

## A Comparative Policy Analysis on Foreign Language Education for K-12 Deaf Students: A Case Study of Türkiye and the United States

Cigdem Fidan<sup>1</sup> 

### Abstract

Foreign languages are linguistic tools that allow access to various resources in the global world. However, access to foreign language education for K-12 (i.e., from kindergarten to the 12th grade) deaf students is restricted because deaf students are often disqualified from foreign language courses based on presumed disability status. This study identifies ideologies underpinning education policies that limit foreign language education for K-12 deaf students and compares Türkiye and the United States. The study employs a qualitative approach and analyzes both countries' constitutions, education laws, and education regulations through critical discourse analysis based on the theories of linguistic human rights and Bourdieu's forms of capital. Findings reveal ideological contradictions concerning deafness and language education for deaf learners, restricting access to foreign language education for K-12 deaf students in both countries.

**Keywords:** comparative policy analysis, deaf students, foreign language education, Türkiye, United States

### Türkiye ve Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'nde K-12 İşitme Engelli Öğrenciler İçin Yabancı Dil Eğitimi Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Politika Analizi: Bir Vaka Çalışması

### Özet

Yabancı diller, küresel dünyadaki çeşitli kaynaklara erişimi sağlayan dil araçlarıdır. Ancak, K-12 (yani, anaokulundan 12. sınıfa kadar) işitme engelli öğrenciler için yabancı dil eğitimine erişim genellikle varsayılan engellilik durumuna dayalı olarak kısıtlanmıştır. Bu çalışma, K-12 işitme engelli öğrenciler için yabancı dil eğitimini sınırlayan eğitim politikalarının temelindeki ideolojileri belirler ve Türkiye ile Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'ni karşılaştırır. Çalışma nitel bir yaklaşım benimser ve her iki ülkenin anayasalarını, eğitim yasalarını ve eğitimin düzenlemelerini dil insan hakları teorileri ve Bourdieu'nun sermaye türleri temelinde eleştirel söylem analizi yaparak inceler. Bulgular, işitme engelliliği ve işitme engelliler için dil eğitimi konusunda ideolojik çelişkiler ortaya koyar ve her iki ülkede de K-12 işitme engelli öğrencilerin yabancı dil eğitimine erişimini kısıtladığını ortaya koymaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** karşılaştırmalı politika analizi, işitme engelli öğrenciler, yabancı dil eğitimi, Türkiye, Amerika Birleşik Devletleri



**How to cite:** Ogelman, H. & Kahveci, D. (2024). A comparative policy analysis on foreign language education for K-12 deaf students: a case study of Türkiye and the United States. *International Journal of Educational Spectrum* 6(2), 204-217.

<https://doi.org/10.47806/ijesacademic.1454440>

Submission Date: March 27, 2024

Acceptance Date: June 12, 2024

<sup>1</sup> Dr., University of Rochester, United States, [cfidan@u.rochester.edu](mailto:cfidan@u.rochester.edu)

## Introduction

In multilingual societies, people must often learn the official or dominant language used in that society and the global language to use worldwide (Shohamy, 2007). Learning foreign languages (FL) is also necessary to access worldwide resources (Bourdieu, 1991). However, the opportunity to learn foreign languages is not always accessible for deaf individuals (Csizer & Kontra, 2020) because education policies exempt deaf learners from FL education, as in the cases of Türkiye and the United States (U.S.), which this study investigates.

Türkiye and the U.S. are multilingual countries. Turkish policy documents explicitly state monolingualism in Turkish policy documents and emphasize Turkish as the medium of instruction. The U.S. policy documents do not explicitly state a particular language as a medium of instruction; however, students must learn English, the country's dominant language (Wight, 2015). In addition, policy documents in both countries state that their educational goals are to provide education for all students without discrimination (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015; Turkish Ministry of National Education, 2012). However, deaf students often face discrimination in foreign language education in both countries where special education policies serve students with disabilities, including deaf students (IDEA, 2004; Turkish Ministry of National Education, 2018).

In Türkiye, deaf students are exempt from FL education. Similarly, in the U.S., New York State Education Department (NYSED) regulations exempt deaf students from FL education. Thus, in both countries, deaf students have restricted access to FL education to investigate which this study asks:

- What are the ideologies in education policy documents in Türkiye and the United States about foreign language education for K-12 deaf students?
- What do education policies in Türkiye and the United States suggest for foreign language education of K-12 deaf students?

### *Deafness and Deaf Students in Türkiye*

Türkiye is a republic country in Eurasia, and Turkish is the country's official language (Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye, 1982). Türkiye is a multilingual country where such minority languages as Kurdish, Arabic, Zaza, and Armenian are spoken, and deaf individuals often use Turkish Sign Language (TSL) (Kuzu, 2016).

Foreign language education is critical in Türkiye, where English is taught as a compulsory FL at the K-12 level (Turkish Ministry of National Education, 2018). English as a foreign language (EFL) in Türkiye is considered a tool to access different resources in globalization (Bourdieu, 1991; Taşdemir & Gürbüz, 2021). However, Türkiye's language policy does not make EFL education accessible for K-12 deaf learners in the country, where deaf learners are exempt from studying FLs (Kuzeci, 2015).

There are two perceptions of deafness in Türkiye, where deaf people comprise 0.6% of the population (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2021). Some researchers and medical personnel attribute deafness to inbreeding and consider deafness a disability. The view of deafness as a disability results in using hearing aids, cochlear implants, and early intervention programs for the spoken

language development of deaf children (Birinci, 2014). In addition, sign language learning is considered unnecessary for deaf children because of the belief that deaf children can fully hear after hearing devices (Csizer & Kontra, 2020).

On the other hand, some researchers describe deafness as a cultural difference and deaf people as a linguistic minority, with sign language as the primary language (Cankuvvet et al., 2015; Sari, 2005). These researchers refer to deafness not as a deficit but as a difference and view deaf individuals as members of a linguistic minority with different values, attitudes, and physical conditions than hearing people (Polat, 2003). However, in Türkiye, the perspective of deafness as a disability is dominant based on which education policies emphasize the oral production of deaf people in Turkish (Ilkbasaran, 2015).

In Türkiye, an oral-based approach that focuses only on improving deaf students' speaking ability is applied at K-12 schools (Karasu, 2014). In 1953, TSL was decided not to be used in deaf education (Zeshan, 2003). However, since 2015, while deaf students in mainstream schools have access to education in Turkish, in deaf schools, both Turkish and TSL are aimed to be used as medium languages (Fundamental Law of National Education, 1973). However, because few teachers are fluent in TSL, deaf students often access education only in Turkish (Ilkbasaran, 2015). Moreover, in Türkiye, while there is no FL education in deaf schools in mainstream schools, education policies exempt deaf students from FL courses (Ilkbasaran, 2015; Turkish Ministry of National Education, 2018).

### *Deafness and Deaf Students in the United States*

In the U.S., linguistically and culturally diverse communities speak an average of four hundred languages (O'Rourke et al., 2016). Moreover, about 20% of K-12 students study a world language or American Sign Language (ASL) as FL. The emphasis on FL education, especially in Arabic and Persian, has increased after the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Gordin, 2015). FL is a "core academic subject" (The U.S. Department of Education, 34 CFR 200/c) and an essential part of education, especially for the global economy (Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 2015). The federal government provides financial support for FL education (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015). For example, in New York, Delaware, and Tennessee states, K-12 students are given incentives (e.g., the Seal of Biliteracy) if they learn at least two FLs before graduating high school (American Councils for International Education, 2017).

In New York State (NYS), the research site of the study, 49% of the population speaks a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Despite the value given to FL education and incentives to support FL learning in the State, access to FL education is restricted for students with disabilities, which also includes deaf students (Wight, 2015).

Around 10.6% of the population in the U.S. is identified as deaf (Statista Research Department, 2019). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (2004), the national law, identifies deaf students as one group of students with disabilities, comprising 12% of the general school population (Evarris & Knotek, 2015). Today, most deaf students in the country have access to public education (Wight, 2015). However, IDEA (2004) defines deafness as being unable to hear. Moreover, the law does not specify sign language as a medium for the education of deaf students

in mainstream schools where deaf students often receive education in English, and sign language services are provided based on students' Individualized Education Plans (IEP) (Wight, 2015).

On the other hand, at deaf public schools, deaf students attend school with other deaf students. In these schools, deaf students can share a language and culture and receive education bilingually through ASL and English (McLeod & Marshall, 2023). However, in mainstream and deaf schools, deaf students often do not learn FL because policies identify deafness as a disability and exempt deaf students from FL courses (Evarrs & Knotek, 2015; NYSED, 2016).

### **Method**

The study employs a qualitative approach and compares education policy documents used in Türkiye and the U.S. through critical discourse analysis. The study holds a critical perspective by exploring the micro-level (i.e., linguistic level) and macro-level (i.e., practice level) interactions among policy documents (Johnson, 2009).

### ***Research Settings***

Türkiye, where the researcher is from, and the U.S., where the researcher pursued a Ph.D. degree, were selected as research sites. In the U.S., NYS was chosen as a research site where the percentage of the K-12 population enrolled in a FL class, which includes ASL, is above the national average (American Councils for International Education, 2017).

In Türkiye, the Ministry of National Education is the central government office regulating K-12 education in the country. The Department of the General Directorate for Special Education and Counseling Services is responsible for improving K-12 education for individuals with disabilities, including deaf education in Türkiye (Birinci, 2014; <http://www.meb.gov.tr>).

In the U.S., the Department of Education is responsible for policies at the national level. In the NYS, the NYSED regulates K-12 education services and has eight branches, including the Office of P-12 Education and Special Education Office, which works for special education policies for students with disabilities, including deaf students (<http://www.nysed.gov>).

### ***Data Sources***

As the data sources, education policy documents (e.g., constitutions, education laws, and regulations) that influence K-12 general education, deaf education, and FL education in Türkiye and the U.S. were utilized. Seven documents were analyzed in each country. Moreover, five documents used as education regulations in the NYS were analyzed. Thus, the study analyzed nineteen policy documents as data sources.

### ***Analytic Framework***

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was applied to analyze the language used in policy texts (i.e., micro-level analysis) and explore ideologies embedded in these texts (i.e., macro-level analysis) (Fairclough, 2013; van Dijk, 1993).

First, the policy documents were thematically categorized (e.g., general education, FL education, and special education, including deaf education). Through thematic analysis, ideologies of education, languages, deafness, and FL education for deaf learners were explored. Then, textual analysis was applied to each document to connect lexical (van Dijk, 1993), interdiscursive (Fairclough, 2013), and theoretical analyses (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Based on the study's research questions, the text's language use and argumentative features were analyzed at the lexical level (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Through interdiscursive and theoretical analyses, the policy texts were deconstructed and interpreted in terms of the language used in these texts. Finally, theoretical analysis was applied, and ideologies identified in the texts were analyzed. In the data analysis process, pen and paper were used, and findings were tabulated.

The theories of linguistic human rights (LHRs) (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2012) and Bourdieu's forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1986) were drawn upon to examine the discourses of rights and ideologies of languages and deafness. The study applied LHRs, which comprise "disability rights, human rights, and minority rights" for deaf people (Murray, 2015, p. 384; Wee, 2007). Because protecting the LHRs of deaf people contributes to the accumulation of linguistic capital and various forms of capital, the study also applied the theory of forms of capital, which includes cultural capital (i.e., forms of knowledge, education, skills), linguistic capital (i.e., the ability to use a language in a particular context), social capital (i.e., having networks), economic capital (i.e., having a job in the international market), and symbolic capital (i.e., recognition or prestige) (Bourdieu, 1986).

## **Findings**

The results reveal that ideologies of education as a right and FL education as forms of capital are identified in education policy documents in both Türkiye and the U.S. However, in both countries, these ideologies contradict the ideology of deafness as a disability, which is signified in education policy documents, thus restricting access to FL education for K-12 deaf students.

### ***Ideologies of Education as a Right***

In Türkiye, the constitution explicitly states education as a right (i.e., "no one shall be deprived"). The document aligns with the theory of human rights, which ensures the legalization of a person's rights, including education (Donnelly, 2013).

In the U.S., the constitution of the State of New York implicitly reveals an ideology of education as a right, and the document states its support for free public education (i.e., the state "shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools"). The document's support for free public education aligns with the ideology of education as a right (UNESCO, 1996). Thus, the state-level constitution supports free public education and promotes human rights (Ishay, 2008) (see Table 1).

**Table 1.** The Ideology of Education as a Right as Embodied in the Constitutions

Constitutions	Language indexing ideology
The Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye (1982)	“No one shall be deprived of the <i>right to receive an education</i> [emphasis added]” (Article 42).
The Constitution of the State of New York (1821)	“The legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of <i>free common schools</i> , wherein all the <i>children of this state may be educated</i> [emphasis added].” (Article XI, Section 1).

### *Ideologies of Foreign Languages*

The use of 'any' in the statement of "any language other than Turkish" in the Turkish policy document presents an ambiguous definition of FL because "any language" may comprise European (e.g., English, German, French), minority (e.g., Kurdish, Arabic) or signed modes of languages (Celebi, 2006; Gee, 2014; Kuzeci, 2015).

A clear FL education policy is needed at the state level in the U.S. (Ricento, 2000). FL education is accepted as part of a "well-rounded education." However, the phrase "as determined by" in the state-level document designates "states and local educational agencies" as agents to include FL education courses in education (ESEA, 2015; Gee, 2014). In addition, the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (2016) defines FL as "any language other than," the dominant language, English and identifies ASL as a FL, signaling the acceptance of the signed modes of a language as a FL.

However, interdiscursive analysis shows that the definition of ASL needs to be more consistent among the documents used at the state-level documents. While the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (2016) define ASL as a FL., the same document defines ASL as “a second language” (100.1/i). Thus, the inconsistency in the definition of ASL as a second and foreign language can lead to deaf students' learning ASL as a FL at the K-12 level instead of preserving an ideology of sign language as the primary language of deaf individuals (Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011) (see Table 2).

**Table 2.** Ideologies of Foreign Languages

Turkish Documents	Language indexing ideology of FL education
Turkish Regulations for Foreign Language Education (2006)	<p>“<i>Foreign language means any language other than Turkish</i> [emphasis added] taught at official and private, primary education, secondary education, distance education, and non-formal education schools and institutions.” (Article 4/e)</p> <p>“<i>The aim of foreign language education</i> [emphasis added] and training in formal, non-formal and distance education institutions under the basic aims and principles of National Education; and considering the purpose and the levels of the schools and institutions is <i>to ensure that individuals who learn a foreign language acquire</i></p> <p>a) <i>Listening comprehension,</i></p> <p>b) <i>Reading comprehension,</i></p> <p>c) <i>Speaking,</i></p> <p>d) <i>Writing</i></p> <p><i>skills, to communicate, and to develop positive attitudes toward foreign language education</i> [emphasis added].” (Article 5/1)</p>
U.S. Documents	Language indexing ideology of FL education
ESEA (2015)	<p>“The term ‘well-rounded education’ means <i>courses, activities, and programming in subjects</i> [emphasis added] such as English, reading or language arts, writing, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, <i>foreign languages,</i> civics and government, economics, arts, history, geography, computer science, music, career and technical education, health, physical education, and any other subject, <i>as determined by the State or local educational agency, to provide all students access to an enriched curriculum and educational experience</i> [emphasis added].” (Section 80002/52)</p>
NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (2016)	<p>“<i>Foreign language means any language other than English (LOTE)</i> [emphasis added] including all modern languages, Latin, <i>American Sign Language</i> [emphasis added], Native American languages, and native languages.” (100.5/h/2)</p>

### ***Ideologies of Deafness as a Disability***

In Türkiye, lexical analysis shows an ideology of deafness as a disability in Article 3/c of the Law on Individuals with Disabilities (2005) (i.e., “disabled individual,” “sensory loss”). The Article implicitly describes deafness as a disability. Moreover, passivation used in the Article (i.e., “is restricted”) obscures the agent, which results in an unclear explanation related to how such ‘restriction’ leads to unequal participation of deaf people in society (Gee, 2014).

Interdiscursive analysis reveals an ideology of deafness as a disability. The Regulations of Special Education Services in Türkiye (2018), which was written based on the Law on Individuals with Disabilities (2005), define “an individual with hearing impairment” as “the one who needs special education support and services because of partial or complete hearing loss” (4/o). Thus, the regulations imply an ideology of deafness as a disability because it defines deafness as an “impairment” and “loss.”

In the U.S., deafness is defined as one of several disabilities (IDEA, 2004). Section 602 of IDEA uses the phrase “hearing impairments” and adds “deafness” as one of the disabilities. Interdiscursive analysis also identifies an ideology of deafness as a disability. According to the

Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (2016), deafness is a “hearing impairment” and “so severe that [it...] adversely affects a student’s educational performance” (200.1/zz/e). The words “severe” and “adversely” refer to an ideology of deafness as a disability by ignoring the cultural aspect of deafness (see Table 3).

**Table 3.** The Ideology of Deafness as a Disability

Documents	Language indexing ideology
Law on Individuals with Disabilities (2005) (Türkiye)	“ <i>A disabled individual</i> is one who is <i>restricted from equal and active participation in society</i> [emphasis added] with other individuals because of the environmental conditions and attitudes <i>caused by physical, mental and sensory loss at any level</i> [emphasis added].” (Article 3/c)
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004) (United States)	“The term ‘ <i>child with a disability</i> ’ means a child with mental retardation, <i>hearing impairments (including deafness)</i> [emphasis added], speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance (referred to in this title as ‘emotional disturbance’), orthopedic impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities; and who, by reason thereof, <i>needs special education and related services</i> [emphasis added].” (Section 602/3/A/i)

### ***Contradictions of Ideologies and Foreign Language Education of K-12 Deaf Students***

The Regulations of Special Education Services (2018) in Türkiye offers 12 deaf students an exemption from FL courses. The document states that the exemption depends on parents' decisions and students' individualized education plans. However, depending on the statement used in the document (i.e., “may be exempted”), parents and teachers often prefer exempting deaf students from FL courses because of an ideology of deafness as a disability (Wight, 2015).

In the U.S., federal-level documents do not mention FL education for K-12 deaf students or offer an exemption for deaf students from taking FL courses. At the state level, NYSED Education Regulations (2016) also do not provide an exemption for deaf students from FL courses. However, because the documents define deafness as one of the disabilities, state-level documents present an option for deaf students' exemption from FL classes depending on the individualized education plans of deaf students. When deaf students do not accept an exemption from FL course, accommodation is provided to provide deaf students full access to FL education (American Councils for International Education, 2017; NYSED, 2016; Wight, 2015). On the other hand, as ASL is defined as a foreign language in the U.S. policy documents, in mainstream schools, deaf students prefer learning ASL as a FL course (ESEA, 2015; NYSED, 2016) (see Table 4).



**Table 4.** Documents Exempting K-12 Deaf Students from Foreign Language Courses

Documents	Language indexing ideology
Regulations of Special Education Services (2018) (Türkiye)	“Students who have a <i>hearing disability, mental disability or autism, with the written permission of parents and decisions of IEP committee may be exempted</i> [emphasis added] from foreign language courses at any level of education.” (Article 24/d)
NYSED Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (2016)	“A student identified as having a <i>disability that adversely affects the ability to learn a language may be excused</i> from the language other than English <i>requirement</i> outlined in this subparagraph if such student's <i>individualized education program</i> [emphasis added] indicates that such requirement is not appropriate to the student’s special educational needs.” (100.5, 7. iv/c)

## Discussion and Conclusion

The critical discourse analysis of the study shows that, in Türkiye and the U.S., in FL education of K-12 deaf students, the ideology of education as a right is not fully applied. In Türkiye, policy documents explicitly offer an exemption for deaf students from FL courses (Regulations of Special Education Services, 2018). In the U.S., policy documents do not explicitly exempt deaf students from FL courses. However, the documents offer ASL as a FL, which most deaf students prefer to take (NYSED, 2016;).

Identifying deafness as a disability or culture in policy documents also influences these students' access to FL education (e.g., Batterbury, 2014; Doherty, 2012). Policy documents that impose an ideology of deafness as a disability do not refer to signed modes of language (Batterbury, 2014). On the other hand, policy documents identifying deafness as a culture refer to sign language as the primary language of deaf people and offer signed language modes in FL education. The policy documents in Türkiye and the U.S. refer to deafness as a disability. In Türkiye, policy documents do not refer to sign languages as a medium. In the country, instead of learning sign language, parents of deaf children often prefer cochlear implants and hearing aid devices because they believe that such devices make it possible for deaf children to hear and speak in Turkish (Ilkbasaran, 2015). However, recognizing deafness as a disability and ignoring cultural and linguistic aspects of deafness restrict deaf individuals' cultural, linguistic, and social competencies (Ilkbasaran, 2015).

The education policy documents in the U.S. define deafness as a disability. The documents also accept sign language as a second or FL language, which confuses the implementation as deaf students often take ASL as an FL (NYSED, 2016). Thus, the policy documents in the country imply an ideology of deafness as a disability and a culture by accepting ASL and other signed modes of languages (NYSED, 2016).

Communication is not a reciprocal flow in that individuals receive, interpret, and produce what is meant in a Discourse (Gee, 2014). In Türkiye, the Regulations used in Special Education define sign language as a tool "to state emotions, thoughts, requests, and needs" and ignore the cultural component of the language. Thus, the document refers to sign language as a visual tool, which, however, is against the LHRs for deaf people as LHRs recognize sign language as the primary language for deaf individuals (Ilkbasaran, 2015). Therefore, the policy documents in

Türkiye need to explicitly define sign language as the linguistic capital and cultural capital of deaf individuals (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2012).

In the U.S., the documents have an implicit ideology of sign language as part of deaf culture and support sign modes of languages in education (IDEA, 2004). Moreover, the documents emphasize the use of sign modes of languages in education, which aligns with the social model of deafness in that sign language is viewed as part of the deaf culture (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2008). In addition, the U.S. policy documents offer ASL as a second and foreign language in education. However, deaf students who learn ASL as a FL may not access opportunities in the global world, although they can accumulate cultural capital through ASL in its embodied form (i.e., personal investment and self-improvement) (Bourdieu, 1991).

### **Conclusion**

Ideologies on deafness and languages embedded in education policy documents influence deaf students' access to FL education at the K-12 level. The study found that in the cases of Türkiye and the U.S., policy documents emphasize education as a right and FL education as a linguistic capital at the K-12 level. However, implicit definitions related to the role of sign languages and explicit definitions of deafness as a disability in policy documents result in deaf students' restricted access to FL education. Based on such ideologies in the policy documents, deaf students are often exempt from FL courses in both countries. The restriction, thus, causes a violation of deaf students' education and language rights (Peters, 2007; UNESCO, 1996). The study argues that ideologies embedded in education policy documents and clarifications of these ideologies are crucial as they guide educators in implementing the policies in education. Therefore, to prevent any misunderstandings or contradictions in policy documents used in education, policymakers should explicitly define deafness as a culture, not as a disability. Moreover, policymakers and practitioners should collaborate in deaf education and with deaf individuals to help deaf students access FL education without restrictions.

### **References**

- American Councils for International Education. (2017). *National K-12 Foreign Language Enrollment Survey Report*. Available at [https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/FLE\\_report-June17.pdf](https://www.americancouncils.org/sites/default/files/FLE_report-June17.pdf)
- Batterbury, S. C. (2014). Democratising policy theories: Enhancing prospects for language justice for sign language peoples. *Policy & Politics*, 42(4), pp. 547-564. <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557312X655701>
- Birinci, F. G. (2014). *The effectiveness of visual materials in teaching vocabulary to deaf students of EFL* (Unpublished master thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Harvard University Press.

- Cankuvvet, N., Doğan, M., & Gürgür, H. (2015). Investigation of parental expectations about cochlear implantation. *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(1), pp. 54-73. <https://doi.org/10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.3c1s3m>
- Celebi, M., D. (2006). Mother tongue education and foreign language education in Turkey. *Journal of Social Science Institute*, 21(2), pp. 285-307. <http://www.acarindex.com/dosyalar/makale/acarindex-1423879786.pdf>
- Constitution of the Republic of Türkiye (1982). Available at [https://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution\\_en.pdf](https://global.tbmm.gov.tr/docs/constitution_en.pdf)
- Constitution of the State of New York. (1821). Available at <https://www.dos.ny.gov/info/pdfs/Constitution%20January%202015%20amd.pdf>
- Csizer, K. & Kontra, E. H. (2020). Foreign language characteristics of deaf and severely hard of hearing students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 104(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12630>
- Doherty, M. (2012). Policy and practice in deaf education: Views and experiences of teachers, and of young people who are deaf in Northern Ireland and Sweden. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 27(3), pp. 281-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2012.678663>
- Donnelly, J. (2013). *International human rights* (4th ed.). Westview Press.
- Evarrs, S., B. & Knotek, S., E. (2015). Foreign language and special education. In A. L. Heining Boynton (Ed.), *American Council on Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2005-2015: Realizing our vision of languages for all* (pp. 117-133). Pearson.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Routledge.
- Gordin, M. D. (2015). Tongue-tied nation, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 61(28). <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Tongue-Tied-Nation/228591>
- Ilkbasaran, D. (2015). *Literacies, mobilities and agencies of deaf youth in Turkey: Constraints and opportunities in the 21st century* (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest. (1656169535).
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (2004). Available at <http://idea.ed.gov/>
- Ishay, M., R. (2008). *The history of human rights: From ancient times to the globalization era*. University of California Press.
- Johnson, D., C. (2009). Ethnography of language policy. *Language Policy*, 8, pp. 139-159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-009-9136-9>
- Karasu, H., P. (2014). Individual literacy activities with hearing-impaired children in the preschool period. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 9(22), pp. 1239-1249. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2014.1851>

- Kuzeci, D. (2015). Choice of foreign language and politics of foreign languages, *Journal of Kazim Karabekir Education Faculty*, 30, pp. 13-26. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/31610>
- Kuzu, D. (2016). The politics of identity, recognition, and multiculturalism: The Kurds in Turkey. *Nations and Nationalism*, 22(1), pp.123-142. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12139>
- Law on Individuals with Disabilities. (2005). <https://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.5378.pdf>
- McLeod, S., & Marshall, J. (2023). Communication for all and the Sustainable Development Goals. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 25(1), pp. 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2022.2160494>
- Murray, J. J. (2015). Linguistic human rights discourse in deaf community activism. *Sign Language Studies*, 15(4), pp. 379-410. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sls.2015.0012>
- New York State Education Department (2016). Regulations of the Commissioner of Education. <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/specialed/lawsregs/part200.htm>
- O'Rourke, P., Zhou, Q., & Rottman, I. (2016). Prioritization of K-12 world language education in the United States: State requirements for high school graduation. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(4), pp. 789-800. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12232>
- Peters, S. J. (2007). "Education for all?" A historical analysis of international inclusive education policy and individuals with disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 18(2), pp. 98-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073070180020601>
- Polat, F. (2003). Factors affecting psychosocial adjustment of deaf students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 8(3), pp. 325-339. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/eng018>
- Pufahl, I., & Rhodes, N. C. (2011). Foreign language instruction in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey of elementary and secondary schools. *Foreign Language Annals*, 44(2), pp. 258-288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2011.01130.x>
- Ricento, T. (2000). Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 4(2), pp. 196-213. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00111>
- Sari, H. (2005). An analysis of the relationship between identity patterns of Turkish deaf adolescents and the communication modes used in special residential schools for the hearing impaired and deaf. *Deafness & Education International*, 7(4), pp. 206-222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dei.9>
- Shohamy, E. (2007). Reinterpreting globalization in multilingual contexts. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 1(2), pp. 127-133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19313150701495421>

- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008). Bilingual education and sign language as the mother tongue of deaf children. In C. J. K. Bidoli & E. Ochse (Eds.), *English in International Deaf Communication* (pp. 75-97). Peter Lang AG.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2012). Linguistic human rights. In P. M. Tiersma & L. Solan (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law* (pp. 235-248). Oxford University Press.
- Statista Research Department (2019). *Hearing loss in the U.S.-Statistics & Facts*. Available at <https://www.statista.com/topics/3491/hearing-loss-in-the-us/>
- Taşdemir, H. & Gürbüz, N. (2021). An investigation into the cultural dimension in EFL classes: Turkish instructors' views and practices. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), pp. 54–74. <https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2021.30667>
- Turkish Ministry of National Education (2006). *Regulations for Foreign Language Education*. Available at <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2006/05/20060531-3.htm>
- Turkish Ministry of National Education General Directorate of Special Education and Counseling Services (2018). *Special Education Regulations*. Available at <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2018/07/20180707-8.htm>
- Turkish Republic Fundamental Law of National Education (1973). Available at <http://www.mevzuat.gov.tr/MevzuatMetin/1.5.1739.pdf>
- Turkish Statistical Institute (2021). *The bulletin of statistics for persons with disabilities and the elderly*. Available at [https://www.ailevecalisma.gov.tr/media/73073/eyhgm\\_istatistik\\_bulteni\\_subat2021.pdf](https://www.ailevecalisma.gov.tr/media/73073/eyhgm_istatistik_bulteni_subat2021.pdf)
- United States Census Bureau. (2019). *Selected characteristics of the foreign-born population by period of entry into the United States*. Available at <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=center%20of%20immigration&hidePreview=true&tid=ACSS1Y2018.S0502&vintage=2019>
- United States Department of Education (1973). *Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/spced/leg/rehab/rehabilitation-act-of-1973-amended-by-wioa.pdf>
- United States Department of Education (2015). *Every Student Succeeds Act*. Available at <https://www.ed.gov/essa?src=policy>
- United States Department of Education (2015). *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Available at <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (1996). *Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights*. Available at <http://www.unesco.org/cpp/uk/declarations/linguistic.pdf>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), pp. 249-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>

- Wee, L. (2007). Linguistic human rights and mobility. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 28(4), pp. 325-338. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ884573>
- Wight, M., C., S. (2015). Students with learning disabilities in the foreign language learning environment and the practice of exemption, *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(1), pp. 39-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12122>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). Critical discourse studies: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Method of critical discourse studies* (pp. 1–22). Sage.
- Zeshan, U. (2003). Aspects of Turkish sign language. *Sign Language & Linguistics*, 6(1), pp. 43-75. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sll.6.1.04zes>

### ***Conflict of Interest***

The author has declared no conflict of interest in this study.

### ***Funding***

The author did not receive any funding for this article from any institution.