultural students ... Active customized training]. *KBS News*. <https://news.kbs.co.kr/news/pc/view/view.do?ncd=5628931>
- PIKTES. (2021). *Suriye çocukların Türk eğitim sistemine entegrasyonunun desteklenmesi projesi* [Project for supporting the integration of Syrian children into the Turkish education system]. PIKTES. <https://piktes.gov.tr/Home/Faaliyetler>

- Rahman, T. (2010). A multilingual language-in-education policy for indigenous minorities in Bangladesh: Challenges and possibilities. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 11(4), 341–359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2010.537816>
- Robertson, S. (2011). Cash cows, backdoor migrants or activist citizens? International students, citizenship, and rights in Australia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(12), 2192–2211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.558590>
- Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society*, 46(5), 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404517000562>
- Seydi, A. R. (2014). Türkiye'nin Suriyeli sığınmacıların eğitim sorununun çözümüne yönelik izlediği politikalar [Policies followed by Turkey to solve the education problem of Syrian refugees]. *SDÜ Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 31, 267–305. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/117752>
- Spijkerboer, T. (2018). Gender, sexuality, asylum and European human rights. *Law and Critique*, 29(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10978-017-9219-2>
- Strekalova-Hughes, E. (2019). Unpacking refugee flight: Critical content analysis of picturebooks featuring refugee protagonists. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 21(2), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.18251/ijme.v21i2.1871>
- Taşkın, P., & Erdemli, O. (2018). Suriyeli mülteciler için eğitim: Türkiye'de öğretmenlerin karşılaştığı sorunlar [Education for Syrian refugees: Problems faced by teachers in Turkey]. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 18(75), 155–178. <https://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2018.75.9>
- Tıraş, Y. C., & Ertürk, H. I. (2015). Türk dili devrimi ile Türkçe'nin kazanımları [Turkish language revolution and gains of Turkish]. *Journal of Turkish Language and Literature*, 1(2), 205–220. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/181199>
- Uçar, F., & Akandere, O. (2017). Turgut Ozal'ın Kurt sorununa yaklaşımı [Turgut Ozal's approach to the Kurdish problem]. *Ankara Üniversitesi Türk İnkılâp Tarihi Enstitüsü Atatürk Yolu Dergisi*, 61, 365–392. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/675412>
- Ünal, K., Taşkaya, S. M., & Ersoy, G. (2018). Suriyeli göçmenlerin yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğrenirken karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri [Problems and solutions that Syrian immigrants encounter while learning Turkish as a foreign language]. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 4(2), 134–149. <https://doi.org/10.31592/aeusbed.472814>
- Usta, M. E., Arıkan, I., Şahin, Y., & Çetin, M. S. (2018). Suriyeli eğitimcilerin gözünden geçici eğitim merkezlerinde karşılaşılan sorunların incelenmesi [Examining the problems encountered in temporary education centers from the perspective of Syrian Educators]. *Mukaddime*, 9(1), 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.341921>
- Vanbuel, M., & Van den Branden, K. (2022). Examining the implementation of language education policies in mainstream primary schools. *Language Policy*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-022-09631-6>
- Wong, A. D., Su, H., & Hiramoto, M. (2021). Complicating raciolinguistics: Language, Chineseness, and the Sinophone. *Language & Communication*, 76, 131–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2020.11.005>