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Abstract
Diasporas are typically seen as the result of population mobility and change. Moving beyond perceiving them as homogenous and static communities, recent socio-/applied linguistic research has focused on the dynamics of membership negotiation. The complex ways in which individuals position self and other as ‘insiders’ or/and ‘outsiders’ has been associated with claiming belonging and fitting in, in the ‘host’/’majority’ society vis a vis an imagined diaspora context. Belonging is a relatively new theoretical construct for socio-applied linguistic research. In the current environment of intense population movement, following geopolitical changes, financial pressures and climate mobility, understanding belonging has significant societal relevance.

Accordingly, this thesis focuses on one particularly community, the Turkish Cypriot community in London, as a case and conduit for unpacking belonging at individual and group level; particularly in relation to material places that constitute focal points for the members. I pay special attention to diasporic associations, which are understudied in linguistic scholarship. Diasporic associations provide a locus for communities and individuals to socialise, negotiate resources and strategies for doing ‘us’ and ‘them’ and converge or diverge from norms and behaviours that are associated with membership to the community. These positions however are not linear, mutually exclusive binaries; to the contrary, they constitute resources for the individual and the group as they construct an imagined collectivity.

Through the analysis of interviews, ethnographic observations, real life interactions and body maps, this thesis takes a language first approach to belonging which is seen as political, emplaced and discursively constructed. I use the concept of place-belonging to show how members negotiate fluidity and stability of their membership in community; by reference to (primarily but not exclusively) linguistic practices and behaviours that they mobilise in discourse, members of the community ‘do’ place-belonging in habitual practices and routines. I discuss in detail the significance of studying diasporic association for future research and close the thesis with offering directions for future socio-/applied-linguistic studies.
1 Introduction

1.1. Introduction to the topic

Scope of the research: Manifestations of belonging and membership in modern diasporas (in relation to the notion of place.)

Diasporas are constant in human history, emergent through forced and voluntary mobility and deeply engrained in population change. Diasporas are political, sensitive and personal; some of their members have often experienced trauma and displacement, others left for a ‘better life’ and in all cases people needed to rebuild networks and relationships while acquiring a new ‘normal’. Modern diasporas have a dynamic and complex relationship with their ‘home’ and negotiate their sense of belonging within their diaspora communities. In diaspora research, the notion of belonging is central and closely associated with the ancestral home in the most traditional sense (Sigona et al., 2015). Previous diaspora research focused on how diasporas kept bonds with their ancestral homes (Mariou, 2020). Human geography, sociology and political scientists have produced significant studies on diasporas (for a compilation see Sigona et al., 2015). Linguists, on the other hand, have approached diasporas from the perspective of language contact, revitalisation, maintenance and attitudes (Auer et al., 2013; Canagarajah and Silberstein, 2012; Creese and Blackledge, 2011; Lyra, 2011; Márquez Rieter and Martín Rojo, 2015; Matras et al., 2022; O’Rourke, 2022; Wei and Hua, 2013) but less on capturing the dynamics of membership negotiation and the relationship between place and community. Sociolinguists in particular have recently turned to how members reconfigure space and transform it into a place of various meanings for its users (Cornips and Rooij, 2018; Johnstone, 2011; Keating, 2015; Kozminska and Zhu, 2021; Scollon and Scollon, 2003).

For modern diasporas, the concept of ‘home’ is multifaceted. Despite the cultural, historical, and emotive significance of the homeland, the diaspora community develops a new sense of belonging. Members of the diaspora maintain ties to their homeland through language, customs, and shared memories, while simultaneously forging new identities and affiliations within
their diaspora communities (Baser, 2015). This dual sense of belonging reflects the fluidity of diasporic identities, as individuals negotiate their relationships with both their homeland and diasporic community (Lowry, 2023).

Although this research project follows a more modern, dynamic and context-sensitive approach, the significance of the notion of home cannot be underestimated for people who self-identify with a community or who move to a new sociopolitical environment. Brah (1996:192) defines home as ‘a mythic place of desire in diasporic imagination’. Such a definition overlaps with the idea of home being No-place, therefore Utopia (Schlink, 2000) which has great importance for my research project. This is because my work is concerned with the case of a Turkish Cypriot (TC hereafter) diaspora. As Kızılyürek (2018) asserts, TCs fail to have a Utopia, a recognised relationship with a place, a ‘home’ (I discuss TC in the following section). Cyprus, as I will discuss later, is still a land of separation and unresolved political conflict between the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities. This puts the TC diaspora in a different place from many other diasporas. Understanding how members of the diaspora negotiate a troubled past, and present, in indexing individual and collective membership is significant for unpacking the process by which places acquire new meanings through interactional practice (Baser, 2015, Féron and Baser, 2023). In order to achieve this goal, I looked at the members’ negotiation of belonging initially by looking at the notion of home and its relation to the community formation within the TC diaspora. Home, nonetheless, is not only a physical space but also a place to which individuals are emotionally attached. I consequently shifted my focus on the diaspora organisations, because these community spaces play a crucial role in the process of community building. In diaspora context, these organisations provide opportunities for diaspora members to forge relationships, strengthen their sense of identity, and negotiate their sense of belonging within their diaspora community. Furthermore, diaspora associations represent home. These organisations bring together geographically dispersed individuals who share a common ancestry, culture, or history. Therefore, diaspora organisations play a central role in sustaining and preserving cultural
traditions, supporting community members, and fostering a sense of belonging by providing a platform for connection and collective identity. Members of the community transform the community spaces into their places of interaction which is filled with lived experience and is seen as a socially constructed place of belongingness, togetherness. It will therefore be recurrent in the discussions in this thesis mainly in relation to place-belongingness, which I use to frame the relationship between individual experiences in diasporas (Yuval Davis, 2006; and earlier Relph, 1976).

My research seeks to add to empirical research on how members of diasporas experience and negotiate membership of their community, how they do place-belonging individually as well as collectively. I will argue that through interactional achievement, members of diasporas undergo a place-making process and develop a strong feeling of belonging that they reside in. Following Yuval-Davis’s (2006) conceptualisation of the notion of belonging, place becomes loaded with symbolic meanings given by the users of that space. Furthermore, my research seeks to make a valuable contribution to our understanding of the concept of belonging within diaspora communities, specifically from a linguistic perspective. By examining diasporas as imagined communities, I aim to investigate how diaspora members construct and maintain their group membership through their habitual practices. Diaspora associations serve as prominent sites where these practices are visible and can be closely studied. Through my research, I have delved into the recurring practices that take place within these associations, aiming to explore how members discursively co-construct, negotiate, manage, and maintain their diaspora identities and group membership within these liminal spaces.

Within my research, I have focused on the concept of belonging in relation to places. I have sought to understand how individuals engage in specific activities within these associations and assign meaning to their interaction spaces. Belonging, in my view, is an interactional achievement for individuals who identify with the diaspora community and the collective community at large. Through my exploration, I have aimed to shed light on the understudied role of diasporic associations as crucial community gathering places.
Surprisingly, linguists have only touched upon this aspect despite its central importance for diaspora communities.

By examining the linguistic dimensions of diasporic associations and their role in constructing place-belonging, my research project contributes to bridging the gap in the existing literature. I aim to provide insights into the linguistic practices, discursive strategies, and social dynamics that contribute to the construction of diaspora identities and the negotiation of group membership within these liminal spaces. Ultimately, this research not only enhances our understanding of the linguistic aspects of diaspora communities but also highlights the vital role that diasporic associations play in shaping the lived experiences and sense of belonging of their members.

Overall, this study seeks to investigate the fluid and complex roles of membership in modern diasporas using a dataset comprised of extensive semi-structured interviews, extensive participant observation, and body maps. The examination of linguistic dichotomies as manifestations of group membership and claims of belonging within the diaspora is given special consideration. The ways in which "us" and "them" are constructed, as well as the political aspect of this process, are profoundly embedded in the lives of the TC communities I researched and have implications for future research. I elaborate on this topic in the following section.

1.2. Significance of the Study

More than 60 years have passed since the first immigration wave of TCs to London. However, it is an under-researched community as only a limited number of studies have been undertaken. This is the case both for TCs and Greek Cypriots (GCs hereafter) (Solomos and Woodhams, 1995). In fact, some scholars have taken a step further, characterising the TC diaspora in the UK as an ‘invisible population’ due to worldwide socio-political restrictions on this community (Bamanje, 2002; Ennelli et al., 2005; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Robins and Aksoy, 2001). The diaspora studies on London are mainly focused on the Caribbean, Asian and Middle Eastern communities. When the TC diaspora was investigated (Atay, 2006, 2010; Ballinger, 2003; Bertrand, 2004; Çilingir, 2010; King et al., 2008; Küçükcan, 2004; 2009; Lytra and Baraç,
2009; Şimşek, 2012), it was categorised as part of Turkish or Kurdish communities, as well as part of GC communities. This is also a result of the lack of data stemming from the fact that the Census in England and Wales run by the Office for National statistics (ONS) did not record TCs as a separate ethnic group (King et al., 2008) until Census 2021.

From an academic perspective, the TC community is a special case, since they do not have an internationally recognised state and TCs consider themselves to be purely Turkish, purely Cypriot or TC. So even in Cyprus, this community as well as any other community in Cyprus, has a conflicted and marked identity (Arkonac et al., 2011; Çakal, 2012; Kizilyürek and Gautier-Kizilyürek, 2004). Robins and Aksoy (2001) found that TC migrants as a whole do not possess a common agreement on their national identity. Extant research has claimed that the TC identity in the UK can be best positioned at the intersection of Britishness, Cypriotness and Turkishness (Ladbury, 1977; Robins and Aksoy, 2001) and is a living case, given the ongoing turbulence in the homeland. This creates a complexity with regard to group identity and a timely and interesting research case (Ballinger, 2003; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Panteli, 1990).

Equally important is that this struggle of national identity is also underpinned by political ideology. TCs who are on the political left tend to favour the term ‘Turkish speaking Cypriots’ to characterise their identity, as they ideologically orient towards a unified Cyprus (Kizilyürek and Gautier-Kizilyürek, 2004; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Robins and Aksoy, 2001). On the other hand, those who lean towards the political right, who favour the continuation of a separate TC state, refer to themselves as ‘Turks’ or ‘Cypriot Turks’ with great emphasis on their Turkishness. In addition, research (Canefe, 2002) has shown the use of descriptive terms, such as ‘London Turks’, ‘London Turkish Cypriots’ ‘British Cypriots’ or ‘Anglo-Cypriots’, by those who tend to foreground their Britishness. We can better understand the complexity of TC identity by realising that never in history have TCs had their own truly independent nation state, which could come with a more or less uniform national identity. Other studies also provide further explanations for the identity struggles of TCs. For instance, Robins and Aksoy (2001) as well as Canefe (2002) argue that TCs
in London have a transnational identity, which is underpinned by a transnational belonging to three countries and corresponding national identities (i.e., British, Cypriot and Turkish).

At the same time, these studies also suggest that first generation TC immigrants have successfully integrated into the larger society in a monolingual and monocultural way (meaning retaining a Cypriot lifestyle in the place of residence) (Bhatti, 1981; Robins and Aksoy, 2001). Currently the TC diaspora in the UK is a self-sufficient community (Thomson, 2006) with statistics showing that 74% are homeowners and they mainly own and work in small-scale family-run businesses in textile production, restaurants, retail and wholesale businesses (Düvell, 2010). However, the second and third generation TCs, who were born and raised in the UK, have a much higher level of education compared to their parents and they work in skilled professions such as law and teaching (King et al., 2008). In addition, whereas the vast majority of first-generation immigrants consider the Turkish language to be their mother tongue, the second and third generations predominantly consider English to be their mother tongue (Robins and Aksoy, 2001). To further increase the complexity, TC communities self-identify, typically, with North Cyprus as the national denominator of the country of origin. ‘North Cyprus’ in itself is already a contested identity claim. Some Cypriots (I use the term in an inclusive meaning for all self-identified members of Cypriot communities) would not accept North Cyprus as a legitimate nation state. Others will use it as a place name or geographical identification, attempting a politically neutral disposition. At international politics level, North Cyprus is embargoed. The result is that the TC community in London, has resettled in a place where they were both given refuge and at the same time are not legitimised in their national identity claim. The complexity of the case makes it relevant to unpacking modern diasporas from both linguistic and sociopolitical angles. Amongst the previous studies on TC communities, the focus on the way TCs have adapted in their diasporic space and negotiated their place-belongingness lacks but needs further academic attention. Therefore, the TC community constitutes an excellent site for the focus of my thesis.
1.3. Research motivation

The primary motivation is my personal desire for bringing out the silenced and unheard voice of the TC community, which has always been neglected by governments both in Cyprus and around the globe. I too see the TC diaspora as an invisible community (Enneli et al., 2005), a consequence of the socio-political situation in Cyprus; their study, however, can provide valuable lessons in our understanding of the complexities of diasporas. The TC home politics is influenced and often shaped by the political engagement of Turkey, Greece, Great Britain and GCs. The complexity surrounding the TC community leads to them often being silenced and marginalised.

Academically, I am interested in bringing together applied linguistic, sociolinguistic and intercultural communication research in understanding community building and its relationship to place-belongingness. My commitment to the topic led me to further investigate the community spaces some of which are stable, and some are temporary. In the process of engaging as a researcher with the community, the concept of liminality came into play. Diaspora organisations epitomise the concept of liminal spaces, as they serve as dynamic arenas where individuals navigate and transform their sense of belonging. Therefore, diaspora organisations provide a prime example for being, using and transforming liminal spaces (Van Gorp and Smets, 2015). Within these liminal spaces, negotiations of membership and claims to diasporic identity come to the forefront. What fascinated me was the agency displayed by self-identified members of the diaspora, who actively engage in "doing" place-belongingness through their interactions within these organisations. These community spaces are not passive settings but rather become vibrant places of gathering, where diaspora members collectively shape and redefine their sense of belonging. Community spaces are transformed into places of gathering and became places where diaspora members actively ‘do’ place-belonging. The transformative potential of these spaces, where individuals negotiate and affirm their membership, sparked my curiosity and motivated me to delve deeper into the realm of diasporic associations. Place-belongingness and membership in diaspora spaces from
the approach I adopted can contribute to research as well as policy related to the integration of diasporic communities within the broader society.

1.4. Outline of the thesis
This thesis is structured in eight chapters. This introduction is followed by the literature review chapter, in which I provide a detailed review of relevant literature that has shaped my reading and informed my conceptualisation of the study. The third chapter reports on the research methodology. The fourth chapter presents the outcomes of the first phase of the study. It discusses the findings derived from the analysis of semi-structured interviews in London. Attention is paid to the factors that participants claim to be important for the building of community membership and their understanding of diasporic home. The fifth chapter presents the outcomes of the second phase of the study. This chapter closely explores the place-belonging as a process and investigates how it is done based on factors such as descent and language, participants’ self-identification, and also looks into how community building is shaped by the participants’ understanding of home politics. Chapters 6 and 7 present the outcomes of the research from third phase. The focus of the third phase is on two diaspora associations called The Olives and The Lilies. Due to large size of the data and importance for this research I decided to separate the findings of the third phase into two chapters and present the associations data in more details. Chapter 6 investigates the dynamic negotiation of membership and claims of belonging done in diaspora organisations. It also explores the marked encounters during weekly activities and take them as markers of group belonging. The seventh chapter investigates the notion of home and belonging from a political angle and explores how participants used body maps in order to covertly voice their opinions on the politics of belonging. The eighth and last chapter provides a comprehensive summary of the thesis, discusses the findings of the overall study, highlighting the contributions made in the extant literature, as well as the limitations of the project, and indicates further areas for research.

Before moving to the literature review, I provide a more detailed discussion on the relevant features of the TC diaspora for this project.
1.5. Background of the Turkish Cypriot diaspora

It is estimated that more than 120,000 TC descendant migrants live in the UK, including second and third generations (Enneli et al., 2005). The main TC settlements are in London and are mainly in the Northern and Eastern boroughs of Hackney, Haringey, Islington and Edmonton with some smaller populations in the Southern boroughs of Lambeth, Lewisham and Southwark (Düvell, 2010). These areas are considered to have the main concentration of TC community but there are smaller communities in wider parts of the UK, such as in Birmingham, where I conducted the first phase of my study.

In order to be able to link and understand the strategic move of TCs to the UK, I would like to provide a brief history of the TCs.

1.5.1 Historical context of the Turkish Cypriot community

I am providing here a brief historical context of the TC community. This is meant to provide the reader with an understanding of movement between Cyprus and Britain and also my own positioning, which I develop further in the methodology chapter and in relation to the researcher’s role. It is not meant to be ‘exhaustive’ or ‘objective’; I align with the view that readings of historical events are represented in different ways depending on individual subjectivities. I identify the people of Cyprus as Cypriots regardless of their language, religion, ethnicity and political stance.

The history of TCs is officially documented to start in 1571 when the Ottoman Empire conquered the entire island of Cyprus. The Ottoman rule of Cyprus continued until 1878. Before the arrival of the Ottomans, the island was largely populated with the Greek Orthodox population. With the aim of increasing the Muslim population on the island, it was the Ottoman Empire’s policy to send their own population to the newly acquired land. Right after the Ottoman Empire conquered the island, government officials, such as governors and teachers, were sent to the island followed by artisans, intellectuals, craftsmen and tradesmen. Later during the Ottoman rule, Cyprus was used as a location for exile. The most notable example of this is the worldwide famous writer and reformer Namik Kemal, who was sent into exile to the island due to his governmental reformist political activism. In 1878, due to tensions between the
Ottoman and Russian Empires, the administration of the island was handed over to the British Empire for the next 99 years. The British saw Cyprus as a strategic location for controlling the security and its interests in the Middle East, Mediterranean and North Africa.

Cyprus was under British rule from 1878 until it gained its independence to become a sovereign state in 1960 with three states being guarantors of the island state: Britain, Turkey and Greece. The guarantor states had the right to intervene to stop any violent conflicts and had a duty to protect the security of the people of Cyprus. The two main communities on the island are 1) Greek Cypriots (GCs), approximately 78% of the total population and who reside in the south in the internationally recognised Republic of Cyprus and 2) Turkish Cypriots (TCs), approximately 19% of the total population and who mainly reside in the northern part, in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) which is a state only recognised by Turkey’s government.

Due to Cyprus’s colonial history with Britain, there has been a constant flux of movement between Cyprus and the UK. Although the migration from Cyprus to Britain dates back to 1930s, the main influx of migrants from Cyprus to Britain took place during the 1950s and 1960s and finally in the 1970s, when intercommunal clashes took place in Cyprus. During these three decades there were intermittent clashes between the two communities, hence the political and social environment within the island was very fragile and violent at times. Until this hostile period, at a community level, Cypriot villages and cities were inhabited by mixed populations consisting of Greek, Turkish and other ethnic minorities, largely living within an overarching harmony and in peace by sharing communal spaces, rituals and habitual practices, as well as a rich multilingual environment.

1.5.2 Contemporary Cyprus

In 1960, when Cyprus was established as an independent state, there was both an agreed political equality and veto rights for both GC and TC communities. Only three years following its inception, the republic became

---

1 It is estimated that 3% of the island’s population is composed of minority groups such as Maronites, Armenians and British migrants.
dysfunctional as GCs requested abolishing the veto rights of TC representatives. On both sides, the nationalist factions were pulling the island in opposite directions, namely either becoming part of Greece or Turkey. Hence, the political clashes quickly escalated into violence resulting in deaths and the suffering of the people of Cyprus. Since GCs were much larger in terms of populations, TCs were outnumbered and scared, therefore they started to emigrate from mixed rural and urban areas towards smaller but mono-ethnic territories. This conflict situation continued until 1974 when the conditions of the communities, especially the TC community, deteriorated significantly due to economic and political embargoes on TC enclaves by GC militias. The events in 1974 drastically changed the political future of the island. In July 1974, there was a military coup d’état in Greece, where the administration was taken over by the military. Immediately after this event, the Greek military in Cyprus also took over the control of the GC-controlled Cyprus administration. This was largely seen as a victory for the political (far) right in the GC community when, in the first days of the coup, GC people were imprisoned or murdered due to their political views which supported an independent Cyprus state not ENOSIS (i.e., the nationalist plan to join Cyprus to Greece). People on the political left within the GC community, fearing for their lives, also emigrated to the UK during this period. Whilst the violent conflict amongst the political right and left in the GC community continued, the TC community became worried for their safety on the expectation that the military nationalist factions had a plan to make Cyprus a Greek island with no political rights for other ethnic groups. In response to the military takeover of Greeks on the island and answering the calls of the TC community, Turkey started a military intervention on 20th July 1974. This led to a strong wave of migration where TC communities emigrated to the Turkish controlled northern part of island and GCs emigrated to the southern part of Cyprus. As a result of the 1974 events, another wave of emigration took place from Cyprus to the UK. Within this period the political environment was uncertain and economic opportunities were very limited.

Overall, these waves of migration were mainly attributed to the desire for better economic status, better lives and greater security on the part of the Cypriots.
As a result of political uncertainty in the island, the migration from Cyprus to the UK is largely seen as an economic migration driven by the deteriorating economic and social conditions of Cyprus during the periods of conflict (Ladbury, 1977). Cypriots who wished to have better lives abroad found the solution by emigrating to Britain, Greece, Turkey and as far as Australia and Canada. Since 1974, the political negotiation for a settlement in Cyprus has been ongoing. This is particularly salient for the topic as is the fragile relationship between the TC/GC communities; I will show the communities have both a shared longing for Cyprus and deeply engrained resentment for the ‘other’, who for many years is construed as the enemy. The public rhetoric in Turkey and Greece exacerbates the divide, depending on the broader political situation in the area.

On this subject, an important milestone in Cyprus history took place in 2004, when a UN administered solution was proposed through a referendum across the island. Nevertheless, this resolution was rejected by the GC community, whereas it was accepted by a large proportion of the TC community during the referendum. In January 2017, the two leaders of the Cypriot communities were in close negotiations in Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations. Another resolution plan was announced over the course of 2017; however, both parties did not seem to be agreeing on common grounds. In 2018, there were several significant meetings for peace negotiations; nevertheless, a solution for this Cyprus issue is yet to be found still in 2022.

The political environment therefore has been and still is in some respects volatile. This is particularly relevant to my project because I will argue the perception of the ‘other’ for both communities in Cyprus in detail. The process of self-other identification is carried across the physical borders and is still visible within the diaspora in London. In the context of the TC diaspora, identity and notion of belonging proves to be of paramount importance. This is perceptible through the ways in which members of the diaspora talk about the ‘other’ and how they draw the boundaries of their group membership.

Next, I now to turn to the literature review chapter which is organised in five parts – diaspora and community, home, space and place, belonging, and
identity. This part of the thesis aims to provide my reading of the core concepts that either remained central to or significantly influenced my framing of the topic. It is connected to the analysis of my data later on and provides my attempt for synthesising literature from cognate disciplines in diaspora research.
2 Literature Review

Overview of the chapter

My research examines modern diasporas from the perspective of imagined social collectives. The social circle, the practices, and the place are all intimately connected to the process of claiming belonging. This presents a close connection to political issues. The concepts of space and place are directly related to this project as it looks into communities and sense of belonging in relation to habitual practices.

Following the literature, I classified five foundational themes for the discussion. These are process of place-making, abstract space, habitual practices, place, and place-belongingness. These and their relationship, in my interpretation, are summarised in Figure 1. The figure shows a relational synthesis of the reviewed literature. I also provide an interpretation in the next paragraph which seeks to guide the reader through the literature review chapter.

Figure 1: Interpretation of the synthesis for the reviewed literature
Although *place-making* (Castillo, 2014) is referred to in the same way as *place-belongingness* (Antonsich, 2010), I consider place-making as a cyclical process and place-belongingness as a dynamic outcome of this process. Place-belonging indicates a process rather than being a fixed entity, because individuals ‘do belonging’ (Bennett, 2013; Skrbiš et al., 2007). Bell (1999) sees belonging as a performative achievement. Similarly, according to Yuval-Davis (2006) ‘belonging is always a dynamic process, not a reified fixity, which is only a neutralized construction of a particular hegemonic form of power relations’ (p.199). Cuervo and Wyn (2014:912) also perceive belonging as a process and oppose the idea of belonging being ‘a fixed property that becomes firm once it has been attained’. In the same fashion, Benson (2014) stresses the multiplicity and intersectionality in the process of developing belonging. Benson (2014:3110) further states belonging is ‘a messy and uncertain process, fractured along a range of axes and social fields’.

The notions of space and place are the main parts of the whole process, whereas the habitual practices play a pivotal role within this process as place-making happens through habitual practice (Thissen and Cornips, 2021). All these foundational themes in the process are interrelated and I take the process to be a never-ending, recurrent cycle. These habitual practices become routinised through time and in preferred shared space. People interact with each other and individually or collectively begin to experience that abstract space from a more internalised way, which turns into a place. So, we can say that that abstract space begins to load a meaning and emotional attachment, therefore it starts to turn into a ‘place’. Thus, place is a space that is experienced, to which concrete reality is attached. Place is where people feel as ‘one’ and, as mentioned above, this feeling is developed through certain individual or common practices among the users of that particular space. Drawing on Lave and Wenger’s (1991) concept of communities of practice, people become as ‘one’, as a community through the ways they share knowledge and resources and develop emotional attachment to certain things and spaces. Therefore, these community practices are on the same line as the habitual practices.
Through various repetitive habitual practices, individuals form a group belonging and through collective understanding they (re-)negotiate their membership in the wider sense. All these constructions of various concepts are in constant negotiation with human action and perception. How individuals perceive themselves and others shape how they practise their experience of the space where interaction takes place. Human interaction is also determined by individuals’ place-belonging. Place-belonging is related to identity and a strong sense of place feeds into a strong sense of identity. In their ‘place’, who those individuals interact with is influenced by reciprocal and shared ideologies. Within diasporic communities, various ideologies exist (political, interpersonal etc.). In this context individuals develop sense of belonging place-belonging on the basis of their experience of the space in which they find themselves.

In the following chapters of the literature review, I discuss in detail the underpinning theories in the literature that marked the significant influence on this study. The literature review chapter consists of five sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Literature Review Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Diaspora and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Space and Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. Belonging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Overview of the literature review chapter

Initially, I introduce the diaspora and community. Within that section, I explore communities of practice framework in relation to modern diasporas. Then in 2.2, the exploration of the notion of home follows. I discuss the concepts of space and place in section 2.3. Following that, I provide a theoretical discussion on the notion of belonging. Finally, I review the literature on identity and discuss how it is enacted discursively in relation to the notion of belonging.

Next, I turn to the diaspora and community section.
2.1. Diaspora and Community
I start with a discussion of key traditional approaches to diaspora and move on to illustrate its more recent conceptualisations in order to reflect the complex nature of modern diasporas. I give particular attention to the fluidity of the modern diasporas and draw on Benedict Anderson’s (1991) ‘imagined communities’ to stress the complex and dynamic nature of diasporas.

2.1.1. Defining the meaning of diaspora
The word diaspora originates from Greek and derives from the preposition *dia* ‘over’ and the verb *speiro* ‘to sow’. It literally translates ‘to sow over’ or ‘to scatter widely’. Over the past two decades, the term diaspora has evolved into an omnipresent, overarching term, which designates any population or group living outside its homeland. The term is used as a collective noun referring to anyone not in their country of origin and yet the definition of diaspora is highly debated not only in academia, but also in the media and politics (Brubaker, 2005). Hence, many scholars point to the proliferation of the concept (Brubaker, 2005; Tölölyan, 1991, 1996). In order to reflect the conflicting views on diaspora research, next I will explore traditional perspectives on diaspora and then the modern diasporas in more detail.

*Traditional perspectives on diaspora*
The term diaspora was used to describe the colonisation of Asia Minor and the Mediterranean in the Archaic periods (800-600 BC). The ancient Greeks perceived diaspora as migration and colonisation (Anteby-Yemini and Berthomière, 2005). Later, the classical notion of diaspora was used to describe forced dispersion of people from their homeland to their countries of exile such as Jewish, Armenian and Palestinian diasporas. In a traditional sense, the homeland corresponded to national borders and nation state (Connor, 1986) and the expression implies collective trauma, dispersal and banishment (Cohen, 1997). Connor defines diaspora as ‘that segment of a people living outside the homeland’ (1986:16); this definition exemplifies how the classical diaspora research mainly concentrates on the reasons for and conditions of dispersal appearing to be the defining factors for diaspora. Safran (1991) proposed a list of features to define diaspora. He is one of the first
scholars to establish the main criteria of the classical diaspora theory and his list of criteria greatly emphasises that the concept of diaspora is coupled with homeland.

Table 1: Safran’s list of criteria (adapted from Safran, 1991)

| 1. Dispersal from a centre to two or more peripheral or foreign regions; |
| 2. Retention of collective memory, vision or myth; |
| 3. The belief that full acceptance by the host country is not possible, resulting in alienation and insult; |
| 4. Regard for the ancestral homeland as the true or ideal home and place of final return; |
| 5. Commitment to the maintenance or restoration of safety and prosperity in the homeland; |
| 6. Personal or vicarious relations to the homeland in an ethno-communal consciousness. |

In Safran’s list, firstly, he points out that the diasporic individuals are dispersed from a particular locus to two or more different areas. Secondly, he states that the diasporic communities tend to retain a collective memory or vision about their homeland, from which we can claim homeland is imagined. Safran’s third point mentions the fear of rejection by the host country. He asserts that diasporic individuals lean towards believing they are not fully accepted by the host country, as they consider their cultural adjustment to the host country can never be entirely complete. This would essentially lead to self-alienation and isolation of the members of diaspora from the wider society. The fourth point is about the idealisation of the notion of ‘home’. From a traditional perspective on diasporas, the ancestral homeland is considered and idealised as the one and only true home, and there is a burning desire to return back to the ancestral home. Commitment to the ancestral homeland and desire to restore its safety is the fifth criterion on Safran’s list. The sixth and final criterion is the retention of relationships with the homeland in an ethno-communal conscious manner. These relationships can be sustained through financial support,
political support or in the form of trade exchange. According to Safran (1991), if a community fully or partially shares the characteristics in the list, it can be regarded as a diasporic community. As my project deals with a diasporic community that meets all the criteria of ‘displacement’, Safran’s work is particularly relevant in contextualising the profile of my participants; however, it will not be used as the core theoretical framework, as Safran’s approach is rather static and dismisses the transnational and dynamic nature of modern diasporas.

Cohen (1996) contributed to recent diaspora research by attempting to introduce new ideas. He proposed an extension to the list of characteristics of diaspora similar to Safran’s (1991) prescriptive formula. In his new list, by adding a point of ‘a sense of solidarity with co-ethnic member in other countries’, he attempted to recognise the transnational character of the diasporas. However, Tsagarousianou (2004) asserts that Cohen’s attempts fail to take the diaspora one step forward, as a great emphasis is given to ‘strong links to the past’. Tsagarousianou (2004) argues that when investigating the concept of diasporas, the ‘connectivity’ should be highlighted rather than ‘displacement’. She further adds that whilst both Safran’s and Cohen’s contribution is very useful for determining and investigating the features of diasporas, the heterogeneity and complexity of diasporas are neglected. She also states that such essential checklists for the ideal type of a diaspora (e.g., Cohen, 1997; Safran, 1991; Tölöyan, 1997) fail to capture the complexity and dynamically changing nature of diasporas and see diasporas as static entities (Brubaker, 2005; Tsagarousianou, 2004). In order to reflect the nuances of diaspora in the literature, next I will present various works and critiques done on the concept.

Modern diasporas
Diasporas from a traditional essentialist perspective have been understood as a movement of a group of people from one place to another, whilst more recently researchers have taken a perspective influenced by social constructivism, which argues that the term diaspora refers to transnational migration and diaspora identity (e.g., Delanty, 2010; Hidle, 2001; Lainer-Vos, 2010; Morawska, 2011). Transnational migration is defined as ‘a process of
movement and settlement across international borders in which individuals maintain or build multiple networks of connection to their country of origin while at the same time settling in a new country’ (Fouron and Glick-Schiller, 2001:60). Such a transnational perspective is built on work about ‘diasporic communities’ as stressed by Clifford;

[the centering of diasporas around an axis of origin and return overrides the specific local interactions (identifications and “dis-identifications,” both constructive and defensive) necessary for the maintenance of diasporic social forms. The empowering paradox of a diaspora is that dwelling here assumes a solidarity and connection there. But there is not necessarily a single place or an exclusivist nation. (Clifford, 1994:322)

Similarly, also challenging the linearity of earlier research in diaspora studies, Anthias (1998) puts emphasis on the modern transnational movement of people and refers to the concept of diaspora as an unlocalised social network. In line with this, some scholars advocate a more dynamic and less essentialist approach with regard to notions such as race, ethnicity and nationality, than in the classical understanding of the concept of diaspora (Anthias, 1998; Brubaker, 2005; Soysal, 2000; Tsagarousianou, 2004; Weingrod and Levi, 2006). Anthias (1998) states that the term diaspora is overused and she compares it with a ‘kind of mantra’, which is frequently described as ‘the process of settlement and adaptation relating to a large range of transnational migration movements’ (e.g., Cohen, 1996; Safran, 1991; Vertovec, 1996). Diasporas are formed through the combination of individual migration experiences and the collective history of dispersal, which is closely correlated with the re-formation of communities away from their geographical territory of origin (Butler, 2001).

Recent studies on diaspora categorise diaspora as a form of transnational community and it has been defined as:

[...] rooted in particular, bounded sending- and receiving-country locales. Because they emerged from the social networks that precipitate migration, members tend to know one another personally or have family members or acquaintances in common during the early phases of community formation. They form organizations that express their identity as a transnational group. They exhibit some level of self-consciousness about belonging to a community spanning borders...Transnational communities include both migrants and non-
migrants, though the nature of non-migrant participation varies considerably.

(Levitt, 2000:461)

Levitt (2000) understands and concedes the term ‘community’ in essence does not imply the fact that all members should feel affiliated to each other. In line with this understanding, methodological nationalism is an adjunct notion that needs to be looked at. Methodological nationalism refers to ‘the assumption that the nation-state society is the natural social and political form of the modern world’ (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller, 2002:301). Therefore, transnationalism is an important concept to be explored in relation to modern diasporas; however this would not mean that the modern diasporas cannot be associated with borderlessness. Indeed transnational spaces more or less consist of penetrable boundaries. Such spaces can be listed as housing, social community clubs, and networks. Within the concept of transnationalism, people tend to ‘forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement’ (Basch et al., 1994). Furthermore, this social network connects together their past, present, as well as their future communities that they wish to be affiliated with. Those transnational networks go across geographic, linguistic, cultural and political borders and that makes modern diasporas imagined collectives where people draw the epistemic boundaries of their communities in and through interaction.

Through interactions people tend to express their sense of belonging as members of a particular group or various groupings (real or imagined). Before discussing the very important notion of belonging to this project, I conclude this section with the positions I adopt in my work.

In summary, modern diasporas are understood to be a construct beyond national and ethnic borders and boundaries and therefore as an imagined construct rather than static geographical realities (Butler, 2001). I define diaspora\(^2\) as a community or a group of self-selected people who claim their belonging to each other and identify themselves as members of a shared, collective community. They (willingly) participate in community activities and

\(^2\) In this thesis I use diaspora and diasporic community interchangeably.
are in regular and frequent interaction. They may or may not maintain relationships with other communities in the residing country or elsewhere.

In the next section, I provide a detailed overview on how I adopted Anderson’s (1991) concept of imagined communities in relation to diasporas and how I synthesised it into this research project.

2.1.2. Diasporas as imagined communities

An influential way of thinking of diasporas is to consider this network of people as ‘imagined communities’ as suggested by Anderson in 1991. He introduced the term 'imagined communities' to refer to nation-states and other political and social institutions whose constituent groups see themselves to be part of a single collective. Anderson (1983) sees diaspora as a form of movement and articulates that all diasporas can be considered to be imagined communities. Tsagarousianou also suggests that ‘diasporas should be seen not as given communities, a logical, albeit de-territorialised, extension of an ethnic or national group, but as imagined communities, continuously reconstructed and reinvented’ (2004:52). Van Hear (1998:195) stresses the continuously evolving state of diasporas as he states ‘diasporas can be made and unmade’. Taking it a little further with the dynamic nature of diasporas, Echchaibi (2002) defines diasporas as ‘re-imagined communities’. Hence, the boundaries of these imagined communities are not rigid or bound by nationality (Clifford, 1994). The disputed notions such as race, ethnicity and nationality are advocated in a more dynamic and less essentialist approach as regards the concept of diaspora (Anthias, 1998; Brubaker, 2005; Soysal, 2000; Tsagarousianou, 2004; Weingrod and Levi, 2006). Drawing on the complexity of these notions, Anderson (1983:6) describes the concept of nation as ‘an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign… It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’. In contrast, Karim (2003) claims that communities in Benedict Anderson’s sense are essentially conceptualised as political communities, whereas diasporas are shaped through social interaction and participation which cross the political
This is a position relevant to some conflicting positions that I will show in the data; on the one hand members converge towards a common imagined and political past and present; on the other hand they transcend boundaries and establish ‘coalitions’ that overcome divides.

People’s imagination distinguishes diasporas from any other form of movement of people. Furthermore, Brubaker (2005:3) criticises the categorisation of people whether diasporic or not. He argues that ‘if everyone is diasporic, then no one is distinctively so... if the term’s discrimination power - its ability to pick out phenomena, to make distinction was lost, it would mean the disappearance of diaspora – the universalization of diaspora’. The definition of diaspora is highly debated not only in academia, but also in the media and politics (Brubaker, 2005). Hence many scholars point to the proliferation of the concept (Brubaker, 2005; Tölölyan, 1991, 1996).

For this research project, from a social constructivist view, diasporas are seen as imagined networks of communities which are formed through interaction and their epistemic boundaries are drawn through common practices. This is in line with the communities of practice framework. Furthermore, King (2019) contends that because diaspora groups frequently entail a common goal of a better future for their society, they might be thought of as communities of imagination. He suggests that there are a variety of ‘modes of belonging’ (Wenger, 1998), so groups of individuals do not need to cultivate shared practises or interact at all to be considered communities on some level. I also consider the TC diaspora as a community of imagination. Firstly, diasporas exist beyond state borders, therefore they are imagined constructs, in which borders are drawn by their members. Secondly, diasporas are seen as socially constructed dynamic entities through interaction. Through a collective process diasporic communities construct their own ever-changing reality and cultivate a sense of belonging. Thirdly, belonging to diaspora communities is done through habitual practices. Diasporic practices redefine, reconfigure and reposition groups of people in relation to their self-representation. Community building is an interactional process and it requires individuals’ meaningful interaction with each other and the space that they are in. Therefore, I see the diaspora organisations as a community of practice as the practices of the
members of the diaspora define and shape the group membership and how belonging is done within the community. When all these three reasons are considered, in this study, community is understood as an emergent social collective. The membership of these collectives is negotiated and dependent on the interactions of the group members. The TC diaspora can be perceived as a community of imagination and the community spaces such as diaspora associations are formed as communities of practice. I intend to utilise CofP framework to emphasise the ongoing interactional formation of modern diasporas. Therefore, I find it useful to look into both the earlier and more recent academic work done on the concept of ‘community’ and trace the development on the chains of thought towards a more interactional approach to the conception of community.

The forthcoming section investigates the framework of communities of practice (CofP) in relation to diaspora associations. The CofP framework provides a dynamic, rich, and complex description of a community through placing greater emphasis on the concept of "practise" (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 1999; Wenger, 1998). I find the CofP framework useful for investigating diaspora associations due to the members' regular activities and shared common objectives.

2.1.3. Communities of Practice (CofP)

CofP draws on practice theory, central to which are the human agency, social order and habitual practices. This theory aims to explain how human beings assume situated agencies in light of the social context in order to define their practices. It is through these emergent practices that human agencies create social order. I use the term CofP in a descriptive sense; I consider the TC diaspora associations to be a CofP because, according to my argument, it is the 'communal habitual practises' that bring them together and allow them to maintain a relationship over time. I am explicitly interested in the lived experience of a community as narrated by its members in interviews and conducted in situ in symbolic locations, such as diasporic associations. In the chapter 6, I will compare and contrast this topic with the findings of phase three.
Lave and Wenger developed the communities of practice (CofP) framework drawing on the social theory of learning (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger et al., 2002). According to Wenger, *mutual engagement, shared repertoire* and *joint enterprise* are the three interlinked dimensions of CofPs that define the community. (Wenger, 1998:72-85).

![Figure 3: Communities of practice framework](image)

Figure 3 illustrates the triadic relationship of elements for the CofP framework. *Mutual engagement* mainly refers to involvement in various sets of practices, meanings of which are negotiated by the members of the CofP. *Shared repertoire* relates to the routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts, which are built and shared amongst CofP members. Lastly, *joint enterprise* is about the mutual sense-making process, reciprocal accountability and endeavour, and also common negotiated interaction. Shared mutual knowledge is generated amongst members, and the way of doing things sustained over time develops a sense of membership and draws the epistemic boundaries of that particular CofP (Wenger, 1998).

Following Lave and Wenger (1991), Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (1992) proposed a definition of a Community of Practice as follows:

An aggregate of people who come together around mutual engagement in an endeavour. Ways of doing things, ways of talking, beliefs, values, power relations – in short, practices – emerge in the course of this mutual endeavour. As a social construct, a CofP is different from the...
traditional community, primarily because it is defined simultaneously by its membership and by the practice in which that membership engages. (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992:464).

Table 2. The characteristics of Communities of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sustained mutual relationships – harmonious or conflictual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shared ways of engaging in doing things together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The rapid flow of information and propagation of innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Absence of introductory preambles, as if conversations and interactions were merely the continuation of an ongoing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very quick set-up of a problem to be discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Substantial overlap in participants' descriptions of who belongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowing what others know, what they can do, and how they can contribute to an enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mutually defining identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The ability to assess the appropriateness of actions and products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific tools, representations, and other artefacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local lore, shared stories, inside jokes, knowing laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jargon and shortcuts to communication as well as the ease of producing new ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Certain styles recognised as displaying membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A shared discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As illustrated in Table 2, mutual practices and membership play a crucial role when constructing a community (Wenger, 1998). Eckert (2006) argues that ‘shared experience stretched over some time’ and ‘commitments to shared understanding’ are the two conditions for the establishment of a community of practice. In a natural setting if people do particular activities on an ongoing basis over time, they tend to feel committed to their practices and mutual sense-making process commences, which leads to the projection of a sense of belonging. Those so-called activities can be in form of verbal and physical
interactions, interests, counselling or linguistic traits (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 1999; Wenger et al., 2002).

Wenger (2000:227-228) distinguishes between three modes of belonging to social learning systems. These are engagement, imagination and alignment. As illustrated in Table 2, engagement, in other words ‘doing things together’, is one of the most important criteria in indexing inclusivity and exclusivity in a community. Members construct their community through claiming or rejecting an identity for the group and negotiating ‘belongingness’ through commitment to the common goal. With these in mind, it can be achieved through imagination. Imagination is essential for members’ orientation and reflection on a situation, and exploration of possibilities. Lastly, alignment is about assuring that members’ local activities are sufficiently aligned with other processes that they can be effective beyond members’ own engagement.

This framework has become influential in sociolinguistics as it allows researchers to connect individual practices with the wider context. De Fina (2007), for example, investigates how a diasporic group comes together as card players, which she defines as a community of practice, and constructs their collective identity through significant practices. She lists three categories of practices as follows:

1. Organisational practices
2. Discourse practices
3. Socialisation practices

Organisational practices are crucial for the physical functioning of the club, whereas discourse practices are associated with the enactment of linguistic strategies and also storytelling in group meetings. Socialisation practices are related to how the group members socialise and share their knowledge with each other in a social gathering. Throughout these practices, identity is ‘done’ at the same time on different levels and in various ways (De Fina, 2007). De Fina’s comparison once again supports the idea behind the membership in CofP. Members belong to more than one CofP at the same time, and their membership status may change in time and vary from one CofP to another. This is particularly relevant to my project as I am going to show how different
members negotiate their membership and construct a diasporic community. Wenger (1991:35-36) states that the concept of peripheral participation denotes ‘multiple, varied, more- or less-engaged and […] developing identities, and forms of membership’. However, this statement does not support an individual’s decision-making process. Thus, Wenger distinguishes peripheral membership from marginalisation. He classifies an individual as ‘marginalised’ if that individual does not want to be a member of the community and expands that the individual becomes a member only if they want to become one (Wenger, 1991). On the other hand, he concludes that the individual becomes a member depending on their own willpower. Membership is an internally emergent construct and participation is a necessity in the process of acquiring membership. An individual’s membership is negotiated and constructed through their daily interactions.

The undeniable relationship between membership, social action and identity in groups is very well depicted in the sociolinguistic construct of CofP (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, 1992). However, the CofP framework has also come under scrutiny, despite its popularity. Seeing communities as stable and homogeneous entities is challenged, pointing to the embedded complexity and heterogeneity associated with any groups of individuals (Cox, 2005). Recent research sees community as constructed through individuals’ claiming or rejecting membership (Angouri, 2015; 2020). The boundaries of a community are drawn in accordance with the self-perception of the group members. From this perspective, it is the group members who define the characteristics of a group. Those characteristics are the influential factors determining who is a part of the community and who is not.

Although CofPs have a dynamically changing core group, the notions of authority and power are detectable. These are related to the politics of belonging where the core members of a group or a governmental organisation can practise power on prospective or current members of a group. Therefore, when defining diaspora as CofPs it is worthwhile pointing out the authoritative power of core members or leaders of a group. Power-related issues in CofPs have been addressed in Roberts’ (2006) work. In her article she provides a critique of CofP regarding how power in CofPs is practised. CofPs are mostly
self-organised entities, in other words they can flourish by themselves sustained over time. In relation to that, Wenger (1998) states that the CofPs do not necessitate extensive amount of management; however, this does not necessarily mean that leadership cannot be practised. Hence, despite the voluntary or unconscious nature of participation, CofPs are somewhat directed or managed by a form of authority that determines the power dynamics within the community. That authority, whether in the form of shared leadership or voluntary leaders, can have a direct influence on sharing of resources, creation of knowledge or determining the practices and priorities of the community.

In addition, it is argued that trust and willingness to share knowledge in CofPs is intertwined but the significant importance of trust and reciprocity is not fully addressed within this framework. Without a certain degree of trust, members of a group tend to be less willing to share knowledge amongst themselves; having trust in each other will provide a high degree of mutual understanding in their social and cultural context and readiness for this exchange (Roberts, 2006). This view challenges the conceptualisation of CofP, which is based on practices and interactions. For instance, trust seems to be one of the significant requirements for establishing a diasporic community. As Lazaric and Lorenz (1998) argue, trust is not only built with one's practices, but is also identified by one's beliefs and values. In diasporic communities, individuals come together and develop a sense of belonging through their mutual understanding of certain sets of beliefs and values.

On the other hand, the size of CofPs is also a point of concern for the critiques, as it is hard to establish boundaries around the number of people associated with the membership of a CofP. Individuals may belong to multiple CofPs and at the same time membership is negotiated in and through interaction and participation. It is claimed that the larger sized CofPs are formed from smaller CofPs. A community of practice is sometimes associated with a network of practice (Brown and Duguid, 2001:205). According to this, the relations amongst members of the smaller communities are not strong, may be due to geographical distance or the nature of their work. They refer to these loose relations among members as network of practice (Brown and Duguid, 2001). Nonetheless, Wenger explicitly argues that a CofP differs from a network,
because a CofP is not just a set of relationships, rather it is ‘about’ something (1998:4). CofP is about shared practice where members engage in a collective process of learning (Wenger, 1998:4). This leads us to the discussion about the scale of a CofP.

The CofP framework has been used extensively in sociolinguistics to examine identity construction and maintenance processes. However, the CofP framework has been suggested as not fully providing the theoretical and analytical tools for capturing the underlying perspectives of the practices that individuals undertake (Angouri, 2018). The fact that a group of people come together and engage in a collective activity over a period of time, does not necessarily mean that they understand and question the things that they do and why. Local norms are sometimes overlooked and a group of people who do not commit to one another and engage in a certain activity are categorised by the researcher as a CofP. The analytical considerations regarding the harmony of practices in the communities are important, but I am not interested in that line of inquiry. King (2019) discusses the development and history of the CofP model, its applications in various research areas such as gender, ethnicity, workplace discourse, language learning, and online/offline discourse, as well as criticisms and controversies surrounding the framework. King (2019) emphasises the need to preserve the CofP framework's rigour and empirical foundations and calls for a renewed emphasis on the work it necessitates.

In conclusion, the concepts of a ‘community of practice’ and a ‘community of imagination’ are both relevant to diaspora associations and diasporas in general. Fundamentally, diaspora associations can be seen as communities of practice, as they involve a shared domain of interest and a common goal. The concept of a community of imagination is also relevant to diasporas in terms of how they function as it describes how people engage in social learning through their shared imagination of a better future. While the former is more relevant to understanding the formation of communities under diasporas, the latter is more associated with how they function in practice. These concepts have important implications for diaspora communities, they also have some limitations. Therefore, following the social constructivist
paradigm, interactions can be further investigated as the essential elements for a group membership and the presentation of a group to the public (De Fina, 2007) in order to capture the diversity of experiences within these communities. Further research is needed to fully understand the dynamics of diaspora associations and how they can be effectively mobilized to achieve their goals. Diaspora associations serve as forums for members to engage in regular interactions, share experiences, and exchange information, nurturing a sense of belonging and collective learning. These CofPs enable diasporas to convert their dispersed populations into vibrant networks of mutual support and cultural preservation by creating spaces where individuals can actively participate, learn from one another, and collectively work towards their common goals. These communities provide a vital link to the concept of 'home,' allowing diaspora members to maintain a sense of rootedness, cultural continuity, and a shared conception of what 'home' means to them across different geographical boundaries. I next turn to this critical concept for diaspora research, that of 'home'.
2.2. Home

Investigating the diaspora’s strong, nostalgic links with their ancestral home or homeland has been an area of interest in sociology, anthropology, human geography, migration studies (e.g., King and Christou, 2011), business (e.g., Gillespie et al., 1999), psychology, and history. In both traditional and modern diaspora research, the notions of home and homeland are overemphasised as they are believed to be the focal point of (dis)placement or dispersal.

My research project adopts a more context-sensitive approach to the study of communities of people who may or may not share a country of origin and often self-identify as part of a diaspora. This does not necessarily mean that the notion of home does not have an importance; on the contrary, the notion of home plays a significant role in modern diaspora research. I approach the notion of home as a mythical place, where the members claim their membership by active participation and have a common ‘we feeling’ (Brah, 1996). This is highly associated with a sense of mutual belonging and obligation to each other (Antonsich, 2010).

It is worthwhile investigating the close relationship between both the notion of home and the sense of belonging. Next, I will study this relationship and their emphasis in this thesis.

2.2.1. Where is home?

In early diaspora studies, the close link between diaspora and displacement implemented the idea that people would disperse from a place of origin – a homeland, where it is assumed their home is. The contemporary understanding of the notion of ‘home’, however, is packed with a collection of lived experiences and close social relationships (Cohen, 2007; Mallett, 2004). Various scholars have explored house and/or home and its symbolic meanings and purpose (e.g., Bourdieu, 1973; Cunningham, 1973; Errington, 1979; Rapoport, 1969). In Bourdieu’s (1973) famous study on home, he investigates the symbolic spatiality of home. Initially, he defines house as ‘ [...] a kind of microcosm organized by the same oppositions and homologies that order the whole universe and stands in a relation of homology to the rest of the universe’ (p.104).
Instead of seeing home as a fixed place, Brah (1996) asserts that home is a mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination. Similarly, Karim (2003:2) stresses that ‘all diasporas do not have homeland myths at the centre of their consciousness’. According to Brah (1996), ‘home’ should be understood as the place of desire.

Where is home? On the one hand, ‘home’ is a mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination. In this sense it is a place of no return, even if it is possible to visit the geographical territory that is seen as the place of ‘origin’. On the other hand, home is also the lived experience of a locality. Its sounds and smells, its heat and dust, balmy summer evenings, or the excitement of the first snowfall, shivering winter evenings, sombre grey skies in the middle of the day … all this, as mediated by the historically specific every day or social relations.

(Brah, 1996:192).

Taking a more dynamic approach, Brah (1996) criticises these discourses around fixed origins. One of his arguments is based on the distinction between ‘a homing desire’ and ‘a desire for homeland’.

Furthermore, the recent approaches to the concept of home in diasporas is much more complex than defining home as the ancestral homeland (Fazal and Tsagarousianou, 2002; Tsagarousianou, 2004). As Tsagarousianou (2004) puts it ‘the notion of home [therefore] is much more complex than approaches to diasporas premised on the power of nostalgia would want us believe’. Nevertheless, Marcu (2014) argues that nostalgic and emotional spaces of home affect how identity is constructed and reconstructed.
As illustrated in Figure 4, ideas of ‘home’ come in a variety of ways. Home can be regarded as a physical place and also it bears symbolic ideas of ‘Heimat’. The untranslatable German word of Heimat is highly associated with the English word ‘home’. Morley (2001) sees home as the *heimlich* place where people feel they are emotionally attached and associates Heimat with the spaces of belonging and also identity. He emphasises that home is not only a physical space but also refers to the rhetorical and virtual space. This is useful to know because in diasporas home is the place that individuals construct in their minds; it is where individuals construct an imagined reality of the feeling of being at ‘home’ (Blunt and Dowling, 2006). As such, Bernhard Schlink (2000) claims that Heimat is Utopia. He investigates the relationship between Heimat and place, and claims that Heimat is actually a *No-place* (I used that term earlier in framing the TC relationship with home), therefore Utopia. He argues that ‘the very relationship between Heimat and Place - birthplace and childhood home, places of happy memories, places in which people live, dwell, work, enjoy the company of family and friends - the complexity of this very relationship ensures that Heimat can never be assigned a proper place. It is neither one place nor another. Heimat is No-place, *ou τόπος*. Heimat is Utopia’ (Schlink, 2000:34).

Such an encompassing argument leads the reader to consider the very well-known, yet enigmatic phrase - *there’s no place like home*. On the one hand the phrase implies that home is the best and no other place can offer what the home has to offer, such as safety, joy and happiness. On the other hand, the phrase can be interpreted in the opposite way. As Friedman (2004:192) states:

> Nowhere is there a place like home. Home is a never never land of dreams and desire. Home is utopia - a no place, a nowhere, an imaginary space longed for, always already lost in the very formation of the idea of home (Friedman, 2004:192).

This is a powerful way of thinking of home as it makes home non-existent without individuals’ constructions of ideals, emotions and their relationships with each other and also with the space they reside in.

With regard to senses and places associated with home, Mallett (2004), in her paper, critically reviews the understanding of home in the extant literature. She
questions ‘whether or not home is (a) place(s), (a) space(s), feeling(s), practices, and/or an active state of being in the world?’. Similar to the feeling that the German word ‘Heimat’ conveys, again an untranslatable Portuguese term ‘Saudade’ can be used in a similar context. According to Dicionário Houaiss da Língua Portuguesa (Houaiss Dictionary of the Portuguese Language), it particularly refers to ‘a somewhat melancholic feeling of incompleteness. It is related to thinking back on situations of privation due to the absence of someone or something, to move away from a place or thing, or to the absence of a set of particular and desirable experiences and pleasures once lived’. It is used in relation to the deep emotion felt due to the absence of a beloved one or thing, or being absent from a special place. In this study home is seen as a space of peace and comfort as well as a place where people can develop a sense of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

In this project, home is understood to be a material and socially constructed place, which brings together people who self-identify as family or friends. Home is understood to be closely associated with the sense of belonging and togetherness, and is closely related to place-belongingness. A sense of belonging promotes a sense of completeness, oneness. This feeling of togetherness – ‘we feeling’ – can be regarded as the milestone for building a community. Figure 5 illustrates the interrelation of notions that are associated with home and belonging.

![Figure 5: Interrelation of notions associated with home and belonging](image-url)
Next, I will explore the process of place-making in diasporas, and what is understood by space and place in relation to the place-belongingness.

2.3. Space and Place
The reviewed literature in this section is particularly related to the emergent focus of this research project on diaspora organisations. The concepts of space and place are highly relevant and significant to diaspora associations because they serve as the basis for the formation of diaspora communities, providing a common ground for people with similar cultural backgrounds and experiences to come together and develop a sense of belonging. Additionally, space and place are essential for the preservation of cultural traditions and practices (Bradley and Simpson, 2020; Higgins, 2017). Diaspora associations frequently utilise physical locations, such as community centres and places of worship, to conduct cultural events and activities and provide services and support to members of their communities. These spaces serve to strengthen cultural ties and facilitate intergenerational learning and the exchange of knowledge (Kozminska and Zhu, 2021; Matras et al. 2022). Diaspora associations frequently utilise physical and virtual spaces to organise and mobilise around issues affecting their communities, including immigration policy, human rights, and social justice. Diaspora communities can amplify their voices and advocate for change by congregating in shared spaces (Higgins, 2017). Overall, space and place play an integral role in human experience and it is particularly relevant to diaspora context.

A space can hold multiple spatial experiences, due to the varying and instinctive perception of each individual. People interact with each other and they (co-)create a place within a space (Low, 1996). Therefore, in the case of diaspora organisations members of the diaspora experience the space of associations and they individually as well as collectively undergo a place-making process (Huang and Roberts, 2019; Thissen and Cornips, 2021). This process puts them in constant negotiation for access and belonging. They negotiate who is in or left out, who has access or is eligible. Insiderness and outsiderness are considered as senses of place, which are closely associated with the notion of belongingness and how people identify both with themselves
and others (Dervin, 2016; Keith and Pile, 2004). Therefore, the notions of space and place play a curial role in constructing the diaspora community and how this is practiced is relevant to experiences of the members in diaspora associations. I look at the notion of belonging from a spatial perspective and take place-making as a process and place-belonging as its interrelated product. The reviewed literature in this section is particularly related to the emergent focus of this research project on diaspora organisations.

Next, I will discuss the theoretical underpinnings of the foundational concepts of space and place and relate them to the place-making process in modern diasporas.

### 2.3.1. Theoretical conceptualisation of space and place

Space and place has attracted a lot of attention in social sciences. As a small example Hubbard and Kitchin (2010) edited a volume which highlights the work of over 65 key thinkers on space and place, and others followed since Anderson (1983). Linguistics is not an exception (e.g., Auer et al., 2013; Georgiou, 2001; Johnstone, 2011; Keating, 2015; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013; O’Rourke, 2022; Scollon and Scollon, 2003) and the list would be longer if space and place are taken broadly to be always integral in language and language use.

Earlier studies assumed that societies, communities, and their features ‘belonged’ to a single particular geographical area (e.g., Blommaert, 2010:63); however, this view has been challenged in so many ways. As such, the flows, trajectories, movements and relative spatiality of culture are emphasised to illustrate the dynamic nature of space (Blommaert, 2010:63). In our globalised world, mobility is a characteristic of society and hence the shared spaces are becoming more and more diverse, even superdiverse. Superdiversity is a notion proposed by Vertovec (2007) and is used for the diversification of diversity through global migration. It is characterised by ‘a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants’ (Vertovec, 2007:1024). In superdiverse cities, (e.g., London, Berlin), people tend to negotiate the epistemic boundaries of their
contact zones through practices, and experience the place by adding meaning and senses to it. Therefore, within the scope of this research project, it is worthwhile exploring how people experience the space and create a place within that space.

Although not all linguists distinguish between space and place, in the context of my study, I make a distinction between space and place (e.g. Lefebvre 1991). This is because I lay emphasis on the place-making process which handles the transformation of spaces into places through human practices. In this research, I understand space as an imaginary construct, where the individual reality is abstract. It is where everything exists but lacks specified connections with lived experiences, meanings and values. In contrast, place is understood to be where everything holds a meaning and carries emotional attachment. In line with Soja (1996), I identify places as interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and represented.

Next, I will discuss how spaces and places are individually conceptualised.

### 2.3.2. Space

According to De Certeau (1984) and Harvey (1996), space is essentially abstract and exists detached from the human interpretation of a particular place, therefore it is considered as placelessness. According to Gee (2005), space refers to the place, literally or figuratively, where people interact with each other (Gee, 2005:214-15). Thus, space is anything and anywhere, while place is an internalised, embodied part of reality.

According to Soja (1989:79-80), ‘space in itself may be primordially given, but the organisation, and meaning of space is a product of social translation, transformation, and experience’. Similarly, Lefebvre (1991) acknowledges that space is abstract, but it is not free from human influence. For Lefebvre, space is a notion the value of which is given by humans (Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain, 2013). This is in line with discourse approaches to space and place, which suggests its construction through ongoing mutual engagement (Keating, 2015).
Space is in a constant process of production in relation to the conceived and perceived spaces; it is negotiated between those two forms. Spatial practices are both being shaped and shaping individuals’ perceptions and uses of space (McCann, 1999:173). This materialised physical spatiality shapes people’s ‘action spaces’ in their everyday lives (Soja, 1996:75). Therefore, it can contain all real and imagined spaces at the same time (Soja, 1996). It can be argued that place is then space, which is filled by people, practices and representations, and becomes place. In line with this argumentation, I turn next to conceptualisations of place.

2.3.3. Place

More recently, a distinction is drawn between the concepts of place and space. Gieryn (2000) collates in his article several literatures that are rarely connected and presents the use of place and space in sociology and human geography. He investigates the sociology of how places emerge and gain a meaning for social life. With regard to the definition of a place he proposes three essential features:

1) Geographic location

Gieryn characterises places as ‘a unique spot in the universe’ (2000:464). This is related to place being a geographic location, which has tangible boundaries such as: a room, building, a village, a city, a borough.

2) Material form

The notion of place is also related to people’s perception of physical space (Gieryn, 2000). Physical objects as well as political entities are associated with geographic space which is tangible and can be measured. The physical aspect of place is prominent when a place is considered to be ‘stuff’ (Gieryn, 2000:465), which has a form of materiality.

3) Investment with meaning and value

It is through those material forms that social practices such as power, collective action and inequality happen. That is to say when a set of practices is performed at a particular space, those spaces become loaded with meaning.
and value and turn into places. This brings us to the third essential feature proposed by Gieryn (2000) — investment with meaning and value. What makes a place is the meaning and value which is invested by the people who use that place. Therefore, it can be claimed that places are constructed (Gieryn, 2000). Yet, a single place can bear multiple meanings and values. To that end, place is flexible, malleable over time and constantly negotiated by its users, as place ‘can be reduced and expanded almost line by line and episode by episode’ (Blommaert, 2010:75-6).

The role of users of place becomes an essential part of the place-making process. The users of place can be community members, where they negotiate access and membership. Symbolic meanings that are attached to their spatial environment are given by the users of the spaces. A community space then becomes their place of interaction and socialisation. Therefore, it is fair to say that places exist only when they are loaded with meanings.

The word ‘place’ is used in conjunction with human activities (Schmidt, 2011). It can be concluded that place is represented and enacted by its inhabitants (Blommaert, 2010:63). As such, in his work, De Certeau (1988:118) uses the terms space and place the opposite way to what I do in my research, and illustrates that places can transform into spaces through human practices, i.e., the people walking in a street which is transformed into a ‘practiced’ place. I understand what he calls place in defining it as the space and align it with my own thinking. In light with that, street being a geographic location, which can be linguistically identified by giving names to it, is transformed into place by people’s human practice. Place is what it becomes when all the meanings and values attach to a particular space.

Table 3: Development of concepts in space and place research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical framework</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Authors cited (adapted from Beidler, 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place interpretation of environmental attributes (relies</td>
<td>Focus is on ‘genius loci’ or ‘spirit of place’ and other symbolic value of</td>
<td>Ignores other attributes of place i.e. social interaction</td>
<td>Green, 1999; Lewis, 1979; Norberg-Schultz, 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relph (1976) identifies that place has three elements: the physical structure, activities that take place there and the meaning individuals give to it. Some academics theorising about the notion of place (e.g., Beidler and Morrison, 2015; Johnstone, 2011; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013; Massey, 1994), argue that place-making is a dynamic process and has a determinative power to decide who counts as ‘one of us or them, an insider or outsider’, who belongs or is left out, and also to draw the boundaries of localities. Beidler (2007) traced the development of concepts in space and place research and categorised them as shown in Table 3.

No matter how space and place are defined in the literature, the common ground around this topic is the human practice is the integral part of the transition for meaning. I call this process the place-making process. In this

| on existential ‘sensing’) (physical attributes) | the landscape – assumes that interpretive knowledge is central to the experience of place. | and activities in the locale |
| Social construction (activities) | Focus is on experiences and daily routine, human behaviours, activities that explain how individuals construct a sense of place | Environmental and affective dimensions of place are considered important; however, activities are central to their conception |
| Place perception-positivistic environmental-behaviour methodology (meaning) | Sense of place is a multi-dimensional attitude towards a spatial setting | The development of affective dimensions of a sense of place and the means of quantifying these spatial responses |

Relph (1976) identifies that place has three elements: the physical structure, activities that take place there and the meaning individuals give to it. Some academics theorising about the notion of place (e.g., Beidler and Morrison, 2015; Johnstone, 2011; Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013; Massey, 1994), argue that place-making is a dynamic process and has a determinative power to decide who counts as ‘one of us or them, an insider or outsider’, who belongs or is left out, and also to draw the boundaries of localities. Beidler (2007) traced the development of concepts in space and place research and categorised them as shown in Table 3.

No matter how space and place are defined in the literature, the common ground around this topic is the human practice is the integral part of the transition for meaning. I call this process the place-making process. In this
process, spaces are discursively constructed in interaction (Dailey-O’Cain and Liebscher, 2011). Those spaces which are transformed into places gain concrete embodiment. Blommaert (2005:222) argues that ‘[…] senses of belonging, property rights, and authority can be projected’ on those into place transformed spaces. This is consistent with discourse approaches to space and place which suggests its construction through ongoing reciprocity (Keating, 2015). This process of placemaking is highly visible in diaspora organisations, as they provide spaces where members undergo mutual activities, can articulate who they are, share experience and guard the boundaries of the community. The section 5.6.1. elaborates on a synthesis of the literature review on place-making and habitual practices prior to the presentation of findings of data collected at the diaspora associations.

Placemaking, as a concept closely intertwined with belonging, emphasizes the active engagement of individuals in shaping and defining the spaces they inhabit. Individuals and communities contribute to the creation of meaningful and inclusive environments that foster a sense of belonging through habitual practices. By actively participating in the association meetings and taking part in the weekly activities, individuals assert their agency in recontextualizing spaces that reflect their individual and collective identities and aspirations, thereby enhancing their sense of belonging and attachment to a particular location. This reciprocal relationship between placemaking and belonging highlights the dynamic nature of both processes and the profound influence the constructed environment can have on shaping the inclusion and rootedness of communities. In the following section, I review in detail work by Yuval-Davis that influenced my own thinking and framing of the concepts of community membership and belonging.

2.4. Belonging

In the contexts of any form of migration, belonging is widely discussed as a central notion. The term belonging can be viewed as a straightforward, literal concept; however, its meaning and interpretation is contested widely by many scholars across different fields (see Lähdesmäki et al., 2016 for a review). The term is used by human geographers (Antonsich, 2010; Ho, 2006; Winders,
2007; 2013), sociologists (Bakkær Simonsen, 2017; Clark, 2009; McNevin, 2006), anthropologists (Getrich, 2008), political scientists (Clark, 2009; Hampshire, 2005; Mason, 2000) and in applied linguistics (Jansson, 2021; Kirilova and Angouri, 2017; Lee, 2015). According to Antonsich (2010) the term belonging is vaguely defined, ill-theorised and multidimensional (Antonsich, 2010; Delanty et al., 2008; Skrbiš et al., 2007). In the next paragraphs, I will provide an overview of the terms closely associated to the term belonging with the overall aim of justifying the definition adopted in this study.

2.4.1. Conceptualisations of belonging

For some, belonging is a synonym for individuals’ or group identity; for others it represents a term closely associated with the notion of citizenship and also covers the notions of ‘[…], nationhood, gender, ethnicity and emotional dimensions of status or attachment’ (Croucher (2004) and Hartnell (2006) quoted in Bhimji, 2008:414). Some scholars make a distinction between a personal, intimate level of belonging, such as a feeling of being ‘at home’ and a discursive and formal level of belonging which enables individuals to claim, reject, or resist their sense of belonging (e.g., Antonsich, 2010; Davis et al., 2018; Fenster, 2005; Krzyżanowski and Wodak, 2008; Yuval-Davis, 2006; 2010). It is about emotional attachment, feelings of being at home, safe and secure (Waite and Cook, 2011; Wood and Waite, 2011). It denotes not only the positive and warm feelings but also the feelings such as shame, agony and pain (Hessel, 2010).

In this study, in adapting Yuval-Davis’ (2006) conceptualisation, I look at the term ‘belonging’ at two levels. Level one is called *notion of belonging* and it centres on personal emotions of feeling at home. Antonsich (2010) calls this part ‘place-belongingness’ as it relates to a place where individuals develop feelings and experience the world. Level two, *politics of belonging*, ‘compromises specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging in themselves being constructed by these projects in very particular ways’ (Yuval-Davis, 2006:197). This second level relates to the political level of
belonging where belonging is also discursively enacted and inclusions and exclusions are negotiated.

Belonging plays a pivotal role to explicate the intrinsic dynamics in modern diasporas. Particularly for this research project, I concentrate on how belonging is claimed and indexed through any interactional encounter. Therefore, I provide a detailed account of the process of establishing, negotiating and maintaining membership through claims of (non-)belonging. Figure 6 illustrates how according to Yuval-Davis (2006) belonging is constituted on various levels.
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The strength of Yuval-Davis’ conceptualisation originates from the differentiation between the notion of belonging and the politics of belonging, whereas previous research dealt with personal and formal under one roof. Next, I focus on and explore the two analytical levels of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006).
Level One: Notion of belonging

The first of the two analytical levels comprises the emotional feeling and the intimate and personal attachments (either to a particular place or to an artefact). Belonging is seen as ‘a desire for becoming other’, which is about a longing for someone/something else (Probyn, 1996:5). This stresses the dynamic nature of belonging. It is not a pre-existing notion; rather it is constantly evolving and changing. It can take many forms and can be influenced through interaction over time. In light of these, individuals index their membership by claiming (rejecting) belonging (Angouri et al., 2020).

Furthermore, belonging indicates a process rather than a fixed entity, because individuals ‘do belonging’ (Bennett, 2013; Skrbiš et al., 2007). Bell (1999) sees belonging as a performative achievement. According to Yuval-Davis, ‘belonging is always a dynamic process, not a reified fixity, which is only a neutralized construction of a particular hegemonic form of power relations’ (2006:199). Cuervo and Wyn (2014:912) also perceive belonging as a process and oppose the idea of belonging being ‘a fixed property that becomes firm once it has been attained’. In the same fashion, Benson (2014) stresses the multiplicity and intersectionality in the process of developing belonging. Benson (2014:3110) further states belonging is ‘a messy and uncertain process, fractured along a range of axes and social fields.’

According to Yuval-Davis (2006:199), the notion of belonging is constructed on three sublevels. These three interrelated sublevels are:

- social locations,
- individuals’ identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities or groupings,
- ethical and political values.

In the next paragraphs, I focus on these three sublevels which together make up the notion of belonging.

Social Locations

The first level is related to social locations, which is closely related to power relations in society; whole life experience and practices, where people interact and influence each other’s lives. People’s perceptions of themselves take
place in social locations. When investigating those, an intersectional approach is needed for analysis of social locations due to human interaction being in a constant state of flux and ever-changing dynamics of power relations. Bugg (2014) refers to such dynamics as ‘intersecting systems’ and emphasises the intersectional negotiations and frictions between gender, religion and ethnicity. Yuval-Davis (2006) puts forward three relevant points to the intersectionality of social locations.

Firstly, she claims that the social location is constructed on multiple levels and an individual’s specific positioning, which is affected by social divisions such as gender, class, race and ethnicity etc. For example, an individual can identify herself only as a woman. This is a distinct identity category, whereas simultaneously her identity as a woman is positioned on multiple levels, and this is when her tangible social location is constructed. In line with current thinking in social sciences in general, the importance of intersectionality when analysing the social locations is foregrounded here.

Secondly, it is emphasised that these various social divisions are all interrelated and cannot be analysed as lone standing items. In an example, Yuval-Davis (2006) mentions that being a woman shows differences from one place to another depending on the group membership. This clearly emphasises that social divisions do not bear concrete meaning and they are context-specific.

Thirdly, and the final point, is the challenging nature of describing social location. How and what determines the particularities of social location cannot be predetermined and simplified. It is all related to and hinged upon trajectories of interactants, and the power relationships between individuals and localities, which are closely constructed by various members of society (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

To close this section, I discussed the three dimensions of social locations which can be listed as multiplicity, interrelatedness and the undefinable nature of social locations. This is important for my research project because social locations are influential in drawing epistemic boundaries round the understanding of self in diasporic communities. I am also examining the
diasporic organizations as significant social locations for claiming membership and engaging in the process of place-belonging (Kozminska and Zhu, 2021). These community spaces provide vital platforms for the members of the diaspora to communicate and articulate who they are and navigate their sense of belonging to the TC diaspora. These are all related to how the members of the community identify themselves and the others around them and how they are emotionally attached to their community. This brings us to the second analytical level of the notion of belonging, which I will discuss further next.

**Identifications and emotional attachments**
The second analytical level of the notion of belonging relates to individuals’ identifications and emotional attachments to various collectivities and groupings. Such identifications are often narratives of selves and the other. In most cases, they are in relation to how individuals perceive and position themselves and at the same time the other. In the same vein, narratives of identifications can be about self-other positioning and also claims to or rejections of group memberships. Identity narratives are related to the past, to a myth of origin and can be changed, contested and multiplied in reference to the present and also would affect how the future trajectories are shaped. This stresses the evolving nature of identity. Yuval-Davis (2006) stresses the complexity of identity as she notes identities are in transmission. She emphasises the continuous change and negotiation of identities in narratives in the form of a ‘combined process of being and becoming, belonging and longing to belong’ (Yuval-Davis, 2006:202).

We see that Yuval-Davis pays attention to identities in detail; in contrast, Probyn (1996) questions the statements that are made about identity and puts forward that the notion of belonging ‘captures more accurately the desire for some sort of attachment, be it to other people, places, or modes of being, and the ways in which individuals and groups are caught within wanting to belong, wanting to become, a process that is fuelled by yearning rather than the positing of identity as a stable state’ (Probyn, 1996:19). In his book Place and Placelessness, Relph (1976) explores people’s identity of and with place. By
the identity of a place, he refers to its ‘persistent sameness and unity which allows that [place] to be differentiated from others’ (Relph, 1976:45). He points out that the following components form the persistent identity:

1. the place’s physical setting;
2. its activities, situations, and events;
3. the individual and group meanings created through people’s experiences and intentions in regard to that place.

According to Relph (1976:141), places are ‘significant centres of our immediate experiences of world’. This denotes the meaning that places are experienced intensely and individuals identify themselves with place. This is an example of insiderness; it means the attachment, engagement and togetherness, belongingness. In contrast, outsiderness is when individuals feel alienated, threatened and left out (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina, 2011; Marra and Angouri, 2011; Seamon and Sowers, 2008).

Emotional attachments are also of great importance when constructing belonging. According to Anthias, ‘belonging is [...] more about experiences of being part of the social fabric and the ways in which social bonds and ties are manifested in practices, experiences and emotions of inclusion’ (2008:8). Deslandes et al. (2012), Kobayashi (2014) and Kobayashi and Preston (2007) emphasise the importance of family ties as a social bond in the context of migration. Anthias (2008) argues that the spatial belonging is shaped in relation to social relationships as part of everyday life. Developing a sense of belonging to a particular place can be regarded as a temporal process. Individuals negotiate their sense of belonging in and through time in various places. Therefore, belonging is also spatially constructed. However, it is not bound to a single place because it consists of simultaneous place attachments. Thus it can be said that belonging is ‘multi-sited’ (Bennett, 2013; Marcu, 2014). Since belonging is a process, individuals’ sense of belonging to one or more places may develop partially; this leads to the feeling of ‘in-betweenness’ (Angouri et al., 2020; Huot et al., 2014) which will be shown in the practices in diasporic associations.
**Ethical and political values**

The third and final level, ethical and political values, concerns the ways in which various claims and constructions of belonging or non-belonging ‘are valued and judged’ (Yuval-Davis, 2006:202). As mentioned above, these three levels are interrelated. Yuval-Davis (2006) argues that the first two analytical levels, social locations, and identifications and emotional attachments, feed into this third level and all these levels are interdependent.

In this level, we can observe how social locations are utilised, and how and by whom such utilisation is permitted or accessed. Who defines the boundaries of social locations, and how narratives of identities are shaped by the users of that particular complex system are the issues for how ethical and political values are estimated. In relation to the sheer complexity of this dimension, Poe et al. (2014) put forward a framework called ‘relational ecologies of belonging’, which deals with the abstract territories of communities of belonging and the power relationships of those within these territories. They highlight that ‘who and what belongs in a specific place is not a reflection of essential nature, but rather arises from the interplay of human and more than human agencies with sociocultural, political, and ecological contingencies’ (Poe et al., 2014:914).

This level is of great importance and is relevant to my thesis when analysing especially the association data. The presumptuous attitude towards the newcomer, the distinct roles and power displays of the Chair and the steering committee proved to be influential factors for claims of belonging in the associations. Such an interplay of human agencies dynamically leads us to the matter of the politics of belonging, which I explain next.

**Level Two: Politics of belonging**

Yuval-Davis’s the politics of belonging encompasses contestations of belonging and membership, as well as access and entitlement. Place-belongingness is enacted by the politics, social circle and spatial access, all of which are unquestionably achieved through language. The role of politics is very evident in people’s understanding of the place that they reside in, where they chose to live, how they pursue their lives, and also at which places they come into contact with others, e.g.; their choice of friends is influenced by their ideologies. This relates to the *politics of belonging* (Yuval-Davis, 2006).
Ideologies can be political and shaped by individuals’ or groups’ trajectories. The politics of belonging ‘compromises specific political projects aimed at constructing belonging in themselves being constructed by these projects in very particular ways’ (Yuval-Davis, 2006:197). It relates to the political level of belonging where belonging is also discursively enacted and inclusions and exclusions are negotiated.

With regard to political agents and the notion of belonging, the question of citizenship is highly debated. Yuval-Davis (2006) questions the membership’s rights and responsibilities in the context of the politics of belonging. She argues that membership is politically driven. Membership is a two-sided process. The first side concerns individuals’ participation and devotion to the group that they wish to become part of. The second side is the opposite, where there are the core members of the group (Lave and Wenger, 1991). These core members have the power to grant access to ‘others’ and also entitle them to become part of the group. This two-sided process is a socially negotiated and contested ‘resource allocation, social positioning and political identity’ (Anthias, 2008:9).

Not only are the relational dimensions of inclusion and exclusion (Gerharz, 2014), as well as access and participation (Anthias, 2002, 2009) all related terms to the notion of belonging. Lähdesmäki et al. (2016) state that the dimensions of exclusion and non-belonging are discussed in a limited number of academic articles (e.g., see Harris and Gandolfo, 2014), whereas the emphasis is given to inclusion and participation. In my thesis, I pay attention to the discursive construction of (non-)belonging. Therefore, inclusion and exclusion are equally important and emergent in the construction of ‘we-ness’ and ‘otherness’ (Anthias, 2008).

In sum, I discussed the main concepts that shaped the understanding of belonging in this thesis. Attention was paid to the understanding of the factors that influence individuals’ development of belonging. This section has also shown the various levels politics involved in the development of belonging, as it is a multisided process. Most of the work I found influential does not come from Linguistics. I believe bringing together the social understanding of the dynamics of diasporas with the power of linguistic framing and analysis has
great potential for deepening our understanding of how members do belonging. I unpack this position further in the discussion and concluding parts of the thesis.

Next, I shift the focus on the notion of identity as it is closely related to claims of belonging in a modern diaspora context.

2.5. Identity

In this section, I focus on the contemporary theorisation of the notion of identity in relation to the modern diasporas; I also explain why I decided not to adopt identity as the main and core ‘pole’ around which I build the thesis. In line with Sociolinguistic classic and current research (from Holmes, 1997 to Angouri, 2015; Angouri and Marra, 2010, and Holmes et al., 2011) identities are seen as discursively enacted and negotiated. This is in line with the social constructionist perspective, which studies the construction of identities as a constantly evolving and developing process (Holmes, 2000).

According to De Fina (2010:205) research on identity has seen ‘a profound change in the theoretical paradigm’. Angouri (2016) provides two conceptualisations of identity in the field of linguistics:

1) An essentialist and positivist view of identity
2) A social constructionist perspective of identity.

In the earlier sociolinguistic theorisation of identity, identity was seen as a well-established specification of an individual or group (Schiffrin, 1996b). This view is in line with the essentialist view of identity.

In line with the social constructionist perspective, individuals contribute towards creation of their perceived social reality and identity. Therefore, identity is related to the emotional state of self-expression and developing a sense of belonging. This is associated with how the world around us is perceived and how membership is claimed by an individual. According to Jenkins (2004:5) ‘identity is our understanding of who we are and of who other people are, and reciprocally, other people’s understanding of themselves and of others (which includes us)’. De Fina (2016) states that identity is not only expressed by language but is also constructed. Identity is a concept which is
difficult to frame. It can be used in various settings and endless definitions can be found. Therefore, in the section that follows I will discuss the notion of identity in relation to self-identification. I will look into the close link between the discursive enactment of identities and claims of belonging in the forthcoming sections.

2.5.1. Approaches to identity

Identities are seen as ‘a sense of belonging to a distinct ethnic, cultural or subcultural group’ (Kidd, 2002:26). Antaki and Widdicombe (1998) argue about the emergence of identity in talk-in-interaction. Such an interactional approach pays more attention to the complexity of identity and argues that identity is not a fixed quality of an individual. Members of the diaspora are exposed to constant identity negotiation in relation to culture-specific perceptions in their daily practices and in their choice of interaction. I adopt such an interactional approach and conceptualise identity as a process that is negotiated and co-constructed through discourse (Bamberg, 2006 and 2011; Bamberg et al., 2011; Schiffrin, 1996b).

In their article, Story and Walker (2016) mention that in a contemporary identity research context, identity can be explored from two perspectives such as:

1) Identity as a defining characteristic for an individual or a group, which is something distinctive but also evolving. It can be compared to the notion of self.

2) Identity as ‘specific sets of characteristics, expressed in particular ways, to which both individuals and groups may subscribe in order to emphasize who they are and to distinguish themselves from others’ (Story and Walker, 2016:138).

In both the above-mentioned perspectives, identity is seen as dynamic, changing and in constant negotiation. They are also in accordance with recent research on identity, which focuses more on the active construction, negotiation and performance of social categories such as social class and gender, rather than social categories being determinants of individuals’ identities (Lowry, 2023).

Bucholtz and Hall (2005:586) mention that ‘identity is the social positioning of self and other’. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) relate identity to sameness and distinction. The construction of one’s self is not only a social product but is also manifested in the actions taken in daily life. Along the same line Dewey defines the self as ‘something [that is not] ready-made, but something in continuous formation through choice of action’ (1916:408).

My project focuses on how place-belongingness is done by the self-identified members of the diaspora by choosing to be members of the community (or not). Identity is, evidently, always related to self-other identification and it has implications for the construction of place-belonging in diaspora. I discuss this next.

2.5.2. Diaspora identity

A large and growing body of literature has investigated the notion of identity and undeniably there is an unambiguous relationship between the notion of identity and the concept of the diaspora. Fazal and Tsagarousianou (2002) stress this strong relationship and claim that ‘today, the concept of diaspora is inseparable from the process of maintaining and negotiating and in some cases reinventing cultural identities’ (p.6). Hall describes diaspora identities as ‘those which are constantly producing and reproducing themselves anew, through transformation and difference’ (1990:235).

Butler (2001) clarifies that diaspora’s characteristics become evident based on the context in which people and groups identify themselves. She also draws upon the fact of existence of multiple diasporic identities even within a single diaspora. Similarly, Angouri (2012) claims that identities transcend essential roots, undergo continuous changes, and morph into new identities. This stresses the fluidity of the notion and context-specific process of identification.
Overall, the literature on identity is vast and for some, identity is a different field (Elliott, 2019). In this thesis, I do not use identity as a theoretical and analytical concept. I prefer belonging and membership as the guiding concepts and therefore my engagement with the vast literature on identity is brief. To conclude the sense of belonging and self-awareness constructs a group’s collective identity. The complexity of the concept of belonging is related to the fluidity of neighbouring and related categories such as ‘local’, ‘national’ and ‘transnational’ (Angouri, 2012). Studies have shown that language, religion, and customs are often associated with the homeland. However, this is not monolithic as diasporic identities are as complex as all other collective identities. What is also clear from this short review (compared to the vast field) is that identity is a ‘macro concept’ (Angouri, 2015). It carries different meanings in different studies and contexts, and it also carries significant first order meanings. As I will show my participants refer to their individual and collective ‘identities’ in different contexts and interactions. This will be shown in the data chapters later.

Next, I move onto the methodology chapter of this thesis.
3 Research Methodology

This chapter presents the research paradigm and tradition, research design, data collection process and the methods of analysis for the study. It is organised within four sections and provides the reader with the rationale of the decisions as well as the framing of the data chapters that follow.

3.1. Research paradigm and research tradition

This study follows the paradigm of social constructionism and situates itself within the ethnographic tradition.

One of the central ideas in social constructionism is that human life is a social construct and is constructed through social and interpersonal influences (Berger and Luckman, 1966; Robson, 2002). Investigating how diasporic communities make sense of the world that they construct and live in, required an analysis of human interaction. Social constructionism contributed to my understanding of how diasporic reality is socially constructed and how experience varies depending on the context.

Ethnography is a qualitative orientation to research, requiring researcher participation and close participant observation at interaction sites (Agar, 2006). With this in mind, I sought to provide a detailed account from the ‘insider’s view’ of the ways in which members of the diaspora interact with one another, negotiate their belonging to the TC diasporic community and claim membership. Adopting an ethnographic approach to research it especially advantageous for my project, because it not only enables me to conduct micro-analysis (see Chapters 6 and 7), but also delve into macro-level discourses (Angouri, 2018). I attempted to comprehend aspects of social world, given that I perceive belonging as a performative act, which is done in relation to the community spaces within the diaspora context.

I adopted an ethnographic approach to research, as it provided access to the spaces and processes through which people negotiate meaning and make sense of their lives (Teerling, 2015) and comprehend their own perspective. As Denzin and Lincoln suggest (1994) the rationale for using such a methodology can be summarised as follows:
• Research questions are exploratory in nature therefore they require an approach that allows for in-depth qualitative enquiry;
• Research questions cannot be studied in a controlled environment, for instance through experiments, and the lived experiences of diasporas encompass three or more generations spanning decades;
• The focus of the research is on the contemporary perception of the participants’ understanding of home and their negotiation of belonging in the diaspora community;
• “Analysis of the data that involves explicit interpretation of the meanings and functions of human actions, the product of which mainly takes the form, the level of analysis is individual. Therefore, the data analysis focuses on the interpretations of meanings, stories, places and artefacts which mainly takes the form of verbal descriptions or explanations, with quantification and statistical analysis playing a subordinate role” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994:248).

An ethnographic study can be considered as emergent, in which the researcher builds an understanding of the phenomenon, as it exists in its natural environment. It generally deals with why and how things happen, rather than describing what happens. Agar’s (2006) ethnographic logic encouraged and enabled me to approach the research field and data with openness for new ideas and readings.

In traditional anthropology and/or sociology, ethnography is seen as an immersion of the researcher into the research site for a long time (Fetterman, 2019). Doing fieldwork requires the ethnographer to immerse him/herself into the systems of everyday life and the practices of a cultural group or collective for a continued timeframe (Parker-Jenkins, 2018) and therefore achieve an emic perspective of the research phenomenon. Anthropologists such as Boas, (1901), Mead (1928) and Malinowski (1922) conducted research by using ethnography. They positioned themselves at a research site for an extended period observing, documenting, being part of the community, and also learning and using the local linguistic resources, with the aim of a detailed explanation of ‘webs of meaning’ and providing extensive and ‘thick’ data (Geertz, 1986). Such data collection processes can lead to a large amount of data. Blommaert
and Dong (2010) draw attention to the sheer amount of data and assert that ethnographers ‘return from the field loaded with bags full of data: raw and half-processed materials that reflect and document the realities in the field. Fieldwork should not just be reduced to data collection, because essentially it is a learning process’ (Blommaert and Dong, 2010:27). Taking fieldwork as a learning process is a way to approach the research site objectively and, more importantly, the researcher returns with a new perspective, thus the researcher can provide ‘members’ complex explanations for when, why, and how particular things happen (Emerson et al., 2011:149). Ethnography helps the researcher to understand participants’ situated meanings of events (Dörnyei, 2007).

I employed Jeffrey and Troman’s (2004) ‘compressed time mode’ as an ethnographic approach. In such an approach, the intensity of the ethnographic research is very high where ‘researchers inhabit a research site almost permanently for anything from a few days to a few months, involve themselves in the life of the inhabitants, and seek access to as many site contexts and people as possible’ (Jeffrey and Troman, 2004:538). Furthermore, I adapted a ‘selective intermittent time mode’ (Hills de Zárate, 2016; Jeffrey and Troman, 2004) because of the flexibility with the frequency of the research site visits. Millen (2000) refers to this as ‘rapid ethnography'. Hammersley emphasises it as ‘a form of social and educational research that emphasises the importance of studying at first-hand what people do and say in particular contexts. This usually involves fairly lengthy contact, through participant observation in relevant settings, and/or through relatively open-ended interviews designed to understand people’s perspectives (emic perspective), perhaps complemented by the study of various sorts of documents/official, publicly available, or personal’ (2006:4). Drawing on Hammersley’s (2006) understanding of ethnography, I participated in and observed events and activities, which I describe later, at intermittent intervals, which took place in the boroughs of London where the majority of the TC diaspora reside. I managed to collect rich ethnographic accounts of groups of people, who claim to belong to the TC diaspora. Observations at participants’ private homes, at the community shop and at the diaspora associations were accompanied by a series of semi-
structured interviews. As I self-identify as a member of the TC community and other members recognise me as one who shares the ‘essence’ of membership, this was a constant factor in the design and carrying out of the work. My own profile played a critical and unavoidable role in the framing and reading of the data. My approach, however, allows for a humanitarian approach to research (Angouri and Mahili, 2022), which, apart from recognising subjectivity as ingrained in any research process, also acknowledges the human and social nature of all stakeholders involved in a project.

3.2. Research Design

3.2.1. Research questions

The overall research aim of this study is to explore how self-identified members of the TC diaspora negotiate their belongingness and make claims of community membership within the TC diaspora. Using an ethnographic approach to research, this project's design has been iterative from the stages of data collection through data analysis. Since the study's inception in 2015, the research's objectives and questions have changed and become more focused. The first phase of the research informed the second phase. Analysis of the data collected from the first two phases of the research played an important role for the design of the third phase of this research project.

The following is how I formulated my research questions:

Research question 1) How do the members of the TC diaspora community do place-belonging?

This overarching research question has guided this study. The answer to this question is discussed across all the four findings chapters. It specifically includes identifying the practises that seem to be crucial for building the community and developing belongingness in the TC diaspora. This research question enabled me to compose the second research question for this research.
Research question 2) What is the role of diasporic associations for community membership?

This research question focuses on and examines the function of diaspora organisations in relation to community membership. It is crucial to note that this research question emerged during the research process and was not decided upon at the outset of the research.

The first and second phases of the research made me aware of the significance of the associations in building the diaspora identity and developing a place-belongingness (Van Gorp and Smets, 2015). Associations’ function as the authentic representations of the community (Çavuşoğlu, 2021; Denk, 2023), intrigued me to further investigate these borrowed communal spaces which are repurposed and recontextualised and eventually become the hub of the community (Bonnerjee, 2017; Silver, 2020; Spaaij and Broerse, 2019). Chapter 6 especially addresses this question by carefully examining the data collected at the two diaspora associations.

Research question 3) How do we capture the process of doing place-belonging in diaspora communities?

This research question explores the ways to capture the dynamic nature of place-belonging in diaspora communities. The claims of membership and negotiations of place-belonging put forward are investigated by exploring the community members’ routinised activities during their weekly meetings at the diaspora associations.

I adopted a holistic approach focusing on diaspora community and the diasporic associations as the physical place of social interactions among TC diaspora in London. This approach is underpinned by an understanding of belonging as a performative act and the diaspora as an imagined, dynamic, and evolving construct enacted by the self-identified members of the community.

Building on the reviewed literature and research questions, the next section details the research design used in this study.
3.2.2. Research design

Research questions guided the research design of this project (Silverman, 2010), while I undertook data collection at different phases as shown in Figure 7. Each phase shaped my understanding of the next and enabled me to engage with the community over a period of time. In the thesis, for economy of space, I report on findings from the analysis of interviews that represent the patterns in the dataset and then focus on data from associations through an analysis of interactions and body maps. I have organised and presented the data analysis in four chapters (see Chapters 4, 5, 6, and 7). The analysis of the data from phases 1 and 2 of this research draws primarily on semi-structured interviews with the members of the diaspora, whereas the phase 3 is accounts of data collected at two TC associations.

The analysis of interview data revealed a captivating narrative that emphasised the critical role diaspora organisations play in nurturing community cohesion and unity. Witnessing the power of these organizations to bring people together, this finding sparked a profound interest within me. It became clear that diasporic associations functioned as vital social spaces where individuals with a shared heritage, culture, and experiences could connect, collaborate, and commemorate their collective identity. These organisations provided a forum for community members to unite, bridging the divide between their ancestral homelands and their current residence. The interviews shed light on the various activities and initiatives undertaken by these associations, ranging from social gatherings and support networks to cultural events and language classes. The impact of these initiatives on the individuals interviewed was remarkable, as they expressed a profound sense of belonging, pride, and empowerment as a result of their participation in these diaspora organisations. The realisation that diasporic associations play a crucial role in nurturing a sense of community, connection, and place-belonging among diaspora populations compelled me to further investigate and delve into their multifaceted world. Given the existing gap in linguistic research on diaspora organisations, the findings of this study serve as a crucial stepping stone for future research. This research opens up new avenues for investigating the intricate relationship between language, identity, and
community in diasporic contexts by highlighting the significance of diaspora organisations as social locations for language use, maintenance, and development. The study underscores the potential of these organizations as rich linguistic environments where language practices, language ideologies, and language choices in relation to place-belonging can be examined in depth. In addition, it suggests that diaspora organisations can serve as sites for investigating language contact, language variation, and language shift in diaspora communities, however this is not within the scope of this research project, therefore has not been covered in my thesis. Future studies can build upon this research to investigate the complex dynamics of language use and language maintenance strategies employed by diaspora organisations, casting light on how language functions as a tool for place-belonging and the formation of diasporic identities. This research ultimately paves the way for a deeper understanding of the complex interplay between language, diaspora organisations, and community membership, providing valuable insights for future linguistic research in this field, as I discuss in the closing chapter of the thesis.

In Figure 7, I provide a schematic design for the data collection process.
**Figure 7: Stages of data collection process**

**Phase 1: Birmingham**
- Exploration of participants' homes and Fish and chips shop
- Audio Recordings and Photos from participants' residences
- Interviews, naturally occurring data and narratives

**Phase 2 - Fieldtrips to London**
- Interviews in London - Wood Green
- Exploratory walk in Haringey and an exploratory research visit to Yasar Halim Shop and self-introduction to the management team
- Mini walk interview, audio recordings, photos and investigation of local TC pamphlets

**Phase 2 - Interviews data - Fieldtrips to London**
- Interviews in - Bromley, Islington, Enfield, Palmers Green, Harringey
- Visit to Embassy - Formal discussion about TC diaspora
- Exploratory walk - Photos, Observation, local newspapers
- Multiple research visit to Yasar Halim Shop - Observations, Photos, Interviews, Naturally occurring interactional data
- Walk interviews, Audio recordings and photos

**Phase 3 - Association data - Fieldtrips to London**
- Visits to The Olives - South London Audio and video recordings, interviews, body maps, naturally occurring interactional data, participant observation, map drawing
- Visits to The Lilies - North London - Audio and video recordings, interviews, body maps, naturally occurring data, participant observation, map drawing
- Exploratory walks in South and North London - Mini on-the-street interviews, observation, short videos, photos, soundscapes, participant observation
The whole database included 11 days’ observational fieldnotes (see Appendices 3 and 4), 28 recorded conversations, with 76 hours of audio-visual recordings, and over 250 photographs. The latter dataset has a secondary role in the thesis and is used sporadically to provide an insight and a ‘feel’ for the reader. It will be reported elsewhere in full detail.

Table 4: Overview of the datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Number: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duration: 35.15 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants: 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio and video recordings of</td>
<td>Total Duration: 76.25 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldnotes</td>
<td>Handwritten and oral fieldnotes collected over 11 days of observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual data/photographs</td>
<td>Over 250 photographs collected over six fieldtrips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body maps</td>
<td>Number: 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, I turn to the criteria for choosing the participants.

3.2.3. Research participants

There are a number of criteria upon which an individual or a group was deemed appropriate for this research. The research sample had the following inclusion criteria:

- They must self-identify as of TC origin;
- They must have immigrated to the UK and should be residing in the UK; and
- They must be identified/perceived by others as part of the TC Diaspora.

In other words, I decided to work with individuals for whom membership is an open and explicit claim and are recognised by the TC community as being one of ‘us’. Other individuals, less self-affiliated with the group, would also provide a relevant population for future research.
Here, I utilised my personal social connections in Cyprus and the United Kingdom to reach out to potential participants. After the initial contact with my participants, I utilised snowball sampling and my gatekeepers referred me to other associated individuals.

3.2.4. Researcher identity and access

Reflexivity is an essential aspect of research on diaspora communities, and should be prioritised throughout the research process. Heller and her colleagues (2018) identified and discussed the principles of reflexivity in their book titled as *Critical Sociolinguistic Research Methods: Studying Language Issues That Matter*. They suggested that an essential component of the ethnographic method used in sociolinguistics research is reflexivity (Heller et al., 2018). It describes the researcher's knowledge of their own role in the research process and their active consideration of how their own experiences, prejudices, and presumptions could affect their observations, analyses, and interpretations of the data (Heller et al., 2018). Reflexivity can help to ensure that the research is ethical, respectful, and inclusive of diverse voices and experiences within the diaspora community. It can also help to produce research that is more nuanced, accurate, and meaningful for the community itself, as well as for wider audiences and stakeholders.

Furthermore, reflexivity might involve reflecting on how the researcher's own linguistic background and proficiency might influence their perceptions of the languages being spoken, or how their own cultural assumptions might affect their interpretations of social norms and practices. By acknowledging these potential biases and engaging in ongoing self-reflection throughout the research process, the researcher can strive to produce a more nuanced and accurate understanding of the linguistic and social dynamics they are studying (Heller et al., 2018). Especially when conducting a research on diaspora communities, the researcher reflexivity is related to researcher’s positionality and political attitude.

Positionality and political attitude can have a big influence on the research process and results in the context of diaspora populations. The researcher is expected to embrace participation and observation; such a twofold role can
pose challenges. On the one hand, the researcher becomes part of the community; on the other hand, the researcher has to take the stance of an outsider. For instance, a researcher who has a strong sense of belonging to a specific diaspora group could be more likely to concentrate on their opinions and experiences while ignoring the variety and complexity of the community. Similar to this, a researcher who holds a certain political opinion may be more prone to structure their study questions and findings in a way that upholds their convictions than to consider other points of view or interpretations (O’Reilly, 2009). Especially, in the context of a much-politicised country, Cyprus, I needed to project my researcher identity rather than my own political stance. For some of my participants, I was perceived as an authentic example of TC women, therefore I was openly welcomed into their social group without hesitation. On the other hand, due to my birthplace (Nicosia/Cyprus), use of modern Turkish language without a London accent, and also my Cypriot accent when speaking English, I was clearly perceived as an outsider to the TC London-based TC diaspora. This provides an interesting space for self-reflection and an opportunity to contribute to work on reflexivity in socio-/applied linguistic diaspora research.

In other words, through reflexivity, I was conscious of the fact that I was not a neutral observer, but a subjective participant because I brought my own perspectives and experiences to the research. This awareness helped me to be more open-minded and self-critical, and to take into account the ways in which my own positionality shaped and influenced my own understanding of the social and linguistic phenomena I was studying. Therefore, I was very self-aware of my convictions, principles and ideologies, and how they might have influenced the topics, my approaches towards my participants and how I reached into conclusions within my research.

One of the considerations I had was in relation to ethical side of the research. Reflexivity and ethical considerations are closely intertwined when researching diaspora communities. Ethical considerations, involve the researcher’s responsibility to respect the rights and dignity of the diaspora community, and to ensure that the research is conducted in a manner that is ethical and respectful. In the context of my research, reflexivity helped me to
navigate ethical considerations in a thoughtful and responsible way. By being aware of their own positionality and biases, I took steps to minimize the potential harm that their research might cause to the community. For example, I considered how my presence and research activities might impact the community's privacy, confidentiality, and sense of trust, and I took steps to mitigate any negative effects. From the beginning of my research, I was transparent about my biases and assumptions, and to actively sought out diverse perspectives and alternative interpretations. I was open-minded about meeting people with a varying political agenda that I have. During my fieldwork I always informed my participants about the nature and purpose of the research and gained consent for their voluntary and informed participation. I was always open for their suggestions and feedback which helped me with research process. Participant feedback involves seeking out the perspectives and insights of the community, and incorporating their feedback into the research process. For example, after conducting the first phase of the study in Birmingham, my research participants informed me of the great volume of the TC diaspora in London. Therefore, I shifted my focus to London, which is a metropolitan city with a rich history of migration from Cyprus. Therefore, I designed the second phase of my research informed by the participants of the first phase of the research. The second phase of the research revealed the importance of diaspora associations for the members of the diaspora and therefore decided to further conduct research on the associations in London.

Ultimately, reflexivity and ethical considerations are essential for conducting research on diaspora communities in a way that is respectful, responsible, and meaningful. As Hammersley (2006) puts it ethnography is ‘political’. For Hammersley (2006:11),

“The ethnographer must neither be in the service of some political establishment or profession nor an organic intellectual seeking to further the interests of marginalised, exploited, or dominated groups. Both of these orientations greatly increase the danger of systematic bias.”
By prioritizing these considerations throughout the research process, researchers can produce research that is not only rigorous and insightful, but also ethical and respectful of the rights and dignity of the diaspora community.

In terms of access into the community, I consciously wanted to approach my research participants with caution, as some of them were likely to be active in following a certain political agenda. When it comes to a politically driven place such as Cyprus and those who somehow are politically affiliated with Cyprus, as a researcher I needed to carefully consider my own positioning.

Through networking, my gatekeeper (Sanders, 2006) agreed to provide me with some contact details on the TC community. Building rapport (Bernard, 1994; Descombe, 2010, Litosseliti, 2003) with my gatekeeper played a big role in reaching further circles in the community, also s/he could act as naturally as possible when s/he was with me. According to Christian (2012:2), ‘depending on the place, nature and participant body of research subjects, the role of gatekeeper can be anything from one of simple formality to one of extraordinary complexity, where sought after access is deeply embedded into the research project such as when gatekeepers are also participants and subjects’. Before contacting my gatekeeper, I took an ‘initial ethnographic tour’ (Whitehead, 2005) of the research site with the aim of ‘mapping the scene’ (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2011). I mainly targeted capturing the utilisation of the physical space that my potential participants inhabited. In doing so, I was hoping to see how their community space defined my participants. Such exploration of the research site can be used as a ‘means of defining the study area, understanding and analysing the geographical description of community members, [and] describing the activity spaces’ (DeWalt and DeWalt, 2011:84).

I applied this technique before meeting any of my participants during the data collection process.

Next, I turn to the data collection process.

3.3. Data collection

Data collection for this research project involved short periods of immersion in the research site over the course of two years. I conducted data collection in
three phases (for more on the research design see Section 3.2.2). Each of these phases are interconnected and the findings of each phase informed the design and structure of the forthcoming phase.

Throughout the three phases, informal and formal semi-structured interviews were conducted, participant observation was employed and an extensive amount of fieldnotes were compiled, either in written or recorded oral form. In addition to those, I utilised body maps as part of the data collection at the phase three.

The first and second phases of the study served as an opportunity to obtain access to the wider TC community, to understand their lifestyle, community practices and their tight cultural habitat (Bourdieu, 1990). This also allowed me to determine and consider the possible topics of interest for the research.

According to Hammersley and Atkinson (2007), the researcher should be able to understand in what ways participants perceive their own and others’ attitudes and utilise this perception to shape their stance in the wider community. To this end, the first and second phases of data collection allowed me to understand core issues associated with belonging and the relationship with ‘home’. It shed some light on my participants’ understanding of their community membership and place-belonging.

The first and second phases of the data comprise the exploratory visits that were conducted by employing a ‘selective intermittent time mode’ (Jeffrey and Troman, 2004). Those exploratory visits entailed informal home visits, observation walks and shop visits. The informal home visits were in the form of a collection of narrative portraits of individuals’ sense of belonging, and perception of self and the other. Conducting data collection at short intervals gave me the opportunity and time to organise and review the data I collected before continuing with the further steps (Jeffrey and Troman, 2004).

After familiarising myself with the community, its norms and habitual practices as well as strengthening my methodological approach, I carried on to the third phase, which is a more formal setting than phase one and phase two. The third phase of the data collection was with groups of people at TC diaspora associations, which provide a communal space for members of the diaspora.
This phase involved multiple visits to associations run by TCs. These associations are pseudonymised in this study as The Olives and The Lilies.

Such diaspora organisations play an important role in building the diaspora identity and developing a place-belongingness (Van Gorp and Smets, 2015). They also serve as a safe space where members retain the social and emotional bonds with the rest of the diaspora.

At the phase three of the research, I collected data with body maps in addition to the interviews and participant observation. How I utilised body maps for my research requires further explanation as it draws on two techniques. Initially, I was inspired by the body-mapping technique which is considered as a community-based participatory action research (Wilson, 2019) and primarily used in the field of psychotherapy and social work with the aim of researching individuals’ subjective experiences (Brett-Maclean, 2009; Crawford, 2010; Santarossa et al., 2023). For example, in clinical psychology body maps are used as a therapeutic tool especially among individuals living with chronic illnesses (Malchiodi, 2020; Skop, 2016) or in Music Education body maps are used to capture the music work done by teacher candidates (Griffin, 2014).

Body map technique has been used in wide range of studies (for an overview see Coetze et al., 2019). During body-mapping participants draw or let other participants to draw a full human-sized outline of themselves and use various tools such as paint, collage, text or drawing in order to respond creatively to interview questions. This is particularly important because through those interview questions might be triggering for the participants and through body mapping they might feel they are in safe space, be able to express themselves and open up by drawing or using the tools provided by the researcher (Coetze et al., 2019; Gastaldo et al., 2012). Therefore, body maps found to be useful as a treatment information and support tool, as an advocacy tool, an intergenerational dialogue tool, a team building tool, an art making tool, and a biographical tool (Coetze et al., 2019; Solomon, 2002). Body mapping is considered as “a data generating research method used to tell a story that visually reflects social, political and economic processes, as well as individuals’ embodied experiences and meanings attributed to their life circumstances that shape who they have become” (Gastaldo et al., 2012:10).
By using this technique I aimed that my participants would manage to centre the body as both a site for eliciting conflicted opinions about island’s troubled political past and also reflect on their identity (Dew et al., 2018; Gastaldo et al., 2012). However, when planning to fully utilise body maps in my research I was aware of the potential psychological risks, ethical considerations as well as physical limitations. Not all my participants were/ would be fit and willing enough to lie down and allow an other person or me outline their body and then dedicate time for my research instead of spending their weekly socialisation time during the association meetings. Therefore, by keeping in mind that the methodology of body maps or body-mapping is a visual technique used to capture qualitative data from participants regarding their subjective experiences (Gastaldo et al., 2012), I decided to use this innovative methodological technique in conjunction with the second technique – language portraits. By adopting this strategy, I aimed to eliminate potential risks associated with the body mapping exercise and provide my participants more practicality. Language portraits are used in applied language studies to focus on multilingual individuals’ lived experiences (Kusters and De Meulder, 2019). The application of language portraits enables and assists researchers in viewing languages as embodied, experienced, and historically lived. Language portraits are considered to be a multimodal research method because similar to body maps they combine drawing and colouring supported with narratives (Busch, 2018; Kusters and De Moulder, 2019). Just like the body maps, language portraits are in line with the concept of visual turn (Kalaja and Pitkänen-Huhta, 2018). Busch (2012) asserts that "In the visual mode, meaning is constituted by pictorial elements such as lines, contrasts, colors, areas, surfaces. Although narrations are structured in a linear and sequential way, the visual mode steers one's vision toward the whole (the Gestalt) and toward the relationality of the parts. Although the verbal mode favors diachronic continuity and synchronic coherence, in the visual mode contradiction, fractures, overlappings, and ambiguities can also remain unsolved" (Busch, 2012:518). Furthermore, according to Coffey (2015), the human body can be regarded as a container or conduit for language. However, instead using the language portrait technique for exploring my participants lived experience of language (Busch, 2017), I adapted these two techniques
to my research project and used body maps for the personification and embodiment of the themes that emerged in the first and second phase of the analysis. As it can be seen with details in the Appendix 2, each body map has a title on top. These titles are emergent themes of the phases one and two.

To sum up, I came to decision to design and utilise the body maps for my data collection because similar to language portraits, body maps are an interactional process (Busch, 2012; 2018). The body maps served as conversation openers and as an ‘effective means of depicting social processes and relationships (...) [which has] the capacity to represent symbolically the ways in which interactions with others and cultural meanings are inscribed and performed through the body’ (De Jager et al., 2016:29). Considering the demographic profile of my participants, I created body maps by using whole body silhouettes for the research participants to draw, colour or assign any part of the body that they would associate with the given theme provided above each silhouette. Ultimately, I decided to use a female body silhouette, which I thought would enable my participants to relate the themes with their own body shapes. It is important to note here that the female silhouette resonates with the female dominated space of the associations within the context of my study.

Figure 8: Empty body map used in this study
Figure 8 illustrates an empty body map that was used for this study. (For examples of the body map booklet see Appendix 2).

Figure 9 illustrates the boroughs of London. The boroughs where the TC diaspora is mainly populated are marked with an arrow. Names of the districts that I collected my data from are shown in the text boxes.

![Figure 9: Boroughs of London](https://maps-london.com/london-borough-map)

I contrasted observations with individual interviews and naturally occurring narratives. Interaction plays an important role in my project and for this I am taking an interactional sociolinguistic (IS) perspective (for more on IS see Section 3.4.2).
3.4. Methods of data analysis

This section deals with the analytical processes for this PhD research. The data corpus for this research project contains a rich variety of datasets in the form of interviews, audio and video recorded interactional data, participant observation, fieldnotes, photographs and also body maps. All these datasets provide a diverse source for informing the different aspects of how belonging is enacted in the given context. Figure 10 demonstrates the relationship between the datasets.

![Figure 10: Relationship between datasets](image)

Different datasets can provide different insights and therefore they are beneficial for a more holistic understanding of the phenomenon being studied (Schnurr and Zayts, 2017). In this project, I utilised each dataset to find out how belonging is done by my participants. In the following, I first discuss how I utilised each dataset for the analysis and then outline the main analytical approaches used for this research project.

Interviews provided me with access to the TC community in London. They were helpful for exploring how belonging is negotiated and constructed in a
natural diaspora setting, where participants provided their personal and intimate accounts (Cohen, 2008). The interviews were conducted during my fieldwork in London (March 2017 - October 2019) and are supported by observations and off-record conversations with the participants. The interviews focused on exploring the participants’ relationship with their place of origin and residence, and by extension the home and host society. The analysis of the interview data provides the foundation for the third and main part of the data analysis, which is discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. The framing has emerged through the analysis of the interview data and hence it is presented here to introduce the reader to the data chapters.

Through participant observations, I gained an insight into their lives, habits and moral value systems. This was a good source for providing an ethnographic ‘thick description’ (Dörnyei, 2007:130) of the lives of members of the TC diaspora in London.

Besides interviews and participant observations, audio- and video-recorded interactional data provided a good source to analyse the ways in which meanings are (co-)constructed and negotiated in interaction.

Photographs were worthwhile for capturing how research participants practised their sense of belonging in their domestic spaces and during their social meetings.

Fieldnotes contributed towards an all-round understanding of the events in the field during and after the fieldwork. The fieldnotes contributed to all steps throughout the data analysis process.

Finally, body maps were utilised for this research in order to ‘engage participants as co-producers of knowledge,’ and disrupt ‘mechanisms that maintain hierarchies of exclusion’ (Parker et al., 2018:2). They also serve for exploration of the research participants’ thoughts and perceptions on the themes that emerged from the analysis of the data collected during phases one and two of this study.

In all cases, my analysis focused not only on what is being talked about but also the ways in which people interact in the given context. Although my
analysis combined thematic analysis with the principles of IS, in all cases I attempted to go beyond a descriptive approach on what people talk about.

In the interview analysis, interactional features were coded systematically. Special attention was paid to: personal pronouns, spatial adverbs and interruptions and floor management (Tannen, 2012) which indicate the power dynamics among participants (Angouri, 2018). Additionally, I observed references to lexical choices of significance to categories such as ‘foreign’, ‘local’ in the given context. In all datasets switches between languages and dialects was recorded but I discuss these only when I consider them to represent a marked membership claim (see in particular section 5.3).

In sum, tailored ways of analysis were required throughout the analytic processes, given the diversity of datasets; these analytic processes are discussed in more detail below.

3.4.1. MAXQDA and Thematic Analysis

This research project explores how research participants discursively negotiate and construct their sense of belonging in relation to their social interactions at various locations as well as their perceptions of their own and others’ identity. The interviews focused on the aspects of their lives in which belonging was practised on various levels. In order to capture and understand those levels, the focus of the analysis was on what was said; therefore, thematic analysis was the most appropriate method to pursue.

Initially the interviews were broadly transcribed verbatim; however, they lacked any detailed transcription conventions. After identification of the key themes, the selected transcriptions were revisited and transcribed with reference to basic transcription conventions, which captured some prosodic information such as intonation and stress.

Due to the large scale of the data corpus, I organised and labelled the information in a ‘manageable and malleable’ way (Dörnyei, 2007:250). I labelled a word or a short phrase that categorised the text and/or indexed a particular theme (Saldaña, 2013). This coding process helped me to ‘establish a framework of thematic ideas’ (Gibbs, 2007). I utilised MAXQDA, a qualitative
A wide range of themes emerged from the data. By coding the data through utilising MAXQDA, I managed to familiarise myself with the data and organised it in broader themes, and then systematically grouped and regrouped the constantly emerging themes from the data. In so doing, I mapped out the focal points and regrouped and refined the segments of coded data according to the recurrence of the themes. By revisiting the coded segments, I eliminated the codes which showed little relevance and this provided me with a clearer thematic framework (Creswell, 2013). This process was to ensure that I handled the vast amount of data in a systematic way when identifying the emerging key themes. Identifying the key themes and any other related concepts by applying a detailed and revisited coding system helped me to visually map out the data according to its themes. According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003) such a familiarisation with the data is one of the most important steps of the data analysis, as it determines the integrity of that analysis.

After identification of key themes that emerged within the datasets, I elaborated these patterns in order to be able to describe the phenomenon studied. This crucial stage can be labelled as the phase of interpretation of the data, as the researcher develops arguments about the research phenomenon (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Within the scope of thematic analysis, I interpreted the data specifically by looking at the dynamics of the notion of place-belonging and membership in diasporas. I provided a link between the micro level discourse and the macro level discourses. On a macro level, I looked at the here-and-now of interaction and established a link to the wider ideologies, stances and positions that are available to members of any group (e.g., Clegg, 2013; Foucault, 1971; Habermas, 1970; 1999; 2015; Piller, 2016).

In the following section, I discuss IS, an analytic framework which informs the critical engagement of the interactional data and the context.
3.4.2. Interactional Sociolinguistics

Interactional sociolinguistics (IS), pioneered by John Gumperz, is a discourse analytic perspective on language (Rampton, 2019). It is often associated with the sociological framework introduced by Goffman (1959) (though not all IS analysts agree with this connection, see Gordon and Tannen in Angouri and Baxter, 2021) and draws on conversation analysis, pragmatics, linguistic anthropology and ethnography of communication (Schiffrin, 1996a). IS investigations how people make sense of extracommunicative events during conversation and how they use these contextual presuppositions to draw situated inferences. Pointing out the importance of context, Roberts and Sarangi (2005) argue that talk has its meaning in the given context and is constantly co-constructed in interaction. In a similar vein, Roberts (2014:26) adds that ‘there is an inevitable circularity in which context, involvement and interpretive processes are continually acting and reacting on each other’. Angouri (2018:72) sees IS as ‘a theory of context’, as the interpretations of sociocultural context are of great importance in understanding interaction (Stubbe et al., 2003).

Overall, context and contextualisation are flexible and reflexive (Auer, 2009), as the context is liable to constant change. In addition to that, ‘context is reflexive in that language shapes context as much as context shapes language’ (Roberts, 2014:26). In this process the background knowledge involves the signalling and interpreting of meaning. For the IS approach ‘the concern is with situated interpretation of communicative intent, not with strategies as such, and that analysis is not confined to overtly lexicalised information’ (Gumperz, 1999:464).

The concept of ‘contextualisation cues’ is employed within this understanding (Gumperz, 1982; 1999); Gumperz defines these as ‘constellations of surface features of message form […] by which speakers signal and listeners interpret what the activity is, how the semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows’ (1982:131).

Within the scope of IS, a linguistic understanding of framing was developed, in which the concept of ‘contextualisation cues’ are employed. Those
contextualisation cues ‘signal meanings’ and are utilised for the identification of situational definitions (Gumperz, 2015:315). Contextualisation alongside indexicality plays a prominent role in the IS framework.

Contextualisation cues are necessary for the analysis of an interaction from an IS perspective (Holmes and Wilson, 2017:401). Analysis not only focuses on linguistic forms such as words and/or sentences, but IS also investigates the contextual cues. Situated inferences are drawn from the contextualisation cues.

Contextualisation cues are indicators that ‘steer the interpretation of the words they accompany’ (Auer, 2009). In other words, the contextualisation cues contribute to putting the talk into context drawing upon contextual knowledge of the uttered words. IS establishes an interpretive link between the macro and micro levels of communication. Macro level relates to the social levels of meaning, such as group identity, regional identity etc., and micro level relates to the situational communicative event (here and now). IS approaches discourse ‘through the worm’s eye, not the bird’s’ (Rampton, 2001:84).

The IS approach adopted here, entails a detailed discourse analysis of the audio and video recorded interactional data. Interactional data for my research was captured through audio and video recordings. This interactional data was then transcribed following basic transcription conventions. Through interactional data, I focus on the role of language in human interaction and investigate how my research participants create meaning through their social interactions. Audio and/or video recording of situated interaction collected in this PhD study, is supplemented by as much participant observation, metapragmatic discussion, and retrospective commentary from local participants as possible.

Interactional sociolinguistics draws on various analytic frameworks, which ‘suggest directions along which to look’ rather than it being ‘definitive’ constructs and ‘provide prescription of what to see’ (Blumer, 1969:148). I particularly explore the power of language in an imposing way that ‘inscribes patterns of sensemaking and affects what people see, what gets silenced, and what is regarded as reasonable and acceptable’ through ‘labelling or naming
a discursive practice’ (Putnam and Fairhurst, 2001:111). Familiarity with the previous discourse and social context is very important for understanding the situation in IS traditions. Interactional sociolinguistics provides a refined analytical framework to critically engage with interactions of ‘participants who are compelled by their subordinate positions to express their commitments in ways that are indirect, off-record and relatively opaque to those in positions of dominance’ (Rampton, 2001:99). Jaspers (2011) argues that IS has great importance because it enables us to investigate the role of language in particular circumstances of social life. It also shows the interplay between shared sociocultural context and linguistic knowledge. Therefore, in my analysis I focused on how interactants ‘do’ discourse in ‘small-scale interactions’ and how they relate their discourses to further ‘large-scale sociological effects’ (Jacquement, 2011:475). Such a process provides a ‘dynamic view of social environments where history, economic forces and interactive processes... combine to create or to eliminate social distinctions’ (Gumperz, 1982:29).

In the analysis of the data I paid special attention to the here-and-now of interaction, traditional dichotomies such as we/they, here/there. I also paid attention to implicit and explicit insider/outsider negotiations, code-switching as well as participants’ affinity with a specific language. The diasporic community space provided a multilingual and rich context for my research. In such contexts a range of discursive strategies are mobilised for indexing membership. Contextualisation cues are useful for conveying meaning at a covert, ‘taken-for-granted level’ (Holmes and Wilson, 2017:403). Therefore, I investigated how manifestations of membership served as contextualisation cues and indexed a wider social phenomenon, and also how the interactants identified and interpreted the possible meanings conveyed by their communicative partner.
3.5. Summary

The generosity of time and interest of the participants, and their engagement in the study provided me with privileged access to them and their places. I collected, therefore, a large amount of data which was feeding into my/our journey and understanding of the topic. In the following chapters, I will provide the reader with the operationalisations of the decisions taken and I discussed here the rationale for choosing them.

However, although I presented them in a linear and ‘tidy’ way, the decisions and my reading of the datasets changed over time, as my understanding of the topic and my relationship with the participants developed. I revisit Figure 11 here. I will provide and anchor my accounts in threads that emerged from interviews which led to the study of interaction in associations and that was further enhanced by the body maps. The latter dataset further supports and provides an insight into the complexity of membership negotiation in my context; it evidences the work participants did by using the different resources I provided them with to navigate their desire to participate in the study and manage the political implications of their accounts.
In closing this chapter, I want to acknowledge that the datasets carry the potential for multiple readings. I therefore provide my interpretation on the analysis I carried out. I follow the position that the responsibility and role of social science is in providing a representation of reality following a path which however is not the ‘only’ one or the ‘true’ one (Angouri, 2018). I invite the reader to engage with and provide their own interpretation of the ways that place-belonging is indexed in the data and connects with their own lived experience; everybody negotiates membership in different communities, in daily practice and in multiple places, and this is a dynamic and changing process over time.

Figure 11: Datasets
4 Gateway into the Diaspora - Outcomes of the First Phase

This chapter presents the data collected from the first phase of this study. The data here comes from a Turkish Cypriot (TC) family based in Birmingham, which encapsulates the issues I explored in more detail in the thesis. I visited a first generation TC family at their residence on the outskirts of Birmingham. The family house is used as a place where family and friends come together and negotiate relationships and ways of conducting daily life, such as greetings, eating habits, etc.

The aim of this visit was threefold: a) to get to know this family and reach, through them, members of the TC diaspora in London, b) get a real feel for the fieldwork I will be conducting, and c) start practising my observation skills and apply my training to practice. I call them the Serbay Family hereafter. I collected a very rich dataset and I provide an overview of it in the next section. I illustrate the issues of:

- complexity of flows with reference to place and space,
- the motivation to migrate,
- how this is presented as related to relevant resources.

The above-mentioned issues were recurrent in the data and feed into my research questions that are closely related to the construction of community through habitual practices and negotiations of membership in the diaspora. At this phase of the study, I examined the traditional understanding of the diasporas and their close relation to the notion of home. I elaborate on that in the forthcoming sections by introducing the Serbay Family as the case of introduction to the community. Next, I present six excerpts corresponding to the notion of home and my participants’ perception of place.
4.1. Serbay Family in detail

Background

In 1959, Mr Serbay owned a little restaurant in Cyprus where he once received a visit from his friend who had been living in London for a while. At that time, Mr Serbay was living in dire conditions barely making ends meet at the end of the month. As Mr Serbay noted (in excerpt 4.1.1.), his friend’s visit has drastically changed the direction of Mr Serbay’s life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.1.: Mr Serbay’s conversation with his friend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>We asked him [his London-based friend] “How is the life in London? Is there any money in England? Is business lucrative?” He laughed and then said; “To be honest mate, once you wake up, you sweep money off the floor as the first thing in the morning. Oh, the life is so good!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Serbay was inspired by this conversation and explicitly indicated that the phrase ‘sweeping money off the floor’ convinced him to move to the UK to start a new life and changed the direction of his whole life.

In this conversation between Mr Serbay and his London-based friend, it can be seen that the ‘unknown space’, in this case ‘England’, can easily be idealised and the conditions can be interpreted in such a way that they may not represent the reality of everyday life. Hope is related to motivation for starting the new home (Mallett, 2004) and the journey to this ‘unknown space’ then becomes appealing for those who are motivated enough and have access to resources (bureaucratic or networks). Figure 12 provides a summary of Mr Serbay’s background.
With the hope of building a better life abroad, Mr Serbay promised to bring his wife to England within four months following his arrival. He started his journey to England on a ship, leaving all his loved ones in Cyprus. In the 1950s men were seen as the only providers for their family and such journeys 'to the unknown' were a common practice among Cypriots (Oakley, 1987; Robins and Aksoy, 2001). My participant was a newly married man at that time, who left Cyprus in 1959 and Figure 13 maps the actual journey from Cyprus to Birmingham where he ended up living for 50 years. This analysis contributes to the argument that ‘home’ has many faces and is intertwined with responsibilities, work obligations, family life, escaping from difficulties (in the form of political and economic) and hopes for a better life (Robins and Aksoy, 2001).
Figure 13 also illustrates the factors that influence decisions for making the journey to a new home. The red colour in Figure 13 demonstrates the significant events in his life. Such influences can be the people who one comes in contact with and also the chain of events that happens.

In Mr Serbay’s autobiographical narrative, I noticed the role of various individuals he met during his journey to a new home and who had a great influence on how he found his way to turn the unknown space into his new home. I extracted the key agents that have helped him in finding a settlement. In a linear order, in his narrative he talks about the people below:

- London-based friend,
- The uncle who took him to the ship,
- People on the ship,
- The taxi driver in Britain,
- The older cousin and his wife in Birmingham,
- The younger cousin in Birmingham,
- The man who rented a single room to him,
- Two administrators at the job interviews,
- An acquaintance who knew the manager at the factory.

So far, from my data, finding a new home seems to be mostly a random process and not predetermined/decided for my participants. Excerpt 4.1.2. is a narration of the conversation between Mr Serbay and the people he met on the ship during his journey.
Even though this incident might seem insignificant, within the narrative it presents a crucial step in Mr Serbay’s life and his ‘new home’. If the taxi driver had not been able to help Mr Serbay or show him the way to reach his final destination, perhaps Mr Serbay would have stayed in Dover until now, or would have joined the family in London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.2.: Narration of the conversation on the ship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>Later on, she [the lady on the ship] asked me where I was going, I said I was going to Birmingham and then she continued; “you are a good lad. Come and stay with us. My brother is also there [London] and he has a business, he can easily arrange something for you. You can stay at his place or he can arrange a place for you too”. And the other woman from there joined the conversation; “Don’t go there, to that Birmingham, what will you do there?” then told her that I had a cousin there [Birmingham] and had promised to go so if I don’t go it would be a shame. So, they all got off at Dover and went wherever they planned to, and also gave me an address but I lost that address. And we got to a taxi driver and gave him the address. He then stared at me and said; “This doesn’t make any sense to me.” But he seemed to be a clever man, he went and got me the ticket for the train to Birmingham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this could happen to anybody in any context, I consider it a good example for approaching my study through the eyes of the participants (Dörnyei, 2007; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1995) and attempting to bring together a range of incidents that play a role in the process of place-making. It is also interesting to note the use of ‘there’ and specific geographical space, such as Birmingham, carry very little meaning for Mr Serbay at that stage of his narrative.
Mr Serbay narrates how he reached his cousin’s house in Birmingham and excerpt 4.1.3. illustrates how the events were spontaneous and causal of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.3.: Mr Serbay in Birmingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>“You won’t be staying here!” he said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Then, I told him; “Is your wife buying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>me or what that she didn’t like me? You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>will give me just a room. You will get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>your money”. But he told me; “my wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>didn’t accept that” and I said;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>“alright then.” Then his little brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>came in and he told me: “I will take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>you with me, I will arrange another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>place for you.” He took me and brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>me to other parts, I mean this part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>the city. I went to one and another,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>they all say they didn’t have a room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>for me and the Greeks were not willing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>to give any rooms at all. There were a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>lot of Greeks here, they had a lot of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>rooms, but the Greeks were not giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>any. There was a conflict then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>At the end I found one from a man from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Abohor (a village in Cyprus). He gave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>us one! I stayed there eventually. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>mean, where I went, then money was over,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 liras not much at all, I took the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>train and the taxi. Peeee, what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>happened... Once I got troubled and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>couldn’t find a job to earn some, I was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>looking for the address which those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Lost it too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>That was lost too. I thought I could</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>take the train and go there (London).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>But in the end I couldn’t go there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>either so I had to stay in this city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Let me put the kettle on now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again reference to places (lines 1, 9 - 12, 16, 21, 22, 31, 33) are signals and can relate to different emotional spaces in the journey (Massey, 1994). The broad thematic analysis (Talmy and Richards, 2010) showed the range of factors influencing how the home is constructed. The most salient so far seem to be ‘safety’ and escaping financial or political difficulties. In Mr Serbay’s case,
it is prominent that financial strength played a big role in his life. In excerpt 4.1.4. below, his feeling of security came with financial independence, both in Cyprus and the UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.4.: Feeling of security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>My job was a very good one. I was a factory worker in a factory. I didn’t quit my job; it was a good one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>Eee if your job was good, why quit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Were you working as a wholesaler? What was it again?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>I was working in a car factory and we were producing car parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mert</td>
<td>Here in Birmingham?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>I was working in a car factory and we were producing car parts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gigi</td>
<td>but how did you find your job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>To be honest, the job, they helped me to find it really. I applied to several of them. Once they gave me the position, the Greek son, they told me “I will ask you two questions.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>When I was working for the police (in Cyprus) I was taking two lessons; Turkish and English. But when I was on the mountains I couldn’t attend those lessons. Because they were taking us all to the mountains as if they were to find Grivas and so on. All those English lies. But for me what was important was the money. But the money was not that much at all. At that time, we were being paid approximately 18 Liras. And 19 Shillings for the night shift on the mountains. I mean on the mountains, the thing, to find the Greeks in the night. Most of the people were of course scared. I was the driver. I was taking the shifts from others. I was in Iskele (a region in Cyprus), would come back and then take the shift to Kyrenia. They were murmuring so I was taking their shifts too. As I said before, that lieutenant really liked me that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>time. You would fill in the forms, get it signed and get the money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>All make noise of agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Mr Serbay I mean it was not as part of my monthly salary. So I can say I worked hard. I came back from Kyrenia; I went to Famagusta. From Famagusta went to Limassol. I came back from Limassol, went to Piskopu. I mean, 15 days here, 15 days there I was earning good money. Yeah, I bought a field and built a house in it and so on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Mert eyya, you built that house with that money didn’t you? To build a house was not easy at that time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kerim surely not!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Mr Serbay Well, just because I left my father’s business and escaped here, for ten years he didn’t talk to me. We were cross with each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mr Serbay that’s why we haven’t received any help. I made it all by myself. Once we came here, the same story goes on. Well, after working in the factory for 8 years, I received golden shirt things (cufflinks), if you had worked for 25 years, they would give you a golden watch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mr Serbay I, after 8 years, well, after our shop went bankrupt, I sold it and bought another one for the wife. After buying that shop, because of prior experience, I quit my job and started with the fish shop. I mean, mean life passed in that fish shop until I got retired. I am very thankful for that. There are 6 children. I got them all wed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>All Masallah.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Mr Serbay Then I bought six more shops and gave them all to the children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Mert What more can you do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Mr Serbay There is no more money left. But I married off all my children. Well, how do you take your tea? Coffee, Nescafe there is if you want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Serbay’s autobiographical narratives follow a linear Labovian narrative model which classifies and delineates the story pattern (Labov, 1997). Table
5 illustrates the Labovian model which can be nicely mapped to Mr Serbay’s life story.

\textbf{Table 5. Labovian narrative model}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative category</th>
<th>Narrative question</th>
<th>Narrative function</th>
<th>Linguistic form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>What was this about?</td>
<td>Signals that the story is about to begin and draws attention from the listener.</td>
<td>A short summarising statement, provided before the narrative commences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td>Who or what are involved in the story, and when and where did it take place?</td>
<td>Helps the listener to identify the time, place, persons, activity and situation of the story.</td>
<td>Characterised by past continuous verbs; and Adjuncts (see A3) of time, manner and place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLICATING ACTION</td>
<td>Then what happened?</td>
<td>The core narrative category providing the “what happened” element of the story.</td>
<td>Temporally ordered narrative clauses with a verb in the simple past or present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION</td>
<td>What finally happened?</td>
<td>Recapitulates the final key event of a story.</td>
<td>Expressed as the last of the narrative clauses that began the Complicating Action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
<td>So what?</td>
<td>Functions to make the point of the story clear.</td>
<td>Includes: intensifiers; modal verbs; negatives; repetition; evaluative commentary; embedded speech; comparisons with unrealised events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CODA</td>
<td>How does it all end?</td>
<td>Signals that a story has ended and brings listener back to the point at which s/he entered the narrative.</td>
<td>Often a generalised statement which is “timeless” in feel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: adapted from Labov, 1972:359-60)

The Labovian narrative is structured and linear, and although it is commonly applied to autobiographical narratives, I aim to take a more dynamic approach and look deeper into how the notion of home is constructed in the narratives in a more nuanced way. The small stories (Georgakopoulou, 2006) approach, which I am currently engaging with, can be a useful tool for combining the ethnographic character of the study, the constructionist stance and interest in narratives.
I am especially interested in how space is indexed in the stories and this includes reference to ‘here’ and ‘there’ as well as reference to specific loci and the meanings associated with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.5: What is Cyprus to you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Among my interests, there is the thing, for example, what is Cyprus to you? =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>=well, Cyprus, the place where we were born and grown up. yes. In fact, I mean, I am very proud of that really Cyprus, that I am a Cypriot, BUT Cyprus is going downhill. How many people do you see who return? Secondly, there is a saying that “The first the place is not you were born, it is where you are fed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr Serbay</td>
<td>We came; we are filled our stomachs (fed) in here. We reproduced, wed the children, we’ve got great grand-children. After that, what will I do if I go back to Cyprus? One says “6 months, I went there and stayed there. You’re old and you don’t think of it, you built a house there etc.” Furthermore, I wanted to buy another place from Kyrenia (Girne) but suddenly I thought to myself “stop [his name], let’s have a look, slowly slowly you are coming towards the end, you are old now, it is difficult to take the flight, to walk in the aeroplane, make things work.”, I said, “sit and stay where you are now and in a couple of years, if you still have time, either in Cyprus or in here.” But I prefer to be here, because all my children are here, my grandchildren are here, BUT once I die, I would like to be buried in Cyprus. Why=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relates ‘here’ as his ‘home’ and associates it with a place of interaction, family, and financial liberation. However, it also goes beyond and brings reference to ‘past home’.

With regard to the ‘past home’, Mr Serbay’s wife associates her memories with the plant that she was growing at their home. The plant itself attracted my attention as my own mother grows them in Cyprus. I felt I had to comment on that plant and it made my participant’s wife open up herself as illustrated in excerpt 4.1.6., and see also the accompanying photo of the plant in the porch of their home (image 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 4.1.6.: Taro Plant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>I saw that you have a Kolokas plant (taro plant) in the entrance. May I ask where you got it from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>Mr Serbay’s wife</td>
<td>(smiles) I got it from Cyprus. There is a woman who brought it from Cyprus and gave me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>I like those plants. My mum has one in Cyprus as well. They have to love their place in order to grow, if not they die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-17</td>
<td>Mr Serbay’s wife</td>
<td>I fancy those plants. I guess, the memories, I have memories. I really like the plants which grow there. In the garden, I have a fig tree. It gives fruits when its fig time and we pick them in the mornings. I walk around it and pick them as if I am living in Cyprus. With that dream...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>aahh, there is a grape tree, I see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>Mr Serbay’s wife</td>
<td>The little grape tree, I collect red grapes sometimes. Ehh, something different.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, this line of analysis provided an insight as to how space and place are indexed and interrelated, with the latter being given emotional meaning and localities of significance for the individual. Artefacts are used in this translation process to bring ‘memory’ or ‘symbolic’ meaning into the ‘new’ context. Those findings were consistent across the data, and I show further detail from interview data next.
5 Doing Place-belonging and Community membership - Outcomes of the Second Phase

The findings presented in this chapter are from the second phase of the research. The discussion here draws on six excerpts, which represent the patterns that emerged from the analysis of data (for the full dataset see methodology Chapter 3). The excerpts come from semi-structured interviews with participants (section 5.2. has a detailed list of the participants and their background).

5.1. Transcription and coding

The interviews data were manually coded by using colour coding and by the use of MAXQDA, which helped to identify recurring themes in the data systematically. I took a mixed bottom up/top down approach to the interview data analysis. I followed dominant themes in the diaspora literature and looked specifically for the cues of place-belonging, home and group membership.

At the same time, themes that are specific to this dataset emerged from a bottom-up analysis of the data. The discussion here draws on the liminality of place and transience of belonging by problematising the limitations of traditional dichotomies such as we/they, us/them, home/host, foreign/local and also here/there.

While discussing the emergent themes, I particularly focused on how the sense of belonging is manifested and how membership is discursively done by the participants. The excerpts chosen for the analysis illustrated how the participants position themselves and their membership in the community. Their insights provided me with a deeper understanding of the roles of participants that emerged in the datasets and their perceptions of place-belonging.

The macro-analysis mainly concentrated on the perception of self and the other in relation to the understanding of home and the ways in which the boundaries of group membership are drawn. The micro-analysis focused on the use of personal pronouns, spatial adverbs and marked interactional phenomena (Angouri, 2018) in floor management (Tannen, 2012), such as
interruptions, which indicate the power asymmetries (Angouri, 2018). Additionally, I observed references to lexical choices of significance to categories such as ‘foreign’, ‘local’ in the given context. The attention is paid overall to what is ‘marked’ (Angouri, 2018) in the context of my research and I justified the reasons for my interpretations through excerpts.

Due to the importance of lexical choices for indexing insiderness and outsiderness relationships (Marra and Angouri, 2011), I particularly addressed the deployment of personal pronouns in the situated interaction. The dialogical relationship between here/there and they/we was considered worth exploring. The personal pronouns ‘we’ and ‘they’ are closely associated with the linguistic establishment of social groups, and collective social identities (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina, 2007, 2011; Helmbrecht, 2002) and spatial adverbs and place markers such as ‘here’, ‘there’ and also names of the places manifest towards place-belonging and people’s affiliation with a particular locale (Krzyżanowski and Wodak, 2008). The use of spatial adverbs symbolises and can be associated with the way participants experience the world (Svorou, 1994), which is in fact crucial for the understanding of the notion of belonging. Added to this, looking into the interactional dynamics and specifically how the participants negotiate their position is also significant for capturing emerging themes from my perspective.

Interruptions were also frequent throughout the dataset and excerpts 5.3.1. and 5.3.2. represent their common functions. They can signify exercises of power (Krzyżanowski and Wodak, 2008) and provide a means to capture relationships in gendered conversative societies. In a patriarchal community such as the TC community in London, interventions and questions can be interpreted as enactment of power and authority as the person who intervenes holds the power to influence the direction of the talk (Holmes and Stubbe, 2015). Holmes (2000) defines aggressive interruptions as a normatively masculine interactional style. Gatekeeping can serve a function as a resource for ‘boundary spanning’ (Banner-Rasmussen et al., 2014), which can be related to interlocutors’ situated negotiation of authority. The gatekeeping puts the interlocutor in a position where they can decide what information to share or what to discard. Therefore, a closer look at the floor management (Tannen,
2012) can provide an insight into the interlocutors’ intentions of displaying and granting belonging to their conversation partners. I exemplified the enactment of group belonging by observing the references to categories such as foreign/local, host/home in the given context. These cues are compared and contrasted with the observational data, which focus on how sense of belonging is indexed and negotiated in participants’ interviews. The expectation is that this shows how my participants engage with those categories and, at times, challenge them through their lived experience. I organised the data on the basis of those findings and show later how this has been informed by the conceptualisation I provided on belonging in section 2.4. At the same time, each of those linguistic features could be discussed in its own right and that would probably also provide interesting results. This is something further research could do, while balancing a focus between the micro-macro phenomena of interest in diaspora studies.

5.2. Place and community membership

For the purpose of discussing the findings, I organised this section around the two interrelated macro themes: place and community membership. I further explore the theme place from two angles. The first is concerned with the understanding of home in the tangible sense in relation to a geographical reality and the second investigates the notion of home from a more abstract and affective understanding in relation to the lived experience.

Figure 14 illustrates the organisation of interrelated themes and their connection to each other in this section.
Place and its close relationship with belonging have been well discussed in the earlier chapters of the thesis. I highly associate with Antonsich’s (2010) argument about people’s desire for place-belongingness and resonate with ‘locally-based’ belonging as discussed by Amin (2002), Bauman (2000) and Castells (1996). In this section, I discuss how place-belongingness is indexed by looking at dichotomies such as home and host, the specific question of origin and the lived experience in the place of residence.

The particular spatial connotations with London and Cyprus are prominent in the analysis, as these localities are the places of interaction where participants (co)construct, negotiate, claim, or even resist their group membership. In the data, the topics related to city and place are very prominent.

Manifestations of belonging are closely related to individuals’ claiming or resisting their group membership. Under the theme community membership, I investigate the factors that influence participants’ claims of inclusion or exclusion. An individual’s perception of self and other in relation to their sociocultural environment and place of attachment, plays a prominent role in their overall sense of insiderness. Claims of integration (Kirilova and Angouri, 2018) are consistently used by the participants to claim ‘becoming one of us’ or labelling as ‘the other’. Claiming a position of an insider in the community has emerged as a core position in the data and triggered my interest in the

Figure 14: Interrelated themes discussed in this section
role of liminal spaces where the insider’s status is enacted, such as the membership of associations, which is discussed in chapter 5.

The chapter is organised in three analysis sections:

5.3. Essence: Descent/ Language/ Religion

5.4. Belonging and self-identification

5.5. Politics and the political

Prior to moving to the findings, I will introduce the participants appearing in the interactions. Their profiles are briefly presented in Figure 15.
I present the selected excerpts for a detailed analysis, with consideration of the themes that emerged. The purpose of the interviews was for the participants to negotiate concepts, as this was the stage where I was framing the specific angle that would be the most relevant for my sample.

5.3. Essence: Descent/ Language/ Religion

Excerpt 5.3.1. is a descriptive example in my data for illustrating how belonging is anchored in the individual’s idealisation of home, which is an amalgam of origin and residence. It projects the trajectories of the members of the diaspora.
community. The episode is also representative of the corpus and the length of the interaction allows for a detailed analysis. The data is drawn from an interaction between, pseudonymed here as Sonya, Gabi and Uncle; Sonya is Gabi’s mother and Uncle is a family friend to them. Gabi is the youngest person in the interaction and is prompted, by her mother, to expand on ‘her understanding of home’. The notion of home is debated among them. The excerpt illustrates well how belonging depends greatly on power imbalance in the social order (Angouri, 2018) and also how my participants approach the notion of home and express their opinion on the ‘myth of return’ (Anwar, 1979; Cakmak, 2018; 2021; Cohen, 2008; Hall, 1990; Van Hear, 1998) in the context of diaspora.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt 5.3.1.: ‘London is my home’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Did you feel like, I mean, have you ever felt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>sort of like lost or confused where you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>belong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Well, here London is my home. London is my</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>house. It’s 100%. I imagine my home. even, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>told this to my mum, not to anyone else, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>somewhere else in the world, or somewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>else in England I don't feel I am at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Like like I can go to another city, but it,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I won't feel like I'm in London. Like I went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>to Manchester, sometimes just for work, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ahm it was good, I was accepted, but I didn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>feel like home. It was like London, but much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>smaller. But I didn’t see any other sort of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>people. I didn't see any Turkish people,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Turks are a few, other cultures there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>There’s the Indians, the Arabs, the English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>too, just those are there, I didn’t see any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>other faces there. In London, there’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>everybody, all sorts. Your neighbours, they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>can be from Turkey, can be Greek, can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Irish, anyone black white anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>In London you mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yeah, and much much more they accept you. They</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>accept you much more, I know we've got</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>problems now, but more, we're more integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>because there're more of us here, more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Turkish Cypriots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>If you leave London, if you go out of London,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>there are much fewer Cypriots, there are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Turks but it gets less and less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonya</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>you can feel confused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>I feel I feel, I am a foreigner too, because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I'm, I'm born here, I know English better than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>some English people but when I go outside my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for instance, outside London, I completely feel like a foreigner. Those people, they look at me.

Uncle 39 yeah yeah (waving his hand) you're foreigner=

Gabi 40 =Because my face, face= (encircling her face)

Uncle 41 =Your parents are foreigners, you foreigner.=

Gabi 42 =oh yeah, my mum and dad are immigrants, but we (.) is it, is Cyprus my home? I mean my blood is from there, or is it London where we've spent our whole lives here? I promise to God, I mean, wherever I live, it, it is my home. I am Cypriot=

Uncle 48 = wherever we go, anywhere on Earth, wherever you go, here is for us the most beautiful place, our land, but we love it there too because we were born and raised in Cyprus=

Gabi 52 =Oh yes=

Uncle 53 =but in order to live there, for me, I think other than pensioners, no one can live there, or else you should have serious amount of money=

Gabi 57 =yeah exactly. There is nowhere better than Cyprus, I mean as a country, but I believe there I won't ever do it.

Sonya 60 yeah me too.

Uncle 61 [inaudible] there, even if they kick you out from here, can’t stay there, here calls you.

Gabi 63 There, there injustice is lots. I mean there is a lot of injustice going on.

Throughout the interaction Gabi expresses an affection towards the city of London – a geographical place and this is evident when she compares feeling at home in London with anywhere else. Such a claim is supported by Gabi’s use of spatial deixis ‘somewhere else in the world’, ‘somewhere else in England’, ‘another city’ in lines 7-9, followed by expressions of negation ‘I don’t feel I am at home’, ‘I won’t feel like I am in London’ which index clear attachment to London. This indexes place-belongingness.

Gabi’s use of home and house attracted my attention in lines 4-5. She made a clear distinction between the affection space and the lived place (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013:16). She perceives a geographical space - the city of London, as a place where she resides, where she physically is and also as a place that she is attached to through her emotions and where she feels safe and comforted by the idea of being part of a bigger community that she feels
she belongs to. Gabi’s comparison of London with Manchester (lines 10-20) and how she felt in both cities supports her claims and justifies the reasons for her views on London being her home. She associates her feelings of being alienated outside London with the presumption of lack of dense population of ethnic minority groups. She displays awareness of the superdiversity of London’s demographic composition by stating ‘In London there’s everybody, all sorts. Your neighbours, they can be from Turkey, can be Greek, can be Irish, anyone black, white anyone’ (in lines 20-22). Such a positioning makes a ‘foreigner’ feel more accepted and makes the city overall more open and inhabitable for the ethnic minority groups. Through this positioning, Gabi is categorising herself as an ethnic minority group member, in which she feels free to practice her TCness, rather than being marginalised (just like the way she felt when she was in Manchester).

Upon Sonya’s request for clarification in line 23, Gabi confirms it is being in London and expands her statement between lines 24-31. In line 24, by using a personal pronoun ‘they’, she makes reference to the people of London, indexing the majority of locals of London, and lines 26 and 27 where Gabi shifts to ‘we’ ‘us’ and then mentions ‘more Turkish Cypriots’, she makes an identity act and frames herself within the TC community. She clearly associates density of population of a group with the notion of integration. This is related to the feeling of oneness, to which she claims an insider status. In so doing, London not only becomes a place where people of diverse backgrounds reside, but also the mosaic hub for all because of its demographic composition and encapsulating, all-receiving nature. Familiarity of faces within a geographical location is a topic which has been dealt with by D’Antoni and De Stefani (2022). They claim that having known faces around people enables community building and strengthens the dialogue. However, it might be restricting because forming a group membership might be limited to physical boundaries of a city and not necessarily open to the whole nation-state. Therefore, Gabi’s expression (supported by Sonya in line 32), might hint at how the TC community constructed their understanding of home in relation to a specific locus, in this case London, rather than the national boundaries of a nation-state. Repetition of the opening lines of ‘I feel, I feel’ (line 33)
emphasises the intensified empathy towards Sonya’s expression of confusion. By double confirming this feeling, we see that Gabi resonates with the feelings of confusion when the boundaries of her comfort zone are overstepped. Gabi moves on to show agreement with Sonya by saying ‘I am a foreigner too’ in line 33. Through the use of the word ‘foreigner’, Gabi labels herself as an outsider, in line with what actually the uncle imposed on her. However, we can see a shift in her opinion when she brings up the topic of language (line 34). Gabi voices her opinion on her command of English, being born in the UK and its relationship to the requirements of integration. This is related to the language ideologies and membership. By comparing her command of the English language, she makes an attempt to compare and categorise herself as ‘one of them’, belonging to a speech community, which grants her access to wider society. Therefore, she claims herself to be ‘an integrated’ individual with a migration background.

When Gabi mentions her physical appearance and being subjected to being labelled as a foreigner, again the uncle makes a comment on her parents being foreigners and therefore her unquestionable status as a foreigner. This emerged as a significant discussion among the dataset and drew my attention to the process of developing ‘integration’ in the different community spaces.

Such a foreigner objectification leads the individual to be seen as the perpetual other in the wider society (Devos and Banaji, 2005; Huynh et al., 2011; Tuan, 1998). Standing out as ‘different’ has been widely discussed in the politics of identity and a person can be subjected to being ‘different’ on many occasions, depending on their appearance, language, background, etc. (Botterill and Burrell, 2019). Gabi’s intensified opinions and her explicit claims of status as an insider by framing disclaimers ‘Here we’re more integrated’ and ‘I speak better, etc.’ highlights a core position showing how societal structure is mobilised in and through language ideology (Piller, 2016). This can be seen as a coping or defence mechanism, as Breakwell (1992) puts it, a person might feel psychologically threatened if their language is negatively evaluated. With this in mind, in Gabi’s case, she compares her English proficiency with those who are from an English speech community and claims her English is better than ‘theirs’, presumably just to be able to ‘fit in’ and belong to a bigger group.
Belonging also denotes longing to become (Probyn, 1996). The group of people she signifies as ‘theirs’ is the speakers of English as their first language. Gabi’s willingness to affiliate herself with a group of people who are well integrated into wider society is manifested through how she expressed her access through language proficiency and being born into the British land.

The uncle’s uptake in lines 39 and 41 is somewhat negatively evaluated given that he labelled her as an outsider, which seemed to be an absolute decision from above. This incident serves as an interesting case to project power display. The way he does this is imposing and maybe because of his older age and male sex, which is associated with power in a patriarchal context, he practises superiority and constantly interrupts Gabi’s turn such as here and on many occasions during this conversation (between lines 39 and 41). This incident is related to politics of difference and otherisation as it is all about perceiving what and who the ‘other’ is and who is ‘one of us’. Politics of difference are very relevant to my project as the TC community negotiates us/them in relationship to both the host community as well as the political landscape of country.

Apparently, for uncle all the individuals, who were born in Cyprus and then moved to the UK, as well as the children of those individuals, are considered to be ‘the outsiders’ in his words ‘foreigners’ to the British. For him being an insider is to be part of the TC community, through such a positioning we can understand his own stance too. In his conversation with Gabi, we can see how he sets boundaries of labelling someone who he can label as an insider in relation to his own stance and heritage, regardless of individuals’ own trajectories and perceptions. There might be two reasons for claiming the position for labelling her as a foreigner:

1) She is young and the uncle holds power, in his mindset, to make and share a decision or determining her positioning.

2) The authoritarian positioning of the uncle projects his superiority within a patriarchal system, which might be associated with his Cypriot roots.

In line 41, Uncle suggests Gabi’s belonging is based on ‘blood’ or on principles of jus sanguinis. She embraces her Cypriot provenance by stating ‘my blood’,
however such a perspective on belonging proves to be linear and categorical, to which Gabi shows partial disagreement by directing a question about her home.

Gabi experiences emotional dilemmas which are marked through her questionings (lines 43 and 45). Her question serves as a powerful interactional device which hints at an unstated meaning rather than her requesting information (Candlin et al., 2017; Schiffrin, 2001; Tannen, 2007). Gabi’s questioning is an illustration of her own struggle with pinpointing where her home is. She not only questions herself but also seeks an answer and indirectly a verification from the others around her about where home should be. Such an act shows ambivalence towards her group membership and also a quest for recognition of her place in the community. She formulates her question by using the personal pronoun ‘we’ in order to draw an imaginary line between those who were born and raised in the UK and those in Cyprus. The attachment to home is intensified by metaphors of ‘the roots’, which are indexed by the spatial deixis such as ‘being there’.

‘Resisting dominant discourses and positioning ‘self’ as different depends greatly on the power imbalance in the encounter and the social order’ (Angouri, 2018:127). Therefore, we can claim that Gabi has very little to no agency to override uncle’s utterance; however, she places a question and challenges the pre-existing structure, to which an answer is not clearly provided.

Rather, we observe a shift in conversation, which marks an association between the physicality of a place and the perception of home. Upon being requested for an answer on the place of ‘home’, the topic turns to the ancestral lands and the focus shifts from emotional attachment to the physical locality. Their conversation between lines 48 and 59 illustrates how research participants intrinsically classify visiting and living in Cyprus. It is marked that the visits to Cyprus are merely ‘roots journeys’ (Levitt, 2003), as my participants see Cyprus as a location for summer vacations, and relaxation. These periodic visits give them the ‘illusion of return’ (Williams et al., 2000) and serve as a kind of ‘mundane pilgrimages’ (Çakmak, 2018; Elaide, 1987; Margry, 2008). Such sentimental links with the ancestral lands mark the
liminality of home and how individuals tend to romanticise a geographical location through their collective memory, which is seen as placebo nostalgia (Poupazis, 2014).

The praise of the geographical location, Cyprus, marks uncle’s (line 49) and Gabi’s (lines 57-58) heightened feelings about Cyprus. The use of expressions such as ‘our land’ and ‘for us’ (lines 49 and 50) marks a static understanding of roots and belonging, which Uncle associates with physically living in Cyprus. He expresses his views on living in Cyprus yet shows aspiration towards living there. Although the desirability of ‘return’ is one of the topics discussed in diaspora studies (Anwar, 1979; Cohen, 2008; Hall, 1990; Van Hear, 1998), the inherent tension between an ideal/imaginary return and the present lived experience is noted here. Although members of diasporic communities aspire to return to their ancestral lands, where they call it home, this is much more complex as the data here shows. For my participants, living in Cyprus is partially fulfilled through membership of the TC community in London (this is an important finding I revisit in 5.4. and 5.5.) and proves the fact that people might feel at home depending on the circumstances they live in. Both Gabi and Uncle conceptualise home as a material as well as a symbolic space. For Uncle, home is where ideas of prosperity and comfort come together. Gabi relates home to integration, safety and societal order. In a study conducted on refugees and displaced persons, Perez Murcia (2018:1518) suggests ‘conceptualising home as a material and symbolic space where ideas of comfort and discomfort as well as ideas of cultural identity and belonging and cultural alienation and not belonging interact, not only allows for painful experiences ‘at home’ but also challenges the idea of ‘going back home’ as a prevailing ‘durable solution’ for refugees and internally displaced persons’. This is the case for Gabi and Uncle. They both think of their ancestral bonds with Cyprus; however, experiences ‘at home’ such as unemployment, poverty, nepotism, and unfair treatment of people seem to be challenging the idea of going to Cyprus (lines 53-64). Denial of one’s attachment to their place of origin is manifested through spatial signifiers (Cyprus=there) as well as through perspectivation by framing themselves ‘us- those in England’ and ‘they- those in Cyprus’ by creating a disparity between perspectives as well as
physical spaces. Thus, these examples recount the liminality of home and contextual understanding of belonging, which is marked by positionings by both Gabi and Uncle. They both project conflicting views on home and belonging. According to Gabi home is where she has built memories, and familiarity with the people in the community comforts her and makes her feel part of the bigger grouping. London is where she finds comfort and where she feels she belongs, whereas Uncle associates home with a physical locality. Uncle illustrates inconsistent views on his belonging and displays clear views of pinpointing one geographical location as his home. His strong views on roots and belonging are contesting his conversation partners’ views. Such claims raise some controversies in terms of further dividing the views on the concept of home and belonging, hence this causes further concerns about group formation and membership status of the individual and its relationship to sentimental links with the ancestral lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 5.3.2.: We and they</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>That's because they came here never to settle, we came, you came here, my parents came here as British. We integrated much more; ah, the Turks from Turkey are not here to settle. They're here to make money and go back. They're very nationalist. We are, the Cypriots, are NOT. That is what the big difference is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 5.3.2. is almost emblematic of the ‘Us/Them’ positions and it reflects the importance of ‘groupism’ within the TC community. Using different labels such as ‘foreigner’, ‘refugee’, ‘immigrant’, ‘migrant’ – two main group categories were drawn upon; ‘the Turkish Cypriots’ and ‘the foreigners’, and the participants in this study would position themselves with these labels interchangeably depending on the context of the conversation. This is all related to politics of difference, which is a term that denotes the process of constructing the ‘other’ by drawing (conceptual and symbolic) boundaries between us/them (Angouri, 2018:128) Contrasting excerpts 5.3.2. and 5.5.1., we can see use of the personal pronoun ‘we’ is interchangeable in relation to Ash’s perceived categorisation. In excerpt 5.5.1., when she was referring to the Cypriots who claims to be displaced, she alienates herself by marking the
Cypriots as ‘they’. This serves as a strategy for distancing herself from the history of the island as she was physically never part of it. In contrast, in excerpt 5.3.2. she takes a stance as a Cypriot in London against Turkish people who migrated to London. This act presents how she distinguishes the two communities from each other by collectivising the TC community in London through the personal pronoun ‘we’ (lines 2, 3, 6) in juxtaposition with the description of the Turkish people from Turkey as ‘they’ (lines 1, 5, 6). Such a subjective and dynamic labelling and perceived categorisation (illustrated in Figure 16) shows the transience of the group belonging. And this practically gave me the motivation for focusing on how individuals build a community membership and develop a place-belongingness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>They</th>
<th>We</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All those outside the TC community</td>
<td>TCs living in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englishmen</td>
<td>TCs in general (irrespective of location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British</td>
<td>Turkish speakers from Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>British Turkish Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London-born and raised individuals with Turkish Cypriot background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 16: Perceived categorisation of ‘they’ and ‘we’ by Ash*

I will show the dynamic interplay between those categories in the data chapters that follow. I argue that instead of a mutually exclusive binary, they form a spectrum which is being renegotiated and redefined constantly.

‘Othering means turning the other into an other, thus creating a boundary between different and similar, insiders and outsiders’ (Dervin, 2016). By articulating the differences between the Turkish and the TCs in London Ash is significantly conducting ‘the dirty work of boundary maintenance’ (Crowley, 1999:30). Metaphorically speaking, she claims more to belong to a geographical space, which in this case is London. By achieving this claim, Ash reinforces a powerful resource for gatekeeping and for constructing a community identity in the TC diaspora. The act has strong connotations of unity and indexes claims of having more ‘right’ over a local, by which exercise of entitlement is practised.
Constructions of belonging are also related to one’s denial of their previous, or in this case perceived, attachments. During the off-record conversations with Ash, she suggests that due to her background being related to TCs, this is making her perceptible to be perceived as a member of ‘the Turkish speakers’. Ash deliberately expresses her discomfort with such a categorisation and indexically uses the adverb ‘we’ to signify herself and family as British and as well as Cypriot. Furthermore, she interchangeably points to a rejection. This is visible in the way she framed her utterance as an enactment of bureaucratic power. The initial ‘we’ as the British is framed to make a distinction between herself and any other Turkish speaking community in London. This strategy can discriminate and show dominance of her British self, by signifying that she is part of the superior group and does not sympathise with any group of Turkish speakers. Yet again, she makes another rhetoric of difference by the utilisation of the personal pronoun ‘we’ to signify ‘the Cypriots’. Here she accepts her family background and the migration from Cyprus, however, she opposes the idea of being ‘just a random’ migrant, which indexes bureaucratic entitlement to her status as a person with a migration background. By attempting to draw a clear distinction between Turkish people and the Cypriots, she is clearly exercising a powerful strategy to outline the status of Cypriots as migrants as well as pulling the Cypriot community within the political and societal boundaries of a superior ‘other’ and labelling the TC as ‘one of them’ and therefore positioning herself as ‘one of us’. Here due to the political past, she displays power and access and acts of superiority, and also acts of denial, for being accounted as being a Turk.

Ash is part of the TC diaspora through membership, but she deliberately distances herself from the Turkish diaspora in London although they share the same geographical location as their place of residence, and they belong to the same speech community (speakers of the Turkish language). This exemplifies subjective perceptions and electiveness of belonging and constructions of it related to one’s denial and acceptance of the membership. I am continuing the exploration of the topic in the next section by looking into the importance of specific localities, some of which are temporary and stable simultaneously.
5.4. Belonging and self-identification

The affective side of belonging, membership and locality is further elaborated in the following excerpt (excerpt 5.4.1., lines 9-12 and 13-17). I focus here on a conversation between Huseyin and Fatma, which emerged in the context of the interview, and shows another dimension prominent in the data, namely the perception of location.

Context: Huseyin and Fatma have agreed to meet me at a local café with a group of other participants. They are both retired and in very close contact with their children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt 5.4.1.: North and South London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not in the North, but have you ever thought of moving to the South any time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huseyin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>For us, I mean for us the foreigners (yabancilar) wherever you go I mean it’s the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Right? (nodding and showing agreement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huseyin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yeah, hehe (shrugging his shoulders and closing his eyes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mine too, because my whole family was in North London, that’s why we were all in North London. We’ve been always at this side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huseyin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(thinking a few seconds)We’ve stayed at this side, because my, I had only one sister, she got married. My wife’s family, for instance, all were living at this side, that’s why we stayed at this side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In excerpt 5.4.1., Fatma and Huseyin display being in a transitional state of being a *foreigner* and remaking their homes based on their emotional family bonds. This state highlights the experience in liminal space for home-making and developing the place-belonging of my participants (Den Boer, 2015; Murcia, 2020; Van Gennep, 1960). The word Yabancilar: In Turkish the same word ‘yabanci’ (plural: yabancilar) has to cover both ‘foreigner’ and ‘stranger’ in English. In their emotion-laden discourse, my participants exclude themselves from the greater geographical entity and consider themselves as aliens to the land and also strangers to the people around them. Huseyin and Fatma display a strong emotional attachment to their families, which in fact became their anchor points for their belonging to their place of residence.
Home for them becomes a place loaded with affection for their families rather than a geographical location. This is related to the individuals’ dynamic emotional attachment in relation to their material and social worlds as well as their experience (Wood and Waite, 2011).

In excerpt 5.4.1., Fatma acts as an active listener and deliberately attends to the conversation by nodding her head and backchanneling with a one-word response, in line 6. This response serves as an approval and agreement with Huseyin (Bolden, 2015). Both Huseyin and Fatma align themselves to each other and verify each other’s views on being ‘a foreigner’ (lines 6, 7,9). This excerpt shows how a physical location loses its relevance and significance to the notion of home. Going outside the boundaries of the community, here North or South London, proves to be not applicable for my participants as their claimed community membership is located within the boundaries of North London. So here we can see this excerpt epitomises the electiveness of belonging. It also shows that being a part of the community does not necessarily make a person a local. This excerpt particularly shows how home is seen as an affective space and how a physical geographical boundary has the power to draw mental and emotional boundaries for (re)making home. By building home on an affective space could mean preservation of a previous community identity as well as the creation of a new or renewed one in the local affectively built home (Al-Ali and Koser, 2002). It is the strength of this pattern in the data that motivated me to look into the role of the local community spaces for the participants’ place-belonging, as I do in chapters 6 and 7.

This is all related to constructing a localised identity, which denotes ‘being a local’ to North London. It signifies a way of belonging, which is based on the membership, therefore it presents itself as a localised identity (Appadurai, 1996). The excerpt shows how the idea of ‘being a local’ follows the dominant belonging discourse, in which belonging, place and membership are closely linked together.

In sum, the TC diaspora forms an interesting case for their quest for home due to its history and how they constructed a local TC diaspora space in the city of London. Throughout the following excerpts, I will discuss further how personal
and political histories are interwoven in a way that index a conflicting sense of self as well as distorted community belonging in the constructed space of the TC community. Ash’s utterance here is intrinsically historical. As in excerpts 5.3.1. and 5.4.1., the members of the TC diaspora see London as their home, but also are proud of their Cypriot heritage, and TC community membership. Next, Ash provides a new perspective on how TC diaspora reconstructed their idea of home in relation to the turbulent history of Cyprus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt: 5.4.2.: Ship sailing away</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yeah, for instance, I too was born here,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>raised. But what Oz tells, that the ship sails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>away, it actually doesn’t sail away, changes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I mean, it just transforms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In excerpt 5.4.2., Ash referred to how Oz utilises the metaphor of a ship sailing away from the shore. In that context, Oz compared cultural values with the ship and expressed that this ship is slowly sailing away and he implied that they, as the members of TC diaspora, could do nothing else but watch it disappearing into the distance. Ash on the other hand, thought her life experience, as a London-born and raised person is different from her husband’s. She categorised her Cyprus-born husband as a representative of all those who were born in Cyprus and came to London afterwards. She claimed that ‘the ship’ in fact ‘does not sail away’ but ‘changes/transforms’. She therefore emphasised the temporal evolution of cultural values. With this in mind, she explicitly differentiated the TC diaspora in London from TCs in Cyprus in terms of the cultural values people hold. By doing so we can say that she explicitly drew boundaries of the imagined community, whereas in contrast her husband Oz thinks TCs on the island and within the diaspora are the same.

Migration is often construed as a rite of passage and related to the experienced imagination of reality. Culture is, in my reading as perpetual, a transient state that undergoes dynamic regime social processes. The use of the ‘ship’ metaphor is documented in the literature when a diaspora represents its life experience as a journey (Mallett, 2004). Through this, change and
movement are presented on a continuum that has a beginning but an undetermined end. It also highlights the individual nature of the experience and allows the individual to position themselves. In social interactions, everyday questions about people’s origins might lead to tension of contradictions, as often places bear an emotional attachment and serve as an index for membership.

The complexity of the accounts led me to represent their perceptions in a multilayered/multidimensional way as per Figure 17 which I discuss at the end of the chapter. Before turning to that, I raise a core issue in my data, that of the politics of the topic.

5.5. Politics and the political

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 5.5.1.: Displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>That's what I am saying, the Cypriots have always been (.). ehm refugees, almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Hm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Maybe not refugees is the right word, but they've never had, (.). They've never had uhm... Displaced! that's right! They've always been displaced. So there isn't that where the Turks from Turkey are very much settled, they're nationalist, they don't have the same history as the Cypriot, which we've, you know, Cypriots have never had (.). anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(inaudible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>=Displaced! They ARE displaced and I think a lot of them here feel more placed here than they would in Cyprus because there's something more concrete here than there is in Cyprus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 5.5.1. illustrated Ash’s views on displacement of people of Cyprus and remaking their ‘home away from their home’. Cypriot communities experienced significant trauma during the civil war in Cyprus (for more on the history of Cyprus please refer to chapter 1). This conflict induced both an internal and external displacement. Displacement here denotes fleeing national borders and finding comfort in unfamiliar lands with a quest for home and place for building a community.
The juxtaposition of place of residence – in this case London – and the place of belonging, justifies the relationship between space and place through lived experience. When it comes to transforming the places into homes, the lived place becomes the anchor as the literature suggests that place-belongingness is achieved through habitual practices and experience. Interestingly, my participant Ash emphasises her view on Cypriots as ‘...here feel more placed here’ in London rather than in Cyprus. She associates safety and comfort with the feeling of being at home. She uses the spatial deixis ‘here’ suggesting that the TC community find themselves disoriented as home proved to be unfamiliar in reality than in their memories. Ash suggests people in the TC diaspora feel more at home in London rather than in Cyprus, as their ‘imagined’ Cyprus does not exist anymore and living in London is more tangible for the diaspora. The reference of the word ‘here’ to London has great importance for the analysis because it clearly manifests the dynamic nature of belonging and identity as well as ‘the discursive construction of dislocation and displacement’ (De Fina, 2009).

In the data, the names of places seem to consistently play an important role for my participants, so I paid special attention to them in my analysis. My participants use the names of places as their reference point when they talk about their sense of belonging – see excerpt 5.4.1. The mobilisation of such adverbs can be regarded as an indicator of attachment (Zappettini, 2019). Looking at the relational aspects of place attachments, it can be argued that my participants create a mental map to designate a particular place; such designation is dependent on the context of the talk. Further, the research data show that the participants use here and there to refer to ‘London, Cyprus, their own or their ancestors’ place of origin, and the UK (or place of residence)’. What is striking in the data is that my participants refer to those places interchangeably, see excerpt 5.3.2., and they show a multiple understanding of their group membership, depending on the context of the conversation.

This complexity is further shown in the next excerpt.

In excerpt 5.5.2. below, Ash’s place-belongingness (Antonsich, 2010) is explicitly handled. She confidently asserts that she is from London. This
exemplifies how the city of London renders as the locus for her home. However, when she is further confronted with the critical question of origin, with the hope of clarifying her ‘origin’, she gives the background of her parents as being from Cyprus. Through mentioning her parents’ background she strategically disassociates herself from them. After that, interestingly, she faces another challenging question of being Greek or Turkish. An intensifying factor in the case of the TC community is the perceived invisibility of that community and the complex relationship with the national and ethnic relations, as discussed earlier in Chapter 1. This makes the ‘us’ and ‘them’, particularly belonging, as fluid and contextualised in situated relationships in the data (Lähdesmäki et al., 2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt: 5.5.2.: originally where?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>So sometimes when I want to be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I say, &quot;I am from Edmonton!&quot;, well they say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;originally where you?&quot; &quot;well, I'm originally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>from London. I am not from anywhere else. My</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>parents are from. &quot;and when you say your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>parents are from Cyprus they say &quot;they're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Greek?&quot; Then you have to explain that you're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turkish Cypriot, not Greek. And even all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>these, HUNDRED of years people still perceive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cyprus as Greek.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diasporic communities makes a distinction between ‘home’ and ‘homeland’. In the first four lines, Ash presents herself as being labelled as ‘the other’ by people, presumably who are not from the TC community. Ash confronts the questions of ‘where are you from?’ as she expresses mixed feelings about how to answer this sometimes benign and sometimes exclusionary question. She perceives such questions as loaded with micro aggressions. She sometimes says she is a TC, but sometimes she says she is from Edmonton. This is related to the place-belongingness and where Ash feels at home. This excerpt also shows the struggle with categorisation on the basis of national or ethnic terms, which is particularly significant for the TC community, given the political history and context of her lived experience. Canagarajah (2012), writing on the ‘where are you from’ question, highlights the ways that people attempt to resist otherising self.
Being associated as Greek indexes symbolism from the turbulent history of the island and displacement of the islanders. She experiences ‘home’ in a form of a tension between the place her parents abandoned and the current place of residence. The politics associated with home and self/other positioning as local or foreigner has a great impact on how individuals develop attachment to a locality. Place attachment is constructed as a point of reference for one’s belonging and therefore group membership. Excerpt 5.5.2. demonstrates the emphasis on my participant’s perceived attachment to a certain place.

She no longer sees Cyprus as her home, as a place which is left behind, but is also aware/conscious of other’s presuppositions of where her home should be.

Excerpt 5.5.2. illustrates how place-belongingness is practised and is consistent in the data. Ash feels more attached to a geographical place, in this case it is Edmonton, because she has spent all of her life there. It is the place where personality and current self has been developed. She constructs a legitimate connection with Edmonton and this allows her to balance the difficult insider/outside or ‘native/foreigner’ divide. Closing the discussion here, the interview data showed the importance of exploring the ways in which local TC communities have organised self in their chosen locality, London and the impact of home politics - particularly the relationship between the TC/GC communities. The fuzziness and liminality of claiming local identities has provided a prompt for looking into a place where negotiations of TC identities is happening in situ. In closing then, the significance of looking into TC associations emerged through the analysis of the interview data and I perceived it to be a mandate for me to get into this under-researched and yet significant space for modern diasporas.

To conclude I revisit Figure 14 and close the chapter in the next and last section.

5.6. Summary and Synthesis

In chapter 5, I examined the interview data with the aim of identifying elements that participants perceive as influential with regard to forming perceptions
about their place-belongingness (Antonsich, 2010), ‘in-between-ness of belonging’ (Probyn, 1996) and how they navigate through the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006). These three concepts are synthesised with an understanding that belonging is fluid and contextualised in situated relationships (Lähdesmäki et al., 2016). The findings of this chapter drew together these concepts and examined the close relationship between the notion of place and the community membership in relation to participants’ claims of (un)belonging. Claims of belonging is an integral part of social life among diaspora members, as it is they who actively negotiate the boundaries of their community. The dataset together shows that belonging is important, highlighting the way in which understanding of home and belonging exist not only just as a tangible geographical reality but also as an abstract notion, which is formed and shaped with lived experience and exists as an affective space.

The notion of community often ‘implies a high degree of common interest and cohesion between its members’ (Montgomery, 2008:201). Male members of TC community seem to claim intrinsic superiority towards younger and female members of the community (Excerpt 5.3.1.). The same approach is also visible with the Cyprus born members of the community in London (Excerpts 5.4.2. and 5.5.1.). The analysis of the data has shown that my participants do not associate membership of the speech community with access to the community, which could be seen in excerpts 5.3.2. and 5.5.1. The place of residence is found to be an important factor in participants’ sense of belonging. Excerpts 5.3.1., 5.3.2. and 5.5.2. are great examples for negotiation of place-belongingness when participants expressed how they felt attached to a geographical location, being London, North London, a specific borough in London, Cyprus island or a village in Cyprus.

Claims of membership became relevant and were mobilised when participants talked about their emotions, understanding of home and relationships with the people within the TC community. More specifically, it was demonstrated that they formed a community membership through ‘essence’ -heritage and blood, family, place of residence and religion. ‘Essence’, however, becomes relevant in the negotiated here and now and the interviews enabled the participants to recount daily practices and their experience in specific places.
Cases presented here both confirm and show nuances and the politics of these patterns; for instance my participant in excerpt 5.3.2. defined the boundaries of the community through members’ underlying motivation for their migration. She created an in-group vs. out-group distinction by strategically utilising personal pronouns such as ‘we-they’ and therefore claimed her group membership.

Turning to another theme, the interviews’ analysis has shown the transient perception of home and belonging in the liminal spaces of diaspora communities and the sentimental link with the homeland. This will be further discussed in the next chapter where I turn to data from diasporic associations. Before that, I revisit Figure 14 here and show the layers and ingredients that are interrelated in the construction of community as emergent from the discussion so far. I will discuss the core concepts further in the discussion and closing of the thesis. At this stage, the figure shows the relationship of ‘core’ and ‘outer’ layers in substantiating and authenticating claims of membership on the one hand and creating the whole TC community on the other.

![Figure 17: Interrelated layers in the community building](image-url)
Overall, the findings contribute to the existing literature by examining the topics of place and community in a cohesive manner, since extant research treated these topics separately with little emphasis on their linkages. Participants’ perceptions of tangible place were found to be important regarding their formation of community and discursive claims of membership. Following the analysis of first two phases of data collection, associations were identified to be an appropriate context to investigate these linkages between place and community. It was evident from the empirical data that the members of the diaspora recontextualise the liminal community spaces into their place of interaction. This is done through a place-making process, which forms the basis for the discussion of the next section.

This is a finding that emerged after the analysis conducted in phase one and two. Therefore, it is appropriate now to discuss these emergent concepts of place-making and habitual practices by initially reviewing the relevant literature. This will then allow a thorough synthesis of emergent findings with extant research.

5.6.1. Synthesis of Place-making and habitual practices

The process of place-making is aligned with human interaction and experience, both of which are associated with personal or collective habitual practices. With the aim of illustrating the relationship between the process of place-making and the habitual practices, I turn to Lefebvre’s work on the production of space.

Lefebvre is one of the scholars who did not distinguish between space and place. His work, The Production of Space (1991), is in line with my understanding of the process of place-making. In his work, he focused on how space is produced. The previous discourses focused on how things were produced in spaces (Schmidt, 2011). I utilised Lefebvre’s framework because I investigate how place is made through human practice. I apply his framework to my research project and utilise the term ‘place’ instead of ‘space’, as he did not distinguish between these terms. Next, I explain how he studied the production of space while keeping the terminology of ‘place’ in mind.

Lefebvre (1991) suggests three dimensions of space. These are:
• representations of space (conceived space (espace conçu));
• representational space (lived space (espace vécu));
• spatial practice (perceived space (espace perçu)).

Firstly, representations of space refer to the space that is constructed through discourse; these are conceived, rather than lived, therefore abstract. This conceived space is planned, designed, shaped and conceptualised in line with the abstract visualisations of a space. This form of conceived space is essential for the further production of abstract space and is in line with my understanding of space.

Secondly, representational space is directly lived and experienced. ‘It is space experienced through the complex symbols and images of its ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’” (Lefebvre, 1991:33). This is where the habitual practices come into play, and the way this space is experienced and how the meaning of it is produced rely on the physical objects found in space. Those physical objects often have symbolisation power, which could transform how space is perceived. In his works, Lefebvre acknowledges the importance of the production of space through spatial practices.

Spatial practices thus simultaneously defines: places ─ the relationship of local and global; the re-presentation of that relationship; actions and signs; the trivialised spaces of everyday life; and, in opposition to these last, spaces made special by symbolic means as desirable or undesirable, benevolent or malevolent, sanctioned or forbidden to particular groups.


In this second dimension, I see the place-making in progress. Through spatial awareness, individuals live in the given space and they attach meaning to their spatiality. Human practices are the lived experiences. Therefore, in this second dimension individuals, or in Lefebvre’s (1991) words ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users’ of the space, fill it with representations, which develop into spatial practices.

Spatial practices, in the third dimension, entail everyday practices of life. These everyday practices are generally routines and experience that exist within users’ own social spaces. This perceived space is materialised and
socially produced. Space evolves around these practices and it is how spaces gain meaning and become places. Spaces therefore, unlike places, are not attached to particular sets of predetermined human practices, but rather rely on ‘qualities that come to be associated with a particular place’, which can be easily observed through the analysis of language in interaction (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013:16).

In my project, I use the terms place-making and place-belonging for putting emphasis on the discursive and social construction of place and the importance of habitual practices in the process. Through spatial experience, individuals co-create their place and attribute meaning to individual and collective practices.

I consider practices, in general, to be the certain ways people do things in their lives and habitus is an insightful way of understanding social interactions. Bourdieu defines habitus as ‘a system of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations’ (1990:53).

Habitus is consequently associated with how a person develops a sense of place and how a person shapes his/her role in the environment in which they live. Therefore, we can say that habitus is embodied in the cognitive sense of place. Painter (2000:242) adds that habitus is ‘the mediating link between objective social structures and individual action and refers to the embodiment in individual actors of systems of social norms, understandings and patterns of behaviour, which, while not wholly determining action […] do ensure that individuals are more disposed to act in some ways than others’. Individual-based action and social determination constantly affect the way habitus is constituted. In the same vein, habitus continually influences the way people behave and act. Habitus ‘is durable but not eternal’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:133). Bourdieu (1990) emphasises that social space is constructed by pre-existing dispositions and experiences which, again, can be reconfigured and changed. He writes that habitus is ‘a product of history, it may be changed by history’. This is a constant reconfiguration, which is constituted in practice.
People encounter situations and interpret them in accordance with their pre-existing dispositions (Hillier and Rooksby, 2005:22). As a result, as a community, individuals claim belonging and a feeling of togetherness. Thus this sense is an end-product of the process of place-making and is called 'place-belongingness' (Amin, 2002; Antonsich, 2010; Bauman, 2000; Castells, 1996).

Place-belonging is found to be affected by the personal relationships developed by the residence in a geographical locus. Underpinning the sense of community is constant interaction and affective connection to the place of residence. All those elements interact and create an unbreakable matrix as shown here.

To conclude, the notion of belonging, community and place have attracted multidisciplinary interest. By taking a socio-/applied linguistics perspective, in particular drawing on insights gained from interactional sociolinguistics and discourse analytical approaches, I showed the connection between place and community membership in the exploration of the notion of place-belonging in the diasporic community. The next chapter further explores the diaspora associations where communal spaces are re-contextualised through habitual practices and the members of the associations negotiate their belonging to diaspora.
6 Diasporic Associations: Negotiations of Place-belonging- Outcomes of the Third Phase

This chapter illustrates how community spaces undergo the place-making process and start to be meaningful places for the diaspora communities, where members do place-belonging and make claims of membership. Therefore, diaspora associations constitute an exemplary locus for studying the dynamic negotiations of participants’ place-belonging, community membership and a renegotiation of the notional ‘home’/‘host’ community binary.

I consider the diaspora associations as a community of practice. Through the members’ continuous participation in activities that bridge the lived experience of the present with the, often inherited, tradition of the past, associations play a unique role in creating a liminal space that connects past and present. Within the CofP framework, belonging to a community is implicitly defined. The definition is through the qualities and traits of the community (De Fina, 2007). The notion of membership is often seen as one of the key factors for the establishment of a community. Being a member has however, different degrees, which vary from one CofP to another. Therefore, the notion of membership is challenged regarding whether it is helpful or not when defining a community (Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain, 2013:14). Diasporas, as do all communities, ‘guard’ their borders and expect members to be able to substantiate claims of being ‘one of us’ through drawing on a community’s symbols. Negotiating access is a significant part of the process through which the collective community and its ways of doing is re-enacted and negotiated. This is very noticeable in the diaspora associations. Associations materialise through meetings in borrowed spaces, which become temporarily the community’s unique place. These borrowed spaces can be community town halls, restaurants, church halls, and school halls. More often than not, communities borrow, rent or repurpose community halls (Bonnerjee, 2017; Silver, 2020; Spaaij and Broerse, 2019). Members of the associations can relate their background and experience to each other and therefore they tend
to reinforce each other’s social capital by strengthening their relationship and building trust.

Many scholars (e.g., Bailey, 2001; Bucholtz, 1999; De Fina, 2006, 2007; Maryns and Blommaert, 2001; Rampton, 1995) emphasise the constructive nature of self-categorisation and belonging understood as a dialogic process between the society and the individual (Kirilova and Angouri, 2017). CofP can be classified as a bottom-up process of membership construction where notions of self-categorisation and belonging are explicitly and implicitly emerging and negotiated, rather than being openly imposed or projected (Benwell and Stokoe, 2006:27). Diasporas are heterogeneous communities which are, however, built on the myth of homogeneity (Perez Murcia, 2018). Following Brah (1996), the ‘other’ is a significant component and resource for constructing ‘us’. Neither category is homogeneous however. As such, all diasporas are differentiated, heterogeneous, contested spaces, even though they are implicated in the construction of a common ‘we’. It is within this confluence of narrativity that ‘diasporic community’ is differently imagined under different circumstances and contexts. In diasporas gatekeeping tends to be more political due to its transnational engagement. Diaspora organisations contribute towards the development and migration policies (Ghorashi, 2004). The gatekeeper not only provides access to the community, but also performs as an authentic representation to the community in context (Çavuşoğlu, 2021; Denk, 2023). Previous studies have paid significant attention to how membership in communication and local interaction are intertwined and closely managed (Bailey, 2001 and 2015; Bucholtz, 1999; De Fina, 2006, 2007; Maryns and Blommaert, 2001; Rampton, 1995). However, diaspora associations, and their structure, have not been studied before using a language lens or in the detail proposed here, despite their significance for diasporas. Further, the role of specific members, such as the Chair/committee is almost completely missing from the discussion in the few relevant studies. Such an investigation provides a close look at the hierarchical power symmetry in the association and how this power is exercised to retain and shape the community. The emphasis in this study is on how a leading person can act as a gatekeeper of a community in and beyond the diaspora association and how
the members, as well as newcomers to that community, comply with, negotiate or resist the dominant norms policed by the Chair and the community itself.

At the Lilies, the role of the Chair is significant for the functioning of the weekly meetings (for more see 6.3.) due to Chair’s role as the gatekeeper to the community. The role of the Chair as the cultural, social as well as political gatekeeper makes the associations an interesting case to investigate and especially in diaspora context the dimension of the gatekeeping exceeds the cultural boundaries as well as the national boundaries. Some of the practices that the Chair, especially at the Lilies, undertakes to perform her gatekeeping/leading role include using national reminders, sympathising with others, being welcoming. This gatekeeping role also involves being authentic to the community profile.

As the analysis of the data will show, associations follow a hierarchical structure and exhibit characteristics of a 'closed' community in which newcomers must be acknowledged and their membership must be legitimised by the existing members of the group. Once within the circle of the association, the members are expected to comply with the norms and rituals that are shaped largely by the old-timers, and more broadly the dominant ideals that circulate in the association. The data will show that act of chairing and display of membership are coupled with each other. The chair role (meaning all those who are acting as the chair, or positioned as the chair) exercise gatekeeping by deciding who is part of the community or what makes one to gain access to the community. Generally, such gatekeeping practice is complex and not defined on one level. If the metaphor of a gate is applied for accessing a collectivity (in this case TC community, or TC diaspora associations), it can be said that it requires an agent of gatekeeper on one level and on the other level it requires those who desire to go through the gate. It can be said that it is a reciprocal exchange. By going towards the gate and seeking access, the individuals illustrate a willingness to comply with the perceived community norms. The access is however through those gatekeepers who make moral judgements about the individuals’ suitability for the community membership. It should not be misunderstood though; the community membership is not automatically ‘given’ once the individuals are allowed to enter through the
‘gate’. Community membership negotiation is a continuous process and does not end once an individual enters to the community space.

The members are required to take an active part of the community by attending weekly meetings. These weekly meetings serve as symbolic collective identity moments and gatekeeping events into the community. Before exploring the dynamics of role performance in this context, I provide a detailed description of the associations, and weekly recurring events taking place at the associations because it is vital to frame the context for study.

6.1. Setting the scene: Associations in London

The Olives

The Olives is a South London-based TC association with approximately 100 members. It welcomes everybody from the local community. The weekly meetings at The Olives take place every Tuesday between noon and 5pm at a hired church hall and are run by the Chair anonymised as Nelda and steering committee members Zehra, Sabine and Yvonne. Alongside the Chair, the steering committee is responsible for the administrative side of meetings, meals offered at the meetings, entertainment and activities, and also the organisation of sightseeing tours in the UK and abroad.
For the weekly meetings, the steering committee members arrive with the pre-prepared meals, set up the seating and make all necessary arrangements for the meeting. Figure 19 presents the weekly recurring events undertaken by the Chair, the group of volunteers and the ordinary members of The Olives.

Figure 18: Hierarchy in The Olives

Figure 19: Recurring events during weekly meetings at The Olives
The meetings start with a welcome speech by Nelda the Chair. Nelda then shares relevant news and information with the members. After the speech, Sabine (steering committee member) collects the money for the lunch menu, Cypriot coffee and the bingo game. Having a meal, drinking coffee and participation in the bingo and card game are not obligatory, but drawing from observational data, the majority of the participants look forward to these activities and they join in and contribute towards them.

A similar weekly schedule takes place at The Lilies. Next, I turn to The Lilies and discuss the weekly events and roles of the Chair, steering committee and the ordinary members there.

**The Lilies**

The Lilies is an established organisation in the TC community in North London with approximately 250 members. The Lilies was founded as an association bringing people from a specific region in Cyprus together in London. In recent years some, but not all, of the current members of the association firstly perceive themselves to be TCs but self-identify with the region too. The association also welcomes members who attend the meetings regularly because of their close affiliation with the TC community in London. The weekly meetings at The Lilies take place at a designated Turkish restaurant in North London. Like The Olives, alongside the Chair - Fatma, and the steering committee run the association. The steering committee is responsible for welcoming and seating everybody. They ensure everyone is greeted and asked about their wellbeing. They perceive their actions as more than just a hospitable interaction, but a routinised series of duties within the association. They embrace an ‘organiser’ identity and seem to perform consistent roles as amicable hosts. The hierarchy at The Lilies is shown in Figure 20.
Figure 20: Hierarchy in The Lilies

Figure 21 illustrates the events undertaken by the Chair, volunteer steering committee and the ordinary members during weekly meetings. Such an illustration is important to demonstrate the variety of roles undertaken during the meetings.

Next, I turn to the analytic focus of this chapter.
6.2. Analytic focus

The analysis focuses on recurrent weekly activities which have a specific start and end point and explores repetitive practices within diaspora associations. As discussed (2.1.3.), I argue that individuals build and substantiate group membership in and through these activities. I look at each of these repetitive practices closely for analysis, focusing in particular on the role performance of the Chair and the volunteers of the two diaspora associations. This is because these roles are visible and symbolic, significant for holding together the community’s ways of doing. Additionally, I investigate instances of marked encounters (excerpts 6.3.2.1., 6.3.2.2., 6.4.1.1., 6.4.1.2., 6.4.4.1., 6.5.1.2. and 6.5.1.3.) during weekly activities and take them as markers of group belonging. Furthermore, I look closely at recurrent patterns and include representative excerpts (6.4.3.1., 6.4.4.1., 6.5.1.1., 6.7.1.1., 6.7.1.3., 6.7.2.2.). I also pay attention to the switches between the Turkish Cypriot Dialect (TCD) and Greek Cypriot Dialect (GCD), when they feed into marked incidents for making claims of membership.

Finally, I explore how and when repetitive national hegemonic narratives are of significance for members’ development of a sense of belonging. I approach the data from three analytical viewpoints:

1. The structure of the activities orchestrated by the Chair role,
2. How members police participation and in/exclude newcomers,
3. How home politics become relevant to negotiating belonging to the group.

The analytic focus is on the enactment of binaries such as, us/them, now/then, foreign/own that signal any claims of membership. Mobilisation of such binaries reveals a complex negotiation of identity boundary crossing as the next sections show.

---

3 The relationship between Cypriot dialects of standard modern Turkish and standard modern Greek is a matter of ongoing discussion. They are typically considered to be dialects of Turkish and Greek respectively. For the purposes of this work I refer to TCD and GCD as the Turkish Cypriot Dialect and Greek Cypriot Dialect respectively.
This chapter draws on the analysis of 23 excerpts and five photos from weekly meetings at two associations in London. The excerpts are selected to represent patterns in the data and incidents for making explicit claims of belonging. The photographs are included to convey the sense of place of the association (Crow, 2000; Crow and Wiles, 2008). In this work, photographs are selected to depict moments of the weekly meetings and contribute towards analysis of community building practices as they illustrate nonverbal communication practices of members. I consider the photographs to be a secondary dataset but I do not adopt a detailed multi-modal analysis methodology; I use the photographs as complementary visual support for my arguments.

Next, I turn to illustrating and examining a selection of repetitive practices that I argue are central to the building of the community. I start with examining acts of chairing as a community building practice done by the Chair Fatma, and Tomris and Sevgi the members of steering committees.

6.3. Acts of chairing and community building practices

Given the nature of the association as a continuation of the imaginaries associated with ‘home’, the Chair role is very important for the continuation of the tradition in the community.

I show how the Chair role is performed and argue that this enables the performer to exercise power over others, to police participation and demonstrate control over the structure of the events in the association. To
support the analysis, I take into consideration where the Chair stands during the welcome speech, how the members are seated and how the physical space is used as part of the community building practices. A detailed analysis of embodiment, however, goes beyond the scope of this thesis.

6.3.1. Getting people on board - the chair as the controller

Giving a speech is one of the generalisable features for the Chair’s role (Angouri and Marra, 2010). In both associations in this study the Chairs, Fatma and Nelda, give a welcome speech and greet all the members at the meeting. The welcome speech serves as a time for displays of power and group leadership. The Chairs seize the moment to get people on board. When delivering the speeches at every meeting they stand in a position visible to everyone and deliver the speeches. For analysis, I will take Fatma, the Chair of The Lilies, as an example and examine her way of enacting leadership in the meetings.

In her weekly speech, Fatma refers to all the historical events that carry significance for the community and commemorates all those who lost their lives in that week of the month. Those who are commemorated include TC political leaders, influential Turkish and TC scholars and intellectuals.

Communal prayers and blessings are common practices that show how the community comes together in the liminal space of the association. As the community leader Fatma invites everybody to join the prayer and gives her blessings to all. This is embodied through a common prayer act by opening the palms of the hands and whispering the prayers. How they were praying collectively is depicted in image 2.
Praying is not the only practice that serves for community building, but also celebrating birthdays and other important personal events. Celebrating birthdays promotes a sense of sharedness and community amongst the members as it serves as ‘the ritual of passage in the community, individuation, provides a sense of group membership […]’ (Rojaka and Lesinskienė, 2018). Fatma again takes on the role of facilitator and announces whose birthday it is. After she announces their names, they stand up and she gives them a pink boa. By doing so, Fatma positions herself as the superior, congratulates the celebrating members and all the members collectively cheer and sing.

Image 3 captures where Fatma stands and the pink boas given to the birthday girls.
The woman in the pink boa is the first member to be announced. Fatma stands in the centre and holds a pink boa ready to give it to the second member who also celebrated a birthday on the day the photographs are taken. Such a central positioning is an indicator of the role that Fatma holds in the community; as Fatma stands in the middle of the restaurant she controls and directs the meetings. The steering committee is part of this power display. The steering committee consists of a group of volunteers who perform as aides of the Chair. In the case of the birthday celebrations, Fatma invites not only the celebrating members but also the steering committee members to perform a waltz in front of everyone as part of the birthday celebration. These moments are represented by the celebrations in image 4.
While they are dancing the waltz, all the members sing a popular Turkish song about friendship. Displays of shared identities and regional bonds as well as commitment to the common activities are frequent in the whole dataset. Such practices mark a joint belonging in the association and the community and illustrate the role of the Chair in facilitating but also controlling the proceedings.

6.3.2. Role performance negotiation

The Chairs of the two associations - Fatma and Nelda - act as the ultimate leaders in both of the associations in this study. They lead the group of volunteers, facilitate the meetings, and give a welcome speech. During these welcome speeches, they inform the members about the news related to the community, share information about healthcare and, as normal in informal social events, they share a story or a joke from the community. Besides the Chair herself, members from the steering committee take on the authoritative Chair role, and claim power to facilitate and navigate the weekly activities. This is where the Chair role becomes apparent through four marked incidents. They are chosen because the sequence shown is in sharp contrast to the rest of the dataset. The first two incidents illustrate the Chair role performed by Fatma at
the Lilies during the welcome speech. Fatma is the founder and Chair of the association.

Excerpt 6.3.2.1. demonstrates the incident where Fatma was interrupted by loud chattering from the ordinary members. This did not occur elsewhere in the dataset and the uptake indicates that it is a behaviour considered as inappropriate and is sanctioned. Upon being interrupted (line 1) she deliberately paused her speech, and the voiced hesitation mark (line 1) serves to actually attract all members’ attention. This is followed by Fatma using a formal structure title and last name to refer to the members (line 1). The laughter in line 12 can afford multiple readings but the relevant function is that Fatma is allowed to stigmatise behaviours and control silence in the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.3.2.1.: Listen to me</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>[...] Emm Mrs Nelly lutfen beni dinleyiniz, Guzelim,</td>
<td>[...] Erm, Mrs Nelly, please listen to me, my lovely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mrs Nelly</td>
<td>Dinlerik tabi seni, biriyle konusmam ki!</td>
<td>We, of course, listen to you. I’m not talking to anyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>Haha, konusmuyorsun ama biseyler yapiyorsun, lutfen beni dinle.</td>
<td>Haha, you’re not talking but doing things, please listen to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>Laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>Evet, evet, arkadaslar</td>
<td>Yes, yes, my friends. [continues with her speech]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of directives towards the ordinary members in lines 2 and 8-9 shows Fatma’s power. Vine (2001) explores power by examining directives as a form used to express control acts. Directives serve as mechanisms for power enactment and they have been widely identified as discursive control devices (Holmes and Stubbe, 2015). In excerpt 6.3.2.1. above, Fatma reinforces her positioning as a leader and as a superior who requires to be listened to. The members of the association negotiate the roles of those in leadership in their context through formal procedures (voting) and in situ accepting the asymmetrical management of the floor.
People take roles that are legitimate within the context of weekly meetings. The regular members know what is expected from them, therefore they align with the current hegemonies within the association. The ‘We, of course’ prefaced utterance in line 4 functions as an alignment to the leader. Mrs Nelly takes a defensive position, but she conforms to what is expected from her and they co-construct their ascribed roles in that context.

As we have seen, hierarchies are constructed through the weekly activities and the roles that people are occupying. The Chair occupies significant interaction time which further emphasises her role; at the same time the Chair role is constrained by the structures constructed by the group. The group is led and informed by the Chair and the Chair’s role is legitimised by the group’s uptake and by endorsing the claims the Chair makes. Newcomers to the association are also expected to accept the authority of the Chair and to adapt to the ‘rules of the game’ such as enacting their role of ordinary member by listening to the Chair when she is giving a speech. That is to say the role of the Chair and enactment of the group belonging is directly related. It is central in the ways in which the association and the ways of doing things in the association emerge in and through interaction.

The Chair plays a big role in the representation of the whole community in local government and beyond. This adds to the power associated with the role of the Chair and makes it a rather political post. Evidently, not everybody who associates with TCness goes to this association, but their visible status is important for both those who engage with and for those who reject those places of nostalgic perpetuation of a common past. The Chair enjoys the support of the group. I show this through the second marked incident in excerpt 6.3.2.2. where Fatma displays clear control by maintaining tight control of the interactional floor. This is again a marked excerpt because the Chair specifically pauses her welcome speech to make a remark.
Fatma here is assigning tasks to others. Task allocation is again associated with the role of the Chair in professional events. In this case, Fatma makes a remark regarding the newcomers by directly addressing one of the steering committee members - Mrs. Dima. Her utterance and the way she used her fingers are indicators of her owning the interactional floor and being at a higher status. She uses directives (lines 2 and 5) as well as the word ‘please’ to soften the imperative. Being in charge is a status practised in the association throughout the meetings. As seen in excerpt 6.3.2.2., Mrs. Dima’s task was to act and intervene with the newly arrived members and seat them. However, she has not fulfilled her duty, therefore the Chair who is in charge of the whole meeting, markedly intervened and openly prompted Mrs. Dima regarding her duty. Division of labour is prominent in the structure of the association but the Chair is the ultimate controller and ratifier. These roles are negotiated in association meetings.

Next, I will focus on one of the social activities during the weekly association meetings, the bingo game. I will explore how roles are performed through members’ engagement in a mutual activity and build a shared repertoire.

### 6.4. The Bingo game

Playing Bingo is perhaps one of the most important activities of the weekly meetings at both of the associations. At The Lilies, there is a visible division of labour. During the weekly recurring activities the steering committee members, Tomris, Yelda and Sevgi, are responsible for a designated task, such as drawing numbers, collecting money, and distributing bingo cards and pens to the players. Image 5 captures a moment where Yelda was collecting money, whilst Sevgi was distributing the bingo cards.
Next, I will show two incidents where the bingo game serves as a platform for role negotiation during the facilitation of the game. The first one is performed by a steering committee member, Tomris, who is in charge of facilitating the bingo game at The Lilies. The second incident is undertaken by Zehra who is on the steering committee at the Olives and is acting as the bingo game facilitator.

6.4.1. Facilitating the bingo game

At The Lilies, Tomris is the person in charge of the bingo game. She is responsible for calling out the numbers. In general she is the facilitator of the bingo game, therefore she is the person who holds power to give directives and to perform the Chair role in that context. Her use of role performance is shown in excerpt 6.4.1.1. below. Tomris draws on the same strategies as Fatma, indicating the acceptance of the hierarchical division of roles in the context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>6.4.1.1.: Tomris- tombala</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Almadiniz mi? (to newcomers) E nasil calisiyorsunuz?</td>
<td>Haven’t you taken one? (to newcomers) Eh how are you doing your work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Insanlar, insanlar tombala istiyor, hayatim. (to bingo card seller)</td>
<td>Those people, people want bingo, my darling (to the bingo card seller)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Yelda Tombala?</td>
<td>Bingo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Evet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yelda
E nasıl oldu?
Eh how did that happen?

Sevgi
İki tane, verdi, onlar yeni gelenler
Two times, she’s given, they are the newly arriveds.

Tomris
To everyone: yeni gelenler var, iki arkadaş geldi. Evet, sessiz olun lütfen, cünkü bugün bir defa söyleyecem numaraları.
To everyone: there are newly arrived ones, two friends have just arrived. Yes, please be quiet, because today I will call the numbers only once.

Tomris constructs herself as the responsible person for the smooth running of the bingo game. In lines 2-3 she reproaches the people who were responsible for selling bingo cards. The direct question and exclamative ‘eh’ indicate her reaction as both surprised and displeased when she discovers the game cannot commence because there were two people who have not received the bingo cards. By making the comment ‘Eh how are you doing your work?’ (lines 2-4), in that context, she aligns herself with a leader role and perceives herself as the superior because; she enacts her role as the facilitator of the game. She uses a direct tone (lines 2-7) which indicates sanctioning of the behaviour of the members. Endearment is a strategy used to soften harsh criticism and soften face-threatening acts by signalling that the speaker considers the power to be small (Baumgarten, 2021; Brown and Levinson, 1987). In line 5-6, Tomris utters ‘my darling’ which indicates a softening of her previous directive. She then resumes her role in chairing the bingo game and provides an explanation to the players why there was a slight delay in starting the game (lines 15-18). In lines 18-21 her seniority is manifested in the interaction. By saying, ‘Yes, please be quiet, because today I will call the numbers only once’, she holds the floor when she introduces the rules in a warning tone by using the discourse marker ‘yes’. The members of the association hold a central role in the operationalisation of practices that serve as points of reference in the community. This is illustrated in the following incident which also draws on another symbolic game.

The fourth encounter, as shown in excerpt 6.4.1.2., entails similar Chair role performance negotiation at the Olives during a bingo game performed by
Zehra, a member of the steering committee therefore showing the complementarity. Her role is relevant to the ways in which management in the association is enacted in the context of the bingo game as well as in the construction of the context itself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.1.2.: C’mon bingo</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Tamam! Disardakiler bingo oynayacak mi? (signs ‘come’ with her hands). Nelda, sor disardakiler bingo oynaycaksa gelsinler. (signing with her hands) Hade.</td>
<td>Ok! The ones outside, are they playing the bingo? (signs ‘come’ with her hands). Nelda, ask them if the ones outside wanted to play bingo to come in. (signing with her hands) C’mon!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nelda</td>
<td>Disardakiler hade bingo!</td>
<td>The ones outside, c’mon bingo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Nelda! (signing photograph clicks with her fingers, looking around) Dear Serra Ablacigim, geliyormun?</td>
<td>Nelda!(signing photograph clicks with her fingers, looking around)Dear Serra sister you coming?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Geliyor, geliyor.</td>
<td>She is coming, coming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Tamam miyiz? Bingoyu baslatlyoruz. Hade!</td>
<td>Are we alright? We are starting the bingo. C’mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>Benim kagidim yok.</td>
<td>I don’t have the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ayse</td>
<td>Necin?</td>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>Kalem da yok</td>
<td>No pen too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Bingo kagidini</td>
<td>Bingo paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In excerpt 6.4.1.2. Zehra begins by calling everyone to be ready for the game and this serves as the verbal headcount (a turn normally associated with the Chair, see Marra, 2003). Her turn is marked with the utterance initial discourse marker ‘ok!’ that shows her high status in the organisation and she focuses the interaction on the bingo game. She clearly demonstrates that she is in charge of the bingo game by enacting the explicit calling for a start, and explicitly calling all participants. It is also enacted through the repetitive use of ‘C’mon!’ (line 10) and ‘Are we alright? We are starting the bingo. C’mon.’ (lines 19-21).
As the game facilitator, the most overt indicator of Zehra’s elevated interactional status is the significant share of the floor time she takes compared to other participants (Holmes et al., 2011). Beyond the local significance of opening/closing the game, being in the position of control in that context has implications for the whole community as the game is an arena where participants negotiate their roles and claim belonging through ratifying the rules of the bingo game. I showed this in light of excerpts 6.4.1.1. and 6.4.1.2. Next, I will focus on the humorous incidents and complaints during the bingo game that index a shared routine. I specifically explore how social practices contribute towards participants’ group identity and how group membership is ratified through enactment of roles.

6.4.2. Bingo numbers

The game involves an interaction between the person who draws the numbers and the bingo players. During the game they exchange shared points of reference in the forms of stories, events etc. Their common discourse of the CofP is used as a resource for bonding as indexed in informal language, use of expletives, or humorous episodes. Members draw on these resources in building insiderness throughout time. Although each linguistic feature can be analysed separately, what is significant is how members mobilise visible points of reference in the community to claim a shared identity. Insider jokes have long been acknowledged as a strategy for separating insiders from newcomers.

The following excerpts 6.4.2.1. - 6.4.2.3. illustrate this interaction between Tomris, who drew the numbers and the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.2.1.: Bingo numbers 1</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Genc asiklar!</td>
<td>Young lovers!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Audience all together</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Aferin!</td>
<td>Well done!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 6.4.2.1. represents how Tomris uses a reference to age (line 1) and calls out the number 22 as ‘two young lovers’. This is a successful attempt as
they share enough common resource to read number 22 as two swans resembling two people as lovers. Similarly, in excerpts 6.4.2.2. and 6.4.2.3. Tomris makes references to appearance and body image. These are topics marked in the community with frequent occurrence in small talk, typically following dominant ideals of slimness used to indicate beauty. She refers to 11 as two skinny women (line 1 in excerpt 6.4.2.2.) and 88 as two fat ladies (lines 1 and 2 in excerpt 6.4.2.3.). These patterns are shared points of reference which serve as memory aids for the players, as indicated by the chorus response. Members’ common acknowledgement of these commodities is what indexes insiderness and how the bingo game players enact group belonging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.2.2.: Bingo numbers 2</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>2 siska Kadin</td>
<td>2 skinny women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Audience all together</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Aferin size, dersinize calisiyoruz!</td>
<td>Well done you all! You’re studying your lesson!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.2.3.: Bingo numbers 3</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Iki sisman hanım nedir?</td>
<td>What is two fat ladies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Audience all together</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tomris</td>
<td>Aferin size. 88!</td>
<td>Well done. 88!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tomris uses markers such as ‘Well done’ (line 6) to index approval and by extension reaffirms both the symbolic value of those rituals and her own role as the meeting controller. Complimenting someone’s action is an important endorsement and by using affirmation, Tomris positions herself as the facilitator of the bingo game as well as the leader because the audience acts as followers by appreciating the jokes. This is an example for the situated nature of learning here and more broadly corresponds to learning in organisations (Holmes and Stubbe, 2015). The association is also an organisation where people learn in situ how things are done through repetition.
Hallett et al. (2009) wrote about praise and the importance of appraisal. What Tomris is doing is sharing the floor with the audience, engaging them in the bingo game by letting them draw the numbers and by giving them praises for knowing and understanding the humour behind the bingo numbers.

Repetition of such humorous episodes during an activity contributes towards building a community of practice. The insiders acknowledge the humorous attempt and they share the floor and complete each other’s turns. The players establish a group identity as insiders by acknowledging the jokes and therefore receiving affirmations by the number caller (Tomris). Through these regular and repetitive performances, the association emerges and the members construct a common front. Constructing and maintaining boundaries is the process through which an organisation emerges and legitimises participation in its core organisational practices (Angouri, 2018:148). This is further elaborated next.

**6.4.3. Co-constructing the rules of the game**

Zehra is one of the steering committee members at The Olives. She is responsible for the bingo game during the weekly meetings, as shown earlier in excerpt 6.4.1.2. The rules of the bingo game are known to every player, but at the same time the players and Zehra reconfirm the order of things in every game. My reading is that this process is part of the members negotiating their position on the hierarchy scale by controlling one of the central activities of the group. Out of the members below Zehra, Sabine and Nelda are old-timers and ranked at a higher status, and Rosy is a new ordinary member.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.3.1.: Construction of bingo game rules</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Arkadaslar, lutfen bir kisi bulsun ha! 1 sirayi. Hepsiniz birden bulmayiniz!</td>
<td>My friends, please only one person finds! First row. Not all of you find it at once!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Cikaracan dernekden da veresin tek tek bu defa.</td>
<td>You will provide it from the association one by one this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>(continues to draw numbers with a smile on her face)</td>
<td>(continues to draw numbers with a smile on her face)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before Zehra started the game, she wittily warned the players not to win the game all at once because in the previous week there had been more than one winner at the same time and that had caused confusion about giving out the prizes. Zehra used a form of endearment (my friends) already in line 1 to possibly index an egalitarian floor. This gave Sabine a chance to take hold of the floor and suggest that the association should provide prizes in case there was more than one winner of the game (lines 5-6). Zehra’s embodied uptake can be read as acceptance of the humorous attempt and is certainly not challenging Sabine’s position as someone senior enough to make a recommendation. In line 11, Sabine steps in and provides a suggestion about how to determine who receives the prize in case there were two winners of the game. She uses a directive which Zehra endorses and confirms agreement with (19-20), repeating for reinforcement in lines 24-27. Sabine’s suggestion ratifies her senior position in the community and being actively involved in communal activities within the association.

Next, I show a similar negotiation between me as the researcher and Sabine and Yvonne this excerpt illustrates the nostalgia for the homeland which resurfaces in the members’ interactions in multiple guises. The excerpt below is in relation to the game itself and one of the few where I caught myself being in the liminal place of the association as a member of the community, while however maintaining a much stronger relationship with the ‘homeland’ and a
researcher on the topic. These nebulous spaces where the researcher operates at the interface of personal and professional identities are significant for the reading of the field and the process of interpreting and representing the data.

6.4.4. Dombula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.4.4.1.: Dombula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Will we call it out <em>dombula</em> (the word)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Oh <em>dombula</em>? It has been ages, we did not call it out <em>dombula</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>We’re gonna play <em>dombula</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Vallahi! <em>(Swear to God)</em>(in thinking manner) My granny used to love playing it. May she rest in peace!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>For us bingo, for you <em>(2nd person plural)</em> <em>dombula</em>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Do we call it so huh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td><em>Dombula!</em> Hahaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Ok then we’ll call it <em>dombula</em> today!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Yes, right, no prezzies for those who won’t call it <em>dombula</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Hahahaha! No prezzies for no <em>dombula</em>! Dombula! Haha Dombulaaaa! *(.) Is it Greek? Dombula? I assume it’s Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>What happened to Antony huh that he didn’t pop in today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Cyprus the bingo game is called *dombula* and I asked the bingo players whether we would call out *dombula* when we mark off all the numbers. Yvonne took the floor first and associated with her grandmother (lines 5-7) also showing however that a different framing is followed by the members. Sabine (in line 8) makes an act for positioning herself as a ‘bingo’ person and me as a ‘dombula’ person. An ‘us’ and ‘you’ distinction is noted which, here, is one of the few occurrences that refers to the community and ‘those back home’. The pronoun ‘you’ in this sentence is 2nd person plural and makes a reference to the Cypriots and how that word is used on the island, whereas ‘us’ refers to those who live in England. She distances herself through making a distinction between the usage of the words for bingo. She identifies herself with the community living in England. This is further elaborated through the repetition of the word *dombula* multiple times in lines 9, 11, 16. Sabine repetitively uses the word *dombula* in order to try to internalise the word and to figure out its
usage. Her laughing response and deliberate giggling (lines 11, 15) may signify her status as an outgroup member and conveys a disaffiliation with those who use that word. It signals her rejection of the word, therefore her membership of that particular group. Repetition affirms her stance. The claims of finding the word *dombula* amusing, strange or even out of context, enables her to draw an imagined line between the Cypriots and the people who live in England (regional identity), who attend that meeting (group membership), and also those who use the English language (linguistic identity). As a result, she categorises me as an outsider, representing the Cypriots through the word of *dombula* and she disaffiliates herself. She makes an explicit reference to her perceived group membership through the denial of that word.

Formulations such as ok, then, if then, bear significance for probability talk in interactions (Sarangi, 2002; 2011). Building consensus is commonly reported in leadership and workplace discourse (Holmes et al., 2011) and is an important strategy for community building. Yvonne and Sabine align to prevent a negative reading of the encounter and use the very marked ‘Greek’ (line 16) reference as a bridge to move to the next topic. I will discuss the significance of the political references separately. I now turn to another favourite activity of the weekly meetings, which is the card game. I use this case as an opportunity to pay particular attention to marked language switches between TCD and GCD.

6.5. The Card game

6.5.1. Group membership categorisation and hegemonic narratives

Playing cards is another popular activity that members of the associations engage in. Especially in the association in The Olives, the card players were rather enthusiastic about playing card games. Image 6 shows a moment with Antony, Susan, Zehra and Rosy (we will see them in the excerpts that follow) playing the card game.
Similarly to the bingo game, the players have developed a shared sense of belonging over time and built their identity as ‘card players’, or as one of them suggested in the conversations with me, they are ‘the gamblers’ of the association. Earlier literature on community research has indicated that group games such as cards function as moments of identity construction (De Fina, 2007). In The Olives being a card player marks their membership of the group. The card players are called Susan, Zehra, Rosy and Antony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>6.5.1.1.: Gamblers</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Gumarcilar burda her hafta bulusur.</td>
<td>Gamblers meet here every week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Bir activity yapmamiz lazim. Ok!</td>
<td>We have to do an activity. Ok!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Tavlacilar, kagitcilar, hepsi, tavla da oynayalim luzum.</td>
<td>The tavli players, card players, all of them, we should play tavli too.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Yeah, ben tavla bilirim.</td>
<td>Yeah, I know tavli.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Gadin tavlasi var cok guzel.</td>
<td>There is ladies’ tavli, very nice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>C’mon Antony! Den exei?</td>
<td>C’mon Antony! Isn’t there any?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Al hade.</td>
<td>Take it!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Isdemem be.</td>
<td>I don’t want that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Self-identification as gamblers provides a collective sense of group identity. In excerpt 6.5.1.1., Susan positions the card players playfully as ‘gamblers’ and indicates it is a permanent recurring event and marks an insider joke. In lines 1-2, the use of ‘here every week’ indexes a regularity and stability of the activity, which is important as the associations themselves only form materially ‘every week’ around the specific activities of their members. The recurring nature of the card game is an activity where they negotiate their membership and make claims of who they are and where they are positioned both in the association and also outside the space of the association.

In lines 1-2 Susan makes a remark about their regular active participation and identifies the card players including herself as ‘the gamblers’. Although they do not gamble here, playing cards is a common activity for gamblers. This playful label is supported, through recycling by Rosy in lines 5-8 and in lines 6-7 she adds to it, by making reference to ‘tavli’ - a reference to a café culture that is practised in Cyprus. Those café environments are male dominated and usually absent of female presence. In lines 11-12, she differentiates female and male versions of the tavli game. During the female version of the game, the players make fewer moves and there are fewer rules for the game. Therefore, players find it to be simpler to play. Gendered practices are visible in diasporas. Here, Rosy displays an assumption that women would not know how to play real tavli and just because of their gender identity she tries to persuade others that the female version is as much fun as the male version. They recontextualise the association space and compare it with a place that exists in Cyprus. The association becomes a place where many contexts come under one roof. Another dimension of referring to tavli is in connection with the Greek community, which is represented in the room by Antony. Antony is a legitimised member of the community despite being associated with one of the ‘others’, the Greek community as we will see later (excerpts 6.5.1.4. and 7.5.1.).

I pay attention to marked language switches into GCD during the card game, where it is most frequent. The card players use marked language switches to acknowledge each other’s identity (e.g., in lines 13-14 and 15 in excerpt 6.5.1.1.). Switching to Greek in particular is always marked, and here it
functions as spanning the boundaries between the GC and TC communities which is central to the good interpersonal relationships of those members.

In order to achieve this, GCD and TCD are used. Susan and Rosy are TCD speakers and Antony is a GCD speaker. They use language as a resource for communication, through which the association becomes a place where the ‘other’, speaker of the other language (by extension of the otherised community), becomes ‘one of us’ – team player. Such claims are highly context-dependent and relative. In lines 1-2, Antony is addressed in TCD, to which he responds in TCD in line 3 ‘cabuk cabuk’. Susan and Antony align themselves to each other by using the referential words in these two languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>&quot;Dur be bekle, be acel edme, be Antony be&quot;</td>
<td>Stop, wait, don’t rush, you Antony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>&quot;Cabuk cabuk!&quot;</td>
<td>Quickly quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>&quot;Grigora, grigora.&quot;</td>
<td>Quickly quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>&quot;Nai, grigora grigora! Bravo!&quot;</td>
<td>Yes, quickly, quickly! Well done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>&quot;Yo Ksero ellinika re.&quot;</td>
<td>Hey, I know Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>&quot;Grigora!&quot;</td>
<td>Quick!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;[...]&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using each other’s language indicates here alignment to each other, their understanding of each other and also it would indicate that they share resources to make it their own place of negotiation. The Yes-prefaced utterance (line 5) and affirmation words ‘well done!’ (line 6) by Antony further enhance this process. Operating at the interface of languages is also indirectly invoking multilingualism and fluency in all varieties in Cyprus, which was common, notably prior to the events discussed in Section 1.1.

Further, in their conversation, we can see that Rosy joins in by using GCD (in lines 4 and 7). She literally translates into Greek what Antony said in Turkish. By doing so she displays agreement and acceptance. Her functioning proficiency in GCD is a useful resource for achieving this. Looking at the role of TCD and GCD as a resource for building oneness, Antony’s and Rosy’s use of these dialects indicates alignment. The repetition of words used in each
participant’s turn signal confirmation and embody their stance as group members (lines 3-8). Shifts in two languages (or use of referential words in these two languages) often function as contextualisation cues indexing social personae (De Fina, 2007). In excerpt 6.5.1.2., Rosy declared her knowledge of GCD and perhaps this is used to also make an alliance with Antony through their shared knowledge. Her utterance is directed to Antony as neither of the other players knew enough Greek to understand her. By acting in this way, she preferred to position herself closer to Antony, yet at the same time, she excluded other players from her conversation by using GCD. Having access to the language resource puts her in a more entitled and flexible position, as she on the one hand had access to be an insider as a TCD speaker, and on the other she could swap sides to perform as an outsider. Rosy and Antony negotiate their relationship through language mobilisation. This, in turn, feeds into the membership of the association and creates a safe place for all, despite the deep political differences that deeply impact the island to the present day. This is further shown below.

In excerpt 6.5.1.3., the players make references to one of the GC participant’s religious identity in a humorous way. Such an act marks a perceived difference and it serves as a mechanism to place Antony, a male, GC, as an insider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.5.1.3.: The King/Popaz</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Ma sen da hep popazlari verin bana be!</td>
<td>Yo, but you always give me the kings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Al papazi da hus ol</td>
<td>Take the king and shut up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Al papazi da hade sus ol!</td>
<td>Take the king and shut up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All laugh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Isdemezsan popazi, al garisini. Haha</td>
<td>If you don’t want the King take the wife. [giving her the queen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Ver Mary’i!</td>
<td>Give me Mary! [Mother Mary]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Al popazi cabuk cabuk.</td>
<td>Take the king quickly Quickly [showing it to Antony]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>E bekle beh.</td>
<td>E wait!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Bekle beh heheh</td>
<td>[surprised, imitates Antony] Wait huh, hehe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>O isder beh,</td>
<td>He wants it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosy, Susan and Zehra align to construct a humorous episode around the card ‘King’ (lines 1-7). The card ‘King’ is called ‘Popaz or papaz’ in TCD. Popaz also refers to the Christian religious leader, a bishop. After their humorous attempt, in lines 14-16 Susan makes a physical move where she shows and passes the card with the King to Antony and orders him to take it quickly. They associate him with the card due to his Christian religion. Here religion is utilised as a mechanism to both draw and span boundaries between the card players. Not following Christianity is a category, which makes Rosy, Zehra and Susan able to mobilise to both position themselves and Antony and also legitimise their group membership. Lines 6-7, Zehra’s deliberate repetition of Susan’s turn, allows her to further align by drawing on their common understanding of the differences of their communities instead of the differences between themselves. Although these references can be read in multiple ways, on the basis of the observation data and the humorous uptake, I argue that the function is a mechanism for inclusion and building common purpose.

Rosy’s use of ‘be [yo]’ in line 1, Susan’s and Zehra’s use of ‘hus ol!’ or ‘sus ol! [shut up]’ in lines 4 and 6 and also use of directives such as ‘take’, ‘give’, ‘wait’ in lines 4, 6, 10, 12, 14, 17 and 19 index familiarity between the participants, and within the context of the card game they signal active engagement in the game. Informal language is common in the association and in the café environment in Cyprus, where most commonly men use swear words when playing card games as a joke or teasing mechanism. In a way the card players, self-defined ‘the gamblers’ of the association, also use marked language to emphasise the identity claim.

Further on this, in line 17 ‘E bekle beh’ Antony negotiates his access to the group membership by joining in the conversation with the TCD words that serve as an act as a card player. His functioning proficiency of TCD indexes a group membership claim and being no different to the others.

The interplay with membership and references to one another’s religion is repetitive throughout the game. In excerpt 6.5.1.4., by showing off their familiarity with each other’s language (lines 1, 9, 14, 20, 22, 24, 27, 28), use
of slang and giving directives for the flow of the game bring them together and they practise ‘oneness’ over being card players in the association. Greek and Turkish words that are symbolic and ritualised can be traced in lines 14 and 22-28. The words ‘Allah Allah’ and ‘Panagia mou’ are symbolic words and bear religious significance for the community members. Religion becomes personified and utilised, relying on the existence of interactants’ previous ideologies and ideological assumptions. In the context of these, card players use such assumptions, and this is shown by how they react and uptake their loaded meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.5.1.4: My friend</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Nere giden?</td>
<td>Where you going?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Nere gidomi? Bakarim arkadas gasmasin da she’s got to give me a lift, my car broke down.</td>
<td>Where am I going? I’m looking for my friend, so that she doesn’t leave, she’s got to give me a lift, my car broke down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Your old friend?</td>
<td>Your old friend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Old friend. My gomma, Yvonne is my friend.</td>
<td>Old friend. My gomma, Yonca is my friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>You too friends?</td>
<td>You too friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Yes. Of course</td>
<td>Yes. Of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Allah Allah!</td>
<td>Allah Allah!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Best friends.</td>
<td>Best friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>All friends.</td>
<td>All friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>We’re all friends, well everybody is our friend.</td>
<td>We’re all friends, well everybody is our friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>E ben?</td>
<td>But me?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Help help!!</td>
<td>Help help!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Oh Panagia mou.</td>
<td>Oh Holy virgin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>Oh Panagia mou.</td>
<td>Oh Holy virgin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Panagia mou</td>
<td>Holy virgin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Panagia mou</td>
<td>Holy virgin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All laugh</td>
<td>All laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>E o der Allah Allah, benda deyim panagia mou.</td>
<td>Well, he says ‘Allah Allah’ and I’d say ‘Panagia mou’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All laugh</td>
<td>All laugh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>Well, I don’t know.</td>
<td>Well, I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>what you mean you don’t know? Then are</td>
<td>what you mean you don’t know? Then are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>you my friend or not my friend?</td>
<td>you my friend or not my friend?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Antony</td>
<td>I don’t know.</td>
<td>I don’t know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Soyle genne.</td>
<td>Tell him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Budur arkadası.</td>
<td>She is the friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>C’mon kim oynar.</td>
<td>C’m, who is playing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Then that’s good. Because, ben</td>
<td>Then, that’s good. Because, I talk to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rumlarnan.</td>
<td>Greek Cypriots. We mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>garisik</td>
<td>up and become friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>arkadas oluruk.</td>
<td>with Greek Cypriots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>[Distributing the cards] Ben verdim</td>
<td>I gave, Antony cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antony keser. Help</td>
<td>Help help please.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>help please.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Kes be Antony.</td>
<td>Cut it be Antony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recurrent reference to ‘friendship’ is noticeable here (lines 3, 8-12, 15-19, 33, 34, 37, and 42) and illustrates a pattern in the dataset. The association is a political space where members shape, influence as well as confront and question their participation and belonging in the group. Drawing on symbols of religion, language, race and ethnicity, the members reaffirm their friendship continuously, which indicates the level of work that is necessary to keep the association open and inclusive. Traces of ancestral histories are pertinent narratives. Diasporas tend to transport homeland conflicts beyond their homelands (Féron and Baser, 2023). The participants bring their conflicted ‘islander’ selves into the covertly perceived ‘apolitical’ space of the association. Although space of the association is deemed to be kept free from country/parent politics, data has shown that participation is a deliberate action of political positioning. Despite Antony’s legitimised membership of the association, the participants need to work together to reaffirm the friendship status within the group (lines 16-18).

Antony’s question ‘But me?’ in line 20, his utterances ‘well, I don’t know’ in line 30 and ‘I don’t know’ in line 35 presuppose how Cyprus politics influence his understanding of the ‘being friends’ with the others in the group. Such a doubt hides a political question behind it. The underlying political question covertly enacts the differences in ethnic identities. This is related to the island’s political past, which is continuously mobilised and negotiated within the space of the association in London. Being friends with a person from the ‘other’ ethnic
group was not regarded possible, let alone desired, back at the time they moved to the UK. The association in fact provided the space for them to negotiate their friendship status. Inclusivity and welcoming all are two of the underlying pillars of the association. The ‘yes, of course’ prefaced turn by Zehra (line 13) serves as a confirmation of his group membership. Antony gains a confirmed ‘one of us’ status. He is aware that his attendance is not unwelcomed, but he ratifies this via questioning whether he is considered to be part of the group or not. The participants continuously recontextualise the ‘parent politics’ and bring in the national level ideology into the space of the association, and they make historically hegemonic claims for national identity. Such an approach oversees the co-construction of membership in the association.

Upon categorisation of who is a friend and who is not, the topic has turned to become at a national level and Susan made an explicit attempt to explain herself, that she did not have anything against being friends with GCs (lines 39-43).

Her position that being friends with GCs now is possible, classifies a GC as a friend and marked it as a proud moment and possibly a moment that indicates hope for a common future for the GCs and TCs in Cyprus. This happened in the liminal space of the association and in the context where participants seem to foreground their common Cypriot identity above that of nationalised Greek/Turkish ones. In the context of a card game at a TC organisation in South London, her classification of the other as a friend is a sign that Antony is an accepted member of the game, as well as the association. Despite working to create this inclusive space, the members also actively police who is allowed in and who is not. This is discussed in the following sections.

**6.6. Friendship transcending boundaries beyond association**

Diaspora associations are places where a lot of people with a common interest come together. For example, for both of the associations in this study, all the members associate themselves with TC diaspora. In addition to their affiliation with a national and ethnic background, the members of the Lilies identify themselves as coming from a particular region in Cyprus. References to
places, nationality, race and ethnic background hold the keys to group membership. The research data showed the prominent role of the associations for the members of the diaspora, especially for building solidarity at home away from the homeland. Diaspora associations also play an important role in building friendship among their members. Supported by the observational data, the following two excerpts (excerpts 6.6.1. and 6.6.2.) show how members’ friendship transcends the physical boundaries of the association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.6.1.: Auntie Nuriye</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fatma</td>
<td>Bak, Nuriye</td>
<td>Look, dear Auntie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teyzecigim, iki gozum, 90’ini asmis</td>
<td>Nuriye, my dearest, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>bir insan. Buraya</td>
<td>person who is over 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>gelmezsem diyor,</td>
<td>years old. If I don’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>rahat etmiyorum</td>
<td>come here, she says, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>diyor. Bizler de ara sira onu evinde</td>
<td>don’t feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ziyaret ediyoruz.</td>
<td>comfortable, she says.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biz de mutlu olyoruz.</td>
<td>And we too visit her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kendisi de mutlu olyor.</td>
<td>at her home sometimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel pleased, she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>too feels happy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In excerpt 6.6.1., a reciprocal friendship is shown between Auntie Nuriye and the steering committee of the Lilies. Fatma, the Chair of the Lilies, shows her gratitude towards Auntie Nuriye’s regular attendance at the association meetings and appreciates the steering committee’s visits to her house. Accepting someone into their home, where they feel the safest and most intimate, shows how deep their relationship is. Fatma, the Chair, acts as the host at the association, owning the space. Her hospitality is reciprocated, when she and the steering committee of the Lilies are invited to Auntie Nuriye’s home. Such reciprocal, unwritten rules of politeness are very well perceived in Cypriot culture and seen as signs of friendship, trust, and safety. By making an announcement of such an act, Fatma validates their relationship in front of everyone present there and this announcement acts as an invitation for others to undertake similar acts of kindness. This shows the members of the association are part of a close-knit community built on reciprocal kindness and friendship. It can also be seen how the association space becomes attached to the personalities and identified with the individuals’ hospitality. Visiting
Auntie Nuriye is one of the examples of how members of the association build friendship within the association space and carry their acquaintance outside this space. Drawing from observational data and undocumented conversation with my participants, I can conclude that the members of the association meet up at each other’s homes, and also go on road trips together. All these activities indicate the sincerity of the members. This finding is further supported with the following excerpt, 6.6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.6.2.: We’ve become a family now</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Aldin o adamin kitaplarindan bir tane?</td>
<td>You bought one of that man’s books?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ha sordum sana aldiysan.</td>
<td>Ah, I just asked whether you bought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>I’m gonna get one. Next week. Cunku bu hafta Emily’e soz verdim.</td>
<td>I’m gonna get one. Next week. Because, this week I made a promise to Emily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Ben da Emily’e dedim, bu hafta kitap alacam seni odevemem.</td>
<td>I told Emily, that I am buying a book this week, I can’t pay you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Ohhh, Uhanam!</td>
<td>Ohhh, oh dear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>E, O, O, O yabanci degil. O gayri aile oldu.</td>
<td>Eh, she, she, she is not a stranger. She became a family now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Yo, ben Emily’e verdim.</td>
<td>No, I gave [money; paid] to Emily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>E cunku adam gelmez belki next time. Annadin, onuncin, yani dedim Emily’e. Emily’nin evine da giderim veririm yani.</td>
<td>E, because the man perhaps would not come next time. You see, that’s why, I mean, I told so to Emily. I mean, I can go to Emily’s house and give it to her too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 6.6.2. illustrates a conversation between Susan and Yvonne. Their conversation contains an implicit evaluation, and projects what being a member of the association entails and what their expectations of role performance from each other are. They are talking about two individuals present at the meetings. One of them is a male newcomer who is a poet and
was selling his books there. He is called Mr Cem. The second person is one of the regular members and their friend called Emily. Emily sells handicrafts and homemade food at the association. The interesting point in their conversation is that they negotiate how they should be treating ‘the outsider’ and ‘the insider’ in terms of buying books or goods from these two individuals. The account here starts with a direct question (lines 1-3), to which a negatively marked turn is offered by Yvonne (lines 4-5). The indirect meaning of the question - suggestion to buy - is acknowledged in line 6, where the emphasis in turn initials a position that indicates some dis/alignment between Susan and Yvonne as to their intentions for the new member. This is evident through use of the why question which comes as a negative interrogative. This presents not buying any books from a person she does not know as the expected or natural behaviour (cf. Heritage, 2002). The reason behind such an act is the fact that Yvonne interprets Susan’s narrative as casting a negative light on their relationship with Emily. Yvonne positions herself as the loyal insider and projects disappointment, which derives from the fact that Susan prioritised a ‘stranger’ man over ‘one from us’. The line 16 utterance ‘Ohhh, oh dear’ signals an implicit accusation in that Yvonne refutes a presupposition in Susan’s support of an ‘outsider’. Yvonne further signals her loyalty and commitment to Emily by emphasising that she ‘promised’ to pay her (lines 8-11). Yvonne is not entirely convinced and retaliates with ‘No, I gave to Emily’ (line 20-21). Yvonne acts confrontationally and puts great emphasis on the support she provides for Emily. She signals that she prefers to support ‘the one she knows’ and not a stranger. These displays of loyalty are significant in showing who is in or who is left out. This also signals disagreement with Susan’s decision to pay the man and not Emily, therefore Yvonne disaligns herself from Susan.

In her defence, Susan attempts to clarify herself by explaining how she considers Emily. Susan’s framing ‘Eh, she, she, she is not a stranger. She became a family now.’ and ending with her knowing where Emily lives, attempt to offset the effect of closeness and familiarity with Emily and foreground the strength of the relationship, which is already indexed through the ‘family member now’. Through repetitive use of the personal pronoun *she*, Susan is also elevating her position and taking a defensive stance. Yvonne’s statement
prompts Susan to provide reasons for prioritising the newcomer over Emily (lines 17-19). She formulates a way to demonstrate her closeness and affinity with Emily as proof to Yvonne. What Susan attempts to establish is a defence against the implicit accusation of betrayal. In order to achieve this, Susan explicitly positions the newcomer as an outsider as she uses words such as ‘that man’ and expresses her doubt regarding his regular attendance by assuming he would not come to the meeting in the coming week (lines 22-31).

The repetition of ‘she’ (line 17) and the juxtaposition of the words ‘stranger’ and ‘family’ illustrate a defensive alignment by Susan and she constructs herself as ‘an insider’ despite Yvonne’s expression of disappointment (lines 16 and 20-21).

Throughout their conversation Yvonne and Susan align themselves with the insider Emily; however, Yvonne seems to be less convinced by Susan’s way of doing it. As proof of her being an insider Susan uses a strategy and calls Emily a ‘family member’ (line 19), which assumption would automatically grant her access to being an insider. We can see how Susan and Yvonne co-construct the boundaries of an ‘in group’ and ‘outgroup’. This is mainly ratified by Yvonne in her interjections (such as disappointment and not being convinced) and her full support for Emily, and also by Susan by calling the newcomer not by his name but as ‘that man’ and signifying Emily as a family member.

The new face has not gone unnoticed by the regular members in the association and the person – Mr Cem, will be seen in excerpt 6.7.1.2., negotiating his way into the group. I discuss this in the section below.

6.7. The Newcomer

As indicated earlier, members police participation and newcomers to the association are presented as insiders or outsiders, either intentionally or unintentionally through the labelling as ‘one of us’ or ‘the other’. Therefore, social acceptance by existing members of the association gives access to the new community.
6.7.1. Facing the newcomer

In instances when a new person appears in any organisation there are significant moments as the outsider is initiated into the established group (Kirilova and Angouri, 2018). The newcomer is expected to negotiate their way into the group. This negotiation depends on their role and the micropolitics of the setting (Angouri, 2018:141). This is an exemplary case with the weekly meetings in the associations. The association provides a prototypical place for such a negotiation of belonging and shared practices, where the members are aware of each other’s participation. The newcomer’s status is deliberately negotiated, and legitimacy of their membership is scrutinised. On the other side, the newcomer is unaware of the expected practices from the members. In excerpt 6.7.1.1. we can see how the newcomers are labelled as such by the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt: 6.7.1.1.: New faces today</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Degisik insanlar var bugün. Yabancidir onlar?</td>
<td>There are new faces today. Are they strangers/foreigners/outsiders?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She labelled newcomers as ‘yabanci’ in line 4, which translates into strangers, foreigners or outsiders. She displayed a presupposition by labelling them as ‘not one of us’.

Mr Cem, a poet and writer, is a new face in the association. The following excerpt 6.7.1.2. illustrates his conditional membership to the association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.7.1.2.: Mr Cem’s conditional access</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Cem</td>
<td>[...]Ekleyelim dedi, konusalim dedi,baska</td>
<td>[...]She said “let’s add”, “let’s talk” she</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>seyler da isdedi, siirler da girdi isin icine,</td>
<td>said, she wanted other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>ama burda isdermis o, baska yerde isdemem dedi,</td>
<td>things too, the poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>yani simdi burda toplantili</td>
<td>are in this too, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>yapar, Josie, muhim olan birliktelik olsun der.</td>
<td>she wanted it here, “I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>don’t want anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>else” she said, I mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>she does all the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>meetings here, Josie,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“the important thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is being together” she</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of Mr Cem’s friends is a regular attendee at the Olives and she has invited him to the association meeting. Upon his arrival, as the first thing he established acquaintance with the Chair of the association and introduced himself, asking how to best engage and provide more content for the association’s meetings. This debate is not captured in the excerpt above but provides an important context in which to read the interaction. Excerpt 6.7.1.2. illustrates how Mr Cem provided an account of his conversation with the Chair to his contact. Throughout the narrative, he used reported speech, reporting what the Chair had told him. This is a strategy, which plays a specific role in negotiation discourse.

He introduced himself, announced that he was a poet, and composed poetry/authored books, which he aimed to bring with him in the coming weeks for others to purchase. His presence was very well accepted by the Chair and she demonstrated a special interest in his poetry. She then offered a proposal of him taking part in the activities at the association.

The alignment is significant and he framed their conversation as a call for help and cooperation. He assigned meaning and purpose to the meetings. He confirmed his willingness by using repetitive formulations such as ‘I mean’ and ‘togetherness’.

They reached a consensus and during the meeting Mr Cem presented two of his poems to the members and agreed to bring his books with him to the next meeting for sale.

This excerpt is thus another good illustration of how group membership is negotiated and in Mr Cem’s case his membership is a conditional one. Through his willingness to share his poetry and to provide entertainment for the association members, he accentuated his positioning as ‘one of them’.
Such a behaviour indexes (Ochs, 1996) membership by aligning with the characteristics of the group to which individuals feel they belong or aspire to. This however is not always the case as I show next.

6.7.2. Confronting the newcomer

Diasporic organisations form a special case for preservation of language, religion and traditions. In such close-knit communities, the newcomers might be subject to/be called to negotiate their way into the community. They are expected claim enough similarities with the community in order to be seen as an insider. This is evident in Excerpt 6.7.2.1. when Rosy started the process of ‘checking’ on the newcomers; ethnicity and association with ‘core’ identity pillars (Angouri, 2012) are central in the process. The excerpt illustrates a narration of Rosy and Anna’s first encounter by Rosy to Yvonne. The data show that the question regarding whether they are TCs or not is critical for them being allowed in. Rosy has already built an image of the newcomer in her head and this image influenced her interaction with the newcomer. Through this excerpt we can see how Rosy created a visual description of Anna to Yvonne and how she perceived Anna’s presence and interpreted their initial encounter. The main language of this conversation is Turkish, but English was also used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.7.2.1.: What is your name?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>But you know, there are many strangers around here, foreigners too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Fore..? Nope, that woman I thought she was a foreigner, and she calls me like “What is your name?” [Anna], she thinks she is English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Yeah. She thinks she is English. “What is your name?” [imitating Anna], I told her “Rose!” “Why don’t you say it in Turkish?”, “E, why do you ask in English?” I told her. “Why don’t you speak Turkish then?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>The one in black?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Haha [laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Ah, for god’s sake, she found the right woman! I am as sassy as they come!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Haha [laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Look at her!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>E, I swear to God, she looks like a foreigner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>E, me too, I thought so, [returning to the topic] no, I couldn’t be not bothered with that, “What is your name?” [imitating Anna,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>sounding irritated], If you ask me in English, how would I answer to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>You’d answer in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Yes “My name is Rose.”, “Oh” she said, she was just like “Why don’t you say it in Turkish?” […] “You too!” I told her. “Why don’t you speak in Turkish then?” When they speak English to me, I get annoyed a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Maybe she can’t speak Turkish, that’s why English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Most of them do, they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Most of them do, I mean the older ones, they don’t know English anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rosy</td>
<td>Yeah [confirming]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A common theme in these studies is the insight that direct reported speech in conversation is not a verbatim, factual reproduction of another’s words, but ‘first and foremost the speaker’s creation’ (Tannen, 2007:21). The use of reported speech is intrinsically linked to one’s othering process from the person they are reporting on. In the case of Rosy, she imitates and distances herself from the newcomer.

Anna was a new face in the association and, as my fieldnotes suggest, she may have sounded unfamiliar because she used only English, (cf. the main language of the association is considered to be TCD). Expectation of the use of TCD at the gatherings influenced the inference of her utterances and she was misjudged. In fact, this caused mild social conflict between Rosy and Anna. This is demonstrated in excerpt 6.7.2.1.

Language choice is a theme that has been recycled several times throughout the dataset. Rose shows strong emotional intensity and resistance in her narrative about Anna. Rose’s nation-state perception is mainly linked to the one language, one religion and one political view to be as one.

This tendency towards monoglot ideology tends to marginalise the use of languages other than Turkish in diaspora organisations. Similar to the TC community in London, Kozminska and Hua (2021) report in their study that the Polish community prefers standard Polish in community activities and online profiles. This is consistent with the notion that language is a symbol of national unity (Duszak, 2002), which renders certain "speakers [...] authentic members
of nations on the basis of their linguistic competence" (Gal, 2010:33). This is evident in Rose's reluctance to let Anna in due to Anna's linguistic non-conformity. Rose asserts her authenticity because she believes that speaking Turkish is one of the most significant markers of being a TC. accomplishment and self-definations of Turkish Cypriotness are recycled in the narratives of my participants.

Lines 4, 7-10, 18 and 22-24 contain the constructed dialogue (Jaspers, 2011; Tannen, 1986) between Rosy and Anna and illustrate how Rosy performed her identity. Drawing on Rosy's interpretation of Anna's response in line 7, a resistance to TCness or Turkishness, or the group's main identity, seems to be explicitly challenged. This was because Rosy associated Anna's style with people who endeavoured to be ‘special’ or ‘different’ from the ‘group’ by not conforming to the unwritten rules of the group, which in this case was not talking in TCD. This led Rosy to infer Anna’s communicative intention as mean and conflicting with the group’s perceived values and caused an invisible miscommunication.

Such differences in cueing and inferencing led to a ‘contrastive cueing habit’ from Rosy (Jaspers, 2011:136), which caused tension between the interactants. Anna chose to speak in English and asked Rosy (line 7) ‘What is your name?’ in return Rosy told her name was ‘Rose’ (line 8), which in essence is what her name literally translates to from Turkish. She seems to have used the English translation of her name so that she can get Anna’s reaction and use this as a resource for challenging her choice. I further read the constructed dialogue and understand that as expected by Rosy, in lines 8-10, she positions herself as a confronter and asks ‘E, why do you ask in English?’ I told her. ‘Why don’t you speak Turkish then?’ Such a confrontational act is rare in the data and indexes co-negotiation at the lack of the use of Turkish within the premises of the association gatherings, which she explicitly mentions in line 25. Anna seems to suggest that her space was violated by the English language, and the ‘other’ ‘newcomer’. This also informs against her prepositioning towards the ‘unknown’. 
From the participant observation and the separate interview that I held with Rosy, I can relate to her positioning in the group and identification of her TCness. She holds a strong relationship between the association and TCness, therefore she identified the regular members of the association as Turkish and she tended not to include non-speakers of TCD into the group. Associations tend to perpetuate rather essentialist approaches to identity and penalise by exclusion the use of the majority language as a ‘danger’ to the community’s own heritage (Angouri, 2012).

Given that social categories are of importance for associating self and other with the community, ‘the essence’ of ethnicity, religion and language, I provide contextual information below which I assess to be useful for the reader to follow the interaction in excerpts 6.7.2.1. and 6.7.2.2.

### Contextual Background Knowledge about the participants

**Rosy:** Arrived in the UK in 2005 after she married a London-born man. She is 65 years old. Native speaker of Turkish and limited English proficiency.

**Yvonne:** Arrived in the UK when she was 5 years old. Grew up in London and married her husband who is originally from Turkey. She is 54 years old. She is bilingual (Turkish and English).

**Anna:** Born and raised in London, UK. Married a man her parents chose for her, then divorced, and never remarried. Identifies herself as a Londoner born to TC parents. She is 57 years old. Native in English language and English is her dominant language. Limited Turkish proficiency.

Challenging proficiency in the ‘home’ language is common in associations but creates tensions with newcomers. In such cases, Erickson and Shultz (1982) (also in Erickson, 2011) propose that ‘situational co-membership’ can lift the communication style barriers and avoid the troublesome cueing between interactants. Such an instance is illustrated in excerpt 6.7.2.2. during the interaction between Yvonne and Anna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.7.2.2.: Why do you speak like that?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Hi, aren’t you Turkish or English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Oh hi, I am Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>So, why do you speak so?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anna is positioned as ‘the other’ here – a possible result of stereotyping as evidenced by her previous discussion with Rosy. Yvonne tries to find a common ground with Anna by talking about her origins, and tries to find out about the village she is from. She found out that Anna is from the same district as she was from. In lines 13-14 Anna made an attempt to explain that she was born in the UK. She says ‘but’ in line 13 to preface her self-perception as being different from those who were born in Cyprus. She distinguishes herself from all Cyprus-born TC community members. However, she negotiates her access to the association and therefore the TC community through her regional heritage.

Through their shared regional identity, Yvonne welcomed Anna and positioned her as an insider and a co-construction of a shared identity under the premises of association was initiated. This was achieved when Yvonne also gave the information about her origin and said ‘Oh my family came here from Larnaca too. Ama neresinden?’ in lines 11-12. This act solved the potential friction between Yvonne and Anna, because they socially construct a place identity. So, they found a common ground and a recognisable frame in their present social world, which is the community they are associated with (Giddens, 1984) and overruled the communication difficulties.

Here we can see the relationship between belonging and place. The association became a place where the insiders acted as gatekeepers for access to the association. They hold the power to determine whether to grant access or not. It is argued that in any aspect of community, exercise of power is detectable and ultimate. Regular attendance and being established in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Anna</th>
<th>Hi, yeah, What’s your name?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yvonne: I am Yvonne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[Greetings and kisses]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Why do you sound like that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>[inaudible] [...] I understand Turkish and Greek too. I am from Iskele (Larnaca) [a district in Cyprus].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Oh my family came here from Larnaca too. Ama neresinden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Luricina [a village in Cyprus], but I was born here, yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community, provides a visible status which is enacted by the same members challenging newcomers and performing a form of social control as to who is allowed ‘in’ or is ‘out’. As an ‘outsider’ Anna was placed at a lower status and we see how she faced a social penalty because of her communication style and choice of language. Yvonne and Rosy are trying to impose the unwritten rules on Anna and to produce established discourses. Erickson (2004:143) argues that such a social interaction is the ‘construction zone’ where the interactants constantly probe each other and newcomers. They ensure that the established discourses are reproduced by maintaining self and co-constructing identities. This showcases that such structures influence each other and are prone to perpetual change and evolution(s).

Anna is negotiating her role as ‘new’ but also claiming her membership of the community through announcing her family’s village in Cyprus which secures her position in the association. Yvonne acts as the interrogator and enacts the role as the gatekeeper in the association.

In excerpts 6.7.2.1. and 6.7.2.2., we have seen how Rosy, Yvonne and Anna negotiated their membership through their experience in the association. Association offered a space for this negotiation. Association, as a physical place, transformed into a place where the participants renegotiated their membership and negotiated their place-belonging. Regular weekly participation is a way to confirm willingness to become members and ratify access to the community. Such a voluntary participation illustrates motivation among members. Next, I will explore the motives for participation, where participants provided salient examples of reasons for their presence in the association.

6.8. Motives for participation
Displays of willingness and readiness to carry out a particular activity are significant in showing interest in becoming a part of the community. The following instances exemplify how members develop a sense of emotional attachment to each other and the physical space of the association. As one of the members mentioned in excerpt 6.8.1., for her the weekly meetings are their only place of socialisation and entertainment.
In one instance, one participant explicitly expressed the importance of the association for her wellbeing. In excerpt 6.8.2., the participant attends the meetings to find a refuge from her daily lonely routine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.8.1.: Tuesdays</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saliyi beklerik gelelim,</td>
<td>We look forward to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>zaten basga yere</td>
<td>Tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>gittigimiz yok.</td>
<td>esday, so that we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>come here and meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>place that we go to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>anyway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpt 6.8.3. demonstrates how this member established a personal bond with the other members. She articulates that the reason she attends the meetings is for friendship. Such a practice marks how a physical space gains a meaning (in this case friendship) and becomes a place with various personal attachments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.8.2.: Refuge from loneliness</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Katilirim, insanlara karisayim. Esimi</td>
<td>I meet up to get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaybettin, aha bir sene oluyor.</td>
<td>social among people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I’ve lost my other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>half, well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it’s been a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts 6.8.1., 6.8.2. and 6.8.3. illustrate how associations become a place for emotional attachment. Through active participation, members establish bonds with each other, and this equally reflects their motivation for participation.

The members have high expectations with regard to the meals they receive at the weekly meetings. The members established ‘a surprise moment’ routine for the meals, as illustrated in excerpt 6.8.4.. The participant was wondering what was on the menu. Use of ‘our meal’ in line 2 indicates ownership of the practice, as she internalises the routinised schedule of the meeting. Such a
practice derives from a frequent and regular participation. The volunteers are aware of this practice, and they try to accommodate the members’ wishes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Excerpt 6.8.4.: Menu</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>bakalım ne yemegimiz var bugün.</td>
<td>Let’s have a look, what’s our meal today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bringing the last all four excerpts together, highly ritualised events and activities become evident for contributing towards constructing a collective ‘we’ identity. They serve as a ceremony in which members mutually engage and where they interactively outline membership attributes by sharing a community of practice (Lave and Wenger, 1991). Waerniers (2017) sees this as a cyclical process in which shared repertoire is developed through time in the given context of associations.

Showing willingness to participate in the activities of an organisation and being part of a community can, however, not be enough for access to a community. Associations in diasporas are frequently places of hegemonic discourses, such as ethnicity, religion, language, and membership to those organisations might be claimed or resisted through negotiations of national politics. It has been argued that associations use the promotion of culture and ethnicity as a tool to address issues of exclusion, thereby ethnicising such issues.

6.9. Summary

In diaspora associations, membership is controlled through locally situated criteria. These often correspond to core social categories, such as family descent, origin, language, family bonds, homogeneity and race. The associations are seen as political spaces by looking at the dynamics between claims of membership and politics of belonging. The members of the diaspora associations often self-position in line with the national narratives relating to these categories. Self-perception of members as an immigrant acts/serve as a mediator for the community’s bonding process. The status of being ‘the other’ eliminates the national animosity and brings people with conflicted histories together. Associations can serve as a liminal space for overcoming the fear of other and providing a safe space for building community. My
analysis shows that participants position themselves as ‘the other’ in Britain. They create/form an in-group status for all those who are ‘the other’ for the British. Such a negotiation of discursive norms indexes ‘(not) being one of us’. Not being something or somebody is a category, which the participants mobilise to both position themselves and legitimise their choices. In this context, the participants negotiate a sense of self and interactionally position themselves towards each other or against the other. Concurrently the access for the newcomers is constantly negotiated. Who is granted access, by whom and how this was achieved, are the attributes contingent on the context and deemed to be ontological aspects of belonging.

Through the excerpts, the participants co-construct a collective group membership formed through ritualised practice, recontextualised tradition and negation of their personal relationship with and understanding of home politics. The process of co-construction has been shown by other significant studies (Angouri, 2012; De Fina, 2015) however, what my study adds is the emphasis on the importance of the association as a liminal place and the complex and living political turbulence which requires a continuous re-contextualisation of ‘self’ by the members of the diaspora. This is further discussed in the next chapter. In chapter 7, I elaborate further the findings of the third phase of the study with an emphasis on politics of belonging. In so doing, body maps were used together with the interview quotes from the members of the associations.
7 Investigating politics of belonging through body maps - Outcomes of the Third Phase

7.1. Analytic Focus and organisation of the chapter
Chapter 7 presents the outcomes of the third phase of the study. Due to rich insights generated through analysis of the body maps and relevant quotes, I decided to present these results as a separate chapter here. In analysing the body maps and excerpts, I explore how research participants contextualise the themes that are particularly pertinent to the dialectic between ‘self’ and ‘other’. This process is closely related to the process of identity construction and the notion of belonging. It is within this concept that the notion of place-belonging has been advocated to be discursively achieved, involving the negotiation of various forms of inclusion and exclusion. Language, in this context, assumes a pivotal role as a resource through which individuals engage in the negotiation of their sense of belonging, positioning themselves and others based on their respective ideologies. Probyn (1996) defines belonging as ‘a desire for becoming other’. Thus, individuals seek something in ‘other’ to be part of it. This process is part of self-actualisation and this stresses the dynamic nature of belonging. It is not a pre-existing notion, it is constantly evolving and changing. It can take many forms and can be influenced through interaction over time.

How individuals position themselves and others in a society determines the abstract territories of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Yuval-Davis (2006:204) asserts that ‘the boundaries that the politics of belonging is concerned with are the boundaries of the political community of belonging, the boundaries that separate the world population into ‘us and ‘them’.

External constraints however such as political agents and legal rules relating to membership affect how people claim, negotiate and index belonging. Such rules are predetermined by political practices; however, the boundaries are barely fixed and are in constant construction. These boundaries are seen as ‘forms of political practices’ (Anthias, 2008).
In her article, Anthias (2008) touches on the intersectionality of the identity and categorisation of belonging. She argues that various categories crosscut each other and individuals or groups belong to different categorisations depending on context, situation and meaning. This illustrates how boundaries are constructed rather than being static and fixed, such as examples of GCs, being categorised as either Cypriot or Greek (Anthias, 2008:9). So, if the TC diaspora is taken into consideration for the purpose of the research project, they can be seen as either Cypriot or Turkish, as well as London Turk, London Cypriot, and British Cypriot, depending on the context of the identification. This type of labelling is socially created and intersects with political reality and identity, as well as social positioning. Embedded in these identities are the notion of home politics. The reference to home politics and politics of belonging also become relevant to the discussion of the excerpts in conjunction with the body maps. More specifically, I focus on the body maps through which participants were able to manage to express and claim their positionality and demonstrate solidarity with their in-group members.

In line with previous chapters, insiderness and outsiderness (Marra and Angouri, 2011) are informed by the ideological dispositions of those who engage in them. This can be done explicitly or in subtle, indirect means. In the analysis, I am interested in looking into the ways individuals use these implicit ways to concretise their sense of ‘self’ and claim membership. The analysis again draws on IS tools to identify contextualisation cues (De Fina, 2015; Gumperz, 1982), i.e. the linguistic, and ideological choices of speakers that enable them to claim their group membership. I focus here particularly on words that bear references to the politics of belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2006; 2016), and convey evaluations of as well as use of metaphors (Tannen, 1986; 2012). All these contribute to illustrating how members of the community legitimise their membership through very close connection to their ideological home politics, and politics of belonging.

In the following, I analyse nine excerpts and 15 body maps, all drawn from a series of visits at the diaspora associations while conducting in-depth interviews. As with the other datasets, the selected maps represent patterns
in the data. During the interviews, participants were given the booklet of body maps (Appendix 2). 21 participants engaged in body mapping.

The body maps and excerpts presented in this chapter were chosen on the basis of their content and their relevance to the notions of self and other and politics of belonging. Taking communities of practice as the unit of sociolinguistic research, I organised the data on the basis of:

a) Semantic field of the label according to the core themes identified through the first and second phases of the study
b) Personal accounts shared on the body map in the textual form
c) Length of the text
d) Position of the label on the body map.

I discuss the data in tandem with the interview quotes to provide the reader with a more complete picture. Although the topic of self/other categorisation is prominent throughout the chapter, collectivisation and rhetorical processes of personal experience were two common actions that were triggered by the body mapping (Coetze et al., 2019; Skop, 2016). In the chosen excerpts and body maps the participants negotiate what a specific topic means to them and how they negotiate that meaning among themselves by claiming solidarity and morality, making judgements and showcasing the expectations of being an ‘insider’. At the same time, since the topic of discussion is the notion of (un)belonging, participants also provide their accounts of personal experience and perception of the so-called ‘other’. This sheds light on their political stance and cultural values as well as how they guard what they call their circle. The body maps provided in this chapter correspond to the patterns that illustrate the data and the selected excerpts are representative of patterns that are noted in the whole dataset.
7.2. Political Positioning as the access point

Showing affiliation with Turkey explicitly seemed to be very important among the members of the TC community. Informed and supported by the interview data from the first and second phases of the study, I chose the body map with the title ‘Turkey’ as the first one for discussing with the participants. I received rich responses from the participants, as expected, in relation to attachment to their political sense of self.

Starting with the graphical choices of the participants, the dataset with the body maps revealed that participants predominantly positioned Turkey on their whole body by circling it and on their hearts by putting an X or a circle, and secondarily on their stomach, eyes, head and feet by putting an X, or an arrow or circling the body part they associated it with. As their lexical choices, participants used metaphors, persons’ names and activities associated with Turkey. Metaphors such as saviour, motherland, hope, heaven stood out from the data. In four cases, participants also associated it with founder of modern Turkey, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, and mentioned his name in their accounts. In addition to those, participants also associated travelling, holidays, and health with Turkey. These lexical descriptions were either written on the side of the body map on their own with/without a reference to the body part on the body map. Additionally, due to the political sensitivity of the topic some of the participants chose to express their opinion in text format on the body map rather than providing an oral account. These form an interesting case to examine. I included examples of these cases in the analysis as well. The examples of body maps with the title of Turkey can be found later in this section, after I discuss excerpt 7.2.1.. and support it with the body maps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 7.2.1. : Turkiye – Anavatan: Motherland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Turkiye, what comes to your mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Yeah, When Turkiye, Ata’ım* comes to my mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>[shouting from the next table] Anavatan!***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Anavatan?[surprised]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Yess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Aaa [overthinking]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>I wrote down like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>I will write down like this too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Denktas’tir*** icinde yatan (where Denktas lies) That’s Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Let her write whatever she like [in a dismissive manner]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>I wrote down like that. [Turkey]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Hahaha That’s [Cyprus] is anavatan! Anavatan is Cyprus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>Mine is Turkiye, my anavatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>My Cyprus is my anavatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>You write down Cyprus. [lowering her voice] They messed up Cyprus, memleketin***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Huh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>But you didn’t point what part of the body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>What shall I write?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>When we say Turkiye […]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>In our heart. That’s part of my heart!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>No, let me write down Turkiye then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Anavatan, in my heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Yeah, they call it so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Whatever it is for you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ata(‘m): The word ‘Ata’ here is used to refer Mustafa Kemal Ataturk. He is the founding father of the modern Turkish nation.
** Anavatan: literal translation – motherland. Turkey and Northern Cyprus is believed to have a special relationship; a relationship of a mother and child. Anavatan is a word used to refer to Turkey as the motherland of the Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus. In this context, ‘yavruvatan’ is a word used for North Cyprus. *** Denktas: Rauf Raif Denktas was the founder of Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. **** Memleket: This word means homeland, homecountry, however it lacks in emotional attachment.

Excerpt 7.2.1. features a conversation among Emily, Sabine, Fiona, Susan and Yvonne about the body map with the title of Turkey, where they negotiate these issues partially in disguise. Political affiliation to Turkey and the notion of motherland became prominent in the context of what seems to be mild disagreement among the participants. More specifically, when I asked my participants what they think about Turkey and where on the body map they would potentially position it, they started to negotiate their decision. Although the associations in this study claim a non-political stance, in practice this is impossible for any society that operates within the constraints they need to navigate. The rhetoric about one nation, one language, one race is dominant among the majority of the members of the associations and is the case in TC diasporas. Displaying non-conformity would be presupposed as an issue of loyalty to one’s national identity and some individuals might feel restricted to express their views concerning government issues, conflicts or decisions. Such an act would be considered as a threat for group membership.
Looking in depth, upon my question ‘Turkiye, what comes to your mind?’ in line 1, the excerpt opens with Emily’s hesitation and indecisiveness in line 2 with the ‘yeah’-prefaced utterance, followed by a repetition of the headline ‘Turkiye’ with a declining tone of voice, which would give her some time to think how to formulate an answer which would be acceptable to others. In close-knit communities such as the TC diaspora, members are expected to conform to the written as well as the unwritten rules of their group. With that in mind, challenging the hegemonic discourses about political stance is one of the important factors that would jeopardise one’s group membership and the overall ability of the group to operate beyond the home politics. Emily is well aware of these insider rules, therefore, we can conclude that at the beginning of the conversation, Emily’s hesitation was because she could have been judged by her political view. Throughout this conversation her indecisiveness signalled a struggle, as well as fear of rejection (lines 20, 22, and 25). Emily’s voice also reflected a contradictory ideological position, which apparently was competing with the dominant ideology within the group. Thus, she reassigned her identity and aligned herself with others so that she does not challenge existing dominant nationalist ideology. And when it came to the affiliation to a motherland, which was a clear and predominant theme within this study, almost all participants spoke of Turkey being the motherland to TCs. According to Kizilyurek and Gautier-Kizilyurek (2004:45), Turkey was exclusively referred to as a ‘motherland’, and ‘Mother Turkey’ and ‘her Turkish children in Cyprus’ were the two dominant metaphors in politics and in cultural policies.

Case in point: the words of ‘Anavatan’ (motherland) and ‘Ata’ (shortened name given to Ataturk) were written on Emily’s, Sabine’s, and Fiona’s body maps (see images 7, 8, 9).
Image 7: Emily's body map - Turkey
Image 8: Sabine’s body map - Turkey
Anavatan is often referred to as ‘motherland’ and in the context of Cyprus and North of Cyprus, it is used for Turkey and the imposed ‘special relationship’ between Turkey and north of Cyprus is overemphasised. The implication of this word also implies North Cyprus being the ‘baby land’ (yavruvatan) of the motherland Turkiye. Here, it is a word which is loaded with a nationalistic meaning and is apparently shaping how Emily and the other women negotiate what Turkey means or should mean for them and everyone.

Emily argues that when she thinks about Turkey, ‘Ataturk’ comes to her mind, whereas Fiona (line 8) joined in the conversation with a strong opinion on Turkey being the ‘anavatan’ - motherland. Then Emily confronted Fiona and responded with a rhyming sentence, ‘Denktas’tir*** icinde yatan (where Denktas lies)’ in lines 9-10, which literally translates as “where Denktas lies”. Rauf Raif Denktas was the founder of the TRNC and is buried in Nicosia, Cyprus. And Emily explicitly mentioned that ‘That’s Cyprus’ (lines 9-10) implying that Cyprus is her motherland because it is where the leader of TCs is currently resting. Such an utterance serves as a clear manifestation of Turkish Cypriotness, and following a political leader shows a sociocultural and
political demarcation. At this point in the interaction, progressively a disagreement emerged between Sabine and Emily. Disagreements have various functions such as expressing and creating hostility or the opposite, i.e., constructing solidarity between interlocutors (Angouri and Locher, 2012; Kakava, 2002; Locher, 2004; Sifianou, 2012). In Sabine’s and Emily’s context, Sabine found a way to diffuse the disagreement situation by uttering that Emily can write whatever she likes (line 11-12). This is a ‘marked’ incident (Angouri, 2012:1576) because Sabine makes an explicit statement about Turkey being her anavatan (motherland) (in line 14), indexing familiarity and closeness with the rest of the group.

Sabine’s implicit way of trying to convince Emily to join her thinking indexes Sabine’s situated power display and an act of border control. Through this act she attempted to convince Emily to join her thinking. Politics and ideology play a big part in individuals’ negotiation and co-construction of belonging here. This is also apparent later in the conversation (line 19), when Sabine aggressively disputed that they (the politicians) destroyed the country. This can be read as a form of rejection of affiliation with her home country of Cyprus. Sabine tries to attract others’ attention by producing an ideological statement about home politics and expresses her disappointment with the governing body in N. Cyprus, but she did not receive the response she was expecting. Note that the other two participants are focusing on the task as the uptake indicates only Emily gave a response as if she did not or did not want to understand Sabine’s comment (line 19).

Irrelevant to Sabine’s comment, Susan made a remark about Emily’s body map (line 21) and points out that Emily should mark the paper and show where on the body map Turkey sits. Susan’s act served as a peacemaker and an attempt to divert Emily’s attention from talking about politics. Furthermore, in line 22 Emily asked others what she should write. Such an act indexes her indecision, and she collectivised the task that was initially addressed to her.

At the end of their discussion, in line 27 Emily’s ‘yeah’ prefaced utterance is indicative of alignment (Jefferson, 1984) in identification with Turkey. She mentioned that Turkey is branded as ‘the motherland’ by everyone else (in line
27, ‘yeah, they call it so’.) and so on her body map, like everyone else who mentioned that Turkey is anavatan, she circled the heart and wrote down the word ‘anavatan’ next to it (see image 7).

Excerpts 7.2.2. and 7.2.3. illustrate how body mapping turned into a collective process. Continuing with the same interaction as in excerpt 7.2.1., here we can investigate how Fiona’s perception of Turkey is shaped by Sabine’s dominant act. This is apparent on their body map. Sabine is the first one in the group to write down ‘Anavatan’ (‘motherland’). Subsequently Fiona follows her in the same way. Here, in fact, it is noteworthy to explore how each of them discursively articulated themselves on the body map. The difference between Sabine’s and Fiona’s use of personal pronouns entangled their perception of homeland. Sabine individualised her perception and used the possessive pronoun ‘my’ (motherland) for Turkey, whereas Fiona collectivised hers and used ‘our’ (motherland).

Sabine’s quote on the Turkey body map (image 8 above):

Excerpt 7.2.2.: My motherland, my saviour, A piece from heaven

Fiona’s quote on the Turkey body map (image 9 above):

Excerpt 7.2.3.: Our motherland, And also the republic that Ataturk established

This showed how individuals’ opinions are shaped in and through their interaction with people around them. Fiona’s collectivisation is an example of how her perception was influenced by Sabine’s utterance. She chose to follow her friend’s understanding and aligned herself with Sabine. In doing so, they formed a pack and intrinsically created a group pressure for others.

In this context, the data revealed a diverse understanding of being a collective, which is closely linked to Cyprus’s national history, as well as their claims of identity within the association. The body map with the headline of Turkiye triggered them to closely associate Turkey with the notion of homeland and they were inclined to identify Turkiye as their motherland. This is closely connected to how my participants idealised and created a collective identity claim (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina, 2011) on the basis of the political
establishment (Wodak et al., 1999). Emily's significant attempt to project similarity to her group members' opinion and the way Sabine implied a shared mentality, denote their collective identity. And such attempts of praising similarities and downplaying differences is a common practice when making collective claims.

7.3. Rhetorical process of personal experience

Body maps recreated complex realities far from being uniform as they evoke all kinds of memories and involve the process of remembering the past. Research participants engaged with the body maps either verbally or in written format. In the case of the TC diaspora, participants’ narratives involve a collectivisation of individual memories into local or institutional histories and body mapping triggered the research participants' memories as images and enabled them to share societal narratives around the themes that are part of their daily lives but not openly discussed. The body maps showed that participants used the medium for expressing their opinion on the proposed body maps beyond verbal interaction. Some of the participants associated their opinion with their subjective political views and did not feel comfortable verbalising their thoughts orally but preferred to have some space to organically complete the body maps on their own, without consulting the people around them.
Excerpt 7.3.1.: Stomach ache, is the first thought that comes to my mind and the next is Turkiye. I can’t think of a Turkey without ATATURK, we were born, got educated, we cherished (embraced) our ATA, we don’t know what will happen to it as of now. Our future is dark. There are traitors in our land. We have to reveal them. Truth is disguised. Not to let villains aggravate only by using the name of Allah, Turkiye not to sink, not to regress.

People’s narratives reflect their unique experience. As it can be seen in excerpt 7.3.1., Susan signifies Turkey as stomach ache and provided a narrative on the body map (image 10). In Excerpt 7.2.1., we can see that Susan aligned herself with the rest of the group by saying ‘I wrote like that’ in line 13 and considered herself as a part of the group. Her body map provides an elaborated account on the politics of Turkey and how she predicts the future of the country. She clearly associates herself with ‘Ataturk’ and shows respect.
for the nation as she clearly pointed out that for her Turkey is homeland. On the body map she referred to Turkey as ‘our land’ and explicated how she felt about the future of the nation of Turkey being threatened by the traitors. She utilised the body map to explain the tension and concerns. In doing so, I managed to capture her unspoken view about politics on the body map. The body maps become artefacts of both conformity and resistance (Gastaldo, 2012); they are a safe space for participants to exercise agency in how much they are willing to publicly challenge the status quo (Dew et al., 2018).

Further, this section has focused on how members of the association reassigned themselves an identity to legitimise their socio-political membership to the group and concretised their perceived selves through the use of discoursive strategies, such as the use of personal pronouns. In diasporic close-knit communities establishing and negotiating a shared repertoire affects people’s lived experience, hence how they draw boundaries to their group and guard it. By projecting similar opinions, if not same, the participants, especially Emily, negotiated their membership within the group and they all claim a group identity. This is an act of an attempt not to be singled out and stigmatised over her political stance. From the nationalist perspective, TCness is denied and TCs are seen as ‘one’ with the Turkish nation. Kizilyurek and Gautier-Kizilyurek (2004) argue this in their article in relation to the discourses of sameness with Turkey influencing the identification/differentiation of TC identity in Cyprus. They provided a detailed historical evolution of Turkishness on the island and how the politics of unity and belonging to a bigger Turkish nation played a role in people’s ideologies around ethnic determinism. With this in mind, it is seen as ‘treason against the Turkish nation’ to claim any peculiarities related to Turkish Cypriotness in Cyprus. Excerpt 7.2.1. exemplifies how the discourses of identification and differentiation are carried outside the nation’s boundaries and lived/experienced within the diaspora space. This is because ‘the boundary that separates the two communities is not only physical, but also psychosocial’ (Spyrou, 2006). Cohen (1982:3) identifies this as a ‘relational boundary’ as it is constantly created and recreated by the members who are in constant negotiation of concretising their sense of self. It is remarkable to observe how
Emily and Susan adapted their political view specifically to the expectations of the group members, who sounded to be supporters of nationalist discourses. Emily reconstructed her identity in line with her friends’ political views, otherwise her friends could have condemned her act and labelled her as a ‘traitor’ and excluded her. In a similar fashion, Susan preferred to stay silent and express herself in textual form by using the body map. Such an act also marks the fragility of sustaining membership in the association. Membership is continuously evaluated and negotiated by the people who are participating actors of the group (Marra and Angouri, 2011). Boundaries of the group are also in a similar manner stretched, crossed, and drawn through mutual negotiation.

7.4. Physical anchor points and governing bodies

The excerpts below are examples of collectivising national memories into an ‘imagined’ community (Drozdzewski et al., 2016). They demonstrate from a different angle what the interview and interactional data have shown. In more detail, for Handan, the TRNC as a political establishment was not relatable. This was because she was not able to develop a sense of belonging to that new political establishment. In the interview she spoke of living in her village, which she was forced to leave during the war. That village is currently located in the south of Cyprus. She expressed having fond memories of her childhood in that village. When she and her family had to move to the northern part of Cyprus, the TRNC did not exist and soon after their forced migration to the north, her family took refuge in England. This happened when Handan was 10 years old and the TRNC as a political nation-state had not been established yet. Therefore when asked to mark on the body map with the headline ‘TRNC’ she admitted that she doesn’t have any affiliation with the TRNC,

Excerpt 7.4.1.: Nothing, nowhere really (.) I don’t feel it, feel anything for it. I was only about 17, I think, when it was announced and (..) yeah also I am from (the village she was born in). That (TRNC) (tapping on the body map) isn’t, doesn’t represent, hmm, where from, I am from. The village, that village is, it is, not this, no.
Handan’s positioning shows overall similarities to the members at the Lilies. The members of The Lilies have close affiliation with the region they come from. After the division of the island, that region stayed in the southern part of Cyprus and, similarly to Handan, some of them did not get to live under the TRNC government, therefore this makes them feel like an outsider. She makes a distinction between the Government and the ordinary people.

Yvonne’s body map reflects those tensions; her association with TRNC allows her to reinforce her existing views of the happenings as cruel and inhuman. Yvonne’s reference to a national entity entails a criticism. The criticism was performed in a form of complaint and distancing herself from the people living there. On image 11, Yvonne expresses her discontentment with the land which she built as her idealised home. Through providing a textual account on the body map (excerpt 7.4.2.), she shares what she has experienced when she visited Cyprus after a considerable amount of time.

**Excerpt 7.4.2.:** First time after 32 years, I stayed in Cyprus for 6 weeks. I lived with my father. Life is very expensive there. **People, the locals** are after some profit and nobody cares for anybody. No respect and love left for the ancestors/elderly. No family bonds are existent. **It looks as if it is not our land, there are many foreigners/strangers/outlander.** Even in the villages, there are no primary schools, but they have a university. The universities became the only source of income for the nation.

Her physical experience of home differed from what she idealised in her mind and this left her with disappointment. The use of ‘people, the locals’ is a strategy she uses to distance herself from the people living in Cyprus and from all the negativity she observed happening on the island. ‘It looks as if it is not our land, there are many foreigners/strangers/outlander’ - with this sentence, Yvonne performs the role of an insider by claiming the island to be her homeland; however, she denoted an alienation with the people living there. This opens the debate of idealisation of home and utopic self. Yvonne, a member of a TC diaspora living in London, criticises what ‘locals’ in Cyprus do
and how they live in Cyprus and she questioned her entitlement of being part of the community at the place which she prefers to call home.

7.5. Self and Other- legitimising a Greek Cypriot as one of us

Excerpt 7.5.1. is on how the participants draw on home politics for tacitly alienating a person who was earlier (in section 6.5) overtly accepted as ‘one of us’. In this excerpt, yet again, the fluid nature of membership negotiation is demonstrated. We observe the fine balance between being affiliated with multiple groups, which sometimes might pose a threat situation for the other concurrent group members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Excerpt 7.5.1.: Greek Cypriot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Now, it’s Greek Cypriot. You already wrote the Greek Cypriot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>I wrote it down. What kind of meaning does it give for you? (.). [a little hesitation] gavurlar*? (giaours, the infidels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>shhhh, and then all giggle when looking around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Shhh, oh my, for god’s sake.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>He didn’t understand it, didn’t understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>You’ll get a beating!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>It’s soo baaadd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>I forgot it yo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>He could not get it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>Ok, alright he didn’t get it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>No, he is a person that I like, I like him actually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>Actually, he mocks us a lot, don’t you notice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>yeah, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>He is such a disgrace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Does he? Why? What did he say to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>I approached him, and talked to him about the word that I know in Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>But he started to take a mick out of us, so I’ve given up with him at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>Oh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>I told him “are you mocking me?” I told to him that and left him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yvonne</td>
<td>oh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>I tried to explain and tell him that I worked with the Greek and we were neighbours [conversation interrupted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gavur:* This is an offensive word used for those who do not follow the religion of Islam. In the context of Cyprus and Cypriot politics, this word is used in reference to Greek Cypriots as an insult. This word is often used in relation to the interethnic conflicts in Cyprus, which is a social taboo.
Image 12: Yvonne’s body map - Greek Cypriot

Image 13: Serra’s body map - Greek Cypriot
Greek Cypriots seem to be excluded from my participants' everyday lives. Antony is a GC man who regularly attends the meetings and we have already seen him in a previous chapter. I consider this a useful sub-case study as it encapsulates the multi-layered nature of the negotiation process between the members, Yvonne in one sense excludes him from the group by referring to his ethnicity as 'gioaur'; however, how she does this is strongly disapproved of by the other group members. Not all of them are of the same opinion and this fact would endanger Yvonne’s position in the group. Traditional and historical enmity towards the other, both politically and socially, is closely related to Cyprus politics (Charalambous, 2012; Hamit, 2008; Spyrou, 2006; Tanyel and Kiralp, 2021 and see Chapter 1 for relevant section on Cyprus history). This is apparent in the discourse here too. When the label Greek Cypriot was given on the body map, Yvonne used the word ‘gavurlar’\(^4\) referring to the GCs. This label is often used as a pejorative term with strong negative connotations. In the Cypriot context this word is used to express criticism, hostility and also disregard towards GCs. There is a tendency towards TC and GC communities of the island to be seen as ‘The Other of the homeland’ (Georgiou, 2001).

In this excerpt, Sabine, Emily, and Susan disalign with Yvonne and express their discomfort with Yvonne’s evaluative word choice and their response shows embarrassment. Yvonne feels judged by them and makes an attempt to reverse the act. She responds in a defensive manner (line 11) and attempts to repair the discriminatory utterance by saying he is a person that she ‘actually’ fancies (line 16). By expressing her fondness for Antony, Yvonne positions him as one of them. In response to her, Serra goes into negotiation with Yvonne through a story. Serra rejects Yvonne’s account and provides her own. Such an act indexes disalignment. In lines 16 and 23, Serra uses the word ‘us’ referring to the female TC members of the association and perceives Antony as disrespecting all other ‘Turkish Cypriots’ in the group. Such a counter-argument is related to Serra’s perceived otherness of GCs which is influenced by her past experience. By keeping silent and not joining in the conversation Sabine, Emily and Susan take a position of disagreement with

---

\(^4\) This word does not voice the researcher’s opinion.
Serra again but avoid escalating. The conversation was interrupted and that could be a sign that Serra’s position is not fully supported but also not further challenged.

A social construct of Us-They dichotomy presents itself once again on Yvonne’s body map where she wrote a Turkish proverb, ‘Domuzdan post, gavuradan dost olmaz.’ (see image 12). This proverb roughly translates as ‘it is impossible to make pelt from swine and friends with ghiaours (infidels)’ (Balaban and Seçkin, 2016). Such a referral represents a longstanding enmity and distrust towards the ‘giavour’ (infidel) (Hamit, 2008). A variant to this proverb is ‘Domuz derisinden post olmaz, eski dusmandan dost olmaz’, which translates as ‘It is impossible to make pelt from the skin of swine and friends from old enemies’. As it can be seen, the words ‘giaours’ and ‘old friends’ are used interchangeably. In their article, Balaban and Seçkin (2016) provided a reason why this proverb exists with a reference to pig in Turkish language. In Islam, pigs are seen as filthy as well as strong animals. In general, proverbs with a reference to pigs are seen to have a negative connotation (Astourian, 1996; 2002). This proverb is one of the commonly known proverbs used in the northern part of the island to refer to GCs and used as a reference for the impossibility of being friends with Greeks. Such phrases support the dominant discourse about nationalism and serve as racist, separationist ideals. The participant here used this phrase (not verbally, but in textual form on the body map), to express her distrust in the GC community. On the whole, the use of such a proverb indexes hatred and hostility to her account and the struggle of her having a relationship with the ‘other’ based on peace and friendliness.

Hamit (2008) conducted a study on Turkish Cypriotness and the perception of ‘the other’ in the northern part of Cyprus. In her study, the participants were asked whether they agreed with the above-mentioned proverb or not. With the GC community in mind, she reported that only a small fraction of her informants agreed with that statement implying their mistrust in GCs. This was related to the happenings in the past and what they have heard from the elderly, who had experienced the intercommunal war, shaped their view on ‘the other’. This tendency resonates with Yvonne’s perception of the GCs. The majority of Hamit’s (2008) informants classified the proverb as being ‘a racist...
and nationalist talk’ and clearly mentioned that it would not be fair to demonise a particular community and make generalised statements which are ‘consciously constructed by nationalists for encouraging separatist perceptions in society’. With this in mind, Josie’s (a member at The Olives) body map revealed a contradictory perception about the GCs. On her body map she wrote ‘sometimes friend, sometimes enemy’. This shows how personal, political, and social relationships are sometimes in tension with one another. The participants have experienced and recount contradictory and deeply personal experiences. For instance Josie, in my observations, mentioned that she used to work with a GC team and she was very content with the teamwork, but on the other hand, she was very upset when she was talking about how her family was displaced at the time of the war. The past and present are in a constant fine balance in the community as the data here also show. The participants provided consistently contradictory accounts with blurred lines between how their perception of GCs was directly related to the particular community of people or to the current and past political practices and discourses. In excerpt 7.5.1. Sabine was one of the silent ones in the interaction. She reacted to Yvonne’s words with disapproval and told to her ‘You’ll get a beating’ in line 9. Instead of participating in the conversation and trying to convince others that Yvonne’s utterance was not acceptable she preferred to use the body map to express her opinion and provide a narrative about war and her encounter with the GC community (image 14).
Excerpt 7.5.2.: Time of war in Cyprus 1974. War took place in my village, I was 9 years old and I remember our family fought. The so-called leaders of the village, all left during the war and they escaped to nearby villages. The folk were alone. After the peace agreement those people took the lead again, they corrupted, they secured their own families and future. When the traitors were leading, and when we have been languishing here, they exploited our Cyprus.

It is clear that the GC community prompted memories from what is framed as an agonising past and instead of sharing it with others and attracting others attention to her experience, she chose not to divert the conversation towards
her bitter past. She also had bitter feelings about the TC leaders of the time too, but she was probably not comfortable talking about it because it would jeopardise her stance in the group. From the observation data supported by my own fieldnotes as well as my experiences in Cyprus, the topic of war and experiences of war are taboo among the community and people choose not to open the ‘old books’ to talk about it. The association space is promoted to be all-inclusive and non-political and members of the association are generally careful with their political stance and their political involvement is kept as opaque as possible. Sabine’s way of providing a narrative about war is covert through the body map and this is a strategy to keep the association space as peaceful as possible. This view is evidently supported by the rest of the team when they did not comment further on Serra’s account. Sabine’s reaction and the account which she provided on her body map testifies to the importance of the remembrance of war memory to a nation’s identity narratives (Chang, 2005; Gillis, 1994; Koonz, 1994; Lowenthal, 1994). In so doing, she makes reference to her TC identity and clearly draws a boundary between GCs and TCs through ‘national past’. In closing, the members negotiated their positions in recurrent events and a fragile balance between the us/them dichotomy continuously resurfaces. To conclude this chapter, I discuss the participants’ reaction to the motherland.

7.6. Cyprus

I have been particularly interested here in the lexical choices that index collectivity. The body map with the title ‘Cyprus’ (image 15) enabled the participants to negotiate their positioning in relation to the wider Cypriot identity claim.

Excerpt 7.6.1. illustrates an open reference to collective identity formation through the strategic use of personal pronouns. This body map, by participant Fatma, shows a strategy commonly used: collectivisation through the use of first person plural pronouns (Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina, 2011), which is systematic across all datasets. The inclusive use of ‘we’, ‘our minds’, index how they perceive the community and the process by which they claim a community voice about the island. This is clearly illustrated in the quote below.
by Fatma. She wrote down the following sentence and put a cross marking on the head:

**Excerpt 7.6.1.:** Wherever we found ourselves, Cyprus is in our minds.

![Image 15: Fatma’s body map - Cyprus](image)

Looking at the visual representations, positioning an X on the head can be interpreted as a signifier for longing, shows a hierarchy of significance and desire for community. Fatma collectivises her opinion on being a community, which is always in her thoughts and expresses her desire to be as ‘one’. The collectivisation process is also a powerful rhetorical strategy, that of generalisation. Generalisation adds credibility and weight to individual viewpoints. In the case of sensitive or complex issues, it is a useful strategy for the speakers to distance themselves and project an opinion to a collective whole. Once the individuals achieve a claim to sharedness, they create a safe space to elevate an account to a position shared by a community. This adds authority as well as distance for the individual. In the body maps Cyprus is presented as what unites and guides the community, which however is much
more complex when the whole dataset is put together. I summarise below the core observations of this chapter.

7.7. Summary

I focused on the nuances of the data collected through the body maps and examined participants’ understanding of self/other in relation to the home politics. Bearing in mind that stereotypical categories are emergent in the data and they appear not only to be on the surface but also have significant depth, I have analysed spoken interactions as well as participants’ textual accounts on the body maps. I compared and contrasted these interactions with the body map data to further support my claims.

I investigated the notion of belonging through the angle of political positioning. I have shown how my participants balanced a sensitive disclosure of their own political opinion in order to retain their group membership. This is perhaps not surprising, given the body of knowledge on identity politics. However, the tensions and contradictions and the ways in which they are manifested in the diasporic context is, in my view, significant for showing how individuals balance competing priorities which impact on inclusion and exclusion.

Further on this, the collectivisation of memories and the ways in which points of reference were negotiated in situ between the participants show the nuances of recontextualising a turbulent past, and uncertain future, into a stable collective identity and community. In the last section of the chapter, I showed how participants organically utilised the body maps to explicate their political positioning which in fact projected some variation from the hegemonic views in the community. This connects the core concepts that guided the thesis and will be further discussed in the next and final chapter of the thesis.
8 Discussion and Concluding Remarks

8.1. Discussion and concluding remarks

Diasporas have attracted the interest and imagination of scholars and lay people alike; despite the complexity of mobility trends, in the present and in the past, the concept of displacement and desire to ‘return’ tend to dominate representations in popular culture, as well as studies, at least in the social sciences. As this project, in line with many others (e.g., Cohen, 1997; Dufoix, 2003/2008; Tölokyan, 1991), has shown however, a heterogenous group of people self identifies, and is being categorised by others, as a diaspora. Expatriates, sojourners, immigrants, asylum seekers, or ethnic communities are given the same label. This is analytically and theoretically problematic. The ways in which a community can be captured and defined is an area linguistic research has made solid contribution to over the decades. Moving from a generalised use of social categories (particularly race, ethnicity, religion) to the significance of membership (Marra, 2012; Angouri and Marra, 2011), the current thinking in sociolinguistic and applied linguistic research focuses on the work the self-identified members of a community do to construct the ‘collective’ in their discourse and practices. This has particular significance for the ways in which the community emerges and individuals claim membership and negotiate belonging while navigating a complex political matrix.

The academic literature on space, place, and diaspora investigates the intricate relationship between diaspora communities and their spatial environments, concentrating on how space and place influence the formation of diasporic identities, a sense of belonging, and community dynamics (Low, 2003; 2014; and 2017; Lowry, 2023; Bradley and Simpson, 2020). Scholars have examined how diaspora communities navigate and negotiate their relationship with multiple spaces, such as their ancestral homeland and the host nation (Kozminska and Zhu, 2021). This body of literature recognizes that diaspora communities frequently exist in a state of liminality, occupying spaces that are neither completely connected to their homeland nor fully integrated into the host country.
In my research project, the concept of place-belonging has been a central focus. Through habitual practices, memories, and social interactions, I examined how TC diaspora community create and maintain a sense of belonging to the place of their residence, associations and also their imagined home. Place-making practices, such as the establishment of diaspora associations or community centers, serve as significant sites for the construction of collective identity and the fostering of social cohesion within diaspora communities (Van Gorp and Smets, 2015).

The notions of place and belonging have been a topic of investigation in the sociolinguistic research (Labov, 1963). However, they have been long remained theoretically underdeveloped, and the notions of space and place have been used interchangeably. In accordance with Cornips and de Rooij (2018) this thesis argues that further sociolinguistic research is necessary on the way place-belongingness is done in and through language practices. I have expanded this to also include collective activities that carry symbolic meaning in their context (e.g., games in the associations). Çavusoglu (2021), Huang (2020), Karatsareas (2021), Lytra (2012), Matras, et al., (2022), and Mavroudi, (2020) looked into migrant communities and belonging from a lens of language maintenance and language ideologies in general. My thesis addresses the gap in the literature and the findings of this study supports introducing place-belonging as a useful theoretical concept in the sociolinguistic and applied linguistic ‘toolkit’ for understanding the ways in which emplaced activities and interactional practices are mobilised by individuals and groups to construct their community.

I unpack this further in this discussion and closing section of the thesis in relation to the TC London community.

**From social categories to social practices**

The term community carries connotations of cohesion on the basis of what the members ‘have in common’; in sociolinguistic literature the ‘speech community’ based on a linguistic variety the members have access to, is well known and discussed (for a critique see Patrick, 2002). As my findings show
(Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7) factors drawing on social categories play a role in the ways in which my TC participants claim membership to the group. The community is constructed through their discourse, the common practices (Chapters 5, 6 and 7), as well as the ‘essence’ of social categories that get recontextualised in the situated here and now. The members of the TC diaspora drew on ‘roots and bloodline’, and ‘language’ (Šimićić and Rajko, 2021) but also in the norms of the TC London community. I argued that understanding those communities as CofPs is appropriate and useful to describe their complexity.

My analysis of membership to the community through the interview data (Chapters 4 and 5 and in methodology, Chapter 3) partly confirms existing studies, but also adds new dimensions and factors. The expectations and idealisation of the social value of membership categories within the diaspora community are explicitly imposed on the members; more clearly so silenced younger members by the older generation or those who are not considered ‘authentic’. This is exemplified in the data and excerpt 5.3.1. which showed how ‘uncle’ automatically labelled Gabi as a foreigner, although she openly feels at home in London rather than in Cyprus. Beyond the recurrent references to places, the associations’ function of bringing together the community provided the impetus to me to conduct further studies in the associations.

Beyond what is said, community building is achieved through routinised and repetitive patterns. Individuals form a community of practice as we saw in the associations (Chapter 6). In order to be classified as a CofP, individuals that self-identify with a certain collectivity are required to undertake common activities sustained over a period of time. The members are engaging in a habitual common practices and they are aware of the social codes required to be part of this collectivity. Those, however, who self-identify as a member of the TC diaspora, but do not exhibit awareness of the social codes and do not index membership by aligning with the characteristics of the group to which they aspire are excluded or categorised as an outsider. In the findings, examples include Anna (Chapter 6) being excluded because of her language choice and proficiency in the association, and Antony being categorised as ‘the
other of the homeland’ (Georgiou, 2001). Further research could usefully focus on those ‘peripheral’ members (see also below).

Diaspora associations play an important part in creating community belonging. In the associations, these include the linguistic, embodied, and emplaced resources within the associations such as prayers, food, commemorating national and religious days, as well as music and dance. This, in itself is not a new revelation; however, this research has illustrated how those practices are mobilised to index and claim membership. The role of specific members (e.g., the Chair and Committee) and the significance of language choice, using Turkish language in the association meetings, while showing some proficiency in other dominant languages of the ‘homeland’ (see excerpt 6.5.1.2. on the use of Greek) gives access to the associations’ linguistic ecosystem. This linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1992) enables participants to have access to different centres of power (for example acting as a steering committee member, or gaining easier access into the community). This is also associated with the practice of power and warrants further research in this under-researched context. In associations where hierarchical order is visible, power is always (re)negotiable, dynamic, (re)produced, and confirmed by interactants (Angouri, 2018; Clegg, 1989; Holmes and Stubbe, 2015).

**The imagined and lived experience**

Turning to the desire for a home (Brah, 1996) and the so called ‘teleology of return’ (Clifford, 1997), the nostalgia for the homeland is based on the principle of a linear relationship between a ‘here’ and a ‘there’. This concept of *nostos* is often associated with a home that the community is legitimately associated with. This however is a rather narrow approach and one that does not capture politically complex and sensitive environments such as the TC community. As well put by Levitt (2009) [they] do not simply choose between the home and the host-land. Instead they strike a balance, albeit tenuous, between the competing resources and constraints circulating within these fields, and deploy them effectively in response to the opportunities and challenges that present themselves. (p.1239). Although Levitt refers to children (second or further)
generations, the same applies to the whole community as I have argued. In summary, my findings show that imagined and lived experiences are negotiated in practices and stories that circulate in the community.

Figure 23 provides an overview of the relationship of these core concepts that I have discussed and the way in which they form an iterative cycle of influence. Following relevant studies (De Fina, 2010; Angouri, 2012; Merino and Tileagă, 2011; Nedashhkivska, 2018) I see those communities as ‘dynamic systems shaping and being shaped in the discourse of their self-affiliated members’ (Angouri, 2012:96) in specific emplaced situations. Angouri’s study focused on a diasporic community that has many similarities to the one discussed here; however, what my findings add is the significance of looking through the lenses of mythical, emotional, symbolic and material place for the way it’s enacted by core members of the community in activities which together construct the community membership. In recent work, Kozmisnska and Zhu (2021) also indicate the important role of diaspora organisations and ‘community organisers who control and regulate’ (p. 83) and the preference for linguistic and cultural purity or while at the same time overcoming other divides (e.g., class). My data show also a tendency towards an imposed ‘standard’ but also contradictions in how members are allowed to claim membership depending on the context (e.g., Greek is also a sign of ‘the stigmatised other’ as well competence in the languages of Cyprus) Diasporic community membership is by and large an interactive achievement.

Besides common practices, emotion-laden discourse attributes to building a connection with the people, place and the system. My analysis here has confirmed previous arguments about the importance of personal relationships for developing place-belonging. The findings build on literature that has associated relationships with place-making (Castillo, 2014; Pemberton and Phillimore, 2018) and has added to that place-belonging. The participants expressed their attachment to London through their close bonds with their family members and their strong social relationships with their friends. Having a mental boundary of South and North London suggests that the members of the diaspora have an emotional attachment to a geographical territory. Moving
outside the physical boundaries of the city of London is associated with moving out of the community therefore causing a feeling of alienation.

Overall, the analysis showed that membership relies on multiple factors that correspond to individuals’ labelling of each other, language preference, feelings of attachment, as well as political views.

As illustrated in Figure 23, the findings of this study revealed that the cyclical process of community building draws on four pillars, *Place, Context, Essence, and the Political*. This thesis focused on the cyclical process of place-making through habitual practices and how these are manifestations of place-belonging and group membership. As supported by Yuval-Davis’s (2006) conceptual framework, social locations play an important role in developing a sense of belonging; I adapted her conceptual framework on belonging and politics of belonging and connected it with place-belonging in relation to interactional practices. Yuval Davis’s (2006) framework and Antonsich’s (2010) place-belonging concept, have been useful in framing my study. I have added a nuanced and holistic understanding of the community building
process based on a diverse dataset and methodological approach that combines thematic analysis with the principles of interactional sociolinguistics and a new method for linguistic research, that of body maps.

**Contributions of the research**

My research has made two original contributions, one methodological and one conceptual. On the former, I have argued that multiple datasets reinforce one another in the study of diasporas. A heuristic combining interviews (the stories of the community), ethnographic mapping of community ‘places’, sociolinguistic analysis of habitual practices together provide a language first approach to place-belonging. On the methodological level, this study works with three data sets. For the analysis of the interviews data, body maps and interactional data, IS approach was adopted. IS provides a holistic understanding how place-belonging is done within the TC diaspora. I adopted IS as my lens and took a discursive interactional approach to belonging. The interactional approach adopted in this thesis brings new perspectives and it appears that the forms of participation rather constantly negotiated between the participants in the context of interaction. The analysis shows how participants use discursive resources in interaction to index membership of the association. These resources can be mobilised in different ways, by referring to linguistic and political ideologies (Piller, 2016).

The second contribution of this study concerns the diaspora associations as physical places, where members of the diaspora community come together. In Linguistics the diaspora associations, as a physical place of gathering, have received limited attention. These organisations can function as places for identification (Ghorashi, 2004) of cultural, national, as well as social identities. Taking diaspora associations as the ‘imagined communities’ (Anderson, 1991), the findings revealed that these places foster participation and signify unity among the people who identify as belonging to a specific community. Using empirical linguistic data, my thesis contributed to understanding the discursive negotiation of place-belonging among the self-identified members of the TC diaspora. On the meso-level, conducting this research on specific structures in the diaspora organisations, such as the role of the Chair, being
the newcomer, made it possible to research how the members do place-belonging in the ways they index membership. This is partially achieved through gatekeeping practices. Through investigating the roles of the participants (chapter 6), this study shed some light onto the structural evolution/existence of the diaspora associations. The findings show that the diaspora associations have a hierarchical structure (see chapter 6). The activities undertaken during the association gatherings, the attitudes towards the newcomers as well as how they negotiated the status of insiderness/outsiderness shed light on how place-belongingness was done actively by the members of the diaspora community.

Overall social locations are constructed dependent on individuals’ specific positioning claim belonging to it. At the macro level, diaspora associations in London create a space for negotiation of membership within the diaspora community. At the meso level, the specific association is significant for its members, and often carries political symbolism for the members. And, at the micro level, the here and now of interaction is where individuals perpetuate or challenge the status quo. In this thesis, the city of London is the place for interaction for my participants (see e.g., Gabi’s trajectory (Excerpt 5.3.1)) and Ash’s narrative (Excerpt 5.5.2.) which exemplified how individuals associate themselves with a particular social location and also want to be identified with that location).

To sum up, belonging is multilevelled (Kelly, 2018) and members of the associations are required/expected to fit into expectations of performance in order to be seen as an ‘insider’, indexing membership through individuals’ past, symbols, myth in the transformed space where community is built. The construction of insiderness presents itself as emergent and in connection with individuals’ perception of who they are and who they choose to define as ‘one of them’. In the process of place-making, individuals negotiate the meaning of the space where interaction takes place and turn it into somewhere they attach meaning to, a place where they feel emotionally attached. This of course does not happen in a vacuum, it is multifaceted and there is a constant flux of alignment and disalignment between the members. The findings showed that being associated with the TC diaspora, being an active participant in the
association, being affiliated to a particular region in Cyprus and speaking the
Turkish language are the explicit categories for gaining access to the
association. Furthermore, implicit categories of membership exist. Findings
suggest that following a political agenda and, having strong affiliation with
Turkishness are the categories that played a determining role in the
negotiation of membership.

In closing, the thesis set three research questions (section 3.2.1.) on the ways
in which membership is claimed and how the members of the diaspora
community do place-belonging. These are answered in chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7.
The analysis has brought together established work in social
sciences/sociology and in sociolinguistics in shedding light on the symbols of
an ‘invisible’ community and its practices. I believe my framework and
methodology pave the way for more studies on modern diasporas and reflect
below on what could have been done differently -and hence provide
opportunities for future research.

8.2. Limitations of the present study
The main limitations of the study are associated with sample size and time to
analyse in detail my own role in co-eliciting the data with my participants. As
in all qualitative studies, in taking an ethnographically informed approach, my
own researcher identity has both influenced the responses of my participants
and impacted on their positions vis-à-vis the associations. Although this may
be expected to be seen as a limitation of methodology, I argue it to be an
unavoidable characteristic of human enquiry. However, I would have liked a
larger sample of associations so that I can challenge and further enrich my
own interpretations.

A further limitation pertains to the fact that the analysis does not extend to post
analysis interviews, whereas conducting further interviews with the
participants after analysing the research material would have provided further
depth to this study. This however was mitigated by the multiple dataset I
collected in the process.
Another limitation is around navigating the first/second order complexity in the participant accounts - the ways in which space/place are used by lay users need to be translated by the researcher which also presents a challenge. Further, on terminological issues, in sociolinguistic research the terms place and space are undistinguished (Cornips and de Rooij, 2018). Theorisation of these notions with very little reference from the sociolinguistic literature presented a challenge, however I brought together various disciplines (see Chapter 2) in which space and place as a topic is established and developed. In so doing, on all accounts I widened my own anticipation and managed to adopt the terminology which best suited the scope of this research.

8.3. Future research directions

This particular study aimed to make a contribution to sociolinguistics but also diaspora studies more generally. First, the study offers insights on the interactional construction of membership in modern diasporas and specifically in prime locations such as the associations. The notions of space and place gained importance with the increasing mobility and interaction of people. Continuing from the research introduced here further work can usefully continue the theorisation of belonging in diasporas, expanding on the role gatekeepers in negotiating processes of in/exclusion.

Moreover, although work on TCs seems to have flourished in the last decade, this particular community is still understudied. Academic research on TCs in Cyprus and around the world, is very limited. My research project aims to address this gap in the literature and through close examination of the phenomenon, it aims to build on studies in intercultural communication and sociolinguistics. This contribution will be of interest to sociolinguistics, as well as migration studies, intercultural communication, and diaspora research concerning modern and liminal diasporic space.

Following the findings of the study, future research on community building, and space and place could also benefit from a closer look at other contexts such as the diaspora business association, sports clubs and supplementary schools in the diaspora. Conducting research on community membership in various
contexts would provide a wealth of information on the place-making process and development of place-belonging.

Finally, future research can benefit from current theorisation in sociolinguistics; in particular the topographies of practice frameworks, the way place and interactional practice are constructed in and construct the dominant ideologies that circulate in the social order, provide a way to look into the enactment of ideologies in a wider set of social practices. Having specific roles within the association defines the places of interaction. That is a valuable contribution to the linguistic literature because how power is exercised and how members use this power to navigate their place-belonging within the association space can be explored by looking at the topographies of practice (Angouri and Humonen, 2022). The topic of in/exclusion can be investigated through looking at the patterns that are un/marked. Special attention should be given to the role of members of the associations who are legitimised to utilise certain areas of their association as a manifestation of doing membership. This research seeks to facilitate more projects in the field and provide a stronger voice to the TC community.

Belonging is directly related to settling in a new socio-political environment. In its turn this impacts social cohesion in times of intense population mobility. In the past ten years, many parts of the world are experiencing ongoing population upheaval and ‘migration crises’ occupy the political and public media rhetoric. The geopolitical and climate changes will continue pushing large waves of population to ‘move for a better life’ or to flee conflict. Those ‘newcomers’ will go through a place-belonging negotiation and I hope my thesis has provided a useful and constructive lens for exploring the nuances of the process.
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10 Appendices

Appendix 1: The interview protocol outlining the key topics

Section 1: Introduction

- Introduce researcher
- Introduce the research
- Mention that this research will only be used for academic purposes
- Make sure to acquire consent
- Ask for consent to record the conversation and also to take photos of their home space

Section 2: Key topics covered in interviews and observations

The areas I identified below can perform as parts of data analysis and would be closely related to the literature review. The references are to be extended.

1. **Home/Residence**
   - Are there any objects which deliberately represent Cyprus or Britain or resemble Cypriot or British lifestyle?
   - Do they have any special attachment towards certain objects which resemble their understanding of home?

2. **Language Preference**
   - What is the preferred language of communication?
   - In a multilingual setting which is the preferred communication language?
   - Do they speak English or Turkish to each other?
   - Are there any differences in language use between generations?
   - Do they prefer to converse in English or in Turkish with me?
   - How often do they code-switch?
   - Are there any particular topics which are best articulated when conversed in Turkish or English?
3. Reference to Cyprus in conversation
   - Do they talk about Cyprus?
   - What kind of topics do they prefer to talk about?
   - Do they talk about their relatives back in Cyprus?
   - Do they have plans to visit Cyprus in the near future?
   - Do they plan to return to Cyprus?
   - Do they constantly compare Cyprus to England?

4. Image of Self
   - Do they refer to themselves as Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Turkish, British?
   - Do they distinguish themselves from the English and the British?
   - How often do they use phrases such as “when I was in Cyprus…”, “Here in England, we do…”, “The English do like this and that, but we …”, “It is not appropriate to us, but it is ok for them.”, “They (the English) do this regularly, we got used to it”, “now we do it in the same way”, etc.

5. Food and Eating Habits
   - What is their way of accepting guests?
   - How are their attitudes towards guests?
   - What do they offer their guests?
   - Do they offer coffee?
   - Do they consume coffee on a regular basis?
   - Do they take alcohol?
   - Do they have the habit of feeding people? Will they ask them to stay for lunch/dinner with them?
   - What is their preferred choice of diet?
   - Do they have access to ‘authentic’ dishes?
   - Does their way of cooking resemble how it is prepared in Cyprus?
   - What do they think of their eating habits?
   - Do they have their own versions of those ‘authentic’ dishes?
6. Social Relations and Networks
   - With whom are they befriended?
   - Are they part of a wider community?
   - How is their relationship with their neighbours?
   - How far is their engagement with the wider community?
   - Do they attend any social events taking place near their area?
   - Are they aware of any events organised by the Cypriot diaspora?

7. Technology
   - Do they have a satellite TV?
   - Do they watch Turkish TV series regularly?
   - Do they have a favourite TV show?
   - Do they follow news in Cyprus or in Turkey?
   - What is their daily entertainment on TV?
   - Do they use internet to communicate with their relatives and friends in Cyprus or other parts of the country?
   - How often do they call their relatives?
   - Are they on Facebook?
   - Do they communicate with other Cypriots in Britain through internet?
   - Do they prefer to listen to Turkish music at all?

Section 3: Ending the interview
   - Are there any other relevant issues that I have overlooked?
   - Could you please provide me with the names of the individuals that could potentially be interested in participating in this research?
   - Could you please provide me with the addresses of the community spaces and also the dates of any social activities that I can potentially attend?
Appendix 2: Body Maps

CYPRUS - KIBRIS

LONDON - LONDRA
GREECE - YUNANISTAN

GREEK CYPRiot – KIBRISLI RUM
TURKISH REPUBLIC OF NORTHERN CYPRUS
- KUZEY KIBRIS TURK CUMHURIYETI
Appendix 3: Example of fieldnotes 1

- Old ladies walking and talking to each other.
- One [illegible] stand - 2 men drawing a heated discussion in Turkish (they did not want to drink alcohol).
- Kebab, pollos (chicken), kebabs (meat), and various other Turkish foods.
- Home-made food.
- Turkish language.
- Afro-Caribbean community.
- Narrow and long shops behind the stalls, packed with various overseas products.
- Fabric stores.
- Turkish language.

At the end of the market street, there is a Turkish food centre across the street.

- The building is being renovated and used to belong to the Alevi Association. It has been converted into film studios.
- There is also England's Fenarbahçeli Park.
- Spent some time at the main market.
Appendix 4: Example of fieldnotes 2

Turks vs. Turks. My participants refer to Turks born in Turkey and Turkish Cypriots from Turkey and Turkish Cypriots. They begin to get the characteristics.

-- Necidini is where anyone from Turkey or Turkish Cypriot--her black dress, dark hair, very friendly in her Egyptian-Syrian accent, speaks Turkish, adds: "They bring her cold glasses of a Turkish coffee so we can drink Turkish coffee together.

I fell I could approach her and talk to her. So when she came out of the shop, I greeted her and I told her how the one who gave the walking stick to her. She shook her head and said hello, while she was placing her luggage. boys into her shopping cart.

I told her that I read she was
Appendix 5: Initial themes that emerged from the thematic analysis of the data collected from first and second phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Context</strong></td>
<td>Politics of belonging</td>
<td>First phase- Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprus identity</td>
<td>• The situation in Cyprus going downhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish Cypriotness</td>
<td>• To sweep the money off the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second phase - London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conversation on Turkish and Cypriot political news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No hope for Cypriot politics, blame on the British and the USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Claims that he is not biased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A bit of reflection of Cyprus history and start points of the problem and division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Same problem between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting hate in London (Greek vs. Turkish) by authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An incident about finding funds for his film project and how he got rejected because he used Greek names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Second son and his girlfriend’s heritage: mixed feelings about him dating a Greek or Greek Cypriot girl whereas they’d be fine with any other nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second phase- London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• politics, Cyprus problem, Cypriotness, Passport issues and Cyprus republic, corruption, othering, ‘being ingrate’ towards one own’s country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• economic problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Historical call by Ecevit in Alexander Park to Turkish Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• population flow, EU, politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Move to the UK to study instead of Turkey, because of political instability in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Turkishness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EU and migration to Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Britishness and Englishness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cypriotness,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Preference</td>
<td>First phase- Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>• Language: “I have lost my language [English]!” . Watching Turkish series and using a translator at hospital. When they were still working he claims his English was superb, but he forgot English now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region/Place (Physical)</td>
<td>Transfer and Acquisition</td>
<td>Second phase- London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cashiers speak Turkish with me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preferred language: English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/ North London</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparison with Spanish speaking South Americans and Turkish speaking Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>• E considers her mother tongue to be English as she is much better at it than Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regret of not having taught Turkish to her sons, only one of them went to the Saturday schools (supplementary schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second phase - London</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being more fluent in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Writing better in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greek speaking customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Language preservation among Turkish Cypriots and Turkish people, Speaking Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Language preference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time - Space (Chronotopos)</th>
<th>First phase- Birmingham</th>
<th>Second phase- London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When unknown becomes the reality</td>
<td>• Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here – there</td>
<td>• Knowing the streets and roads in Birmingham and “I am from Birmingham!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once upon a time</td>
<td>• Frequent use of names of locations (villages, cities) in Cyprus (old and new names)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>• here is where family lives; sister, uncle, grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>First phase- Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal spaces/access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational identities - (Permanent liminality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material manifestation of identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second phase- London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I miss London when I am there (Cyprus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Cypriots in Cyprus and how they other and criticize themselves
- Moving to the South of London, living in the South of the river
- Cultural change in Cyprus makes it not liveable
- Thought of returning to Cyprus- towards end of 70s
- living in Cyprus – bad mistake, they came back to the UK
- Cyprus as a holiday destination but not a place to live any more
- In older times, “Turk” in London was meant to be the Turkish Cypriots, nowadays Turks are understood to be people of Turkey origin, Kurds and Turks in London
- change of local culture in Cyprus puts people off returning
- no Turkish people in the school when they were going to school, but now their children’s school is full of Turkish children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Second phase- London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal spaces/access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational identities - (Permanent liminality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material manifestation of identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Though of buying a house in Kyrenia but because his children live in the UK and his health is deteriorating, he decided not to. “What will I do if I go back to Cyprus?”
- Food: They bring olives with them from Cyprus but Halloumi cheese is available in Lidl (globalization)
- Language: “I have lost my language [English]!” Watching Turkish series and using a translator at hospital. When they were still working he claims his English was superb, but he forgot English now
- Kolokas plant, fig plant
**Second phase - London**
- Peksemet and lokma freshly prepared and sold
- Variety of customers from various backgrounds, language use
- Buying a house in Cyprus
- Food and culinary skills of the host (serving Cypriot dish to please me, researcher as an outsider – from Cyprus so Cypriot dish)
- Shepherd’s pie (something different, claiming she’s not one of them through cooking a British meal in Cyprus at a family gathering)
- Travelling to/from Cyprus, choice of airlines, via Turkey instead of flying directly from Larnaca (Supporting a Turkish company, solidarity)

**Second phase - London**
- Turkish TV series
- Education
- Retirement in the UK and quality time with family
- Weddings and its preparation from Izmir-Turkey
- Food, community work
- Health and government support
- Offering Turkish coffee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First phase - Birmingham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Proud father and grandfather (showing photos of his children and grandchildren)
- Memories and family members keep (kept) them in Birmingham
- Marrying off his son to a lady is a muslim, she is not a Turk
- Community in Brum
- T never regrets to be in the UK, never questioned why not in Cyprus
- Death and Cyprus- one day he will join his family in a cemetery in Cyprus “I will join them one day!”

| | | | |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Second phase - London** | | | |
- Health issues
- Remembering names of relatives in Cyprus
- Marrying her first son off- to a London born, Cyprus descent girl
- Second son and his girlfriend’s heritage: mixed feelings about him dating a Greek or Greek Cypriot girl whereas they’d be fine with any other nationality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Stories</th>
<th>Cyprus</th>
<th>First phase - Birmingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early life</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retrospective life story of the participants, their motivation of moving to the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties they faced when building their lives in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stories about his life in Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liminal space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problem with his father because he left Cyprus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When narrating his story he constantly used the pronoun “we” instead of “I” (togetherness, decision taking with wife?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Second phase - London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How he got married, story of his wife’s life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memories of his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How we came to the UK in 1959 with a Jewish owned ship called Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relatives in Perth (A new city), Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call from Australian government and then from the USA, but he decided not to leave the UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Job opportunity in the USA as a pesticide plane pilot

Second phase – London
• Move from Cyprus to the UK- historical trajectories, how they travelled. Larnaka-Greece-Italy-France-UK (Ship-train-ship-train), Work motivation
• Turkish Cypriotness being absorbed/eliminated by the wider society, children born in the UK to Cypriot parents have no grasp of their culture
• Turkish people migrating to London and its negative effect on Turkish Cypriot society, ‘our society’ becoming smaller and smaller.
• In older times, “Turk” in London was meant to be the Turkish Cypriots, nowadays Turks are understood to be people of Turkey origin, Kurds and Turks in London
• family history, motivation to move to the UK and comparison with
• Family history
• working conditions in old days

Perception of Self- Other
self
I and they
We and us

First phase- London
• I am from here, buralı olduk artık
• - we

Second hase - London
• Willing to talk about his life and how he perceives himself
• Reference to immigrants as ‘they’
• Comparison with first and second generation and third generation
• Perception of his own father and uncle – ‘Turkish men’
• He says “I am Turkish speaking Cypriot”

Second phase London
• othering, ‘being ingrate’towards one own’s country
• perception of self,
• TCs as minority in London
• Neither living as an English, nor staying as a Turkish,
• British people,
• We and Other, Turkishness, ‘Turkiyeli’ vs Turkish, Kıbrıslı,
• Discrimination, Groupings in the community,
• Cypriotness, Britishness
• being a minority
• Turkish from Turkey
• In older times, “Turk” in London was meant to be the Turkish Cypriots, nowadays Turks are
| **understood to be people of Turkey origin, Kurds and Turks in London** |
| **Laziness, Envy, pomposity (arrogance) among Turkish Cypriot community which was affected by the history.** |
| **Mesokorto—(no idea what it exactly means in which language) but refers to Cypriot culture being in between, mixed.** |
| **“Foreigners are foreigners”? , Cypriots being displaced vs Turkish people more nationalist. – “We are foreigners to them!”**, |
| **Identity problem among Cypriots, Culture and Turkey in Cyprus.** |
| **we are turkish Cypriots celebrating bayram and also Christmas.** |
| **perception of self and others** |
| **what others think about his thoughts (Exclusion of himself from others, so who is the other? The TCs or the British? Liminality)** |
| **Fun stories about Cypriotness** |
Appendix 6: Themes emerged from the analysis of the first and second phases of the study