

Dissertation title: Ethnic Identity among Young Turkish-Speakers in Britain

Dissertation Supervisor: Professor Tariq Modood

Candidate Number: 20599

Word Count: 14986

Academic Year: 2015/2016

'A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the requirements for the
award of the degree of MSc in Sociology in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Law'

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the ethnic identity formation of young Turkish-speakers in Britain. It aims to explore how the youths construct their ethnic identity by looking at their relationships with the family, the Turkish-speaking community and the host society, and also their religious attitudes and practices. By analysing these relationships, this research is expected to fill some of the gaps in the literature on ethnic identity.

This research focuses on young Turkish-speakers who were born not only in the country of immigration but also were born in the country of origin (Turkey or Northern Cyprus) but migrated to the UK at an early age. I chose this demographic group because I assumed that the young people termed as second or third generation are separated from their parents in terms of the construction of ethnic identity. Such that they are more open social and cultural changes in everyday life particularly through school, college and other institutions than the first generation.

The empirical data are based on 13 semi-structured in-depth interviews with young Turkish-speakers between 18 and 27 ages in London and Bristol, as well as unstructured interviews with 3 older Turkish people who gave information about Turkish community in Bristol. One of the reasons for conducting the research in these different cities is the lack of the number of respondents in Bristol. Secondly, earlier research done on ethnic identity of Turkish people has merely included Turkish community living in London. I argue that the experience of Turkish people in Bristol could be different from the community in London. In that sense, the research also provides a comparative analysis.

The findings of the research confirm that the ethnic identity construction of young Turkish-speakers has taken place on a tension line which arises from between their own culture and the

dominant culture. Their relationships with the family, Turkish-speaking community, friends and the host society, and their religious attitudes and practices have significantly influenced the construction and maintenance of their ethnic identities.



CONTENTS

Abstract of Thesis	1
List of Tables	5
Chapter One: Introduction	6
1. 1. Turkish Migration to Western Countries	6
1. 2. Turkish Migration to Britain	7
1. 3. The Number of Turkish Speakers Living in the UK	9
1. 4. The Aims of the Research and Research Questions	10
1. 5. Overview of the Chapters	13
Chapter Two: Theoretical Issues	15
2. 1. Identity	15
2. 2. Religious Identity	16
2. 3. Ethnicity and Ethnic Identity	18
2. 4. Young Turkish-Speakers: The Literature	22
Chapter Three: Methodology	25
3. 1. Data Collection	25
3. 2. Challenges	28
3. 3. Analysis Process	29
Chapter Four: Ethnic Identity among Young Turkish-Speakers in Britain	31
4. 1. Background Information regarding the Respondents	31

4. 2. Young Turkish-Speakers and the Way They Define of Their Ethnic Identity	34
4. 3. Relationships with their Family and the Turkish Community	37
4. 3. 1. Family Relationships	38
4. 3. 1. 1. Marriage	40
4. 3. 2. Relationships inside the Turkish Community	41
4. 3. 2. 1. Turkish-Speaking Organisations	42
4. 3. 2. 2. Friendships	43
4. 4. Relationships with the Host Society and the Home Country	44
4. 4. 1. Language	45
4. 4. 2. Participation in British Organisations	46
4. 4. 3. Maintaining Links with the Home Country and the Importance of Their Respective Countries	47
4. 5. The Religious Attitudes and Practices of Young Turkish-Speakers	50
Chapter Five: Conclusion	53
Bibliography	57
Appendix I: Interview Questions	67
Appendix II: 2016 PGT Dissertation Ethics Questionnaire	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1: Background Information of the Respondents	31
Table 4. 2: Ethnic Self-Definition and Background Information of Young Turkish-Speakers	34
Table 4. 3: Ethnic Self-Definitions by Frequency and Percentage Distributions	35



CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1. 1. Turkish Migration to Western Countries

Population movements have been one of the main characteristics of mankind's history since the origin of man (Lewis, 1982). Migration is, indeed, a complex phenomenon such that the physical transition of people generally entails abandoning one place and moving to another social setting (Eisenstadt, 1954). Having said that, this is not only a displacement in space but, most importantly, a change of social, cultural, political and economic conditions (Le Bris, 1989/90 cited in Leloup, 1996). At this point, the question then arises: what are the factors that explain the decision-making processes of migrants? In that sense, the main point here is that, in order to understand migration better, it is crucial to examine the reasons of making the migration decision (Tassinopoulos and Werner, 1999). Many migration theorists (see Ravenstein, 1885, 1889; Beijer, 1969; Harris and Todaro, 1970; Bhagwati and Srinivisan, 1974; Fields, 1975; Castles et al. 2014) tend to focus primarily on economic reasons as the primary driving power. According to Beijer (1969), for instance, the economic reasons are one of the main factors behind the decision-making processes of voluntary international migrants.

Since the 1940s, migration has brought about a growing cultural diversity and the formation of minority groups and new ethnic communities in many countries such as Germany, France, and the UK. Those groups and communities are visible by means of the presence of different ethnic, racial and cultural features (Castles et al. 2014). One of the most prominent ethnic groups in Europe are Turkish-speaking migrants — specifically, Mainland Turks, Kurds from Turkey, and Cypriot Turks. More than 5,5 million Turkish migrants currently live abroad, around 4,6 million of which live in European countries (MFA, 2016). From the foundation of the Republic of Turkey

in 1923 till the early 1960s, Turkish migration into other countries had been very low (Yalcin, 2000). Most especially, though, during the 1960s and 1970s, a large number of Turkish migrants migrated to Western European countries for mainly economic reasons, following bilateral agreements between Turkey and those countries — most particularly Germany (Kastoryano, 2013; Akca, 2015). Sayari (1986) notes that, by the 1960s, a great number of Turks were attracted to the idea of being migrant workers for Western countries. Most of them expected economic returns from being employed in Europe. Numbers of migrants returned to Turkey during their annual summer vacations with expensive gifts for their relatives and friends. Throughout the trip, they were driving their own cars, wearing European-made clothes, and buying new land or housing with their savings. As a result, many people were attracted by the lucrative economic conditions of Western European countries — so much so that, while in October 1960, the Turkish population living in Germany was around 7 thousand (Abadan-Unat, 1976), this number reached around 3 million by 2016 (Aydin, 2016).

1. 2. Turkish Migration to Britain

On the other hand, the research available suggests that Turkish migration to the UK was firstly initiated by Cypriot Turks in the early 1930s. Their number, however, was very small such that, according to Home Office statistics, between 1933-34, there were only three and, in 1936, only four Turkish Cypriots (Oakley, 1989). The turning point in facilitating a great number of immigrants from Cyprus to migrate was its independence in 1959 and its becoming a member of the Commonwealth. By 1964, there were 78,486 Cypriots, including both Turks and Greeks, in the UK (Kucukcan, 1996). It is noted that, following the ethnic tension in Cyprus in 1974, ‘several thousands of Cypriots entered Britain on a short stay basis as unofficial “refugees” from the fighting and territorial displacement’ (Oakley, 1979: 13).

The first migration movement from Turkey to Britain mainly began with the bilateral agreement struck between the two countries in 1970 (Kucukcan, 1996). During this period, Turkish people migrated due to economic reasons, with the great majority of them leaving their families behind them for the purpose of working and earning money in the UK (Simsek, 2012). For many Turkish migrants, the UK was one of the most suitable places for visiting and staying, seeing as they did not need to have visas until 1989 (Kucukcan, 1996). Apart from the economic factors, a few political issues also triggered some people to migrate to the UK as well (Kucukcan, 1996; Mehmet Ali, 2001; Simsek, 2012). For instance, because of the military coup on 12 March, 1971, a number of educated young people migrated to the UK, thereby escaping from the Turkish army. From the late 1970's onwards, an increasing number of Turkish people migrated to the UK through their kin relations and social networks (Simsek, 2012). In 1980, Turkey experienced another military coup, which initiated a new wave of migration to Europe. Many people, including intellectuals, the educated classes, professionals and trade union activists began to seek political asylum in the UK (M. Ali, 2001).

Kurdish migration from Turkey to the UK became an issue at the end of 1980's, when the armed conflict between the Turkish state and the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) erupted. The conflict caused displacement for many Kurds from their settlements; therefore, most had to migrate to Western European countries, notably Germany. Some Kurdish men decided to travel to the UK and, after finding employment and accommodation, brought their families and relatives with them as well. In this way, they tried to construct social networks and a socio-cultural space for themselves in the UK (Simsek, 2012).

On the other hand, around 1500 Turkish speakers live in Bristol. According to the data which was obtained from 3 respondents who moved to Bristol around 20 years ago, the first migration to

Bristol followed a similar pattern to migration to the UK in general. In that sense, the first migration started with Cypriot Turks during the 1970s. Nevertheless, they noted that there were very few of them and it is difficult to track them. The main movement to Bristol started at the beginning of the 1990s. The first group mostly moved there from London and, in the following years, their families and relatives then moved to Bristol. In 2006, they constituted a Turkish community Bristol and opened a Turkish mosque.

1. 3. The Number of Turkish Speakers Living in the UK

According to the 2011 Census, 163,923 people in Britain identified themselves as Turkish (60,726), Kurdish (52,341), or Turkish Cypriot (50,856) (ONS, 2011). Nevertheless, there were also around 400,000 people who identified themselves as being under other ethnic categories, such as mixed, multiple, Asian/Asian British, and other ethnic groups. Therefore, it is hard to estimate an accurate number regarding how many Turkish speakers live in the UK. Simsek (2012) noted that the number of Turkish migrants from Turkey and North Cyprus is estimated to be around 300,000 by some researches, including those sponsored by the Turkish Consulate. In 2011, Turkey's Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu said that there were approximately 400,000 Turkish citizens living in the UK (Turkishny, 2011). Another estimate based on Home Office statistics estimated the size of the population as being around 500,000 (Travis, 2011). Thus, one could estimate that the number of Turkish speakers living in Britain is currently between 300,000 and 500,000.

The great majority of Turkish speakers in the UK live in London. The main reason for this is because there are many social networking, kinship, and patronage relations between the Turks that have already moved there in order to make a community in the city (Kucukcan, 1996). Dokur-

Gryskiewicz (1979) also found that 54% of her participants lived with Turkish neighbours in particular quarters of London.

In contrast to London's Turkish population, in Bristol, the Turkish population is very low. In order to obtain population statistics, I contacted a research and statistics specialist from the Bristol City Council. According to the 2011 census data provided by the specialist, there were 895 Turkish people, including mainland Turks, Kurds, and Cypriot Turks living in the city. In order to discover the current number of Turkish speaking people, I conducted interviews with 3 Turkish people who came to Bristol almost 25 years ago. They estimated that there are approximately 1500 Turkish speaking people in Bristol.

1. 4. The Aims of the Research and Research Questions

There is no doubt that these immigrants became a Turkish ethnic minority group and, in time, constituted a Turkish-speaking community by means of family reunions and the growth of its young generation in the host society. Ethnic minority groups follow different patterns of culture, religion, and ethnicity. Furthermore, each ethnic minority group endeavours to maintain their distinct cultural characteristics by establishing various organisations and institutions. Nevertheless, the young Turkish-speaking generation has simultaneously experienced different social and cultural values within the British context. Accordingly, they might see themselves as being influence by two different kinds of cultures and ways of life.

The fact that most Turkish-speaking parents were born and grew up in the country of origin and, thus, constructed their ethnic identity only through their own social and cultural contexts, the younger generations who have been born and brought up in Britain are negotiating their ethnic identity in the context of different social and cultural forces encountered within the multicultural

classrooms and society at large. Identity is negotiated by the relationships which one has between one's self and one's society, culture, ethnicity, and religion. As Markston-Adam (1992) stresses, identity formation is not only an individualistic process; rather, the social environment exerts power on the individual as well. In that context, young Turkish speakers feel themselves as being members of their social, or cultural, environments and, in this way, constructs their ethnic identity. It is important to emphasise here that the dimension of their relationships with their social circles, such as their families, friends, the Turkish-speaking community and their host society, plays a significant role in how they construct their ethnic identities. Furthermore, religious values should also be taken into account when speaking about how young Turkish speakers form their ethnic identities. According to Enneli (2001), the religious and ethnic identities of the Turkish speaking community mix with one another and are all, at heart, social and cultural.

On the other hand, a review of the literature reveals that only very few studies have focused on the identity formation of young Turkish speakers in the UK. Kucukcan's (1996) PhD thesis, *The Politics of Ethnicity, Identity and Religion among Turks in London*, provides valuable information about the Turkish Muslim community in London. He mainly concentrates on the Turk-Islam ethnic identity. According to him, family relations and social organisations have a significant role on every stage of immigration and settlement. He asserts that traditional values are represented as an expression of Turkish identity and that religion is one of the most significant factors of Turkish identity formation. Yalcın's (2000) PhD thesis, *Ethnic Identities in Action: The Experience of Turkish Young People in London*, examines 'the relationships of young Turks at the family, community, and host society levels' (p. xi). It takes into consideration ethnic and sub-ethnic groups. He argues that the main studies which have been conducted regarding Turkish ethnic identity have not touched upon the different ethnic group identities that make up the

Turkish-speaking community (e.g. the Alevis and Kurds). His findings show that there are significant differences between how sub-ethnic groups affect their members in their relationships within the community and host society. Enneli's (2001) PhD thesis, *Turkish-Speaking Young People in North London: A Case of Diversity and Disadvantage*, focuses on the construction of young Turkish speakers' ethnic and religious identities and their attitudes towards family issues. She came to the conclusion that there are many differences among Turkish-speaking community members with relation to their ethnic and religious identities. Simsek's (2012) *Identity Formation of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Young People in London in a Transnational Context* provides significant information regarding identity formation in young Turks in transnational social spaces. She found that young Turks do not see themselves as belonging to fixed categorisations and that their transnationalism has been shaped by their everyday life experiences which are, obviously, different from their parents'.

The literature demonstrates three primary deficiencies. Firstly, as has been seen above, the past research conducted on the issue of young Turkish speakers' ethnic identity in the UK are few and far between. Secondly, these studies have overlooked either the internal or external dynamics of that community which, as have been shown, significantly influence ethnic identity construction in younger generations. Lastly, they have only examined the Turkish speaking community living in London. This last deficiency is significant in that the experience of the Turkish speaking community in Bristol might be different from the community in London because the Turkish community in the latter has more facilities and opportunities to easily support each other without needing to interact with the host society.

This study aims to fill these gaps in the literature. It further purposes to explore how young Turkish speakers living in the UK construct their ethnic identity by taking into account their

relationships with their families, the Turkish-speaking community, their host society, and their religious attitudes and practices. In that context, this study will focus on the following research questions:

1. In what ways do young Turkish speakers define their own ethnic identities?
2. How do young Turkish speakers construct their ethnic identities?
3. What are the roles of the family, the Turkish speaking community, and the host society on the ethnic identity formation of the younger generation?
4. What are the differences between the young Turkish speakers living in Bristol from the young Turkish speakers living in London in terms of ethnic identity construction?
5. What roles do religious attitudes and practices have on the identity formation of young Turkish speakers?

1. 5. Overview of the Chapters

This study is organised into five chapters. **Chapter One**, 'Introduction', gives a review of Turkish immigration to Western Europe in general and to Britain in particular. This chapter also contains the aims of the research and research questions. **Chapter Two** contains a discussion of theoretical issues related to identity, ethnicity, and ethnic identity. This chapter also examines the literature concerning the identity formation of young Turkish speakers. **Chapter Three** discusses the methodological issues concerning this paper, including details about data collection, the analysis process, and the challenges which were encountered throughout the research. This chapter also provides a detailed account about chosen method to obtain data from Turkish speaking young people in London and Bristol. **Chapter Four** analyses the gathered data in order to explore the

aims of the study. The chapter firstly gives background information about the young Turkish speakers which were interviewed. It then examines how they define their ethnic identity. Thirdly, their relationships with their family and the Turkish-speaking community are examined by taking into account their ideas regarding their family relationships, the concept of marriage, their relationships within the Turkish community, Turkish organisations, and friendships. Later, it looks at their relationships with the host society and their home country by focusing on language, their participation in British organisations, their maintaining links with the home country, and the significance that they ascribe to both their host and home countries. Finally, this chapter will examine their religious attitudes and practices. **Chapter Five**, 'Conclusion', will discuss the research questions in the light of the researcher's analysis of the research findings.

CHAPTER TWO: THEORETICAL ISSUES

The aim of this chapter is to discuss the theoretical issues of the research. For this reason, this chapter focuses mainly on identity, religious identity, ethnicity and ethnic identity, and the literature related to identity construction of the Turkish speaking young people.

2. 1. Identity

Identity is a multidimensional and ambiguous concept. It comes as no surprise, then, that it has been famously difficult to determine. Some writers (Giddens, 1991; Bauman, 2001) have even argued whether it is possible to talk about identity at all. According to Woodward (1997: 12), this is due to the fact that ‘identity often seems to involve essentialist claims about belongingness where, for example, identity is seen as fixed and unchanging.’ Furthermore, identity is being negotiated through the relationships between the self, society, culture, ethnicity, and religion. In the literature on identity, the basic arguments generally revolve around a sense, self-structure, resolution and attitude (Erikson, 1959; Marcia, 1980; Wright, 1982). Erikson (1959), for instance, sought to understand how one’s sense of identity develops from childhood through adolescence and the role of the environment on that formation.

Wright (1982), in his study *Erikson: Identity and Religion*, states that the main question for an individual when defining him or herself is “who am I?” Thus, by asking this question, the individual feels him or herself as part of an environment, society or culture. In addition to this, identity is defined as adopting others’ perceptions about their environment. At this point, it would be true to say that there is an interplay between ‘our sense of who we are and our relationship with the world’ (Kanno, 2003).

The concept of identity has two dynamic principles: similarity and difference — in other words, the ways in which the individual and the social are differentiated in their social relations with other individuals and social groups (Jenkins, 1999). As such, identity has both self and social dimensions (Liebkind, 1989); furthermore, these are ‘inextricably related’ with one another (Buckingham, 2008: 6). With regards to the social meaning of identity, Jenkins (1999: 5) argues that ‘social identity is a game of playing the vis-à-vis. Social identity is our understanding of who we are and of who other people are, and, reciprocally, other people’s understanding of themselves and of others.’ Furthermore, in relation to identity, Markstrom-Adams (1992: 174) argues some social contextual factors, including family relationships, ethnic and racial group membership, and religiosity, are all ‘pertinent to identity formation.’ According to him, identity formation is not only an individualistic process; rather, the social environment strives its forms of power and effect. It is pointed out that identity formation is more fluid and dynamic and that it is affected by historical ethos, culture, geographical environment, political systems, social class, education, economics, ethnicity and religion (Erikson, 1968; Kroger, 1993; Jones and McEwen, 2000; Lawler, 2008).

2. 2. Religious Identity

In any discussion of identity, the role of religion on identity formation should also be taken into consideration. Mol (1976) and Fulton (1996) argue that there is a significant correlation between identity and religion. Many researchers have explored the central function that religion has had on the formation and maintenance of personal, group, and social identity (see, for example, Erikson, 1965, 1968; Mol, 1978; Knott, 1986; Baumeister, 1986; Hammond, 1988; Knott and Khokher, 1993; Fulton, 1996; Queen, 1996; Kucukcan, 1996; Verkutyen and Yildiz, 2009). Erikson (1965) recognises that religion is closely connected with the identity formation of young

people, contending that religion ‘systematises and socialises the first and deepest conflict in life’ and ‘combines the dim images of each individual’s first providers into collective images of primeval superhuman protectors’ (Erikson, 1968: 83).

According to Knott (1986), the effect that religion has on personal identity is seen in three ways. Those are life cycle rites, beliefs and practices, and traditions of religious authority and organisation. Baumeister (1986), furthermore, emphasises that religious values have positive impacts on youth identity formation. According to him, religion is an optional identity choice grounded intensely on self-definition. Yang and Ebaugh (2001) point out that having a minority status in a host country is one of the most important factors that one has to comprehend in order to understand the strategies related to religious and ethnic identities, as well as the achievement of those strategies. Smith (1978) observed that, in order to deal with the issue, they often cling to religion by building religious institutions and by establishing social and cultural activities in the host society. What is emphasised here is that religion may play an important role in the identity formation of immigrants — particularly the young ones (Peek, 2005). Smith (1978) points out that any other factors, such as having a common language, a national feeling, and a belief in a common descent, are less sufficient than the outweighing attraction of religious affiliation as an organising impulse. In his study, Modood (1997), for instance, found that religion is the most important factor for a great majority of South Asian people, with roughly 96% and 95% of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, respectively, calling themselves Muslim. These percentages are more or less true for Turkish speakers as well. According to Enneli (2001), the majority identifies themselves as Muslim or Alevi. Furthermore, she argues that, in the case of Turkish-speaking people, religious and ethnic identities are mixed with each other and are at the base of their society and culture.

2. 3. Ethnicity and Ethnic Identity

The issues of ethnicity and ethnic identity have always been the main research subjects for many scholars and research organisations. The term “ethnicity” was first occurred in the English language in the midst of the twentieth century, being first used by David Riesman in 1953 (Hutchinson and Smith, 1996). It was, however, only included in the Oxford Dictionary in 1972 (Hutnik, 1991). While ethnicity is an elusive concept and very difficult to define precisely (Burgess, 1978), it continues to fascinate and perplex many scholars (Banks, 1996). Scott and Marshall (2005: 197) define ethnicity as ‘individuals who consider themselves, or are considered by others, to share common characteristics that differentiate them from the other collectivities in a society, and from which they develop their distinctive cultural behavior to form an ethnic group.’

The notion ethnicity is, indeed, one of the constructors of identity seeing as it allows an individual a sense of belonging — specifically, to an ethnic group. Being a member of the ethnic group by way of having a sense of individual identification with that ethnic group is defined, in part, as ethnic identity (Hutnik, 1991). In the light of this definition, Hutnik (ibid) argues that such a definition explicitly focuses on the psychological aspects of ethnic identity and, thus, may affect the following generations such that, while they display an identical lifestyle with the dominant group, they may simultaneously continue to hold varying degrees of identification with their ethnic group.

It appears that there are two main approaches in the area of ethnicity: viz., the primordial and situational (or instrumentalist) approaches. The former approach to ethnicity was first developed by Edwards Shils in his well-known article “Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties.” His

study is based on some observations about the relationship between sociological research and theory. He touches upon the concept of “primordial attachments,” which are related to kin, territory, and belief systems (Shils, 1957). Clifford Geertz, on the other hand, further developed this approach by arguing that primordial attachments are not only attachments Shils asserted that they are also attachments to language, blood ties, region, custom and race (Geertz, 1973).

In contrast to the primordial approach, the situational approach views the concept of ethnicity as a rational response to social, cultural and economic circumstances (Kucukcan, 1996). According to Barth (1996), ethnic groups are made, not born. Barth (ibid:77) asserts that ‘the same group of people, with unchanged values and ideas, would surely pursue different patterns of life and institutionalize different forms of behaviour when faced with different opportunities offered in different environments.’ Shortly, this approach means that ‘ethnicity is situational. The implication is that people have different ethnic identities in different situations. Their salience is affected by such factors as the distribution of desired resources and the objectives of the people concerned’ (Mason, 1995: 13). In this context, our study will analyse both approaches. In the literature, it clearly seems that ‘the ethnic and sub-ethnic group characteristics of Turkish people have strong primordial attachments and at an individual level the situational characteristic of ethnicity is also observable’ (Yalcin, 2000: 60).

It is important to emphasise that these definitions of ethnicity mostly refer to a common cultural structure which distinguishes the ethnic group from other immediate groups (Hutnik, 1991). The term “ethnic group” is generally used to designate a population. For instance, according to Barth (1969: 10-11), a population:

- 1) is largely biologically self-perpetuating;

2) shares fundamental cultural values, realised in overt unity in cultural forms;

3) makes up a field of communication and interaction;

and 4) has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others, as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order.

It is argued that the sense of belonging to an ethnic group is described as a process of internalising an identity which is built over time (Phinney, 1990). An ethnic group differs with regard to certain ties of national, racial, or cultural characteristics from the larger society (Morris, 1968). Gordon (1964) used the term “ethnic group” to refer to a ‘sense of peoplehood’ set off by national origin, race, religion, or some combination of these concepts. In this light, the concept of ethnic group is generally described with regards to cultural, religious, biological and linguistic categories (Liebkind, 1989).

In his analysis of an ethnic group, however, Francis (1947; cited in Hutnik, 1991: 17) argued that, while each ethnic group has a certain culture, it does not mean that a common cultural pattern automatically creates an ethnic group. What is particularly emphasised here is ‘the sharing of a common culture’ (ibid). This notion is clearly shared by Rex (1991: 11), who emphasises the idea of group membership in the following way: ‘the essence of a purely ethnic tie is that it is based upon a sense of sameness with one’s fellow-ethnics and distinction from those who do not share the same observable characteristics.’ Referring to the term “ethnie,” Smith (1986: 22-29) pointed out that there are six components of an ethnic group which enable one to recognise someone. These are: a collective name; a common myth of descent; a shared history; a distinctive shared culture; an association with a specific territory; and a sense of solidarity.

On the other hand, it is argued that some people have multiple group affiliations. Wallman (1983) points out that one of the assumptions that scholars usually mistakenly make is the idea that ethnic identity is a fixed and inflexible commitment. Rather, identity markers are part of the symbolic currency of identity processes and have a possible resource value which can be developed if they are well used. He further argues that ethnic identity does not have to be singular; rather, multiple identities may co-exist. Lyon (1997), in his study 'Defining Ethnicity: Another Way of Being British,' argues that being "British," "Pakistani," or "Asian" all refer to different statuses in different circumstances and, thus, may either be political or cultural. He underlines that the notion of ethnicity includes a classification based on duality and reflects relationships both of inclusion and exclusion. In light of this classification, 'an ethnic group, then, is an acknowledged subset of an acknowledged set; all members of A are also members of B; some members of B are also members of A' (Lyon, 1997: 187).

Another issue which should be taken into account is that of the family and the past since they play a significant role in the ethnic identity formation of young people. Erikson (1959: 109) described the concept of identity as 'an individual's link with the unique values, fostered by a unique history, of his people.' Phinney and Rosenthal (1992) argue that the role of family on the construction and maintenance of ethnic identity is very strong and penetrating. Furthermore, they also point out that the family is 'the source of children's first experiences related to ethnicity and it is generally with the parents and other family members that children make their first identifications as part of a group' (Phinney and Rosenthal, 1992: 153). Related to identity development, Waterman (1993) addresses the fact that the initial identity status is significantly affected by family factors. Parents' work roles, religious affiliations, or political attitudes influence the identity construction of

children. The past, on the other hand, is central to and inherent in the formation of peoplehood and identity (Wallerstein, 1991).

2. 4. Young Turkish-Speakers: The Literature

In the literature, it is argued that many young Turkish speakers are generally aware of their identities in comparison to members of the host society in the UK (Yalcin, 2000; Enneli, 2001). One study associates this awareness to the way in which the Turkish speaking community has learnt how to rely on each other for much of the assistance that they require. Furthermore, the community's common language, culture, and minority status have strengthened a sense of solidarity amongst themselves (Greater London Authority, 2009). Notwithstanding their strong sense of identity, some studies suggest that the Turkish speaking community in Britain has seen the emergence of hybrid identities, such as Turkish-British or Kurdish-British (Kucukcan, 1996; Yalcin, 2000; Faas, 2009b; Communities and Local Government, 2009). According to Faas (2009a: 180), usually, the Turkish youth in Europe has no singular identity; rather, they 'employed hybrid ethno-national, ethno-local and national-European identities as a result of their national location and, especially, schooling and social class positioning (rather than migration histories).' In his other study on Turkish young people, Faas (2009b) found that the majority of Turkish youth in both England and Germany had adopted a regional identity, such as Swabian or English. Furthermore, most of them comprehended that national and regional identities compete with one another and that the latter was perceived as a kind of ethnic identity which one, usually, has to be born into. Enneli (2001), on the other hand, argues that young Turkish speakers' ethnic and religious identities should not be evaluated merely in terms of the conflict between the values of the host society and those of the Turkish speaking community. Her study explores the idea that the young Turkish speakers in the UK do not usually adopt hybrid identities. This is because they

believe that being born in this country does not mean that they can become British in the cultural sense. Instead, they felt themselves as being Turkish-Kurds, Muslim-Turks, or Muslim-Turkish Cypriots.

Moreover, the literature reveals that some young Turkish speakers define themselves with multiple identities rather than simply using the Turkish identity. Nevertheless, they eschewed the British identity in many cases (Enneli et al., 2005). In her study on the achievements and aspirations of Turkish-speaking girls at a North London secondary school, Jones (2008) found that the majority of the girls defined themselves very much in terms of ethnicity, choosing multiple ethnic identities such as Turkish-Kurdish, or Turkish-Turkish Cypriot.

In the literature, it has also been pointed out that religion is one of the most important factors in the self-definition of the majority of Turkish speakers. Kucukcan (1996: 315), for instance, suggests that ‘Islam is one of the indispensable components of Turkish/Cypriot identity. Even those who defined themselves as “not religious” or “nominal” Muslims, feel that religion has had public and private influence on the formation of [their] Turkish identity.’ He further argues that Turkish identity, ethnicity, and Islam are closely intertwined and cannot be easily separated from one another. For this reason, it is almost impossible to examine Turkish identity without referring to Islam. Yalcin (2000) also found that the religious attachments of young Turkish speakers played an important role in constructing one’s group identity. Enneli et al. (2005), however, argues that young Turkish speakers’ relationship with religion seems to be relatively complex. Scholars have revealed that Turkish youth do not observe themselves as being part of a Muslim group; rather, some of them simply consider their religious identity as a natural extension of their ethnic identity. On the other hand, in her study, ‘Reconstructing Ethnicity and Identity: The Influence of Second-Generation Turkish-Cypriot and Pakistani Women in London’, Butler (2001)

argues that Turkish Cypriots were more relaxed towards Islam and that this factor distinguishes them from mainland Turks. The Turkish-Cypriot women that she interviewed believed that a more passive approach to Islam was a distinctive character of their Cypriot identity such that most of them believed that they were less religious and less traditional than mainland Turks.

In relation to the concept of transnationalism and the identity formation of young Turkish speakers, Simsek (2012) stresses that they do not describe themselves as belonging to fixed categorisations and that, furthermore, their everyday life experiences have changed the way they construct their identities and sense of belonging. His findings suggest that their visits to the country of origin affected their identity construction and that their ethnic identity and relationship with the country of origin was shaped by their family and by the community organisations that they participated in. This point is also supported by other researchers as well (Kucukcan, 1996; Yalcın, 2000; Enneli, 2001; Enneli et al., 2005; Ayten, 2012). Kucukcan (1996), for instance, claims that family, marriage, social networks and religious organisations have played a crucial role in the construction of Turkish identity. It is also explained that engaging with transnational media constructed diverse and mixed identity possibilities for them.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The aim of this chapter is to examine methodological issues including details of data collection, analysing process and challenges encountered throughout the research. This chapter also will give detailed account on chosen method to obtain data from Turkish speaking young people in London and Bristol.

3. 1. Data Collection

In this research, qualitative interviews were conducted in order to collect detailed data from respondents. Undoubtedly, interviewing is the topmost preferred method of gaining data for qualitative researches (Atkinson and Silverman 1997; Brenner, 1981). I used semi-structured in-depth interviews as this method allows one to ask open-ended questions of participants in order to collect a detailed set of information. These interviews gave me the opportunity to discover young people`s attitudes, motivations, and feelings through observation and allowed respondents to elucidate their views in their own words. By using the verbal reports of the respondents, the technique allows researchers to access ‘an almost infinite variety [of] information that would be virtually impossible to gather by any other method’ (Ackroyd and Hughes, 1981: 70).

It is true to say that the technique gives considerable opportunities, both to the interviewer and to the interviewee, to develop their ideas such that they will be able to have time to consider, rephrase, discuss and analyse the topic of the interview. As Burgess (1995) notes, the use of this kind of interview would provide rich, detailed data for researchers.

Many scholars emphasise the fact that having personal contacts make negotiating access easier (Reeves, 2010; Duke, 2002). I should note here that, when I came to Bristol to do my Masters,

my purpose was already to have this be my research project. For this reason, I tried to establish contacts with the Turkish community in Bristol from early on. Meanwhile, I also made several contacts with a variety of different Turkish communities, including Milli Gorus, Gulen, Suleymanci Groups and the Aziziye Jama`a in London during my language course in 2015. I also made contact with the Turkish community in Bristol through religious and cultural organisations. In order to establish contacts with the young Turkish young people of Bristol, I regularly joined classes at the Turkish supplementary school as a voluntary teacher. These early encounters gave me the opportunity to observe and understand the social lives and activities of this demographic.

This research focuses on young Turkish-speakers who were not only born in the country of immigration but were also born in the country of origin but who then migrated to the UK at an early age. I chose this demographic group because I assumed that the second or third generations of young people are separated from their parents in terms of the way they construct their ethnic identity: viz. they are more open to social and cultural changes in their everyday lives — particularly through school, college, and other institutions — than the first generation was. What is more, they play a critical role in transferring the cultural heritage that was transmitted to them by previous generations to the following generations.

I conducted interviews with 13 young Turkish-speakers, including 7 in London and 6 in Bristol, as well as unstructured interviews with 3 older Turkish people who gave information about the Turkish communities existing in Bristol. Earlier research shows that there is no general agreement on what the specific age group of "young people" should be (Patterson et al. 1992; Banks et al. 1992; Kucukcan, 1996). In this study, I chose to interview young Turkish people between the ages of 18 and 27. The reason for choosing such an age group is the contention that individuals under the age of 18 have difficulty understanding and concentrating on interview questions linked

to the academic literature, such as identity and ethnicity. This was explicitly concluded as well during a pilot study which included two 16-year-old Turkish students. I attempted to ask them to describe their identity, but they could not sufficiently understand the question; thus, they could not give an answer. Therefore, the semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted on young people between the ages of 18 and 27.

Furthermore, it is important to emphasise here that the period of residency in the UK was also decisive for the detection of respondents. This is because, in order to adjust or integrate into the host society's culture, language, and way of life, it is required for the immigrants to have lived in the receiving country for a number of years. Therefore, in this research, I sought a minimum of five years of residence in the UK when choosing the participants.

The interviews primarily took place in the following three social settings of the participants: cafés, workplaces, and mosques. The informants were told to choose a meeting place where they could feel more comfortable in expressing their emotions and thoughts. In addition to this, the settings were chosen by taking into consideration their own convenience in order to make high quality interviews. Furthermore, before initiating the interviews, all of the respondents were informed in more depth about the study, as well as their rights if they chose to participate in the research. For instance, I told them that they would have the right to stop and leave the interview at any time and that, in such cases, I would not have the right to force them back into participating in the research. In this respect, throughout my interviews, I tried to protect my subject's rights. Beginning the interview, I also usually carried out a talk with the participants in order to make them feel more comfortable. The majority of the respondents answered the questions by using the English language. It is also noted that as a result of being bilingual, some interviewees switched between both Turkish and English whenever they felt more comfortable to express their feelings and ideas

one of the two languages. The interviews took between 30 and 50 minutes and were all recorded after being given permission to do so from the respondents.

3. 2. Challenges

In terms of finding respondents, gatekeepers are always central elements for access. Indeed, they may either `help or hinder research depending upon their personal thoughts on the validity of the research and its value, as well as their approach to the welfare of the people under their charge' (Reeves, 2010: 317). My primary gatekeepers were the Turkish Imams from the Bristol Somuncu Baba Mosque and the London Aziziye Mosque. Their support was very helpful because it was through them that I was introduced to young Turkish-speakers. Nevertheless, while these gatekeepers facilitated my accessing those young people, accessing female participants was still a challenge.

Being a male researcher in some cases might have brought about some difficulties when attempting to interview women. The fact that, in Bristol, the Turkish population is much lower than in London made it very difficult for the researcher to find young Turkish-speakers for the interviews there. Through my gatekeeper in Bristol and his wife, I tried to contact three young Turkish-speaking women; unfortunately, though, they were reluctant to speak with me. Even though I offered to interview them in the presence of my wife or in the presence of their family members, they still rejected to have an interview with me. That was because they believed that talking to strange males was not approved of, neither by religious and cultural norms, nor by their parents and the Turkish community at large. Anwar (1985) and Kucukcan (1996) also experienced almost the same difficulty in their researches on Muslim communities. Anwar (1985), in his study on Pakistanis in the UK, for instance, noted that, in order to overcome this religious barrier, he

interviewed Muslim women by way of *purdah*, which is a religious practice of some Muslim women. Kucukcan (1996) argues that the issue of gaining access to women`s world becomes more pronounced when a gender segregation is observed more strictly.

Another issue which emerged during the course of the interviews was that of arranging meetings with young Turkish-speaking people who work at Turkish Kebab restaurants. When I contacted those young employees, they all told me that they worked very hard and that, therefore, they hardly had enough time to breathe. Indeed, they worked at those restaurants around 15 hours a day. In order to tackle this problem, I talked with their employers and asked them to permit me to interview these young people at their restaurants. Because of my having earlier contact with them, the employers allowed me to conduct the interviews at the restaurants while the employees were working at the same time.

Furthermore, on one occasion, I was accused of being a spy collecting information about Turkish-speakers who had migrated from Turkey to the UK. In this particular occasion, at a Turkish organisation in Bristol, I was introduced, by means of my gatekeeper, to a young Turkish speaker in order to interview him. When I explained my research to him, he asked me why I wanted to gather information about him and who I was collecting it for. Even when I tried to clarify my purpose in-depth, he kept implying that I was an intelligence officer. For this reason, I did not maintain the discussion any further considering the informant`s concern.

3. 3. Analysis Process

In this study, a qualitative thematic analysis was used in order to identify and analyse patterns of meaning in the dataset (Braun and Clarke, 2006). There are many reasons why I used thematic approaches for analysing the specific data. Only two reasons, however, will be discussed here.

Firstly, a thematic analysis creates ‘key themes, concepts and emergent categories’ (Ritchie et al., 2003: 220) with which to classify, organise, and understand the phenomenon under study (Daly et al., 1997; Joffe and Yardley, 2004). Secondly, it offers a ‘theoretically-flexible approach to analysing qualitative data’ (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 77). It renders possible a useful and flexible research tool which may provide a rich, detailed set of data by means of the theoretical freedom which is accorded (ibid).

On the other hand, in order to facilitate the coding of the transcripts, NVivo software was used. This is because it has a range of tools for recording, organising, and linking the patterns and ideas in the data in a number of ways (Richards, 1999; Wiltshier, 2011). In that sense, first of all, the selected transcripts were read several times in order for the researcher to become as intimate as possible with the explanations and accounts provided. During each reading of the transcripts, initial codings were developed by taking into consideration the research questions. After that, considering the chronological order of the codes, the emerging theme which captured the main characteristics of the accounts were organised in the form of nodes. This technique was utilised on all transcripts. Each transcript offered several themes. These were then organised into a final set of themes. Meanwhile, at this point of the analytical process, some themes, which were extraneous to the research questions, were excluded from the themes generated. In this sense, the original master themes which were created will be reported in the following sections by ordering them into a logical and coherent structure.

CHAPTER FOUR: ETHNIC IDENTITY AMONG YOUNG TURKISH- SPEAKERS IN BRITAIN

The main aim of this chapter is to present the findings gained through the in-depth interviews which were conducted regarding ethnic identity among young Turkish-speaking generation in the UK. In this sense, this chapter will examine the ethnic identity of those young people from various aspects, including the background information of the respondents; how they define their identity; their relationships with the family, community, culture, and friends; their relationships with the host society and the home country; and the religious attitudes and practices of young Turkish-speakers.

4. 1. Background Information regarding the Respondents

The following findings are based on in-depth interviews which were conducted in London and Bristol. At the beginning of each interview, various questions were asked of the respondents in order to obtain information concerning their age, place of birth, city of residence, period of stay in the UK, marital status, and family type (see Table 4. 1.).

Table 4. 1. Background Information of the Respondents

Respondent	Sex	Age	Place of Birth	City of Residence	Period of Stay in the UK (in years)	Marital Status	Family Type
1	M	18	London	London	Since birth	Single	Nuclear
2	F	22	Turkey	London	14	Single	Nuclear
3	F	18	Turkey	London	10	Single	Nuclear
4	M	27	London	London	Since birth	Single	Nuclear
5	M	24	London	London	Since birth	Single	Nuclear
6	F	18	London	London	Since birth	Single	Nuclear
7	M	25	Turkey	London	17	Single	Nuclear

8	F	18	London	Bristol	Since birth	Single	Nuclear
9	M	21	Turkey	Bristol	9	Single	Broken
10	F	25	Turkey	Bristol	10	Single	Nuclear
11	M	20	Turkey	Bristol	10	Single	Nuclear
12	M	22	Turkey	Bristol	19	Single	Nuclear
13	M	25	Turkey	Bristol	10	Single	Nuclear

During the course of the interviews, I tried to interview a sufficient number of people from both sexes in London and Bristol. As seen in Table 4. 1., even though the number of female participants (5) is slightly lower than the number of male participants (8), it can be said that a satisfactory number of participants from both sexes was reached.

As stated earlier in the methodology section, the age range from which the participants were chosen was between 18 and 27 years old. As can be discerned from the above table, the age distribution of the respondents covers the targeted sample of those young people in terms of both two cities and sexes. The reason for choosing such an age range is that young people between the ages of 18 and 27 are still going through a process of exploration, questioning, and acquisition about their ethnicity and identity. As Phinney (1993: 75) points out, these young people ‘attempt to learn more about their culture and understand the implications and come to accept their culture and themselves.’

The majority of the respondents (8) stated that they were born in Turkey and had migrated to London or Bristol with their parents or joined them at a later time. If we examine Table 4. 1., it can be seen that there is a clear difference between those young people who live in London and Bristol in terms of birthplace. This is due to the relatively short history that Turkish speakers have had living in Bristol, which primarily began in the 1990s, vis-à-vis the longer migration history

that they had living in London, which began in the early 1970s. Although the majority of those young people were born in Turkey, as shown in Table 4. 1., since the minimum period of stay that they have had in the UK is stated as 9 years, their residency period in the UK is quite sufficient to talk about their adapting to the host society`s different value systems, such as language and way of life.

One of the remarkable outcomes of the research is that all of the young people who the researcher interviewed were single. Accordingly, their marital status can be discerned in the above table. It should be noted that there are some factors which play a critical role in making marriage decisions, such as education level, employment and age. When the marriage statistics in Turkey published by the Turkish Statistical Institute (2016) are examined, it is seen that the average age at which men first married in 2015 was 27 for men and 23.9 for women. In that sense, it could be said that the marital status of young Turkish people in the UK parallels that of people in Turkey.

It is clear from the above table that, except for one person, all of the respondents were members of a nuclear family. They lived with their parents and siblings even after reaching the age of 18. In that sense, it could be said that the family type in which young Turkish speakers lived in the UK includes a father, mother, and unmarried children and that this parallels the modern Turkish family's structure.

Furthermore, when I asked them why their parents came to Britain, the majority of them stated that their father moved to the UK first for mainly economic reasons. One of the respondents, for instance, said ‘mainly for work, for saving up, helping..., providing for our financial needs’ (London, Female: 18b). Accordingly, it could be said that economic factors and motivations influenced Turkish family structure and values.

4. 2. Young Turkish-Speakers and the Way They Define of Their Ethnic Identity

This section presents the findings concerned with the kind of ethnic identity expressed by young Turkish-speakers living in London and Bristol. It is clear from the existing literature that ethnic identity has been influenced by a characteristic of a person`s lifestyle, one`s feelings of belongingness to a group or community, one`s cultural or religious activities, and so on. In that sense, our focus here is mainly on how those young people defined their ethnic identities as forms of self-identification. The questions "how would you describe your ethnic identity?" and "what do you think yourself as an ethnicity?" play important role in the respondents' describing him or herself.

Table 4. 2. Ethnic Self-Definition and Background Information of Young Turkish-Speakers

Respondent	Sex	Age	Place of Birth	City of Residence	Period of Stay in the UK (in years)	Ethnic-Self Definition
1	M	18	London	London	Since birth	Turkish
2	F	22	Turkey	London	14	Turkish
3	F	18	Turkey	London	10	Kurdish
4	M	27	London	London	Since birth	Turkish-Turkish Cypriot
5	M	24	London	London	Since birth	Turkish
6	F	18	London	London	Since birth	Turkish-Kurdish-British
7	M	25	Turkey	London	17	Turkish-British
8	F	18	London	Bristol	Since birth	Turkish-British
9	M	21	Turkey	Bristol	9	Turkish
10	F	25	Turkey	Bristol	10	Turkish
11	M	20	Turkey	Bristol	10	Turkish
12	M	22	Turkey	Bristol	19	Turkish-British
13	M	25	Turkey	Bristol	10	Turkish-British

As can be seen, the above table indicates the background information of the respondents, as well as how they define their own ethnic identities. In this way, we have the opportunity to observe whether there is any correlation between the ethnic self-definition of young Turkish-speakers and the various variables related to their background information, such as place of birth, length of stay in the UK, and city of residence.

Table 4. 3. Ethnic Self-Definitions by Frequency and Percentage Distributions

	Frequency	Percent
Turkish	6	46.5
Kurdish	1	7.5
Turkish-British	4	31
Turkish-Turkish Cypriot	1	7.5
Turkish-Kurdish-British	1	7.5
Total	13	100

As can be seen from Table 4. 3., the majority of respondents (46.5%) identified themselves as Turkish. Some of those interviewees strongly highlighted their Turkishness. One, for instance, states, ‘I am [a] more conservative Turk. I would define myself as a Turk’ (Bristol, Male: 20). Another respondent who had similarly been born in the UK explained that ‘I am [one] hundred percent Turkish. When my friends [asked] me "where are you from?" I would say I am from Turkey even [if] they [did] not [ask] whether [I was] born in England or not. I would always say [that I was] Turkish’ (London, Male: 24). It could be said that their intense feelings towards Turkishness did not have anything to do with their place of birth. As can be seen from Table 4. 2., their place of birth did not correlate with any common ethnic identity. For this reason, their answers (e.g. as Turkish or Kurdish or Turkish-British) should be approached by considering their attachments to their respective cultures. The roles of family, culture, and religious organisations

in the UK may have influenced the construction of their ethnic identities. This view is clearly posited by one respondent. When I asked him whether there was any way in which he did not feel Turkish, he said: 'No, you are surrounded by your community which makes you like you are Turkish and part of the nation also' (London, Male: 18). As Waters (1990: 19) points out, 'ethnic identification involves both choice and constraint. Children learn both the basic facts of their family history and the cultural content and practices associated with their ethnicity in their household.' Young Turkish-speakers' relationships with their family, the Turkish community, and the host society will be examined in detail in the following sections.

It is also important to note that 4 respondents (23.5% of the respondents) felt like they were both Turkish and British. Earlier research conducted on Turkish-speaking communities suggests that having a country of settlement tends to develop a hyphenated identity (see, for instance, Kucukcan, 1996 and Yalcin, 2000). According to Hussain (1989: 10), this kind of identity 'contain[s] within themselves a bi-polarity, a movement between cultural identity and nation states.' The development of hyphenated identities is associated with one's place of birth and the increasing length of stay that one has in the host country (Kucukcan, 1996; Necef, 1996; Yalcin, 2000; Enneli etc., 2005).

Moreover, as seen in Table 4. 2., one of the female respondents, who was born in London, stated that she felt like she could identify with three ethnicities, including Turkish, Kurdish and British. She noted, 'I mainly feel Turkish, Kurdish because my dad is Kurdish, and my mom is Turkish... I feel quite isolated because we are living in Walford where there is not a lot of Turkish families around.... There is no[thing] like socialisation' (London, Female: 18a). It can be argued that, during adolescence, many youths may become deeply involved in learning about their ethnicity. As Phinney et al. (2001: 496) point out, getting to the level where one can achieve an ethnic

identity depends on ‘socialization experiences in the family, the ethnic community, and the larger setting.’ It may be suggested that her identifying with multiple ethnicities stems from her being isolated whilst struggling with her being both Turkish-Kurdish and British. She might not feel a strong sense of belonging, neither to her Turkish-Kurdish identity, nor to her British one either. Furthermore, when she visits her parents` country of origin, she feels quite isolated and feels as if she is an outsider. She stated that:

When I go to Turkey I feel like a guest. When I come here I feel like a guest. I feel like there is no country that belongs to me because I do not spend enough time in Turkey. When I go out, I cannot express myself... I cannot mix with my cousins because, [when] my cousins see me, [they] look down. (London, Female: 18a)

Furthermore, some respondents described their identity by closely linking it to the practical benefits and rights that they obtain from being a citizen of the UK, such as voting rights, political freedom, and the benefits of having a UK passport. When asked about how they describe their identity, one individual, for instance, noted that ‘I do feel that I have — that I owe — something [to] Britain because [it has] provide[d] me [with a] good..., quality life, [the opportunity for] good stud[ies],...and work opportunities’ (Bristol, Male: 25).

What this demonstrates is that, for some young Turkish speakers, Britishness is a political, rather than an ethnic or cultural, identity.

4. 3. Relationships with their Family and the Turkish Community

The first social interaction that children have begins in their own family unit. Therefore, the family plays an immeasurably significant role in transmitting traditional values to the younger generations. This section will analyse the relationships of young Turkish-speakers with their

family in the Turkish communities of London and Bristol. In order to obtain a better understanding of these relationships, five main issues will be examined in this section: their relationships with: (i) their families; (ii) marriage; (iii) the Turkish community; (iv) Turkish organisations; and (v) friendships.

4. 3. 1. Family Relationships

Family relations play a significant role in the identity formation of young Turkish-speakers since parents, siblings, and other family members are ‘the source of children’s first experiences related to ethnicity’ (Phinney and Rosenthal, 1992: 153). In that sense, in order to understand the relationships that family members have with those young people, a number of questions were asked of the respondents.

One of the questions was associated with parents’ and siblings’ relationships with the participants from the points-of-view of those young people. The vast majority of the interviewees stated that they have good relationships with their mothers. Frequently mentioned reasons for their having such close relationships with their mothers included their being “like a (best) friend” with their children, being “open-minded,” and the talk between them being “highly enjoyable.” One respondent (London, Female: 18b) said that ‘My mom is my best friend. I could talk to her about anything and I can always express my feelings to her.’ Some of the respondents stated that they have the closest relations with their siblings. For instance, one respondent (Bristol, Male: 20) said: ‘I am very close to my brother. Even though he is older than me, we have a friendly type of relationship. He supports me a lot financially and in everyday situations.’ On the other hand, just two of the thirteen respondents noted that they have good relationships with their fathers. One of the possible reasons for this is because they are often separated from their fathers for very long

periods of time. Some respondents held this view because, being brought up in Turkey, they experienced a lack of fatherly love. Others, who lived with their fathers, did not have close relationships with their fathers because of their fathers having to work long hours in Turkish restaurants in the UK. This view is supported by one respondent (Bristol, Female: 25), who said that ‘We grew up far away from our father; therefore, there is always a distance and seriousness between me and my father.’

In order to better understand the family relationships of the respondents, their independence from their parents was also interrogated. Kucukcan (1996) and Yalcin (2000) found that the majority of their respondents thought that their parents exercised excessive control over them. My research, on the other hand, reveals different results from their findings. When asked whether their parents exercise control over them, the majority of the respondents believed that the control exercised over them was a kind of their protection rather than their parents’ being intolerant or strict. They were of the opinion that their ‘parents [simply] do not want something bad happen to their children’ (Bristol, Female: 18). One female interviewee, for instance, noted, that, ‘at first, I thought that their behaviour was too strict; however, I later realised that that was the right decision for me’ (London, Female: 18b).

When it came to making girlfriends or boyfriends, some respondents linked the issue directly with the cultural and religious attitudes of their parents. When I asked whether they could make their own decision regarding whom they could make a boyfriend or girlfriend, the respondents noted that ‘we are a strict, religious family’ (London, Male: 18), that they could not have any ‘boyfriends because of the religion’ (London, Female: 18a), that their parents ‘did not want me to make friends with non-Muslims because of our religion and culture’ (Bristol, Male: 21), that ‘my mom would want me to make friends with Turkish or Muslim backgrounds rather than

British, Christian, or any other ethnic background' (Bristol, Male: 20). It could be said that some cultural and religious values seem to be the main features of many Turkish-speaking parents. Furthermore, these findings on parental attitudes show that both the male and female respondents were under parental control with relation to making relationships. As Kucukcan (1996) points out, this is because Turkish-speaking parents do not want their children to be involved in dangerous acts, such as drugs, sex, and prostitution, and that that is the reason why they want to protect them.

4. 3. 1. 1. Marriage

Marrying somebody from an ethnic group is a very important indicator which shows whether there are any issues associated with ethnic, cultural, and religious backgrounds. In traditional Turkish culture, parents play a decisive role in determining a spouse for their children. It is argued, however, that, as a result of immigration to different countries, new patterns of marriage have appeared in the Turkish community (Kucukcan, 1996). In order to reveal this issue, the respondents were asked some questions related to their personal views, as well as those of their parents, regarding marriage.

When asked whether their parents believed that they should marry a person from their own culture, all of the respondents noted that their parents wanted them to marry someone from their own culture. It is also a fact that all of them, besides two, stated that they would prefer marrying a person from their own communities. Enneli's study (2001: 92) provides almost the same picture. Her findings suggest that very few people prefer to marry someone outside of their own communities. As for my own respondents, some of them would be willing to marry a Muslim person from another ethnic background, but none of them would marry a non-Muslim, even if

they were in love with them. They believe that ‘ethnic groups are not a problem — it is more to do with religion’ (Bristol, Male: 20) ‘because he would be a Christian and it would not be acceptable’ (Bristol, Female: 18) ‘because you will be judged in terms of religion, whereas, in terms of culture, you cannot be judged’ (London, Female: 18b). When asked whether they would be able to marry a Muslim person from a different ethnic background, many of them stated that they could but that they would not want to. One interviewee, for instance, noted that ‘[ethnicity] would not stop me from marrying someone but I simply would not want to marry someone who is not from my own culture’ (Bristol, Male: 25). They believed that, if they were married to someone from outside their own community, they would have an ‘unhappy life’ (Bristol, Male: 22), there would be ‘communication barriers with my mom and the lady’ (Bristol, Male: 25). One can see from the above quotations that young Turkish-speakers consider the expectations of their parents and want their prospective spouses to have healthy relationships, not only with them, but with their parents as well. This view also can be observed in Turkey, where people say “when someone is married, families are married as well.”

4. 3. 2. Relationships inside the Turkish Community

According to Markstrom-Adams (1992: 174), ‘[i]dentity formation is not wholly an individualistic process; rather, the social environment exerts its forms of power and influence.’ Interactions between Turkish-speakers through various organisations and close social relationships have had an important influence on the development of an ethnic identity in the young Turkish-speaking generation. These types of relationship will be analysed in the following two sub-sections.

4. 3. 2. 1. Turkish-Speaking Organisations

It is argued that cultural, religious and political organisations play a crucial role in the formation and maintenance of young Turkish-speakers' identity in the UK (Kucukcan, 1996; Yalcin, 2000; Enneli, 2001; Costu, 2009; Communities and Local Government, 2009; Simsek, 2012). According to Simsek (2012), the majority of Turkish-speaking community organisations' purpose is to circulate and strengthen their national, ethnic and cultural identity. In London, there are a number of social, cultural, political and religious organisations which are promoted by Turkish, Kurdish, and Cypriot Turkish communities, whereas in Bristol, there are only just two official organisations, including the Bristol Somuncu Baba Turkish Mosque and the Bristol Yunus Emre Turkish Supplementary School. As soon as the mosque in Bristol was founded, an Imam was appointed by the Turkish Directorate of Religious Affairs to lead prayers and to provide religious services to the Turkish-speaking children and adults living there. At the supplementary school, on the other hand, young people are taught the Turkish language, Turkish culture, and religious subjects.-Apart from these, at the time of my Masters studies in Bristol, I observed that there were a few religious activities organised by some Jama'as (Cemaatler), such as the Suleymanis and Fethullah Gulen groups, as well as one political organisation called the UETD (or the Union of European Turkish Democrats). This latter organisation has branches in six European countries. Turkish-speaking organisations in Bristol, however, are not as strong or as organised as the organisations in London.

In order to reveal young Turkish-speakers' relationships with Turkish-speaking organisations, some questions were asked of the respondents. When asked if they were attached, or were members, of any Turkish organisations, the great majority of the respondents said that they were more involved in religious activities. It should be stated that Turkish Mosques are seen as the

most important of all of the aforementioned organisations. As Enneli (2001) noted, religion plays a central role in some people's lives and, therefore, might be expected to be more involved in religious activities, especially those organised by Turkish Mosques. It could be said that Turkish Mosques are not only considered to be places which provide religious services but also places where social, cultural, and educational programmes and activities are carried out. When asked why they are involved in Mosque activities, they particularly pointed out its importance in terms of 'gathering together' (Bristol, Male: 25), 'socialising' (London, Male: 25), 'learning the Qur'an' (London, Female: 18b), 'having religious talks' (London, Female: 18a), 'meeting on special days' (Bristol, Female: 25), and 'learning the Turkish language and culture' (Bristol, Male: 21).

On the other hand, it should be noted that two interviewees from Bristol stated that they are actively involved in political organisations (i.e. the UETD Bristol). Some respondents stated that this organisation's main reason for existence is that of 'bringing Turkish-speakers together' (Bristol, Male: 20) and that of 'promoting Turkish-British relations' (Bristol, Male: 22).

Indeed, these respondents were very close friends and actively involved in the UETD Bristol. They would actively organise meetings and would call politicians from Turkey in order to give talks or seminars to the Turkish-speaking community in Bristol.

4. 3. 2. 2. Friendships

According to Caglar (1995), Kucukcan (1996), Verkuyten and Hagendoorn (1996), Yalcin (2000) and Enneli's (2001) findings, the majority of young Turkish-speakers prefer having contact with their ethnic groups. It is clear from this research that the friendship patterns of the young generation indicate that, although almost all respondents have friends from other ethnic groups, including both Muslims and non-Muslims, their close friends were mostly from the Turkish-

speaking community. The reasons why they tended to only have best friends from their own ethnic groups are that they could be 'trusted' (Bristol, Female: 18), that they 'shared the same values' (Bristol, Male: 20), that they followed 'the same religious beliefs' (London, Female: 18a), and are 'easier to get along with' (London, Male: 25). Due to these and other similar reasons, the majority of respondents stated that it is easier to make friends from the group that they belonged to rather than other ethnic groups.

Another respondent (London, Male: 27) who was born in the UK stated that 'I am not very friendly with people from other ethnic groups because they want to drink and go to pubs. It is not easy to make friendships with them.' It seems that religious and cultural values have influenced the friendship patterns of the younger Turkish-speaking generation.

4. 4. Relationships with the Host Society and the Home Country

Interaction with the host society is one of the main issues that immigrants have. In their new social and cultural environment, the migrants might find themselves in a position of obtaining some of the host community's culture, such as speaking its language. It should be pointed out that basic knowledge of the host society's language is seen as being essential to successful integration (Niessen and Huddleston, 2009). On the other hand, young Turkish-speakers' attitudes towards language and participating in the social, cultural, and political lives or organisations of the receiving country may demonstrate how the young generation constructs their ethnic identity, as well as how those young people integrate within their host society. In addition to these, the ethnic identity formation of young people may also be observed in their maintaining a variety of links with their home country.

In order to obtain a better understanding of this, four main issues will be examined in this section: language, participating in British organisations, maintaining links with the home country, and the importance that they hold for their respective countries.

4. 4. 1. Language

Waters (1990: 116) argues that ‘language is one of the first elements of the immigrant culture to disappear over the generations.’ It is true that an ethnic language embraces the history, culture, and customs of the community it belongs to. Therefore, not being able to communicate in the ethnic language seems to be directly correlated to one’s losing one’s ethnic identity (Kucukcan, 1996; Simsek, 2012). In order to communicate with one’s host society, though, immigrants have to speak the language of the receiving country. In that sense, some questions were asked in the interviews for the purpose of revealing which language the respondents preferred to use in their everyday lives.

First, it must be noted that, according to my observations during the interviews, all of the respondents — except for one female who was born in London — were able to speak Turkish fluently. In that sense, it could be said that there is no connection between the interviewees’ ability to speak Turkish and their place of birth. When two of the respondents who were born in the UK were asked which language they would want to use during the interview, they stated that they would be able to express their feelings and ideas better in Turkish. As a side note, some respondents switched to Turkish or English whenever they felt more comfortable with one of the two languages. It is important to emphasise, though, that the respondents’ ability to speak English directly correlated to how long they had lived in the UK, with those having lived in the UK longer being able to speak better. Necef (1996) and Yalcin’s (2000) mirrors the findings of this study.

With regards to the everyday lives of the respondents, the great majority of them noted that they mostly speak Turkish at home and with their Turkish friends. When asked whether their parents required them to speak Turkish at home, 10 out of the 13 interviewees explained that no such requirement existed in their homes. One (Bristol, Male: 25) respondent, for instance, said that ‘my mom actually asks me to speak English (laughing).’ Another (London, Female: 22) interviewee stated, similarly, that, ‘when we were younger, they asked us to speak English more.’ One might suggest that the reason for asking their children to speak Turkish at home is due to their not having the ability of speak English with them. Some of the respondents also noted that, sometimes, they preferred to speak English with their siblings. This was mainly due to the fact that, since they had been born in the UK, they were more comfortable with the English language, thereby making it easier for them to explain their feelings and thoughts using that language. As one (London, Male: 25) of the respondents mentioned, ‘my brother and sister were born here so they understand English better.’

4. 4. 2. Participation in British Organisations

As mentioned earlier, regular participation in the organisations of the host country is one of the most important indicators of how young immigrants will construct their identity. In that sense, in order to understand what type of relationships young Turkish-speakers have with British organisations, some relevant questions were asked of the respondents.

When asked whether they were members of British organisations, the great majority of them stated that they did not. Yalcin`s (2000) reports similar findings with this research. The reasons given by some of them for not being members of British organisations were that ‘I do not want to attend those organisations because, when they organise meetings, they primarily serve alcohol’

(Bristol, Female: 18). Another respondent, moreover, stated that ‘I mostly come to this Mosque so, whatever I do, I do with the Mosque community — I mean, with people the same age as me’ (London, Male: 18). One might suggest that religious beliefs and values provide a paradigm which influences the attitudes of some young people towards whether or not they will join British organisations.

Two other respondents, on the other hand, said that they are active members of student clubs at their universities. One (Male, Bristol: 22), for instance, explained, that ‘there is a football club that I play for.’ The other (Male, London: 24) respondent similarly joined an athletic club at university, saying that ‘I play tennis with my British friends.’ It is important to keep in mind that social settings and groups influence one’s activities. According to Van Tubergen (2007: 748), ‘people who are strongly integrated into a social group are assumed to be more likely to comply with the norms of that group.’ In that sense, the research demonstrates that the young generation’s social settings play a crucial role in whether they become a member of a British organisation or not.

4. 4. 3. Maintaining Links with the Home Country and the Importance of Their Respective Countries

In order to understand the transnational physical mobility of young Turkish-speakers and their relationship with the country of origin, some questions were asked of them related to their visits to their country of origin, the length of stay that they had in their home country, their opinions about permanently returning to their home country, and the importance of the UK and their country of origin, respectively, for them.

Although all of the interviewees stated that they had visited their country of origin, the frequency of their visits varies. According to the data provided in the interviews, 7 of the 13 respondents visit Turkey at least once every year, 4 of them go once every two years (with one of them going to Northern Cyprus). Apart from these, 2 respondents, who have lived in the UK for 10 years, explained that they travelled to Turkey only twice in all that time. They mostly visit their home towns in order to visit their families, relatives and friends and stay there for roughly a month. It should be stressed that the young people who were born in the UK do not have as close a relationship with their country of origin as their parents do. As Simsek (2012) points out, their relations with people in Turkey or Cyprus is limited to the period of stay that they have in their home country. Therefore, some problems might emerge with relation to their adapting to, or isolation from, their country of origin when they visit that country. One female respondent (London, Female: 18a), for instance, said that,

[w]hen I go to the east of Turkey, they judge me. They judge your looks. They say “why do you not cover yourself with a hijab?” I do not want to cover my head... Then I feel really left out.

One might suggest that this respondent’s problem with Turkey is that she feels isolated — particularly when visiting her relatives in the eastern part of Turkey. She additionally noted that, due to her knowing an insufficient amount of Turkish, she could not communicate with her cousins. Thus, she feels like she does not belong to the country.

On the other hand, when asked whether they wanted to return to their home country permanently in the future, the great majority of the respondents said that they intended to move. It is important to note, however, that all of those who expressed a desire to return their home country, except one, had originally been born and raised in Turkey. In this respect, one should stress the fact that

there is strong relationship between young people`s approaches to returning to their home country vis-à-vis to their place of birth. Gmelch (1980) argues that migrants decide to return for various reasons. One reason stems from ‘those who failed to adapt to the way of life in the host society, perhaps because of the strangeness of the language, people, and customs or because they could not bear the psychic costs of being separated from close friends and the familiar environment of home’ (ibid: 137). It could be said that this is the case for the respondents hoping to return to Turkey. An interviewee (Bristol, Female: 18), for instance, said that

I want to live in Turkey because you would have a better social circle there. I have many friends in Turkey. All of my cousins are there. You could make new friends easily there and would not have to suffer the difficulties of being a stranger because the culture is the same.

There were similar responses from some of the interviewees, who referred to social and cultural reasons for returning to Turkey. One of them (London, Male: 25) explained that ‘I belong to Turkey and I am here only temporarily to learn the English language and get experience. I will work in a better job and will go and help my country become better.’ As Safran (1991) argues, some migrants believe that they should be committed to maintaining and improving their country of origin for its further prosperity.

On the other hand, the reasons that some gave for not returning to the country of origin in the future were related to their having adapted to the British system and its lifestyle. This echoes the findings of Yalcin (2000), who reported that the participants of his study who wanted to remain in the UK cited that they would have better conditions and an easier life in Britain when compared to Turkey.

The interviewees were also asked which country is more important for them. While 7 respondents said that Turkey is more important, others stated that both countries hold an equal importance for them. The former group noted that they have a stronger sense of belongingness towards Turkey despite the practical benefits and rights that they receive from living in the UK. When the young people mentioned Turkey, they commonly used the term “memleketim” (my country), which is closely linked to nationalist ideas. One interviewee (London, Female: 18b) stated that Turkey held more importance for her ‘...because it is my country. I was born there. my parents came from there. My background and my language originate from there.’ The latter group, on the other hand, argued that neither country was more important than the other in their opinions. The data shows that the great majority of those who were born in the UK said that both countries were equally important for them. According to them, in terms of a sense of belongingness and family background, their home country is important but they also believed that they are part of their host country. One respondent (London, Male: 27), who described his ethnic identity as Turkish-Turkish Cypriot, for instance, said that ‘both countries are equally important for me. It is quite important for me to be in Britain. It is a good place for me because I live here. But Turkey is very important because my family is there.’

4. 5. The Religious Attitudes and Practices of Young Turkish-Speakers

In order to reveal the religious attitudes and practices of these young persons, a number of questions were asked them. As has already been noted, religion tends to be a significant source in the lives of the majority of young Turkish speakers, especially when it comes to protecting their national culture. When asked whether they are religious, the great majority replied that they did consider themselves to be religious. This does not, however, mean that, for other young people, religion is not important in their everyday lives. Rather, they believed that they are not

very interested in religious practises and, therefore, did not describe themselves as being religious. As a report published by the Greater London Community (2009) noted, most Turkish-speakers living in the UK come from a Muslim background. The initial instruction that they receive about Islam are mostly provided by the family. It has been found that young people's practicing their family's religion is strongly linked to their parents' religiousness (Hyde, 1990; Kucukcan, 1996). This point was clearly stressed by one of the respondent (Bristol, Male: 20), who stated that 'my family would be my primary source [for attaining Islam].' In the UK, this initiation is typically supplemented and supported by religious and cultural organisations, such as supplementary schools and mosques. All of the respondents noted that they attended religious classes through either Turkish supplementary schools or Turkish mosques. In this respect, as the research reveals, the respondents were provided a religious education in order for them to gain some knowledge about Islam.

Furthermore, when asked how important religion was in their lives, respondents stressed that it shaped most of their lives. These young people's accounts indicate that Islam is seen as a source of guidance for practising the religion and for living one's life. One respondent (London, Male: 18) stated that religion dictates '[e]verything. Like what I choose to eat, what I choose to wear, where I choose to go, who I choose to speak to.' Respondents mostly emphasised their associating religiosity with action. As Kucukcan (1996) points out, the ritualistic dimension of religion refers to certain religious practices expected of its followers. In that sense, Muslims are required to perform some obligatory practices, such as daily prayers (5 times a day), fasting throughout the entire month of Ramazan, and attending Friday prayers in a mosque. From the data, it is clear that 6 of the respondents tried to keep their daily prayers, with some of the others stating that they really wanted to perform all of the required prayers. Furthermore, all of the male respondents,

besides one, noted their commitment to going to the mosque for Friday prayers. All of the respondents, nevertheless, stated that they fast during Ramazan.

On the other hand, when asked whether they ever ate non-halal meat, some confessed that, although, when they were younger, especially in primary school, they ate non-halal meat, they currently make sure that all of the food that they consume are halal. When asked whether they drank alcohol, highly important data emerged. 4 of the young people noted that they had drank alcohol but had quit, whereas another two respondents said that they consume it at times. One interviewee (Bristol, Female: 18), for instance, stated that '[i]t depends on the situation. For example, I drink at special parties with my friends but not too much.' Even though the use of alcohol is strictly forbidden in Islamic practice, alcohol is, nonetheless, very common — not to mention extremely visible — in Western society. In this respect, one might suggest that, since Islamic and Western principles differ from one another, conflicts transpire between young people from these different cultures often.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

I believe that the research presented in this thesis has contributed to filling in gaps in the research that focuses on the ethnic identity formation of young Turkish speakers in the UK. I mentioned in the Introduction that one of the deficiencies in the existing research is that they ignored either the internal or the external dynamics of the Turkish-speaking community which lives in the UK. Therefore, in this research, I have explored how the young Turkish speakers living in the UK construct their ethnic identities by considering their relationships both inside and outside of their community. I also discussed the differences between the young Turkish speakers living in London and Bristol in terms of the ways in which they construct their ethnic identities.

The findings of this research show that the identity construction of young Turkish speakers has taken place based on a tension between their own culture and the dominant culture. In that sense, they have defined their ethnic identity by taking this fact into consideration. The research indicates that they are aware of their ethnic identities (Turkish, Kurdish, or Turkish Cypriot) and the cultural, social, and religious values which are the building blocks of their identities.

On the other hand, my findings have also suggested the existence of hyphenated identities among these young people. The new generation of Turkish youth has experienced a bivious socialisation process through their families, schools, mosques, and circles of friends. The new generation is mostly bilingual, feels loyalty both to their host country and their country of origin, and, thus, have two homes and identities. It is inherently possible that people can feel like they are part of the two cultures without making concessions regarding their traditional cultures and ethnic identities. As a result, they all bring their ethnic identities to the forefront, even if they state that they belong to both cultures.

Another implication of this thesis is that the family and friend relationships of these young people have significantly influenced the construction and maintenance of their ethnic identities. Mothers are thought of as being the most important characters in their families. Most of the young people I interviewed believed that they are understood better by their mothers than their fathers. This might have been caused by their fathers remaining separate from them for very long periods of time. They suffering from this in particular because many Turkish-speaking fathers in Britain work for very long hours, especially in Turkish restaurants. Furthermore, although earlier research has found that parental control is very common among Turkish speaking families, this research has revealed that parental control is perceived as a kind of protection rather than as acts of intolerance or being strict. Therefore, these young people's views about issues regarding marriage and making friends are almost the same as their parents'. Young Turkish speakers consider their parents' expectations and want their prospective spouses to have a healthy relationship, both with them and their families. My findings have also shown that young Turkish speakers tend to make friends in the groups that they belong to, preferring to make friends with those who share the same values and religious beliefs as themselves.

The role of cultural and religious organisations in the construction and maintenance of the Turkish-speaking ethnic identity is also very important. From my findings emerged the fact that the organisations of Turkish-speaking communities both in London and Bristol have an important influence on young Turkish speakers. Turkish mosques and Turkish supplementary schools are seen as the most important of these organisations. These two places are not only considered to be places in which educational or religious services are provided but are also known places in which social and cultural activities are carried out. The research also clearly shows that these kinds of organisation in Bristol are not as dominant and organised as those in London. Therefore, it could

be said that cultural and religious organisations in London have had a greater impact on the ethnic identity construction of young Turkish speakers in comparison with Bristol.

Young Turkish speakers' attitudes towards the language, as well as their participation in the social, cultural, and political lives or organisations of the receiving country demonstrate that bilingual young people, on the one hand, integrate into British society while, on the other hand, try to protect their ethnic and cultural identities. The findings confirm that cultural and religious values have greatly affected the attitudes of young people towards British organisations.

Furthermore, the research reveals that, on the one hand, the transnational links of some young people who were born in Britain, such as visits to the country of origin and constructing social networks with relatives and Turkish friends, are not as strong as their parents'. On the other hand, the majority who were born in Turkey have intended to return to their country of origin permanently in the future. These two findings indicate that they have failed to adapt to the way of life, either of their host society or that of their country of origin. As Gmelch (1980: 137) argues, this is 'because of the strangeness of the language, people, and customs.'

A final implication of this thesis is that religion is one of the most significant sources of Turkish ethnic identity. The findings demonstrate that the great majority of the young people interviewed in this study described themselves as being religious. Religion in the diaspora provides a more significant contribution to the identification process of individuals themselves and their commitment to groups (Peek, 2005). The findings demonstrate that young Turkish speakers construct their ethnic identity with reference to religion. Religious organisations, in this regard, are highly influential. In his study on Turkish-Dutch Muslims, Verkuyten (2007: 343) points out that 'religion is often of profound importance to people's lives and religious groups are among

the more salient buttresses of identity.’ Islam is seen by young Turkish speakers as a source of guidance which provides clear rules, not only about how to practise the religion, but also as a way of life. In that sense, the research shows that religion is one of the most important factors in the ethnic identity construction of the young Turkish speakers living in Britain.



Bibliography

- Abadan-Unat, N. (1976). Turkish Workers in Europe 1960-1975. In Nermin Abadan-Unat (ed.). *Turkish Workers in Europe 1960-1975*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1-44.
- Ackroyd, S. and Hughes, J. A. (1992). *Data Collection in Context*. 2nd Ed. Harlow: Longmans.
- Akca, Hasan (2015). Analysing Turkish Labour Migration to Europe via SWOT and STEEPLE. In *Turkish Migration Conference 2015 Selected Proceedings*. Güven Seker et al. (eds.). Transnational Press London.
- Anwar, M. (1985). *Pakistanis in Britain: A Sociological Study*. London: New Century Publishers.
- Atkinson, P. and Silverman, D. (1997). Kundera's Immortality: the interview society and the invention of the self. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 3(3): 304-325.
- Aydın, Yasar (2016). The Germany-Turkey Migration Corridor: Refitting Policies for a Transnational Age. *DC: Migration Policy Institute*.
- Ayten, Al, (2012). Kimlik ve Din: İngilterede'ki Türk Gençleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. 12(2): 101-119.
- Banks, Michael at al. (1992). *Careers and Identities*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Barth, Fredrik (1969). Introduction. In Fredrik Barth (ed.). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organisation of Culture Difference*. London: George Allen &Unwin.
- Barth, Fredrik (1996). Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith. *Theories of Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 75-82.
- Bauman, Z. (2001). *The Individualised Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1986). *Identity: Cultural Change and the Struggle for Self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bhagwati, J. N. and Srinivasan, T. N. (1974). On Reanalysing the Harris-Todaro Model: Policy Rankings in the Case of Sector-Specific Sticky Wages. *American Economic Review*. 64: 502-508.
- Beijer, G. (1969) Modern patterns of international migratory movements. In J. A. Jackson (ed.). *Migration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 11-59.
- Berry, John W. (1980). Acculturation as Varieties of Adaptation. In Amado M. Padilla (ed.). *Acculturation: Theory, Models and some new Findings*. Boulder: West-view. 9-25.
- Brenner, M. (1981). *Social method and social life*. London: Academic Press.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 3 (2): 77-101.
- Buckingham, David (2008). Introducing Identity. In David Buckingham, The John D. and Catherine T. (eds.). *Youth, Identity and Digital Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Burgess, Robert G. (1995). *In the Field An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, Charlotte. (2001). *Reconstructing Ethnicity and Identity: The Influence of Second-Generation Turkish-Cypriot and Pakistani Women in London*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. *University of Warwick*.
- Caglar, Ayse S. (1995). German Turks in Berlin: social exclusion and strategies for social mobility. *New Community*. 21(3): 309-323.
- Castles, Stephen, Haas, Hein De and Miller, Mark J. (2014). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Fifth Edition. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Communities and Local Government (2009). *The Turkish and Turkish Cypriot Muslim Community in England: Understanding Muslim Ethnic Communities*. Change Institute. webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk.
- Costu, Yakup (2009). Londra'da Türklere Ait Dini Organizasyonlar. *Hitit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. 8(15): 77-100.

- Daly, J., Kellehear, A., and Gliksman, M. (1997). *The public health researcher: A methodological approach*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Dokur-Gxyskiewicz, N. (1979). A Study of Adaptation of Turkish Migrant Workers to Living and Working in the United Kingdom. Unpublished PhD Thesis. *University of London: Birkbeck College*.
- Duke, K. (2002). Getting beyond the 'official line': reflections on dilemmas of access, knowledge and power in researching policy networks. *Journal of Social Policy*. 31(1): 39-60.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. (1954). *The Absorption of Immigrants*. London: Routledge & Keagan Paul Ltd.
- Enneli, Pinar (2001). Turkish-Speaking Young People in North London: A Case of Diversity and Disadvantage. *PhD Thesis*. University of Bristol.
- Enneli, P., Modood, T. and Bradley, H. (2005). *Young Turks and Kurds: A set of 'invisible' disadvantaged groups*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Erikson, E. H. (1965). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton&Company Inc.
- Erikson, Erik H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle: selected paper*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and Crisis*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Faas, Daniel (2009a). Young Turks in England and Germany: an exploration of their identity formation and perceptions of Europe. In Talip Kucukcan and Veyis Gungor (eds). *Turks in Europe: Culture, Identity and Integration*. Turkevi Research Centre.
- Faas, Daniel (2009b). Reconsidering identity: the ethnic and political dimensions of hybridity among majority and Turkish youth in Germany and England. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 60(2): 299-320.
- Fields, Gary S. (1975). Rural-Urban Migration, Urban Unemployment and Underemployment, and Job-Search Activity in LDCs. *Journal of Development Economics*. 2: 165-187.

- Fulton, A. S. (1996). Identity Status, Religious Orientation, and Prejudice. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 26 (1): 1-11.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Gmelch, George. (1980). Return Migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. (9): 135-159.
- Gordon, Milton M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Greater London Authority (2009). Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Cypriot Communities in London. www.wellondon.org.uk.
- Hammond, P. E. (1988). Religion and the persistence of identity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 27(1): 1-11.
- Harris, J. R. and Todaro, Michael P. (1970). Migration, Unemployment and Development: A Two-Sector Analysis. *American Economic Review*. 60: 126-142.
- Hussain, Nasser (1989). Hyphenated Identity: Nationalistic Discourse, History, and the Anxiety of Criticism in Salman Rushdie's *Shame*. *Qui Parle. Cultural Identity and the Promise of Literature*. 3(2): 1-18.
- Hutchinson, John and Smith, Anthony D. (1996). Introduction. In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (eds). *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 3-14.
- Hutnik, Nimmi (1991). *Ethnic Minority Identity: A Social Psychological Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hyde, K. E. (1990). *Religion in Childhood and Adolescence: A Comprehensive Review of the Research*. Alabama: Religious Education Press.
- Jenkins, Richard. (1999). *Social Identity*. Second Edit. London: Routledge.

- Joffe, Helene and Yardley, Lucy (2004). Content and Thematic Analysis. In David F. Marks and Lucy Yardley (eds.). *Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Jones, A. Elisabeth (2008). Language, Culture and Identity: the achievement and aspirations of Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Cypriot Girls in North London Secondary Schools. *Unpublished PhD Thesis*. University of Reading.
- Jones, S. R. and McEwen, M. K. (2000). A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity. *Journal of College Student Development*. 41(4): 405-414.
- Kanno, Y. (2003). *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities: Japanese Returnees Between Two Worlds*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kastoryano, Riva (2013). "Turks Abroad" Redefine Turkish Nationalism. In Susan Eva Eckstein and Adil Najam (eds.). *How Immigrants Impact Their Homelands*. London: Duke University Press.
- King, R. (1982). The changing distribution of Cypriots in London. *Etudes Migrations*. XIX (65): 93-120.
- Knott, K. (1986). Religion and Identity and, the Study of Ethnic Minority Religions in Britain. In V. C. Hayes (ed.). *Identity Issues and World Religions: Selected Proceedings of Fifteenth Congress of the International Association for the History of Religions*. Australian Association for the Study of Religion. South Australia.
- Knott, K. and Khokher, S. (1993). Religious and Ethnic Identity among Young Muslim Women in Bradford. *New Community*. 19 (4): 593-610.
- Kroger, J. (1993). Ego Identity: An Overview. In Jane Kroger (ed.). *Discussions on Ego Identity*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 1-20.
- Kucukcan, T. (1996). *The Politics of Ethnicity, Identity and Religion among Turks in London*. PhD Thesis. University of Warwick.
- Lawler, Steph (2008). *Identity: sociological perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Leloup, F. (1996). Migration, a complex phenomenon. *International Journal of Anthropology*. 11(2): 101-115.
- Lewis, G. J. (1982). *Human Migration*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Liebkind, K. (1989). Conceptual Approaches to Ethnic Identity. In Karmela Liebkind (ed.). *New Identities in Europe: immigrant ancestry and the ethnic identity of youth*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing Company Ltd. 13-40.
- Lyon, Wenonah (1997). Defining Ethnicity: Another Way of Being British. In Tariq Modood and Pnina Werbner (eds.). *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in Adolescence. In J. Addles (ed.). *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. New York: John Wiley. 159-187.
- Markstrom-Adams, C. (1992). A Consideration of Intervening Factors in Adolescent Identity Formation. In Gerald R. Adams, Thomas P. Gullotta and Raymond Monternayor (eds.). *Adolescence Identity Formation*. USA: Sage Publications. 173-192.
- Markstrom-Adams, C., Hofstra, G. and Dougher K. (1994). The Ego-Virtue of Fidelity: A Case for the Study of Religion and Identity Formation in Adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 23(4): 453-469.
- Mason, David (1995). *Race and Ethnicity in Modern Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mehmet Ali, A. (2001). *Turkish Speaking Communities and Education*, London: Fatal Publications.
- MFA (2016). Turkish Citizens Living Abroad. <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-expatriate-turkish-citizens.en.mfa>.
- Modood, Tariq (1997). Culture and Identity. In Tariq Modood et al. (eds.). *Ethnic Minorities in Britain-Diversity and Disadvantage*. London: Policy Studies Institute. 290-338.
- Morris, H. S. (1968). Ethnicity. In David L. Sills (ed.). *The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. The Macmillan Company and The Free Press. 5: 167-172.
- Mol, J. (Hans) J. (1976). *Identity and the Sacred*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Mol, J. (Hans) J. (1978). Introduction and Maori Identity and Religion. In Johannis (Hans) J Mol (ed.). *Identity and Religion: International, Cross-Cultural Approaches*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Necef, Mehmet Umit (1996). Ethnic Identity and Language Shift among Young Turks in Denmark. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Center for Contemporary Middle East Studies. Odense University. Denmark.
- Niessen, J. and Huddleston, T. (2009). *Handbook on Integration: for policy-makers and practitioners*. 3rd Ed. France: European Communities.
- Oakley, R. (1979). The Cypriot migration to Britain. In Verity Saifullah Khan (ed.). *Minority Families in Britain*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd. 13-34.
- Oaldehy, R. (1989) Cypriot Migration to Britain to World war II. *New Community*. 15 (4): 509-525.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS). (2011). 2011 Census: Ethnic group (detailed), local authorities in England and Wales. Available via: <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/census/2011-census/key-statistics-and-quick-statistics-for-wards-and-output-areas-in-england-and-wales/rft---qs211ew-wm.xls>
- Queen, E. L. (1996). The Formation and Reformation of Religious Identity. *Religious Education*. 91 (4): 489-495.
- Patterson, S. J., Sochting, I. and Marcia J. E. (1992). The Inner Space and Beyond: Women and Identity. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gullotta and R. Montemayor (eds.). *Adolescent Identity Formation*. London: Sage Publications. 9-24.
- Peek, Lori (2005). Becoming Muslim: The Development of a Religious Identity. *Sociology of Religion*. 66 (3): 215-242.
- Phinney, J. S. (1990). Ethnic Identity in Adolescents and Adults: Review of Research. *Psychological Bulletin*. 108(3). 499-514.

- Phinney, J. S. (1993). A Three-Stage Model of Ethnic Identity Development in Adolescence. In Martha E. Bernal and George P. Knight (Eds.). *Ethnic Identity, Formation and Transmission among Hispanics and Other Minorities*. State University of New York Press.
- Phinney, Jean S. Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K. and Vedder P. (2001). Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-Being: An Interactional Perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*. 57(3): 493-510.
- Phinney, J. S. and Rosenthal, D. A., (1992). Ethnic Identity in Adolescence: Process, Context, and Outcome. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gullotin and R. Montemayor (eds.). *Adolescent Identity Formation*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. 145-172.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1885). The laws of migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. 48: 167-227.
- Ravenstein, E. G. (1889). The laws of migration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. 52: 241-301.
- Reeves, Carla L. (2010). A difficult negotiation: fieldwork relations with gatekeepers. *Qualitative Research*. 10(3): 315-331.
- Republic of Turkey Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). (2016). Turkish Citizens Living Abroad. Available via: <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/the-expatriate-turkish-citizens.en.mfa>
- Rex, John (1991). *Ethnic Identity and Ethnic Mobilisation in Britain*. University of Warwick: Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations.
- Richards, Lyn (1999). *Using NVivo in Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ritchie, Jane, Spencer, Liz and O'Connor, William (2003). Carrying out Qualitative Analysis. In Jane Ritchie and Jane Lewis (eds.). *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Safran, William. (1991). Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*. 1(1): 83-99.

- Sayari, Sabri (1986). Migration Policies of Sending Countries: Perspectives on the Turkish Experience. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 485: 87-97.
- Shils, E. (1957). Primordial, Personal, Sacred and Civil Ties. *British Journal of Sociology*. 8: 130-145.
- Simsek, D. (2012). Identity Formation of Cypriot Turkish, Kurdish and Turkish Young People in London in a Transnational Context. PhD Thesis. City University London.
- Smith, Anthony D. (1986). *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Basic Blackwell.
- Smith, Timothy L. (1978). Religion and Ethnicity in America. *The American Historical Review*. 83(5): 1155-1185.
- Tassinopoulos, A. and Werner, H. (1999). To move or not to move: migration of labour in the European Union. *Labour Market Research Topics* (35). Available via: <http://213.241.152.197/topics/1999/topics35.pdf>
- Travis, Alan (2011). UK immigration analysis needed on Turkish legal migration, say MPs <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2011/aug/01/turkish-immigration-possibilities-assessed>.
- Tubergen, Frank van (2007). Religious Affiliation and Participation among Immigrants in a Secular Society: A Study of Immigrants in The Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. 33(5): 747-765.
- Turkishny (2011). Turkey's Foreign Minister Says Turkey and Britain have Bright Future. <http://www.turkishny.com/news/turkeys-foreign-minister-says-turkey-britain-have-bright-future#.V7kruWWCFmA>.
- Turkish Statistical Institute (2016). Evlenme ve Bosanma Istatistikleri, 2015. Number: 21515. 02 March 2016.
- Verkuyten, M. (2007). Religious Group Identification and Inter-Religious Relations: A Study Among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group Process and Intergroup Relations*. 10(3): 341-357.
- Van Tubergen, F. (2007). Religious affiliation and participation among immigrants in a secular society: a study among immigrants in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. (33): 747-765.

- Verkuyten, Maykel and Hagendoorn, Louk (1996). The Ethnic Hierarchy Among Majority and Minority Youth in the Netherlands. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 26(12): 1104-1118.
- Verkuyten, M. and Yildiz, A. A. (2009). Muslim immigrants and religious group feelings: Self Identification and Attitudes among Sunni and Alevi Turkish-Dutch. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. 32(7): 1121- 1142.
- Wallman, S. (1983). Identity Options. In C. Fried (ed.). *Minorities: Community and Identity*. New York: Springer-Verlag. 69-78.
- Wallerstein, I. (1991). The Ideological Tensions of Capitalism. Universalism versus Racism and Sexism. In Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (eds.). *Race Class and Nation*, London: Verso. 29-37.
- Waterman, Alan S. (1993). Developmental Perspectives on Identity Formation: From Adolescence to Adulthood. In J. E. Marcia et al. (eds.). *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research*. New York: Springer-Verlag. 42-68.
- Waters, Mary C. (1990). *Ethnicity Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wiltshier, Fiona (2011). Researching With NVivo 8. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*. Available via: 12(1). Art. 23. <http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1101234>.
- Woodward, Kathryn (1997). Concepts of Identity and Difference. In Kathryn Woodward (ed.). *Identity and Difference*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Wright, J. E. JR. (1982). *Erikson: Identity and Religion*. New York: The Seabuxy Press,
- Yalcin, Cemal (2000). *Ethnic Identities in Action: The Experience of Turkish Young People in London*. *PhD Thesis*. University of Surrey.
- Yang, F. and Ebaugh, H. Rose (2001). Religion and Ethnicity among New Immigrants: The Impact of Majority/Minority Status in Home and Host Countries. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 40(3): 367-378.

Appendix I: Interview Questions

Background information

1- How long have you been here? (By period of residency in the UK).

- How old are you?
- Where were you born and brought up?
- When you were growing up, whom did you live with? (Including ages of brothers and sisters)
- Whom do you live with now?
- What part of Turkey are your parents from?
- When did they come to Britain?
- Why did they come to Britain?

2- Turkish young people and their expression of themselves. (Ethnic self-definition). (Turkish, Kurdish, Half Turk/Half British, British, Half Turk/Half Kurd etc.)

- What do you think of yourself as?
- How would you describe your identity?
- Do you consider yourself to be Turkish?
- Are there any ways in which you feel you are not Turkish?

3- Do you have belonged to a religion? (Religious attachments). (Sunni, Alevi and so on)

- Do you know which religion your parents belong to.

4- Do you attend religious places such as Mosque, Church?

- If the answer is yes, how often do you attend there?

5- Which country is more important to you? Turkey or Britain and why?

Relationships inside the family and community

6- What type of family structure do you have? (Nuclear, Broken, Living alone, with Friends).

7- Who are you understood in your family by your father, mother or someone else?

- Do you think that you are under parental control?
- Can you make your own decisions? (Make friends (girl or male), go out at night, economical independent and so on). (Is there any religious issue there?)
- What kinds of challenges do you encounter and how do you solve them?

Marriage

8- Do your parents believe that you should marry a person who belongs to your culture?

- What do you think about the issue? Do you think that you can marry anyone you are in love with?)
- What kind of challenges do you think you may encounter?
- Would you try to prevent your children from marrying a member of other ethnic groups (such as British, Black, German).
- Why, what are the reasons?
- If you have children, what will you do the same as and what will you do differently to your parents in bringing them up?

Relationships inside the community

9- Do you have any membership to Turkish organizations (student clubs, societies, social, cultural and religious organizations)?

- Why have you been a member of Turkish Organizations? What are the reasons?

10- Do you think that Turkish community helps each other? (Finding a job, a place to live, financial help and other ways).

Friendships inside the community

11- How many friends do you have in Bristol?

- Are they Turks or from other ethnic groups such as British or Pakistani?

- Who is your best friend and why?
- Do you think that it is easier to make friends with Turkish people rather than English people?

Relationships with the host society

12- Which language do you prefer to use in your everyday life?

- Which language do you usually use, as you speak with your parents, siblings and Turkish friends and why?
- Do your parents require constraint you to speak Turkish at home?

13- Do you have membership or regular participation to British organizations such as student societies, cultural organizations, and support groups?

- Why did you join such organizations?
- If not, why?

Maintaining links with the home country

14- Have you ever visited Turkey?

- How often do you go to Turkey?
- Which country is more important to you and why?
- Do you wish to return to Turkey permanently in future?

Culture and Interests

15- How would you describe Turkish culture?

- Do you watch Turkish films?
- What kind of music do you listen to?
- Do you prefer Turkish food?
- Do you read any Turkish magazines or books?

Religion

16- Are you religious?

- What part does religion play in your life?
- Does Islam influence your day to day life?
- Do you ever leave your religion behind?
- How do you practice your religion?
- Do you fast? Every year? For the full month?
- Do you eat halal meat? Do you ever eat non-halal meat?
- Do you drink? Have you ever drunk alcohol? Do you think you will?
- What does Islam mean to you?
- What are your views on other religions?
- What were the main ways you learnt about religion?
- Did you attend religious classes? When? Were these helpful?
- How did your parents teach you about Islam?
- Do you attend any talks, seminars or conferences on Islam?
- Are you involved in any religious study groups?
- Do you discuss religion with your family?
- Do you discuss religion with your friends?

Appendix II: 2016 PGT Dissertation Ethics Questionnaire

Response ID	Completion date
180992-180985-13621494	26 Apr 2016, 23:04 (BST)

1	Please fill in your student ID number so that your responses can be matched to your user account.	U 1555449
----------	--	-----------

2	Please enter your name.	Muhammed BABACAN
----------	--------------------------------	------------------

3	Your supervisor	Prof. Dr. Tariq Modood
----------	------------------------	------------------------

4	<p>Please submit a brief summary of your methodology which includes your topic and method of data collection (if For example: What is the influence of school-type on University entrants? Interviews with ~ 10 UoB students.</p>	<p>In this research, semi structured in-depth interviews will be carried out with approximately 16 Turkish young people living in London and Bristol in order to reveal how those people are constructing their Turkish identities.</p>
---	--	---

5	<p>Does your research involve interacting with people in order to gather data about them, using methods such as interviews, focus groups, questionnaires and participant observation? If YES please continue at Section 3 (Research Ethics) If NO please continue at Section 4 (Data Protection)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	---	------------

6	<p>Will you only be using secondary data analysis e.g. analysing policy reports, media or existing research data. If YES please continue at Section 4 (Data Protection) If NO please continue at Section 3 (Research Ethics)</p>	No
7	<p>Does your study involve NHS staff or patients? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire</p>	No
8	<p>Does your study involve children (under 18's)? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.</p>	No

9	Does your study involve vulnerable adults (see ethics supplement for definitions)? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	No
----------	--	----

10	Does your study involve educational establishments (other than UoB)? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire	No
-----------	---	----

11	Does your study involve residential care facilities? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire	No
-----------	---	----

12	Does your study involve prisons or other remand centres and institutions? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	No
-----------	--	----

13	Are you collecting personal or sensitive data about health or disability issues? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	No
-----------	---	----

14	Are you collecting personal or sensitive data about sexuality or sexual practises? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	No
-----------	---	----

15	<p>Are you collecting personal or sensitive data about religious or political beliefs? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.</p>	Yes
----	--	-----

16	<p>Are you collecting personal or sensitive data about ethnic or racial origins? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.</p>	Yes
----	--	-----

17	<p>Are you using a gatekeeper to gain access to the groups/individuals to be included in your research?</p>	Yes
----	--	-----

18	<p>My gatekeeper is:</p>	<p>Mehmet Kayışkanat (The Imam of Turkish Mosque in Bristol)</p>
----	---------------------------------	--

19	Wil you give your participants a verbal summary of your research aims? If NO please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	Yes
----	---	-----

20	Wil your participants be taking part with their full consent acknowledged as such by the signing of a consent form? If NO please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire	Yes
----	---	-----

21	Wil your participants be able to withdraw from your research at any point? If NO please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire	Yes
----	--	-----

22	<p>Do you think your study may induce psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or other negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal daily life? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.</p>	No
23	<p>Will you offer financial inducements to participants? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire</p>	No
24	<p>Will participants be identified in the research? If YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire</p>	No

25	I confirm that I have read and will fully comply with University policy on Data Protection and Information Security	Yes
----	---	-----

26	If I use a monitoring device e.g. digital recorder, I will gain consent from my participants? IF NO please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire.	Yes
----	--	-----

27	I have read and understood the University guidance on off-site working	Yes
----	--	-----

28	Does your research involve travel outside the UK? IF YES please submit your research design to Susie.Potts@bristol.ac.uk on completion of this questionnaire	No
----	--	----

29	I have considered the implications of my research for my personal safety, as set out in the University guidance documents	Yes
-----------	--	-----

30	I will ensure an appropriate emergency contact procedure is in place before each fieldwork visit, as set out in the University guidance documentation	Yes
-----------	--	-----

31	If there are any changes in my research methodology that would result in changes to the answers given in this questionnaire I will seek additional approval for the research	Yes
-----------	---	-----

32	Please confirm your supervisor is aware of the ethical implications of your project.	Yes
-----------	---	-----

