WHO AM I?

Everyday Politics of Identity among the Turkish-Dutch Youth
in the City of Utrecht, The Netherlands

November 2016

Carlotta Zanzottera

Cover Picture by Tessa de Geus,
Lombok, Utrecht

Master's Programme: Cultural Anthropology: Sustainable Citizenship

Utrecht University, The Netherlands, 2015 - 2016

MSc Thesis *Carlotta Zanzottera*

Student ID: 5702429

email: c.zanzottera@students.uu.nl

Universiteit Utrecht

Title: Who am I?

Everyday Politics of Identity among the Turkish-Dutch Youth in the City of Utrecht, The Netherlands

Supervisor: Nienke Muurling

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

This thesis is dedicated to all the persons I have met in these two intense years. Sharing my life with you and, sometimes, walking on the same paths made me the person who I am now. To my mother and father, who taught me the bravery to leave the safe home to follow my dreams. To Lella, who has taken care of me as I was her daughter for twenty years old.

I am particularly thankful to all the Turkish-Dutch young people who have kindly shared their personal stories with me, for their time and for speaking with open hearts. Having a glimpse of your life has been truly inspiring. I want to thank all the men I have met at Ulu Camii Mosque for their help and kindness and especially Mr. Turgay for his unexpected role as a translator. I want to thank Marieke for translating with great care my interviews and for keeping searching for informants. Finally, I am sincerely grateful to Alberto Salza who has brought new lifeblood to this thesis.

Without all of you, this thesis could have never been done.

Preface

This thesis could be considered as the outcome of a personal wonder arose as soon as I left my home country, Italy, to move to the Dutch city of Utrecht. Having been always interested in multicultural contexts, the first thing that stroke me when I arrived was the large mosque in the city centre. Since it is near the central station, the mosque is the first building anyone can see entering the city by train and it shapes the skyline of the entire city. This fact is quite an exception in Europe and in The Netherlands, as most of the time the mosques, if any, are positioned in the outskirts and they are smaller. For these reasons, I started visiting the mosque itself and I discovered that it is placed in a multicultural neighbourhood called Lombok. While walking around Lombok I got astonished by its atmosphere that reminded me of the *casbah* I visited during my trips in North Africa and Middle East. In Lombok, women wearing head scarves do their shopping in the various Turkish, Afghani, Surinamese shops, while men and young boys have conversations in different languages. Next to them, Dutch people live and do their shopping. Later on, I discovered that the mosque was funded by the Turkish community and it is its core. Therefore, I took an interest in the Turks in the Netherlands.

Combining my own interest and passion for multicultural contexts with the knowledge I got concerning the large and old presence of a Turkish community in The Netherlands, I decided to conduct my fieldwork among the Turkish people, which developed into the more specific issue of identity of their sons and daughters.

1. Introduction

> "When I was younger I had few identity crises. As Turkish-Dutch people we are stuck in a grey line, figuring out who we are. We are looking for a definition, a sort of label." (Gizem, 25 years old, Turkish second generation girl)[1]

> "I don't want to give up on either my Turkish or my Dutch background, since they are both part of me, of my identity. I am both Turkish and Dutch. However, it is difficult to deal with a double cultural background." (Ekin, 25 years old, Turkish second generation girl)

Gizem and Ekin are two of the twenty sons and daughters of Turkish migrants I met during my ethnographic fieldwork in the Dutch city of Utrecht. Their quotes reveal a particular struggle they face in daily situations, the issue of identity. Simply speaking: do they define their identity as Turkish-Dutch, Dutch-Turkish, Turkish or Dutch?

In a world of international migration and global flows of ideas, people with different culture backgrounds live together. Nevertheless, this doesn't happen without issues, tensions and struggles. One of these issues is the construction of cultural identity, to be further elaborated. I focused my research on the children of Turkish immigrants, who I defined as "second generation"[2], living in Utrecht, The Netherlands.

In order to understand the discourse of identity, imagine you were born in a specific country, your passport defines your nationality and citizenship. You have been schooled in this country where you have learn its culture and national language. Yet, your parents were born in a different country, they speak a different mother tongue, they have a different culture and moral values which they have passed on to you together with their mother tongue. Likely, you have a second passport which defines your second citizenship. Now, which answer would you give when someone questions you about your identity? This is the situation of the identities joined by an hyphen, scientifically defined as "hyphenated identities", such as: Turkish-Dutch, etc.

My thesis investigates the issue of identity. My research question therefore is: how do the Turkish second generation individuals construct their cultural identities? Specifically, how do they position themselves in the Dutch society in terms of identity: how would they connect with their Dutch and Turkish backgrounds? Lastly, do they feel like they belong to Dutch society? And if it so, when and how.

To begin with, what makes the construction of their shared identity problematic is the

[1] For the sake of the privacy, all the informants are named by a fictive name

[2] The definition of "second generation" is scientifically problematic. Some scholars refer to the descents of migrants as "first generation", (more demographically correctly, because they are the first to be born in the host country),others refer at them as "second generation".

theoretical paradigm concerning the construction of the national and cultural identity, an outcome of the nation-state. As I will explain in the next chapter, this paradigm claims a rooted notion of identity. This means that from this point of view, everything that doesn't come from or belong to the nation (in this case The Netherlands) is perceived as foreign (Baumann 2002; Ghorashi 2009, 84). The first consequence is that people with a different cultural background, such as migrants or second generation individuals, belong to the place they, or their parents, come from. The paradigm here is that migrants' and second generation people's most natural link should be the one they have with the cultural origin, even if they were born in the host country. A paradigm that could prove false because nations and identities have no scales to be weighted upon. Halleh Ghorashi (2009, 84) explains this point through a joke by Ulrich Beck: "A black man in Germany is asked: "Where are you from?" He answers: "From Munich" Q: "And your parents?" A: "Also from Munich". Q: "And where were they born?" A: "My mother in Munich" Q: "And your father?" A: "In Ghana...." Q: "Ah, so you are from Ghana" ". Clearly, the link with their parents' home-country makes second generation people seen as they do not belong to the place where they were born (in our case The Netherlands), they are constantly perceived as foreigners.

The rooted notion of identity is also culturally exclusive. The effect is that within the construction of the national and cultural identity there is no room for any cultural differences. The majority perceives the values and the habits the second generation individuals have learn from their parents as foreign values.

We can see that the theoretical construction of national and cultural identities leads to a strict notion of Dutch and non-Dutch. Since second generation people have a double set of values they are perceived as non-Dutch, just like their parents. It's their real or putative link to their parents' home-country that doesn't fit into a notion of identity which perceives all that doesn't come from the nation as foreign. Thomas Eriksen (2003, 232) explains this "Otherness" discourse: "(…) they are quite often confronted with notions among the natives to the effect that they don't belong there. This may happen in everyday situations when a Danish-born boy with a Turkish appearance and name is asked whether he understands Danish or when he is going back".

The outcome is that second generation people have a difficult time with the construction of their cultural identity. They struggle with connecting to their Dutch and Turkish identities at the same time. The goal of this thesis is to show that, in order to cope with the "Otherness" discourse, the Turkish second generation people develop politics of identity building. Those are ways of constructing their identity based on which identity they want to be connected with (the Turkish, the Dutch or both) and how to do that.

In order to explain the problem and answer the research question, this thesis is structured as it follows. I will first provide a theoretical chapter where I introduce the reader to the academic

debate concerning the issue of identity. The main goal of this chapter is to explain how the theoretical discourse about the construction of the national and cultural identity highlights and threatens the sense of multiple identities of people with a different cultural background, leading them to have a “unsolved” cultural identity. The national and cultural identity' s paradigm arose in the Nineteenth century to solve the problem concerning the identity of legitimate citizens of a nation-state. Citizenship and national and cultural identity are, therefore, intertwined. The citizenship legally defines the border between who is included in a society as a legitimate member and who is not. I argue that the definition of citizenship set in the Nineteenth century is still effective. Its connection with the soil and the national culture legally strengthens the feeling of exclusion of the second generation people. The “unsolved” cultural identity and the feeling of non-belonging are the causes of the identity's construction process.

Before going into the core of my thesis, I will provide a chapter where I define the research location and the implemented methodology. Here, I explain how I got in touch with my informants and approached them as well as my position as an anthropologist in the field. Three empirical chapters follow. Those are the core of the thesis, where I answer the research question. I present my ethnographic data and try to understand them through the theoretical lens of the construction of the national cultural identity. To begin with, the fourth chapter explains how in daily situations my informants face ethnic and social boundaries. I argue that the boundaries are practical outcomes of the rooted notion of identity. I show how my interlocutors became aware of the presence of the invisible but clear-cut boundaries between the two groups in question. Through these boundaries, such as the widely spread low expectations of performance from the Turkish second generation people, my interlocutors became aware of the social distance between them and the major Dutch group. The awareness of being considered “the Other” leads them to the question: who am I?

The fifth chapter takes the reader deeper into the consequence of the “who am I?” question. The strict dichotomy between Dutch and non-Dutch requires conscious or unconscious strategies to construct their identity, I define these strategies as politics of identity elaboration. Through my informants' voices, I explain the strategies they develop and I argue that the strategies are individual and contextual attempts to belong.

The sixth chapter moves to the connection between one's cultural identity and the feeling of belonging. The assumption is that only quality social relations existing between Turkish-Dutch citizens and their Dutch peers are evidences of a real belonging to the society. By analysing the social interactions that occur between Dutch citizens and the Turkish-Dutch youth, I show to what extent the ways in which my informants construct their cultural identity affect the type of social relations they have with their Dutch peers. More specifically, which strategy of identity leads to a real feeling of belonging. To make the point complete, I present the data I collected concerning the

social interactions existing between Turkish people and Dutch people in the neighbourhood of Lombok. This is the place where some of Turkish people live, where they do their grocery shopping and they come to pray. This allowed me to look at this neighbourhood as the ideal place to research the sort of social interactions that occur between Turkish people and Dutch people who live there.

In the conclusions, I underline the anachronism of the theoretical paradigm of national and cultural identity. This doesn't work in a globalized world of migrations and cultural exchange.

2. "Unsolved" Cultural Identities

The construction of the individual identity is the way by which an individual creates an idea of the self that satisfies them. The construction of the identity arises from the awareness that there is a gap between the self-perceptions, which is what a person thinks about themselves, and the hetero-perceptions, which is what others think about that particular person (Goffman 1963; Spedicato 2006). When an individual becomes aware of this gap, they, consciously or unconsciously, begin to construct their identity. They create an idea of themselves that in a way matches with the hetero-perceptions and in another it separates from them. The reification of identity is crucial to be part of any society as identity is what makes an individual a particular person and therefore, enables him or her to deal with other people and act within a society. Spedicato (2006, 152) explains: "Without an identity, in fact, we cannot either act within a society, or take coherent decisions, or further significant identity politics".[3]

The construction of identity is an issue itself, however, it is even harder for the second generation individuals. This happens because their construction of the individual identities involves their cultural identity, their double cultural background. The question is: what makes the construction of their cultural identity problematic? To answer the question, I will explain the theoretical paradigm concerning the construction of the national identity, where the nation-state plays the main role in defining the national cultural identity.

According to Ernest Gellner' s (1983, 7) definition of nation, nations can be defined both in terms of culture and will. Two men belong to the same nation "if and only if they share the same culture, where culture in turn means a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating". Two men belong to the same nation "if and only if they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation" (Gellner 1983, 7). Summarizing,

> "a mere category of persons (say, occupants of a given territory, or speakers of a given language, for example) becomes a nation if and when the members of the category firmly recognize certain mutual rights and duties to each other in virtue of their shared membership of it. It is their recognition of each other as fellows of this kind that turns them into a nation" (Gellner, 1983,7).

For the sake of the argument it must be said that Gellner (1983) points out that his definition can be applied to the modern nation-state which is the outcome of an historical process which happened in Europe[4]. Only if we take into account this point, we can define nations in terms of both

[3] My own translation. Here is the original quote: "Senza identità, infatti, non ci si può collocare nella realtà sociale, compiere scelte coerenti, individuare linee di condotta significative"

[4] "When general social conditions make for a standardized, homogeneous, centrally sustained high culture, pervading

culture and will.

The point in Gellner's definition of nation is that, at least in Europe, culture and identification are the two main features of a nation, two men identify themselves as belonging to the same nation because they share the same culture. The implicit assumption is that even one man recognizes himself as belonging to a nation because he shares the culture of that nation, because he has a specific culture identity. In the modern state the culture is not provided by kin or local units, it can only be provided by a modern "national" educational system and the state has the monopoly of it. Thus, what are the effects for the cultural identity construction? The nation, the culture, the process of identification and the state are closely linked. Culture allows the individuals to identify as members of a certain nation and the state has the monopoly over culture and thus it spreads culture through a 'national' educational system. We can argue that the state reinforces the national cultural identity of its members.

The idea that the state defines cultural identities is legally reinforced. In the Nineteenth century, when the modern nation state arose, a question was posed: who are the legitimate members of a state? In other words, the issue of citizenship suitable for nations, who legally belong to the nation-state and who does not. The answer which was given still affects the definition of citizenship nowadays: members are everyone who speaks the same language, shares the same culture, etc. It is the idea which was carried on by the romantic writers. In other words, the member of a particular state is the one who bears the identity markers legitimized by the state. Those "homogeneous" individuals are the citizens of the new and modern nation-state. Citizenship is, therefore, the tool used by the state to legally define the cultural identity, therefore we can talk about cultural citizenship. As citizenship is linked to national culture it proposes an "ideal" behaviour, the perfect Dutch, Turkish, Whoever must do this and that and must not do this and that. As we will be seen in the research, my data are evidences of the fact that citizenship is still connected to national and cultural identity markers and this affects the feeling of belonging of the second generation citizens.

The idea of national cultural identity and cultural citizenship are, according to Gerd Baumann (2002, 24), based on an essentialist view of culture. This was first proposed by Gottfried Herder around 1800 and then perfected by Franz Boas, the founder of anthropology in America. It comprehends culture as the collective heritage of a group, that is as a catalogue of ideas and practices that shape both the collective and the individual lives and thoughts of all members. As Baumann (2002, 25) puts it somewhat polemically, culture, thus, appears "as a giant photocopy machine that keeps turning out identical copies"… "and no one will deny that every cultural collective shows a certain stability in traits and tastes, styles and routines that its participants have

entire populations and not just elite minorities, a situation arises in which well-defined educationally sanctioned and unified cultures constitute very nearly the only kind of unit with which men willingly and often ardently identify". (Gellner 1983, 55)

learned to cultivate". The state, therefore, through the educational national system and citizenship furthers and strengthens the theoretical discourse about the construction of the national and culture identity and, in doing so, it spreads the essentialist view of culture through its members. The outcome is that we are divided into: Dutch, Turkish, others and this idea is strongly rooted in our minds. This could affect the second generation individuals as will be seen in the research.

The consequence of this paradigm is that the national culture identity is rooted in a place where someone is born and, since it has within itself the essentialist notion of culture, it is culturally exclusive, meaning that there is little to no room for any cultural differences within itself. As Ghorashi (2009) shows, when the notion of national cultural identity happens to be so strongly linked to the place where someone was born and so culturally exclusive, it leads to a process of exclusion and sets up a dichotomous relationship between "Us" - the people who were born in that nation and share the national culture – and " the Other" - everyone else. The essentialist idea of culture that perceives culture as an heritage with rules and norms, fixes the difference between "Us" and "Them". As Baumann (2002, 25) pointed out: "To socialize a child is always to acculturate the child, to tell him or her that "this is what We do, so do it; and that is what They do, so don't! " ". The consequence is that the national cultural identity is limited to a strict notion of Dutch and non-Dutch, Turkish and non-Turkish, etc. Therefore, people with different or double cultural backgrounds who are born in The Netherlands, for instance, or who have lived most of their lives there and have a Dutch nationality are not included as "one of us".

The dichotomy of "Us" *versus* "Them" is legally and semantically strengthened. For the sake of the argument, I will talk about the Dutch society. This makes a distinction between *autochtoon* and *allochtoon*[5]. Officially, in the Netherlands (and Flanders), the term *allochtoon* refers to anyone who had at least one parent born outside the Netherlands. The *autochtoon* is less widely used, but it roughly corresponds to ethnic Dutch[6]. Legally speaking, the Dutch nationality law is based on the principle of *jus sanguinis* ("the right of the blood")[7], citizenship is conferred primarily by birth to a Dutch parent, irrespective of place of birth. This means that the *allochtonen* born in The Netherlands to two foreign parents keep the citizenship of their parents. Only when they turn eighteen and if they want to, they can obtain the Dutch citizenship through the "option procedure", as reported in the website of the Ministry of Security and Justice[8]. This consists of a paid procedure where the *allochtonen* have to present a valid passport and birth certificate. It can be concluded that the Dutch law reinforces the dichotomy between "Us" *versus* "the Other", making clear that the *allochtonen* are "the Other". Legally, the *allochtonen* are not Dutch citizens until they are eighteen.

[5] It must be reported the ongoing debate in Dutch society concerning the term *allochtoon*. The debate considers the possibility and the will to abandon the term *allochtoon*

[6] Definition by the Dutch Central Buro of Statistics (CBS), in Dutch; cbs.nl

[7] The Dutch nationality low is governed by the Kingdom Act on the Netherlands nationality, in Dutch: *Rijkswet op het Nederlanderschap*

[8] Ministry of Security and Justice, ind.nl

The theoretical construction of the national culture identity which is the base of the cultural citizenship and, therefore, leads to the nationality laws and protocols, has important consequences on a psychological level. Firstly, since citizenship legally defines the border between who is included in the society as a legitimate member and who is not, the Dutch nationality law threatens the feeling of belonging of second generation individuals who are legally Dutch citizens after they turn eighteen. Secondly, the dichotomy is so strongly rooted in the minds of individuals to the extent that it affects the construction of the individual identity of the second generation individuals. For them it becomes difficult to connect with their cultural identities, because their double cultural background doesn't fit into a theoretical construction of the national and cultural identity which is so deeply rooted and so culturally exclusive. As an example of this phenomenon, I report an article from Ghorashi (2009) about Iranian migrants in The Netherlands. The author shows that the rooted notion of culture leaves no room for a construction of identity which is connected to double identities, forcing people to position themselves only as Iranians rather than Dutch–Iranians. "The thick construction of Dutchness also makes virtually impossible the existence of hyphenated identities that are linked to multiple positions of cultural differences" (Ghorashi 2009, 85).

As a conclusion, when the second generation people have to construct their identity, they become aware of the fact that in the society the hetero-perceptions look at them as "the Other" because of their double cultural identities. Thus, connecting with their double cultural identities becomes problematic. Psychologically, this situation brings them to a feeling of distress since they have an "unsolved" cultural identity, they are stuck in a sort of no man's land. The point is that the theoretical construction of the national and cultural identity defines monolithic, fixed-without-any-doubts identities such as Dutch, Turkish, Whoever, and it proposes "ideal" behaviours such as the perfect Dutch, the perfect Turkish, etc. which is deeply rooted in individuals' minds. This theoretical discourse concerning the identity doesn't leave any room in the individual's mind for identities such as Dutch-Turkish, etc.

What are the consequences of an "unsolved" cultural identity? In this thesis, I argue that the second generation Turkish people have room to develop politics of identity building. Those are ways of constructing their cultural identity based on individual choices of whether to connect with both of their cultural identities or to just one of the two and how to do this. Constructing their cultural identity means that they choose which values are essential to them. It is important to note that the politics of identity building are individual choices derived from the fact that the second generations cannot follow a specific "identity model", the Turkish-Dutch identity, as we will be seen in the empirical chapters.

3. Research Location and Methodology

In this chapter I present the research setting, the methodology I used to carry out my research, the problems I faced as well as my own position in the field. Since the main actors of my thesis are the children of Turkish immigrants, it is important to briefly introduce the Turkish community itself.

The Turkish community is one of the largest and oldest in The Netherlands. Turks settled in Europe in the late 1960s and 1970s as a predominantly male population of low-skilled workers. They were, therefore, labour migrants with a low educational level which entered the social hierarchy at the bottom. Nowadays the percentage of the Turkish population in The Netherlands is 2,3% and it is still the biggest minor group.

It is worth saying that I worked on two different tracks. On one hand I focused on the Turkish-Dutch youth; while on the other hand I focused on the neighbourhood of Lombok. The goal of the research in Lombok was to study how Turkish and Dutch citizens socially interact with each other. I implemented this topic with studying to what extent social interactions are affected by how Turkish-Dutch people position themselves in the society in terms of identity. For my research, a distinction between key informants and second informants was necessary. The former are the Turkish-Dutch young people. Those are the main actors of my thesis, since they are dealing with a double cultural background, the obstacle for the construction of their cultural identity. The latter are a host of different Turkish people I met in Lombok, such as workers and at the mosque, plus Dutch people living there.

I start talking about my key informants and the main topics I questioned them about. When I started moving the first steps in the field I soon noticed that there isn't a Turkish community. Instead, there are Turkish second generation people who, sometimes, hang out with Turkish-Dutch and Turkish people, but they are more individualistically oriented. Therefore, there wasn’t a specific meeting place, like schools, social centres or *topos* where I could meet them. Moreover, my goal was to get in touch with a heterogeneous group of people; consequently I avoided such meeting places, where usually a more homogeneous group of people gets together. First, I got a list of contacts: names and email addresses from a Turkish-Dutch classmate of mine. Every time I could reach one of the name on the list I asked them whether I could get in touch with any of their Turkish-Dutch friends. Through their networks, I contacted around twenty Turkish second generation young people. I will present my informants in the research.

As stated before, I wanted to get in touch with a heterogeneous group of people in terms of interests, ways of living, religious backgrounds, etc. Nevertheless, I selected my informants on

educational and employment basis. They are highly educated people in their twenties. Some of them are attending HBO or the university, others have already finished their studies and are entering the labour market. Due to their high education, none of them are unemployed. The reason why the education and the employment were selection requirements relays on the fact that I wanted to avoid relating the identity's struggle with situations of marginalisation and frustration that might arise in people who couldn't get good life opportunities. Moreover, most of my interlocutors are girls. At the beginning of my fieldwork that wasn't a requirement, however during my research it turned out that girls are struggling with their double cultural background more than boys. As women, they have to face some moral values that are not an issue for their male peers, such as the social pressure on dress code, whether or not wearing a headscarf and on the marriage.

My research among the Turkish-Dutch youth are based on structured face to face interviews. I defined few topics and a branch of questions which developed during my fieldwork. The main topics are: daily habits, social interactions, religion background, private and public life, sense of identity and general thoughts concerning the Dutch policies about people with a different ethnic background (see the Appendix).

Since identity issues and the feeling of belonging are an ego-centric prospective based on feelings, I structured the interviews in a way that my informants felt comfortable with talking about their sensations and experiences. From the beginning, I avoided mentioning the term interview, whereas, after having introduced myself and the topics of my fieldwork, I asked them whether they were willing to have a conversation about their life as Turkish-Dutch people in Utrecht. For the same reason, I interviewed them in cosy public places, like coffee places. Nevertheless, I always asked the permission to take notes. Since I questioned them about their personal experiences and private lives, I first asked them whether they wanted to be mentioned in my thesis and, as everyone didn't want to, every informant will be named by a fictive name. I approached the interviews as they weren’t sources of theoretical truths but of personal feelings and emotions. Later, I analysed the common topics that came up during the interviews through the lens of the theory I studied in the literature. As an example, several informants mentioned the feeling of astonishment of Dutch people when they became aware of my informants’ ability to speak Dutch as their mother tongue or of their high level of education. Since that was a common topic, I did theoretical research based on the literature and, finally, I could link the feeling of astonishment to the Dutch thick sense of identity proved in the literature. I held interviews of two or three hours long and often I caught up with the same person two or three times. This allowed me to fill the gasps of my interviews and to question them about new ideas and theories that came up as time passed. I ran the interviews in English, I will come to this topic later.

In analysing my data, I based my methodology on the book by Joost and de Vries (2015). As

suggested there, I took fieldwork notes to observe the diversity in the behaviours of my informants. At the beginning they were simply scratch notes, such as personal impressions; later they became interpretative notes and finally I was able to take notes linked to the theory I was studying, thus they became explanatory memos. In order to study my data, I first compared them with each other to see the differences and the similarities. This allowed me to make some generalizations and categorize my interlocutors based on their answers to the main topics. Later, I linked the main topics and my informants' answers one with each other in order to see whether there were any good connections between the topics and the kind of answers. The goal was to see if any new insights or new categories could emerge. The last step was to crystallize the data into a theory (Joost & de Vries, 2015).

I did part of my fieldwork in the neighbourhood of Lombok, focusing on the social interactions existing between Dutch and Turkish citizens living there. I have been involved in daily visits in Lombok that allowed me to get an insight into its life. During my visits, I took fieldwork notes where I wrote my impressions such as smells, feelings, noises and I observed the persons who use to live there or just visit the neighbourhood. I studied the urban geography in order to see whether the Dutch citizens are well mixed with the non-Dutch citizens in terms of houses' location. I included in my notes few informal conversations I happened to have with Turkish and Dutch people I met on the streets. In this way I understood that most of the Turkish people don't live there but they daily visit Lombok to either attend the mosque, do their shopping, get together in Turkish cafés, etc. My notes were mostly based on my own feelings, thus they were superficial; nevertheless they proved invaluable in being the first step of the following research.

The second step was to implement my personal observations with structured interviews. I investigated the topic of social interactions by interviewing some Turkish workers in Turkish shops, such as small shops or cafés, as well as Dutch citizens living in Lombok. I asked the Turkish workers whether Dutch people visit their shops, how frequently and what type of products they use to buy. Moreover, I questioned them about the life in the neighbourhood (see Appendix). I focused on the Turkish shops because, as public places, here people interact with each other in daily situations the most. Moreover, I focused on food as a common example of cultural exchange. I questioned Dutch citizens about the same topics: whether or not they do the grocery shopping in Turkish places, the reason why they do it and their knowledge about the Turkish culture.

Lastly, I did few research in Ulu Camii mosque. Through structured interviews with a Turkish member of its board, I investigated the negotiations between the community and the municipality of Utrecht when the mosque was announced as well as the reactions of the Dutch neighbours both at that time and nowadays (see Appendix). How Dutch citizens react at the presence of the largest mosque in The Netherlands highlights the nature of social interactions

happening between the two groups. Especially because the mosque represents the religious identity of the Turkish Muslim believers. I complemented these information by having few informal conversations with people I met at the mosque during weekly days and the Friday prayers.

During my ethnographic fieldwork, I collected, compared, categorized, connected the data and, eventually, crystallized them into theories. In order to get a broad overview of the social interactions, I triangulated the data about Lombok with the ones I collected among the Turkish-Dutch youth. Overall, I am able to say that the data concerning Lombok provided me practical evidences of what the Turkish second generation people told me about the type of interactions occurring between them and their Dutch peers.

During my fieldwork, I made use of second sources. Newspapers and website proved invaluable in complementing my understanding of Dutch society. In order to know the Dutch nationality laws and protocols, I referred to the website of the Ministry of Security and Justice[9]. Furthermore, in order to understand the Dutch educational system and the percentages of second generation students enrolled in academic tracks, I scanned the TIES website[10]. I made use of newspapers to be updated regarding the main public debates concerning the second generations and immigrants. Moreover, a few informal conversations I had with academics involved in the issue of identity provided me unexpected theoretical insights which I used to crystallize my data into theories. Lastly, I ran two structured interviews with Turkish first generation women. In this way, I got an idea about how the issue of identity is experienced differently by the first and the second generation. I used these interviews as second sources since they improved my knowledge about the identity's issue but they were slightly off-topic.

I shall clarify that, in my thesis, I refer to the Dutch people as an homogeneous group, according to the common understanding of it. However, it must be said that there is one different ethnic group within The Netherlands, the Frisian. For this reason, I avoided, when possible, to call the Dutch people as an ethnic group. When I did it (see chapter fourth), I refer to the common understanding of Dutch people and ethnicity. Furthermore, Dutch culture and people are presented as they are perceived by the Turkish-Dutch and the Turkish people, since their point of view is the main focus of my research.

[9] Ibid.
[10] The website of The Integration of European Second Generation (TIES); tiesproject.eu

I, an Italian researcher among the Turkish-Dutch youth in The Netherlands

I now explain my own position in the field and the troubles I ran into. Since I questioned the Turkish-Dutch youth about their personal, private experiences and feelings, I needed to create a relationship based on trust. Therefore, I introduced myself as a person interested in multicultural contexts and in people with different cultural backgrounds. I talked them about myself and how I could combine my passion with my studies. This allowed me to be considered as a person rather than as a researcher. With the same aim, I highlighted my different cultural background, which turned out to be a winning strategy. As an Italian girl living in Holland, I could understand their struggles with the Dutch culture, particularly with the downsides of it. As an example, a few people told me that, since I also come from a Mediterranean country, I must find Dutch people colder and more distant then Italians. For the same reason, a few of them guessed that in Italy, as in Turkey, the family seems to be more valuable and people over there have a different sense of humour. Moreover, my impression is that my girl informants found easier to talk about love relationships, marriages and social pressure on dress code with me, since I am myself a girl. Overall, being an "outsider" helped me with developing empathy. I was able to understand the importance of the feeling of belonging, what threatens it and the frustration arose when this happens. Furthermore, my position provided me an objective gaze on the Dutch culture, which was useful to understand the downsides of it. Nevertheless, the difference between me and the Turkish-Dutch people had also an impact on my research. I belong to those who have a fixed cultural identity, I don't have a double cultural identity, therefore I don't share their struggles. I have the possibility to go back to my home-country where my feeling of belonging and sense of identity are not threatened. Whereas, my informants' struggles arise in their home-country. They cannot choose to avoid them. For these reasons, I also found myself trapped in schemes strongly rooted in my minds and I tended to consider them as Turkish, as "the Other", instead of Turkish-Dutch. Sometimes, my informants' uneasiness made clear that I was approaching the issue in the wrong way, considering them as Turkish. Therefore, while preparing the interviews, I questioned myself whether I was making the same mistakes of the main society and considering my informants as Turkish, as "the Other".

Conducting researches in The Netherlands among Turkish and Turkish-Dutch people led me some practical problems. First, I ran into languages issues due to my inability to speak either Turkish or Dutch. Most of the time, I was able to run the interviews in English because my interlocutors spoke very good English. However, in order to have conversations with both the Turkish first generation people and the Turkish people I have met in Lombok, I worked with two translators. My translators were a Dutch woman and a Turkish man. The first one helped me with interviewing the Turkish first generation women and she ran the interviews in Dutch. The second

one helped me with talking to the Turkish people, the conversations were, therefore, in Turkish. Overall, I could say that the language barriers were obstacles in the research in Lombok, since the Turkish people there, did not speak a proper English. Whereas speaking a different language with the Turkish second generation people was, in general, not a problem. Second, I lack the knowledge about Dutch laws and school system, therefore I had to do research, for which I also needed a translator. I worked with a Dutch man to understand properly the articles in the newspapers and to collect information on the websites. Another issue was due to the shyness of people in Lombok. Some of the Turkish workers were probably afraid of saying something wrong about their jobs which could have disappointed their bosses. Lastly, I have never used any voice-recordings. My previous experiences as a researcher taught me that people feel more comfortable when they are not recorded. Somehow, taking notes have always made my informants more at ease, allowing me to collect more authentic information.

4. Ethnic and Social Boundaries within Dutch society

The expression of the "Otherness" discourse

I arrived at the coffee place where I had to meet my first Turkish-Dutch informant. I looked around to seek for her, I didn't have a picture of her, stupid mistake. Suddenly, I saw a girl wearing an headscarf and a typical Turkish dress. That must be her... "Sorry, Ekin?" "No". I turned around, a girl wearing a short skirt and a wonderful make-up waved at me: "You must be Carlotta". I waved her back and, unconsciously, thought of what my father used to tell me when I was child: "*Clichè* Carlotta, *clichè*".

Eriksen (2003, 232) explains that second generation people "are quite often confronted with notions among the natives to the effect that they do not belong here. This might happen in everyday situations, as when a Danish-born boy with a Turkish appearance and name is asked whether he understands Danish or when he is going back". In Eriksen's quote we can see an example of what, in daily situations, arouses a feeling of not belonging among the second generation people, the fact that the natives expect them not to understand the national language and to go back to their parents' home-country.

The goal of this chapter is to show the existence of invisible but clear barriers that make the second generation individuals aware of the fact that they are perceived as "the Other". This awareness is the first obstacle in the process of constructing their identity, since they realize that connecting to their double cultural background becomes problematic.

The empirical data collected shows that my informants cope with invisible but clear barriers. Similarly, in Alba (2010) has a theory in which he explains that there are boundaries in the societies that act to exclude the second generation people from the society itself. In his theories, Alba claims that boundaries are made to delimit people who either belong or do not belong to a given group.

In a society there are different types of boundaries, here I present the social and ethnic ones. Ethnicity can be defined on the basis of Max Weber's (1968, 369) famous identification of it: a "subjective belief in common descent". For instance, in a shared history based on a common point of origin in the past, which may be real or putative. In his theories Weber explains that ethnicity is best conceived as a boundary with both symbolic and social aspects. Thus, it is a distinction that individuals make in their lives and that shapes their actions and mental orientations towards others. It is typically embedded in a variety of social and cultural differences between groups that give an ethnic boundary concrete significance (so that, members of one group think 'they are not like us because...'). Connecting Weber's theory to Alba's one, an ethnic boundary separates people who

belong to a given ethnic group from those who do not belong on the basis of a shared culture and habits. The presence of ethnic boundaries promotes a feeling of exclusion among people with a different ethnic background. Those individuals will perceive themselves as part of a minor group separated from the majority. In other words, ethnic and social boundaries, the "otherness" discourse and the feeling of non-belonging stand in a relation of cause-effect.

Since ethnic boundaries divide people who belong and who do not belong based on ethnicity, therefore, affecting the social life of the individuals who don't belong, I define them as social and ethnic boundaries. Among other things, this chapter will explain how these boundaries affect the life of second generation individuals.

In order to explain the mechanism of the boundaries, I pose the questions: how do people become aware of the presence of ethnic and social boundaries? And how are the boundaries exercised in practice? As we will see in this chapter, studying the mechanism of the boundaries is important since the boundaries make clear to my informants that they are perceived as "the Other". This leads them to develop a process of cultural identity construction. To answer the questions we have to look at the web of interrelated patterns that govern the way a specific boundary can manifest to different social actors. Triangulating my data, I realised that all my informants mentioned similar experiences. Confronting their struggles with the literature, I deducted that they cope with two different ethnic and social boundaries which I named as: low expectations of performance manifested by the major group and the Dutch thick sense of identity.

Low expectations of performance from the Turkish-Dutch youth

The empirical data I will present in this sub-paragraph shows that the Turkish second generation youth faces different kinds of low expectations in daily situations. Somehow, most of the Dutch people expect less from them than from their Dutch peers. My informants explained that, earlier, the teachers at primary schools show a lack of trust towards the children with a non-Dutch parentage, later on their Dutch peers show a sense of disbelief as they do not expect them to be well educated, or ambitious and to speak proper Dutch. Through the personal experiences of five Turkish -Dutch girls, I will explain how the low expectations work. The mechanisms themselves will reveal the strict cause-effect relation between the boundaries, the dichotomy of "Us" *versus* "the Other" and the feeling of non-belonging. Moreover, my aim is to show how my interlocutors cope with this sense of exclusion. Through the following data, I explain the low expectations experienced at the primary school.

> "At school, teachers assumed that my parents didn't speak Dutch so they couldn't help me, therefore I would have never made it. On the other hand, the teachers of my brother assumed that he could make it because they knew that I was doing a bachelor so I could help him" (Pinar, 21 years old Turkish second generation girl)

> "What happens is that teachers are holding back the children, because they don't believe in them and when their parents don't speak Dutch, there is no one who could stand for their rights" (Nuran, 25 years old Turkish second generation girl)

Pinar and Nuran are both highly educated girls, Pinar has a bachelor degree in economy whereas Nuran has a master degree in sociology. Pinar's quote shows how the mechanism of low expectations works. One afternoon, she explained to me that the teachers' assumption is that whenever a child cannot get help from their parents, they wouldn't make it, whereas whenever they know that the kid can get help from a well-educated member of the family, there is a chance for them to make it. Nuran's quote shows the consequences of low expectations. The girl sees the lack of trust and the absence of someone who stands for the child's rights as the main cause of the neglect of the children with a different cultural background.

The connection between the lack of trust and the holding back of the children shows that the feeling of frustration and anger arising from experiencing discrimination. Expecting less from the pupils with a non-Dutch parentage makes the dichotomy between "the Dutch" and "the Other" evident and most of all, clarifies that they are on the other side of the boundary, not included in "one of us" because they do not have a Dutch parentage.

The mechanism of low expectations is not a simply subjective and personal experience that might be overstated by the people who experienced it. On the contrary, the national education inspectorate has studied and proved this through several scholarly articles. For instance, Crul and Doomernik (2003) explain that the reason why teachers assume that the pupils with a non-Dutch parentage would never make it can rely on the fact that the Dutch educational system is based on self-study which requires the parents to help the children with their homework. The teachers assume that the non–Dutch parents do not speak proper Dutch or they are not highly educated and therefore are not able to help the pupils. This assumption encourages the teachers to expect much less from the non–Dutch pupils.

The low expectations syndrome leads to important effects. First, it affects the self-confidence of the children with a non-Dutch parentage, as Nuran said: "the teachers hold back the children". Since the pupils understand that the teachers expect less from them or even that they don't expect them to ever make it, they are less motivated to study and to perform well at school. Moreover, the syndrome affects the quality of the educational programs. As the teachers know by experience that many such pupils cannot handle the full study load received by the children of Dutch parents, they consciously or unconsciously lower their standards, providing the kids with a

non–Dutch parentage an education of a lower quality. The mechanisms involved here were reported by the national education inspectorate, which monitors schools on a regular basis (Crul & Doomernik, 2003).

Lowering the standards has snowball effects. One of them is that the children of non-Dutch parents won't be able to reach high educational standards: they will always be slightly behind their Dutch peers. The consequence is that, when the kids have to be selected, which happens rather early at the age of twelve, the children of immigrants might not be qualified enough or they might haven't reached high goals during their school years. Therefore, they are unable to choose an academic track. Overall, this mechanism could explain the low percentage of second generation people enrolled in academic tracks. (See table 1)

Summarizing, the low expectations shown by the teachers lead to a discrimination at a very young age. Psychologically, they affect the self-confidence of the pupils with a non–Dutch parentage and stimulate a feeling of anger and frustration. In practice, they make a clear and visible distinction between the children of Dutch parents and the children of non-Dutch parents, since the latter are not likely to be able to enrol in academic tracks.

Table 1. Turkish second-generation and native-origin respondents following academic tracks in secondary education and whose parents only possess low educational qualification (%)

Country	**Turkish second generation following academic track**	**Turkish second generation not following academic track**	**Respondents of native parentage following academic track**	**Respondents of native parentage not following and academic track**
Austria	18	82	23	77
Belgium	50	50	70	30
France	46	54	69	31
Germany	12	88	17	83
Sweden	51	49	56	44
The Netherlands	23	77	37	63

TIES data 2007-2008 [11]

Nuran decided to take action in order to remedy the consequences of low expectations in primary schools. With pride in her eyes, the girl explained to me that she is aware of the fact that a lack of trust and the lowering of the educational standards are discriminations. She reported that she herself had to go through this kind of discriminations, however this has pushed her to work harder to prove that the low expectations are baseless. Eventually, she got a master degree in sociology.

[11] Ibid.

Nevertheless, she admitted that she is an exception since few Turkish-Dutch people are able to obtained a master's degree.

Being aware of this discrimination, she established RASA a small organization on a volunteer basis that organizes conferences for bi-cultural youth. The lectures are always run by bi-cultural successful people and they are focused on business and entrepreneurship in The Netherlands. As she explained to me, the goal is to inspire the bi-cultural youth by giving them good models. What this organization does is teaching the bi-cultural youth to be ambitious, a quality that they were unable to develop at an early age.

> "It happens a lot that bi-cultural young people look at a successful person and think that he/she made it because he/she is Dutch." (Nuran, 25 years old Turkish second generation girl)

The feeling of hopelessness and the lack of self-confidence are practical consequences of the ethnic and social boundaries. The fact that the bi-cultural youth sees the Dutch nationality of successful people as the main reason of their success clearly shows how the boundaries (in this case the low expectations) make the bi-cultural youth aware of the dichotomy between “Us” and “The Other”.

The following data show that the low expectations syndrome doesn't happen just at primary school but also in daily situations.

> "They (the colleagues and business partners) don't expect me to be ambitious because of my headscarf. There is a difference between me and my parents: I am climbing the social ladder. I have to work harder to prove that I can do it. Once, the secretary was surprised that I have an high level of education (master's degree). I remember, once I was the only high educated girl and they didn't expect it so I felt uncomfortable. I thought: "Why is it so special? Haven't you ever seen a high educated girl?" (Safiye, 26 years old Turkish second generation girl)

> "During the job interviews people in charge to hire new workers always say to me: "you speak perfectly Dutch". It's weird because they see my CV, they see that I have attended the school in the Netherlands." (Ekin)

> "Sometimes they ask "How can your name be Fatma and speak Dutch so good?" (Fatma, 26 years old Turkish second generation girl)

Safiye, Ekin and Fatma are highly educated and they recently entered the labour market, Safiye works in the communication department of a company, Ekin as an account assistant and Fatma, after she got a bachelor in Dutch law at the HBO, is now doing an internship. The three girls explained to me that some of their Dutch colleagues and employers are stunned when they realize that Turkish-Dutch individuals can be highly educated and speak Dutch as their mother tongue. The

consequent astonishment and the uncomfortable feeling experienced by the girls: “I felt uncomfortable”, “it is weird”, “why is it so special?”[12] point out how the ethnic and social boundaries make clear to the Turkish second generation citizens the dichotomy of “Us” *versus* “the Other”. The awareness of being “the Other” leads the Turkish second generation girls to a feeling of astonishment because it threatens their sense of identity. They feel lost when they realize that the Dutch society looks at them as “the Other”.

As a conclusion, through expecting less from the Turkish second generation people, most of the Dutch people make clear that they still consider the Turkish second generation people as “the Other”, as “foreigners”, making them wonder: then “who am I?”. This is the first step of the complex process of the construction of their identity.

The Dutch thick sense of identity

I now want to focus on another ethnic and social boundary that manifests to the social actors the distance between them and the main Dutch group or, the Dutch thick sense of identity. Ghorashi (2009) has studied the sense of identity in the Netherlands and she concluded that the notion of “Dutchness” is homogeneous so that the Dutch sense of identity leaves within itself little to no space for any cultural differences. “The Dutch notion of identity has been quite exclusive and thick. This thick notion of Dutch identity leads to a process of exclusion and sets up a dichotomous relationship between The Dutch and the Others” (Ghorashi 2009, 85).

Through the voices of three Turkish second generation girls, I will show how the Dutch thick sense of identity increases my informants' awareness about the social distance between them and the major Dutch group.

Ekin, who wears fashion clothes, a short skirt and make-up, explained to me:

> "It is easy for me to feel integrated because I act as a Dutch person. I drink alcohol, I don't talk about religion every day. Otherwise, they set you apart" (Ekin)

The interesting point in the quote is the connection between feeling integrated and acting as a Dutch person. Moreover, by acting as a Dutch person, the girl refers to shared culture habits, such as drinking alcohol and not talking about religion every day. Her experience taught her that keeping different cultural habits sets a person apart. This confirms what Ghorashi said about the Dutch thick notion of identity, it leaves no room for any cultural differences. Here, the dichotomy of “Us” - the ones who act in a Dutch way, who drink alcohol, etc.- and “the Other” - the ones who act differently, who do not drink alcohol, etc.- cannot be clearer. The fear of being set apart by acting

[12] The quotes are, in order, from: Safiye, Ekin, Fatma

differently highlights Ekin's understanding of the social distance between the Turkish second generation and the Dutch majority. From the quote, I am able to say that the most important practical consequence of the thick notion of “Dutchness” is that everyone who looks different and acts different is seen as "the Other". This affects the sense of identity of the Turkish-Dutch youth.

Pinar, has just finished her studies and she is looking for a job. She is a member of the board of the Turkish mosque in Ondiep, Utrecht, and she wears the typical Turkish clothes and a headscarf. Nevertheless, like Ekin, she explained to me how the Dutch thick sense of identity works:

> “When I check out the job profiles on internet I realize that they are looking for someone who fits into the team, and I cannot be part of the team because I am not a typical person. They love drinking alcohol together and enjoying themselves. I am not into those things, I don't drink alcohol, I don't fit into the job profile, so I am scared that I will have a hard time with finding a job. Therefore, I have to work harder to get the same things”. (Pinar)

The fear of having a hard time with finding a job reveals how the boundaries work. The quote demonstrates that the Dutch thick sense of identity acts to exclude. In fact, Pinar makes a connection between being a "typical person", meaning to act as a “perfect Dutch” and being part of a team. Her feeling of anxiety: “I am scared that I will have a hard time with finding a job” proves that she feels different and, therefore not suitable for any job profiles.

> "I don't drink alcohol so I don't go to parties, I don't want to be surrounded by drunk people. This sets me a bit apart from Dutch people, that's why they cannot really be my friends because we don't share the same tastes. My network is a multicultural one, but I have more Turkish friends since it is easier to do the same things because we have the same tastes, we like doing the same things and we dislike the same things (going to parties, for instance). I have a Dutch network but my real friends are Turkish". (Aynur, 23 years old Turkish second generation girl)
>
> "I act as Dutch, so I don't show my “Turkishness”, that's why I am completely integrated. I have Dutch friends. I never hang out in Turkish places and I cannot hang out with Turkish people because they are not open minded" (Ekin)

The two different witnesses have something in common, the connection between showing their “Turkishness” and the nationality of their friends. It is clear how the Dutch thick sense of identity leaves within itself little to no space for big cultural differences. In fact, the exclusion caused by the Dutch thick sense of identity works as follow, it makes it difficult to combine the Turkish values and habits with the Dutch ones. Therefore, being faithful to the Turkish values and to the way of living and thinking leads one to have Turkish friends and to be set apart from Dutch people and the other way around. The social distance between the Dutch and the non-Dutch, once again, is manifest to the Turkish social actors.

Lastly, it is worth noting that the girls call the Dutch people: "they". Their language reveals how much they are aware of, or at least how much they perceive, the social distance between themselves and the major Dutch group. Their language, their fears and their behaviours are great evidences of how the Dutch thick sense of identity acts to exclude. They find hard to combine the Turkish values and habits with the Dutch ones at the same time.

Theoretically speaking, I am able to conclude that the understanding of the "Otherness" discourse and the consequent social distance is the beginning of a complex process of identity building. The realization of not being considered Dutch, even though they were born in The Netherlands, leads the second generation youth to a feeling of astonishment and, later, to a feeling of distress that arises from a new question: "so, who am I?".[13] Moreover, considering the data I have presented, the boundary is an invisible but clear delimitation between who belongs and who does not belong and this brings forth feelings of frustration, fear and embarrassment. Identity is, therefore, crucial to act within a society and to a feeling of belonging. The boundaries question the will to feel like a part of society plus the need to have an identity. This obliges the social actors to begin a construction of their identity which takes into account the two cultural identities, also as an attempt of belonging. We will see that in the next chapter.

[13] The quote presented in the introduction can be treated as an empirical evidence of the arising of the question: "then who am I?". "When I was younger I had few identity crises. As Turkish-Dutch people we are stuck in a grey line. We are still figuring out who we are, we are looking for a definition, a sort of label." (Gizem)

5. Everyday Politics of Identity

The previous chapter showed that the boundaries question the identity and threaten the feeling of belonging of the Turkish-Dutch youth. The consequence is that people who were actually born in The Netherlands or spent the most of their lives in The Netherlands are not included in the "one of us" concept. The impact is that even successful second generation people feel uprooted and not a part of the society. As I showed, even when immigrants became part of society through their contacts with Dutch people and through their achievements they do not see themselves as part of the society itself. Nevertheless, the will to have a well-defined identity and the need to feel a sense of belonging are incitements to construct identity in a way that the "otherness" discourse doesn't have a strong impact on the Turkish-Dutch youth. In this way they won't feel frustrated or scared of being on the other side of the boundary.

This chapter shows how the Turkish second generation individuals construct their cultural identity. I name this process as individual politics of identity and they are individual decisions upon whether connecting to their Turkish identity only, to their Dutch one only or to both of them.

The topic of identity politics has been one of the themes of several studies about the second generations and integration. The articles by Alba (2010) and by Waldring, Crul and Ghorashi (2013) describe two different strategies of identity, the first one analyses the "cross-cutting strategy", and the second one "the negotiation of identity". Some of my informants develop the same two strategies, therefore, in explaining my empirical data, I will refer to the authors above. However, analysing my data, I deduct a third strategy which I named as "building bridges between different cultures". This has never been clearly described in the literature. In my description of the topic, which will follow, I consider that the construction of cultural identity is a decision, made by an individual, concerning their relation with the parents' culture. From my data, I deduct that my informants decide which cultural values (Turkish, Dutch or both) are crucial to their identity. The interviews I conducted show that my informants stand in a non-linear and non-uniform relation with their parents' culture, however, in its entirety, I spotted three attitudes: "refusal", "separation" and "ethnic claim". These three attitudes are well known in the academic debate about the relation between migrants, their descendants and their culture of origin[14]. However, while describing the politics of identity, I will show that those three attitudes are not as strong as we might think.

Differently from Alba (2010), Waldring, Crul and Ghorashi (2013), in my description of the

[14] The book by Lannutti, Vittorio. 2014. *Identities hanging between two cultures. Identity building and family dynamics of second generation individuals in Marche* (my own translation), can be taken as an example. In Italian: I*dentità sospese. Formazione identitaria e dinamiche familiari delle seconde generazioni nelle Marche*

strategies of identity, I will highlight the dependence of the strategies on social factors: the ethnic and social boundaries. Moreover, I focus on what type of relation stands between the politics of identity and the dichotomy of “Us” and “the Other”.

To begin with, the strategies developed by my interlocutors differ from each other and they are based on the individuals, therefore a generalization is difficult to make. However, as mentioned above, I am arguing that the politics of identity depend on the boundaries. How a person reacts to the boundaries, in other words the type of strategy they decide to develop, depends on how that person perceives the boundary itself. A social factor and the individuals’ psychology are interdependent.

Alba (2010, 24) defines “bright” boundaries the boundaries that draw a sharp distinction between individuals being within the boundary lines and those who are not. “How ethnic individuals, parts of ethnic groups, or even entire groups narrow the social distance that separates them from the mainstream and its opportunities depends on the nature of the boundary. One case is that the boundary is bright and thus that there is no ambiguity in the location of individuals with respect to it”. Therefore, bright boundaries require people to fully adopt the cultural norms and values of the "other side" of the boundary, enabling them to become included in the group of which they want to be a part of. Alba defines this process as "cross-cutting boundaries". Borrowing Alba's definition of bright boundaries, from my data, I conclude that when the boundary is perceived as a bright one, then a compromise between a double cultural background is less likely to occur. The individuals tend to depart from their parents' group and enter the major group by giving up on their Turkish background and adopting the norms and values of the majority. Whereas, the less bright the boundary is perceived, the more compromises between their double cultural background are likely to happen.

I will provide three examples of different strategies of identity. The first two strategies resemble each other because both of them do not aim to weaken the dichotomy of “Us” *versus* “Them” but are rather just ways of dealing with it. Whereas, the last strategy is different because it intends to invalidate the dichotomy. The people who develop this last strategy think that spreading knowledge by building bridges between the Dutch culture and the Turkish one is a solution to remove the ethnic and social boundaries. The three different strategies of identity I am going to talk about are: “cross-cutting boundaries”, “juggling one's identity” and “building bridges between different cultures”.

Cross-cutting bright boundaries

In order to explain this strategy, I refer to Alba's (2010, 23) definition of "cross-cutting boundaries".

> "Boundary crossing corresponds to the classic version of individual-level assimilation: someone moves from one group to another, without any real change to the boundary itself (although if such boundary crossings happen on a large scale and in a consistent direction, then the social structure is being altered). In this case, assimilation is likely to take the form of boundary crossing and will generally be experienced by the individual as something akin to a conversion which is a departure from one group and a discarding of signs of membership in it, linked to an attempt to enter into another, with all the social and psychic burdens a conversion process entails: growing distance from peers, feelings of disloyalty, and anxieties about acceptance".

In this quote, Alba himself defines the strategy as 'individual-level assimilation'. The scientific debate, as Alba himself explains it, considers the assimilation as a consequence of a refusal of the parents' culture. My case-studies do confirm this idea; from the way my informants talk about their behaviour I could deduct that the strategy is a departure from their parents group in order to enter the major group. However, my data also show that the refusal is not strong, since all my informants define their identity as Turkish-Dutch: "I am not sure whether or not it makes sense, but I am still both Turkish and Dutch"[15]; "I would never get rid of my Turkish passport"[16]. Moreover, it is worth clarifying that my informants never mention a complete refusal, nevertheless, they define their Turkish-Dutch peers and their parents as: not open-minded or old fashioned. For the aim of this research, I don't further implement this topic, it should be sufficient to say that, according to my data, the decision to refuse their parents' culture might not be as strong as we might think.

As my data will show, my informants connect to their Dutch cultural identity the most, or at least this is the way they perceive and talk about themselves.[17] The Dutch cultural values are crucial to the construction of their identity, therefore they are faithful to them.

I now want to clarify the relation standing between the boundaries and the individuals' psychology. From my case-studies I deduct that, whenever the boundary is perceived as a real bright one, the Turkish second generation individuals see no other possibilities but giving up their Turkish background in order to be on the "right" side of the boundary. The brightness of the boundary leaves little space for any hybrid positions. Therefore, my informants seem to know that

[15] Ekin
[16] Fatma
[17] For the sake of the argument, I shall clarify that the strategies of identity are based on the way people perceive themselves and, therefore, talk about themselves. In anthropology, we must be aware of the gap between how people experience, perceive and talk about themselves and the way they actually act in the real life. The paradigm here is the difference between "ideal behavior" and "real behavior" For further clarifications see the "narrative identities" theory

they either act as “real Dutch” people, most of the time, or they are excluded.

This strategy is a strong one since it implies cutting off what is perceived as a large obstacle to the attempt of belong. They cut off their cultural difference and they stay loyal only to their Dutch identity. Nevertheless, this strategy is also dangerous. In fact, as it is a departure from their parents' group, from the first generation people, there is a risk to be seen as a disloyal person and therefore to be excluded by them, whereas still trying to belong to the majority. Based on my data, I now describe the startegy.

> "In general, I am more Dutch. I cannot hang out with Turkish people because they are not open-minded. I never go to Turkish places, I prefer the Dutch ones. I love going to the Dutch festivals in Utrecht, such as the festival on the fifth of May or the one on Kingsday. I act as a Dutch person so I don't show my “Turkishness”; that makes the integration easier for me." ... "The first generation people are not interested in the Dutch society and they do not do their best to fit in. So they tend to stick together without even trying to integrate. They just have Turkish friends and they feel like they are completely Turkish. They are nationalistic." (Fatma)

Fatma’s words reveal that she is developing a strategy of identity building as an attempt to belong. She doesn’t want to connect to her Turkish cultural identity because her “Turkishness” is an obstacle to belonging: she explains that not showing her “Turkishness” leads to easier integration. The social and ethnic boundaries are, therefore, experienced as real bright ones, since they seem to leave no other possibilities than renouncing her Turkish cultural identity, which positions her on the other side of the boundaries. This is proved by her sentence: “I belong to the Dutch society more than to the Turkish one”.

Fatma is aware of her double cultural identity and background but she leaves her “Turkishness” behind: “I don't show my Turkishness” and she stays loyal to her Dutch one “I act as a Dutch person”. In constructing her identity she is connecting to her Dutch cultural identity only, here expressed in terms of tastes. She links the Dutch behaviour with a Dutch taste; she acts like a Dutch person and therefore she goes to Dutch festivals and places. Moreover, she told me that refuses to talk Turkish and she doesn't share the Turkish thick sense of community. In general, she leaves her “Turkishness” behind in every daily aspects of her life-style.

By giving up her “Turkishness”, Fatma refuses the culture of her parents. This is proved by all the social burdens that a cross-cutting strategy brings along. First, the growing distance from peers. She doesn't want to spend time with her Turkish peers because she doesn't get along with them. Claiming that her Turkish peers are not open-minded means that they are faithful to their “Turkishness”, this leads Fatma to have a hard time socializing with them. Second, Fatma shows the huge distance from the Turkish first generation people. She is blaming them for not trying to integrate into Dutch society. She sees the Turkish first generation people's behaviour as the opposite

of hers and she clearly expresses the distance from them. Furthermore, blaming them for being nationalistic and for not integrating is a sign of her refusal of her parents' culture. The following quote from Ekin, perhaps, highlights this topic better.

> "I struggle a lot with my Turkish peers. I am different, I am more Dutch. I am free,while they remain faithful to their "Turkishness", that is the reason why I don't have any Turkish friends."... "My parents are different from the other Turkish first generation people; for instance, I can wear skirts and have a normal life but lots of my Turkish peers cannot do that. However, my parents expect me to marry a Turkish man but I don' t want to because Turkish men are so traditional, so old fashioned: they don't want women to use make-up and they want us to stay at home. The mother of my ex-boyfriend asked me: "Why do you show your hair?"I don't want to cover my hair. I cannot live with a man without getting married because my family will never accept it." (Ekin)

Ekin's words really resemble the ones in the first quote. She is also cross-cutting the boundaries, departing from her parents' group and entering the Dutch group: "I am so different, I am Dutch". Like Fatma, it's her life-style, so different from her Turkish peers one, that mostly shows her decision to cut-off her "Turkishness", in daily situations she wears skirts, uses make-up, she doesn't talk about religion all the time and, even though she is Muslim, she doesn't cover her hair, she drinks alcohol, she doesn't attend the mosque.[18] What is interesting is her struggle with her parents and with the first generation people in general. The struggle involves moral values: the marriage and wearing a headscarf. Her parents allow her to wear skirts and "have a normal life" However, they expect her to marry a Dutch man and they don't allow her to live with her partner without getting married. The fact that she is cutting off her Turkish background leads her to have fights with her parents and with the Turkish first generation people, in particular with the mother of her ex-boyfriend. Her struggles are evidence of the growing distance from the Turkish first generation people and they make clear what are the everyday challenges that the Turkish second generation youth have to face in their attempt to belong. Therefore, it is possible to note that departing from the parents' group leads the second generation to be seen as disloyal people, since they refuse to second the moral values of the group they are departing from. The struggle about moral values shows that, in constructing her cultural identity, Ekin decided which cultural values are crucial to her identity. Clearly, marring an "old fashioned" Turkish man means that she has to respect few moral Turkish values that are not part of her cultural identity.

All the girls I interviewed who are developing the cross-cutting strategy mention that their parents used to say that they think and act "too Dutch"[19]. They all seem uncomfortable with it because they are aware that their parents do not really understand them and perceive them as

[18] "It's easy for me to feel integrated because I drink alcohol, I don't talk about religion everyday". "Sometimes, my parents go to the mosque, especially if there is an important festivity. I never go to the mosque, I think that being a good person is better than go to the mosque every Friday" (Ekin)

[19] Nuran

disloyal people.

As the last point, it is worth a consideration about the relation standing between the dichotomy "Us" *versus* "Them" and the cross-cutting strategy itself. The people who develop this politic of identity accept the dichotomy as a 'natural assumption', therefore their strategy doesn't aim to weaken the dichotomy. They choose one of the two sides of the boundary. By requiring to give up the Turkish background, the strategy ends up strengthening the dichotomy. This can be revealed by all the social burdens brought along by this policy of identity building, the growing distance from peers and the first generation. Once a person gives up on his Turkish background they are not able to socialize or spend time with their Turkish peers.

For the sake of the argument, I shall clarify that the quotes above are based on their own experience and feelings. It is an ego-centric prospective. It's all about their feelings. As a researcher I am not allowed to say, for instance, whether it is true or not that the Turkish first generation people are really nationalistic or tent to stick together. Moreover, that is not the aim of the research, since it aims to explain the individual strategies of identity which are based on the feelings of each individual.

In the next sub-paragraph I will describe what happens when people don't want to give up on their "Turkishness" since they find both the Turkish and Dutch values crucial to their identity. I will, therefore, talk about the "juggling the identity" strategy.

Juggling the identity

A few scholars describe the strategy of "juggling the identity" in their studies about migrants and their descents. The data I collected proves that my informants have this attitude, as a confirmation of their theories. In particular, I refer to Eriksen (2003) to theoretically explain this strategy.

Juggling the identity is based on de-emphasizing one's cultural differences in public places. The Turkish second generation people who develop this strategy do not give up their Turkish background, they do not depart from their parents' group but they keep their "Turkishness" private because they are aware that showing their cultural difference in public could compromise their attempts to belong. In his study concerning human creativity and identity politics, Eriksen (2003, 233) explains that individuals who develop this strategy try to connect with both sides of their cultural identity.[20] However, they cannot connect with the two at the same time, they have to choose when to connect with their Turkish identity and when to their Dutch identity. Their strategy is an

[20] Eriksen (2003, 233) defines the people who develop this strategy as hyphenated identities: "The hyphenated identities are an attempt to bridge two discrete bounded categories: Turkish-Danish, Kurdish-Swedish, Norwegian-American and so on". The author uses the term in a real specific way, to make a distinction between "pure identities", "hyphenated identities" and "creole identities"

attempt to combine different input from two different cultural universes, the one of their parents and the one of the Dutch group. “They may live in a “Turkish” way inside the house and within ethnic networks, but in public arenas they behave like everybody else. The hyphenated identities presuppose that there are clear boundaries between the groups in question and thus require conscious or unconscious code switching” (Eriksen 2003, 233). In other words, it is a balancing act, the individuals know which part of their identity they should highlight and which they have to de-emphasize, in particular situations and contexts (Waldring, Crul, Ghorashi 2013). In public and among Dutch people they tend to stress their sameness, acting as Dutch persons, inside their houses and among Turkish peers they express their cultural and religious identity. In constructing their identities, my informants find the Turkish and the Dutch cultural values crucial to their identities. Therefore, they connect with both their cultural sides. However, they have to pass through the two sides of their cultural identity. This requires a high sensitivity to understand when it is better to stress on their “Turkishness” and when to de-emphasize it (Waldring, Crul, Ghorashi 2013).

My informants' attitude toward their parents' culture can be defined as a “separation”. They don't refuse it, however they have a certain distance from it. The distance allows them to be able to de-emphasize the cultural values of their parents. Through the voices of Pinar and Damla, I explain the dependence of the strategy on their perception of the boundaries. The two girls do not perceive the social and ethnic boundaries as bright ones or as a strong rupture between them and the major group. This can allow them to circumvent the boundaries instead of crossing them in order to belong to the society. The following quotes show that the two girls circumvent the boundaries by being very sensitive and competent in dealing with the limitations of the boundaries. This sensitivity has become a second nature for them, through which they juggle sameness and difference, resulting in what has been defined as: “boundary sensitivity” (Waldring, Crul, Ghorashi 2013, 84), namely an embodied knowledge learnt in time.

Circumventing boundaries with the aim of gaining acceptance while staying true to oneself is an individual and contextual strategy. By developing this strategy, Pinar and Damla avoid boundary crossing which holds the inherent risk of losing the link with the ethnic group of the first generation, as well as never truly becoming accepted by the majority.

> "I tend to be more Turkish with my parents. Because they really care about Turkish values and about Turkey in general. I show my religion and Turkish identity: I wear a headscarf and a typical Turkish dress but I don't like to talk about my religion or about Turkey in public, because I am more than those things. I have Dutch colleagues and the relationship with them is fine, but I just have Turkish friends, I cannot be friends with Dutch people because we are different." (Pinar)

The first thing I want to show is Pinar being comfortable with showing her religion and

Turkish identity. This proves that she doesn't perceive the ethnic and social boundaries as bright ones. In her attempt to belong, she is able to manage her double identity by de-emphasizing her cultural differences in public.

Pinar admits that she acts in different ways depending on the context: when in public she tends to avoid talking about her religion and Turkish identity, whereas when at home with her parents she tends "to be more Turkish" . It is important to note that she shows her “Turkishness” by wearing a headscarf and a typical Turkish dress. Differently from Fatma and Ekin, Pinar wants to stay true to her “Turkishness” by showing her religion and Turkish identity. Nevertheless, she doesn't feel comfortable with talking about them in public because she is aware that her cultural differences can be obstacles to her attempts to belong. Moreover, she is also a member of the board of a Turkish mosque in the neighbourhood of Ondiep, however, in public, among Dutch people she doesn't talk about it unless she is explicitly asked. An effect of this strategy is that her network is a mixed one, whereas her real friends are Turkish people. This is a logic consequence of keeping the cultural differences private. Murat, a Turkish second generation boy, explains this point:

> "I feel comfortable with showing my “Turkishness” but when it comes to make friends, my cultural differences might become a challenge, a small challenge though. There are two different behaviours when it comes to show your cultural differences. When you want to build business relationships you tend to hide them because you don't want them to know all about you. They don't need to know who you exactly are. Whereas when it comes to make friends, then you have to show your cultural differences, you have to be completely open about it otherwise you make wrong friends." (Murat, 28 years old Turkish guy)

I now quote Damla's words in order to explain the boundary sensitivity. I want to show to what extent my interlocutors are sensible to the limitations of the boundaries.

> "When I am among Turkish people I act a bit different than when I am with Dutch people. For instance: when I am talking with a 65 years old Turkish man I show my respect, I show that I respect him because he is old. That's how it works in Turkey. My parents taught me the Turkish values so I know that Turkish people respect the hierarchy. On the other hand when I am with a 65 years old Dutch man I don't show that I feel his authority, I treat him like a friend." (Damla, 25 years old Turkish second generation girl)

Damla has a Master degree and she works at the municipality of Utrecht. She told me that she is a Muslim believer and sometimes she visits the mosque in Lombok to pray. She wears fashion clothes and uses make-up and she doesn't wear a headscarf because she doesn't feel the need to do it.

Her words reveal that she is sensible enough to know how to behave in different contexts. Moreover, it clarifies that the reason of juggling one's ethnic identity is the attempt to belong. In order to be accepted by the majority, Damla acts according to the Dutch habits, she doesn't show

respect to an old Dutch man just because he is older than her. On the contrary, she does show respect to an old Turkish man, because respect and authority are important values in the Turkish culture.

Even though this strategy is less strong than the previous one, it is based on the acceptance of the dichotomy 'Us'' and "the Other". My informants move from their Turkish identity to their Dutch one, but they are not able to connect to the two at the same time. This fact proves that they still perceive a difference between the Dutch and the Turkish culture. It is the acceptance of the difference that forces them to juggle their identity. Nevertheless, the two politics of identity differ from each other. The first, strengthens the dichotomy, the second simply accepts it and finds ways around it .

In conclusion, the girls are able to connect with their double cultural identity and, therefore, keep the Dutch and the Turkish values, however which ones they should show depends on the context. Damla mentioned a cultural value, the respect for authority. In constructing her identity, she connects to both her cultural identities, but that requires knowing when to show the Dutch moral value and when to show the Turkish ones. Therefore, the personal experiences of Pinar and Damla confirm what Eriksen (2003, 234) pointed out: "Hyphenated identities require that one finds a balancing point and develops some criteria in order to be able to combine input from two distinctive cultural universes"[21].

In the follow sub-paragraph I will describe what happens when my informants want to stay true to their Turkish identity the most. I will, therefore, talk about the third strategy: "building bridges between different cultures".

Building bridges between different cultures

Nuran and Turgay are busy with building bridges between them and the major ethnic group. They feel the social and ethnic boundaries and the social distance between them and the majority. However, they think that the social distance and the ethnic and social boundaries exist, due to a lack of knowledge. This is the reason why the majority looks at them as "the Other". Bridges are ways to connect different cultures by explaining the cultures themselves. Nuran and Turgay try to let the majority knows who they are, they want them to know their Turkish values and habits in order to not be regarded as strangers but as Dutch people with a Turkish background. The boundary, once again, is not perceived as a bright one because they do not feel the need to depart from their group. On the contrary, they are the ones who perhaps want to stay loyal to their parents' group and to their Turkish background the most. This attitude can be seen as a sort of "ethnic claim", however it is not

[21] For clarifications about Eriksen's use of the term hyphenated identities, see the quote above

a strong claim. This strategy shows that, in constructing their identity, my informants connect to their Turkish background the most. Their Turkish values are crucial to their identity, however this requires spreading knowledge amongst the two groups.

As stated before, this strategy resembles the previous two because it is an attempt to belong and it is a way Turkish people cope with their double cultural identity.

> "In Amsterdam 50% of the population is not Dutch, there is no choice, we do live in a multicultural society and we have to deal with it. How can we live with different values? Through contacts. Contacts will reduce the fears of each other. The best way of building up contacts is start looking at what we have in common. Earlier I was in a board of the mosque in Ondiep but I quit because I realised that we just did things from Turkish people to Turkish people. On the contrary, I am interested in building bridges between cultures, otherwise we just stay in our environment and that's not good for the feeling of belonging and our integration." (Nuran)

Nuran explains the connection between the feeling of belonging and building bridges. Trying to let people know who the Turkish people are, their values and habits is considered as a solution to be regarded as "one of us".

I now mention two examples of how Turkish people are building bridges. Both examples are about the Islamic religion. My informants pointed out that Islamophobia is widely spread in The Netherlands and this makes them feel like they are not welcome. They are aware of the fact that non-Muslim people are afraid of Muslim people, especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Feeling like they are not welcome is a reason for my interlocutors to do something in order to show who the Muslim people are.

The first example is about a public event which took place in the main square of Utrecht. It was called “Hello, we are Muslims”[22] and it was organised by the Turkish mosque in Ondiep. Nuran herself was involved in it and she explained to me that that event was a way of building bridges since it was a way to connect people and spread knowledge. One morning, I could observe the Muslim people from the board of the mosque giving away roses and flyers to the folk and answering to the questions people have about Muslims. The flyers stated: "We know you are scared of Muslim people and we are scared of terrorists too but we are not terrorists. The reason why we are doing this is because there aren't any contacts between Muslims people and non-Muslims people. We want to create empathy in order to understand each other."

The second example comes from Turgay, a Turkish member of the board of Ulu Camii Moskee in Lombok.

> "The atmosphere is changing, when I moved to The Netherlands we were welcome, but nowadays we are not welcome any more. The situation for us (the Muslim people) is getting

[22] Originally in Dutch: “*Hallo, wij zijn Moslims*”

> hard especially after the terrorist attacks. But what can we do about it? We just talk to the scared people and explain who we are. For example we organise conferences in Ulu Camii Moskee for both Muslim and non-Muslim people. The mayor and the police come to talk about current issues, like racism and criminality, but also about practical problems like health care. The goal is to bring people together. One of the most important value of the mosque is tolerance of religion: there is a room where people who believe in other religions can come to pray." (Turgay, 45 years old Turkish man, member of the board of Ulu Camii Moskee)

The wish of bringing different cultures together in a place like a mosque which is the core of the Islamic religion clearly shows the attempt to make non-Muslim people familiar with the mosque and with the Muslim people who come to pray here. The conferences as well as the room where different believers can pray, are attempts to show the best side of the Islamic religion in order to let people know that the connection between Muslim people and terrorists is baseless.

Lastly, this strategy seems to not accept the dichotomy "Us" *versus* "Them" and therefore it aims, or claims to aim, to weaken it. The attempt to belong here is based on cutting out the dichotomy that acts to exclude by building bridges between different people in order to connect them.

My conclusion of this chapter is that the politics of identity are effects of the theoretical notion of the construction of cultural and national identity. This defines fixed-without-any-doubts identities, connected to a particular nation-state and it leaves, theoretically speaking, no space for hybrid identities such as Turkish-Dutch. The consequence is the paradigm: "Us" *versus* "the Other" rooted in the mind of the members of that nation-state. The interesting point is that, as I showed through the data, this dichotomy is widely accepted by most of the Dutch people and the Turkish-Dutch youth. The first ones, unconsciously, set up boundaries; the second ones, since they feel their identity being questioned (or they feel like they are without an identity) and they feel excluded, have to develop politics of identity.

The first strategy strengthens the dichotomy. In fact, not only does it accept the fixed-without-any-doubts identities paradigm, but it tends to act as the "ideal Dutch", most of the time. It is basically the model of assimilation, accepting the majority's values. This model has been theoretically overtaken, however, somehow, it is still an attitude of the second generation individuals. The second strategy doesn't strengthen the paradigm, however it accepts it. In fact, the individuals who develop it, move from their parents group to the mainstream, depending on the context. The last strategy is the most problematic, I now argue that it has within itself a paradox. It tends to cancel the dichotomy by spreading knowledge about the Turkish culture. However, this might end up strengthening the idea that the "Us" is still something different from "the Other". Eventually, the Dutch society and the Turkish-Dutch youth all accept the paradigm of the "one of us", deriving from a theoretical construction of the national and cultural identity. In the conclusions,

we will see the importance of this. The acceptance has strong impacts on the second generation people‘s psychology who feel the need to develop politics of identity building in their daily lives.

6. Social Interactions and Feeling of Belonging

This chapter is a corollary of my thesis, since it explores one of its main topic's effect and it can be seen as a starting point for further researches about cultural diversity and belonging. Since the scientific debate defines ones identity as a crucial factor for an individual to act within a society, this chapter takes into account the social interactions existing between Turkish-Dutch people, Turkish people and Dutch people. The focus of this chapter is how and whether the politics of identity building affect the social interactions between Turkish second generation people and their Dutch peers. The questions ask are: how do Dutch and Turkish-Dutch people interact with each other in daily situations? Do the different ways in which the Turkish second generation people position themselves in terms of cultural identity affect their social relations with their Dutch peers? Furthermore, focusing on the society, I will show what are the effects of the dichotomy of "Us" and "the Other" in regards of Dutch and Turkish-Dutch people living together.

I will answer the questions through the voices of the Turkish-Dutch people I met. However, to explain in depth the theoretical question concerning the effects of the dichotomy, I will present the data I collected in Lombok. Those consist of mostly structured interviews with both Dutch and Turkish people living there. The reason why I focus on Lombok is because it is regarded as a real multicultural area of Utrecht, the place where Turkish and Dutch people live next to each other and therefore where they are more likely to interact. Moreover, since the dichotomy is stronger and more effective when it comes to defining the first generation people, it is best to explain the effects of the dichotomy itself by focusing on the interactions between the Dutch people and the Turkish migrants.

As stated in the previous chapter, the way the descendants of Turkish migrants construct their cultural identity has an impact on their interactions with the Dutch people. To begin with, the different ways in which my informants construct their cultural identities are individual decisions concerning whether refuse, take distance or claim their parents' culture. Thus, to understand the causes of the connection between the politics of identity and the social interactions, I look at the gap between the Turkish culture and the Dutch one, as it is perceived by my informants.

By triangulating my data I could make a list of the most important Turkish values that differ from the Dutch ones, according to my informants. The importance of the family, as Ekin said: "Every time a relative comes to visit, we always invite them for dinner, that doesn't happen in the Dutch society." This can be a consequence of the fact that the Turkish culture is felt as less individualistic than the Dutch one, as Suheda stated: "In the Dutch society you can be whoever you

want, in Turkey you have to respect the moral values". The hierarchy and the authority of the elders are important values as well, while it seems it is not the case in The Netherlands. Lastly, the most problematic ethic value: sexuality and dress code.

Having explained that my informants feel a gap between the two different cultures and set of values, I move to explain how, why and whether the decision to either stay true to the Dutch values or to the Turkish ones, even though they are kept private, affects the type of network that exists, their interactions and life-style.

One afternoon, Aynur told me:

> "For a few years after he moved to the Netherlands, my father didn't even learn the language; then he had to because of his job, therefore he hasn't a Dutch network. He and his friends prefer to spend time with Turkish people in Turkish places because of the atmosphere: the meat served there (no pork meat) and the non-alcoholic environment." (Aynur).

Her father refused the integration: he learnt the Dutch language only when he was forced to. The construction of his identity is not a question, he wants to completely stay faithful to his Turkish identity. His decision to fully keep Turkish values leads him to have a strong sense of being Turkish and because of this, he spends time only with his countrymen in Turkish places which match with his taste: “no pork meat served” and “non-alcoholic atmosphere”. From my data, I conclude that his Turkish personal taste strongly shapes his network.

I further implement the topic by showing the opposite behaviour of Aynur, Nese and Akin who decided to cross-cutting boundaries and give up on their “Turkishness”.

> "We have a different taste, we like doing different things, therefore I don't have Turkish friends (...) I act as Dutch, so I don't show my “Turkishness”, that's why I just have Dutch friends and I never go to Turkish places." (Aynur)

The quote mentions the same topics as the one before: her decision to connect to her Dutch identity is the reason for her Dutch tastes, which are so different from the Turkish ones to the extent that she cannot have Turkish friends because they “like different things”.

> "My friends and me are more open-minded, for instance about sexuality, some of my girl Turkish peers are not allowed to bring their boyfriends at home, whereas my parents let me do it, because they are more Dutch." (Nese, 20 years old, Turkish second generation girl)

Nese is the youngest Turkish girl I met, she got a bachelor degree in Arts and Society and she is having a year off. What she said is interesting since it is based on the moral value concerning sexuality, which effects girls the most. Her language clarifies the different kind of social

interactions. Nese defines her friends those who are allowed to bring their boyfriends home and this makes them more open-minded, whereas she defines her Turkish peers as the ones who are not allowed to do the same. Furthermore, she perceives the parents who do not allow their daughters to bring their boyfriends home as "more Turkish". The quote shows that she refuses the way the Turkish culture understands sexuality, thus she developed a sort of "Dutch" idea about it, which is considered as more open-minded. Her decision to depart from her Turkish identity has shaped her network to the extent that she cannot get along with her Turkish peers because they are close-minded.

In order to make the point complete, it is worth presenting a quote I have already presented in the previous chapter.

> "I don't want to marry a Turkish man. Turkish men are so old fashioned, they don't want us to use make-up and wear skirts." (Ekin)

The quote touches another different type of interaction: marriage. Ekin's decision to stay true to her Dutch identity has led her to consider the mentality of the Turkish men as old-fashioned and therefore not suitable for marriage. Her quote shows how constructing her cultural identity affects the social interactions of marriage.

Before explaining my conclusions, it is worth saying that it is not completely certain whether the girls developed only a Dutch taste or their Dutch way of living and thinking have more effective impacts on their lives and minds. Once again, there is a gap between how people perceive themselves and, therefore, how they talk about themselves and the way they actually act and behave[23]. However, for the sake of the research, I presented my conclusions based on how my informants talked about themselves, since the construction of identity is about how people present themselves.

From my data I deduct that connecting to their Dutch identity has led the girls to develop a more "Dutch" taste (Aynur), values (Nese) and mentality (Ekin). The differences are perceived as so vast and unbridgeable that the girls cannot have a Turkish network. Their Turkish peers who didn't depart from their Turkish cultural identity are seen as closed-minded and old-fashioned. In conclusion, the decision to cross-cut boundaries does affect the type of social interactions that occur.

I now analyse the same phenomenon considering the data I collected by interviewing Damla and Pinar, who are juggling their identities.

[23] See note 17 concerning the "narrative theory"

> "I don't have any problems with my Dutch colleagues, they are really nice and I want to spend time with them, but, I don't know, somehow I feel more comfortable with my Turkish peers, we match more, it can be a matter of sharing the same way of thinking." (Damla)

Damla affirms that she doesn't have problems with her Dutch colleagues and she wants to have relationships with them. However, she is aware that she matches more with her Turkish peers because they share the same ""way of thinking".

> "I have Dutch colleagues and the relationship with them is fine, but I just have Turkish friends, I cannot be friends with Dutch people because we are different." (Pinar)

What Pinar says can be seen as the logic result of Damla's quote. The paradigm is the same: the ease of having good relationships with Dutch colleagues and the awareness of the differences. This leads them to make a distinction between Dutch colleagues and Turkish friends.

Combining the two quotes, I can draw a few observations. First, differently from the previous quotes, the two girls don't firmly assert the impossibility to get along with their Dutch peers. On the contrary, they can and want to. The will to have good relations with Dutch people can be considered as a result of their attempt to belong to the Dutch society itself, and therefore, avoid living in a sort of Turkish community only. Nevertheless, keeping their "Turkishness" private disables them from having Dutch friends because their way of thinking don't match with the Dutch ones. Their way of constructing their identities, which is connecting with both their cultural sides capacitates them to have good relationships with their Dutch colleagues, however, their decision to keep their Turkish identity private makes it hard to have Dutch friends form them. Again, the different cultural values and tastes play an important role.

As a conclusion, what my data shows is that the Turkish-Dutch people can have quality relationships with their Dutch peers only when they depart from their Turkish identity. In any other cases they have daily relationships, they are colleagues and classmates, for instance.

Theoretically speaking, my data confirm the paradigm which claims that culture and its set of moral and ethical values affect personal tastes: personal preferences or liking.[24] Combining all the data presented in this chapter, I am able to conclude that the ways in which my informants construct their cultural identities shape their social interactions because their cultural identities shape their personal tastes, values and mentality. Therefore, the cultural identity and the consequent personal tastes, values and mentality play the main role in shaping the social interactions within a (multicultural) society.

[24] The opposite is also true. The scientific debate claims the idea that culture makes men and men make culture. However, for the sake of the argument, I focused on the the effects of culture on men, only

Social interactions in Lombok

I now want to focus on the neighbourhood of Lombok. As it stated before, Lombok is regarded as a multicultural neighbourhood and, at least historically, it is so. In the seventies it was one of the poorest areas of Utrecht where the majority of the immigrants used to live, Turkish people in particular lived in this neighbourhood. Since Lombok was a dangerous area where criminality was at its highest rate, in 1996 European Union allocated some money to the city of Utrecht to develop and improve it (Meder, Dibbits 1999). Since the end of the nineties, Lombok has changed a lot, it looked nicer and this has captivated Dutch people who started moving in this neighbourhood. Nowadays, even if Lombok remains one of the cheapest area next to the city centre, most of the Turkish people that used to live there moved away because the houses are still too expensive for them[25].

> "My family and me used to live here but we had to move ten years ago because our house was too small and too old. We found a new and a nicer house in Kanaleneiland. Lots of other Turkish people did the same and we like to live there, it is nice, but Lombok is better, at least it is near to the city centre." (Saliha, Turkish second generation girl working in a Turkish cafe in Lombok)

Even though lots of Turkish people moved away from Lombok, heading to cheaper and more far away neighbourhoods, like Kanaleneiland and Overvecht, it has maintained its own multicultural atmosphere. Turkish shops are still there, as a reminder of the past years and the largest mosque of The Netherlands, funded by Turkish citizens is placed there.

It's in this neighbourhood, therefore, that Dutch people and Turkish people are more likely to interact with each other. I will explain the kind of social interactions between Turkish people and Dutch people by presenting the empirical data I collected.

> “Lombok is not a ghetto, people are quite mixed but in general there is a huge group of Turkish people that stick together, but there is also a group that mixes up, even though it is less and less mixed up. Turkish people don't hang out in the city centre.” (Gulvin, 23, Turkish girl living in Lombok)

> "Yes I do the groceries in the Turkish shops but just because they are cheaper and smaller than the Albert Heijn. I do have small conversations with the Turkish workers there but they are just general conversations, we never talk about Turkey. I do however go to a Turkish hairdresser which is a place where Turkish people go to chat with each other and I happen to have a few conversations with them." (Bart, 33 years old, Dutch citizen living in Lombok)

[25] I am referring to the website: https://ind.nl/EN/individuals/residence-wizard/dutch-citizenship/option Lombok.aspx

I analyse what the quotes have in common. The first one shows that Gulvin perceives the life in Lombok as a quite mixed one and it is not a ghetto. This is confirmed by the second quote, the point of view of Bart, a Dutch citizen who has been living in Lombok for three years. He interacts with Turkish people, he does his groceries in Turkish places and he has conversations with the Turkish workers and at the hairdresser shop. During the interview he also told me: “I am proud of living in Lombok because of its multicultural atmosphere, it is a successful experiment.” His statement could prove that he is amused when he interacts with Turkish people. However, what the quotes also show the problematic nature of the interactions themselves. Combining the two, it is possible to note a tendency for the Turkish people to stay together and to avoid the city centre. This has been confirmed by another Turkish boy I have interviewed in the city centre who ironically asked me: “look around, do you see any Turkish-looking guy here?”.[26] The Turkish hairdresser as a gathering place for Turkish people to chat can also confirm this tendency. The experience of Bart endorses the problematic nature of the social interactions. He does the grocery shopping in Turkish places but only because they are cheaper. Thus, his interest in Turkish shops is based on utility. Moreover, he has a few daily conversations with Turkish people and he also stated that he doesn't have any Turkish or Turkish-Dutch friends.

The following quotes highlight the problematic nature of the social interactions, focusing on food habits.

> "Dutch people come to do their grocery shopping here and they buy a bit of everything, especially fruits and eggs but they don' buy Turkish products so I guess they don't cook Turkish food. They might be interested in our culture but they don't cook Turkish food. They come here because it is cheaper, not because they know the Turkish food. There are lots of Turkish people who come to do their groceries here and they do buy Turkish food because they know how to cook it since they have been raised cooking Turkish food." (Turkish shop worker in Kanalstraat, Lombok)

> "I only eat Turkish kebab because you can find it everywhere and it is cheap. I don't know anything else about the Turkish culture." (Mirte, 21 years old, Dutch citizen living in Lombok)

The witnesses show two elements. First, the habit of Turkish people to buy Turkish food because “they have been raised cooking Turkish food” and the same tendency of Dutch people, who visit Turkish shops because they are cheaper but they buy, on average, only Dutch food. Moreover, they show a lack of knowledge of Dutch people toward the Turkish culture, the ignorance is explicit said by Mirte and deducted by the Turkish shop worker. Not differently form Bart, Mirte's habit to eat kebab is simply based on utility,

By combining all the data and having presented the point of view of both sides, I can

[26] Tarikk, 26 years old Turkish second generation guy

conclude that Turkish and Dutch people interact with each other, and they might be amused by that, but the kind of interactions are not quality ones, they are merely daily ones.

Lastly, I want to examine the kind of social interactions taking place within Ulu Camii Moskee between Turkish, Muslim and Dutch people. This topic can be of interesting in order to see, in terms of social interactions, how Dutch people behave toward the institution which represents the religion identity of Turkish people.

Before going deep into the topic, it is worth making a brief introduction. According to Verkaaik and Tamimi Arab[27], the presence of mosques in the Netherlands is quite an issue both on a local governance scale and on a national scale. Many mosques, newly built or still under construction, have been vandalized. And yet, Ulu Camii Moskee has been build right in the city centre with two high minarets shaping the skyline of the entire city. Unfortunately, since no one from the municipality agreed to talk to me about the issue, the data I could collect is not enough to enable me to say whether the building of the mosque has been an issue both on a local governance scale and on a national scale. Mr. Turgay, a spokesman of the Turkish community at the time of the negotiations concerning the building of the mosque, has stated that the negotiations went well and there haven't been any bad reactions either from the municipality or from the citizens of Utrecht. The few data I collected by talking to Dutch people living in Lombok and on the newspapers seem to confirm what Mr. Turgay stated. Dutch citizens seem aware that Muslim believers have the right to pray in a mosque, as Bart told me:

> “In Lombok there is a church, so why there shouldn't be a mosque?” (Bart)

My data plus my personal observations enable me to state that on a real small-scale, the Dutch citizens of Utrecht agree with the presence of a mosque, the place where Turkish people manifest their religious identity. My data concerning the kind of social interactions happening within the mosque, which follow, seem to confirm the point.

In the mosque, during prayer time, there are quite a few people coming from different countries, but during the rest of the day only Turkish people spend their time there. During day time Turkish men hang out here; in the evening a few women get together and in the weekend there is a youth centre.

> *“*We also organize Turkish lessons so I guess yes, you can consider the mosque also as a place for Turkish people to get together. However, we organize guide tours of the mosque for schools and lots of Dutch people, not only students, come because they are interested in it." (Turgay)

[27] The article I am referring to is forthcoming

My personal observations and Mr. Turgay's words show the problematic nature of social interactions between Turkish and Dutch people. What it is interesting is that the members of the mosque organize daily tours for the students of the schools and for everyone who is interested in knowing the history of the mosque; even more interesting is the fact that Dutch citizens visit the mosque. This fact shows a double attempt to interact with each other, on one hand the Turkish community is interested in letting the Dutch people know what the mosque is and on the other hand Dutch people do respond to this call. Nevertheless, the mosque remains the core of the Turkish community and of its religious identity, with rooms, a common kitchen and a cafe for Turkish man and women, with a youth centre and classrooms for Turkish lessons.

As a conclusion, my data showed the problematic nature of the social interactions between Turkish and Dutch people. They tend to confirm that Lombok is not a ghetto; people with different cultural backgrounds are mixed, they interact with each other[28] and they might be amused by that. Nevertheless, the social interactions are not quality ones whereas they are merely daily interactions.

I am confident that my data could answer the questions concerning the kind of social interactions that occur. Now I want to answer the theoretical question I posed at the beginning of this chapter, that is: what are the consequences of the dichotomy "Us" *versus* "the Other" in regards of Turkish-Dutch and Turkish people living together with Dutch people. The outcomes of my research showed that quality social interactions can arise only when the Turkish second generation youth depart from their "Turkishness". This empirical fact strengthens the theoretical paradigm concerning the idea of autochtony and feeling of belonging.

As Geshiere (2009, 2) points out, the notion of autochtony condenses the essence of the idea of belonging: "To Anglophone readers this notion may appear somewhat exotic and even quaint. It does figure in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but it is certainly not a familiar term. Yet there are two reasons why it is of special importance. First of all, it seems to represent the most authentic form of belonging: "born from the earth itself" - how could one belong more?". The idea of belonging is, therefore, strongly connected to the soil. I argue that the idea of belonging is also linked to the culture. Even though this link is not specifically asserted by Geshiere, later on in the same book, he makes a connection between the "ritual of integration", called naturalization, the process of receiving the Dutch citizenship, and the Dutch culture.

> "If more pressure was necessary for these *allochtonen*[29] to "integrate," especially in cultural respects, it was urgent to have a firmer idea of what they were to integrate into. Prime Minister Jan-Peter Balkenende appealed to common values; journalist Paul Scheffer to common stories; Rita Verdonk, minister of integration and immigration, ran into serious difficulties when she had a film made that was intended to serve as the basis for the new

[28] The opposite would be surprising, since Turkish people live in the Dutch society and therefore they are part of it, this is even more true for the second generation that attended school in The Netherlands

[29] Whoever has at least a non-Dutch parent

inburgeringstest (citizen's test). Clearly the quintessence of Dutchness was not that easy to conceive." (Geshiere 2009, 219)

The stress put on the role of the Dutch culture in the process of integration proves that whoever wants to become a new Dutch citizen has to know the Dutch culture. What it is meant by Dutch culture is slightly out of my argument. It is enough to say that theoretically the idea of belonging is linked to the soil and to a shared culture. Therefore, the idea of autoctony, presented above, plus its link to the culture, threaten the sense of belonging of whoever comes from a different soil and has a different culture.

The data I have presented in my thesis show that even a double cultural identity is problematic, since the theoretical construction of the national and cultural identity is so culturally exclusive that it has within itself no room for any cultural differences. Therefore, the feeling of belonging is threatened when someone has a different or a double culture and comes from a different soil. This idea is confirmed by my data. First, I showed that the Turkish second generation have to develop politics of identity to be seen as "one of us" and, to a certain extent, these strategies are successful, all my interlocutors feel quite included. Second, I explained that there isn't a real exclusion or a ghettoization. However, there is a sort of social distance which threatens the feeling of belonging. Only when Turkish-Dutch people put their "Turkishness" aside they have quality relationships with their Dutch peers. Otherwise they have merely daily interactions. This happens to both the Turkish second generation people and the Turkish migrants. It is again the dichotomy "Us" - the autochthonous – and "the Other" - anyone else, that threatens the feeling of belonging of "the Other". They can have quality relationships and therefore being completely included without feeling a sort of distance, only when they decide to depart from their different cultural identity.

7. Conclusions

My thesis didn't aim to be thorough and amply representative, instead it intended to be exploratory and provide a further insight into the phenomenon of cultural identity building of second generation people. Throughout my case-studies, I wanted to highlight the theoretical causes of the issues of identity and how, in practical terms, the Turkish-Dutch youth faces it.

The theoretical construction of the national and cultural identity, the outcome of the modern nation-state, defines monolithic cultural identities and "ideal" behaviours. Thus, we are divided into: Dutch, Turkish, Whoever, and the "perfect" Dutch, for instance, must do this and that and must not do this and that. Within this theoretical model there is no room for both hyphenated identities and "ideal" behaviours concerning them. The consequence is that, theoretically, the hyphenated identities have an "unsolved" cultural identity, due to the lack of a theoretical model as a "guideline". An "unsolved" identity has large impacts on the hyphenated identities' psychology and it brings a feeling of distress. It forces them to develop a process of identity building which involves the construction of their cultural identity. As Ghorashi (2009), somewhat differently, pointed out in her studies concerning the Iranian migrants, this theoretical model is spread in The Netherlands and my case-study proved it right.

My thesis argued that the process starts when the Turkish-Dutch people realise that, even though they were born in The Netherlands, they are considered as non-Dutch. According to Alba (2010), in some societies there are ethnic boundaries that act to exclude the second generation people. In chapter four I presented two boundaries[30] spread in Utrecht. Firstly, the low expectations and secondly the Dutch thick sense of identity. The boundaries make my informants aware of the fact that they are perceived as "the Other", leading to the anguished question: then, who am I?

The consequence is the inevitable process of identity construction, which consists of a individual decision concerning the kind of relation they want to have with their parents' culture: refusal, separation and ethnic claim. In chapter five I argued that my informants develop three different strategies of identity. The first one, cross-cutting bright boundaries, is based on refusal. Referring to Alba's (2010) theory, the subject departs from their parents' culture and completely embraces the majority's values and habits. The second one, juggling one's identity is based on separation. Referring to the literature (Waldring, Crul & Ghorashi 2013; Eriksen 2003), it consists of a contextual moving from their parents' culture to the mainstream's one. The last one, building bridges between different cultures is based on ethnic claim. People who develop this strategy want to stay faithful to their parents' culture while spreading knowledge about the Turkish culture within the Dutch society.

[30] Which I defined: ethnic and social boundaries

The practical goal of the politics of identity is finding ways around the boundaries, since the strategies are an attempt to not be seen as non-Dutch, which is also an attempt to fully belong to the Dutch society itself. Consequently, in chapter six, I clarified the connection between cultural identity and the feeling of belonging by analysing social interactions in Utrecht. The theoretical assumption is that one's cultural identity is essential in establishing certain social interactions within a society. I argued that Turkish-Dutch people are able to have quality social interactions with Dutch people and, therefore, experience a feeling of belonging without feeling a social distance, only when they depart from their "Turkishness".

In conclusion, what my thesis showed is that the construction of cultural identity is an anguished mental process due to a clash between the "Old" and the "New". The second generations are the outcomes of the globalization: the *status quo*. Nevertheless, European countries are not yet able to create new theoretical paradigms which can embrace and give meaning to the presence of the second, even third, generations. My thesis has showed that the cultural identity becomes problematic because we, second generations people included, are trapped in theoretical paradigms which arose in the Nineteenth century and are suitable for the nation-states. However, since the globalization has begun, the nation-states are crumbling (Beck 2005; Beck 2005; Brinkman & Brinkman 2008) and their theories and models are, therefore, becoming anachronistic. Theoretical, monolithic paradigms such as: fixed-without-any-doubts identities, "ideal" behaviours, nationality and citizenship are overtaken and unable to give meaning to the flowing globalized reality of hyphenated identities, "real" behaviours and the moving of peoples.[31]

[31] These idea fit into the already ongoing scientific debate concerning the crumbling of the nation-states

Bibliography

Alba, Richard. 2010. Bright Versus Blurred Boundaries: Second Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1), 20-49

Baumman, Gerd. 2002. *The Multicultural Riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities*. London: Taylor and Francis

Becht, Ulrich. 2003. Toward a New Critical Theory with a Cosmopolitan Intent. *Constellations Volume* 10(4), 53-68

Becht, Ulrich. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. UK: Polity Press

Beuving, Joost and Geertz, de Vries. 2015. *Doing Qualitative Research : The Craft of Naturalistic Inquiry*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Brinkman, Richard L. and June E. Brinkman. 2008. Globalisation and the Nation State: Dead or Alive. *Journal of Economic Issues* 42(2), 425-433.

Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Crul, Maurice. Snakes and Ladders in Educational Systems: Access to Higher Education for Second-Generation Turks in Europe*, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* (2013). DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2013.815388

Crul, Maurice and Jeroen Doomernik. 2003. The Turkish and Moroccan Second Generation in the Netherlands: Divergent Trends between and Polarization within the Two Groups. *The International Migration Review* 37 (4), 1039-1064

Crul, Maurice and Jens Schneider. 2010. Comparative integration context theory: participation and belongng in new diverse European cities. *Ethnic and racial studies*. 33(7), 1249-1268

Crul, Maurice and Hans Vermeulen. 2003. The Second Generation in Europe. *The International Migration Review.* 37(4), 965-986

DeWalt, Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt. 2011. *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Plymouth: Altamira Press

Eriksen, Thomas H. 2003. Creolization and Creativity. *Global Network.* 3(3), 223-237

Gellner, Ernest. 2006. *Nations and Nationalism.* Oxford: Blackwell

Geshiere, Peter. 2009. *The Perils of Belonging. Autochtony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe*. The University of Chicago Press

Ghorashi Halleh. 2009. National Identity and the Sense of (Non) Belonging: Iranians in the United States and the Netherlands. In *Paradoxes of Cultural Recognition in Northen Europe,* edited by Algashi, Eriksen & Ghorashi, 75-89

Ghorashi, Halleh. 2010. The right to be different: The position of Muslim Migrants in the Netherlands. In *Rights in Context: Law and Justice in Late Modern Society* ,edited by Renza Banakar, 163-177

Ghorashi Halleh. 2014. Racism and "the Ungrateful Other in the Netherlands. In *Dutch Racism,* edited by: Ph. Essed and I. Hoving, 101-116

Ghorashi, Halleh and Elena Ponzoni. Reviving agency: Taking time and making space for rethinking diversity and inclusion. *European Journal of Social Work* doi:10.1080/13691457.2013.777332. (2013)

Ghorashi, Halleh and Ida Sabelis. 2013. Juggling difference and sameness. Rethinking Management of diversity in Organizations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management.* 29, 78-86

Ghorashi, Halleh and Ulrike M. Vieten. Female narratives of 'new' citizens' belonging(s) and identities in Europe: case studies from the Netherlands and Britain. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 19(6), 725-741 doi: 10.1080/1070289X.2012.745410. (2013)

Goffman, Ervin. 1963. *Stigma. Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. London: Pinguins Books

Lannutti, Vittorio. 2014. *Identità Sospese tra Due Culture. Formazione Identitaria e Dinamiche Familiari delle Seconde Generazione nelle Marche*. Milano: FrancoAngeli

Meder, Theo and Hester, C. Dibbits. 1999. Kasbah in de Kanaalstraat. Beeldvorming in en rond een multi etnische stadswijk: een verkenning. *Volkskundig Bulletin.* 25(1), 39-70

Ray, Brian. Immigrant Integration: Building to Opportunity. *The Online Journal of Migration Policy Institute,* October 1, 2002, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/immigrant-integration-building-opportunity

Slootman, Marieke. 2014. Reinvention of Ethnic Identification Among Second Generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch Social Climbers. *New Diversities.* 16(1), 58–70

Spedicato, Eide. 2006. *Per incontrare la sociologia*. Lanciano: Rivista Abruzzese

Stolke, Verna. 1995. Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rethorics of Exclusion. *Current Anthropology.* 36 (1), 1-24

Tamimi Arab, Pooyan. 2015. Amplifying Islam. Pluralism, Secularism and Religious Sound in the Netherlands. PhD diss., Utrecht University

Verkaaik, Oscar and Pooyan Tamimi Arab. Practicing Secularism in Dutch Mosque Issues: Constitutional versus Nativist Secularism. Forthcoming.

Waldring, Ismintha, Maurice Crul and Halleh Ghorashi. 2014. The Fine Art of Boundary Sensitivity. Successful Second Generation Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands, *New Diversity*. 16 (1), 71-87

Waldring, Ismintha, Maurice Crul and Halleh Ghorashi. 2015. Discrimination of Second-Generation Professionals in Leadership Positions. *Social Inclusion.* 3, 38-49 doi: 10.17645/si.v3i4.227, (2015)

Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society.* New York: Bedminster

Websites:

Dutch Central Buro of Statistics (CBS);
https://www.cbs.nl/nlnl/artikelen/nieuws/2006/36/minder-allochtone-tienermoeders/allochtoon

The Integration of European Second Generation (TIES);
http://www.tiesproject.eu/content/vieew/31/69/lang,de/

Ministry of Security and Justice;
https://ind.nl/EN/individuals/residence-wizard/dutch-citizenship/option

Lombok
http://www.50jaargastarbeidersutrecht.nl/50jaargastarbeiders/Wonen/Wijken/Lombok.aspx

Appendix

•Topic-list

With Turkish second generation people

•Name

•Age

•Education

• Job

•Knowledge of the Turkish language

•Celebration of the Turkish and Dutch festivities

•Religion

•Attendance to mosques

•Relationship with the parents

•Relationship with Dutch and Turkish peers

•Discriminations because of being Turkish and because of being a Muslim believer

•Do you feel a gap between the Turkish values and the Dutch culture?

•Do you feel comfortable with showing your "Turkishness"?

•Does behaving in a different way than your Dutch peers affect your public life? For instance, do Dutch people tend to set you apart because of a different behaviour?

•What do you think about the Dutch policies on immigration?

With Turkish workers in Lombok

•Name

•Age

•How long do you work in Lombok?

•Do Dutch people attend your shop and why do they do it?

•What kind of products do Dutch people buy?

•Do you have any social interactions with Dutch people?

•Do you think Dutch people are interested in the Turkish culture?

With Dutch people living in Lombok

•Name

•Age

•How long have you been living in Lombok?

•Would you consider Lombok as a multicultural neighbourhood?

•Do you have any social interactions with the Turkish community?

•Do you attend any Turkish shops or café?

•Do you know the Turkish culture?

•Would you consider Lombok as a ghetto?

•Do you consider Lombok a safe neighbourhood?

•General thoughts about the presence of a huge mosque

•General thoughts about the Dutch policies on immigration

With Mr. Turgay, member of Ulu Camii Moskee's board

•History of the mosque

•Who did finance the mosque?

•Which activities are organized?

•What is the role of the mosque within the Turkish community?

•Who attend the mosque?

•How did the negotiations with the municipality go?

•Have Dutch citizens ever complained about the mosque?

•How did the Dutch citizens react to the mosque?