02

Ah, our village was beautiful ... Towards a critical social linguistics in times of migration and war

02

Ah, our village was beautiful … Towards a critical social linguistics in times of migration and war

Katharina Brizić, Yazgül Şimşek & Necle Bulut

1. Introduction

It is extensively documented that Central European education systems are rather ill-equipped when it comes to coping with their students' social and linguistic diversity. In consequence, students with home languages other than the school language face particular obstacles in the education system (e.g., OECD 2019a: 18, 2019b; LPB, 2010).

In Germany and Austria, for example, one of the most serious obstacles they are confronted with is the early segregation of students into a 'stronger' and a 'weaker' group. The segregation already takes place in the last year of primary school; at this point, the students are only 9 or 10 years old. The 'stronger' group then continues education in the *Gymnasium*[1] (graduating with the qualification for university entrance), while the 'weaker' group continues in

[1] Or, alternatively, in the *New Secondary School.* Cf. https://www.bildungssystem.at/ [accessed 2020-01-15].

the *Comprehensive Secondary School* (in German: *Gesamtschule*, *Realschule* or *Kooperative Mittelschule*, with only compulsory graduation).

Particularly for 'immigrant' students[2] with home languages other than German, this segregation is known to account for massive disadvantages, as more than four years and/or specific support would be needed to acquire German on the required level (OECD 2019a: 27). For this reason, multilingual 'immigrant' students are – far more often than others – assigned to the 'weaker' group (OECD 2018a, 2018b, 2016a, 2016b; SVR 2015: 146). Their manifold language competencies, amongst others, remain largely unrecognized. Poor school success, in turn, also accounts for negative consequences when they get older and enter the labor market (e.g., OECD 2019a: 20ff.). This entails serious disadvantages for general participation in society – in other words: for 'raising one's voice' and 'being heard' in key economic, social and political discourses and decision-making processes of society (Blommaert 2005: 4; Hymes 1996: 64; OECD 2019c: 256).

Considerably less known, however, is the fact that the education system's shortcoming in this field increases with every additional language. In short: particularly students who are not just bilingual but highly multilingual – with three, four or even more languages as part of their everyday lives – are at risk of attending school without their competencies being recognized (Brizić 2007). A relatively well-researched example are the Roma and Sinti minorities in Europe (cf. Matras 2005; for facts and figures documenting persisting educational exclusion, see Strauß 2011). Less research exists on Kurdish migrant families in Europe with a similarly wide scope of multilingualism. Kurdish families who migrated from Turkey to Austria, for example, often speak one or more Kurdish languages in addition to Turkish and German (Brizić 2007). Historically, this extensive multilingualism has already been under pressure in their countries of origin: in Turkey, for example, the 20th century was characterized by rigorous language bans against Kurdish, with many restrictions continuing to date and going hand in hand with political and educational deprivation (Coşkun et al. 2011; Öpengin 2012; Çağlayan 2014; Amnesty International 2018: 367ff.; Gourlay 2020). As a result of the exclusion of Kurdish from the Turkish education system, comparatively high illiteracy rates are also found in the Kurdish migrant diaspora – e.g., in Austria.

Given the historical dimension and its continuing repercussions, particularly students from the groups mentioned above would need both time and adequate support to acquire literacy in German – time and support, neither of which can be provided, given the early segregation process as depicted above in the example of Austria. The result seems quite paradoxical: it is often the most multilingual students who have the least chances of successfully 'raising their voices', and thus of 'being heard' in the multilingual polyphony of late-modern societies.

In our contribution[3] we will follow up on this matter. The aim is to empirically investigate two questions: first, *how are educational*

[2] Also referred to as students with 'immigrant languages'. For figures regarding Austria, see STATISTIK AUSTRIA (2017: 8–9); for Germany, see SVR (2018: 1). For detailed definitions, cf. e.g., https://mediendienst-integration.de/artikel/wer-hat-einen-migrationshintergrund.html [accessed 2020-01-15].
For a critical discussion of the term 'immigrant students' and related terms, see Brizić (forthcoming b), as well as SVR (2015: 146-147), to name but a few. For a critical discussion regarding the term 'immigrant languages', see Adler (2018: 7).

[3] This research project was supported by the Austrian Science Fund FWF under Grant P20263-G03.

disadvantages – i.e., unequal opportunities – constructed and put into action in the particular case of highly multilingual students? And second, *can our insights contribute to breaking the vicious circle?*

Regarding the structural or 'macro' aspects of education systems, our questions are essentially answered, given the amount of existing quantitative surveys (see, e.g., OECD 2019a, 2019b, 2018a, 2018b; and many more). Regarding linguistic 'micro' aspects, an equally wide range of qualitative studies exists, analyzing individual interactions between teachers, students and other interactants in rich detail (see, e.g., Kotthoff & Heller 2020, to name but one volume out of a wide range of recent works).

And yet, a crucial question is still largely open that connects the 'macro' to the 'micro': *How are structural 'macro' aspects specifically translated into individual 'micro' disadvantages, and thus into unequal opportunities?* (cf. our first question above). Our contribution is dedicated to this unresolved issue[4], zooming in on the scarcely researched context of particularly unequal opportunities for highly multilingual students. Moreover, we are committed to *confronting inequality*[5] *within and through our work* (cf. our second question above). We will pursue this target by tying in upon Norman Denzin's (2001: 24) notion of moral responsibility in social research, in order to ultimately proceed to an approach visionary also in terms of our linguistic work.

It is particularly the latter aim of a socially responsible linguistics that moved us to venture into performative writing (cf. again Denzin 2001). The approach is based on the understanding that research is never 'innocent', let alone 'objective'. Rather, it is consequential and powerful, bearing more or less visible, more or less serious societal effects. We, therefore, explicitly intend – i.e., perform – our work to pay tribute to the societies we belong to, the migrations we are part of, and the many *voices* contributing to our insights. The dialogical nature of all our work is reflected here to the extent possible – for example, by taking up the poetic tone from one of our interviews. It is this approach that has ultimately led to the hybrid overall format of our contribution.

The contribution is organized into seven parts. Following the overview (this part), we set out to define the core concepts needed here: *voice*, *hearing/silencing*, and *polyphony* (part 2). Using the example of the Kurdish case, the concepts are further substantiated (part 3) before they are put into action in our methodical approach (part 4) and empirical data analysis (part 5). This finally lays the foundation for new perspectives to unfold – both for our question on multilingualism and inequality (part 6) as for our vision and commitment to act in a socially responsible way as researchers in linguistics (part 7).

2. Core concepts

In the frame of this issue on *Migration, Language and Integration*, our contribution focuses on three core concepts.

First, within the topic of *migration*, our key concept is *voice*. It serves to grasp the paradox named above: the highly multilingual yet

[4] Cf. also Gomolla and Radtke's (2002) pioneering study investigating exactly this 'macro'-and-'micro' connection. However, multilingualism and *voice* were not part of their work.

[5] Also: *equity* as referring to *adequate* support, which is not necessarily *equal* for all (see OECD 2019a, 2019b, 2018a, 2018b). We do, however, prefer the term *equality*, as we are talking about *equality of access*, *equality of chances* etc., in sum understood as contrary to *social inequality*.

critically disadvantaged 'immigrant' students in European societies – students who face the risk of never successfully raising their *voices* in decisive economic, social and political discourses. *Voice* thus stands "(...) for the way in which people manage to make themselves understood or fail to do so" (Blommaert 2005: 4).

Second, within the topic of *language*, our core concept is *hearing (versus silencing)*. This concept serves to describe the processes leading to educational disadvantages – processes that often result in unequal chances for later participation in society. The crucial question already arises in the education system: whose *voice* is "heard" and considered "worth hearing" (Hymes 1996: 64); and who is, in contrast, leaving school after compulsory education with his or her *voice* never to be *heard* (and, henceforth, *silenced*) in higher education?

Third, in contrast to the concept of *integration*, we focus on *polyphony* here. This is to pay tribute to the aim of equal opportunities for *all voices* in society (OECD 2019a: 24; Bade 2007: 75), whether defined as migrants or not, as integrated or not, as multi- or monolinguals, as students, parents or teachers. Unlike the term 'integration', the concept of *polyphony* implies how diverse, contradictory and yet co-constructed our experiences are – just as diverse as our *voices* are when expressing these experiences.[6] It is exactly this *polyphony* of experiences, of *heard* or *silenced voices* and resulting discourses that we are interested in (Blommaert 2010; see also Mecheril 2004: 11–12).[7]

With our three key concepts in mind, our research question re-reads as follows: In a society shaped by migration, how come that *multilingual voices* are so frequently turned into *silenced voices*? More precisely, how are different *voices*, particularly multilingual ones, present in the education system? And are they *heard* by teachers – i.e., understood and evaluated as 'worth hearing'? Or are they *silenced* – i.e., evaluated negatively? Finally, what are the perspectives of accomplishing education opportunities that are as equal as possible for *all the voices* of our globalized, *polyphone* society? And what can our work as researchers contribute here?

3. The Kurdish example

It is impossible to listen to *voices* that are missing in the core discourses of our times; there is no audible trace of them. What is possible, though, is: listening to the processes where *voices* are being *silenced*. We have chosen to do this by example of the Kurdish case, as it provides particularly vivid evidence of silencing processes throughout history.

One of the most powerful silencing processes has already been depicted above: in schooling systems like the Austrian one, resources are directed towards the segregation of students after primary school into a 'stronger' and a 'weaker' group (OECD 2019a: 17 and 23f.; Gomolla & Radtke 2002: 13ff.). Through this segregation process, the 'weaker' group (often 'immigrant' students) tends to be socially *silenced* –

[6] We use the term *polyphony* not strictly in Mikhail Bakhtin's sense (i.e., as *polyphony* within an *individual* character; Bakhtin 1929), nor in a strictly linguistic sense (e.g., as *polyphony* within a *text*; Nølke 2017). Rather, we are following Blommaert's (2010) sociolinguistics of globalization (i.e., focusing on *polyphony* within globalized *discourses*). And yet, there is also a Bakhtinian aspect remaining, that is: the focus on the very 'human' character of *polyphony* and its wider societal resonance (c.f. Bakhtin 1984: 293).

[7] Equally relevant to this approach is the term *postmigration society* (Foroutan et al. 2014), as migrations are global and non-temporary phenomena far beyond (and post) any 'exceptionality'.

i.e., not represented later in life in the key discourses and decision-making processes of society, as this would require higher education (cf. OECD 2016a: 47; LPB 2010).

Nevertheless, there are silencing processes that reach even further. In the Kurdish example, we have outlined how 'immigrant' multilingualism may have already been exposed to sociopolitical powerlessness and economic poverty in the countries of origin. Poverty, in turn, tends to persist over migrations and generations (Feliciano 2006) – and poverty is, fatally, one of the strongest predictors of 'weak' school performance in countries like Austria (OECD 2019a: 19f.). In consequence, rather than a student's individual performance, it is often a student's 'origin' and family 'capital' that decide over success or failure (cf. OECD 2016b: 8–9). In sum, the chances for multilingual students as discussed here to ever participate in core discourses of society are systematically restricted.

After migration and multilingualism, there is yet a third factor exposed to silencing processes, that is: illiteracy. Particularly in the case of Kurdish minorities, a high degree of educational deprivation has already taken place in the countries of 'origin' – e.g., Turkey. In many 'immigration' countries such as Austria, however, much weight is put on the parents' shoulders – i.e., on reading and literacy in the family, and on helping with the homework – a task apparently unfulfillable for illiterate parents. In a nutshell, the chances of 'immigrant' students shrink once again, as students with historically silenced multilingualism *and* migration *and* illiteracy in the family would have to overcome all these silencing processes in order to have the slightest chance of later participating in any core discourse. This is also how present silencing processes (e.g., intrinsic to formal education in Austria) accumulate with historical silencing processes (e.g., against Kurdish in Turkey).

At this point, a fourth rift comes into play, this time specific to Turkey, the country of 'origin' of many Kurds in Europe. In the Turkish context, the Kurdish case goes hand in hand with a so-to-speak 'collectivized' suspicion of terrorism. The roots can be found not only in Turkey's policies of suppressing anything 'non-Turkish' (c.f. Ercan 2013: 113; Haig 2003) but already earlier in the Ottoman Empire and its decline (e.g. Arakon 2014). In modern times, Turkish-Kurdish history is often reduced to the war between the Turkish state and the PKK (for a detailed discussion, see e.g. Ercan 2019 and 2013; Jongerden & Akkaya 2015). This war, with its peak in the 1980s and 1990s, is engraved in highly conflicting collective memories (Neyzi 2010), as tens of thousands of lives were lost, with large stretches of the Kurdish territory being depopulated, villages burned down, and populations displaced by Turkish military forces (Bruinessen 1995). However, the 21st century's ongoing wars and persecutions against minorities in Turkey, Syria and Iraq (cf., e.g., Sevdeen and Schmidinger 2019) reveal how far the dimensions reach beyond the mere Turkey-PKK context. And yet, it is all the more remarkable that in European political discourses, the Kurdish case is persistently linked to 'terrorism' and the PKK[8], and to the notion of Kurdish aspirations for an independent state. Kurdish has, however, remained a 'stateless' language so far. And statelessness,

[8] For example, the European Union designated the PKK a 'terrorist organization' in 2002, although the PKK had announced its decision to rely on peaceful methods in 1999 (Ercan 2019: 123).

in turn, can be a particularly severe form of *silencing* in our globalized times.[9]

Kurdish *voices* are thus often missing in core societal discourses, even when the discourses are 'about them'. The only traces we all too easily find in the Kurdish case are: low socioeconomic status, unequal opportunities, low literacy rates, and an enormous quantity of media reports on war and forced migration – in short: a strongly curtailed picture.

For this reason, it was our primary aim to listen to *voices* that are not easy to *hear* – be it because of poverty, illiteracy, stigmatized multilingualism, statelessness or forced migration from the country of 'origin'; be it because of early segregation processes in the country of 'immigration'; or be it all of the above. We will, therefore, stick to the Kurdish example throughout this empirical study.

4. Methodical approach

Our approach is intended for us to pay tribute to the societies we belong to, the migrations we are part of, and the many *voices* that have at all times been the sources of our dialogues, our work, and our insights.

The insights intended here imply particular sensitivity for *voices* that are largely missing in societal *polyphony* as well as in academic research: *voices* that are not easy to *hear*. Our primary aim has thus been to avoid 'selecting' participants for a classic 'interview' format. Rather, the approach was to reach out to, and search for, potential conversation partners who expressed the explicit wish to raise their *voice* and speak up on experiences of being *silenced*. Unlike a classic interview, our conversation format was hence intended, tried out and further developed to become "(…) a vehicle for producing performance texts (…) about self and society" (Denzin 2001: 24). In this spirit, it was our most important concern to provide an appropriate 'stage' for the performances, with the researcher[10] representing the partner and attentive 'audience' for the performer (ibd. 25ff.). In fact, this approach gave birth to several momentous 'events', as our data selection will show below (see part 5).[11]

Our first two conversation partners or 'performers' are RE (see 5.1.), a woman from a Kurdish village near the Turkish-Syrian border, and TA (see 5.2.), a woman from the same region. Both women experienced forced migration in the 1990s. Their home villages were accused of 'collaborating with the PKK' and, in consequence, destroyed by the Turkish military. Therefore, the women also share the experience of stigmatized multilingualism, as their first language is Kurdish-Kurmanji, spoken together with other Kurdish varieties as well as Arabic, Turkish and a little German. None of the women ever attended school or learned to read and write. And both RE and TA are now mothers, their daughters being 10 years old and attending their fourth year of

[9] For example, when it comes to international negotiations about the future of the Kurdish population in the Middle East, Kurdish representatives are often excluded, as they are only 'non-state' actors. See, for example, https://www.diepresse.com/4947398/syrische-kurden-wollen-autonome-region-ausrufen [accessed 2020-01-15].

[10] The number of conversations conducted in our study amounted to more than 200 in total. In every single case, however, the responsible researchers were trained extensively and were free to choose the language and 'interview' contexts according to their personal competencies.

[11] Additional sources were: official databases, questionnaires and psycholinguistic tasks for the students (e.g., oral and written narrations and retellings, amongst others; cf. Blaschitz 2014; Brizić forthcoming a).

primary school in Vienna, Austria. However, the women had never met, nor were the conversations organized together. Rather, the conversation with RE took place in Istanbul, using Kurdish, whereas the conversation with TA was conducted in Vienna, using Turkish. The choice of languages had been up to the women.

Our second two conversation partners are female primary school teachers in Vienna, Austria. The first is LOU (see 5.3.), teacher of TA's daughter; the second is BAL (see 5.4.), teacher of RE's daughter. Like the mothers above, the teachers did not know each other, and the conversations were organized separately. Both of them took place in Vienna, and the language was German, since this is both teacher LOU's and teacher BAL's first language.

The topics of our conversations were, in the case of the mothers RE and TA, their migration, language and schooling biographies, with a strong focus on the mothers' goals for their ten-year-old daughters.

In the case of the teachers LOU and BAL, the topic was their professional biography, with a strong focus on the evaluation and assessment of their students – i.e., RE's and TA's ten-year-old girls.

In addition, in each of the four conversations, the common point of reference was the upcoming segregation process at the end of primary school, requiring the teachers to recommend their students either for the 'weaker' or the 'stronger' group (as depicted above, cf. part 1).

Our choice of topics (biographies, ambitions, segregation process, school success) later allowed us to analyze not just each conversation individually but also the different conversations in juxtaposition to each other, since all of them addressed related points of reference. In this way, we ultimately arrived at the much-intended bigger picture, showing a *polyphony* of languages[12], experiences, discourses and *voices*, raised and being *heard* in our context of war and migration, of multilingualism, education, and the inequality of chances.

All four conversations were recorded and transcribed following the GAT-2 transcription system (Selting et al. 2011; for an explanation of the signs, see chapter 'transcription conventions' at the end of our contribution). The transcriptions served as a base for subsequent educational-linguistic approaches[13] (regarding the individual *voices* and their literacies), interactional-linguistic analyses[14] (regarding institutional experiences of being *heard/silenced*), and a discourse-linguistic synopsis[15] (regarding the societal *polyphony* of discourse patterns and frictions between them). Moreover, the number of participating parents, teachers and students was large enough to also allow statistical analyses (for a comprehensive description, see Brizić forthcoming a).

[12] The overall study sample comprises roughly 50 teachers and 200 families, with speakers of Romani, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Albanian, Romanian, Macedonian and Turkish (from former Yugoslavia's follow-up states), as well as speakers of Kurdish, Turkish, Armenian, Aramaic, Arabic and Caucasian languages (from Turkey). For a detailed description, see Brizić (forthcoming a).

[13] Cf. e.g., Spolsky and Hult (2008).

[14] Cf. e.g., Lucius-Hoene & Deppermann (2002).

[15] Cf. e.g., Warnke (2007); Warnke & Spitzmüller (2008).

5. Empirical study: four voices

5.1. The 'Resisting Voice': mother RE and her village

RE was born near the Turkish-Syrian border in a Kurdish village that does not exist anymore. The village was burned down by the Turkish army during the war between the Turkish state and the PKK in the 1990s. The destruction of villages was justified by accusing the villagers of 'collaborating with the PKK', and in further consequence of 'Kurdish terrorism'. RE was still a child back then. Now, at the time of the interview, she is in her mid-30s and mother of a ten-year-old girl.

The conversation (in Kurdish) between mother RE and interviewer INT is one of the most extensive in our study. Both mother and interviewer apparently enjoy talking and sharing their largely congruent views on the long history of the Turkish-Kurdish conflict. In total, the interview lasts almost two hours, with the two women sitting in the little office of a social centre in the heart of Istanbul[16], accompanied by traffic noise, prayer calls and other sounds from the bustling streets outside.

After the first third of the interview, all of a sudden, mother RE's lively conversation tone changes: she has apparently left behind the bustling streets of Istanbul. In a deep, calm voice, she now turns to another time, another place: to the past, and to her village on the Turkish-Syrian border – the village that was destroyed more than two decades earlier.

Transcript: **My Village-Part 1**
Speaker: **Mother RE**
Interviewer: INT
Interview language: **Kurdish (Kurmanji variety, dialectal)**
Transcript translation: English (in orange)

001 RE: (---) <<deep, calm> a/gundê ma XWEŞ bû;>
(---) <<deep, calm> ah/our village was BEAUtiful;>
002 (1.0) ji:=e: <<all, high, rhythm> ÇI tiştê xwade daye-
(1.0) of=eh <<all, high, rhythm> whatEVer god has given-
003 HEmû te da hebun-
EVErything was there-
004 xurMA te tune bun,
DATES weren't there,
005 portaQAL te tune bun,
ORanges weren't there,
006 (.) sev ji ew e ŞINeke;=
(.) apples these GREEN ones;=

[16] The interview took place in an economically poor neighbourhood in Istanbul where Kurdish migrants from eastern Turkey and other minorities have become the majority in the course of decades.

```
007         =ewê HUrik bun,
            =the SMALL ones,
008         (.) ew TAne te da tune bun.
            (.) these were the ONLy ones we didn't have.
009         (.) çi ku/ hemu xwadê daYI te da bun;>
            (.) anything (else) GIVen by god was there;>
```

Ah, our village was beautiful (*A, gunde ma xweş bû*) (line 001): this is the onset of something we cannot yet grasp. It seems new in form and content, given the yet unfamiliar, deep, narrative tone used by RE. And this is not the only feature attracting attention here, as RE's deep intonation is closely followed by a sudden rise to a high pitch (line 002-003), and on to a rhythmically marked, increasingly accelerated recital of the village's fertility. All the vividly named fruits that *weren't* there (lines 004-008), nevertheless, draw attention to a wide range of unnamed fruits that *were* there (009), in all their abundance, *given by God* – back in the past, back in the village on the Turkish-Syrian border (see transcript above: My Village-Part 1).

Transcript: My Village-Part 2

```
010   RE:   sed e ave TE da bu,
            a creek with WAter was there,
011         (.) çeşme ave TE da bu,
            (.) a FOUNtain was there,
012         (.) <<acc> çi çawuşeki diHAT giriYA diçu,=
            (.) <<acc> every military officer who CAME left WEEPing,=
013         =çi alimeki diHAT giriYA diçu-=
            =every teacher who CAME left WEEPing-=
014         =digo wi gunde halo XWEŞ-=
            ={he} said such a BEAUtiful village-=
015         =ame çiLO je harin.>
            =HOW can we ever leave it.>
016         (1.2) hinki <<p, len, deep> AZEni şerif (...)->
            (1.2) now  <<p, len, deep> the holy PRAYer (...)->
017         <<cresc, moved> hinki waleteki !GEL!ki xweş bu;=>
            <<cresc, moved> it was a !VE!ry beautiful home;=>
018   INT:  =aRE-=
            =YES-=
019   RE:   =waLEte me.
            =our HOME.
```

The visualization of abundance is expanded now, as RE sets out to draw a picture of heavenly beauty: there is a *creek with water* and a *fountain*[17] (010-011) amidst the aridity of a desert steppe and its hot summers. As a stylistic means, the speech is again rhythmically accentuated. The rhythm now marks the presence of Turkish military officers and teachers in the village, all of them foreigners[18] who were sent to the village from elsewhere.[19] And although they *came* as foreigners, all of them *left weeping* when their time in the village had come to an end (012-013). Such was the beauty of the Kurdish village that, in RE's account, even Turkish military officers could not but express deep affection: *Such a beautiful village, how can we ever leave it* (014-015).

At this point of the interview, a loud prayer call from a nearby mosque can be heard (016). However, RE is anything but irritated by this intrusion. Quite on the contrary, she integrates the prayer call into her narration: after listening, she gives it a particular mention (*...The holy prayer...* , line 016). She even adjusts her own voice to the deep voice of the prayer call. Thus, RE's narration inside the room is seemingly joined by the holy prayer outside in the air – not just *acoustically* by the muezzin but also *spiritually* by *God*. It is as if RE's village appraisal obtained attention even from heaven.

Highly moved and again louder, RE concludes her appraisal with strong emotion and emphasis. Here she does not cite teachers nor officers any more but speaks for herself, the woman who was born and raised in that village so blessed (017-019): *It was a very beautiful home. Our home* (see transcript above: My Village-Part 2).

Transcript: My Village-Interruption

020	**INT:**	**[ÇU waxt (...)-]**
		{which} time (went by) (...)-]
021	RE:	[hami dari BER,]
		[TREES all around,]
022	**INT:**	**(--) ha _ HA,**
		(--) i _ SEE,
023	RE:	u sed e ave TE da bû,
		and a RIVer was also there,
024		(1.0) !GEL!ki xweş bû.
		(1.0) it was !TRU!ly beautiful.

The audience – i.e., the interviewer – seems to be slightly distracted (020): INT obviously wants to ask something and starts a question, as she has been doing many times during this interview.

But this time, INT's question turns out to be a faux pas. RE, usually more than willing to show an interest in questions, does not even react. Rather, and *exactly* together with INT, RE starts talking again with a voice loud enough to stop INT's question altogether (021). So, whereas RE had fully integrated the muezzin's *holy prayer* earlier, she now treats INT's question as an interference.

INT, in turn, immediately understands: she *must not* interrupt here. Instead, her role is to agree, to certify, to support the narrator.

[17] From this point onwards, for the sake of clarity and brevity, only the English translation is given. For the Kurdish original, please see the transcript.

[18] This information was provided in a different part of the conversation.

[19] RE's account reminds us of the massive presence of the Turkish military in the Kurdish parts of eastern Turkey. Moreover, it has been common since the foundation of modern Turkey in the 1920s that teachers from the western parts of Turkey were sent to the eastern (Kurdish) regions to teach there for some time.

And INT bows to her role. To the ongoing testimony of RE (*trees all around*), INT finally answers what she is supposed to: *I see!*, she confirms emphatically (022).

RE has won and the stage is fully hers again. Without further interference, she sums up her message. Once again she refers to the water, so precious a commodity in dry steppes (023), and to the village so lush: *It was truly beautiful!* (024).

We do not know if RE's repetition of water and beauty (023-024) would have occurred at all *without* INT's attempt to ask a question (020). This is why we refer to lines 020-024 as 'interruption'; see transcript above: My Village-Interruption).

But what we do know now is that something is happening here, something that is carefully conceptualized by RE in form and content, something that *must not be disturbed*. INT's interruption in line 020 has thus helped us to understand that something more profound than just an interview is taking place, something that is superordinate to a simple process of question-and-answer. It might have the form of a song or a poem: RE's poem for her village that was lost. In this framework, the first two transcripts (My Village-Part 1 and Part 2) could be seen as *the first and the second stanza of a poem*.

Transcript: My Village-Part 3

025 RE: <<all> û ÇOLe wê HEbû li çile EZinge xwe bine beleş;>
<<all> and {the village} had {dry} steppe fields
in fall you could get FIREwood for free;>
((...))
026 (.) te piwaZEN biçandana;
(.) you could grow ONions;
027 te giZER biçandana-
you could grow CARRots-
028 te: biber BIçandanaya,
you could grow sweet bell pepper,
((...))
029 çeLI ji tişti hebu,
in FALL there was {every}thing,
030 haVIN(e) ji tişti hebu;
in SUMMer there was {every}thing;
031 tiş(t)i li ber deriye TE bun-
everything was right at your door-
((...))
032 ave ta BOL bu,
you had water in aBUNdance,
033 (.) te kaDIye.
(.) you could get by WELL // life was PLENtiful.

Lines 025-033 fit into this framework. The appraisal is still continuing here. Again, it starts with the details of everyday life (025-028), and again it ends with repetition and rhythm, and, for the first time, also with rhyme: *In fall there was everything - in summer there was everything* (029-030). In Kurdish, not just the endings but also the beginnings of lines 029 and 030 rhyme: *çeli ji - havin ji* (literally translated: *fall in - summer in*, given that *in* is a postposition in Kurdish-Kurmanji).

And again (see already first stanza), *everything* was there, *right at your door* (031). And, again (see already second stanza), *you had water in abundance* (032). Thus, the last of the three stanzas confirms it again (033): in the village that was lost long ago, life was truly *plentiful* (see transcript above: My Village-Part 3).

Transcript: The Destruction-Part 1

034	RE:	(1.5) e: ew derikê wan te girtIN (...);
		(1.5) but their door CLOses (...);[20]
035		hukumatê male MA xerab kir.
		the government destroyed our house.
036	**INT:**	**(hukumatê) aRÊ-**
		(the government) RIGHT-
037	RE:	A:.
		ye:s.
((...))		
038		xaNI me-
		our HOUSE-
039		(ew) d/ e/ xaniye diYA min;
		my MOTHer's house;
040		mala me xaMIti,
		our deSTROYed house,

RE's tone changes again (line 034) – just as in the beginning of what we now call the *village poem* – and again something new begins: after a long break, a rift is indicated by the phrase *But their door closes*. In Kurdish, this phrase expresses that someone is not interested in something. The following line (035) sheds light on the protagonists: it was the *government* (of Turkey) that was not interested in *our house* (the village house of RE and her family)

Meanwhile, INT has learned the lesson of how an 'ideal audience' has to behave. Neither does she interrupt nor ask any other questions; instead she agrees without hesitation and supports RE's performance, confirming: *The government, right* (036).

RE in turn adheres to her stylistic means of repetition as a marker of utmost significance. By repetition RE emphasizes how dear the home destroyed by Turkish military was to her (038-040): *our house; my mother's house; our destroyed house* (see transcript above: The Destruction-Part 1).

[20] Or, in a different interpretation: *Deri wan te girtin (Let them be cursed forever).*

Transcript: The Destruction-Part 2

041 RE: (--) ha wilo danin ser sindoqekê
belkî <<deep> tu zanê sindoq çiye sindoq evê BEri.>=
(--) they put {this} on a wooden box
probably <<deep> you know what i mean boxes from those times.>=
042 INT: =sindoq evê BEri ez zanim;
=boxes from those times i know;
043 RE: ezing danîn SER? (-)
they placed firewood on top? (-)
044 INT: m_hm,
m_hm,
((...))
045 RE: <<deep> u benzIN lê kir li xaniye ↓diYA MIN şautand.=
<<deep> and poured PEtrol on it and burned ↓MY MOther's house.=
046 =↑DU ↓qat.
=↑TWO ↓storied.[21]
047 (.) u le kuli askeRIya hat li xaniye diYA MIN
şautand.>
(.) and the MILitary came and burned
MY MOther's house.>
048 <<all, high> ka çi na ↑GOT u kas li wir ↓tune.>
<<all, high> without even ↑ASKing if someone
was ↓inside or not.>
049 <<moved> darîyê ↑jia min ↓baQANdin.
<<moved> my ↑mother's door ↓they BLEW up // BURST open.
050 (---) !HA!tin ↓şau!TAN!din.> (--)
(---) they !CAME! and ↓!BURNED!.> (--)
051 INT m:-
m:-

After the first stanza on village destruction, a second stanza follows. This time, and again with the constant support of INT, narrator RE delineates the destruction in much more detail: the military piled up *old wooden boxes* and *firewood*, then *poured petrol on it and burned my mother's house* (041-045) – a house of good quality and size: *Two storied!* (046). *And the military came and burned my mother's house* (047). And there, the peak of inhumanity is reached: the perpetrators did all of this *without even asking if someone was inside or not* (048).

With the very destruction of her home, RE's accentuations turn noticeably sharper than ever

[21] A different interpretation is possible here: *duqat* could also mean *without hesitation.*

before (*PEtrol, MY Mother's house, TWO storied, MILitary, MY Mother's house, without even ASKing*). Equally marked are her pitch rises and falls, from average to very deep (*and poured petrol on it, and the house...*) and even deeper (*...of my mother they burned*), then immediately very high (*Two!...*) and very deep again (*...storied*) (045-048).

Moreover, instead of the usual single focus accent per intonation unit, RE accentuates each intonation unit several times (*and the MILitary came, and MY Mother's house they burned*). In addition, RE accelerates, jumps up to a high pitch level (*without even ASKing if someone...*) and down again, and ends with a markedly deep voice (*...was inside or not ...*) (045-048).

Both her pitch movements and accentuations reach their peak in the following climax: RE starts very moved, yet on an average pitch level (*my...*), then jumps up significantly (*...mother's door...*) and falls down again (*...they BLEW up*) (049). After a marked break (050), RE starts anew with an immediate accent on a higher pitch level (*they CAME!...*), to end, this time without transition, on a deep pitch level with a strongly marked accent (*...and BURNED!*) (049-050).

The interviewer gives her consent carefully and softly (051): with RE's so powerful account, no particular proof of credibility is needed from the audience (see transcript above: The Destruction-Part 2).

Transcript: The Judgement-Part 1

```
052   RE:   <<high, moved> haqaniye  xwede ↑NE [wilo ye-        ]>=
            <<high, moved> this is ↑NOT god's  [will-           ]>=
053   INT:                                    =[harê RASTe-     ]
                                              =[so   TRUE-      ]
054         [ew naHA-           ]/
            [they now-          ]/
055   RE:   [VALLah,            ]
            [i SWEAR,           ]
056         pi me ra ha/ bêhaqi!YE! dikin.
            they do great in!JUST!ice to us.
057   INT:  are bêhaqiYE dikin.=
            yes they do inJUSTice.=
058   RE:   =behaqi!YE! dikin.
            =they do in!JUST!ice.
```

The judgement stanza that follows is largely co-constructed by the narrator and the interviewer. While RE sets out to explicitly judge on the village destruction (*This is NOT God's will*), INT does not hesitate to join in and starts confirming (*so TRUE*) while RE is still speaking. The short overlapping speech, however, does not seem to disturb RE; rather, it affirms the correspondence between the two women's judgement on the events (052-055).

I swear, they do great inJUSTice to us!, RE calls out now, with strong emphases on *SWEAR* and

inJUSTice (055-056). *Yes, they do inJUSTice* (057), repeats INT, leading over to another repetition, this time by RE: *They do inJUSTice!* (058), RE exclaims and thus contributes the last component to an impressive three-unit judgement (see transcript above: The Judgement-Part 1).

Transcript: The Destruction-Part 3

```
059   RE:   (-) na haqaniye xwaDÊ bû,
            (-) this was not GOD'S will,
((...))
060           (--) MAle (we/wer) şautand-=
              (--) they burned her (i.e., my mother's) HOUSE-=
061           =TIŞteki we li we dere ne hiştin.
              =NOthing they left there.// EVErything they destroyed.
```

The last of three 'destruction stanzas' repeats what we have heard so far. The destruction is complete now; the village house is about to burn down. Little remains to be said (059-061): *This was not God's will. They burned (my mother's) house – nothing they left there* (see transcript above: The Destruction-Part 3).

Transcript: The Miracle-Part 1

```
062   RE:   (1.3) ziLAM kete qulpe,=
            (1.3) a MAN was in the room,=
063           =ku em li we deri VIderketin-
              =when we came OUT-
064           <<deep> go> <<calling> qurAN li we bu->
              <<deep> he said> <<calling> there was the korAN->
065           go egir debir LIST go;
              he said flames were flickering around it he said;
066           kesk u sor dore qurHAne çedibu. (-)
              they went green and red around the korAN. (-)
067   INT:    ((laughs briefly))
              ((laughs briefly))
068   RE:     diya min bi halalTI kiri bu,
               my mother bought it heLAL // in the name of god it is RIGHTfully hers,
```

In line 062, a long break indicates that again something new might be about to start. This is confirmed by the interviewer who remains silent, despite RE's break (062).

And in fact, RE now introduces a new protagonist: *a man* who *was in a room* – probably a room of the still burning house (062). And it is truly astounding what the eye-witness has seen

there, in the midst of the scene of destruction: *a Koran*, the holy book, with *flames flickering around it*, and finally taking on the colors of *green and red* (063-066). In a later stanza (not enclosed here), the colors *green* and *red* are joined by *yellow* – together making up the colors of the Kurdish flag.

Here, for a brief moment, INT has forgotten that she must not interrupt or question the credibility of the presentation: she laughs very briefly, probably indicating the miraculous nature of this incident, or her disbelief in miracles, and – maybe – even her disbelief in *God* (067).[22]

RE, however, reacts immediately by providing evidence of her truthfulness: *My mother bought it helal*, in the sense of *My mother's house was rightfully deserved / lawfully acquired* (068). With this, RE implies that for a decent person like her mother, even a miracle – a sign from *God* – deserves credibility.

In fact, in RE's account it is *God* himself who shows compassion for the burned house and its suffering inhabitants. Furthermore, *God* is showing his sympathy not only for RE's family but for the whole village, if not for all Kurds, his solidarity materialising in the colors of the Kurdish flag. In RE's account, the unjust destruction of home, of beauty, of sheer life is counteracted by a strong supporter for the weak. And so, while any earthly justice seems to be gone, a heavenly power materialises. Amidst destruction and loss, a miracle takes place.

In the subsequent stanzas, RE retells the miracle another *four* times – adding up to *five* stanzas in total. The miracle is thus the topic with the highest number of stanzas, some of them longer, some shorter, all of them carefully shaped for a devoted audience. In our transcript, only the first stanza is provided, while the other four are omitted here (see transcript above: The Miracle-Part 1; omitted due to space: The Miracle-Parts 2-5).

Transcript: The Judgement-Part 2

069	RE:	<<soft, tender> (-) male ha!LAL! e=alaw le nare-> (-)
		<<soft, tender> (-) the house was !RIGHT!fully deserved
		the flames didn't spread-> (-)
070	**INT:**	**Arê-=**
		RIGHT-=
071		**=RAST e-**
		=this is {so} TRUE-
072	RE:	<<confirming> eh->
		<<confirming> eh->
073		(--) vallah=GElek-
		(--) by god=GREAT-
074		be haqiye bi MAR dikirin?
		inJUStice they did to us?
075		(1.0)

[22] There are several other instances in the interview where INT does not agree with RE's belief in God and indicates this disbelief by discussing or laughing. This is why we interprete INT's reaction in line 067 as disbelief, *not* as a nervous or random laugh.

After a wealth of rhythms and rhymes, accentuations, pitch rises and falls, the fifth and last miracle stanza ends in a soft and tender tone, repeating for a last time the moment when God sent a sign: *The house was rightfully deserved. The flames didn't spread...* (069).

Even the interviewer who had been resisting earlier fully agrees now, resonating: *Right, this is so true* (070-071). *Eh* , the narrator confirms (072), to bring *God* in for one last time: *By God, GREAT...* – and here she starts a completely new intonation unit – *...inJUStice they did to us*. This very last line of the village poem is intonated with a high rising voice, just as a question or exclamatory accusation: *By God, GREAT – inJUStice they did to us* (073-074). This is followed by silence (see transcript above: The Judgement-Part 2).

In a poetic event, RE has paid narrative tribute to a village that is gone. She performed thirteen stanzas: three on the fertile, beautiful village; three on its destruction; five on God's miracle; and, intermittently, two on moral judgement. With its artful construction in form and content, the poem gives the impression that it has not been told for the first time here. And yet, the poetic momentum was unique, as the interaction between RE and INT has shown. The village is gone, but it is alive in the poetic account of the narrator RE. And the village did not go without resistance. It is, however, RE's own emotion and attachment, her own *resistance*, and her own *voice* that materialize in such powerfully moving language.

5.2. The 'Targeting Voice': mother TA and her daughter

Just as mother RE above, our second conversation partner, mother TA, was also born and raised in a Kurdish-speaking village in eastern Turkey. And just as in RE's case, TA's village was accused of 'terrorism' and thus heavily affected during the war between the Turkish state and the PKK in the 1990s.

And yet, TA's positioning towards her experience stands in sharp contrast to RE above. While RE had expressed resistance against the Turkish military and a strong solidarity for her Kurdish village, TA by contrast completely rejects anything 'Kurdish' in her life. To the interviewer's question regarding Kurdish language competency in her family, TA only states: *Well our – actually we are NO Kurds, according to my father* (*Ya bizdekisi – aslımız kürt DEyil babamın anlattığına göre*). The conversation with TA is, therefore, held in Turkish.

And it is not just the Kurdish language and 'affiliation' that TA distances herself from. Rather, 'being Kurdish' seems in TA's experience to be inextricably linked to the complete lack of education. In her childhood, TA had always been longing for education – but her grandfather and father forcibly prevented her from going to school. In consequence, TA seems to equate being 'Kurdish' and 'male' with being 'violent' and 'education-averse'.[23] Only with her mother could TA share her dreams of schooling and literacy.

Now a mother herself, TA explicitly pursues schooling as the ultimate goal for the next generation – not for her son, though, but all the more for her daughter:[24]

[23] It does not come as a surprise that someone sees 'being Kurdish' as equivalent to 'being uneducated'. After all, Turkey has been exercising far-reaching measures of educational deprivation in Kurdish areas for a long time. What comes as a surprise, though, is that TA sees Kurdish men as being *generally* education-averse and somehow *deliberately* education-deprived (for details, see Brizić (forthcoming a).

[24] Cf. a first discussion on TA's *voice* in Brizić (2016, 2019).

Transcript: **My Daughter-Part 1**
Speaker: **Mother TA**
Interviewer: INT
Interview language: **Turkish (Istanbul variety, colloquial)**
Transcript translation: English (in orange)

076 INT: <<pp> =mesela emre' den neLER beklersiniz;
<<pp> =for example WHAT do you expect from (your son) emre;
077 TA: <<resolutely> ben (.) emre'de şöyle bişey DEğil de-
<<resolutely> i (.) for (my son) emre there is NO such thing but-
078 kızımın okumasını ÇOK istiyo(r)dum;
what i REALLy want is my daughter's education;
079 benim kızım Bİ tanedir,>
my daughter is my EVerything,>
080 <<singing> babasının Aİlesine sülalesine göre
içimde bi tek benim kızım yani->
<<singing> compared to her father's FAmily and relatives
in me there is only my daughter->
((...))
081 okul (-) benim kızıma (---) ya hemşirelik ya da polislik
ÇOK yakışıyo=benim kızım iri yapılıdır;
education (-) for my daughter (---) nurse or policewoman
is VEry appropriate=my daughter is robust;
082 kendisi de şey (2.0) olsam da diyo
güvenlik olmayı da isTERim anne diyo.
and another thing (2.0) i could also {my daughter} says
mummy i would also LOve to become a security guard she says.

Expressed by a woman for her ten-year-old daughter (line 082), these wishes are anything but usual. The wish for a girl to become not just a nurse but a policewoman or even a security guard (let alone the realization of that wish) is highly exceptional – not only in an education-deprived and thereby even more patriarchal minority-and-villager population. But as a mother, TA is certain: leaving behind any 'Kurdishness' will also help leaving behind any lack of education, any male violence, and ultimately all accusations of being a 'Kurdish terrorist'. Hence, TA concludes by painting a radiant future devoted to education, citing herself as how she speaks to her daughter:

Transcript: My Daughter-Part 2

083 TA: ama kızımın okumasını ÇOK istiyorum YALnız;>
but my daughter's education ONly {this} is what i MUCH desire;>
084 <<instructive> evde TUTmuyorum,=
<<instructive> i WON't leave {you} at home,=
085 =işe gönDERmiycem,
=i WON't send {you} to work,
086 ASla ve ASla,>
NEVer EVer,>
((...))
087 <<pp> BÖYle yani.>
<<pp> THAT is the way {it is}.>
088 INT: <<pp> haydi HAYırlısı.>
<<pp> may it BE so.>

5.3. The 'Loud Voice': teacher LOU and her student

Let us now change context and location: we are in Vienna in a primary school. The conversation partner is now a female teacher named LOU. The conversation is in German.

LOU is the teacher of mother TA's daughter – the ten-year-old girl who wants to be a nurse, policewoman or security guard, according to her mother. The girl is now in the fourth – i.e., last – grade of primary school. As such, teacher LOU has to assess whether TA's daughter may continue her education in the 'stronger' or 'weaker' group within the Austrian school system. The teacher's recommendation will be decisive for TA's and her daughter's dreams to come true.

After a detailed discussion, the interviewer asks teacher LOU to put her overall impression of TA's daughter into briefer, exemplary 'pictures':[25]

Transcript: **My Student-Part 1**
Speaker: **Teacher LOU**
Interviewer: INT
Interview language: **German (Austrian variety, colloquial)**
Transcript translation: English (in orange)

089 LOU: sie is ein kind das ABsolut WILL.
she's a kid that WANTS it 100% // that is ABsolutely deTERmined.

[25] For details, see Ehlich and Rehbein (1986); Brizić (forthcoming a).

090 WILL ABsolut=arbeitet STÄNdig mit=ist sogar ÜBereifrig-
ABsolutely deTERmined={she} conTINuously participates=
{she}'s even OVERly ambitious-
091 hat auch so eine LAUte stimme=und SCHREIT dann auch immer gleich,
and has such a LOUD voice too=and is also always SHOUting
{at the others} immediately,
092 sie STROTZT vor selbstvertrauen.
she BRIMS over with self-confidence.
093 JA AB-SO-LUT.
YES AB-SO-LU-TELY.
094 das is auch ein mensch der gleich KEIFT und sich DURCHsetzt;
she's a person that immediately starts SCOLDING and aSSERting herself;

As the transcript above shows, teacher LOU fully realizes the strong positioning of the ten-year-old girl. In fact, teacher LOU's characterization of the girl as outstanding (*absolutely determined*, line 089) strongly reminds us of mother TA's equally outstanding ambitions for the girl (*a life devoted to education*, cf. lines 083-087). This is remarkable, especially considering that teacher and mother do not personally know each other.[26] The teacher is, therefore, not at all familiar with mother TA's ambitions and *voice*. The only *voice* teacher LOU can directly refer to is that of TA's daughter. And yet, it is almost as if we could still *hear* the mother, too, in the daughter as characterized by the teacher: *She is a kid that wants it 100%*. It seems that nothing can stop mother TA's and her daughter's ambitious *voice*, so strong through generations.

However, with every line the teacher's depictions of TA's daughter get more and more mixed: the girl is not just ambitious – she is *overly* ambitious. Her voice is *loud* and *shouting at others*, *brimming with* – too much? – *self-confidence* (lines 090-093). In line 094, all of this culminates in the girl being described as a person that immediately starts *scolding*, which in Austrian German is exclusively used for female voices[27], and exclusively in a negative sense. It seems that, in the teacher's eyes, TA's daughter wants far 'too much'. Hence, asked for the girl's dreams and prospects, teacher LOU responds:

Transcript: My Student-Part 2

095 LOU: ihr TRAUMberuf ist auch LEHRerin.
her DREAMjob is {to} also {become a} TEAcher.
096 aber das wird nicht zu SCHAFFen sein.
but this will be just imPOSSible.
((...))

[26] The reason is that mother TA hardly speaks any German–and hardly any primary-school teachers in Austria's schools speak Turkish or Kurdish.

[27] We are not referring to the sociolinguistic concept of *voice* here, but simply to the human voice in general and to the 'acoustic impression' teachers reported to have of their students.

097 REdet REdet UNunterbrochen=↑bl-bl-bl-bl-bl-
{she} PRATTles (and) PRATTles CONstantly=↑BL-bl-bl-bl-bl-
098 ↓und SCHON weiß jeder was gemeint ist=
und auch wenns TÜRkisch ist-
↓and iMMEdiately everyone knows what it is about=
and even if it's in TURkish-
099 {dann} gehts TÜRkisch=
↑bl-bl-bl-bl-bl=FÜLLfeder=blblblblblll=TINtenpatrone-
{then} 't goes {in} TURkish=
↑BL-bl-bl-bl-bl=PEN=BL-bl-bl-bl-bl=INK cartridge-

We learn here that – in addition to nurse, policewoman and security guard – the girl has another *dream job*: to become a teacher. Yet, immediately after naming that dream job (line 095 above), teacher LOU declares it to be unrealistic: *but this will be just impossible* (line 096). To substantiate this assessment, teacher LOU proceeds to a more illustrative enactment of TA's daughter and her exuberant presence in the classroom: very high, almost singing (*BL-bl-bl-bl-bl*, 097), the teacher imitates the girl now, characterizing her voice[28] again, this time as (too) dominant, yet cunningly hiding linguistic errors in whatever language by talking much too fast (lines 097-099).

In sum, the girl's *loud voice* turns out to be *too* ambitious, *too* self-confident and *too* loud, compared to what the teacher would assess as appropriate. Yet, appropriate for whom? For a girl? For an immigrant? We do not yet know. The only thing we know is the overall outcome: TA's daughter gets a poor grade in German; she is hence recommended for the 'weaker' group of secondary schooling. With this assessment, however, mother TA's and her daughter's ambitions (*a life devoted to education*, see above) turn unattainable; their *voice(s)* will never be *heard* in Austrian higher education.

5.4. The 'Balancing Voice': teacher BAL and her student

We are yet in another pimary school in Vienna, yet with another female teacher: now it is teacher BAL who is asked to assess one of her students. The student at stake is also a girl, also in fourth grade, again with illiterate parents born in a Kurdish village.

Interestingly, this girl, too, has a *loud voice*, according to teacher BAL. But the teacher's interpretation of that voice is heading in a totally different direction:

[28] Once again, we are not referring to the sociolinguistic concept of *voice*, but to the 'acoustic impression' teacher LOU has of her student.

Transcript: **My Student**
Speaker: **Teacher BAL**
Interviewer: INT
Interview language: **German (Austrian variety, colloquial)**
Transcript translation: English (in orange)

100 BAL: dieses mädchen KANN nicht leise sprechen.
this girl is UNable to speak softly.
101 IS einfach so.
it's as SIMple as that.
102 und geNUG fehler-
and {makes} QUITE a few mistakes-
103 aber allein {schon} der WILLe;
but her determiNAtion {alone};
104 die hat sich SO in die aufgabe verBISSen,=
she's been SO preoccupied with the homework,=
105 dass i ihr jetzt dann im zeugnis den EINSer geb;
that i decided to ultimately give her an A;

What was inappropriate in the eyes of teacher LOU seems to be just fine in the eyes of teacher BAL: a girl's loud voice (lines 100-101 above). Teacher BAL interprets this 'loudness' as an appropriate feature as long as it is *balanced* with such incredibly strong ambitions (103-104). The resulting grade A in the girl's school report will enable her to continue education in the 'stronger' group – i.e., at the higher level of secondary schooling (*Gymnasium*) in Austria.

6. New perspectives: multilingualism and inequality

What does listening to these *voices* reveal in answer to our research questions?

The first *voice* is mother RE, the Resisting Voice. She is illiterate and thus *unheard* in the core discourses of society – or problematized, at best: either as a 'terrorist sympathizer' (in Turkey) or, due to her illiteracy, as an 'obstacle to education/integration' (in Austria).[29] However, RE resists in two different ways. One way is to raise her *voice* against the unjust destruction of her village, thus heads-on opposing dominant

[29] E.g., www.dw.com/de/asylbeh%C3%B6rde-bamf-besorgt-%C3%BCber-zahl-der-analphabeten-unter-den-fl%C3%BCchtlingen/a-42053563.6 [accessed 2020-01-15].

political discourses in Turkey. The other way is much more implicit (and likely not even intended as resistance) yet clearly visible to linguistic analysis: RE's village poem in stanzas and rhymes is nothing less than linguistic art.

Let us take a closer look: on the one hand, the text type is monologic, with the participating roles being clearly distributed, putting the main burden on the narrator's shoulders; on the other hand, syntax and lexicon are complex and dense, accounting for formal cohesion (with pronouns and deictics) and textual coherence (with distinctive lexicon, main and subordinate clauses, and a wealth of rhetoric means as described in part 5). In our study's numerous conversations[30], however, such ways of narrating were never found with educated mothers or fathers. Quite on the contrary: our first core finding is that such artful oral language was *exclusively* created by illiterate conversation partners – mainly women.

The 'resisting' aspect is thus academic in nature: we claim that RE is *not illiterate*. We are raising this claim not just because of the artful structure depicted above – but rather because these features represent precisely some of the foundations of academic literacy as required in school (in German: *Bildungssprache*; cf. Morek and Heller, 2012). In this context, our modest proposal is to replace 'illiteracy' with 'oral literacy'[31], as 'illiteracy' suggests an educational shortcoming, while 'oral literacy' points out the power inherent in parental *voices* – and these, in turn, are decisive sources with regard to their children's literacy (cf. e.g. Heller 2013).

The second *voice* is mother TA, the Targeting Voice. She, too, was *silenced* as a 'Kurd/ terrorist' in Turkey; in addition, she is *silenced* as a 'Turk/ immigrant' in Austria. The consequences are visible in her account: heads-on the woman leaves behind her Kurdish village, language, community, and whatever else might affiliate her with 'Kurdish terrorism' or – just as bad – with 'immigrant illiteracy'. To her daughter, TA already transmits a newly-learned language (Turkish, in which she is less fluent) and targets education (in German) to ensure a better life.

And TA is not the only one: our second core finding is that among all our conversation partners, Targeting Voices like TA were exclusively found in highly stigmatized language communities. In order to escape being *silenced* as a 'terrorist', as an 'immigrant' or as 'illiterate', mothers like TA tend towards a certain kind of 'self-silencing' – i.e., leaving behind the stigmatized language forever.

Together with TA's first language, Kurdish, the related art of narrating is also lost. Moreover, when leaving their 'oral literacies' behind, parents make them inaccessible to their children's education – just as Targeting Voice did. She has done this, however, after core societal discourses had declared both her 'illiterate' Kurdish (in Turkey) and her 'illiterate' Turkish (in Austria) as being of little value for school (e.g., Esser 2006).

And yet, what makes TA's account so impressive is her strong female *voice*, not bending to any patriarchy or tradition. For her daughter to receive education, TA risks to lose even her closest family ties. Unlike RE above who resists in Kurdish, TA's strongest motive is her uncompromising will to succeed in the education system as well as the dominant language: German.

[30] More than 200 in total; see Brizić (forthcoming a.)

[31] Cf. the term *oral literature*–e.g. in Kreyenbroek and Marzolph (2010).

The third *voice* is LOU, a Viennese teacher who reports that one of her students, a girl, has a 'loud voice'. The 'loud' girl, however, is the daughter of TA, the Targeting Voice, the uncompromising mother.

At this exact point, we are leaving behind the level of individual *voices* and transition to the level of discourses with all their frictions, divides and *polyphonies*. And only from there, a vicious circle becomes visible: with all their strength, Targeting Voice and her 'loud' daughter have been fighting for recognition and female education, for female *voices being heard* and *worth hearing* (cf. again Hymes 1996: 64). And yet, the 'louder' the struggle of mother and daughter, it seems, the deeper the disturbance on the side of the teacher. But is it really the rebellious (female) *voice*, so strong through generations, that upsets the (female) teacher at such a profound level? Our third core finding is: 'loud voices' (in a negative sense) are attested by female (!) teachers only; and they are attested to female (!) students only – never to boys. And even more strikingly, girls are assigned to be 'loud' *only and exclusively* when they are from migrant, multilingual, and illiterate families – and these families, in turn, mostly occur in stigmatized communities (often communities 'without a state', cf. part 3). In other words: as soon as a student is female and comes from a highly stigmatized community (e.g., Kurdish, Roma), she is at risk of being 'too loud' – i.e., inappropriate – for higher education.[32] In this way, the inequalities imposed to 'origin' (migration, multilingualism, illiteracy, and 'statelessness') are even intensified by merging them with inequalities imposed to gender.

'Gender equality' is, however, often claimed to be a basic value of European societies. And yet, our data shows that there is still a long way to go. One of the reasons for this can certainly be found in the fact that teachers – above all: female primary school teachers – work under conditions that largely restrict autonomy and critical self-reflection (cf. again Gomolla and Radtke 2002): many teachers work under great time pressure, lacking both material resources and immaterial recognition. Accordingly, our data demonstrates that whenever teachers report to work under particularly adverse conditions, the teachers' discourse shows the highest number of 'collective' judgements – such as, e.g., the 'loud voice' assessment made for girls from migrant, multilingual, illiterate families.[33]

There are very few exceptions: one exception is our fourth *voice*, teacher BAL. She, too, characterizes a girl in the classroom as 'loud'; yet, she evaluates the girl's 'loudness' in a 'balancing', positive way. The teacher thus enables the girl to proceed to higher education (*Gymnasium*, cf. above). But BAL is the only teacher in our study to do so.

Moreover, and most fatally, teachers experience gender inequality as well, given a generally low public recognition for the largely 'female', low-paid professions in Austria's social and school sectors (e.g. Dolton et al. 2018; Krüger-Potratz 2006). We are, therefore, not even close to gender equality in the education system, as long as we do not pay tribute, time, adequately high wages and respect to the professionals in education. In other words: This study is also about the teachers' *voices* being *heard* or *silenced* in society.

[32] The three core findings presented here are also statistically significant; see Brizić (forthcoming a).

[33] Cf. other research on teacher discourses, e.g. Heller (2012) or Hu (2018), to name but a few.

Furthermore, all the factors mentioned above (migration, multilingualism, illiteracy, statelessness, gender) tend to be interpreted as 'disadvantages' by the teachers even when the girls perform equally or better than other students (e.g., in the subject of German; cf. Brizić forthcoming a; Blaschitz 2014). This means: a girl from a stigmatized and/or 'stateless' (*silenced*) population is most likely to be evaluated as 'weak' in the Austrian school system. This applies even if she performs equally or better than a girl from a prestigious (*heard*) 'population with a state'. Together with gender, 'origin' therefore beats individual performance – over generations.[34] Or, in our core terms: it makes all the difference if *voices* are *heard* or *silenced* in the *polyphony* of classrooms, schools and societies.

Based on the example of four *voices*, our data has shown how political and structural 'macro' aspects are translated into individual and very personal perceptions, ambitions, assessments and disadvantages. At this 'micro' level, a variety of *hearing* and *silencing* experiences are expressed – and artfully performed – by our conversation partners. Viewed in juxtaposition to each other, however, the experiences and perceptions can differ to such a degree that common ground is lost (such as between mother TA and teacher LOU): what is seen as a 'strong girl' by the mother can be seen as an 'inappropriately loud girl' by the teacher. In addition, our data shows that the individual loss of common ground between a mother and a teacher can become a 'collective' and hence a societal issue: in our study, *voices* like mother TA regularly occur in stigmatized communities; *voices* like teacher LOU regularly occur across Viennese schools; and the *voices* of girls from stigmatized communities are regularly assessed as 'inappropriately loud'. It becomes visible here how individual *voices* can accumulate and find their way up to the collective level, amounting to societal discourses[35] about 'weak' immigrant students, 'illiterate' immigrant mothers, and primary school teachers with a profession considered 'low' in prestige.

The *polyphony* of discourses reflected in our data is, therefore, not harmonious. It is a *polyphony* that informs us of the loss of common ground, and of the growth of frictions, not only between mothers, daughters and teachers: it is a glance into the making of educational inequality in society.

7. New perspectives: Critical Social Linguistics in times of migration and war

From the making of educational inequality, we proceed to the vision of breaking the vicious circle, and to the question of the role research can play. Put into the core terms of our study: Which *voices* are *heard* in academic research, and which ones are not?

Let us stick to the Kurdish example. In the Middle East, the Kurdish actors have shown to be of direct relevance to European issues of security and migration.[36] And even more importantly, Kurdish students have made up a substantial part of 'immigrant' students in Europe for decades, particularly in Austria and

[34] The findings regarding male students are omitted here; they can be found in Brizić (forthcoming a).

[35] We are referring to *discourses* here (as opposed to personal *interactions*), as our conversation partners did not personally know each other, nor had they ever communicated with each other.

[36] Take, for example, the fact that Kurdish territories were, at times, the only line of defense against the 'Islamic State'.

Germany.[37] Nevertheless, language and education research still failed to take into account the respective figures, languages and discourses in schools[38] (Brizić 2007). Kurdish has been, and to a great extent still is, *unheard*. Among the manifold reasons for this phenomenon (cf., e.g., D'Souza & Pal 2018), 'statelessness' has proven to be particularly fatal. Languages 'without a state' lack all the institutions that can make *voices heard* (e.g., university departments, language programs and alike; cf. Akın 2017). Research on languages and education, therefore, conceived 'immigrant diversity' largely in line with 'nation states' (i.e., 'countries of origin').[39]

In other research fields, in contrast, Kurdish has been a core subject for a long time. Kurdish languages and their structures have been described to great extent (e.g., Haig & Öpengin 2014), and, mostly in social research and Memory Studies, 'stateless' *voices* and their oral poetics, narratives and discourses have become 'audible' in great detail (e.g. Çağlayan 2019; Hamelink 2016; Kreyenbroek & Marzolph 2010; Turgut 2010; Neyzi 2010). Unfortunately, linguistic work on education and society is simply absent in these fields. Quite on the contrary, there are voices in linguistics strongly advising against a 'non-canonical use' of linguistic methods in social research.[40] Apart from possible reasons for this deep rift between linguistic and social approaches, the consequences are equally momentous – and far from having purely academic relevance.

The damage in real life might best become apparent in the example of the Kurdish language Bezeynî, spoken in Central Turkey (also: *Şeyhbızın;* cf. Çelebi 2017). As early as in the 1950s, numerous Bezeynî speakers reached Austria and its schooling system, entering the country as 'Turkish labor migrants'. And yet, both the language and its numerous speakers have remained a blank spot in European academia, even to experts, for more than half a century. This, in turn, provided fertile soil for what later turned out to be a multi-layered process of educational *silencing*: first, Bezeynî speakers are positioned as a deprived minority even within Kurds in Turkey; second, Bezeynî speakers fall victim to the same deprivations as all Kurds, considering that they are categorized as 'Kurds' by the Turkish state; and third, they experience the same deprivations as other migrants, considering that they are seen as 'Turks' in Austria. A position this low in social hierarchy implies highly stigmatized multilingualism, in this case comprising Kurdish-Bezeynî, Kurdish-Kurmanji, and often also a Caucasian language of Central Turkey (e.g., Chechen or Cherkessian), together with Turkish and German – all that in everyday family life. And it also implies all the oral literacy of 'illiterate' parents, and all the aspirations of 'loud' girls, and all the difficulties of teachers to cope with these aspirations – just as discussed above. In light of our data, it does not come as a surprise that Austrian schools have been unable to cope with such diversity, and that Bezeynî *voices* are largely missing in higher education as well as core societal discourses.

[37] See, e.g., https://mediendienst-integration.de/artikel/wer-hat-einen-migrationshintergrund.html [accessed 2020-01-15].

[38] As well as in large-scale assessments like PISA (Brizić 2008) and in official censuses (Adler 2018).

[39] Just to mention a few exceptions here: pioneerig work is done, for example, by Sürig et al. (2016), Kırgız (2017) or Altun (2020).

[40] As an example, cf. the position formulated in Deppermann (2008: 60).

As a fatal consequence, however, Bezeynî students finally *did* enter a core public discourse – yet not as a 'highly multilingual language community' but as 'highly problematic students from Central Anatolia'. Even more devastatingly, teachers considered Bezeynî children as 'Turks' and were surprised that these children 'do not even speak their mother tongue Turkish very well' – an allegation that even found its way into research in a most ethnicizing way. Today we know that in numerous cases, multilingual Bezeynî students have been mistakenly assessed as 'suffering from language impairment' and thus assigned 'special needs' (cf. Brizić 2007 and Brizić, forthcoming a) – with serious consequences for later participation in society as discussed above.

What we have here is *silencing* at its best; and it makes things hardly any better to know that much of this has been carried out unconsciously, not only by teachers but also by researchers not prepared for *hearing* 'unheard' *voices*. An academic blind spot, based on the division of disciplines, impeded the much needed understanding of the role that language and multilingualism play in educational equality.[41] The consequences reach far beyond the education system, up to the level of participation in society, of losing or gaining common ground, and of social (in)equality. Research on language is powerful.

In light of this, we envision a linguistics that is fully responsible and aware of its power to reproduce inequalities; that is alert at all times that *voices* are missing in our research, let alone among us researchers; and a linguistics that responsibly directs its resources, its agency towards an outreach to all parts of society as equal as possible. In Denzin's words: "I want a performative social science (…) that embraces (…) social difference (…). This social science asks: Who has the right to ask whom what questions? (…) Who has the right to see what?" (Denzin 2001: 26). Or, in the linguistic approach that we envision: Who has the *duty* to ask whom what questions? Who has the *duty* to see – and *hear* – what?

We envision a linguistics that is fully aware of the power of its methods; and that responsibly yet without reservation opens them up to the service of social research. There is an endlessly rich range of perspectives to be gained by implementing multilayered linguistic analyses. As our data shows, only the educational-linguistic approach enabled 'illiterate' *voices* to prove rich in literacy aspects; only from an interactional-linguistic perspective, the autonomous, fully-intended format of the narrator's artwork became *heard*; and only a discourse-linguistic point of view was able to visualize how *voices* interact in *polyphony* – for the good or the worse – without ever having met. Such multilayered linguistic analyses, in turn, can only come about if we apply a critical sociological approach to *hearing*. We therefore seek, again in Denzin's words, an approach

> (…) that is simultaneously autoethnographic, vulnerable, performative and critical. (…) It is a way of being in the world, a way of writing, hearing and listening. (…) This is a return to narrative as a political act; a social science that has learned how to critically use the reflexive, dialogical interview. This social science inserts itself in the world in an empowering way. It uses narrated words and stories to fashion performance texts that imagine new worlds (…) (Denzin 2001: 43).

We envision a linguistics aware of its power to not just reproduce but also reduce inequality

[41] Also: *equity* as referring to *adequate* support; cf. earlier footnote.

and conflict. Let us return to the Kurdish example one last time. Take Resisting Voice RE, on the one hand, who suffered loss after loss and thus strongly opposes the Turkish state. Take Targeting Voice, on the other hand, who suffered most from accusations of 'terrorism' and, therefore, strongly opposes anything 'Kurdish'. Or take individuals who have lost a friend in a terrorist attack; take children who have learned that only anti-immigrant nationalism may protect them; or children who have been taught antisemitism: we could go on and on. Our postmodern times are abundant in discourse diversity – i.e., in highly divergent collective experiences and accordingly fragmented discourses. These fragments and frictions are powerful and violent at times. How else could it be possible that we have anti-immigrant attacks, growing antisemitism, anti-Turkish and anti-Kurdish assaults etc. in so many schools in Europe (cf. Salzborn & Kurth 2019)?[42] Common ground is not granted in the classrooms of our times. Even within a single school, society and country, our experiences can be so different that they make us lose sight of each other (c.f. Janmaat 2013; Macchia et al. 2019). From a linguistic point of view, this risk of 'losing each other out of *sight*' also comprises the risk of 'losing each other out of *ear*'. And if this is so, then "(…) a bridge connecting diverse racial and gendered identities to discourse in the public arena cannot be constructed. Democratic discourse is threatened" (Denzin 2001: 35).

Linguistic methods enable us to *hear*, document and connect the powerful discourses of our times. From there, a next step could be to make the many *voices* in all their *polyphony* audible, and increasingly also understandable, *to each other*.[43] Let us imagine the strength and life that could spark from such an approach. Imagine the strength such a path might develop for mutual belonging – in the classroom and beyond (cf. Freadman 2014: 378). In this spirit, a linguistic definition of *social cohesion* could be *the ability of all parts of a society to hear each other.*

We cannot afford to leave voices unheard in a globalized world where common ground is not granted. With its powerful tools, linguistic research allows for such hearing, carried out as the "radical democratic practice" so badly needed at the beginning of the 21st century (Denzin 2001: 23). We have a self-critical, reflective academia in mind that takes its power seriously. In order to broaden such an approach and address it as an explicit change in awareness, we propose to call it *Critical Social Linguistics*.[44]

Acknowledgements

We are deeply grateful to the Berkeley Language Center, University of California-Berkeley, for the wealth of inspiration and support during a fellowship grant, which was the starting point for this article. Special thanks are due to our large team of researchers (interviewers and transcribers), and equally special thanks go to all our conversation partners: mothers and fathers, teachers and students, and many more. We thank our proofreader Daniel Stevens, our colleague Şerif Derince, and our reviewers for their critical, thoughtful and thorough reviews and constructive remarks which have been invaluable to improve our contribution.

[42] See also https://www.verband-brg.de/ [accessed 2020-07-15].

[43] With the main aim to create an environment of mutual respect.

[44] Not to be confused with Sociolinguistics (working with mainly linguistic methods on mainly linguistic topics). We understand the term *Critical Social Linguistics* as working with linguistic and transdisciplinary methods on social topics. There is, of course, a close connection to Educational Linguistics, on the one hand, and Sociolinguistics of Globalization, on the other.

Transcription conventions (GAT-2, adapted from Selting et al., 2011)

?	rising to high pitch movement
,	rising to mid
-	same level
;	falling to mid
.	falling to low
SYLLable	focus accent
!SYLL!able	extra strong accent
(.)	micro pause, up to 0.2 sec. duration
(-)	short pause, appr. 0.2-0.5 sec. duration
(--)	intermediary estimated pause, appr. 0.5-0.8 sec. duration
(---)	longer estimated pause of appr. 0.8-1.0 sec. duration
(2.0)	measured pause of (e.g.) 2.0 sec.
=	fast, immediate continuation (latching)
[ ]	overlap and simultaneous talk
:	lengthening, by about 0.2-0.5 sec.
::	lengthening, by about 0.5-0.8 sec.
°h	breathing
/	self-repair
((laughs))	non-verbal vocal actions and events ...
<<laughing> >	... with indication of scope
<<moved> >	interpretive comment with indication of scope
<<p> >	piano, soft
<<pp> >	pianissimo, very soft
<<len> >	lento, slow
<<all> >	allegro, fast
<<acc> >	accelerando, increasingly faster
<<cresc> >	crescendo, increasingly louder
<<akz> >	accentuated
(...)	unintelligible passage
((...))	omission in transcript
//	alternative translation
{...}	amendment to literal translation

References

Adler, Astrid. 2018. *Die Frage zur Sprache der Bevölkerung im deutschen Mikrozensus 2017*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.

Akın, Salih. 2017. Language planning in the diaspora: Corpus and prestige planning for Kurdish. In Katharina Brizić, Agnes Grond, Christoph Osztovics, Thomas Schmidinger & Maria Six-Hohenbalken (eds.), *Migration – Language – Cohesion. Kurdish and its Diaspora*, pp. 159-175. Vienna: Praesens.

Altun,Tülay. 2020. *Das Osmanische Reich in Schülervorstellungen und im Geschichtsunterricht der Sekundarstufe I und II*. University of Duisburg-Essen: Unpublished PhD dissertation.

Amnesty International. 2018. *Report 2017/18: The State of the World's Human Rights*. London: Amnesty International.

Arakon, Maya. 2014. Kurds at the transition from the Ottoman empire to the Turkish Republic. *Turkish Policy Quarterly* 13.1: 139-148.

Bade, Klaus J. 2007. Versäumte Integrationschancen und nachholende Integrationspolitik. In Klaus J. Bade & Hans-Georg Hiesserich (eds.), *Nachholende Integrationspolitik und Gestaltungsperspektiven der Integrationspraxis*, pp. 21-95. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1929. *La Poétique de Dostoïevski*. Paris: Seuil.

Blaschitz, Verena. 2014. *Narrative Qualifizierung. Dimensionen ihrer Erfassung bei Kindern mit Deutsch als Zweitsprache*. Münster: Waxmann.

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blommaert, Jan. 2005. *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brizić, Katharina. forthcoming a. *Der Klang der Ungleichheit*. Münster: Waxmann.

Brizić, Katharina. forthcoming b. Der Umgang mit sprachlicher Vielfalt. In Heike Wiese & Ulrike Freywald (eds.), *Deutsche Sprache der Gegenwart*. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Brizić, Katharina. 2019. Ein Meer von Sprachen: Vielfalt, Institution und Ungleichheit in Wien. In Ulrike Reeg & Ulrike Simon (eds.), *Facetten der Mehrsprachigkeit aus theoretischer und unterrichtspraktischer Sicht*, pp. 17-35. Münster: Waxmann.

Brizić, Katharina. 2016. Sprachliche Diversität und Schule. Diskursive Strategien für und gegen Ungleichheit. In Angelika Redder (ed.), *FISS 2015. Transfer-Perspektiven*, pp. 42-46. Berlin: BMBF.

Brizić, Katharina. 2008. Alles spricht von Sprache. Linguistisch-soziologische Begegnungen in der Migrations- und Bildungsforschung. *Journal for the Sociology of Education and Socialization (ZSE)* 28.1: 4-18.

Brizić, Katharina. 2007. *Das geheime Leben der Sprachen*. Münster: Waxmann.

Bruinessen, Martin van. 1995. *Forced Evacuations and Destruction of Villages in Dersim (Tunceli) and Western Bingöl, Turkish Kurdistan. September – November 1994*. University of Utrecht: University Repository.

Çağlayan, Handan. 2019. *Women in the Kurdish Movement: Mothers, Comrades, Goddesses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Çağlayan, Handan. 2014. *Same Home, Different Languages. Intergenerational Language Shift: Tendencies, Limitations, Opportunities. The Case of Diyarbakır*. Diyarbakır: DİSA Yayınları.

Çelebi, Cemile. 2017. Bezeyni – Historie, Migration, Diaspora und linguistische Besonderheiten. In Katharina Brizić, Agnes Grond, Christoph Osztovics, Thomas Schmidinger & Maria Six-Hohenbalken (eds.), *Migration–Language–Cohesion. Kurdish and its Diaspora*, pp. 63-79. Vienna: Praesens.

Coşkun Vahat, Şerif Derince & Nesrin Uçarlar. 2011. *Scar of Tongue: Consequences of the Ban on Mother Tongue in Education and the Experiences of Kurdish Students in Turkey*. Diyarbakır: DİSA Yayınları.

Denzin, Norman K. 2001. The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research* 1.1: 23-46.

Deppermann, Arnulf. 2008. *Gespräche analysieren. Eine Einführung.* Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Dolton, Peter, Oscar Marcenaro, Robert de Vries & Po-Wen She. 2018. *Global Teacher Status Index 2018*. University of Sussex: Varkey Foundation.

D'Souza, Ryan A. & Mahuya Pal. 2018. Encountering the postcolonial in academia. *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 7.3: 361-372.

Ehlich, Konrad & Jochen Rehbein. 1986. *Muster und Institution: Untersuchungen zur schulischen Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.

Ercan, Harun. 2019. Is hope more precious than victory? The failed peace process and urban warfare in the Kurdish region of Turkey. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 118.1: 111-127.

Ercan, Harun. 2013. Talking to the ontological other: armed struggle and the negotiations between the Turkish state and the PKK. *Dialectical Anthropology* 37: 113-122.

Esser, Hartmut. 2006. *Sprache und Integration. Die sozialen Bedingungen und Folgen des Spracherwerbs von Migranten*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Feliciano, Cynthia. 2006. Beyond the family: the influence of premigration group status on the educational expectations of immigrants' children. *Sociology of Education* 79: 281-303.

Foroutan, Naika, Coskun Canan, Sina Arnold, Benjamin Schwarze, Steffen Beigang & Dorina Kalkum. 2014. *Deutschland postmigrantisch I. Gesellschaft, Religion, Identität. Erste Ergebnisse*. Berlin: BIM.

Freadman, Anne. 2014. Fragmented memory in a global age: The place of storytelling in modern language curricula. *The Modern Language Journal* 98.1: 373-385.

Gomolla, Mechthild & Frank-Olaf Radtke. 2002. *Institutionelle Diskriminierung: Die Herstellung ethnischer Differenz in der Schule*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Gourlay, William. 2020. *The Kurds in Erdoğan's Turkey. Balancing Identity, Resistance and Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Haig, Geoffrey. 2003. The invisibilisation of Kurdish: the other side of language planning in Turkey. In Stephan Conermann & Geoffrey Haig (eds.), *Die Kurden: Studien zu ihrer Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur*, pp. 121-150. Schenefeld: EB-Verlag.

Haig, Geoffrey & Ergin Öpengin. 2014. Introduction to Special Issue: Kurdish – A critical research overview. *Kurdish Studies* 2.2: 99-122.

Hamelink, Wendelmoet. 2016. *The Sung Home. Narrative, Morality, and the Kurdish Nation*. Leiden: Brill.

Heller, Vivien. 2013. Der Erwerb von Diskurskompetenz in multilingualen Kontexten: Ressourcen der interaktiven Unterstützung im "shared language space". In Yvonne Decker-Ernst & Ingelore Oomen-Welke (eds.), *Deutsch als Zweitsprache: Beiträge zu durchgängiger sprachlicher Bildung*, pp. 53-72. Stuttgart: Fillibach/Klett.

Heller, Vivien. 2012. *Kommunikative Erfahrungen von Kindern in Familie und Unterricht: Passungen und Divergenzen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Hu, Adelheid. 2018. *Language Awareness von Lehrkräften: Bildungsverläufe und professionelles Handeln*. Luxembourg: Ministry of Education.

Hymes, Dell. 1996. *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Janmaat, Jan Germen. 2013. Subjective inequality: a review of international comparative studies on people's views about inequality. *European Journal of Sociology* 54.3: 357-389.

Jongerden, Joost & Ahmet Hamdi Akkaya. 2015. Kurds and the PKK. In John Stone, Dennis M. Rutledge, Anthony D. Smith, Polly S. Rizova & Xiaoshuo Hou (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism*, pp. 1-5. Hoboken, New Jersey: Blackwell.

Kırgız, Yasar. 2017. Mehrsprachigkeit im Kontext des Kurdischen in Deutschland. In Katharina Brizić, Agnes Grond, Christoph Osztovics, Thomas Schmidinger & Maria Six-Hohenbalken (eds.), *Migration–Language–Cohesion. Kurdish and its Diaspora*, pp. 140-149. Vienna: Praesens.

Kotthoff, Helga & Vivien Heller (eds.). 2020. *Ethnografien und Interaktionsanalysen im schulischen Feld. Diskursive Praktiken und Passungen interdisziplinär*. Tübingen: Günter Narr.

Kreyenbroek, Philip G. & Ulrich Marzolph (eds.). 2010. *Oral Literature of Iranian Languages*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.

Krüger-Potratz, Marianne. 2006. Aktuelle Brennpunkte der Zuwanderung: Erziehung, Bildung und Ausbildung. In Marianne Krüger-Potratz (ed.), *Zuwanderunggesetz und Integrationspolitik*, pp. 89-104. Göttingen: V & Runipress.

LPB. 2010. *PISA, IGLU, OECD-Jahresberichte und Ländervergleich der KMK-Bildungsstandards*. Stuttgart: Landeszentrale für politische Bildung Baden-Württemberg.

Lucius-Hoene, Gabriele & Arnulf Deppermann. 2002. *Rekonstruktion narrativer Identität*. Wiesbaden: Springer.

Macchia Lucia, Anke C. Plagnol & Nattavudh Powdthavee. 2019. Why do people tolerate income inequality? *Havard Business Review*. [https://hbr.org/2019/11/why-do-people-tolerate-income-inequality] (accessed 25 November 2019).

Matras, Yaron. 2005. The classification of Romani dialects: A geographic-historical perspective. In Barbara Schrammel & Dieter W. Halwachs (eds.), *General and Applied Romani Linguistics*, pp. 7-26. Munich: Lincom.

Mecheril, Paul. 2004. Migrationspädagogik. Hinführung zu einer Perspektive. In Paul Mecheril (ed.), *Einführung in die Migrationspädagogik*, pp. 7-22. Weinheim: Beltz

Morek, Miriam & Vivien Heller. 2012. Bildungssprache – Kommunikative, epistemische, soziale und interaktive Aspekte ihres Gebrauchs. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik* 57.1: 67-101.

Neyzi, Leyla. 2010. Oral history and memory studies in Turkey. In Celia Kerslake, Kerem Öktem & Philip Robins (eds.), *Turkey's Engagement with Modernity: Conflict and Change in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 443-459. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nølke, Henning. 2017. *Linguistic Polyphony. The Scandinavian Approach: ScaPoLine*. Boston: Brill.

OECD. 2019a. *PISA 2018: Insights and Interpretations*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2019b. *PISA 2018 Results (Volume I-III)*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2019c. *Education at a Glance 2019: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2018a. *Country Note Austria: Results from PISA 2018*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2018b. *Country Note Germany: Results from PISA 2018*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2016a. *PISA 2015 Ergebnisse (Band I): Exzellenz und Chancengerechtigkeit in der Bildung*. Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.

OECD. 2016b. *PISA 2015. Ergebnisse im Fokus*. Bielefeld: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.

Öpengin, Ergin. 2012. Sociolinguistic situation of Kurdish in Turkey: Sociopolitical factors and language use patterns. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 217: 151-180.

Salzborn, Samuel & Alexandra Kurth (eds.). 2019. *Antisemitismus in der Schule. Politische Bestandsaufnahme und pädagogische Handlungsmöglichkeiten*. Weinheim: Beltz.

Selting Margret, Peter Auer, Dagmar Barth-Weingarten, Jörg Bergmann, Pia Bergmann, Karin Birkner, Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen, Arnulf Deppermann, Peter Gilles, Susanne Günthner, Martin Hartung, Friederike Kern, Christine Mertzlufft, Christian Meyer, Miriam Morek, Frank Oberzaucher, JörgPeters, Uta Quasthoff, Wilfried Schütte, Anja Stukenbrock & Susanne Uhmann. 2011. A system for transcribing talk-in-interaction: GAT 2. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion* 12: 1-51.

Sevdeen, Bayar Mustafa & Thomas Schmidinger (eds.). 2019. *Beyond ISIS. History and Future of Religious Minorities in Iraq*. Policy Series. London: Transnational Press.

Spolsky, Bernard & Francis Hult (eds.). 2008. *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Blackwell.

STATISTIK AUSTRIA. 2017. *Migration & Integration – Zahlen. Daten. Indikatoren 2017*: KMI. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Strauß, Daniel (ed.). 2011. *Studie zur aktuellen Bildungssituation deutscher Sinti und Roma. Dokumentation und Forschungsbericht*. Marburg: I-Verb.de.

Sürig Inken, Yazgül Şimşek, Christoph Schroeder & Anja Boneß. 2016. *Literacy Acquisition in School in the Context of Migration and Multilingualism: a Binational Survey*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

SVR – Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration. 2015. *Unter Einwanderungsländern. Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich*. Berlin: SVR.

SVR – Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration. 2018. *Fakten zur Einwanderung in Deutschland. Dezember 2018 (aktualisierte Fassung)*. Berlin: SVR.

Turgut, Lokman. 2010. *Mündliche Literatur der Kurden in den Regionen Botan und Hekarî*. Berlin: Logos Verlag.

Warnke, Ingo H. (ed.). 2007. *Diskurslinguistik nach Foucault. Theorie und Gegenstände*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Warnke, Ingo H. & Jürgen Spitzmüller (eds.). 2008. *Methoden der Diskurslinguistik. Sprachwissenschaftliche Zugänge zur transtextuellen Ebene*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.