



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/240009/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

ÇİFTÇİ, AYSE and ROBERTS, LEAH (Accepted: 2026) "The goal is to live their heritage culture, speak their language": Teaching, techniques, and environments in UK Turkish weekend schools. Journal of Language, Identity and Education. ISSN: 1532-7701 (In Press)

---

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence. This licence allows you to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon the work, even commercially, as long as you credit the authors for the original work. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# **“The goal is to live their heritage culture, speak their language”: teaching, techniques, and environments in UK Turkish weekend schools**

## **Abstract**

This research scrutinizes Turkish weekend schools in the UK, investigating their instructional practices, teaching methodologies, and educators' perspectives. Despite the expectation of homogeneity in teaching qualifications, the study reveals a lack of consistent prerequisites for formal Turkish language teaching credentials. Findings are based on questionnaires from 22 teachers and interviews with five teachers from Turkish weekend schools across the UK.

The study demonstrates that being a native Turkish speaker does not necessarily equate to effective pedagogy. The primary language of instruction is Turkish, while students predominantly employ English. It indicated that family involvement, student motivation, and the creation of an appropriate language acquisition environment play pivotal roles in language education. This study highlights the widespread provision of Turkish language instruction for bilingual learners and the challenges associated with teaching practices, home language environments, and cultural transmission, underscoring the need for further scholarly exploration in the domain of heritage language education for bilingual children.

**Keywords:** weekend schools, teachers, heritage languages, Turkish, bilingualism

## **Introduction**

The UK's diverse society encompasses numerous ethnic and linguistic groups, yet research on minority languages and language environments is still emerging (Çiftci, 2024). Heritage language education is predominantly provided through part-time, minority-led weekend schools (Lubińska, 2024). Although some studies have examined heritage language education in the UK, Turkish weekend schools remain comparatively understudied (Çavuşoğlu, 2014). These schools are particularly important as they serve as key community-based resources that support the maintenance and development of Turkish language competencies among bilingual children, while also facilitating cultural transmission beyond mainstream school hours (Yağmur & Gökmenoğlu, 2010). Çavuşoğlu (2014) similarly highlights their vital role in preserving minority languages, cultures, and religions. At the same time, ongoing debate regarding the extent to which attendance at Turkish weekend schools influences children's broader language development underscores the need for further empirical research.

Weekend schools aim to preserve heritage language and cultural practices, as well as support immigrant parents by providing guidance on bilingual education and helping them engage with

their children's language learning (Lubińska, 2024). Some evidence suggests that students studying heritage languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, and Turkish in these schools tend to achieve higher GCSE results, potentially due to enhanced literacy skills, cognitive benefits of bilingualism, and additional practice outside mainstream schooling (Ofsted, 2008). This study focuses on Turkish weekend schools in the UK, involving 22 teachers, and examines their instructional practices and perceptions, shedding light on their commitment to fostering effective heritage language learning.

### **Research questions**

*Research Question:* What does the Turkish weekend school system look like in the UK?

- a. Do teachers' teaching environment, techniques and perceptions on Turkish language learning vary according to demographic variables such as gender, education, training, general teaching experience, and teaching experience at a Turkish weekend school?
- b. How do the teachers in weekend schools apply the teaching in a classroom?
- c. What are the perceptions of teachers about Turkish weekend schools in the UK?

### **Weekend Schooling in the UK: A Historical Overview**

Heritage language schools have increasingly attracted scholarly attention in the UK, USA, Australia, and Canada since the late 1990s, a period marked not by their initial establishment but by the growing formal recognition and systematic study of these long-standing community institutions (Mulvey, 2016). However, these language schools were set up in England, in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, although they increased since the 1950s with the increase in the population of different communities (McLelland, 2018; Pérez-Guilarte et al., 2023). Following World War II, with the arrival of refugees from Eastern Europe and increased immigration from Commonwealth countries, heritage schools became more widespread during the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Pérez-Guilarte et al., 2023). The number has increased again more recently due to conflict-induced migration, including forced displacement and the arrival of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK (Abdelrazak, 2001; Maylor et al., 2013).

The National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education for weekend Education (NRCSE) reported that there are approximately between 3000-5000 weekend schools in the UK (NRCSE, 2019). The largest number of heritage schools in the UK respectively belong to Jewish, Eastern European, Greek, Albanian, Italian, Turkish, Chinese, South-East Asian, African and African-

Caribbean communities. Although weekend schools are set and run by different communities, they have similar aims, such as developing and maintaining the minority child's ethnic identity, self-esteem and self-confidence; improving heritage language; and developing the mainstream schooling achievement of minority ethnic children (Lubińska, 2024).

### **Turkish weekend Schools in the UK: A Focus**

Turkish weekend schools in the UK serve the purpose of instructing Turkish language and culture to UK-residing children (Çiftci, 2024). Turkish weekend schools first emerged in the early 1980s (Cohen Yanarocak, 2024) and are currently composed of 37 schools affiliated with the Ministry of National Education in Turkey and the Turkish Education Consultancy in London (MEBLEM, 2019). Teaching staff are appointed by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey, requiring a minimum of five years teaching experience in Turkey and successful completion of an English language proficiency exam.

These schools primarily focus on Turkish language and culture, incorporating elements such as traditional music and folk dancing in their curriculum. Additionally, they offer GCSE and A-level preparation classes in subjects like mathematics, literature, and history upon request by parents. Their mission revolves around preserving and enhancing the heritage language and culture of immigrant children (Otcu, 2010; Tiryakiol, 2023), evident in the celebration of Turkish national and religious festivals, explained in English but closely tied to the heritage language and culture.

The role of teachers is pivotal in explaining the background of traditional practices and beliefs in both languages. The curriculum and teaching materials are provided by the Turkish Ministry of National Education; however, their classroom implementation varies considerably, resulting in inconsistencies in how the content is delivered depending on individual teachers' pedagogical approaches. Two classroom language ideologies prevail: 'separate bilingualism,' where English is not used, and 'flexible bilingualism,' where both languages are employed (From et al., 2024). Flexible bilingualism affords teachers and students the freedom to communicate, organize materials, and tailor classes to students' language proficiency.

These features encompass teachers' instructional techniques and perceptions, which influence children's linguistic performance and language knowledge. This study explores the Turkish weekend school system in the UK, examining the teaching environment, educators, their strategies, and perceptions.

### **Data collection**

The study involved 22 Turkish weekend school teachers in the UK, selected through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with five teachers. Participants were chosen purposefully based on their teaching roles in Turkish weekend schools, sourced through contacts or the Turkish Embassy Education Consultancy in London, creating a comprehensive teacher database for each school. These schools mainly emphasized Turkish language learning, served students aged 5-17 in mixed-gender classes, and enrolled children from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

Gender distribution showed 11 female and 11 male teachers, predominantly in the 30-39 age group (72.7%). Educational qualifications ranged from bachelor's degrees (45.5%) to postgraduate degrees (54.5%), with only 9% educated in England, while 91% graduated from Turkish universities.

Regarding teaching backgrounds, 45.5% had degrees in Turkish Language and Literature teaching, 27.3% were primary school teachers, and 13.6% held BAs in English Language Teaching. Only 4.5% had a Diploma in preschool teaching. Thus, 59.1% of teachers providing Turkish language education had formal training in language education.

Most teachers had extensive teaching experience, with 68.2% reporting more than 10 years of experience; within this group, 31.8% had between 10 and 15 years, and 36.4% had more than 15 years. The smallest groups had 3-5 or 5-7 years (each 4.5%), and 9.1% had less than 3 years of experience. Only 4.5% had two years of weekend school experience, while 31.8% had five years, and 27.3% were in their first year. Notably, no teacher had more than five years of experience in accordance with Turkish Ministry of National Education and Turkish Embassy regulations (MoNE, 2019).

### **Data analyses**

To enhance internal validity and support study reliability, the internal consistency of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha = .854$ ). Subsequently, SPSS 26 was employed for descriptive analysis of the questionnaire data. This encompassed an examination of Turkish weekend school characteristics (e.g., size, location) and teacher demographics (e.g., age, education, experience). Additionally, a descriptive analysis was conducted to scrutinize the teaching environment, pedagogical techniques, and teachers' teaching perspectives on Turkish language instruction. Furthermore, Regarding the teacher questionnaire data, item-total correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between individual questionnaire items and their respective thematic group scores, in order to evaluate the coherence and internal structure of the instrument. Given the small sample size and the absence

of normality in the data distribution, non-parametric methods were considered more appropriate than parametric alternatives. Mann–Whitney U tests were therefore used to explore differences in teaching environments, pedagogical practices, and teachers’ teaching perspectives across selected demographic variables. Owing to the limited sample size and the multiple demographic comparisons undertaken, these analyses were conducted on an exploratory basis only, and the findings should be interpreted with caution, as they are not intended to support generalisable inferential conclusions but rather to indicate potential trends warranting further investigation.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted, with audio recordings subsequently transcribed and subjected to multiple reviews to comprehensively grasp respondent perceptions. For the purpose of thematic coding, following Braun & Clarke (2006) approach, transcripts underwent iterative readings and were color-coded to identify patterns and distinctions in the data (see appendix).

## **Findings**

The forthcoming sections elucidate the distinguishing attributes of Turkish weekend schools in the UK. Firstly, we analyze these characteristics through questionnaires, focusing on teachers' teaching environment, instructional techniques, and perceptions. Subsequently, in-depth interviews were conducted to provide contextualised insights into teachers’ teaching perspectives and practices, to elaborate on and explain patterns observed in the questionnaire data, and to capture nuances in instructional decision-making that could not be fully explored through quantitative measures alone. Notably, the latter section integrates insights gleaned from both questionnaire and interview findings.

## **Results of questionnaire data**

### **Turkish weekend schools’ characteristics in the UK**

Participants in the study were invited to disclose the name and location of their weekend school on the survey. Of the 20 cities in which Turkish weekend schools were identified, responses were obtained from seven, with the majority coming from schools located in London (68.2%), followed by Nottingham (9.1%), and the remainder from Bristol, Coventry, Manchester, Newport, and Swindon (4.5% each). No responses were obtained from the remaining 13 cities. Notably, Turkish Weekend Schools typically operate within facilities rented from other communities or mainstream schools, predominantly on weekends (Saturdays and/or Sundays), though some also offer after-school sessions. These schools function on a voluntary basis, with

teachers receiving compensation from both parents and the Ministry of National Education in Turkey (MoNE, 2019).

Regarding school size, participants categorized their institutions into eight groups, each representing a range of 10 students. The largest reported school had 150 students (located in London), while the majority of Turkish weekend schools housed 40 students or fewer (76.1%). One teacher from Swindon did not provide a response. Notably, schools in London had the highest student population concentration (71.4%), followed by Nottingham at 9.5%, with other cities having approximately 4.8% each. Pupils attending these schools typically range in age from five to 14 years and are assessed for language proficiency prior to enrolment using school-designed language examinations.

Teachers were asked to assess their students' Turkish language skills using a researcher-designed five-point scale ranging from *Excellent* (0) to *Terrible* (4). The most frequently selected category was *Good* (54.5%), while only 13.6% of teachers rated their students' vocabulary as *Excellent*. No respondents selected the *Poor* or *Terrible* categories. In this context, a *Good* rating was understood to indicate functional language skills sufficient for classroom participation but still requiring further development to meet higher instructional and learning goals. These ratings may also reflect teachers' subjective perceptions and a tendency toward optimistic assessment, which should be considered when interpreting the findings.

Additionally, teachers were questioned about their use of language instructional materials for students with varying vocabulary levels. Of the 22 teachers surveyed, the majority (72.7%) indicated that they employ different materials (e.g. worksheets, MoNe materials, video etc.) tailored to students' proficiency levels, while a minority (4.5%) stated that they use the same materials for all students, irrespective of their language skill level.

### **Descriptive Analysis of Teachers' Teaching Environment, Technique and Perceptions**

In the survey, educators responded to a series of Likert scale questions, employing a five-point scale ranging from "1 = strongly agree" to "5 = strongly disagree." These questions pertained to three domains—Teaching Environment (TE; 8 items), Teaching Techniques (14 items), and Teachers' teaching Perceptions (4 items)—which were developed by the researchers drawing on relevant literature, expert input, and related questions from previous studies.

## 1. Teaching Environment (TE)

Table 1 indicates that responses to the teaching environment-related items were generally positive, with mean values aligning with the *agree* category on the 1–5 scale. This indicates an overall positive sentiment among teachers regarding their teaching environment. The data indicates that teachers prioritize the creation of a conducive learning atmosphere, express job satisfaction, and perceive their educational impact on students' lives as substantial. Notably, the statement “*I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson*” elicited the greatest variability in responses, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, and recorded both the highest mean score ( $M = 2.82$ ) and the highest standard deviation ( $SD = 1.181$ ) among the items. Only 36.4% of teachers expressed interest in students' contributions, while a majority (27.3% and 40.9%, respectively) indicated “strongly agree” or “agree” with their ability to provide additional assistance to students when needed. These findings collectively suggest that educators are content with their teaching environment and demonstrate a willingness to nurture a welcoming learning milieu.

**Table 1. Statement related to teaching environment**

| ( <i>n</i> = 22)                                                                          | Mean | SD    | Min | Max |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-----|-----|
| All in all, I am satisfied with my job.                                                   | 1.86 | .834  | 1   | 4   |
| I feel that I am making a significant educational difference in the lives of my students. | 2.05 | .653  | 1   | 3   |
| Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.                 | 2.32 | .839  | 1   | 4   |
| If a student from this school needs extra assistance, I can provide it.                   | 2.23 | 1.152 | 1   | 5   |
| I work with individual students.                                                          | 2.18 | .853  | 1   | 5   |
| I take care to create a pleasant learning atmosphere.                                     | 1.64 | .658  | 1   | 3   |
| I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson.                   | 2.82 | 1.181 | 1   | 5   |
| I use video and audio material in Turkish.                                                | 1.82 | .907  | 1   | 4   |

## 2. Teaching Technique (TT)

Table 2 below displays the average response to the teaching techniques (TT) assessment, indicating that teachers generally held positive opinions of their TT, such as effective pedagogical practices. The strongest agreement was observed for “*I always prepare the teaching material before arriving at the school*” ( $M = 1.36$ ), “*I speak the target language and give instructions in Turkish*” ( $M = 1.50$ ), and “*I correct the students in a sensible way*” ( $M = 1.50$ ), reflecting high levels of reported instructional preparedness and target-language use. There was a tendency toward teacher-directed lesson planning rather than the systematic inclusion of student input on activities or topics of interest. For instance, the statement “*It is better when the teacher—not the student—decides what activities are to be done*” yielded a

mean score of 2.77, while “*I ask my students to suggest or help plan classroom activities or topics*” had a mean of 2.32, indicating generally neutral to mixed responses regarding student involvement in lesson planning. The data suggests that educators primarily focus on teaching the Turkish language and independently planning their lectures.

**Table 2. Statements related to teaching techniques**

| <b>(n = 22)</b>                                                                                                                                   | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Min</b> | <b>Max</b> |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| I usually know how to get through to students.                                                                                                    | 1.73        | .703      | 1          | 3          |
| It is better when the teacher – not the student – decides what activities are to be done.                                                         | 2.77        | 1.152     | 1          | 4          |
| I always use Turkish in the class.                                                                                                                | 2.00        | 1.113     | 1          | 4          |
| I always prepare the teaching material before arriving at the school.                                                                             | 1.36        | .727      | 1          | 4          |
| I present new topics for the class (lecture-style presentation).                                                                                  | 1.91        | .750      | 1          | 4          |
| I review with the students the homework they have prepared.                                                                                       | 1.77        | .752      | 1          | 3          |
| I ask my students to suggest or help plan classroom activities or topics.                                                                         | 2.32        | 1.211     | 1          | 5          |
| I track the study process.                                                                                                                        | 1.82        | .664      | 1          | 3          |
| I use pictures and objects for my students to make connections between words and the associated objects.                                          | 1.64        | .790      | 1          | 4          |
| I speak the target language and I ask a question and give instructions in Turkish.                                                                | 1.50        | .673      | 1          | 3          |
| I assign activities that require a group.                                                                                                         | 1.82        | .733      | 1          | 3          |
| I use Turkish texts which accommodate real-life language use.                                                                                     | 1.55        | .596      | 1          | 3          |
| I correct the students in a sensible way.                                                                                                         | 1.50        | .598      | 1          | 3          |
| I give commands through one word along with gestures such as pointing which provides opportunities for initiating the interaction among students. | 2.09        | .921      | 1          | 5          |

### 3. Teaching Perceptions (TP)

Teachers' teaching perspectives on Turkish language instruction and weekend schools were surveyed. Results from Table 3 reveal that a significant majority of teachers (90.9%) strongly endorse the importance of teaching Turkish to young children in the UK, with 95.5% acknowledging that proficiency in Turkish holds value for students' future prospects. However, teachers did not express strong agreement that weekend schools play a role in students' language development, as reflected by a mean score of 3.00 on the relevant item. When inquired about their views on the significance of weekend schools in students' language development, the prevailing response leaned towards "neither agreeing nor disagreeing" (40.9%). In summary, teachers generally hold positive opinions regarding the instruction and acquisition of the Turkish language, recognizing its benefits for students' life trajectories.

**Table 3. Statements related to teaching perceptions**

| <b>(n = 22)</b>                                                            | <b>Mean</b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Min</b> | <b>Max</b> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| Do you think is it important to teach Turkish to young children in the UK? | 1.18        | .664      | 1          | 4          |
| Do you think Turkish will benefit the students in the future?              | 1.05        | .213      | 1          | 2          |

|                                                                                               |      |      |   |   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|---|---|
| Do you think any certain ideas that can only communicate in Turkish not very well in English? | 2.23 | .922 | 1 | 3 |
| Do you think the weekend schools play a role in the students' language development?           | 3.00 | .873 | 2 | 5 |

## Reliability

### a. Teaching Environment (TE)

The eight items in the teacher questionnaire, designed to assess teaching environment, displayed inadequate internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.47, indicating that they should not be used as a composite scale for teaching environment measurement. To investigate this further, correlations among the individual questionnaire items were computed. Analysis revealed that three items, namely "If a student from this school needs extra assistance, I can provide it" (TE4), "I work with individual students" (TE5), and "I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson" (TE7), exhibited weak correlations with the remaining items, as depicted in Table 4. Omitting these items from the scale resulted in an improved Cronbach's alpha reliability of 0.78. Consequently, the TE group removed these items from consideration, and subsequent analyses were based on teachers' responses to the remaining five items (TE1, TE2, TE3, TE4, TE5).

Table 4 presents the three most robust correlations, indicating that teachers who perceive a substantial educational impact on their students' lives also report job satisfaction. Furthermore, a majority of teachers express a desire to receive feedback from students. Moreover, teachers who report job satisfaction are more likely to cultivate a positive learning environment. Notably, the findings regarding the use of video and audio resources were intriguing, as teachers perceived that such materials can significantly enhance students' educational experiences.

**Table 4. Teaching Environment-item correlation**

|                                                                                                | TE1    | TE2    | TE3   | TE4  | TE5 | TE6 | TE7 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| TE1. All in all, I am satisfied with my job.                                                   |        |        |       |      |     |     |     |
| TE2. I feel that I am making a significant educational difference in the lives of my students. | .712** |        |       |      |     |     |     |
| TE3. Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.                 | .406   | .581** |       |      |     |     |     |
| TE4. If a student from this school needs extra assistance, I can provide it.                   | .034   | -.078  | -.078 |      |     |     |     |
| TE5. I work with individual students.                                                          | .304   | .412   | .315  | .247 |     |     |     |

|                                                                              |       |       |       |       |       |         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|
| TE6. I take care to create a pleasant learning atmosphere.                   | .513* | .373  | .220  | -.011 | .208  |         |
| TE7. I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson. | -.123 | -.174 | -.275 | -.178 | -.107 | -.334   |
| TE8. I use video and audio material in Turkish.                              | .281  | .497* | .393  | .133  | .353  | .363    |
|                                                                              |       |       |       |       |       | -.477** |

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)      \*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

### b. Teaching Technique (TT)

The 14-item teaching techniques groups' dependability exhibits a robust internal consistency, as indicated by a high Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.85. However, a closer examination of item correlations highlighted one item's suboptimal performance relative to others, despite its overall trustworthiness for research purposes. Specifically, the item *"It is better when the teacher—not the student—decides what activities are to be done"* was identified as a weaker contributor and stands in conceptual contrast to student-centred teaching ideologies that emphasise learner participation and shared decision-making. Upon its removal, Cronbach's alpha increased to 0.88. Subsequently, the study proceeded with the remaining 13 items, excluding the aforementioned item.

Analysis presented in Table 5 unveiled significant correlations among pairs of teaching techniques group questionnaire items. Numerous items exhibited moderate correlations, with the most pronounced associations observed between teachers who facilitate question-asking and answering in the students' target language, as well as those who provide instructions in Turkish. Strong correlations were also evident in various areas, including soliciting student input or involvement in designing classroom activities, utilizing word-related visuals or materials, reviewing student assignments, and teachers who possess effective communication skills with students. Moreover, teachers who actively engage in homework assessment, introduce new topics in the class, encourage student input in lesson planning, monitor student progress, use the target language, assign group projects, incorporate Turkish texts reflecting real-life language usage, and employ equitable correction practices demonstrated strong correlations.

To investigate potential demographic variations among groups of teaching environment and teaching techniques items and individual teaching perceptions items in the context of Turkish language learning and teaching, such as teachers' gender, education, training, general teaching experience, and weekend school experience, a series of Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted.

**Table 5. Teaching Techniques-item correlation**

|                                                                                                                                                                | <b>TT1</b>    | <b>TT2</b> | <b>TT3</b>    | <b>TT4</b>    | <b>TT5</b>    | <b>TT6</b>    | <b>TT7</b>    | <b>TT8</b>   | <b>TT9</b>   | <b>TT10</b>   | <b>TT11</b>   | <b>TT12</b>   | <b>TT13</b> | <b>TT14</b> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>TT1.</b> I usually know how to get through to students.                                                                                                     |               |            |               |               |               |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT2.</b> It is better when the teacher – not the student – decides what activities are to be done.                                                          | -.257         |            |               |               |               |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT3.</b> I always use Turkish in the class.                                                                                                                 | .122          | .186       |               |               |               |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT4.</b> I always prepare the teaching material before arriving in the school.                                                                              | .390          | -.067      | .118          |               |               |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT5.</b> I present new topics for the class (lecture-style presentation).                                                                                   | <b>.583**</b> | -.190      | .399          | <b>.500*</b>  |               |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT6.</b> I review with the students the homework they have prepared.                                                                                        | <b>.599**</b> | .048       | .342          | .333          | <b>.637**</b> |               |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT7.</b> I ask my students to suggest or help plan classroom activities or topics.                                                                          | <b>.443*</b>  | -.253      | -.035         | .241          | <b>.558**</b> | <b>.607**</b> |               |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT8.</b> I track the study process.                                                                                                                         | .399          | .130       | .386          | <b>.538**</b> | <b>.634**</b> | <b>.581**</b> | <b>.431*</b>  |              |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT9.</b> I use pictures and objects for my students to make connections between words and the associated objects.                                           | <b>.671**</b> | -.305      | .271          | <b>.573**</b> | <b>.745**</b> | <b>.496*</b>  | <b>.476*</b>  | .413         |              |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT10.</b> I speak the target language and I ask a question and give instructions in Turkish.                                                                | .302          | .031       | <b>.636**</b> | .000          | .378          | <b>.518*</b>  | .088          | .320         | .359         |               |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT11.</b> I assign activities that require a group.                                                                                                         | .362          | .231       | .292          | .309          | .402          | <b>.700**</b> | .283          | .418         | .210         | <b>.483*</b>  |               |               |             |             |
| <b>TT12.</b> I use Turkish texts which accommodate real-life language use.                                                                                     | .372          | -.088      | .359          | .180          | <b>.542**</b> | <b>.715**</b> | <b>.474*</b>  | .383         | <b>.442*</b> | <b>.713**</b> | <b>.674**</b> |               |             |             |
| <b>TT13.</b> I correct the students in a sensible way.                                                                                                         | .340          | .173       | <b>.573**</b> | .000          | .319          | <b>.689**</b> | .099          | .360         | .303         | <b>.889**</b> | <b>.653**</b> | <b>.669**</b> |             |             |
| <b>TT14.</b> I give commands through one word along with gestures such as pointing which provides opportunities for initiating the interaction among students. | .261          | -.024      | .046          | .233          | .219          | .375          | <b>.613**</b> | <b>.495*</b> | .244         | .154          | .237          | .166          | .260        |             |

**\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)**

**\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)**

The findings of the Mann-Whitney  $U$  tests showed that there was no difference in answers between teaching environment and teaching techniques based on gender, education, training, general teaching experience and teaching experience at a weekend school (see Table 6).

**Table 6. Teaching environment and teaching techniques by demographic characteristics**

|                                              |                  | Teaching environment | Teaching technique |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                                | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 58.50                | 50.00              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .89                  | .49                |
| <b>Education</b>                             | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 56.50                | 52.50              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .82                  | .62                |
| <b>Training</b>                              | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 45.50                | 46.50              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .38                  | .42                |
| <b>Teaching experience</b>                   | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 40.50                | 38.00              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .39                  | .31                |
| <b>Teaching experience at weekend school</b> | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 49.00                | 43.00              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .44                  | .25                |

Table 7 shows that teachers' teaching perceptions were not influenced by gender, level of education, teacher training, overall teaching experience, or teaching experience in weekend schools, as all  $p$ -values exceeded .05, indicating no statistically significant differences across any Teaching Perceptions (TP) items.

**Table 7. Teaching perceptions by demographic characteristics**

|                                              |                  | Do you think is it important to teach Turkish to young children in the UK? | Do you think Turkish will benefit the students in the future? | Do you think any certain ideas that can communicate in Turkish not very well in English? | Do you think the weekend schools play a role in the students' language development? |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                                | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 60.000                                                                     | 55.000                                                        | 45.500                                                                                   | 56.000                                                                              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .948                                                                       | .317                                                          | .272                                                                                     | .754                                                                                |
| <b>Education</b>                             | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 50.000                                                                     | 54.000                                                        | 52.500                                                                                   | 55.000                                                                              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .186                                                                       | .273                                                          | .581                                                                                     | .727                                                                                |
| <b>Training</b>                              | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 49.500                                                                     | 54.000                                                        | 46.000                                                                                   | 40.000                                                                              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .228                                                                       | .405                                                          | .352                                                                                     | .190                                                                                |
| <b>Teaching experience</b>                   | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 45.500                                                                     | 49.000                                                        | 30.000                                                                                   | 49.000                                                                              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .323                                                                       | .495                                                          | .077                                                                                     | .794                                                                                |
| <b>Teaching experience at weekend school</b> | Mann-Whitney $U$ | 49.5000                                                                    | 55.000                                                        | 58.000                                                                                   | 35.000                                                                              |
|                                              | $p$ (2-tailed)   | .148                                                                       | .317                                                          | .855                                                                                     | .076                                                                                |

## Results of Interview Data

Following the collection of questionnaire data examining the roles of teaching environment (TE), teaching techniques (TT), and teaching perceptions (TP) in Turkish language instruction, in-depth interviews were conducted with a subset of teachers working in Turkish weekend schools attended by the children of the study participants. Participants were selected purposively from among questionnaire respondents to ensure representation across key themes and response patterns, and interviews were carried out at Turkish weekend schools in London, Manchester, and Nottingham. Microsoft Excel was used solely as a data management tool to organise transcripts and codes, while the analytic decisions and theme development were guided by the principles of thematic analysis outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006). Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework, three primary themes were identified through a systematic process of familiarisation, coding, and theme development; these themes are elaborated in the following sections.

### 1. Theme 1 – Teaching Environment (TE)

The majority of schools lack permanent buildings, opting for rented non-profit facilities. Turkish weekend schools are described as operating voluntarily during weekends or after mainstream school hours, providing limited instructional time mainly centered on Turkish language, culture, and religious studies. Teachers express concerns regarding the insufficiency of the provided curriculum and materials, often resorting to diverse resources to accommodate students' diverse needs and proficiencies.

In the words of one teacher,

"Most of the students do not want to attend the classes on the weekends as the school's attendance is voluntary; they would prefer to take off from the mainstream schools." (T1)

Another respondent noted,

"Schools are run only at the weekend or after mainstream school, and it is only three hours a week as two hours Turkish language and culture and one-hour religious studies." (T3)

Additionally, *"At the same time, we teach Turkish culture."* (T5)

While teachers acknowledged the importance of weekend schools in supporting Turkish language and cultural learning, they consistently highlighted the home language environment as a more influential factor, particularly for students with non-native Turkish-speaking parents. As one teacher observed,

"Some of the students have one non-native Turkish parent. If the student has both native parents, it is easy to practice at home; however, if s/he has one non-native parent, I think they speak English at home, so they do not have a chance to practice." (T3)

This comment highlights teachers' teaching perceptions of the home language environment as a key factor shaping students' opportunities for Turkish language use, particularly in families where English is more dominant due to mixed linguistic backgrounds.

In light of these challenges, teachers' adaptability in generating new content or modifying provided materials becomes crucial. However, even when adhering to the curriculum and resources, students continue to struggle due to language proficiency issues. Consequently, the teaching environment program's viability hinges on the context of weekend schools and their capacity to address age and language proficiency-related challenges.

This study suggests that an effective teaching environment program may be achievable within the framework of weekend schools, and the poor test scores of children may stem from the lack of age-appropriate curriculum and resources suited to their linguistic proficiency levels.

## **2. Theme 2 – Teaching Technique (TT)**

In response to the question of language teaching strategies, resources, and activities, educators provided the following insights:

Teacher T5 expressed,

"Students should expose to the language because of this, I always use Turkish in the classroom and stick some teaching posters in Turkish or provide visual information (PowerPoint, pictures etc.) on the walls."

This statement illustrates a deliberate instructional strategy aimed at increasing students' exposure to Turkish through consistent target-language use and visually rich classroom environments, reflecting teachers' efforts to compensate for limited opportunities for language use outside school.

Teacher T2 articulated,

"Exposure is important to learn a language; however, I consider the students' readiness for the language and then I enrich the learning environment with visual materials. I also provide them with a song or film, or puppet show to teach new vocabulary. The students like role-play activity, crosswords, vocabulary match so an activity by doing students themselves."

This statement highlights teachers' efforts to balance sustained language exposure with sensitivity to learners' readiness, employing multimodal and activity-based strategies to support vocabulary development and engagement.

Teacher T4 stated,

"English is the majority language here, and the students expose to English more than Turkish. Because of this, I use English to teach Turkish by translating one word to Turkish from English. Moreover, teaching poems and songs also play an important role; therefore, the students learn by enjoying and they easily remember short poems and songs."

This reflection underscores how teachers adapt to the dominant English-language environment by integrating translation and culturally engaging materials, such as poems and songs, to facilitate vocabulary retention and make Turkish language learning more enjoyable for students.

Regarding family involvement in language learning, one teacher, T1, mentioned,

"I let the families know about what the student did in the classroom like 'we did this activity today; it would be good for you to do more practice about it at home.' I gave the completed activity sheets to students to take home and show their parents."

This example illustrates teachers' strategies to engage families in supporting language practice at home, reinforcing classroom learning and promoting a collaborative approach between school and home environments.

Another teacher, T2, shared,

"Unfortunately, the learning practice does not move to home because most of the families do not speak Turkish at home. I do not give them homework because they already have homework from their mainstream schools. Even if we do, there is no feedback from the students and families. However, when they learn songs, some of them sing at home and the parents let me know. The problem is for this group of students' one of the parents is a non-native Turkish speaker."

This statement highlights challenges in extending language learning beyond the classroom, particularly in households where Turkish is not actively spoken. It also underscores the limited feasibility of homework as a reinforcement tool and points to songs as one of the few effective strategies for promoting incidental practice at home.

In summary, educators unanimously stressed the importance of language exposure, visual materials, and student engagement in language learning. However, opinions diverged on the effectiveness of promoting family involvement. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged that home environments can significantly impact language acquisition, particularly in households where the target language is regularly practiced, benefiting bilingual children's literacy development in their home setting.

### **3. Theme 3 – Teaching Perceptions (TP)**

In response to inquiries regarding the pedagogical objectives underpinning the instruction of Turkish to bilingual children, the participants articulated their perspectives in the following manner:

Across all participants, a consensus emerged on the overarching aim: the cultivation of Turkish language proficiency and cognitive enrichment. Informant T2 succinctly summarized this aim as the acquisition of

"Turkish language proficiency, concomitant with cognitive enrichment, and the ability to engage in Turkish discourse when interfacing with familial ties during sojourns to Turkey."

This highlights the dual focus on both functional language skills and maintaining familial connections.

Emphasizing the imperative of mother tongue preservation, T5 firmly asserted,

"Turkish represents their indigenous linguistic heritage, and I staunchly advocate its perpetuation."

This underscores teachers' commitment to sustaining students' linguistic identity within a predominantly English-speaking environment.

Moreover, one educator, T1, expounded upon the matter, emphasizing the preservation of cultural and linguistic heritage:

"The fundamental aim resides in the preservation of their cultural and linguistic heritage. As inhabitants within a host-country milieu, conformity to the majority language is obligatory. Nonetheless, it is our presumption that these students should not relinquish their ancestral heritage, in alignment with state policy."

This reflects a recognition of the tension between integration into the host country and the maintenance of the students' ancestral language, aligning with broader policy objectives.

Regarding the dividends of Turkish acquisition for bilingual progeny, educators provided insightful perspectives:

T2 postulated,

"Foremost, their Turkish heritage equips them with the means to sustain their cultural and linguistic identity. Additionally, it facilitates efficacious communication with their kindred domiciled in Turkey. Subsequently, Turkish proficiency significantly contributes to their scholastic achievements and life perspectives."

Here, the teacher connects language proficiency to both cultural continuity and academic and personal development.

T1 opined,

"A command of Turkish engenders a nuanced comprehension of Turkish culture and engenders intergenerational connectivity. Moreover, it equips them to undertake Turkish language examinations at the A-level standard."

This highlights the practical benefits of language learning, linking proficiency to cultural literacy, family engagement, and formal academic achievement.

During face-to-face interviews, teachers underscored the pivotal role of parental involvement in nurturing students' Turkish language proficiency through home-based practice. Concurrently, educators underscored the critical importance of furnishing diverse and intellectually enriching instructional resources for the efficacious pedagogical delivery of the target language.

In summation, the respondents collectively advocated the centrality of language acquisition, asserting that the pedagogical endeavor safeguards linguistic and cultural heritage, augments

cognitive faculties, and fosters meaningful familial communication. Furthermore, they accentuated the manifold academic and practical benefits accruing to students through the acquisition of Turkish proficiency.

### **Integrating the Questionnaire and Interview Findings**

To facilitate a triangulated presentation of data, themes derived from interview analysis, specifically focusing on teachers' teaching environment, teaching techniques, and teaching perceptions, were juxtaposed with findings from the questionnaire analysis. The significance of themes identified in the interview analysis was compared to the elements discerned and extracted from the questionnaires. The resulting data from both methodological components were consolidated in Table 8 to achieve triangulation. Notably, questionnaire responses were used to inform the development of interview questions, consistent with the sequential explanatory mixed-methods design, in which quantitative findings guide the subsequent qualitative inquiry.

Furthermore, it was observed that data obtained from questionnaires and interviews mutually reinforced each other. The subsequent discussion, which contrasts these results, illustrates this synergy. Interviewees consistently expressed reservations about the effectiveness of the teaching environment, highlighting challenges such as limited instructional time, classroom management difficulties, and resource constraints. This contrasts with the questionnaire results, which suggested that teachers were generally satisfied with their jobs and work settings. The discrepancy points to an important tension: while teachers may feel content with their overall professional role, they simultaneously perceive structural and pedagogical limitations that may impede optimal language instruction. Teachers frequently employed the Turkish language in their classrooms for instructional purposes, citing efficiency as a primary motivator. Additionally, they displayed adaptability by creating or modifying materials to align with students' prior knowledge when teaching language. According to the teachers, Turkish weekend schools played a vital role in students' lives and in fostering proficiency in the Turkish language, impacting areas such as students' performance in A-level exams, family communication, and bilingualism. However, they also tended to emphasize the importance of the home linguistic environment, suggesting that schools alone may not suffice for acquiring and sustaining proficiency in the target language.

**Table 8. Integrating questionnaire (factors) and interview (themes) findings**

| Questionnaire findings (factors/statements) |                                                                                                                                                   | Interview findings (Themes)                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Teachers' teaching environment</b>       | All in all, I am satisfied with my job.                                                                                                           | Classes<br>Time<br>Curriculum<br>Language environment                                                                                  |
|                                             | I feel that I am making a significant educational difference in the lives of my students.                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | Most teachers in this school are interested in what students have to say.                                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | If a student from this school needs extra assistance, I can provide it.                                                                           |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I work with individual students.                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I take care to create a pleasant learning atmosphere.                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I lose quite a lot of time because of students interrupting the lesson.                                                                           |                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Teachers' teaching technique</b>         | I use video and audio material in Turkish.                                                                                                        | Using target language<br>Teaching technique<br>Teaching strategy<br>Books<br>Materials<br>Activities<br>Homework<br>Family interaction |
|                                             | I usually know how to get through to students.                                                                                                    |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | It is better when the teacher – not the student – decides what activities are to be done.                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I always use Turkish in the class.                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I always prepare the teaching material before arriving at the school.                                                                             |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I present new topics for the class (lecture-style presentation).                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I review with the students the homework they have prepared.                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I ask my students to suggest or help plan classroom activities or topics.                                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I track the study process.                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I use pictures and objects for my students to make connections between words and the associated objects.                                          |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I speak the target language and I ask a question and give instructions in Turkish.                                                                |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I assign activities that require a group.                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I use Turkish texts which accommodate real-life language use.                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | I correct the students in a sensible way.                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Teaching perception</b>                  | I give commands through one word along with gestures such as pointing which provides opportunities for initiating the interaction among students. | Importance of teaching Turkish<br>Aim of teaching Turkish<br>Benefit of learning Turkish                                               |
|                                             | Do you think is it important to teach Turkish to young children in the UK?                                                                        |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | Do you think Turkish will benefit the students in the future?                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | Do you think any certain ideas that can only communicate in Turkish not very well in English?                                                     |                                                                                                                                        |
|                                             | Do you think the weekend schools play a role in the students' language development?                                                               |                                                                                                                                        |

## Discussion

This study sought to investigate the attributes of Turkish weekend schools in the UK, concentrating on educators' classroom environments, instructional methodologies, and perceptions of Turkish as a legacy language. The results highlight areas that demand for more critical thought while also providing insight into how these schools function pedagogically and ideologically within a community-based educational setting.

The findings show that demographic factors like gender, educational background, or teaching experience did not systematically affect teachers' teaching environments, methods, or perceptions. Despite the fact that teachers' ages, career paths, and disciplinary training varied, there were no discernible trends in the way they taught. This research implies that the structural conditions of heritage language teaching, such as low institutional regulation, part-time availability, and community expectations, have a greater influence on instructional approaches in Turkish weekend schools than individual teacher qualities. Similar trends have been noted at heritage language schools around the world, where instructors frequently enter the profession through non-linear pathways and rely more on their own experience than on formal training tailored to legacy languages (Cruickshank, Lo Bianco, & Wahlin, 2024).

There appears to be an increasing need for Turkish language instructors in the UK. The current study does not offer quantitative data to support a definite rise in demand at the national level, even though participants did indicate rising enrolments and ongoing parental interest. Therefore, rather than being a recorded trend, this assertion should be understood cautiously and reframed as an observed perception among teachers. To verify whether the demand for Turkish language instruction in the UK is actually rising, more research utilising enrolment information, staffing data, or policy documents would be required.

Despite the fact that students mostly utilise English in their daily lives, teachers used Turkish as the primary language of teaching in the classroom. The majority of the instruction focused on vocabulary and grammar, frequently using translation and bilingual techniques to enhance comprehension. According to recent research, code-switching and translanguaging are popular and useful techniques in legacy language classrooms. These activities are a practical response to learners' bilingual acquisitions (Mashala & Sanders, 2025). However, teachers were frequently forced to modify or create their own resources because to the lack of availability to heritage-specific teaching materials. In heritage language settings, where curricula are

frequently adapted from foreign language models rather than created for bilingual learners, this problem has been extensively documented (Lubińska, 2024).

Comparing the results with state-sponsored heritage language models in other European nations allows for additional contextualisation. For instance, in a number of federal states in Germany, legacy language instruction (*Herkunftssprachlicher Unterricht*) is included into the public education system with standardised curricula, qualified teachers, and official acknowledgement of pupils' linguistic proficiency (Hassani et al., 2025). In a similar vein, state-funded mother language instruction (*modersmålsundervisning*) in Sweden is clearly positioned to promote both social inclusion and academic success (Alisaari et al., 2023). Turkish weekend schools in the UK function primarily outside of the state system, depending on volunteer or semi-professional teaching staff and community effort, in contrast to these models. This comparison demonstrates how the UK's lack of consistent governmental funding limits prospects for professionalisation and curriculum development while placing more responsibility on educators and families (Cruickshank, Lo Bianco, & Wahlin, 2024).

The linguistic and cultural diversity of the Turkish-speaking community in the UK, especially the existence of Cypriot Turkish groups, is a significant aspect that has surfaced but still needs more attention. Numerous Turkish-speaking families in the UK have ties to Cyprus, and Cypriot Turkish dialects are distinct from Turkish standard Turkish in terms of language, culture, and history (Evripidou & Çavuşoğlu, 2015). A tendency towards favouring a standardised form of Turkish is suggested by the lack of clear allusions to Cypriot Turkish in curricula or classroom procedures. This calls into question the degree to which students' home variety and identities are acknowledged and appreciated, as well as linguistic representation and diversity within weekend schools (Çiftci, 2024). In line with recent research highlighting internal variability within legacy language communities, addressing this factor would help develop a more nuanced understanding of heritage language teaching in the UK.

Teachers' teaching perspectives on Turkish weekend schools were overwhelmingly positive, with participants emphasising their importance in language preservation, cultural transmission, and identity development. Strong ties between the home, school, and community are necessary for successful language maintenance, according to findings from international heritage language research (Fatima & Nadeem, 2025). Family engagement was consistently seen as crucial. Teachers did, however, also voice concerns about institutional constraints, such as

irregular attendance, constrained class time, and a dearth of chances for professional development specific to legacy language education (Cruickshank, Lo Bianco, & Wahlin, 2024).

Finally, the involvement of the Turkish Ministry of National Education (MoNE) and its curriculum deserves more examination. Although MoNE offers curriculum direction and materials for Turkish weekend schools overseas, the majority of these resources are created using a national framework that is centred on Turkey (MoNE, 2019). To varied degrees, teachers in this study adhered to the curriculum, frequently modifying it to fit the needs of the classroom. It is still unclear, though, how much the curriculum fosters pupils' sense of belonging in the UK setting rather than just strengthening their emotional and symbolic connections to Turkey. Since national identification and patriotism play a major role in Turkish education policy, it is crucial to take into account how these ideological orientations are replicated, negotiated, or reinterpreted in diaspora situations (Lubińska, 2024). From the standpoint of heritage language education, curriculum that strike a balance between acknowledging students' lived experiences in the UK and their ties to their place of origin may be more successful in fostering the formation of multilingual identities.

Overall, the data indicate that Turkish weekend schools in the United Kingdom operate as community-driven places with flexible teaching techniques, strong cultural orientations, and limited institutional backing. While broader structural, ideological, and sociolinguistic elements are crucial, demographic characteristics do not seem to have a substantial impact on teaching environments or perceptions. Research and practice in this area would be further strengthened by further involvement with comparative international models, internal community diversity, and the ideological aspects of curriculum design.

## **Conclusion**

The current investigation scrutinized Turkish weekend schools in the UK, analyzing their policies, characteristics, and teachers' teaching perspectives on the instructional environment and techniques. These findings offer valuable insights for educators to assess classroom dynamics and teaching methods, accounting for crucial elements. Notably, despite earnest efforts, this study did not encompass all Turkish weekend school teachers in the UK.

Weekend schools primarily aim to impart language, culture, and religious education. The results revealed a predominant focus on language instruction, with the possibility of a more

comprehensive examination in subsequent studies. This mixed methods approach fosters a deeper understanding of the weekend schools' role in heritage language education. Despite its limitations, this study's outcomes align with prior literature, highlighting the prevalence of Turkish language instruction for foreign learners rather than heritage language instruction for bilingual children due to a dearth of research in this area.

## **Acknowledgements**

## **Disclosure statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## **Funding**

The authors report there are no competing funding to declare.

## **Data available statement**

Due to ethical considerations and to protect participant confidentiality, the dataset is not publicly available. However, anonymized data may be made available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and subject to appropriate ethical approvals and data-sharing agreements.

## **References**

- Abdelrazak, M. (2001). *Towards More Effective Supplementary and Mother-tongue Schools: (in England)* (Second Edi). Resource Unit for supplementary and mother-tongue schools.
- Alisaari, J., Møller Daugaard, L., Dewilde, J., Harju-Autti, R., Heikkola, L. M., Iversen, J. Y., Kekki, N., Pesonen, S., Reath Warren, A., Straszer, B., & Yli-Jokipii, M. (2023). Mother tongue education in four Nordic countries - problem, right or resource?. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 17(2), 52-72. <https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.113671>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Cohen Yanarocak, H. E. (2024). The role of the official ceremonies and hidden curriculum on Atatürkism's socialization and indoctrination in Turkish schools (1980–2002). *Turkish Studies*, 25(5), 937–961. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2024.2374327>

- Cruikshank, K., Lo Bianco, J., & Wahlin, M. (Eds.). (2024). *Community and heritage language schools: Transforming education—Research, challenges, and teaching practices*. Routledge.
- Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2014). Functions of Turkish complementary schools in the UK: Official vs. insider discourses. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(3). <https://doi.org/10.15700/201409161043>
- Çiftci, A. (2024). How Turkish supplementary schools in the UK boost vocabulary in bilingual children (ages 4–8). *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2024.2393712>
- Evripidou, D. & Çavuşoğlu, Ç. (2015). Turkish Cypriots' Language Attitudes: The Case of Cypriot Turkish and Standard Turkish in Cyprus. *Mediterranean Language Review*, 22, 119–138. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/medilangrevi.22.2015.0119>
- Fatima, S., & Nadeem, M. U. (2025). Family language policy and heritage language transmission in Pakistan-the intersection of family dynamics, ethnic identity and cultural practices on language proficiency and maintenance. *Frontiers in psychology*, 16, 1560755. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1560755>
- From, T., Platzgummer, V., Laihonen, P., Sahlström, F., & Szabó, T. P. (2024). Spatial ideologies on official bilingualism and co-located schools in Finland and South Tyrol, Italy. *Language and Education*, 38(6), 1027–1043. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2362908>
- Hassani, S., Zupan, K., Vaughn, M., & Schwab, S. (2025). Teachers' perspectives towards German language learning for multilingual pupils in pull-out classes. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2480797>
- Lubińska, D. (2024). Aiming high in heritage language education: the case of *de jure* policy for complementary Polish State Schools abroad. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 27(3), 427–442. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2023.2213373>
- Martin, P., Creese, A., & Bhatt, A. B. (2004). *Final Report on Complementary Schools and their Communities in Leicester*.

- Martin, Peter, Bhatt, A., Bhojani, N., & Creese, A. (2006). Managing bilingual interaction in a Gujarati complementary school in Leicester. *Language and Education*, 20(1), 5–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780608668707>
- Mashala, M., & Sanders, D. A. (2025). The use of translanguaging to support the teaching of literacy: intermediate phase teachers' perceptions. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2025.2502949>
- Maylor, U., Rose, A., Minty, S., Ross, A., Issa, T., & Kuyok, K. A. (2013). Exploring the impact of supplementary schools on Black and Minority Ethnic pupils' mainstream attainment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 107–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.614689>
- McLelland, N. (2018). The history of language learning and teaching in Britain. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(1), 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2017.1382052>
- MEBLEM. (2019). *Turkey Education Consultancy in London-The List of the Supplementary Schools*. Turkey Education Consultancy in London.
- Mete, F. (2012). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Dede Korkut Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(1), 102–125.
- Mete, F., & Gürsoy, Ü. (2013). Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretiminde Öğretmen Yeterliklerine İlişkin Görüşler. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 28(28–3), 343–356.
- MoNE. (2019). *Appointment of Instructors and Teachers Abroad*.
- Mulvey, N. (2016). Constructions Of Heritage In Japanese As A Heritage Language Schools In England. *Papers from the Education Doctoral Research Conference 2015*, 77–85.
- National Resource Centre for Supplementary Education (NRCSE). (2019). <http://www.supplementaryeducation.org.uk>
- Ofsted. (2008). *Every language matters: An evaluation of the extent and impact of initial training to teach a wider range of world languages*.

- Otcu, B. (2010). Heritage Language Maintenance and Cultural Identity Formation: The Case of a Turkish Saturday School in New York City. *Heritage Language Journal*, 7(2), 112–137.
- Pérez-Guilarte, Y., Gusman, I., & Lois González, R. C. (2023). Understanding the Significance of Cultural Heritage in Society from Preschool: An Educational Practice with Student Teachers. *Heritage*, 6(9), 6172-6188. <https://doi.org/10.3390/heritage6090324>
- Tiryakiol, S. (2023). Turkish Heritage Language Programs for Immigrant Children in the United States: The Current State and Opportunities. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*(34), 457-471. <https://doi.org/10.29000/rumelide.1316209>

#### **Appendix An example of thematic analysis of interview transcription**

Çocuklar öğrendiklerini nasıl gösteriyorlar, bunu fark edebiliyor musunuz çocuklarda?

Çok kısa vadede bunu bazen alamıyoruz. Çünkü bazı gruplarımızda çocuklar sadece sınıfta öğrendiklerini kullanıyorlar, evde Türkçe konuşulmadığı için, ya da Türkçeyle ilgili bir yaşantı olmadığı için film izleme anlamında olsun televizyon anlamında olsun, arkadaş grubu olarak da genellikle Manchester bölgesinde aileler dağınık yaşadığı için çocukların Türkçe konuşabilecek akran grupları da yok. Genellikle çocukların öğrendikleri sınıf ortamında kalıyor biliyorsunuz okullar da çocukların ödevleri olduğu için çok fazla biz ev çalışması da vermiyoruz. Verdiğimiz zamanda zaten çok fazla dönüt geri alamıyoruz. O noktada sınıfta öğrenilen ne kadar ilgi çekiciye sınıfta kalıyor. Bir şekilde biz bu sınıftaki öğrenmeyi, sınıftaki süreyi verimli kullanmaya çalışıyoruz. Ama zaman geçtikçe çocukların tepkilerinden kurdukları cümlelerden kullandıkları kelimelerden epeyce yol katettiğimizi görüyoruz. Özellikle şarkılar söylendiği zaman, aileler söylüyorlar, evlerde de çocuklar şarkıları kullanıyorlar. Genellikle velilerden daha çok geri bildirim alıyorum. Yani ben çocukların evlerde ne yaptığı Türkçeyle olan iletişimi konusunda bizim diğer sıkıntımız da ebeveynlerin bir tanesinin genellikle yabancı olması bu nedenle Türkçe konuşulmaması ama süreç ilerledikçe çocuklardan olumlu gelişmeleri görebiliyoruz, sezebiliyoruz.

Teachers' teaching perceptions

Teachers' teaching technique

Teacher's teaching environment and Teaching perception