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Abstract

This thesis explores the identity formation of three Turkish speaking social groups – Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish (CKT) – living in London in a transnational context. The thesis aims to explore how CKT youths negotiate their identity by looking at their everyday experiences. The everyday experiences of CKT youth are observed through their discourses and interpretations of different interactions. By analysing these interactions, this thesis aims to fill some of the gaps in the literature on transnationalism.

The theoretical framework of this thesis is based mainly on Giddens’ theory of identity formation and Faist’s concept of transnational social space. By focusing on the concepts of identity and transnational social space, the thesis examines how the experiences, perceptions and social relations of CKT youth are formed by negotiation and dialogue with the country of origin, host culture and individual attachments. Giddens helps us to conceive identity in a dynamic way and as an outcome of the interaction between structural dimensions, social relations and the self. In this thesis, these structural, social and individual dimensions are operationalised through the analysis of CKT youth interaction with their family, community organisations, school contexts, neighbourhood environments and transnational medias. The concept of transnational social space is used to characterise the identity formation occurring across the borders of nation-states and brought into a single social space.

The empirical data are based on 45 semi-structured interviews with CKT youth, 16 semi-structured interviews with first generation CKT migrants, one focus group and participatory observation at five community meetings, as well as several social events organised by CKT youth.

The thesis concludes that the choices young people make in terms of their ways of life, the sorts of interactions they have, and their social and cultural preferences frame their positioning within society. Their experiences are diverse and transformative, formed through their interactions with various social and structural aspects surrounding them.
Introduction

This research aims to explore the identity formation of CKT (Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish) young people in a transnational context and to examine how CKT youth negotiate their identity by looking at their everyday experiences. Defining identity has always been difficult and describing it in the context of transnational migrants is even harder (see Anthias, 2001; 2002; Bauman, 2001; Beck, 1994; Giddens, 1994 and Robins, 2001), because transnational migrants build their lives across the borders of more than two countries and locate themselves within the socio-cultural, economic and political life of both receiving and sending countries (Faist, 2000; 2000a; Glick Schiller et al., 1992; 1997; Portes et al., 1999; Vertovec, 1999). With the emergence of the concept of transnationalism, migrants’ relationship with both societies, the issue of belonging, and the ways they define themselves in the context of those societies become highly important questions (Faist, 2000; Glick Schiller et al., 1992; Portes et al., 1999; 1999a; Vertovec, 2001a).

The concept of transnationalism has become one of the fundamental ways of understanding the practices of migrants across the borders of nation-states (Dahinden, 2009; Faist, 2000; Glick Schiller et al., 1995; Pries, 1999; Vertovec, 2001; 2001a). In the literature, transnationalism is most of the time defined as ‘a process by which migrants, through their daily activities, forge and sustain multi-stranded social, economic and political relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement, and through which they create social fields that cross national boundaries’ (Glick-Schiller et al., 1994: 6). However, the context of transnationalism has been criticised, because it does not answer certain questions such as, what sort of migrant community does it cover, what is its historical limit and what kinds of migrant practices it includes (Al-Ali and Koser, 2002; Basch and Szanton- Blanch, 1994; Guarnizo and Smith, 1998; Mahler, 1998).

Even though at the beginning, the concept of transnationalism focuses on exploring the first generation migrants’ relationship with both sending and receiving societies (Faist, 1999; 2000; Glick Schiller et al., 1994; Glick Schiller, 1997; Portes et al., 1999; Vertovec, 1999; 2001a), it then considers transnational links of the second generation migrants. Since the 1990s, the second generations’ identity formation is analysed within the context of transnationalism (Eckstein, 2002; Glick Schiller and Fouron, 2002; Levitt
and Waters, 2002; Ueda, 2002; Wessendorf, 2010; Wolf, 2002). Some of these scholars (Caglar, 2001; Foner, 2002; Golbert, 2001; Lam, 2004; Vickerman, 2002) juxtapose the identity formation of second generation migrants with transnationalism and assimilation, because, according to them, young migrants who were born or raised in the receiving country have built their lives there. They do not, it is argued, have direct relation with the sending country, because they lack historical links and nostalgia (Levitt and Waters, 2002). The ‘here’ and ‘there’ situation, in the case of second generation migrants and their experiences, is analysed as being ‘between two cultures’, (Anwar, 1998; Watson, 1977) as ‘culture conflict’, (Ballard, 1979; Ballard, 1994) and as ‘hybridity’ or the ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1990; Featherstone, 1994; Gilroy, 1987; Hall, 1991; Kaya, 2002). In some senses, these authors put these young people into categories of identity, such as defining their practices as being in between two cultures, experiencing hybridity, and in cultural conflict. From a different angle, this research is also interested in exploring the positioning of young people within society. It focuses on the formation of identity among Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youth through their ‘everyday life experiences’ which includes the young people’s interaction with various cultural elements and recognising themselves in relation to transnational social spaces. This research seeks to explore the negotiation of identity among CKT youth by looking at their everyday life experiences and questioning whether they negotiate their position within and between societies as ‘individual’ beings. By doing so, this study has two main interests in understanding the formation of identity and transnationalism. This thesis will examine the concept of identity as transformative and as something which is negotiated through the social relations of individuals and it will analyse identity formation of young people within transnational social spaces. Throughout this research, the concept of transnationalism and identity will be questioned. First, I would like to explore how identity is understood in this research; second, I will explore how the research contributes to the concept of transnational social space.

Questioning Identity in the Context of Transnationalism

Some migrants play an active role in both their country of origin and the host country, others engage in transnational practices only in one setting (Levitt, 2002; Morawska, 2003). In this research, I am interested in young people who are active – not necessarily physically – in multiple settings, i.e. not just in the receiving or sending society. The identity formation of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people might be affected by being involved in multiple settings and experiencing different cultural
resources. Their identity formation might take different forms: while some engage more with the receiving society, others engage with cultural resources from the country of origin. In Levitt’s account, the transnational practices among the second generation are based on necessity rather than choice. Levitt (2002) argues that there are certain factors, such as institutional completeness, life-course factors, socio-economic characteristics which necessarily affect identity formation and against which individual choices are limited. In contrast, Robins (2001) states that personal experiences are crucial in defining an individual’s positioning and the concept of identity is limited in exploring the feeling and thinking of individuals. According to him, ‘the question of identity which is generally posed in terms of the question of belonging and loyalty is always hanging around them’ (Robins, 2001: 13-14). Instead of the concept of identity, Robins develops the idea of ‘mental space’ which is a space in which individuals participate. In his account, ‘mental spaces’, as opposed to ‘spaces of identity’, are spaces of experiencing and thinking (2001:15). Robins’ research refers to the experiences of migrants and their thoughts and sentiments about those experiences; for instance, recognising Turkish migrants as individual beings. Similarly, Anthias (2002) also argues that we need to move beyond limited understanding of ‘identity’. She offers the term ‘transational positionality’ instead of ‘identity’. ‘Transational positionality’ refers to the claims and attributes that individuals make about their position in the social order, their views of where and to what they belong (and do not belong), as well as understanding the broader social relations that constitute and are constituted in this process’ (Anthias, 2002: 512). Her study recognises the importance of the context, examining how individuals position themselves within a range of locations and dislocations in relation to gender, ethnicity, national belonging and class (2002: 502). Although I share Robins and Anthias’s critique on identity as a concept which relies upon itself for its own definition, i.e. being recognised in terms of belonging and loyalty, I still feel the concept of identity is analytically useful for two main reasons. First, it offers a ground to understand communal identifications in terms of its reasons, i.e. identifying oneself with respect to a particular group. Second, it makes it possible to show diverse identifications which are not based on the issue of belonging, i.e. identifications rise from everyday experiences of individuals. Other authors such as Giddens, Bauman, Beck, and Hall (1990) have successfully used the concept of identity. As Hall (1990) argues, the concept of identity is still useful because it makes us think about the key questions, such as feelings of commonality and otherness with regards social relations and for individuals. In this sense, the concept of ‘identity’ is used to
explore a wider set of social relations in both the sending and receiving societies, and to examine everyday life experiences of individuals which are reconceived as a changing diverse phenomenon. ‘Identity’, however, will be questioned in this research in terms of its function in analysing the positioning of CKT youth in the receiving and sending societies.

This research tries to understand the functions of identity and transnational social space in analysing the positioning of CKT young people within society. The discussions on the concept of identity focus mainly on the work of Giddens (1991; 1994). Giddens’ (1991) work of ‘reflexivity’ examines the negotiation of identity among CKT youth within society. In his account, identity can be studied in terms of the relationship between ‘self’, ‘structure’ and ‘social relations’. For Giddens (1994), individuals move between different social contexts in their everyday life and take decisions whether to participate or not in institutional forms, such as community organisations, community, and in constructing social relations with particular people or groups. The choices of individuals are based on self-awareness, reflection and perception. However, Bauman (2001) also pays attention to individuals’ choices and thoughts in perceiving their relation to the social world. In his account, the process of individualisation is different to individualism which is not a choice but escaping individualisation by not participating is not on the agenda (2001:47). Within the process of individualisation, individuals are responsible for their choices and any situations they happen to find themselves in (Bauman, 2001: 6). Bauman addresses human freedom in taking decisions and participating in public space. He stresses the importance of ‘free choice’ in discussing individualisation, but does not pay much attention to the life cycle of individuals or the processes they have gone through: for instance, an individual might not have the conditions to choose freely, such as is the case with refugees. Rather, ‘individualisation’ in this research is used to denote how individuals make their personal choices based on their experiences, their perceptions of interactions and experiences in their world, and where they position themselves in relation to the social world in which they interact. This inference requires a close reading. My research, therefore, addresses Giddens’ formulation which considers the relationship of three dimensions in the construction of identity. However, it is also crucial to look at how young people negotiate and translate social relations and perceive their interactions and positioning within societies in order to understand individualisation as a part of the life cycle process of young people.
Transnational Social Space as an Operational Concept

‘Transnational social space’ is the operational concept employed in analysing the identity formation of young people in relation to their attachments with their country of origin and their experiences of living in London. As defined by Faist (2000) and Pries (2001), this concept expresses a metaphorical space where the circulation of ideas, thoughts, social ties, organisations and social networks is built across the borders of multiple states. Mainly, this metaphorical space includes the social practices in the everyday life of migrants. By ‘space’ these authors do not mean a physical space, rather a reproduction of social networks across the borders of nation-states (Faist, 1999). In other words, transnational social space means for Faist ‘a combination of social and symbolic ties, positions in networks and organisations and networks of organisations that can be found in at least two internationally distinct places’ (1999: 40). In his view, there are three types of transnational social spaces: kinship groups, transnational circuits, and transnational communities. All of these types signify a constant relationship with the country of origin and a shared conception of collective identity. Even though Faist focuses on migrants’ lives in two societies, his conceptualisation of transnational social spaces considers the influence of the country of origin on the country of residence, and in this sense, it is located in one setting (Kivisto, 2001). In contrast to Faist’s perspective, I will use the concept of transnational social spaces to explore ongoing relationships of young people with the receiving and sending societies which means that migrants in transnational social spaces have also constructed a strong relationship with the receiving society as in the case of the second generation migrants. In other words, transnational social space is chosen to show the lives of CKT youth in two worlds – sending and receiving countries. This view takes into account the fact that CKT youth are primarily located in one place – the receiving society – where they spend most of their day to day lives, but that they have built links with the country of origin – the sending country – through visits, family, community and cultural resources around them. By using transnational social space as a theoretical lens, the research aims to show that forms of identification are not only built on shared common and ethnic identities, but also on the everyday experiences, this means that identities are unbounded. Several concepts explain the idea of ‘unbounded identities’. For instance, Glick Schiller et al. (2011) use the term ‘cosmopolitan sociability’ in the case of transnational migrants. They define ‘cosmopolitan sociability’ as ‘consisting of forms of

1 see chapter 1 of this thesis, page 38
competence and communication skills that are based on the human capacity to create social relations of inclusiveness and openness to the world’ (2011: 403). As CKT youth might still practice the culture of the country of origin and participate in its ethnic identity, they could be considered ‘cosmopolitan’. The formation of transnational social spaces is explored in this research through institutional factor such as media, community organisations, school and social relations of youth with their family and peers with both sending and receiving societies, and the experiences and perceptions of young people. In order to analyse identity formation of young people, this research focuses on the self, the institutional factors (media, community organisations, school) and social relations of youth, with both sending and receiving societies.

Researching second generation migrants’ transnational practices offers a different perspective to the first generation. In the case of the second generation, socio-cultural ties and networks built across national boundaries are more crucial than economic and political attachments with the country of origin (as already showed by Leichtman, 2005). Second generation transnationalism is also different from first generation transnationalism (Levitt and Waters, 2002) as growing up in the receiving society may influence young people’s methods of practicing transnationalism. They might be influenced by both the receiving and sending societies, and their transnational attachments with the country of origin might not be as direct as the first generation. Besides transnational experiences of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youths can be separated from dominant conceptual frameworks which focus on economical and political ties, within which processes of transnationalism are currently being explored. For instance, Portes (1997) focuses on the economic side of transnational activities and states, ‘the phenomenon of transnationalisation acquires accumulative character expanding not only in numbers but in the qualitative character of its activities. Hence while the original wave of these activities may be economic and their initiators can be properly labelled transnational entrepreneurs, subsequent activities encompass political, social, and cultural pursuits as well’ (1997: 15).

In a nutshell, the concept of transnational social spaces will contribute to an understanding of the positions of the young people in social networks across the borders of multiple states.
The Subject and Aims of the Research

This thesis aims to explore the identity formation of CKT youth in a transnational context, because they have a migratory background and live in London. Their identity formation will be analysed with respect to their migratory background as interacting with both sending and receiving societies.

This study is empirically situated in North London where Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants mainly live and it focuses on three social groups: Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish. These groups have been chosen because whilst much has been written on the first and second generation migrants from Turkey living in Germany, those who have migrated to the UK have been largely ignored. Besides they represent an illustrative case of how the experiences, perceptions and the methods of participation of young people can be diverse within transnational social space. Indeed, these three groups are described as ‘Turkish-speaking society’ (Enneli et al., 2005; Robins, 2001) which underlines the interconnections between these three groups who, it is argued, share a common language and culture. My thesis counters this preconceived notion and demonstrates that these groups are, in fact, fragmented. Although they may share similar experiences related to being migrants, they do not share the same culture and language, especially in the case of Kurdish migrants. I focus on the similarities among CKT youth in this thesis and will not highlight the differences. Although the differences in terms of ethnic identities among CKT communities are acknowledged, they are not the main focus of this thesis. The term ‘Turkish speaking population’ is problematic, because of the label ‘Turkish’. In fact, three distinct groups need to be recognised: Turks (Turkish nationals and Turkish-speaking), Cypriot Turkish (Turkish-speaking but coming from Cyprus), and Kurds from Turkey (Turkish passport-holders and speakers for the most part, but ethnically Kurdish). Whilst the term ‘Turkish-speaking population’ has often been applied to encompass ‘Turks in the UK’ (Enneli, 2002; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Robins, 2001). This is clearly offensive to Kurdish people, who have their own language (Thomson et al., 2008). Therefore, I will not categorise the population studied as ‘Turkish speaking’ but I will use the terminology of CKT communities in describing the Cypriot Turks, Kurds from Turkey and mainland Turks regarding to time zone of their migration.
Young people have been chosen as the subject of this research with the assumption that a young person’s identity might be more clearly in a process of construction and more fluid than an adults’. This population would therefore provide a key to understanding the identity dynamic and its main dimensions. Young people are in the process of transforming to adulthood and they may be more aware of what is going on around them in comparison to previous generations in terms of interaction with other community members. Fluently speaking English may also assists them in engaging with different cultural components. Moreover, young people may easily change and analyse the various different positions among themselves.

The experiences of young people within transnational social space are interpreted in this study within the framework of interactions with the family, community cultural organizations (youth associations, youth centres, etc.), the homeland media, peers at school and the local environment. These different aspects correspond to the main areas of social interaction of CKT youth.

Existing literature on Turkish and Kurdish youths mostly focuses on hip-hop youth culture (Kaya, 2001), the disadvantages of being a migratory youth (Enneli et al., 2005), being in-between two cultures (Soysal, 2001), cultural clash (Kucukcan, 1999), and educational problems and generational differences (Kucukcan, 1999). Much of the research on Turkish and Kurdish youth focuses on the formation of identity of young people with a migratory background. Distinctively, this research seeks to explore what this migratory background means in terms of the identity formation of young CKT in looking at their everyday life experiences, their interactions with cultural surroundings, and their thoughts about possible positioning in society. Therefore analysing the experiences of young CTK in the light of the concept of a transnational social space aims to fill some existing gap in the literature. Firstly, it explores a less studied community, namely the ‘second generation’ Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish people live in London. Secondly, from the theoretical point of view, this research aims to provide some further understanding of the formation of identity among young people in a transnational context. Although the concept of transnationalism appeared in the early 1990s and has gained importance in social sciences since then, its value in the case of identity formation of young people with a migratory background has been underresearched.
The main aims of this thesis are to explore how the identity of CKT young people is formed and negotiated in their everyday life, to examine both the characteristics and the role of transnational social spaces in the formation of identity among CKT young people living in London and to analyse the challenges and values of transnationalism in identity formation of CKT young people. In order to achieve these aims, the objectives of the thesis are, first, to explore the diverse experiences of CKT young people and their identity formation. Second, the thesis examines the role of family, community organisations, school and transnational media in the construction of transnational social spaces. Third, it discusses the similarities in terms of identity formation amongst CKT young people. Lastly, it identifies the shape, nature and extent of transnational social spaces and questions it as a theoretical concept.

Overview of Chapters

This thesis is organised into nine chapters, excluding the introduction and conclusion. The first chapter broadly reviews literature related to identity and transnationalism and asks whether these concepts offer a broad enough understanding of the positioning of CKT youth in London. This chapter also explains the theoretical frameworks used in order to answer the research questions and put the empirical results in context. Chapter Two discusses methods used in this research, and explains the need for three research methods such as qualitative interviewing, focus groups, and participant observation.

In Chapter Three, I examine the historical process of migration from Turkey and Cyprus to the United Kingdom, the reasons for migration, and the relationships among these communities. This chapter will help to explain how these communities have created their own social space and how this space affects the lives of young people.

Chapters Four to Nine analyses the gathered empirical data in order to explore the aims and objectives of the thesis. Chapter Four examines the role of the family in constructing a transnational social space and forming identities among young people. It asks in which ways families influence the identity perspectives of young people and their position in a transnational social space, and explores how young people perceive the possible outcomes that come from living with their parents. The chapter firstly looks at the relationship between families and young people through the literature on the second generation and their families, and puts this literature into context with the
empirical findings. It then explores the outcomes of this relationship in constructing a transnational social space among young people.

**Chapter Five** focuses on the role of community organisations established by CKT migrants and on identity formation of young people in the construction of transnational social spaces. It firstly explores the structure of community organisations established by CKT communities in London in order to show the purpose of these community organisations, why communities need these organisations, and to what extent these organisations are transnational, national or promote integration. The chapter will then analyse the perceptions of young people of community organisations in order to discover why young people attend these community organisations, and what influence such organisations have in their everyday life.

**Chapter Six** examines the school experiences of CKT young people and seeks to discover the role of schools in the identity formation of CKT youth in a transnational social space. It focuses on the experiences of young people in the school environment and gives attention to the perceptions of CKT youth about their school life, focusing on their secondary school experiences, and their relationship with their peers, and the difficulties they face in the diverse school environment. It firstly looks at the structure of schools in London and then examines the role of schools in identity formation of CKT young people in a transnational social space.

**Chapter Seven** studies the ways in which transnational media influences the identity formation of young people and how transnational media consumption of young people is reflected in a transnational social space. The chapter looks at the engagement of young people with transnational media as a part of everyday activity in order to understand their relation to the media of their country of origin and the receiving society as a structural factor in identity formation. The chapter specifically focuses on satellite television and other media resources such as national newspapers and the internet. First of all, the chapter overviews the literature on transnational media and then focuses deeply on its consumption in London. Thirdly, it looks at the transnational media practices of CKT young people in London and finally, it highlights the role of other media resources in constructing a transnational social space among CKT youth.
In Chapter Eight, I look at the role of living in a ‘cosmopolitan’ city such as London and the extent to which this diversity is experienced by the population studied. First of all, the chapter focuses on the perceptions of young people about living in an ethnic enclave and its outcomes in forming identity. Secondly, their relation to the city of London is explored, and thirdly, explores their thoughts about their country of origin and experiences when they visit. Fourthly, the chapter presents the perceptions of CKT youth about ‘home’ and the issue of belonging and finally asks whether such places are reflected in the construction of a transnational social space and identity.

Chapter Nine questions the key concepts- ‘identity’ and ‘transnational social space’- used throughout this research by focusing on how CKT youth identify themselves with regards to their positioning in society. Using the empirical evidence provided in the previous chapters, it examines to what extent identity is negotiated, the thoughts of young people about their identifications, and how this is reflected in the cultural practices of CKT youth.

In my Conclusion, I will discuss my research questions and summarise the insights provided by the analysis of my fieldwork. This will lead me to highlight the importance of everyday life experiences in the study of identity. I will also examine the challenges and limitations of the research and address the future directions for further research.
Chapter 1: Identity and the Transnational Social Spaces of Second Generation Migrants

The thesis focuses on the identity formation of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people in a transnational context. Therefore, notions such as identity, transnationalism, and youth will be at the core of this study. The discussions on the concept of identity will focus mainly on the work of Giddens (1994) and Bauman (2000), while the scholarship of Faist (1999), Levitt (2001), Robins (2001) and Vertovec (2003) will be the main entry points in empirically situating how identity is produced and reproduced in a transnational context. This chapter first explores how the concept of identity is conceived in theoretical literature and the main questions are raised by the concept, and will discuss how I will use it in this research. I will then discuss the concept of transnational social space. The concept of transnational social space will help to understand how migrants interpret and perceive the social relations they build within different societies at an individual level. It is important to note that a transnational social space does not only include cultural resources from the country of origin, but also the methods by which migrants practice the culture and lifestyle of the receiving society. This chapter focuses on how the interactions of these different cultural resources create an environment for negotiation of identities. In the context of transnationalism, migrants are able to engage with cultural resources in both receiving and sending societies, to construct social networks with people from different societies. The concept of transnational social space is used to explore how cultural sources are interpreted, analysed by migrants and how social relations are built.

The Need to (Re)conceptualise Identity

In this section, I will firstly discuss categorised identities, such as national, cultural and ethnic identity in order to have a general idea about what the term ‘identity’ means; I will then move onto the perspective that focuses on the individual agenda. In this research, identity will be studied in relation to transnationalism.

Identity is a famously difficult concept to determine and some scholars even question whether it is possible to speak about identity at all (Bauman, 2001; Giddens, 1991; Maalouf, 2000; Robins, 2001). Because identity seemingly involves essentialist views about belonging, some see identity as fixed and unchanging. Essentialist perspectives
often define identity with regards to belonging to a nation, culture and ethnicity, often focusing on the relation between ‘us and them’ and, therefore, understanding identity as a collective phenomenon. More specifically, **national identity** is defined in relation to a particular bounded place: common historical memories and shared cultural practices produce a categorised identity which describes a social group which shares the same practices and comes from the same national/ethnic origin (Lesser, 1999; Smith, 1991). Morley and Robins (1995:46) state that national identity is ‘a specific form of collective identity’ which is based on a common historical past, while for Woodward (1997:18) ‘it would not be possible to know all those who share our national identity; we must have a shared idea of what it constitutes. The difference between national identities therefore lies in the different ways in which they are imagined.’ This view derives from in Benedict Anderson’s work (1983) to describe ‘imagined communities’. The idea of having a national identity creates attachments with respect to belonging is not only related to being connected to a territory. The idea of belonging with respect to national identity is related to ‘culture’ and ‘kinship’.

**Cultural identity** is another sort of collective identity which is often compared and conflated with national identity, for example, Chinese culture or Turkish culture. Generally, cultural identity emphasises the ways in which one group differentiates itself from other groups. According to Hall (1990), there are two different ways of thinking of cultural identity. He states that:

The first position defines “cultural identity” in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective “one true self”, hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed “selves”, which people with a shared history. Within the terms of this definition our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared codes which provide us, as “one people” […] The second position recognises that, as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and significant difference which constitute what we really are; or rather—since theory has intervened—what we have become (Hall, 1990: 223 and 225).

The first position of Hall’s definition of cultural identity refers to shared history, common historical experiences, shared memory and representation of a particular group. It is associated a sense of ‘we-ness’. The second sense of understanding culture identity offers the possibility of transformation through time. In this sense cultural identity is not something fixed, but reconstructed through memory. Even though identity is under
transformation, it still underlines the shared memories, the history which is particular to a one group, and has a sense of ‘we-ness. Another category underlines the sense of ‘we-ness’ is ethnic identification.

Ethnic identification is a characteristic feature of diaspora communities which underlines the differentiating function from others and also designation of others in its definition. According to Anderson (2005: 22) **ethnic identity** can be defined as a ‘categorical identity’ in the case of immigrants who share one specific characteristic, which makes them ethnically defined from others. Similarly, Barth (1994) has defined ethnic identification as constructed in relation to the ‘other’. Belonging to an ethnic group, having similar ethnic background, religion, culture and geographical identifications are significant in ethnic identities as stated by Bull (2003: 42):

Collective identities can be defined as constituted by a shared and interactive sense of “we-ness” associated with a collective agency. In terms of content, collective identities can be constructed around specific traits which are seen to distinguish one group from another: language, ideology, class, ethnicity and religion.

More specifically, collective identity has been understood as a distinctive feature of one group from another and related to how others see us. As Bhabha (1990: 221) argues, ‘identification is a process of identifying with and through another object, an object of otherness.’ At the same time, identity is always defined in relation to others: how others see us and why we are different from others constructs our identity in this sense.

The main critique to these perspectives is that their collective understanding of the concept of identity leads us to apprehend identity in a fixed and determined way. In contrast to this understanding, this research argues that identity should be perceived as fluid and transformative. Hall argues that ‘instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a ‘production’ which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation’ (1990: 222). Although the notion of ‘we-ness’ can be used to underline characteristic features, what consists of ‘we’ is necessarily transformed in the context of time and space.

Other critiques of the classical perspective of the concept of identity and its collective and essentialised limitations are provided by scholars such as Bauman, Beck, Giddens
and Lash in relation to their notion of ‘reflective modernity’. This leads individuals to have more power in the definition of the self. For Giddens, everybody who lives in ‘reflexive modernity’, defined as ‘a very strong programme of individualisation’ (Lash, 1994: 111), is able to construct his or her own biological narrative (Giddens, 1994). Lash (1994) explains the increased power of the self in terms of freedom from social and structuralist demands: ‘the standard biography becomes a chosen biography, a “do-it-yourself biography” or, as Giddens says, a “reflexive biography”’ (Giddens, 1994: 15).

Individuals must be able to live within the complexity of modern society, in order to be able to take a necessary decision on a responsible basis. Individuals are able to choose, perceive, and interpret outcomes in reflexive modernity: “I” is increasingly free from communal ties’ (Beck, 1994: 111). According to these authors, communal ties are broken down, and therefore the “we” has become a set of abstract, atomized individuals’ (1994: 114). As a consequence those scholars define identity as a fragmented, diverse, constantly changing individual choice.

Following this line, reflective identity is defined in this research as the outcome of negotiation of different positions of people within a society. In exploring the participation of young people within a transnational social space, this research takes account of how young people make choices.

Furthermore, Bauman argues that the conception of fluid identity is incompatible with the notion of belonging, which deprives people of diversity: ‘the quandary tormenting men and women at the turn of the century is not so much how to obtain the identities of their choice and how to have them recognized by people around them, but which identity to choose’ (2001: 477). ‘The thought of “having an identity” will not occur to people as long as “belonging” remains their fate, a condition with no alternative’ (Bauman, 2004: 11-12). In this sense, identity is flexible within the ‘liquid modern era’ (Bauman, 2000).

With the emergence of modern societies, or in Bauman’s term ‘liquid modern’ societies, traditional customs have been undercut and personal experiences have become increasingly important. Bauman emphasises the individualisation process in the construction of identity, by underlining the ambivalence this diversity and choice creates.
In line with Bauman (2001), this thesis hypothesises that one individual can have many identities and that different notions of identity can be found in a given context. For Bauman, however, this diversity has a side effect as it requires more than a choice from the individuals: ‘in a liquid modern setting of life, identities are perhaps the most common, most acute, most deeply felt and troublesome incarnations of ambivalence’ (Bauman, 2004: 32). Bauman argues that the “two (a dream and a nightmare) liquid modern modalities of identity cohabit, even when located at different levels of consciousness” (2004: 32). In this sense, identity always encompasses challenges and potentials even though they are situated at different level of individual consciousness. In other words, identity should require a construction from one’s own choice or standing which could represent both an opportunity and a problem for individuals: a problem because, for the individual, the necessity to choose could represent a risk of ‘belonging’ to one identity. It also makes identity fragile and changing. It is an opportunity because it allows more freedom in the negotiation of the self.

Bauman’s argument is acceptable but not in the case of every individual or social group. If there are mixed identities that are different from each other within the consciousness of individuals, why do we still name this dynamic as ‘identity’? Focusing too much on individuality as a reproduction process of the self might reject the importance of social relations between the self and institutional structures. Neither does it take into account the notion that individual identity is constructed in a dialectic relation to collective identities. I will not focus on the ‘free choice’ of individuals in order to define ‘individualisation’ in the way Bauman does. I will, however, use ‘individualisation’ in order to explore individuals’ choices regarding their everyday experiences, their life cycles and the conditions they face, the way they perceive their interactions and experiences, and where they position themselves in relation to the social world in which they interact.

Giddens offers us a way to understand the dialectical relation that occurs in negotiation of one’s identity through the concept of ‘reflexivity’, and offers a more effective way to conceive identity. Giddens argues that “‘self’ and ‘society’ are interrelated in a global milieu’ (1991: 32). ‘Global milieu’ means that economic and cultural globalisation along with technological developments open up possibilities for individual growth and development (Kumaravadivelu, 2008). For Giddens, the relation between ‘self’ and ‘society’ has shifted today in a global milieu where individuals construct a dialectical
relationship between institutional factors in society and their standpoint in relation to a given task or situation: in a traditional society, institutional factors such as family or church are the framework for the formation of identity. Giddens (1991) suggests that identity can be studied through three dimensions in particular: the self, structure, and social relations. I will now illustrate his understanding of these three dimensions.

**Structure**

According to Giddens (1991), any phenomenon is structuralised. This means that structure is constituted by rules – followed by people in social life – and resources which are mobilised by people in their interactions (Giddens, 1987). Giddens sees structure and agency (human action) as two sides of the same process, which can be summarised by the notion of ‘duality’. In this perspective, self and collective structures are always in interaction and reproduce each other (Giddens, 1987). The self reflects on the ‘rules’ and ‘resources’ of collective structures: therefore, they must be analysed together. Agents can be active in the transformation of society through their actions. From Giddens’ perspective, society is a product of agents, but there is a limitation in exploring the level of interaction between agent and structure. Agents can also be constituted within their actions. His structuration theory is simplified into one which just takes into account agency and structure. In other words, social structure is organised by the individual’s interaction with institutions and the social world. Social activities reproduce the structures of the social world. Individual identities are constructed by interaction with the social world, groups, collective groups, and institutions. In concrete terms, these structures can be found in language, power and tradition, the organisational areas for collective memory (Giddens, 1994). I use the term ‘structure’ to refer to institutional factors, such as community organisations, schools, media, and family which are powerful in constructing identities among individuals.

**Social Relations**

Social relations have to be mentioned in looking at identity formation because they represent a different influence from structure or individual perception and experiences in identity formation. According to Giddens, ‘social relations must always involve differentiations of identity and practice between individual agents, as well as among and between diverse groups and to further complicate matters social relations need to involve agents who are physically co-present’ (Giddens, 1987: 303). For Giddens,
studying ‘social relations’ involves considering the interaction between individuals and others’ individuals or individuals and groups. According to Giddens, social relations create different identities and in order to do so, social relations need to be either interactions with the self or groups, i.e. between individuals and institutions. In the case of migratory youth, I will observe two types of social relations: with their families and with their peers. Looking at these interactions, I will analyse their identity formation and examine the negotiation process at home, at school, and in community organisations.

The Self

In Giddens account, the self is an uncertain personal relationship which operates across many different social and institutional contexts. Individuals use institutions for stability and security in their everyday life, and they move between different social contexts, taking risks in doing so. O’Brien et al. (1999) explain this risk in terms of the diversity and ambivalence created by the traditional vectors of social inclusion: ‘self-identity is grounded in relations of trust and security, risk and anxiety. In conditions of modernity, traditional parameters for fixing self-identity such as kinship, locality or community break-down: individuals encounter a much wider range of ambiguous social networks and institutions that represent an equally wide range of, often contradictory, personal choices’ (O’Brien et al., 1999: 20). According to Giddens (1991: 32), the self is a ‘reflexive project’ and the identity of the self presumes reflexive awareness which means that people take responsibility for deciding and building their own identities (1991, 52). This view of the self implies that individuals make choices according to ‘panoramas of choice’ (1991: 139). According to Armstrong (1998: 24) self-identification reflects a determination to hold onto one’s sense of difference of self. Both descriptions of self- identity underline the necessity of choice and the acceptance of differentiations.

For Giddens, individuals who are knowledgeable move between different social contexts and use institutions as resources for their everyday social life (Giddens, 1994: 20). This view implies that their choices are based on rational intentions, involving human self-control and awareness. This means, for instance, that migrants could take decisions whether to participate or not in a community organisation and accepting or not accepting this institutional context in the formation of their identities. They can also
choose to participate in more than one community at the same time and construct social relations within diverse groups. However, as labelled by Giddens, their choices are the outcome of a negotiation ‘among a diversity of options’ (1991: 5). By referencing Giddens (1991), Nowicka (2006: 1073) argues that ‘people of transnational descent perfectly fit the model of an individual of late modernity’. This underlines the importance of reflexivity and making choices in the formation of identities.

In agreement with Giddens, I emphasize individuals negotiating as part of their lifestyle choices, according to the diversity of options offered by their structural and social context. However, in the case of the population studies the number of options might be reduced because, for instance, of a lack of linguistic fluency, which would oblige them to make some choices by necessity.

The scholars of the ‘reflexive modernity’ whose perspectives undermine my theoretical framework argue that identity has to be conceived as the outcome of the interactions between the self, social relationships and institutions. These dimensions are interrelated in the negotiation of identity. This perspective moves beyond the classical perspective which links identity with belonging and nation because it allows the participation of the self in the construction and formation of identity. Individuals make choices by using institutions as resources and in their construction of knowledge. Individuals negotiate their positioning through interaction with the social world in their everyday life. This conception opens up a diversity of possibilities and makes the concept of identity more complex and difficult to ‘group’ because of its plurality and changing character. This leads authors such as Robins to question the concept of identity. Studying the case of migrants, Robins (2001) argues that identity is a part of fictive unity which leads him to suspend the category of identity in order to consider its empirical reality:

the question of identity—which is generally posed in terms of the question of belonging and loyalty- is always hanging around them…To shift the focus from the ‘fictive unity’ to ‘empirical people’ would mean to recognise Turkish people as individual beings- human beings who are very much like-do things like, feel like, are capable of thinking like, and being unthinking like European people (Robins, 2001:13-14).

For Robins, using these notions of identity only pushes migrants to reproduce stereotypical categories. He basically ignores the concept of identity because, in his
view, “‘identity’ is a category that gives no space for human consciousness, awareness, reflexivity and thoughtfulness’ (Robins, 2001: 15). Similarly to Robins, Anthias (2002) suggests that we need to move beyond ‘identity’. In her account, the concept of identity has its own limitations: because it has expanded so much and can embrace everything, its usage takes us back to its theoretical baggage of being fundamental. Instead of ‘identity’, belonging or nation, Robins (2001) suggests focusing on ‘empirical people’, and ‘mental spaces’ which include experience and the thinking process of individuals. Anthias (2001; 2002) meanwhile uses the terms ‘translocational positionality’ and ‘locational positioning’. These terms recognise locality and the conditions and claims of individuals in understanding social processes. In agreement with these authors, the concept of identity will be understood in this research as existing beyond stereotyped categories. As other scholars argue (Giddens, Bauman, Beck), I will use the concept of ‘identity’ reconceived as a changing and diverse phenomenon. I will, however, question the function of identity and question at all stages whether it can still be usefully used to study CKT youth.

To sum up, this research argues that individual identity is not predefined by social and structural factors, but by the outcome of negotiation between these dimensions and the self. In this sense, individuals are conceived as agents able to influence their life and their world. These oppositions lead me to ask which dimensions will play an important role in the formation of identity in the context of reflexive modern societies. Figure 1 illustrates that identity is the outcome of interplay between social relations, structural interactions, and their interpretations from the self. From Giddens’ perspective, I add a fourth dimension based on Robins’ critique built on the case of migrants. I assume that migrants’ identities are negotiated within transnational social spaces. The question raised by this fourth dimension is its position within the dialectical process of the negotiation of identity. Is transnational social space a fourth dimension influencing the negotiation or is it the product of the negotiation between the self, social relations and institution? In this second case are they a juxtaposed phenomenon or does one replace the other? How do transnational social spaces impact on the negotiation of identities? These questions will be addressed through my empirical work with Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people.
Now that I have explained how the notion of identity will be approached in this research, I need to explain the concept of transnationalism and, more specifically, a transnational social space.

**Transnationalism and its Context**

Transnationalism is a recent concept that has been developed in the 1990s, as a replacement or addition to the concept of diaspora. In this section, I will first reconsider this development and explore the difference and similarities between these concepts. This will lead me to explain why I choose to focus on the concept of transnationalism. Finally, I will clarify the use of the term transnational social space which I make use of in this research.

*From Diaspora to Transnationalism: A Replacement or a Development?*

Until 1980, diaspora was a common way to define migrant communities which share common interests, have strong attachments to each other, and to their ethnic identity. This concept has been deployed in the analysis of migrant communities in terms of ethnic enclaves and in maintaining close relations with the country of origin (Cohen, 1997; Vertovec, 1999). Diaspora, as a term, is associated with the increase of migration...
flows. As mentioned by Sreberny (2003: 301), ‘the massive migrations that this century has witnessed have produced “diasporas”. Diasporic communities exist across national boundaries, but also within a number of national boundaries, altering the spaces in which they function.’ In other words, diaspora entails different ways of identifying with the homeland or an ancestral community. According to Pattie (1999: 3), ‘like identity itself, the concepts of return, homeland, and diaspora are all continually in the process of construction. They interact with each other.’ However, we need to reconsider the pertinence of this concept in the frame of current mobility and interaction (Brubaker, 2005) and especially in the case of migratory youth that question the possibility of ethnic enclaves. More specifically, diaspora refers to communities whose populations have been forced to migrate from their homeland to other countries and move between the country of origin and destination, and share common parameters which extend across and beyond national boundaries (Werbner, 2002).

Historically, diaspora was first used for the Jewish community. In some senses, the use of diaspora has differentiated. Robin Cohen separates diasporas on the basis of the genesis of the global economy: ‘Old diasporas are twofold: a) forced diasporas such as Jewish and Armenian, b) colonising diasporas such as Greek and British. On the other hand, the modern diasporas are threefold: a) trading diasporas like Jewish and Lebanese, b) business diasporas such as British; and c) labour diasporas such as Irish, Indian, Chinese, Sikh and Turkish’ (Cohen, 1997: 73). Following from this, the formation of modern diasporas should be explained according to economic needs rather than as forced diasporas. In both notions of diaspora, people migrate from the periphery to the centre which is the main feature of diaspora; the old notion of diaspora, however, does not offer any choice to migrants. The perceptions on the issue of migration have been changed because of the influence of globalisation. Today, migrants have more choices to return back to their homeland or to stay in their host society: whatever their choice they build broader social networks within more than one society. Modern migrants form identity by constructing links with the country of origin, developing other links with the receiving country or other countries with which they are in contact physically or virtually through new technologies of communication and information (Horst, 2002; Portes et al., 1999).

While Cohen (1997) distinguishes diasporas according to economic change, Vertovec (1996, 1997) categorises this notion according to its functions. He distinguishes three
different types of modern diaspora. First, he identifies diaspora as a *social form* (Boyarin and Boyarin, 1993; Safran, 1991) which refers to transnational communities whose social, economic and political networks crosses the borders of nation-states. The second approach conceives diaspora as a *type of consciousness*, which emerges by means of transnational networks (Bhabha, 1990; Clifford 1994, 1992; Cohen, 1997; Gilroy, 1987, 1993; Hall, 1990; 1991; Vertovec, 1996; 1999). This approach departs from Du Bois’ notion of ‘double consciousness,’ and refers to individuals’ awareness of being simultaneously ‘home away from home’ or ‘here and there’. Lastly, the third understanding regards diaspora as a *mode of cultural construction and expression* (Gilroy, 1987, 1993; Hall, 1990). These three approaches to modern diasporas provide a theoretical understanding of diasporic identity. According to Hall (1990) diaspora identities are constantly producing and reproducing themselves. Even though they have strong attachments to country of origin, they are neither fixed nor essential, and can reproduce themselves through transformations. Diasporic young people’s socialisation has taken place across different cultural fields (Vertovec, 1996: 235). Kaya (2001: 80) also argues that the construction of diasporic identity has connections with the production of culture on a transnational level. Diasporic identity is always a part of social interaction and reproduces itself.

Diaspora entails different ways of identifying with a homeland or an ancestral community. It does not necessarily involve physical return and transnational relations. The concept of diaspora mainly focuses on sharing a particular culture and maintaining a close relationship with the homeland. It implies that people keep strong attachments with the country of origin with which they carry out economic, political and cultural transactions (Soysal, 1999: 3). The concept of diaspora also involves a strong connection between territory and national community lives abroad. In this sense, this concept implies that migrants have strong feelings of belonging to nation-state, ethnicity and collective identities, and that they construct strong ties between the receiving and sending countries, being active members in both settings.

In exploring new experiences of migrants, and especially those of the second generation, the concept of diaspora is too limited, as it focuses on the issue of belonging and understands migrants’ identity through their strength of attachment to the country of origin. In the 1990s, four processes challenged the notion of diaspora and led to the new concept of transnationalism. Transnationalism is conceived as a ‘composition of
networks, activities and patterns of life [that] encompass both their host and home societies. Their lives cut across national boundaries and bring two societies into a single social field’ (Glick Schiller, 1997: 158). In the next section, I will look at transnationalism from four perspectives: a) the new shape of migration; b) the globalisation process; c) the weakening of the nation-state in a global age; d) the level of diasporic exchanges focusing more on the individual. These phenomena are in part related to the historical processes that help explain the emergence of transnationalism.

**The New Shape of Migration**

As a concept, transnationalism has been used in anthropology, sociology, human geography, and international relations from the early 1990s onwards (Levitt, 2001a; Smith and Guarnizo, 1998; Vertovec, 1999a). Transnationalism has been used in studies related to migration to analyze daily practices and experiences of migrants (Levitt, 2001; Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2002). Transnationalism has emerged as a new theoretical framework and analytical tool which accounts for the changing nature of contemporary migration which is now received as more fluid rather than being fixed to nationally defined borders. The concept of transnationalism seems to be more adequate in explaining the fluidity of migrants’ practices. The main difference between old diasporic communities and transnational communities is that diasporic communities are mainly the result of forced migration whereas transnational communities have a choice to settle down in a new country or to stay in their homeland. Recently, the new trend of diaspora, which may be called a modern or new diaspora, defines the notion of diaspora as an example of the transnational understanding of migration. Both concepts are integrated in terms of experiences, ethnic communities and spaces. The way of defining experiences of migrants and communities differs between diasporas and transnational communities: whereas the term diaspora is used for characterising ethnically defined communities, transnational communities are multi-local, having distinct ways of life across multiple national boundaries. These concepts also differ in terms of their function: as Vertovec (2000: 12) states, ‘all transnational communities comprise diasporas but not all diasporas develop transnationalism’. Therefore, transnationalism focuses on the transformation of networks.

**The Process of Globalisation**
Globalisation is linked with the concept of transnationalism as highlighted by Levitt (2001: 4), among others: ‘transnational social spaces are becoming a mass phenomenon and are important outcomes and forms of what is frequently referred to as “globalisation”’. The link between globalisation and the idea of transnationalism is based on new advances in communications, involving transportation technologies, policies such as Europeanization, international rights, the economy, and the mobility of people influencing the social relations of migrants between sending and receiving societies. I focus here only on some of the technological developments that influence migrants’ lives. New technologies of communication allow migrants to communicate easily with their families in their country of origin, as well as with their friends in several countries. In such a way, they can easily develop transnational ties which transform their communities (Kennedy and Roudometof, 2002: 17). In Vertovec’s argument, (1999a: 449) ‘the dispersed diasporas of old have become today’s ‘transnational communities’ sustained by a range of modes of social organization, mobility, and communication.’ In the context of diaspora, sharing culture, sharing images, and sharing sounds become the most important factors in sustaining community. From the transnational perspective, communities are more open to change in the age of globalism: facilities such as the rise of communication and transportation represent a danger in the hegemony of nation-state; these changes create a sense of global community rather than just sharing information on a hypothetic common identity.

The Weakening of the Nation-state in a Global Age

Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002) state that nation-state building processes have shaped the ways migration has been perceived. They argue that methodological nationalism accepts the nation-states and its boundaries as a given in social analyses (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). The concept of transnationalism represents a shift of perspective beyond methodological nationalism and is classified as a challenge to the nation-state (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). Although these authors make a distinction between the concepts of diaspora and transnationalism, and argue that transnationalism has become a more useful concept in understanding the current situation, they conceive several links between them. Consequently, they conceive diasporas as being related to a particular population and to a particular homeland (Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002: 324). Transnationalism, on the other hand, entails
the movements of people, groups or entities *across* borders with the implication they are doing so because of the developments in globalisation. The concept of diaspora suggests that dispersed/migratory communities develop more emotional ties with their homeland, whereas transnational communities have the ability to maintain close links with both the receiving and sending countries, as well as other countries. For this reason a transnational community is almost always diasporic, whilst a diasporic community is not necessarily transnational. In other words, transnationalism is a general concept describing the movements of individuals and/or communities across nations, whilst diaspora has a more confined definition, describing cultural affiliation, rather than active mobility. Despite transnationalism became a modish concept in the recent decade, some authors (Al-Ali and Koser, 2002; Soysal, 1999) have provided radical critiques to the concept of transnationalism, arguing that nation-state continues to shape social circles and that transnational is more a fiction than a reality.

Soysal (1999) and Kastoryano (2003), for instance, argue that transnationalism does not differ from nationalism because transnational communities construct strong ties with the country of origin which are mainly national. Kastoryano argues that transnational communities are constructed through their national links and states:

> in most cases transnational communities are built on common geographical, cultural and political references, hence their relative homogeneity as well as the intensity of intra-communal relations and the efficiency in their action (Kastoryano, 2003: 8).

In her account, transnationalism appears as ‘a new type of nationalism’, transnational nationalism. According to her, transnational nationalism is expressed and developed beyond the borders of state and its territory. She argues that especially Muslim migrants in Europe construct networks to highlight transnational nationalism. She states:

> Transnational nationalism takes form after nationalism and nation-states have become realities; it may extend state nationalism in new ways, producing exclusionist discourses based on national membership that is ‘de-territorialized’…It fashions new power relationships with states which are concurrently engaging the process of globalization through economy and culture…One can see this phenomenon among immigrant communities that are now settled in Western Europe, especially among the Muslim (Kastoryano 1999: 200).
Her statement might, however, be too general because it implies that every migrant who constructs economic and cultural ties with their country of origin practices nationalism by identifying with common interests across national borders. Her main reference point is Muslim migrants in Western Europe who do not represent transnational communities. There are diverse groups also within transnational communities, such as Kurds and Alevi in Turkish speaking transnational communities, and their ways of practicing transnationalism differ: while Kurds use transnational links to strength their political rights, Turks use it to strength cultural and economic links.

Rogers (2007: 15), however, argues that ‘not all migrants are transmigrants and not all cross-border moves are transnational. The various policies and programmes described as a mobility order set the conditions under which individuals, families, and communities make their decisions’. There is not a specific definition of transmigrants and transnational communities. Both derive from distinctive characteristics of transnationalism, such as geographical, generation and type of migration. According to Al-Ali et al. (2001: 594), ‘it is clearly problematic to use the phrase ‘transnational community’ without analysing how different people are more or less likely to be involved’. There are differences within migrant communities and many other studies of transnationalism have tended to gloss over these differences. Guarnizo and Diaz (1999: 416) also underline the fact that the term transnational community does not apply to all migrant communities. As a case in point, Colombian migrants in the US are highly fragmented, heterogeneous and involved in different transnational activities. It is difficult, therefore, to define Caribbean migrants in US as a transnational community.

According to Soysal (1999), the dichotomy of transnational and national needs to be seen in terms of variability rather than as a completed theoretical framework in understanding the new debates on identity and citizenship. She states,

We can no longer frame our debates on membership and identities within the dichotomy of national and transnational, and the expected linear transition from one to the other. There is much confusion around the issue and much time and energy is spend in arguing whether we are approaching transnational stage or not. Rather than treating national and transnational as stages in progress, we need to incorporate them into our theoretical frameworks as variables, and treat them as concurrent levels within which the current practices of citizenship and identities should be understood (Soysal, 1999: 13).
In her account, transnationalism and nationalism coexist with each other. This means that migrants who are transnational could also have national links. However, Soysal fails to understand migrants’ positioning on a multinational level and does not take into account migrants’ experiences at the global level. Arguing that national and transnational are on similar levels does not offer a coherent picture of the diverse practices of migrants. It also does not help to understand the experiences of second generation migrants who were born or raised in the receiving society. In this research, I differentiate between transnationalism and nationalism: transnationalism is about multiple experiences across the borders of nation-states, while nationalism is found in only one setting: ‘The national is about place, territory, landscape, rootedness, belonging; the transnational connotes space, de-territorialisation, other global cultural ‘-scapes’ like media-scapes (Appadurai, 1996), uprooting, rootlessness and routes of travel, and exclusion and longing’ (Crang et al., 2004: 4). Transnationalism connects multiple spaces into one rather than practicing the sources of one place as mentioned by Fitzgerald (2004). He argues that in the case of Mexican immigrants in America ‘there is no evidence that transnationalism in the strict sense of transcending nationalism in a ‘workers of the world’ discourse, for example was relevant to the actors in this case’ (2004: 243). He defines Mexican immigrants as ‘dual nationalists’ rather than simply long-distance nationalists who supports the idea that assimilation and transnationalism are interconnected, as do Kivisto (2001, 2003) and Q’Flaherty et al. (2007). In this sense, transnationalism is more open to negotiation as well as comparing different cultural sources and social relations within and between the receiving and sending societies.

Rather than focusing on transnationalism and nationalism as variables, I will ask how newly emerging migrants’ experiences could be analysed beyond nationalism. This leads me to consider how long migrants hold onto any sense of nationalism, if at all, when they live between and within diverse cultural resources and interact with those resources in their everyday lives.

The Level of Diasporic Exchanges: From Collective to Individual

Finally, the level where diasporic exchanges occur is different in both conceptions, quite probably as a consequence of the phenomena mentioned above. Diasporas imply collective and common sense exchanges between communities while transnationalism
refers more to the individual participation in the spaces of both sending and receiving society, going beyond the collective forms of identification. The concept of transnationalism requires taking into consideration the individual by understanding segmented identities. As highlighted by Faist:

instead of stretching the term ‘diaspora’ beyond its limits, it is more meaningful to speak of a segmented and transnationalised cultural space, characterised by syncretistic identities. (2000: 235).

Focusing on the identity dynamic of young people, the concept of transnationalism offers a more appropriate frame for studying migration than diaspora, allowing the consideration of a diverse and transformative formation of identity. As highlighted by Soysal (1999: 11), ‘migrants’ connections to multi-level discourses and their access to diverse citizenship practices are invisible under the modus operandi of diaspora theorising’. Besides, the idea of belonging to a nation, sharing a common political orientation might not be a common experience of youth with a migratory background, as many of them were born or raised in the receiving society and might have limited information about their country of origin. This may lead to the construction of segmented identities.

The Framework of Transnationalism: Transnational Social Spaces, Field or Practices. An Attempt at Clarification

We have seen that the concept of transnationalism is commonly used in social sciences to explore the experiences of migrants. This concept leads to a stream of new notions confusing further the definition of the term and highlighting the issues we face in debating its theoretical efficacy. As Al-Ali and Koser (2002: 1- 14) states, ‘there is little doubt that the term transnationalism is currently en vogue, and that as a result it has been overused and misused, and furthermore, often used without conceptual or definitional clarity’. These ambiguities derive from a lack of definite consensus on the concept of transnationalism. While some authors perceive this notion as an old one (Portes et al., 1999a), others argue that it provides a new analytical framework (Glick Schiller and Fouron, 1999; Levitt, 2001a; Smith, 2002; Vertovec, 2007). In this section, I will review the main understanding of this concept found in theoretical literature and clarify its context in the analysis of my empirical findings.
The concept of transnationalism, in some definitions, stresses the relationship between the country of origin and the receiving society. This is developed by Portes who defines transnational communities or transmigrants as people who are, ‘at least bilingual, move easily between different cultures, frequently maintain homes in two countries and pursue economic, political and cultural interests that require simultaneous presence in both’ (Portes, 1996: 76-77). His understanding is, however, too limited as migrants are often connected to more than one society economically, politically and culturally.

Glick Schiller et al. manage to avoid this limitation by defining transnational communities or transmigrants as ‘immigrants whose daily lives depend on multiple and constant interconnections across international borders and whose public identities are configured in relationship to more than one nation-state’ (1995: 7). In their view, transmigrants or transnational communities are defined in terms of social relations built between a diversity of communities and interconnections which are constantly activated, but they are ‘bounded social actors’. However, they do not consider which migrants – the migrants from the past or today’s migrants – should be viewed as transnational (Kivisto, 2001).

While Kivisto (2001) criticises the efficiency of transnationalism by not offering a convincing argument about which sort of migrants it includes, Dahinden (2009) questions the concept as focusing on migrants and ignoring non-migrants who might also be involved in transnational activities. In her account, if we consider that globalisation has had a huge impact on people’s lives in terms of constructing social networks across the borders, it should be said that almost everybody nowadays to some degree is transnational, but their transnationalism distinguishes varying social positioning in globalised world (Dahinden, 2009: 1383). Social networks play a crucial role in her understanding of transnationalism, as they also do for Riccio (2001) who argues that transnationalism is constant networking within transnational spaces and encompasses differing practices.

For Vertovec, ‘transnationalism broadly refers to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states. Transnationalism describes a condition in which, despite great distances and notwithstanding the presence of international borders (and all the laws, regulations and national narratives they present),
certain kinds of relationships have been globally intensified’ (Vertovec, 1999: 1-2). However, in his analysis transnationalism is embedded in a constructivist perspective where individual action is influenced by structure and social relationships more than by the self. His argument is grounded on six factors: ‘social morphology’, ‘type of consciousness’, ‘mode of cultural production’, ‘avenue of capital’, ‘site of political engagement’ and ‘reconstruction of place and locality’ (1999). Social morphology refers to social networks among migrants, modes of social organisations described as structures or systems of relationships described as networks. The second important aspect of Vertovec’s work is types of consciousness that concern multiple identifications among migrants. His mode of cultural productions underlines the importance of social production and everyday practices in the context of transnationalism. His term ‘avenue of cultural capital’ refers to transnational corporations. His analysis of political engagement examines the creation of political lobbies in the receiving society. Finally, his reconstruction of place and locality include translocal interactions that have been made possible by telecommunications, a high degree of human mobility, satellite TV, the Internet, videos and films. All of the aspects of his research are reciprocally interconnected phenomena involving structure, institutions, media, collective memory and nostalgia rather than involving individuals’ experiences in the decision making process in participating to structure and social relations. His use of the term transnationalism fails to cover the possibility of inclusion into the receiving society which is a crucial part of the everyday experience of migrants. However, my use of transnationalism takes into account everyday experiences of second generation migrants which consider social inclusion into the receiving society rather than ignoring it. It should be understood as social processes as argued by Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004).

Beyond these fundamental oppositions, other theorists have raised objections to (a) transnational fields; (b) transnational practices; (c) transnational social spaces. However, the differences among these concepts are neither clear nor explained by their authors. In general, these terms refer to ties of people, networks and organisations across the borders of nation-states. The terms are characterised by a high density of ties on informal and formal institutional levels (Faist, 2008: 2). In the following section, I will try to clarify their respective understanding.

*Transnational Fields*
Transnational fields became part of the discourse on identity formation in migrant communities at the same time as the notion of transnationalism. The term transnational field is a blurred concept which is used for different purposes among researchers. Vertovec (1999) uses transnationalism to describe the act of building *social networks* and *social fields* across the borders of nation-states. In his definition, all activities across the borders of nation-states are conceived within social fields, such as global, local, national and transnational. Nonetheless, Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) conceptualise transnational social fields as transcending the boundaries of nation-states. Building on Glick Schiller *et al.* (1994), Levitt and Glick Schiller define ‘social fields as a set of multiple interlocking networks of social relationships through which ideas, practices and resources are unequally exchanged, organised and transformed’ (2004: 6). These theorists combine the notion of social fields with the transnational context and create the notion of ‘transnational social fields’ defined as the participation of a person in social networks which assist them in receiving ideas and information across the borders of nation-states. They distinguish, however, individuals’ experiences from *ways of belonging* (Glick Schiller, 2003; 2004). Glick Schiller *et al.* (1994: 13) argue that ‘transmigrants operate in the national arena of both their country of origin and country (or countries) of settlement, they develop new spheres of experience and new fields of social relations.’ They reconceptualise the idea of society in relation to the social field and distinguish between *ways of being* and *ways of belonging*. In their account, *ways of being* refers to social relations and practices in which individuals engage rather than to the identities signified by their actions. For instance, an individual might eat certain foods as a family habit without identifying with a particular ethnicity. Social fields contain institutions and organisations with a particular ethnicity. In contrast, *ways of belonging* refers to practices which demonstrate the conscious connection to a particular group, such as wearing a Christian cross or Jewish star (Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004). These theorists argue that individuals within transnational social fields combine *ways of being* and *ways of belonging* in different ways. For instance, an individual might construct social networks with people in the country of origin but not identify himself/herself as belonging to the country of origin. This might be observed in the case of second generation migrants.

I prefer not to focus on the notion of transnational social fields in exploring the identity formation of CKT youth because, firstly, it contains political, social, cultural and
economic links with the country of origin itself whilst the actions of CKT young people might not involve economic, political participation. Second, it does not take into account the links with the receiving society in building transnational social relations across the borders of nation-states.

Transnational Practices

The concept of transnational practice has been used in most research papers related to transnationalism. Transnational practices refer to migrants’ ways of engaging with cultural resources from both the receiving and sending societies. Border crossing activities as transnational practices are not limited to traditional or physical border crossing activities; they are now easier in the global context as a result of new technological developments (Levitt, 2002). Transnational practices refers to building social networks across the borders of nation-states, engaging with cultural elements from both receiving society and the country of origin, and being economically active in both settings. The ways of practicing culture are differentiated among migrants according to their respective experiences and life-cycle, depending on migrants’ perception, everyday experiences, and connection to the country of origin through memory, nostalgia, and generation (Levitt, 2009: 2). Furthermore, transnational practices can be carried out in formal and informal settings which further increase their diversity (Levitt, 2001b).

According to Sklair (1999), transnational practices operate in three spheres, the economic, the political and the cultural-ideological. In his definition, economic and political links are major aspects of transnational practices and are appropriate to the first generation migrants rather than the second. While Sklair separates transnational practices into three spheres, Itzigsohn et al. (1999: 323) look at transnational practices in both a narrow and broad sense. In their account, the ‘narrow’ sense refers to people involved in economic, political, social and cultural practices that involve a regular movement within a geographic transnational space, whereas a ‘broad’ sense refers to engagement in a series of material and symbolic practices which include both countries as reference points’. In this perspective, transnational practices are included in transnational social fields. These notions are interrelated and might require a different description and framework in the case of second generation migrants.
The notion of transnational social space has been developed by Faist (2000), Lewellen (2002) and Pries (2001), and has been central to the analysis of transnational relationships and communities (Howard, 2011). Generally, social networks which span national borders can be seen as a form of transnational social space and these social networks are constructed not only with people from the country of origin, but also potentially by everybody in the so-called global era. The space which spans beyond borders by migratory practices and social networks in the era of globalization is conceptualized as a transnational social space in which new kinds of social networks link at least two distant geographical spaces. Lewellen defines transnational social space in terms of social networks: ‘these networks usually follow economic linkages, lines of capital that unite the group within an interweaving of trade, finance and remittances’ (2002: 8).

While Lewellen focuses on the economic linkages of social networks, Faist has a broader definition for transnational social space, defined as ‘combinations of social and symbolic ties, positions in networks and organisations that can be found in at least two geographically and internationally distinct places’ (Faist, 1998: 216). In his definition, the idea of transnational social space represents a constant movement of not only people but also goods, thoughts and information in two or more nation-states which brings them into a single social space. TSS includes ‘the circulation of ideas, symbols, and material culture’ (Faist, 2000: 13). From this perspective, migrants can mobilize and maximize their facilities beyond national borders by merging different locales into a single social space. Faist (2000) discusses three analytically distinct types of immigrant transnationalism: kinship groups, circuits, and communities. These groups represent different types of transnationalism which arise from different patterns of integration and types of activities that migrants practice. For instance, kinship groups represent sharing familial tasks and transnational circuits signify trading networks, i.e. Indian trading networks and transnational community is constituted on the base of collective representation (Faist, 2000). According to Faist, these diverse groups are included in transnational social spaces and are characterised by triadic relationships between groups and institutions in the host state, the sending state (sometimes viewed as an external homeland), and the minority and/or refugee groups’ (Faist, 1999: 41). As highlighted by Kivisto (2003), Faist locates transnational migration within relationships of the
immigrant group, the governments of both the homeland and the receiving nation, and the civil societies of both nations. In Faist’s definition, transnational social spaces apply to the transnationalism form above which is associated with global capital flows and supranational political institutions (Crang et al., 2004). Faist (1999) suggests that transnational social spaces develop in two stages: first, as a product of international migration and limited to the first generation of migrants. In the first phrase, the reproduction of migrant networks and the movement of money earned by the first generation of Turkish migrants working in Germany back to Turkey allowed by transnational social spaces (Faist, 1999). This first stage of transnational social spaces is defined by exchanges of capital flows, institutional levels, and government policy in both settings. The second stage of transnational social spaces includes social networks of individuals across the borders of nation-states. Despite its interest, Faist’s understanding of the concept of transnational social space has some limitations. Its largest issue is that it is not concerned with the individual’s positioning, but focuses on the ‘collective level’ of groups, states and institutions. His approach is also limited to the first generation migrants and argues that ‘transnational social spaces go beyond strictly migratory chains of the first generation migrants and develop a life of their own’ (Faist, 1999: 37).

Pries (2000, 2001) offers us a wider understanding than Lewellen and Faist, including individual positioning in his analysis of transnational social space. Pries argues that ‘every view and concept of space is an outcome of human reflection’ (2000: 21). Transnational social spaces are becoming a mass phenomenon and are referred to as ‘globalisation’ (Pries, 2001: 23). Pries uses this concept in a more flexible way, as for him, ‘the approach of transnational social spaces is not the product of a finished conceptual framework, but a research agenda’ (Pries, 2001: 28). Like Faist, he conceives TSS as the outcomes of interactions occurring in pluri-local contexts and involving not only economic exchanges, but also ‘composed of material artifacts, the social practices of everyday life, as well as systems of symbolic representation that are structured by human life’ (Pries, 2001: 8). Unlike Faist however, Pries does not divide transnational social spaces into categories, instead dividing them into geographic and social spaces: ‘the micro-regional, the national, the macro-regional and the global that correspond to different types of predominant social spaces: community, national society, civilisation/cultural region and humanity within transnational social spaces’ (2001: 22). According to Pries (1999: 27), ‘new transnational social spaces with
multiple geographical spaces are emerging, within which life plans and projects are becoming structured within social relationships and institutions’. He underlines the fact that transnational social spaces are important in determining new everyday practices and identities beyond borders of nation-states. However, transnational social spaces are not the same for everybody. Anderson argues that ‘transnational social space can help us to analyse the interwoven relations between individual, collective, socialisation and social reproduction’ (2001: 3). Anderson comes to the same conclusion as Pries, suggesting that ‘the ways of engaging in transnational social space are concerned with power which is in turn determined by matters of gender, race, and the intersection of these with class’ (2001: 30). Therefore, the ways of engaging in transnational social space are not matters of personal choice rather concerned with powerful dimensions, such as class and race.

This research aims to explore the identity formation of CKT young people living in London. For this purpose, I will use the concept of TSS as diverse metaphorical spaces where individual identity is negotiated, and is composed of experiences, ties, interactions, representation, links and material artefacts, such as the media. Instead of looking at TSS as ‘living’ categories like Faist and Pries, I will use this concept to demonstrate the outcomes of young CKT’s (living in London) through everyday interactions and experiences, looking specifically at their family and peer interactions, school and neighbourhood environments, cultural and communicative experiences and links with their country of origin. In other words, this concept is not related to specific geographical or material frames, but to the plurality of experiences occurring in human life. The concept of TSS will be helpful for my questioning in three ways. Firstly, it emphasises the fact that population studies are connected to diverse societies. That said, this also might be the case for any citizen nowadays: the migrant background of the population study may increase this phenomenon and that could increase the difficulties in their identity negotiation or in the contrary provide more options. In other words, this concept obliges me to pay a constant attention to the multiple ties, attachments, interactions related to the migrant background of the population studied.

Secondly, although I have not redefined categories of analysis, the concept of TSS lead me to structure my analysis of identity formation according to social frameworks such as family, community organisations, media and neighbourhood which are identified in the literature as key elements of social inclusion and, therefore, identity formation (Kivisto, 2001; Levitt and Waters, 2002). In highlighting the experiences and
interactions across the borders of nation-state, this concept also underlines that these actions are then brought to a specific ‘social space’, be it material or non-material.

Thirdly, TSS underlines the fact that identity is not an individual phenomenon, but is necessarily the outcome of social interactions. Along with Vertovec, I argue that the concept of transnationalism and identity ‘inherently call for juxtaposition’ (2001: 573), because as people share the same common identities in their transnational networks they negotiate and, therefore, transform these identities within their social worlds (2001: 573). In other words, transnational dynamics affect the formation and negotiation of identities, offering a circulation of ideas, ties and experiences from a diverse range of countries including both the sending and receiving countries. Considering TSS and identity together gives two advantages. First, linking identity with TSS leads us to consider the transnational experiences in the receiving country and explore the role of social inclusion in promoting these experiences. At the same time, the concept of transnationalism emphasises both ‘here’ and ‘there’ in constructing migrants’ identities (Espiritu and Tran, 2002). Second, linking TSS with identity leads us to conceive transnational experiences beyond nation and ethnic categories in line with Glick Schiller et al. who critiqued (2011) the original scholars who dealt with this concept (inter alia Faist, 2000; 2000a; Pries, 2001; 2001a; Vertovec, 2004). For these reasons I will keep using both concepts in this research.

Finally, although TSS, ‘transnational fields’ and ‘transnational practices’ are interrelated and their distinguished use is never justified by the literature consulted, I choose to use TSS, because it seems more open and able to entail the characteristics of the others categories. Furthermore, this concept, as highlighted by Pries, allows me to consider the individual dynamics of identity formation, and to take into account both material and non-material transnational spaces. My analysis will, however, lead me to consider the value of this concept in exploring identity negotiation within transnational contexts.

**Researching Transnationalism among Second Generation**

The concept of transnationalism has gained greater attention through various disciplines. The research on transnationalism mainly focuses on practices of migrants – their everyday life experiences, political participation, cultural representation, economic links, identity, and integration (see Glick Schiller et al., 1994; Kyle, 1999; Levitt and
Most of the research on transnationalism has been based on the experience of first generation migrants, such as travelling to the country of origin, the idea of returning back to the homeland, constructing strong ties with relatives and friends in the country of origin, sending remittances, and having investments in the country of origin. The focus on the first generation is justified by some authors by the fact that second generation migrants may have less connection with their country of origin than their parents and, therefore, that the ‘transnational consciousness of second generation should be less transnational than that of their parents’ (Vickerman, 2002: 343). In other words, especially in the case of the second generation migrants, ‘assimilation appears to have implications for understanding transnationalism’ (Q’Flaherty et al., 2007: 840). For instance, cultural assimilation offers the ability to speak English which in turn helps migrants construct close ties with the receiving society and to have a better standard of living. The experiences of the first and second generation could be differentiated regarding the length of stay in the country of origin and the receiving society, as well as the level of interaction with the receiving society. Young people who were born or raised in the receiving society may engage with the receiving society more than their parents: they go to school, have ‘foreign’ friends, and may adapt to the ways of life of the receiving country more easily than their parents. At the same time, they know, learn the culture of the country of origin from their parents, community organisations, homeland media, and their visits to the country of origin and elsewhere. Generally, young people negotiate the social and cultural positioning within both societies. Eckstein (2002: 232) states that “the second generation, in particular, has ties to the broader receiving society through language, education, friendships, work, marriage, and children that their parents may not have.” Similarly to Eckstein, Golbert (2001) also argues that Ukrainian Jewish youth have adapted to the linguistic, cultural and socio-economic life of another country. In the case of young people, the level of integration needs to be linked with transnational connections because they bring cultural references from both settings to a single social space.

In other words, rather than focusing on the level of transnationalism among the first and second generation, this research focuses on how the concept of transnational social space assists in understanding the identity dynamics of young people.
The fact that youth is characterised in the theoretical literature as the ‘next’ generation, critics such as Epstein (1998), argue this ‘group’ should be considered in a specific way. As Epstein argues, ‘young people, after all, sometimes seem like a completely different species from adults, and their habits, idiosyncrasies, and argot have long mystified grown-ups’ (1998: 1). To associate youth with migration allows us to tackle a range of societal transformations. The young generation are more able to mix two different settings in a single space compared to the first generation. At the same time, they can also play a major role in keeping transnational connections alive by engaging in several societies (Burholt, 2004). Young people are understood in this research to be second generation migrants.

The few studies on second generation transnationalism aimed to investigate the specifics of young people’s transnational experiences in comparison with their parents. For Levitt and Waters (2002), second generation transnationalism exists and will continue, as ‘transnationalism and integration should not be seen as opposites’ (2002: 223). They argue that ‘there are multiple ways in which immigrants and their children can combine transnationalism and assimilative strategies, leading to diverse outcomes, both in United States and in immigrants’ countries origin’ (Levitt and Waters, 2002: 231). According to these authors, young people are more likely to engage in the receiving society than their parents through education, language and friendship. As they have grown up in the receiving society, they have built their social networks and social environment in the receiving society under the lifestyle and rules of the receiving society. At the same time, however, they are aware of the socio-cultural life in the sending society through their family, transnational media, and their visits to the country of origin. In this sense, transnational networks of young people are different from their parents’. Language is the most important factor of distinction as it influences the participation of the receiving and sending society, in other words the engagement in transnational networks. Correa argues that the ‘second generation may know some of their parents’ language, but they are not as fluent in it as they are in English’ (2002: 234). Loss of language affects the ability of young people to participate in transnational networks. When young people are not fluent in their parents’ language, they are dependent on their family or community; they cannot act independently. (Eckstein, 2002: 234). Like Eckstein, Reynolds (2006) argues that for the Caribbean second generation, transnational ties are strengthened by the family, holidays, and improved telecommunication systems in the country of origin.
Most of the studies concerning Turkish speaking first or second generation migrants have been conducted in Germany (Caglar, 2001; Kaya, 2001), neglecting the situation in the UK. Likewise, most of the research on Turkish speaking migrants and transnationalism has focused on limited number of issues, such as socio-economic exchanges, the formation of Turkish cultural identity, difficulties in education, and adaptation to different cultural spaces. These researches have explored cultural practices and identity positioning of Turkish speaking youth and argues that Turkish youth in Germany have multiple identifications such as German, Turkish, global (Kaya, 2001), and they connected to Berlin- an urban space- rather than a nation and/or ethnic communities (Caglar, 2001).

This research aims to fill some of the gaps in the literature, taking into consideration a population that has been so far under researched, i.e. Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youth living in London, and using a broad approach, exploring the everyday experiences of this population. One of the central aims here is to explore the Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youth in London, and to display how their experiences, perceptions and relations are formed by negotiation and dialogue with the country of origin, host culture, and individual attachments.

In addition, exploring how Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youth in London have constructed transnational social space, this research scrutinizes the themes of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish cultural organization and family as dominant discourses within transnational social space and questions how much they are effective in the discourse of CKT youth in London by focusing on the experiences, perceptions of CKT youth. The research will also indirectly ask how CKT youth relate themselves to national culture and how they renegotiate their given identities. However, the purpose of this research is not to investigate how national identity is reshaped in a transnational context. Rather it will focus on the individual negotiation of identity in interaction with social and structural transnational contexts.

This research aims to explore how the identity of CKT youth is negotiated in their transnational context. To do so, I used Giddens’ theory that identity is an outcome of the interaction between structure, social relation, and the self. In focusing on these three
dimensions, I asked young people questions related to their perceptions and experiences with their family, peers, and different institutions.

The experiences of CKT youth will be observed through their discourses and interpretations of their different interactions. The social relations dimension will be analysed in relation to CKT youth’s perceptions of their family and peers. Finally, the structural influence of identity negotiation will be explored through CKT youth experiences at school, community organisations, neighbourhood and family. I focused on these dimensions as they represent the key factors of inclusion into society (Kivisto, 2001; Levitt and Waters, 2002) and, therefore, have an influence on the creation of TSS and the negotiation of identity. The methodological aspects of my research on transnationalism and identity will be explored in the following chapter.
Chapter 2: Methodology

This chapter discusses the methods used in exploring the research questions outlined in the introduction and illustrates the methodology used in conducting my empirical research. Firstly, the chapter introduces the population studied and the context of the study. Secondly, it discusses the research methods used in collecting the data. Thirdly, it discusses how these data have been analysed.

In order to explore and then understand the ways identities are negotiated among Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people, I analysed the context of identity formation and collected the voice of the agents. The choice of subjects focused on CKT young people’s experiences within their social life in London and their relationship with social structures and other individuals. During the fieldwork, I aimed to keep an open mind in order to be able to discover unplanned factors influencing TSS construction and identity formation. The interpretive approach developed by Weber allowed me to develop this ‘open to discovery’ perspective. Weber argues that a sociological understanding can be only developed from a reflexive reconstruction and an informative understanding of human beings (Weber, 1977). According to him, individuals are the main actors in defining their life-world in relation to everyday life. Schultz developed Weber’s approach by focusing on the ‘subjective meaning’ and arguing that the meaning of social forms and activities need to be taken into account in analysing the interpretation of individuals about their social lives (Schultz, 1967). In other words, human feelings and meanings, how they conceive the meaning and the context behind the social reality are crucial in analysing the everyday lives of individuals. In line with Schultz, this research believes first that agents can make sense of their life-world, interpret it and negotiate their identity. The agents in this research are young Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks living in London. Secondly, the comprehensive approach signifies that social action can be understood only through the meaning given by these agents. Based on this perspective, this study places great importance on empirical findings, focusing on the feelings and thoughts of the population studied about their experiences, relations and interactions with institutions, social groups, and other individuals.

This perspective is based on an inductive approach which is developed on the voices of young people making sense of the social world. To collect these voices, this research
used different research methods, such as semi-structured interviews, participant observation and focus group discussion.

**Data Collection**

I used three different research methods – qualitative interviews, focus group and participant observation – to collect my data. Qualitative interviews gave me an opportunity to understand individuals’ perceptions on cultural resources around them and their positioning in the social world (Bryman, 2001; Esterberg, 2002; Flick, 2002; Hopf, 2004; Seale, 2004). While qualitative interviewing methods allowed me to understand the young people’s thoughts, perceptions and experiences, focus groups helped me to perceive individuals’ interactions with each other (Krueger, 1994; Miller et al., 1998; Morgan and Krueger, 1998). Participant observation, on the other hand, allowed me to observe individuals’ behaviour, interaction and daily life in its social context (Atkinson and Silverman, 1997; Bryman, 2001; Delamont, 2004; Iacono et al., 2009; Luders, 2004). Using more than one approach to the investigation of research is called the triangulation method (Bryman, 1992; Flick, 2004). Triangulation enabled me to study different influences on identity formation and investigate research questions which could not be investigated by using a single research method (Flick, 2004).

I interviewed young people to understand their positioning as individuals, in interaction with others, and as representatives of community organisations to explore the institutional part of the identity dynamic. Fieldwork started in April 2007 and ended in January 2008. In this section, I describe the methods used and justify why I used the triangulation method to collect my data.

**Qualitative Interviews with Young People**

In this section, I describe the type of interview conducted; my methods in recruiting interviewees, the interview process and the main difficulties in conducting qualitative interviews.

*Type of Interview*

I used semi-structure interviews because they allowed me to use open questions in order to get information about young people’s experiences, feelings and thoughts but did not
influence my interviewees’ answers with structured questions. As Hopf (2004) states, qualitative interviewing plays an important role in understanding the subjective perspective of the participants about their ‘life-world’. I did, however, cover similar issues with all my interviewees to ensure I could obtain useful data for analysing the collective group.

Semi-structured interviews gave me a clear idea of how young people translate and negotiate social relations with others, and allowed interviewees to express their opinions in their own words (Esterberg, 2002). I focused my interviews on participants’ everyday lives and their level of engagement with cultural resources. Qualitative interviewing can be valuable in exploring different perspectives in greater depth (Rapley, 2004). As a method, qualitative interviewing is useful for accessing individual’s values and experiences which cannot be observed or accommodated in a formal questionnaire.

This research method is appropriate for analysing the interaction of the self with social structures and other individuals. Forty-five young people (approximately fifteen male and female young people from each social group) were interviewed for this research.

Recruitment

In terms of finding participants, I used my social networks. I reached them through community organisations in local areas where the studied population live. All interviews were conducted around North London where the majority of Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks live.

The common features of these young people were being raised in London, speaking Turkish and English, and having attachments with their country of origin. I used ethnic, social and gender categorisations for selection and recruitment, but, as mentioned above, I did not use these categories systematically during the interview or in my analysis. Before I started the fieldwork, I interviewed first generation migrants from community organisations. I requested their advice in finding out the best way to invite young people to participate in the research. Through their advice, I visited community organisations that run specific courses, such as dance, theatre, Turkish/Kurdish language courses for young people. The teacher of the course introduced me to young people, gave me information useful to my research, and asked young people to participate in the research. I did not, therefore, need to write a formal letter to describe
my research.

*The Interview Process*

I spent approximately an hour conducting each interview. I used cafes and community organisations around North London for conducting my interviews. Most of the interviews were conducted in English even though the participants had the opportunity to choose English or Turkish. Most participants said they could best express themselves in English. Some of the interviewees switched from English to Turkish during the interview.

The topic guide I used in my semi-structured interviews was based on my theoretical background. This allowed enough flexibility for participants to discuss topics not predicted by the theoretical background, but also ensured the inclusion of the key dimensions of social inclusion predefined before the fieldwork: family, social networks, education, transnational attachments, media use, and issues related to the country of origin and the Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish, Turkish communities in London. Besides the interview guide, new questions were raised during the interview in order to achieve a fluidity of ideas. Full questionnaire is provided in Appendix I.

There are some difficulties which are typical to qualitative research. Some of the difficulties I encountered were similar to those of all qualitative research projects such as finding participants, time, travel, and transcription costs. Others were more specific to this study. Firstly, I observed that conducting research with young people is difficult because they tend to be distracted more quickly during the interview compare to the first generation migrants. I realized that after an hour, participants started losing their motivation and concentration. Therefore, I limited interviews to an hour. I did not see my informants several times because I had collected all necessary information during the interview.

Second subject specific problem was that the interviews included sensitive topics such as identity, ethnicity, and family relations. These topics raised several issues. On the one hand, the complexity of these issues makes it difficult to discuss them and manage to grasp the meaning given by the interviewee. On the other hand, these issues are sensitive because they are related to the intimate sphere of an individual’s self and social life. In order to overcome these difficulties, it was crucial to gain the trust of my
interviewees. As mentioned by Lee, ‘it is difficult to avoid the fear of being a stranger, the fear of rejection when seeking personal details about people’s lives, and the fear of violating the normative standards of those being studied’ (1993: 12). To combat this difficulty, I provided information about my position as a researcher and explained why I was conducting interviews. To overcome the complexity of issues raised and to ensure I understood what interviewees were saying, I asked for concrete examples and summarised their ideas back to them.

Thirdly, there were advantages and disadvantages in being a native researcher. It is important to emphasise that my own personal biography played an important role in terms of the way in which the research was conducted. I was born in Turkey and lived there for 23 years, then moved to London to have master and PhD degrees. I have been living in London for approximately seven years. I have always been living in North London where Turkish and Kurdish people mostly live. In that sense, I have been close to the community and interacted with the community in my everyday life, in other words I have been familiar with the social environment of my participants which constructed proximity between me and them. My interactions with Turkish and Kurdish migrants, and my observation of how they position themselves within society, have caused me to reflect upon my personal experience within society. My experience of being a migrant as well as a member of the community created particular engagement with the positionality of young people especially in the case of positioning the self within the society. In a way, I empathise with their positioning within the society through my experiences in living in North London with Turkish and Kurdish migrants and in London as a Turkish migrant which have raised my interest on migrants’ feelings, perspectives and thoughts about their lives. However, my background did not mean that I can fully comprehend the experiences of these young people. Accordingly, I aimed not to relegate myself to a specific, marginal position in the course of the research. Rather, I aimed to consider myself both an insider and outsider. In a way, I had double positions as an insider and outsider. My respondents could relate to me because of their closeness in terms of age/generation and origin, but at the same time felt far enough removed from me because of the fact that I was Turkish-born and they were British-born. For example, it was difficult to understand why most of the participants switch between English and Turkish when they speak to each other. My insider-outsider position as a Turkish migrant living in the London guides and informs this research endeavour.
Because of my Turkish background, I had opportunities to explore and analyse certain issues related to Turkey and migrants’ life in London from an insider perspective. My relationship with Kurdish youth in these areas was also not problematic, because I openly stated that such discriminations and inequalities towards Kurdish people were unacceptable and nationalist discourses were wrong. Therefore, my Turkish background and the way it was constructed within the fieldwork relationships as understanding their relationship with its cultural identity was played an important role in terms of trust that were established. CKT youth openly shared their experiences in relation to community, parents and peers with me. Being few years older than my participants also created an opportunity for me to build good relations with them. Speaking Turkish and being familiar with the local areas and environment of my participants’ community provided me with easy access to the community. I have had more advantages compared to outsider researchers, because I was able, to a greater extent than outside researchers, to bridge the gap of socio-cultural misinterpretation. Furthermore, coming from the same country and knowing the political and cultural transformations in Turkey gave me an advantage in seeing the different perspectives in the Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish, Turkish communities that may have been more difficult to analyse for someone from outside the community. However, occupying the role of an insider researcher provides conveniences to practical negotiation of the research process, such as accessing the community and conducting interviews.

Besides the advantages described above, being an insider also brings with it some inherent disadvantages. It might easily be the cause of native positioning: it might lead to cultural partiality and close links with the research subjects. These close links sometimes served to create an environment for interviewees to assume I was in a position to give them advice and even solve the problems they face at school, with their peers and teachers, at home with their parents and also with the community members. For instance, they wanted me to talk to their teacher about the difficulties they face at school. However, as a sociology researcher, I did attempt not to get involved in their private problems. Such an association could be too personal and close for me as a researcher, for them as a subject, and most importantly, for the purpose of this research. In order to manage the expectation of the interviewees in terms of the role as a problem solver, I openly stated my positionality as a researcher rather than as a problem solver by explaining them the role of the researcher and the reasons of not forming that kind of
relationship with them for ethical reasons. When they were mentioning their private issues during the interview and seeking for advice, I tried to limit my own contributions to the conversation by not commenting on their issues and waiting for them to complete their sentence and then moving to the next question. I was constructed a balance between ‘distance and engagement’ during the fieldwork as Ellias (1995) suggests.

Finally, although in-depth interviews are used to get deeper information about the practices and experiences of young people, this method is not sufficient and does not necessarily give accurate data because the participants may not give full information about their experiences and themselves.

*Interviews with Community Organisations and the First Generation*

Apart from qualitative interviews with young people, I carried out unstructured interviews which ‘tend to be more spontaneous and free-flowing’ (Esterberg, 2002) with representatives of community organisations and first generation migrants in order to understand their role in the identity formation of CKT youth. This group was also used as a ‘pilot study’. I conducted fifteen interviews with first generation migrants, four of whom were representatives from community organisations. The participants were of mixed gender and from different ethnic origins. The aim of interviewing first generation migrants and representatives of community organisations was to find out their reasons for migration, the experience of migration for first generation migrants, and to discover what community organisations offer to young people.

I had little difficulty in recruiting ‘first generation’ participants through community organisations and in the local areas where the studied population live. Interviews took place in cafes and cultural organisations to make participants feel comfortable within their regular environments.

For this group, I did not use an interview guide and instead organised the questioning in a flexible way around three topics: the migratory trajectory; life in London, with particular reference to their relationship with community organisations; and finally, their views on and relationship with second generation. I spent on average one hour per interview. The interviews with the first generation migrants were conducted in Turkish, because participants expressed themselves better in Turkish.
I found some difficulty in conducting interviews with Kurdish community representatives because of my Turkish origin. Kurdish migrants did not as readily want to discuss their experiences of being a migrant in London and their relationship with the rest of the community. Because I was more of an ‘outsider’ to them, I had to make several efforts to create a dialectical relationship with participants (Ahmad and Sheldon, 1993; Devault, 1990), in order that they answer my questions openly.

**Focus Group**

I conducted one focus group with six young people of Turkish origin. I aimed to use the focus group to explore how common social meanings can be differentiated among individuals who belong to the same social group. Focus groups seek to explore individual accounts in social contexts that emerge through interaction, as opposed to qualitative interviewing which seeks to examine the issues from individual accounts outside the social context (Bryman, 2001; Krueger, 1994; Miller et al., 1998).

The focus group method provided me with a basis for observing participants’ social interactions in relation to each other within the same social group, and examines issues that are not easily observed in a one-to-one situation. Finally, this method helped me to evaluate and explore the findings that emerged from interviews, reviewing participants’ views on shared and contested meanings, giving me the opportunity to realise ‘how people respond to each other’s views’ (Bryman, 2001: 337).

I spent approximately two hours on the focus group discussion which took place in a café in the area where the majority of participants live. I reached focus group participants by using my social networks within the community. During the discussion, different views, voices, and ideas of people were reflected within the same community. Choosing participants from the same social group allowed for the isolation of the influence of ethnicity and culture on identity formation, focusing, therefore, on the role of other factors. The focus groups I conducted consisted solely of young people of Turkish origin who have different educational and family backgrounds, different interests, and different ideas about their cultural identities.

The topics covered during this focus group included family relations, identity perceptions, social networks, and visits to the country of origin. The main difficulty of conducting focus group discussion is finding participants who are all available at the
same time for the interview. Specifically during my research, I found it difficult to encourage participants to contribute in group discussion because they were uncomfortable in stating their thoughts and feelings about their identity in front of other people who share the same origin.

**Participant Observation**

Participant observation offers a distinct way of collecting data to the researcher (Bryman, 2001; Delamont, 2004; Denscombe, 2003; Luders, 2004). It does not take into account what people say, as it is more direct with researchers observing actions and interactions first hand. As Bruyn (1963: 224) states, the observer shares the life activities and thoughts of people in face-to-face relationships. The observation method offers a close relation with the subject of the research, as it allows researchers to gather information first hand rather than relying on secondary sources (Denscombe, 2003). I chose the participant observation method to analyse the life-world of the young people under observation.

This method was crucial in understanding the social relations of CKT youth as it allowed me to immerse myself in their environment, spend time with them, and observe their interactions. It helped me grasp and understand the interplay between individuals and their social and structural environment. The participant observation method gave me an advantage in understanding participants in their own social space and in their own language.

I communicated with young people through social events, activities, and parties. I was trying to understand their relation to each other and their families by examining which language they use when they communicate with each other, what they mainly talk about, their potential differences according to their social groups, how they communicate with their families, how they act and behave within local area, and how they behave outside of the local environment. I took notes during the fieldwork on the observations and discussions gathered during each event.

As my fieldwork in North London continued over six month period I was known by the members of the community organisations and CKT youth. During the fieldwork, I observed how their social relations played an important role in their perception of their identities; the ways they interact with each other. For example, in this neighbourhood
these young people constructed good relationship with their peers and other community members. They know most of the Turkish and Kurdish people in the environment and constructed good relationships with them. They looked like an extended family. It is also observed that they have switched between Turkish and English languages which depended on who they were speaking to. For example, in the community organisations young people spoke Turkish with their teacher and older members of the community, but they mostly spoke English amongst each other. When they were doing social and cultural activities such as traditional dance and drama with other Turkish and Kurdish youth in the community organisations, they seemed to enjoy sharing something together rather than learning about the culture as most of the participants mentioned. Their accounts therefore did not differ in practice and theory. How they perceive identity was visible and clear in the context of their interactions with peers and community members.

I used my social contacts in reaching the subjects of this research. I attended activities and workshops organised by community organisations, creating social networks with their members. To sum up, this method provided me with the opportunity to experience the social spaces of young people first hand and provided a good platform for gaining diverse insights into their social world. This method has some limitations in terms of choosing the setting and the roles into which participants adapt. It also relies on note taking which is problematic because the observer is in danger of taking too many notes and not observing properly, or the reverse.

**Summary of the Collected Data**

In Table 2, I summarise the types of data collected and the methods with which I collected them. I describe the main characteristics of the data and finally their aim with regards my research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Aim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews with first generation</td>
<td>16 Interviews conducted with mixed gender first generation migrants and opinion leaders (representatives of community organisations, Gikder-Refugee Workers Association, Komkar-Kurdish Advice Centre, Halkivi- Kurdish-Turkish organisation, Cypriot Turkish)</td>
<td>To understand their reasons for migration, the migration processes of first generation migrants and what community organisations offer to young people. This was used as a pilot study in order to understand the influences of social structure on the identity formation of young people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-structured interviews with second generation (Main empirical material)

45 semi-structured interviews:
15 Turkish male and female
17 Kurdish male and female
13 Cypriot Turkish male and female youth

To have detailed and in depth information about young people’s experiences, feelings and thoughts. Interviews helped me form a clear idea of how these young people translate and negotiate social relations with others in the community. These interviews assisted me in the analysis of self and social relations of identity formation.

Focus group with second generation

1 Focus group with Turkish origin male youth (6 participants)

To explore how common social meanings can be differentiated among individuals who belong to same social group

Participant Observation

Participatory observation going to several informal social places where Turkish and Kurdish male youths mostly socialize, involving private and public places (house, local areas)
Participation at 5 community meetings about migrants’ problems, cultural and social life in London

To analyse the life-world of studied young people. I used this method in order to understand structure and social relations among participants and other people

Documents and literature

Secondary sources, books, articles related to migratory youth identity and transnationalism, and annual reports of community organisations

To build theoretical ground for empirical findings

Table 2.1: Collected Data

**Defining the Population and the Context of the Study**

In this section, I explore the characteristics of the main population studied, and illustrate the reasons for choosing to study young people within three specific social groups (Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish), as well as the reasons for carrying out this research in London.

**Characteristics of Main Studied Population**

The narratives of this research are based on forty-five mixed gender young Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish people living in London: 17 Kurds (8 female, 9 male), 15
Turks (7 female, 8 male), and 13 Cypriot Turks (5 female, 8 male). The ages of the young people are between 18 and 23; most were born in London or came to London at an early age which means they were educated in London. Most of them probably are bilingual and lived with their parents.

**Young People**

This study focuses on young people: there are a number of reasons for choosing this demographic. First, I assumed that young people are more open to change in terms of culture and identity. They also play an important role in taking into the future what they have learnt from the previous generation. Secondly, I assumed that the young are in social interaction with other communities and cultures more than previous generations, because in everyday life they interact with other cultures more through school, college, and other institutions. Thirdly, the young people in this study are second generation migrants: as they were born and raised in the country of settlement, this might make the renegotiation of their identity and culture faster in comparison with first generation (Kucukcan, 1999).

I chose the age group 18 to 23 under the assumption that young people of this age are in the process of transforming to adulthood. They will be more aware of what is going on around them in comparison to previous generations in terms of interaction with the other community members. Their ability in using the English language will also assist them in engaging with different cultural components (Epstein, 1998). I chose the second generation because I believed that young people have more opportunities to move between and within different social spaces. Young people face the challenge of adapting to change and the various different positions among themselves.

**Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Youth**

Apart from focusing on youth, this research also aims to explore three different social groups: male and female members of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish origin. The reasons for choosing these three social groups are to examine the connections between them. On the one hand, they all have cultural and historical connections with each other; on the other, there might be differences regarding their experiences growing up and living in London. I will focus, however on the similarities among CKT youth rather
than differences in this research. Consequently, focusing on three groups contributes to
developing a broader view of the major concerns and diversity of experiences. The
differences between these different social groups also assisted me in analysing how their
social relationships might be shaped with institutional factors on different levels,
depending on the historical background of their family and the socio-cultural factors
relating to their community. Studying three different social groups also led me to
consider the influence of ethnic and cultural backgrounds on identity formation, in
comparison to other factors such as socio-economic backgrounds.

Even though these three groups are differentiated with regards ethnic origin, they do
have cultural similarities and experiences because of their migratory background. All
three groups have material and spiritual connections with Turkey and Cyprus (in the
case of Cypriot Turks). When examining these groups, which are 'Kurds' and 'Cypriot-
Turks', it is understood that their ethnic and national origin is not identified as Turkish.
Their most important common feature is a common language used in their daily life and
accounts for some cultural similarities between Turks and Cypriot Turks. Kurds
differentiate from Turks and Cypriot Turks in terms of their language and ethnic origin.
Interviewing three different social groups assisted me in understanding the ways they
differ from each other and how these differences are reflected in the identity formation
of young people.

Instead of categorising the young people within the certain types, such as Cypriot
Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish, British-Turk, British-Kurd or simply British, the young
people in this study as seen as individual human beings. In this sense, the questions
related to identity must be asked in a broad context. The aim was to find out the
perceptions and thoughts of young people when thinking about their identities.
Consequently, I did not focus on putting young people in a category when I was
interviewing them. During my pilot empirical work, I asked young people to choose an
identity between various options such as Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish, Turkish, British-
Turk, British-Kurd, Alevi, Sunni and so on. Many could not find an answer easily and it
became difficult for them to pick one or two of the options. Because of this I changed
strategy and asked them how to describe their identity. This approach, I realised, led to
discussions about their perception and experiences as an individual, which was very
broad rather than a limited discussion of fixed categories. After understanding their
perception on the issue of identity, I asked them what it means to be Cypriot Turkish,
Kurdish, Turkish or British for them. This gave me a specific understanding of their perceptions related to certain categories of identities and helped me understand how they position themselves within society. This also led to further questions: does identity change in different circumstances? How does being a migrant play a role in describing these fixed categories? Does being integrated into British society change their perception on these categorisations?

London

This study is focused on the situation in London. I chose London because most of the population from Turkey and Cyprus living in the UK is established in London. Secondly, Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish, Turkish youth living in London are understudied groups.

London’s status as a multicultural city also led me to consider the relation of CKT youth to other cultures and, more generally, the experiences of CKT young people living in a city offering such diversity. The fieldwork mainly took place in North London, where the majority of migrants from Turkey and Cyprus live and have built their social life. Conducting interviews in their local area also gave me an idea about their positioning in local environments and how they perceive their social position compared to other parts of London.

Other Characteristics

Cultural categorisations among the research participants which refer to ethnicity and gender are often used to identify sociological differences. I did use these categories to select the population studied, but neither took them into consideration during the interview nor in the analysis, because I assumed the categories would limit the outcome of my data. Firstly, because I was interested to find out how CKT youth describe themselves. Secondly, I was interested in their similarities in the formation of their identity. The categories of being Cypriot Turk, Kurd, and Turk, the class, gender, religion or absence of religion were therefore considered only if mentioned spontaneously by participants during the interviews.

Characteristics of Other Participants

Apart from young people, I also interviewed representatives of community
organisations and some first generation migrants in order to understand the relation of the young people with social structures and within the community. I interviewed sixteen mixed gender first generation migrants from three social groups (Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish). The members of community organisations included the following: Cypriot Turkish Association, Halkevi (Kurdish-Turkish organisation) and Komkar (Kurdish Advice Centre) and Gikder (Refugee Workers Association).

Data Analysis

In this section, I discuss how I analyse the data collected, distinguishing the methods with which it has been gathered.

I recorded all interviews and focus group discussions with the permission of interviewees. The transcripts were read several times. While transcribing the interviews, I also paid attention to what has not been said during the interviews and focus group discussions, and what can be interpreted either from the tone of voice of the interviewees and from silent responses. This assisted me in analysing how interviewees react when they talk about sensitive issues or do not have answers to certain questions. I did not record any conversations during the observation period. I took field notes and used these notes for my analysis.

Interviews were analysed both ‘what interviewees say about their lives and experiences, (the interview as a resource) (Byrne, 2005: 183). I analysed my interview transcripts mostly as a report of experiences which contributed in answering my research questions. This was also motivated by the nature of my interviews (i.e. semi-structured questions, short duration) which were semi-structured. Following this logic, in analysing the 45 semi-structured interviews with CKT young people, I used qualitative content analysis which used to analyse any kind of text-written materials such as, books, magazines, letters, interview transcripts and filed notes, involves a systematic analysis of texts (Esterberg, 2002; Titscher et al., 2000); employing a thematic coding system which helps to create analytical categories (Spannagel et al., 2005). More specifically, I started to define categories of analysis that were related to my research questions based on specific theoretical aspects. These categories included family and peer relationships, school, community organisations, media, and neighbourhood. Having done this, I organised these categories into themes and sub-themes which aimed
to explore the role of each factor in the formation of transnational social space, the type of transnational social spaces created, and the negotiation of identity of CKT youth. To do this, sub categories were based on the themes of each chapter of this thesis. For example, the main categories for the chapter on the influence and the role of family in identity formation in a transnational context were grouped in relation to family in London and in relation to family in the country of origin. The same logic was then adapted to the rest of the data chapters.

At the second stage, I reexamined the categories created in relation to examining the common theoretical indicators in identifying transnationalism. These include, for instance, multilingualism, social relationships with more than one country, economic exchanges with more than one country and political engagement with more than one country (Basch et al., 1994; Faist and Ozveren, 2004; Portes et al., 1999; Roberts et al., 1999; Vertovec, 2001). These theoretical categories are not derived from empirical data but added to the empirical data (Flick, 2006). Afterwards, I imposed externally to this list of themes which arose from reading my transcripts and selecting the recurrent points among my interviewees to elaborate a theory. The collected data elaborates and refines categories in emerging theory (Charmaz, 2006). For instance, under the main category of general relationship, use or consumption, I first tried to identify the type of relationships, use or consumption developed by the population studied respectively with the members of their close or extended family, community organisations, school and media. To do so, I looked first hand at the type of relationship, activities or events offered. For example, in the case of community organisations, I tried to identify what type of activities and events were offered by these organisations as were they political, educative or reactional which gave some insights into the type of TSS created and on what type of event decreased the creation of TSS. Then I focus on their frequency by looking at their media consumption and identifying the amount of time spent in consulting media and how many different media are consulted by the population studied. Finally, I looked at how this relationship, use, or consumption of media was judged by exploring the general impression of the relationship and looking at whether it was perceived by CKT youth as something which made them feel better or disrupted them. Other main categories explore the influence of diverse and/or homogeneous experiences, relationships or interactions, and interpretations of young people about cultural repertoires and social relations around them. The full list of my main categories and codes are given in Appendix III.
I used NVIVO software in order to facilitate the coding of my transcripts, because it was easier to organise my data, such as linking, managing and synthesising my ideas (Dey, 1993; Richards, 1999; 2005; Seale, 2004a; Wiltshier, 2011). This facilitated a transversal analysis of my data. I created tree nodes to correspond to my categories and sub categories. Tree nodes refer to codes that are organised in a hierarchical structure of related themes (Gray, 2009; Wiltshier, 2011). The data collected during the participative observation, the 15 unstructured interviews with first generation of CKT migrants transcripts and focus groups, were analysed according the same categories and codes. They fulfilled the semi-structured interview transcripts.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the methods used to understand how the identity formation of CKT youth was analysed in the context of TSS. This study aims to explore how CKT youth position themselves in relation to social and structural factors. Furthermore, it investigates issues such as the relationship young people have with people in their country of origin, the receiving society, local neighbourhood, transnational media, school, community organisations. Finally, it analyses how the social relations of young people and their interactions with structural factors are negotiated by CKT youth.

As this study concerns how CKT youth negotiate their position in society by focusing on social relations, structural factors, a methodological framework which involves qualitative interviewing, focus groups, and participant observation was appropriate because it enabled me to understand their interaction with social structures and other individuals within the same social groups, and assisted me in understanding the interaction between the self and the social and structural environment. Furthermore, using three methods helped me to investigate the identity positioning of CKT youth in different environments which could not be investigated by using a single research method.

During the course of this study I conducted forty-five semi-structured interviews with Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people, fifteen interviews with first generation migrants, and one focus group with young people of Turkish origin. This enabled an in-depth analysis of the interactions of CKT youths within their social
context and assisted me in explaining the relationships of CKT youths with social and structural factors through their everyday experiences across the borders.

The methodological aspects of this research allowed me to understand the diverse experiences of CKT youth. The next chapter seeks to explore the structure of CKT communities, their relationship with each other, and their migratory trajectories in order to explore the reason for studying these three communities.
Chapter 3: Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks in London: Diverse Migratory Trajectories

This chapter aims to explore the historical background of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities (hereafter ‘CTK’) regarding the historical period of migration to London, in order to have a better understanding of how these communities created their own social space, how the political situations in Turkey and Cyprus affected the lives of migrants, and, in particular, how it affects the lives of CTK young people. All of these three communities migrated in different time periods and, for various reasons, have different reasons for migration. This historical detour is necessary in order to understand where young people stand within their community and whether they follow the same routes as their parents. Indeed, the first generation’s reasons for migration might also influence the identity formation of young people, especially in the case of political migrants. Young people whose parents are political migrants may find themselves politically engaged because of their parents.

Looking at the connections between CTK communities and how the relation between these communities has been established, also explores the differences and similarities among the young people who are members of these communities. In this research, young people’s families come from different places in Turkey and Cyprus, from different social classes, and have different lifestyles. The main connection between them is having a migratory position in London.

Much of the research on the ‘Turkish-speaking’ population conducted in the UK has tended to conflate Cypriots, Turks and Kurds (Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Enneli et al., 2005; Erdemir and Vasta, 2007; Kucukcan, 1999). As Enneli et al. (2005) acknowledge in their research, ‘the term ‘Turkish origin’ is not right, because it does not cover those who are from Cyprus; nor is ‘Turkish-speaking’ because, for many Kurds, it is Kurdish, not Turkish, that is their primary language. If we use ‘Turks and Kurds’, this will omit the Cypriots. We do in fact use all three of these terms because no single term itself is satisfactory and nor is any other term. We mostly use ‘Turkish speaking’ for the majority of the people studied as their families do indeed speak some Turkish’ (2005: 54). Enneli et al. acknowledge the problem of combining Kurds with Turks, but they still define them as ‘Turkish speaking’ which does not really take account of the political and ethnic differences between Turks and Kurds. In order to include Kurdish
migrants and to have an apt description with regards the ethnic identity and political rights of Kurdish migrants, I will not try to associate these three groups under the terminology of Turkish-speaking migrants. Rather, I will use the term Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish (CKT) communities to define them with regards to their own ethnic, cultural and political rights.

These three social groups need to be recognized as Cypriot- Turkish who come from Cyprus but Turkish-speaking, mainland Turks and Kurds from Turkey who holds a legal status of citizenship on the basis of identity cards and passports (Icduygu et al., 2008) but have different ethnicity. This chapter first of all explores the reasons for migration of the three social groups, their backgrounds, and their settlement. Secondly, it examines the idea of returning back to the country of origin in the case of first generation migrants. Thirdly, it examines the interactions between Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities. Finally, it provides some insights into the potential influence of the first generation on CKT young people.

**CTK Communities: Diverse Experiences of Migration**

This section will discuss the migratory trajectories of three social groups considered in this study and focusing on their differences. It explores the respective reasons for migration, socio-economic demographic profiles, social networks, and the settlement in London of Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks. This focus on the first generation CKT migrants’ background will help in understanding key aspects of young people’s identity formation and inclusion in London.

**Cypriot Turks**

*Reasons for Migration*

Cypriot Turkish migrants were the first CKT migrants to move to the United Kingdom. This group is not present in other European countries (Enneli and Modood, 2009: 189). Their migration process to the UK started in the 1950s for economic reasons: ‘Economic migration started during British colonial rule in the 1920s and increased in the 1940s and 1950s, when the British government actively recruited Cypriot workers’ (Ostergaard, 2003: 687). From 1950 to 1960, Cypriot Turks benefited from liberal British immigration policies as the island gained its independence; as a consequence, at
that time economic stagnation and the opportunity to earn money were the main reasons for their migration to the UK (Ladbury, 1977). Although, the increase in the volume of Cypriot migration led to the introduction of restrictive measures by the early 1950s, the more intense phase of Cypriot Turkish migration began after inter-communal strife in late 1963. Aside from economic reasons, the political situation in Cyprus was also an important factor affecting migration patterns until the 1970s. After the de facto partition of the island in 1974, Cypriot Turks began to return to Cyprus. Since then, their immigration has been on purely economic grounds. However, as highlighted by Ostergaard, the economic situation was politically induced: ‘The economic situation in Northern Cyprus is also politically induced since discrimination by the Greek majority before 1974 and international sanctions after 1974 make economic prosperity difficult to achieve for the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus’ (Ostergaard, 2003: 687).

It can be said that in the early days of migration during the 1950s, economic crises and political instability were the main reasons for migration from Cyprus to the United Kingdom; now, however, Cypriot expectations of staying in London are related to having an alternative place to live and especially making more money. Indeed, these migrants have strong relations with relatives and friends living in Cyprus in terms of sending remittances and establishing transnational business with people or companies in Cyprus. With these connections, relatives living in Cyprus might depend on migrants living in London for their financial needs. Consequently, living in London and the prospect of migration can be seen as an individual choice rather than economic necessity for the majority (Ladbury, 1977; Mehmet Ali, 2001).

**Numbers of Cypriot Turks in the UK**

In 1958, there were 8,500 Cypriots living in England (Bhatti, 1981: 2). In 1964, the number of Cypriot migrants in England had risen to 78,846 (Kucukcan, 1999: 61). After 1974, migration increased again, and at the beginning of the 80s the number of Cypriots living in England had reached 160,000. During the 1980s, 50 - 60,000 Cypriot Turks were given the chance to become naturalised as British. ‘The number of Cypriots, regardless of their ethnic origin, was 160000 in the 1980s, of which 20-25% are said to be Cypriot Turkish’ (Kucukcan, 2004: 247). According to Enneli et al. (2005), an estimated 120,000 Cypriot Turks across three generations live in the UK. Cypriot Turks are the wealthiest group among Turks and Kurds because they were the first group to
migrate to UK and because their ability to use the English language provided them with advantages in establishing businesses. When Turks first came to London, they had to work for Cypriot Turks, because they could not speak English well enough to enter the job market.

Cypriot Turks have an important role among Turks and Kurds because the large numbers of Cypriot Turks who migrated to the UK created the social, economic and cultural environments for the new comers. Moreover, they have had better inclusion to the receiving society as a result of historical connections to the UK and better use of the language. These factors create more opportunities to practice transnationalism, for instance, constructing economical links with the sending and the receiving country.

Settlement of Cypriot Turks in London and Establishment of Social Networks

The geographical distribution of Cypriot Turks in London has parallels with Greek-Cypriot migration. Cypriot Turks were dependent on Greek Cypriots for jobs and finding accommodation when they first migrated to the UK. This might have affected their settlement choices. According to Ladbury (1977: 306), Cypriot Turks initially settled slightly to the east of the main areas of Greek Cypriot settlement, which were Camden and Islington. Similar to Ladbury, Kohler (1974: 10) also mentions that the 1971 Census indicates that their settlement has progressed further north of Camden and Islington since 1966, whilst Yilmaz also demonstrates significant communities in south London areas, such as in Elephant & Castle, Lewisham, and Peckham. Even so, it is clear that the majority of Cypriot Turks live in the Boroughs of Camden and Islington Borough (2004: 59), whilst a minority live in south London. When Cypriot Turks first migrated they mainly socialised with Greek Cypriots, as there were not many Turkish speaking people in London. As one of the Cypriot Turks interviewees points out:

The first arrivals of Cypriot Turks did not have good conditions; there were small amount of Cypriot Turks. We were going to a Turkish café from Elephant and Castle to socialize with a few Turks (74 year old Cypriot Turkish man, 12.10.07).
After opening up business, Cypriot Turks started to employ Turkish migrants. They created social networks in London. Mainland Turks and Cypriot Turks who live and work in the same areas of London are involved in similar social and cultural activities:

I have been living in London since 1973 with my two daughters. I have worked in different sectors such as textiles, coffee shops and offices. Cypriot Turks and Turks are in London always having a connection with each other, living in the same locations. They work usually in the same jobs, usually in the service sector, but they all have their own business. In their social life lots of them protect their cultural values, and some of them do not (43 year old Cypriot Turkish woman, 12.10.07, café in Dalston).

Social networks continued to play a crucial role in helping arrivals adapt to London. Cypriot Turks created their own social space with the participation of some mainland Turks as well. In their social spaces, they established community organisations which aimed to spread Turkish culture and identity especially among second generation migrants. The purpose of the first Cypriot Turkish organisation was to protect Turkish culture among Turkish and Cypriot Turkish youths who were born or raised in the UK. The first Cypriot Turkish organisation was established in 1951, under the name of the Cyprus Turkish Association with the first arrival of Cypriot Turks. The director of the Cyprus Turkish Association underlines the cultural and educative role of the organisation:

The aim of establishment of Cyprus-Turkish Association is to introduce Cyprus issue to students, Turkish community and foreigners. I am a director since 1970s. When I started to work at this organisation, I looked at the documents and realised that there is a problem of Turkish education around Cypriot Turkish and Turkish young people. It is important our youth to know Turkish culture and language. We are now working towards to give Turkish education to our youth. We have Turkish language courses, especially for Turkish and Cypriot Turkish youth who were born or raised in London from the early ages (Mustafa Gencsoy, Director of Cyprus Turkish Association, 11.09.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

The organisation gives importance to practicing Turkish culture and the use of language especially among Cypriot Turkish young people. However, it could be wrong to generalise Cypriot Turks as migrant group who have a strong attachment to their cultural identity. A Cypriot Turkish family who have been living in England for 30
years underline that they are different from the mainland Turks and Kurds from Turkey. When they migrated to England there were few Turkish people in London. In that respect, they have integrated with British citizens at work, and felt that they were a part of British society:

We feel that we were a part of British culture. We can't say that we are British, but we related ourselves to British society. We have been trying to keep our identity as Cypriot Turkish. But it has become very difficult after having lived here for a long time. We are different from other Turkish speaking migrants. Because, when we came to London, there were no more Turkish people, and subsequently we had to interact with British. We had worked with them; they are our neighbours and the most important thing that we learned easily was the English language and we had been able to communicate with them. Consequently, we become a part of English society. We watch on English channels, consuming English products (Cypriot Turkish family, 13.10.07, house of interviewees).

Even though there are nationalist organisations working to spread cultural identity, the experiences of Cypriot Turkish migrants in some instances contradict the beliefs of such organisations. As Aksoy and Robins (2001) point out, Cypriot Turks have three dominant spheres of identity: their successful integration to British society; the culture of Greek- dominated Cyprus; and, finally, the culture of ‘mainland’ Turkey. Cypriot Turks position themselves culturally with reference to this overall frame (Aksoy and Robins, 2001: 686). Inside the CTK communities, Cypriot Turks first migrated to Britain and they have had an important role in terms of setting up businesses for themselves and for mainland Turks and Kurds from Turkey. This longer settlement and successful economic inclusion in London, as well as their diverse identity roots, might ease the TSS construction among the second generation because they easily move across different social spaces across the borders. As a result of economic and social inclusion into the receiving society, it is easier for the second generation to construct social networks with the people in the country of origin through visits and the use of communication technologies; better use of English helps them to engage in the social spaces of the receiving society.

Mainland Turks

Reasons for Migration
Turks from the mainland were the second of the three migratory groups to arrive in the UK. Migration from Turkey can be traced back to the late the 1960s and early 1970s, and was mostly due to economic reasons. Cypriot Turks who lived in England had established catering and textile companies and received employees from Turkey (Cicekli, 1996: 191). After this period, the number of Turkish migrants increased throughout the 1970s (Kucukcan, 1999: 62).

The first migration movement from Turkey to the United Kingdom was to work in textile factories established by Cypriot Turks.

After 1960s, our population has risen to 80.000. That time there was some mainland Turks. In 1966-67s’ one of my friend wanted to bring workers to work for his factory. We were bringing Turkish workers from Bursa and Izmir in Turkey. We were helping these workers in finding accommodation and constructing social networks. They did not have the same problem as we had, because we were here to help them (74 years old Cypriot Turkish man, 13.10.07, café in Hackney).

The main reason for migration in the late 1960s and early 1970s was economic, and firstly men migrated to the UK to work and earn money. This created the environment for bringing their family. ‘Migration from Turkey to Britain began in the early 1970s, with men arriving on their own and bringing their wives and children in the late 1970s and early 1980s. This created a different social position for the women who were left behind for many years to look after children and run life in the villages without recognition and the men who lived their own’ (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 7).

In exploring the reasons for migration from Turkey to the United Kingdom some researchers (Kucukcan, 1999; Mehmet Ali, 2001) argue that the main reason for migration in those years was economic, as was the case with Cypriot Turks. Apart from economic reasons, political issues which occurred in the 1970s can also be seen as contributory factors. For instance, migration increased following the military coup in Turkey on 12th March, 1971. Because of this event, three leaders of the anti-government movement had been hung by the Turkish army and many intellectuals had been tortured and arrested. As a result of this situation, the first political migration from Turkey to the
United Kingdom started, with educated young people who established organisational structure and socio-political networks with regards to their political stand in the United Kingdom.

Aside from the military coup in 1971, there was another political clash in Kahramanmaras, a region of Turkey. This conflict was between Sunni-Muslims and Alevi-socialists, a branch of Islam based in Anatolia. These two groups have different interpretations of Islam and religious identity (Verkuyten and Yildiz, 2009). In 1978, Sunni-Muslims attacked Alevi people in Kahramanmaras. As a result of this massacre, more than a hundred Alevi people were killed and many villages and houses were destroyed. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, a large amount of Alevi people from Kahramanmaras migrated to the United Kingdom. It was the starting point of Alevi migration from Turkey to the United Kingdom which constructed transnational networks among Alevi people in Turkey, the United Kingdom, and also in Germany. From the mid-1970s onwards an increasing number of Turks started coming to London on their own initiative using their social networks and kin relations.

The third military coup in 1980 must also be recognised as a driving force for Turkish migration to Europe, especially to Germany and the United Kingdom. It was the second wave of migration from Turkey to the United Kingdom. The military coup in Turkey in 1980 pushed many intellectuals, educated people, trade union activists and professionals to migrate to Europe, some seeking political asylum in Britain (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 7-8). People who migrated after the 80s came from the rural areas of Turkey, and differed from the educated migrants who came to England in the 1970s from the larger cities of Turkey. The military coup in Turkey further motivated not only politically active people, but also those who were disillusioned with economic and political instability, to seek alternative places of work and residence. The process of migration has emerged economic stagnation and political instability. However, the political situation is a more important factor for Turkish migration than for Cypriot Turkish migration. This may have an effect on the identity formation of the second generation. Turkish migrants were motivated by both economic and political reasons, whilst the choice of England as their destination was motivated by their social networks.

*Number of Mainland Turks in the UK*
Even though there is no accurate number of Turks, Kurds and Cypriot Turks in England, some researches and the Turkish Consulate argue that the number of migrants from Turkey and Cyprus is around 300 thousand. Kucukcan (1999) argues that the number of Turkish immigrants has changed at different times due to variable political situations. Statistics show that the number of Turkish migrants living in England oscillated over time between 35,000 and 300,000 which corresponds to the Home Office statistics, 2009.

Settlement of Turks in London and Establishing Social Networks

Migrant settlements and adaptation processes are commonly depicted in terms of ethnic solidarity and community (Marger, 2006). Turkish migrants use family networks in finding accommodation and employment. The first arrivals of Turkish migrants worked with Cypriots, and lived in the same areas. The reason for living in the same areas might be related to being closer to other members of communities, their relatives, workplaces, and not being able to speak English. In choosing locations, knowing someone was important for newly arrived migrants, and so the number of Turkish migrants increased within certain locations.

Lots of Turkish people live in London. My shop is in the Turkish area. I can't work at the centre of London, because I can't speak English. It will be difficult to communicate with people whose mother tongue is not Turkish. I have to work in the Turkish area with Turkish people. I don't have any other choice (29 year old Turkish man, 08.09.07, café in Dalston).

The majority of Turks live in North London, around Green Lanes which starts in Newington Green and extends to Winchmore Hill. A significant minority live in North East London, in areas such as Hackney, Dalston, Stoke Newington, and Tottenham. Turks have also, therefore, established their businesses, community organisations, Turkish language schools, and so on in North London. Like Cypriot Turkish, Turkish migrants try to instil a sense of cultural identity among second generation migrants through their community organisations.

Kurds from Turkey

Reasons for Migration
Migration from Turkey rose again at the end of 1980s because of the conflict between the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) and the Turkish government, in eastern and south-eastern Turkey. As a result of this conflict, many Kurds were displaced from their villages and had to migrate to Europe. ‘Since 1984, South-eastern Turkey has been the scene of serious fighting between government security forces and the PKK (Workers Party of Kurdistan), a militant armed Kurdish group whose explicit claims range from complete independence to regional autonomy within Turkey’ (Human Rights Watch, 1999: 10). While a significant number of people from eastern and south-eastern Turkey came as students and with business visas, many others sought political asylum in the UK.

Distinctive experiences among Turkish and Kurdish young people have been pointed out by Enneli et al. (2005: 48), who highlighted the fact that ‘Kurds, as the newest migrant group, suffer the highest levels of disadvantage in their lives. In part, this is linked to the refugee status that many of them have; while the longest settled group, the Cypriot Turks, are the least disadvantaged’. Naming Kurds as a disadvantage group is related to migrant status: Kurds are differentiated with Cypriot Turks and Turks, because of their refugee status.

Like Cypriot Turks and mainland Turks, Kurds from Turkey build social networks which they use to settle in the UK, finding employment and accommodation. As in the case of mainland Turks, Kurdish men arrived first in the United Kingdom and, after finding work brought their wives and children to join them. After bringing their families and relatives to the receiving society, it became easier to construct social networks and socio-cultural space.

*Number of Kurds Living in the UK*

According to Home Office statistics, there are around 60,000 Kurdish-origin migrants who live in England. (Home Office, 2009) The fact that Kurds are routinely registered as Turks by local authorities (Thomson et al., 2008: 9), leads to an undervaluation of their real number in the UK. Therefore, many organisation use the terminology of ‘Turkish speaking community’ when considering this population. However, Kurdish organisations do not accept this terminology as explained by this interviewee:
Kurds are now diasporic community. There are many Kurds living in London and they are different from Turks and Cypriot Turks. Our language is also different from Turkish language. We just have a Turkish passport. Turkish nationality tries to cover everyone, but Kurds are different than Turks. For this reason, we regret the terminology of ‘Turkish speaking community’ which has been included Kurds (Ibrahim Dogus, Director of Halkevi, 03.09.07, Halkevi).

Ibrahim’s view about not including Kurdish migrants under the heading ‘Turkish speaking migrants’ reflects the political resistance of the Kurdish diaspora. As mentioned above, Kurdish migrants in particular are political refugee in the UK because they left Turkey as a result of ethnic conflict between Kurds and Turkish state. In order to protect their ethnic identity and be recognised by others as Kurdish, Kurdish migrants in the UK prefer not to be bracketed in the terminology of ‘Turkish speaking’.

Settlement of Kurds in London and Establishment of Social Networks

The diversity of these three social groups is reflected in their settlement in London. As a result of the increased amount of Kurdish and Alevi migration in the 1990s, settlement choices were affected by the political and ethno-religious features of community members. In the last ten years, while left wing Kurdish and Alevi migrants have settled in Harringay, Dalston and Stoke Newington, right-wing nationalist Turks and Cypriot Turks have settled in Newington Green which is the beginning of Green Lanes. After the settlement of significant numbers of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants in Harringay, Turkish and Kurdish migrants also established their businesses there (Mehmet Ali, 2001). In the social life within the same locations, CKT migrants interact with each other, doing business in terms of establishing partnership, communicating with their mother tongue between themselves. ‘A comparison of Cypriot-mainland Turkish relations in London, though difficult to assess because of their unobtrusive character, nonetheless confirms the importance of local environmental conditions in determining the nature of ethnic relations’ (Ladbury, 1977: 318).

The political background of these three groups is also reflected by local social environments. In coffee houses and restaurants in Newington Green, there are Turkish nationalistic symbols and posters. These political and ethical divisions have affected the regional structure and migrants’ choices of which area to live in. Although there are
political and ethnic divisions among Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities, economic factors, for instance, doing business, working together, etc. transcend the political separation among the communities. We will see later how living close to each other affects second generation young people from all backgrounds.

The first generation migrants constructed their social life in Britain with social and community resources from their country of origin. Some of the first generation of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants have always kept the idea of returning back to their homeland, but have postponed doing so on a number of occasions:

I have been living in London about five years. The reason of my migration was economic. I am here to work, earn money and reach my aims. My dream is to return back to Turkey one day, but I do not know the exact time. I always socialise with Turkish people and in this way I am not away from my culture (31 year old Turkish man, 14.10.07, café in Dalston).

In the case of some first generation migrants, being a member of a diaspora and sharing similar experiences in the destination country makes it difficult to contemplate returning home:

Majority of Kurdish and Turkish migrants say that they will go back to the country of origin, but they never do. As we are witnessing many of them live in London for a long time (A theatre teacher at Halkevi- Kurdish organisation, 14.10.07, Halkevi).

Once families have settled within the UK, there seems to be a reluctance to return home. As a result, the population of Turkish migrants living in England has risen. Returning back seems difficult for migrants who have built their life in UK, and whose children have grown up and adapted to the receiving society.

Connection between CTK Communities

In order to analyse interactions between CTK communities, it is crucial to know in which ways they connect with each other and what they share together. In this section, I will highlight connections related to reasons for migration and relationships in everyday life.
As mentioned above, there is an ethnic division between these communities. Apart from ethnic division between these groups, there are also religious differences that can be significant, such as among Alevi and Sunni people. Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities in London are not a unitary homogeneous community. Apart from three distinct ethnicities (Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks), there are also sub-groups within these three (Enneli et al., 2005) because of differing ethnic, cultural, social and political backgrounds. For instance, Kurds suffer the highest levels of disadvantage in their lives because they have refugee status (2005: 48). Communities also differentiate with regards to their processes of migration: all of these three social groups migrated to the UK within different periods of time and under different circumstances. Despite all these differences, there are some similarities between these three groups.

First, through their migration to the UK, these three groups started to live and work in the same areas. For instance, Turkish migrants from mainland Turkey, who has came to the UK in the early 1970s, started to work at the textile factories owned by Cypriot Turks. The mobility in social and economic situations, the increased number of migrants, and the diversity of jobs within the communities, assisted Turkish and Kurdish migrants in creating their own social space without the need of Cypriot Turks. Whilst each group constructed its own social space with regards to their political, cultural, and social standpoint, at the same time their social spaces continue to interlink through economic and social exchanges at community organisations etc. As a consequence, marriages do take place amongst the communities, though the tendency is still to keep to one’s own grouping. This is especially true of the Kurdish community (Kucukcan, 1999; Mehmet Ali, 2001).

Second, these three social groups have built community organisations in the UK through which they practice their culture. These organisations represent both a similarity and an element of separation between the three groups. Politically the communities are separated by their affiliations to their own organizations and groups based on parties and political movements in their original countries’ (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 9).

The clash between different political standpoints and ethnicities in Turkey, such as anti-Kurdish discourse in the media and in daily life (Saracoglu, 2009) has also been
reflected in the diverse communities in London. Consequently, there is still tension and segregation between Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks living in London. For instance, whenever there is a demonstration organised by Kurdish people, some Turkish nationalists organise a demonstration against the Kurds.

Demonstrations in London are mainly held by Kurds, because Turks do not have any problem. Turks rarely have protests against Kurds. The latest tension between Turks and Kurds is because of Newrooz- an ancient spring celebration for Kurds and Persians. Turks do not let Kurds to celebrate Newrooz in Trafalgar Square. These kinds of things happen (Director of Turkish Education Forum, 10.10.07, Turkish Education Forum).

The tension between Turks and Kurds is mainly because of nationalists on both sides:

At some point, Turkish women discriminate Kurdish women, but it was not because ethnic difference. It was related to unconsciousness among Turkish women. They were saying that ‘we came here earlier than Kurds, but they took over our jobs, houses. The tension between these two communities is not too serious, but nationalist Turks and Kurds sometimes create problems (Director of IMECE- Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish women groups, 11.10.07, café in Dalston).

There are different organizations established by Turks and Kurds. These organizations work for their communities’ right. For this reason, there is tension between the two groups. Whatever happens in Turkey between Turks and Kurds, it is reflected to the UK and Europe. The tension is between the state supportive Turkish organizations and leftist Kurdish organizations. Turkish organizations which support the state do not even try to talk to Kurdish organizations. When there is no negotiation, there is a tension. There is always tension between Turks and Kurds (Peacebuilding member and Turkish journalist who migrated to the UK in 90s, 09.09.07, house of interviewee).

Third, these community members also share similar experiences regarding the education of their children. In brief, bringing up children in a different society is another shared factor between Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities. Families faced with similar kinds of problems in bringing up their children in a different society are faced with similar difficulties such as problems of communication between parents and
children, experiencing different socialisation processes, and generational problems. Regardless of the social group they identify with, parents have strong emotional connections with their country of origin whereas young people do not (Kasinitz et al., 2008; Kucukcan, 1999; 2004; Levitt and Waters, 2002; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; see Chapter Four).

Fourthly, these three groups have developed transnational social spaces which include economic, political, social, and cultural links across the borders of nation-states. For instance, these communities built transnational businesses that link the receiving and sending society and represent the culture of the country of origin through establishments they have. Migrants have also constructed political links through community organisations with both the receiving and sending countries. These three communities use their social networks to construct TSS, but their TSS might differ in terms of the structure of communities: for instance while Kurdish migrants use TSS to build political attachments across borders, Cypriot Turks and Turks aim to build strong economic links within the TSS. We will see in the next chapters how these connections and tensions among first generation migrants affect their children.

**Conclusion**

The researchers referred to in this chapter (Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Enneli et al., 2005; Erdemir and Vasta, 2007; Kucukcan, 1999) make an important contribution in elucidating the migration history of CTK migrants and their connections with the country of origin. Most researchers did not, however, take into account the different social, political and economic circumstances of the different Turkish speaking populations. For instance Kurdish migrants in the UK tend to be more politically distant from Turkish state institutions because of the conflict between the Turkish state and Kurds in Turkey; Turkish and Cypriot Turkish migrants expand economic links between two or more countries through transnational businesses.

This chapter sketched the historical and social backgrounds of CTK communities. We have seen that these three communities have some connections and tensions. We have seen that these three communities have assisted each other in starting a new life in the receiving society in terms of finding jobs, accommodation, and establishing social ties. Apart from connections in daily life, these groups also connect with their cultural background, sharing the same language and history. Their connection also carried on
after settlement in the receiving society. These communities have grown and now have second and third generations living in the UK.

This chapter also showed that both economic and political issues were important reasons for the migration of CKT migrants. This is seen especially in the case of migration from Turkey to the UK from the 1970s onward. However, the political issues also create a separation between Turkish and Kurdish people that has continued to affect their migration in the UK. Because of the political history, these communities are divided into opposing groups, reflected in everyday life by their settlement patterns and organisational structures. For instance, all of these three communities have their own organisations to support their political and cultural stance which tends to create separation among community members.²

This discussion of some of the key patterns of the first CKT generation was undertaken with the hypothesis that these characteristics might influence the CKT second generation in the negotiation of their identity and formation of TSS. In their everyday life experiences (school environment, relation to the community, local environment, transnational media practices, attending in community organisations, family relations, attachments to the country of origin through visits, social networks), I assumed that the social class of the family which is related to the historical process of migration, the socio-economic background of migrant groups, and the places where they have come from, their jobs and the settlement choices in the UK all have an influence on the relation between CKT youth living in the UK, their links with community, and their inclusion into the receiving society.

The structure of CKT communities discussed in this chapter provides a background to understanding their influence on the identity formation of CKT youth. After exploring the structure of these communities, the following chapter, therefore, seeks to specifically focus on the role of family in the formation of identity and TSS among CKT youth.

² see chapter 5
Chapter 4: The Role of the Family in the Formation of Transnational Social Spaces

The main focus of this chapter and following five chapters concentrates on presenting the findings of this study and analyses the gathered empirical data in order to explore the aims and objectives of the thesis. This chapter will show that families build bridges between young people and the country of origin. They play a crucial role in constructing transnational social spaces which constitute social relations across the nation-states among CKT youth. I argue that CKT youth negotiate their relation with their families. Different to the first generation, they construct social networks with the people in the country of origin based on interpersonal relationships rather than strengthening ethnic and national ties. In this way, their transnational social spaces differ from their families’ TSS. I also argue that there are conflicts between families and young people which are occurred as a result of different levels of socialisation and engaging in different social and cultural repertoires. In order to explore the ways CKT youth negotiate their relationship with their families this chapter focuses on the role of family in the construction of transnational social spaces among young people and, questions how families influence the identity perspectives of young people and how young people perceive their relationship with their parents. If families are a crucial site in forming ethnic identities (Goulbourne et al., 2010: 99; Goulbourne and Chamberlain, 2001) and building social capital (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997; Edwards et al., 2003), what specific role do they play in the identity formation and, more specifically, in the construction of a transnational social space of second generation migrants? The existing literature has shown the differences between the first and second generation are related to the different time frame in which inclusion to the receiving society occurs: parents have a strong connection with the country of origin, whereas young people might be less rooted in it and more influenced by their social networks, which might have diverse ethnic backgrounds. According to Elliot and Gay (2009: xiv), ‘such information gleaned about self and world is not simply incidental to experience and everyday life; it is actually constitutive of what people do, who they think they are, and how they ‘live’ their identities’. In this sense, it is crucial to understand how young people perceive their relationship with their parents, how this relation influences the shape of their identity and the construction of a transnational social space, and in what ways they are influenced by their parent’s transnational connections.
Theoretical literature has already highlighted the potential conflicts between young migrants and their families (Castles and Kosack, 1973; Christou, 2006; Goulbourne et al., 2010; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; 2001a; Rumbaut, 1996; Warner and Srole, 1945). According to these authors, conflicts are seen more often in families from lower socio-economic level (Rumbaut, 1996; Warner and Srole, 1945) and they are perceptible especially through communication and language issues (Rumbaut, 1996). Rumbaut (1996) argues that in ethnic communities in the US, conflict increased where the children prefer to speak English, have a poor command of the native language, and their parents are not able to speak English. This situation creates communication problems as well as a lack of parental control and authority. The decrease of authority is illustrated also in Warner and Srole’s research (1945). They point out that this happens because children have a higher level of literacy and end up teaching English to their parents.

In contrast to the authors above, Stepick et al. (2001) show that the parents of young people with a migratory background aim for them to integrate; therefore, the better their literacy in the receiving society’s language, the less there is conflict between them. Whilst this view is held by the population studied here, the CKT communities and families interviewed seem at the same time afraid that if their children integrate well into the receiving society, they will not practice the culture of the country of origin. This ambivalence was highlighted by Goulbourne et al. (2010), in a study of Caribbean migrant parents who, whilst encouraging their children to socialise with white and/or other ethnic minority groups in the UK, also had concerns about their children not knowing the culture of the country of origin. Bianchi and Robinson (1997: 332) also argue that ‘parental education is the predominant predictor of the human and social capital investments that children receive’. Parents play a crucial role in building social relationships with others and in teaching children about culture and ethnic identity. However, this might be variable in terms of the social class of families.

My findings indicate that young people socialise in the receiving society and have more interaction with different cultures compared to their parents which leads them to develop different attitudes towards parental values (Kucukcan, 2004). This chapter will firstly look at the relationship between parents and young people to understand the influence of the family on identity formation of young people. Secondly, it will explore the impact of these relationships in constructing transnational social spaces.
Relationship between Young People and Their Families

Young people socialise and are educated in the receiving country, whereas parents socialise in the country of origin and are less able to engage in the language. As Kucukcan demonstrates (1999), Turkish young people in the UK who participated in education and social life in the receiving society have different processes of socialisation compared to their parents. Like Kucukcan, Boehm et al. (2011) and Portes and Rumbaut (2001) state that children of migrants adopt the practices, norms, and language of the receiving country more quickly than their parents. This demonstrates that migrant parents do not experience what their children experience in the receiving society. Engaging in different social and cultural repertoires and different levels of socialisation might create communication problems between young people and their families. This produces a fear among parents. For example, a community organisation representative mentioned that CKT families are afraid that their children will not know much about the culture of the country of origin and not practice it (Gul Karadag, Director of Gik-Der, 21.01.08, Gik-Der).

Most of the literature shows that the first generation migrants feel they are making a sacrifice in order to get a better life for their children (Lopez and Stanton-Salazar, 2001). The integration or social inclusion of their children is important for them to get a better education and lifecycle in the future (Stepick et al., 2001; Goulbourne et al., 2010), as many migrants would not have had the opportunity for higher education in the country of origin. Despite this parents also show concern when they notice that their children seem to forget the language and culture of their country of origin.

According to Rumbaut (2001: 164), ‘language and education are central issues in the relationship of migrant parents and their children, which may spark conflict between them’. For this author, the conflict would be visible where children prefer English and have a poor command of the native language, while their parents are not able to speak English and are less educated. This results in communication problems, as well as problems of parental control and authority. This situation might cause role-reversal between parents and their children. As Castles and Kosack state,

Their parents may find it difficult to integrate into the new society, but children, being naturally more adaptable, do not have the same problem.
Second generation migrants, and especially those from CKT communities, use English better than their parents and become interpreters for them. As Nursel Tas, the director of Derman (Turkish-Kurdish community centre) suggests, in the case of CKT communities, young people become interpreters for their families, undertaking tasks such as reading letters, paying bills, sorting out legal issues of living in the United Kingdom, because their other family members cannot speak English. This means young people know the private issues of their family and come to have the authority over their family (Interview at Derman, 10.01.08). As Eylem an 18 year old girl explained: ‘my brother teaches my parents how things work in England' (Kurdish, 25.04.07, Komkar). Young people challenge their parents’ authority and these challenges are increased by the problems of communication between them.

Stepick et al. (2001) suggest that the problems of communication between parents and children are related to the social class of parents. Those in the second generation whose parents have a lower socio-economic level are more likely to experience cultural dissonance. ‘Uneducated’ parents, who also do not have language skills to engage with the receiving society, are not able to help their children with the problems they face at school and tend to impose the cultural identity and traditions of the country of origin onto young people which does not always fit with the expectations of migrant youth. The second generation, on the other hand, having been educated in the receiving society, engages with the language of the receiving society independently of their socio-economic background, constructing social relations in the receiving society with people who belong to different ethnic origins. My findings confirm in part this view. Although I note some conflicts among CKT first and second generation along these lines, they do not seem to be only due to socio-economic factors as I will able to discuss in the next sections.

Stepick et al. have also analysed the conflict in relation to language use and argue that ‘many Haitian students develop ambivalence about their cultural roots, including both an alienation from their parents’ native language and conflict with and frequently alienation from their parents’ (2001: 234). The conflicts come from a cultural
dissonance which they define as ‘a situation in which parents and children possess dissonant cultural views of appropriate ideas and behaviour (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001 in Stepick et al., 2001). This cultural dissonance is translated into conflicts among young people and their parents, and also conflicts between peers.

As mentioned by Kasinitz et al., ‘so many first generation parents worry about what will happen to their American children. There is a parental concern over the second generation. “We are afraid for our kids,” we have been told. Immigrant parents say their children are “becoming American” (2008: 5). These authors contend that this fear is a part of the paradox of the immigrant experience. Immigrants overcome obstacles to give their children the chance to become American, but at the same time parents are uncomfortable with their children becoming American (2008: 5). This parental fear is also visible in the case of the Turkish, Kurdish and Cypriot Turkish parents that I met. They fear that their children are losing their cultural roots. The representatives of organisations who are also parents highlighted this feeling and the correlated fear of losing the ability to guide and influence their children: ‘we are losing our children, ...they are becoming English,...they should know who they are and where they come from’ (Gul Karadag, Director of Gik-Der, 21.01.08, Gik-Der). Like Kasinitz et al. (2008), I noticed that migrants come to the UK to improve their lives and provide better future for their children, while the same time they do not want their children to lose the cultural background of the country of origin and become British. For young people who are growing up with such a dual frame of reference, however, remaining close to the culture of the country of origin becomes difficult: they interact with different cultural repertoires in everyday life and they do not have a direct relationship with the country of origin, i.e. they have never lived there (Levitt and Waters, 2002).

Kucukcan (2004: 250), on the other hand, finds that ‘Turkish young people seem to attribute different meanings to some of the elements of traditional values’, and they construct an emergent identity as a result of adapting to the receiving society’s culture and values. Like Kucukcan, I noticed that the interaction with both societies helps young people to construct transnational social spaces which transform traditional values and the values of the host society through their everyday experiences. Experiencing more than one or two cultures makes them creative in their reactions and perceptions, as suggested by Kasinitz et al. (2008). Holding two cultural identities is not necessarily problematic because young people switch between cultural identities (Giguere et al.,
2010: 14) and young people do not only take their parents lifestyles, instead choosing their positioning within wider repertoires. They are more involved in mainstream cultures compared to their parents (Giguere et al., 2010). In the next section, I will explore whether the conflicts are due to cultural or generational differences, and then examine the importance of socio-economic background in determining identity.

**Cultural Clashes and Life-Cycle Differences**

The migration process in some instance estranges young people from their parents. Families want their children to speak the native language, as well as learn and practice the culture of the country of origin. As an example, when I interviewed Tezcan (18 years old, Cypriot Turkish youth) at one of the Cyprus Turkish associations, we spoke English and her father, who works for one of the weekend Turkish schools, sat at the next table listening to us. I was later told that he was vexed over the interview being held in English rather than Turkish. His reaction indicates that families expect that their children speak Turkish with other Turks and do not think it appropriate for them to talk in English (10.10.07, Cyprus Turkish Association). Families have contradictory expectations from young people: for instance, practicing the culture of the country of origin and not engaging more than necessary with the culture of the receiving society but at the same time wanting them to succeed in their education. For young people adapting to the receiving society, however, it is simply a question of survival. This dilemma creates several types of problems between the family and young people, as highlighted by Ceren:

> I had some problems with my parents when I was growing up. Problems are related to cultural clash. We had conflict because they were thinking differently. They are very different people. Sometimes your parents think that you become British and forget your own culture - which is not the case - because you adapt to the way they are living, you have to change because you do not live in Turkey, you live in England (Ceren, 18 years old, Turkish, 25.06.07, café in Dalston).

The dilemma here underlines the different experiences that families and young people have. Ceren clearly demonstrates that she lives in the UK and organises her life in line with the regulations and lifestyle of the UK. Her parents, however, emotionally still live in Turkey even though they are not physically there. Different socialisation processes
influence their participation in a transnational social space. As a result, young people feel alienated from their families, as mentioned by Stepick et al. (2001) in relation to Haitian youth. In their account, alienation happens when parents and children possess dissonant cultural views about appropriate ideas and behaviours (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001 in Stepick et al., 2001). Ceren has experienced cultural dissonance with her parents. Cagdas here highlights some specific problems raised because of the migration:

There have been problems with my parents, some of which would have been the same had we been living in Turkey and others are unique to life in London. As my parents are unfortunately not fully integrated into society, they do not understand the education system, and for this and various other reasons, I have problems. Lots of youngsters have problems. Our families have not gone through the same education system. They do not have English friends like we do. Their backgrounds are totally different. Sometimes we have problems because of the lack of communication (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Cagdas sees this problem with his parents as both generational and cultural: in his case, the problems stem from different levels of socialisation between himself and his parents, and the difficulties of his parents in adapting to life in the UK. The problems are associated with entering into different social worlds and practicing their social codes. Both parents and young people have distinct expectations about their life-cycles and follow different paths.

Similar experiences were also mentioned by Ayse, who has grown used to the way of life of the receiving society by interacting more with British people and practicing diverse cultures. She says of her parents, ‘there are certain things they do not understand, because I grew up here after a certain age and adapted to the British way and kind of mixed with them’ (Ayse, 20 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 04.05.07, café in Soho). Like Ayse, Ayten also experiences clashes in the way she and her parents live their lives: ‘They do not think in the way you do and tend to go on with their old way of thinking’ (Ayten, 21 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 04.05.07, café in Soho). While families tend to impose the traditional culture of the country of origin, children who are socialised in a radically different context to their parents feel misunderstood and show reluctance to accept parental guidance. Nevzat also arrogates these problems as being due to both generational and cultural differences:
Growing up in different countries creates a generation gap. They do not know how to approach their sons and daughters, because they do not know the way of life in London. It is not easy for them to get their children to obey. They see things in a certain way. Sons and daughters do not accept their views. They want to choose their friends. Parents could be closer to their children, but I don’t know how. It they knew the way of life in London, it would be much easier to approach them. Growing up in London makes a tremendous difference. Families do not speak the language. Between 17 and 20, I had lots of problems and so did my peers. They do not understand us. It is not that we live in a different world. The times have changed. I cannot blame them either (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

According to Nevzat, the problems between parents and young people occur when families are too authoritative in imposing their values and a sense of Turkish or Kurdish identities upon young people. Dilek states that parents imposing rules increases conflict: ‘I had problems with my parents because they were strict. I wanted to go out and they did not give me permission. It was because of the cultural clash’ (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston). This is even more problematic for Castles and Kosack: they demonstrated that second generation migrants faced subtler and more severe problems in adapting to the new society and establishing identity compared to the first generation. For them, the conflicts are essentially due to cultural discrepancies occurring in the migratory trajectories rather than because of generational issues.

If a child of immigrant born in the new country he has poised uneasily with a foot in two separate worlds. His parents expect him to follow their culture and their traditions and to have a feeling for a ‘home country’ he has never seen, while he desperately wants to belong to the only country he knows (1973: 366).

Unlike their parents, the attachment of young people with the country of origin is less associated with ‘emotional’ aspects as they have not experienced a daily life there. Their relationship with the country of origin and its culture is built through their parents, family and community and might, therefore, be more ‘mechanical’. This might involve contact with their country of origin during holidays, or celebrations, and through the influence of their family and community. Azra (see below) illustrates these differences between her parents:
I think there are differences between my parents and I because, I am the product of people who lived in their home country until their twenties, whereas I was born in a country that is not mine but where I have lived all my life. I know my parents have an attachment to their country, whereas I have lived in only one country and am attached to it in the sense that I grew up and all my habits were formed here: shopping for food or clothes, home, but then again my attachment is not to a country but to London, which is my home. When I travel out of London, I feel like a stranger, in Turkey I feel like a stranger too, since I was not brought up there but I think that when I am older I may adapt to it if I am in an environment I like (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

In the case of Azra, the notions of home, identity and culture do not refer to the country of origin, but to where her life is constructed and where her habits and social relations occurred, i.e. London. Being integrated into the receiving society constructs a new social context in understanding the relation between cultures and identities. Different methods of identification between families and young people tend to create conflict. For Kucukcan, as for Castles and Kosack (1973), these identity discrepancies are related to different ‘cultural references’ and migratory backgrounds of the first and second generations:

…children of ethnic communities within a multicultural society face different sets of cultural values. The young generation may sometimes adopt the culture of the larger society which might conflict with the parental culture. The existence of multiple identities may lead to disagreements between parents and the young generation (Kucukcan, 1999: 121).

Trillo (2004) also acknowledges the multiple cultural references of the second generation compared to the first generation: ‘parents seek to preserve cultural ways that they interpret as being helpful to survival in the new society. Their children may live at home but they form their lives in the outside world of school, work, social activities and friendships’ (2004: 67). Young people develop a plural positioning that includes their parents expectations in practicing the culture of the country of origin and their way of relating themselves to their peers, teachers, and other authorities. The social relations which young people build outside home can conflict with familial expectations and, in this sense, the conflict between parents and children is caused by experiencing different social worlds. While parents seek to preserve the traditional culture which they practice
back in the country of origin, young people practice various cultural repertoires which are different from their parents.

While some interviewees such as Cagdas, Nevzat explain that conflicts with their parents are due to both generational and cultural discrepancies, others such as Berkiye and Alev insist on the second aspect which corresponds with Kucukcan (1999) and Castles & Kosack’s (1973) interpretations. For Berkiye, the conflict with her parents stems from the different ways of practicing culture: ‘I think they want us to carry on with our culture and mix with Cypriot Turkish people a lot. I also want to practice different cultures. This creates clash’ (Berkije, 21- Cypriot Turkish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics). The disagreement might lead to different methods of practicing culture between parents and young people because the expectations from young people may not match the way their parents’ expectations in terms of behaviour. When I asked Alev, 22- Kurdish, about her relationship with her parents, she mentioned that there are problems related to different understandings of culture:

*Q-How do you see your relationship with your parents?*

*Alev: I think I am different with my parents; it is not just about age and generation. It is cultural. Sometimes it became tenser. Now, it is not that bad, I know how to make agree them.*

*Q-Which kind of cultural differences?*

*Alev: My parents are not really religious and conservative, but they care about what other people around them say. What they say about me (Alev, 22 years old, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).*

In Alev’s argument, her parents live their lives according to the culture of the country of origin. She clearly underlines that her parents mentally live in Turkey even though they physically live in London. She, on the other hand, experienced more points of reference through media, education, and interaction in the UK. Families still carry on the traditions of their homeland, whereas young people practice mixed, diverse cultures.

**Socio-Economic Situation of Parents**

CKT communities have diverse socio-economic backgrounds. In the case of Cypriot Turkish youth, the conflict with parents occurs in different ways to Turkish and Kurdish young people. This might be due to the better and longer inclusion of this group in the
UK. As shown in Chapter 3, Cypriot Turks migrated before Turks and Kurds, and had an English education system in Cyprus and, therefore, have had greater employment opportunities than the people of the other groups.

According to Rumbaut (1996), the parent-child conflict in the case of migration is related to the socio-economic situation of families. He argues that when parents are unskilled workers, are not able to help children with their education, and have a lower economic situation, parent-child conflict is increased (1996: 164). His analysis gives importance to the changing roles between parents and children. When parents are less able to advise their children and understand the problems they face, they lose parental authority over their children. Similar to Rumbaut, Wolf (2002) argues that children of wealthier Filipino immigrants in the US have fewer conflicts with their children. When Filipino parents are well integrated into the United States, speaking ‘excellent English’ and having ‘greater familiarity with American institutions’ (2002: 279), they have better control over their children. Wolf argues that better-off parents use their resources to keep their children active in maintaining relationships with both the Philippines and the United States (2002: 280). Sharing this flexibility in their ties with both sending and receiving countries decreases potential conflicts with their children. However, according to the people interviewed in this research, having a higher socio-economic situation itself does not reduce the conflict between parents and youth. Some Cypriot Turkish young people mentioned that even though their parents are wealthy and educated, their relationship is problematic because of their different ways of life.

Although the socio-economic status of parents is described in the theoretical literature as an explicative variable of the conflicts between the first and second generation of migrants, the three social groups studied do not support this idea, as socio-generational conflict occurs at all levels of economic level. None of the interviewees mentioned socio-economic factors as a reason for the problems rose with their parents; all of the interviewees attributed the problems they have with their parents to cultural factors. The conflict between the first and second generations are mainly culture-based and do not based on wealth: for instance, Cypriot Turkish young people Ayse, Ayten, and Berkiye and Kurdish young people Alev, Cagdas, and Nevzat experienced similar conflicts with their parents as seen above. Specifically, entering into different kinds of social worlds cause problems between parents and young people. In the next section, I will explore in
what way families influence the participation of young people in transnational social spaces.

**Transnational Social Space, Ties and Youth**

Transnational social space is used to explore dislocated identities from a particular place, focusing on the social relations and everyday life experiences in order to understand the transformation of identities. It is a conceptual tool that will help us to understand how young people build social relationships across the borders of nation-states and how they perceive social relations. As seen in the theory chapter, the concept of transnationalism and a transnational social space could be differently interpreted by young people and their parents, the first generation migrants. On the one hand, the second generation migrants occupy a particular transnationalism in terms of constructing links with the country of origin: for instance, they are not as highly involved in economic and political transnationalism as their parents (Glick Schiller and Fouron, 2002). Therefore, second generation transnationalism is concerned with the cultural domain (Perlmann, 2002: 217). In this way, the second generation differ from their parents because, whilst their parents are involved in wide range of transnational practices, CKT youth construct a transnational social space which includes social and cultural activities and spans the borders of nation-states. For instance, they build social networks with relatives and friends in both the receiving country and the country of origin and are involved in social and cultural activities related to both. Social inclusion into the receiving society is more successful in the case of the second generation migrants compared to their parents because they have a better use of language, instinctively understand social mores, and are educated in the receiving society. Transnational activities and involvement in a particular transnational social space which includes the social and cultural aspects of both the receiving and sending societies could influence the identity formation of young people.

The influence of families, community organisations, and social networks with relatives and friends abroad, as well as physical visits to the country of origin, builds bridges between young people and the country of origin. Young people grow up in the environment where they are surrounded by the cultural repertoires from the country of origin. With technological developments in communication and relatively cheap transportation migrants are able to socially connect to their country of origin more
easily than in the past (Kasinitz et al., 2008: 4). According to Al-Ali and Koser (2002), family and kinship ties have moved from the local to the global scale through transport and electronic communications. Young people construct transnational networks with people in the country of origin, and also in other destinations, by communicating with them on the Internet and by telephone. In this way, they become ‘globally connected’. Therefore, ‘the family and ethnic home became important spheres of social interaction through which people reproduce and negotiate ethnic and cultural values’ (Evergeti and Zontini, 2006: 1026). In this respect, ethnic and family relations facilitate both continuity and change through dynamic and complex social interactions. In the case of CKT youth, young people whose families participate actively in trying to create a strong sense of cultural identity tend to feel more bounded to the culture of the country of origin. Because their families spend so much time attending meetings, weddings, and cultural presentations with other members of the community, these young people experience their connection to the country of origin as a constant reminder in their everyday lives. To reduce cultural boundaries between young people and family, parents teach, for instance, the language of the country of origin and provide knowledge about its culture and traditions. They also register them to Turkish/Kurdish language schools and community youth organisations, as well as visiting the country of origin at least once in every year, maintaining and developing new social networks with their families back in Turkey, Cyprus or in other countries. They are often reminded of the value and meaning of these connections. As argued by Phalet and Heath (2011: 143), Turkish migrants in Brussels pass on traditional family values to the next generation through dense ethnic and extended family ties. In other words, families strongly influence the degree to which the second generation comes into contact with their country of origin on and the regularity of this cultural interaction by having close intergenerational ties, shared norms, high levels of ethnic language retention, using ethnic media, constructing ethnic networks (Phalet and Heath, 2011).

The majority of young people in this survey have contact with their families in the country of origin, but most state that they do so because of their parents. Fidan, for instance, communicates with her relatives in the country of origin because of her mother:

**Q-Do you maintain contacts with relatives and friends in Turkey?**
Yes. My mum calls them every week and I talk to them (Fidan, 18 years old, Kurdish, 06.01.08, cafe in Dalston).

Similarly, Eren also demonstrates that his mother plays a crucial role in constructing social networks with his extended family in Turkey. However, he also calls spontaneously and regularly:

Q: Do you maintain contacts with relatives or friends in Turkey? How often do you contact them?
Eren: My mum does. When she calls them I say hello. My mum contacts them nearly every week. They are my aunties and my mum’s cousins. I call my dad nearly every week (Eren, 18 years old, Kurdish, 15.06.07, café in Dalston).

These two quotations illustrate that their parents play a crucial role in constructing transnational links between the young people and family. This is in line with the articulation of ethnic and national identities as demonstrated by Goulbourne et al. (2010: 99). Most of the interviewees speak the language of the country of origin fluently which helps them to communicate with people in the country of origin, and with their parents who cannot always speak fluent English (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). In this sense, young people have to speak the native language in order to communicate with their parents and other members of the community while they are in London (Portes and Hao, 2002). As already discussed, language is a central issue in the relationship between migrant parents and their children. It is also crucial in creating transnational links across the borders, facilitating social networks with the people in Turkey and/or Cyprus, and creating attachments to the country of origin. Knowing the country of origin’s language leads some young people to create emotional links there, as illustrated by Cagdas:

There is an emotional tie with the people in Turkey. I feel like I should kind of keep in contact to them. It is not that necessary, because of the emotional contact, it became necessary (23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

In the case of Cagdas, constructing social networks with relatives and friends in the country of origin has emotional attachments. The importance of family and keeping in contact with relatives in the country of origin seems to be a necessity rather than a choice because of kinship and emotional ties.
According to Reynolds (2006), young people in Caribbean families have a sense of belonging and collective membership by participating in transnational rituals and networks. Similar to Reynolds, Wolf (2002: 256-258) argues that family plays a crucial role in building transnational ties with the country of origin and offers a positive basis for the Filipino identity of many children of immigrants, for instance, in building social networks with relatives in the country of origin, visiting and sending money and other goods etc. In the analyses of Reynolds and Wolf, this situation means young people are deeply connected to their ethnic identity symbolically and physically, as the process of building ethnic identity includes interactions with ethnic identity on multiple levels in both the receiving and sending society.

In the case of CKT youth, the process of building social networks with relatives and friends in the country of origin is an outcome of interpersonal relations. Many respondents, such as Arzu, illustrated that maintaining contact with relatives in the country of origin involves personal participation:

Q-How important is it for you to maintain contact with people in Turkey?
Arzu: It is important because my uncle is alone there and he is not working as well. I sometime send some money to him when I am working. End of the day he is my uncle, I do not want to live him alone there. He is very happy when I call him (Arzu, 18 years old, Kurdish, 09.01.08, Cemevi).

As highlighted by Goulbourne et al. (2010: 85) and Zontini (2004), migration creates caring relationships between family members in the country of origin and migrants. This is the case with Arzu who has constructed an emotional relationship with her uncle, even though they do not live in the same country. If, by building constant communication and providing emotional and material support to her uncle, he and Arzu create forms of transnational social spaces, these interactions are not related to a collective identity, but an interpersonal relationship.

Another example that the transnational ties built by young CKT people are not related to a national or cultural sense of belonging, but rather from interpersonal connotations is the transnational networks built by people (friends or family members) living in countries other than their country of origin or the UK. These social networks with
distant relatives in other countries are also based on solidarity and emotional ties, as highlighted by Orhan and Burcu:

I have got relatives in France, Sweden, Germany, and Holland. My family has contact with them. This year I went to France two, three times to visit my cousins. We help each other with money problems and other things (Orhan, 20 years old, Kurdish, 19.11.07, Komkar).

I have my aunties in Switzerland. I contact with them every couple of weeks. I have been there couple of times. We do still help each other even though we are in different countries (Burcu, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.06.07, café in Dalston).

Wolf (2002) also highlights this phenomenon in the case of children of Filipino immigrants in the US, suggesting that they form their identities not only in one place, but through a variety of interactions with people from not only Filipino origin but also diverse ethnic groups and from a plurality of countries. One of these interactions includes, as for the population studies, emotional contact with family in the country of origin, which leads Wolf to speak of ‘emotional transnationalism’ (2002: 258). By emotional transnationalism, the author means ‘evoking a sense of multiple discourses circulating and competing in the emotional lives and minds of Filipino children of immigrants and to go beyond binary and segmented notions of assimilation’ (Wolf, 2002: 283). She argues, ‘referencing of Home juxtaposed with the daily realities of home in California creates a kind of transnationalism, even if it is based on ‘imagined community’ and in that sense, these children of immigrants experience ‘emotional transnationalism’ (2002: 264). Defining emotional transnationalism is based on perceptions of an imagined ‘Home’ and the actual ‘home’ of their day-to-day lives. In the case of Filipino second generation migrants, the strength of these emotional ties is correlated with how strongly their parents are related to ‘Home’ through their memories and nostalgia. However, in the case of CKT youth, my respondents’ emotional ties refer to interpersonal relationship with the relatives in the country of origin, rather than an imagined ‘Home’.

Through the term ‘emotional transnationalism’, Wolf argues that family plays a central role in the formation of identity of Filipino young people living in the US. On this point, my findings contrast those of Wolf. CKT parents living in London see their authority
challenged by the transnational social spaces created by their children, as they fail to grasp the context into which their children are socialised. They are concerned that their children lose their cultural moorings and try to prohibit their children from intermingling and engaging in the culture of the receiving society. If they agree to register their children in British schools, they maximize at the same time their exposure to the culture of the country of origin, by asking them to attend community organisations and other groups which strongly connote with the country of origin.

The fact that many of my interviewees, such as Alev below, stated that their transnational contacts with family are chosen and not simply based on parental pressure and kinship is further evidence for individuality in identity formation:

I do not know what my relatives are doing, I contact with the ones I like. My mum is more interested in what they are doing. I am not very interested; maybe I do not have time, so I just keep contact with the ones important for me. I would not just keep in contact with someone, because they are my relatives, but my mum would (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

In contrast to her mother, Alev would not build relationships with people purely because they are her relatives. She chooses who to communicate with and who not to communicate with in her interpersonal relationships with people in the country of origin. Despite this, parents have a strong influence on their children regarding their relationships with family members and in keeping the culture of the country of origin alive.

Kibria (2002) and Vickerman (2002) provide a possible explanation as to why the transnational ties built by CKT second generation migrants with their relatives in the country of origin (and elsewhere) are not formed to reaffirm ethnic, cultural, or national attachments and identities, but are instead based on highly individualised personal and emotional relations. These authors contend this can be explained by the fact that, unlike their parents, second generation migrants cannot make claims to an identity based on birth or a personal history of residence in the homeland. This allows them to take advantage of a wider social world when constructing their social space, engaging with various cultural repertoires. Tahsin is an example of this, learning about cultures through his parents, but also moving between different cultures:
I have very interpersonal relationship with my parents. My dad fills me about what is happening in Cyprus, its historical process and culture. I know I am in between two cultures or maybe more. I am not more towards Turkish than British, no towards British than Turkish. I am somewhere in the middle and it is perfect, it gives me opportunities and makes me a better person. It makes me think more, makes me more emotional, and makes me more open definitely. No problems at all. I cannot imagine sticking in one culture, which would create problem, because I need to feel accepted and useful (Tahsin, 19 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 21.09.07, University College London).

Tahsin experiences the richness of practicing various cultures in his social space which includes the culture of the country of origin, the receiving society, and other cultures surrounding him. He claims that this situation gives him a rich perspective in understanding other cultures and feels accepted by both societies. He mixes various cultural repertoires in a single social space which reinforces a sense of global participation.

To conclude this section, it is important to note that my results did not point out any major differences between CKT youth in their methods of constructing transnational social spaces. The three social groups develop similar transnational ties with their family in the country of origin and other countries. In all cases, this was based on strong interpersonal and emotional interaction, rather than an engagement with collective identity.

**Conclusion**

I have described the relationship between parents and their children in describing the role of families in building transnational ties with relatives and friends in the country of origin. I have shown that CKT youth have multidimensional ways of participating in transnational social spaces which are shaped by their self-identification, social networks, and perceptions about the cultural repertoires surrounding them. It has been demonstrated that CKT youth negotiate their relations with their families by not accepting all cultural values transmitted from their parents and they have constructed social networks with their families around the world which signifies interpersonal relations rather than a collective identity. The ways of participating in transnational social spaces have therefore differentiated between the first and the second generations.
Most theoretical literature argues that first generation migrants prefer their children to integrate into the receiving society in order to have better lifecycle in the future (Goulbourne et al., 2010; Lopez and Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Stepick et al., 2001). The case of CKT youth provides a conflicted view on this. First generation CKT migrants living in London want their children to succeed at school and, later, economically, but paradoxically want to prevent them becoming ‘British’. Because of this, first generation CKT migrants are active in the transmission of their native culture of their country of origin to their children through the use, for instance, of the ‘mother language’, and in ensuring regular contact with their extended families in the country of origin or elsewhere. On the one hand, the first generation CKT migrants help their children to build transnational ties with their culture of origin because they are afraid that when their children build social spaces solely within the UK it will lead them to forgetting their culture of origin. This is a source of conflict among first and second generation migrants. As demonstrated by this chapter, these conflicts seem to be more related to cultural issues than generational or socio-economic reasons.

Another important result concerns the specific nature of the transnational social spaces built by CKT youth through their regular communications and contacts with their family abroad. If transnational ties continue across generations, the type of transnationalism constructed by young people is different from their parents’ transnational ties. CKT youth’s transnational relationships have an interpersonal and emotional meaning rather than a collective identity as is the case with their parents. In other words, CKT youth do not consider national and cultural attachments when they build transnational ties with relatives in the country of origin and other destinations. This is illustrated by the fact they choose whom they want to build relationships and do not have transnational ties that are solely based on kinship. Moreover, their transnational links are not limited to the host or sending countries but sustained and developed between relatives and friends living in different parts of the world. In this sense, their transnational social space includes personal attachments with the members of the family or friends rather than signifying an ethnic identity.

This interpersonal characteristic of CKT young people’s is due to the fact that their identities are not based on birth or personal history of residence in the homeland, but necessarily attached to diverse references (Kibria, 2002; Vickerman, 2002). Family
networks are, in this sense, the product of individualisation of social relations (Beck, 2002; Reynolds, 2006). In their everyday life, social networks allow them to create identification across ethnic/national boundaries: for instance, there is a constant negotiation with regards to building networks with relatives in the country of origin, because these networks are not established and maintained in the same way as for the first generation. Therefore, second generation migrants have methods of participating in transnational social spaces which take a different form based more on interpersonal relationships. Apart from family, community organisations are also recognised as an important factor in cultural and ethnic identity. The next chapter, therefore, will examine the role of community organisations in the formation of identity and transnational social spaces among CKT youth.
Chapter 5: Community Organisations and Transnational Social Spaces

This chapter discusses the role of community organisations in the identity of CKT young people and their transnational social space formation. I argue that community organisations play a crucial role in the construction of transnational social spaces and identities among CKT youth but young people negotiate their positioning within community organisations through their individual experiences. The theoretical question that I am raising is how the concept of transnational social space offers a constructive theoretical background for analysing the influence of community organisations on the identity formation of young people. I will also examine which community organisations are catalysts for and which are barriers to building transnational social space and what type of transnationalism these organisations lead to.

As mentioned in the previous chapters, the concept of transnational social space is used to examine the experiences of cultural movement for Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people. The movement here does not indicate a physical movement; rather, it means movement within a metaphorical space where different cultural and social practices of young people in everyday life interrelate in a specific context and time (Faist, 1999). According to theoretical literature (Basch et al., 1994; Faist, 1999; Pries, 1999; 2001; 2001a; Rouse, 1991), transnational social spaces are created through cultural, social, and economic exchanges involving at least the country of origin and another country. On the one hand, these exchanges reproduce the culture of the country of origin and, on the other; they lead to the development of new identities. This chapter will examine the role of community organisations within this dynamic, aware that community organisations play a crucial role for migrants, especially for the second generation in engaging with the cultural repertoires of the country of origin. The general aims community organisations are to strength ethnic ties among young people, to teach them the culture of the country of origin, including the native language (Mehmet Ali, 2001; Thomson et al., 2008), and to defend the rights of migrants in the receiving country. Recent literature on community and youth underlines the fact that community organisations instil a sense of ethnic identity and provide cultural resources (Goulbourne et al. 2010; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Takenaka, 2009). Community organisations also offer different sets of attachments with the country of origin which could be political, cultural, religious or social and which influence the relationship with
the country of origin. For instance, community organisations with a political background will reinforce not only collective identity but political incorporation (Horta, 2002; Kibria, 1997; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Portes et al., 1999; Portes et al., 2008).

According to Kasinitz et al. (2008: 261), belonging to ethnic organisations is automatically associated with transnational practices because community organisations are structured to transmit cultural values and the practices of the country of origin to migrants, especially to the second generation. This is illustrated by Goulbourne et al. (2010: 107) in the case of young Caribbean migrants. Along with these authors, I contend that community organisations create strong links with the cultural repertoires of the country of origin for CKT youths living in London and, at the same time, support the political background of the ethnic group they belong to. Different identities have been claimed by migrants’ organisations, based on national, class or religious affiliations (Dumont, 2008: 809). This political connotation is particularly prevalent in the case of CKT communities, as their organisations are structured according to their political ideology, religion and culture (Kucukcan, 1999). From such organisations, we can assume that CKT community organisations might promote both integration and separation between the three communities as well as with the host society. This also implies that CKT community organizations are diverse. This diversity may be even more profound in a global city like London. This chapter will show the ways in which diversity amongst community organisations influences the construction of transnational social space for young people.

In general, the theoretical literature asserts that community organisations reinforce links and solidarity with the country of origin, and between the members of an ethnic group (Goulbourne et al., 2010; Kasinitz et al., 2008; Kucukcan, 1999). Goulbourne et al. (2010) showed, for instance, that Italian migrants in London participate in community organisations because of a sense of solidarity with other Italians and a sense of socialisation. Goulbourne et al. (2010: 108) divides Italian organisations into two groups, Catholic churches and left wing trade unions. Both types of organisations ran similar activities for Italian migrants. In the case of Italian organisations, a sense of solidarity and socialisation are more crucial than political representation. There are diverse community organisations within CKT communities in terms of their structure, i.e. political and cultural but, unlike the Italian community, their activities represent and are linked to their political backgrounds. The political emphasis of Turkish-Kurdish
organizations compared to other groups such as Italian is more visible and more obviously reflected in their activities. According to Yurdakul (2006), Turkish immigrants in Germany establish politically-oriented associations in order to defend their interests. This can also be said in the case of CKT community associations in London, where political separation among communities is visible and each community supports their own political backgrounds on a transnational level. Political representation plays a crucial role in the case of CKT communities (Mehmet Ali, 2001; Miall et al., 2010).

This political nature of organisations is reinforced in this case by transnational links created with other Turkish and Kurdish organisations in Europe, and especially those in the country of origin. In this chapter, I argue that organisations and/or associations in the case of CKT communities do not only promote the cultural identity of the country of origin, they also actively work as political agents in order to circulate their political ideology.

Kurdish and Turkish organisations represent different ideological standpoints. While for other ethnic groups, community organisations create and maintain transnational ties, especially through cultural repertoire as illustrate by Takenaka (2009) in the case of Japanese community institutions, in the case of CKT communities, community organisations are structured regarding to their political backgrounds.

In exploring the role of community organisations in the formation of transnational social space and negotiation of identity, this chapter will first address the politics of community organisations in order to find out the aims of the organisations. Second, it will analyse the perception of young people about community organisations and the influences of these on their everyday lives.

**The Politics of CKT Community Organisations in London**

As stated in the introduction, community organisations generally promote ethnic identity and cultural values among migrant youths. In the case of CKT communities, political aspects also come into discussion. These community organisations function through the funding they receive from the British government: some have paid
employees, but majority of people associated with such groups work on a voluntary basis.

There is a diversity of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish community organisations distinguished by their ethnic background and political ideology. Mehmet Ali (2001) explains that Turkish and Cypriot Turkish migrants establish their organisations and schools to spread a sense of national identity, whereas Kurdish migrants establish their organisations to protect their ethnic and cultural rights. He suggests that Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities protect their own rights through community organisations, but in doing so clearly create ideological separation among CKT communities which is reflected in their separated structure. Kucukcan (2004: 252) also highlights this separation and argues that it creates diversity among ‘Turkish’ organisations: ‘the institutionalisation of identity politics assumes diverse meanings according to the cultural, religious and political orientations of Turkish organisations’.

As already highlighted in Chapter 3, Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish communities are heterogeneous: there are ethnic, national, and, at some levels, cultural differences between these communities which are reflected in their everyday lives. The separation of Turkish and Kurdish people in Turkey persists even in the UK (Miall et al., 2010). The Turks and Kurds establish different organisations which work for the rights of their communities. The distinction between Turks and Kurds is also visible in the structuring of community organisations. While Kurdish organisations hold seminars about Kurdish issues in Turkey and protect their ethnic rights through Kurdish language courses, Turkish and Cypriot Turkish organisations are more likely to promote national culture through language and history courses and celebrations of national days (Kucukcan, 2004). The organisations were set up to meet the needs of specific communities but some have become vehicles for the propagation of various ideologies. Their foundational purposes differ from each other and each community has its own organisation.

In the table below, I show the structure of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish organisations in underlining their aims and the characteristics of their members (ethnicity, first or second generation, gender). I classified the organisations as either promoting inclusion to the receiving society or promoting national and cultural identity, or doing both. An organization is classified as aiming for inclusion when it provides activities with members of other communities, such as teaching English and helping
migrants to socialise with others in the receiving society. It is classified as promoting national or cultural Turkish or Kurdish identity when the main activities are based on circulating cultural identity including Turkish and Kurdish language courses, and Turkish history classes. In addition, the table indicates if the organisation promotes transnationalism, such as organizing activities which bring the migrant community in Europe and the country of origin together to create a ‘space’ where young people share the cultural elements both from the country of origin and the receiving society. Examples include organising cultural activities where migrants from different ethnic backgrounds perform traditional dances: in 2007 the youth committee of Daymer organised an event where different cultural repertoires meet with each other. The event was run by the Daymer Youth Committee for young people from different backgrounds to perform a show which represented their culture. Caribbean, Turkish, Kurdish, and British groups presented something from their culture in the same environment.

The background of these organisations is built on the activities and the aims of each organisation. This table is based on interviews with the representatives of community organisations and the members of community organisations, as well as and their annual reports. The table includes all CKT organisations in London at the time of the field work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aims to promote inclusion in the receiving society</th>
<th>Aims to promote national or cultural identity of the country of origin</th>
<th>Aims to promote both inclusion to the UK and national/cultural identity of the country of origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Daymer (Turkish-Kurdish organisation)</td>
<td>1-Cyprus Turkish Association</td>
<td>1-Halkevi Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Turkish-Kurdish migrants</td>
<td>For Cypriot Turkish migrants</td>
<td>For Turkish and Kurdish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the biggest organisations among Turkish-Kurdish organisations</td>
<td>Available to first and second generation</td>
<td>Focus on circulating Kurdish identity, culture and language among second generation migrants, protect ethnic and cultural rights and help migrants to fill in the application forms. Available for first and second generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly for first generation</td>
<td>Circulate Turkish identity and culture among young people by seminars and language courses</td>
<td>Available since 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help migrants to fill in application forms</td>
<td>Available since 1989</td>
<td>Not transnational organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not transnational organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Refugee Workers Cultural Association (GIKDER)</td>
<td>2-Ealfield Cyprus Turkish Association</td>
<td>2-Association of Turkish Women in Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Turkish-Kurdish migrants</td>
<td>For Cypriot Turkish migrants</td>
<td>Turkish women association, not political organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a leftist organisation, majority of members are Kurdish.</td>
<td>Available to first and second generation</td>
<td>Available since 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For first and second generation</td>
<td>Circulate Turkish identity through courses and seminars</td>
<td>Not transnational organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available since 1991</td>
<td>Available since 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has branches in Germany and Turkey</td>
<td>Not transnational organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Tohum Cultural Centre</td>
<td>3-London Alevi Cultural Centre-Cemevi</td>
<td>3-Kurdish-Workers Association (KOMKAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a Turkish organisation.</td>
<td>For Turkish-Kurdish Alevi migrants</td>
<td>For Turkish-Kurdish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For first and second generation</td>
<td>Focus on circulating Alevi identity and culture through courses and seminars</td>
<td>To protect the rights of migrant workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise cultural events and social activities include people from other ethnicities</td>
<td>Available to first and second</td>
<td>For first and second generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available since 1993</td>
<td>Not transnational organisation</td>
<td>Transnational organisation (has branches in Germany, France and Asia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Target Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Renk Art</td>
<td>Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hackney Cypriot Association</td>
<td>Cypriot Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Imece Women Association</td>
<td>Turkish and Kurdish women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cypriot Turkish Community Association</td>
<td>Cypriot Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Educators Forum</td>
<td>Turkish and Kurdish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ataturkcu Dusunce Dernegi UK (ADD)</td>
<td>Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Derman</td>
<td>Turkish and Kurdish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Federation of Turkish Association in the UK</td>
<td>Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UK Turkish-Islamic Cultural Centre Trust</td>
<td>Turkish migrants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Overview of CKT Organisations in London

The table above shows that the majority of community organisations among CKT communities aim to circulate national and cultural identity among migrants. This kind of organisation also tends to be older. A minority of Turkish and Kurdish organisations promote inclusion to the receiving society and an even smaller number try to promote both. On the whole, most organisations dealing with Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants aim to provide cultural resources – language courses and cultural activities – to strengthen national, ethnic, and cultural identity. There are not a large
number of religious organisations among CKT communities, instead taking their impulse from promoting political and cultural continuity. Most groups are ‘in theory’ open to everyone regardless of ethnicity. Some groups have members of Turkish and Kurdish origin, as in the case of Halkevi and Daymer which are among the biggest organisation in London. Halkevi has 6,000 members and Daymer has 1,000 to 1,500 members out of the 300,000 migrants in London. Daymer and Halkevi organise meetings which aim to solve Kurdish-Turkish conflicts. This illustrates that some Turkish and Kurdish organisations which have similar ideologies work together (Miall, et al., 2010: 54). ‘Separatist’ organisations are those which defend Turkish national ideology or the leftist Turkish and Kurdish organisations. As it shown in the table, some organisations are transnational- meaning that they have other branches in Europe and in the country of origin. All organisations, however, have transnational connections with the social, cultural, and political elements from the country of origin.

Community organisations provide different methods of establishing transnational connections for migrant communities. First of all, they bring migrants together and create a social environment where they can discuss the recent socio-political issues happening in the country of origin, their life in the UK, and generally socialise. Secondly, some community organisations promote a certain political ideology for specific groups and migrants who support this political ideology. Although most of these organisations are orientated towards political activities, some – the Turkish and Cypriot Turkish groups in particular – also combine cultural activities. Below, I will discuss the different types of organisation: Turkish and Cypriot Turkish nationalist organisations which aim to promote language and culture; other types of nationalist organisations, such as political groups as in the case of some Kurdish organisations; organisations which aim exclusively to promote inclusion in the receiving society; and finally organisations that mix activities and are open to both the receiving and sending societies.

As Thomson et al. (2008:19) point out, ‘at present, the Kurdish language and identity are largely promoted through community organisations’. Many community organisations established by CKT communities provide Turkish or Kurdish language courses for young people: for instance, the Cyprus Turkish Association was the first community organisation among CKT communities established in London in 1951 to
provide Turkish language and history courses. As its president Mustafa Gençsoy highlighted, Turkish language courses are their main objective:

The Cyprus Turkish association was set up by students, and later workers joined as well. The major issue for us is that our London-born youth cannot speak fluent Turkish. We are concerned with the effectiveness of Turkish language courses that are currently offered. The objective of this association is to teach the Turkish language, culture and Turkish identity to Turkish youth in London (10.01.08, Cyprus Turkish Association).

The representatives of the Cyprus Turkish Association argue that young people need to learn the language of the country of origin in order to engage with their culture, traditions, and history more effectively. Its mission is to protect and promote national identity and culture among the migrant community by transferring this knowledge to the second generation (Lamb, 2001). There are currently 26 Turkish weekend schools around North and South London for adolescents between the ages of 10 and 17. These groups achieve their purpose according to Mehmet Ali (2001), as CKT youth are more fluent in their language of origin than previously:

The increase in the number of Saturday and Sunday supplementary schools and the involvement of the parents indicate the value parents put on education and on the maintenance of the mother-tongues. The fear over the second and third generation young people losing their mother tongues and therefore their identities needs to be taken into serious consideration. However, there is a renewed interest by young people, which is supported by frequent visits to Cyprus and Turkey. They are more competent in their languages than ever before and use them in the creation of their own cultures reflecting their realities as young people living in multicultural and multilingual societies (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 96-97).

Language is thought to be a key element in promoting cultural identity among young people in the case of CKT communities, as is the case for other communities (Goulbourne et al., 2010; Kibria, 2002). Language represents a sense of belonging and national identity among young people. Besides language training, these schools offer classes in Turkish history and culture. The weekend language schools play an important role in protecting Turkish language and culture for the second generation of Turkish people living in London. One of my respondents, an 18-year-old Cypriot Turkish girl
called Tezcan, highlighted this view: ‘We sing our national song ‘Istiklal Marsi’. We do folk dancing, we have Turkish lessons. We talk about Turkish culture at the Turkish school and it brings Turkish people together’ (10.10.07, Cyprus Turkish Association). Tezcan’s statements emphasise that language schools create a mental relationship with ‘Turkishness’. These organisations and weekend Turkish schools seek to foster a sense of Cypriot Turkish identity and safeguard it from what some regard as the undermining influence of British culture. Others, such as Alev expressed their frustration at attempts to glorify Turkish culture:

Some organisations and weekend schools are annoying; I do not think that they make you a good person or somebody who is more informed about what is going on. There are organisations which try to make Turkish and Kurdish people more aware of London. In a Turkish weekend school, one speaker said that all Christian countries will be flooded and the Islamic world will flourish and that will be heaven on earth. She was a teacher and I would not want to have a teacher like her. This was an extreme case. I was very young at the time and do not remember the name of the organisation. Some of the organisations (nationalist ones) harp on what a wonderful culture we have, that we must protect it and not become British (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Alev states her uncomfortable experience with an organization which imposes its nationalistic views. She claims that these kinds of organisations aim to circulate religious views and the Turkish nationality among young people, promoting it through language and history courses. She also underlines that these organisations glorify culture to impose national and ethnic identity. She regrets their lack of openness to the receiving society.

Apart from Turkish and Cypriot Turkish nationalist organisations, there are also Kurdish organisations which are political and focus on Kurdish-Turkish conflicts. The activities of the second type of organisations aim to strengthen ethnic identity among the population, by establishing Kurdish language courses and history courses.

A third type of organisation concerns those promoting inclusion to the receiving society. These types of organisation were created later than those whose focus is on promoting national identity. In the beginning, their aim was to provide concrete information to
migrants about their rights and assist them in administrative tasks. This material role is even more obvious for organisations dealing with refugees, such as Gik-Der whose users lack fluency in English:

Gik-Der was established in 1991 to assist migrants with problems which are related to their status as migrants in the receiving society. Most of our migrants are refugees and do not know the language, and this is a challenge for integration into the receiving society (Gul Karadag, Director of Gik-Der, 21.01.08, Gik-Der).

More recently, these organisations have developed inclusion through a broader range of activities, less related to immediate survival and more to improving well-being. Daymer, for instance, contributes to the needs of communities in their daily life by teaching members how to write formal letters fill in forms related to job and housing applications, and providing general information on any kind of issues related to life in the UK.

[Daymer] was set up in the 1990s to help Turkish and Kurdish communities with everyday problems in London, for example housing problems. This community organisation helped them to fill out application forms (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

As noted by Tulay and Cagdas, the spectrum of community organisation activities extends to material support, as in the case of translation and training to help the community in providing cultural resources:

I guess community organisations are useful, because they help Turkish speaking people in terms of translation, training and education and access to cultural resources (Tulay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

They also provide recreational activities such as music and dance festivals:

We organise festivals every year. There is a free annual festival organised by the Turkish-Kurdish community centre which promotes the integration of different communities and ethnic groups. It just gives them the opportunity to enjoy dance and music from different cultures. I am
involved in organising these youth events which promote integration
(Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

The expansion of the remit of such groups includes forming links with similar organisations in Europe and even the creation of branches in other European countries. Gik-Der has, for instance, offices in Germany, the Netherlands, and Turkey that communicate with each other in order to organise seminars, exchange materials, and share ideas for projects to help their members’ inclusion.

As these groups have focused less on immediate problems of migration and emergency support, the more they have expanded to focus on improving the well-being of the community, as well as providing political activities such as discussions on the social agenda of the country of origin. Cagdas, who is 23 years old and an organiser at Daymer, explains that this development is due to the political involvement of the founder members of the organisation in the country of origin:

The urgency of such problems decreased over time and they were replaced by issues of integration and political participation (...)

There is a political dimension in [Daymer]. These people [the members of Daymer] were politically active in Turkey; they immigrated to London for political reasons and had been involved in political organisations. They wanted to set up parallel structures in London, but some of these have been transformed into organisations tackling urban issues in North London (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

This has some side effects, such as leading some Turkish and Cypriot Turkish organisations to foster a national identity and, as a result, to exclude other ethnic groups, as described by Tulay:

Although [community organisations] are useful for their own community it seems that they are there only for their own community. For example, Alevi people go to Cem Evi or Kurdish people go to Halkevi. It is just another way of segregating people, as only a specific type if people can join. It creates boundaries between different ethnic groups (Tulay, 20 years old Kurdish, 14.09.07, cafe in Stoke Newington).
Whilst this is true of some groups, others such as Daymer and Gik-Der, have continued to include people from other ethnicities as they have increased their political involvement, trying both to create a common space to improve inclusion in the UK and protect the culture of the country of origin.

Although at first these organisations were focused on the situation in the host society, they become with time transnational, enlarging their activities to the promotion of culture of the country of origin through recreational events, for instance, and by developing branches in Europe with which they have regular contacts. In other words, while their main aim is to encourage inclusion among migrants, they cannot avoid spreading their ideologies, bringing socio-cultural and political aspects of two societies into one social space. In this sense, promoting inclusion automatically helps migrants to create transnational social spaces.

A fourth type of organisation acknowledges in its ‘charter’ this double purpose, i.e. inclusion to the host society and promotion of the culture of the country of origin. According to Yuksel Konca who is a project manager of Halkevi,

Since 1984 Halkevi has run 10 to 15 projects which includes English language courses, ESOL courses (a course about British history and culture for migrants who needs to pass to become British citizen), small entrepreneurship project, elder migrants project, computer courses, theatre courses, children projects, smoke free projects. It has 3000-6000 members, has its own newspaper called Telgraf and radio called Roj radyo. It was established to provide services to CKT communities in London (Project Manager of Halkevi, 04.09.07, Halkevi).

Halkevi is one of the main Kurdish organisations in London, founded in 1984 by the Kurdish community in Stoke Newington, Hackney. In promoting inclusion to the UK, Halkevi acts as a substitute for the state, doing social work, such as health support for the elderly, or prevention treatment for Kurdish drug addicts. At the same time, this organisation develops social and cultural events to promote Kurdish culture in the UK.

We have lots of projects for drug addicts, women, the elderly and drop-outs. We have cultural and social activities too. Theatre is a critical tool to spread our culture, and we would like to improve our Turkish and Kurdish magazines (Ibrahim Dogus, Director of Halkevi, 03.09.07, Halkevi).
Like other organisations of its kind, the mission of the Halkevi is to help migrants who experience problems living in the UK and to protect the culture of Turks and Kurds living in London. A 24 year old Kurdish migrant says the following:

I know lots of people in Dalston, Harringay and Tottenham. They would not even cross the street from where they live. They have established their own space in these places and have everything they need. The second generation gets on with its education, and facing their parents, they find themselves between two cultures. They use violence and get involved with gangs. The reason might be the clash between cultures. Organisations such as Halkevi and Cemevi have been established to promote cultural values. They are afraid of abandoning this cultural space. The evolution of Turkish-speaking migrants living in London is just a myth (11.11.07, café in Dalston).

This quotation implies the need for community organisations in the everyday life of CKT migrants. The respondent mentions two important roles of community organisations for migrants. First, as mentioned by the respondent, some CKT migrants create a homogenised space which is not open to other cultures. In this limited space, community organisations would be inevitably for only one groups of migrants, because it is the only public space where they meet with people from the same ethnic origin, share their experiences, and practice culture. Second, the risk of violence among CKT youth is decreased when they attend community organisations. The respondent also underlines the role of inclusion played by this organisation especially for CKT youth alongside its role as a ‘promoter’ of Kurdish culture through Kurdish language courses, dances, theatre courses and other means of providing the community with a ‘cultural space’.

Besides these diverse functions, the organisation has also developed its activities in different countries, such as Germany, Switzerland, Netherlands, and Turkey through its website. It announces numerous activities in London as well as the organization’s own activities (Van den Bos and Nell, 2006: 209). The organisation constructs transnational links across Europe to allow ethnic and national identification and for political activism, through internet and social networks.
This kind of organisations, more than the others, prioritises the well-being of migrants, helping them to feel part of the society where they live, whilst at the same time keeping their cultural and social world alive. By facilitating migrants in the creation of plural attachments, these groups decrease the fear of the unknown and the fear that they might lose their roots. As pointed out by the director of Komkar (Kurdish Advice Centre), ‘community organisations play a crucial role in protecting and circulating ethnic identity among migrants and at the same time they encourage migrants to be open to other cultures and help to create an environment to live with other cultures and understand them’ (Director of Komkar, 07.09.07, Komkar).

Komkar, the Kurdish Workers Association, was established in 1990 by Kurdish migrants and has 800 members, the majority of whom are Kurdish. Like Halkevi, the group aims to facilitate Kurdish cultural expression and, at the same time, support inclusion into the receiving country. In this sense, it is distinguished from the third type of organisation, because it promotes both inclusion into the receiving country and supports the culture of the country of origin in different ways, as well as offering exchanges with different countries to help Kurdish youth create transnational social spaces. The influence of this on identity formation will be discussed below.

In this section, we have seen that, while the majority of community organisations tend to focus on spreading ethnic identity, there is diversity in the level of transmission of a sense of ethnic identity between them: while some of the organisations: (Daymer, Gik-Der, Tohum Cultural Centre) insist on the need of inclusion to the host society, others (Cyprus-Turkish Association, weekend Turkish language schools) focus only on building a strong sense of ethnic identity. In the first case, organisations tend to improve well-being and so represent a positive influence on the negotiation of identity and creation of transnational social spaces, as I will demonstrate later. In the second case, these groups risk losing their functionality by closing off their community by avoiding engagement with different views. Ekim summarises this problem:

It is not about being Turkish or Kurdish. It is about ideology. I cannot say all of these organisations are good. There are community centres in Newington Green which have a fascist ideology. I cannot say they are for the better people. Some do impose national identity, some encourage integration. Human being is social, it needs others to survival. You cannot know your problems as well without seeing other people’s
problems. You need to share your problems, do things together. That’s how you learn, that’s how you become better person. The organisations contribute to socialisation process of migrants in their own way (Ekim, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.09.07, Gik-Der).

In the next section we will see how CKT youth react to these differences and how they are influenced by them.

**Community Organisations and CKT Identity**

This section focuses on the perspective of young people on community organisations, discussing why they attend and what they think about them. The majority of respondents are members of community organisations and supplementary language schools, but not all of them are active in attending the activities of community organisations. This section also outlines the different influences of community organisations on CKT youth’s identity formation and the creation of transnational social spaces.

As we have seen in the previous section, community organisations established by Turkish and Kurdish migrants in Europe are structured according to their political orientation to the country of origin (Kaya, 2001; Kucukcan, 1999). According to the literature, young people participate in community organisations in order to socialise and practice the culture of the country of origin (Kaya, 2001; Kibria, 1997; King *et al.*, 2011; Kucukcan, 1999; Mehmet Ali, 2001). These organisations try to raise consciousness among young people regarding their cultural and national identity (Kucukcan, 1999), while at the same time promoting the inclusion of migrants into the receiving society. This happens through educational, cultural, and social activities organised by community organisations.

Most of my respondents told me that they became a member of a community organisation because of the social and cultural activities it offers. Of all the activities promoted by the community organisations, CKT youth particularly enjoy socialising with people from the same background, and creating a sense of belonging, as explained by Ekim who also acknowledges the practical help they provide through language courses:
Organisations like Gik-Der are vital for our integration and survival. They preserve the positive sides of our culture and enable us to be strong through unity. They create a collective spirit, and the major benefit is that they provide education. There are parents who have lived here many years and do not know English, and there are those who have come recently and do not know anything about London, for instance where to go for information, and do not speak English. These places are vital in helping them (Ekim, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.09.07, Gik-Der).

According to Ekim these organisations not only allow greater inclusion but also create a space based on a shared cultural and ethnic background. He also suggests that language barriers make integration into the receiving community more difficult, whilst the use of the native language facilitates communication among members of the ethnic community. The community organisations are particularly important for migrants who cannot communicate in English.

Several other respondents highlighted the role of community organisation in creating a sense of belonging among second generation migrants. ‘Belonging to something’ or ‘to somewhere’ is, according to Belgin, ‘good’ for people:

I think people from Turkey really need to feel that they belong to a culture of the country of origin, so by joining these organisations they feel that they belong to something and they belong somewhere. It is good for them to have that (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

Ceren points out that it is especially important for young migrants, because they might feel less attachment to Turkey than their parents:

Community organisations are important, some people, and especially youth, lose their sense of belonging and community organisations help them (Ceren, 18 years old, Turkish, 25.06.07, café in Dalston).

Nevzat has even a stronger view. For him community organisations are the ‘backbone of the community’ and something that can ‘guide you’ in life:

These community centres are the backbones of the community itself. It is very hard to live without a community centre. It represents our culture.
Let’s forget everything else like dance or drama classes; it is a place where you are together, where people come. Not that the gathering of Turkish or Kurdish folks is a good in itself… Nonetheless, you should always remember where you come from and culture of the country of origin, because it will guide you (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Belgin, Ceren and Nevzat, make a connection between community organisations and the issue of belonging and underline the role of community organisations in creating a collective spirit among migrants.

The majority of my interviewees highlighted that their main reason for participating in community organisations was the influence of family and friends. According to Goulbourne et al. (2010: 108), this happens more often when parents are already members themselves of a community organisation: ‘social networks of Caribbean parents were instrumental in determining their children’s identity and the type of activities in which they involve themselves’. In some cases, the parents of my interviewees know the founders of the organisation and were friends with them in the country of origin. Tahsin, for instance, attends the activities at Daymer because his mother is a close friend of the communication directors: ‘They were my mum’s friends. These were intimate relationships’ (Tahsin, 19 years old, 21.09.07, University College London). The same is true for Fidan: ‘I chose this Kurdish organisation because my brother used to go there, my dad was a member; I knew the people there’ (Fidan, 18 years old, Kurdish, 06.01.08, café in Dalston). For Ekim, who chose to attend Gik-Der, the relationship with his parents has not only a social background but also a political one:

My parents brought me here nine years ago. Basically, there are many community centres in Stoke Newington, Haringey and Dalston for Turkish and Kurdish communities. They proliferate because each organisation is set up by a different political organisation. People usually come here because of common political backgrounds. The person who set up this community organisation is a close friend of my parents (Ekim, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.09.07, Gik-Der).
The importance of this political attachment can be explained by the reasons for migration from Turkey to the UK which always includes a political aspect. Migrants become politically engaged in both countries and maintain enduring transnational political ties (see for example, Ostergaard, 2003; Smith, 2003; 2007). Hence, most community organisations were established to construct political networks among migrants who support a certain ideology. Eren also underlines the fact that the decision to participate in a community organisation and the choice of one in particular was motivated by her parents’ political connection with the organisation in the country of origin: ‘I just come to Komkar because my dad and my uncle used to come. They know people here and do not want me to go into political stuff. They want me to get to know the culture’ (Eren, 18 years old, Kurdish, 15.06.07, café in Dalston).

The decision to participate in a community organisation – or to opt out – occurs very soon in the migratory trajectory. For first generation migrants, it occurs immediately after their migration to the UK. As the second generation is influenced by their parents, their participation in community groups occurs when they are children. This was the case for Nevzat:

> When I was six years old, I started going to Gik-Der, because my parents were going. It was very hard for parents to take care of their children. I am fortunate to have been brought up in a community centre. The community centre has a political background. This has been fortunate (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Though the motivation for participating in a community organisation is their parents, young people keep participating as they discover some advantages on their own. This explains why many of my interviewees had been members of community organisations for more than a year when I interviewed them. Others, such as Ersin, had rejected their initial organisation but still felt attendance was important, so chose a new community group:

> I used to go to Gik-Der, but I realized their values and beliefs are not mine. They are communists. I believe that communism is a dream. That’s why I stopped coming here. My parents used to come here. I was little then and did not know what is wrong or right. I did not know what

---

3 see chapter 3
capitalist and communist meant. They used to send me. I now understand that they did it to keep me out of trouble. They thought that I would be smarter if I went to Gik-Der because it was a place for people who ask questions and want to learn more. I realized that this was not the case. I attended Gik-Der for five years. I was working for its youth magazine. Once I started questioning myself about identity, I decided to quit Gik-Der (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Ersin stopped attending the organisation because he rejected its political stand and ideology as reflected in their activities. He negotiated his position within community organisations and made his own decision. Some young people take an independent decision as to which organisation to join or reject. In refusing to follow their parents’ path, second generations act as individuals in a transnational landscape. Ersin’s experience about the community organisation does not match with his own self-definition. He realised this as a result of exploring his own identity, and the divergences contributed to his self-knowledge. Aziz also changed community organisation:

My parents used to go to Halkevi and Kurdish Association. I chose to join Gik-Der. The reason is because I already know Kurdish, and Halkevi is like a guerilla organisation. I was interested in organisations that embraced Turkish and Kurdish people. I do not want them to impose on me just Kurdish culture (Aziz, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.09.07, Gik-Der).

Similar to Ersin, Aziz also negotiated his positioning within the community and its organisation by comparing his identity with different organisations. Young people live within more than one culture and they do not want to have a single cultural repertoire imposed upon them. By negotiating their relation to community organisation and positioning themselves within the community, they participate in transnational social spaces on an individual level, a view not accounted for in previous studies (see Faist, 2000; Levitt, 2001).

**Influence of Community Organisations on Transnational Social Space and Identity Formation**

This section explores the ways in which community organisations influence the identity formation of young people and the creation of transnational social space. As mentioned in Chapter 1, transnational social spaces are understood to be metaphorical spaces
created in everyday life interactions which involve experiences across the borders of one nation-state. Participating in community organisations could be seen as one of these experiences as it builds bridges between young people and the country of origin.

As already highlighted by several scholars (Aksoy and Robins, 2003; 2003a; Mehmet Ali, 2001), London offers various cultural resources to Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants. These cultural resources include local Turkish radio stations, four free Turkish local newspapers published in London, mosques and other religious institutions, communities associations, football clubs, shops selling CDs and books in Turkish and Turkish food etc. The Turkish speaking community represents a huge market for Turkish pop-stars and other musicians whose concerts are sold out to crowds of 2,000 – 3,000 people. Theatre groups and companies from Turkey perform at least once a month in London, and the new Arcola Theatre in Hackney run by Turkish-speaking professionals has generated interest especially amongst the young. Many of these resources are either organised or advertised by community organisations. The diversity of cultural resources provided to Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants means it is easy to connect with the culture of the country of origin and keep the culture alive. This diversity is not limited to resources from the host or sending countries, as there are many transnational products. CKT youth’s consumption patterns are indicative of their transnational cultural preferences. These patterns are part of a changing lifestyle and identity. As argued by Hannerz, ‘in transnational cultures, a large number of people are nowadays systematically and directly involved with more than one culture’ (1996: 107).

Young people are attracted to transnational social spaces in different ways and community organisations play a crucial role. Cagdas, for instance, enjoys cultural festivals which are held by community organisations that create a space for knowing other cultures:

I am one of the guys who organize these events. For example, we organise festival every year. Festival organized by Turkish-Kurdish community centre which promotes the integration of different communities, different ethnicities and held on every year, free of charge. It just gives them the opportunity to experience dance and music from different cultures while involving cultural elements from the country of
These cultural events organised by community organisations aim to include different cultural elements and allow young people to experience this cultural diversity. For instance, Azra states:

There are many community centres e.g. Halkevi, Daymer etc. and the Arcola theatre regularly present plays in Turkish for Turkish-speaking citizens. At the Rio Cinema, every year they hold a Turkish film festival and a Kurdish film festival. I attend Daymer festival every year where they invite artists from Turkey to come and perform, and in the past Kazim Koyuncu has come, Siwan Perver, Mogollar, Kardes Turkuler etc. (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, interviewee’s house).

Azra likes to keep abreast of cultural evolution and the latest events in Turkey. Access to cultural productions has raised her awareness of the music community and Turkish and Kurdish films. As a result of her transnational engagements, she can enjoy cultural elements from the country of origin. She is able to interact with both Turkish and Kurdish culture at the same time.

These transcultural resources are easily accessible to CKT youth economically, socially and culturally. They allow them to enjoy culture as a transnational product, moving across different cultural spaces at the same time. They learn about the country of origin and cultural elements from the country of origin through available cultural resources in the community and they became able to compare these with various cultures around them.

Apart from transnational cultural resources which promote young people’s socialisation, solidarity and cultural practices, some community organisations create a political space for migrants to circulate their ideas. This leads some to claim that more recognition is required by the government of the host society, as discussed by Faist and Ozveren: ‘Some Kurdish organisations in Germany approach and introduce the German government with respect to the cultural and political rights in of Kurds in Turkey’ (2004: 18). Kurdish community organisations based in London also work at the local and transnational level as political representatives of the Kurdish community.
I will now discuss in more detail the types of activity community organisations tend to promote, both socio-cultural and political, which will give more insight into the type of influence they have on CKT youth. As mentioned previously, the majority of community organisations established by Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants offer cultural activities for the second generation migrants. The activities aim to teach the culture and lifestyle of the country of origin. Additionally, these organisations have a youth committee which run activities such as language courses, and music and drama classes specifically for young people, as highlighted by Nevzat, who organises events and teaches folklore at Gik-Der:

In our youth committee, we plan trips, picnics, but our activities are mainly folk dancing, which we have been doing for ten years, and I have been teaching thus for three years. We have also drama classes which were a big hit. We have a football team. However, we try to have our players not use foul language as usually happens in football (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Youth communities have social activities which address different sort of interests. They try to have a good influence, being careful not to influence young people in a bad way by the language they use. Like Gik-Der, Daymer also organises activities for Turkish and Kurdish youth to socialise and learn the culture:

It is a Kurdish-Turkish community centre. I have been an active member of the committee for five years. We organise events, camping trips, concerts, festivals, conferences. This is all for the youth, and I am active in the organisation. We want youth to get together (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).

The main aim of these activities is to create an environment for young people to socialise and share experiences. It also creates a collective spirit among young people and helps them to discover and learn more about their culture. Serdar highlights that the community organisation of which he is a member, taught him a lot and made his life better, but without imposing on him:

I was quite young when I started to go there and I learned how to play saz and folk dancing. I do not think it changes your life. Instead of doing nothing, you can do interesting stuff like playing instruments (Serdar, 21 years old, Kurdish, 25.04.07, Daymer).
Attending the activities of community organisations does not have a vital influence in the life of the young people. It is rather seen as an activity to spend leisure time with their peers. Young people do not give any ‘existential’ meaning to the activities they attend in community organisations, only practical ones, ‘keeping it light’:

I have been going there since I was 7, because my parents were active, and after a certain age, when I was about 14-15, I became active too. There have been lots of drawing and painting courses, language courses and other art and cultural activities. I have attended Turkish language courses just to improve my Turkish (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

While educational, cultural and, recreational activities are perceived as benefits, they also attend these organisations to see friends and meet new people. The environment enables them to practice their native language and exchange cultural references. In this respect, community organisations offer a unique social space which provides, in Coleman’s terms, ‘a social function that can be used as a resource by members’ (quoted in Reynolds, 2006: 1090). It can help them to ‘relax’, ‘have fun’ and ‘get to know people’. This is the case for Eylem, who is 18 years old, and is involved in Komkar (Kurdish, 25.04.07). In the case of Ozkan, it also represents a form of protection:

I used to go to Kurdish centre in Harringay. I was doing folklore. There were more adults than young people. I came to Komkar because I have more friends here. I like coming here, and it has become a habit. I like folk dancing; it attracts people in different ways. I come to Komkar to see my friends and folklore is a hobby for me. Previously I used to hang out in the streets and got into fights. I thought that was wrong and I should instead learn about my culture and do things (Ozkan, 19 years old, Kurdish, 18.11.07, Komkar).

For Ozkan attending to a community organisation offers a different sort of socialisation process among young people. Instead of socialising in the streets and having bad experiences, Ozkan chooses to attend Komkar to know about culture and learn new things. In this sense, community organisations have a role in protecting young people and the culture of the country of origin. Similar to Ozkan, some Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youths felt uprooted and disoriented before attending community
organisations. In the community centres, they develop a sense of belonging to a group of people from the same background:

I think community organisations are valuable. Why should kids not visit places like this, where they can spend time and get to know people from their culture, talk their language and learn, instead of loafing in the streets and getting into trouble. I think everyone should attend (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café in Dalston).

It is very hard to live in a place like London where there are a lot of gangs, drug abuse and street violence. The community centre was an alternative to hanging out in the streets for me. I almost got involved with a gang. Then I thought that I cannot do this, there is a better life. Now I am here and I am one of the youth leaders, and I try to keep youth away from drugs and gangs (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Other respondents underlined the importance of being with friends and people from the same background within a community organisation.

I have been going to Gik-Der for fourteen years. I attend folklore courses. I chose this organisation because I can be with people from the same background, like relatives and friends. I come here every Sunday. I would come every day if they needed me (Taner, 19 years old, Kurdish, 21.09.07, Gik-Der).

I used to go to Halkevi where I could improve my Turkish and took maths and science classes which were taught in Turkish. My main goal was to socialise with my peers rather than improve skills (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

Community organisations allow young people to socialise with people from the same cultural background and with their peers. These organisations also offer a safety net from delinquency in London. Young people feel that if they join, they are more likely to stay away from the streets where they are threatened by drugs, gangs, and criminality. Turkish and Kurdish community organisations promote a sense of cultural identity to young people and encourage them to practice the culture of the country of origin in order to reduce youth crime. In other words, community organisations play an important social, cultural and, to a lesser extent, political role for CKT youth living in London,
helping them to be included into the host society and increasing their well-being through education, a sense of security through solidarity, and the feeling of belonging to a community.

This overview shows that if community organisations have an influence in the construction of transnational social spaces among young people, their influence serves mainly to strengthen cultural ties with the country of origin by practicing its culture, language, and traditions as well as socialising with peers from the same ethnic background. In this sense, the influence of community organisations in the construction of transnational social space among young people visibly emphasizes socialisation, cultural identity, and safety. However, by strengthening cultural identity among young people community organisations risk promoting a nationalist identity, which can then reduce their ability to create transnational social spaces. This can be increased by the fact that community organisations are politically structured, even though their activities do not necessarily reflect a political separation as we have seen. The people interviewed in this research show demonstrate that CKT youth constantly negotiate their participation in community organisations and take what benefits them, whilst rejecting aspects which do not agree with their self-identification.

**Conclusion**

This chapter describes the influence of community organisations in the creation of transnational social spaces among CKT youth living in London. It underlines the fact that CKT community organisations are politically and culturally diverse, but that their activities for young people do not necessarily reflect political divergences, as they mainly develop activities in relation to socialisation, cultural practices, and solidarity. CKT youth demonstrated their ability to negotiate their relations to community organisations and reject them if they feel uncomfortable with their ideologies. Young people attend community organisations, under the influence of their family who are members of those organisations, but at the same time, they change organisation or stop participating if it does not correspond to their view as in the case of Ersin. In this sense, transnational practices of young people are a mixture of necessity and choice.

It has been demonstrated that community organisations play a major role in connecting young people with the culture of the country of origin and in doing so indirectly promote transnational social spaces. However, the organisations which promote social
inclusion into the receiving society at the same time as strengthening relationships with the country of origin are more successful in constructing a transnational social space than those who focus exclusively on ethnic and cultural identity. The fact that the three social groups considered in this research choose to attend different organisations according to their ethnicity (Kurdish youth participate in Kurdish organisations whereas Turkish and Cypriot Turkish youth attend Turkish organisations) is an illustration of this ‘separatist’ influence.

I have shown that the structure of community organisations does not always match with the everyday life experiences, expectations and perceptions of young people. Young people socialise with various cultural repertoires in their everyday life which gives them the opportunity to negotiate between what they have learnt from their family and community, and the culture of the receiving society and other cultures around them (Levitt and Waters, 2002). In this sense, their transnational connections are different from their families’ connections (Charsley, 2004; Vertovec, 2004), but also different from the community organisations. In their everyday lives, young people are engaged in reaffirming their ethnic identity through their relations with families and community, whilst at the same time being able to create identification across national boundaries. As a result, young people find themselves in a process of constant negotiation in terms of choosing which community organisations to attend and which activities to participate in. The following chapter seeks to examine the role of schools in the formation of identity and TSS.
Chapter 6: School Experiences of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Youth

This chapter focuses on the experiences of CKT youth in the school environment and the challenges faced by young people with a transnational background. It explores the ways the school experiences of young people influence their identity formation in a transnational social space. As mentioned in Chapter 1, identity formation of CKT youth will be analysed in relation to individual, social, and structural factors. The influence of school on identity formation represents a structural factor. I aim to show in which ways school environment play a crucial role in the construction of TSS and identity. I argue that school environment plays a crucial role for social mobility if it mixes such diverse identifications as a whole in its context. It therefore questions the levels of ‘multiculturality’ in the school environment by focusing on the experiences of CKT youth at school.

School life is a crucial part of the everyday life of young people. School represents a place where young people socialise with peers from different ethnic and national backgrounds and a place where they negotiate their participation in the receiving society and in defining themselves (Kivisto, 2003; Levitt and Waters, 2002; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001a). Theoretical literature on education and second generation migrants focuses on school choice and racial differentiation within schools (Kasinitz et al., 2008; Sikkink and Emerson, 2008), relating to the success, achievement, and failure of young people (Enneli et al., 2005; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001), and on parental involvement in education (Coleman, 1988; Zhou and Bankston, 1994). The majority of the literature highlights the educational successes and failures of migrant children. Much of the literature on migration and education attempts to describe, explain, and analyse the way migrant children are incorporated into the education system (Tomlinson, 1983).

The school environment in Britain is multicultural and multiracial (Berdichevsky, 2008; Giles and Taylor, 1977; Patterson, 1969; Taylor, 1974) and migrants send their children to schools and universities in multiethnic neighbourhoods (Kivisto, 2003). According to Levitt and Waters (2002), this situation creates pressure to identify racially in the case of black Americans. These identifications are seen as an outcome of the relationship with peers from different ethnic backgrounds. Anthias (2002) notes that Greek-Cypriot and Asian youths experience a sense of isolation from English youths. This isolation is
related to ‘feeling other’ and racist rejection. Anthias focuses on direct expressions of racism in the case of studied groups in a school environment. Back (1996) also stresses the experiences of racism among minority youths in multicultural environment. Enneli et al., (2005) argue that young Cypriot Turks, Kurds and Turks are disadvantaged groups in London and they relate this disadvantage to ethnicity and class. Unlike Enneli et al. (2005), Portes and Rumbaut (2001) argue that minority groups can be successful when they form strong ethnic ties in the school environment.

In order to explore the role of school in constructing TSS and identity, this chapter focuses on the school environment itself and the interactions taking place with members of the same or different ethnic backgrounds. Social interactions are analysed in a transnational social space, which includes sharing experiences developed by practicing culture and experiencing a social life across the borders of nation-states. The chapter also explores the perceptions of young people about their school life, mainly focusing on secondary school experiences, and exploring the difficulties faced in their relations with peers. By exploring the structure of schools in London and their influence on the identity formation of young people and transnational social spaces, this chapter will distinguish the specific role play by homogeneous and heterogeneous environments at school.

**The Role of the School Environment in Forming Identities**

The education of minority groups in Britain has moved from assimilationist model to a cultural pluralist model which theoretically allows minority groups to maintain their own cultures, languages, traditions and religions (Bolton, 1979). According to Tomlinson, ‘there was initially no central policy or planning to meet the needs of immigrant children in the education system in 1960s’ (1983: 16). Previously, the major concern of the education system was to culturally assimilate immigrant children into ‘British life’ (Tomlinson, 1983). This model caused a lack of identification with the school and poor school achievement of children with a migrant background, because issues such as different learning processes and lack of fluency in English were not considered. In the 1970s, the education system and school policy started to pay more attention to the needs of ethnic minority communities in retaining their linguistic and cultural traditions (Tomlinson, 1983). In 1981, it became a duty for schools to take into consideration, in policy and practice, ethnic minorities’ needs such as language courses
and cultural activities. This allowed migrants to register in any school (Little and Willey, 1981).

Despite some recognition by the educational system, ethnic minority children continued to be a part of a wider group of ‘disadvantaged’ children according to many authors (Enneli et al., 2005; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Tomlinson, 1983). This might be explained by the organisation of schools. CKT youth mainly attend neighbourhood state schools close to their homes. In London, these schools are situated in Haringey, Islington and Enfield (Mehmet Ali, 2001). The neighbourhood determines both the type of household and the type of schools where children will be registered. This structure creates social and cultural homogeneity which might contradict their ‘multicultural’ purpose and lead to the reproduction of social inequalities. So far, theoretical literature has provided contrasting results as to the extent schools encourage diversity, socio-economic mobility, and negotiation between different transnational social spaces. While Portes and Rumbaut (2001) and Berdichevsky (2008) have argued that schools promote diversity by having children from various ethnic background in certain neighbourhoods, Waters (1999), Anthias (2001, 2002), and Goulbourne et al. (2010) show that the school environment can be homogenic and static.

The school environment emphasises differences because it receives children from different ethnic backgrounds and also creates segregation by including many children from the same ethnic background. Consequently, the school system fails in different contexts at both assimilation and integration. The structure of the school system contradicts Brubaker’s argument (2003: 52) that ‘assimilation does not involve a shift from one homogeneous unit to another. It involves, rather, a shift from one mode of heterogeneity to another mode of heterogeneity’.

In the following sections I will explore respectively the forms of homogeneity and heterogeneity within the school environment, examining their influence on identity formation and the negotiation of transnational social spaces by CKT youth.

**Forms of Homogeneity and Diversity within the School Environment**

All of my respondents were grown up in London from an early age and were educated in Britain from primary school up to university. According to my respondents, homogeneity in schools is reflected in their friendship choices. Most of them, such as
Cagdas, stated that classmates from the same ethnic background tend to form their own groups. This occurs more at the level of secondary schools:

All the friends I made at secondary school were from the Turkish community; we were always together and believed that we could express ourselves better. I think I was able to express myself better in Turkish and that’s why I became friends with Turkish people; I had more things in common with them. It turned out that we had all immigrated to England in the early 1990’s; we all speak Turkish at home, we all probably watch the same Turkish channels, we had more things in common. We became friends not because we were excluding other ethnic minorities but because we had more things in common (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Cagdas explains that when he was at secondary school he feels more comfortable with classmates from the same origin because he could express himself easily, was more easily understood by people who experienced the same background, and also understood them better too. He felt part of a group by interacting with students from the same ethnic background. Cagdas also suggests that becoming a friend with people from the same ethnic background was not the result of discrimination by other ethnic minorities, but his own choice.

Similar to Cagdas, Ersin and Serpil found it more convenient to socialise with people from the same ethnic background, in order to prevent misunderstandings. These quotes show that sharing similar experiences is crucial in forming peer groups:

You are more comfortable, you understand each other. If I am with English or black friends and I tell them that I have to be at home at 6pm, they don’t understand. They think it is weird. I prefer friends for my own background because we understand each other better (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

There are two or three Turkish girls in my class; I don’t think I would hang out with anyone else. Not to be racist, but you get along better with people from your culture. I get along with most of them. I am glad that they are in my class. They speak my language, I can sit down and chat with them and share my feelings. They enjoy the same things, which others may not. What matters is that we speak the same language and nobody can understand us (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café
These interviewees all feel that they ‘can understand each other better’ and, therefore, feel more comfortable. This is related to mutual comprehension of culture, habits, and rules. All interviewees claimed that speaking the same language makes them closer but they also acknowledged they could also speak English. In this sense, speaking the same language signifies sharing similar life experiences which does not only include being a part of the ethnic minority group, but also covers similar experiences shared with their parents, in the local environment, and by watching transnational media. Similarities in life patterns bring these young people together in sharing their ‘transnational habitats’ (Guarnizo, 1997; Vertovec, 2001; Wessendorf, 2010).

Getting together with students from same ethnic background and forming groups is one way of asserting oneself in a cosmopolitan environment where young people might feel lost. It provides them a feeling of security, comfort and solidarity as was identified by Fidan:

There are no Turkish students in my class. I do not like black people but all of my classmates are black. I asked my teacher if there were any Turkish people and she said no... If there is a problem you can deal with it together; you can go out to lunch but you cannot do it with black people. I would like to attend a college where I can have Turkish friends (Fidan, 18 years old, Kurdish, 06.01.08, café in Dalston).

Fidan’s statements are even stronger: not only does she prefer to socialise with people from the same ethnic background, she ‘does not like’ socialising with people from different ethnic backgrounds. She does not mix with the other students from her school not even for lunch.

Forming friendships with people from the same ethnic background reduces the feeling of ‘strangeness’ to the school environment that some CKT youth experience. In this sense, the impossibility of forming alliances with people from the same ethnic background is perceived as a hardship by Dilek:

Secondary school was hard for me. I was different from my friends. My friends were mostly British, Asian and Chinese. There was a cultural clash’ (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).
This is a common feeling around young people from a transnational background. They have difficulties in socialising with people from different ethnic backgrounds, as they fear being discriminated against. Their lack of ability in speaking English is the most common cause for young people to socialise with people from the same ethnic background. According to Goulbourne et al. (2010: 73), ‘a shared ethnic background and similar lived experiences appeared to be the most important factors shaping some of British-Italian closest friendship networks.’ Similar experiences, such as mutual understanding, trust, and transnational backgrounds are also some of the reasons invoked by CKT youth for having friends from the same ethnic background. This attitude can be also motivated in some cases by the exclusion and racism experienced at schools, as Anthias argues: ‘the more the experiences of exclusion in British society, the greater the likelihood that many young people would construct themselves in ethnic terms’ (2002: 492). In other words, feeling a part of a group is a way to overcome discrimination and racism in the school environment as mentioned by Azra:

I do not feel that I really fit in at school; I enjoy it, but do not feel like I fit with any of the groups. I don’t think it is because of the barrier of nationality; it is just the groups are already formed in my year and it is difficult to fit in with established groups. With other classmates I get on well, my friends comprise people who are not originally British. I did not choose my friends according to their nationality, but it does seem to be the norm for ‘foreigners’ to stick together. I am sometimes scared that my name or background will somehow affect my prospects. If I were to encounter a racist person, say a teacher who disliked me because of my background, I would feel bad and my education would suffer – I would feel very angry if they discriminated against me (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

Azra felt an ‘outsider’ in the school environment because she found it difficult to fit into any established group of students. She experienced what Back (1996) has described, in the case of Vietnamese youth in London, as a new form of racism which includes new groups who are excluded and marginalised in specific areas. This often occurs, according to Mehmet Ali (2001), through the behaviour of peers and teachers. In the case of Azra, the label of ‘foreigner’ leads her not only to seek support from peers of the same ethnic background but also to socialise with other ethnic minority groups. She stressed the difficulty of fitting into the majority as a result.
Forming groups with people from the same ethnic background at school is the ‘easy’ way to feel better or to cope with discrimination:

Racism is a misnomer since you do not have to attack another ethnic group to be a racist. You could be asserting your ethnic origin and doing nothing else. This is nationalism, but has racist implications. Although there is a lot of Pakistani, African, Turkish and Kurdish people in my school, they do not intermingle. All divided up. I cannot blame their families. It is just their way of life. They choose the easy way. They don’t bother to learn about a new culture, because learning is good but it also tough. You get exposed to a new culture and things which can be challenging. They choose the easy way; they reckon they know the language and are comfortable (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Nevzat claims that forming groups at school is related to expressing oneself to people from the same ethnic background rather than getting to know people from different backgrounds. However, he does acknowledge this can produce even more separatist attitudes and prejudices. For Waters, this creates a chain reaction, where people in reacting to discrimination, reproduce other forms of discrimination, as in the case of Fidan quoted above: ‘the ways in which young people experience and react to racial discrimination influence the type of racial and ethnic identity they develop’ (Waters, 1999: 178). As a result of experiencing discrimination and racism, CKT youth form their own groups and experience ethnic tension and sometimes physical fights between the members of other ethnic groups at school:

I went to school in Enfield and there were always fights between African black children and Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish children. There were clashes for no apparent reason, just because of ethnic differences (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

People never admitted they fight because of ethnic discrimination. There was a tension between black people and Turkish people. I am sometimes worried to say that I am Cypriot Turkish (Tahsin, 19 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 21.09.07, University College London).

In some cases, ethnic discrimination is also attached to communal belief and prejudice
within the community, as highlighted by Ersin:

There is a lot of discrimination and prejudice at school. It is less marked than in Turkey, because of the multicultural environment. It is like our Kurdish community hates black people even though they have not met any black person. It is just based on what they see in their local community. There are a lot of educated black people as well. They hold things against other cultures. They say English people do this and that, and they are not like that. They should try to understand different cultures instead (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

If forming groups with a similar ethnic background plays a crucial role in forming ethnic solidarity as the above quotes have suggested, doing so can also create differentiation too. The issue of ethnic identity becomes widely used with CKT students differentiating them from being black. These results confirm Faas’s findings where he observed that Turkish students had few cross-ethnic friendships and formed an ethnic solidarity group on the basis of a common language, culture and physical appearance, which he explained by the conflicts they have with other ethnic groups: ‘Turkish youth faced substantial conflict at Millroad School and were subject to verbal and physical abuse from the African Caribbean community in their struggle for power and control of the school’ (2009: 176).

Such ethnic tensions are also visible among social groups from the same country such as between Turks and Kurds. Cagdas stated that the Kurdish situation in Turkey is reflected in the everyday experiences of migrants at school:

The political debates in Turkey about Kurdish identity or the role of the current government get sort of reflected in North London. There is always tension between Turks and Kurds in Turkey, and this is reflected on the streets and in the schools of North London. These people watch Turkish television, these people do lots of things that Turkish community does. Unfortunately friends sometimes split because one is Turkish and the other is Kurdish. I have seen lots of rows, abuses and even physical fights (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Transnational links with the country of origin through media brings political debates to the lives of young migrants. As Cagdas states, young people are also influenced by the
community and family, even though they are not fully aware of the history and reasons for the tension between Turks and Kurds. Like Cagdas, Tulay also mentions the visible tension between Turks and Kurds at school:

There are no physical fights at university, although there is fighting between Israelis and Palestinians. There is sometimes tension between Kurdish and Turkish students. Some Kurdish students say that they are from the Kurdish community and do not wish to approach the Turkish community. When I was at secondary school, it was extremely common to have fights among Cypriot-Turks and Kurds. There were not many Turks where I grew up. There were mainly Cypriot-Turks and Kurds. During the rare occasions when they faced each other, they fought the blacks and the Kurds. The norm was to make friends from within your ethnic group. In our college there is a huge square and in one corner there are Cypriot-Turkish, Kurdish, Turkish students, and in another corner Asians, in one corner Black-African students and in a smaller corner there are Chinese students. Many people form groups, which I do not think it is a good thing (Tulay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

For Alev, if CKT youth used to fight with ‘black children’ at secondary school it was motivated by ethnic differences and prejudices; when it occurs between Kurdish and Turkish students, the fight is based on a individual and personal matters, which occur therefore less often.

There were lots of fights at my school but I cannot say that it was due to ethnic differences. It is not always between Turkish and Kurdish people. In Turkey, there are problems between Turks and Kurds but in London, Turkish and Kurdish children fight with black children; of course they sometimes fight among themselves but it is because of personal reasons. They fight with people from different ethnicities (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

In summary, CKT young people seem to encounter some difficulties in interacting with different cultures. Even though most of them were born and raised in London, their home lives and communities may not equip them sufficiently to benefit from their cosmopolitan environment. According to some respondents, forming groups with similar ethnic backgrounds at secondary school was motivated by fear and discrimination which in turn creates further differentiation and discrimination. As
argued by Henry (2002), the continuing existence of racism and discrimination causes the absence of transnationalism in the case of African-Caribbean people in the UK. As mentioned by the majority interviewees, the racist environment at school encourages these young people to stick to friends from their ethnic background.

Other respondents, however, highlighted the fact that forming groups with people from the same ethnic background is motivated by the feeling of understanding, security, and solidarity. In this sense, it has a positive meaning helping to improve their wellbeing and inclusion into the receiving society. This has been shown by Portes and Rumbaut (2001), who argue that socialising with people from the same ethnic background not only provides a feeling of better understanding but also impacts on academic achievement. These authors state that ‘students who have kept most of their close friendship within the ethnic circle do consistently better’. According to these authors, ‘full acculturation is not necessarily the best path to achievement. A selective path guided by strong family and friendship ties, yields better results on average’ (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001: 242). This is corroborated by several authors who see strong ethnic ties and fluent bilingualism as a vector of success at school (Coleman, 1988; Francis and Archer, 2007; Lauglo, 2000; Modood, 2004; Zhou, 1997). This might explain why parents also encourage their children towards such behaviour.

Similar attitudes have been indentified in other ethnic communities and receiving countries. Reynolds (2006), for instance, shows that parents in the black community in the USA prefer to send their children to community based secondary schools, because they prefer them to speak their mother language well and socialise with people from the same ethnic origin. This homogeneity does not completely prevent them from interacting with other cultures, but does help them strengthen their transnational identity.

While some respondents tend to socialise with people only from their own ethnic background, others are more open to socialising with people from different ethnic groups. Engaging with diversity is promoted when it is the norm of the school environment. For Tahsin, socialising with different ethnic groups is also a way to ‘learn’ about other cultures. It can, in this sense, promote transnational experiences for young people:
The diversity of my secondary school was not a problem. The difficulty was to talk to people who were obsessed with their culture. I cannot tell why, perhaps it was easier for them, but I did not feel like finding a Cypriot Turkish group and joining them. Being with people from other cultures is better because I can learn and reflect. There were a few Turkish students at school, but I did not associate with them. I was with my Iranian, African or Japanese friends (Tahsin, 19 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 21.09.07, University College London).

Tahsin feels comfortable with mixing different cultural repertoires in his social space and is open to every culture which helps him to understand the world better. Like Tahsin, Eylem, Tulay and Azra also stated that they enjoy the diverse environment at school:

I enjoy school. There are not a lot of Turkish students in my class. I get along with people from different countries and ethnic backgrounds (Eylem, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.04.07, Komkar).

It is a multicultural school and I enjoy it thoroughly. It encompasses different cultures, ethnicities, religious backgrounds, economic backgrounds. My experience at school is positive (Tulay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

In my class there are twenty-three people from different countries, and I like to communicate with them (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

The respondents above are more open to understanding other cultures and communicating with them in a constructive way. The choice of mixing with other cultures depends on the environment. It is a question of what the school environment offers to young people. By learning about other cultures, interacting with young people from different ethnic background allows students to have an idea about the diversity of the society in which they live. Therefore, it opens a space for negotiation of identity among these young people and exposes them to different cultural repertoires, i.e. the culture of the receiving and sending country, and other cultures surrounding them meet within this transnational social space.
As shown above, there are two possible influences of the school environment: either homogenisation or diversity. For the young people who form homogeneous ethnic groups at school as an outcome of racism or in an attempt to increase self-confidence and security, there is a decrease in English competency. This might be related to a timing issue: forming homogenous group at secondary schools helped some interviewees to feel more secure, it becomes problematic for them later, for instance at university. In other words, though homogeneity can have a positive impact on CKT youth’s well-being and inclusion, it becomes problematic later as it can decrease bilingual skills and, therefore, represents a barrier to both inclusion and transnational experiences. The young people who prefer to interact with other cultures negotiate their identity positioning and the formation of transnational spaces earlier in their lives, and thus are less prone to these issues later on.

*Language as a Vector of Inclusion and Transnationalism*

Language is a crucial factor in participating in transnational networks and for experiencing diversity in the receiving society. On the one hand, the dominance of the English language influences young migrants’ ability to participate fully in transnational networks (Eckstein, 2002). On the other, being able to engage in the mother language has effects on the achievement of young people (Rumbaut, 1996). Bilingual students are able to use languages relevant to social context. For instance, they use mother language with their parents and friends from the same ethnic background, but communicate in English with their teachers and friends at school (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Whereas limited bilingualism causes the loss of parental language and parent-child cultural conflict, Portes and Rumbaut show that ‘fluent bilinguals’ not only have better relationships with both their parents and peers, but also better results at school. These results indicate that bilingualism is a driver of inclusion and transnational experiences.

The problem, as demonstrated by my interviewees, is that second generation migrants’ use of English is neither grammatically correct nor sophisticated because they mainly speak Turkish in homogenous local environments where they do not mix often with other communities. Even though many of my respondents have stated that their spoken English is good, they use mainly slang and make grammatical errors, as acknowledged by Ersin:
I need to improve a lot. I would like to improve my English, especially my writing and reading skills. Many people would consider my English good because I use less slang, but I still want to improve it. I am doing my best to speak correct and fluent English (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

In some cases, the accent of CKT youths limits their acceptance. Though their spoken English may be of a high level, their accent still indicates that they are ‘foreign’. Some of the respondents feel that they are singled out because of their accent, which reflects the parts of town where they live:

I am quite comfortable with English but I have always had this inferiority complex with my English level since I started university. My pronunciation is different because I am from North London. I have grown up in an environment where the way I speak is normal but it is not standard English (Tulay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

In the case of Tulay, speaking standard good English is important at university lectures where the majority of students speak English as a first language. However, it is less important in local areas. Many interviewees want to improve their English in order to be a part of the receiving society and to decrease the risks of discrimination based on their accent. Like Tulay, Azra states that having a ‘foreign’ accent makes her different from native British people.

I do not have language difficulties and I am comfortable at speaking, writing and reading English. Out of the three languages I know, English is the best, as in reading and writing skills. I have been told that when I speak, there is a slight hint of a ‘foreign’ accent, and I do not really like to be told that as it makes me different but not particularly in the best of ways, as accent is something that can be mocked, though that is not the case with me (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

Azra claims that even though she has a good level of English, her accent makes her feel different. Young people feel insecure and marginalised because of their accent which
marks them as foreigners. They take a low profile in class because they fear discrimination, as highlighted by Belgin:

I am not very confident at school and find it extremely hard to approach teachers, because I do not feel comfortable. I’d rather not talk with teachers unless I have to. It is same with friends. I do not approach people; I expect them to take the first step. I think that goes back to feeling a foreigner wherever you go (Belgin, 20 years old, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

Young people who do not live with Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants speak English rather than Turkish in their daily lives and they have a better command of the language:

I learned English rapidly because we do not have Turkish family here; it helped. We did not live with Turkish people and had to learn English. I had a very good grasp of English in a year. I was better at school (Filiz, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.01.08, café in Hackney).

In the case of Filiz, living with people from a different ethnic background forced her to speak English rather than Turkish. According to Min and Hong ‘approximately eighty-five of Korean American second generation respondents in the US reported that they used English always or more often to communicate with their Korean friends even outside of school’ (2002: 118). CKT youth also prefer to speak in English in daily life with their Turkish peers, but they use Turkish with their parents and elder members of the community. Speaking English helps them to participate in society. According to Cressey (2006), switching from one language to another helps them to find shared meanings and symbols in a transnational social space. In this way, they preserve language and cultural competence, whilst at the same time fluent bilingualism assists them at school. The dominance of the English language influences young migrants’ ability to participate fully in transnational networks (Eckstein, 2002).

Some researchers argue that strong ethnic ties accompanied by fluent bilingualism increase the achievement of young people, (Coleman, 1988; Francis and Archer, 2007; Lauglo, 2000; Modood, 2004; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Zhou, 1997) because it increases the likelihood of parental involvement in education (Coleman, 1988; Zhou and Bankston, 1994). According to Mehmet Ali (2001), bilingualism is related to
generational, socio-economic, and educational characteristics which differ among the three social groups studied: for the second generation, the higher the socio-economic and educational level, the higher such skills are. This is also apparent in the area of living: the richer and more heterogeneous the neighbourhood, the likely CKT migrants are to be bilingual:

The Cypriot group includes older people who may know little English as well as the British born generations who may be fluent. The group from Turkey consists of educated professionals, who either had some knowledge of English on arrival or have attended classes, and people with little education who came from rural areas and may not see the need to learn English as they can survive without difficulty in the communities (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 90).

In summary, being bilingual is important in participating in transnational social spaces because it offers the ability to participate in two spaces which bilingual young people can easily move between.

**Conclusion**

The diversity of school environment has been described in the literature as a vector of inclusion of second generation migrants (Berdichevsky, 2008; Giles and Taylor, 1977; Patterson, 1969; Taylor, 1974). However, as we have seen, the reality is more complex. In general, schools receive children who live in the same neighbourhoods which in some cases decreases diversity in terms of ethnicity and socio-economic background. This homogenous organisation of schools in London questions their ability to promote socio-economic mobility, social inclusion, and transnational experiences. However, if there are children from different ethnic backgrounds at schools despite this organisation, many CKT youths try to form homogeneous groups at secondary schools. It has been demonstrated that forming homogenous group is motivated by different things: in some cases it concerns communication, in others self-confidence and it is sometimes a reaction against discrimination and racist behaviour. This introversion might have a defensive purpose and lead to further separation and prejudice among ethnic minorities, but it also seems to reinforce, in the short term at least, CKT youth’s confidence and identity, helping them to integrate and negotiate their transnational identity more freely. In other words, when homogeneity is chosen by young people and occurs at secondary school, it seems to have some advantages in terms of inclusion and may even necessary
at the beginning. However, in the medium to long term, this homogeneity prevents them from forming identities based on interaction with various cultures and, therefore, limits their ability to create transnational social spaces.

Whilst only a few interviewees stated that they enjoyed diversity at secondary school because of the opportunities to learn about other cultures and broaden their life experience, most of them recognized that diversity was valuable in their current life at university or in employment. Diversity, in this case, is not only chosen but researched by CKT youth as a form of inclusion and maintenance of their transnational background. In order to socialise with people from different ethnic backgrounds and perform transnational interactions, CKT youths also highlighted the need to be bilingual.

In summary, if schools have a crucial role in terms of social mobility and the inclusion of second generation migrants, it seems that their ‘multicultural’ policy in London is not really implemented until the university level. In fact, diversity might not be helpful in the earlier years for second generation youth, if it is not accompanied and supported by the school and social environment with measures to increase sensitivity towards racial and ethnic differences. This could include, for instance, teaching on ethnic minority history, teaching on the economic value of bilingualism, peer group discussions on ethnic issues and solutions, etc. Indeed at the secondary level, CKT youths seem to face difficulty in knowing how to benefit from diversity. The next chapter will focus on the media consumption of CKT youth in order to analyse their transnational links with both the receiving and sending countries and its influence in the formation of identity.
Chapter 7: Transnational Media: From Exclusive to Plural Practices

This chapter focuses on the transnational media consumption of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people and its influence on their identity negotiation. The chapter analyses their engagements with the media in transnational social spaces. This chapter aims to explore the role of transnational media in the negotiation of CKT youth identity and the construction of transnational social spaces. More specifically, it will explore whether the media practices of young people strengthen identity and sense of belonging with the receiving country or whether they reduce ties with this country by reinforcing the national identity of the sending country. I argue that CKT youth engage in transnational media in different ways which depends on their perceptions and thoughts about possible transnational media options, and it does not reinforce the ethnic and national identity. The question I ask is; does transnational media consumption strengthen the ethnic and national belonging?

The 20th Century has faced a massive expansion in communication technology which helps migrants to build ties to their country of origin. As consequences, today we can access cable, satellite, computer, internet, television, and other new technologies for transmitting information and images (Faist and Ozveren, 2004). The diversity of media offers various options for migrants to connect to the country of origin and the rest of the world. Some authors say that this has helped the formation of transnational social spaces (Faist, 1999; Pries, 1999), whereas others see this as reinforcing national identities (Arslan, 2004; Kastoryano, 1999), saying that it is a barrier to the formation of transnational social space.

According to Faist and Ozveren, the ‘technological progress in transport and communication play a major role in the formation and dynamics of transnational spaces’, because they allow migrants to be continuously in contact both with the receiving and the sending society and, therefore, to create continuous transnational social spaces (2004: 11). These continuous relationships are also made possible by the decreasing cost of long distance communication. These new technologies make it possible to reach many different television channels and online newspaper from all around the world (Katz, 1992). People are able to watch the same channels, soap operas, and news as people in different countries (Ernst and Moser, 2005). Satellite television
allows almost every migrant to be able to watch the news and cultural programs from the country of origin. At the same time, it makes possible for migrants who have returned home, either permanently or for a holiday, to engage with British media sources. This affects the everyday life of migrants, as they live in different cultural spaces where they shift their perspectives (Robins, 1998). According to Robins, Turkish audiences shift their perspectives by engaging in transnational television because they are aware of the issues going on in Turkey, such as day to day politics, so do not have a frozen image of Turkey, remembering it as it was when they left (Robins, 1998: 9). Therefore, they engage with the new perspectives across cultural boundaries, not limited to the national structure.

The literature on media and identity focuses on the construction of national identities (Dhoest, 2007). When we focus on the ethnic media, scholars suggest two views. Both views argue that media has an influence on the identity formation of young people, but that its effects are different: the influence of transnational media on process of identity formation might strengthen a sense of belonging or suggests a movement between different cultural spaces. Some argue that ethnic media helps viewers to integrate to the receiving society and create transnational attachments (Lin and Song, 2006; Riggins, 1992; Zhou and Cai, 2002). Others state that ethnic media reinforces the cultural and national identity of the sending society (Johnson, 2000; Zhang and Xiaoming, 1999).

Kastoryano (1999) argues that transnational media engagement creates new expressions of nationalism. She argues that although these new expressions of nationalism are deterritorialised because they involve participation in at least two economic and political spaces at the same time, they perpetuate a sense of belonging to the country of origin. Similarly to Kastoryano, Johnson (2000) and Zhang and Xiaoming (1999) also argue that ethnic media strengthens cultural and communal ties among people belonging to the same ethnic group.

Those who support the view that engaging in transnational media makes the inclusion process easier mainly focus on sharing local news in terms of social reproduction and its essentiality for participation in various spaces. Kosnick (2007) argues that the transnational migrant media practices of individuals create attachments to diverse ethnicities. For Kosnick, transnational migrant media does not necessarily support the reconstruction of national identity; rather, it emphasises that the use of media is
dependent on migrants’ choices and personal interests. In engaging with the Turkish and Kurdish media and other cultural resources from the country of origin, CKT youth deal with the cultural references of both the receiving and sending country. However, media practices could facilitate transnational dimension between more than two cultural spaces. According to Aksoy and Robins, these transnational experiences challenge the categories of identity and belonging, weakening their national identity with the country of origin:

Watching Turkish television channels is not about reinforcing identities... Access to the Turkish media brings with it a new experience of cultural freedom; migrants feel free to continue to be like ordinary human beings, getting on with their lives as they did back in Turkey. They can take Turkish culture as granted and get on with other things (Aksoy and Robins, 2003: 377).

In their account, Turkish media helps migrants to connect to the country of origin, its everyday realities and transformations: migrants know what is going on in the country of origin day to day. This frees them to engage with Turkish culture as and when they wish to, rather than out of constant obligation, meaning they have more freedom in negotiating their permanent identity in the receiving country. Thus, watching Turkish television does not suggest endorsement of a nationalist position and does not indicate cultural marginalization. For Hannerz (1996), the influence of wide media sources leads migrants to ‘many possible lives’, creating a mix between reality and fantasy:

In real life migration and medialization run parallel, not to say that through the globalizing uses of media technology, the balance between lived experience and imagination may have shifted. Everybody, almost everywhere, is more than ever before aware of many possible lives; fantasy has become a major social practice. Yet people may act on such fantasy in different ways. They may, for example, engage with the media, and then migrate to a possible life depicted there (Hannerz, 1996: 101).

This plurality of ‘possible lives’ contributes to transnational experiences among migrant youths. In this sense, media exposure increases the creation of transnational social spaces. According to Zhou and Cai (2002: 441) Chinese language media in the US serves as a road map for the first generation to become incorporated into American
society by promoting entrepreneurship and educational achievement. Similarly, Lin and Song (2006: 22) argue that ethnic media in Los Angeles maintains a healthy balance between news stories ‘here’ and ‘there’ which helps the first generation migrants’ adaptation and provides information about the country of origin to second generation migrants. Riggins also points out that ‘ethnic media does not only contribute to ethnic cohesion and cultural maintenance, it also helps members of minorities integrate into the larger society’ (1994: 4). In the light of these arguments, ethnic media creates a space between ‘here’ and ‘there’, and in this space migrants engage in both sending and receiving societies. Ethnic media, therefore, plays a curial role in the formation of transnational social space.

While it may be held that migrants seek to develop a sense of belonging and national identity through their media consumption, it is crucial to look at what transnational media brings into migrants’ live. This chapter specifically aims to examine the engagement of young people with Turkish and/or Kurdish transnational media, and the sense in which this creates multiple possibilities for young people to negotiate their positioning and a space for comparing various media practices. It will also discuss freedom of choice in selecting which media to access. Media practices of young people differ from their parents. Inevitably, they may watch British television channels more than Turkish or Kurdish transnational media. They may easily switch to different media options and take their decision regarding their media consumption choices (television, newspapers and internet) through their experiences in multiple cultural spaces. Their media choices could be understood as increasing cultural interconnectedness and encounters between spaces. Young people grow up in a world of global media and engagement with global media plays a more important role than their own cultural origin in the process of identity formation.

In exploring the relationship between media and national and/or transnational links, I firstly look at the possible transnational media options for Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants. In order to analyse the influence of transnational media on the identity formation and transnational experiences of CKT young people, I will first provide an overview of transnational media in London. Then, I will explore the media practices of CKT youth in London. The chapter specifically focuses on satellite television, national newspapers, and the internet.
Transnational Media in London

This section focuses on the existing transnational media in London for CKT communities. It first looks at what transnational media offers to CKT communities and it discusses the media consumption of CKT communities. The literature on transnational media in Britain shows that twenty five television channels are available in Europe to migrants from Turkey (Aksoy and Robins, 2000), as well as two national newspapers arriving from Turkey, several Turkish newspapers published in London, and one Turkish radio channel broadcasts from London. In other words there is a plurality of transnational media which allows migrants to be aware of political, economic, and social issues happening in the country of origin, and in constructing social networks.

This plurality started in the early 1990s with the arrival of satellite televisions. Since then, various television channels have become available to migrants living in Europe. Satellite dishes provide access to television channels from Turkey and also to transnational Kurdish channels broadcasting from Western Europe (Kosnick, 2007: 1-2). Aksoy and Robins (2003) indicate that these diverse media providers include the activities of the Turkish state broadcaster TRT (the Turkish Radio and Television Authority), and the new commercial broadcasters such as Kanal D, Show TV, ATV, CNN Turk, NTV, and Star. Some of these channels, such as ATV, Kanal D, Star and NTV can also be seen in the USA and Canada through digital stations. With the arrival of satellite television, Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants can now watch the official state television channels TRT-INT and the new commercial television channels. Besides these television channels which broadcast in Turkish, there are also Kurdish-language stations such as MED-TV and Kurdsat that target the Kurdish population across Europe, Turkey and the Middle East (Aksoy, 2006a: 926). There is also some access to local television programs, such as programmes only broadcast in certain parts of Europe. Along with satellite television, Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants can access daily newspapers from Turkey, local Turkish language newspapers published in London and Turkish radio stations. There are five weekly newspapers published in London that are available free of charge in many Turkish shop and supermarket.

The broadcast of radio and cable TV directly from Turkey has had a great impact on the lives of the CKT migrants. The presence of Turkish languages, politics, culture and
daily events is practically in every home in London (Mehmet Ali, 2001: 92). While transnational television connects migrants with the country of origin, it also plays a crucial role in the circulation of ideological reconstruction, as in the case of Kurdish migrants in Germany, where they use their television channel, radio and web site to give information about their political activist movements (Kosnick, 2007).

As already argued, transnational media might strengthen national and ethnic identity or construct transnational spaces beyond national representation. To understand more fully the consequences of transnational media we need to explore whether CKT migrants use the plurality of media available by examining their media consumption and comparing their consumption of Turkish TV and British TV.

The mixture of local, national, and transnational dimensions has influenced migrant media practices (Kosnick, 2007). First, I will study the case of Open Channel Berlin (OKB), a cable television channel that both Kurdish and Turkish groups were broadcasting on with differing ethnic and ideological views. In the case of Turkish migrants broadcasting in Berlin, Kosnick argues that public policies prioritise local integration over transnational ties. The channel goes beyond broadcasting debates and positions from Turkey and focuses on the German political agenda in order to show diverse voices for integration to work. In opposition to Kosnick, Faist and Ozveren argue that ‘Kosnick’s case study indicates that the opposition of the local to the transnational is a misleading conceptual lens, because she pays more attention to locally based multicultural ideologies of Turkish migrant broadcasting rather than transnational’ (2004: 27). In their account, ‘the combination of local orientation and multiculturalism results in increased transnationalism’ (2004: 26). Because the broadcasting stations need to have knowledge of both Germany and Turkey, and because the journalists need to know ‘pure Turkish’, it means they need to be imported from Turkey. Consequently, ethnic media participates in transnational social space through building an economic market and cultural transfer between Turkey and Germany in order to respond the needs of migrants.

In the case of UK, the consumption of transnational media among CKT migrants is very high, as demonstrated by Aksoy and Robins (2000). Euro D – a private television channel from Turkey – reaches 4.5 million Turks in Europe. Even the consumption of
national newspapers is high: *Hurriyet*’s European edition is bought by 160,000 people daily outside the country of origin, whilst *Sabah* sells 38,000 copies daily.

Through transnational media, migrants engage with the social, cultural, and political spaces of the country of origin. Transnational television channels offer various distinct political standpoints through the different television channels and through their different programmes. While the state-owned channel TRT tends to show news, movies, entertainment, etc. which promote Turkish national unity, private television channels such as Euro D, Euro Star, ATV Avrupa, and Euro Show broadcast Turkish movies, American movies, talk shows, news, entertainment, music programs etc. from a more secular perspective. There are also religious based television channels such as Kanal 7 and TGRT which give priority to discussion programs and movies with religious themes (Kaya, 2007). From this variety of transnational media, migrants have to operate a choice which can reinforce their opinion or expose them to different opinions. In the following section, I will discuss how CKT youth operate their choice and examine the types of transnational media they consume.

**Media Practices of CKT Youths in London**

Transnational media, especially broadcasting, plays a crucial role in the construction of transnational social spaces for CKT migrants. This section will discuss media practices and the rationale of these practices based on my interviews. I will explore the reasons for engaging with various transnational media and the potential consequences of consuming transnational media on the identity formation of CKT youth. Young people’s media practices differ from those of their parents according to several scholars. Karim (1998), for instance, shows that while older generations prefer content related to their cultural background, younger generations want a wider variety and have, therefore, a plurality of practices. My findings contrast with this view. Though the second generation tends to develop a plurality of practices, some do not engage with transnational media consumption: some do not watch any transnational television, others watch only transnational television, and others watch both transnational and British television. Their consumption is influenced by different factors such as language, their links with the country of origin, and their level of social inclusion within the receiving society. For example, language might limit the engagement of second generation migrants with local and national media. If they are not able to understand Kurdish or Turkish television channels, their participation with them will be limited.
The same is true for the use of the English language. Second generation migrants have a better command of English than their parents, which may affect their consumption of British media. Unlike their parents, young people often lack a direct relation with the country of origin, which may explain why their media consumption is not exclusively focused on the country of origin. As they experience the way of life and the socio-political issues of the country of origin only through the mediation of satellite television, this indirect link might allow them to be more critical towards the media, culture, way of life, etc. of the country of origin.

The Reasons for Watching Turkish-Kurdish Television Channels

Young people might not choose to watch the television channels of the country of origin because they do not have the same attachments as their parents. According to Foner, the transnational engagement of young people is influenced by institutional factors and especially the family: ‘when they are young and still living with their parents, children of immigrants are more likely to be influenced by their parents’ transnational connections’ (2002: 249). The majority of respondents argue that the main reason for watching television channels from the country of origin is because their parents watch it. It may be argued that they do not have a choice in the consumption of the transnational media. Ayse claims that ‘I watch Turkish television because of my parents. I watch what they watch. They mostly watch Turkish television series’ (Ayse, 20 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 04.05.07, café in Soho). Like Ayse, Ozkan, says that his parents influence which television channels he watches: ‘I watch Turkish and Kurdish television, because my parents watch and they want me to watch’ (Ozkan, 19 years old, Kurdish, 18.11.07, Komkar). Alev also mentions that watching Turkish television is not her choice:

When I get ready for school in the morning, there are lots of women’s programs on Turkish television. It starts at 10 am and goes on till afternoon, with stories of missing husbands and couples trying to get together. We do not have that many English stations. They have programs on interior decoration or the construction market abroad. On Turkish television, there are programs about individual problems. I watch both, but I watch Turkish television more because my mum is watching it. When I am in the living room I watch Turkish television; it is not because I would like to watch it, it is because my mum watches it (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).
Alev clearly states that if she had a choice, she would not watch Turkish television. She watches Turkish television because of her mother but would prefer to watch English television. She critically engages with Turkish television and compares it with English television. Alev and the respondents above do not enter spaces of transnational media through their own choices, but are influenced by their parents. These respondents do not seem to make full use of the possibilities of transnational media consumption. Their Turkish media consumption does not help them to become more sensitive to their country of origin, to create or keep contacts with their relatives or friends in the country of origin, or help them be more involved in the Turkish and Kurdish speaking communities in London. This pattern signifies more the choice of their parents rather than individual construction of links with the country of origin. Watching Turkish television channels is a necessity in the case of these respondents. Their interest in media is focused on English television because it includes general issues about the everyday life, rather than individual problems as seen in Turkish television mentioned by Alev.

For other informants, watching Turkish TV is neither related to the influence of their parents, nor to out of a real choice. Ilkan, for instance, watches Turkish television because he understands it both linguistically and culturally, which makes it more entertaining.

I would not really watch Turkish television because it affects me. I get informed, but that is not why I watch it either. I do not really watch it because I identify with it. I watch it because I understand it. I watch the sitcom called Avrupa Yakasi. I like the sense of humour and find it fascinating (Ilkan, 23 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

In this case, as in the case of those influenced by their parents, watching Turkish television does not necessarily involve identification with the country of origin. Young people in this situation watch Turkish television for entertainment and cultural insight, as they understand the dialogues, lifestyle, and the sense of humour, and not because they find in it an endorsement of their cultural or national identity. Their favourite stations such as Kanal D, ATV, Show TV and Star, broadcast soap operas, talk shows, movies, debate programs, meet their expectations of media generally. Ilkan shows that, while there is a constant process of negotiation between cultural references offered both by the receiving society and the Turkish society which is seen on television, the degree
of negotiation varies according to language skills: the more able interviewees are in English and Turkish, the larger their choice is.

Other interviewees seem to choose to watch exclusively Turkish television more freely than those quoted above. They explain their practice by the links it helps them to create with the country of origin and in improving their understanding of it. Fatih, for instance, says:

I do mainly watch Turkish television. Obviously, other people just watch British television. The reason why I watch my own television is that I understand it better and get the latest news, learn what is going on in my country. I hear about the latest songs. If someone comes and asks me if I have heard about the bombing in Turkey, I do not want to say no. It is embarrassing. To the contrary, I would like to be well-informed and say something like ‘It is because the government of Tayyip Erdoğan did this and that.’ You start to understand old Turkish movies (Fatih, 20 years old, Turkish, 15.10.07, café in Hackney).

Through his consumption, Fatih connects with everyday Turkish realities: Turkish television provides him with information about political events and cultural change in the country. As his consumption seems to be mainly focused on Turkish television – his ‘own’ television, as he stresses – he does not consume from the country he lives in and, therefore, he does not develop transnational social spaces in the host country. Participating only in a single social space limits his movement across different social spaces.

These cases show that watching Turkish television, be it freely chosen, influenced by their parents, or as a result of the lack of English skills, does not lead young people to create transnational social spaces: their participation in differentiated cultural spaces remains separated. They do not mix different cultural repertoires through their transnational media consumption. Their relation to Turkish media is reflected only in Turkish cultural space, i.e. amongst their own community, with Turkish peers, parents, and people in the country of origin. Therefore, it is isolated from the rest of the cultural spaces which they interact with.

The reasons for watching English television channels
Most of the informants who said they watch exclusively English television channels explained their choice as being realistic for their everyday life: living in London leads them to watch English television. Watching television seems to be a tool which is attached to the society they live in. It is a way to improve their language skills and learn about the politics and culture of the receiving society. Ersin, Ozkan, Ceren and Ekim all argue that they will derive more benefit from watching English than Turkish television. For Ersin, it will help to understand the English culture – which he still describes as ‘their’ culture underlining his distance from it.

I prefer to watch English channels to understand their culture. I prefer English, because I live in England and I have to learn their culture (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

For Ozkan it is a way to improve his English skills through entertainment: ‘I do like English television because I like to watch football and improve my English. I want to know what is going on in England (Ozkan, 19 years old, 18.11.07, Komkar). As for Ceren, it is a way to be informed about the events in the country where they live; they can get information about their country of origin from their parents.

I prefer to watch English television. I find it more interesting to understand what is going on in England, because we live in England. But I also know what is going on in Turkey, my mum tells me and I sometimes watch Turkish television (Ceren, 18 years old, Turkish, 25.06.07, cafe in Dalston).

Watching Turkish television, or refraining from doing so, may be construed as a method of integration. This is the case for Ekim who does not have Turkish television at home:

It was my father’s choice not to have Turkish television at home. The reason was that television itself is not vital. Turkish would encourage me to watch more television. It was hard for my parents to learn English; and then you can always read the newspapers (Ekim, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.09.07, Gik-Der).

Again, it was a parental choice not to have Turkish television, in this instance to facilitate the integration of the second generation. Thus, migrants may prefer to disengage from transnational television in order not to delay their adaptation to the host
The young people mentioned above find it unnecessary to watch Turkish channels because they do not have a direct relation with the country of origin and are not attached to the country of origin like their parents. They are more interested in what is happening in the UK, because they were raised in London. Like those people watching mostly Turkish television, these exclusive media choices show the difficulty CKT young people have in moving between a plurality of cultural references and using transnational media.

**Switching between Transnational Television Channels and Other Media**

Other participants manage to switch between transnational television channels, meaning that they watch both English and Turkish or Kurdish televisions channels. These transnational media practices lead them to compare Turkish and English television in terms of the content of programs and advertising strategies. Cagdas lists his reasons for watching both Turkish and English television:

> I sometimes watch the news and political discussions [Turkish television] because I am interested. I tend to watch English television more for simple reasons. If I want to watch a movie on Turkish television, it would take me hours because of the commercials. But if I watch a movie or program on an English television station such as BBC there are no commercials. I am also convinced of the low quality of broadcasting in Turkish television. But I am sure there are lots of people watching it, especially soaps (Cagdas, 23 years old, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Cagdas compares two broadcasting cultures in terms of quality of programming and commercials. He engages in two cultural spaces and is aware of the differences between the two. Like Cagdas, Filiz complains that Turkish television is commercial: ‘I prefer English television, because it is less commercial. There is more to learn from’ (Filiz, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.01.08, café in Hackney). Critical engagement with the cultural sources and being aware of the differences between them enables the young people to negotiate their way between cultural spaces. Yasar claims that his parents also prefer to watch English channels because of the quality of programming:
There are too many commercials in Turkish television, so I cannot be bothered. My parents used to watch when I was younger. It is now easier to access English television, so they mostly watch English television (Yasar, 19 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 19.09.07, café in Dalston).

The choice of which television station to watch may depend on the circumstances and the social environment. Pembe watches Turkish television with her parents and English television when she is with her friends:

My parents watch Turkish because they do not understand English, and I was also brought up in a Turkish background so why should I watch English television. But if I am with friends I watch English television because I do not want to be left out (Pembe, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 23.11.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

This informant has transnational engagements and moves between different cultural spaces. Unlike some of their parents, young people have plural cultural references and can switch more easily between English and Turkish television stations as the situation requires. As highlighted by Aksoy and Robins (2001), there is a constant process of negotiation taking place. In the case of CKT youth, even though they choose to watch specific television channels and programs, they are aware of what is offered by transnational television. Their choices about which television station to watch involves thinking about what is happening in different cultural positions. Transnational television opens a space for young people to move between different cultural references. The movement between the cultural resources of the receiving and sending countries establishes a critical perspective on the available television channels. They compare the programmes, the contents of channels, and think through their engagement with transnational televisions in a critical way. This is evidenced by the interviewee below who ranks English television programmes higher than Turkish ones:

We do have access to Turkish television at home which is really unhelpful. Because my mum is trying to learn English but she cannot because there is Turkish television. There are Turkish programs and soaps to watch. There is nothing else, even the news is a joke in Turkey. It is all about magazine, the lives of celebrities and routine stuff. There is not much about politics or education (Tülay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, house of interviewee).
I do not have access to Turkish television, which is good because otherwise I would probably be watching that trash, but when I do watch it at parent’s friend’s house, I like watching the series as they can be entertaining (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

I prefer to watch English television, because I can improve my English and the programmes are better (Ali Ihsan, 21 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 20.11.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

If Turkish television provides an attachment with the country of origin, as suggested by Aksoy and Robins (2000), this attachment is reflexive as it opens young people up to diversity and, therefore, to comparison and critical engagement. Transnational television represents a difficulty for migrants in understanding their relationship with the country of origin in a critical way. It helps CKT young people to be aware of the cultural transformations and political changes happening in the country of origin. In such a way, Turkish television is a crucial cultural resource for following what is happening in the country of origin, rather than a vehicle for strengthening national identity. In some cases, it can represent for a minority a tool for political education but even in these cases migrants are aware of the political affiliation of stations when they choose to watch local television channels such as Roj TV, a satellite television station which broadcasts both in Kurdish and Turkish which functions as a political network among Kurds living in Europe. As Kosnick states, such local stations represent various minority communities and use different strategies to reach their targets:

Alevi producers and other migrant broadcasters might switch between different representational strategies, depending on the particular audience they want to reach. Kurdish producers tend to address their audiences as part of a Kurdish diaspora exiled from their rightful homeland (2007: 181).

MED-TV is an example of a Kurdish satellite television channel which plays an important role in promoting a pan-Kurdish identity on a transnational level (Kosnick, 2007; Wahlbeck 1998). Some respondents stated that they value the political perspective and breadth of coverage in the Kurdish media:

I watch Turkish, English television and three to four Kurdish channels. Kurdish television shows Turkish and Kurdish fights which they do not
show in Turkish television. It is good to know what is happening in Turkey (Ozkan, 19 years old, Kurdish, 18.11.07, Komkar).

I always watch Kurdish television. By watching Kurdish television I do not get connected to Turkey, I am already connected. It is just good to listen to news and know what is going on the Kurdish side (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

For Kurdish young people, who are not as politically active as the previous generation, political networking via transnational television might not be effective because transnational television strengthens political identities in its own way. As argued by Ehrkamp, ‘transnational Turkish or Kurdish televisions are intricately linked to political identities, and the multitude of news, information, and commentaries that television conveys provoke differentiated reactions in viewers’ (2005: 356). Growing up in the receiving society, not speaking Kurdish and lacking insight into the issues between Kurdish civilians and the Turkish state weakens their engagement with the transnational Kurdish media, as is the case with Aziz. He points out the importance of language in engaging with the transnational Kurdish media:

I prefer to watch Turkish television. I also enjoy watching television in my own language. But I do not really understand the jargon used on the Kurdish station. I like watching the news in Kurdish and the music programs (Aziz, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.09.07, Gik-Der).

Finally, watching English television also creates links with the host country, helping CKT youth, for instance, to improve their English skills.

Besides transnational television, there are daily Turkish newspapers and other communication technologies that connect young people to Turkey, Cyprus, and Europe. Transnational media in general connects migrants to the country of origin: they get a sense of the country of origin and follow the cultural and political transformations happening in the country of origin (Aksoy and Robins, 2000).

The Internet is an especially valuable tool for following the events in the country of origin and communicating with relatives and friends. When I ask my respondents why they use the Internet, many, like Cagdas, said that they use it for accessing the Turkish press:
I log in every day to read the daily paper. It also helps me in my daily life. I am just interested in Turkish politics, which is why I read the Turkish dailies and political news in magazines (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

The engagement of the young people with the transnational media heightens at times of crisis as highlighted by Azra:

I visit the BBC news website quite regularly so that I know what happens in the world and to be aware of injustices or good things that happen. I have recently started to visit ‘Radikal’ newspaper site. It was after the death of Hrant Dink and I wanted to know what was going on in Turkey, but sometimes it is hard to understand everything from an article, so I become lazy and don’t finish articles entirely. If I do go onto ‘Radikal’, which isn’t very often, I use a site called ‘http://zargan.com/’ which translates English words into Turkish and Turkish into English, this helps me to understand ideas or statements in the article, since there are many Turkish words I do not know. I also use internet to stay in touch with friends and family (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

Apart from connecting to daily news in the country of origin, the Internet is also used to keep in touch with relatives and friends in the country of origin: ‘I contact with my relatives by internet. I call my grandparents. I speak to them once in every two or three nights’ (Ozkan Aydin, 19 years old, Turkish, 12.11.07, café in Dalston). Similar to Ozkan Aydin, Eren also stated that internet is vital for keeping in touch with people in the country of origin: ‘I use internet very often for msn to communicate my relatives and friends from Turkey’ (Eren, 18 years old, Kurdish, 15.06.07, café in Dalston).

New communication and transnational media makes it easier to keep in touch with people in the country of origin, to connect with the country of origin, and to move easily between different cultural spaces. CKT youth move from one cultural space to another, aware of the differences between the two broadcasting culture, and having a critical understanding of what transnational television offers them. Transnational television assists young people in negotiating and comparing different positions, and moving between different cultural spaces. They are not attached to the culture of the country of origin like their parents are. Young people are more integrated into the receiving
society. Their grasp of English enables them to switch between television channels and move between different spaces. Unlike their parents, they are engaged with the receiving society’s media and develop a critical and comparative perspective on Turkish, Kurdish, and English broadcasting. Their engagement with transnational television involves a constant process of negotiation because they take decisions about which channels and which programs to watch in terms of their individual life world and experiences.

Unlike some of their parents, young people have a dual cultural reference and can switch between English and Turkish television stations as the situation requires. Transnational media choices vary according to generation. Carstens (2003: 339) argues that in the case of Malaysian Chinese audiences, the choices between various types of Chinese media are reflections of generational divisions within the Malaysian Chinese community. Like CKT youth and their parents, the expectations from transnational media and the way of consuming transnational media are differentiated.

**Conclusion**

I have explored how transnational media influences the formation of identity and the construction of transnational social spaces among CKT youth. The everyday life experiences of young people, their thoughts, feelings, and decisions are reflected in their media consumption choices. I have shown that their media consumption choices are self-reflective which contradicts Zhang and Hao’s and Johnson’s idea that transnational media consumption is based on national belonging (Johnson, 2000; Zhang and Hao, 1999). For most of my informants, engaging with transnational media does not strengthen their national and cultural identity, but instead leads them to develop a critical perspective on both the host and sending countries. These young people compare British and Turkish televisions in terms of the quality of programmes and the content of the television channels. They choose what to watch in relation to their everyday life experiences and personal preferences.

It has been shown that CKT youth watch Turkish television when they are with their parents and in order to be informed of the situation in the country of origin which they engage with it in a critical way. They prefer to watch English television when they are with friends. In general, they prefer English television broadcasting which is more related to their life in the UK and everyday experiences. Transnational media practices
(from global to local) open up a space for negotiation and critical engagement for CKT youth with what is offered to them. They are taking decisions on what to watch, to read, and to attend. While young people are rooted in local communities, they can also connect to a global world. They easily switch between different cultural settings, shifting from national to transnational. As argued by Ernest and Moser (2005) in the case of Turkish migrant youths in Switzerland, CKT youth construct their own concepts of identity within the global, the local, and the native through their media experiences, and move between these identity possibilities. Overall, I have argued that their transnational media experiences construct diverse and mixed identity possibilities which are new and revised according to the circumstances.

The following chapter will present their relationship with the places they interact in order to understand the role of these places in forming TSS and identity.
Chapter 8: Neighbourhood, Place and Identity

This chapter focuses on the influence that living in London, the local neighbourhood, and visits to the country of origin has on identity formation and the construction of TSS among CKT youth. I argue that the relationships of CKT youth with London, the local neighbourhood and the country of origin are characterised by their everyday experiences rather than ethnic and national bonds and their experiences in reference to these places play an important role in the articulation of their positioning in society.

The majority of CKT migrants in the UK are settled in London which offers a lot in terms of jobs and education (Liempt, 2011; Wiles, 2008). It has a cosmopolitan character that attracts all sorts of migrants. Forms of migrant cultural difference become a valuable asset for the cosmopolitan city (Aksoy, 2006; Glick Schiller et al., 2011). How migrants experience the city could vary depending on their everyday life patterns. As seen in Chapter 3, Cypriot migrants settled in London to work and establish businesses; then they employed Turkish and Kurdish migrants to work for them and offered them accommodation. Economic reasons, job opportunities, and other facilities influence migrants’ choices about which city to live in. CKT migrants constructed an urban space in North London where they created local and transnational connections to the country of origin through shops, media, travel agencies, restaurants, bars, coffee houses, and satellite dishes. They live in the urban space within the multicultural city where they maintain multiple ties to their country of origin through social networks, consumption practices, and transnational media. In this way, migrants create new transnational social and cultural spaces for themselves which span between the sending and receiving societies (Faist, 2000; Levitt, 2001a). According to Caglar (2001), maintaining close ties with the country of origin in the case of Turkish migrants living in Germany leads to the ‘transnationalisation of spaces’ in German cities. She argues that Turkish youth in Berlin identify themselves in relation to urban space rather than a nation. As well as exploring the expressions of young people about the places they live, I also focus on their relationship with the country of origin when they visit. Recent research (Anderson, 1991; Caglar, 2001; Ehrkamp, 2005; Faist, 2000, 2000a; Kibria, 2002; Levitt, 2002; Wolf, 2002) on urban spaces, identity and transnationalism focuses on how urban spaces are transnationalised through immigrants’ transnational practices when exploring migrant identity in relation to places, but the influence of visits to the
country of origin on identity formation of migrants, especially the second generation and their perspective about the country of origin, has not yet received much attention. I believe that in order to reach concrete results about the identity formation of young people in relation to place, transnational social space should include attachments with both the receiving and sending countries.

Therefore, this chapter takes into account the ways in which CKT youth construct their identities in relation to places in the receiving and sending countries. It specifically focuses on the city of London, local neighbourhoods, and the visits to the country of origin in order to understand the ways in which places influence identity formation among young people. As I have argued in previous chapters, transnational social space refers to a space where young people develop new forms of identity because their identity is constantly negotiated through several contexts. This chapter argues that CKT youth construct complex relationships with the places such as, local neighbourhoods, London, and their country of origin.

The chapter first looks at how ethnic enclaves and urban space influence identity formation, asking what the perceptions are of young people about North London where the majority of CKT migrants are settled. Secondly, it explores their relationship with London and, then, at the practices of visiting the country of origin. The chapter then explores the perceptions of young people on belonging and ‘home’, before finally examining how these reflections affect the construction of transnational social space and identity.

Living in an Ethnic Enclave

Cosmopolitan cities like London, New York, and Berlin offer a diversity of cultures, containing localized spaces whilst being at the same time global (Cattacin, 2006; Dahinden, 2009; Parkin, 1999; Smith, 2001). These cities are localized because they receive a large number of migrants from all over the world and migrant communities construct their urban spaces in specific locations they have settled in. Vertovec (2007) introduced the term ‘super-diversity’ to explain the variety of local spaces established among increasing numbers of migrants within global cities. As a result of this diversity, transnationally connected and socio-economically differentiated local places could be found in global cities (Dahinden, 2009). According to Parkin (1999), the significant migrant populations in the big cities of Europe is an important characteristic feature of
these cities, as these migrant communities have their own political agenda which are not necessarily compatible with British, German or French identities. This can also be seen in the case of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish migrants living in London. Social networks, kinship relations, and job opportunities seem to influence migrants in settling in particular locations of London. Turkish migrants have also created particular neighbourhoods in Kreuzberg in Berlin (Kaya, 2007). The majority of CKT migrants live in North London, Green Lanes which starts in Newington Green and goes to Winchmore Hill in the North part of London; Cypriot Turks settled in South London, but some of them still live in North London. They have built their lives within the borders of North London by establishing businesses, community organisations, shops, restaurants, bars…etc. They have constructed a place where they can call home by applying their habits and preferences. Castles and Davidson (2000) argues that ‘newcomers seek to construct a place that they can again call home, and follow their own preferences.’ Migrants transform the urban district in making their own in the ghetto trope (Caglar, 2001). Caglar (2001) focuses on cultural consumption; transnational media, the type of music second and third generations listen to, restaurants, and bars established by Turkish migrants to show how they transform the national discourse on identity. This section also analyses the influence of urban space on the identity formation of young people, but also focuses on their perceptions, thoughts about urban space, and their relationship with this space rather than stressing the specific cultural sphere in an urban space.

Socialising with people from the same ethnic origin plays a crucial role in exploring the relationships with North London for some respondents. The geographical situation creates a space for everyday socialisation between CKT youth, as illustrated by Cagdas:

I really enjoy socializing in the Turkish and Kurdish community but also I enjoy living in North London, I am so used to the environment. I would not want to live in Turkey. It is probably just because I have been brought up since the age of four and am used to the environment. I believe I should continue living here, because I made friends and built a social life here. I am sure if I were four years old, living in Istanbul, I would say the same thing about Istanbul and I would not want to live in North London (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).
In his account, his primary identification is with the local environment where he was raised and bases his social life. Habits, social life, and experiences of young people in North London render this place home for him. Most participants lived in North London since they were born or from an early age and thus constructed their social life in this specific urban district. Friendships were built with the people living in the same area, they have gone to school in the same area, and they are familiar with all the shops and institutions established in this specific urban district.

The Turkish and Kurdish community in North London has created a transnational social space which offers specific cultural services such as shops selling products from Turkey, community organisations, and local media which is available in the shops of North London and facilitates contact between Turkish and Kurdish migrants. Even though the political separation between Turks and Kurds is reflected in the structure of community organisations and settlement patterns, both groups mainly live in North London, close to each other. Therefore, the separation between Turkish and Kurdish communities is not reflected in the everyday life of young people; it is only visible in terms of establishment of community organisations. Cagdas stated, ‘I really enjoy socializing in the Turkish and Kurdish community’ (23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics). This underlines the fact that these communities are bonded to each other by living and working in the same urban space. This embeddeness in its local and daily environment transcends their cultural differences and makes it possible for the Turkish speaking population to bond.

Some see living in North London as being of lower status and feel ostracized. According to one respondent, Belgin, the local area she lives in labels her in the eyes of others:

I have grown up in North East London, Hackney and it really affected my accent. People pick up from my accent that I have grown up in a specific place. I do think that where you live affects your identity
(Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee)

Belgin’s North East London accent and its lower social connotation affect her daily life. Because her socio-economic and cultural origin is instantly recognizable by others as soon as she speaks, she feels that it affects her whole identity. There is a risk that because of this she excludes herself from mixing with people outside her local context.
in order to avoid being judged. Castles already pointed out that ‘residential segregation in Britain was presented as the choice of migrants, but the development of minority neighbourhoods then appeared as the result of ‘natural processes’ of racial differentiation’ (2000: 198-199). Tulay has a similar perspective on this. She feels that this influence on identity is not only related to migratory background, it also touches class issues:

I say I am from Enfield and my accent is obviously a North London accent. People can realize it is different from other regions of London. It does help to form my identity, and it reveals not only my cultural background, as everyone knows that North London is where Turkish people live, but also my working class background; it is just the way I speak (Tulay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

This feeling of ‘otherness’ occurs independently of the cultural and social background of the interviewer. It seems, therefore, motivated by the local environment. Ekim claims that living in North London makes it difficult to adapt to the receiving society compared to other places in London:

I grew up in Lewisham but I know North London. I grew up among English, Indian and black people. Where I live there were not many Kurdish and Turkish people, which is why I had to adapt. If I were to live in North London, which is sort of a ghetto, I would not have been able to adapt. I would not have had such a diverse group of friends (Ekim, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.09.07, Gik-Der).

Ekim feels that living in an environment where there are various cultures and a diverse group of people make the adaptation process necessary. He compared two different urban districts - South and North London - in relation to diversity within population, claiming that living outside of the urban space where the majority of Turkish and Kurdish community lives helps to interact with the rest of society. The question arises here as to whether being removed from North London helps young people to be included into the receiving society. Alternatively, living in North London could also help CKT youth in negotiating identity positioning by transforming the ‘collective belonging’ discourse of ethnic enclaves.

In the case of some young people who feel stuck in North London, interaction with
other cultures is reduced. The predominantly Turkish-Kurdish ethnic composition of the neighbourhoods creates a space where they practice the culture of the country of origin as interpreted by family, relatives and friends, therefore limiting their involvement in British culture. Ersin, 18, stated the reasons for not socialising with British people:

I do not feel any affiliation with British culture. I never had any English friends. I tried my best, but it is quite difficult in North London, because there is not an English population (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

I do not have an affinity to British culture. I only observe it through the behaviour of students at school and on the streets or television, but my family life does not reflect British culture (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

Azra and Ersin practice the culture of the country of origin at home and in the local environment. The social environment in which Azra and Ersin interact has limited interaction with British culture. As mentioned by the respondents above, living in an ethnic enclave reduces the interaction with the rest of the society. This opposes the arguments of Liempt (2011) and Zhou (2004). According to Liempt, the strength of the community can actually facilitate integration into the country of settlement, especially into the local market. Zhou (2004) also argues that ethnic enclaves facilitate opportunities for migrants and their children. However, the experiences of young people living in an ethnic enclave do not necessarily promote integration among CKT youth.

However, living in an ethnic enclave also has positive influences on identity formation of CKT youth. Dilek, a 23 year old Kurdish youth, claims that living in a specific urban district where the majority of the Turkish and Kurdish community has settled has a crucial influence on her identity formation:

Hackney has made me who I am today. But it is not that important. I am closer to my community living in Hackney, possibly because of that I am more engaged with my community. It changed me completely as a person. I still have my beliefs, but it makes me closer to the community. It has got its advantages and disadvantages. Being so close to them means that you cannot be comfortable. You cannot walk with your
boyfriends; there is always a chance that you will meet your dad’s or mother’s friend on the street. You are in their face all the time. Everyone knows your business, you cannot hide anything. This is a drawback. The benefit is that you are part of the community, its weddings and parties, and it is not hard to meet people (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).

Her experiences of living in an ethnic enclave underline the importance of being a part of the community in terms of social networking. She is, at the same time, aware of the negative aspects of living in an ethnic enclave. She has adopted the ways of life of the ethnic enclave as a crucial element in defining her situation and relationship to CKT communities in North London. She transforms traditional discourses of the ethnic enclave into her everyday life and negotiates them in her own term. As Caglar (2001) states, German Turkish youth accept the ghetto metaphor to define their relationships to places and this leads to negotiation because they do not adopt the concepts of the dominant discourse. Ehrkamp (2005: 349), similarly, states that ‘migrants engage in creating places and transform the urban landscape of contemporary cities’. Urban settings represent new forms of identity and cultural references in the case of young German Turks (Pecoud, 2004).

As illustrated by the interviews, CKT communities live in North London and created a homogenous urban space where they could practice their culture, lifestyle, and habits as seen in other European cities among Turkish migrants settlement (Caglar, 2001, 2007; Kaya, 2002; Kucukcan, 1999; Wagner, 2002). Living in an urban space helps young people create a transnational social space which spans the sending and receiving societies through social and cultural attachments in ethnic enclaves (Faist, 2000; Levitt, 2001a; 2001b). While some respondents enjoy living in an ethnic enclave, others mention the negative aspects of it. For some, this specific urban space plays a crucial role in their everyday life because they have built their social lives, friendships, and habits a feeling of comfort and safety there (Ehrkamp, 2005). Knowing the people in the area also helps social networking (Zhou, 2004). Others underline the negative aspects of living in an ethnic enclave, such as feeling ‘other’ to the rest of society (Castles, 2000). Young people talk about ethnic enclaves through their experiences and are aware of the opportunities and difficulties of living in a specific urban space.
Experiencing London

In order to understand how young people can transform the urban district of the city and how their interaction with London influences the identity formation of young people, I asked my respondents about their experiences of living in London. They said that the cosmopolitan character of London offers them a rich perspective in understanding other cultures surrounding them. Alev stated that living in London offers a lot:

Living in London is in fact very attractive, because when I go to Istanbul, I look around and everybody is the same. I love it, but it is not what London can offer. London is multicultural. You meet with different cultures all the time. In the place where we live, there are Asians, Chinese. In Turkey, the upper class encounters different cultures. I like living in London. When I was younger I did not realise what London has to offer, I was happy in Istanbul, but now I appreciate London better (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

When Alev realised what London offers in terms of diversity of cultures, she started questioning her relationships with Istanbul where she was born and where she travels every year. London’s ‘super diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007) and cosmopolitan character is attractive for Alev who compares it to how big cities are structured in Turkey. Alev clearly negotiates her relationships with Istanbul and London through her experiences formulated in a transnational social space, where she brings elements of both the sending and receiving society.

Serpil, an 18 year old Kurdish youth, also claimed that London is a unique city in terms of the diversity of people and cultures:

London is a place where there are a whole lot of different cultures. People would never guess that they survived, but they exist in London. You can encounter people from many different cultures and you know that you are not the only one in the world. In a way, living in London is the best. You know how to get along with different people (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café in Dalston).

Serpil feels that she is a part of the diversity which London offers. The cosmopolitan character of London helps her to be socially included and not discriminated from the rest of the population. She is comfortable with the city because in London everyone is
from somewhere. Living in London offers ‘a globally understood and cosmopolitan identity’ (Lam and Smith, 2009: 1264). In the case of Alev and Serpil, cultural diversity is one of the things they liked most about London. Kasinitz et al. (2008) also stress that the second generation migrants living in New York appreciate the cosmopolitan nature of the city.

While some respondents enjoy the diversity of London, others have a very different experience. For Ilkan, 23 years old, diversity does not always have a positive influence on the formation of identity. He states that learning about other cultures makes us reflect on our own:

First of all, it affects me positively in that we get to learn about other cultures and identities. We get to understand ourselves more, that is the culture where we belong. There is also a downside, because when there are so many different backgrounds it is likely that there will be clashes. We have different interests, objects, food, different ways of acting and dressing. For example, Arabic people talk from the back of their throat. They sound alien, strange and different. We push it away, it makes us feel insecure, we don’t understand, we can’t get used to it...Some people say that Pakistani food stinks. Well, to you it stinks because your food is different. If you were from that culture, that ethnicity, it would not stink (Ilkan, 23 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

This quote shows that on the one hand, Ilkan appreciates the opportunities of diversity in London in terms of knowing other cultures; on the other hand, he claims that living with other cultures and the character of London which offers freedom to people in terms of practicing their own cultures creates problems. He feels safe and comfortable in ethnic enclaves because this is where he interacts with other people from the same ethnic background. He has had a much more ethnic enclave oriented experience of the city and knows all cultural products in the ethnic enclave he lives. In the case of Turkish migrants living in Marxloh, Ehrkamp (2005) stresses the Turkish character of the environment because it provides migrants a feeling of comfort and safety. Similar to Ilkan, Cagdas also claimed that the diversity of the city could be problematic in identity formation and inclusion:

It is not just living in North London that has had an important effect on our identity formation. Migration to England causes lots of problems.
You are lost between two identities. When we go to school, we have to assume a different identity; when we are at home we have to portray a different identity. It is a huge struggle for a kid to grow up in this kind of environment. I guess this is a clash of identities, and it is very hard to find your way (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Cagdas claims that interacting with various identities in the same city could cause problems in defining one’s identity. At the same time, few have access to this diversity, which can cause some deprecating feelings on the self.

Some young people stated that once their environment has changed and when they have more social interaction with other cultures, their view on identity has changed. Alev said that she has learnt Turkish and Kurdish traditions and culture from her family, but started socialising with people from different cultures at university:

When I was at secondary school, I had a lot of Turkish and Kurdish friends. The cultural activities like Newrooz or Bayram were more important, everybody were celebrating it with their family. You get it from school and from home. I was more exposed to it. I was not really involved community organisations, like youth club, but I was involved with activities. The way I behave is very different and it is not in terms of age, not because I was younger. It is just I cannot remember but I had more Turkish and Kurdish friends, now I have got more English, British friends, because, my environment change. My secondary school was in an area where there was ethnic minorities mainly (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

In the case of Alev, the socialisation process, different life experiences related to changes in her social environment, and increased interaction with people from different ethnic backgrounds including British people, opens a space for Alev to engage with different identity positions. This leads her to start questioning why she held onto Turkish people and culture when she was in secondary school.

Similar to Alev, Tulay also stated that she practiced Turkish culture a lot when she was growing up in the environment where many Turkish and Kurdish migrants live:

Before, it was in my school as well as in my local environment and my
home. Now I am in university, there are not as many as Turkish people, except we do have a Turkish society in our school. But, other than that I do not experience Turkish culture (Tülay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Stoke Newington).

In the case of Alev and Tulay, when they started university they experienced the multicultural side of London and their social worlds and perspectives on identity have changed. They accept what London offers to them. Alev compares herself with her friend in terms of experiencing different sides of the city. She said that her path diverged from her Turkish friends who preferred to stay among themselves:

I compare myself with a friend who stayed in the same environment and do not have much of an experience with British culture. It was quite strange that my friend did not know Tate Modern; she lives in London but does not know what it has to offer. She seems more concerned about her family; she wants to get married and is just 19. We did not have much to talk about. We do not have similar interests. She wants to spend more time with her family, get married and have kids. She was my best friend at primary and secondary school. She goes to university but there are a lot of Turkish students there. She has the same friends as before, whereas I do not see the same people. Her environment has not changed even at university, because she had same friends, same things. We became quite different. We have grown apart. Environment is really important. This is also about where do you study and who do you study for (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Alev has moved to higher education and she has expanded her social networks and developed multi-cultural, multi-racial social networks. However, her friend’s social environment has not changed: she was still mixing with peers from the same ethnic background. In the case of Alev, multi-ethnic and multi-racial networks open up a space for her in which she negotiates the issues of identity.

Young people’s experiences of living in London expose different views. On the one hand, young people enjoy the diverse character of the city (Vertovec, 2007) which helps them to interact with different people from various backgrounds. On the other, some argue that this diversity can result in some complications, such as the difficulties of experiencing various identities and not feeling comfortable around people from other
cultures. In order to understand how these diverse experiences influence identity formation for young people, the next section focuses on the construction of a transnational social space in order to understand how young people reflect their relationship with such places.

**Visits to the Country of Origin**

All of the respondents said that they visit the country of origin every year and stayed there for at least a month. They mainly go to rural places in the country of origin where their parents are from to visit their family and relatives, staying in relatives’ houses.

The experience of trips to the country of origin is the focal point for discussion in their relationships with Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish societies. The young people who were raised in the receiving country do not have as close a relationship with Turkey or Cyprus as their parents do. They cannot make claims to their identities based on birth or a personal history of residence in the country of origin (Kibria, 2002: 301). In this respect, their relationship with Turkey and Cyprus is limited to the periods they spend in the country of origin. All of my respondents state that they travel to Turkey and/or Cyprus once or twice a year with their parents. Their visits to the country of origin are fairly short in duration, and are focused on seeing family and friends, tourism, learning and practicing cultural resources, such as food, music, cinema, etc.

In order to understand the transnational engagements of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish youths and their relation to the country of origin, I asked them questions related to their visits to the country of origin, the time period they spend there, and their reflections on this time. Many of my respondents state that they visit their relatives when they go to Turkey or Cyprus, and many of them travel with their parents every year and stay there at least two months. The majority of the respondents state that they mainly go to rural areas of Turkey where their relatives live. The lifestyle in Istanbul and in rural areas is different. One of the questions I asked them is about adapting to the country of origin when they visit. Many of the young people I interviewed said that they have problems in adapting to the country of origin because of their inability to express themselves in the mother tongue, feeling that they do not belong to the country of origin, and because of differences in lifestyles and everyday life. Tezcan is indicative of this:
It might be hard to adapt to another environment after getting used to the environment in England. Cyprus might be safe, but England is not. You cannot go out at 10 o’clock at night in London, it is not safe. Things like this. I do not have a cultural adaptation problem. I have just problem in adapting to a new environment. I am used to this way of living in London, in Cyprus it is different (Tezcan, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 10.10.07, Cypriot Turkish Association).

Her adaptation problems have practical reasons behind which lay her habits and lifestyle in the receiving society. Ersin also sees difficulties in adapting to a new environment where the system and everyday life is different:

I definitely find it difficult to adapt when I go back to Turkey. I was like a stranger in Istanbul. It was very difficult. Even going to a shop, you do not know the prices, the currency, all sorts of problems, like how to pay...I do not have any cultural adaptation problems. They are really kind people. I do not have cultural, but system-related problems when I travel to Turkey (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdi, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Ersin claims that adapting to lifestyle in Turkey can be problematic, but he finds difficulties in practicing specific rules related to everyday life in Turkey such as shopping and transport. His habits and lifestyle are associated with the receiving country. Like Ersin, Alev and Belgin also feel like outsiders in the country of origin because they are not familiar with the lifestyle and social systems in Turkey. They find it difficult to conform to the norms having spent most of their lives in another culture. Alev said, ‘I found a lot of things different in Turkey. For instance if you wear something unusual, they will stare at you in Turkey but not in London’ (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

The differences in value systems and lifestyles make adaptation difficult. Belgin also states clearly that she does not feel she belongs:

I do not really feel at home when I go there; I feel like an outsider anyway. In that sense, it is quiet difficult to adapt... It is because everyone knows that you did not grow up there and assumes that you are different. So they treat you differently. You have to act accordingly (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).
In the case of Alev and Belgin, adaptation proved to be a challenge as they were regarded as outsiders and treated differently. Christou (2006a: 841) states that ‘second generation Greek Americans feel like strangers in their homeland’. Alev and Belgin also feel like outsiders when they visit the country of origin. Caglar (2001) states, Turks in Germany relate themselves to urban spaces in Turkey, mainly Istanbul which is a mix of international and Turkish. Regarding this, it is crucial to look at which parts of Turkey the young people experience and what sort of lifestyle they see. If they experience adaptation problem in Turkey, it is probably because they find it difficult to adapt to the lifestyle of rural areas after experiencing the multicultural side of London.

Besides problems with the environment and the social systems which these young people perceive in the country of origin, there are problems related to language and feelings of marginalization. Some young people are unable to speak fluent Turkish and experience communication problems. Ceren says that she has communication problems with people in Turkey and this makes it difficult for her to be accepted:

Because I do not use that much Turkish in London, I have communication problems with people in Turkey. In London, I just talk to my dad in Turkish, so it takes a while to go back to your language. My vocabulary is not extensive, so I sometimes find it difficult to express myself. I need to make an effort. After a while I adapt to the environment because my family is there. It is home (Ceren, 18 years old, Turkish, 25.06.07, cafe in Dalston).

Ceren feels that she needs to make an effort to improve her Turkish because her family lives there and considers it as her home. The inability to speak fluent Turkish is clearly a concern for Ceren. Belgin also discusses the language barrier:

I do not feel very comfortable in the Turkish environment, because I do not feel comfortable with my Turkish and do not want to speak it. When I speak English, they do not understand and everyone gets uncomfortable…I am quite lost (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

Language is central issue for Belgin in terms of adapting to the environment. Serpil has more issues with the lifestyle of the receiving society though her knowledge of English is also a crucial factor:
I feel that London is my home. If I had to go back to my own country, I would never be able to live there. I am so used to the lifestyle here. Knowing English, speaking the language makes life easier. I cannot live in anywhere else (Serpil, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 20.10.07, café in Dalston).

Language plays the crucial role for young people in building social ties with people in the country of origin. Losing their parents’ language over time makes it difficult to participate in social networks and they feel uncomfortable in the environment.

Though these young people face problems in terms of adapting to the country of origin, they have families there which make the adaptation process easier. Family plays a central role in the adaptation of youth to the country of origin. Ozkan underlines the role of the family and relatives in the smooth transition to the country of origin: ‘I do not find it difficult to adapt when I go back to the homeland, because I have got relatives. If I have enough money I will go to Turkey’ (Ozkan, 19 years old, Kurdish, 18.11.07, Komkar). Social networks with people in the country of origin facilitate the process of adaptation. In the country of origin, young people build social relations with relatives and friends (King et al., 2011). Despite these connections, they do not identify the country of origin as their home and the object of their primary allegiance. As argued by Sokefeld and Schwalgin (2000: 28), ‘not all kinds of transnational relations entertained by actors should be subsumed under the label of the respective community.’ For example, when Alevis travels to Turkey to visit relatives or to holidays there, this does not necessarily have anything to do with self-identification. Transnational activities of young people should not be analysed under a label of any specific community. Young people identify places as home where they can adapt and feel comfortable. Unlike the previous generation, young people are not keen to define home with reference to national and cultural belonging.

**Sense of Belonging and ‘Home’**

Many studies have emphasized the changing meaning of belonging and home in the context of migration, highlighting the stretching of their meaning between the local context of the destination country and global ties in relation to the country of destination and transnational ties formed by migration. Massey (1992) for instance highlights the
fact that belonging and home are defined in relation to everyday life experiences and even more precisely by social relations. Taking into account the new practices of migrants within specific places and societies, she argues that these notions are transformed through the experiences of migrants and their negotiation processes. Therefore, makes a case for the reconceptualising of home in relation to places that people inhabit with others. In other words, the meaning of home has shifted from the old paradigms that connect the issue of belonging with notions of mother tongue and fatherland. Home is now a dynamic concept which changes meanings between people. Migrants now experience new social spaces. Home is a multiple concept which is identified with the social world people live in. According to Al-Ali and Koser (2002), a home is a place where personal and social meanings are grounded. In this sense, it also includes a sense of self: young people’s relation to places and their experiences could make a place ‘home’. The definition of home is a constantly shifting phenomenon in the case of transnational migrants (Al-Ali et al., 2001). In this sense, home is not necessarily a fixed and bounded place; it represents relationships to people (Wiles, 2008).

In the case of second generation migrants, the country of origin is not the main place they spend most of their time and socialise: they have built their lives in the receiving country and are familiar with the social life and regulations of the receiving society (Haller and Landolt, 2005; Schans, 2009). Many of my respondents were either born or raised in London from an early age. London represents everyday life for them as their schools, friends, and parents are based in London. Aziz points out the importance of social networks in London:

I was in Turkey for four months. But I really missed London when I was in Turkey. It is not because I belong to London. It is because my all friendships and my whole life are in London. I know every single place in London. In Turkey, I do not know any places. I had my life here. In Turkey, you are from Europe and they look at you in a different way (Aziz, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.09.07, Gik-Der).

He neither feels he belongs to London nor Turkey. The issue of belonging to a particular place is not a crucial point when he describes his experiences in both places. Instead, social networks and habits are important in engaging himself with a place. Aziz also feels he is an outsider in Turkey. He does not know the lifestyle or social system in
Turkey compared to London and this make him feel different. Eylem also finds difficulties being in Turkey:

My home is London because this is the country where I have been brought up. This is the place to which I am used. When I went to Turkey, I never liked it because they have a different mentality. They are not like the British. They are racist. You cannot compare this place with Turkey (Eylem, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.04.07, Komkar).

For Eylem, home is the place where she is accepted. She stated that ‘Turks are racist’ and feels that were she to live in Turkey she would face discrimination. She prefers to live in England which she perceives to be a more just society. Her definition of home is not related to identity; it is rather the place where she feels comfortable and accepted.

Some of the respondents did not consider Turkey their home and did not want to live in Turkey permanently. It could be said that the young people depend on their parents for information on Turkey in order to affirm their ethnicity. It is difficult to call Turkey ‘home’ even though they visit the country nearly every year and construct transnational ties based on their parents’ relationships there (Wolf, 2002). Burcu and Dilek consider London as their home and think that it would be hard to live in Turkey even though they are familiar with the culture and language:

I regard London as home, because I was born in London. When I go back to Turkey, I really like being there. Some things are different from to the way I have been taught here. I believe that I cannot live there, but I really like Turkey. I believe that London is my city (Burcu, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.06.07, café in Dalston).

London is home. Because as long as I can remember I have been living in London, this is home to me. I do not feel at home in Turkey and I do not think I could live there. It is just like a holiday for me. I cannot live under Turkish rule. Even though I experience the culture, language and traditions, it is totally different in the country (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).

The difficulty of living in Turkey or Cyprus is connected with the experience of living in London from an early age. Ahmet states that it is important to get used to the lifestyle of the receiving society:
I would say London is my home, because I was in England in my teenage years. Whatever I learned I learned in England. I cannot see myself in Turkey or in Cyprus. I came to this country when I was little. If I had come later to England I would have found it difficult to adjust here (Ahmet, 22 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 19.06.07, Cemevi).

In the case of these young people, the definition of ‘home’ is related to where they built their social lives. As mentioned by Cressey (2006: 62) in the case of Pakistani and Kashmiri youth in London, ‘being born in Britain makes it home; being raised in Britain makes it home’. Socialising and building a life in London make it easier to familiarise with the city and plays a crucial role in defining ‘home’. They also have links with the country of origin through their visits every year which helps them to know about Turkey and Cyprus, and in constructing social networks and friendships. For these reasons, some respondents define Turkey and Cyprus as ‘home’ although they have not lived there. Here, an important question arises. How is it that young people who were born and raised in England define home as Turkey or Cyprus? Is this situation related to identity or does it have more to do with family and their personal experiences in Turkey or Cyprus? Özkan is one interview who ‘feels at home in Turkey’:

It is because all my family and relatives are in Turkey. In England, I do not have that many relatives, I have only friends here. When I am in Turkey, I have got lots of places to go to like my aunties, my uncles (Ozkan, 19 years old, Kurdish, 18.11.07, Komkar).

For Özkan, home is where his family lives; family networks play an important role in his definition. Ceren also feels at home when she goes back to Turkey: ‘the majority of my family is in Turkey, so I would say my home is Turkey. But, I also feel comfortable living in England’ (18 years old, Turkish, 26.06.07, cafe in Dalston). Besides family ties, background and origin are important factors in identifying Turkey or Cyprus as home. Tezcan believes that Cyprus is home for her: ‘Cyprus is home for me, because it is from where I originate, it is my destination. I was born in London but my home is Cyprus’ (Tezcan, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 10.10.07, Cypriot Turkish Association).

In the case of the respondents above, the meaning of ‘home’ is linked to family and background. According to Al-Ali and Koser (2002), a home is a place where personal
and social meanings are grounded which includes national and cultural belongings but also relates to the context in which young people define home. In this sense, for Ozkan, Ceren and Tezcan, the meaning of ‘home’ is connected to their strong attachments with their families.

Visits to the country of origin open up the possibility of living there in the future. When I asked young people where they want to live in the future, they clearly stated that they would prefer to live in London, because they are used to the lifestyle and social system in London. Alev considers what city would offer her in taking decisions about her future:

Before, I wanted to be based in Turkey. I felt I belong there. I felt that I would be happier in Turkey. After my education I want to go there, actually I wanted to go to Turkey but my parents did not let me. Now, I say I want to live in London in the future.

Q: Why your thoughts are changed?
Alev: Because, before I was not really enjoying the environment (North London), I did not feel I am a part of my environment and I felt I belong to Turkey, but now I do not feel the same way.

Q: Is it because your environment has changed?
Alev: My environment has changed. I am at LSE, I realised that a lot London can offer to me (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Alev feels that she is a part of London, realises what the city can offer, and understands that her life is not limited to North London. Moving from that ethnic enclave has helped her to experience the cosmopolitan character of London and her relationship with London has been affected by this. Being raised in London, having friends and family in London, and especially in North London makes feel at home. Unlike Alev, Cagdas considers North London solely to be his home:

Q: Where do you want to live in the future?
Cagdas: North London.

Q: Why?
Cagdas: It is a place I used to. It is a place I form my family here, my friends here, my teachers here. If I go back to any other country it would be very difficult to form the things I have formed in here. To make my life easier, I stay here (23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).
Cagdas considers living in London in the future but apart from this, he imagines his life being in North London where he has formed his social networks and social life. Eylem also considers living in London because of social networks and community:

I want to live in London in the future. I have been brought up here and I know the areas here. I lived in Manchester for a month. It is a nice place as well, but you feel lonely there, because, there is no one from your culture. In London I feel that I am not alone (Eylem, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.04.07, Komkar).

I want to live in London in the future, because, I was brought up here and I am really used to it. I feel like it is my country. I do not see myself living in somewhere else (Burcu, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.06.07, café in Dalston)

In the case of the respondents above, being used to the environment, social system, lifestyle and social networks are important features in choosing where to live in the future. Many of them have formed their life in London from an early age and never lived anywhere else. Their life experiences in London make them consider the place home.

Some of the young people considered living in Turkey, but only when they are retired and older:

I think I want to live in London but, when I get retired, when I am really old. I want to go back to homeland. I am getting my degree here and I can get a job afterwards. It would be easier here. You cannot really know it depends on future (Ayse, 19 years old, Turkish, 05.05.07, café in Dalston).

I am unsure of where I would like to live indefinitely in the near future, but when I am older, for example retired, I would like to go to Turkey to live with my family. This is because in my old age, I would rather be close to people who are closer to the culture I have been brought up with and the language I have been brought up with (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).

I think I would live in London for most of my life. When I get older,
I would go back to Turkey, but a quiet part of Turkey. I would not go to a big city because we live in London and it is very big city. I do not want to go to a big city as Istanbul after living in London (Ceren, Turkish, 18 years old, 25.06.07, café in Dalston).

I want to live in London for now, but in the future I would go and live in Turkey, North Turkey. I go there every summer; it is nice to travel around (Ozkan Aydin, 19 years old, Turkish, 12.11.07, café in Dalston).

These young people consider living in Turkey when they get older. They want to use the opportunities of London offers to them until they are older. They see the country of origin as a secure place where they have their relatives around, but at the same time they do not belong to the country of origin. They just want to live there when they get old. In other words, they do not only want to live in London. This suggests that they do not completely belong to either place.

The majority of my respondents define ‘home’ in relation to the place they live, where their social relations are built, and where they go to school and work. Wessendorf (2010: 377) argues that ‘many second generation Italians emphasise that home is where they grow up’. Social relations play an important role in defining home. Massey states that ‘social relations exist, necessarily, both in space (i.e. in a locational relation to other social phenomena) and across space. Given that conception of space a ‘place’ is formed out of the particular set of social relations which interact at a particular location’ (1992: 12). Social relations transform a neutral place into home. This definition of home would match with the experiences of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people who identify with different elements in these countries. Transnational social spaces eliminate the possibility of belonging to a certain place. These young people experience different ties to both sending and receiving societies. Even though their ties are not direct or close, they still find elements to identify both places as home. In this respect, transnational ties reduce or even reject the idea of belonging to a certain place and can provide access to resources and connections in two societies (Foner, 2002: 249).

In the case of CKT youth, the meaning of home is expressed in terms of their experiences and perceptions of the places they interact. While some of them mentioned that they have multiple homes, others define London as home. In their definition of home, the social system of the UK, lifestyle, environment, social networks, and habits
are important. As seen in the previous section, all of these respondents have visited Turkey and have an idea of life there but they find it difficult to identify with the social life in Turkey.

**The Reflection of Places in Transnational Social Space**

Transnational social space focuses on the everyday life of young people which also includes visits to the country of origin, their relationship with London, and their experiences of an ethnic enclave. I focus on living in London and in a specific urban space whilst also visiting the country of origin, in the creation of a transnational social space which gives a better understanding of how individuals perceive their relation to these specific places as a part of their everyday social life. Young people compare different experiences of living in London and spending time in Turkey or Cyprus, and they bring different elements of these experiences into their transnational social space. In this section, I analyse the perceptions of young people about Turkey, London, and North London. This will demonstrate the ways in which young people mix various experiences and negotiate their positioning within both societies. As seen above, all of the CKT youth have connections to both settlements and also have an experience of living in an ethnic enclave which reflects the culture of the country of origin. Young people associate themselves more with the city, the specific urban space, than the country of origin. Being able to interact with different places helps young people to negotiate their relationship with these places. They are constantly moving from one cultural space to another. Alev states that she is moving between different cultures when travelling from North London to Central London:

> I feel every day that I am moving between two different cultures. It is not just about home. It is about when I am walking at LSE and in Holborn. It feels like a different place than Wood Green where I live. Even though we are in the same city, there are differences between Holborn and Wood Green. People in Wood Green are ethnic minorities and they are more connected, we have got a little Turkish street, little Asian street, little Greek street, different places (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Alev feels that she is moving from a kind of ghetto to the multicultural side of London, which shows the differences between her local environment and multicultural London. This also assists in her negotiation of positioning herself within different cultures. The
movement among cultural spaces helps young people transform these cultural spaces through their experiences in the settlements while constructing their own. Many respondents also mentioned that the movement from the UK to Turkey or Cyprus helps them to bring different elements of these places into a transnational social space. As mentioned in the previous section, most of the respondents are aware of the opportunities London offers to them and the different experiences they gain when they visit the country of origin.

Young people have constructed transnational social spaces through the movement across various cultural spaces by experiencing different forms of belonging in the places they interact. They understand different aspects of the country of origin, the specific urban space in North London where they live, and London as a whole where they experience various cultures. They bring their thoughts, perceptions, and practices about these places into a transnational social space. They make choices about what to accept and what to ignore in those places and create a space which mixes different elements of these places into one. As mentioned by many respondents, their social networks, social life, family, school, friendships, and habits are the main aspects in their definition of ‘home’. However, at the same time some of them consider living in the country of origin in the future. They have multiple homes which are transformed through the negotiation of the social life of the places they interact and their experiences within these places. Belonging is challenged and participation in social life in these places is negotiated. Belonging is not based on young people’s national entitlement; it is associated with the everyday experiences of young people and the meaning they give to these places and their social world. Therefore, transnational social space is constructed through social relations, habits, and everyday life associations with home.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has explored in which ways living in an ethnic enclave, experiencing London, and visits to Turkey or Cyprus influenced the identity formation of CKT youth. It has focused on the relationship of young people with both destinations, tried to analyse the perceptions of young people about London, the urban space in which they live, and the country of origin in the light of constructing transnational social spaces and identity formation. I have shown that their individual experiences become the basis of their relationships with the geographical places with which they interact. Their relation to the ethnic enclave reflects the social lives of many CKT youth. Some respondents
stressed that they feel safe and comfortable (Ehrkamp, 2005) in the ethnic enclave and
living in an ethnic enclave helps social networking (Zhou, 2004). Others, such as Belgin
and Tulay, pointed out the disadvantages they have faced about living in an ethnic
enclave, such as being perceived as having a low socio-economic background because
of their North London accent. As Cressey (2006) states in the case of British Pakistani
youths, being stereotyped, being misunderstood, feeling misrepresented are all
alienating experiences. It has been demonstrated that they take into account social
networking, safety and habits as positive aspects of living in an ethnic enclave, but they
also think that it reduces their interaction with the rest of the society.

Their experiences of living in London are mainly positive. They find the diverse
character of the city attractive but at the same time this relationship can be complicated
according to some respondents. For Ilkan, interacting with people from other cultural
backgrounds also helps him understand his cultural background better by comparing the
cultural practices. It is also important to highlight which parts of London they live in.
All respondents are aware of the opportunities London offers to them and how
experiencing London gives them a different perspective and helps them to understand
the rest of society better. Their relation to London also helps them to negotiate their
relation with the ethnic enclave in terms of comparing what is different between these
places.

Visits to the country of origin also influence the identity formation of young people.
Their experiences with the country of origin are mainly negative. The majority of young
people identified adaptation problems related to social systems, the environment, and to
lifestyle. Some said that they do not have cultural adaptation problems as they are
familiar with the culture through their family and community. Most, however, found
difficulties in communication with people in Turkey or Cyprus. In the case of Ceren,
Belgin and Serpil, not being comfortable with the mother language make them feel
uncomfortable in the environment. Their experiences with the country of origin are not
as positive as the experiences with the receiving society, because they have not lived in
the country of origin. They have built social relations with relatives and friends in the
country of origin but despite these connections they do not construct strong ties there.

In terms of defining home, young people take into account of where they live, where
they built their social relations, and where they go to school. Social relations play a
crucial role in their definition of home, as Massey (1992) concludes. Caglar (2001) argues that Turkish youths living in Berlin consider Berlin as their home: belonging is connected to an urban space rather than a nation and/or ethnic communities. Similar to Caglar’s findings, the majority of my respondents stated that London is their home, instead of highlighting the specific urban space they live, and only some of them mentioned the country of origin as their home. For many respondents, ‘home’ is where they have their social relations and are familiar with the environment. They do not feel bound to a particular place. This is confirmed by the concept of transnational social space which analyses how migrants’ lives are embedded in more than one society (Basch et al., 1994; Glick Schiller et al, 1995; Guarnizo and Smith, 1998; Vertovec, 2003). In the case of CKT youth, their transnational social space includes various cultural spaces articulated in different places across the borders of nation-states. They have built complex relationships with the places they interact as a result of diverse experiences. They do not feel they belong to a particular place and transnational social spaces eliminate the possibility of belonging to a certain place. There are not significant differences among Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish, and Turkish youths in relation to perceptions about home and belonging.

CKT youth have constituted a non-rooted relationship with the places they interact because, through their diverse experiences, the issue of belonging and the meaning of ‘home’ have been transformed within a transnational social space. For example, Ayse, Azra, Ceren and Ozkan Aydin enjoy living in London, but they consider living in Turkey when they get older. They are open to moving across different spaces and do not only want to live in one place. In other words, they do not see themselves as belonging to either place. They make choices about what to accept and what to ignore in those places and accept different elements of these places within a transnational social space. They try to straddle two cultures, which they compare and contrast. While some of them, such as Ahmet, Burcu, Dilek, Eylem and Serpil define London as home, others, such as Ozkan and Tezcan define Turkey as home or say that they have multiple homes. There is no longer any single place to which these young people could be said to belong. For most of the interviewees, however, defining home is not related to issues of identity or to a particular place, but to the community. They negotiate their positioning within these places and within the societies through complex and mobile lives that cannot fit any specific category. In this way, it is important to analyse the relationship of CKT youths with places because it underlines human relations beyond national
boundaries and the importance of social relations and networks in their local and international aspects (Cressey, 2006).

The next chapter focuses on the perceptions and thoughts of CKT young people about ethnic identification and culture.
Chapter 9: Identity and Transnational Social Space

The thesis has explored identity formation of CKT youth in relation to everyday social experiences within transnational social spaces. This lens lead me to switch from the classical question in migration studies of what happens to ‘identity’ in the migration and settlement process to what happens to ‘identity’ when somebody such as a second generation migrant, has lived only in one country but is constantly influenced by both sending and receiving societies. I argue that the identity positioning CKT youth is characterized by their everyday life experiences.

On the one hand, young people are influenced by their family and community; on the other, they are influenced by various cultural repertoires surrounding them. The influence of structural and social factors on the identity formation of young people has been shown by focusing on their family relations, the impacts of community organisations, school environment, transnational media practices, and the local neighbourhood. This chapter focuses particularly on the self and examines what young people think about their identity positioning, how they perceive their positioning in society, what the relationship is between identity and transnational social space, and how and why ethnicity is important in one’s identity.

In this research, the concept of identity is studied in relation to transnationalism and theoretically it has taken into account Giddens’ conception of identity formation which put at the centre of the analysis the interaction between the self, structure, and social relations (see Chapter 1). As already highlighted, identity is a slippery concept because of its abstract and changing meaning which lead some researchers to avoid using it (Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Anthias, 2002). Along other scholars (Bauman, 2004; Giddens et al., 1994), I chose to still use it whilst emphasising its liquid, fluid and transformative characteristics. As mentioned in introduction of this thesis, I found this notion useful in exploring the perceptions of young people about their positioning and in analysing the process of negotiating identity, because it offers a ground to understand communal identifications at the same time as grasping the diverse identifications of individuals.

Second generation migrant identities have been explored in relation to ‘hybridity’, ‘third
space’ (Bhabha, 1994; Kaya, 2001), being ‘between two cultures’ (Anwar, 1998; Watson, 1977), and ‘culture conflict’ (Ballard, C., 1979; Ballard, R., 1994). These concepts look at second generation migrants’ identities in certain boundaries of ethnic categorizations and I would prefer to move ‘beyond the ethnic lens’ (Glick Schiller et al., 2006; Glick Schiller et al., 2011; Rouse, 1995). In doing so, I focus on the everyday social experiences of young people in understanding their identity formation and explore it in the context of a transnational social space. I believe that analysing their everyday social experiences in the context of a transnational social space helps widen the understanding of identity beyond commonalities and the issue of belonging in order to engage at an individual level constantly in the process of negotiation.

Transnational social space in this research refers to a single social space which brings different cultural elements from both receiving and sending societies and everyday social relations of individuals across the borders of nation-states (Pries, 2001a). Transnational identities emerge from transnational experiences of individuals. The term ‘transnational’ enables me to take into account the influences of the culture of the country of origin as well as the receiving society. According to Goldring (1999: 164), ‘transnational social space provides a special context in which people can improve their social position, make claims about their changing status and expectations’. In line with this, I argue that the identity positioning of young people is transformative with respect to their everyday social life experiences. In this sense, I believe that CKT youth define their positioning in society in relation to sociability as a result of everyday interaction. Throughout their everyday interaction, most of the interviewees question ethnic categories and the issue of belonging.

This chapter focuses first on the perceptions of young people about different cultures surrounding them and how they reflect these cultural practices in their everyday lives. Secondly, it focuses on the perception of young people on their ethnic identity. Finally, it explores the influences of cultures on identity formation of young people and explores the relationship between ‘identity’ and transnational social space, questioning whether they are in opposition or replace each other.

**The Popular Discourse: ‘Being between Two Cultures’**

As mentioned above, identity is difficult to define because it is in constant
transformation and always in the process of negotiation. In order to have a better analysis of the fluidity of identity, I have taken into account Giddens’ theory of identity which comprehends identity as the product of negotiation and dialectical relation between the self, social relations and institutions. To this perspective I added the influence, for people in transnational context, of cultural repertoires of both the sending and receiving societies and social relations of everyday life into a single space.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, in exploring the identity formation of young people within a transnational social space, this research examines various factors such as family, community organisations, school, transnational media, and local neighbourhoods. It tries to analyse the relationship of young people with these factors and how young people perceive these relationships. While other chapters focus on structural and social factors of identity formation, this chapter tries to examine the other dimension of ‘the self’: how young people see their positioning within the society and how they define themselves.

Ethnic and cultural identity is often seen as a strong link to the cultural and symbolic roots of the country of origin through families and community. As mentioned by Levitt (2001a), Smith (2002), and Glick Schiller and Fouron (2002), second generation migrants’ relationship to the country of origin is shaped by the resources and social networks of their parents and community organisations. But ethnic, cultural and national identities can also be transformed by the participation of young people in transnational social spaces. As Maalouf (2000: 20) argues, ‘identity is not given once and for all: it is built up and changes throughout a person’s lifetime’.

In the case of CKT youth, ethnic identity and the relationship with the country of origin is shaped by family and community organisations. However, the connection of young people to the country of origin and ethnic identity might be different to their parents because they grew up in another country and are more familiar with the lifestyle of the receiving country as argued by Song (2003: 118): ‘in comparison with their parents, second and third generation individuals are more likely to engage in forms of code switching and ethnic reinvention, and more likely to embrace complex diasporic identities.’ According to Nowicka (2006), having ‘dual identity’ offers practical benefits, such as using the knowledge of both cultures and languages in a professional career. In engaging with various different cultural repertoires, young people experience
complex identity options which they can choose or switch around. These various complex identity options can be practiced within a transnational social space which includes the cultural resources from the sending and receiving country through social networks. Unlike their parents, young people are deeply involved in the negotiation of ethnic identity because they interact with different ethnic identities more than their parents do (Ballard, 1994; Song, 2003). As shown in Chapter Four, according to young people, cultural conflict can cause communication problems between young people and their parents.

Living across more than two cultural spaces demonstrates the different experiences young people face. It is seen as problematical in some cases. 'Being in the middle of two cultures' is a phrase used by the families and community organisations to describe the positioning of young people. The heads of community organisations and families believe that young people are not successful at school and have serious identity problems because they are ‘between two cultures’ (Anwar, 1998; Watson, 1977). They believe that young people being neither Turkish nor British and not belonging to a particular culture is problematic. Some researchers (Bhabha, 1990; Featherstone, 1994; Gilroy, 1987; Hall, 1990; 1991; Kaya, 2002) introduce the concept of hybridity as the ‘third space’ between home and host society in order to avoid essentialising identities of migrants by attributing them a preconceived identity and limited to certain characteristics. According to Kaya (2002: 58), Turkish youths in Germany employ the conjunction ‘and…and…and’ in the process of identity formation: for instance they describe themselves as ‘German and Turkish and global and…’. This refers to multiple identifications with different cultures; discourses are constantly intermingled and associated with globalization. Toyota (2003) argues that multiple identifications are somewhat problematic when situated within the country of origin and the settlement. The concept of ‘third space’ does not pay much attention to other factors, such as racial discrimination, which may constrain people’s experiences of identity (Song, 2003). It does not stress the need for creating social networks which transcend ethnic categories and national boundaries (Toyota, 2003) and it sometimes reassigns fixed identity (Hutnyk, 2005). In order to explore diverse and complex identity positionings, I focus on everyday experiences of young people. Young people experience different social worlds between home, school, community, and their peers in forming their position in society. In these social spaces, they interact with the culture of the country of origin and
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other cultures. Therefore, throughout this research the main focus is the everyday social experiences of CKT youth which includes everyday social interactions and relationships which might influence their identity.

Some of my respondents such as Alev, Azra, Ersin and Tahsin had a reluctance to define themselves with either British or Turkish/Kurdish culture and to assert a definite cultural allegiance. Some of these young people do not know both Turkish and British cultures well and this situation opens a space for them to practice these cultures in their own way. Some of them said that they do not feel they are part of one or other culture, because of their limited knowledge and experience:

The funny thing is I have no idea of both of the cultures, just a general view and no details (Mustafa, 22 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 20.11.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

I do not even know what British culture is. How I could be in the middle of two cultures? (Taner, 19 years old, Kurdish, 21.09.07, Gik-Der).

I am not stuck between two cultures, but yes I am in between two cultures. I cannot really say I am English and I cannot say I am fully Turkish. I feel more Turkish, but I cannot really say I am fully Turkish (Filiz, 21 years old, Turkish, 05.01.08, café in Hackney).

I have not lived in Cyprus all my life. I kind of live in both countries. I do not know Cypriot Turkish culture fully (Ramazan, 20 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 20.11.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

I do not feel in between, I do not really know what British culture is (Duygu, 19 years old, Turkish, 25.05.07, house of interviewee).

These young people claim that they have limited understanding of either or both cultures, because they cannot fully practice these cultures. They live in Britain, but have limited relationship to British culture and they never lived in the country of origin, but they try to practice its culture in London. The experiences of these young people demonstrates the possibility of constructing their own positioning by articulating a variety of interpretations as to what certain cultures mean and what identity positioning means to them. Not knowing both cultures fully makes them accept different cultural positions easily and transforms their notion of cultural belonging. In this way, knowing
either cultures or being in between two cultures creates a unique position, which need not be defined as problematic (Kaya, 2002; Kucukcan, 1999; 2004).

Other participants stated that they are ‘between two cultures’ and did view this as problematic. Nevzat becomes aware of cultural differences when he leaves his local environment and believes that the transition between two cultures creates problems in the formation of identities among young people:

I feel that I am in between two cultures. That’s the problem. When they (the young people) go outside, they face a different culture and way of life, and when they go home there is a different way of life. It is very hard for young people to live even without gangs and drugs. When they go outside they see a lot of different cultures. It is very hard for them to settle down to a way of life. They usually choose the bad way like taking drugs and joining gangs. When they go home there is a different way of life with mom and dad arguing and telling them to this and that. Their parents do not even know how their life is (Nevzat, 22 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Nevzat touches on issues related to communication problems with parents and bad habits when mentioning the experiences of being ‘between two cultures’. He believes that this situation is problematical for young people in terms of choosing which life path to follow and, as a result of this; they become involved in gangs and drugs. However, he does not take into account that moving in different cultural spaces creates more complex forms of identity which help young people negotiate their positions within societies and form perspectives about their identities.

Cagdas also states the difficulties in between two cultures:

I am in between two cultures. It is really hard, because I want to be more English and also more Turkish and also more Kurdish. But it is very difficult to be all. As a result of living two different identities, we (young people) have a problem. We have the responsibility of understanding our parents’ backgrounds, Turkish, Kurdish culture. We also have another responsibility of understanding the community we live in, English culture we live in, the English education system. Sometimes there can be differences which do not mean that we cannot live together, because there are differences, it is really hard for someone to form the right part,
especially when you do not have the right support. The youngsters do not have the right support from their parents, that’s why they had problems (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

According to Cagdas, living with many cultures is sometimes hard for young people to deal with because it gives them the responsibility of understanding both cultures in order to survive in different social spaces they encounter in their everyday lives. He stresses the negative aspects of interacting and living with different cultures and claims that it is hard to deal with differences. He argues that young people need support from their parents and communities to deal with the problems raised in everyday life. The expectation of fully participating in the social space of all cultural repertoires makes their life difficult; however, this difficulty is related to the level of acceptance and identification of oneself in certain cultural positions. In everyday life, CKT youth enter into different spaces and participate in different cultural and identical positions, such as at school, at home, in their neighbourhoods, at celebrations, with their peers, etc. They find they have different social identities, such as migrant, youth, British, Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish, and they do not conform entirely to any single category. Anthias (2002) argues that the identity formation of young people from minority groups and the outcomes of collective identities need to be analysed in relation to location and positionality, because this includes the views of individuals about the broader social relations which are constituted in the process of identity construction. In the process of identity construction, young people may also feel close to certain cultures within various cultural repertories in their lives. Some young people feel that their Turkish side seems to be stronger than any other culture. Tezcan, Gazi and Ozkan Aydin believe that they are not in ‘between two cultures’ because they mainly practice Turkish culture:

I live in London but I do not have a British way of life. I live my life according to Turkish culture and norms. I am in between because I live in a British milieu but follow my Turkish culture. When I am at school sometimes I feel that I am stuck between two cultures. But most of the time I know my direction. My parents show me and tell me which route to follow, what our culture is, where actually it comes from. We try our best to continue with our culture as a new generation (Tezcan, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 10.10.07, Cypriot Turkish Association).

When someone asks me where I am from I say Cyprus, I am not stuck between two cultures; I have my Turkish culture. We bought up as
Even though I was born in here, my first language is Turkish; I practice it through my language (Gazi, 21 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 20.11.07, Cypriot Turkish Association).

I would not say that I am in between but I am involved in multiple cultural discourses. But I feel more Turkish than English. Wherever I go, I am Turkish I live my Turkish culture. I do not really know Turkish culture very well. I have got just the name. It is difficult I do not really look into Turkish culture; I do not practice as much as other Turkish people do. I have learnt Turkish culture through my parents and Turkish culture lessons. I had a family friend working in mosque. He taught me praying, the cultural values, how proper Muslims act (Ozkan Aydın, 19 years old, Turkish, 12.11.07, café in Dalston).

The respondents above believe that they need to hold onto their ethnic background. In the case of these respondents, Turkish culture is a way of living even though they have grown up in Britain and still live there. The question arises as to how someone holds onto the culture of the country of origin when they live in Britain and have been around British culture, and have never lived in the country of origin and do not know the culture of the country of origin well. Put simply, these young people culturalise ‘origin’ through what they have learnt from family and community. According to Vermuelen (2001), ‘culture as a way of life’ refers to the values and practices that someone learns in the socio-cultural context in which he/she grows up. The young people above are deeply influenced by their family and community in practicing Turkish culture, and it seems that practicing Turkish culture has become their way of living. They do not identify with multiple cultures, only with the country of origin (Dahinden, 2009). These young people use their transnational perspectives to strengthen their ethnic identification. Family is a crucial site for these young people in articulating ethnic identities as in the case of Caribbean and Italian migrants (Goulbourne et al., 2010). Their identification with the country of origin and its culture is strengthened by structural factors, such as family, community organisations and weekend language schools. They do not approach these identifications in a critical way and do not move between different cultures. Their socio-cultural environment in Britain, their family and homogenous ethnic community make them feel that they belong to just one culture (Kucukcan, 2004). This situation differs between people: while some young people hold onto their ethnic identities, others try to learn from both cultures. According to Ilkan,
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being raised in the UK makes him feel British:

I am very integrated with the culture in England. I describe myself as British as well, because I was born here. I have taken a lot of things from British culture. That is why I call myself British-Turkish (Ilkan, 23 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

Social relations and the ways of life in a country make young people identify themselves with the culture and identity of the country of settlement, because they become a part of the social life there. Ilkan identifies himself according to the place he was born and raised, and where he constructed his social life. In his social life, he incorporates different experiences with various identifications such as British and Turkish through transnational networks and practices. His social relations, cultural practices, and identifications are shaped by the transnational social arenas in which he grew up. Wessendorf presents similar findings about second generation Italians living in Switzerland (2007; 2010). Ilkan has never lived in the country of origin, and so embraces the social system and way of life in the country of settlement. This situation sometimes creates difficulties for young people in adapting to the way of life in the country of origin when they travel home:

In Turkey they look at you as someone from Europe. Even though my Turkish is not bad, you sometimes forget words, because you are nervous; it is a new place and you are not used to the system. That’s why. When you are in London, they look at you in the same way. Your English is for the most part poor because not much has been imparted to you (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

Ersin’s identification with Turkey is not as positive as his identification to London. He does not feel a strong attachment to Turkey, because he does not know Turkey and was not raised there. In his case, identification is not related to ethnic identity and origin; rather it is related to the place he constructs his social world. The process of adjustment to the receiving society becomes problematised. Kasinitz et al. (2002, 2004) state that the tension of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ status makes identification with the city of birth easier than the country of origin as illustrated by Fidan. She feels in between two cultures when she goes back to Turkey. In her case, ethnic identity has not been practiced in London and she finds difficulties in communicating in Kurdish:
When I go back to Turkey, I feel like I am in between cultures. My grandmother can speak Kurdish, I can understand but cannot speak properly and that was a problem for me. She tries to talk but I do not understand. In London, it is not a big problem, because at school I hang around with my Turkish friends. We go everywhere together, we speak Turkish, and I do not really feel that I am in between two cultures (Fidan, 18 years old, Kurdish, 06.01.08, café in Dalston).

In the case of Fidan, moving between Turkish and British culture is not a problem. However, not practicing and knowing Kurdish culture creates communication problems with relatives back in Turkey.

The main difference between the young people who feel that they only belong to Turkish or Kurdish culture and the ones who accept different cultural positions is found in their everyday social experiences and interactions with various cultural repertoires. It seems that the local environment, the influence of community organisations, and the family are important for the level of interaction of the young people with the country of origin. Basically, social relations play the crucial role in their identification. Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people who were born or raised in England and move between different cultures indicate that the allegiance to the country of origin is not obligatory but is based on choice. They practice more than one culture and move between different cultures, whilst some of them choose to hold onto the culture of the country of origin. When these people speak about Turkish or Kurdish culture, they refer to their families and communities. Their relation to the country of origin is vicarious. The outcomes of the popular discourse of being in ‘between two cultures’ therefore needs to be analysed in relation to the everyday experiences of young people.

Doing Identity?

This section explores how young people perceive their identity by looking at their views on ethnicity and culture, questioning what identity means to CKT youth, how they practice it in their everyday life and transform it through their everyday life experiences; how their transnational background is reflected in their perception of identity; how the dimensions of the self, social relations, and social structures influence identity negotiation among young people; what possibilities there are to negotiate ones’ identity; and what similarities and differences, if any, exist among the three groups of young people.
The identity of migrants is usually associated with ethnicity (Faist, 2000; Guarnizo et al., 2003; Pries 2001a; Vertovec, 2004). However, as we have seen, young people construct their ethnic identity through complex mixtures of experiences that are around them: for example, Turkish, Kurdish, British, Alevi, transnational, ‘Londoner’. As Bulmer and Solomos (1998: 826) state, ‘each of us lives with a variety of potentially contradictory identities’. These identities change depending on the place and living conditions. In this sense, ethnic identity can be transformed in relation to the everyday life experiences of young people. According to Anthias (2002), the question of ‘who are you?’ has been replaced by ‘what and how are you?’ In agreement with this, I contend that everyday social experiences transform the meaning of ethnicity in the case of CKT youth. According to Thai (2002: 57), experiences of ethnicity are related to a complex interplay between identity and culture, especially when migrants’ marginality is highlighted within the sending society. This situation might change depending on generational differences. Anil (2007) argues that third and fourth generation Turks are more likely to identify themselves as Turkish-Germans, not foreign, because Germans will not see them as foreigners but as natives born with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds. This might be different in the case of my respondents. First, the identification of CKT youth differs in response to their everyday experiences. Second, as seen in the previous section, the majority of respondents mentioned that they feel that they do not know either culture well. In order to understand how young people describe themselves in relation to their identity, I ask questions regarding what it means to be British or Turkish or Kurdish.

The majority of the participants find difficult to define their identity. Most of the young people define their identity in relation to their ethnic background, even if they do not know a lot about their ethnic background, as is especially the case with Kurdish young people. Some see identity as a more stable phenomenon with nationalist connotation. Others regard identity as fluid and cosmopolitan, defined as culture and language but influenced by the everyday experiences.

*Changing identity: a way of life and universal identification*
Alev states that ethnic identity comes from the family. In her account, identity is related to her experiences in both settings, London and the country of origin, although Britishness or Turkishness is not conceived as a coherent whole.

I am not really sure how you define yourself. Is it language or culture? I do not really know what forms my identity. I do not know. Is it my culture or living in the same place? I am not really sure about it. I also do not think that ethnic identification is important at all, because I do not want to be a part of a certain thing and a certain place. I can have lots of other things that form my identity. For instance, I do not feel a connection to an Iraqi or Iranian Kurd. Being born to a family who is Kurdish does not make you Kurdish. Identity is more related to language, education, interests, a way of life, and your preferences. I do not think ethnicity should be common for my preferences or the choices I make. It is not really important for me (Alev, 22 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

In the case of Alev, identity is conceived as ‘a way of life’ which refers to everyday practices in the socio-cultural context. She preferred to talk about her preferences, rather than describing herself with national or ethnic labels. Like Alev, Azra refers to her experiences rather than socio-cultural labels when she describes her identity. But unlike Alev, Azra is aware of the highly nationalist connotations the word ‘Turk’ carries:

I don’t really describe myself as a Turk but as someone from Turkey because as well as being a mixture (mother not from Turkey), I think that it sounds quite nationalist to say just Turk, rather than Turkish. To be from Turkey for me means having a different culture whereby people are closer to each other, for example being close to neighbours, whereas I don’t experience that here. In certain parts of Turkey neighbours share food and visit each other. It means having different foods, a different language, customs others may not understand: meaningful songs and dances; traditions. It also means different ways of going about life: e.g. doing things differently in a wedding ceremony in comparison to that of a Western country. I do not feel in between, I do not really know what British culture is (Azra, 18 years old, Turkish, 20.04.07, house of interviewee).
Azra references her experiences in Turkey when she identifies being Turkish. She enjoys the diversity in Turkey and compares certain cultural values of the country of origin and the receiving country. She negotiates her position in different ways, at times stressing transnational experiences and at others comparing of cultural reference points.

Similar to Alev and Azra, Tahsin also refers to his experiences, but he pays more attention to his connection to other cultures when talking about his identity:

> Personally, ethnic identity means nothing. It is just categorisation. I am anything. I would describe myself as confused. I was born in London, so my mother tongue would be English. Every year, for six weeks, I go to Cyprus, I have family there. I have no religion. It separates me from the culture in Cyprus maybe. In terms of culture, I am very much at ease with African culture. I have a bit of diverse culture at the moment (Tahsin, 19 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 21.09.07, University College London).

In his case ethnic identification is replaced with universal identification (Dahinden, 2009). Tahsin accepts different cultural elements from various references in his social environment. Interacting with various cultural references assists him in comparing these references and constructing an identity linked to his social world. Ersin also adopts a ‘universal identification’ but in a negative way as it seems to confuse him:

> I always say to myself that I am a citizen of the world, because I do not have a country, I do not belong anywhere. I was a citizen in Turkey, because of the social exclusion I had to come over here. It was not my choice; it was my parents’ choice at the time. But here there is socially same exclusion. I cannot say anything about my identity. Ethnic identity shows that you are where you come from, where you belong. At this point I do not belong anywhere (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

This quote underlines a universal element as an identity: being a ‘world citizen’ is similar in outcome to the phrase ‘not belonging anywhere’; however, it implies being comfortable in any socio-ethnic environment rather than not being comfortable in either the receiving or sending country.

More stable identity and nationalistic meaning
Others respondents define themselves as British-Turkish in relation to where they were born and where their parents come from. They adopt in this case a more nationalistic meaning in their definition of identity which could mean a rejection either of the country of origin or of the country where they live. In this case identity is envisaged as a more stable phenomenon.

Ayten identifies herself with reference to where she was born:

> For me I would describe myself as British, because I was born here. I tend to go by the values of Turkish culture. Turkishness is a community thing, related to background and values. It does not have a deep meaning (Ayten, 21 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 04.05.07, café in Soho).

In her account, being British makes more sense than being Turkish. According to her, practicing Turkishness is related to community and values that do not play a crucial role in her identification. As Lam and Smith state in the case of African and Caribbean adolescents in Britain, ‘where their dual British-ethnic membership is highlighted, if boys do not identify very strongly with the ethnic culture, Britishness offers an alternative concept for self-identification’ (2009: 1265). In the case of Ilkan and Ayten, the lack of identification with their ethnic identity brings British identity to front. In the case of Serkan, Britishness is seen as a strong reference to identification with the place of birth. Serkan also feels close to Britishness because he is familiar with the lifestyles and systems of Britain:

> I am British. My parents are Turkish. My background is Turkish. That makes me a Turk. Because, I was born in this country, I am British in some way. If I was born in Turkey, I would have lot things to say about Turkishness. But to me Turkishness in this country is just being a Turk. It is just a family thing. Food I eat at home. In my home, I eat Turkish food, chat with my family in Turkish. This is Turkishness. There is nothing I can add to it basically. If we come to Britishness, because I was born in this country, I have more things to say about Britishness. I think I am more British than Turkish. I was raised in this country. I kicked out to Turkey for five years. I lived there for my education. But it was really bad and I didn’t like it. I am so used to British culture. I was born here then I went to a primary school. Everything was English, chatting in English, eating your mash potatoes. I may say that they
Serkan believes that Turkishness comes from his family and is related to the food he eats at home and his communication with people in the country of origin. Identifying himself as British is related to his everyday life experiences, especially his experiences outside the home. He practices his ethnic identity through his family which does not have an important meaning for him. British birth (or socialisation from an early age) encourages young people to view themselves as British, which go against tendencies towards national and ethnic identification. Serkan sees himself as British but also as Turkish, drawing his ethnic identity primarily from his family, community organisations, and the ethnic enclaves in which he lives. Vickerman (2002) has similar findings in the case of second generation West Indians who perceive it to be a simple fact: they are British because they were born in Britain.

However in some cases identification to Britain can mean a rejection of the cultural values of the country of origin as highlighted by Anthias (1992) in the case of British Cypriots. Some of my respondents identifying with British culture and find it difficult to adapt Turkish culture when they go to Turkey:

I am a British citizen and I have been living here for many years. I get along fine; I would never be able to live in Turkey, because I am so used to the lifestyle here. I am glad I am not English although I speak the language very well. I can make friends and know a culture besides my own. The familiarity with British culture helps me improve my language skills and career prospects. My friends tell me about their culture, the fact that I live in England, I am also a part of this culture but it is not as strong as Turkish culture for me (Erkan, 23 years old, Turkish, 25.11.07, café in Hackney).

I am very integrated with the culture in England. I describe myself as British as well, because I was born here. I have taken a lot of things from British culture. That is why I call myself British-Turkish (Volkan, 21 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, café in Dalston).

I do identify with British culture, I speak the language, I live in their country, and I went to school here. I have been in their education system. I have grown up in a British milieu. I can grasp things I like in British as
well as in Turkish culture. I have my own values and beliefs. I live life according to what I believe to be right (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).

There seems to be a clear impulse towards straddling both cultures: adopting the British way of life in things such as higher education and in social interaction with other cultures in Britain but linking the sense of being Turkish or Kurdish to ethnic origin, family, and socialisation with Turkish or Kurdish people. Regardless of whether these young people see themselves as Turkish or Kurdish, it could be claimed that they do not understand the lifestyle in Turkey because they do not have direct ties to the country and never lived there. The respondents above define themselves regarding to everyday life experiences and identify themselves ‘beyond the ethnic lens’ (Glick Schiller et al., 2006). According to these respondents, identity is not related to any single dimension mentioned by Giddens (1991), but rather involves mobility and diversity through experience. For example, Dilek mentions that she can grasp British cultural references as well as Turkish ones, moves between these cultures and takes what she considers to be compatible to her individual values and beliefs.

Although my interviewees find it difficult to define their identity they all believe it is important to know one’s ethnic identity. Cagdas highlights however that it should not necessarily affect ones’ way of life:

I have mainly got Kurdish roots, Turkish passport and live in England. It is really hard to describe identity, especially for someone who migrated to England at the age of four. But, being Turkish probably means that some sort of Turkish background or Kurdish background. I speak the language, and that’s what generally it means. Also background brings lots of different cultures; way of life that’s what ethnicity generally is about. Ethnic identity is important in the sense that you understand someone’s background, someone’s history. But it has no bearing on how you live (Cagdas, 23 years old, Kurdish, 14.05.07, London School of Economics).

Cagdas values ethnic identity as a means of expression and communication but does not think it has a visible influence on him as being someone who was born and raised in Britain. He says that ‘for someone who lives in a place where there are lots of Kurdish dominated people, I am sure expressing themselves in Kurdish has much more value...
than me learning Kurdish in this country’. He puts himself in a different position to those who only socialise with the people from the same ethnic background. As a result of interacting with various cultures, he communicates and experiences different cultures in London and, as a result of this; his attachment to ethnic identity is weakened. In some cases, ethnic identity plays an important role in identification.

For others, such as Belgin, identity refers to their country of origin which could mean a rejection of Britishness.

Being Kurdish for me is how I would describe myself. It plays a major role in forming my identity, because I was born in Turkey and here as a foreigner, we have to hold on to our identity to get somewhere. We still value Kurdish culture and it affects our life here in Britain. I have grown up with values like traditional celebrations. It is important to always remember where you come from. I just value my ethnic identity, because it enriches my character, my everyday life, a way of life (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

Even though she has grown up in Britain, she does not consider herself British:

Although I am officially British and have a British passport, I do not actually ever consider myself British. I still feel like this is a foreign country (Belgin, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.10.07, house of interviewee).

Belgin highlights the fact that as a result of being ‘foreign’ in Britain, she holds on to her ethnic identity in her everyday life. It becomes a way of life for her and plays a crucial role in her identification. She uses the term ‘identity’ to distance herself from being British, a term which has significance for her, even though she is officially British. Like Belgin, Serpil also thinks that ethnic identity plays an important role in her life:

I am proud of being Turkish or Kurdish, when people ask me I say my ethnic identity without being embarrassed. It is definitely important for me. There is a lot of people can hide their background and say something else. For me I am fine, I do not see the point for embarrassing. At the end of the day it is who you are (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café in Dalston).
She identifies herself with her roots and background, and says she is ‘proud of her ethnic identity’. She identifies herself within a single culture associated with the country of origin. Practicing ethnic identity signifies representation and, in the case of Serpil, the representation of her ethnic background happens through her cultural practices:

I am personally proud where I come from and I try to represent my country as much as I can. I dance, I do drama and I go to Turkish school (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café in Dalston).

She chooses to represent the culture of the country of origin through traditional dance, drama and going to Turkish school. Like Serpil, Tezcan also has strong links to her identity on a national level:

We are Cypriot Turkish, we are all proud of it. Whenever someone asks, we show our moon and star big everyone to see. We go to Turkish school, we do Turkish folk dancing. We also go to walks, protects. We all stick to our culture (Tezcan, 18 years old, Cypriot Turkish, 10.10.07, Cyprus Turkish Association).

In the case of Tezcan, there is a nationalised sense of identity which separates her Cypriot Turkish identity from other national and ethnic categorisations. When she refers to her ethnic identity, she refers to ‘we’ to identify with a particular group, signified with national symbols and flag of the country. Even though she was born in the UK, she holds onto her ethnic identity strongly through her practices. She has a strong sense of belonging to particular group: when she talks about her identity, she only refers to a group identity rather than her individual personality. Many of the young people state that they are exposed to Turkish or Kurdish culture in their families, friends, and community organisations. As also highlighted by Goulbourne (2002), community, the place or residence, and family background all affect the identity formation of young people.

I am exposed to Turkish culture through my family and Turkish community in London; this is my direct experience of Turkish culture (Gurkan, 19 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

I experience Turkish culture in my family life. There are lots of Turkish,
Kurdish and Cypriot people in Enfield where I live. I experience Turkish culture in my home than anywhere else (Tülay, 20 years old, Kurdish, 14.09.07, café in Dalston).

I learnt from my parents about my culture. I taught the way of my culture, when I am at Turkish school, we show our customs like Kina Gecesi (Serpil, 18 years old, Kurdish, 25.11.07, café in Dalston).

My parents show me and tell me which route to follow, what our culture is, where actually it comes from. We try our best to continue with our culture as a new generation (Sertan, 18 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

Many respondents stated that they like to practice the culture of the country of origin and feel that they belong to that particular culture. Dilek, Ersin, and Taner mention the importance of community organisations and their local neighbourhood in practicing the culture of the country of origin. As also highlighted by Kucukcan (1999, 2004) Turkish young people are highly influenced by family and community in practicing the cultural values and traditions of the country of origin. Young people practice the culture of the country of origin through family and community organisations in London.6

The culture for me is not the main thing. I am not very strict. Turkish, Kurdish people are more close people with our community, family; we are more into our foods. We have got boundaries; we have to act and behave in certain way, respecting our older, loving our younger. We have got certain qualities that make us Turkish or Kurdish. We have got values and traditions. Growing up in London since age of four, through attending community organisation, I experienced it. I had saz lessons for five years. I experienced it through dance; I did folk dancing form ages of 8 to 15. I am linked with music, dance and know how to cook traditional food. I kind of prefer it as well (Dilek, 23 years old, Kurdish, 07.05.07, café in Dalston).

When you come to the organisation they tell us things about Kurdish culture, events. Every year we go to camping. Since 1994, I came to this organisation, they give us leaflets. They talk to us in English, Turkish or Kurdish (Taner, 19 years old, Kurdish, 21.09.07, Gik-Der).

Even though they were born or raised in Britain, they are still attached to the cultural values of the country of origin through attending community organisations, and

---

6 see chapters 4 and 5
spending time with their families and within the ethnic enclave. Through community organisations and language schools, young people learn about Turkish and Kurdish culture and engage with traditions and lifestyles. They are the main aspects which strengthen their ethnic identity and help them to construct strong ties with the culture of their parents’ country and the local community. In this sense, they rarely interact to British culture in their everyday life:

I do not have any relationship with British culture. I never had any English friend. I tried my best to have but it is quite difficult in North London, because there is not any....You are basically invisible. Everywhere we experience Turkish culture because we stuck in North London, Turks, Kurds and Cypriot Turks. I get up in the morning I talk to the guy next door is Turkish, towards to bus stop there is a Turkish off licence, I say the guy ‘hi’ in Turkish not in English because I know he is Turkish. Everyone around is Turkish. We cannot see other cultures. It is quite difficult to see other cultures (Ersin, 18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der).

In the case of the respondents above, structural factors have an influence on the way young people perceive their identities. These young people prefer to hold onto their background, including its culture and way of life. Even though they live away from the country of origin, they learn and practice its culture through community organisations and family. They are more involved in the collective situation. Despite the fact that the respondents are British citizens, they do not identify themselves as British. They tended to define their identity through their ethnic background, although they interact with British culture. Living in England and having English friends also familiarises them with British culture. Many respondents stated that they did not feel British because thinking of oneself as Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish is something they have done all their lives.

Ilkan highlights that being Turkish has a deeper meaning because it is his parents’ background. However, he chooses to present himself as British-Turkish which is a mixture of British and migrant positioning, because he was born in the UK and feels integrated into British culture.

I describe myself as British-Turkish. That’s the simplest label I can point. I describe myself as Turkish, because my family is from Turkey. I am very integrated with the culture. I also describe myself as British, because I was...
born here. I have also taken British culture as well. That’s why I call myself British-Turkish. I can never ever say I am hundred percent British and I can also never say I am hundred percent Turkish. What I can say is I am standing in the middle ground which is affected by sociological factors of both Turkey and Britain. So, I am somewhere in between there and I produce Turkish-British identification. Being British for me is basically sharing, having a piece of their cultural influences. Being Turkish goes a little bit deeper for me. My parents are Turkish, my background. We have language, religion, moral values. It is a combination of all of those. Being Turkish is although I am here, still affecting by sociological system there (Ilkan, 23 years old, Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston).

In any case, when they adopt a nationalistic reference, one of the ethnic identities seem to be more important than the other even when they describe themselves as British – Turkish, Cypriot or Kurdish. Whilst when they define identity in relation to their everyday life, they adopt a wider and changing identification which contrasts Waters’ notion of ‘contrasting identities’ (1996). Waters (1996) uses it to highlight the identity positioning of black Americans who stress mainly one identity position, but do not actively distance themselves from the other identity position: for instance, a young person thinks of himself/herself in terms of American categories but he/she also accepts ethnic identification. Whilst the notion of ‘contrasting identities’ stresses the need for choosing one of the two identities, the one of transnational social space allow to think identity as the product of the multiple and diverse experiences of young people highlighting the multiple meaning of identities. As I have highlighted family, local community, local environment, community organisations, and social networks in general are crucial influence in the definition of identity among CKT youth. These aspects blur ethnic identification but at the same time assist young people in comparing different cultures. It seems that ethnic identity is not at the centre of their definitions of identity: even though some young people believe that ethnic identification is crucial, they appreciate the fact that they are British by birth. The notion of transnational social space helps to consider different cultural elements into a single social space and by so doing emphasises that identity is formed through an individual and subjective interpretation of everyday experiences or in Faist’s terms (2000: 37) ‘self-feeding processes’ instead of a limited number of influences.

This section has shown some differences among my interviewees. On the one hand, there are some CKT youth who move across various cultures and do not identify with
bounded cultures and ethnicity. On the other hand, some CKT youth describe themselves according to ethnicity and culture, are influenced by family, community organisations, and their ethnic enclave. But in both cases, identity perceptions of young people are formed by their lived experiences. In this sense, they are ‘doing their identity’ because they negotiate it in their everyday life which is shaped by them more than being passively received. As a result of interacting with more than one culture, these young people identify themselves in relation to transnational experiences. In the next section, I focus on the concept of identity and its relation to transnational social space in the case of CKT youth.

Identity and Transnational Social Space: Competing or Complementary?

In a transnational context, identity is analysed in relation to the influences of more than one state and it creates an understanding beyond national approaches. In other words, transnational identities are fluid and flexible, and emphasises interconnectedness across borders (Fakhri et al., 2003). As stated by several scholars the notion of transnational identities allows us to think beyond ‘territorially bounded notions of nation, culture and ethnicity’ (Song, 2003: 115).

For Vertovec, ‘transnationalism and identity are concepts that inherently call for juxtaposition’ (2001: 573). He explains this juxtaposition by arguing that ‘on the one hand, many peoples’ transnational networks are grounded upon the perception that they share some form of common identity….on the other hand, among certain sets of contemporary migrants, the identities of specific individuals and groups of people are negotiated within social worlds that span more than one place’ (2001: 573).

In other words, for Vertovec, transnationalism and identity share similar meanings because first the identity of migrants is based on the shared identity of living in a transnational context and second their identities are negotiated within a transnational context. In Vertovec’s (2001) analysis, transnational categorisation includes people both with and without a migratory background. This raises the question whether we are all transnational (Dahinden, 2009), echoing to Hall’s statement that ‘we are all migrants now’ (1989). As argued by Dahinden (2009: 1382) ‘everybody is nowadays to some degree transnational, but there are different transnationalisms, such as weak, medium and strong network transnationalisms related to varying social positioning of in globalised world’. In this sense transnational experiences are part of everyone’s
experience nowadays at different level. This transnational influence increases the changing characteristic of our identity.

The notion of transnational social space describes the wider picture of everyday life experiences for young people – going to school, living with parents, neighbourhoods, media consumption, community relations, etc. – which bring various cultural positions into one social space. It emphasises the interplay between transnational structures and social relations and their dynamic and changing meaning. The concept of transnational social space does neither explain the specific conditions which cause changes nor the diverse positions of young people.

The same is true for the concept of identity which cannot grasp the diverse positions of CKT youth that have expanded so much (Anthias, 2002). Therefore, the positioning of CKT young people can neither be analysed by the concept of identity, nor by transnational social space. Rather, we must focus on the transnational experiences of CKT youth which take into account an individual’s positioning as an outcome of their everyday experiences.

**Conclusion**

I have shown that the identity positioning of CKT youth is shaped by their everyday life experiences. When asked to describe their identity positioning, some young people referred to their ethnic background and culture, while others said they could move from one culture to another smoothly and found this process enriching. The closer the interaction of young people with the receiving society, the more they tended to distinguish themselves from their families and communities. All interviewees spoke about their identification with reference to their everyday experiences.

My interviews suggest that a significant number of young people hold on to their Kurdish and Turkish identity because of the influence of family and community. As in the case of Ekim and Tulay, family and community play a crucial role in the formation of ethnic identity. Once young people move from the local environment and interact more with other cultures, they negotiate their identity positioning more. As argued by Song, (2003: 106) ‘many people manifest their awareness of choices when they experience shifts in their ethnic identities over time, or when they change or adjust their
behaviours and practices in specific social situations, with different groups of people’. Similarly, I found examples of young people who integrated into the receiving society whilst also staying connected to the country of origin. Alev learnt about other cultures when she started university and made friends from different ethnic backgrounds. She moves between different cultural repertoires and negotiates her identity positioning. Nevzat, Azra and Cagdas share the same experience of moving between different social spaces in a process of negotiating and forging their identity. The common theme among these young people is the inability to adapt to the country of origin when they visit Turkey or Cyprus. Most participants feel like outsiders within Turkish society and find it difficult to adapt to the way of life in the country of origin.

Most participants also admit that they do not fully adapt to both cultures but they have some knowledge about both cultures. Many are constantly moving from different cultural spaces, negotiating their positioning by bringing all cultural elements into a single social space and creating their own identity in the process. Ersin and Tahsin opt for universal identification, seeing themselves as ‘world citizen’. Both found it difficult to describe their identity because they do not feel as though they belong to any particular culture or place. They have multiple influences around them, which give them ideas about their background. They state that their perceptions about their identity positioning are transformed through their everyday life experiences. Alev and Cagdas pointed out that how you live your life does not always match with your ethnic and national identity. It has been demonstrated that the choices young people make, their ways of life, and their cultural and social preferences say more about their positioning within society. Either they feel bound to ethnicity or culture, or they move between various positions: these identifications are made in relation to their everyday experiences which are diverse according to the level of transnationalism they practice. There are different identifications as a result of different interpretations of the everyday experience of migrants (Itzigsohn et al., 2005). Therefore, we are all transnational on different levels depending on the everyday experiences of the self.

Although this study originally applied the concepts of identity and transnational social space, it has been shown that they are insufficient in analysing the positioning of CKT youth within society. Experience, as the product of young people’s interactions with various cultural and social repertoires, seems to be a more useful notion in order to understand CKT youth changing and negotiated identification in a transnational context.
Conclusion

In this research, I have been exploring the everyday life experiences of CKT youth by linking it with the concept of transnationalism and focusing on the everyday activities of CKT youth in the sending and receiving societies. More specifically, throughout this research, I have explained the experiences of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people and analysed how their everyday life experiences change their way of understanding concepts such as identity, culture, and social positioning. In order to study the identity formation of young people within a transnational social space, the research focused on the relationship with both sending and receiving societies. This relationship included social networks, engagement with the culture, and media resources.

As shown by several scholars (Faist, 1999; 2000; Glick Schiller et al., 1995; Glick Schiller and Fouron, 1998; Levitt; 2001a, 2001b; Portes et al., 1999; Vertovec, 1999a), the links with the country of origin become a part of the daily routine of migrants. Questions such as ‘what happens after migration?’; ‘what do migrants carry with them to the new settlement?’; ‘how do migrants deal with their different backgrounds?’; ‘what do they feel and think about their experiences in both societies?’; and, ‘why do they still continue to build connections with the country of origin long after their migration?’, are intriguing to scholars, policy makers and migrants themselves. The concept of transnationalism became a prominent tool in understanding what happens after migration. Although transnationalism is not a new phenomenon, it has been facilitated by globalization (Cohen, 1996; Guarnizo and Smith, 1998; Levitt, 2001a; Portes et al., 1999a; Tollolyan, 1991; Vertovec, 1999a; Yang, 2000). It contributes, therefore, to research into studying how new technologies have enhanced transnationalism among migrants. Subsequently, transnational networks have been seen to fit into the everyday life of migrants. Within the literature on transnationalism, the influences of both sending and receiving countries are dominant frameworks for understanding migrants’ identities, cultures, and social positions.

This research aimed to explore the identity formation of CKT youth and analyse the determinants of identity and the construction of transnational social spaces. It has answered the question of how the identity formation of CKT youth is formed and
negotiated in their everyday life and what the role of transnational social spaces are in the process of identity formation. The thesis argues that CKT youth negotiate their identity formation in relation to the society they live and with the country of origin through their everyday life experiences. By focusing on the perceptions and thoughts of young people about their lives and relationships within the receiving society, the country of origin, and the wider culture, this research explored their links with the sending and receiving societies. This study contributes to the literature of transnationalism by focusing on the experiences of CKT youths in various social spaces, such as London, local neighbourhoods, and the country of origin, whereas most research carried out on transnationalism has focused solely on the links with the country of origin (Caglar, 2001; 2007; Faist, 1999; 2000; Portes et al., 1999a; Vertovec, 2001a). This led me to reconsider the concept of transnational social spaces in explaining the cross border experiences of CKT youth in both the receiving and sending societies. I used the concept of transnational social spaces throughout this research because it has been central to the analysis of transnational relations and focuses on the cultural, social, political and economic processes of migration. I have analysed the transnational relations of CKT youth throughout my empirical work and found out that their transnational relations and their methods of practicing transnationalism are mostly based on the receiving society, as they have limited relation to the country of origin. They also have diverse relationships with the receiving society, sending society, and cultures surrounding them which are not always included in the same social space.

In analysing the everyday experiences of CKT youth, I also choose to use the concept of identity, because it was clearer in addressing certain issues, such as belonging, culture, and in questioning the ongoing function of the term. While some researchers (Aksoy and Robins, 2001; Anthias, 2002) resist using the concept of identity, others (Bauman, 2004; Giddens, 1994) still use the concept but attribute different meanings to it. In this research, identity is conceived as the experiences produced during dialectical relations between the self, social relationships, and institutions in modern society.

In researching identifications of CKT youth, the research focused on three dimensions: the self, social relations, and structural dimensions. Throughout the research, the identity formation of young people has been explored in relation to social relations such as interactions with parents and peers, as well as structural dimensions such as family, community organisations, media, and the influence of school. My empirical data shows
that the concept of ‘identity’ fails to include the complex, mobile, diverse and transformative positioning of CKT youth because the concept does not offer a wide enough theoretical framework. Identity, at once refers to a highly fundamental context and, at the same time, has been expanded to such an extent that it is useless in specific analysis (see Anthias, 2002).

The empirical work has raised some questions about the concepts of transnationalism and transnational social space. It has been observed that the theoretical literature on transnationalism does not offer a grounded understanding of the experiences of CKT youth, because it does not take into account the social inclusion of young people when analysing transnational relations (for instance, see Haller and Landolt, 2005; Levitt, 2001; Levitt and Waters, 2002; Morawska, 2003; Smith, 2002; Vickerman, 2002). As stated in the theoretical framework, the concept does not have a grounded meaning (Al-Ali and Koser, 2002; Portes et al., 1999a; Smith, 2002). By looking at the experiences of a specific group, the second generation, in the context of transnational social spaces, my analysis focused on the social and cultural aspects of the receiving and sending societies, rather than the economic and political aspects. In this research, the concept of transnational social space is analysed in the light of the social inclusion of CKT youth because their experiences and lifestyles are based on the city in which they live. For instance, as seen in Chapter 8, the majority of CKT youth would prefer to live in London because they are comfortable with the lifestyle and have an established social network.

The next section of the conclusion will examine the observations made about transnational social space and identity. First, I will discuss my main findings in relation to the context of identity and transnational social space, and the contributions of the thesis to the literature on transnationalism and second generation migrants. Secondly, I will discuss the challenges I faced and the limitations of this research. Finally, I will address the future directions that research in this area can take.

**Importance of Everyday Life Experience**

The ways in which CKT youth perceive themselves in society are constructed through their everyday life experiences which recognise the participation of the self in the public discourse (Giddens, 1994). By focusing on ‘experience’, this research gives importance to the interaction of the self with the social world. As Aksoy and Robins (2003: 373)
state, ‘experience starts from what people ‘live through’, from the multiplicity of their implications in, and engagements and interactions with, the social world. At its most basic, it is concerned with the texture and the movement of living and of (actual) lives that are lived’. Taking this perspective led me to explore how CKT youth negotiate their relationship with British culture, Turkish-Kurdish culture, and the wider community through their everyday life experiences. The following is an example of how one Kurdish youth sees her relationship to British culture compared with her friend. It is notable that the importance of everyday life experiences is stressed in her comparison:

I compare myself with a friend who stayed in the same environment and do not have much of an experience with British culture. It was quite strange that my friend did not know Tate Modern; she lives in London but does not know what it has to offer. She seems more concerned about her family; she wants to get married and is just 19… We did not have much to talk about. We do not have similar interests…We became quite different’ (see Chapter 8, page 169).

This quotation clearly shows that these young people interact with the social world in different ways and the difference is related to their everyday experiences. They have different ideas, thoughts and perceptions about their social relations, cultures, and the institutions that surround them. Their experiences formulate the ways they live. On this basis, this thesis has argued that the everyday life experiences of CKT youth offer dynamic, mobile, and fluid positioning which is part of the process of moving beyond being considered ‘migrant children’.

As seen in earlier chapters some scholars study the identity formation of second generation migrants primarily in relation to their ethnic identity (Anwar, 1998; Bhabha, 1990; Kaya, 2002). They argue that second generation migrants are in ‘between two cultures’ (Anwar, 1998) and/or experience hybridity as the ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1990; Kaya, 2002). By defining second generation migrants as being ‘between two cultures’ or in a ‘third space’ these scholars force young people into categories of identity. Unlike these scholars, this research explored the identity formation of young people through ‘everyday life experiences’, taking into account the diverse positioning of individuals in understanding the broader social relations that are constituted in the process. This includes the thoughts and perceptions individuals make about their position in society and their views of where and to what they belong. The everyday experiences of young
people include social relations and their participation in institutions because these reflect social positioning and, thus, gives more concrete results in analysing the positions of young people. In doing so, the thesis has analysed the relationships between self, social relations, and social structures (Giddens, 1991) in the context of transnational social space that includes experiences in both sending and receiving societies.

I have argued that neither the concept of ‘identity’ nor ‘transnational social space’ is sufficient for explaining the position of CKT youth in society. I found that CKT youth do not consider themselves as belonging to fixed categorizations. Their thoughts about identity and belonging have changed in relation to their everyday life experiences. Transnational social space, therefore, does not represent individual experiences because it offers a general understanding of migrants’ practices and mainly focuses on groups rather than individuals. As empirical data has shown, CKT young people refer to their everyday experiences when talking about their social relations and relationships with the institutions. Therefore, transnational social space should be seen as a space which includes the practices and experiences of individuals.

**Reflecting ‘Self’ in the Social Structure and Social Relations**

The identifications of CKT youth are constructed through their social relations and institutions, such as family, community organisations, transnational media or school. As shown, young people are dependent on their family and community in order to strengthen their ties and in learning the language and culture of the country of origin (Craig *et al.*, 1988; Eckstein, 2002; Kucukcan, 2004; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Reynolds, 2006). To a certain extent, families strengthen the ethnic and national consciousness of CKT youth. However, as we have seen in Chapter 4, the extent of this strengthening is dependent on how young people practice it in their everyday lives. On the one hand, families fear that their children will move away from the culture of the country of origin and so work at transmitting cultural values to them. On the other, families want their children to integrate into the receiving society in order to have a better lifecycle. This creates a conflict between the first and second generations (Goulbourne *et al.*, 2010; Lopez and Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Stepick *et al.*, 2001). As seen in Chapter 4, CKT young people perceive the conflict with their parents as an outcome of cultural discrepancies, socialising in different countries, and being attached to the country of origin less than their parents. They develop a position of plurality within the society,
practicing the culture of the country of origin at home by eating Turkish food, watching Turkish television, attending community organisations and by practicing the culture of the receiving society outside home with their peers. As Serkan, a 21 year old Turkish youth, says ‘in my home, I eat Turkish food, chat with my family in Turkish. Outside home, everything was English, chatting in English, eating your mash potatoes’ (Turkish, 30.11.07, cafe in Dalston). The majority of CKT youth emphasize that they have developed their social life in the society in which they live and get used to the lifestyle in the receiving country. Their transnational links are not as strong as their parents’ and are shaped by parentally organised visits to the country of origin, practicing the culture of the country of origin, and constructing social networks with relatives in the country of origin. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, even though families impose the culture of the country of origin and ethnic identity on CKT youths, young people give different meaning to their transnational links. Their social networks with relatives in the country of origin have an interpersonal and emotional meaning and do not mean there is a shared mentality in sustaining social networks. This is illustrated by the fact they choose whom to build social networks with and do not simply construct transnational ties on the basis of kinship. Different to their families CKT youth have constructed social networks with their relatives in the country of origin and other destinations which are based on interpersonal and emotional relations rather than collective links and identity. In this way, the ways of practicing transnationalism differs from their families.

As seen in Chapter 5, community organisations established by CKT migrants also have a significant influence on the positioning of young people in society, as they raise consciousness of national and cultural identity. Community organisations generally offer language and history courses, as well as cultural activities which promote the culture of the country of origin (Goulbourne et al., 2010; Kaya, 2001; Kibria, 1997; Kucukcan, 1999; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Thomson et al., 2008). In this way, they work to cultivate among CKT youth a sense of belonging to the culture of the country of origin. This lack of openness in community organisations creates tensions with CKT youth. My findings suggest that, first of all, CKT youth do not choose to participate in community organisations out of personal choice, and instead are in attendance because of family pressure. Second, young people often criticise the function of these community organisations because they do not match with the everyday life experiences, expectations, and perceptions of CKT youth. Young people incorporate different cultural practices and socialise with various cultural repertoires in their everyday life,
while community organisations tend to create barriers for young people in engaging with repertoires beyond the culture of the country of origin. In Chapter 5, I have shown that CKT youth negotiate their positioning in relation to community organisations and take decision on what to accept or not. In this way, community organisations function as spaces where young people can negotiate, and either select or reject aspects of the culture of the country of origin. The majority of respondents said that community organisations play an important role in constructing social ties with people from the same ethnic origin and circulating cultural identity and community feeling. While reaffirming their ethnic identities through attending community organisations and family influences, young people are also able to practice different cultural repertoires which allow them to create identification across national borders. As a result of these diverse experiences, CKT youth negotiate their relation with the community organisations in choosing which activities to participate in, or even changing organisation or stopping altogether if the organisation does not correspond to their view. As Ersin stated: ‘I used to go to Gik-Der, but I realized their values and beliefs are not mine.... Once I started questioning myself about identity, I decided to quit Gik-Der’ (18 years old, Kurdish, 23.09.07, Gik-Der). Therefore, as signified in Chapter 5, community organisations play a major role in connecting young people with the culture of the country of origin and in doing so indirectly promote transnational social spaces, but CKT youth do not accept everything community organisations provide.

Another illustration of CKT young people’s ability to negotiate their social position is found in their peer group formation. Although most young people appreciate the diversity offered by a city like London, they tend to construct a homogenised environment at school. As seen in Chapter 6, secondary school experiences of CKT youth demonstrate that they prefer to form groups with peers from the same ethnic origin in order to deal with discrimination they face at school or the feeling of being an outsider7. In a provocative way, these results even suggest that the diversity of the school environment in London leads to less formation of transnational social space among CKT youth as they tend to create homogenised peer-groups on the basis of ethnicity. This attitude tends to occur when CKT youth have experienced some discrimination when they are in secondary school. Such homogenisation decreases and even disappears as young people develop to university or adulthood. As signified in Chapter 6, at the secondary school level, on the one hand, CKT youths seem to face

7 see chapter 6
difficulty in knowing how to benefit from diversity and this limits their ability to create transnational social spaces in the long term, but offers some advantages in terms of social inclusion. On the other hand, being bilingual offers the ability to move between two spaces and participate in transnational social spaces.

In contrast with CKT behaviour at school, young people tend to seek transnational experiences in their media consumption. As demonstrated in Chapter 7, they tend to watch both British and Turkish/Kurdish television although most of them prefer to watch television from the host country\(^8\). Most of my respondents claim that engaging with transnational media does not strengthen their national and cultural identity; instead it helps them to shift from national to transnational settings. CKT youth construct their own concepts of identity within the global, the local, and the native through their media experiences, and move between these identity possibilities. CKT young people exercise critical judgement in selecting and differentiating between the transnational media available; what they choose to watch tends to conform to their everyday lives and personal preferences. Their transnational media experiences construct diverse and mixed identity possibilities.

Throughout my research, I have highlighted the fact that social relations play an important role in the everyday life of CKT youth with people in the receiving society as well as with relatives in the country of origin. The thesis has analysed the relationship of young people with family, relatives in the country of origin, community, and friends in both societies. As argued in Chapter 8, social relations have a crucial role in their definition of ‘home’, as Massey (1992) points out. Many respondents do not see themselves as belonging to either place and ‘home’ is where they have their social relations. However, defining home is not related to issues of identity or to a particular place, but to the community.

Their social relations are mainly based in London, but young people also build social networks with relatives in the country of origin in a selective way. They mainly contact relatives in the country of origin with whom they have emotional attachment. The social relationship between CKT youth and people in the country of origin is based on interpersonal relations and emotions, rather than maintaining and strengthening cultural and national attachments (Carling, 2008; Goulbourne et al., 2010). These results suggest

---

\(^8\) see chapter 7
that CKT youth participate in a transnational social space on an individual level which confirms Kibria (2002) and Vickerman’s (2002) assertions. Their transnational relations are highly individualised as the majority of CKT young people said that their individual experiences help to construct their relationships within the places where they interact. For instance, as in terms of defining ‘home’, young people take into account where there social relations are based and where they grew up\(^9\). These findings also highlight the diversity of transnational experiences: whilst CKT youth engage in transnational practices regarding their use of media for instance, most of my interviewees tend to prefer contacts with peers with a same background at school, as if school environment offered them already enough transnational experiences. Finally, the context of transnationalism in the case of young people has offered a different perspective to previous theoretical works. Young people who were born or socialised from an early age in the receiving society do not have direct relationships with the country of origin and its culture. It has been shown that they learn many things related to the country of origin from their family, community, and relatives. For instance, Tahsin, 19 years old Cypriot Turkish, states that his father updates him about the political, cultural, and social agenda of Cyprus. Young people learn about the country of origin and its culture first from their families\(^10\), as they do not have a historical past there or any memories of the country of origin. Because their relation to the country of origin is not based on national and cultural attachments, consequently they do not feel part of the collective category of the country of origin. Their everyday life experiences across the borders of nation-states constructs the ways CKT youth position themselves with reference to Turkish- Kurdish and British culture. My research shows that the positioning of CKT youth differs in relation to their experiences, and the majority of them do not define themselves in relation to any single dimension of identity positioning, such as being ‘Turkish’ or ‘British’. As argued in Chapter 9, many participants are constantly moving across different cultural spaces, creating their own identity in the process. Their perceptions about their identity positioning are transformed through their everyday life experiences. As a result of experiencing Turkish- Kurdish and British culture in everyday life, these young people construct transnational experiences which include everyday experiences across the borders. In the next section, I will explain the term ‘transnational experience’.

\(^9\) see chapter 8
\(^10\) see chapter 4
Transnational Experiences

After exploring how the role of institutions and social relations are dependent on understanding young people’s positioning in society, the aim of the thesis was to explore how CKT youth describe themselves in society. First of all, I argued that CKT youth have diverse identifications, such as British, Turkish-British, Turkish, Kurdish, Cypriot Turkish, transnational, Londoner, etc., which depend on their everyday life experiences. Defining them is problematical within the borders of a particular national, cultural, or ethnic identity. The findings suggest that CKT young people have spoken about their identification with regards to their everyday experiences. They did not know what their identity consisted of or what the term referred to. They also made it clear that ‘culture’, belonging, and the means by which they identify themselves is transformative depending on their experiences.\(^\text{11}\) Therefore, the category of ‘identity’ has limitations; it does not capture the transformation of individual positionings. In this sense, the issue of identity is not enough in explaining the diverse social positioning of CKT youth. It has been shown that CKT youth do not have a clear idea about what identity is or what it pertains to, therefore, it is difficult for them to position themselves in a frame of identity. When asked to discuss identity, the young people chose to talk about their experiences in everyday life. Therefore, this research has shown that the concept of identity does not offer a theoretical ground in order to explore the positioning of CKT youth within society. Rather, social relations, individual perspectives and everyday life experiences are crucial for CKT youth in order to position themselves within society. Social relations are significant in their everyday lives for example, in their relationship with family, relatives in the country of origin, community and friends in both societies, and also in defining ‘home’. Their individual perspectives are also important regarding to their position within society, mainly in their relations with structural factors, such as transnational media, school, community organisations and family. Their identifications therefore are made in relation to their everyday life experiences as seen empirical chapters.

At the beginning of this research I assumed that the construction of transnational social space offered a basis with which we might understand the various transformative social positionings of young people. However, as the research progressed I realised that the concept of transnational social space did not adequately describe social positioning

\(^{11}\) see chapter 9
because it is impossible to define something which is acceptable in all places and at all times. The concept of transnational social space is not clearly defined enough to be a useful gauge for establishing social positioning. I have shown that CKT youth position themselves in society in relation to their transnational experiences. Their experiences are diverse and transformative, formed with regard to their interaction with various social and structural aspects surrounding them. In this way, social positioning is constructed throughout a transformative process in relation to time and space. The choices young people make in terms of their ways of life, the sorts of interactions they have, and their social and cultural preferences frame their positioning within society. In this way, my analysis takes into account how the second generation thinks, rather than how they belong.

Second generation migrants position themselves in three different locales: the society in which they live, the country of origin, and the migrant community in London. Their everyday life experiences are constituted by interacting with these aspects. However, it has been demonstrated that they do not fix their positioning in any particular space, time, or place. Their positions with regards to these locales are in a process of transformation based on a dialectic relationship which is open to interpretation, reflection and comparison. For example, the majority of CKT youth said that their attitude to London had changed since realising what London has to offer them outside their ethnic enclave. Their thoughts about the city have changed through everyday experiences. In this way, their positioning with these locales is transformative regarding everyday experiences.

As can be seen in the data, CKT youth did not refer to their positioning in terms of being a member of a social group. By referring to everyday experiences they speak on an individual level. The self is analysed as an individual rather than as a member of an ethnic group. In this case, it has been difficult to see significant differences between Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish young people even though these communities have created distinct social spaces for political and historical reasons.

Because young people speak as individuals rather than as a group, I was led to consider the meaning of transnationalism as well as transnational social space. On the one hand, some studies have shown that transnationalism is about strengthening ties with the country of origin (Cohen, 1996; Guarnizo and Smith, 1998; Kastoryano, 1999; Portes et
al., 1999a; Tollolyan, 1991; Vertovec, 1999a). On the other, it has argued that transnationalism occurs only on the condition of being ‘integrated’ in the receiving society and the country of origin at the same time (Glick Schiller and Fouron, 1999; Levitt, 2001a; Wimmer and Glick Schiller, 2002). With specific reference to the second generation, transnationalism has been considered as a process which suggests that young people live their lives according to both settings (Caglar, 2001; Eckstein, 2002; Foner, 2002; Glick Schiller et al., 1994; Golbert, 2001; Kibria, 2002; Lam, 2004; Levitt, 2002; 2009; Vickerman, 2002). In fact, it can be argued that transnationalism includes all people – migrants and non-migrants. My findings also suggest that every CKT young person was involved in transnational activities regardless of their bond to a particular culture or ethnicity. Therefore, who is exactly involved in transnational practices is not altogether clear. The next section will consider who this concept involves and whether we all have transnational experiences.

Is Transnationalism Universal in the Global Era?

As seen in Chapter 1, there are no universally understood or accepted definitions of transnationalism. Some studies have shown that not all migrants are involved in transnational practices (Dahinden, 2005; Guarnizo et al., 2003; Levitt et al. 2003; Van Hear, 1998). According to Carling (2008: 1456), ‘the boundaries between migrants and non-migrants engage in transnational practices or not are not so blurred.’ Their relations are at a societal level, for example, being a migrant worker and an entrepreneur. The ‘experience of living abroad’ becomes a key element in distinguishing migrants and non-migrants. Therefore, the experience of mobility and the sort of experiences people have in the processes of movement could be called ‘transnational experiences’. Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002: 326) state that ‘transnational life of migrants constantly on move is now the prototype of the human condition’. However, this mobility occurs to a different extend in relation to the ways people position themselves in the globalised world. For example, some people incorporate only a single culture while others are able to live with many different cultures together (Dahinden, 2009). Therefore, everybody engages in transnational practices and everybody is transnational on certain levels; however, there are different levels of transnationalism. For instance, the more integrated migrants are, the less network transnationalism is observed (Dahinden, 2009: 1376), such as with second generation migrants and high-skilled migrants. Besides, transnationalism is always inscribed in a ‘national’ modus operandi.
This national modus operandi does not mean a territorially defined boundary; rather, it means any experience within that space is determined by certain social and structural relationships both stable and changing. For instance, migrants sometimes embrace ‘long distance nationalism’ (Glick Schiller and Fouron, 2001; 2001a) when it comes to membership and identification (Dahinden, 2009). According to Dahinden (2009) membership and identification refer to ethnic categories and nation-states; nation needs to be taken into account when researching transnationalism because it influences the level of transnational practices among migrants.

Transnationalism helps to provide a rich methodological background when used in analysing the ties between CKT youth and the country of origin and the reflection of this in their lives in London. However, it does not offer a grounded meaning which captures the diverse experiences of CKT youth. Throughout this research, it has been shown that CKT youth experience different levels of transnationalism: for example, while some young people construct strong ties to the country of origin, others are more attached to the receiving society. Their everyday life experiences articulate their positioning with reference to different cultures.

**Research Innovations and Challenges**

The ‘here’ and ‘there’ situation, in the case of second generation migrants and their experiences, are mainly analysed in relation to ‘culture conflict’ (Ballard, 1979; Ballard, 1994), being ‘between two cultures’ (Anwar, 1998; Watson, 1977), and hybridity as the ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1990; Featherstone, 1994; Hall, 1990; Gilroy, 1987; Kaya, 2002). In the work by these researchers, these scholars analyse their practice in determining categories of identity. Unlike these works, my research explores CKT youth practices through their everyday life experiences and pays more attention to the positioning of CKT youth within and between societies as ‘individual’ beings, questioning how the identity formation of CKT youth is negotiated in their everyday life.

Throughout this research I have encountered some methodological difficulties. The first difficulty was visible as a result of the ambiguity in the concept of transnationalism. Transnational activities can be seen in relation to individual’s choices and, in this respect, it offers variable meanings. For example, visiting the country of origin is an enjoyable experience for some young people, for others it is not a good experience.
These differences complicated the theoretical grounding of my empirical work, but also raised crucial questions for analysing the data.

Secondly, asking questions in relation to identity caused confusion in the case of young people. They were not clear about how to define themselves. They did not understand the frames of identification and this caused difficulty during the interviews because there were no artificial categories.

Thirdly, asking questions on a variety of topic, such as identification, school, media, family, community organisations, visits to the country of origin, local environment and London, reduced the motivation of young people during the interview. By the end of the conversation, my participants got bored and shortened their answers. It was difficult to obtain detailed information about the thoughts and perspectives of young people with regard to their social positioning.

By including three different social groups – Cypriot Turks, Kurds, and Turks – this study has been valuable in illuminating the differences and similarities between these young people. I interviewed 15 young people, a mixture of male and female, from each group. In total, I examined the social positioning of 45 young people in London. However, I have not found any significant differences between CKT young people or between male and female young people, because they have referred to their everyday life experiences which do not necessarily involve ethnic identification. Apart from ethnic and gendered identities, religious identities and practicing religion was not mentioned by CKT youth except by one respondent. It is clear that these young people did not take into account certain identifications when they spoke about their everyday life experiences. No participant, for instance, mentioned being ‘Muslim’ or ‘female’ in relation to either sending or receiving country.

**Future Directions of Transnationalism among Second Generation**

The findings of this thesis show that the second generation’s transnationalism has been shaped by their everyday life experiences. Unlike other research on second generation transnationalism which focuses only on the attachment with the country of origin (Golbert, 2001; Kibria, 2002; Levitt, 2002, Vickerman, 2002), this research considers the relationship of CKT youth with the receiving and sending societies. It sees
transnationalism as an outcome of their everyday life experiences which also includes their relationship with both the receiving society and the sending society.

This thesis has not described how the social structure of the receiving country influences the types of identifications open to young people when considering their identity. Their position in the receiving society only takes into account the social relations constructed with institutions and people in the receiving society. Future research should consider the impacts of local contexts and local institutions, such as participation in city politics, and explore how these public discourses influence the transnational activities of young people.

This research has suggested that ‘transnational social space’ is not a wholly suitable term for understanding the positioning of young people in society. Therefore, transnational experience is more useful concept in exploring the identification of young people rather than the concepts of identity and transnational social space.

Overall, this research has opened up discussions on second generation transnationalism and second generation identity in a transnational context. With academic arguments and the empirical data, this research has promoted a wider understanding of the positioning of CKT young people as it does not consider their experience through an ethnic lens and it does not analyse their positioning as something permanent. The future direction of this research should be to consider a comparative analysis of the experiences of Turkish and Kurdish young people living in two different countries, for instance the UK and Germany. This will help further our knowledge on migrant attitudes to receiving countries and give us opportunities to examine the ways different countries treat migrant communities through policy and public discourses.
Appendix I: Interview Guide

Name:
Surname:
Gender:
Age:
Ethnicity:
Place of Birth:
Country of Origin:
Contact Details (e-mail or phone):
Lives with:

Identity and Culture

1- How do you describe yourself?
2- What does it mean for you to be a Cypriot Turk, Kurd or Turk?
3- What does it mean to live in the UK?
4- What is the difference between Turkishness and Britishness for you?
5- In which ways do you experience Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish culture?
6- What do you understand from Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish culture?
7- In which ways do you experience British culture?
8- What do you understand from British culture?
9- Where is home to you?
10- Where do you feel to belong?
11- Where are your parents from in Turkey?
12-Where do you live?
13- What do you think about the place where you live?

Education

14-Where do you study and which level?
15-How is the environment at school?
16-What are your experiences at school?
17-How do you see yourself at school? How do you define your relationship with teachers and other classmates?
18-Do you have any language difficulties? Are you comfortable speaking, writing and reading in English?
19-Do you work while you are studying? Where do you work?
20-Do your parents support your study? (both financially and immaterial)
**Ethnicity**

21- When people ask you what is your ethnic background is, what, do you answer? Does it different under different circumstances?
22- Is this the way you tend to think of yourself all the time? If not, why so?
23- How important ethnic identification to you? Why?
24- Have you ever experienced ethnic discrimination based on your ethnicity? Tell me a little bit about that.
25- What do you think is missing from your life in the UK? How can your life here be better than it is?
26- Can you pick one identity from several options which include Turk, Kurd, British Turk, British Kurd, Turkish Cypriot, Middle Eastern, Muslim, Christian, British, Alevi?

**Cultural Experiences**

27- What languages do you speak/read/write?
28- How important is it that you know English and/or Turkish?
29- Do you feel that language is a part of your cultural identity? Why (not)?
30- What language do you speak with your parents? Do you speak the same language with your Turkish friends?
31- Do you have access the Turkish language sources in your community? Are there cultural centres of social events where Turkish is spoken? Please tell me a little bit about that.
32- What are your hobbies?
   - Reading: Who are your favourite authors?
   - Music: Who are your favourite singers?
   - Sports: Do you follow Turkish sports?
33- Which kinds of music do you listen?
34- Do you participate in cultural events, such as festivals, exhibitions, etc?
35- Which ones have you participated in during the last year? Why?
36- Do you have access to Turkish TV? If yes, what programs do you watch? What other TV programs do you watch (British or Turkish)?
37- How often do you use internet? What do you use it for?
38- Are there some sites that you visit on regular basis? How often? Which ones, and why do you visit them?
39- Can you name a few of your closest friends? Can you tell me a little bit about some of your closest friends? Where do they live? What is their ethnic origin?
40- How important is it to have close friends who share the same ethnic background (Turkish, Muslim, Kurd, and Cypriot-Turk)?
41-Which activities do you involve with your friends? What are your special interests?
42-Do you have contacts with Turkish people outside of the UK and Turkey? What is their relationship to you? How do you know them?
43-How often do you communicate with these people? How do you get in touch with them?
44-Are you a member of any social/cultural organisation at present? Which ones?
45-Why did you choose these organisations? What do these organisations do? Can you tell me a little bit about some of the latest activities?
46-Were you a member of different ones in the past? Why did you choose them?
47-How important do you consider these organisations to be, for you and for the Turkish people in London in general?
48-Can you tell me your thoughts about the Turkish community in London? What are some of the interests, activities, contributions that they have had?
49-What would you like to see the Turkish community do in London?
50-What do you want to do in the future?
51-Where do you want to live in future? Could you please give me the reason?
52-How do you see your relationship with your parents? Do you think you are different regarding to your environment in London the fact that you were born in London?
53-Do you think that you are in between two cultures as may have Turkish culture at home and British culture at school?
54-How do you deal with these cultural differences?

Social Networks

55-What do you think of cultural/social life in Turkey? Do you follow any of the current cultural/social issues? Can you tell me some of them?
56-Do you maintain contacts with relatives or friends in Turkey? Tell me a little about this. How often do you contact them?
57-Do you travel to Turkey to visit? How often and how much time do you spend there? Do other family members go with you? Which ones?
58-When you go back to Turkey? How do you identify?
59-How often do you communicate with people you know in Turkey? What is the means of communication that you use the most?
60-What will make it easier for you to stay in touch with people in Turkey?
61-How important is it for you to maintain contacts with people in Turkey?
62-Is there anything you want to add?

Thank you very much for participating in my project. If you need any questions please feel free to contact me by e-mail: D.Simsek@city.ac.uk
Appendix II: List of Interviewees

Cypriot Turkish Youth

Ahmet (Male, 22): He was born in Cyprus, came to the UK when he was four years old. He lives in Southeast London with his parents.
Ali Ihsan (Male, 21): He was born in the UK. He lives in Southgate with his parents.
Ayse (Female, 20): She was born in Cyprus, came to the UK when she was ten years old. She lives in North London with her parents.
Ayten (Female, 21): She was born in the UK. She lives in Wood Green with her parents.
Berkije (Female, 21): She was born in the UK. She lives in Southgate with her parents.
Gazi (Male, 21): He was born in the UK. He lives in Stoke Newington with his parents.
Mustafa (Male, 22): He was born in the UK. He lives in Greenwich with his parents.
Pembe (Female, 18): She was born in the UK. She lives in Tottenham with her parents.
Ramazan (Male, 20): He was born in the UK. He lives in Southgate with his parents.
Serpil (Female, 18): She was born in the UK. She lives in Enfield with her parents.
Tahsin (Male, 19): He was born in the UK. He lives in university halls of residence. His parents live in North London.
Tezcan (Female, 18): She was born in the UK. She lives in Hackney with her parents.
Yasar (Male, 19): He was born in the UK. He lives in Harringay with his parents.

Kurdish Youth

Arzu (Female, 18): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was six years old. She lives in Tottenham with her parents.
Alev (Female, 22): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was four years old. She lives in Wood Green with her parents.
Aziz (Male, 18): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was five years old. He lives in Newington Green with his parents.
Belgin (Female, 20): She was born in the UK. She lives Enfield with her parents.
Cagdas (Male, 23): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was four years old. He lives in North London with his parents.
Dilek (Female, 23): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was five years old. She lives in Hackney with her parents.
Eren (Male, 18): He was born in the UK. He lives in Tottenham with his parents.

Ersin (Male, 18): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was six years old. He lives in North London with his parents.

Eytem (Female, 18): She was born in Germany, came to the UK when she was three months old. She lives in Hornsey with her parents.

Fidan (Female, 18): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was five years old. She lives in Shoreditch with her parents.

Nevzat (Male, 22): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was four years old. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Orhan (Male, 20): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was two years old. He lives in Tottenham with his parents.

Ozkan (Male, 19): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was nine years old. He lives in Tottenham with his parents.

Serdar (Male, 21): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was three years old. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Serpil (Female, 18): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was one years old. She lives in Tottenham with her parents.

Taner (Male, 19): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was six years old. He lives in Edmonton with his parents.

Tulay (Female, 20): She was born in the UK. She lives in Enfield with her parents.

Turkish Youth

Ayse (Female, 19): She was born in the UK. She lives in Edmonton with her parents.

Azra (Female, 18): She was born in the UK. She lives in Islington with her parents.

Burcu (Female, 21): She was born in the UK. She lives in Hackney with her parents.

Ceren (Female, 18): She was born in the UK. She lives in Southgate with her parents.

Duygu (Female, 19): She was born in the UK. She lives in Dalston with her parents.

Ekim (Male, 21): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was five years old. He lives in Lewisham with his parents.

Erkan (Male, 23): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was five years old. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Fatih (Male, 20): He was born in Turkey, came to the UK when he was eight years old. He lives in Lewisham with his parents.
Filiz (Female, 21): She was born in Turkey, came to the UK when she was three years old. She lives in Camden with her parents.

Gurkan (Male, 19): He was born in the UK. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Ilkan (Male, 23): He was born in the UK. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Ozkan Aydin (Male, 19): He was born in Turkey, came to London when he was three years old. He lives in Palmers Green with his parents.

Serkan (Male, 21): He was born in the UK. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Sertan (Male, 18): He was born in Turkey, came to London when he was four years old. He lives in Chingford with his parents.

Volkan (Male, 21): He was born in the UK. He lives in Hackney with his parents.

Other Interviewees

Gul Karadag: Director of Gik-Der Community Organisation (Refugee Workers Cultural Association) in London

Nursel Tas: Director of Derman Organisation in London

Ibrahim Dogus: Director of Halkevi Organisation

Yuksel Konca: Project Manager of Halkevi

A 24 year old Kurdish migrant

Mustafa Gencsoy: Director of Cyprus-Turkish Association

A 43 year old Cypriot Turkish woman

A 74 year old Cypriot Turkish man

A Cypriot Turkish family

A 31 year old Turkish man

A 29 year old Turkish man

A Theatre teacher at Halkevi Community Organisation

A Director of Komkar (Kurdish Advice Centre)

A Director of Turkish Education Forum

A Director of IMECE- Turkish, Kurdish and Cypriot Turkish women groups

Peacebuilding member and Turkish journalist who migrated to the UK in 90s
Appendix III: List of Analytical Categories/ Nvivo Nodes

Influence and the Role of Family in identity formation within a transnational context

a) The relationship between young people and their families in London
   CKT youth construct different types of relationships with their families in London which are related to engaging in different social and cultural repertoires.
   i. Close Relationship
   ii. Individual Relationship
   iii. Cultural Clash between young people and family

b) The relationship between young people and their families in the country of origin
   Different types of relationship is constructed with their families in the country of origin which underlines their links with the country of origin
   i. Close Relationship
   ii. Individual Relationship
   iii. Cultural Clash between young people and family

Influence and the Role of Community Organisations in identity formation within a transnational context

Analyses the influence of community of organisations on identity formation of CKT youth by focusing on their aims

a) Types of CKT Community Organisations
   Separate community organisations regarding their aims and projects in relation to migrants
   i. Promoting social inclusion
   ii. Promoting National- Cultural Identity of the Country of Origin
   iii. Promoting both inclusion to the UK and national/cultural identity of the country of origin

Influence and the role of schools in identity formation within a transnational context

Looks at the factors influence identity formation of CKT youth in school environment
a) Discrimination in the school environment
   i. Teachers: The relationship with teachers
   ii. Peers: The relationship with peers including both from the same ethnic background and from different ethnic background

b) Language: The level of English
   i. Positive
   ii. Negative: eg. Accent

**Influence and the role of media in identity formation within a transnational context**

Separate the types of transnational media in which CKT youth practice in order to understand the specific influences of the particular media and their relation to the receiving and sending societies
   a) Types of Transnational Media
      i. Television: including Turkish-Kurdish television channels and English television channels
      ii. Newspapers
      iii. Internet

**Influence and the role of neighborhood within a transnational context**

The perceptions of CKT youth about the places they interact and the influence of these places on identity formation of CKT youth
   a) Ethnic Enclave (North London)
      i. Positive Influences on identity formation
      ii. Negative Influences on identity formation
   b) London
      i. Positive Influences
      ii. Negative Influences
   c) Country of Origin (Cyprus-Turkey)
      i. Positive Influences
      ii. Negative Influences

*The perception of CKT youth on identity*
a) **Nationalistic identification**: Britishness or Turkishness is conceived as a coherent whole
   i. Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish
   ii. British

b) **Universal identification**: Not belonging to any particular community/group
   i. Identity as a way of life: Refers to everyday practices in the socio-cultural context

**General relationship, use or consumption**

Identify the type of relationships, use or consumption developed by the population studied respectively with the members of their close or extended family, community organisations, school and media.

a) **Events**: for instance, in the case of community organisations, I tried to identify what type of activities and events were offered by these organisations: were they political, educative or recreational?

b) **Frequency of relationships, use or consumption**: for instance, in the case of media, I tried to identify the amount of time spent in consulting media and how many different media are consulted by the population studied.

c) **Positive or negative judgement on relationship, use, or consumption**: Focused on the general impression of the relationship with media looking at whether it was perceived by CKT youth as something which made them feel better or disrupted them and how they responded to these challenges and opportunities.

**Influence of diverse and/or homogeneous experiences, relationships or interactions**:

a) **Culture**: Language, food, music, etc. For instance, the language they use in their everyday life and whether it represents cultural attachment or not.

b) **Social Relationships**: This code is gathered the ways their social relationships are built with their family, peers, community and people from the country of origin, and tried to analyse in what ways their
social relationships influence the identity positioning of CKT youth

c) **Political Engagement**: Political links with the country of origin; political engagement through community organisations

d) **Economic Exchanges**: Involvement in transnational business

**Interpretations of young people about cultural repertoires and social relations around them**: For instance, accepting or ignoring certain cultural resources

a) **Possible identity positioning**: I gathered the responses of young people as to how they perceive their ethnic and cultural identity.

b) **Defining oneself**: I gathered under this code information about how young people position themselves in society
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