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1. Introduction

This chapter begins with a digest before an overview of the context and background framing the study. The problem statement, the statement of purpose, and accompanying research questions follow it. Also, discussion sections are allocated for the research design overview, researcher’s assumptions about the research problem and his position in the study with his background, knowledge and connection with the research context. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the significance and rationale of this study.

1.1 Abstract

This study seeks to comparatively explore, through the case of the Greek and Turkish compulsory education, how the citizenship have been perceived, and how the direction of objectives regarding citizenship policies in these two historically bounded nation-states’ education have been affected by the social and political changes. It was anticipated that the knowledge generated from this inquiry would create a tentative ground for further researches about citizenship policies in the referred policy contexts. I adopted a conceptual-theoretical analysis based on the examination of official policy documents framing the rules and objectives of educational activities and curricula goals of civic-related subject areas taught at both Greek and Turkish schools. In this way, it was aimed to reveal the differences and similarities in the focus of the citizenship policies in these two states.

The findings indicate that both Greece and Turkey have commonalities in terms of their approach to citizenship equated with creation of a collective national identity and have kept their ethnocentric and assimilationist view of citizenship so far. Moreover, these two states’ integration into the global world and their diverse population do not seem to have created an influencing discourse for the policy makers so much. Despite some improvements, there is still need for a more inclusive citizenship policy in both states.
1.2 Background of the Study

The changing nature of identity in today’s societies is often expressed by the scholars as a result of socio-political occurrences at global and local levels (Banks, 2008; Castells, 2004; Soysal, 1996). As a result, the role of nation-states in relation to create collective identities through their citizenship policies is claimed to have been challenged. However, this transformation does not occur all around the world at the same phase. While some states are said to face with the cultural diversity in their education policies, many national educational systems, Greek and Turkey included, continue assimilationist policies by promoting rigid and predetermined citizenship identities. School curricula and the legislative educational documents impose an approach based on cultural monolism and are determined centrally. Consequently, an exclusive and hegemonic citizenship model constructed on the dominant values, language, symbols and ethnicity has prolonged.

The states of Greece and Turkey, which view themselves as the high-point of Greek and Turkish national identity, have inherited these debates but try to find a way for a more inclusive citizenship policy through their education systems due to the marking social and international context. As a result of these attempts, a fierce political battle between the conservative nationalist and liberal political groups in both states continues. This study describes and analyses the direction of citizenship policies in these contexts.

1.3 Problem Statement

Literature about the cases of Greece and Turkey shows that education in both countries historically had explicitly defined ideological objectives and strongly nationalist motives as an instrument to ideal citizen building project. Despite the global trend toward more inclusive and universal identity policies, these two countries have been criticized in terms of their educational objectives’ incompatibility with the changing social realities. Some researches have been done to analyze the changing citizenship policies separately at different levels (Mandyr, 2009; Chelmis, 1999; Sakonidis, 2001 etc.). However, there is little information as to how the reflection of citizenship policies in these two countries’ education system have evolved as a response to socio-political changes from a comparative perspective.
1.4 Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

It is anticipated that, through mapping of the developments of citizenship policies in education system at macro-level, more grounded judgment can be made about the compatibility of the policies with changing social realities in both countries. To shed light on the problem, the central question of the study seeks to address: How has the ideological objectives of citizenship policies in Turkish and Greek Education curricula as a result of social and political developments? This general question involves the research questions elaborated in chapter three and a final comparative ground question addressing what the differences and similarities in the direction of citizenship policies are in Greece and Turkey.

1.5 Research Design

In order to answer the research questions, the researcher adopted a qualitative approach considering the nature of the questions and research focus. There are basically two steps in the inquiry:

- Theoretical Analysis- which involves a review of literature on basic terms employed in the study such as citizenship, nation-state and citizenship policy in education and the position of Greek and Turkish nation-states’ in this field as well as mapping of socio-political background of both states.

- Qualitative Analysis- Based on the review of the relevant literature and analysis of official binding educational documents which explicitly present the intentions, objectives and ideals of the policy makers. In other words, the main data source is the official curricula of the civic-related subjects, educational laws and relevant policy texts. These documents are analyzed with an interpretative hermeneutical approach in align with the objectives of the study.

After investigating the country cases, the researcher focuses on finding the similarities and differences in the way how these two historically identical countries diverge or resemble in their policies in relation to their sociopolitical conditions.
1.6 Assumptions

Based on the researcher’s background knowledge and the prior literature review, two primary assumptions were made regarding this study. First, both countries impose explicit values aiming to build their rigid single citizenship framework, as both Greece and Turkey are keeping their nationalist roots with historical pride. Secondly, as a result of the surviving political culture attached to this tradition in both of them, they may present a slow transition toward more inclusive citizenship model recognizing multiple identities. This assumption is based on the premise that both Greece and Turkey have had pursuit of a homogeneous Turkish and Greek citizenship identity (Soysal, 1996; Dimitris, 2009) since their foundation and their socio political conditions revealed by an intensive literature review.

1.7 The Researcher

At the time of conducting this study, the researcher was an MA student in Policy and Planning concentration of Comparative and International Education Department. Hence, he had chance to implement his fresh knowledge on policy practices to the inquiry. Also, as he comes from Turkey, he brings to the process practical experience by having advance knowledge and understanding of the context of the research.

Even though the same inspiring experience may jeopardize the subjectivity and lead the researcher to biased judgments, eradication of the bias in question was tried to be maintained through self reflection and feedback received by contact with academic advisor, and colleagues as well as paying attention to the validity issues discussed in the chapter three.

1.8 Rationale and Significance

The reason why these two countries were chosen is their similarities in terms of political and social structure since their foundation as centralized nation-states. This resemblance having led to identical structural practices, and in then, it promises a common base and provides an equal unit of analysis for comparison.
The rationale for this study springs from the researcher’s desire to uncover the direction of the citizenship policies in Greek and Turkish education and prepare a solid ground for comparing two countries’ performance in development of inclusive policies as response to the social and political realities.

Revealing the citizenship policy goals and comparing two countries’ cases may provide a framework for evaluating the performance of these two countries in actualizing more inclusive citizenship policies that can meet the changing diverse social structures of two countries as a result of immigration and the rise of minority rights demand and beside a theoretical offspring for further researches in this research context.

1.9 Structure of the thesis

The thesis starts with a theoretical and background chapter to provide some insight to the main concepts relating to my study. The theory part consists of two main sections. The first section was allocated for the discussion about the concepts of citizenship, citizenship policy and education. The second chapter provides a soci-historical background of Greek and Turkish cases. The information obtained from this chapter helps me to create a framework to conduct my research. The following methodology chapter deals with a detailed description of the methods employed in the research. A conceptual definition introduces the chapter in which policy term and policy research is defined and the approach to policy research is discussed to ratify my research approach. The significance of the policy text analysis and the methods used for analysis continues the discussion. The last part of this chapter is allocated for the ethical and technical issues of the study. The challenges I had to face during the research and analysis period, delimitations and limitations of the research conclude the chapter. In the subsequent chapter, the actual analyses take place under the light of the findings. The findings are discussed according to the research questions for each case separately and at the end of the chapter a comparison is done between them. The final chapter is the conclusion chapter, in which the results from the analyses are summarized aligning with the assumptions and some concluding remarks are added.
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2. Theoretical and Historical Background

2.1 Introduction

This critical review aims to provide a conceptual framework for the research questions of the study. In the light of this, two major areas of the literature were critically reviewed: The first part is theoretical background and discusses the concepts regarding the conception of citizenship. This part is presented in three main sections: Definition of the disputed citizenship term, its dimensions and association with identity are discussed and citizenship policies applied in nation-states are presented. The first part serves as a bridge to the review’s second part which focuses on the schooling-citizenship relation in detail. After the discussion of the role of education in creating citizens, the paradigm shifts in citizenship policies through education and legacy of the nation-states in these policies as a result of the changing nature of the nation-states triggered by globalization and its counterparts are reviewed. The second part is allocated to the historical and political discourse of the two states selected for the study, Greece and Turkey. First historical and political background is presented about two states. Linking to this background, their historical citizenship policies are discussed. Then, finally, the new social and political changes in these two countries, similarities and differences regarding their policies in creating citizens conclude the chapter.

2.2 Theoretical Background

2.2.1 Clearing the Air before Starting: Nation, State, and Nation-State

In this section, I will critically review the citizenship within the discourse of nation state. This discourse has direct impact on the meaning, and function of citizenship and citizenship policies referred in this study. Therefore, clarifying the “nation-state” term is a prerequisite for better understanding of the discussions about the critical concepts referred in this chapter.
Manzon and Bray (2007) attributes the looseness in the use of nation-state term to the confusion about the concepts of ‘country’, ‘state’ and ‘nation’. It is thus crucial to start clarification with these terms. As the least problematic term, ‘country’ simply refers to a geographical territory, whereas state is a political unit having sovereignty on this territory which is populated by people. A state, in this sense, is a more political entity composed of set of institutions having the legitimate power to govern its people. In common perception of state; these people who are living in the same state simply make up a single unit called “nation”. These nations are literally groups of people who are bound together by a strong sense of unity with shared beliefs and customs, the same language, culture, and territory with a historical continuity (Gelner, 1983; McKean, 2005). Similarly, Ernest Renan argues that what ultimately holds a nation together is sharing in the past, a glorious heritage and regrets and a shared future (Renan, 1996). Such conceptions of nation are a result of classic 18th century German philosophy which equates ethnicity as a community with demographic characteristics, language, religion and culture. For the German philosophers of that period, the existence of a nation is not a selection of its members, but the result of such common features, which form their consciences (Safran & Dilek, 2008).

On the other hand, Anderson (1991) refuses the entity of the first romantic model of nation definition in reality and portrays nation as "an imagined political community that is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" and a nation exist in the minds of their members with all these shared fabricated paradigms (p. 6). In this frame, Christina, Mehran and Mir (2002) and Mc Kean (2005) base the nation on the external references such as linguistic and cultural sameness, while Anderson (1991) focuses on the psychological dimension in persuasion of common membership to a nation. We must therefore emphasize that state and nation are two conditions which are often confused and used interchangeably, but not always identical. The state is a political entity with a specific territory, recognized borders, population, and political organization. The nation, on the other hand, is a module which is distinguished by demographic characteristics, language, religion and culture, common historical consciousness and experiences, and values, which cause people a sense of ethnic community (Dinc, 2008).

A special combination of these two entities leads us to the nation-state concept. Nation-state is a result of a nation having the same borders as a state. Namely, it is the geographical coincidence of the political state entity with a cultural or ethnic entity (White, 2006). The
nation-state, as an ideological construction of the European Enlightenment, bases on the nation conception which sees the people of a state as group of people linked by common race, common language, common customs and traditions and a common historical space and time (Walker, 2003). A key idea is that the moral elevation of its members and their progress can be ensured best in the nation-state. Combination of these perceptions provides an enormous legitimacy and efficiency for ensuring the sovereignty of a state (Wang, 2004). Hence, states have been interested in the promises of being ‘nation-state’, because it promises to attain the legitimacy, even if the presence of nation-state in reality has never become possible (Green, 1997). States’ defining themselves as ‘nation-state’ then can be understood as a common strategy in building a sense of internal unity among the people they govern. In this sense, even if the term has no concrete reference in the real world, the term ‘nation-state’ is used for the states which pursue policies on the way of being a ‘nation-state’, promoting their own preferred vision of nation and a sense of shared national identity streaming from the values of the dominant group within the boundaries of the country.

### 2.2.2 Citizenship Conception

**The Origin and Definitions of Citizenship**

In this turnout of state and nation-state, citizenship as a membership status to the state has gained different meanings. Historically, a citizen was first simply a member or “denizen” of a city, a carrier of urban collectivity which was relatively decoupled from the demands of a state (Bennett, Grossberg & Morris, 2005; Janoski, 1998). In this sense, the early references to citizenship reveal its limited meaning as simply the inhabitant of a city or a certain province. The evolution of this early conception to the classic citizenship, in which citizens are the members who are allowed to have some legal and political rights and obligations, can be traced to Ancient Greece (Bellamy, 2008). The framework of citizenship of that time was bound to obligations of citizens towards their city community. This framework, imposing the obligations as the virtues rather than rights, was limited to a small portion of the city population who were men having had property. This citizen group had the right to participate in political life directly through military service or other service sectors (Derek, 2004). This city level model of citizenship was expanded by the Roman Empire to the entire population on the same continuum of rights and duties.
This enduring classical concept was revisited in the context of the bourgeois revolutions of Europe in the 18th and 19th century and the emergence of nation-states in the aftermath of these revolutionary transformations introduced relatively new features to this concept (Purvis & Hunt, 1999; Janoski, 1998). These new states, which were founded with an emphasis on national roots, actively engaged in the solidification of its own national characteristics through a common language, territory, symbols, and values to keep their communities under their rule against the ethnic and cultural fractions. In this hegemonic nation-building project, the citizenship had a central role (Purvis & Hunt, 1999), since identification through citizenship could provide a stronger bond than that of other social classes (Rex, 1996).

This motivation of the new states brought two new features to the citizenship: Firstly, the accessibility of the rights and obligations of citizenship gradually expanded to all individuals (Janoski, 1998). Bennett, Grossberg and Morris (2005) attribute this expansion to the growth of state power over civil society. Similarly, Ravazzolo (1995) explains this change as an attempt of the state authority to seize and control the individuals not to leave even one single member out of the nation building process. Secondly, the concept of citizen became associated with the constitution and operation of the nation-state (Torres, 2002; Purvis & Hunt, 1999). The constitution process was a result of the attempt to identify citizens of a state in a way that its members differentiate themselves and their own state from other states and create an emotional attachment and sense of belonging through prescribed national values.

This conceptual association is stressed in the definitions of citizenship in a nation-state context. Banks (2008) highlights nation-state, duties and loyalty to state while defining a citizen as an individual who lives within the border of the nation-state and has rights and privileges, as well as duties to the state, such as allegiance to the government. Like Banks, Janovski (1998) sees the membership to a nation-state as the prerequisite of citizenship. Another definition by Somers (1993) remarks the embedded nature of citizenship into the institutionally political idiom of the state by rejecting the definition of citizenship as a passive member of the population. Koopmans et al. (2005) also sets his definition in the tight bond between nation-states and citizenship, which is the set of rights, duties, and identities linking
citizens to the nation-state. This definition indicates that the border of obligation and rights make sense if they bind the people or increase their allegiance to the state in this context.

**Dimensions of Citizenship**

As these diverse definitions partially indicate, citizenship in nation-states was reconstructed on a base in which membership was situated in the ideological foundations of nation-states and that citizenries are basically associated with national identities (Joppke & Morawska, 2003). Jenson (2001) argues that this citizenship model is basically driven by “the definition of nation in both the narrow passport sense of nationality and the more complicated notion of national identity and its geography” (p. 5), therefore establishment of the boundaries of belonging in addition to its classical elements such as emphasis of basic values about the responsibility, and the formal recognition of particular rights. In this sense, citizenship in nation-states has switched to a three-dimensional-frame consisting of rights, duties and identities.

The rights regarding the citizenship status was categorized as civil, political, and social rights by Marshall (1964) in his study of Citizenship and Social Class. He discussed that these rights emerged successively since 18th century to the 20th century with the development of a nation-state citizenship. Accordingly, civil rights refer to ”the legal state of being” (passive) such as free to own property, freedom to worship. On the other hand, political rights include “the legal state of doing” (active) like the right to vote and standing for the office (as cited in Bendix, 1996). As for the most recent of three, social rights grant social protection and access to education and social facilities.

“The rights” dimension of citizenship may be ascribed to the effort of authorizing the citizens in a state, but accepting rights brings some obligations in return. Marshall (1964) words this aspect: “If citizenship is invoked in the defense of rights, the corresponding duties of citizenship cannot be ignored” (p. 123). However, these duties have not always been in reciprocity with the granted rights throughout the nation-states’ history. In fact, when the root of the citizenship is traced, we witness that obligations were perceived as obedience. The leading member of the Girondist movement during the French Revolution, Jacques-Pierre Brissot (1789) points out this perception by stating that “people can only maintain their authority through obedience…The citizens who disobey the public authority disobeys
himself” (as cited in Janovski, 1998). Obligation in citizenship, which was primarily conceptualized as obedience to the state apparatus, has been approached differently on the basis of rights and duties balance in different context and three main approaches emerged from these diverse conceptualizations: In the first approach, there is a balanced reciprocal relation between obligations and rights. The rights and obligations rely on a direct exchange relation. On the contrary to this strict pragmatic model, the other obligation model includes some indirect reciprocity. Herein, some responsibilities do not entitle rights in a direct way. There are obligations from which citizens do not see direct returns but expect their returns over time as in military service, which can be perceived as an investment for their own security in the future. The third approach is the least balanced of the three in terms of exchange relation. It prescribes a moral heroism, in which the citizens are expected to fulfill their duties without any material expectations (Janovski, 1998).

Citizenship, conceived as an enclosure of these rights and obligations governing the members of a community mainly determines the political roles of the citizens as in the classical Greek conception in which citizenship was the only political identity of the members of polis (Purvis & Hunt, 1999; Burbules & Roth: 2007). Yet, Janovski’s (1998) classification of obligations shows that political roles, here, may also include a promotion of allegiance to the state and a collective national good according to the way of presentation of obligations as in moral heroism approach. The state, for example, may load a moral attribute to a regular citizenship duty such as military service as an evidence of the country love and may equalize it with self-sacrificing for the goods of nation. Such an approach leads us to question the nation-states’ citizenship conception, which emerged as a state of belonging to a national community, differently. Unlike the classical rights-obligations matrix having a limited uniting function, this notion of citizenship serves for the acquisition of a sense of belonging by citizens (Rex, 1996) and collectivity. And this is ensured through developing an ability to differentiate their own nation state, their nation, and their culture. Then, introduction of common values, symbolic icons and figures, building of common institutions, a shared history and a certain degree of coordinated action on different level of society have been used (Scheilke & Schreiner, 2001; Rex, 1996). Lastly, they have been encouraged to attach to each other with emotional bounds and share a common ideology (Zajda, 2009). At the junction of all these nationalist, ideological, and hegemonically cultural prerequisites of the traditional sovereignty concept,
we encounter with the identity dimension of citizenship or in other words, “citizenship as identity” (Williams, 2003).

First of all, we need to understand the components and definition of ‘identity’ to be able to grasp how it functions in the sovereignty and national unity project of the citizenship conception: There are at least two uses of the term identity: The way in which people identify themselves, namely, individual identity and the way in which others identify them (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2008). The latter one is a base for the notion of collective identity, which is targeted in citizenship projects. The word identity in collective term refers to “being the same in all respects, either to oneself or to a similar entity” (Altwajri, 2001). Erdenir (2006) notes the dependency of state of being the same in the community and adopting the national values in his identity definition. In this definition, identity is that individuals associate with the social group, which is an artifact of society and its dominant ideology and values. Erdenir (2006) lists these ideology and values as all fundamental values, traditions and beliefs, shared symbols and meanings in addition to inherent religious and ethnic elements of the society as a result of states’ struggle to make their populations united around these common values and elements. Smith (1992) expands this list by adding a historical homeland, nation, common myths and historical heritage, and a national language. The aforementioned elements of identity are built on spiritual and material bases shared by the individuals who have adopted the collective identity. Based on these elements, people are expected to identify themselves with the common identity through an emotional bound (Connor, 1978). This abstract part of identity is an area consisting of gratification and anguish, which binds people firmer. Behests and taboos, the perception of the others and the world, and the encouraged and discouraged way of life and thoughts all rationalize this side of identity. Both Connor and Smith are supported by Castells (2004) who remarks how the identities are built on both material and emotional elements. He points to history, collective memory and personal fantasies, power apparatus and religious revelations as the building materials of identities (Castells, 2004).

With whichever elements our identity is based, it includes an emotional attachment and a sense of belonging of a semi-sacred kind beside a sameness and uniformity in the group (Rex, 1996). The level of emphasis on this kind of sameness is an area to be applied by the nation-states to create a uniqueness feeling within the population. Therefore, such a uniqueness loaded to the identity is prone to lead to contemption, exclusion or otherness towards the others outside the group as they are viewed either as rivals or threats to the unity and favored
identity model (Burbules & Roth: 2007). Even Taylor (1998) sees this inclination as a natural component of identities. He claims that no identity is developed internally; on the contrary it is shaped by the relation with the outsiders. In this sense, developing an “other” against the identity is a prerequisite of creating a collective identity. In fact, this inclination is a result of the foundations of the nation-state idea: in which its members differentiate themselves from other members within and outside of the state (Rex, 1996). Hence, increasing otherness of the non-group members and reducing the sameness in the group through egocentrism, and ethnocentrism emerged as the most common strategies of states in identity construction projects (Burbules & Roth, 2007). These are ensured by assigning centrality, assertiveness, absoluteness and superiority to the elements of collective identity over the ones of other groups and nations (Norval, 1996). As a result, all other individual identities threatening the legitimating discourse of the collective identity tend to be either excluded or silenced (Purvis & Hunt, 1999).

The citizenship I applied in the study is such a conception which is a contesting area for creation of identities rather than a right-obligation matrix.

2.2.3 Citizenship Policy and Model

Identity dimension of citizenship, which governs a wide spectrum from belonging to nationalism, makes up the determining aspect of citizenship policies of nation states, which entails both identification and recognition (Purvis & Hunt, 1999). Brubaker (1996) notices this fact as follows:

> The politics of citizenship today is first and foremost ... a politics of identity, not a politics of interest...The ‘interests’ informing the politics of citizenship are ‘ideal’ rather than material. The central question is not ‘who gets what?’ but rather ‘who is what? (p. 182)

Likewise, Hall (1992) stresses how the politics of citizenship is embedded in the identity dimension. Citizenship policy basically is a struggle over the meaning of membership to the community rather than simply regulation of rights and obligations.

All these definitions invite us to focus on the identity dimension of citizenship, hence, the work of nation states in promoting their own preferred vision of nation, in addition to the broad range of conditions which serve to promote a sense of shared national identity: the
vernacular languages, fabricated rituals and traditions gain importance to understand the citizenship policy in a nation state, while conducting this study (Skinner, 1989).

When analyzing the states’ positions to the identity dimension of citizenship, two polar come out. First of all is the liberal model, having emphasis on individual and being flexible about the individual identities. Here public policy can regulate only the external behavior of people, not their inner motivations (Purvis & Hunt, 1999). On the contrary to the liberal citizenship model, the assimilationist model has explicit homogenizing imperatives, reserving citizenship status to either those who meet strict ethno-cultural criteria or accept the norms of dominant political power. Here is a strong emphasis on community-nation association, and its aim is basically building a strong community based on a collective identity (Janovski, 1998; Purvis & Hunt, 1999). It is important to note here that these polars are not absolute constructs but any state can be located in an interval section between these two points.

2.2.4 Education and Citizenship Policy

In the framework of the citizenship project explained above, the forms of creating “ideal citizens” vary in various political regimes; however, the means which they use are identical. Herein, the task of building citizens identified with the states’ ideology and paradigms is enacted through the education system. This mission to education was given in 19th century with the advent of nation-states regimes. Their embodiment has gradually loaded a new task for schools and educational practice turned into an expression of values (Hargreaves, 1998). Within this period, the education system was transformed to the transmitter of a system of values and norms and procedures to the younger generation. Beyond this fundamental function, education has started to serve a double purpose in the context of the perpetuation of the nation-states. It has been used, firstly to ensure the continuity of the homogeneous nation myth, with the help of teaching of the myths of nationhood, national identity and national culture (Brown, 1999). Secondly, it has functioned as a tool for teaching pupils about their rights, duties and obligations (Osler & Starkey, 2000).

Though, the other functions of education have been carried out for two millennia with a central purpose of preserving and passing on the values, the first function as a nation-state apparatus of acquisition of certain collective identity and allegiance to the state has been more ambitiously adopted (Griffith, 2000). In this form, it has enabled the states to promote a
common identity and loyalty towards the nation, to use the national education in connection with nation building, to foster common national identity, major culture and language, as well as encouraging symbolic and cultural role models related to the norms of behavior (Burbules & Roth, 2007; Skeie, 2001). The result of Euro Barometer 2004 showing a positive correlation between the duration of schooling and sense of belonging to European identity, which is the part of the European citizenship project, is a concrete example of the education and identity construction processes relation (as cited in Erdenir, 2006).

Assuming all these utilities of the education, many states created centralized governmental bureaucracies for decision making in directing the educational activities. Given the centralized nature of these political structures, they could maintain the content of education in align with the desired policies (Freebody, 2003). Policy documents as an expression of this centralized content can be seen as an organized result of decisions made by political institutions after political processes involving parties, interest groups, religious organizations (Griffith, 2000). Conceptually, these documents consisting of laws, curricula and decrees provide an “institutionalized forms of political knowledge, values, attitudes, and group identification” required for creation of citizens (Ichilov, 1998: 12).

As a result of engagement of states in education, the reflections of two citizenship models can be observed in education system. While the assimilationist conceptions of citizenship, which have historically dominated citizenship education in nation-states, is based on the idea that individuals from different groups have to give up their own community cultures and languages to integrate effectively in the national dominant culture under the roof of the school, liberal citizenship model views education as a utilization area for the individuals (Banks, 2008).

In this sense, liberal citizenship conception in education allocates space for the individual values and goods rather than imposing one collective frame. However, educational policies in most of the nation-states throughout the world have been guided by policies based on an assimilationist understating (Graham, 1996). In this policy circle, the aim of schools is to develop citizens who internalize their national values, respect and accept their national heroes as role model, and adopt their glorified national histories (Banks, 2008). As a result of this assimilationist citizenship policy in education, many lost their first cultures, languages, and ethnic identities (Banks, 2003).
2.2.5 Nation-State Legacy and Citizenship Policy

The point to be raised at this point is the role of the state in the choice of these policies. This can be understood better by reminding the citizenship and nation-state’s close relation. Torres (2000) claims that the two concepts—citizenship and the nation state—are interrelated to each other because nation state’s operation and constitution is linked to citizenship (Burbules & Roth, 2007). Likewise, the citizenship is attached to the state apparatus. Therefore, implementation of citizenship policies requires a state which can legally make its own decisions. The changes at both global and local levels, however, challenge the power of nation-states, and consequently citizenship policies embedded in its absolute power. The loss of their power takes place in several ways. On the one hand they find themselves belonging to supra-national entities like the European Union; on the other hand, they face with other reflections of the globalization post cold war period pointed by Soysal (1996):

“The internationalization of labor markets, characterized by massive flows of immigration...massive decolonization and emergence of small states and increased global discourse on individual rights and ethnic revitalization (p. 23).

The first progress leads the loose of the ability to readily realize the states’ particular objectives without the approval or support of supranational organizations (Wing, 2002). Besides, the created juristic relationship of these organizations with the nation-states’ citizens weakens the legal bond between the state and its members (Burbules & Roth, 2007). As for the migration flows and ethnic revival, it had more deep effects on both the absolute power of the nation-states and the traditional notion of loyal citizenship. These groups make national homogeneity ideal as a foundation of politics of citizenship irrelevant, because the presence of immigrant citizens and the rising demands of minorities ‘dissociate the citizenship from membership based on nationalist motives’, and force nation-states to emancipate from religious and ethnic values of the dominant ideology (Parsons, 1971). As a result, social unity can no longer spring from central dictated values; on the contrary, a multiplicity of conflicting conceptions of the goods (Rawls, 1985). Many ethnic, language, and religious groups develop weaker identifications with their nation-states or in the schools, day by day (Ladson-Billings, 2004). Even though the heterogeneity and immigration are not new phenomenon in these states, in a circumstance in which they have to face, “the established nations” need to revise their citizenship policies (Rex, 1996). In this intersection, nation-states had to make a choice about whether they perceive themselves as multicultural and adopt a policy in a way to
include cultural rights within a democratic framework or continue with assimilationist policies (Kymlicka, 1995). The first path leads the states to a liberal argument of citizenship model which enables the individuals to realize their autonomy and freedom, and which endows transcending significance to private activities or a more universal argument uniting around universal values (Banks, 2008; Kymlicka, 1995). On the other hand, the second path is taken by the nation-states where there is a fear of transformation and though this may bring unbounded society in which everyone flees from the centre, unity that is classically provided by the third dimension of citizenship, citizenship as identity (Joppke, 2008). Due to these concerns, the idea that allowing cultural communities to identify themselves with their own cultural values keeps them from strong attachments to their nation-states prevails (Kymlicka, 1995). That is the reason why we have to be cautious with concluding about the influences of the globalization and its derivations, and the role of the nation-states before considering other reflections of this context. It is true that liberal notion of citizenship has challenged traditional concepts of national citizenship based on nation-states, but this does not necessarily mean that nation states are organizationally weaker in every part of the world (Soysal, 1996). Besides, universal and local identities may be corroding the national identities. Nonetheless, it cannot be deduced that these progresses unbounded the psychological and irrational bounds feeding the national identities (Erdenir, 2006).

Moreover, the age of globalization does not only pose barely threat to nation-states. It is also the age of nationalist resurgence and therefore an opportunity for reconstruction of identity on the basis of certain nationalist values and the reawakening and development of a national consciousness (Castells, 2004). Burbules and Roth (2007) draws attention to another source of survival of nation-state in this order. He states that it is the difficult and challenging to create a “public” or “new” citizenship frame without nation-state itself. Accordingly, it is too early to hope for totally abandoning of assimilationist citizenship policies in some nation-states as they have still have a strong legacy due to the aforementioned conditions. This fact both verifies my research’s framework taking Greece and Turkey as surviving nation-states and makes it possible to find the traces of assimilationist citizenship policies.
2.3 Cases Background

In this part, two states chosen for this study, Greece and Turkey are presented in relation to the discussions around citizenship raised above. In this frame, the socio-historical review of both states is first introduced to inform the policy context and to prepare a ground for detailed review of their positioning in citizenship and education. These historical reviews include the period since the foundation of both states and their relations, since each segment of this period has a great impact on shaping of the current socio-political context in Greece and Turkey. Afterward, the critical overview of both Greece and Turkey’s citizenship policies through their education systems from a historical point of view comes and helps to build a conceptual framework for the analysis chapter. In this part, citizenship policies of both countries are presented in the light of the general socio-political context and the theoretical arguments proposed in the first part and at the end of the chapter two states are compared in terms of their similarities and differences with specific reference to issues of citizenship policy.

2.3.1 Greece: Historical Background

A prerequisite for understanding the policy in any system is knowledge of history. Because it is clear that policy decisions intersect with changes in the economy, society, politics and social struggles. Socio-economic and political realities, in this sense, are quite important in revealing a better interpretation of policy materials. Especially, the history of politics is quite promising in revealing the policy patterns in centralized systems where policy actors have an influencing effect on discourse as in Greece and Turkey.

The history of the Greek State starts with the independence revolution against Ottoman Empire. However, a civil war breaks out, which leads to embodiment of the ongoing clash between the populist conservatives represented by the militarist groups and aristocratic westernist side. After the establishment of monarchy, the first king of the independent Greek state, Kapodistrias is convinced with the idea that the Greek society was incapable to govern themselves, and rules the society which was not yet united with suppression (Vogli, 2007). This period sets the stage for a statist political ideology followed by the following militarist regimes. After Kapodistrias’ assassination, two happenings which are quite important to shape the historical Greek citizenship policy occur. Firstly, the seeds of Megali Idea are set in Greece. This concept is the root of nationalism ideology pursuing the goal of creating a Greek
identity and establishing a holy Greek state that would unite all ethnic Greeks (Vogli, 2007). Then, it is supported with the establishment of a universal educational system. Meanwhile, the new state witnesses the first two of successive militarist interventions having shaped the political culture in Greece and the militarist governments set to implement the Megali Idea aggressively in these years (Diamandourous, 1993).

After their elimination, the political context was shaped by two competing political camps. While the first one was representing the westernization in the political and social life, the other was the carrier of the conservative traditional Greek nationalist ideology (Demertzis, 1997). Their stance was also different towards Megali Idea. The former ideology was in the claim of representative of the expansionist, nationalist ideal. On the other hand, the latter had based its argument on the economic development (Diamandourous, 1993). While the political interest groups were shaping in the state, military took the stage again and the military coup occurred and an influencing political figure on the Greek state, Venizelos, was elected with the favor of the junta. In this period, Greece managed to increase its land twice times as a result of Balkan wars aligning with Mega Idea. Venizelos’ ambition continued with the attempt to occupy Agian region of Anatolia dragged the country into Greco-Turkish War that would continue from 1919 to 1922. However, Greece lost the war against the newly forming Turkish state. This defeat initiated a new chaotic period for Greece and fading of the Megali Idea which dominated the foreign policy and the domestic politics of Greece for a long period (Demertzis, 1997).

The Treaty of Lausanne was signed after the war. According to the treaty, exchange of the Greek and Turkish populations in each country was decided. 1.250.000 Rum, who are Christian population who only speaks Turkish1 (even most of them cannot speak Greece), and the 500.000 Muslim Turks were forcefully migrated. This migration movement worsened the unity problems due to the rapid military extension and played an important role in shaping the ethno-cultural structure of the society. 1923 was a turning stone for Greek politics. That year, monarchy, which had lost its power, was totally eliminated. However, after a decade group of generals re-established the monarchy in Greece. Even though, the parliament continued in this period, Generals created one of the dictatorship regimes, which took place in Greece occasionally (Vogli, 2007). This regime, nonetheless, was replaced by a pro-Nazi government after Germans invaded Athens during the WWII. This occupation period unexpectedly reversed the future of Greek state and boosted a new nationalist movement. As
A result, the resistant underground organizations appeared. These organizations which sometimes applied to terrorist activities towards the ones resisting themselves came in a power struggle among each other after the occupation. Communist ELAS were aiming to be the only armed power in the country after the war. In this course, the uprising chaos in the society led frequent take overs in the government. This period witnessed also another significant beginning. The traditional interventionist role of England to Greece had passed to the USA. This hand-over helped the government to fight against the communist guerillas as a result of the conjectural anti-communist propaganda of the USA (Demertzis, 1997).

After the devastating defeat of the communist guerillas, the following governments set their policies primarily in order to prevent the expansion of communism rather than constructing the state. In the aftermath of the martial rule till 1950, two new political formations rose. The first one was the right wing party which was ruled by one of the generals having fought in the intestine war and the other party was the left wing party having had root in the banned communist movement. At the same time, uncontrollable rise of the communist party encouraged the other parties united against them, and this fear ended up with another coup in 21 April 1967 in a similar way with the one on 1936 against communists. During this military junta, a new constitution was prepared and put into effect to legalize the influence of military in governance of the country. Accompanied with violent student demonstrations, the military regime was handed to another stricter military regime with the discharge of the former military rule in 1973. This period witnessed the birth of another national project Enosis (the unification of Greece and Cyprus) and continued to be actively implemented until the military junta was abolished by another group of soldiers and politicians which was also the beginning of a new political era in Greece under the leadership of Konstantinos Karamanlis. This time Karamanlis could implement more democratic policies as the military groups lost support from the society due to the devastation of Cyprus operation. This new democratic context was solidified with allowance of the banned communist party get in politics again. Also the authoritative constitution was replaced with a new one which redistributed the separation of powers in favor of executive institutions in the same period. Another influencing occurrence of this period was Greece's agreement to participate in European Community (today's EU) (Demertzis, 1997; Vogli, 2007).
After the military groups were managed to silenced, the historical ideological competition between the nationalist Greko-Orthodox political tradition and westernist liberal wing have continued at civil political level, so far.

**Minorities and Diversity in Greece**

But, EU accession brought some challenges for the homogeneity claim of the Greek state. The flow of economic refugees and immigrants into Greece from both Balkans and Asia made the supposed ethnic unity of the state disputed (Koumandaraki, 2002). But it is important to note that this heterogeneity was a reality of Greece since the foundation. Nonetheless, the Balkan Wars, World War I and the Greco-Turkish War in the first quarter of the century are three most important turning points structuring the ethnic composition of the Greek nation.

These wars caused the transformation of linguistically, ethnically and religiously mixed heir of Ottoman Empire in this land into a more homogeneous population. Especially, the Lausanne Treaty in 1922 at the end of the Turkish Independence War contributed a lot to this metamorphosis as it demanded a population change between Greece and Turkey. With 1.5 million Greek having come from Turkey, the Greek state increased the ratio of the ethnic Greeks in addition to the extraction of ethnic Turkish having migrated to Turkey. Additionally, the incoming Greek population from Turkey between 1924 and 1955 helped this process with their higher birthrate ratio. It thus helped the internalized understanding of the homogeneous Greek population in origin, white, fluently speaking the Greek language, and Orthodox. However, the state still included ethnically, linguistically and/or religiously non-Greek minorities scattered around the country. The major minority groups included Macedonians, Albanians, Ulahs, Pontus Greeks, and Muslim minorities of Turks, Pomaks, Saidi Arabs, Moroccans, and Africans (Koumandaraki, 2002).

In spite of this mixed mosaic, Greek is the only official language in Greece. When the state was founded, the Kathareuousa was chosen as the official dialect, while people continued to speak Demotiki in daily life. When Demotiki was allowed to be taught at schools in 1964, a dual dialect emerged. But in 1976 with the abolishing of Kathareuousa as official language, Demotiki was made the only official language to ensure uniformity.
Greek Citizenship Policy

...a child born to non-Greek nationals in Greece does not acquire Greek nationality. Greeks born abroad may transmit citizenship to their children from generation to generation indefinitely (Greek Citizenship Law 217/2004)

The way how the citizenship is built on the ethnic base is well reflected by the current law of citizenship and reveals insights for understanding the conception of the citizenship. After the independence from Ottoman Empire in 19th century, Greece has been involved in a condense nation-building and a creation of a unifying collective identity (Koumandaraki, 2002). As a part of this historical process, the past and the national community have been re-constructed in such a way that the nation has been represented as a homogeneous unit (Dimitrakopoulos, 2004). Nationality and national superiority fed by the historical legacy coming from the reviving ancient Greece heritage constructed a national myth and history as a ground to build a common citizenship identity. The tool for this identity was first the Mega Idea but after 1922, especially after 1950, the homogeneity population, or the "outbreaks of Hellenism, which is a product of linking the glorious Greek past to today’s Greece for creation of an uninterrupted Greek identity. As in all nation-building processes, the nationalist sentiments were solidified with the help of the important past events and myths in the frame of Hellenism’s value system. Religion is an important ingredient of the political culture of Greece. Church practices its power on society thanks to the citizenship model fostered on the axis of Hellenism and Christianity. The nationalist and religious discourse which was created through the ethnocentric identity building project, however led racism and intolerance against the outsiders in the society. Most of this othering process targeted at religious and ethnic minorities such as the Romans and the Muslim minority. Chrysoloras (2004) ascribes this situation to the membership (citizenship) policy linked to the myth of an ethnically, linguistically, culturally and religiously homogenous society. Chelmis (1999) points out the recent racist assaults and the resistance among the Greek people to the non-Greek society. He attributes this resistance to the promoted image of a unified and homogenous Greek nation through citizenship policies since the foundation of Greece (Koumandaraki, 2002).

In the 1990s the flow of foreign immigrants, and refugees have reversed “the traditionally homogenous” composition of Greek society. The idea of homogeneity was so absorbed that the sudden flow of the outsiders was not manageable neither for the people nor the politicians. The prolonging regulations soon seemed to boost the negative stereotypes about...
foreigners. At the same time, racist incidents and attitudes began to sky-rocket (Makrinioti & Solomon, 1999).

Despite the unwillingness for change, this modern multicultural social reality and the EU membership started to challenge the long established notion of a single homogenizing citizenship identity corresponding to a single nation-state and consequently, the ethnocentric political discourse started to pay attention to ethnic groups and immigrants as a result of binding EU regulations (Stavros, 1996).

2.3.2 Turkey: Historical Background

The history of republic of Turkey begins with a semi-civil independence war led by Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and a group of former Ottoman commanders against England, France, Greece and Italy which occupied the Ottoman Empire after the WWI (Lewis, 2002). The main fundamentals of the new state were described in Treaty of Lausanne (Bilsel, 1998). Accordingly, The Turkish nation consists of the ones who make up an undivided unity with the state and the rest of the nation (Ataturk, 1927). After this treaty and the abolition of the monarchy by deporting the last Ottoman Sultan, the governance system of the new state was discussed in the parliament and in 29 September, 1923, it was decided on Republican model and the state was named a Republic of Turkey (Lewis, 2002; Gokalp, 1994).

As the official founder and the leader of the revolution, Ataturk rose as a very influential figure in the formation of the state. After the foundation of the Republic, he was successively elected as president by the parliament till his death. He also founded the first political party of the new state, CHP (Republican Party), which stood as the only party in the multiparty democratic system (Lewis, 2002). But his most significant action was the westernization project the seeds of which were planted in late Ottoman period. He continued this action in a very assertive way based on six principles; republicanism, statism, nationalism, revolutionism, populism and laicism. His ambition to create a westernized nation with its appearance and ideology, he did not restrain to apply to oppressive methods to make the society accept the new norms. The most symbolic and controversial activity of this period is the ban on the traditional costumes and the ban of broadcasting Turkish music on state radios in favor of the western music (Heyd, 2002). These harsh policies, some of which contrasted with the nature of dominantly Muslim population, caused conflicts with his fellows in the war and in
the society. As a result several rebels broke out against limiting of religious life with the strict laicism regime. On the other hand, the first political opposition movement was initiated by some commanders who organized the independence movement against Ataturk's CHP and policies. Then, they established a political party named Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Firkasi-TCF (Progressive Republican Party). This party was representing more traditionalist and Islamic view and defending a more balanced modernization (Kadioglu, 1996). With TCF, the chronic laicist modernist, and Islamic modernist conflict has been initiated. However, the party was banned after less than one year because of a point stating they have courtesy for the principles of religion in its ruling code. Consequently, TCF became the first of the chains of the parties which was banned with the accusation of their religious motivation.

1930s were critical for both the world and Turkey. While fascism was spreading in west, communism started to settle in another neighbor, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in a totalitarian way. At the same time, the pressure of the financial crisis on all states was increasing day by day. In this context, Turkey chose to follow a state-controlled governance model. In this period, the most significant detail was USSR's close interest in Turkey (Kadioglu, 1996). In the last years of 30s, when Ataturk died in 1938, he had left a significant revolution project, which made him both an immortal national hero, whose legacy still continuous and ideology lives as "Kemalism" and at the same time a controversial figure among the traditionalists (Heyd, 2002). As a national leader of these two contradictions, he was also initiating a struggle between two camps: Laicist elites and Traditional Progressivist (Karpat, 1970).

The years after Ataturk's death were remarked with more strictly intensified westernization activities in addition to the economic turmoil due to the WWII (Lewis, 2002). In the aftermath of WW II in 1946, a new party, called Democrat Party (DP), ceased the one party regime. DP members who were coming more traditionalist segment of the society, was defending liberal policies in both politics and economy. The struggle between the governing DP and opposing Kemalist party, CHP has created an acute ideological clash based on being militarist, anti-Kemalist, and democratic and anti- democratic (Gokalp, 1994).

While the tension was rising between two parties, Kemalist generals, who were not comfortable with DP's liberal policies and the lifting ban on Arabic prayer, made a coup in 1960. DP was banned with this coup in a similar way with TCF and the members of the party
including the prime minister, Adnan Menderes were executed by the military court. After one
decade of the coup, the military took stage back by using the student movements motivated
with communism as an excuse. The coup was declared from the state radios by stating:

Parliament and government caused our country to be dragged into anarchy, chaos, fraternal fighting and a social turmoil because of their policies and stances. Society was kept away from the mission of actualization of modernized civilization ideal Ataturk targeted... The Turkish Military will eradicate this desperate situation and anarchy by evaluating the solutions with a manner over political parties; will handle the reforms in a way Ataturk prescribed.... (as cited in Aydemir, 1973: 263)

The third explicit intervention of the army occurred during a government formed by three nationalist and conservative parties. The division between socialists and nationalists turned into a civil war. Consequently, the army headed by chief of General Staff levied the governance of the country in 1980. In this period, all parties and unions were banned. In 1982, the military government prepared a new constitution. With a referendum, the constitution was accepted. As a result, Evren became president and the National Security Council (MGK) was reorganized.

MGK, founded after the military coup in 1960, was a council consisting of the president, senior commanders and civil government representatives. Its presence with a strong military influence provided a double headed political system in Turkey (Sakallioglu, 1997). The role and authority of MGK was strengthened with the 1982 constitution. With this constitution, the council’s recommendations would be given priority consideration by the council of ministers as well as the number and weight of military officers in MGK was increased. This active council turned into a very powerful political organ impacting the civil parliament (Heyd, 2002). However, Turkey recently has passed a number of reforms to ensure civil control over the military due to EU's political demands for starting EU membership negotiation. With these regulations, MGK was transformed into a more civilian body.

In the aftermath of the junta, the first elections were held in 1983. ANAP led by Turgut Ozal won the elections. Ozal's liberal policies made the country more integrated into the global world order by leaving statist principle. In the context of relatively free political atmosphere, both ethnic Kurdish parties and Islamic political parties gained power (Sakallioglu, 1997). Even Islamic party, The Welfare Party (RP) received the highest vote with 21.3 % in 1995 rally and founded a coalition government with another centrist party which was descendant of
banned AP in 1960. However, the military was not content with the policies of the government. Then, another coup was put on the stage with the concerns of military officers about the fundamentals of Ataturk principles which was declared in the MGK meeting. Consequently, the government had to resign, RP was banned and a new period called ‘28 Subat’ (28 February) was initiated. The process started with decisions of the MGK and supported with bureaucracy and military with a claim of struggle to preserve the fundamentals of Ataturk’s Turkey against anti-Kemalist ones (Kadioglu, 1996). In this period, civil religious groups, and wearing hijab at public areas were banned. The Islamic media and the schools were strictly put under the supervision of the state and the actions against Ataturk and his principles were harshly punished. The conflict having historical root between laicist westernizers consisting of the bureaucratic and militarian elites of the society and the conservative proggressivist were deepened within this period (Zubaida, 1996).

After several unsuccessful coalition governments with financial crisis, in 2003 a new party-AKP (Justice and Development Party) formed by the reformist faction of the banned RP, was elected and in 2007, the party was re-elected with a record number of vote. The party defined itself as a moderate, conservative, pro-western party. In addition to their liberal economic and social policies, they followed an ambitious path for Turkish membership in the European Union.

**Minorities and Diversity in Turkey**

As the heir of the Ottoman Empire, the new Turkish State inherited a mosaic of cultures and ethnicity. Even though a great amount of the Greek population were sent to Greece as a part of the Treaty of Lausanne, a number of minority groups continued to live in Turkey. Turkey, in addition to housing Turkish speaking Sunni Muslims, included Alevi, Arab Christians, Jacobites and Assyrians, Armenians, Circassians, Karamanlides, Greek Orthodox Christians, Kurds, Bosnians, Jews, Laz, Pontics and Roma. However, the state was built on a homogenous nation ideal in the presence of ethnic and linguistic cleavages (Kadioglu, 1996).

In the context of Ataturk’s nation-building project, the language issue has turned into a hot potato. The constitution strictly determined that there would be one language that cannot be changed: “The language of Turkish Republic is Turkish” (Article 2). The language taught at schools and used in public space is the official dialect. Local dialects of Turkish are not
recognized officially. However, recently ethnic minorities were granted right to open language courses and teach their own language as a part of integration to EU standards. Also, A Kurdish TV Channel was opened by the State to promote the Kurdish language learning.

**Turkish Citizenship Policy**

Turkey set out to build a modern Turkish nation out of the remaining population from Ottoman Empire. The most significant feature of this population was its multi-cultural, multi-religious and multi-ethnic structure. The policy makers of the new republic was, however, fueled with the dominant assumption of those years that modern nation can only be ensured via a national, common language, culture, and unified by the virtues of the principles and values brought by the republic. Accordingly, the members of this nation should have been laisist, namely, detached from the religious roots as well as other ethnic roots. The republic’s citizenship notion was all based on this paradigm (Kadioglu, 1996; Heyd, 2002).

Modern citizenship concept was first introduced in Turkey with the reformist policies called “Mesrutiyet (Legitimizing)” in late Ottoman era, coinciding the emergence of the modern-nation-states in Europe. With this reform in 1836, the legal and social rights of Ottoman citizens were legalized by including all ethnic and religious backgrounds (Lewis, 2002). However, citizenship was conceptualized as the legal base of creating the ideal citizens united around the aforementioned common elements.

One year after the foundation of Turkey in 1923, with Treaty of Lausanne, the rights of the non-Muslim groups were guaranteed. In other words, they were granted right to keep their language and culture. On the other hand, the Muslim majority groups, which consists of diverse ethnic (Kurdish, Laz, Bosnian, Pomak, Alban) and religious sects (Alevism- a different interpretation of Shia sect, and Caferis), were used building blocks of “the modern Turkish nation”, speaking “Turkish”, obedient to the state and Turkish culture and state-led religious body, Diyanet Isleri Baskanligi (Religious Affairs Directorate) (Alpay, 1993:35). The objective of this project was converting the Ottoman millet1 from various backgrounds

---

1 Millet is an Arabic-origin term for confessional community during the Ottoman Empire. Millet literally means "nation" in Arabic. The Millet system of Ottoman is closely linked to traditional Islamic rules on the treatment of non-Muslim minorities. The Ottoman term specifically refers to the separate legal courts pertaining to personal law under which minorities were allowed to rule themselves (in cases not concerning any Muslim) with fairly little interference from the Ottoman Government. (Zachariadou, 1997)
into the modern Turkish ulus\(^2\). The 88th law of the Turkish constitution prepared in 1924 emphasis this mission: "In terms of citizenry, the people of Turkey are named “Turk” disregarding their language and religion." (Erdenir, 2006)

The dominant citizenship model of the Republic was driven by the fundamental regime of the Turkish modernization and nation-building, Kemalism (attachment to the fundamentals of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk’s ideology). Kemalism, emerged as mythical propaganda between 1930 and 1945, was a regime promising a laicist, modern, and westernized Turkish identity and a unseperated, homogeneous and identical citizens. There are six pillars of this regime, on which the citizenship policies are based: Republicanism, Nationalism, Statism, Laicism, ironically Revolutionism, and Populism. (Aydin, 1998)

Among these six, populism was the most disputed one. The Kemalism’s populism interpreted the citizens’ sovereignty as identical, culturally united and nationally harmonious citizens. It was ensured with the Turkish nationalism, created with the sense of being seized with the help of the historical common memory of the recent independence war. As in the other nationalist regimes, Kemalism appointed the state in the center as a sacred and ultimate source of the power and legacy. This kind of statism led a definition of citizenship worded by Atatürk: “The people of Turkey who have a common land, common race and ethnic root, and a glorious history” (Atatürk, 1927:22). This perception made the membership to the state a more ethnic-based identity, Turkishness. This definition of citizen was on the contrary to the legal tag, Ottoman citizenship. The implication of another significant pillar, laicism was used as an antidote against the elements making up the Ottoman citizenship. Therefore, Kemalist citizenship excluded the religious identities out of the state’s repertoire (Heyd, 2002).

### 2.3.3 As a Prologue to Comparison: Similarities and Differences

When compared two states, the similarities in terms of governmental structure and socio-political context, are strikingly more than differences. The first of all these resemblances is the centralized governance system which makes two of them available for policy analysis at more

---

\(^2\) Ulus is a word meaning citizens attached to the state. According to Atatürk (1927), Turkish ulus is made up a common political body, linguistic unity, racial unity, a common history and value. It is commonly used by secular and Kemalist circles.
or less equal level of analysis. Managerial structure as a result of this system provides similar policy units to focus on. Also, the hegemonic powering of the state apparatus due to their conservative centralized structure constitutes similarity like in the central role of the military in an interventionist manner and as a guardian of this system. When the roots of the ideology of this state apparatus are investigated, more common points in the political culture arise.

The most appealing of these commonalities is their identical modernity-tradition dilemma. In both states, modernity and tradition have been continuously negotiated at political and social levels as a part of their collective citizenship identity. While being part of the Europe has a diasporal claim for both Greece and Turkey, they are, at the same time, in claim of a descendants of a glorious past and culture which are to be preserved against the threatening other norms and values. As a result of this duality, an acute division between traditionalist and modernist ideology regulates the political context in both states. In this identical ideological clash, the source of challenges to the enduring citizenship policies, which is assimilationist and hegemonically homogenizing in both contexts, are also identical. The presence of the diverse minority groups and European Union’s entailment for new political directions and legal construction beyond national objectives are these sources.

In fact, even if there seems to be a lot of common patterns between these states, there are points separating them even in the common areas. The place of religion and religious values in Greece and Turkey is a good example of this kind of divergence. There is no legal separation between the State and the Church in Greece but in Turkey. Moreover, In accordance with the Greek Constitution (Part A, Section B, Article 3) the prevailing religion in the country is that of the Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ but Turkey keeps away from identifying itself with the dominant religious belief, Islam and prefers to locate its identity on a secular nationalist path. This situation leads to different focuses on their citizenship policies. While Greece citizenship model has been embedded in Greko- Christian tradition and values, Turkish citizenship has raised on secular nationalist roots. On the other hand, relation to the historical heritage in their nation building process has different references. While Greece relates itself with ancient Greece and uses its values, Turkey maintained its identification based on denial of heritage of Ottomans and glorification of the Turkish Republic history and figures.

Finally, the diversity issue in Greece shows a different feature due to the immigration issue beside its settled minority population unlike Turkey’s stationary minority groups. The
dynamic migration flow to Greece leads to proposal of the diversity issue on the agenda more explicitly. Moreover, the full membership of Greece to European Union (EU) prepares a more binding framework for the domestic policies. Under this circumstance, Turkey is expected to progress slower in the inclusive practices as EU regulations have not the same legitimate effects.

Regarding these similarities and differences, a Greek citizenship policy based on the Orthodox Christian and a Hellenic nationalist tradition and a Turkish citizenship policy based on Kemalist secular nationalist ideology stand out as two frameworks, which guide the methodological and analysis part of the research.
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3. **Methodology**

3.1 Introduction and Overview of the Study

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first part starts with a theoretical discussion of the complex nature of studying policy and clarification of the term policy used in the study. This discussion helps me to be located in a methodological approach to the policy issue. Then, the rationale of the study design is endeavored discussing the data needed for studying policy. This part of the chapter presents an overall picture of the research approach adopted for this study and the overview of the data used to investigate the research questions. I first elaborate the data sources for the analysis and their ratification in terms of their potential to provide the relevant information for the inquiry.

Analysis approach of the documents is elaborated after the design part. My intention is to describe methods of data analysis and discuss their advantages and disadvantages. The complexities of comparative studies and comparative research initiates the analysis part and the arguments proposed here prepare a framework for analysis process. A detailed explanation of the steps I took in data analysis and the method to process the documents with research questions guiding me to render them are provided here. The last section is allocated to the technical challenges and delimitations which I encountered during the data collection process and the ethical issues in the analysis part.

3.2 Researching Policy

Despite its common usage in social research, Ball (1998) points out that one of the conceptual problems related to policy research is the difficulty to define the term ‘policy’ and its diverse usage at different points in the same study. The words of Ball (1990) reveal theoretical uncertainties about the concept. While Paquette (2002) avoids from its definition preferring to list its components, Hogwood and Gunn (1984) define it as an “expression of general purpose or desired state of affairs” (p. 13). Stephen Ball (1998), on the other hand, bases his definition on its value-oriented nature by stating that “policy is clearly a matter of
the authoritative allocation of values” (p. 3), in a similar way with Kogan (1975)’s naming policies as “the operational statements of values or statements of prescriptive intent” (p. 55).

The last two definitions both make the reference of this research’s policy conceptualization and help positioning in Ball (1990)’s conceptual model, distinguishing policy as ‘discourse’ and ‘text’. In Ball’s formula, these two categories sketch the level of relation of discourse and individuals with policy decisions. The researchers who view policy as discourse sees what is said and thought as a part of policy are framed by a wider system of social relations and policy texts come out of this social discourse (Levin, 1998). In another word, policy as discourse is determined by factors external to the individuals who are involved in policy making. However, policy as text reflects the conflicted, changing and negotiated character of policy rather than a linguistic sense of language on paper (Trowler, 2003). In this approach, policy statements are viewed as an outcome of struggle among interest groups involved in policy making. Herein, policy as text contradicts with the former approach as the individual actors have roles in the definition of meaning and intentionality of policy in addition to assignment of a new role of helping to create the reality, rather than representing reality to discourse (Arvast, 2006). In this understanding, discourse can be both an agent and subject of policy. On the contrary to the former model, policy makers, and consequently policy texts may create discourse for policy as well as they are influenced by it. This notion does not deny that policies do not emerge in an isolated context and they are embedded in discourses of their own, but proposes that they are the results of the competing interests within this context (Schwandt, 2002; Taylor et al., 1997). But it is important to note that there is a little nuance between the two approaches regarding their position to discourse and they do not represent two camps of policy research. Ball (1990) points out this fact stating that his point of move in this dichotomy is that “policy is not one or the other, but both: they are implicit in each other” (p. 44). In a sense, policy actors regulating the discourse and discourse, having an effect on what can be said, when, where and with what authority, are in a ‘chicken or the egg causality dilemma’. Nonetheless, policy as a text is important in terms of eradicating the underestimation of policy actors by the policy as discourse approach and provides a more inclusive analysis framework. Especially for the cases where competing values are present and certain ideological players have a dominance as a central power to structure the way how people act, policy as text providing a perspective of the text as the point where power struggles occur is a more relevant conception as it takes into account the role of political
actors’ impact on discourse and is based on value prescription argument (Trowler, 2003; Arvast, 2006). Considering the underestimation of actors in policy as discourse approach as a disadvantage in understanding the power relations in centralized systems such as Greece and Turkey, the policy approach of this study can be understood better. Additionally, the choice of policy text approach has practical reasons regarding the nature of this study. First of all, researcher cannot follow the discourse of both cases equally to have equal unit of analysis. Also, considering the historical dimension of the research, direct access to the discourse of policy cases would not be possible.

In this sense, this study, seeking the direction of citizenship policy in two states, which have a top-down powerful governing structure and which are the battle ground of ideological powers throughout their histories, approach policy as text. However, centrality of power and control of dominant interest groups in the concept of policy as text is challenged in global policy discourse where the nation-state as a central power of structuring discourse is losing power. Hence, it is important to note that studying policy in a decentralized political system which experience difficulty in making up their minds what the goals of policy are and it is most relevant in the cases where there is a centralized policy making mechanism (Dryzek, 1982). Herein, the relevant choice of Greece and Turkey, as two centralized states is verified again, and they make themselves as available for policy as text with their central policy mechanisms.

3.3 Overview of the Research Design

3.3.1 What is needed?

Because policy problems are normally characterized by conflicting values, purposes on policy texts are difficult to detect in the contexts where legitimate power of policy is decentralized (Dryzek, 1982). Therefore, policy evaluation of these documents is relevant if only there exists a single, identifiable, legitimate policy-making body having power to implement its decisions (Olssen et. al, 2004). My policy research on the Greek and Turkish cases, hence meaningfully started with the research of policy texts produced by the central policy mechanisms in these states. At this point, the focus of the research: “the citizenship policy in the Greek and Turkish education systems” led me to explore the documents that reveal:
The notion of citizenship and the explicit values which the students are supposed to acquire as citizens within this citizenship conception

However, due to the conceptual complexity of reading state produced policy documents, this exploration process was not just a reading it as the prescriptions of some arbitrary rules (Dryzek, 1982). In the frame of policy as text conceptualization, the policy texts required an understanding of the interest groups, and factors surrounding the processes of their productions in the context of wider political, economic and social forces. This necessity required another category of data for the research:

Background information about both states regarding their social, historical and political structures as well as characteristics of their education systems.

However, the combination of these two categories of data could be meaningful on a well grounded theory framework regarding citizenship concept. This frame was especially necessary in such a topic which has multiple meanings. Therefore, clarifying the basic concepts about it and positioning in a conceptual frame required a third a category of data which is:

Theoretical data about the concept of citizenship, the themes and theories related to it.

The review of literature done in theoretical discussions about the citizenship concept and citizenship policy in education in addition to socio-historical background of Greece and Turkey provided the data falling in the last two categories and helped to determine the themes to probe regarding citizenship notion and provided the necessary information about the political and social context of both states to understand these themes better.

The first category of data needed in answering the research questions constituted the primary data source. In deciding on these documents, I focused on the binding policy texts that create circumstances for real world as indicated by Ball (1990). In this sense, they were obtained from the constitution of Greece and Turkey, Law on Education, acts, and legislation, decisions of the ministry of education in addition to the other official publications prescribing
the goals of language, history, religion subjects which are usually organized around ideologically loaded aims in the frame of citizenship policies.

3.3.2 Policy Texts as the Primary Data Source

Maxwell (2004) and Glesne (1998) point out four main methods for gathering information in research: a) participation in the setting, b) Direct observation, c) In-depth interviewing, and d) document and material review. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses. Yet these particularities are not innate but depend on the nature of the research. Therefore, decisions about the conducting of data collection with any of these four methods are up to the information sought as well as practical considerations.

This research involves an understanding of a concept at policy level. Maxwell (2004) favors reviewing document method by depicting it as an unobtrusive method, rich in portraying the values in the setting besides facilitating discovery of nuances in cultural settings. Document review, with these particularities, poses a great potential of what the researcher needs in his exploration of citizenship policies in Greek and Turkish Education setting from a comparative perspective. Besides, while determining the method of data collection, practical considerations are as crucial as other points requiring attention. Documentary sources are particularly valuable when situations or events cannot be investigated by direct observation or present investigation, or where reliance upon the public record alone (Mason, 2002). When considering the scope of the study with its time and resource limitations, document review fits well in our objectives, in that sense.

Pinson (2007) points the potential of educational policy documents in understanding the citizenship policy in a state. He notes that the designing and implementation of education policy documents such as curriculum guidance or teaching materials are often where processes of constructing the notion of citizenship and the meanings of ‘being citizen’ take place. Similarly, Olssen et al. (2004) depicts policy documents as the expression of political purposes, that is the statements of the courses of action that policy makers intend to follow. Thus, policy statements or documents have an enormous potential to reveal educational intentions, in the form of values and goals in specifically centralized systems. However, the demand of inferential reasoning stands out as a potential weakness of this method (Marshall
& Rossman, 1989). It is often speculated that documents does not provide descriptions about the reality of the social world. In this sense, I certainly cannot assume that documentary accounts are “accurate” portrayals of the social world. But depending on the context and level of legacy, they can provide valuable information about the social world. Especially in the formula of ‘policy as text’, documents are to be approached as constructions according to conventions that are themselves part of a documentary reality (Atkinson & Coffey, 2004). Also, its incapability to provide a complete picture about the implication does not change the reality that policy texts are textual interventions into the practices and they create circumstances in which the range of options are narrowed, which conserves some political views (Ball, 1998; Muntigl, 2002). From this perspective, even if analyzing policy texts does not tell us about the implementations of the policies in question, they tell us what is promoted as desirable and good in the society, moreover they may even construct goods in circumstances where the power was centralized. In this sense, policy texts pose patterns of ideological goals and intentions of their creators, which make them valuable sources to understand the policies which are products of competing ideologies.

As for the policy documents in education, education laws, curriculum documents, decrees, regulations and even constitutions are the most public and concrete forms of education policy comes to mind first (Looney, 2001). Foucaldian analysis of education also notes what is studied in schools should be understood as a significant site in which competing bodies of knowledge, identities and discourse are negotiated (McCarthy & Crichlow,1993; Mills,1997). These official texts, with this feature, carry explicit or implicit intentions and objectives of their designers (Cornbleth, 1990). In this sense, while conducting any educational research aiming to reveal ideological patterns, applying to them is a strategic start.

The research, hence, focuses on analyses of recent documents prescribing of goals of civic related subjects. Even though all subjects may involve an ideological underpinning, I specifically chose the civic-subjects; history, language, and religion. Because, they are most suitable ground for feeding all elements of a citizenship identity such as common history, religious values and language. Moreover, a state’s constitution as the legal foundation of all public practices promises valuable clues about the directions of policy action. Therefore, I revised the constitution for exploring the legal foundation of the citizenship policies in education. While, this legacy of constitution over education draws the frame of the possible
policy options, educational laws, acts, and legislation reflect the policy decision of the governing apparatus in this frame. In this way, these documents contain the political rationales for teaching citizenship at school; as well as definitions of citizenship. They somehow create official discourses on citizenship and its relationship to education. They represent, therefore, a significant site within which particular aspects of the narratives of nation, of national belonging and of citizenship are expressed in relation to the education of young citizens (Safran & Dilek, 2008). Another point to remind is that the educational legislation, which is a systematic code of core citizenship policies, and generally the law of a state, is constantly being amended, supplemented with other provisions, decrees or ministerial decisions. Hence, it is important to follow all of these documents for a better comprehension of the direction of the policies.

3.4 Analysis

3.4.1 Policy Text Analysis

The most significant feature of qualitative research is its focus on extraction and interpretation of meaning (Kus, 2003; Merriam, 1998). More specifically, the scope of qualitative research tends to deal with questions about the meaning of the events and activities, questions about the influence of the physical and social context on these events and activities, questions about the process by which these events and activities occurs (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). Qualitative Research with these features are praised by scholars for the researches seeking to explore stated, and organizational goals and seeking to explore the particular interaction, social situation or cases, as well as the ones who are interested in process, meaning, and a deep understanding of text (Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Cresswell, 1998). When compared the objectives of this research, understanding a case within its socio-historical context, and potential of qualitative inquiry, adopting a qualitative approach promises a more relevant path to find answers to the research questions.

3.4.2 Conducting a Comparative Study

This research has complications both as it is placed in the case study design within the qualitative framework and as it is a comparative study. First of all, the term case, itself
constitutes confusion for the researcher, because it is not an untroubled work to decide what can be regarded as a case in education. Stake (2006) notices this complexity warning the researcher to understand what the case is before studying its functions and activities. Freebody (2003) answers the question of what constitutes a ‘case’ as anything from single student to educational policies and reformulates the question as ‘what is this case of?’. While Freebody’s argument suggest that anything can be a case to study, Shulman (1996) clarifies the limit by proposing distinctive attributes of an educational case: accordingly, a case can be studied if there is an explicit and formal purpose in it, if there is a probability to be interrupted, and when there is no simple answer for the examination of the consequences of actions. In this frame, my cases of citizenship policies having these three features meet the criteria of being a researchable educational case.

Having ensuring the limits of the cases, Bryman (2004) defines comparative design as a study using more or less identical methods of two contrasting cases. In this definition, the comparative design takes the form of a multiple case study. Herein, another challenge regarding the multiple-case research design emerges. Stake (2006) explains this challenge with ‘case-quintain-dilemma’. First of all, to make a comparative analysis, we need to understand the single cases which are compared in the study. But to relate each of them to the whole comparative picture is a challenge for the researchers. That is the reason Stake (2006) makes a distinction between the study of case and target comparative outcome which he calls it as ‘quintain’:

Multi-case research starts with the quintain. To understand it better, we study some of its single cases... But it is the quintain we seek to understand. We study what is similar and different about the cases to understand the quintain better (Stake, 2006, 46).

That is the reason why the study design had to be designed at two levels. First, a design was built to understand the cases and another for the quintain. Both research questions and the data analysis were done in this duality.

3.4.3 Framework and Analysis in Action

Because qualitative research, by its nature, flexible and there are no strict guidelines and standards for data analysis, every qualitative researcher will approach to the analysis process
differently (Maxwell, 2004). Especially in a policy research, which is a divided and incoherent field lack of accepted paradigm and a well-developed body of theory, coming to a decision about the most relevant method of analysis is more challenging (Dryzek, 1982). While deciding on the relevant approach to the comparative policy data, it is vital to consider the fact that conditions, goals, methods and outcomes are highly sensitive to the macro-political cultures and discourse of the policy cases (Mintrop, 2000).

But the main question is how this data should be read and analyzed. Freebody (2003) notes that there are two main categories for this mind bending task: Approaching it sociologically or linguistically. While the linguistic approaches basically deal with the grammar and semantic sides of the text, sociological approaches look at the ideological and political work done by the texts. The latter one suits best to the focus of this research probing the citizenship concept in the political context of two states.

The sociological level analysis is commonly done at interpretative level. The interpretative perspective, which is also known as the hermeneutic perspective seeks to reveal hidden meanings and objectives that were directed by the socially and politically powerful (Habermas, 1971). Arvast (2006) maintains that the aim of hermeneutic analysis aims to recover the original intention of the text’s author by simultaneously viewing the text, the organization, and the specific social, cultural, and historical contexts of the policy. Hermeneutics analysis, with these features, guides the analysis of this study, since this study is conducted for understanding of the policy objectives within the policy as text approach.

Beyond revealing the meaning and intentions in the cases by a single framework to attain an equal units of analysis, I compared them. So, there was a need for a more detailed framework for analysis than a single case framework. That is the reason why I followed two cycle analysis design. First of them was the one proposed by Adamson & Morris (2007) dealing with the ideologies and components related to the citizenship policy in each single cases. In it, the following themes were addressed: the priorities and aims of the policy documents; the definition of citizenship; the ways in which universalistic and particularistic fostered values; the difference between the old and the new citizenship conception at policy level. In order to capture the ‘politics of citizenship’ as it emerges from the official documents, both the curriculum documents and legislations and acts having a word on the objectives of education
were discursively analyzed with a sociologically interpretative manner (Gee, 1992; Fairclough, 1995). While studying the single cases in this way, 3 tracks of comparative studies will be followed to reach to the ‘quintain’: 1) emphasizing individual case findings, 2) merging case studies, 3) providing factors for analysis of each case in terms of their similarities and differences.

While analyzing these documents for understanding the citizenship policy of two states, I needed to apply to the citizenship policy notion discussed in the theoretical chapter. While discussing the policy of citizenship, Skinner (1989) invites us to examine a broad range of conditions serving to promote a sense of shared national identity: the vernacular languages, fabricated rituals and traditions beside promoted vision of nation in the axis of diversity and homogenization by the state. Also, the means of citizenship policies in education raised by scholar like Burbules and Roth (2007), Skeie (2001) discussed in the theoretical chapter helped me to determine the focal points. As a result of the intensive discussion of the parameters of citizenship policy, I ended up with several themes: promotion of a national identity, loyalty towards the nation and the state, an elevation national language, conception of their own culture and country and others, symbols and historical role models, national and religious ceremonies, and promoted virtues based on the proposals about the contents of the citizenship politics urged with creation of a collective identity (Griffith, 2000; Brown, 1999; Hargreaves, 1998; Skinner, 1989).

When these themes came together with the used documents, 8 main guiding questions adopted from Purta et al. (1999) came up for analysis of single cases:

1. What are the priorities and aims of compulsory education regarding a citizenship model for the students?

2. What are the students expected to learn from study of nation’s history and literature as a guide to understanding their country?

3. What are young people expected to have acquired as a sense of national identity or national loyalty? To what degree or loyalty or sense of belonging to its nation, communities or traditions? What if any symbols are thought to
be important for students to respect? What are the historical events, national stories, and ideals and role models are believed to be important for all citizens to know about for example national liberators, constitutional principles, and revolutions?

4. What are young people are to learn about the role of their country in global and region today and tomorrow and yesterday?

5. Which supranational structures or organizations and sub-national groups are thought to be important enough to have place in the awareness of young people’s awareness?

6. What are young people expected to learn about those belonging to minority groups or other groups out of major population?

7. What are young people expected to learn concerning the use of a particular official language or languages within the nation?

8. What are young people expected to have acquired with regard to the understanding of religion or religious values?

After single case analysis was completed guided by these questions merged from the theoretical review, a comparative inquiry for revealing quantum was applied. In relation to this comparative approach, the main task was to identify differences, if any, in the ways that citizenship have been conceptualized in educational policy texts between the Greece and Turkish states. Then, how the change of political context may have influenced these differences in their policies was discussed.
3.5 Technical and Ethical Considerations

3.5.1 Negotiating Access to Documents and Translation

During the investigation, the main problem was the availability and reliability of information necessary to be able to start analysis of the single cases and uniformity of information to generate a sound comparison ground. The lack of an updated and uniformed database of the documents led me to collect data from many different sources, which were not all compatible. Furthermore, the available data of these sources was very limited and totally inadequate especially in the quality of information. It therefore became necessary by the researcher, to perform aerial survey of random sources related to the focus of the study. The data collected from these scattered sources provided valuable information concerning the determination of the types and the source of data that would help me most. Namely, using this information, in a sense, led to construction of an initial setting for the direction of data collection.

Given the heterogeneity of the primary database that I used, a key part of the research process was spent in organizing and building the necessary ways to access to data. The organization of the existing database, which is mostly from ministries of education, ensured a uniform and updated databases thank to the similar governing structure in both states. However, accessing to these databases was not always possible as some parts of them were not available for public use on the internet or they had been put for public use on other internet sources.

So, I sometimes had to get official approval from the ministry to demand information from the responsible bodies. The permission from the ministries took up to several months because of either language barrier or the sensitivity of the officials about being investigated by a foreigner. Especially, they were more skeptical when they heard the concept of citizenship policies. But thanks to the web sources and independent researchers whom I contacted, I

---

1 Being treated as foreigner was a matter in both Greece and partially in Turkey. My inquiry request was not welcomed in the best way in the most welcomed manner in Turkey as a Turkish citizen who is living abroad and might be viewed as one of those educated by the “bossy and know-all” Europeans due to the tensed relation with European Union.

2 After I decided on my research topic, a controversial initiative called democratic Kurdish expansion to grant more cultural rights to the Kurdish society by the government in Turkey. Pro-nationalist and Kemalist circles who have an
could obtain most of the documents, which I looked for. However, these documents were not problem-free in both cases. There is a huge amount of written material on both the Greek and Turkish cases in various disciplines. But, the literature is limited to political and anthropological works in English. It was only possible to find a few studies on educational issues of these countries in their native languages. Even though I can read in English and Turkish, I could not access the documents in Greek from first hand. At this point, challenges stemming from translation in cross-country comparisons emerged as predicted as Fairbrother (2007:47) cited from Elley (1999).

The translation of Greek documents was done by the external translators, but the background of translators was not educational sciences. One of them was a PhD student in economics; his familiarity with academic stance was an advantage, in this sense. The other one was a graduating law student, which brings an advantage for translation of legislations and law texts. However, this situation was not a guarantee to secure the validity of the interpretation of the picked documents in the translation due to the political agenda of the translators. That is the reason why I tried to apply to the current relevant literature to verify the data and be cautious about my conclusions to ensure the validity of my analysis.

3.5.2 Ethical Considerations

While doing this research, I did not expect many of the ethical and critical appraisal issues, as analysis of policy- its content and processes are the results of basically formulation and acceptance in its official setting. And, data is already available in this setting. Hence, I, as a policy researcher, did not need to deal with constructing my own data, and consequently the concerns about the data construction. However, I had to face with structural and ethical challenges in the process. The most challenging part was developing a well defined construct of the study, citizenship and its policy, which was a challenge to the construct validity.

Even though most constructs of interests in education are impossible to size and capture (Kleven, 2008), the struggle of solving it goes through a well structured theoretical influence in bureaucratic system of the state have been sensitive to certain concepts such as citizenship and identity. Similarly, Greece was discussing more inclusive citizenship framework for the minorities and immigrants with the accompany of resistance of Church and nationalist circles in the country.
discussion. I tried to ensure this aim by clarifying the terms disputed in the study in literature review. This discussion helped me to determine indicators and to develop research questions related to them for inferences to the construct. Being well informed by the theory discussion, I tried to overcome this challenge.

Another unexpected hindrance was the temptation of 'journalism' and 'selective reporting' in my inferences as pointed by Cohen et. al (2000). There was a hazard of picking out more striking features of the case, to support a particular conclusion, thereby misrepresenting the whole case. But, the remedy of this challenge also goes through an adequate literature review. Including the works done in this field, was a strategic action to lessen such a possible prone. Finally, I had to face with my personal prejudices about the cases, which Betti (1980) warns about. She states that the researcher who does hermeneutic analysis should recover the original intention of the policy author and analysis should be maintained in a subjective way. Accordingly, having prejudices poses a threat to the validity. At this point, I made use of the literature review but still it was not the ultimate solution to let aside my prejudices. However, I was convinced that having certain limit of prejudices is not that a threat as long as it is based on legal facts referring to Gadamer (1975). He argues that our prejudices invokes our participation in the historico-cultural tradition, and defines the limits and the potentialities of our horizon of understanding. Hence, he depicts them as advantage rather than as obstacles to understanding as long as they are not at a level of hindering our true understanding (as cited in Prasad, 2002). Considering all these methodological issues, and threats to the research, a research framework was created and the research analysis was done in the following chapter accordingly.
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4. Findings and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyzes the findings of the research. The chapter is organized by the following categories:

1. Current structural and administrative features of the education systems of Greece and Turkey to reveal the degree of centralization of power and its influence on the educational practices.
2. General objectives of both countries’ compulsory education
3. Specific historical and current aims from teaching of Religion, History, and Language subjects, and other supporting school activities such as school visits, and ceremonies expressed in the binding policy documents in the frame of building Greek and Turkish citizenship identity.
4. The similarities and differences in both states regarding the aims with social, political and historical factors

Initial data sources for cultivating them were divided in two categories. The first category provided primary data for understanding the current structure and functioning of the education system and the current policies. These documents were the ones that can be directly accessed by the researcher and which frame the current policy context. In this category:

- Primary Education Laws, Constitutional articles regarding the education of the citizens
- Decrees
- Ministerial decisions
- Circulars
- Excerpts from correspondences and speeches among the authorized bodies
- Goals of Religion, Language and History subjects at compulsory school level were used.
The second category of the documents consisted of the relevant academic literature scratching the citizenship policies in Greece and Turkey from both current and historical perspectives in education as a support basement for the primary data analysis.

4.2 Overview of Current Education System

To draw an outline of the prospects of the overtly centralized Greek and Turkish public educational systems, there is an overview of both systems referencing to the role of the state in the educational in the educational activities through policy-making process.

4.2.1 Greece

The Education in Greece is free and compulsory for all children between ages 6-15 at Primary (Elementary) and lower secondary. Even though mandatory school life starts at 6, students can start from the age of 2.5 years at private and public preschool education institutions whose curricula is yet under the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs. The post-compulsory secondary education, according to the 1997 reform (Giamouridis & Bagley, 2006), consists of two school types: unified upper secondary schools and technical vocational schools (TEE). The duration of studies in the former is three years, but two years or three years at technical vocational schools.

Figure 1. Greece Education Managerial System
The managerial system hierarchy presented above shows how highly centralized Greek national education has. In this system, the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs has an absolute responsibility for all matters concerning the education of both Greek and foreign nationals at primary, secondary and tertiary levels including both public and private institutions. The Ministry operates this granted right of structuring and functioning of Education System in Greece in the frame of the Law nr. 1566 issued in 30th of September 1985. The 4th article of the law lists the rights and obligations of Minister National Education and Religion as:

a) the organization and functioning of schools in detail,

b) recording and classification of students,

c) starting and ending of school and school year, teaching hours and break duration

d) regulating procedure, decision to stop the taught courses,

e) creating courses and the weekly teaching guides and curricula, the distribution of the subjects to be taught

f) ensuring assessment of students, organization of student life and the social context of school events, and

g) any other details on the functioning of schools.

The possession of these core functions of the maintenance and control of the education system show that the political power represented by the government still aims to continue to direct the educational activities from the center to ensure their alignment with their desired objectives. They seem to be aware of the potential of centrally controlled education system as pointed by Freebody (2003). On the other hand, the 12th section of the same article exempts the teaching of physical education, music, foreign languages and art courses out of the binding regulation. Herein, it is worthy to remember the discussion of the school subjects which serve the ideological goals of education such as history, language, and religion (Kellaghan & Madaus, 1995). While keeping the core civic subjects, leaving the less ideologically loaded subjects having no direct function to transmit desired values out of the strict control area of the law supports the view that Greek state does not approach the
education as a whole service but it is interested in the control of the ideologocially contested area.

The ongoing discussions on changing of this centralized system also support how keeping it is significant for the interest groups. There have been several attempts to decrease the heavily centralized feature of Greek education in recent years, but they all failed to be actualized. For example, George Papandreou, the Minister for National Education and Religious Affairs (1988-1989 and 1994-1996), announced a policy frame for decentralization of the education system with the transfer of powers to local government in February 1995. However, the fierce reactions by the political circles who are concerned with the national autonomy led to the decision not to implement the plan (Mikrakis, 1993). After Papandreou, several attempts were launched to decrease the ultimate autonomy of the government agent over education but the rights granted to the local authorities have stayed limited to the taking care of the school buildings (Sitaropoulos, 2004). With removing the chance to distribute the power to the local authorities, centrally controlled institutions could have been still active in prescribing the policies of general education. Among those active bodies, Pedagogical Institution (P. I.) comes in the first place. The curricula and teaching and school activities frameworks are prepared by this institution. Although, P.I. originally was designed as an independent structure for supporting education reform and making contribution to the preparation of curricula, textbook and teaching materials, it changed in time. During the dictatorship, the Center for Educational Research and training (K.E.M.E) had been established with the law nr 186/1975. Its responsibilities were similar to those of P.I. The law nr 1566/1985 accepted after the dictatorship removed KEME and established the P.I. which is still directly subordinate to the Minister of National Education. After its subordination to the ministry as a center of development of curricula and teaching materials, it has taken over a more active role in developing detailed curricula, and revising of educational policies by advising to the government (Marantos & Couloubaritis, in print). The most striking pattern in these two centralized institutions is their preservation with a binding influence on the educational practices in both dictatorship and democracy.

The aforementioned legislative framework, which is still in action, has been modified with the several laws and presidential decrees. The most important of these changes in the Greek-Orthodox ideology driven system were the law nr. 2341 in 1995 regarding the education of the Muslim minority, and the law nr. 2413, issued 1996 by which the new method of
education for immigrant children was instituted (Chelmis, 1999). This law regulated the education of aliens, immigrants, Roma, religious minorities and repatriate ethnic Greek students at primary and secondary, general and technical education level. Based on the same law, the Directorate of Greek Diaspora Education and Intercultural Studies were formed for the regulations for both the education of non-Greek population and the Greeks living abroad. The directorate aims to implement intercultural education methods in order to facilitate the minority and immigrant groups’ integration into the education system through tutorial classes operating in mainstream schools and the establishment of intercultural schools. However, it is important to note here that the intercultural education regulation is solely viewed as a tool of the integration of the minority background student rather than taking it as a subject to educate all students to live in a multicultural society.

4.2.2 Turkey

Education in Turkey at all levels except for higher education is provided by the public education institutions and private ones which are strictly under the supervision of the Ministry of National Education (MEB) regarding their curricula, teacher qualifications, plans and, assessment etc. 8-year-primary education is compulsory and free for every citizen according to the law nr1739 issued in 1973 named Milli Eğitim Temel Kanunu (National Education Fundemental Law). This law regulates all the framework of functioning of Turkish Education System. According to the law, all the children between 7-14 have to attend to the formal primary education. But the application of this article of the law was suspended with a permanent conditional article and the compulsory education was applied as 5 years for a while. In 1983, the law nr, 1739 was modified with the law nr. 2832 and the age of starting the school was decreased to 6. The ministry, however, could start to apply the 8 year mandatory education with the introduction of a new regulation in 1997. With this law, 5-year-primary education institutions and 3-year-secondary schools have been merged uninterruptedly.

As in Greece, administrative legislation and supervision of all these schools are performed by Ministry of National Education according to the current law named Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın Teşkilât ve Görevleri Hakkındaki Kanun(The law on the duties and organization of National Education Ministry), .3797/1992. This law organizes the units in the ministry and lists the
duties of all these units. Accordingly, Turkish National Education Ministry has an ultimate authority and a strong centralized role, like its counterpart, Greek Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, in:

- Preparing the curricula,
- Maintaining and supervising educational institutions,
- Creating the school books,
- Determining the school calendar and all the activities

Even though educational activities in the provinces are organized by the Provincial Directors of Education, it does not ensure a decentralized structure. Because the personnel of directories are appointed by the ministry, and they are officially assigned to make the schools follow the ministerial decisions. In this system, a unit called Talim Terbiye Kurulu (Education and Training Council) functions as an advisory committee in preparation of the curricula and objectives of the education system. The unit established based on National Education Basic Law nr 1739 has an identical status with the Greek Pedagogy Institute (P.I.). The 6th article of the legislation frames the duties of Education and Training Council, as the first and closest advisory unit of the minister, as:

a) To take the necessary precautions to ensure the national education is functioning according to the general aims and principles of the Turkish Education System

b) To determine what kind of citizen model National Education aims to train,

c) To provide works about the improvement of education system, education plan and programs… to be approved by the ministry

d) To evaluate and improve the school books, and teaching materials, which are prepared by the responsible units of the Ministry and to decide on the appropriate ones.

e) To follow and evaluate the educational developments and movements domestically and internationally.

---

5 This term was directly translated from the original text and “citizenship model” was the exact equivalence in the original text.
4.3 Objectives of Education

4.3.1 Greece

All the duties and rights granted to the centralized institutions mentioned above are regulated by the constitution, legislations and laws created in the centralized systems depicted above. In this sense, it is evident that they are driven with the legal framework of these documents. Looking at these documents, therefore, has potential to learn about what kinds of general objectives of the compulsory education in both Greece and Turkey.

This potential led many former studies to start analyzing these documents to reveal the aims of the education in these states. Vamvoucas, M. and Movroidis, G. (1990) for example, refers to the Constitution of 1975 setting the new general framework of the education policy, and education laws and legislations while he is explaining the evolution of education policies and reform in Greece since the foundation of Greek state. A similar analysis focusing on citizenship education in Greece from a historical perspective conducted by Chelmis (1999) concentrates on the same documents, text books and curricula objectives. Another common point in their studies is the intersection of their analysis about the general objectives of Greek education system. In these works, the general orientation of Greece educational discourse and practice is described as conservative, nationalist and Greek Orthodox church ideology. Chelmis (1999) notes that this inclination was emphasized more during the 1967-74 dictatorship. Makrinoti and Solomon (1999) explains how the Greek education policies historically were shaped around the objective of giving an image of the ideal citizen in this discourse.

Makrinori and Solomon (1999) jadopize the result of these priorities of education in Greece after WWII as ”idealization of the past, an overreacted nationalism” and adds how the conservative military juntas and parties in this period used the values of the past by using the Fatherland, Family and Religion trio. Makrinoti and Solomon (1999) supports these statements by pointing out that there was an over-emphasis of the national identity and the Christian –Orthodox values and anti-communist propaganda among the top privileges of the education policies in Greece till the recent years. Chelmis (1999) delineates this context of education policy as an intense citizenship education aiming to transmit the basic components of the Greek National Identity by promoting national symbols, celebration of national days,
and glorification of national heroes as well as promoting the role of the Greek language in the conservation of the national feeling mixed with the feeling of superiority of the Greek civilization. He also argues that one of the fundamental objectives of education has been to develop a sense of loyalty and belonging to the nation, respecting for national symbols, acquisition of a wide knowledge of historical events of Greece, national enemies and national allies (Chelmis, 1999).

The Greek Constitution referred in the studies of Chelmis (1999) and Vamvoucas, M. and Movroidis, G. (1990) is still in operation with several modifications. When I analyzed it, the Article 16 was my focal point. The article in question regulates education, arts, and science and dictates the core mission of the compulsory national education in Greece as “the moral, intellectual, vocational and physical training of Greeks, the development of national and religious consciousness and the creation of free and responsible citizens” (Article 16). This clear objective serving the creation of citizens who are equipped with the national and religious values is also under the protection of the same article: “Academic freedom and freedom of teaching shall not exempt from the duty of obedience to the Constitution (Article 16, 1975). This article somehow needs to address the issue of limits of freedom in schooling, and reveals the intention of policy makers for ruling these laws and regulations.

In addition to the fundamental regulations of constitution, the law nr 1566/1985 is the most important legal text which specifically prescribe the general aims of the compulsory education. According to article 1 of this education law, educational activities are to be for assisting the students:

a) To become free, responsible, democratic citizens, to defend national independence, territorial integrity of the country and democracy, be inspired by love for human life and nature and to improve the loyalty to the homeland and the original elements of the Orthodox Christian tradition. Freedom of religious conscience is inviolable.

b) To grow and develop in harmony with the spirit and their body, the inclinations, interests and skills. To acquire a social identity and consciousness to grasp and realize the social value of intellectual and practical work. Be informed about right and duties which is beneficial for the human kind and value of the goods of modern civilization, and values of folk tradition.
c) To develop creative and critical thinking and perception of collective effort and cooperation to take initiative and responsible participation to contribute decisively in the progress of society and the development of the Greek state.

d) To understand the importance of art, science and technology, respect human values, and to preserve and promote Greek culture.

e) To develop a spirit of friendship and cooperation with all peoples of the earth, looking forward to a better world, fair and peaceful.

In addition to these expectations from all educational activities, the Article 4 of the same law assigns more specific ideological roles to the compulsory primary education. In particular, the elementary school students are expected to gradually become familiar with the ethical, religious, national, humanitarian and other values as well as to help pupils become free, responsible and democratic citizens, as well as citizens capable of fighting for national independence and democracy (Article 4/E).

It is meaningful that the reservation of the regulation in constitution shows consistency of the similar aims from the education. The objectives of the education law which were structured around creation of a Greek citizen who is equipped with the same nationalist motives listed by Chelmis (1999) shows alignment with this motivation and supports the inference that Greek political actors has not altered the focal points of citizenship policies.

4.3.2 Turkey

The researches on Turkish education policies reveal that there are abrupt transitions among the governments rather than a consistent policy. But, still it is possible to locate it into a nationalist and Kemalist, positivist category (Ozdalga, 1999, Aycan, 2005). Dogan (1990) elaborates these characteristics of Turkish Education policy in his study scratching the evolution of the ideological objectives in education since the foundation of Turkish Republic. He proposes that education objectives were directed toward westernization ideal by the authorities since Ataturk and points out the stress on the “national” education driven by the positivist ideology as a part of transforming the nation of the new state.
The objectives of national education constructed on these pillars were determined as ensuring the national unity and expansion of the citizenship education to make revolutions of Atatürk accepted for a very long time (Aycan, 2005). Atatürk’s statement in 1924 that “Education which the new republic would give to the new generation shall be national” (cited in MEB, 2001: 291) gives the clues about the policy of the foundation period of the state.

The studies discussing the period after Atatürk shows that the policy makers put forward the westernization ideology more. The discussions of the politicians referred in Dogan (1990)’s article shows that objectives of education were determined to create citizens who feel and live like a westerner. As a result, promoting western culture and values, teaching Latin and Greek as a tool and rejecting the Islamic and Ottoman roots and cultures were adopted to create “enlightened westernized, laicist and modern Turkish citizens” (MEB, 1941:32). According to Ozdalga (1999), this period was remarked with the ideology that there was only one culture and civilization and that is Western civilization, which was viewed as the ultimately ideal model for whole humanity. The successive military dictatorships till 1980s, on the other hand, increased the emphasis on Atatürk principles and especially, Turkish nationalism were fostered through the creation of heroic figure of Atatürk as an immortal national leader, national days, teaching of glorious independence war and stories (Kulu, 2009). Doğan (1990) states this situation created such a discourse that even the civil policy makers needed to rely on legacy of Atatürk to safeguard themselves. Also the reactionary stance toward Islamic values also transformed into controlling it with the introduction of compulsory religious courses at schools. In this context, education policies were structured on a state-driven nationalist religion and at the same time laicist Kemalist saying.

In a similar manner with Greece, Turkish constitution, which was prepared by the military government in 1982, still affirms the role of the state driven education. Its article 42, entitled as ”education rights and duties”, draws the scope of the function in educational activities. This article granting the right of performing education and instruction to the strict control of the government, in condition of training the Turkish citizens in the frame of Atatürk's principles and revolution and taking the necessary actions to educate them to avoid the ideologies contrasting with the sovereignty of Turkish state. Beside the constitutional statements about the desired function, the objectives were also prescribed by the current educational law. The second article of the education law applied in Turkey explains the
general purpose of the Turkish National Education is as to raise all Turkish citizens (the law nr. 1739):

1. as individuals who are committed to Atatürk’s principles, the revolution and the Atatürk Nationalism defined in the Constitution, who protect and develop the national, human, moral and cultural values of the Turkish nation, who love and continuously try to appraise their family, country and nation, who are aware of their duties and responsibilities towards the Turkish Republic, a democratic, secular and social state of law based on human rights and the basic principles defined at the beginning of the Constitution and for whom these duties have become a habit⁶.

2. as individuals who have a balanced and healthy personality and character, who are developed in terms of body, mind, moral, spirit and emotions, free and with scientific thinking abilities and a wide worldview, who respect human rights, who value personality and enterprise, who are responsible towards society, who are constructive, creative and productive;

3. in line with their own interests and abilities, to prepare them for life by helping them to acquire the required knowledge, skills, behavior and cooperative working habits, and to ensure they have a profession which will make them happy and contribute to the happiness of society

4. to increase the welfare and happiness of the Turkish citizens and Turkish society, and to support and facilitate economic, social and cultural development in national unity and integration, and finally to make the Turkish nation a constructive, creative and distinguished partner in modern civilization.

Aligning with these objectives, the fifth article of another legislative numbered 2003/25212 regulating the primary education’s aims and structures stresses on armoring the students with the consciousness of national culture in addition to the universal ones, and making them

⁶ “Habit” (Aliskanlik) was the exact word in the original text referring to internalizing the duties as a habit.
adopt Ataturk’s principles and revolutions and respect these values. The preservation of the same ideological patters serving the ideal citizenship model is still a case in Turkey just as in Greece. Moreover, the first article of the law about the teaching of duties shows that a moral heroism is the valid paradigm in perception of duties, which supports the identity dimension of citizenship (Janovski, 75).

4.4 Civic-Related Subjects Regarding Construction of Citizenship

The classic 18th century German philosophy emphasizes demographic characteristics, language, religion and culture in addition to sharing of the past as the prerequisites of creating a nation. The nation, in this formulation, is a module which is distinguished by demographic characteristics, language, religion and culture, common historical consciousness and experiences, and values, which cause people a sense of ethnic community (Dinc, 2008). Hence, teaching history, and language of the nation beside common spiritual values are historically important tools of transforming the subjects into citizens (Aycan, 2005). These subjects can be used to foster "a common measure culture and ideology and a set of common perceptions, aspirations, feelings and ideas that unite the population as defined space as a home" on which a common citizenship model can be structured (Smith, 1992:11). Considering these potentials of these subjects for the construction of the identity dimension of citizenship, hence citizenship policies, the research continued with the teaching objectives of religion, history and language subjects in the frame of compulsory education in Greece and Turkey.

4.4.1 The Subject of Religion and Its Objectives

The subject of religion, as one of the most referred area for the policy makers to support nation-building process, has found a special place in both states’ education policies. Even though the constitutional approach to religion is different in Greece and Turkey, they both equally spared attention to the subject in the legislations and curricula.
In the Turkish constitution, the laicity of the state apparatus is presented as one of the unalterable articles. Under the strict laicism of the Turkish Republic, the religion is seen to be approached as a rival to the Turkish nationalism and state ideology aligning Ataturk’s principles. This situation is worded in the constitution with a foreword:

“Any of the thinking, conviction, and ideology cannot be favored against Turkish national benefits, Turkish presence, the state’s sovereignty with its nation, ‘Turkishness’, and Ataturk nationalism, principles and civilization; and holy religious motivations can never be let in the politics and state affairs as a result of laicism” (Foreword to Turkey’s 1982 Constitution).  

However, the religious education is not let aside by the state. The 24th article of the constitution grants the state the only authority in ensuring and supervision of religious education, and ironically religious education is made mandatory in both primary and secondary education under the name of ‘Religion and Moral Education’. The general objectives of this state-driven compulsory subject includes getting to know:

- Ataturk’s views on Islam
- The major religions of today’s time (Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism etc.)
- The concept of secularism
- Love for the country in the frame of Islam
- The principles of Islam and its practices from a Turkish historical context.

The relation between the state and religion in Greece is different from Turkey, on the other hand. The name of the education ministry, The Ministry of Education and Religion is a concrete evidence of this relation. The second paragraph of article 16 in the Greek constitution, which stresses out growing religious consciousness, in conjunction with Article 3 paragraph 1, is mainly for knowledge and study of the Orthodox Christian tradition which is seen as a component of the Greek nation on the contrary to Turkey. Additionally, law nr 1566/8 specifies the framework of the religious education provided by the Constitution. In the theoretical context, it sets the primary purpose of education as 'developing an integrated and universal human relative, inter alia, to the Orthodox Christian tradition. In particular, article 6 paragraph 2 states that the school seeks to complete the objectives of education of the students, "to realize the deeper significance of the Orthodox Christian character and sustained commitment to universal values" (1566/85/6)
The religious lesson under the same law on education (1566/1985) as a separate subject is compulsory for all students, but the Circular No. 104071/G2/4.8.2008 issued by Ministry of Education exempts the non-orthodox students from the subject of the Religious. In this context, students have the possibility not to attend religious lessons. However, the exemption from these classes, which traditionally constitutes a backbone of the Greek national education, has still been a matter of debate since 2008. Reply letter from the Minister of National Education and Religious Affairs to Ombudsman, George Kamini in 20/11/08 (AP: 450) shows that this exemption decision causes conflict between church and the ministry. In the letter, the minister accuses political groups’ effort to exploit the issue by accusing the government with the systematic exclusion of the subject of religion on media and he needs to clarify that the lesson of Religion still remains mandatory for all Orthodox Christians students. All these discussions and polemics show that the issue of religion keeps its central role in shaping the policies. In such a context supported with the constitutional requirement, the objectives of religious education are oriented towards knowledge about faith, tradition, life and culture of Orthodox Christianity. In this way, the development of the religious consciousness of students is aimed through the knowledge of Christianity, predominantly of Orthodoxy beside other worldwide religions (Law nr 1566/1985).

Despite their constitutional differences in terms of stance to the religion and the state relation, the objectives listed above show that both Greece and Turkey want to keep the official religious values in the hearth of educational activities. As Alpay (2007) mentioned, Turkish State continues to impose the state-led religion understanding over other sects and world views. This supports the idea that the rejection of all religious values policy in 40s was abandoned for the sake of controlling the religious teaching, dominantly Islam as a tool to implement the identity policies in the dominantly Muslim society. The mission loaded to this subject by the laws reveals that the Turkish state sees religious as a mean to increase the legacy of the Kemalist principles and specifically nationalism by integrating them into the teaching of Islam. Mentioning Atatürk’s views on Islam and state love for the country in Islam are two striking examples of how the laicist state use the religion in its citizenship policy aligning with Alpay (2007)’s statement about the state’s Turkifying all Muslims via the doctrines of the state-led religious values.

In Greece, on the other hand, religious lesson is in a turning point. In a context where there is no legal distinction between the church and the state and Orthodox Christianity values are set
as the sovereign claim of the state and virtues of citizens in the constitution, granting the right of being exempted from the mandatory religious subjects to the non-Orthodox students still causes discussions. Despite this alteration, the expected outcomes of the religious lesson which is still mandatory for all Christian-family-born students give the impression that creating a nation with one religion is still an issue of the education regarding citizenship policies of Greece. Although there is a constant EU pressure, a lot of issues including elimination of Orthodox religious symbols from schools wait to be dissolved for a more universal religious teaching (Chelmis, 1999).

4.4.2 Language Teaching

The language is often considered to be the most conspicuous symbol of national identity. A language incorporates separate attitudes, values and ways of expression, creating a sense of familiarity and a feeling of belonging (Crawford, 1996; Blommaert, 2004). The German nationalism, for example, traditionally relied on the sense of cultural unity, reflected in the purity and survival of the German language. The nations are also very sensitive to any attempt or threat of dissolution of language. For example, the text is that basically divides the French-speaking residents of Quebec from the rest of English-speaking Canada, while the Welsh nationalism is based primarily on a strong effort to maintain the Welsh language (Modood, 2005). Such an important building block of the membership to a nation receives a significant focus in both states who are in claim of homogenization.

Article 42 of Turkish constitution, for example dictates that no language other than Turkish may be taught as mother tongue to Turkish citizens in education. The foreign languages to be taught in educational institutions and the principles governing the schools where education is held in the foreign language are defined by laws. In the legal borders of this rule, the objectives of teaching language at schools as ensuring the students to gain ability to communicate with their environment in a proper way, to love and admire Turkish language, be informed about its rules, to use it correctly and confidently, to improve the skills of listening and reading, to enrich the word knowledge through activities, to have a national feeling and enthusiasm, to get acquainted with Turkish culture, admiring it, loving the Turkish land, life, humanity and nature through oral and written literary works, and to acquire a constructivist, and creative thinking (Law 25212/2003).
The unchallengeable oneness of Greek language education is also under the protection of Greek constitution. Educational objectives of language, in this context, is constructed to make students gain the basic instrument of communication of linguistic community to develop mentally and emotionally, to realize the importance of speech to participate in social life, either as transmitters or as receivers of speech to participate in commonalities of society with critical and responsible attitude, to appreciate the importance of language as a key expression of Greek culture and every people, understanding the nature and location of language in general culture, its importance for the nations, to identify the structure and characteristics of Greek national language, to recognize and appreciate the preserved continuity of Greek language and the richness of the interactive forms, realizing the social and geographical diversity of the Greek language, to develop skills and abilities which will contribute to harmonious and balanced development, to become integrated personality and to live the life as a responsible and creative citizen, and to successfully use the appropriate level of speech communication at every opportunity, gaining a sense and knowledge of the language of delivery and thus enhancing the linguistic self-consciousness (Ministry of National education and Religious 2nd Community support framework for History Teaching, 2006).

The same law also puts goals of language teaching for the foreign student by expecting these students to internalize linguistic structures of the Greek language and especially to become acquainted with the first use of realistic situations in school and extracurricular life in addition to learn the language through the Greek culture and adopt a positive attitude towards it. Another issue of Language in Greece is the discussion of teaching ancient Greece which was reinstated by the military dictatorship of 1967 in line with language and intellectual creation of Hellenism. After the restoration of democracy, the general climate of change and favored at school. The official recognition of the Modern Greek language to1976 and teaching at all school levels, both the teaching of ancient texts in translation from high school and limiting the teaching of ancient Greek at school level high school, on the other, undoubtedly strengthened the position of new Greek, but they changed their method of teaching ancient Greek. The course, however returned in 1992. The public discussion of this issue has brought two results: one was to create the public impression of a credible, according to which the learning of ancient Greek is a prerequisite for learning and good use of Modern Greek, the second result was the introduction of teaching of earlier forms of the Greek language
(Ivrideli, Papadakis & Fragkoulis, 2003). Besides, literary texts used in language courses possess potential for cultivation of identity of future citizens. The literary texts, approaching life with its values, featuring national and religious values are tied inextricably to the education of citizens, raise standards of courage and altruism, value grows over time, spiritually, and introduce the language in the highest form. That is the reason why the choice of texts to be read has become a matter of constant polemics in both states. In Turkey, the determination of literary books to be read at primary school turned into an ideological war between Laicist Kemalist and the governing liberal Islamic party recently. The choice of the national authors from both political camps constituted the ground of discussions. As a result, more international authors were included in the reading list. Similarly, Greece has recently adopted to decline the literary text to a large extent, and introduction of new texts, such as recipes, classifieds, advertisements, posters, instructions, coffee maker, newspaper articles and magazines, announcements (Ivrideli, Papadakis & Fragkoulis, 2003). This initiative led the conservative circles to raise criticism of emptying the national features of the education.

The most striking pattern in these documents is that both states’ avoidance of naming another language beside the national language. It can be understood as a result of struggle to keep a common language as a unifying element of the nation. The objectives of both education systems are designed to convince the necessity of promoting and admiring the national language. It seems that language is also seen as a promoter of collective identity and values, an integrating tool beside its functional characteristics. The point diverging Greece from Turkey is its approach to the historical form of the national language. The reason why Greece is focusing on teaching of Ancient Greece can be interpreted as a result of its struggle to solidify the image of uninterrupted Hellenic culture ideology and to link its nation-building project to its historical root which was pointed in the literature review section. Also, mentioning the foreign students in teaching Greece is an outcome of the reality of the immigration and the increasing number of the foreign-origin people unlike in Turkey. On the other hand, the modification of the literary texts in both countries shows an orientation toward a more pragmatic and universal understanding of literacy as well as a decline of national and cultural influence in shaping the character and the adoption of criteria in establishing the teaching frame of Modern Greek and Turkish, even if is partial and limited.
Among all other school subjects, the role of history education in the formation of identity and building nation-state is significant (Dilek & Safran, 2008). Therefore, the history teaching is an area shaped by the ideological social forces through the state control for the sake of creating citizens. A core conception of history education in this context consists of transmitting values of ethnocentric vision of historical development (Ozdalga, 1999). This view remains stable and unchanged in most part of the world. The critical against possible changes related to the risk of deterioration in the national identity ensures the continuity of this view.

In the cases of Greece and Turkey, a similar stance is still valid. This sometimes heats the conflict about the role of teaching of history (Chelmis, 1999; Aycan, 2005). The conflict is embedded in a broader context of debate between two different trends. The first argues that the goals of history should be personal and social objectives associated with the sense of identity. The second trend considers that the main objective of history should be changing the way students understand their world through study of the past and the development of historical thinking (Avdela, 2000).

Historically, the first trend has dominated both states’ education discourse for a long time. In Greece the ideological conflict took place mainly during creation of the curriculum objectives in teaching history. The dominant approach was the "great tradition" of Hellenic Greek civilization which placed emphasis on knowledge transmission and memorizing, especially the history of Greek which is organized around significant events and great personalities (Zambeta, 2000). The main objective of this history education in Greek schools, then has been national formation. This goal shaped the historical Greek education in the 19th century, the era of national integration of the Greek social formation and is based on the sovereign for the time concept of the nation. The approach prevailed in Greece till the democratization process of Greece which started after the last military dictatorship in its peak point. This approach fed with the ideology of the Hellenism, rivalry with Turkey and the idea of a nation that is in constant danger has been maintained (Aycan, 2005). The current history education objectives continues to be Hellenistic (Makriyianni and Psaltis, 2007). General purpose of the history is described as to help students learn and appreciate the history and cultural heritage of Greece and shape national consciousness as members of Greek nation.
The narrative promoted through the textbooks promotes a picture of a glorious ancient Greek civilization and the brave struggles for freedom of the Greeks (Makriyianni and Psaltis, 2007). The narrative is dominantly Greek and little attention given to other people or historical events except for the European history. Another significant pattern in Greek history education comes out of the European Integration. For the first lesson, objective of the instruction is:

"To form students as possible a clearer picture of the features of European culture. To know and understand, respectively, conditions and procedure for the formation of discrete elements of European culture in the length of the historic process. To realize the complexity of European culture, the breadth of content and contradictions. To understand how hierarchies are created in Europe and non-European peoples. Be aware that the modern European world was formed through a complex network conflicts, dependencies and interactions between European nations. Be aware that Greece is an organic part of the European world in the development of which have key elements of Greek culture. To reflect on what they inherit from the European history of the peoples in the historical process" (Ministry of National education and Religious 2nd Community support framework for history teaching, 12)

As occurred in Greece, history teaching is given with ideological aims in Turkey (Ozalga, 1999). Dilek and Safran (2008) points out that history teaching is used to give citizenship education to the students. However, this process was a bit different in Turkey. Seeking the national root in the pre-Islamic roots and avoidance from the Islamic roots led an interrupted but more secular nationalist view of history. Especially, the stories of the Independence war and major Turkish leaders and specifically Ataturk’s life and revolutions constituted the major part of history teaching (Turkone, M, 2009). Today, the objectives of history subject in Turkish education are:

“to make students understand the role of Ataturk and his principles and its contribution to the development of Turkey, acquire the motivation of guarding the secular, democratic, nationalistic and westernized virtues of Turkish republic; to make them acquire a consciousness of history, future and today, to make the students take responsibility to conserve cultural and historical heritage by teaching them basic principles and pillars of Turkish history, culture and historical events; to make students comprehend the national identity, the components of the identity and necessity of preserving that identity; to make students comprehend the importance of national

7 Comprehend is used to internalize in the official text even though they are not two word that can be used interchangeably in Turkish.
unity by creating a bridge between past and present; to make them learn\(^7\) about the civilizations throughout the history; to make them comprehend the contribution of Turkish nation to the humanity and world civilization….; and to make them comprehend the fundamental universal values such as peace, tolerance, democracy and human rights and ensure them to be sensitive to these values” (Law 25212/2003)

As the examples present, the objectives of history subject in Greece and Turkey are strikingly similar: both nationalist and ethnocentric serving the building of national identity though fostering national heroes, the glorification of the civilizations. However, the main difference is the presentation of these values. While Greek history is presented as unaltered from ancient times until today as it constructs the identity on the antiquity of Greko-Orthodox history, Turkish history subject focuses on the recent history, specifically the independence war and Ataturk revolution. Beside this similarity, the European dimension introduced in Greek education is aligning with the EU citizenship policies fostering a common European identity. As a candidate state, Turkish history education is lack of such a focus.

### 4.4.4 School Activities

The central structure of both education systems enables the regulation and dictation of operations and the activities out of classroom in detail. The presidential decree nr 201/1.7.1998 of Greece framing the organization and operation of primary schools and primary education institutions legislation with number 2547 applied in Turkey pose the same legislative power and potential attempts to control every moment of educational activities from the ceremonies, symbols and even the content of school trips for the sake of promoting the desired values.

For example, the Greece presidential Decree 201/98 published in government gazette 161 τ.Α-Article 13, paragraph 5, points A and B make the common prayer of students and teachers in the school yard prior to the start of the course mandatory. The prescriptions of the activity is too detailed that they even explain how this ceremony is done in the rainy days. Teachers participate in mandatory Morning Prayer and church attendance and supervise their departments. The heterodox students attend the the area of the ceremony without participating in prayer, keeping absolute silence and respect while their teachers and fellow students pray. A similar compulsory ceremony is also done in Turkish primary schools. This
ceremony, which is more nationalist rather than religious, is obliged to be done in both private and public primary schools before the classes according to the 12th article of primary education institutions legislation with number 2547. Students recite an oath called “Andimiz (pledge of allegiance)” in which they all (except for non-Turkish student) say:

“I am a Turk. I am honest and I am a hard worker. My duty is to protect those younger than me and to respect my elders, to love my country and my people more than I love myself. My ideal is to (improve), to move forward/to progress, Hey Great Atatürk!, promise solemnly to walk on the road you have opened, to the goal you have showed, without stopping, I offer my existence to the Turkish nation as a gift, How happy for the one who says ‘I am a Turk’!

Another detail covered by the identical legislations in both countries is the official raising of their flags at schools. The national flag as a concrete object falls under the shared national symbols creating a sense of unity and representation of a history and nation. noted by Purvis & Hunt (1999), Hence, flag ceremonies and its presence at schools has a direct effect on arousal of the feelings regarding a common national identity. Both Greece and Turkey, seek to make use of this significant symbol in their citizenship construction project. Accordingly, on the first Monday of each month (by the school's morning shift) and in the national and local anniversaries, and national holidays, having flag ceremony with national anthem is to be done. The flag is displayed in the fabric of the school, like all public services during working days. Lowering of the flag is practiced when it is deemed appropriate by the competent authorities.

Official raising of the flag is:

(1) the first Monday of each month (by the school's morning shift)
(2) national and local anniversaries, national holidays
(3) where appropriate by the faculty club or designated by the “competent authorities” through whom, respect to national symbols are aimed.

8 The statement How happy for the one who says ‘I am Turk’ is a saying of Ataturk, depicting the fundamental of Turkish nationalism.
The tours and teaching visits of primary schools has also to be organized in compliance with § 3, Article 13 of Decree 201/98 in Greece. This article divides the tours into two categories:

- Daily teaching trip
- Educational visits - Participation in events and activities

Both groups of trips are part of the educational process and serve teaching and educational purposes of the curriculum by choose carefully the places to be visited. They are an integral part of the annual planning of educational work, to class level and school, and is committed to involving all teachers (p2-3).

The objective of these kinds of activities is outlined in the following section of the law as meeting the needs of the curriculum and bringing the child in touch with modern realities and cultural values at local or national level, and to reach the national cultural heritage, to learn, to love and to respect them. Following the mission of implementing values of Orthodox-tradition of Hellenic culture, Greece schools have to arrange church attendances in accordance with Article 9, while the Turkish schools are strictly restrained from the religious institutions.

The usage of symbols and extracurricular activities beside the curricular activities supports the idea proposal that both states continue their intense citizenship policies aimed to create a nation united under the common symbols in addition to language, religion and a common history discussed in the chapter 2. The other point to pay attention here is the religious nature ceremonies in both states. The pledge of allegiance at Turkish school is as religious as the morning prayer of Greek schools in terms of spiritualizing the nation and national hero. All these patterns which are integral part of citizenship policies and heavily emphasized in the educational activities and

To sum up, these two historically, and politically identical states’ citizenship policies show identical patterns. Both of them remarked with a militarist, nationalist and ethnocentric ideology and they still continue to apply their assimilationist citizenship policies despite their integration into the global world order. However, the root of their understanding of nation and the values of their nationalist discourse look quite different. While Greek conception of citizenship includes more religious and antiqued roots, Turkish citizenship notion is kept to be
landed on a secular, and reactionary to its Islamic heritage in the documents revised above.
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5. Conclusion

Although the recent years brought changes and pressure to national narratives and limited their influence in the whole the world, the effort of cultivating an official identity (directly or indirectly) through education looks to be a phenomenon still observed in both politically and historically identical states keeping their centralized governance system. This effort is reflected through their constitution and education laws framing the objectives of education. The most striking pattern of them is reflected in the naming of the ministries. Both Turkish and Greek education ministry is named with “national” tag. Similarly, Greek education ministry adds a religion tag, too. These tags in the names of the education ministries possess hints about their position to the national ideology and religion. In this system, the schools have been functioning on the romantic notion of citizenship and develop their core versions (cultural and linguistic homogeneity, superiority of the nation, a lasting historical continuity from antiquity to modern times, etc.). So the education policies of the Greece and Turkey have still a number of implications for the Greek and Turkish citizenship policies.

Concentrated around the objectives of the compulsory education as analyzed in legally binding texts for the citizenship notions promoted in the education systems in both states, are in the frame of a systematically cultivation of patriotism and a collective identity based on homogeneity ideal, while keeping avoidance from identifying and mentioning the minority groups.

Despite several modification aligning the universal, democratic values as a result of both states’ political and social evolution occurring in the global context of European Union and economy, classic conception of citizenship in both states reflected in the studies is still kept alive. This assimilationist conception keeps promoting an official narrative for the ideal citizenship. In this discourse, while Greek education is prioritizing the sense of national pride, loyalty to the country and Orthodox Christian tradition (Greek Education Law, 1) and hence keeping the link with Hellenistic ideology, Turkish education continues to legalize the educational values adjusting to Kemalist doctrines shaped around loyalty, Turkish nationalism and laicism build around heroic Ataturk figure. On the other hand, it is observed that universal and pragmatic objectives which are expected to improve as a result of their political integration are approached cautiously in both. Even though the more universal dimension of
the educational objectives, such as democratic values and personal freedom, are mentioned, they are overshadowed with the states’ particular priorities. In this sense, general objectives of serving the creation of future citizens rest on blend of a cautious “contemporary progressivism” and cautious universalism in both states (Chelmis, 1999, Aydin, 2004). As a result, language and education have kept standardized to create a Turkish national identity.

The last two decades of immigration, however, have significantly, and irreversibly, have an altering social and demographic characteristics of the population residing within Greece. Faced with increasing and changing diversity as a result of immigration, “Greek society and the state have been called to respond, adapt and formulate adequate policies through which to manage these transformations” (Triandafyllidou and Gropas, 2007). At the same time, continuing European Union pressure for the promotion of more inclusive reforms has potential to bring some changes in Greece, even if it has a limited effect at this point. The adoption of intercultural education law and the regulation of the religion classes for the non-orthodox students can be ascribed to these contextual factors. Similarly requests of EU from Turkey as a precondition for accession to EU member may function as a pushing factor for improving the educational practices for a more inclusive citizenship policy. However, the measures are not as binding for Turkey as in Greece, so it is expected that the process shall not be expected at the same phase. But their strong centralized political system seems to prevent the impact of the international context.

To sum up, despite procedural applications such as multicultural education regulation and emphasis on universal humanistic values in both countries education system, the classic conception of citizenship in education knitted by homogenizing, nationalist, ethnocentric, patriotic and religious Greek and Turkish official ideology. Through the analysis of their current citizenship policies, the first impression is that both states needs to embrace a more inclusive framework for education and therefore in citizenship policies. However, it is expected that cautious progressivism and political resistance towards this inclusive model will pertain as a result of the pertaining ideology of the centralized political power. Herein, this study is verified in terms of its approach to the policy as text.


Appendix

Legal Texts

Circular 104071/G2/2008 issued by Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs about the status of non-Orthodox student in religion classes (Greece)

Convention on the Reduction of Situations of Multiple Nationality and Military Obligations in Cases of Multiple Nationality of 1963

Law 1566/1985 on the rights and obligations of Minister of National Education and Religion (Greece).

Law 1739/1973 on the basement of national education (Turkey)

Law 186/1975 on center for education research during the dictatorship (Greece)

Law 2341/1995 on the education of Muslim minority (Greece).

Law 2413/1996 on intercultural education (Greece)

Law 2413/1996 on intercultural education (Greece)

Law 2413/1996 on the intercultural education (Greece).

Law 2413/1996 on the intercultural education (Greece).

Law 25212/2003 on primary education’s aims and structures (Turkey)

Law 2832/1983 on the basement of national education (Turkey)

Law 3797/1992 on the duties and organization of Ministry of National Education

Law 4306/1997 on the compulsory education (Turkey)

Legislation 2547 on the organization and operation of primary schools (Turkey)

Ministry of National education and Religious 2nd Community support framework for history teaching (Greece)

Official Letter of Minister of National Education and Religious Affairs to Ombudsman, George Kamini/ 20. 11. 08/AP:450 (Greece)

Order No 10 of the Ministry of Internal Affairs 15/5/2001 (F.79174/16211)

PD201, Gov. 161/13-07-98 and circulars G2/633/20-02 on educational visits (Greece)

Proposal for a Law 186/1975 adopted with amendments (Greece)

The Greek Constitution

The Greek Nationality Code of 1955

The Law 576/1977, subject to Article 51 of Law 1404/1983
Law 217/2004 on Greek Citizenship
The presidential decree 201/1998 (July, 1) on the operation of primary education institutions (Greece)
The Turkish Constitution
The Curriculum of Primary Education guidance, 2006 (Greece)

Letter of Confirmation from the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs

[Image of a letter with Greek text]

[Translation of the letter]

Na diatpethi mechi
Bathmos asfaleias

Marousi, 8 - 10 - 2008
Arith. Prwt. Bathmos Proter. YS

PROS: Vedat Sevincer
vedats@student.uv.uio.no

Ola eina thema Paidias

ENAIOO DOIKHTIKOS TOMEAS
PROTOBAOMIA KAI DEUTEBAOMIA
EKPAIDEUSIS
DIEOUTHYNH SPOUDON P.E.
TMHMA A'

A. Papantvedou 37
15180 MAROYSI

Plenopofories: P. Gvphgakoptulos
Tlepfrino: 210.34.42.243
Fax: 210.34.42.241
e-mail: t05@yepth.gr

THEMA: "Apantpsi se erwtpma"

Sas enimerwvnsme oti gia ta erwtpmatata sa, mporite na apevthvtheite sthn
istoseidha tou YP.E.P.T., www.yepth.gr, kathws kai sthn istoseidha tou Paidagwngiko
Instipouto http://pi-schools.gr

Syn: 1 sselida

Esoterik Diagomi
Diewthunh Spoudwn P.E.
Tmhma A'

O AN. DIEOUTHINH
RHAGAS GEORAKOPYLOS