Introduction

Since the start of the crisis in Syria in 2011, more than 2.7 million registered Syrians have migrated to Turkey (Unicef, 2016). Since the beginning of the civil war, almost half of Syria’s population has displaced, which severely affected Turkey along with some other neighboring countries (Culbertson & Constant, 2015). As the number of people seeking for a safe place to live in neighboring countries increases, this topic has started to gain much more attention. Currently, it is no longer a simple foreign policy for the states, but it rather takes a place on the top of the agenda (Yazgan, Utku Eroğlu, & Sirkeci, 2015).

Despite most people in host countries show their warm hospitality, they also prefer that the refugees return to their home countries, which seems quite impossible to happen soon (Culbertson & Constant, 2015). As the burden of the refugees on host countries escalates, so does
the need of analyses in every aspect of refugees’ life in this irremediable situation. For this reason, researchers have already conducted studies on several issues, such as migration of people (Yazgan et al., 2015), the effect of refugees on host countries’ labor market (Ceritoğlu, Gürçihan Yüncüler, Torun, & Tümen, 2015), and education (Aras & Yasun, 2016). Apart from these, many field works of organizations have been published in order to make the picture clearer in host countries (e.g. Human Rights Watch, 2015; UNHCR, 2016; World Bank Group, 2015).

Of all the issues concerning the refugees, education takes place on the top due to its impact on future of both host and refugees’ home countries. Turkey, which has been affected most pervasively among all the host countries by receiving more than 3 million registered and unregistered refugees in a short period of time, took place among the seven countries where more than half of world’s out-of-school refugee children are located (UNHCR, 2016). Recent statistics showed that of 1,471,958 Syrian children, only 320,000 were enrolled in schools in Turkey (UNHCR, 2016). Despite Turkey’s best efforts to provide education for refugee children according to binding articles of ‘law on foreigners and international protection’, ‘UN convention on the rights of the child’, and ‘basic law on national education’, many school-aged children do not receive education. Of all the children enrolled in schools, while 78,000 and 145,000 of them are in ‘temporary education centers’ in and outside of camps respectively, around 55,000 students have access to basic education in public schools, which teach Turkish school curriculum (ECRE, 2015).

While Syrian teachers provide instruction in Arabic in line with the adapted Syrian school curriculum in ‘temporary education centers’ in the camps, those who attend public schools in almost all the provinces of Turkey are taught the Turkish school curriculum with the instructions in Turkish (ECRE, 2015). Though it has been a hot issue for the past few years, the perspectives of the teachers, actual witnesses of this educational crisis, were neglected. Only few studies were conducted to find out the views of teachers related to problems encountered while teaching refugee kids in Turkey (Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015).

Especially considering refugee students’ problems in public schools in Turkey regarding language and language learning stemming from the lack of Turkish language knowledge (ECRE, 2015; Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015), this study aims to address this issue by focusing on views of Turkish teachers of English as a foreign language (hereafter EFL) working with refugee students in public schools in various provinces of Turkey.

The conflict in Syria started in 2011 forced millions of people to leave their home countries behind and initiate a new life in mostly neighboring countries, mainly Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt. Although the refugee crisis has already spilled over into Europe, the challenge was mostly taken up by these neighboring countries despite the economic and social difficulties. Although all institutions and individuals are severely affected, by and large, children bear the heaviest burden of this devastating crisis.

One of the biggest concerns for these children is their education (Culbertson & Constant, 2015). Despite the best efforts of neighboring countries, the school-aged children enrolment rate is only 20% in Lebanon, 30% in Turkey, and 68% in Jordan (Şirin & Şirin, 2015). However, despite the general negative picture, approximately 90% of Syrian children living in 25 government-run refugee camps in Turkey regularly attend school (Human Rights Watch, 2015). These students in camps have access to basic education in temporary education centers under the supervision of Turkish Ministry of Education with the instructions in Arabic by Syrian teachers (ECRE, 2015). However, the children living in refugee camps in Turkey form just 15% of the total school-aged refugee population in Turkey (Human Rights Watch, 2015). The rest of the refugee stu-
dents living outside the camps either attend a public school with the instructions in Turkish by Turkish teachers or one of the private schools run by Syrian charities with the instructions in Arabic following adaptations of Syrian school curriculum (ECRE, 2015).

Although refugee students have the opportunity to receive education in Arabic from Syrian teachers in temporary education centers in camps for free and private schools run by Syrian charities, a great number of students have to prefer public schools for their education due to economic problems as these schools are free of charge and dispense certificates and diplomas to foreign children with full validity. However, despite Turkish government's best efforts to provide the best and free education for the refugees in line with its ‘open door’ policy to all refugees since the start of the so-called ‘the worst refugee crisis since the World War II’, many problems arose in the field of education, such as lack of Turkish language ability of the refugee students, the problems they had in relations with Turkish students, public schools’ inefficacy to meet refugee students’ needs, and their inability to make friends due to several reasons (Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015).

Considering the significance of the current state of refugees, several topics have been touched upon in the reports of organizations published in line with the refugees’ life in host countries, such as education, health, and nutrition in Turkey (Unicef, 2016), employment and education, health care, Turkeys’ temporary protection regime for Syrian refugees (ECRE, 2015), the educational opportunities and challenges of Syrian refugee students in Turkey in temporary education centers (Aras & Yasun, 2016), and the educational and mental health needs of Syrian refugee children (Şirin & Şirin, 2015). The critical picture of the refugee students and their families has been drawn in these and many other field works of several organizations with the statistics. However, only few researchers investigated the challenges refugee students face in public schools (Seydi, 2013; Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015). In one of these studies, Seydi (2013) focused on the perspectives of the Syrian academicians and educators on the reflections of the conflict in Syria on the education of Syrian students. The views of 15 Syrian academicians and educators gathered through interviews revealed that Syrian students had important educational problems and certain expectations from Turkey. Especially, university education, Arabic language teaching, and the education outside of camps were found to be problematic. The other study (Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015) concerned with the general educational challenges of the refugee students was conducted in an eastern province of Turkey. Turkish teachers working in public schools with the refugee students were interviewed and the results showed that lack of Turkish language ability and education tailored for refugee children, and their relations with Turkish students were the main problems.

Considering the dramatic refugee issue in the world and Turkey’s position as the most affected country of the Syrian crisis, refugee education has become the top priority due to the significance of it for the host and refugees’ own countries. However, despite the variety of topics dealt with in the reports in the existing literature, the refugee education has still not received the attention it deserves both globally and in the context of Turkey (Bircan & Sunata, 2015).

Concerning education, regardless of the efforts to create the best school atmosphere for refugee students, these students are inclined to have problems due to their vulnerability in the integration to host countries and their involuntariness to join in the acculturation process (Berry, 2011). Their past experiences, cultural differences, and the problems with speaking the language of the host country may make the situation even worse in schools for refugee students (Hart, 2009). Beyond all differences, refugee students’ inability to speak Turkish language in public schools creates the most serious problem.

Lack of Turkish language knowledge of the refugee students may be considered to be over-
come through the use of English as an international language. At this point, the role of teachers of English in public schools becomes crucial. Teaching of English is not only important for refugee students’ integration into the host community but also for their future studies. In spite of the studies dealing with the general educational challenges for refugee students in public schools (Seker & Sirkeci, 2015), their language learning-related needs, lacks and wishes have not been investigated specifically from their EFL teachers’ point of view in public schools. In order to fill this gap in the literature and contribute to the foreign language learning of refugee students through eliminating the barriers, this study aims to reveal the problems both refugee students and Turkish EFL teachers face in English classes in public schools. In line with this aim, this paper aimed to find answer to the following research question:

*What are the problems refugee students and Turkish EFL teachers have in English classes in public schools in Turkey from the perspective of Turkish EFL teachers?*

The qualitative approach was employed in the present study, which is mostly interpretivist and concerned with how the social world is understood, experienced, and interpreted by the active participants (Mason, 1996). Broad experiences of Turkish EFL teachers regarding the problems in English classes where the refugee students were involved were deeply investigated through semi-structured interviews.

Compared to quantitative inquirers, “qualitative researchers set out to build a sample that includes people selected with a different goal in mind: gaining deep understanding of some phenomenon experienced by a carefully selected group of people” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 56). The participants, who were especially knowledgeable about and experienced with refugee students’ EFL learning, were identified and selected purposefully. In addition, participants’ availability and willingness to participate in the study were also the other factors played role in the selection of the sample.

The personal information of the participants with their codes are provided below in Table 1.

The data were gathered by means of semi-structured interviews conducted with 10 EFL teachers teaching in public schools in various provinces of Turkey. The participating 8 female and 2 male teachers were from different districts of Turkey with an average English teaching experience.
experience of almost 8 years. They had almost 9 primary or junior high school refugee students in their classes. Their experience of teaching English to refugee students ranged from 2 months to 3 years with an average of 19.7 months.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted to gain a deep understanding of the participants’ experience and perspective regarding the problems of refugee students and Turkish EFL teachers in teaching and learning English in public schools in Turkey. In this kind of interviewing, the researcher may have a set of prepared questions which can be used as a point of departure for the conversation and will not be constrained by them (Nunan & Bailey, 2008). Its flexibility makes the interactions rich and the data produce extraordinary evidence that may not be possible in other types of interviews (Dowsett, 1986).

An interview schedule was employed for the semi-structured interviews. The questions’ usability in this schedule was evaluated by two experts in the field of English language teaching before its final version. The interviews were audio recorded with the consents of the participants. The interviews lasted between 20-35 minutes. The interviews were transcribed and sent back to the participants after the analysis in order to ensure member check.

The following topics were attempted to be enlightened during the interviews: the relationships of refugee students with host country students, the problems they encountered while learning English, their basic needs in English classes, how suitable the current English program for refugee students, and potential suggestions of EFL teachers for refugee students’ English language learning. All the data were analyzed by using open coding to find out the recurrent categories which are explained and presented with relevant parts of the interview excerpts.

Before explaining the general categories and the sub-categories appeared as a result of the detailed analysis of the interviews, some common expressions shared by all participants as a response to questions are provided as the beginning of this section. Firstly, the responses of all EFL teachers showed that there was not a special English program designed for refugee students. They attend English classes like they attend all other classes with Turkish students with the same amount of absenteeism right. Secondly, no in-service teacher education was provided for the EFL teachers who had refugee students in their English classes. Lastly, EFL teachers try to implement positive discrimination for the refugee students in their English classes in several different ways, such as giving them extra points in the examinations, providing extra explanations to let them understand the instructions both for the exams and the activities in the book, motivating them, and simplifying the activities for them.

Four categories and their sub-categories found out as a result of the analysis are illustrated in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Lack of a common language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The difference in English proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material</td>
<td>Lack of suitable materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>EFL teachers’ suggestions for refugee students’ learning of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Problems with the EFL program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lack of a common language**

Refugee students’ communication with their peers in their classes and with their teachers was found problematic by the participants. They claimed that especially in the beginning most of the refugee students felt lonely in their classes which seriously affected their integration in the school community. T1 said...
“I felt that during the first few weeks my refugee students felt a kind of inferiority complex due to several reasons. As Turkish students played and spent time together, they could not because they were able to communicate with them in neither Turkish nor Arabic. Both sides were not so willing to communicate in the beginning.”

The same communication problem was also experienced by Turkish EFL teachers. The participants emphasized their wish to help and communicate with refugee students. T4 stated that

“I could not figure out how to communicate with them when they first arrived in my class due to lack of a common language. I was showing them what I wanted them to do with my gestures. I think they started understanding my instructions in Turkish in time perhaps with being exposed to a lot of Turkish language in their classes.”

Participants focused on the lack of a common language to communicate. However, they also highlighted the help they received from Turkish students in their classes in establishing the close relationship. T6 stated that

“"We were having a kind of communication in which no sides could understand each other. I was using English and Turkish and they were answering in their own language. However, after a certain period of time, I observed that, especially 5th graders, when I instructed them to do some activities in English or Turkish, Turkish students helped them by showing and exemplifying which made me quite happy. I saw the happiness in their eyes when they could answer few questions".

Therefore, lack of a common language caused communication problems both among the students and also between the teachers and the refugee students as well.

The difference in English proficiency

When refugee students were registered in public schools in Turkey, their English proficiency was not measured. The only criteria in the placement of the students in different classes was their age. However, considering the chaos in the country since 2011, it is easy to understand that the education system did not work well and students were not very well educated in all subject as in English. Therefore, many refugee students did not actually know what they were supposed to know according to their education system in their own countries and they came to host countries with very limited knowledge compared to the students studying in their classes in peace. This being the case, it turned out to be major challenge for EFL teachers in Turkey to teach English in a class in which majority of the students having a common background knowledge and few students having limited knowledge in English compared to those in the same class. T8 stated that “in my class, the refugee students did not have any idea about what we were talking about. I wanted to find out the reason but it was not possible to communicate with them”.

The same problem was also mentioned by T9

“The biggest problem was that they did not study English before in their country. For example, I was teaching in the 5th grade and one refugee student came. He did not learn anything in English before. As they do not have a background, they cannot learn what we teach in that grade. However, the ones coming in the first grade who start learning English in the second grade as with all Turkish students do not have so serious problems”.

Teaching English is especially problematic for the refugee students who are registered in Turkish public schools after the second grade when Turkish students start learning English first time. The students starting after the second grade have serious adaptation problems.
Lack of suitable materials

Materials that would fit for the needs of all students in language classes are of crucial importance for a successful language teaching and learning. However, in line with the previously mentioned problems, mostly due to the low English and Turkish proficiency of the refugee students, they could not understand the expressions or instructions in the book. T2 states that

“We do not have an English book published specifically for the refugee students in their own language. When we want to do an activity from the book, it is always hard to make the refugee students understand the activity completely because they cannot understand the instructions in English in the book either.”

Apart from that, as evaluation is another major issue for teachers, they had to design their lesson plans so that refugee students in the class can benefit as much as Turkish students in order to avoid inequality in the evaluation process. T3 says that “As we have to conduct the same examination for refugee students as for Turkish students in our classes, we have to somehow simplify the activities that our book suggests for these students to let them comprehend everything.” Moreover, almost all the participants agreed on the idea that more visual items should be added to the materials used in English classes so that refugee students can figure out easily. However, lack of technological materials, such as projector or smart boards in some schools were the major impediments.

EFL teachers’ suggestions for refugee students’ learning of English

There are many suggestions of teachers who had refugee students in their English classes for a better teaching and learning atmosphere. First of all, as it was very hard to communicate with them, a common language issue was suggested to be solved with teaching Turkish to refugee students through extra Turkish language courses. T5 states that “If these students have the ability to communicate in Turkish with teachers, this could help them not only in English classes but also in other classes.”

Another suggestion was provided by T6

“I think as the number of refugee students increases, so does the need for English teachers speaking their own language, mostly Arabic. I think these students would be much more successful and comfortable with a teacher speaking their own language and with the full knowledge of their own culture.”

Refugee students’ active participation in English classes was another suggestion appeared during the interviews. T7 claimed that

“Many EFL teachers just try to keep them silent in their classes and give extra points in the examinations and they think that problem is solved. I think rather than keeping them inactive, just the opposite way, they should be encouraged to take active part in the activities so that they can develop their self-perceived communication competence, self-esteem, and eventually their English.”

One of the crucial suggestions was respect and love towards the refugee students. Embracing them with their all lacks and differences and behaving them as teachers behave other students in their classes are critical factors in making them feel that they are not different from other students. T1 stated that

“As many of these students had bad experiences in their home countries and forced to live in another culture, they have a kind of inferiority complex. In order to overcome this problem, apart from all methodological concerns, teachers should behave sincerely and encourage other students to welcome refugee students. I think this is the key for their success.”
Teaching English to refugee students in separate classes designed for their own needs and their proficiency levels was another suggestion to make it easier for them to learn English. T8 suggested that

“I taught English to refugee students in various levels and I think they cannot learn when they are forced to learn English in the classes where they have similar aged-students. Therefore, I would recommend a separate classroom with all the necessary elements in which refugee students are grouped according to their English proficiency.”

Moreover, use of digital materials with lots of visual elements that would decrease the use of mother tongue in EFL classes, emphasis on four skills, and increase in their English class hours were among the other suggestions of teachers.

**Problems with the EFL program**

As previously put forward, the EFL program for each grade was designed in line with the needs of Turkish students studying in that grade. However, when students from other countries, mostly from Syria and Iraq, started to join English classes, some problems started to emerge. As a response to the problems refugee students having in these classes, participants, as the key witnesses of this situation, had various suggestions. T10, for instance, recommended use of TPR by stating that

“In my school, there are no technological tools, such as projectors or multimedia. In these conditions, I think, one of the best ways to be successful in these international classes is to use more simple techniques like TPR with the dominance of target language.”

The dominance of vocabulary and grammar teaching in the program was also criticized by T6. She claimed that “I think the program with full of vocabulary and grammar teaching makes them feel nervous.” Moreover, the problems arose due to the mismatches between the English proficiency of the refugee students and that of host country students. T1 mentioned about this by stating

“I think the program is not convenient for the refugee students because of the language education they received in their home countries. I feel that it is quite different compared to the one here. In addition, while English proficiency of the some refugee students is much behind the proficiency of Turkish students in some classes, the situation may also be just vice versa in some. According to my experience, the best results can be seen when the refugee student starts learning English with Turkish students in the second grade as all Turkish students start.”

In addition, while refugee students were found more successful when the teacher required them to make vocabulary-picture matching activities, when the activity required any kind of reading or writing, they mostly had problems. As a final remark, almost all the participants mentioned about the need for psychological support for these students who had serious dramatic problems in their short life span. T9 stated that

“I think beyond the endeavor of the teachers to develop academic success of the refugee students, this issue should be meticulously handled by the experts, solutions should be developed, but most importantly, these students should be psychologically supported. The academic success will eventually follow this.”

Significant number of refugee students are enrolled in many public schools in Turkey where they learn English along with other school subjects provided by Turkish Ministry of Education. Teaching English in these classes where refugee students were present for Turkish EFL teachers was as astonishing as learning English with the students and teachers who did not speak...
the same language in another country for refugee students. Therefore, an in-service training was needed for EFL teachers just before these students joined these classes in order to be more aware of the presence and needs of these students. This could reduce the possibility of biases and discrimination against refugee students by host country students, which could reduce drop-out rates of refugee students (Şeker & Sirkeci, 2015). Moreover, EFL teachers have made some privileges for the refugee students who are expected to meet the requirements of the program as perfectly as the Turkish students. However, the disadvantages that began with their inability to speak Turkish have dragged the unhappiness in this new environment, where refugee students have not fully known. At this point, it may be more efficient to implement a program that tries to teach English to refugee students to their own English level in separate schools or classes by the EFL teachers who could speak their mother tongue. In this way, Turkish students will not think that they are being injustice to them, and they will learn English more efficiently in their own environment, which is suitable for their own level, as there is no need for the Turkish EFL teachers to make positive discrimination, such as simplifying the activity and giving extra points in examinations. As feeling safe is a key to begin learning, this may improve refugee students’ success in learning English (Richman, 2000).

The findings also showed that the most significant problem encountered in English classes was a lack of a common language to communicate both between EFL teachers and refugee students and also among the host country and refugee students. The teachers particularly emphasized refugee students’ use of Arabic language and not being aware of the Latin alphabet as a major impediment. Even if the ultimate goal is to learn English as the target language for both Turkish and refugee students, it is crucial for all students and the teacher to speak a common language in the class for a fruitful classroom communication. This problem could be solved by developing Turkish language knowledge of refugee students which could eventually ease their integration process both in school and in the society as well (Hart, 2009). However, despite this apparent problem, these students did not receive extra Turkish language courses in public schools. Though it was almost in the beginning phase of the migration, the results Seydi (2013) provided were in accordance with this study in terms of the need to learn Turkish language to find a common language to communicate. The study of Şeker and Sirkeci (2015) also provided similar results in that the refugee students in the east part of Turkey did not know Turkish which created problems in understanding and expressing themselves clearly. Even if they learnt some basic expressions, they still had problems due to poor vocabulary.

The mismatch in English proficiency of refugee students with that of the rest of the host country students in the same classroom was also another problematic issue. This could be solved by grouping the refugee students according to their proficiency for English classes. However, if the refugee students start learning English in the second grade as all Turkish students do, the teachers find it more manageable.

Finally, apart from general consensus on teaching Turkish language to refugee children, the teachers also suggested use of visual materials, simplifying activities in books, increased class hours of English language, suitable counselling for their orientation to Turkish school system, academic and psychological support during the education period, activities to make them feel the sense of achievement, and grouping refugee students in separate classes and employment of Syrian English teachers. In line with the findings from the interviews, several implications were drawn, such as the use of visual materials developed specifically for refugee students who are taught by Syrian teachers of English and use of online platforms with the instructions in their own languages (Refugee Studies Center, 2014).

This study aimed to investigate the views of Turkish EFL teachers working with the refugee students in public schools in Turkey in terms of the problems faced in their classes. Lack of
a common language and suitable materials, the difference in English proficiency of the refugee students and Turkish students, the problems in the EFL program in public schools, and suggestions of Turkish EFL teachers for a better language teaching atmosphere for refugee students were among the outstanding findings of the present study.

Above all the suggestions and implications drawn from the responses of the EFL teachers to increase the success of the refugee students in English classes, the respect shown for them by EFL teachers and Turkish students is of the utmost importance for these students to increase their participation in English language lessons as well as to integrate in host countries easily. This study had some limitations that might possibly hinder the generalizability of the results, such as gathering the data through only interviewing and only from Turkish EFL teachers teaching refugee students. As for the recommendations for further studies, refugee students’ views with regard to their language learning might be gathered which could be supported with classroom observations. Moreover, Syrian EFL teachers might be interviewed as they are more knowledgeable about the potentials of the refugee students and their language learning backgrounds.

Conclusion


Mehmet Asmali. Mėginimai sukurti viltį “prarastajai kartai”: anglų kaip svetimos kalbos Turkijos mokytojų požiūris

Pastaruoju metu į Turkiją atvyko milijonai pabėgėlių. Kadangi šiems pabėgėliams švietimas yra vienas svarbesnių jų ateitį nulemsiantių veiksnių, anglų kalbos studijos yra labai reikalingos įvairiose Turkijos vietose, mokėti ne tik senės anglų kalbos mokytojai, bet ir pabėgėliai. Šio straipsnio tikslas yra ištirti turkų tautų anglų kalbos mokytojų požiūris įvairiose Turkijos vidinėje ir požiūris į tos mokymo procesą ir potencialius paramas pabėgėliams mokytojams – tai temos, įtrauktos į interviu turinį. Analizės metu buvo suimta kai kurių kelių temų, susijusių su pabėgėlių mokykloje, mokymo procese ir potencialiu mokymo procesui padidinti gyvenimo kokybę.

Asmali, Mehmet
PhD (Instructor Dr.), Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University, School of Foreign Languages.

Academic Interests
English Language Teaching, cross-cultural pragmatics, teacher education, young learners, and individual differences in language learning.

Address
Bandırma Onyedi Eylül Üniversitesi Merkez Yerleşkesi 10200 Bandırma/ Balıkesir, Turkey

E-mail:
asmalimehmet@gmail.com