Working Papers in

Urban Language & Literacies

Paper **109**

Complementary schools as 'safe spaces' to practise hybridity? Language, power & resistance

Çise Çavuşoğlu
(Near East University)

2013

Complementary schools as ‘safe spaces’ to practise hybridity?: Language, power and resistance [1]

Near East University
cise.cavusoglu@gmail.com
July 2013

Introduction

Complementary schools in the UK first emerged as part of the black supplementary school movement. This was black parents’ response to the “failure of state schooling to provide ‘proper’ education for Black children” (Dove, 1993, pp. 434-435). Parents believed that by focusing on Black heritage and history in the complementary schools, they would help raise their children’s self-esteem, which was being weakened in the mainstream schools due to institutional racism. The complementary school movement was also credited for its power to give parents a great deal of say in what and how their children were being taught (Reay & Mirza, 1997). Although bilingualism was not central to their concerns (Wei, 2006), language was a core issue for the first supplementary schools because underachievement of African-Caribbean young people was closely associated with their lack of competency in Standard English in the official discourses (Dove, 1993; Reay & Mirza, 1997).

The establishment of supplementary schools by other minority groups, primarily in the Muslim and South Asian communities, followed the black supplementary school movement and were encouraged by the debates around multicultural discourses in the British educational context. The central focus of these schools varied from community to community but they included the teaching of at least one of three common elements: religion, culture and language. The primary motive behind these foci was the “the fear of loss of language and culture and the consequent urge to protect and nurture” their heritages in a diasporic context (Creese, 2009, p. 270). Creese et al. (2006) argue that complementary schools reinforce social, linguistic and cultural experiences that are not available in mainstream schools and thus allow fluid and hybrid ethnicities to be formed and performed. Wei (2006) also suggests that many of the latest studies regard complementary schools as “unique contexts – safe space, as authors call it – where transformation, negotiation and management of linguistic, social and learner identities take place” (p. 80). While they are observed practically as serving linguistic, cultural and/or religious communities and providing mother-tongue classes (Creese, 2009; Martin, Creese, & Bhatt, 2003), they are also described as “political and social contexts where particular ideologies dominate and children, adolescents, teachers and parents interact to reproduce and reaffirm or resist and challenge these ideologies” (Creese et al., 2006, p. 24). Although all of these descriptions seem to point towards a ‘negotiation’ within the context of the complementary schools, none of them focus on how this negotiation is done, whether this process causes any tensions or not, and how people deal with such tensions. With the exception of a few recent publications (see Archer, Francis, & Mau, 2010; Lytra, 2012), the discourses around complementary schools in the UK seem to emphasise a positive atmosphere created within these institutions for exploration of various identity positions. Yet, my main argument in this paper is that these schools are not such “safe” places to try out or demonstrate hybrid ethnicities because their aims of ‘preserving culture/identity’ and ‘maintaining language’ assume by default that there is a well-defined or fixed form of culture and language to be preserved and protected, and later to be handed over to the younger generations. This assumption creates tensions with the everyday hybrid experiences of young people in a superdiverse context such as London (Blommaert, 2012; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011). My analysis of one particular Turkish complementary school in London revealed that a dominant mono-ethnic model of ‘Turkishness’ was intended to be reproduced by organisers and other community members. This was done through the imposition of particular linguistic practices and the delegitimisation of certain others. Similar findings were reported by Archer, Francis and Mau (2010) with respect to Chinese complementary schools

[1] A version of this paper was presented at the i-mean 2013 Conference at University of West of England, Bristol.

in the UK. So in this paper, my main focus will be on the way young people respond to specific linguistic impositions within one Turkish complementary school in London, in order to understand how young people deal with such cases of tension/negotiation.

Complementary Schools, "New Ethnicities" and Turkishness

As mentioned earlier, the main reason behind the setting up of community schools or complementary schools seems to be the fear of assimilation. This has been identified as a general characteristic of diasporic communities, and language shift is perceived as the tangible outcome – communities fear that if their younger generations stop using their 'mother tongue,' then they will be assimilated and will lose their identities (Hobsbawm, 1990). However, this sort of description of the diasporic experience focuses on fixed definitions of identity, language and ethnicity as it implies that there is a concrete form of ethnic identification, which may be eradicated or lost if not preserved. It ignores the fuzziness that surrounds 'imagined identities' (Anderson, 1991) in real life experience, and it ignores the hybridity of the diasporic experience that many young people today are very familiar with. To be able to investigate issues related to ethnicities and language in a way that does not ignore this hybridity and fuzziness, I believe that Stuart Hall's theorisation of 'New Ethnicities' (Hall, 1992a, 1992b, 1992c, 1996a, 1996b) is very useful. It highlights the agency of people in shaping discourse, while their actions and choices are also shaped by it. From this perspective, ethnicity and social identity are not static, and nor is the discourse within which they operate (Hall, 1996b). The interaction is two-way, where 'here and now' experiences gain meaning through a negotiation of meaning alongside the dynamism of the discourse within which they take place. Hall goes on to argue that the "term ethnicity acknowledges the place of history, language and culture in the construction of subjectivity and identity, as well as the fact that all discourse is placed, positioned, situated and all knowledge is contextual" (Hall, 1992a, p. 257). The located nature of ethnic experience, its plurality and subjective relations, play the central part in this theorization:

> That is to say, a recognition that we all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular experience, a particular culture, without being contained by that position as 'ethnic artists' or film makers. We are all, in that sense, *ethnically* located and our ethnic identities are crucial to our subjective sense of who we are. But this is also a recognition that this is not an ethnicity which is doomed to survive, as Englishness was, only by marginalizing, dispossessing, displacing, and forgetting other ethnicities. This precisely is the politics of ethnicity predicated on difference and diversity (Hall, 1992b, p. 163).

According to Hall, the new meaning of ethnicity must be theorized within the context of this plural experience (Hall, 1992a, 1992c), which also denotes a hybrid nature and is central to understanding any group. One implication of this theorisation is that 'Turkishness' cannot be interpreted as a fixed notion, and hybridity of experience should be central to an understanding of it. While meanings behind the existing terminology of ethnicities, e.g. 'Turkish-speaking communities', imply something that is homogenous (İssa, 2006a, 2006b) and static throughout history and context, the fluidity of everyday experience opposes these meanings. The theorization of 'new ethnicities' frees us from these meanings, enabling us to refer to different ethnic groups without marginalizing them or taking a defensive position while arguing against their marginalization.

If we turn to complementary schools with this theorisation in the background, the research literature suggests that complementary schools are safe spaces that allow young people to perform different identity positions without being judged (Creese, 2009; Creese et al., 2008; Creese et al., 2006; Martin et al., 2003; Wei, 2006). Therefore, they allow for hybrid ethnicities to be formed and performed (Creese, 2009; Creese et al., 2006). This, however, is a difficult task when you are at the same time trying to preserve a certain form of identity/ethnicity by teaching it to younger generations. From this perspective,

complementary schools are worth looking at, as one can observe how young people with diasporic experiences respond when they are faced with language and cultural teachings informed by fixed understandings of identities.

Complementary Schools, Knowledge and Power: A Foucauldian Perspective

The assumptions about ethnicities, nation states, diasporas and linguistic identities with which many complementary schools are set up entail many ideological and practical impositions in everyday school interaction. Interestingly, these impositions overlap with Foucault's theorisation of modernity and its effects on nation states and their institutional apparatuses (Foucault, 1991). In trying to understand these phenomena, Foucault uses notions of discourse and discursive formation (Gutting, 1994; Hall, 1997). According to Foucault, discourse "is a group of statements which provides a language for talking about a particular topic, one that constructs that topic in a particular way" (Lidchi, 1997, p. 185). Although Foucault's main concern was the production of knowledge and meaning within a certain historical period, his conceptualisation of discourse as a way of talking about these powerful notions is useful in understanding many institutional practices, including those of a (complementary) school.

For Foucault, discourse also provides a way of "formulating a topic and a field of inquiry which answers specific 'governing statements' (questions) and produces 'strategic knowledge'" (Lidchi, 1997, p. 185). This construction is always situated within a particular historical period, i.e. it is historically located, and knowledge produced through these historically located practices brings power to its bearers (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983; Foucault, 1983; Hall, 1997; Lidchi, 1997). Power in this sense is not necessarily negative, nor is it static, i.e. belonging to a person/group. As Oksala (2007) points out, Foucault's notion of power regulates people and their behaviour:

> Both those who seemingly hold power [...] and those who are under guard are caught up in the rationality of the power network. Their behaviour is regulated and largely determined by rules of practices that they did not formulate and of which they are not even necessarily aware. (Oksala, 2007, p. 67)

In addition, power "traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms of knowledge, produces discourse" and it works as a "productive network which runs through the whole social body" (Foucault, 1980, as cited in Hall, 1997, p. 50). From this perspective, "Discourses [...] do not simply reflect 'reality' or innocently designate objects. Rather, they *constitute them in specific contexts according to particular relations of power"* (Lidchi, 1997, p. 185, original emphasis). Hence, Foucault's main concern with the production of knowledge leads to an inevitable discussion of power relations, where power always produces resistance (Foucault, 1983).

Foucault's concept of knowledge is that knowledge produces power and that it does not do so in a void (Gutting, 1994; Hall, 1997). On the contrary, Foucault's endeavour to understand modernity leads him to believe that knowledge is "put to work through certain technologies and strategies of application, in specific situations, historical contexts and institutional regimes" (Hall, 1997, p. 49). So in order to study a certain phenomena, one must look at how discourses and power work at a particular point in time and how statements and knowledge about an issue have lead to specific practices for the people involved (with varying degrees of power). I have found this conceptual perspective very useful when analysing the way power relations were formed, utilised and negotiated in various linguistic, educational, ethnic and cultural practices at Tulip Turkish School (TTS).[2] None of the previous studies focusing on complementary schools in the UK context seem to adopt this perspective. Moreover, Foucault's explanation of the effects of the state's power and its 'watchful gaze' in regulating

[2] All names referring to people and institutions are pseudonyms.

people's everyday behaviours through its institutional discourses (Foucault, 1983, 1991) was very useful in explaining how certain linguistic, cultural and ethnic practices were privileged over others by teachers and organisers within the school, while others were made invisible.

Citizen Speak Turkish

In trying to understand how the concepts of knowledge and power will be used, it is crucial to explain what I mean by the imposition of power in this particular case. In TTS, there was a general unwritten rule of "speaking in Turkish at all times." Teachers and organisers strongly believed that if students used Turkish all the time, this would help them practise the language and help them maintain their linguistic skills in Turkish. But however ordinary and pedagogically well-informed this rule may sound, in the Turkish (Cypriot) context, it appears as an echo of the "Citizen Speak Turkish" campaign. This was a nation-wide campaign launched in Cyprus in the late 1950s to promote the use of the Turkish language and to Turkify the Muslim Cypriot population of the island against rising Greek nationalism (Kızılyürek & Gautier-Kızılyürek, 2004). This campaign advanced to the extent that people from Turkish (Muslim) backgrounds were criminalised by fines and occasionally imprisonment for using Greek words when communicating in their everyday lives, which was actually a very common practice at that time (*Kıbrıs tarihi - 3. kitap [Cyprus history - 3rd book]*, 2004; Kızılyürek & Gautier-Kızılyürek, 2004).

At TTS, there were discernible echoes of this 'speak Turkish' rule. Although it was not written in any document or anywhere in the school, my observation of people's routine interactions revealed that the rule was well known both by teachers and students. It broadly stated that all activities in the school (including during the break times) should be accompanied by Turkish language use. There was no punishment for those who used another language (mainly English) in their interactions, but the rule was continuously reiterated. I identified 31 instances of this prompting in my data but it happened more often than that. The rule was a manifestation of the institutional power imposed on young people's everyday practices: Young people tended to use English exclusively in their interactions with their peers but they seemed to switch when talking to a teacher or an adult, who are the authority figures in this context. As for their reactions to this prompting from adults, young people had two types of response. In some cases, they complied with the rule partially. But for the majority of the cases, they resisted in different ways.

In the following sections, I will focus on 'verbal prompting' and examine how this extension of the speaking Turkish rule was realised, together with the range of responses from young people at TTS.

The Data

The data presented in this paper comes from my PhD project, in which I conducted an ethnographic study of one complementary school (Tulip Turkish School - TTS). Fieldwork consisted of 13 months of participant observation and 20 individual and group interviews with young people, parents, organisers and teachers. In addition, natural speech recordings were collected with three young people wearing radio-microphones (approximately 10.5 hours). These audio-recordings were followed-up by playback sessions where young people were listened to their own voices and were asked to comment about what was going on in the interaction. Artefacts such as teaching materials used in the classroom, lists of performances for ceremonies, information letters sent to parents throughout the academic year, and young people's drawings, were also collected. Emerging themes were analysed using qualitative methods and micro-discourse analysis was used to analyse the linguistic data.

The data analysed here come primarily from fieldnotes based on participant observation. These cover 4 instances of young people responding to prompting with partial compliance,

and 27 instances of resistance, which itself involved three different strategies that occurred in the data with equal frequency.

Partial Compliance

Verbal prompting in TTS usually happened when young people were spotted by an adult or a peer speaking in English. In four of the prompting instances I observed, young people did not obey the rule in full, but found ways of partially complying. When prompted to switch to Turkish, they did so when addressing the person perceived as being in authority (who in some cases had issued the instruction), but they continued to speak in English to each other. For example, when observing the class taught by Nazmi, a Turkish Cypriot (TC) teacher from London, I noted that "All the conversations of the students with each other were in English and they occasionally used Turkish [when they needed] to talk to the teacher". This was a classroom where the teacher continuously reminded students to use Turkish. In another example, young people were talking enthusiastically about their plans for the summer to Zehra, their modern dance instructor. When they were spotted by Sevgi, the organiser and the head teacher of the school, she immediately prompted them to switch to Turkish. As the extract here shows, they switched to Turkish but they did so only when they addressed Zehra, perceiving, and thereby constructing her as the authority figure in their interaction:

EXTRACT 1 (Fieldnotes)

1 [Zehra, the modern dance instructor and Sevgi's daughter,
2 second generation London born TC background] kept talking to the
3 girls [from the dance group], asking when their school finishes
4 and whether they were going to visit Cyprus this year. Almost all of
5 them said they are going to Cyprus for the holiday, except for one. She
6 said she cannot go this year because she is going to have an operation
7 on her ear in the middle of July. All of this conversation was in English.
8 Then Sevgi interrupted them in Turkish and warned them to
9 speak in Turkish as much as they can. She said "***We want you to talk in***
10 ***Turkish at least for a whole day on Saturdays. Turkish for a whole***
11 ***day. During the time you are at school. Don't worry if you get stuck,***
12 ***if there's anything you don't know, we'll help you. As long as you try***
13 ***speaking [in Turkish]***.[3]" From then on, the girls talked to Zehra more
14 quietly and with fewer words but in Turkish. They kept whispering
15 each other in English.

Zehra (London born, TC background) had been talking to her students in the staff room about their upcoming holidays entirely in English (lines 3-7), but following Sevgi's prompting, the girls switched to Turkish partially – they kept talking to each other in English (line 9-13). Some of these girls were from Turkish mainland families, so the varieties of Turkish used in this interaction were a mixture of Standard Turkish (ST), Turkish Cypriot (TC) and London TC dialects. When they switched to Turkish, their utterances became shorter, fewer and stilted (line 14) – they may have been complying with the school's rule (speak in Turkish when in TTS), but they did so in an unnatural manner and their actual language production was reduced, and their Turkish utterances were only addressed to the authority figure in the interaction (Zehra). Both here and in the Nazmi example, the young people's linguistic choices reflect their responses to institutional power imposed on their practices by the school's rule (McHoul & Grace, 2002; Oksala, 2007). These show that while the young

[3] Throughout this article, utterances in ***Standard Turkish (ST)*** are marked in ***bold italic***, whereas utterances in **Turkish Cypriot (TC)** dialect are marked in **bold** only. Utterances in *English* are marked in *italics.*

people recognise and understand what is required of them when prompted, they see the rule as only applying to interactions with authority, thereby submitting to the power only partially (Foucault, 1983; Oksala, 2007).

Resistance

Despite the partial compliance demonstrated in the previous section, Foucault (1983, 1991) explains that applications of institutional power can also result in resistance. But he does not spell out any specific forms for this. As I will illustrate below, resistance can take many different forms and may not necessarily involve sensational rebellious actions. In fact, there were three kinds of resistant response to the imposition of institutional power displayed in verbal prompting. These were (a) playful resistance, where young people prompt each other to switch to Turkish but do so in a subversive manner; (b) silent resistance, where young people simply refuse to respond and remain silent; and (c) open resistance, where they continue to respond in English.

Playful Resistance

During the 13 months I spent in TTS, I was able to observe young people both in and outside classrooms. Interestingly, the majority of resistant responses to prompting in my data occurred in class. I also noted that it wasn't only adults prompting young people to switch to Turkish but also young people prompting each other. This peer-prompting resulted in what I call 'playful resistance,' where they prompted each other jokingly to switch, but none of them actually did so. For example, when I was substituting for Ezgi (TC teacher from London), the students kept conversing in English among themselves and occasionally told each other, rather jokingly, to switch to Turkish. Here is an example:

EXTRACT 2 (Fieldnotes)

1 While all this [moving tables around to make a u-shaped class] was
2 going on, they [students] never talked to me but they conversed among
3 themselves in English. When Hasan (16-year-old boy, TC background)
4 said "*There are no places for me here*," the girls laughed and Sezin
5 (16-year-old girl, TC background) said "*You should say that in Turkish,*
6 *you know*." And he replied, "*yeah, <u>you</u> should say that in Turkish <u>too,</u>*
7 *you know*." And they all laughed. Throughout the lesson, this phrase
8 was said 6-7 times, sometimes by Hasan, and sometimes to Hasan,
9 producing a giggly effect on the girls.

In this episode, the young people are reproducing the 'speak Turkish' ideology promoted in the school, but they are playfully challenging/resisting it in practice by only using English and in this case by treating it as a joke with one another.

Silent Resistance

The second kind of resistance can be considered 'silent.' This included refusing to use Turkish and not speaking when prompted. The following example occurred during breaktime:

EXTRACT 3 (Fieldnotes)

1 While we were chatting, students kept coming to buy little sweets or
2 snacks and I saw Hakkı (the co-ordinator of TTS and Sevgi's

3 husband) not taking money from students who just wanted to buy a
4 sweet that would cost 15p. A girl also came and asked Hakkı about
5 the price of a snack in English. She was a girl of about 7-8 and she was
6 from the second level class. When Hakkı prompted her to speak in
7 Turkish she said "*I can't talk in Turkish.*" Hakkı waited for her until
8 she talked but the girl did not utter a word. Hakkı kept talking to me
9 and the girl stood there waiting. A few seconds later, Hakkı asked
10 the girl what she wanted again, in Turkish, and the girl showed him the
11 crisps she wanted. She didn't utter a word. Hakkı asked her again
12 about how many she wanted. She showed two fingers and did not utter
13 anything again. Hakkı gave her the crisps, she paid for her crisps
14 and left. Hakkı did not make any comments about this.

In terms of Turkish language competency, this girl was rated as Level Two by her teachers, and the language functions covered by a Level Two student included counting, asking simple yes/no questions, saying what they like/want/dislike, and thanking. So the girl should have been able to say "I want this one" in Turkish, and to indicate verbally how many sweets she wanted. Instead, she claimed that she could not speak Turkish (line 7) and stayed silent when prompted for the second time by Hakkı (line 7-8). In fact, her resistance eventually paid off and Hakkı served her (line 13). So young people could find ways of getting around the school without being forced to use Turkish. Whilst it was only a 'small act' in Extract 3, it was also quite powerful symbol of resistance.

Open Resistance

The third type of resistance to being prompted to switch to Turkish was to continue to speak in English. In the following extract, Hakan, a 12-year-old boy with a TC background, was being asked to stand up because he had not applauded his classmate for his well prepared assignment. Hakan not only resisted standing up, asking why he was being requested to do so, but also twice refused the teacher's prompts to switch to Turkish. Moreover, he did so while directly addressing the teacher:

EXTRACT 4 (Fieldnotes)

1 Then he (Tarık, a contract teacher from Turkey) turned back to the
2 topic of not doing their assignments and asked Hakan (12-year-old boy,
3 TC background), Mustafa (11-year-old boy, TC background) and two
4 more boys to stand up because they did not applaud Selim (11-year-old
5 boy, TC background) for doing his assignment. Hakan was not listening
6 so he did not stand up. When Tarık called his name and told him to
7 stand up he said "For what?" Tarık did not hear the first word and
8 he responded: "*What* ***değil. Kalk ayağa bakalım.*** *What* ***ne demek?***"
9 (Not *what*. Stand up. What does *what* mean?). Hakan said "*I didn't say*
10 *what. I said <u>for what</u>. (then to himself) God's sake.*" He had a half grin
11 on his face while saying this. Tarık insisted that Hakan rephrased
12 his question. Hakan said, pronouncing words one by one and louder "*I-*
13 *said-for-what?* <u>**Neçin**</u>?" (For what?) (This word is a very Cypriot one
14 because the standard version is "***niçin.***" It is a combined word, made of
15 "***ne***" (what) and "***için***" (for).) and Tarık said "***Bak isteyince***
16 ***'niçin' diyebiliyosun. Demek ki biliyosun. Niye*** *what* ***falan diyosun***
17 ***o zaman?***" (Look, you can say 'why' when you want to. That means
18 you know it. Why do you say things like *what* then?). When this
19 exchange was over, Tarık asked the students who were standing up

20 to give Selim a round of applause. They did so (some unwillingly) and
21 they sat down.

In this episode, Hakan's open resistance involved the following moves:

(a) In line 7, he recognises that he has done something wrong because in the context of this classroom, being asked by his teacher to stand up is usually followed by identification of misbehaviour and/or behavioural sanctions. In this instance, he resists standing up (i) by not standing up immediately, (ii) by questioning why he's being asked to stand up, and (iii) by responding in English (line 7), which is against the Turkish speaking rule of the school. Hakan says "For what?" (line 7).

(b) Tarık misses Hakan's first word "for" in his response "for what" (line 7). He thinks Hakan said "what?" and assumes that Hakan did not hear what he's asked to do. From Tarık's point of view, Hakan not only breaks the Turkish speaking rule but also responds to his teacher in an impolite manner – even if Hakan had not heard what he was being asked to do, responding to one's teacher, saying "what?" is rude. Tarık repeats his request "Stand up" (line 8) and demands an explanation about why Hakan said: "what?" (lines 8-9).

(c) In response to Tarık's second request, Hakan continues to use English to explain what he actually said in the first instance (lines 9-10). When Tarık insists for Hakan to rephrase his question (lines 11-12), Hakan uses two language practices that are both against the language ideology of the school. First, he continues to respond in English for the third time despite being prompted twice already (lines 8 and line 11). He spells out what he said in English (line 12-13). Second, he uses TC dialect (line 13) when translating his utterance into Turkish. His use of the TC word "**neçin**" (line 13) was not intended to provide a compliant response to the prompt made by Tarık but was part of his explanatory statement of what he said in English. He realised that Tarık missed his first word – "for" – and thus wanted to make it clear for him by translating it into Turkish. Yet, he did not translate it into ST but preferred to use TC dialect – a variety that (i) his teacher is not competent in and (ii) is not deemed 'proper' in the classroom setting. Here, the half grin on Hakan's face and his verbal reaction "*God's sake*" (line 10) can be read as mixture of irritation and enjoyment at the teacher's moment of relative powerlessness. Together with Hakan's translation of his statement into Turkish, this irritation positions his teacher as someone who lacks linguistic competence in English, while positioning Hakan as someone who is competent in different languages and varieties, i.e. more knowledgeable and thus more powerful.

(d) Being partly relieved that Hakan had finally switched to Turkish, Tarık ignores Hakan's use of TC dialect and focuses on his use of English in class. He rhetorically questions Hakan about his use of English (lines 15-17), implying that he should not have used English at all. In this instance, Tarık also recognises that Hakan had used English on purpose because he acknowledges that Hakan knew the Turkish equivalent of his question (line 16) and questions Hakan's use of English instead of Turkish (lines 16-17).

The episode reveals the subtle ways in which young people can capitalise on their linguistic competencies to reverse classroom power relations in the classroom, openly resisting the imposition of standard Turkish language as the only medium of communication, albeit momentarily. It also exemplifies Foucault's arguments that power is not static and that it does not stay hierarchical (Hall, 1997). Rather it moves in all directions in a systematic way (Oksala, 2007) and circulates through a "net-like organisation" (Hall, 1997, p. 50).

The fact that this is only a "momentary refusal of powerlessness" (Skeggs, 1997, p. 11) is also significant. According to Skeggs (1997), "To challenge powerlessness does not mean that one

automatically shifts into positions of power. It means, straightforwardly, that one is refusing to be seen as powerless or be positioned without power" (p. 11). When Tarık questioned and reprimanded Hakan about his use of English in the classroom ("Not *what*. Stand up. What does *what* mean?" in lines 8-9), he de-legitimised Hakan's linguistic capital, emphasizing that Hakan's good command of English language is not valuable in his classroom. Hakan's response to this is an instance of "counteract[ion] to the de-legitimation of their own cultural capital at a local level" (Skeggs 1997p. 11). It is a refusal of the powerless position that Tarık was trying to put him in, so as to keep authoritative control of his classroom.

Conclusion

The data presented in this paper are instances of interaction which reveal how power is exerted, perceived and responded to in an ethnically oriented complementary school in the superdiverse context of London. But they also need to be scrutinised with the question 'So what?' My main aim here has been to show the subtle ways in which young people resist impositions of power within the context of a Turkish complementary school. It is clear from Hakan's data, for example, that the young people from TC backgrounds could capitalise on their linguistic competencies (e.g. varieties of English, TC dialect, ST, etc) when they needed to. Indeed, contrary to the views of Sevgi and other adults in the school, they do not necessarily see talking in Turkish as the primary marker of affiliation to Turkishness. Furthermore, such resistances not only show the hybridity of the ethnicities with which young people are identifying, Turkishness being only one element. They also show that the language ideologies prevailing in complementary school settings are not necessarily creating "safe spaces" (Wei, 2006) for young people to try out these identity positions, as argued in the previous studies. When there is verbal prompting and the imposition of institutional power, then there appear to be tensions between adults and young people. These instances of tension show the discrepancy between adult views of language use as 'identity building in young people', and my young participants' perception of these ideologies and practices. The young people's responses do not necessarily represent a refusal of 'Turkishness' in itself. But they signify a tension between the different views of language learning and use, and they reflect the subtle ways in which young people challenge existing power relations and hierarchies within the complementary school setting.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin spread of nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Archer, L., Francis, B., & Mau, A. (2010). The Culture Project: Diasporic negotiations of ethnicity, identity and culture among teachers, pupils and parents in Chinese language schools. *Oxford Review of Education, 36*(4), 407-426.

Blommaert, J. (2012). Citizenship, language & superdiversity: Towards complexity (Paper no: 95) [Electronic Version]. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/95.pdf.

Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and superdiversity: A position paper (Paper no:70) [Electronic Version]. *Working Paper in Urban Language and Literacies*. Retrieved June 30, 2013 from http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/70.pdf.

Creese, A. (2009). Building on young people's linguistic and cultural continuity: Complementary schools in the United Kingdom. *Theory into Practice, 48*(4), 267-273.

Creese, A., Baraç, T., Bhatt, A., Blackledge, A., Hamid, S., Wei, L., et al. (2008). *Investigating multilingualism in complementary schools in four communities: Final Report* (No. RES-000-23-1180). Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Creese, A., Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, heritage and learner identities in complementary schools. *Language and Education, 20*(1), 23-43.

Dove, N. (1993). The emergence of Black supplementary schools: Resistance to racism in the United Kingdom. *Urban Education, 27*(4), 430-447.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1983). Afterword: The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed., pp. 208-226). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1991). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Alan Lane, London: Penguin.

Gutting, G. (Ed.). (1994). *The Cambridge companion to Foucault*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, S. (1992a). New ethnicities. In J. Donald & A. Rattansi (Eds.), *'Race', culture & difference* (pp. 252-259). London: Sage.

Hall, S. (1992b). The new ethnicities. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 161-163). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hall, S. (1992c). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, T. McGrew & D. Held (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures: Understanding modern societies* (pp. 273-316). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1996a). New ethnicities. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 441-449). London: Routledge.

Hall, S. (1996b). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert & K. Thompson (Eds.), *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies* (pp. 595-634). Oxford: Blackwell.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage and Open University.

Hobsbawm, E. (1990). Ethnic nationalism in the late twentieth century. In J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith (Eds.), *Ethnicity* (pp. 355-358). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

İssa, T. (2006a). Children's home languages in the classroom: Development of identity and emotions in bilingual children. *Childright, 225*, 24-27.

İssa, T. (2006b). An ethnographic case study of code switching and language choice: The uses of Cypriot Turkish in London. *International Journal of Sociology of Language, 181*, 83-106.

Kıbrıs tarihi - 3. kitap [Cyprus history - 3rd book]. (2004). Lefkoşa: KKTC Milli Eğitim ve Kültür Bakanlığı [TRNC Ministry of National Education and Culture].

Kızılyürek, N., & Gautier-Kızılyürek, S. (2004). The politics of identity in the Turkish Cypriot community and the language question. *International Journal of Sociology of Language* (168), 37-54.

Lidchi, H. (1997). The poetics and politics of exhibiting other cultures. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. London: Sage.

Lytra, V. (2012). Discursive constructions of language and identity: Parents' competing perspectives in London Turkish complementary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 33*(1), 85-100.

Martin, P., Creese, A., & Bhatt, A. (2003). *Complementary schools and their communities in Leicester: Final report to the ESRC* Leicester: University of Leicester.

McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (2002). *A Foucault primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. Oxon: Routledge.

Oksala, J. (2007). *How to read Foucault*. London: Granta Books.

Reay, D., & Mirza, H. S. (1997). Uncovering genealogies of the margins: Black supplementary schooling. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(4), 477-499.

Skeggs, B. (1997). *Formations of class & gender*. London: Sage.

Wei, L. (2006). Complementary schools, past, present and future. *Language and Education, 20*(1), 76-83.