

Journal of Constructivist Psychology, 21:1–23, 2008
Copyright © Taylor & Francis Group, LLC
ISSN: 1072-0537 print / 1521-0650 online
DOI: 10.1080/10720530802070635



1 **NEGOTIATING MULTIPLICITY: ADAPTIVE**
2 **ASYMMETRIES WITHIN SECOND-GENERATION TURKS’**
3 **“SOCIETY OF MIND”**

4 **EMMA-LOUISE AVELING**
5 Department of Social and Developmental Psychology, University of Cambridge

6 **ALEX GILLESPIE**
7 Department of Psychology, University of Stirling

8 *If identities are socially produced, what happens when individuals grow up*
9 *participating in divergent or conflicting social contexts? This article reports*
10 *on research with second-generation Turkish adolescents in London. Using the*
11 *concept of the dialogical self, the research examines the dialogical structure of*
12 *these young Turks’ selves. The analysis is Bakhtinian and seeks to identify*
13 *the different discourses through which these young Turks talk about themselves.*
14 *Three distinct discourses, or I-positions, are identified. These are then related to*
15 *the sociocultural context within which these youth live, and specific attention is*
16 *given to the constraints on these youth in expressing aspects of their identity.*
17 *We demonstrate that the asymmetries and tensions within these adolescents’*
18 *dialogical selves are adaptive to the fractured and asymmetrical social contexts*
19 *in which they are embedded.*

20 The concept of the dialogical self is ideally suited to analyzing
21 identity in the current context of globalization (Hermans &
22 Dimaggio, 2007). It has long been recognized that the self is
23 forged in cultural and community contexts (James, 1890). While
24 all adolescents in late modernity must negotiate a heterogeneous
25 and fragmented society (Rappoport, Baumgarden, & Boone,
26 1999), for second-generation ethnic minorities socialized into
27 both the culture of their parents and the host culture the existen-
28 tial drama is even greater (Parker, 1995). The present research
29 focuses on identity work and dialogical positioning among young
30 Turks¹ growing up in London. Specifically, our aim was to use

Received 31 August 2007; accepted 1 October 2007.

Address correspondence to Emma-Louise Aveling, Department of Social and Developmental Psychology, School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Cambridge, Free School Lane, Cambridge CB2 3RQ, UK. E-mail: ela29@cam.ac.uk

31 the concept of the dialogical self to pursue the fragmented and
32 asymmetrical sociocultural context experienced by these second-
33 generation immigrants into the micro-dynamics of identity.

34 **Identity and Globalization**

35 The rapid pace of change in contemporary societies is evident in
36 the increasing “moving and mixing,” collapsing and coalescing
37 of cultures (Hermans & Kempen, 1998, p. 1117). Globalized
38 communication technologies, cheaper travel, increased transna-
39 tional migration and the creation of diasporic communities, and
40 the expansion of capitalist commodity and culture production
41 have transformed everyday life across the globe (Giddens, 1991).
42 This sociocultural flux has led to new forms of cultural identity,
43 especially the construction of “hybridized” identities (Hermans
44 & Kempen, 1998). Much research has described the agency
45 and creativity of second-generation adolescents in drawing on
46 multiple cultural resources to construct novel, “in-between” iden-
47 tities (Back, 1996; Gervais & Jovchelovitch, 1998). However, the
48 notion of hybridized identities should not be taken to imply an
49 integrated developmental end-point. Rather, it characterizes a
50 complex of multiple, shifting identities and an *ongoing* process of
51 negotiation as different aspects mutually define and redefine each
52 other (Bhatia & Ram, 2001; Da Cunha, 1995; Howarth, 2002).
53 Moreover, these identities, embedded in multiple, overlapping
54 cultural territories, are contextual and contingent (Baumann,
55 1996; Nagel, 1996). Thus for the British–Sikh teenagers in Hall’s
56 (1995, p. 254) study, there is a “time to act English” and a “time
57 to act Indian,” as well as a time to “play with the identities in
58 between.” This highlights the importance of attention to the
59 sociocultural context, including what kind of “time” the research
60 setting represents and how the participants are engaging with that
61 context.

62 Despite the evidence of creativity and novelty in the emer-
63 gence of ethnic identities, identities are not freely constructed.
64 Rather, identity construction involves a negotiation between in-
65 ternal identifications and external ascriptions (Nagel, 1996). As
66 Bhatia (2002) argued, these dialogues are always situated in a
67 macro context influenced by historical and political issues of
68 racism, gender, imperialism, and power. For example, the power

69 of new racist discourses based on cultural purity has been revealed
70 by Enneli, Modood, and Bradley (2005, p. 38), who found that
71 young Turks in the United Kingdom felt that “British” identity, in
72 its “wider ethnic or cultural meaning” could only be claimed by
73 white English people.

74 An additional identity constraint is provided by the stories,
75 legacies, and immigration heritage within the given ethnic group
76 (Bhatia, 2002; Bhatia & Ram, 2001). For example, Mandel (1995)
77 showed that discourses of return or repatriation constitute the
78 “master narrative” for the Turkish diaspora in Germany; yet for
79 the second generation, some of whom have never been to Turkey,
80 this discourse is replete with paradoxes and contradictions. Sim-
81 ilarly, Hall (1995) examined the constraining forces of cultural
82 conservatism within the British–Sikh community.

83 The children of immigrants therefore must find their posi-
84 tions within a particularly taut tangle of contradictory demands
85 and discourses from both their ethnic community and the wider
86 society. The aim of the present research is to provide a dialogical
87 analysis of the identity construction of second-generation Turkish
88 immigrants in London, an “invisible minority” in both youth
89 and ethnicity research (Enneli et al., 2005). Based on previous
90 research, we attempt to articulate both the constraints on and the
91 creativity within their identity construction. Often, culture and
92 agency are separated and opposed. In contrast, our approach con-
93 ceives of culture as a semiotic system through which individuals
94 think and act (Gillespie, 2006a; Valsiner, 2002). Yet, for ethnic
95 minority youths in particular, such cultural contexts are structured
96 by asymmetries of power. The process of identity construction
97 therefore entails not only an accommodation of the potential
98 cultural “pushes and pulls,” but also adapting to the constraints
99 imposed by such asymmetries.

100

The Dialogical Self

101 The concept of the dialogical self (Hermans, 1996, 2001a, 2001b;
102 Hermans, Kempen, & vanLoon, 1992) can be used to elucidate
103 identity dynamics within a heterogeneous sociocultural context.
104 The self is depicted as a multiplicity of I-positions representing
105 a “society of mind” (Hermans, 2002, p. 147). Each of these

106 I-positions stands in some relation to the social world, such
107 that the “growing complexity of the world goes hand in hand
108 with the growing complexity of the self” (Hermans, 2001b,
109 p. 361).

110 The concept of I-positions goes back to James’ (1890) dis-
111 tinction between the “I” and the “Me.” The “I” is the position
112 from which someone acts or speaks, it is self as subject. The
113 “Me,” on the other hand, is self as object, or self as known to
114 self. To describe the self as a dynamic multiplicity of relatively
115 autonomous I-positions is to recognize that there are many dis-
116 tinct discursive and action positions an individual can take up.
117 This makes possible internal dialogue, as the I-positions within
118 this polyphonic self can “agree, disagree, misunderstand, oppose,
119 contradict, question, challenge, and even ridicule the I in another
120 position” (Hermans, 2001a, p. 249).

121 Where does this heterogeneity come from? The words we use
122 and the discourses we take up are not only our own (Bakhtin,
123 1981). The words one uses are also always another’s words: We
124 both shape and are shaped by the words and the narrative
125 traditions in which they are embedded (Shotter, 1993). If the
126 individual lives in society with competing discourses, then in
127 taking up those conflicting discourses, so we will find the conflict
128 within the individual. Equally, if the individual inhabits two quite
129 different social contexts, each with its own discourse, so within
130 the individual we will find these two discourses. The study of the
131 dialogical self is the examination of these social discourses within
132 the individual.

133 Crucially, the macro-context in which the dialogical self is em-
134 bedded is characterized by patterns of dominance and asymme-
135 tries in social power. Due to such differences, some groups (e.g.,
136 English people) have more opportunity to be heard than others
137 (e.g., ethnic minorities). The discourses of dominant groups thus
138 constrain the subject positions available to be occupied by less
139 powerful others. Consequently, power asymmetries within the
140 sociocultural environment become reflected within the society of
141 mind, organizing, coloring, and constraining the meaning system
142 that emerges (Valsiner, 2002).

143 The following research uses the concept of the dialogical self
144 to analyze the I-positions occupied by second-generation Turks,
145 the discourses through which they speak, and the origins of these

146 discourses in their social world, thus providing a window into their
147 asymmetrical sociocultural context.

148 **Research Context: Turkish Adolescents in London**

149 The participants in this study (five boys and five girls, ages 14
150 to 18 years) were all students at a Turkish supplementary school
151 in North London. All were born and brought up in England.
152 Nine participants had Turkish Cypriot parents; one had one
153 Turkish and one Turkish Cypriot parent. All the students had
154 been at the school between 2.5 and 10 years. The school, which
155 operates every Saturday, is run by parents and professionals in
156 the Turkish and Turkish Cypriot diaspora, to teach second- and
157 third-generation Turks and Turkish Cypriots about their heritage,
158 including Turkish language, music, and dance.

159 This Turkish school is a part of a large, vibrant, and indepen-
160 dent Turkish community. The tight-knit nature of this community
161 is evident in the fact that half of the participants in this sample
162 were related to members of staff. The students in this sample
163 also had known one another for a number of years and said that,
164 although it had been their parents who encouraged them to come
165 initially, they also saw the school as an important opportunity to
166 socialize with their friends from the Turkish community.

167 The main method of data generation was interviews (10
168 individual and 2 group) conducted by the first author. All of the
169 interviews took place during the Turkish supplementary school
170 hours in an unused classroom, and lasted between 55 and 65
171 minutes each (11 hours 26 minutes in total). Students were
172 first interviewed individually, and then in one of the two focus
173 groups.

174 The individual interviews covered participants' experiences
175 at mainstream school and Turkish school, descriptions of their
176 families and friendships, social/leisure activities, Turkish lan-
177 guage facility and use, perceptions of the Turkish community
178 and their place within it, and their hopes and aspirations for the
179 future. Following Kvale (1996), the focus groups were a form of
180 "re-interview," which allows the researcher to reflect back emerg-
181 ing ideas and assess how common salient understandings are to
182 the group. Thus the topics in the group interviews overlapped
183 with topics from the individual interviews.

184 Participant observation was also used. This included back-
185 ground reading of relevant books, newspapers, and Internet sites;
186 observation of school activities; and informal discussions with
187 students. Combined with interviews with two staff members, this
188 method provided insight into the nature of the discourses sur-
189 rounding the participants (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). During
190 two months of weekly visits to the school, the first author was
191 able to observe assemblies, classes, special events (e.g., Turkish
192 festival celebrations), and interactions between staff, parents, and
193 students.

194 **Analysis: From the “Society of Mind” to Society**

195 Coding the data aimed to identify the I-positions from which par-
196 ticipants spoke and the relation between these I-positions and the
197 sociocultural context, and to analyze conflicts and asymmetries
198 within the dialogical self in terms of conflicts and asymmetries
199 within that sociocultural context. To these ends, the coding and
200 analysis proceeded in three phases.

201 The first phase of coding used *in vivo* codes (Strauss, 1987)
202 to identify the main I-positions. These codes included ethnic
203 self-identifications and ethnic identifications ascribed by others.
204 These were supplemented by a “hybridized” code, derived from
205 the literature on novel identities. Application of codes moved
206 beyond self/other identifications, to attitudes, values, aspirations,
207 and reported practices that constituted expressions of those
208 identity positions. It was an iterative process, whereby interviews
209 were compared and contrasted and initial codes refined over
210 several cycles as cultural I-positions emerged and code boundaries
211 became more distinct.

212 The second phase of coding asked, “Who is doing the talk-
213 ing?” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 63), in order to identify the social origin
214 of I-positions, or voices, in participants’ utterances. Following pre-
215 vious research (Gillespie, 2006a, 2006b, 2007; Gillespie, Cornish,
216 Aveling, & Zittoun, 2008), this analysis coded reported speech and
217 echoes. Reported speech refers to utterances that are attributed to
218 specific others (e.g., parents, peers, and teachers) and generalized
219 others (e.g., “the Turkish community”). Echoes are utterances
220 that are not attributed to others, but that nonetheless seem to
221 have a distinct social origin beyond the speaker. The main aim of

222 this phase was to systematically relate the I-positions identified in
223 phase one, with the sociocultural context and discourses.

224 Finally, the analysis focused on shifts between I-positions.
225 This process was supported by a cycle of coding for contradictions
226 within each interview and between individuals' responses in the
227 interview and focus group. The focus was on dialogical tensions
228 between I-positions and how these relate to the sociocultural
229 context.

230 The following presentation of the analysis details the three
231 identified I-positions: I-as-Turkish, I-as-Ethnic-Other, and I-as-a-
232 Young-Turk-in-England. For each of these I-positions our present-
233 ation describes the I-position, analyzes the social origin of the
234 I-position, and then proceeds to analyze the dialogical tensions
235 relating to that I-position. Toward the end of our analysis, we try
236 to relate these tensions to the sociocultural context and existent
237 power asymmetries.

238

I-as-Turkish

239 Unlike many studies of second-generation youth (e.g., Modood
240 et al., 1997), not one participant in this study used a hy-
241 phenated identity label, such as British-Turkish, in their initial
242 self-presentations. Without being asked directly, all participants
243 described themselves as "Turkish." Only three, in further elabo-
244 rating, explained that they were "probably" half and half (English
245 and Turkish), although one qualified this with, "But I think you've
246 gotta be a bit more of one than the other" (i.e., more Turkish).

247 For all participants, I-as-Turkish was the dominant voice.
248 Even for those who felt they were partly English, their use of
249 language (e.g., possessive pronouns) reflected the dominance of
250 I-as-Turkish and the difference felt between "us" (Turkish) and
251 "them" (those outside the Turkish community). Yusuf articulates
252 the centrality of the Turkish I-position:

253 I don't want to forget that I'm Turkish—I wouldn't want to ever forget that.
254 I mean its not really big, but it's a good part of my life, 'cause everything
255 revolves around me to do with Turkish.

256 This Turkish identity was also associated with a great deal of
257 pride, which was frequently expressed without direct questioning.

258 For example, one participant explained that he pronounces his
259 name the Turkish way because:

260 **Ahmet:** You gotta show who you are . . .

261 **Emma:** And who are you?

262 **Ahmet:** Turkish-Cypriot and proud to say it, yeah

263 Such claims of a Turkish identity must be understood con-
264 textually. Arguably, being interviewed by a white British woman
265 who had asked to speak to second-generation Turkish adolescents
266 within the school may have produced a context in which these
267 adolescents felt an expectation to assert their Turkish identity.
268 However, this does not mean that such identity positioning is
269 false. Such an identity positioning is as “real” as the situation
270 that produced it. Moreover, identities are not completely context-
271 bound, and there are demands for consistency across contexts.
272 For example, all participants were wearing “the moon and star”
273 (a pendant symbolizing the Turkish flag) because “its basically
274 saying . . . I’m proud that I am a Turk,” and it is saying this in all
275 contexts.

276 For all participants, knowing their Turkish heritage—their
277 culture and their language—is an important aspect of the Turkish
278 I-position, as reflected in their tendency to exaggerate their use of
279 Turkish among friends. Indeed, all participants suggested that not
280 knowing one’s language and culture could compromise claims to
281 a Turkish identity, as Fatma explained:

282 **Emma:** And so does it make any difference if they [other young
283 Turks who aren’t taught about it] don’t know about their
284 culture and you do?

285 **Fatma:** Well, me as a person who loves my culture, I think it
286 matters because, if you define yourself as Turkish, then in my
287 opinion you should know your language—you should know
288 your traditions, you should know your customs

289 For about a third of the group, not knowing the language
290 and culture deserves criticism, even condemnation: Such people
291 do not deserve to be considered “True Turks.”

292 *Who Is Doing the Talking?*

293 If we ask, “Who is doing the talking?” echoes of the voice of
 294 the Turkish community can be heard. Often the voice echoes
 295 generalized feelings within the Turkish community, about the
 296 need to be proud of Turkish culture and identity. Consider, for
 297 example, Atatürk’s “pledge”—“Andimiz”²—which is recited every
 298 Saturday morning in assembly at the Turkish school. Many of the
 299 participants made reference to the pledge.

300 **Mehmet:** It’s like a speech said by Atatürk which was, it just
 301 signifies that you are Turkish ... what you should ... its just
 302 like a basic law

303 **Emma:** And what does that mean ... in the speech when they are
 304 talking about being Turkish, what does that mean?

305 **Mehmet:** Just like basically saying you have got to do anything you
 306 can to preserve Turkey or Cyprus, whatever, and like at the end
 307 they say, “Ne mutlu türk’um diyene!” That’s like, “Forever be
 308 happy that you’re Turkish.” So it just signifies that you should
 309 be proud of who you are

310 In Mehmet’s utterances we can hear the voice of Atatürk
 311 and a popular saying, and thus we can see the macro discourses
 312 manifesting within Mehmet’s dialogical self. As with all the other
 313 participants, the collective voice of Turkish culture interpolates
 314 Mehmet’s dialogical self.

315 There are also many references to specific voices, especially
 316 the voice of parents. For example, some participants ventriloquate
 317 the voice of their parents and teachers that they are living
 318 “in a foreign country”—“foreign” because “who you are” is “in
 319 your blood.” These voices appear to encourage their children to
 320 associate awareness of their cultural heritage and pride in the
 321 Turkish identity with family loyalty. The power of this discourse
 322 was particularly evident with regard to marriage. All participants
 323 said their parents would prefer—in some cases insisted—that they
 324 married within the Turkish community:

325 **Emma:** Do you think about getting married, or having a family?

326 **Ayse:** If I marry a person he would *have* to be a Turkish Cypriot,
 327 not only for me but for my parents as well. Because they told

328 me, "If you bring someone from a different culture then you
329 forget me, you'll forget your family."

330 Here one can hear the voice of Ayse's parents, equating mar-
331 riage outside the community with neglecting both her heritage
332 and her family, *within* Ayse's dialogical self.

333 This emphasis on the link between heritage and Turkish
334 identity is implicitly dichotomizing, and perhaps underlies some
335 of the tendency to choose to emphasize a "pure Turk" identity,
336 rather than present themselves as, for example, British-Turkish. As
337 Ahmet said, "There's not one drop of blood in me that's English
338 so you know, I can't be British." That is, reflecting the voices of
339 the Turkish community, these young people would find it difficult
340 to claim to be both Turkish and British.

341

Dialogical Tensions

342 Besides asking, "Who is doing the talking?" a dialogical approach
343 also needs to ask the question, "Who is being talked to?" Every ut-
344 terance is oriented to an audience, makes presuppositions about
345 the audience, and aims to have some effect on the audience. So,
346 in the above cases when we hear the voice of the I-as-Turkish
347 arise, what are these utterances doing? Consider again Ahmet,
348 who says that he is "Turkish-Cypriot and proud to say it, yeah."
349 Why does Ahmet feel the need to say that he is proud, and
350 then affirm this with a "yeah"? Pure pride needs no self-assertion.
351 Equally, consider Yusuf, who says, "I don't want to forget that
352 I'm Turkish." Such an utterance implies that the alternative exists
353 as a possibility, yet the voice of the Turkish community at times
354 appears to deny this possibility. Indeed, it is this possibility that
355 motivates these utterances. So here, then, in these seemingly
356 simple assertions of I-as-Turkish, we find faint traces of a dialogical
357 tension, which we will examine in greater detail later.

358

I-as-Ethnic-Other

359 Another I-position to emerge was the I-as-Ethnic-Other. This
360 position was less dominant than the I-as-Turkish, but nonetheless
361 it had a distinctive voice, which was particularly prominent when
362 students talked about their mainstream school life. Significantly,

363 implicit in this representation was a denial of access to an English
 364 identity from the more powerful social group—"white English
 365 people." As Ahmet put it, "Ethnic is not being English, innit?" an
 366 understanding reflected in their own descriptions of who qualifies
 367 as English: people with white skin and English parents. Moreover,
 368 the dichotomizing discourse of English–Ethnic mutual exclusivity
 369 echoes their own I-as-Turkish exclusiveness.

370 Hall (1995) argued that this rationalization leads to the
 371 collective marginalization of ethnic minority students in main-
 372 stream schools. While all the participants at times spoke from
 373 this position, some merely acknowledged this representation; for
 374 others, they "don't fit in here." A small minority felt they had
 375 experienced outright discrimination or racism in mainstream
 376 school. Yet there was also a more subtle sense of marginalization,
 377 whereby many felt that important skills were not recognized by the
 378 mainstream school because they were "ethnic" (e.g. their Turkish
 379 as a qualification).

Q1

380 *Who Is Doing the Talking?*

381 While participants sometimes spoke from the I-as-Ethnic-Other
 382 position, when we asked, "Who is doing the talking?" we was that
 383 this position emerged from a particular aspect of the way the
 384 participants found themselves represented by the "majority white"
 385 within mainstream British society. "The 'ethnic minority,'" Hassan
 386 said, "that's what they call us"—"they" being the "majority white"
 387 mainstream school peers and, for some, teachers. Discourses
 388 surrounding ethnic minorities prevalent throughout multicult-
 389 tural London were also echoed in participants' utterances. For
 390 example, participants described how ethnicity monitoring forms
 391 often forced them to choose "other" or even "white other," even
 392 though for many, their position on the white/nonwhite divide
 393 was ambiguous (Howarth, under review). Here we see the insti-
 394 tutionalized voice of the hegemonic English culture positioning
 395 and classifying these young Turks.

Q2

396 *Dialogical Tensions*

397 This positioning by others as "ethnic" enters into the dialogical
 398 self of these youth, providing them with a new facet of their

399 identity and coming into conflict with existing facets. While
 400 unable to deny that they fall into the “ethnic” category, all partici-
 401 pants expressed some resistance to this alienating representation.
 402 Thus, the dialogical tension seemed to arise mainly in the way
 403 that the I-as-Ethnic-Other worked to exclude these youth from
 404 an English identity. Their resistance was complex and was most
 405 clearly revealed when participants claimed to be “half and half.”
 406 The question is, at what point does one cease to be “ethnic” and
 407 so become British? How can one make this transition if one is
 408 being excluded from the British identity? These tensions become
 409 explicit when we consider the hybridized I-as-a-Young-Turk-in-
 410 England position.

411 **I-as-a-Young-Turk-in-England**

412 The participants felt alienated from a British identity position,
 413 and felt the discourse of ethnic minorities to be foreign. Yet we
 414 have also seen that they were not simply occupying a Turkish
 415 identity position. While the voice of parents was strong, these
 416 youth did not align themselves completely with these voices. A
 417 close analysis of identity positioning reveals yet another identity
 418 position, which we call “I-as-a-Young-Turk-in-England.” As this title
 419 suggests, this I-position is hybrid, but it is not yet reflexive. This is
 420 not a position that is explicitly claimed; rather, it is a position from
 421 which these youth spoke and reflects an attempt to negotiate the
 422 tension between the demands of their home community and the
 423 wider society.

424 Most participants agreed they were British in the narrow,
 425 technical sense of being born in England and having a British
 426 passport. However, in contrast to the majority of Asians and
 427 Caribbeans (Modood et al., 1997), the majority completely re-
 428 jected an English or British identity in the “wider, cultural, or
 429 ethnic meaning” (Enneli et al., 2005, p. 38). For example:

430 **Hatice:** Turkish Cypriot I would class myself as . . . Yes, that fits me.

431 **Emma:** Right. Would you say you were also British or English in
 432 any way?

433 **Hatice:** Definitely not [laughs]. No. I’ve got the passport, I live in a
 434 country, but I would not class myself as British. . . . I wouldn’t say
 435 I am British because I live in the country. I speak the language

436 but I wouldn't want to be . . . I've got the passport, I live in the
437 country, but . . . I would never define myself as British

438 However, among the group there were three who acknowl-
439 edged they were "probably half and half." For example, for Zehra:

440 I would say I am Turkish Cypriot slash British citizen kind of thing. I've got
441 the Turkish Cypriot in me, but also the English, 'cause I've grown up here
442 and gone to English school. So, yeah, I've got a bit of both in me

443 In such utterances the hybridized I-position is most explicit,
444 but even among those who rejected such hybridization, and
445 claimed they were not English—and didn't "want to be"—there
446 was also evidence of hybridization. One illustration of this was
447 their use of English. Yusuf, for example, said that even with friends
448 from Turkish school he speaks mainly English, because "its like,
449 in your mind really, 'cause you think English you're gonna speak
450 English. . . . My Turkish isn't 100% good, so I'm more confident
451 speaking English."

452 This represents a contradiction with subsequent denials of an
453 "English" identification according to their own definition of what
454 it means to be *Turkish*: knowing the language is a marker of a par-
455 ticular cultural identity; thus there is some tension. For example,
456 Hatice pointed out explicitly that this definition includes English
457 identifications: "In my opinion, if you class yourself as something,
458 like if you class yourself as English, you should know the English
459 culture, you should know the language."

460 Yet Hatice would "never" define herself as English. In this
461 sense, this hybrid position is more of an enacted I-position than a
462 reflexive "Me." The "Me" is very much "Turkish," but the actions,
463 the I-positions from which they act, are hybrid and contain traces
464 of a more British I-position.

465 Another illustration is the fact that England, not Cyprus, is
466 where the students felt most at home and where they saw their
467 future. This sense of belonging in England included frequent
468 references to the ethnic diversity of their friendship groups,
469 in contrast to the more segregated friendship patterns of their
470 parents' generation. Consequently Hatice (who would "never"
471 define herself as British) said, "that's why I would probably be
472 more British than anyone [in my family]".

Dialogical Tensions

474 While few participants explicitly claimed a hybrid identity such
 475 as British-Turkish (or vice versa), the enacted hybridized identity
 476 position of a Young-Turk-in-England nonetheless created dialogi-
 477 cal tensions within the young Turkish self. The expression of this
 478 hybridized position often conflicted with the prescriptions of the
 479 Turkish voices linked to I-as-Turkish and thus contradicted their
 480 own assertions of a “True Turk” identity.

481 The following excerpt illustrates such internal dialogical ten-
 482 sions being played out in Ahmet’s external dialogue. As described,
 483 all participants felt their parents would prefer, if not insist, they
 484 marry a Turkish/Turkish Cypriot person. Speaking from the
 485 position of I-as-Turkish, most accepted this societal prescription.
 486 Yet dialogical tensions between I-as-Turkish and a more *hybridized*
 487 *position* (shown in *italics*) are evident (though at times the voices
 488 cannot be disentangled (and so are marked with underlines):

489 **Emma:** And do your parents have ideas about the kind of person
 490 they would like you to marry?

491 **Ahmet:** Yeah they have! (laughing) *It’s been drilled in my head since*
 492 *I was a baby, every single day like, “You’ve gotta marry a Turkish*
 493 *girl, you can’t dishonour the family”* and stuff like this, but *I*
 494 *don’t really care because love only comes once in a lifetime. I think*
 495 *you’ve just got to take it, even if it means family’s gotta go . . . family’s*
 496 *gotta go.*

497 **Emma:** Is that what would happen if you wanted to marry some-
 498 body who wasn’t Turkish?

499 **Ahmet:** Definitely. But the thing, is if I liked a Greek bird then *that*
 500 *would cause a lot of problems, and I would not blame my mum or*
 501 *my dad at all, whereas I think that if I married an English girl, I*
 502 *could say you lot have got backwards views but if I married a Greek*
 503 *bird then I would be . . . treading in really, really deep waters*
 504 *because my dad’s like been a prisoner of war and my mum was*
 505 *left without a dad at the age of 8, so by that I would definitely*
 506 *respect that, but to be honest even if there was a Greek bird and I*
 507 *really, really did like her, I think I would go with her.*

508 Ahmet is able to give voice to the different perspectives.
 509 We hear the “True Turk,” who “would not blame” his parents

510 and “definitely respect” them, but also the hybridized identity
 511 position. Through the latter voice, he positions himself in relation
 512 to those voices (as a young person in England) outside the values
 513 of the Turkish community, saying, for example, “you lot have
 514 got backwards views.” In shifting between I-positions and hearing
 515 himself from another position, he says, “to be honest,” as if
 516 recognizing that is a lie. What drives Ahmet to this contradiction?
 517 Although Ahmet often affirms his I-as-Turkish position, a voice
 518 that respects prescriptions to remain loyal to the culture and val-
 519 ues of the Turkish community, he also holds some independence
 520 and expresses views that contravene such values—specifically, a
 521 commitment to love marriage.

522 Thus, while we see frequent and vehement self-identifications
 523 as Turkish, dialogical tensions exist in that the thoughts and
 524 actions of these youth also reveal a more hybrid identity, albeit
 525 one they are reluctant to acknowledge in their self-identifications.
 526 Indeed, speaking with their Turkish voice, hybridity is frowned on.
 527 To understand the privileging of the Turkish voice and the de-
 528 fensive rejection of an English, or even hybridized, identification
 529 requires consideration of the socioculturally situated voices linked
 530 to and shaping the development of their various I-positions.

531 *Rejecting an English Identity*

532 One reason for the overt rejection of an English identity, despite
 533 evident hybridity, can be found in the context of a fragmented
 534 multiculturalism in North London. For these participants, being
 535 British or English in Enneli and colleagues’ (2005) “wider, cul-
 536 tural, or ethnic sense” appears an ambiguous, if not vacuous,
 537 notion. As Hatice commented:

538 **Emma:** What does count as a British person then?

539 **Hatice:** They probably have to be, like their parents have to be
 540 born into a British family and culture. I’m not sure, I don’t
 541 have any proper British friends

542 **Emma:** No? Even from your other school?

543 **Hatice:** No, they’re all—English people have become so diverse
 544 you can’t find anyone. It’s like old people you can. But our age,
 545 I haven’t met a proper British person in ages.

546 This is in contrast to the clear sense of a Turkish identity
547 supported by the Turkish diaspora and supplementary school,
548 which potentially offers the kind of coherent world view that, in
549 Erikson's (1968) view, young people need to fashion their identity.
550 Perhaps, then, students' desire to "stay true to [their] origins,
551 especially in London 'cause there's so many different origins" is,
552 in part, a response to the experience of uncertainty precipitated
553 by the increasing density and heterogeneity of positions and
554 possibilities in multicultural London and an ever-more globalized
555 world (Hermans, 2001a).

556 However, this is not sufficient explanation. Examining the
557 collective voices of both the Turkish community and the wider so-
558 ciety that populate these adolescents' society of mind (Hermans,
559 2002) reveals two significant and mutually reinforcing discourses
560 of ethnicity that shape the development of their I-positions: Both
561 work to exclude these Turks from an English I-position despite
562 their socialization into the multicultural of London.

563 First, there is the dichotomizing discourse of British ethno-
564 cultural purity (cf. Back, 1996; Hall, 1995). In being represented
565 as ethnic minorities, or even simply as "not white," these young
566 people are denied access to an English identity by a more pow-
567 erful majority. The resulting I-position of I-as-Ethnic-Other would
568 be in direct conflict with an I-as-English. For example, although
569 Mehmet attempts to contest this denial in his interview ("Well,
570 I am half English"), it is sufficiently powerful that in the focus
571 groups he asserts, "We just don't fit in this country."

572 Second, there is the dichotomizing discourse of Turkishness
573 that exists within the Turkish community. Within this discourse,
574 to voice an English or even hybridized identity warrants social
575 sanction as a betrayal of being a "True Turk." For example,
576 during one focus group, two boys emphatically rejected an
577 English identity. The third participant disagreed, but in doing so
578 felt he had to defend this position and his claims to a Turkish
579 identity:

580 **Ahmet:** This is my home. Sorry boys, but it is [laughter in the
581 group]. . . . I mean, don't get me wrong, I'm still Turkish. D'you
582 know what I mean? Turkish and proud of it. It don't mean that
583 just 'cause . . . just 'cause I fit in here . . .

584 **Mehmet:** Yeah, yeah . . . that doesn't make you a bad person just
585 by saying that. It's just an opinion, innit?

586 Ahmet's defensiveness, along with Mehmet's reassurance, im-
587 plies a danger that this treacherous utterance *could* make Ahmet a
588 "bad person"—that is, someone who has forgotten his culture and
589 "who he is." Furthermore, in individual interviews both the other
590 participants had previously expressed a greater sense of belonging
591 in England (and for Mehmet, "if I look at it, I'm half and half"),
592 yet neither felt able to acknowledge an English identification in
593 the group situation with their Turkish peers.

594 However, there is also another context in which these youth
595 are *attributed* an English identity and *denied* a Turkish identity.
596 This conflicting discursive context arises when these young Turks
597 go back to Cyprus or Turkey to visit relatives. Many participants
598 mentioned in their interviews, and everyone in the focus groups
599 agreed, that during such visits they had experienced Turkish
600 family calling them "the English." For example:

601 **Ayse:** Yeah, they live in Cyprus. They say 'cause your London
602 you're English. . . . You just an English now.

603 **Emma:** What do they mean if they say that to you?

604 **Ayse:** Well, basically, what they are trying to say is that because I
605 am from London I'm not a Turk no more. I'm English

606 **Emma:** And how does that make you feel?

607 **Ayse:** It's really annoying

608 Such discursive interactions threaten their claims to I-as-
609 Turkish because who you are is "in your blood." Thus, this
610 collective voice reinforces the dichotomizing, mutually exclusive
611 perception of "English" and "Turkish" identities, but from the
612 *opposite* direction: In this case, they may be denied access to a
613 Turkish identity. Given the implicit sense of familial loyalty in
614 assertions of the Turkish identity, this accusation may be all the
615 more powerful. Thus, what we observe in the dialogical tensions
616 within these second-generation Turkish youth is a double rejec-
617 tion. Instead of being positioned with identities that encompass
618 both their family origin and their own current situation, they are
619 forced to construct an identity in the space between being Turkish

620 and British, yet they are not provided with the discursive space in
621 which to do so.

622 **Negotiating Multiplicity**

623 The preceding section described the various cultural I-positions
624 participants have marked (with personal variations). The self-
625 constructions they presented are both shaped by and a reflection
626 of the asymmetrical power relations between different cultural
627 voices within their “real” environment, both as adolescents within
628 the diaspora and as members of an ethnic minority in Britain.
629 Thus, these second-generation adolescents are caught in a tangle
630 of loyalties and racializing discourses, and the consequent identity
631 struggles are manifest in complex dialogical relations between the
632 individual and collective voices that constitute the self.

633 Of particular interest is the apparent contradiction between
634 assertions of being a “True Turk” and evidence of a more
635 hybridized I-position than this self-narrative allows for. This con-
636 tradiction is crystallized in the following rap lyric, taken from a
637 website run by one of the participants and familiar to all of them;
638 indeed, several of them have their photographs posted on the web
639 page from which this rap plays.

640 I'm from the UK
641 but don't be mistaken
642 pass the kebab
643 keep your egg and bacon
644 see it's where you're from
645 not where you're at
646 now I'm from Cyprus
647 and that's a fact

648 Central to this narrative is the dominance of I-as-Turkish:
649 Both the rap and the web page are intended to affirm their
650 status as “True Turks.” The dominance of I-as-Turkish in this
651 self-narrative is an adaptive response to the various (conflicting)
652 ways in which they are positioned by the essentializing discourses
653 in their sociocultural context. While admitting the technical
654 British identity—“I'm from the UK”—it also acknowledges the
655 prescriptions of the Turkish community in showing they have
656 not forgotten “it's where you're from/not where you're at.”

657 It also represents a defense against accusations that they are
658 English and no longer Turkish—so “don’t be mistaken.” While
659 maintaining a positive Turkish identification, from the perspective
660 of I-as-Ethnic-Other they invoke cultural stereotypes to accept
661 the implicit outsider status—“pass the kebab/keep your egg and
662 bacon.. This perhaps represents a way of reclaiming agency
663 within the “othered,” marginalized space of being “ethnic.” Fur-
664 ther, this narrative allows them to impose clarity and bound-
665 aries on the fragmented multiculturalism of London: There may
666 be many different origins, but “I’m from Cyprus/and that’s a
667 *fact.*”

668 Yet paradoxically, the same self-presentation rejects the essen-
669 tializing discourses on which these stereotypes of ethnic otherness
670 are based. The complexity and contradictions of being a Turk
671 in London are inherent in the style in which they choose to
672 express their Turkish pride and identity. It is not traditional
673 Turkish folk music but a rap, a style that originates from black
674 Anglo-American culture. This is further reinforced by the “hip-
675 hop” style images posted of themselves, a style in which the poses
676 and dress clearly contravene the values of the Turkish diaspora (as
677 they describe them). Thus the “True Turk” website itself illustrates
678 the hybridization of Turkish and other identities, even though
679 these young people are reluctant, at best defensive, in verbally
680 acknowledging such hybridization.

681 This rap then reflects a means of negotiating an asymmetrical
682 and constraining sociocultural context, and reveals a duality in
683 the ways in which they relate to their identity. The authority of
684 discourses cannot be separated from the actual social positions
685 of self and other (Gillespie, 2005). The Turkish in Turkey have
686 more power to say who is Turkish, and the white English have
687 more power to say who is English, and both seem to reject
688 these second-generation immigrants. What emerges is a knotted
689 dialogical identity position that explicitly rejects the English
690 identity while embracing a Turkish identity they work hard to
691 claim and defend. While the particular context represented by the
692 research setting—being interviewed by a white English woman at
693 their Turkish school—may have foregrounded their I-as-Turkish
694 position, the data also suggest that its dominance persists across
695 contexts (e.g., in the wearing of the moon-and-star pendant or
696 the creation of a “True Turk” website).

697 Yet the dialogical knot remains: They have all been born and
698 brought up in London, schooled in London, are more fluent
699 in English and more “at home” in England. Socialized into this
700 society, they implicitly adopt resources, such as the rap genre,
701 from globalized culture to forge a hybrid identity position that
702 allows them to be competent social actors in the multicultural
703 setting in which they live out their daily lives. However, due to the
704 asymmetries within their sociocultural context, they do so without
705 being able to explicitly claim an English identification.

706

Adaptive Asymmetries

707 How can we understand the constitution of this internally frag-
708 mented and asymmetrical dialogical self? Our analysis concurs
709 with Valsiner (2002, p. 259), who argued that different I-positions
710 are distinct “matching psychological devices” for adapting to
711 different social contexts. In some contexts, these young people
712 must deal in the currency of essentializing discourses. In these
713 instances, speaking from I-as-Turkish or I-as-Ethnic-Other, they
714 suture themselves into the spaces constructed by the identity
715 discourses of more powerful others in their sociocultural con-
716 texts (e.g., parents, the white majority). In other situations, the
717 reifications on which these identifications are based are acknowl-
718 edged as false, not least amid the reality of the cultural flow
719 and flux of London. Through a rejection of these discourses in
720 the expression of a more hybridized identity, they are able to
721 undermine these constraining racial chauvinisms, allowing them
722 to build cultural bridges—as, for example, in the diversity of
723 their friendship groups. Thus, while reflecting persistent and
724 unresolved dialogical struggles resulting from the asymmetries of
725 power that structure their sociocultural context, this movement
726 between positions is nonetheless adaptive.

727 It is now common to assert that identities are multiple,
728 fluid, and hybridized, reflecting the postmodern condition (e.g.,
729 Bhatia, 2002; Hall, 1996). In line with this, our analysis shows
730 that these young Turks are agentic in appropriating cultural
731 resources to enact a novel and hybridized identity. However,
732 using the concept of the dialogical self, our analysis pushes this
733 line of thought further. Different social contexts and voices—the
734 Turks in Turkey and the white English in England—constrain

735 the field of identity positions these second-generation Turks can
 736 occupy, and that constraint reveals itself in the suppression of
 737 the hybridized I-position at the level of self-identifications. Thus,
 738 by analytically situating the dialogical self within its sociocultural
 739 context, one sees beyond the contradictions to reveal a logical and
 740 adaptive response to the hybridity produced by globalization and
 741 the asymmetries of power inherent within it.

742

Notes

- 743 1. The Turkish-speaking population consists of Turks, Kurds, and Turkish-
 744 Cypriots. Participants referred to themselves under the general category of
 745 “Turks”; thus, we follow their terminology. This does not include young
 746 Kurds, who constitute a more distinctive group within the Turkish-speaking
 747 community (see Enneli et al., 2005).
 748 2. The recital of his pledge entails pledging to be hard working, honest, and
 749 respectful to one’s elders and to protect those younger, and to be proud to
 750 be a Turk.

751

References

- 752 Back, L. (1996). *New ethnicities and urban culture: Racisms and multicultural in young*
 753 *lives*. London: University College London Press.
 754 Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
 755 Baumann, G. (1996). *Contesting culture: Discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London*.
 756 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 757 Bhatia, S. (2002). Acculturation, dialogical voices, and the construction of the
 758 diasporic self. *Theory and Psychology, 12*, 55–77.
 759 Bhatia, S., & Ram, A. (2001). Locating the dialogical self in the age of transna-
 760 tional migrations, border crossings, and diasporas. *Culture and Psychology, 7*,
 761 297–309.
 762 Da Cunha, M. C. (1995). Children, politics, and culture: The case of Brazilian
 763 Indians. In S. Stephens (Ed.), *Children and the politics of culture* (pp. 282–291).
 764 Chichester: Princeton University Press.
 765 Enneli, P., Modood, T., & Bradley, H. (2005). *Young Turks and Kurds: A set of*
 766 *“invisible” disadvantaged groups*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
 767 Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
 768 Gervais, M.-C., & Jovchelovitch, S. (1998). Health and identity: The case of the
 769 Chinese community in England. *Social Science Information, 37*, 709–729.
 770 Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*.
 771 Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
 772 Gillespie, A. (2005). Malcolm X and his autobiography: Identity development
 773 and self-narration. *Culture and Psychology, 11*, 77–88.
 774 Gillespie, A. (2006a). *Becoming other: From social interaction to self-reflection*.
 775 Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

- 776 Gillespie, A. (2006b). Descartes' demon: A dialogical analysis of *Meditations on*
 777 *First Philosophy. Theory & Psychology*, 16, 761–781.
- Q3 778 Gillespie, A. (2007). Collapsing self/other positions: Identification through
 779 differentiation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, XX, xx–xx.
- 780 Gillespie, A., Cornish, F., Aveling, E.-L., & Zittoun, T. (2008). Conflicting
 781 community commitments: A dialogical analysis of a British woman's World
 782 War II diaries. *Journal of Community Psychology*, XX, xx–xx.
- 783 Hall, K. (1995). "There's a time to act English and a time to act Indian": The pol-
 784 itics of identity among British-Sikh teenagers. In S. Stephens (Ed.), *Children*
 785 *and the politics of culture* (pp. 243–644). Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- 786 Hall, S. (1996). Who needs "identity"? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions*
 787 *of cultural identity* (pp. 1–17). London: Sage.
- 788 Hermans, H. J. M. (1996). Voicing the self: From information processing to
 789 dialogical interchange. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 31–50.
- 790 Hermans, H. J. M. (2001a). The dialogical self: Towards a theory of personal and
 791 cultural positioning. *Culture and Psychology*, 7, 243–281.
- 792 Hermans, H. J. M. (2001b). The construction of a personal position repertoire:
 793 Method and practice. *Culture and Psychology*, 7, 323–365.
- 794 Hermans, H. J. M. (2002). The dialogical self as a society of mind. *Theory and*
 795 *Psychology*, 12, 147–160.
- 796 Hermans, H. J. M., & Dimaggio, G. (2007). Self, identity, and globalization in
 797 times of uncertainty: A dialogical analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 11, 31–
 798 61.
- 799 Hermans, H. J. M., & Kempen, H. J. G. (1998). Moving cultures: The perilous
 800 problems of cultural dichotomies in a globalizing society. *American Psychologist*,
 801 53, 1111–1120.
- 802 Hermans, H. J. M., Kempen, H. J. G., & vanLoon, R. J. P. (1992). The dialogical
 803 self: Beyond individualism and rationalism. *American Psychologist*, 4, 23–33.
- 804 Howarth, C. (under review). "I hope we don't have to understand racism one
 805 day": Problematising racial difference in a British primary school. *British*
 806 *Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Q4 807 Howarth, C. (2002). Identity in whose eyes? The role of representations in
 808 identity construction. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 32, 145–162.
- 809 Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*.
 810 London: Sage.
- 811 James, W. (1890/1981). *The principles of psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
 812 University Press.
- 813 Mandel, R. (1995). Second generation non-citizens: Children of the Turkish
 814 migrant diaspora in Germany. In S. Stephens (Ed.), *Children and the politics of*
 815 *culture* (pp. 265–281). Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- 816 Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research*, 2nd ed.
 817 London: Sage.
- 818 Modood, T., Berthoud, R., Lakey, J., Nazroo, J., Smith, P., Virdee, S., & Beishon,
 819 S. (1997). *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. London: Policy
 820 Studies Institute.
- 821 Nagel, J. (1996). *American Indian ethnic renewal: Red power and the resurgence of*
 822 *identity and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 823 Parker, D. (1995). *Through different eyes: The cultural identities of young Chinese people*
824 *in Britain*. Aldershot: Avebury Press.
- 825 Rappoport, L., Baumgardner, S., & Boon, G. (1999). Postmodern culture and
826 the plural self. In J. Rowan & M. Cooper (Eds.), *The plural self: Multiplicity in*
827 *everyday life* (pp. xx–xx). London: Sage.
- 828 Shotter, J. (1993). *Cultural politics of everyday life*. Buckingham: Open University
829 Press.
- 830 Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge: Cam-
831 bridge University Press.
- 832 Valsiner, J. (2002). Forms of dialogical relation and semiotic autoregulation
833 within the self. *Theory and Psychology*, 12, 251–265.
- 834 Wertsch, J. V. (1991). *Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action*.
835 London: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.

Q5