



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ijscl.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

Native English Speaking Teachers as Cosmopolitans or Citizens of the World: An Anthropological Study in Istanbul, Turkey

Mahir Sarigül^{1a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received June 2020
Received in revised form August 2020
Accepted September 2020
Available online September 2020

KEYWORDS:

Cosmopolitanism
Cosmopolitan
Identity
Nationalism
Patriotism

Abstract

The study of cosmopolitans – citizens of the world— and cosmopolitanism, traceable to ancient Greece, has, after a long decline in interest, made a strong comeback in social sciences since the 1990s, particularly in sociology and anthropology. This anthropological study aims to understand cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitans through native English speaking teachers (NESTs) living in and working at various foundation universities in Istanbul, Turkey. A qualitative method of in-depth interviews with 21 participants was employed over a period of 20 months. Drawing from Diogenes' and Kant's concept of "world citizen", the author elaborates on this theory by highlighting how cosmopolitanism has varied due to globalization and given birth to new cosmopolitan types, one of which is the *white-collar cosmopolitan*, a category defined through themes and commonalities during data analysis and the interviews, to which NESTs belong. The findings also indicate that cosmopolitanism is evolving into a new form and producing new meanings through specific dispositions particularly, willingness to engage with "the Other" and to embrace cultural, social, ethnic, and religious diversity.

© 2020 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ PhD, Email: mahir.sarigul@ozyegin.edu.tr

Tel: +90-532-2774664

^a Ozyegin University, Turkey

1. Introduction

“It makes no difference whether a person lives here or there, provided that, where he lives, he lives as a citizen of the world”.

Marcus Aurelius

Cosmopolitanism is a long-sidelined concept that has recently been reactivated (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002, p. 1) and has become a field of interest for many theorists and researchers (see e.g., Appiah, 2006; Cheah, 2006; Hannerz, 2000; Pollock, Brikenridge, Bhabha, & Chakrabarty, 2002) from various disciplines such as anthropology, history, language studies, philosophy and so on since the 1990s. The re-appearance of cosmopolitanism has been attributed to various reasons by writers on the topic. To some, cosmopolitanism refers to a vision of global democracy and world citizenship or it points to the possibilities for shaping new transnational frameworks for making links between social movements while others invoke cosmopolitanism to advocate a non-communitarian, post-identity politics of overlapping interests and heterogeneous or hybrid publics in order to challenge conventional notions of belonging, identity, and citizenship (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). Yet some others use cosmopolitanism descriptively to address certain socio-cultural processes or individual behaviors, values, or dispositions manifesting a capacity to engage cultural multiplicity (Vertovec & Cohen 2002). With the widespread of globalism and global capitalism, the use of concepts like cosmopolitan and cosmopolitanism has gained ground and in the 1990s, the word “cosmopolitan” became the ‘buzzword’ in anthropological circles, which means a citizen of the world, who has “both ethical commitments and political policies which embrace the whole world in their purview and [who] refuses to prioritize local, parochial or national concerns” (Van Hooff & Vandekerckhove, 2010, xvii). Studies on NESTs in Turkey mostly focus on the native – non-native roles in teaching English (see e.g., Tatar, 2011; Çelik 2006) and their effects on the learners (see e.g., Şahin, 2005) while others (see e.g., Nergis, 2011; Sarıgül, 2018) deal with the historical background of English language teaching and teachers. However, the aim of this study is to investigate cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan identity among the NESTs at foundation universities in a cosmopolis,

Istanbul, and thus, bringing out a new type of cosmopolitan identity through NESTs by presenting some commonalities that contribute to forming their identity. Although the existence of native English speaking teachers (NETs) in Turkey goes back as early as the late 19th century during the Ottoman Empire, the influx of those NESTs at an increasing rate is rather new and this was mainly due to the number of private high schools and later private universities that mushroomed in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s respectively all around the country, primarily in Istanbul and the other highly populated cities of Ankara and İzmir (Sarigul, 2018). Eventually, those native speakers have created a population of a distinct group who are willing to engage in and interact with the other and alien culture as the white-collar cosmopolitans. In this research, world citizenship or cosmopolitanism is viewed as the primary trait of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) who hold “cultural capital” (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 53) or “expert or referent power” (French & Raven, 1959, pp. 161-163) and share commonalities such as weak nationalistic and patriotic feelings towards their home country, non-religious attitude towards any belief system, and a strong passion for travelling. The NESTs are, at the same time, willing to adapt to and engage with the culture and the locals as *white-collar cosmopolitans*, a term coined to describe them based on world citizenship.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. An Anthropological Overview

The term *cosmopolitan*, before being used in anthropology, had various positive and negative connotations. From an etymological point of view, *cosmopolitan* or *cosmopolite* originates from the Greek words “*kosmos*” meaning “world” and “*polite*” meaning “citizen” (Beck, 2007, p. 35; Cheah, 2006, p. 21; Malcomson 1998, p. 233; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002, p. 137; Werbner, 2020, p. 2). It mainly describes a universal fraternity of human beings, in other words, a universal humanism which goes beyond the borders of regional particularism.

The origin of cosmopolitanism can be traced back as far as 1375 BCE to the Egyptian pharaoh Akhenaton, who advocated a universal monotheism whereby all humans owed each

other equal moral duties regardless of their political affiliation. Nevertheless, the term is said to have been coined in 300 BCE by Diogenes of Sinope (Brown, 2009), a follower of Cynic philosophy, who gained notoriety as a result of his shameless behaviour, like living in a tub in the market-place, excreting in public and behaving like a dog (Heater, 2002). Diogenes rejected the status of a “*polites*”, a citizen, in favor of that of a “cosmopolites”, a citizen of the “cosmos,” asserting that he was not a political animal, but a multicultural one (Heater, 2002, p. 27). He uttered the oft-cited phrase, “I am a citizen of the world” (Brown 2009, p. 4; Erskine, 2002, p. 457; Nussbaum, 1997, p. 29). What Diogenes meant was that he rejected belonging to a place or community and described himself as having more universal aspirations and concerns, with a focus on the worth of reason and moral purpose (Nussbaum, 1997). The cosmopolitan movement Diogenes initiated gained ground and one of his most ardent followers was Crates of Thebes who taught Zeno of Citium. Zeno, migrating from Cyprus in 310 BCE, started his own school in Athens in the painted porch (*stoa poikelē*) of his house and established a system of thought which eventually culminated in Stoicism.

However, the Stoics’ cosmopolitan idea was different to that of Diogenes and they developed the image of the *kosmopolitēs* (world citizen) more fully. For Diogenes, who coined the term, cosmopolite is someone who denies any bond to their local origins, nation or tribal background. Whereas, for Stoics, cosmopolitan thinking had two layers: local and global. In other words, “one does not need to give up local identifications, which can be a source of great richness in life” (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 9). Stoics also introduced the idea that we are encircled by a “series of concentric circles” (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 9) starting from the “self” in the center and moving on to “family” as the next circle, “relatives” as the third and to “humanity” as the last circle, which, according to Nussbaum (2002) describes a center-periphery relation of an individual. The Stoics had a great impact on the formation of cosmopolitan philosophy especially in the Roman Empire where philosophers like Cicero and Seneca as well as Marcus Aurelius (121-180 AD), the renowned Stoic Roman Emperor who once said, “It makes no difference whether a person lives here or there, provided that, wherever he lives, he lives

as a citizen of the world” (Brown, 2009, p. 31; Nussbaum, 1997, p. 31) were inspired by them. The effect of Stoicism was also seen in early Christianity, which underlined the notion that all human beings were members of single, monotheist religion.

However, due to various reasons such as wars, rising patriotism, and nationalism, cosmopolitanism had fallen from grace for about 1,600 years, and it was not until the 15th century (c. 1480) that cosmopolitanism had been revisited by philosophers. Particularly, during the Enlightenment period in the 18th century, thinkers like Michel de Montaigne (1533-1592), John Locke (1632-1704), Francis Bacon (1561-1620), Denis Diderot (1713-1784), and Immanuel Kant (1724-1802) were inspired by Stoicism and the idea of natural law. Among the prominent figures of the Enlightenment period, Kant’s “intellectual commitment to the cosmopolitan ideal” (Heater, 2002, p. 28) was noteworthy.

2.2. A Leading Concept: Kantian Cosmopolitanism

Kant, seen as the father of a cosmopolitan world in modern philosophy (Cheah, 2006; Kleingeld, 2006; Pojman, 2005; Wood, 1998), wrote an essay, *Perpetual Peace*, in 1795, in which he endeavoured to encourage the achievement of “endless peace” on earth by suggesting a theory of law in which the sovereignty of the state was redefined. Kant, in his essay, maintained that a confederation or League of Nations was necessary to stop wars and other possible disputes, violations or unfair treatment of human beings throughout the world by presupposing six Preliminary and three Definitive articles with which all the nations of the world would have to comply.

While the Preliminary articles constitute the basis of Kant’s cosmopolitanism, Definitive articles or “positive conditions” (Kleingeld, 2006, p. 482) form a basis for political premises and guarantors. The third definitive article is of particular importance since it requires that all states should respect and observe the *cosmopolitan right* of each and every individual in terms of *universal hospitality* regardless of their nationality since everyone is at the same time a “citizen of the world” as well as a member of the society to which he/she belongs (Reiss, 2008, p. 105).

2.3. Cosmopolitanisms Today

The concept of cosmopolitanism has not always been attributed to someone commendable or respectable. The 19th century in particular witnessed a relentless criticism of cosmopolitans as individuals who had no loyalty to their homeland or to the community in which they lived. Moreover, they were considered “footloose” (Hannerz 2000, p. 104; Van Hooft & Vandekerckhove, 2010, p. xv), “rootless” (Malcomson, 1998, p. 233; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002, pp. 5-6; Holton, 2009, p. 11) or “vagabonds” (Beck 2006, p. 3). In different settings, they were met with open antagonism, mistrust and they were even exposed to suppression. For instance, in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Stalinist Russia, a cosmopolitan was someone who was a threat to the state since they were not attached to a specific land and thus, were enemies and had to be terminated wherever and whenever captured (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002, p. 6). By the mid-20th century, however, cosmopolitans were seen as “dilettantes” or “connoisseurs” (Hannerz, 2000, p. 103) who were well-travelled, privileged wealthy individuals with fine tastes and were frequently associated with international entrepreneurs, wealthy jet-setters, entertainers, academics, intergovernmental bureaucrats and intellectuals (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002; Van Hooft & Vandekerckhove, 2010).

The year 1990 was a turning point for cosmopolitanism as immense changes in the political, social, economic arenas as well as global ecological threats appeared. Particularly, following the end of the cold war and the fall of the Berlin Wall, terms such as “expatriate,” “transnational,” “diaspora,” “exile,” “refugee,” “immigrant,” or “migrant” have been used abundantly to refer to cosmopolitans, which triggered controversial discussions among the academia as to whether anyone who is just on the move could be considered a cosmopolitan. According to Hannerz, a leading figure in urban anthropology, it is *not* the case since cosmopolitanism requires a more intense involvement with different cultures (Hannerz, 2000, p. 103). On the other hand, Werbner (2020) envisages a broader umbrella term under which immigrants, refugees, working-class people, and many others should be included into under the cosmopolitan category. As a

result, new forms and meanings of cosmopolitanism have emerged. In other words, as Robbins states, “cosmopolitanisms are now plural and particular. Like nations, they are both European and non-European, and they are weak and underdeveloped as well as strong and privileged” (Robbins, 1998, p. 2). Dower (2010) mentions two types of cosmopolitanism – ethical and institutional. With ethical cosmopolitanism, he means all human beings matter and matter equally and one has responsibilities towards one another across boundaries. On the other hand, institutional cosmopolitanism, according to him, includes “proposals for new forms of global governance, new global political order, ... stronger international institutions, cosmopolitan law, [and] world government” (Dower, 2010, p. 4). The type of cosmopolitanism I have tried to conceptualize in this study, however, has more of an eclectic form of those mentioned above. Native English speaking teachers (NESTs henceforth) are cosmopolitan individuals with no links to tourists, exiles, diasporas or expatriates, immigrants, or ordinary labourers, but they are “white-collar cosmopolitans” who try to make a living in a totally foreign land. This cosmopolitan type includes individuals with MA, MS, or Ph.D. diplomas on top of their college degrees unlike Werbner’s (2020) working class cosmopolitans, or “blue-collar cosmopolitans” who look for job opportunities in the remote corners of the world, particularly due to the fact English has become a lingua franca or more rightly to call it, international language.

3. Methodology

In this study, an in-depth interview method was employed as a basis for qualitative analysis and the fieldwork completed over 20 months. The participants were 21 NESTs working at various foundation universities and living in Istanbul, Turkey. In selecting potential participants in the study, my personal connections played a significant role since I have been working as a teacher and administrator actively in the field of English language teaching (ELT), and thus was able to approach NESTs either by kindly asking them to take part in the research or through heads of foreign language departments at foundation universities in Istanbul, most of whom are friends of mine. I conducted 24 semi-structured formal in-depth interviews with 21

participants, each of which lasted between 50 and 90 minutes. The interviews began with a “grand tour” (Spradley, 1979, p. 86) question about the participant’s *life story* regarding their family members, childhood, education, adulthood, and how they ended up in the present locale. Following this, a set of open-ended questions under various headings from ‘home’, ‘homeland’ ‘future’, ‘family life’, ‘work life’, to issues like ‘religion’, ‘second language learning,’ ‘cosmopolitanism’, and ‘identity’, were asked. Although the interview questions were structured, during the interviews, participants were given the freedom to digress from the set framework and were encouraged to talk about experiences, problems, events or topics that were not directly related to the framework of the study.

Data analysis was a time consuming, onerous process in which a huge volume of data was translated into a more “insightful analysis” (Gibbs, 2007, p. 1). During the data analysis process, it was observed that certain dispositions were common to almost all NESTs. While they bear the typical characteristics of cosmopolitans, such as willingness to get to know and engage with the members of other cultures, respectful of diverse cultural values, or de-emphasizing locality and locals, they also carry transnational dispositions, they travel armed with cultural capital – “knowledge, skills, and other cultural acquisitions, as exemplified by educational or technical qualifications” (Thompson, 1994, p. 14). Cultural capital as Bourdieu explicates, is the educational credentials which “have become increasingly necessary for gaining access to desirable positions in the job market” (Swartz, 1997, p. 76). According to Swartz (1997, p. 77), Bourdieu’s view on cultural capital is mainly based on social stratification and it is this privilege that makes the NESTs different from any other cosmopolitan type such as transnationals, migrant workers, refugees and so on since they are all college graduates holding MA or MSc and even Ph.D.

degrees. Thus, drawing on Spradley’s taxonomic analysis of interviews (Spradley, 1979), five themes were specified: *identity, home and homeland, nationalism and patriotism, religion, and travel bug.*

3.1. Participants

The participants in this study were chosen purposively (Flick, 2007; Silverman, 2001) among the NESTs who teach English in the foundation programs at various private universities in Istanbul. Although there are NESTs working at other private universities in cities like Ankara (the capital), İzmir, Mersin, Gaziantep and so on, the scope of the study was limited to Istanbul since more than half of the 68 foundation universities (Higher Education Council (YÖK), 2018) are located in the city. This provided me with both a wide range of choices and easy access to my participants. Second, the fact that they live in Istanbul provided easy access for the researchers to do the interviews. Another criterion was that the participants were selected from as many different foundation universities as possible since different settings would offer a wider perspective of my participants. Finally, the length of stay in Turkey was also a criterion to find out how they were coping with the new culture, language, traditions, and other issues related to their adaptation process. To this end, NESTs who had been living in Turkey for at least two years were selected.

The demographic profile of the participants, as indicated in Table 2, reveals that almost all the NESTs held either MA diplomas and/or internationally recognized certificates in English language teaching (ELT) such as DELTA, CELTA, or TESL and some also held Ph.D. degrees. Although neither gender nor age was a criterion, there was a fairly even distribution of male (N = 12) and female (N = 9) participants with an average age of 40.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Native English Speaking Teachers (NESTs)

	Name*	Sex	Age	Family Status	Education	Nationality	Home-town	Time in Istanbul
1	Andrew	Male	42	Native spouse	College + MA	British	London	3 years
2	Aaron	Male	28	Single	College + MA + DELTA	American	small town in Ohio	5 years
3	Bob	Male	53	Single	College + MA	British	Stevenage, Hertfordshire	25 years
4	Charles	Male	40	Divorced	College + MA + DELTA	American	Eugene, Oregon	2 years
5	Chris	Male	27	Native spouse	College + MA	American	Ohio	4 years
6	Jean	Female	33	Single	College + MA + DELTA	British	Saint Neance, Cambridge	8 years
7	Jerry	Male	40	Native spouse w/ a child	College + MA + DELTA	American	Connecticut	13 years
8	Jill	Female	47	Native spouse w/ a child	College + MA	Australian	Sydney	19 years
9	Joe	Male	53	Native spouse	College + CELTA	British	Near London	7 years
10	Kate	Female	30	Native spouse w/ a child	College + MA	Australian	Putramunda	2 years
11	Ken	Male	43	Divorced	College + MA	Australian	New Castle	4 years
12	Lisa	Female	53	Single	College + MA	British	Nottingham	10 years
13	Lucy	Female	36	Native spouse	College + MA + DELTA	American	Southern California	3 years
14	Martha	Female	30	Native spouse	College + MA	Armenian-American	Los Angeles	2 years
15	Mary	Female	36	Native spouse w/ two children	College + DELTA	British	Small town in England	13 years
16	Phil	Male	33	Native spouse	College + MA + DELTA	British	Plymouth	2 years
17	Sam	Male	61	Native spouse	College + TESL	American	Detroit, Michigan	19 years
18	Sally	Female	34	Native spouse	College + MA + TESL	American	Florida & Michigan	3 years
19	Stuart	Male	38	Native spouse w/ a child	College + Ph.D	Scottish	Greenock	14 years
20	Suzan	Female	51	Divorced w/ two children	College + Ph.D	American	North Carolina	3 years
21	Tim	Male	44	Native spouse	College + CELTA	British	London	7 years

*Most names are pseudonyms but some are real by courtesy of the participants.

4. Findings

As mentioned in the Methodology section of this study, there are four themes defined

following the interviews, and the analysis of the data and the below table will help better understand each theme that came to light.

Table 2

Example Comments Representing Each Theme and the Ratio of Nests Who Made Similar Comments on Each Theme

Themes	Sample Comments	No. of NESTs	%
Identity	<p>“And I also feel like my identity more of a patchwork. I feel like I'm European, and British and Turkish, all of these things at the same time...”</p> <p>“As far as identity, I'm a Turkish-American, or American-Turkish, however, I feel more Turkish, so... I would say, Turkish-American.”</p> <p>“I've always felt like I was never really English... I don't have a strong identification with being English.”</p>	13	61.9
Home & Homeland	<p>“I think home is where I live with my two boys. That's what's home for me.”</p> <p>“[Home] is a feeling... Britain is no longer home... I am a visitor [there].”</p> <p>“Home is where I come from; it's where my family is. It's where my best friends are.”</p> <p>“I don't know where my home is. I'm thinking England and then when I start thinking more, I'm thinking Turkey...”</p>	16	76.1
Nationalism & Patriotism	<p>“I kind of feel happy to be anywhere in the world... my identity is not connected to a nation.”</p> <p>“...so, in terms of nationality, I feel like I have no nationality. I'm a citizen of the world.”</p> <p>“I DON'T miss my country ... at all. ... I think for me missing a country is that sense of wanting to be there... And I never want to be there.”</p> <p>“I hate anything patriotic, nationalistic, you know, anything that just kind of tries to elevate one culture above another.”</p>	14	61.9
Religion	<p>“I don't practice my religion. I don't believe in organised religion at all. I think it's a form of control.”</p> <p>“I'm an atheist. I don't believe in God or any religion at all.”</p> <p>“As far as religion goes, I believe in God, but I don't necessarily believe in any kind of established religion.”</p>	19	90
Travel Bug	<p>“Because I was travelling a lot, I didn't want to be tied down to a job...”</p> <p>“I had a dream for many years of travelling. That was a huge dream of mine, being able to travel.”</p> <p>“And I have this bug to travel and to learn.”</p>	14	66,6

4.1. Identity

During the interviews, what has become apparent is that almost all the participants were experiencing an “identity conflict” (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016, p. 451) or “identity crisis” and they demonstrated a wide array of identity “deformation” ranging from hybridization, in-between-ness, and liminality to “identity-less-ness” in terms of their nationality or sense of belonging to a place or a community, all of which contributes to the formulation of forming a cosmopolitan identity, in other words, a world citizenship. In that sense, what Jackson recounts aptly applies to the participants when he states, “you feel estranged from your European roots yet cannot identify wholeheartedly with the indigenous culture of the land. You live betwixt and between, uneasy about your origins, unsure of where you stand” (Jackson 2005, p. 6). Native English teachers paint just the same picture of themselves in terms of having ambivalent feelings of belonging everywhere and nowhere. Through their narratives, it was understood that NESTs are global citizens who feel comfortable anywhere in the world and are more than happy to live with people from an alien culture – a culture that is totally different from its Western counterparts.

Identity has long been at the centre of a problem that scholars have long been grappling with. “Who am I?” or “Who are you?” is the question that an individual has to answer from a wide range of options such as national, social, cultural, racial, class, familial, gender, or sexual among others (Appiah, 1998). Therefore, as Maalouf states, “Each individual’s identity is made up of elements ... A person may feel a more or less strong attachment to a province, a village, a neighbourhood, a clan, a professional team ... with the same passions, the same sexual preferences, the same physical handicaps” (Maalouf, 2000, p. 10).

In other words, unlike “the classic theory of identity [that] is based on the essentialist paradigm which considers identity as a fixed entity” (Rezaei & Bahrami, 2019, p.68), identity is rather elusive and cannot be restricted to just one or two particularities and advocates the idea that it is “dynamic and subject to change” (Afshar & Donyaie, 2019, p. 82) and development (Maalouf, 2000).

Due to the high mobility of people and interconnectedness through communication, identities are now becoming more fluid. In particular, the rapid flows of capital, labour, people, goods, and technology that transcend national boundaries have become increasingly permeable and made it impossible for identities to remain solely and fixed within the borders of the nation state (Çağlar, 1997; Türmen, 1999; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). As a result, it is possible to maintain that more complex and non-unitary identities occur and various terms have been coined in academia to describe them, such as “hybrid”, “hyphenated”, “creolized” and “diasporic” (Çağlar, 1997). The de-territorialized lives of twenty-first-century people, especially migrants, refugees, cross-border workers, and transnational professionals, have created a population with less attachment to their localities or nation-states. Thus, they develop a multicultural and multinational identity within which they may, in some cases, experience an in-between-ness or “liminality”, as Turner suggests, meaning people who are on the “threshold” of a transition process or entities that “are neither here nor there; they are betwixt and between” (Turner, 1969, p. 359). Mary, one of the participants, very aptly describes her liminality as “I’m *stuck in the hole* [emphasis mine] that they’re pulling me through. Just stuck in the middle there. I’m too fat to get through. That’s exactly how I feel”.

In like manner, Lisa, a British participant who has been living in Turkey for almost fourteen years, states, “I can’t say I fit into British culture ... There are things I don’t know anymore ... but again, I wouldn’t consider that I’ve been...*türkleşmedim* [turkified]”. Lisa explains how she feels alienated from her Britishness through her linguistic capabilities in English.

4.1.1. Cosmopolitan Identity

The participants in this study largely fit in the definition of Erkmen’s “ideal” cosmopolitan, one that “is mobile, flexible, adaptable, and can exist anywhere in the world” (Erkmen, 2008, p. 29) and that has “cultural marginality” or “lives at the borders”, (Barduhn, 2011, p. 64). At this point, it can be maintained that a cosmopolitan typology is necessary to describe NESTs as white-collar cosmopolitans.

First, these NESTs, more than two-thirds of them, have either no or very little nationalistic and patriotic feelings towards their homeland and they adopt a more critical look towards their homeland and co-nationals, which is contrary to Appiah's concept of a cosmopolitan patriot who celebrates "the variety of human cultures while they are rooted – loyal to one local society that they count home" (Appiah, 1997, p. 633). NESTs see the world as a global village and they have no biased or prejudiced thoughts or attitudes towards "other" cultures or peoples; on the contrary, they are open to understanding, and engaging with the other.

4.1.2. *Hyphenated, Hybridized, Liminal, or In-Between Identities*

Liminal, hyphenated, hybridized, or in-between identities indicate a duality in which a person feels neither completely at home in culture X nor culture Y, but instead swinging to either end of the continuum and feeling sometimes conflict or apprehension at either end of the hyphen or raising questions as to which side of the hyphen weighs heavier in terms of the feelings, dilemmas and oscillating movements they experience while their identities are being split between. For instance, Sam, a 61-year-old male American married to a Turkish woman and living in Istanbul for almost 19 years, expresses his two cultural wholes, i.e. his Turkish and American culture, and describes himself thus: "as far as identity [is concerned], I'm a Turkish-American or American-Turkish, but because I feel more Turkish than American, so I would say, Turkish-American". Sam's adoption of Turkishness and putting it before his Americanness sets a good example to hyphenated identities, which denotes a syncretism or bricolage between two distinct cultural and national identities as Kaya (2007) suggests.

Lisa, a 53-year-old single British woman, has been living in Istanbul since 1996. She also exemplifies hyphenation, recounting that she would neither consider herself British nor Turkish as she feels she does not belong to either. Although her British identity is the "core self," in her terms, and is something that cannot be gotten rid of, she knows her Britishness has already become alien to her since she believes culture and even the English language have changed and are still changing.

4.2. Home and Homeland

For NESTs, the idea of home is problematic. During the interviews, it was one of the questions they had real difficulty responding to. It could be a sensation, a style, or as Martha, one of the participants claimed, a "mental state". Or it might represent a group of people whose presence gives life meaning (Jackson, 2005, p. 66), as Jerry, another participant, describes, "home is where my daughter and my wife are".

To most of the participants "home" is not a place or something concrete, nor is it where they were born and grew up, but is a feeling, sensation, or concept attached to either their homeland or the country where they are presently living and enjoying life with those they love. Jackson similarly perceives the idea of home as constituting a group of people without whom one's life would stop having meaning (Jackson, 2005, p. 66). It is also possible to talk about a state of "two-homedness", or having "multiple homes" or "homelessness" as some of the participants suggested. Some of the participants associated "home" directly with "homeland or home town" while a few consider it "having the basic essentials and being comfortable and secure", or a physical place with all the furnishings, light inside and located in a vibrant city as Jill pointed out. Therefore, as Hannerz states, "After they have taken out membership, cosmopolitans are never quite at home again, in the way real locals can be [because] their perspectives have been irreversibly affected by the experience of the alien and the distant culture" (Hannerz, 1992, p. 253; Hannerz, 2000, p. 110). In other words, once an individual has interacted and engaged with peoples of different cultures and developed a cosmopolitan identity, they are no longer locals but a citizen of the world.

To start with, Suzan, an American widower with two children, living in Istanbul for more than three years tries to explain what home means to her as she states, "*In a way I have two homes ... It's hard for me to answer that question. It's really difficult. I think home is where I live with my two boys*".

Suzan claims she has two homes; yet she conceptualizes them differently. While Ashville where her parents live is a dwelling,

the other is a feeling that she experiences when she is with her sons.

Mary, one of the British participants, who is married to a Turkish man, has two children, and has been living in Turkey for almost twenty years has difficulty recounting what and where home is, *“I don’t know where my home is. I’m thinking England and then when I start thinking more, I’m thinking Turkey, ... So I don’t know. Maybe, I have two homes”*.

While most of the NESTs consider home as an abstract concept or a kind of utopia, some of them – to be precise, almost one-third of them – regard home a place. With “place” they try to create a nest, a shelter in which they would feel safe and cosy or they entertain the idea of building a relationship between the physical place and the people that live in it.

Phil, a British participant who will soon get married to a Turkish woman, attaches priority to security rather than the location of home, *“Perhaps I would say at the moment it’s a safe place where my books are. I can feel home anywhere as long as the shelter’s alright, safety, basic things. And of course, being with the people that you love”*.

Phil’s home is a concrete place providing safety or in Gaston Bachelard’s term, a “nest” or “refuge” in which he feels secure and snug (Bachelard, 1964, p. 91).

From participants’ understanding of home, it can be inferred that these people are, in fact, experiencing a sense of “homelessness,” not in the sense that they are having a kind of uprooted-ness due to economic instability, wars, or ethnic clashes, but due to their understanding of world citizenship. These Native English Teachers, as Hannerz argues, “after they have taken out membership in that category [real cosmopolitans], are never quite at home again, in the way real locals can be” (Hannerz, 2000, p. 110).

4.3. Nationalism and Patriotism

Related to “home” and “homeland” issues, two concepts came to the fore: Nationalism and Patriotism. Upon analysing the data from the interviews in terms of how the participants view the concept of “home”, they voiced mixed

feelings and opinions. At this point, these white-collar cosmopolitans, unlike Appiah’s *cosmopolitan patriot* who visualizes a world full of rooted cosmopolitans with ties to his home and his own cultural values and attachments as well as enjoying the existence of the other (Appiah, 1997), do not bear strong bonds to, nor hold patriotic feelings for their homeland. During the interviews, the participants were asked how often they miss their country as this question is closely linked to one’s feelings towards one’s homeland and thus, patriotism. Patriotism is, as Appiah (1997) highlights, a “sentiment more than ideology” or as Audi states, it can be explained as a trait that requires a certain degree of loyalty to and pride of one’s country as well as emotions connected to one’s well-being or “roughly, love of one’s country” (Audi 2009, pp. 366-368).

Most of the NESTs lack strong nationalistic and patriotic attachment to their countries and they are mostly critical about their homeland in terms of politics and politicians, people’s indifference, bias or prejudice, and sometimes antagonistic attitude towards the Other. NESTs look at their own country from a reflexive distance and adopt a more critical stance against their homeland and their fellow citizens. One of them is Sally, an American who is married to a Turk, who elaborates on patriotism and her homeland, *“I hate patriotism. Anything that just kind of tries to elevate one culture above another... I really can’t stand nationalism and nationalism has obviously been responsible for a hell of a lot of death and destruction in the world”*.

Here, Sally holds more of an anti-ethnocentric stance and displays a more cosmopolitan disposition, valuing human concerns more than national concerns, as well as being very critical of her own country, USA. She also attacks nationalism as being responsible for most of the wars and conflicts among the nations all over the world and she implies that as long as nationalism exists, which it will, there will be no peace on earth.

Stuart, a Scottish participant, who is married to a Turkish woman and has a daughter, also expresses that he does not have any longing to go back to his country except for national football matches, calling it “ninety-minute nationalism”, quoting a Scottish politician, Jim

Sillars. Stuart describes how he feels about his country and his nationalistic views in the following way, *“I don’t miss people in my country. I’m not nationalistic at all unless there’s a football match. I don’t have that sort of longing like wanting to be buried in Scotland”*.

Here it is essential to notice two aspects of nationalism: political and cultural. Stuart refers to the cultural aspect of nationalism when he talks about a national football match between Scotland and another country.

Ken, an Australian participant who is married to a Turkish woman, expresses that his longing for his homeland is only when it comes to visiting it on holiday, *“To be honest, very rarely [I miss my country] I love going back to Australia to visit. I don’t want to live there. There are many things I miss about it; particularly the beaches and the red wine. But really, I very rarely miss Australia”*.

Ken’s nationalism, just like Stuart’s, is on the material culture level, which means food or recreation or any other non-political activity. Other than that, he does not show any strong attachment to his homeland.

4.4. Religion

NESTs as white-collar cosmopolitans have weaker ties to their homeland and countrymen, exhibiting very few or no nationalistic and patriotic attributes. They also have weaker or no bonds with religion except certain rituals such as Christmas, or celebrations such as Thanksgiving Day or Halloween (originally a pagan rite), which, according to them, have already become commercialized and are now being celebrated mostly outside of their religious meanings. When they were asked how they practice their religious duties, *none* expressed their loyalty to their religion – Christianity, or Islam (those who have converted).

Suzan, for instance, who was born and grew up in a rather conservative community, remarks that she is no longer a Church-goer but observes *“things like Christmas and Easter primarily for [her] children’s benefit”*.

Another participant, Kate, who converted to Islam, believes that Christianity was not the right “shoes”, and suggesting that “the shoes didn’t fit me,” now feels comfortable in her “Muslim shoes”. However, she is not “overtly religious” nor is her husband. The rest of the participants can be grouped in a range from atheist to agnostic or deist. Nevertheless, most of them – like Jerry, Stuart, Jill, Aaron, Charles, Andrew, Ken, and Bob – observe the rituals of Christianity such as Christmas since those times, according to them, are the occasions when friends and family members come together and have a good time, eating and drinking.

It is clear that while cosmopolitanism avoids developing or having strong bonds to nationalism and patriotism, it, at the same time, implicitly weakens religious beliefs and thus helps the cosmopolitan individual embrace and perceive the world as a whole. Being a member of any religion, in contrast, requires a strong attachment to the group one belongs to and, whether it is Christianity, Islam or Judaism, they all value their fellow-believers more highly than outsiders and have little tolerance for non-members even though they seem to be embracing the whole humanity.

As for the NESTs, their non-nationalistic, non-patriotic views are reflected in their religious practices. They either do not practice their religion at all or they just observe some of the rituals which have actually become a tradition. Those who celebrate days like Christmas or Halloween call themselves “cultural Christians” meaning they have only taken the cultural part of the ritual – enjoying exchanging gifts or having a nice meal with family members or friends. Stuart, the Scottish participant, candidly states, *“I would consider myself a cultural Christian in the sense that I would celebrate Christmas as a sort of time to get presents...but religious wise I have no interest whatsoever; I don’t believe in anything like that”*.

However, the majority of the NESTs manifest various degrees of non-religious or religion-less attitudes ranging from atheistic to agnostic. Atheistic discourse is also common among the NESTs though they observe Christian traditions. For instance, Aaron, is a typical atheist, who does not believe in God or any

religion but at the same time respects Islam and Islamic tradition and rituals, *“I’m an atheist. I don’t believe in God or any religion at all. I don’t celebrate Christmas, usually. Sometimes my friends might have a Christmas dinner”*.

On the other hand, more than half (61% - 12 NESTs) describe themselves as either agnostic or religion-less, referring to the fact that they have no faith in any established or organized religion. Sam, 61, who is married to a Turkish woman, is interesting to quote since he has his own ways to communicate with God despite his Catholic background, *“So as far as religion goes, I believe in God, but I don’t necessarily believe in any kind of an established religion”*.

4.5. Travel Bug

NESTs express “a love for travelling and a passionate desire to move beyond their familiar cultural surrounds in order to live in and experience a new culture” (Thomson & Tambyah, 1999, p. 225). The term “Travel Bug” is an expression that one of the participants, Lucy used during the interview and I adopted it as it fits the participants’ general tendency to travel. However, their passion for travelling is rather different from those of tourists’ and old-time cosmopolitans.

The participants in this study, all have the desire to know other cultures, to communicate with people of distant lands, and have a typical Western attitude of being curious about foreign societies. They call it a “travel bug” that they have been carrying in them ever since they could remember. Lucy sets a good representative example in this respect, *“I have been travelling since I was 17 years old, and I have been to probably almost thirty countries in the world. I have this bug to travel [emphasis is mine] and to learn”*.

Although having a travel bug is one of the traits, cosmopolitans need to get to know diverse peoples and cultures, as Hannerz (2000) contends, it does not necessarily mean that all those who are on the move are cosmopolitans.

This *travelling bug* is so powerful in some that it even affected their career path and made them choose a field in which more job opportunities would be available when they went abroad. Of course, on that point, English as a lingua franca,

or to be more precise, English as an international language (EIL), offers a myriad of opportunities, so they either obtained a certificate or a diploma in English Language Teaching (ELT) after they got their college degree or did a Master’s degree in ELT.

5. Concluding Remarks

The data analysis of the interviews revealed NESTs are a distinct group of cosmopolitans who have been having diverse identity crises varying from hyphenation to in-between-ness, identity-less-ness, or unresolved liminality in which they represent a duality of belonging to neither this nor that culture or nation. To some of the NESTs, on the other hand, they are still in a quest for their identity since they feel that they fit neither of the cultures. As far as their identity goes, none of the participants expect to be accepted as a member of Turkish culture and no matter how long they stay or how much they adopt it, they are aware of the fact that they will remain the “Other.” They also express that they feel alien to their own culture when they go visit their home country and only then do they realize that they have been strongly affected by Turkish culture.

NESTs carry very little or no nationalistic and patriotic feelings towards their nation-state in contrast to the conventional wisdom that presumes nationalism and cosmopolitanism can co-exist (see e.g., Appiah, 2007; Beck, 2006; Holton, 2009) and “are mutually constitutive” (Calhoun, 2007, p. 13). In fact, Nussbaum also emphasizes that cosmopolitans are not keen on nationalism and patriotism when she portrays them as individuals who have chosen to stay away from “the warm, nestling feeling of patriotism” (Nussbaum, 2002, p. 15). My participants, like Thomson and Tambyah’s (1999) expatriate professionals working and living in Singapore, have a passion for travel and moving “beyond their familiar cultural surrounds in order to live and experience a new culture” (Thomson & Tambyah, 1999, p. 225).

NESTs do not bear any similarities with those who move about in the world and do not have any involvement with different cultures such as Lagos women travelling between Lagos and London carrying goods under their clothes and doing business as Hannerz (2000) points out.

Therefore, I have concluded that the NESTs, are “real” cosmopolitans since they carry features that all identify them as real-world citizens, but with a new face. NESTs have distinct characteristics that differentiate them from any other cosmopolitan types that have been introduced in anthropology in the last two decades. Here, I would like to suggest a Hannerzian approach to cosmopolitanism; that is, people moving across borders are less likely to be cosmopolitans since, according to Hannerz (2000), cosmopolitanism demands a genuine inter-cultural openness and willingness to interact with people from diverse cultures. What Hannerz actually implies is that to be a cosmopolitan, one has to have some intellectual capacity and competence as well as cultural skills. In that respect, NESTs fit this description perfectly since they carry a referent and expert power or as Bourdieu (1998) states, “cultural capital” with college diplomas and even MA and Ph.D. degrees, which puts them into a category of *white-collar cosmopolitans*.

References

- Afshar, H. S., & Donyaie, S. (2019). EFL teachers' identity construction through a reflection consciousness-raising interactive workshop. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(2), 80-93.
- Appiah, K. (1997). Cosmopolitan patriots. *Critical Inquiry*, 23(3), 617-639.
- Audi, R. (2009). Nationalism, patriotism, and cosmopolitanism in an age of globalization. *The Journal of Ethics*, 13(4), 365-381.
- Bachelard, G. (1964). *The poetics of space* (M. Jolas, Trans.). New York, NY: The Orion Press.
- Barduhn, S. (2011). The global educator: Challenges and opportunities. In T. Pattison (Ed.), *IATEFL 2010 Harrogate Conference Selections* (pp. 64-65). Britain: University of Kent.
- Bartu, H. (2002). Independence or development? An overview of Turkey's foreign language education policies. *Anadolu University Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(1), 59-80.
- Beck, U. (2007). *Cosmopolitan vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, G. W. (2009). *Grounding cosmopolitanism*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Calhoun, C. (2002). The class consciousness of frequent travellers: Towards a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism. theory, context and practice* (pp. 86-110). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cheah, P. (2006). *Inhuman conditions*. Massachusetts, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Çağlar, A. (1997). Hyphenated identities and the limits of culture. In T. Modood & P. Werbner (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism in the new Europe: Racism, identity and community* (pp. 172-175). New York, NY: Zed Books.
- Çelik, S. (2006). A concise examination of the artificial battle between native and non-native speaker teachers of English in Turkey. *Kastamonu University Journal of Education*, 14(2), 371-376.
- Dower, N. (2010). Questioning the questioning of cosmopolitanism. In S. V. Hooft & W. Vandekerckhove (Eds.), *Questioning cosmopolitanism* (pp. 3-20). London, England: Springer.
- Erkmen, D. (2008, April). *Transnational networks, identity, and cosmopolitanism: A comparative study*. Paper presented in the Annual Meetings of the Middle East Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Erskine, T. (2002). Citizen of nowhere or the point where circles intersect. *Review of International Studies*, 28(3), 457-477.
- Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2016). Identity conflict or compatibility: A comparison of Muslim minorities in five European cities. *Political Psychology*, 37, 447-463.
- Flick, U. (2007). *Designing qualitative research*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). *The bases of social power*. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150-167). Michigan, MA: Research Center for Group Dynamics, University of Michigan.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. London, UK: Sage Publications.

- Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond culture: Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural Anthropology*, 7(1), 6-23.
- Hannerz, U. (1992). *Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (2000). *Transnational connections*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Heater, D. (2002). World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents. London, UK: Continuum.
- Holton, R. (2009). Cosmopolitanism: New thinking and new directions. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jackson, M. (2005). *At home in the world*. London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Kaya, A. (2007). German-Turkish transnational space: A separate space of their own. *German Studies Review*, 30(3), 483-502.
- Kleingeld, P. (2006). Kant's theory of peace. In P. Guyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Kant and Modern Philosophy* (pp. 477-504). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maalouf, A. (2002). *On identity*. London, UK: Harvill Pres.
- Malcomson, S. L. (1998). The varieties of cosmopolitan experience. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics, thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (pp. 91-113). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nergis, A. (2011). Foreign language teacher education in Turkey: A historical overview. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 181-185.
- Nusbaum, M. C. (1997). Kant and cosmopolitanism. In J. Bohman & M. Lutz-Backmann, (Eds.), *Perpetual peace: Essays on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal* (pp. 25-59). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2002). *For love of country?* Boston, USA: Beacon Press.
- Pojman, L. P. (2005). Kant's perpetual peace and cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 36, 62-71.
- Pollock, S., Brikenridge, C. A., Bhabha, H. K., & Chakrabarty, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Cosmopolitanism*. New York, NY: Duke University Press.
- Reiss, H. (Ed.). (2008). *KANT, Political writings*. (H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rezaei, S., & Bahrami, A. (2019). Cultural Identity among Iranian English Language Teachers. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 7(1), 67-82.
- Robbins, B., & Cheah, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Şahin, İ. (2005). The Effect of native speaker teachers of English on the attitudes and achievement of learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 1(1), 30-42.
- Said, E. (1979). Zionism from the standpoint of its victims. *Social Text*, 1, 7-58.
- Said, E. (2009). *Yersiz yurtstuz* [Out of place]. Istanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları.
- Sarıgül, M. (2018). Native English-speaking teachers in foreign language teaching in Turkey: A brief historical overview. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 39(4), 289-300.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographing interviewing*. New York, NY: Hold, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture & power: The sociology of pierre bourdieu*. Chicago, USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tatar, S. (2011). The role of NESTs and NNESTs in the teaching of English as a foreign language. *Boğaziçi University Journal of Education*, 27(2), 49-57.
- Thompson, C., & Tambyah, S. (1999). Trying to be cosmopolitan. *The Journal of Consumer Research*, 26(3), 214-241.
- Turner, V. (1969). Liminality and communitas. In V. Turner (Ed.), *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure* (pp. 94-113). Chicago, CA: Aldine Publishing.
- Türmen, R. (1999). On multiculturalism. *Journal of International Affairs*, 3(4), 1-12.
- van Hooff, S., & Vandekerckhove, W. (Eds.). (2010). *Questioning cosmopolitanism*. London, UK: Springer.

- Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice*. London, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Werbner, P. (Ed.). (2020). *Anthropology and the new cosmopolitanism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Westwood, S., & Phizacklea, A. (2000). *Transnationalism and the politics of belonging*. London, England: Routledge.
- Wood, A. W. (1998). Kant's project for perpetual peace. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics, thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (pp. 62-63). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.