CONCEPTUALIZING SCHOOL EDUCATION WELLBEING FOR MIGRANT GIRLHOOD IN GERMANY

Pinar Burcu Güner[1]
Bielefeld University, Germany

Abstract

The main focus of the study was to explore the experiences of inequalities and the expectations of a good life of girls at the age of 14 to 16 years old from a Turkish background living in Germany. Essentially, the research focused on identifying the gaps and analyzing inequality through girls' interpretation of a good life in Germany. Specifically, this paper will concentrate on the finding "capabilities for other girls". Girls who participated in the interview have experienced exclusion in their everyday life which made them feel other and this paper will highlight what are the valuable capabilities for these girls not too feel other. To find the inequalities in the life of socially vulnerable girls of Turkish origin, this research conceptualized how ethnicity and migration background deprives or enhances the capabilities (opportunities) of 2nd, 3rd and 4th generation Turkish migrant origin girls living in Germany. The data for research was collected in collaboration with schools and youth institutes in the Federal State of North Rhein Westphalia in Germany.

A pilot study was conducted to define the research design, research questions, data collection methods and methodology. The pilot study had identified that focus groups provided a rich amount of data but were not enough to analyze the experienced inequalities and the individual agency of the participants. The pilot study revealed that it needed to be triangulated with a socio-economic questionnaire, to be able to report the distribution of the socio-economic backgrounds of the participants among the Turkish immigrant youth. An individual life history interview was used as a method of data collection to analyze how Turkish girls interpreted their feelings of inequality and active agency.

As a result of analyzing the pilot data using Grounded Theory methodology, two goals of the research were identified. The first one was to determine how girls of Turkish origin living in Germany developed a positive view of themselves; such as empowerment, agency, emancipation, inspirations and aspirations, as they were challenged at school and in the German society. The second was to ascertain how girls of Turkish origin living in Germany interpreted challenges, at school and in the wider society, to obtaining a good life. I aimed to develop the literature review with concepts derived through the results of the pilot study, because a literature review that has been conducted with the concepts relevant to the objective of the study results in building the background of the research (Hammick, 1996).

---

[1] *Correspondence*: pburcu.guner@gmail.com

This research is framed with Sen's (2009) conceptualization of the Capability Approach to welfare and well-being, as well as Martha Nussbaum's concept of education and agency (2013). The Capability Approach (Sen, 2009 & Nussbaum, 2011) discusses what a person can do with the given resources and what a person needs in order to live a life which he/she desires to live. The Capability Approach is an evaluative approach for analyzing what the limitations are in life which prevent a person from living a good life. Biggeri and Libanora's (2011) implementation of the capabilities approach is used for designing the interview guidelines. A Grounded Theory approach (Charmaz, 2017) was used to analyze the data.

Research in Germany reveals that children of immigrants are disadvantaged in the German school education system and the family's socio-economic status determines the school education outcomes of children and youth (OECD 2017). The starting point of this research questioned how inequality in school education would affect the life opportunities of the socially vulnerable children and youths of immigrant-origin. The pilot data revealed that girls highlighted a 'good school education' as fundamental for a 'good life'. In the actual data collection, opportunities for a good life were linked to opportunities for a good school education.

In the main data collection phase there were 20 focus groups, consisting of five to eight girls, a socio-economic questionnaire after each focus group and 25 individual life history interviews with the girls who participated in the focus groups, conducted in order to analyze the personal experiences of inequality. The questionnaire was included in order to control the effects of external factors, such as migration background, ethnicity, religion and gender, as it was a heterogeneous group of participants. In the main data collection, the interview guidelines were structured to investigate what girls of Turkish origin perceived to be opportunities and inequalities, and how they removed these limitations (agency) for a good life. As a result, the research was centered on two main concepts, these were a 'good life' and opportunities to achieve a 'good school education'.

Four main categories were identified in the findings of the research: Construction of Identity; Aspiration for Education; Marginalization; and Living in a Multicultural Society. Construction of Identity has been subcategorized into; 'Citizenship', 'Religion' and 'Identity'. 'Marginalization' also has three sub-categories, namely 'Discrimination', 'Stereotypes' and 'Institutional Marginalization' and 'Living in a Multicultural Society' has been separated into categories termed 'Unity' and 'Multiculturalism'.

Theory of Capability Approach

The main theoretical framework of this research is the Capability Approach. The Capability Approach was first introduced by the 1998 Nobel Prize winner, Amartya Sen. Martha Nussbaum was also a strong contributor to the development of the Capability Approach. The Capability Approach is a broad normative framework for the evaluation and assessment of well-being and social arrangements of a society. The concepts of the Capability Approach have been determined in the literature review, which guided the design of the project to allow the research questions to be answered. The Capability Approach is primarily a framework of thought, a mode of thinking about normative issues, hence a paradigm — loosely defined — that can be used for a wide range of evaluative purposes. The Capability Approach also identifies social constraints that influence and restrict well-being as well as the evaluative exercises (Robeyns 2005).

The paper discusses two main concepts of capability approach. The first term is capabilities; this term discusses what a person can do with their capabilities (opportunities). The second term is functionings; the term discusses what a human being can achieve as a result of being or doing. This research also focuses on human diversity

in two ways: by its focus on the plurality of functionings and capabilities as the evaluative space, and by the explicit focus on personal and socio-environmental conversion factors (limitations) of commodities into functionings (Robeyns 2008). Because the pilot study has found that Turkish migrant background girls living in Germany are diverse in terms of needs and values. The distinction between achieved functionings and capabilities is that one is possible and the other is realized. In other words, functionings are achievements and capabilities are the valuable opportunities that people can choose from. What is important is that people have the freedom and valuable opportunities (capabilities) to lead the lives they want to live, to do what they want to do and be the person they want to be (Sugden 1993).

The Challenges for Migrant Origin Pupils in the German Education System

This research claims that education system in Germany is the main factor producing inequality for children and youth from Turkish migrant background. This is why understanding the capabilities for migrant origin pupils centered around education is vital in the research. Children of immigrants have been challenged in the German education system. The data obtained during this research project revealed that children of immigrants encountered various difficulties during their school education. In addition, children of immigrants have been subject to various disadvantages and unequal treatment in their school education. For example, studies have shown that migrant children tend to be classified as having learning disabilities simply because of their sub-standard German language skills (Kornmann, 2006; Hovestadt, 2003). Some academics infer that students are not primarily disadvantaged because of their migrant origin, but rather because of their socially disadvantaged position (Kristen, 2006), which often coincides with a 'migration background'.

The 2015 PISA results revealed that equity has improved in Germany since the 2006 PISA results. Students' socioeconomic status became less of a reliable predictor of achievement in Germany. The number of resilient pupils who beat the socio-economic odds against them increased (OECD 2016). Despite the increase in the skills of young people with low socio-economic status, further efforts are still needed to reduce the linkage between social background and achievement. In addition, research in Germany does not provide sufficient answers on whether pupils of migrant origin are primarily disadvantaged because of their migration background or because of their socioeconomic situation. Regardless of these questions, pupils of migrant origin are disadvantaged in school education.

The main reason for this considerable discrimination against pupils with a migration background can be found within the multi-track school system – with its highly selective streaming after grade 4 (or 6 in Berlin). Mechanisms inherent to the school system contribute to discrimination against migrant children (Gomolla and Radtke, 2000). There are also social inequalities in the transition from primary school (Grundschule) to lower secondary school (Realschule) that children of immigrants are subject to. Children of foreign origin have fewer chances of being recommended for the Gymnasium than German children, even when they share the same academic achievement level and social status (Bos *et al.*, 2007). The children and youth of migrant families have a high rate of repeating a class or attending a special education (Auernheimer 2005).

Method
Design of the Study

A pilot study was necessary in order to decide how suitable the data collection methods and methodology were for addressing the research questions, as well as figuring out how to implement the concepts of the Capability Approach and contribute to the qualitative knowledge of the Capability Approach. I planned to conduct a pilot study in

order to understand the life, culture and values of young people of immigrant origin to better design the research goals, rationale, questions and data collection methods. I entered the field knowing only Grounded Theory methodology, I had not reviewed the literature relating to the phenomena I was planning to study. Also, I was aware that, in Germany, there had not been much research conducted to investigate good life opportunities, agency, empowerment and the identity of Turkish youths of immigrant origin. I decided to use focus groups in order to obtain the necessary amount of data in a short time. The interview guidelines had open questions such as: What are your everyday activities? How do you spend your free time? These were designed to facilitate an understanding of youth culture as well as break the ice. I was also interested in how girls defined a good life for themselves and for other girls their age living in Germany or in any part of the world, how they perceived their existing opportunities for having a good life in Germany and what they interpreted as obstacles to gaining these opportunities to live a good life.

The research design focused on highlighting ontological, epistemological, and axiological issues. Ontologically, I was interested in the multiple realities surrounding the good life opportunities of girls of Turkish origin living in Germany, for example, how girls of Turkish origin viewed reality and experienced reality. I was also aware that society constructs a reality which influences personal interpretations and experiences. From an epistemological perspective, I was interested in understanding what knowledge already existed in the field I was studying, to identify knowledge gaps, and to maximize my contribution to the knowledge production for literature concerning both the Capability Approach and migrant youth in Germany.

The pilot study results also revealed that focus groups were used for collecting rich data in a short period of time. For the main data collection, in order to control the effect of the socio-economic status of the girls, a homogenous group of girls with Turkish immigrant backgrounds, I developed a socio-economic questionnaire to be administered after each focus group interview. The questions were adapted from Shell Deutsche Jugendstudium, 2010 (Shell German Youth Study). Also, in order to identify individual interpretations of existing opportunities, inequalities, and possible actions (agency) to make changes, individual interviews were necessary. In order to analyze the opportunities and inequalities in different life courses and transitions, I decided to conduct life-history interviews. As a result, triangulated data from the focus groups and individual interviews were used to answer the research questions.

Triangulation

The term 'triangulation' is reserved for instances where methods are combined for the purpose of confirmation (Lambert & Loiselle, 2007). Triangulation is defined as researchers taking different perspectives on an issue being studied or, more generally speaking, to answer research questions (Flick 2014). The perspectives can be substantiated by using several methods and/or several theoretical approaches. It refers to using a combination of different sorts of data as the background for theoretical perspectives, which are applied to the data. As far as possible, these perspectives should be treated and applied equally.

In this particular research project, data triangulation led to the following results: (1) a productive, iterative process, where an initial model of the phenomenon guided the exploration of individual accounts, and successive individual data further enriched the conceptualization of the phenomenon; (2) identification of the individual and the contextual circumstances surrounding the phenomenon, which added to the interpretation of the structure of the phenomenon; and (3) convergence of the central characteristics of the phenomenon across focus groups and individual interviews, which enhanced the trustworthiness of the findings (Lambert & Loiselle 2007). Triangulation

with focus groups and individual life-history interviews supported the analysis. More specifically, how ethnicity and migration background might result in exclusion in the life of the girls. The structure is defined within the context of Grounded Theory.

Developing Interview Guidelines

The operationalization and implementation of the Capabilities Approach for domain selection, especially the question of whether and how to construct a capability list from the perspective of individuals or groups, has been extensively discussed in the literature (Biggeri *et al.*, 2006; Martinetti, 2006, 2015). Also, Burchardt and Vizard (2011) discussed a key issue, raised in the debates about the 'operationalization' of the Capability Approach, of a need for a methodology to develop and agree on a list of countable, substantive freedoms and opportunities for the purpose of measurement. The capability approach concepts were implemented as discussed below.

The first stage was characterized by the following question on the interview guideline: What are the most important opportunities girls should have throughout their life? The objective of this question was to identify which capabilities were relevant without limiting the possible answers with a predefined questionnaire. If the young woman mentioned a capability that had not been identified earlier by the researcher, their answer was added to the list. In this research project, the first question for the focus group was an introductory question to break the ice in the group. I asked, "What are your everyday activities and what kinds of hobbies do you have?" After the introductory question, the focus questions began with, "What are the most important opportunities for girls of your age all over the world to have a good life?"

In the second step of the interview guideline, the participants were asked to discuss and make a list of opportunities and rank them from most important to least important. A similar question was posed, "What are the most important opportunities for young, similarly-aged women of Turkish origin living in Germany to have a good life?" This step was also used to analyze group capabilities because the Capability Approach has been criticized for excluding groups due to its very individualistic approach. In this project, the data on group capabilities have been limited to the discussion of the group capabilities of girls of Turkish origin living in Germany.

In the third stage of the interview guideline, the girls were asked about the actual functioning achieved, which involved drawing on personal experiences. This step was implemented to ascertain whether they had the opportunity for a good life or a good school education in two different sections. The participants were asked, "Do you have opportunities?" They then listed valuable opportunities in their lives. The same question was repeated for school education in the second part of the interview guideline. In addition, I rephrased the question to allow detailed discussion during the individual life-history methodology.

In the fourth stage, the girls were asked about the relevance of each specific capability/dimension for girls in general, i.e., the broader community. An individual capability set, achievable functionings at the personal level, may be limited for children who are vulnerable because it could be influenced by adoptive preferences in which people normalize limitations and deprivation after a certain period of time. The data of this research project has been limited to identifying and discussing adoptive preferences. In the interview guideline, this question was asked: In your opinion, how important/unimportant is it to be able to have opportunities as a member of the group you listed, for example, of your age and background? According to Bigger and Libanora (2011), the aim of this question is to measure the relevance of each capability dimension for the whole group. Also in this research project we asked the question, "What are the opportunities to have a good life and a good school education for girls with a German

background?" This was asked to identify the adoptive preferences of each participant. Also, the data on adoptive preferences has been limited for a substantial analysis.

In the final stage, the girls were asked if they wished to add any other dimensions of well-being to the study. In order to obtain a partial ordering, the researcher asked the girls about their preferences. This question was posed as, "Among the aspects we have discussed, could you tell me which are the five most important opportunities a young woman should have during her lifetime?" This phase aimed to identify the most relevant capabilities for the group. After finishing the interviews, it was possible to draw a list of relevant capabilities which had been defined by the girls themselves and legitimized by the group (settings specific to prior vote rules). The level of achieved functionings was pointed out, at both the individual and aggregated level, under some assumptions and the first prioritization of the dimensions of well-being was achieved. In this particular research project, participants prepared a list of their functionings and ranked them in order, from the most achievable to the least achievable.

After following the above-mentioned procedures, the following question was presented as the final question in the interview guideline: What are the limitations and obstacles girls experience, and are forced to confront, at school and in society? In addition, to be able to achieve an in-depth analysis of social vulnerability and inequality during the individual life-history interviews, we asked, "What do you think makes you disadvantaged and unequal in the school and society?" To be able to analyze agency participants were asked, "How do you remove these obstacles and limitations in order to have a good life and a good school education in Germany?" Finally, to analyze their aspirations, they were asked, "Imagine your 18th birthday/what are you planning to do in the next 2-3 years?"

Sampling the Participants

In Germany (Bielefeld, Gütersloh, Dortmund, Duisburg, and Düsseldorf), I sent letters for the attention of the school administration, teachers and parents, to schools which had pupils of immigrant origin. The letters requested the schools to gather girls who would like to participate in the research project, which was described in the letter. I made an agreement with a contact from each school that each group would consist of five to eight participants of the same age group. Girls who volunteered to participate in the research brought a signed letter from their parents. Girls, who were over 18 years old, registered their names and contact details to be invited for an interview. Participation in the research was not an issue because many girls volunteered to participate. The only selection criteria stated in the invitation letter was that the interviews would only be conducted with girls of Turkish origin.

Socio-Economic Background of the Participants
The main goal of the survey was to analyze the socio-economic status of the girls in order to identify external factors of social vulnerability that may differ from those available to a homogeneous group of a sub-community, i.e. Turkish immigrants, in Germany. This was because this study focused only on researching the 'good life' opportunities of girls who are part of the Turkish immigrant community in Germany.

Table 1.
Survey Results of the Socio-economic Questionnaire

Country of Birth	▪ All participants were born in Germany
Number of Siblings	▪ All participants had at least one sibling and a maximum of three siblings.

Citizenship	▪ 70% were dual citizens and 30% of participants had dual citizenships and had to decide which citizenship to obtain when they were 18 to 23 years old. They all wrote they would choose to be solely German citizens.
Birthplace of Parents	▪ 60% of participants had two Turkish-born parents. ▪ Only 1% of participants had two German-born parents. ▪ 39% of participants had one parent who was born in Germany.
Country of Parents' Education	▪ 60% of participants answered that their parents were educated in both Germany and Turkey. ▪ 40% had parents that were only educated in Turkey. ▪ The 'only educated in Turkey' group was dominated by mothers who were never educated in Germany. Generally, mothers came to Germany through marriage as participants highlighted in their written answers.
Parents' Education Level	▪ Only 1% of participants had parents who were literate but had not been in formal education. ▪ 99% of parents had a formal school education, ranging from elementary education to obtaining a vocational high school diploma. ▪ None of the girls had parents who participated in higher education. The questionnaire included labels both from Turkish and German education systems, but many parents were educated in Turkey and later had training in Germany.
Mother Tongue and Home Language	▪ All participants identified their first language as Turkish. ▪ 70% of the participants spoke Turkish and German at home. Participants generally spoke German with their siblings and friends. Turkish was mostly spoken with parents. ▪ Only 30% of participants spoke Turkish at home with their siblings. ▪ Participants stated that the main reason for speaking only Turkish with parents and siblings at home was to improve their Turkish language skills, as they had no other chance to speak Turkish. The second reason participants gave for only speaking Turkish at home was the lack of German language skills of their mothers.
Parents' Employment Status	▪ 60% of the participants had a father who had a full-time job with a minimum of 35 hours per week. ▪ 20% of fathers were unemployed. ▪ 20% of fathers were working part-time, less than 15 hours per week. ▪ 60% of participants had mothers working part-time, a minimum of 15 hours or more. ▪ 20% of participants had a full-time working mother, 35 hours or more per week. ▪ 20% of participants had mothers who were housewives.

Materials	▪ Materially, participants were well equipped. A high number of them had the following, at home or in their rooms: books, games, a CD-player, a TV, a computer, a play-station, and/or a Gameboy. Most frequently, their free time was spent listening to music, joining a sports team, internet surfing, reading books and magazines, meeting with friends and doing activities with their families.
	▪ 90% of participants had 25-100 books at home and 10% had 1-24 books at home.
Home Situation	▪ 95% of participants shared a room with their same-sex siblings.
	▪ All participants had at least one older or younger sibling. - 90% of participants were one of three children.
	▪ 5% of participants had one sibling and the other 5% had more than two siblings.
	▪ Families consisted only of children and parents. There were no parents who were divorced or separated.
Free Time	▪ All participants spent their free time with friends and family. They enjoyed surfing the internet, reading books and magazines, playing computer games, shopping, going to see movies and watching TV.

The questions for the socio-economic questionnaire were selected from Shell Deutsche JugendStudie, 2010. The questions used in this study were selected based on their ability to support and answer the research questions in addition to being complementary to the focus group and individual life-history interviews. I selected questions related to measuring socio-economic background. To analyze the questionnaire, I used a frequency measurement on SPSS.

Analytical Procedure: Grounded Theory Methodology

Grounded Theory analysis starts with the initial step of open coding. Categories that will be developed during open coding related to: which phenomenon the actions and interactions related to; conditions that led to the occurrence of the phenomenon, the context of the investigated phenomenon; other aspects that influenced the phenomenon because researchers are advised to identify types of phenomena; context; casual intervening conditions; and consequences which are relevant for the categories (Kelle 2010).

After several rounds of open coding, the remaining codes and their properties will be gathered to explore what the main category should be. This phase will be 'focus coding'. Focused coding means using the most significant and/or frequent codes, obtained during the open coding process, to sift through a large amount of data (Charmaz 2006). In this phase, the researcher will investigate the data critically to focus on the emerging concepts (Charmaz 2006). Also, the researcher will define the meanings of the concepts and as a result will be able to explain the data in-depth.

The final stage is the 'Theoretical Phase'. For this stage, the data will be analyzed from an abstract perspective. Theoretical codes are advanced abstractions that provide a framework for enhancing the explanatory power of the storyline and its potential as theory (Birks & Mills 2015). Theoretical codes specify possible relationships between categories

developed during the focused coding stage (Charmaz 2006), this phase can be considered as the saturation process. Theoretical saturation is used by Glaser and Strauss (1967) to define the criterion for when to stop theoretically sampling and the data pertinent to a category. Theoretical saturation will be a crucial phase for the researcher to think about building the abstract conceptualization of the data. During this phase, new codes will be found to build a meaningful category which would assist in answering the research questions. Also in this stage, researcher will include all properties of the categories, sub-categories, and categories for a distinct integration.

Findings & Discussion

During the interviews, themes connected to exclusion and unfair treatment were the main topics analyzed to find grounded concepts to explain abstract phenomena. I interpreted that the girls' experiences were a reflection of dealing with Germany's political debates on immigration and integration in their everyday lives. According to Tuğba's interpretation, being German was determined by hair color and eye color rather than citizenship, which they were eligible to obtain. The interpretations of the girls were reflections of the constraints driven by the representation of diversity and plurality in policy and the public space.

> *Deniz: You have a black head, you have black eyes and you have black hair. Even if you are German on paper, you are still Turkish. In the eyes of Germans, you are Turkish.*

The participants pointed out that 'equal opportunities for everyone' and 'anti-discrimination' were the most important components of schooling. I argue that the girls emphasized such concepts because these were the political debates taking place in Germany. In the next quote, Nil gave an example of how societal constraints functioned. According to that quote, one had the legal right to apply for a job according to his or her preference. However, in the process, societal mechanisms might restrict existing opportunities because of a lack of fundamental rights. A lack of visibility of diversities and pluralities has already been discussed in many quotes. In the next quote, fundamental rights overlapped with the lack of visibility of pluralities. Because of this overlap, one's external and internal functionings were restricted.

> *Nil: My sister is a bus driver, she was trying to get a promotion. As my history is good, she asked me for help. We studied questions someone gave her, we slept together that evening and she woke up during the night and gave me the answers to the questions. She took the exam, three people were accepted and out of these three names my sister's name was also there. Someone told her that one German was selected to be promoted. My sister said, "I was so sure of myself". The man said, "you were also on the list but we decided to take one German". My sister said, "next time I will go there, dye my hair blond and I will change my name in the court". It was so sad for me. Another thing just happened last week. In our class there is a girl, she is very friendly. She told me, "Please do not speak to me in Turkish when there are Germans". I thought that it was because she didn't want to be disrespectful to Germans when they didn't understand what we said, and she said something like, "yes, it is". Accidently, when we were together with other Germans, I told her something in Turkish. Do you know how she answered me? "I don't understand what you said". Later on, I said that why did you speak like that, why do you hide your identity? She said to me, "don't you know here, if I say I am Turkish and if I show how much I love Turks, if I don't say bad things about*

Turks, if I say I am Turkish proudly, they will hurt my feelings and they will not become my friends, and my grades will go down. If I say Turks are bad and if I say that I became a German, I am a German, I am a liberal and if I try to explain to them that I am modern, if I put it in their brains, I will get better grades". She said and it happened as she said. "My father is German, and my mother is Turkish", she said.

Connecting the grounded concepts with the next quote, the external and internal functionings are restricted by one's diversity. The plural identities, which are undermined in the public space, create different mechanisms to be dealt with. In the next quote, in order to reduce 'the harm of her diversity', the young woman framed her ethnic identity as being Turkish and German. At the grounded conceptual level, the data reveals how societal mechanisms create a situation in which young people have to struggle. Pluralities of identity would be embedded in the systems and structures to create diverse opportunities for all kinds of people.

Nil: I have a classmate, she says, "my father or my mother is Turkish". "She didn't teach us Turkish", she says, "we are Germans and we don't like Turks".
Interviewer: She actually speaks Turkish.

Gül: Yes, she speaks very well.

Interviewer: Do you think the teachers like it?

Ece. They like it very much.

Interviewer: She openly told you that.

Deniz: She even said, "don't you know what these people are?" If I don't say bad things about Turks and if I don't put them in a higher place and if I say I am Turkish, they are not going to take me inside with them, they will give me lower grades and it happened as she said.

Özlem: You will say that I am not a Turk, I am a German, I was born here, too many things. It is difficult, but one can succeed, but not many people can achieve that. One will immerse into their eyes, and one will fight.

Deniz: It is very wearing.

The participant highlighted that climbing the ladder, or even becoming a politician was possible, by speaking proper German language, being proactive and tolerating differences with Germans and sacrificing oneself to say, "I am German, and I can only speak the German language". I claim that the girls have interpreted that they have to obliterate their plural identities and emphasize their 'German-ness' and their 'German identity' to have value in German society. The girls have contradictory voices because of how they have been negatively 'framed' and 'narrated' in the German political discourse. I highlight that 'being integrated into German society' was also controversial and contradictory within the context of the girls. The grounded concepts in the quote were a 'lack of acceptance of diversities' as an everyday reality, rather than an abnormality, and 'confronting obstacles for a meaningful life' due to not being accepted with their pluralities. The external and internal constraints overlapped to reduce possible functioning`s to have a meaningful life.

> *Deniz: I don't want to say something stupid but people behind me are coming in front of me, for me to go near him/her, why do I need to fight that much? People get work in front of them, this and that we need to fight. I called a workplace and directly I said this and that, I spoke really high German, I spoke well. The man asked if I could come to speak, so I went. When he saw my head scarf, he said, "Can you open it?", I said no. He said, "I am sorry, I cannot take you", but on the phone he said, "Come, I will take you".*

> *Merve: Do you know what the problem is? Instead of accepting us as we are, they want us to change, then they want us to accept, that is the problem. They say integrate. We didn't say we wouldn't integrate but we said we cannot be like you.*

The girls had confronted various exclusionary experiences in their everyday life. The concepts grounded in the data were 'being different' and 'being other'. The young people could not find a space to realize their being. In the next quote, the girls highlighted the possibilities of being visible and acceptable in the community. She again returned to the existing reality that fewer people could access opportunities for emancipation in Germany. She emphasized that 'sacrificing oneself' would be interpreted as having various challenges. The grounded concept in the data is the expansion of opportunities for all without discriminating, restricting, and stigmatizing diversities.

Conclusion

The data meaningfully revealed that girls want to be included through education in order to raise their voice, be noticed, recognized, accepted and valued in German society. The data highlighted that girls clarifying who they are, what they believe in and being accepted with their ethnicity, migrant background and religion are important capabilities of a good life. Girls highlighted that education does not have a materialistic value. Education is a capability for independence, emancipation, empowerment, acknowledgment, being heard, being recognized, and being valued. Also Education is a capability for being accepted by society and living in a liberating society to become the person they would like to become. The evidence suggests that an education would not only focus on gaining skills in subject matter. Education would be a sphere to bring various children and youth to fulfill their capabilities for a good life to be recognized, valued, heard, to be accepted with their differences and receive the support they need to become emancipated and empowered women.

References

Auernheimer, G. (2005). The German education system: Dysfunctional for an immigration society. European Education, 37(4), 75-89.

Bos, W., Lankes, E. M., Prenzel, M., Schwippert, K., Valtin, R., & Walther, G. (2007). Erste Ergebnisse aus IGLU: Schülerleistungen am Ende der vierten Jahrgangsstufe im internationalen Vergleich. Sozialwissenschaftlicher Fachinformationsdienst soFid, (Bildungsforschung 2007/1), 9-46.

Biggeri, M., Libanora, R., Mariani, S., & Menchini, L. (2006). Children conceptualizing their capabilities: results of a survey conducted during the first children's world congress on child labor. Journal of Human Development, 7(1), 59-83.

Biggeri, M., & Libanora, R. (2011). From valuing to evaluating: Tools and procedures to operationalize the Capability Approach. In Children and the Capability Approach (pp. 79-106). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Biggeri, M., Ballet, J., & Comim, F. (2011). The Capability Approach and research on children: Capability Approach and children's issues. In Children and the good life (pp. 75-89). Springer, Dordrecht.

Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015). Grounded Theory: A practical guide. Sage, London.

Burchardt, T., & Vizard, P. (2011). Operationalizing the Capability Approach as a basis for equality and human rights monitoring in twenty-first-century Britain. Journal of human development and capabilities, 12(1), 91-119.

Charmaz, K. (2006). Constructing Grounded Theory. Qualitative research in organizations and management: An International Journal, 2(2), 84-103.

Charmaz, K. (2017). The power of constructivist Grounded Theory for critical inquiry. Qualitative Inquiry, 23(1), 34-45.

Flick, U. (2014). An introduction to qualitative research. Sage. (Gomolla and Radtke, 2000).

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London). Google Scholar.

Gomolla, M., & Radtke, F. O. (2000). Mechanismen institutionalisierter Diskriminierung in derSchule. In *Migration, gesellschaftliche Differenzierung und Bildung* (pp. 321-341). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.

Hammick, M. (1996). Managing the ethical process in research. London: Quay Books (pp. 125).

Hovestadt, G. (2003). Wie setzen die Bundesländer den Bildungsauftrag der Kindertageseinrichtungen um. Vom Gesetz zur Praxis. Eine Studie im Auftrag der Max-Träger-Stiftung. Rheine.

Kelle, U. (2010). The development of categories: Different approaches to Grounded Theory. The Sage handbook of Grounded Theory, 2, 191-213.

Kirsten, C. (2006). Ethnische Diskriminierung im deutschen Schulsystem? Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Ergebnisse (No. SP IV 2006-601). WZB Discussion Paper.

Kornmann, R. (2006). Entwicklungstheoretische Grundlagen für eine diagnostisch gestützteindividualisierende pädagogische Förderung 4-bis 8-Jähriger. Beiträge zur Lehrerinnen-undLehrerbildung, 24(2), 183-191.

Lambert, S. D., & Loiselle, C. G. (2007). Health information – seeking behavior. Qualitative health research, 17(8), 1006-1019.

Martinetti, E. C. (2006). Capability Approach and fuzzy set theory: description, aggregation, and inference issues. In the Fuzzy set approach to multidimensional poverty measurement (pp. 93-113). Springer, Boston, MA.

Martinetti, E.C., Egdell, V., Hollywood, E., & McQuaid, R. (2015). Operationalization of the Capability Approach. In Facing trajectories from school to work (pp. 115-139). Springer, Cham.

Nussbaum, M. (2000). Women's capabilities and social justice. *Journal of human development, 1*(2), 219-247.

Nussbaum, M. (2011). Creating Capabilities. The Human Development Approach. Harvard University Press: Cambridge.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2013). Political emotions. Harvard University Press.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2016). Country Note Germany. Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) Results from PISA 2015.

OECD, Paris: France. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pisa/pisa-2015-Germany.pdf

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD (2017). Education at a Glance: OECD Data Germany.
    Retrieved from https://data.oecd.org/germany.htm#profile-education

Robeyns, I. (2005). The capability approach: a theoretical survey. *Journal of human development*, *6*(1), 93-117.

Robenys, I. (2008). Sen`s Capability Approach and feminist concern, in *The Capability Approach*, Comim, Qizilbash & Alkire (eds), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sen, A. (1999). Commodities and capabilities. *OUP Catalogue.*

Sen, A. (2002). *Rationality and Freedom*, Cambridge (Mass.): The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Sen, A. K. (2009). *The idea of justice.* Harvard University Press.

Shell, D. (2010). Jugend 2010. 16. Shell Jugendstudie. FfM: Fischer.

Sugden, R. (1993). Welfare, resources, and capabilities: a review of inequality reexamined by Amartya Sen.

About the Author

Pinar Burcu Güner earned her doctoral degree from Bielefeld University Faculty of Educational Sciences in 2018. Her doctoral research focused on educational opportunities and inequalities of girls from a Turkish migration background in Germany. Dr. Güner was a postdoctoral research fellow at the School of Public Health in Bielefeld University (2018-2019). Her postdoctoral research focused on the intersection of educational opportunities, mental health and emotional wellbeing of girls and young women from migrant and refugee backgrounds in Germany.

Appendix 1: Socio-economic questionnaire

Socioeconomic questionnaire

1 - I am _____ years old.

2 - How many siblings do you have?
_____ younger brother / brothers / does not apply
_____ younger sister / sisters / does not apply
_____ older brother / brothers / does not apply
_____ older sisters / sisters / does not apply
I have no siblings

3 - What nationality do you have?
German
Turkish
dual citizenship

4 - Where were you born?
I was born in Germany
I was born in Turkey

5 - Where did you live so far? (a or B)
a) - I lived exclusively in Germany
b) - it was as follows:
I lived _____ years in Turkey
 and I came to Germany,
when I was _____ years old.

6 - Are your parents born in Germany,
or is one of them or both from Turkey?
My parents were born in Germany
One parent comes from another country
Both come from another country

7 - What degree does your mother have? (a or B)
a) If she attended the school in Turkey:
Ilkokul
Ortaokul
Lise
Meslek okulu
No education, but can read and write
No education, can not read and write

b) If she attended the school in Germany:
Secondary School (8th / 9th grade)
Secondary school / middle school (10th grade)
Fachhochschulreife
High School
Has no degree
Still goes to school

8 – What degree does your father have? (a or B)

a) If he attended the school in Turkey:
Ilkokul
Ortaokul
Lise
Meslek okulu
No education, but can read and write
No education, cannot read and write

b) If he attended the school in Germany:
Secondary School (8th / 9th grade)
Secondary school / middle school (10th grade)
Fachhochschulreife
High School
Has no degree
Still goes to school

9 – My dad is:
Full-time employment (35 hours and more)
Part-time employed (15 to under more)
Minor (under 15 hours)
Unemployed
On parental leave or other leave of absence
In education
Hausmann or for other reasons not gainfully employed

10 – My mother is:
Full-time employment (35 hours and more)
Part-time employed (15 to under more)
Minor (under 15 hours)
Unemployed
On parental leave or other leave of absence
Stay-at-home spouse or for other reasons not gainfully employed

10 -In what language do you mainly speak at home?
Rather in German
Rather in Turkish
German and Turkish

11 -What is your native language?
My native language is _____

12 – How many people live with you in your household?
Overall, we are _____ in the household.

13 -Do you have your own room?
Yes (If yes, then continue with item 14.)
No

If you do not have your own room, with how many

Persons (except you) do you share your room? Number _____

And with how many siblings do you share your room?
I share with my brothers. Number _____
I share with my sisters. Number _____

14 - What do you usually do in your free time?
A TV
B- listen to music
Carve C videos / DVDs
D- Surf the Internet
E- Do not "hang out"
Read F-books
G- Go to the pub
Read magazines or magazines
I- go to the disco, to parties or fetuses
J-Playstation, play Nintendo, computer games
K- Jugendfreizeittreff, visit youth center
L- Sport in the spare time, like cycling, skating, kicking etc.
M-Training / active sports (fitness club, sports club ...)
N- Meet with people
O- Engage in a project / initiative / club
P- do something with the family
Q-shop, buy great things
R- do something creative, artistic

15 - How many books are there at home?