Addressing the Issue of Standardization through Bidialectalism in Kurdistan, Iraq
Ass.lec. Jiyar Othman Hamadamin
College of Languages/ Salahaddin University-Erbil

معالجة مشكلة اللغة المعيارية (الرسمية) للغة الكوردية في كوردستان العراق بواسطة طريقة Bidialectalism في كردستان العراق

م.م. زيار عثمان حمدامين

كلية اللغات/ جامعة صلاح الدين– أربيل

الملخص

في بعض الدول حول العالم، تحديد ماهية اللغة أو اللهجة التي ينبغي أنْ تستخدم كوسيلة اتصال في العملية التربوية في المدارس قضية رئيسة. اليوم في إقليم كردستان العراق، أصبحت قضية اللهجة (السورانية أو الكرمانجية) التي يجب أن تكون وسيلة الاتصال في العملية التعليمية موضوع نقاش محتدم بين العلماء والمؤلفين والأكاديميين الأكراد. يطالب بعض العلماء أنْ تكون اللهجة "الكرمانجية" هي اللهجة المعيارية (الرسمية) في كردستان. في حين يعتقد البعض الآخر أنّ اللهجة "السورانية" يجب أن تعتمد كلهجة رسمية في أنحاء البلاد.هذه الدراسة هي محاولة للتحقيق في قضية اللهجة المعيارية في إقليم كردستان العراق. والغرض من هذه الدراسة هو إظهار الكيفية التي تصدت بها بلدان مثل أمريكا، استراليا، كندا، بريطانيا وغيرها لهذه القضية من خلال استخدام طريقة تسمى"bidalectialsim" وهي استخدام لهجتين من اللغة ذاتها. وهذه الطريقة تساعد الطلاب على تعلم اللهجة المستهدفة من خلال استخدام اللهجة الأم لهم (Yakoumetti, 2006, 2007). ولتحقيق الهدف المنشود من هذه الدراسة، سوف يتم عرض الدراسات السابقة التي تناولت مواضيع تعدد اللهجات وجهود الدول التي واجهت هذه المشكلة وبالتفصيل، وأيضاً كيف وضعت هذه الدول البرامج التعليمية لتلبية احتياجاتهم في مواجهة تعدد اللهجات الناطقة بها طلابهم. الدراسات السابقة المعروضة في هذا البحث اوضحتْ أنّ طريقة "bidialectalism" قد يكون الحل للحكومة الكردستانية في العراق في معالجة مسألة اللهجات القياسية والمعيارية.

Abstract

In some countries around the world, determining what languages or dialects should be the instrument of education in schools is a major issue. Today, in Kurdistan, Iraq the issue of which dialect, Sorani or Kurmanji, to be the medium of education has become the subject of a heated debate amongst the Kurdish scholars, authors, and academics. Some scholars claim that Kurmanji should be utilized as the standard dialect in Kurdistan. Whereas, some believe Sorani should be adopted as the official dialect across the nation. This study is an attempt to investigate the issue of dialect and standardization in Kurdistan, Iraq. Its purpose is to show how other countries, such as America, Australia, Canada, Britain, etc. have grappled with this issue through the use of a method called bidalectialsim. This method helps students learn the target dialect through the use of the students' home dialect (Yakoumetti, 2006, 2007). For this reason, to achieve the aim of the study, the literature review relating to issues of bidialectalism and efforts in countries dealing with problems of multi-dialects are used to consider in detail how other countries have crafted educational programs to meet the needs of their multi-dialect speaking student populations. The literature presented in the study makes it clear that bidialectalism can offer the Kurdish Government in Iraq a blueprint for how to address the issue of dialects and standardization.

Keywords: Bidialectalism, the Kurdish Language, standard language, Sorani, Kurmanji,

1. Introduction
1.1 An Overview of the Dialectical Issue

In most multi-ethnic and multi-lingual countries around the world, which language or dialect to use in education is a major issue. As a consequence, the question of which dialect to employ as a

medium of instruction has caused a heated debate in many societies (Pavlou & Papapavlou, 2004). The debate about language and dialect in recent years has resulted in the advent of bidilectical education. Bidialectalism approach propelled educators in those countries where more than one local dialect exists to reconsider and reform their old and traditional educational system which allowed only one dialect to be utilized in schools. The issue came into the national debate due to the fact that imposing one language and/or dialect and ignoring the others severely affected students' academic achievements and cultural heritage in schools (Elifson, 1977; Mordaunt, 2011; Rosier & Farella, 1976; Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007). Further, the issue of imposing one language or dialect is widespread and prevalent in many countries around the world. In some countries, such as Norway and Canada, major efforts have been attempted by educational professionals and government policy makers to address the associated problems. In other countries, like the United States, Australia, New Zealand, India and Pakistan, these issues are still highly divisive and have only been dealt with on a very local and limited basis (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Battisti et al., 2011; Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2007). For examples, in these countries, these issues have been addressed through the use of bidalectialsim or other methods similar to bidialectalism. Bidialectalism teaches the dominant dialect through the use of the students own native dialect (Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007). Additionally, still other countries, such as South Africa, have constitutionally guaranteed dialectical language rights, but are discovering the difficulties of implementing such policies (Lodhi, 1993).

However, in some countries, including China, only one dialect is to be used in schools and all students are supposed to learn in this dialect (Alena, 2012). In Kurdistan, Iraq, the Sorani dialect was used to be taught in schools to the Kurmanji dialect speakers without considering the negative impact this type of education had on students (Hassanpour, 2008, 2010, 2012). Sorani and Kurmanji are two dialects of the Kurdish language (Khalid, 2015). However, in 1998, the government in Kurdistan, Iraq decided (according to an official letter, no. 4508) that the curriculum should be in Kurmanji in Duhok city(a Kurmanji speaking city) and all the areas affiliated to it from the first grade to fourth grade. In 2002, in Duhok, the curriculum was changed from Sorani to Kurmanji in the fifth and sixth grades. This decision was made due to the fact that Kurmanji speakers had trouble understanding Sorani and consequently they did not do well in schools. Also, political factors played important roles in changing the curriculum from Sorani to Kurmanji (Khoshnaw, 2013; Nawkhosh, 2010).

In addition, in 2008, in an official letter, no. 57, the Directorate General of Duhok called upon the then minister of education, Dilshad Abdulrahman, to change the curriculum from Sorani to Kurmanji from the seventh grade to ninth grade in the City of Duhok and all those areas belonging to it. According to the official letter, the reason for changing the curriculum was because studying in Sorani had negative impacts on the Kurmanji students' academic performance (Khoshnaw, 2013). Moreover, in 2009, the head of Duhok governorate's county council demonstrated that they worked hard to change the curriculum from Sorani to Kurmanji from the seventh grade to ninth grade. He asserted that they prepared everything needed for this process, such us budget, publishing house, materials, etc. (Ghazi, 2009). From then and on, the curriculum gradually changed from Sorani to Kurmanji. Now, the schools in Duhok and the areas affiliated to the city study in Kurmanji from the first grade to ninth grade. In some schools, the curriculum is in Kurmanji until the eleventh grade. On the contrary, the curriculum is in Sorani in the Sorani speaking cities, such as Erbil and Sulaimani. This means that educational system in Kurdistan is almost in two different dialects.

Although the decision to change the curriculum was made in an effort to solve problems, it has had many unintended consequences. For example, there are many areas where the margins between the two predominant dialects are small and there is no clear majority. As a result, there are numerous places where a curriculum system is in the Kurmanji dialect in some Sorani speaking areas because the areas are affiliated with the Kurmanji cities, such as Duhok city (Muhammad, 2014). Also, still there are many Kurmanji places which are affiliated to Sorani speaking areas studying in Sorani. Additionally, still the eleventh and twelfth grades in some Kurmanji speaking areas in Kurdistan, Iraq

are in Sorani, but the curriculum at Universities in Kurmanji Speaking areas are in Kurmanji and Sorani in Sorani speaking areas.

In addition, in Kurdistan, Iraq, this issue has always caught many researchers' attention in the linguistic field to extensively research dialect and education. Most of the debate surrounding this issue regards which dialect, Kurmanji or Sorani, should be adopted across the nation. Few studies have offered solutions for accepting one of the dialects across the nation and facilitating the acquisition of the standardized dialect for students of nonstandard dialects. Moreover, there are many authors who believe the Kurmanji dialect should be the official language for education. On the other hand, there are also many who believe that the Sorani dialect should be the official language. Each group gives many reasons for supporting their views (Khoshnaw 2013; Rasul, 2013; Shakali, 2011). In addition, the aim of this paper is not to argue which dialect, Sorani or Kurmanji, is more beautiful or systematic than the other. Rather, its aim is to investigate how other countries have grappled with dialectical issues and how they have incorporated a bidialectaism approach into their educational systems to address the issue of standardization and help local dialect speakers upgrade their academic achievements in schools. Bidialectalism should offer both the government and the Ministry of Education ample evidence to address the issue of standardization in Kurdistan, Iraq. In other words, the aim of the study is to show that this methodological approach can offer Kurdistan a blueprint for how to resolve the growing problems between Kurmani and Sorani and how to prevent these two dialects and their speakers from further division. Furthermore, this paper is an attempt to show that the curriculum should be in Sorani in Kurdistan, Iraq (as it used to be), yet bidialectalism should be used to help Kurmanji students easily learn this dialect and build positive attitudes towards Sorani. Incorporating this method into the curriculum is a crucial step that needs to be taken to prevent schools in the country from studying in two different dialects.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Should Nonstandard Dialects be Brought to Schools

As mentioned above, educators, linguists, and politicians have long been arguing about the issue of dialects in school curricula. This debate has divided them into many groups. Each group has a particular point of view to counter argue the other group. Some educators, politicians and linguists maintain that only one variety should be used. Wolfram (1991) says that for some critics, authors, linguists, and teachers utilizing local dialects in schools mean the decline of the standard variety in society. That is, they consider the standard variety (i.e. Standard English) to be the high moral of the society. On the other hand, many argue that more than one local variety should be utilized as a bridge to help students learn the standard one (Dean & Fowler, 1974; Yiakoumetti, 2006). In other words, the authors' opinions can be divided into three: (1) utilizing only the standard variety in education; (2) using a local variety in education; and (3) employing bidilectical approach which involves using both varieties (Yiakoumetti, 2006).

2.1.1 The Use of the Standard Dialect in Schools

There are many authors available supporting the use of the standard variety in schools. Using only standard dialect is also called "eradication theory" (Dean & Fowler, 1974, p. 302; Rowland & Marlow, 2010). The proponents of this view claim that every student in schools must learn the standard dialect. In other words, school curriculum must be designed in a way that is devoid of features pertaining to vernacular dialects, and teachers' main role is to teach only this variety (Dean & Fowler, 1974). For example, Bersten is one of the proponents of using standardized dialects and believes that society would be better served if such dialectical features found in American ghetto areas could be eradicated. This is perhaps an extreme view, but one held by others (as cited in Dean & Fowler, 1974, p. 302).

In addition, Pavlou has different points of view from Bersten. He claims that using only a standard variety as the medium of instruction in a country results in the creation of a very strong sense of feeling of nationality and unity amongst people (as cited in Yiakoummetti, 2006, p. 296). Pavlou's

view is also supported by Bric-Finch who points out that students of every dialect should concentrate on the standard variety because it is like "a passport allowing them to go anywhere they want to go" (as cited in Johnson, 1999, p. 12). Moreover, Custred (1990) demonstrates that mastering standard variety is a must for students so that they will be proficient in the modern society in which economy is at the top. That is, economy is dominant in a way that makes everybody speak the same dialect in order to communicate well with one another.

Some other proponents of this view claim that it is not a good idea to utilize local dialects in schools due to the negative impacts it has on students in terms of education. For instance, some authors set African American Vernacular English (AAVE) as an example to show that teaching AAVE, which is a nonstandard English dialect, alongside the standard one results in the formation of two groups: black linguistic groups vs. white linguistic groups. It also leads to cultural separatism and verbal segregation in the country (Holmes, 1996). It is also argued that using nonstandard variety in schools encourages students to only employ their home dialect. That is, it makes them give too much weight to their home dialect which is full of deficiencies in contrast to the standard one. This will not help students who speak nonstandard varieties to be successful in the classrooms, but rather causes them greater confusion. In other words, it severely affects students' learning of the dominant dialect, and as a consequence it results in a negative interference (Holmes, 1996; Siegel, 2007). Some other people argue that there is a big similarity between the dominant dialect, which is also known as the standard one, and other varieties in the country. For that reason, there is no need for other dialects to be used separately in schools. Further, the proponents of this view claim that only standard dialects should be used in schools as the number of the persons who utilize local dialects are less than those who speak the standard one. There are also a few works written in vernaculars (Baron, 2000; Fox, 1997; William 1997; Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007).

2.1.2 The Use of Nonstandard Dialect in Schools

This view supports the use of the local dialects as the medium of instruction in schools. This view has also been extensively researched in recent years. The proponents of this view claim that all dialects are equal, systematic, and rule-governed. Therefore, local dialects should have the same right as that of the standard variety to be utilized in classrooms. This view also says that any obstacles that come in the way of the learning process should be eliminated to pave the way for students to learn what they want. In other words, students should not be given the burden of acquiring other dialects. Students are more adept at expressing their feelings and skills in their home dialects (Cummins, 1979; Dean & Fowler, 1974; Shuy, 1968; Siegel, 2010; Yiakoumetti, 2006). This view is also supported by one of the AAVE proponents who claim that AAVE is too different from General American English (GAE) in that it hampers students' academic successes in academic life. However, this does not mean that it cannot be used as a medium for teaching Standard English. For example, there are a lot of words that are available in GAE, but their meanings are different from that of AAVE. This makes students confused between their dialect and the standard one during the exam, because the exam criteria rely largely on the Standard English (Gopaul-McNicol, Reid, & Wisodm, 1998; Smitherman, 1997). More interestingly, Fasold (1999) also argues for the use of nonstandard dialects in schools and uses AAVE as an example to support his view. He says that "we should get across linguistics perception of the nature of Ebonics much more efficiently by framing its relation to English as one of language to language'' (p. 3). That is, if a local dialect is considered to be language, then it will be easier to teach.

In addition, some proponents of this view also maintain that there should be an education in order to teach local dialects to standard speakers. In other words, what they want is exactly the opposite of the proponents of the use of the standard dialects in schools. This "radical" view is evidenced by the following statement:

> Instead of 'enriching' the lives of the urban children by plugging them into a 'second' dialect (if that enterprise is too 'enriching' (sic): why don't we let everyone in for the fun and games; 'enrich' the suburban kid with an urban dialect, we should be working to eradicate the language

prejudice, the language mythology, that people grew into holding and believing. For there is clear evidence that the privileged use their false beliefs about language to the disadvantage of the deprived. One way to stop this is to change nonstandard dialect speakers into standard dialect speakers at least for some of the time. (Shuy, 1968, p. 5)

This statement shows that helping students is not a one-way process that can only be done through the standard variety, but it can also be done through the local dialects.

2.1.3 Bidialectalism

The third view about dialectical issues in education is known as "bidialectalism" education (Rickford, Sweetland, & Rickford, 2004; Shuy, 1968). Due to the prejudice and bias against the word dialect, sometimes bidialectalism is referred to as "biloquialism" (Severino, 1998, p. 189; Shuy, 1968, p. 4). Pride (1979) says that a bidialectal situation is usually to be found in those countries where, in addition to the standard verities, several other dialects are obtainable. That is, it is available in a country where students' dialects are different from the standard one in terms of vocabulary and syntax. The differences are not enough to cause mutual unintelligibility, but at least these differences, to some extent, cause trouble for students. The aim of this approach is to employ the standard dialect in schools and also to encourage students to utilize the local dialects in their own environment. Further, this program teaches students the standard dialect through their own dialect in that it facilitates the learning of the target variety by making comparison and contrast between the dialects (Dean & Fowler, 1974; Fox, 1997; Perez, 1999; Yiakoumatti, 2007). In addition, the instructors in this program also help those students who are fluent in the standard variety to ameliorate their home dialect. Not only does the bidialectalism approach help students in their academic life, but also it helps teachers to work on both their knowledge of the standard variety and the local one and prevents teachers from correcting students constantly based on the idea that students' speech is wrong. Also, this program pays scrupulous attention to code-switching in that it teaches students to easily code-switch between the dominant varieties in different situations (Rafols, 1974; Yiakoumatti, 2006, 2007).

However, this approach is not devoid of criticism. Trudgill claims that bidialectalism might be adequately and successfully implemented in only writing "since children will adopt the *speech* of another group only if they wish to become economically and socially accepted members of that group" (as cited in Singh & Sudarshan, 2004, p.8). Further, opponents of this approach claim that this approach is difficult to implement in classrooms because every teacher must have some knowledge of the students' dialects so that he/she would be able to make comparisons and contrasts between the dialects. Teachers should also have the class time to do all the exercises and drills belonging to bidialectalism. Otherwise, the class will be tedious and the students will lose motivation for learning the target dialect (Dean & Fowler, 1974).

In addition, another approach which is somehow similar to bidialectalism is called 'appreciation of dialect differences'. This view, like bidialectalism, supports the idea that teachers should appreciate the dialect that the students bring into classrooms. Students must not be forced to change their dialects for the sake of the standard one. It has been stated that "instead of condemning our student's language, then, because it violates our rules, we would do better to respect it (it is very much a part of him) and to try persuading him that he should respect it, too" (Dean, & Fowler, 1974, p. 304). Those who employ the appreciation theory accept the idea that all dialects are equivalent, and also in doing so, they accept the notion that local dialects are also used for communication like the standard dialect. On the surface, this approach appears to be practical, yet some writers maintain that this method of teaching is "hopelessly utopian". This is due to the fact that that this type of education requires teachers to eliminate their prejudices against dialects and accept the fact that all dialects are equal. It is obvious that it is quite difficult to find instructors or teachers without having some negative attitudes towards local dialects (Dean & Fowler, 1974; Singh & Sudarshan, 2004).

3. Methodology

This paper is an attempt to investigate the issue of standardization in Kurdistan, Iraq. Its aim is to show how other countries have dealt with dialectical issues and how they have integrated a bidialectaism approach into their educational systems to address the issue of standardization and improve nonstandard speakers' academic performance in schools. Moreover, the study also throws light on how bidialectalism can be a crucial step to build more understanding and unity between the two dialects. For this reason, in this paper, the literature review relating to issues of bidialectalism and efforts in countries grappling with problems of multi-dialects were used to achieve the aim of the study. In other words, the literature utilized in this research considers in detail how other countries, such as Canada, Australia, America, etc. have crafted educational programs to meet the needs of their multi-dialect speaking student populations. Also, this paper discusses and analyzes the results of several studies that have been conducted on the effectiveness of bidialectalism in the countries mentioned above. This is to demonstrate whether or not this type of education is feasible. From these experiences, Kurdish educators should be able to learn how other countries around the world have managed to keep one dialect as the medium of instruction and what types of programs they have implemented to tackle dialectical issues.

4. Bidialectalism: An Approach to Tackle the Issue of Dialect and Standardization

In several countries around the world, dialect and language are a major problem. These dialect and language issues negatively affect educational systems, especially in places where the standard dialect is very different from the other dialects. Some countries have dealt with this issue by implementing several different types of programs including the use of a method known as bidialectalism. These programs help students who speak dialects different from the standard one learn through the use of their own dialects (Papapavlou & Pavlou, 2007; Siegel, 2010; Yiakoumetti, 2006; 2007). However, in some countries, such as Cyprus, Kurdistan, etc.; this issue has yet to be seriously taken into consideration (Hassanpour, 2008, 2012; Yiakoumetti, 2006). This section is an attempt to illustrate how other countries have dealt with dialectical issues and how they have incorporated some bidialectical programs into their educational systems to help local dialect speakers upgrade their academic achievements in schools. The approaches and programs discussed here clearly show that resources and solutions already exist for problems like those being experienced in Kurdistan. Moreover, they should offer both the government and the Ministry of Education ample evidence to address the issue in Kurdistan.

To begin with, the United States is one of those countries where speakers of some dialects, such as AAVE, face some classroom related issues in schools. The debate about this issue and about whether or not these dialects should be brought into schools dates back to the 1970s and 1980s. The debate reached its peak in 1996 when the Oakland School Board of Education passed a resolution calling upon the government to recognize AAVE as a tool to be used in schools with large numbers of AAVE speaking students (Baron, 2000; Fox, 1997; Wright, 1998). Consequently, now there are many programs available in America helping AAVE and some other Creole language speakers in schools learn GAE. One of the most important programs designed for this issue is the Academic English Mastery Program (AEMP) in Los Angeles, California. Another program which is also important is the Bidialectical Communication Program (BCP) in Dekalb County, Georgia (Denham & Lobeck, 2010; Siegel, 2006b, 2007). These two programs place a great emphasis on the Contrastive Analysis Approach. These programs also include some aspects of sociolinguistics. Further, they teach students language and dialect awareness. This approach allows students to consider important aspects of language, and gain a greater appreciation of how dialects function. Moreover, these methodologies help students recognize that all dialects are equal. In other words, through these two programs, students learn that no dialect is greater and more developed than the other. Students are also taught to have positive attitudes towards both their dialects and the main dialects (Denham & Lobeck, 2010; Rowland & Marlow 2010; Siegel, 2006b, 2007).

In addition, these schools utilize several other techniques and approaches to facilitate the acquisition of GAE. These techniques all belong to bidialectalism approach. For example, literature is employed to help students of other dialects, such as AAVE, learn the differences between formal and informal English. Through this technique, students learn grammatical patterns belonging to GAE and also learn how to distinguish GAE patterns from patterns of their dialects (Jones, 2013; Perez, 1999; Wheeler & Swords, 2006). Another technique used is a method called Journaling. In this technique, students are required to write about topics assigned by teachers, such as a story, poem, etc. They are sometimes asked to write about topics of their own interests. Then, the students should read aloud to each other the things they write in their class. This "increases the possibility that they will be able to detect deviation from Standard English" (Jones, 2013, p. 115).

Another important technique utilized by these schools, such as AMEP, is the use of a Dialogue Journal. This technique creates a situation in which both teachers and students feel relaxed in classrooms. Their interaction with each other in class is based on a "non-threatening context" (Jones, 2013, p.113). In this technique, students are required to talk about their feelings about a poem, story, movie, topic, etc. to each other. They do this by writing their feelings on a note card (Linnell, 2010). For example, Jones (2013) shows us an example to illustrate the use of the dialogue journal:

Student #1 writes: I felt sad when people lost their home after storm.

How do you feel?

Student # 2 (a dialect speaker) writes: I sad too.

Then, the teacher analyzes what the students write on the card and helps them improve the rules of the standard dialect. This technique helps students compare and contrast between the two forms of English. It also helps students recognize the similarities and differences between the forms of English. Costa and Lowery maintain that this technique is of significant importance for "cognitive process" as it makes students "engage in tasks, such as comparing, classifying, creating metaphors, and creating analogies" (as cited in Jones, 2013, p. 114).

Most importantly, these schools or programs employ another technique known as Daily Oral Language in which students are provided with sentences used in everyday conversations (Jones, 2013). For example, the teacher might give such examples as "she be grocery shopping every monday" versus "She usually goes grocery shopping every Monday". In this sentence, the teacher explains three things to AAVE students, such as how to utilize "be verbs" in GAE, how to capitalize the first letters of the days of the week and the first letter of the first word in a sentence; and how to employ punctuation in sentences. Then students are allowed to discuss these things together and they are also allowed to discuss with each other about the stories, poems, and other topics they read. All of these allow students to effectively build the ability of oral language in both dialects (Jones, 2013; Rickford, 1999).

In these programs, students also engage in extensive writing exercises. They are required to write many things, such as a short play, debatable topics, etc. Also, they are required to play roles in a short play, story, etc. This shows students that there are different ways they can use to express something. This also helps students know which form should be utilized in daily conversations and which one should be employed in academic writing (Delpit, 1998; Jones, 2013; Perez, 1999; Smitherman, 2000).

Many studies have been conducted on these schools which provide assistance for students of other dialects, such as AAVE. The aims of the studies are to show whether or not the programs provided by these schools are effective. For example, Pandey (2000) conducted a study on 66 students. Sixty four students were native speakers of English. This study also included many AAVE students. They were pre-college and freshman students. In this study, two approaches were employed. One is called the Contrastive Analysis and the other is called the Sociolinguistic Component of Dialect Awareness Program. The result was that the students learned to have positive attitudes towards both their dialects and the mainstream dialect. These two approaches also improved students' academic achievements during the 6-week study. Moreover, students' performances on tests were measurably

improved. Importantly, the students' dialectical awareness also improved. This shows that programs which teach students learn GAE through their own dialect are better than just imposing the GAE without any clear and thoughtful plan (Pandey, 2000).

The effectiveness of this bidialectical program is also shown by Siegel (2006b). He talks about a study conducted by Maddahiam and Sandamela in 2000. In this study, two groups of students were involved. One of the groups was students in AEMP, whereas the other group was students taught by traditional methods in some other schools. A Language Assessment Writing Test was utilized to gauge students' outcomes. The result showed that students in AEMP did better than those who were in traditional schools. Siegel (2006b) says that their use of GAE significantly improved and their use of AAVE patterns considerably decreased in their writings in the test.

Additionally, Deak (2007) talks about two programs in the USA. He contrasts the controversy surrounding the Standard English Proficiency Program (SEP) in Oakland with the absence of the controversy surrounding the AEMP in Los Angeles schools. The writer employs language policy and planning theory to analyze the public's reaction to both programs. The study showed that the latter met with less controversy as it did not explicitly raise the status of AAVE. However, in practice the AEMP program did raise the status of AAVE, but simply chose to place emphasis on AAVE as a tool for educational achievement in their policy document thereby paying tribute to the public's desire for educational success. The article also showed that this program helps teachers build positive attitudes towards AAVE and respect African American literature, arts, history, etc. Deak (2007) also maintains that AMEP is really effective and successful in that it helps AAVE students improve their GAE and upgrade their academic achievements.

Concerning BCP, there are many studies showing that this program in Dekalb is successful in teaching GAE to AAVE students. One of the studies was done by Sweetland. She tested a group of teachers who taught fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students. The study took 10 weeks to complete. During this time, the teachers were required to integrate into their curriculum "dialect awareness activities and contrastive analysis exercises" (as cited in Denham & Lobeck, 2010, p. 163). The purpose of the study was to discover whether or not the students' achievement would improve. Its aim was also to see whether or not the teachers' attitudes would change during the ten-week experiment. As the author mentioned, the teachers' attitudes were really negative before the experiment began. Before the experiment started, the teachers reported that AAVE "did not exist" (Sweetlan, as cited in Denham & Lobeck, 2010, p. 167). All of the teachers regarded AAVE as a corrupt, fractured, and slang dialect. However, at the end of the experiment, the teachers' attitudes dramatically changed from negative to positive. Most importantly, in the beginning of the experiment, the students used a lot of AAVE patterns in their writings and the tests, but later they considerably decreased the use of AAVE patterns in their writing (Denham & Lobeck, 2010).

This bidialectical program was also tested by Taylor in 1989 at Aurora University. She tested some students who often utilized AAVE features in their speaking and writing. So in her study, she arranged two groups. One group was taught by the Contrastive Analysis Approach and the other was taught by traditional teaching methods which did not refer to dialects in class at all. After 11 weeks of the experiment, the first group taught in the traditional method increased their use of AAVE patterns by 8.5%. However, the second group who was taught by the contrastive analysis method saw a 59% "decrease" in their use of AAVE features in their writing. One of the features Taylor identified was third person singular –s absence. She said the first group indicated a 91.7% decrease in the use of this feature, whereas the second group demonstrated only an 11% decrease in the use of this feature (as cited in Ramirez et al., 2005, p. 28-29).

Another country which has dialectical problems is Australia. In this country, Aboriginal speaking students face a lot of problems in schools due to the fact that their dialect is very different from that of Standard Australian English (SAE) (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Eades & Siegel, 1999; Moses & Wigglesworth, 2008). After years of problems associated with language and declining tests

scores of Aboriginal students, a call was raised to bring new dialectical approaches into schools to help students of Aboriginal English (AE). As a result, the Australian government took some effective steps to resolve this issue. One of the methods employed was a program known as "two-way bidialectical" education. This program was first adopted in West Australian schools. The primary aim of this program was to help the students learn SAE through their dialect and it also "recognized the existing bidialectical and bicultural realities of the students" (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006, p. 31). Today, many schools in Australia have incorporated some methods and approaches belonging to bidialectalism into their programs.

Moreover, the Australian government has developed many materials to help the students, such as Fostering English Language in Kimberley Schools (FELIKS), Langwij comes to schools: Promoting Literacy among Speakers of AE and Australian Creoles; Deadly Ideas: print and video materials for teachers, etc. All of them help teachers learn how to teach Aboriginal students. These guides and programs require teachers to use the Contrastive Analysis Approach to teach students who speak non-standard dialects. They also require teachers to teach students to have positive attitudes towards other dialects existent in English. In other words, these programs and guides are designed in a way that teach students to compare and contrast not only grammatical rules, but also "social function of each variety" (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006, p. 31).

There is also another program in Australia known as Aboriginal Language Speaking Students Program (ALSS). This program, like the ones mentioned above, facilitates the acquisition of SAE through students' home dialect (Department of Education, Western Australia, 2012). This program employs English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D). It helps students learn how to use code switching between their home dialect and the standard one. This program has played an important role in improving students' academic achievements in SAE. The program also played an important role in reducing the negative attitudes that teachers and students have had towards local dialects (Department of Education, Western Australia, 2012). Moreover, providing assistance for Aboriginal students and teachers does not pertain only to activities inside schools. In other words, outside of schools, there are a lot of training courses for those workers who speak AE or another non-standard dialect. These training programs, for example, are for those who work with doctors, lawyers, high ranking people, etc. (Eader & Siegel, 1999).

Another country which also helps Aboriginal students is Canada. For many years, the Canadian government and various school systems have offered programs designed to help students of AE in schools. As a result, many programs were opened by the government and many schools integrated Aboriginal English into their school program as a tool (Battisti et al., 2011; Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2007). For instance, one of the programs in Canada is English as a Second Language (ESL). This program has special programs helping those who speak AE or other dialects that are really different from that of Standard Canadian English (SCE). Any schools containing Aboriginal students are funded by the Canadian government. This is common especially in British Colombia where a large population of Aboriginal speakers exist. Presently, there are 92 school districts receiving government funding to help the Aboriginals in their ESL program. This program was tested by Battisti et al., (2011) regarding its effectiveness. Battisti et al., (2011) reviewed those school systems in which the bidialectical approaches were used. They found that in most of the schools the students raised their test scores in comparison with the test scores where students were taught with traditional methods. They also became better in terms of writing in CSE (Battisti et al., 2011; Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2007).

Another important dialectical related issue is the matter of Creole Languages. Like AAVE, Creole speakers face different kinds of classroom related issues in schools (Siegel, 2006a, 2007; Winer, 2006). For this reason, many countries have taken some effective steps to resolve this issue. These countries have established different kinds of methods to help Creole speakers learn the standard dialects and upgrade their academic achievements. Three approaches are usually utilized to help Creole language

speakers, such as the Instrumental Approaches, Accommodation Approach and Awareness Approach (Siegel, 2010, 2006a). The Instrumental Approach is employed to teach students the standard dialects through their own dialects. In other words, their dialect is employed as a medium of instruction in early education to prepare them for the mainstream dialect. Sometimes, such subjects as mathematics, science, history, etc. are taught in their dialect. This approach is really helpful, especially in those classes where the majority of the students are speakers of a dialect other than the mainstream one. In the Accommodation Approach, unlike the Instrumental Approach, the first dialect is not the medium of instruction but to some extent it is used to facilitate the acquisition of the mainstream dialect in schools. For example, during the years of elementary education, students' home dialects are allowed to be employed without correction. Teachers use many kinds of techniques, such as stories, to improve students' use of the standard dialect. Also, in this class both standard dialect speakers and non-standard dialect speakers are taught together in one class (Siegel, 2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2010; Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015; Winer, 2006). Concerning the third approach, which is the Awareness Approach, instead of just focusing on the standard dialect, students' dialect is used as tool to upgrade their academic achievement. This approach also focuses on how to make students aware of the similarities and differences between the dialects and how to teach students that all dialects are equal and systematic (Rowland & Marlow, 2010; Siegel, 2006a, 2007; Yiakoumetti, 2007). For example, Siegel (2010) maintains that in this approach "students learn about variation in language and the many different varieties that exist, such as types of dialects and creoles" (p. 210). He further asserts that students are taught the "history around them" (p. 210) and the world they live in. Although there are many other bidialectical approaches, these approaches are usually used to help Creole language speakers.

Britain was the first to use the Awareness Approach. They used this in the program known as "Afro-Caribbean Language and Literacy Project in Further and Adult Education (ALLPFAE) to help speakers of Creoles languages. This program was supported by the Language and Literacy Unit of the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) in 1984 (Siegel, 2010). Also, this approach was used in the state of Hawaii in the United States during 1984-1988. This program was known as Hawaii's Project Holopono (HPH). It was used to teach students in grades four to six in eight schools. The programs in these schools focused on how to incorporate into their programs some piece of literature consisting of HC features, and how to compare and contrast between GAE and Hawai'i Creole (HC) (Siegel, 2006b, 2007, 2010). This program was evaluated by some experts and it was discovered that 84% of the HC speakers improved their Standard English and also increased their scores on tests (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Siegel, 2006b).

Moreover, during the 1970s, the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP) integrated HC into their educational system and helped students learn the standard dialect via one of the above-mentioned approaches (Eades, Jacobes, Hargrove, & Menacker, 2006). In other words, the program placed great emphasis on students' interactions with each other and sought to minimize the role of teachers as the center of classroom activity and focus. Further, teachers were not allowed to correct students overtly and they were required to let students have as much discussion with each other as possible. This was found to be a very effective program that assisted students to upgrade their oral and writing proficiency. Additionally, Project Akamai was another Hawaiian program employed to help students of grades nine and ten in 11 schools. It taught 600 students. This project employed the Awareness Approach. This approach resulted in improving students between 35% and 40% in Standard English exams and it also improved students' fluencies in GAE (Jones, 2013; Siegel, 2006b, 2007). There several other programs in Hawaii helping students of HC speakers. One researcher known as Day discusses an experiment where students from Kindergarten up to the fourth grade participated. Teachers were also taught creoles history and how language and dialect function. Later, due to the program, the teachers' negative attitudes towards HC and its speakers dramatically improved and changed to positive. Also, HC students' proficiency in tests and writing improved and they considerably decreased the use of HC features and patterns in their writing (as cited in Siegel, 2010, p. 209).

In other parts of the United States, Creole speaking students are also provided with assistance in terms of language. For example, there is a program at Evanston Township High School near Chicago known as the Caribbean Academic Program (CAP). This program aims at making Creole speakers and teachers be aware of the similarities and differences between dialects. This program uses the Awareness Approach. In the class, teachers focus on both GAE and Caribbean English Creoles (CEC) in reading, writing, speaking, etc. (Siegel, 2006a, 2006b). Moreover, Fischer conducted a study on students enrolling in this program. Before the experiment began, 73% of the students were in the lowest level of the academy. This was due to the fact that they were not good in terms of academy ability. However, at the end of the experiment, only 7% of the students stayed in their levels, whereas 81% of the students successfully passed to another level; 24% passed two levels, and 26% moved up to the highest level (as cited in Siegel, 2010, p.218).

In addition to Great Britain and the United States of America, some other countries employ bidialectal education in their schools systems. For example, Nicaragua and Jamaica use the Instrumental Approach to help those who speak Creole languages. The same holds true for Curacao and Bonaire where creoles are used as a tool to help students learn the standard dialect (Migge, Leglise, & Bartens, 2010).

More to the point, in Guinea-Bissau, where Standard Portuguese (SP) is the medium of instruction, the Ministry of Education passed a resolution in 1986 ordering that a Portuguese lexified Creole 'Crioulo' (PLC), which is the language of the majority of the people, should be utilized in the first two years to teach some main subjects. Later, students should be taught SP through their own dialect. This program is still available in this country (Siegel, 2010). As already mentioned, all of the programs were proved to be effective and successful in teaching students standard dialect. For example, Decker (2000) conducted a study in Belize. The study took 13 weeks to complete. The study included some different features in Belize Kriol and Standard English. The features were plural marking of nouns, present time reference, past time reference, and subject verb agreement. These features work differently in both Standard English and Kriol. The teachers had to first describe and explain the features available in English in their language which is Kriol. Then the teachers explained the features mentioned above in the English language. The students were required to discuss these things with their classmates in English. They were also required to do different kinds of activities, such as storytelling, writing, speaking, etc. During these activities, they could use the features in both languages. At the end of the study, students in Standard English improved their language skills. They were able to distinguish the Belize Kriol English features from Standard English features. Also, they did well in a pre and post test that they took. They significantly improved in the use of Standard English features (Decker, 2000).

Furthermore, Yiakoumetti, Evans and Eich (2005) conducted a study on students in Cyprus. The method used in this study was the Language Awareness Program. The aim of the study was to upgrade rural and urban students' academic performance in their second dialect, which was Standard Modern Greek (SMG). The study also focused on whether or not the program could change students' attitudes towards the two varieties. The study discovered that students drastically reduced the use of features and grammatical patterns belonging to their home dialect in their writing and speaking. Is also helped students have positive attitudes towards both their dialect and SMG, and language in general. Another study was also conducted by Yiakoumetti (2007) in Cyprus on whether or not bidialecticalism was effective. This study also supports the study mentioned above. In this study, 90 students participated in two schools in the Larnaca district. Fifty-three students were from the urban schools, and 39 pupils were from the rural schools. They were taught in both dialects. Both students' location and gender were also taken into account for the analysis of their performance and production. The findings showed that the local dialect should be brought into classrooms because it was discovered that the students measurably improved their knowledge of SMG and their academic performance (Yiakoumetti, 2007).

Some other studies have also been conducted in Europe to determine whether or not bringing dialects to schools was effective. Although two of these are considerably older than the others, they show that scholars have been working on dialectial related issues for a long time. One of the studies by Osterberg in 1961 investigated the Swedish dialects and education. Osterberg's methodology focused on teaching one set of students in their own vernacular dialect of Swedish. Later, Osterberg (1961) switched class instruction to the Standard form of Swedish. By contrast, Osterberg taught another group of students entirely in Standard Swedish. This was similar to an earlier study conducted by Cheavens (1957) who also looked at this same issue. After 35 weeks, Osterberg (1961) found that the dialect method was more effective both in terms of reading and the students' comprehension of the material. Between 1980 and 1982, another researcher Bull (1990) did a similar study in Norway. The study included 10 classes of beginning students. In this study, nearly 200 students about seven years of age participated. The design Bull (1990) utilized in her study was like Osterberg's study. In her study, she had two groups. The first group was the speakers of varieties of Norwegian who were taught in their own dialect and then switched to the standard dialect. The second group was students taught solely in Standard Norwegian. Then, Bull (1990) compared the improvements of the first group with that of the second one. The results indicated that students allowed to learn in their own dialect before moving into the Standard dialect did significantly better than the other group of students. These students had higher reading and comprehension scores than their counterparts taught solely in the Standard dialect. Bull (1990) maintained that the vernacular to Standard approach was more effective because the students could pay specific attention to the vernacular and learn to analyze their own speech. Further, Bull (1990) maintained that this process improved the students' "metalinguistic awareness of language" (as cited in Ramirez et al., 2005, p. 33)

In conclusion, across the world from Australia to Canada and Africa to Central America, many governments have been grappling with dialectical related issues for a long time (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Battisti et al., 2011; Saskatchewan Ministry of Education, 2007; Siegel. 2006a, 2006b, 2010). The programs outlined in this section clearly show that there are working models of ways countries and school systems can find solutions to these complex problems. Moreover, many of these examples have been carefully analyzed and proved that working within a bidialectical frame work is a much better approach than simply ignoring the issue. For the Kurdish government and higher education bureaucracies, several of these existing programs can offer them a blueprint for how the growing problems between Kurmanji and Sorani can be addressed. At present, the Kurdish government has not adequately addressed the growing problem. The possible solutions offered here should be considered in detail, if and when the Kurdish government decides to seriously address the issue of standardization. Not to think about solutions at this point will only continue to fuel the hatreds and resentments that the speakers of both Sorani and Kurmanji harbor against one another. In other words, if the government doesn't take the issue of standardization into serious consideration, the education will be in two different dialects forever.

5. Conclusion

The most important point to address the issue of standardization is to adopt an educational policy strategy that allows the use of more than one dialect and the appreciation of dialects as part of the larger language family. In the literature, several such strategies are discussed and analyzed. In the previous section, several of these strategies have been shown to be successful tools for addressing dialectical problems in schools.

Among the strategies discussed is the use of bidialectialism and the various methodologies designed to complement this strategy. These programs help students who speak dialects different from the one being used as a standard to learn the target dialect through the use of their own dialects. The research findings show that bidialectical approaches are being used successfully in school systems around the world to help students master another dialect by using their own dialect (Perez, 1999; Rickford, Sweetland, & Rickford, 2004; Shuy, 1968; Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007). We see that these

programs have addressed similar problems like those in Kurdistan in places like Australia, Canada, and even in the United States. In the literature review, there are reports by scores of scholars and researchers showing that these strategies are often preferable to forcing students to learn in an alien or foreign dialect. For example, the work of researchers in this study (e. g., Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Battisti et al., 2011; Siegel, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007) shows that strategies like bidialectialism promotes a greater appreciation on the part of students and teachers for other dialects and helps students gain skills they need to successfully meet the academic demands of their schools. These programs have been shown to lower negative feelings between dialectical groups and promote greater unity and understanding among students and their teachers. Moreover, the research indicates that these programs have a dramatic effect on improving the teachers and the administrators of public education's attitudes to the complexities of learning other dialects that students are faced with. As a result, through the bidialectical process a greater understanding of what students are experiencing is fostered and new approaches to addressing the dialectical problems are embraced by the school systems (Ball, Bernhardt, & Deby, 2006; Battisti et al., 2011; Denham & Lobeck, 2009; Siegel, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Yiakoumetti, 2006, 2007).

As mentioned above, one important way to address the issue of standardization in Kurdistan, Iraq is to adopt an educational policy strategy that allows students to learn the target dialect through their own dialect. The Sorani dialect can only be accepted as the standard dialect of the Kurdish language if teachers incorporate bidialectalism into their school curricula. If not, people and students in Kurmanji speaking areas consider Sorani an imposed dialect. Consequently, this belief leads to the formation of negative attitudes towards the Sorani dialect and its Speakers. Further, the government should pass a resolution to make Sorani the language of education and, if and when needed, order all teachers in Kurmanji areas to incorporate bidialectical approach into their curriculum. In daily life, people should be free to use their own home dialects. In doing so, the standard dialect, as Nawkhosh (2016) maintains, doesn't pose a threat to the unity of the Kurdish people and dialects. In other words, Failure to do so will result in creating further divisions among the speakers of both dialects. In addition, through this program, Kurmanji students can be taught that all dialects in the Kurdish language are equal and systematic. The same holds true for Sorani speakers. They should be also taught that all dialects are equal. No dialect is superior to the other one. Through the use of the bidialectical approaches, Kurmanji students can be taught to differentiate between the two dialects. In doing so, they learn to utilize the Sorani dialect in schools and their dialects outside of school. Further, it is handy in that it assists the students to reduce the use of their home dialect features in their writing, upgrade their scores in tests and care about both varieties in school. It also teaches them how to make code-switching between their dialects and the target one. Incorporating this program into the school curricula is a good step to address the issue of standardization. The Kurmanji students and people might again accept Sorani as the medium of instruction and they do not see Sorani as an imposed dialect. Further, this approach would not only help build more understanding and unity between these two groups, but also stop the growing divisions between them which could threaten the fragile unity of the Kurdish people.

In addition, how teachers should be trained is something that needs to be seriously taken into consideration by the Kurdish Government and the Ministry of Education in Kurdistan, Iraq. Every year, the government should allocate a budget to provide teachers with training courses in which language experts should participate to educate teachers on how to teach Sorani to the Kurmanji students by using bidialectical approaches in schools. Further, The Kurdish Government should issue laws requiring TV channels to have different shows on how to educate teachers and students that there is no difference between all the dialects in the Kurdish language, and all of them are equal, systematic and rule-governed. Additionally, the government needs to develop different kinds of materials to help teachers be aware of how to treat dialectical differences and how to incorporate some methods of teachings pertaining to bidialectalism into their curricula. Also, the government has to form committees in the Ministry of Education and the schools to monitor the teachers about whether or not they properly

implement the methods or about whether or not the teachers mistreat students based on dialectical differences. This solution would be more effective if the government asks the Ministry of Higher Education to integrate methods of teaching pertaining to bidialectalism into their curricula at all the Kurdish Departments at the universities in Kurdistan. At the University level, instructors should be taught how to teach students with different dialects to learn the target dialects. In sum, the literature presented in the previous section makes it clear that alternatives already exist for addressing the issue of standardization. The paper has only focused on bidialectalism as an approach to grapple with the issue of dialect and standardization. Additional research should be conducted to deal with the relationship between politics and the issue of standardization in Kurdistan, Iraq, and how politics can play key roles in addressing this issue.

REFERENCES

Alina. (2012). Dialects in Chinese Is Mandarin dominant? Hills Learning. Retrieved October 20, 2016, from http://www.hillslearning.com/2012/09/14/dialects-in-chinese-mandarin/

Ball, J., Bernhardt, B., & Deby, J. (2006). First nations English dialect: exploratory project proceedings. Vancouver: Human early learning partnership.

Baron, D. (2000). Ebonics and the politics of English. World Englishes, 19(1), 5-19.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. Review of Educational Research, 49(2), 222–51.

Custred, G. (1990). The primacy of standard language in modern education. American behavioral Scientist 34(2), 232–9.

Dean, M. B., & Fowler, E. D. (1974). An argument for appreciation of dialect differences in the classroom. The Journal of Negro Education, 43(3), 302-309.

Delpit, L. (1998). Ebonics and culturally responsive instruction. In T. Perry & L. Delpit (Eds.), The real ebonics debate: Power, language and education of African American children (pp. 17-26). Boston: Beacon Press.

Denham, K., & Lobeck, A. (2010). Linguistics at school: Language awareness in Primary and secondary education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eades, D., Jacobs, S., Hargrove, E., & Menacker, T. (2006). Pidgin, local identity, and schooling in hawai'i. In S. J. Nero (Ed.), Dialects, englishes, creoles, and education (pp. 139-163). New Jersy: lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Eades, D., & Siegel, J. (1999). Changing attitudes towards Australian Creoles and aboriginal English. In J. Rickford & S. Romaine (Eds.),

Creole genesis, attitudes and discourse: Studies celebrating charlene j. sato

(pp.265-277). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Elifson, J. M. (1977). Teaching to enhance bidialectalism: Some theoretical and practical considerations. English Education, 9(1), 11-21.

Fasold, R. W. (1999). Ebonic need not be English. ERIC Issue paper 6. 1-7.

Fox, S. (1997). The controversy over ebonics. Phi Delta Kappan 79, 237-244.

Gopaul-McNicol, S., Reid, G., & Wisdom, G. (1998). The psychoeducational assessment of ebonics speakers: issues and challenges. The Journal of Negro Education, 67(1), 16-24.

Hassanpour, A. (2008). Kurdi wak zimaneki jut-standard: tebini sebaret be gallallay daxwazinama bo rasmi kirdni sorani [The Kurdish language as a bi-standard language: View on the petition for the officialization of sorani]. Kurdish Academy of language. Retrieved August 2, 2016, from http://www.kurdishacademy.org/?q=node%2F22

Hassanpour, A. (2010) Shovinismi sorani w afsanakani [Sorani chauvinism and its myths].Ruwange. Retrieved July 2, 2016, from http://www.ruwange.blogspot.com/2010_03_01_archive.html

Hassanpour. A. (2012). Sorani is a dialect with an army and parliament. Thinker. Retrieved August12, 2016, from http://www.thinkir.co.uk/sorani-dialiect-with-army-and- parliament/

Holmes, S. A. (1996, December 30). Black voice of the streets is defended and criticized. New York Times. P. 1.

Johnson, M. A. (1998). The Ebonics debate: Perspectives and possibilities. Journal of Pedagogy, Pluralism, and Practice, 1(3), 1-12.

Jones, A. J. (Ed.). (2013). Overcoming language barriers: how teachers can help dialect speakers succeed. Indiana: Author House.

Khalid, H. S. (2015). The Language and politics of Iraqi Kurdistan: From the 1991 uprising to the consolidation of a Kurdish regional government. Saarbrucken: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.

Khoshnaw, N. A. (2013). Zimani standardi kurdi [The standard Kurdish language].Hawler: Hevi Press.

Linnell, K. (2010). Using dialogue journals to focus on form. Journal of Adult Education, 39, 23-28.

Lodhi, A. Y. (1993). The language situation in Africa today. Nordic Journal of African Studies, 2(1), 79-86.

Mordaunt. O. G. (2011). Bidialectalism in the classroom: The case of African-American English. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 2(1), 77-87.

Moses, K., & Wigglesworth, G. (2008). The silence of frogs: dysfunctional discourse in the 'english-only' aboriginal class. In J. Simosn& G. Wiggleworth, (Eds.), Children's language and multi libgualism: indigenous language use at home and school (pp.129-153). London: continuum international publishing group.

Muhammad. S. (2014). Khwendkaran bo gorini shewazari badini khopishandan dakan [Pupils protest about changing the Kurmanji dialect]. Xendan. Retrieved, October 2,2016, from http://archive.xendan.org/dreja.aspx?=hewal&jmara=9430&Jor=1

Muhammad S. (2014). Hawt mndali khopishandanakai kalak dagiren [Seven children in the Kalak demonstration are arrested]. Xendan. Retrieved , October 2, 2016, From http://archive.xendan.org/dreja.aspx?=hewal&jmara=14009&Jor=1

Nawkhosh, S. (2016). Afsana w aydolojia w ziman [Myth, ideology and language]. Tafseer Publisher: Hawler

Nawkhosh, S. (2010). Standardbuni zmani kurdi la newan zimani siasatw siasati Ziman [Standardizing the Kurdish language between political language and language policy]. Hawler: Minara Press.

Papapavlou, A., & Pavlou, P. (2007). Scociolinguistic and pedagogical dimensions of dialects in education. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Pavlou., P., & Papapavlou (2004). Issues of dialect use in education from the Greek Cypriot Perspective. International Journal of Applied Linguistics 14 (2), 243-258

Perez, S. A. (1999). Using ebonics or black English as a bridge to teaching standard English. Race, Class, Culutre, 1(7)

Pride, J. B. (1979). Sociolinguistic aspects of language learning and teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pandey, A. (2000). TOEFL to the test: Are monolingual AAL-speakers similar to ESL students? World Englishes 19(1), 89-106.

Rafols, M. V. (1974). The use of the standard versus nonstandard Spanish in bilingual education and its effect of the learning ability of children who speak nonstandard dialects (M. A thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign). Retrieved from

http://vufind.carli.illinois.edu.proxy.lib.siu.edu/all/vfsic/Record/1067959/Request.

Ramirez, J. D., Willey, T. G., Klerk, G. D., Lee, E., & Wright, W. E. (Eds.). (2005). Ebonics: the urban education debate. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Rasul, S. (2013) Jut standardakai amini hassanpour w afsanakani [Hassanpour's bi-standard language and myths]. Raman, 19(5), 119-129.

Rosier, P., & Farella, M. (1976). Bilingual education at rock point—some early results. TESOL Quarterly, 10(4), 379-388.

Rowland, J., & Marlow, D. (2010). *Dialect awareness education: the importance of watching our words*. USC upstate undergraduate research journal, 3, 2-8.

Rickford, J. R., Sweetland, J., & Rickford, A. E. (2004). *African American English and other vernaculars in education: A topic-coded bibiliography*. Journal of English Linguistics, 32, 230-320. doi: 10.1177/0075424204268226

Severino, C. (1998). *The political implications of responses to second language writing. In T. Smoke (Ed.), Adult esl: Politics, pedagogy, and participation in classroom and community programs* (p. 189). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Shakali, F. (2011). *Zimani kurdi la astanai sardameki tazada [the Kurdish language at the threshold of a new age]*. Hawler: Aras Press

Shenton, A. K. (2004). *Strategies for trustworthiness in qualitative research project Education for information*, 22(2), 301-315.

Shuy, R. W. (1968). *Bonnie and clyde tactics in English teaching*. Florida: FL Reporter.

Shwani, R. (1385). *Choniati awetakirdni zarakan zimani kurdi [Mixing the Kurdish dialects]*. Zimanawan, 1(2), 33-47.

Shwani, R. (2001). *Chand babteki ziman w rezmany kurdi [Some topics on the grammar of the Kurdish language]*. Hawler: Ministery of Education Press

Siegel, J. (2006a). *Keeping creoles and dialects out of the classroom: Is it justified? In S. J. Nero (Ed.), Dialects, englishes, creoles, and education* (pp. 39-70). New Jersy: lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers Mahwah.

Siegel, J. (2006b). *Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach*. linguistics and education, 17, 157-174.

Siegle, J. (2007). *Creoles and minority dialects in education: an update*. Language and Education, 8(3), 66-88. Doi: 10.2167/le569.0

Siegel, J. (2010). *Second dialect acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Singh, U. K., & Sudarshan (2004). *Language education*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing Pvt.Ltd.

Smitherman, G. (1997). *Moving beyond resistance: ebonics and arican American youth*. Journal of black psychology, 23(3), 227-232.

Smitherman, G. (2000). *Talking that talk: language, culture, and education in African American*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Wardhaugh, R. & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Massachusetts: Wiley Blackwell.

Wheeler, R., & Swords, R. (2006). *Code-switching: Teaching standard English in urban classrooms*. Urbana: National Council of Teaching English.

William, R. L. (1997). *The ebonics controversy*. Journal of Black Psychology, 23(3), 208-214.

Winer, L. (2006). *Teaching English to Caribbean English creole-speaking students in the Caribbean and north America. In S. J. Nero (Ed.), Dialects, englishes, creoles, and education* (pp. 105-118). New Jersy: lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers

Wolfram, W. (1991). *Dialects and American English*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc and CAL

Wright, R. L. (1998). *Sociolinguistic and ideological dynamics of the ebonics controversy*. Journal of Negro Education, 67(1), 5-15.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2007). *Choice of classroom language in bidialectal communities: to include or to exclude the dialect?* Cambridge journal of education, 37(1), 51-66.

Yiakoumetti, A. (2006). *A bidialectical program for the learning of standard modern Greek in Cyprus*. Applied Linguistics, 27(2), 295-317.

Yiakoumetti, A., Evans, M., & Esch, E. (2005). *Language awareness in a bidialectical setting: The oral performance and language attitudes of urban and rural students in Cyprus*. Language Awareness, 14(4), 254-259.