In this paper we want to ask attention for the position of second- and third-generation pupils from Turkish parents in Dutch secondary education. The focus will be on the role of culture related values imbued in Dutch education and their role in identity construction – from a Dutch and from a Turkish perspective. In what way contributes intercultural/interreligious education for these students to the creation of a ‘brave space’?

Turkey and the Netherlands
First we describe the general background of both countries, especially the religious and cultural backgrounds and the impact of immigration of Turkish people in the Netherlands since the 1960s. Turkey (officially the Republic of Turkey) is a transcontinental country in Eurasia, mainly in Anatolia in Western Asia with a smaller portion on the in Southeast Europe (Turkey, 2017). Turkey, geographically and culturally a blend of East and West, is a secular country in the world where approximately 98 percent of the population is Muslim.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founded the state of the Turkish Republic in 1923 after the Ottoman Empire. “Atatürk” means the father of Turkish people. Atatürk, who was Turkey’s first president, envisaged a modern Turkish state. His reforms strictly enacted and he is the central figure in all the development of modern Turkey. The secular ideology and Westernizing reforms of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk has changed and modernized Turkey.

After 1923, civilization of the modern Turkish society was gradually put into practice. Abrogation of sultanas’ rule in 1924, adoption of secularism, unification of education, acceptance of the principle of equality by the constitution have constructed the infrastructure for improving women rights. In 1928, the country was proclaimed a secular state with a Western-style constitution. The Islamic courts and religious schools were abolished and a Latin- based alphabet replaced Arabic and Persian ones. Abolition of veil under the dress reform in 1925 and the adoption of Civil Code in 1926 reinforced the egalitarian legal framework. Atatürk adopted legal codes used in Germany, Italy and Switzerland and abolished the traditional Muslim governing body, the caliphate. The Turkish Republic is founded on secular principles. In line with these, women were included in the first census in 1927. On the other hand, women were donated with equal rights and opportunities as men, in education and employment after the adoption of the new Turkish alphabet and the new education campaign. They participated to the first municipality elections in 1930 and gained the right of representation in the parliament in 1934 elections.

From a comparative perspective the right of women to vote in general elections was won by the women of Australia in 1902, Finland in 1906, Norway in 1913, Soviet Union in 1917, Great Britain in 1918, United States in 1920. Women living in the Gulf States and some Arab nations still have not been able to win this right (Sağlam, 2005). Thus, concrete steps were taken in providing social and political rights to women, as men, for ameliorating their status in the society.
Mustafa Kemal Atatürk gave women equal social and political rights with men. Turkish women entered education, employment and other public domains of life increasing numbers since then (Atay and Çetin, 2015). There is a positive correlation between women’s education and their employment (Özkanlı 2001, 131).

The participation of women in working life in the world determines the structure of labor markets, employment policies, education investments, legal structure that regulate working life and cultural conditions. The lack of adequate education investments in developing countries causes women to be seen as substitute labor in working life. Those words of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk in his speech in 1923 proves the determination of his policies (Atatürk, 1969:700):

“One must believe that, everything we see on the world is a work of woman…If a society satisfies with the fulfillment of one of its components’ contemporaneous needs, then it is more likely that it weakens. Thus, a society must consider this as a starting point if it wants to develop and modernize…Our women will be scientists and pass through all education steps as well as men. Then, walking together with men in social life, they will help and support each other.”

Higher education right to Turkish women was first given in Constitutional Monarchy period (Kurnaz, 1996: 101-107). On February 5, 1914, Darülfünun (this word stands for University and means ‘House of Science’ in Turkish) started to accept girls (Ergün, 1978:441, Spuler, 1975: 428-439). In 1933, Darülfünun was closed with “University Reform” and instead Istanbul University was established. Then many universities were established in Turkey. Since 1993, there has been a significant increase in the number and share of women teaching staff (Özkanlı 2006).

Women were admitted to the academic professions for the first time in 1932, but their larger scale recruitment started in 1940s (Köker, 1988). Since 1993, there has been a significant increase in the number and share of women teaching staff in Turkey. Currently, Turkey has 177 Higher Education Institutions (HEI) - 112 public and 65 foundation universities. Today, 42, 6 % of all academic personnel in the universities are women. Their representation as full professors is 31.8%, associate professors 31.7%, assistant professors 37.15 and research assistants 47% in 2018 (http://www.dbp.gov.tr/tr-tr/istatistikler/kamu-personeli-istatistikleri_06.09.2018).

These percentages are impressive when compared with the other countries in the world. During the Republic, women saved and developed their university education, academic promotion and appointment to managerial ranks rights.

Various historical, social and cultural factors may explain the high representation of Turkish women in academic positions; they were supported to advance to senior academia. Women entered academic employment through a set of principles-secularism, republicanism, populism, statism, reformism and nationalism- introduced by Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (Healy et al., 2005, p.p. 252-253). Zeytinoglu (1999) and Kandiyoti (1997) noted that academic careers were historically and socially constructed and gender typed as “safe” and “proper” choices for graduate women in Turkey. Women were encouraged to take up professional employment, as opposed to entrepreneurial or commercial careers, that was considered harmonious with the potent image of “a respectful Turkish woman”. This ideology effectively demarcated women’s careers in “safe”, “secure” and “esteemed” forms of professional employment (Healy et al., 2005, p.253).
The Netherlands began to face a labor shortage by the mid-1950s, which became more serious during the early 1960s. The first Turkish immigrants arrived in the Netherlands in the beginning of the 1960s. On 19 August 1964, the Dutch government entered into a Recruitment Agreement with Turkey. Thereafter, the number of Turkish workers in the Netherlands increased rapidly. In May 1968, new European Economic Community rules forced the Netherlands to instate a travel visa system to regulate labor immigration and from then on the state recruited foreign workers. Some population figures: in 1970 20,615 Turkish laborers had a working permit in the Netherlands (amongst the entire 80,000 guest workers from Mediterranean countries).

Due to the 1973 oil crisis the Den Uyl cabinet ended labor immigration in 1974, and Turkish remigration strongly decreased. A system of family reunification had been arranged in the 1960s and gradually Turkish workers after 1974 brought over their wife and children. The latter predominately married partners from Turkey. The initial idea in the Netherlands was that the immigrants were just temporarily in the Netherlands, to return to Turkey when the need for laborers was ending. This appeared to work out quite differently, as we will see later on. Many Turkish immigrants gained a residence permit, for instance in 1974 60,000 Turkish people resided in the Netherlands. However, due to the two oil crises the jobs for Turkish and other immigrant workers declined hugely, so many Turkish men became unemployed. The Turkish families became both nationalities so a return to Turkey was still a possibility and real opportunity, in the idea of Dutch politicians at least. In the late 90s the working conditions rise again, and therefore also the unemployment amongst Turkish immigrants declined. Then more family unification again took place. For instance, in 1996 271,500 Turkish people resided in the Netherlands (Statistics Netherlands 2016).

Realizing the Turkish and other often Islamic immigrants were going to stay in the Netherlands, a less friendly position also arises in right-wing Dutch politics. This was linked to the Christian background of the Netherlands and the Islamic background of Turkish immigrants. In the early twenty-first century the second Balkenende cabinet imposed much stricter conditions on unification, to a large extent ending Turkish marriage immigration. This coincided with a drop of birth rates, leading to a gradual leveling off in the growth of people of Turkish descent. Since 2003, there have often been years with an emigration surplus. Still the amount of Turkish people in the Netherlands is growing, in 2016 397,400 Turkish people live in the Netherlands (204,700 men and 192,700 women, 115,400 under the age of 20, 259,600 between 20 and 65, and 22,400 over 65 years old). The total population of the Netherlands is 17,066,700 in 2016, so the Turkish population is 2.3 percent.

Turkish immigrants first began to settle in big cities in the Netherlands such as Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague, as well as regions like Twente and Limburg where there was a growing demand on industrial labor. However, not only the capital cities but also medium-sized cities and small villages attracted the Turkish people. In 2018 especially in the large cities the secondary schools have a very multicultural population, and therefore we think it is important to look into the consequences of this for children of a Turkish background. Therefore, we now will focus on the values of both countries.

**Cultural values in the Netherlands and in Turkey**
Geert Hofstede has defined “culture” as “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others” (2001). Based on this definition Hofstede focused the national values and identified dimensions of “power distance”, “individualism”, “masculinity”, and “uncertainty avoidance” for comparing cultures. Later on the
“long term orientation” and “indulgence” dimensions were added to national values (Hofstede, 2017; World Values Survey, 2017).

Power distance (Low & High) is defined as “the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally”. Individualism (reverse is Collectivism) is the “degree to which people in a society are integrated into groups”. Masculinity (reverse is Femininity) refers “a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material rewards for success”. Uncertainty avoidance (Low & High) is defined as “a society's tolerance for ambiguity”. Long term orientation (reverse is Short Term) links to the connection of the past with the current and future actions/challenges. Indulgence (reverse is Restraint) represents “a society that allows relatively free gratification of basic and natural human desires related to enjoying life and having fun” (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, 2017; World Values Survey, 2017).
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**Figure 1:** The cultural dimension scores of Turkey & Netherlands

In 1980, Hofstede conducted a large international research on work values amongst 72 countries, and in 2001 he added ten more countries. With this study he proposed that a culture of an organization is a “collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group from another” (1980, p.13). He identified five universal values occurring to varying degrees in each country: individualism, masculinity, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation. His study can be regarded as the dominant culture paradigm in business studies.

In our article we will use his values for the two countries we combine in our study; the Netherlands and Turkey. First, we will describe the outcomes of the values studied in the mentioned Hofstede survey. Second, we will elaborate on this national values by zooming into the specific encounter of these values in Dutch secondary schools. Especially values are regarded as basic characteristics for clashes when people of different nations, and thus different cultures, meet each other, which is the case in many schools in the Netherlands nowadays. We will describe the figures of this situation in the Netherlands and will look into the effect at value level deeper by entering our data of a qualitative pilot interview with a Turkish teacher at a Dutch secondary school. We will conclude with recommendations to focus on these value differences as a challenge to overcome
the gap between Turkish and Dutch children on secondary schools by introducing specific religious education strategies directed towards this focus.

In this part we will present the different values while comparing the Netherlands and Turkey. The first dimension is “Power Distance”, which deals with the fact that all individuals in societies are not equal, it expresses the attitude of the culture towards these inequalities amongst us. He defines it as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. The Netherlands scores low on this dimension, which means that the following characterizes the Dutch style: being independent, hierarchy for convenience only, equal rights, superiors accessible, coaching leader, management facilitates and empowers. Power is decentralized and managers count on the experience of their team members. Employees expect to be consulted. Control is disliked and attitude towards managers are informal and on first name basis. Communication is direct and participative. Turkey scores high on this dimension which means that the following characterizes the Turkish style: Dependent, hierarchical, superiors often inaccessible and the ideal boss is a father figure. Power is centralized and managers rely on their bosses and on rules. Employees expect to be told what to do. Control is expected and attitude towards managers is formal. Communication is indirect and the information flow is selective. The same structure can be observed in the family unit, where the father is a kind of patriarch to whom others submit.

Turkish and Dutch cultural differences have been extensively documented in both cross-cultural managements in the workplace (Hofstede, 1991, 2005; Adler, 2008; House et.al., 2005) “Power Distance” cultural dimension deals with the role of authority within a society, or the extent to which less powerful members of organizations accept an unequal distribution of power. This can be defined as the degree of inequality among people that the population of that country accepts as normal. In a relatively high PDI country like Turkey, people accept differences in power, or inequality, more willingly and therefore have more hierarchical tendencies. In a low PDI country such as the Netherlands, people do not accept differences in power as willingly and have more egalitarian tendencies (Hofstede, 1991). The PDI score of Turkey is 66. In Turkish culture more hierarchical workplace, less equality of gender roles, larger gaps: compensation/ authority/ respect, acquired professional status are five important dimensions of PDI. However, in Dutch culture, more egalitarian workplace, more equality of gender roles, smaller gaps: compensation/ authority/ respect, achieved professional status are the five important dimensions of PDI. The PDI score of Netherland is 38.

Individualism points to the degree of interdependence a society maintains amongst its members. It has to do with whether people’s self-image is defined in terms of ‘I’ or ‘we’. In individualist societies people are supposed to look after themselves and their direct family only. In collectivist societies people belong to ‘in groups’ that take care of them in exchange for loyalty. The Netherlands scores very high on this dimension. This means that there is a high preference for a loosely-knit social framework in which individuals are expected to take care of themselves and their immediate families only. In Individualist societies offence causes guilt and a loss of self-esteem, the employer/employee relationship is a contract based on mutual advantage, hiring and promotion decisions are supposed to be based on merit only, and management is the management of individuals.
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1 www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison
Turkey is a collectivistic society. This means that the “We” is important, people belong to in-groups (families, clans or organizations) who look after each other in exchange for loyalty. Communication is indirect and the harmony of the group has to be maintained, open conflicts are avoided. The relationship has a moral base and this always has priority over task fulfillment. Time must be invested initially to establish a relationship of trust. Nepotism may be found more often. Feedback is always indirect, also in the business environment.

A high score on “Masculinity” indicates that the society will be driven by competition, achievement and success, with success being defined by the winner/best in field. This is a value field that starts in school and continues throughout organizational life. A low score, which means a high score on “Femininity”, means that the dominant values in society are caring for others and quality of life. A feminine society is one where equality of life is the sign of success and standing out from the crowd is not admirable. The fundamental issue here is what motivates people, wanting to be the best (masculine) or liking what you do (feminine).

The Netherlands scores low on masculinity and is therefore a feminine society. In these, it is important to keep the life/work balance and you make sure that all are included. An effective manager is supportive to his/her people, and decision making is achieved through involvement. Managers strive for consensus and people value equality, solidarity and quality in their working lives. Conflicts are resolved by compromise and negotiation and Dutch are known for their long discussions until consensus has been reached.

Turkey scores 45 and is on the Feminine side of the scale. This means that the softer aspects of culture such as leveling with others, consensus, sympathy for the underdog are valued and encouraged. Conflicts are avoided in private and work life and consensus at the end is important. Leisure time is important for Turkish people, it is the time when the whole family and friends come together to enjoy life. Status is shown, but this comes more out of the high PDI.

The dimension “Uncertainty Avoidance” has to do with the way that a society deals with the fact that the future can never be known: should we try to control the future or just let it happen? This ambiguity brings with it anxiety and different cultures have learnt to deal with this anxiety in different ways. The extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid these is reflected in the score on Uncertainty Avoidance.

Turkey scores 85 on this dimension and thus there is a huge need for laws and rules. In order to minimize anxiety, people make use of a lot of rituals. For foreigners they might seem religious, with the many references to “Allah”, but often they are just traditional social patterns, used in specific situations to ease tension.

The Netherlands scores 53 on this dimension and thus exhibits a slight preference for avoiding uncertainty. Countries exhibiting high Uncertainty Avoidance maintain rigid codes of belief and behavior and are intolerant of unorthodox behavior and ideas. In these cultures, there is an emotional need for rules (even if the rules never seem to work) time is money, people have an
inner urge to be busy and work hard, precision and punctuality are the norm, innovation may be resisted, security is an important element in individual motivation.

So, this fourth dimension describes how every society has to maintain some links with its own past while dealing with the challenges of the present and future, and societies priorities these two existential goals differently. Normative societies, which score low on this dimension, for example, prefer to maintain time-honored traditions and norms while viewing societal change with suspicion. Those with a culture which scores high, on the other hand, take a more pragmatic approach: they encourage thrift and efforts in modern education as a way to prepare for the future. Turkey’s intermediate score of 46 is in the middle of the scale so no dominant cultural preference can be inferred. The Netherlands receives a high score of 67 in this dimension, which means that it has a pragmatic nature. In societies with a pragmatic orientation, people believe that truth depends very much on the situation, context and time. They show an ability to easily adapt traditions to changed conditions, a strong propensity to save and invest, thriftiness and perseverance in achieving results.

One challenge that confronts humanity, now and in the past, is the degree to which small children are socialized. Without socialization we do not become “human”. This dimension is defined as the extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses, based on the way they were raised. Relatively weak control is called “Indulgence” and relatively strong control is called “Restraint”. Cultures can, therefore, be described as Indulgent or Restrained.

With an intermediate score of 49, a characteristic corresponding to this dimension cannot be determined for Turkey. With a high score of 68, the culture of the Netherlands is clearly one of “Indulgence”. People in societies classified by a high score in “Indulgence” generally exhibit a willingness to realize their impulses and desires with regard to enjoying life and having fun. They possess a positive attitude and have a tendency towards optimism. In addition, they place a higher degree of importance on leisure time, act as they please and spend money as they wish.

Let us consider these differences in values between the two countries chosen. Because Turkey is a transcontinental country, its cultural values are charmed by incompatible European and Asian cultural values. Based on the Hofstede studies as described, Turkey, when comparing to the Netherlands, is categorized as high in power distance, collectivistic, masculine, high in uncertainty avoidance, and no preferences in both of orientation and indulgence dimensions of cultural values.

**Schools in the Netherlands**

In 2016, 1.443.100 pupils populate Dutch primary schools. 355.500 of them are foreign and 42.000 Turkish. On secondary schools, 1.472.000 pupils get their education. Of these, 351.000 are foreign and of which 50.800 are Turkish. The numbers for high schools are 442.600 students, of these 117.845 are foreign and 12.100 Turkish. At universities 261.200 students reside of which 83.900 are foreign and 4.200 Turkish.
The Netherlands has its origin in Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, but nowadays there are high percentages for the Christian religion (40%), for no religion (49%), and much lower percentages for Muslim (5%), Hindu (0.5%), Buddhist (0.5%) and ‘other religion’ (5%).

When we look at the religious background of schools, most of the 655 secondary schools are confessional, being either Roman Catholic (153) or Protestant (133), with 184 public schools and 185 other non-public schools (Statistics Netherlands, 2016). These are quite remarkable figures, considering the distribution of religions amongst the population of the schools.

Empirical Research
These results from the large Hofstede survey are interesting to look into when thinking about the consequences of Turkish children in Dutch classrooms. This is not easy to conduct research on, for many reasons amongst which the accessibility of the respondents and the precarious nature of such a topic in the Netherlands in this time. So, we started with a very small pilot study that was accessible. Therefore, we have conducted an interview with a Turkish teacher who lives and works in the Netherlands to discuss these cultural values and the experience with it, being in the Netherlands as a Turkish-cultural originated person. Where do the values clash, where do they transform, where do they fit?

The teacher is a woman of 48 years old, living in the Netherlands since her 3rd. Her parents had ‘worker’ in their passport, her father was a labor worker. In her youth she always heard ‘you will leave our country in a few years’, but she herself decided quickly she was not likely going to do that. Her peers were Dutch children and she got used to the Dutch way of living, although she admits she felt unsafe because of the suggestions of others that ‘they were to leave’. In her rooting in the Netherlands her faith was very important. “We is important when you enter discussions at school. In the Netherlands it is often ‘every man for himself’ and I miss the warmth I am used to from my family and background”. Rules are more important in the Netherlands than in my family and birth-country, and also the idea to have to achieve results is something new to her, and she sees these aspects in her Turkish pupils as well when she compares them with autochthonous Dutch pupils. Dutch people, like her colleagues, are more directly in communication.

With data like this we hope to get more information on where values still differ amongst second and third generation Turkish pupils and will work on educational programs to enter especially those values into a dialogue so there grows more understanding to both sides, and hindering differences resulting in social inequality will decrease in the future.

Religious Education to Overcome the Value Clash
At the end of this article we like to reconsider the implications the described differences in the values between Turkish and Dutch people might have in the classroom of secondary schools. We will hope to overcome the gap and start a genuine intracultural dialogue in RE-classes to focus on this issue in multicultural classrooms.

Activating exercises like creating an interreligious passport or doing Bibliodrama helps pupils to discover their own core values and to really learn about, from, into and even through the values of
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their fellow-pupils. This will add to overcoming the gap between the Turkish and Dutch values, and we hope to do more research on this topic in the near future.
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