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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

1.1 List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCK</td>
<td>Adult Cross Cultural Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMK</td>
<td>Adult Missionary Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATCK</td>
<td>Adult Third Culture Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BFLA</td>
<td>bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSLA</td>
<td>bilingual second language acquisition (BSLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCK</td>
<td>Cross Cultural Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Communal Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Educational Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>Father Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
<td>Home Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>Missionary Kid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>National Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCK</td>
<td>Third Culture Kid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Introduction

In this time of globalization, many more people are living outside their country of origin (Storti 2001). Globalization has offered significantly more opportunities for many people, including moving to and working in different cultures; meanwhile increasing the number of transnational marriages. Before WWII, the majority of children living outside their country of origin were missionary or diplomatic children, but today many more children live abroad because of their parents’ work in the oil industry, government service, in the military, in business (Polluck 2009), or simply because the parents longed for a life in a different country.

My son who was born in Norway and now lives in Germany has a Dutch mother and an American father. He was born in Norway and now lives in Germany. He is being raised trilingual; Dutch, English, and now German instead of Norwegian. Currently, he has both Dutch and American nationality, and may legally become a Norwegian citizen following his 18th birthday. He is a child with parents of two different nationalities, growing up outside either country of his two supposed mother tongues: Dutch and English. A mother tongue
is described by Polluck and Van Reken (2009, 121) as “the language of their family roots and personal history.” Meaning that the languages spoken by both the father and the mother are referred to as ‘mother tongue’. As most parents in this research have different mother tongues, the fathers’ native language will be referred to as father tongue (FT).

I often wonder if my son will ever feel Dutch? For him to possess a sense of Dutch identity is important to me as I am very proud to of my Dutch heritage. Will my son cheer for the Netherlands in the World Cup Soccer? Will he ever feel like he belongs somewhere? What will be home to him? What holidays will he celebrate? This question of my son’s sense of national identity is what inspired me to do this research.

1.3 Background

1.3.1 Third Culture Kids

Children living (part of) their childhood outside their passport country, or children that have been influenced by multiple cultures in other ways, have received many labels. The following categories or terms are considered most relevant to this research.

The most widely used and accepted label is third culture kids (TCKs): “A third culture kid is an individual who, having spent a significant part of their developmental years in a culture other than their parents’ home culture, develops a sense of relationship to all of the cultures, while not having full ownership in any. Elements from each culture are incorporated into the life experience, but the sense of belonging is in relationship to others of similar experience” (Pollock and Van Reken 2009, 13).

Ruth van Reken (Pollock 2009, 31) developed the following definition of cross-cultural kids (CCKs) as “persons who are living or have lived in or meaningfully interacted with, two or more cultural environments for a significant period of time during childhood (up to age 18).”

Many types of CCKs can be defined under this umbrella term - not only military brats¹. For example, children of minorities, kids from Shell families, refugees, and children growing up in bilingual countries. The experiences of these children are so very varied that categorization

¹The term ‘brat’ is often considered offensive by those who have never heard the term military brat before. However, to most military brats it is a term of affectionate humor as well as identification (Edwarts Wertsch 2006). The term is accepted by the military brats themselves as “the term is ... defining of who we are” (Edwarts Wertsch 2006: p. xvii). However, the term is both accepted and used in the literature as well (Polluck 2009, Edwarts Wertsch 2006).
is necessary. One of the subgroups of CCKs is Third Culture Kids (TCKs) as described in the introduction. This group consists of “foreign service kids,” “corporate brats,” “military brats,” and “missionary kids” (Polluck 2009). The home culture of TCKs is considered their first culture, the host culture is considered their second culture and the third culture is the culture expats (particularly children) make up for themselves by combining aspects of the first and second culture, but also of the cultures of other expats present; the shared commonalities of those living an internationally mobile lifestyle (Polluck 2009). A key distinction with other CCKs is that parents of TCKs leave the home country with an expectation of repatriation (Polluck 2009).

Another term often used to describe CCKs or TCKs is ‘global nomads’. As I agree with Mary Edwards Wertsch (2006) and Braidotti (1994 in Ahmed, 1999) that both CCKs and TCKs are not really nomads as they suggest, I have chosen not to use this term: “True nomads move in entire communities; the social fabric of their lives is kept intact” (Edwards Wertsch 2006: 253). The constant change for TCKs and many CCKs is not balanced by the same kind of social stability that nomad children have. Every time a CCK moves, they not only change location, but also social networks; their world dissolves and is swept away (ibid.).

The number of people moving abroad for work continues to increase. In 2007, more than four million Americans worked outside the USA (Smith 1994) and both Australia and Japan had more than one million citizens living outside their national borders (Polluck 2009). As a result, many children around the world grow up outside their country of passport. All these children have very different experiences and yet, when adults, they feel most at home among other people that share the same experience of having lived outside their passport nation during their developmental years. As a result, different transnational communities emerged that now Adult Third Culture Kids (ATCKs) feel a part of; TCK departments or alumni associations in universities, online as well as print magazines for ATCKs, and the establishments of many web groups on Facebook, and other internet portals show a desire for ATCKs to bond over their shared experience. With their increase in numbers and the emergence of many ATCK communities, this phenomena along with issues of multilingualism, have received interest from the academic world. In the last decennia varied research concerning TCKs and related topics have taken place – most notably on the topics of belonging, characteristics and upbringing (Byram, 2009; Ahmed, 1999; Brickel, 2012; Clark, 2009; Edwards, 2009; Wertsch, 2006; Fail, 2012; Brickell, 2011; Fail, Thompson & Walker, 2004; Luke, 2003; Byrd, 2009). However, I have found very limited literature on the topic of
identity development of TCKs, and none at all on the development of a sense of a national identity.

1.3.2 Language and Identity

Part of this research focus will be on the subjects’ communication with their mother tongue and acquired languages as it relates to their sense of national identity. Michael Byram (2006) researched the link between language and identity and states that language symbolizes identity and that languages are used to signal identities by those who speak them. He concluded that there often is a strong link between language and a sense of belonging to a particular nationality. Additionally, he sees a further link between language and identity since he found that learning foreign languages in certain circumstances may be an experience of acquiring a new identity. Byram is not alone in his research of language and identity; the book Language and Identities, edited by Carmen Llamas and Dominic Watt, (2010) also shows. Many researchers in this field contributed to this book. Much research has been done on the topic of bilingualism throughout the world. For this research I made a small selection of the bulk of reading available, which includes but is not limited to Julie Byrd Clark’s book (2009) in which she makes a connection between multilingualism and identity.

1.3.3 My contribution to this field

Extensive research on bi- and multilingualism and social identity development of CCKs and TCKs is available; however, I have not located much information on national identity development. With this research, I want to contribute to the knowledge in this particular area. I want other parents of TCKs to be able to find information on what factors might and might not shape the development of a sense of national identity of their children. I want to encourage ACCKs and ATCKs to think about who they are and how they became who they are. I want them to feel the same relief that some of my subjects felt after the interview - realizing they never thought about certain things. For them it was an eye opener to actually think about the process of their identity development. Last but not least, I want this research to be of assistance to parents of CCKs and TCKs in supporting their children during their difficult identity development phase by gaining more insight in the influences on this process.
Chapter two

METHODOLOGY

This study investigates the variables that lead to a sense of national identity of the research population. Therefore, this research aims to reach the following research objectives:

RO1: Identify if there is a relation between the first language of both parents and the subject’s feeling of national identity

RO2: Identify if there is a relation between the relations between subjects, their parents and their family and the sense of national identity.

RO3: Identify if there is a relation between the actual time spent in a passport country and the sense of a particular national identity.

RO4: Identify other factors that might be of influence on the sense of national identity.

This report is based on qualitative sampling in the form of semi-structured interviews with open ended questions, which is linked to the expectation that the participant’s viewpoint is authentically expressed (Flick, 1998 in Varcasia (ed.), 2011). A detailed account of the methodology is given below.

2.1 Research Population

The original research population was identified as ATCKs living in Stavanger. Subjects had to be born out of a transnational marriage. In other words, the original research population was defined as: ‘adults that as children with parents of different nationalities, moved into another culture than that of their parents.’ The move into another culture was supposed to be due to a parent’s career choice without expected repatriation. Potential subjects were approached once or more by email via the following institutions: Misjonshøgskolen (MHS); Det Norske Misjonsselskap (NMS); Joint Warfare Centre (JWC); Stavanger Expats Facebook page and Norske Shell. This resulted in 24 responses, of which only two matched the defined research population. Reflection on both the population description as well as the stories of the respondents was necessary. It became clear that in this field of research, the personal experiences are extremely varied and all just as interesting. My description of the research
population seemed to be too narrow for a search in a relatively small geographical location (Stavanger). To broaden the geographical outreach could be one solution. Though it would most likely result in 100% respondents that fit the defined research population, it would mean that not all interviews could be done face to face. Interviewing by phone and even Skype would most likely result in a loss of data. Body language and intonations might be missed or misinterpreted. Considering this, enlarging the geographical location in the research population description was not an option for this research. An alternative option was to enlarge the definition of the research population by changing the criteria. In fact, many of the different stories the respondents wrote me, would be great contributions to the research. By enlarging the definition of the research population I would be able to include the stories of the respondents and get the same research question answered.

The adjusted research population is described as ATCKs living in Stavanger, born out of a cross-cultural marriage. Thus: persons who have lived in or meaningfully interacted with, two or more cultural environments for a significant period of time during their childhood and whose parents have different cultural backgrounds (not necessarily different nationalities). The initial description of children with parents of different nationalities has been replaced with children with parents of different cultures. The personal narrative of the respondents made me realize that even within one country, parents can come from completely different cultures.

Geert Hofstede (quoted by Lewis, 1996) defined culture as ‘the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one category of people from another’ (Lewis 1996). Milton Bennet (1998) calls this subjective culture as opposed to objective culture, with which he refers to institutions of culture – behavior that has become routinized into a particular form. He describes subjective culture as the psychological features that define a group of people- their everyday thinking and behavior – rather than the institutions they have created (Bennet 1998). For this thesis, I prefer the by Bennet (1998) suggested working definition that is derived from his definition of subjective culture: culture is the learned and shared patterns of beliefs, behaviors, and values of groups of interacting people.

With the new defined research population I had eight respondents that matched this population. From the remaining respondents, two particular stories got my attention, both respondents do not have parents from different cultures, but they both had such extensive exposure to one particular country, other than their parents’ home culture. As a result they seem to be struggling with issues such as home, belonging and identity in a similar way as
the ACCKs. They were brought up with another culture in a way that was probably the same or even more determining for their identity development than the research population. The consideration of the above, as well as the pressure of time, I decided to include these two respondents in my research. After all, I had to respondents that could help me answer my research questions, even though they did not match the full description of the research population. After all the interviews took place and knowing that all interviews would contribute to this research, I finalized the description of the research population: ATCKs living in Stavanger.

I never intended to make a selection of subjects based on gender. I did not want to research a difference in the sense of national identity among women and men, but just what influences this sense of national identity. One of the influences of course could be gender, but I did not select based on potential influences, just on experience. Also, the limited response had even prevented such a selection. However, the gender division turned out to be 50% male and 50% female. Age was not a selection criterion either for the same reasons as stated above. Nine of the subjects are between 34 and 65. One subject is under 20.

2.2 Research Method

The choice for a particular method depends, among other things, on the pre-perceptions of the researcher. I do not have the pre-perception that national identity is derived through categorisation. The development of a sense of national identity is therefore not measurable and easy to compare or analyse. The hard and reliable data of quantitative research would thus not deliver the results that I aimed to achieve.

Another influence on the choice of a particular method in this case if the relationship between the researcher and the subject (Bryman 1999). I needed to be close to the subjects, in order to explore their interpretations of their experiences. I needed to gather rich and deep data that included emotions and body language. This would only be possible by conducting face-to-face interviews. I needed data with limited space for generality, rather than hard, reliable and superficial data. The lack of or even non-existent contact between the researcher and the subject within quantitative research allowed me to have a preference for qualitative research methods before even exploring other factors. Also, the findings of this research had to be ideographic rather than nomothetic. Qualitative research offers the opportunity for ideographic findings, unlike quantitative research, which is more likely to deliver a nomothetic scope of the findings (ibid.). This research focuses on individual cases with the
aim to construct an overall understanding of the development of a sense of national identity, which can be achieved more likely with an ideographic rather than a nomothetic method.

This research did not use any theories or concepts as a starting point for investigations (ibid.), thus did it not search for confirmation of such theories. Instead, any possible relation between the research and theory was emergent. Qualitative research methods allow this discovery of theory instead of verification of a theory. The latter can be achieved by quantitative research methods. One final decisive factor in choosing the research method was the image of social reality. Quantitative research conveys a view of social reality, which is static in that it tends to neglect the impact and role of change in social life (ibid), which is exactly what I wanted to research. I needed to search for linkages between events and activities and to explore the subject’s interpretations of the factors that produce exactly such connections. Again, qualitative research methods seemed to be a better fit for my research than quantitative research methods.

After going over the above-described considerations, I had to conclude that the method most suitable to this research is qualitative research because of its interpretative nature. This turned out to be the correct decision, as the different experiences of the subjects were delivered to me in complete different statements, rationales, stories, emotional spilling and so on. In fact, the social process of identity development entailed many more variables than I initially anticipated for. The majority of the stories of the subjects for this research include either a strong (political) historical factor or family drama. Two factors that in all the cases of the subjects seem to have a strong connection with the identity they developed.

2.3 Data Collection

In the center of the chosen qualitative research methods we find the interview (Drønen, 2006). Essential when conducting interviews is communicative competence (ibid.), or in other words, understanding what is and also, what is not said. The task of the interviewer is to know enough about the culture within which the message is transmitted to avoid distortion in the communication process and to have enough inside in the culture to recognize the repertoire of metacommunicative events in action (Briggs, 1986). This was recognized as a potential limitation to this study as I only know some of the subcultures of the subjects well. I am very familiar and comfortable with the military subculture as well as the expat subculture. However, I am not a TCK myself and therefor do not know the TCK subculture from personal experience. Also, I can’t possibly know as much of all the national cultures the
subjects are related to as I ideally should know. I did however, recognize the utmost importance of knowing the setting in which a researcher does her fieldwork (Drønen, 2006). To mitigate the potential limitation of not knowing all cultures that matter to this research and therefore not to have the ability to recognize metacommunicative events, I limited the research population to those living in Stavanger. I do know the Norwegian culture as well as many of the present and relevant subcultures (military; expat; oil industry) very well.

Another potential limitation to the data collection is the language. All interviews were conducted in English. For 40% of the subjects and the interviewer herself, English is not the mother tongue. However, I did not expect this to lead to a loss of data. For both the interviewer as well as the above mentioned 40% of the subjects, English is and has been their work language for a long time and in some cases even their home language due to international marriages. English is also the main language used within expat communities and the shared expat culture. This implies the use of a particular reference frame shared by interviewer and subjects (Byram, 1997). In other words, I expected all subjects and the researcher to have developed a socio-cultural competence that presupposed a certain degree of familiarity with the expat context (ibid.). I did not believe that any additional sociolinguistic competence on my part would have contributed to additional data or better understanding of current data by decoding and thus understanding what was actually said (Drønen, 2006).

In order to meet the objectives of the study, ten people were interviewed in a semi-structured interview, nine in person and one by telephone. The decision to do this particular interview by telephone was made because of her personal story that I had heard when I met her. After hearing about her experiences and feelings, she was asked to participate. During the field research, she was out of the country. As her story was not new to me and I had seen her body language and responses to my question, I felt confident that the risk of losing data was minimal. However, the risk remains that some data might have been lost, or that certain tone of voice or body language were missed. After the interview, the notes taken were read to her and approved. One more follow up email followed the interview to clarify something.

A potential limitation to this research was the limited time to build rapport with the subjects. It takes time to develop personal relations and to gain confidence (Drønen, 2006). The time limitation of this research did not allow me to develop deep personal relations, while the subjects were expected to share their life stories with me. To mitigate this limitation, all subjects were allowed to choose both time and location for the interview to be scheduled. By letting the subjects choose the location, I hoped they would choose a place
they would feel comfortable with. Some subjects seemed to be more comfortable in a public setting (two persons chose a bar), while other apparently felt more comfortable being interviewed in the comfort of their home (two persons). The remaining five chose to be interviewed at a quiet corner at their workplace. It is difficult to determine whether these locations were chosen because of practicality or because of higher comfort levels for the subject. It is also hard to determine whether similar settings for all subjects would have had a different impact on the interviews, I did not feel that to be the case as this way all subjects chose a location that they felt comfortable in and that delivered minimum disruption in their daily life.

Each interview lasted between 40 and 80 minutes. The interview guide was used as a baseline for the interview, but all interviews evolved naturally following the life story of the subjects. The interview schedule included at least:

- General quantifiable information (e.g. age; profession (of subject and parents); etc)
- Countries that for any reason were or are part of the subject’s life and why.
- Sense of home, belonging and identity and their feelings and ideas about these factors
- Linguistic background and experience
- Cultural issues respondents face(d)
- Education and social issues such as relations with parents and family respondents face(d)

Initially I planned to record all interviews, however, I ended up only recording the first interview. I found the recorder to be disruptive since I was worried about distance to the microphone, if it was working properly and so on. I also found that I prefer to write everything down anyway as I write things down the same way I organize things in my brain. This way, all my notes made sense to me and it helped me organizing the data. Also, I can write while looking at the subject, so I matched what I wrote with what I heard and saw. When I listened to the recording of the first interview, it confused me, as I only had the sound and I had to try hard to hear any of it. Carefully I considered how making notes instead of recording the interviews could “negatively” affect or limit the amount of data. Making notes at the same time as interviewing is normally very challenging and could impact on the social interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. The moments the interviewer looks down at the paper, are the moments during which she misses body language and during which there is no eye contact. Also, especially if the interviewee is a fast speaker, it is
difficult to write down everything. It is tempting to write a summary of the spoken words with the risk of missing out on particular information. I never summarized what was said on paper and only wrote down full sentences exactly as the subjects said them. That said, the positives outweighed the negatives for me; my ability to write while looking at somebody else; my fast writing skills; the way I organize data in my head linked to how I write things down and my full attention for the interviewee because of the non-distraction of the recording device. I concluded that I would not record the other interviews. To minimize the loss of information, I summarized what I wrote down to be approved by the interviewee.

2.4 Data Analysis

The method of data analysis that was used is ‘grounded theorizing’ combined with ‘constant comparison’ and coding. Grounded theorizing is a process during which theory is developed out of data analysis, while not solely thinking about the data, yet with and through the data in order to produce fruitful ideas (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). There is no standard procedure or process for grounded theorizing. It is all about our ideas being used to make sense of data and of data being used to change our ideas. This relationship between data and ideas is the basic of grounded theorizing (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). The activity of grounded theorizing took already place during the interviews. Initial analysis of the unfolding stories of the respondents resulted in an emergent theory that strategically guided every subsequent interview.

After collecting the data and before storing it, the data were coded. The data were allocated to different categories. In the early stages of the field research categories that made sense of the data were identified (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). The first categories were very generic. However, after continuous (re)reading during the analysis, new (sub)categories were generated. This process of defining categories and to allocate data to them was a reoccurring process. With every newly generated category, all previous coded data had to be reviewed and possibly be recoded. The main categories and subcategories identified were: Nationality of subject; nationality of mother and father; nationality of children; language; HL, EL; CL; MT; FT; countries lived in; countries lived in at what age; exposure to host cultures; visits to (parents’) home countries; sense of home; sense of belonging; sense of identity; sense of where from; support to national sports teams; relation to mother, father, mother’s and father’s family then and now; traditions celebrated as child and traditions celebrated with own children. Constant comparison was used as an analytic procedure and
strategy as a base to the coding process during which the relationships between all identified categories were explored (Corbin, 1998). This constant comparison by (re)reading, discovering and coding of variables and their interrelationships displayed the mutual relationships and internal structures of categories more clearly (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). It helped to give the concept in grounded theory its precision and specificity (Corbin, 1998).

2.5 Bias

As a researcher, I am fallible. Researchers can make mistakes or get things wrong. According to Meloy (1994), qualitative research requires personal rather than detached engagement in the context. My affinity with the topic can influence my objectivity and therefore the research in some ways such as interpretation, explanation or even misunderstanding of data, expectations of outcome and prejudice in the form of certain theories. Another possible bias in this research is a selection bias, where the results might be influenced based on the deliberate choices I make in the selection of the respondents. Due to the limited response to my search for subjects, this bias was limited naturally as I did not have many respondents to choose from. However, this in itself can also be a bias that affects the research.

To reduce my bias, I constantly confronted my own opinions and prejudice with the data (Meloy 1994) as most opinions and prejudices are rather superficial. To minimize this bias, I verbalized my opinions and prejudices as an indirect question to the subject. My prejudices included, but were certainly not limited to: the influence of the mother on identity development should be larger than the influence of the father when the mother spends more time with the child; a sense of national identity is linked to the country one spends most time in. Quite often my prejudices were proven wrong, which allowed me to approach the subjects even more open minded. The data that I collected provided a much more detailed rendering of events than even the most creatively prejudiced mind might have imagined prior to the study (Bogdan & Biklen 1982). I attempted to objectively study the subjective state of the subjects by asking mainly open ended questions, by not sharing my experience or life story, by not projecting, by asking for emotions felt, by asking what certain non-verbal communication meant and by writing down literally what the subjects said and what body language they used (Bogden & Biklen 1982). After all, the goal is to add knowledge, not to transcend my own prejudice.
I also grappled with the issue of ‘external’ view of the observer and the ‘internal’ view of the participant (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007). Outsiders and insiders have immediate access to different sorts of information. The danger for me during the interviews and during the analysis, was to fail to understand the perspectives of the participants. In order to limit this kind of bias, I asked the subjects repeatedly if I understood them correctly by rephrasing or repeating their words. I kept detailed notes during the interview, which I summarized for the subject’s approval at the end of the interview. I also included my own thoughts and expectations and where they were proven right or wrong in the notes.

2.5 Reliability and validity

Many researchers agree on the importance of testing reliability and validity in quantitative research (Kirk & Miller 1986; Charles 1995; Golafshani 2003). There seems to be a general agreement among these researchers that reliability is about stability of a measurement over time (ibid.). “A high degree of stability indicates a high degree of reliability, which means the results are repeatable (Golafshani, 2003, p. 599)” However, proving the repeatability of test results does not necessarily validate the test instrument (ibid.). “Validity determines whether the research truly measures that which it was intended to measure or how truthful the research results are (Joppe, 2000 in Golafshani, 2003 p.599)”.

Unlike quantitative research with its aim of finding causal determination and generalization of findings, qualitative research aims at understanding of findings in context-specific settings in a real world that is continuously changing. This research is about perceptions rather than hard facts. Opinions and perceptions are likely to change over time when the context changes. This research is about perceptions of the subjects, and during the interviews it became clear that their perceptions have changed over time when they entered different life phases; when their family situations changed or simply, because the context changed. The fact that the results of this research are thus not necessarily replicable does not mean that the results are not reliable or that this research is not credible. Qualitative analysis obviously results in a different type of knowledge than quantitative analysis (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992 in Golafshani, 2003). A different outcome also requires a different research method and instrument; a different attitude from the researcher towards the research and a different quality concept of the research. The quality concept in qualitative studies has the purpose of generating understanding of a situation that would otherwise be confusing rather than generating understanding which is the purpose of the quality concept in quantitative

Clearly, in quantitative research, reliability concerns measurements in a static context. The issue of reliability has thus no relevance to the judgment of quality of qualitative research (Stenbacka, 2001 in Golafshani, 2003; Seale, 1999 in Golafshani, 2003; Altheide & Johnson, 1998; Leininger, 1994; Healy & Perry, 2000 in Golafshani, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Yet qualitative researchers do need to demonstrate the trustworthiness of their research to ensure reliability (Golafshani, 2003) and it had been said that different terms for quality in qualitative research methods should be redefined (Guba & Lincoln, 1981 in Morse et al. 2002). Lincoln and Guba (1985) were amongst the first to develop their own essential criteria for quality or trustworthiness in qualitative research methods. They introduced the concepts of Credibility, Neutrality or Conformability, Consistency or Dependability and Applicability or Transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). However, not all researchers agree with the necessity of new concepts for qualitative research. Specific methodological strategies to demonstrate trustworthiness of the qualitative research can be the audit trail, member checks when coding, categorizing, or confirming results with participants, peer debriefing, negative case analysis and referential material adequacy (Guba & Lincoln, 1981 in Morse et al. 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985 in Morse et al. 2002; Guba & Lincoln, 1982 in Morse et al. 2002). However, these are all measures taken after the research has finished. They might be useful for evaluating relevance and utility of the study; they do not in themselves ensure that the research will be relevant and useful (Morse et al. 2002). That is why Morse, Barret, Mayan, Olson and Spiers (2002) claim that reliability and validity are pertinent to qualitative research.

Not only the concept of reliability, but also the concept of validity have been argued not to be applicable to qualitative research; while at the same time, a need for some kind of qualifying measure for research has been acknowledged (Golafshani, 2003). Many researchers have developed their own concepts of validity and called them, among other terms, quality or trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stenbecka, 2001 in Golafshani, 2003; Davies & Dodd, 2002 in Golafshani, 2003).

No matter what naming convention is being used, it is all about differentiating a good from a bad research by determining its quality. “The quality of a research is related to generalizability of the result and thereby to the testing and increasing the validity or trustworthiness of the research (Golafshani, 2003, p. 603)”. Triangulation has been on the rise as a method of testing and strengthening the validity and reliability of a qualitative research, especially in the constructivism paradigm. Constructivism sees knowledge as
socially constructed and context dependent and thus values multiple realities in people’s minds (ibid.). “Therefore, to acquire valid and reliable multiple and diverse realities, multiple methods of searching or gathering data are in order (Golafshani, 2003, p. 604). Triangulation is an appropriate method to identify the construction of reality. Researchers triangulation was in the case of this research not an option as there could only be one researcher according to MHS regulation. Data triangulation on the other hand has been used to improve the trustworthiness of this research. First of all, by using open-ended questions, the researcher allowed the subjects to assist in both research questions as well as the data collection. Second, quantitative and qualitative data were combined. Further more, collected data was shown to and approved by the subjects. Any ambiguities were cleared with the subjects. Internal consistency was guaranteed by exercising the same process for every interview.

In qualitative research, the validity and reliability both depend on the effort and qualities of the researcher, as the researcher is the instrument. In this case, the researcher has been responsive; flexible and sensitive. The researcher has shown the ability for clarification and summarization.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

Only indirect personal identification information was collected. This information will only be accessible by the researcher and is stored on a private computer. The contact details are stored separately in a cabinet with a lock.

The respondents were provided with information about the project, about the researcher, about the dissemination and the duration both in the call for subjects and in the beginning of each interview. All participants gave their informed verbal consent. They were aware that they had no obligation to answer questions and they could withdraw from the interview at any time without providing an explanation. As the respondents were promised anonymity, I shall number them from 1 to 10 and refer to all of them with her.
3.1 Introduction

This research is marked by a concern with the discovery of theory rather than the verification of theory (Filstead 1979). This means that theory has not been used as a precursor to this research, but rather as a means of providing orientation to the situation as in ‘grounded theory’ (Bryman 1999). The grounded theory in this research minimally entails theory on (national) identity development, development of mother tongue(s), multi-linguistic children, TCKs and culture. These are all variables, among many others that influence the national identity development of the research population.

The complexity of national identity development for this research subjects as well as the complexity of all factors involved demanded that the focus had to be on the individual rather than on the group as a whole. The different experiences, situation and location of the individuals only support this statement. With this statement, relativism as a science-theoretical approach can be excluded. I do agree with a relativist belief that truth is relative to some particular frame of reference (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007), such as language or culture in this research. Relativism theory does not recognize an absolute truth, just a relative, subjective value according to differences in perception and consideration (Murray 2005). However, I do not have the pre-conception that a sense of national identity is derived from analyzing what happens in social relations. I agree with Løngreen (2006) when she says that the individual expresses herself or himself and that he or she is positioned in a concrete social context that means that research redirects its focus from relation to individual and to how identity is constructed. Instead, a sense of national identity is derived through analyzing the social context using a framework defined through theory (Løngreen 2006). This social theory called social constructionism considers how social phenomena develop in social situated contexts. When it is said that national identity is socially constructed, we focus on its’ dependence on variables of our social selves rather than any inherent quality that identity possesses in itself. My constructivist approach for this research aims then to identify what conditions and constructs self-representation and identity (Løngreen 2006). In order to achieve this, the focus is on language, particular contexts and individual unique situations.
The research is not aimed to identify what passport nationality the research population has, but rather what nation they feel they belong too. It is not aimed to identify where ‘home’ is, or where they are from, but rather what traditions are important to them, what football team they cheer for and what country’s politics is important to them. CCKs and their parents don’t always share a common sense of national identity or a similar sense of ‘home’ (Polluck and Van Reken 2009). Although children are given a certain passport nationality by birth, a sense of national identity develops over years, just like many other identities children have to learn and develop like a social, a personal or a group identity. These identities are all formed by experience and cultures we are faced with. That is why what ACCKs appear to be by passport, isn’t who they necessary are in the invisible place within (ibid.). There often is a strong link between language and a sense of national identity (Byram 2006). This makes identity development for CCKs more complex, as they are often brought up with multiple languages. Especially complex is the case of CCKs that are brought up with two different languages at home and another language at school in which all subjects are being taught. This means that when children learn the school language, they learn the language, which they and others will use to identify themselves with the social group called ‘nation’ (ibid.), which can weaken the identity formed by traditions and language in the home. Bilingual children, children who can speak, read and write more than one language, may however be encouraged to maintain or develop both identities linked to both languages.

In order to contribute to the knowledge of national identity development of CCKs, it is however important to look at more variables than social identity and language. Although variables as mother tongue, national language, passport country, bilingualism, language of education and identity development are extremely valuable for this research, other key variables include, but are not limited to: traditions celebrated at home; (nature of) host cultures; relation with family and relation to parents.

3.2 Identity

3.2.1 In General

There is no universal agreed upon definition of (the nature of) identity, and little accord exists on how identities are created, reproduced and transformed: conceptualizing identity therefore can be quite complex (Storti 2001). Moshman (2011) however, came up with a brief definition of identity: “An identity is, at least in part, an explicit theory of oneself as a person”. But he adds that to have an identity is more than having an explicit theory of
oneself; it is to have an explicit theory whereby one construes oneself as a person (ibid.). The fact that people have so many different roles (as a wife; a son; a Muslim; a student; etc.) and belong to many different groups (a company; a sports club; a nation; etc.) complicates defining oneself as a person. People have many different social identities and in fact many (sub)cultural language identities. These cultural languages are not just limited to the verbal language, but include also body language and attitude as well. By belonging to many groups, people speak the different languages of each group. Speaking the ‘correct’ variety makes the individual an ‘insider’, a member of the in-group; being unable or unwilling identifies the individual as an outsider or a member of an ‘out-group’ (Byram 2011). By interpreting experienced meanings and structuring them into differences and similarities, identity is constructed, not only that of the other but also of the self and even collective identities (Svane in Dahl 2006). Self-identity is the most complex identity we can possess; not only because it requires self-analysis, but also because the way that we identify ourselves at any given time depends on context. Self-identity changes from context to context as we shift roles or groups which cause several or even multiple simultaneous overlapping identities (Lewellen 2002).

Part of the problem with defining “identity” is that the term applies to at least three completely different concepts: first, how the individual perceives himself (also called social identity); second, how the person is popularly perceived (also called psychological identity); and third, how the individual is perceived by the social scientist (Lewellen 2002). More often than not, the way other people perceive us is not the same as people understand themselves (Luke 2003). In this research, the aim is not to define the identity of the subjects; it is to identify how they themselves see their identity. The third concept therefor will in this case not include how I see their identity but how I interpret their sense of identity by looking at the multitude of ways the subjects belong, or not belong, to groups. I will now give an introduction to the social and psychological identity.

3.2.2 Social Identity
For this study, the approach to development of social and psychological identity is based on Delfos (2009, 2011) and Moshman (2011). The development of the social identity (how you experience that others see you) starts in pre-puberty when the hormonal changes start (Delfos, 2011). Most children will then be between 10 and 12 years old. Boys are on average a bit older than girls when the hormonal changes start. During this phase of hormonal change, the children develop an image of the self, based on how they are seen by others. To develop
their social identity; they analyse the opinions of parents, peers, brothers, sisters, family, teachers and so on. While these children feel the need to fit in; they also feel a need to be different. These conflicting needs produce tension. Yet, the same needs also trigger the display of an own identity: The child lives up to the group norms in order to be part of that group and at the same time they make themselves attractive by standing out and taking initiative. These activities show an own identity (ibid.).

3.2.3 Psychological Identity

The development of the social identity is followed by the psychological identity development in puberty (Delfos, 2009). This type of identity development is closely related to the social identity. If anything, the yet developed social identity is a precursor for puberty. A positive social identity (my parents and friends like me) based on self-analysis is a protection for puberty will make it easier to develop a healthy psychological identity. The teenager then reflects on the self and looks for his deepest reasons and being during puberty. Children with a positive identity are less likely to face risks to join a risk group with simple group rules about language, looks, drinking and drugs (Delfos 2011). The psychological identity consists of all self-conceptions including, but not limited to, sexual identity (how you experience yourself sexually), cultural identity (which culture are you a member of and how this culture expects you to behave), intellectual identity (how you experience yourself intellectually) and spiritual identity (to what religion you belong) (Delfos 2009; Moshman 2011). In these and other domains adolescents explore possibilities, make commitments and construct theories of themselves. The process of identity development can bring along different issues, especially identity confusion. This can show by not developing close relationships, a sense of missed opportunities or choosing for a negative identity. These issues are also called ‘identity conflicts’ and are, according to Delfos (2009) never solved.

Delfos (2009) describes the process of identity development as one of continuing individuation. This individuation process contains 4 phases:

• Differentiation: this takes place in the early adolescence (approximately 12-14 years). The emphasis in this phase lays in the search for differences with the parents.
• Execution: this takes place between 14 and 16 years of age; during this phase the teenagers try things out and think they can do everything. The teenagers see no or little danger at this age.
• Coming closer: this takes place during mid adolescence; during this phase the young adolescents face a fear of complete differentiation

• Reinforcement: this starts at the end of adolescence when teenagers start to feel having a personal identity

Delfos (2011) explains that it is necessary to know and recognize one’s own relativity with the surroundings during this process. To have an identity is to have commitments in those domains you yourself see as central to personhood and to have an overriding theory of self that coordinates these commitments (Blasi & Glocis 1995). Identity, both personal and social, is always constructed in, but never entirely determined by, social and cultural group contexts (Moshman 2011). One of the most important groups in our lives is an abstract social entity such as nation. Such an entity has the potential to outlast the individuals who compose them at any given time. Identification with a nation thus provides a deepened sense of continuity, permanence, and meaning. As a result, “we are highly motivated to act on behalf of abstract groups central to our social identities” (Moshman 2011, 141).

In the light of identification with a nation, Storti (2001) introduces the term “cultural conditioning”. He describes this process as a group process, whereby the members of a certain group teach the next generation how to behave in order to function and survive in that particular group. Any member, whether it is a parent, a coach, a teacher or a babysitter, teach the youngsters how to behave and not to behave in that particular group. In other words, through cultural conditioning we learn the norms that prevail in that social group, whether that group is the nation or the soccer club. The essential fact to grasp about norms is that they not only make it easier to interact with other people – they make it possible (Storti 2001). Without norms, if we could not relay on people to behave in certain ways in certain situations, human interaction would be hopelessly unpredictable and chaotic. We depend on people to act like us.

3.2.4 Identity and the Cultural Encounter
Halfway through the 20th century, the concept of identity was clear; bounded by culture and language. Identity was thought of as a group personality (Lewellen 2002). People were assumed to fit in one culture that determined their identity. Identity was presumed to be a national one. In the late 1970s 1980s, when postmodernism shifted attention away from supposedly objective structures and facts to the subjective experience of the people being studied, identity was seen in a light of self-questioning rather than to be limited to a nation
Nowadays, the dominant theoretical perspective on identity development is constructionism (Storti 2006); identity is perceived to be constructed and context depending. This also means that identities are not fixed. They can change over time when the contexts change.

Most people nowadays encounter people with different cultures, because of travel, migration or work. But even those who never leave the borders of their own country are likely to meet people with different cultural backgrounds. Identity in general raises certain expectations to how oneself and the other act and react towards each other; as well as to socialisation and communication. It is during this very cultural encountering that nationalism surfaces. Nationalism often elicits a primary sense of identity (Lewellen 2002). It is through the process of cultural conditioning as mentioned above, and our sense of national identity that it can be challenging to identify the correct behaviors when immersed in other cultures. In the light of identity construction in the cultural encounter, we can see how culture and identity are thus changed in and through the same interaction processes and closely intertwined into each other (Svane in Dahl 2006).

Developing a (social) identity is difficult in the best of circumstances. However, for CCKs in general and for TCKs in particular, the process of national identity development adds an extra dimension due to their exposure to multiple sources of identification. It is especially challenging for children between the age of 11 and 13 that are situated in two or more cultural communities. These children are in the phase of developing their social identity. They are trying to fit in, yet they start to realize that others might see them as different. This phase, that is all about the children discovering how others see them, can have a profound influence on the children’s sense of identity.

CCKs are immersed in multiple cultures before they even develop a strong sense of national identity, if at all. TCKs, for example, are faced with host and home cultures; they are also faced with different cultural backgrounds of other expat children. This mixture of cultures within an expat community is called the third culture (Ruth Hill and John Useem, in Polluck and Van Reken 2009); the third culture is best described as the shared commonalities of those living an internationally mobile lifestyle (Polluck and Van Reken 2009). “Growing up in different societies with different values, believes and social etiquette, these TCKs are faced with the task to achieving a satisfactory integration of national identity and self-identity” (Phinney and Rosenthal 1992, 145). It does not make it easier for these TCKs that monocultural members of the different cultures the TCKs belong to, usually want to know to what culture their identity is linked. But this is not only so for TCKs, it is applicable to many
CCKs as well. Polluck and Van Reken (2009) mentioned that for TCKs the most difficult question to answer is: "Where are you from?" This question is just as hard to answer for most CCKs.

CCKs are always tied to multiple geographies; both imagined and real places. Their connection is not just with the countries and cultures they live in, but just as much with the countries and cultures that are part of the cultural or family shared memories or dreams. They might feel just as connected to the place where grandma lives as to the place where their ancestors build a community. Moreover, with continuous relocations, more cultural encounters are experienced. As a result the identity of CCKs are always in flux. CCKs are challenged with an identity that is never stable or predictable; rather there identity is always in a state of immanent and permanent formation (Luke 2003).

From the above we can conclude that multiple and mixed identifications characterize the dynamic process of cultural identity formation (Luke 2003). These multicultural identities are formed during and after many relocations and transitions. They attest multiple attachments, deterritorialization\(^2\), and cultural hybridity (Luke 2003).

### 3.3 Language Development

Language means different things to different people. Language means something different to the hearing impaired person than to the academic scholar. It also means something different to the Somalian refugee than it means to the bilingual child. Therefore I consider language to be a discourse. It is so much more than just a language: language is a social construction; a representation and at the same time, a dynamic social phenomenon (Clark 2009). I will now briefly discuss the theory of language in general, bi- and multilingualism, biculturalism and bilingualism, language in the cross-cultural encounter and the relationship between language and identity. The paragraph “language in general” is mainly based on the theory of Lievegoed (2003). The work of different theorists has been used for the other paragraphs. The main theorists used in these paragraphs are, but are not limited, to: Grosjean (2010); Byram (2006); Storti (2001) and Brickell (2012).

\(^2\) Deterritorialization is considered a central feature of globalization. It implies the growing presence of social forms of contact and involvement, which go beyond the limits of a specific territory (Giddens 1990). Deterritorialization generates closeness in distance, and a relative distancing from what is close (Hernández, 2006).
3.3.1 In General

Babies’ first sounds are “A” sounds: Dada, papa, mama. These sounds are used to express feelings, not concepts. ‘Real’ talking will develop along with the walking skills of the child. Learning to speak is both physiological and psychological a difficult process. The physiological process that takes place in this phase is the brain developing the speech center in coordination with the center of the hand while psychologically the speech ability is the basic for the conscious human soul (Lievegoed 2003). The ability to speak adds (spiritual) order to the soul.

Language is the collective-spiritual possession of a group of people that feel connected through that language more than through anything else (Lievegoed 2003). Different populations give words to phenomena, whether things, experiences or emotions. The fact that different populations have different words or naming is because they have different minds and experience the world differently. By adapting a certain mother tongue, we not only acquire a language to communicate our needs, experiences and emotions; we become part of a culture and a country. Simultaneously we also develop a worldview, concepts and emotions (Lievegoed 2003). This is precisely why CCKs might find that they don’t have a particular mother tongue. They are brought up with multiple languages, possibly even multiple home languages and multiple cultures and worldviews. They might find themselves not fluent in either one of them or they might find that they own all languages equally.

The mother tongue has a very important role in the development of our personality; it forms us. Storti (2001) mentions that language is not simply how people speak; it is who they are. A mother tongue is the basis of the structure in the worldview; it also connects the child to the population that speaks that particular language. The more words a language entails, the more it allows differentiation. The way sentences are build offer a different way of thinking. This process has a great influence on the formation of the child’s personality. That is why the intellectual understanding of a child, and the emotions, are closely connected to the mother tongue. It is also why multilingualism creates refinement of our thinking. It allows us to have another frame of reference, another worldview to see the world from a different perspective. However, if a child does not learn a language in the first few years of his or her life, he or she will be able to form an understanding of things, but he or she will always have difficulties with abstract understanding and higher thinking in this particular language (Lievegoed 2003).
3.3.2 Bi- and Multilingualism

Bilingualism is neither a well-described nor well-understood phenomenon (Hoff and McCordle 2006). There is no general agreement on a definition other than that to be fluent in speaking a language is not sufficient to be a bilingual. Bilingualism requires fluency in reading, speaking and writing in two languages, while multilingualism requires fluency in reading, speaking and writing in two or more languages. Being bilingual thus means also being multilingual. We can make a distinction between ‘bilingual first language acquisition (BFLA) and bilingual second language acquisition (BSLA) (Werker et al. 2006). BFLA are those who acquired their languages from an early age. To become BFLA, children are born into a family and acquire the language variety of that family. A child can learn any particular language from a parent, a grandparent or even a nanny. As young children they learn a language like they learn any other skill – by being part of the language; to imitate and to explore the language. As soon as they go to school they might acquire additional languages from their friends and the community (Communal Language, CL) or because the language of the school (Educational Language, EL) is different from the language spoken at home (Home Language, HL) (Grosjean 2010). CL and EL are often the same language, but just as often they are not. In cases where the child attends an international school or a school in a country with multiple official languages, the changes are they CL and EL are not the same. Research has shown that the influence on language development from the mother is the same as the influence of the father if they both speak different languages. Even when quite a high proportion of a young child’s input was just in one language, children in this situation were fluent in both languages (Thomas 2012). But when the child speaks or learns three or more languages, there is always one language that suffers. This language is practically never the educational language (Vooght 2008). Most often, the EL becomes the first language; this is the language that is spoken with peers, unless multilingual schooling is offered (Varcasia 2011). This puts extra pressure on the parents to maintain the HLs but also on the schools to motivate the parents to promote their HLs (Varcasia 2011). Language upkeep and development is required in all languages the child speaks. When this does not happen, the child will never be completely fluent in any of the languages. Another danger is that the relationship between the multilingual children and their parents may get damaged when the HL is not developed (ibid.). This obviously is an undesirable outcome for all involved.

The BSLA on the other hand are those who acquired their languages later in life (Werker et al. 2006) like those who learn a new language in high school or as an adult when they move to another country.
Grosjean (2010) refers to bilingualism as people using two or more languages in their everyday life. The active use of the languages in this definition is added because people can easily fall in and out of bilingualism. When a language is not used on a daily basis; a process of language forgetting starts; leading to language loss. This can take up to years. Changes in the lives of bilinguals, such as immigration or the loss of a close family member, may be the start of language loss. It is not clear whether a language is really forgotten or is simply deactivated in a way that one can no longer access it correctly (Grosjean 2010). Children can go in and out of bilingualism in a very short time. In order to remain bi- or multilingual, a child needs input from all languages. All languages need to be used and developed, mainly on abstract concepts. When a language is not needed for school, to communicate at home or elsewhere, it becomes a challenge to use and develop that language. The need for a particular language seems to be a precursor for the upkeep and the continuing development of that language. Simultaneously, in the multilingual family, everyone is using mixed words, phrases and sentences that make up a family’s insider language (Luke 2003). This phenomenon that is common amongst CCKs in general and TCKs in particular, should be avoided any one language when possible. It might lead to a lack of vocabulary, but also to a lack of the nonverbal language or body language that is being used in that language.

3.3.4 Bilingualism and biculturalism

Bilingualism is a phenomenon not only seen among multicultural families or in expat families. Bi- or multilingualism is the most common linguistic condition of societies as no state is exclusively monolingual (Mendoza-Denton 2010). People all over the world speak multiple languages, simply because they need to (Storti 2001). That said; being bilingual does not necessary mean that an individual is also bicultural and a bicultural individual is not necessarily bilingual. While bilingualism is not congruent with biculturalism, many bilinguals are indeed also bicultural (Grosjean 2010). This is caused by the fact that when we acquire a new language, we are also (partially) acquiring a new worldview. After all, we can’t learn a language without learning the “grammar” and “vocabulary” of that culture and accompanying worldview (Storti 2001). Learning a new language allows us to gain knowledge on the particular culture. It allows us to become culturally competent as we learn the beliefs and values behind different local norms; it allows us to see the world from a new point of view (Storti 2001). This is especially true when we learn a language in its natural setting. We then become aware of a different way of thinking by being emerged in the culture and language.
For most bicultural people, one culture is more dominant than the other. The dominant culture can however be changed over time or is depending on context (Grosjean 2010). Unlike bicultural people, most bilingual people can deactivate one language depending on the situation. When they do, they shift identity (Byram 2006). Deactivating specific mannerisms of one of their cultures in a monocultural situation is, however, not always possible for bicultural people.

3.3.5 Language and identity

“Languages symbolizes identities and are used to signal identities by those who speak them” (Byram 2006 p. 5). Every group has its own language, whether it is a nation, a family, a soccer club or a company. In order to feel part of a particular group, one has to speak its language. There is an especially strong connection between language and a sense of belonging to a national group, a sense of national identity (Byram 2006; Llamas, 2010). In fact, the relation between language and identity is more than strong; language is an integral part of culture, identity and nationalism (Storti 2001). Not only do we identify ourselves for a large part by our language (e.g. I speak Dutch, I am Dutch), others make assumptions about our identity based on our language expression too. Ascriptions of linguistic competence are commonly linked in people’s minds to visible markers; if you look Vietnamese, you must be able speak Vietnamese. Wrongful identity ascription as well as the disempowerment and humiliation it can generate occur in situated community contexts – in one’s host or home country (Luke 2003). Although language is often a strong give away when it concerns our identity, our identity is not only assumed based on our linguistic skills, but we are also judged and positioned based on our body language, the way we dress, our actions and our behavior (Clark 2009).

Michael Byram (2006) studied the link between language and identity. He found that when the EL is different from the HL(s), there might be implicit or explicit encouragement to forget the language of the home. This could mean that different social identities of a child can be weakened or forgotten. But it is not only the formal language teaching that influences the relation between language and identity; also natural language acquisition can have consequences for the identity development. An important language/identity link is the one between national language and national identity (Byram 2006).

Children develop their spoken language naturally and inevitably but written language has to be formally taught and learnt. In most schools, the children learn to read and write in
the language of the nation. The process of learning the nation’s language is part of the process of developing one’s national identity. This is a process in which the whole school curriculum clearly plays an important role as many of the school teachings are icons of national identity (Byram 2006). In this way a collective memory is created in the nation’s language which children will use to identify themselves with the social group called ‘the nation’ (Byram 2006). The better developed a child’s language is, the more he or she will identify with the national identity. This is not only truth for the EL, but for any language a child acquires.

3.4 Sense of Home and of Belonging

According to Wise (2000, 297), home and identity are inseparably linked. Both are a result of territorialization. Home is not an originary place from which identity arises; nor is it the place we ‘come from.’ It is the place we are (Wise 2000). As a result, home and territory are linked, as are territory and identity, and thus home and identity (ibid.). In this paragraph this link will be further discussed.

The home is commonly understood as a geographical location that represents a place and a sense of belonging. The home is used as a symbol for this sense of belonging, but also for nostalgia, memory and rootedness as a place can acquire deep meaning through the steady accretion of sentiment (Brickell 2012). The home is a formation of space, a territory that has been made home with a collection of objects. The presence of loved ones is another important marker of home (Wise 2000). Basically the home is the creation of a space of comfort (Wise 2000); a comfort that can originate in a place, material collection or relations.

High mobility in the last decades caused the creation of a new kind of home: the imaginative (Brickell 2012). The home is not only a physical location in which people reside, but also an imaginative and metaphorical space of emotion and belonging (ibid.). CCKs often simultaneously have a geographical place they call home as well as an imaginative home. In this paragraph I will discuss the sense of home and belonging as it is for TCKs. Depending on the context, this is not applicable to all CCKs.

For TCKs, a home always involves encounters between those who stay, those who arrive and those who leave (ibid.). This implies that home is always in movement (Wise 2000). Travel is always about to happen, for vacation, family reunions or relocation. The
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3 This also applies in countries where there is more than one official national language.
inevitable movements can cause an individual to feel a sense of not belonging anywhere. With the loss of a sense of belonging can cause a shift from identification with over there as ‘home’ to ‘homelessness’, from membership as ‘one of us’ to outsider, foreigner and stranger in a strange land that once was home (Luke 2003). For adults it is a choice to move from one location to another and to be ‘homeless’. For TCKs however, this is not a choice, but part of their being (Ahmed 1999). Quite often, the parents have roots in a particular place, and parents will refer to this as home. For the children, this place is not home. When parents go home for vacation with their children, children do not feel that they are going home. It is after all the parents’ home and not theirs. The children will feel they go home, when the family returns to the place they live, after the vacation. That place is home to them, even if this is just a temporarily one (Luke 2003).

TCKs often don’t have a place they call home; they have live in far too many places to allow any place to secure their roots (Ahmed 1999). TCKs, but also many other CCKs, generally find a sense of belonging in social relationships rather than in a place (Luke 2003). This does not mean that TCKs as well as many other CCKs don’t feel a sense of belonging in any geographical place, on the contrary. They often feel a sense of belonging in multiple places in the world. The one constant in a TCKs life is the relocation. The space of the literal journey between the moments of departure and arrival is quite often the most comfortable space for many TCKs (Ahmed 1999). That is where they feel at home and where they feel they belong. In fact it is the place their parents always refer to as home that is the most unfamiliar. For TCKs this is an imagined place of origin, where they are nothing more than just guests, relying on the hospitality of others.

Many TCKs refuse to claim one particular geographical space as they may lack a sense of home or belonging. But the need to belong and the longing for home always remain (ibid.). Geography is also not the place where TCKs find their identity. They find their identity in relationships to other people, whether it is family or friends (Luke 2003). Thus the high mobility of TCKs and many CCKs allows for new forms of identity thinking. A sense of belonging or home is found in the shared experience of being ‘homeless’. It is the high mobility or the absence of a home that creates a new community that offers a common bond based on shared experiences. It offers many TCKs a sense of belonging. This forming of a new community provides a sense of fixity through the language of heritage – a sense of inheriting a collective past by sharing the lack of a home rather than sharing a home (Ahmed 1999). By refusing to belong in a particular place, the world becomes their home and the ability to see the world becomes the basis for a global identity and community (ibid.). For
TCKs, a great part of their identity as well their (sense of) home is constructed of movement, communication and social relations (Wise 2000).
Chapter four

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

4.1 General

Although our identity is continuously changing, the main part of our identity develops while we are adolescents (age 12 – 25) (Lievegoed, 2011). For this reason the preferred age for subjects was 25 years or older. Nine of the ten persons interviewed were between 34 and 65 years old, while one subject was only 18. The reason she was selected is because she is one of the only two respondents that matched the initial described research population.

Although I was aiming to interview two persons of each subcategory of TCKs, I did not receive enough response to be that selective. Instead, I interviewed ten ACCKs, of which an adult missionary kid (AMK), three adult military brats (AMBs) as well as five other TCKs/CCKs. It was difficult to categorize every subject in a particular box. None of the stories and experiences of my subjects were to be simplified to a general category. For example, do you categorize the child that leads the military lifestyle because a parent works as a civilian on military bases a military brat, while technically she is not? Do you categorize the woman that grew up in a country foreign to her parents, a migrant, while her parents always planned to one day go home, but in the end never did? Though difficult to categorize, the subjects do represent a good mix of different international experiences, while sharing the experience of a cross-cultural childhood. Of the ten subjects interviewed only four have parents of different nationalities. Of the six subjects that have parents of the same nationality, two have parents of different cultures within that nation.

Although the duration differed, all subjects have lived in their original passport country, the country that gave them a passport after birth. Two subjects lived in their passport country their entire upbringing (until the age of 18); six subjects lived in their passport country between three and six years while two subjects had only lived in their passport country for respectively one and two years.

With the purpose to contribute to the protection of the subjects’ identity, I will only refer to all of them female.
4.2 Findings

A brief summary of each subject’s individual stories will follow in the next paragraphs.

4.2.1 Subject 1

Subject 1 has parents with different nationalities and she carries both of these. Initially her military dad declined her the mother’s nationality, but she acquired it later in life after all. Subject 1 was born in a third country and only raised bilingual until the age of two. After that home and educational language were English, except for a short period in the teenage years where the educational language was her mother’s mother tongue. She never lived in her mother’s country of origin, and only two years in her father’s country. The parents divorced when she was two and the custody battle took place in the father’s country. Between the age of four and 18, she lived in four different countries; of which one was a country where the communal and educational language was the mother’s mother tongue. In the other three countries, the educational language was her father’s language, while the communal language was a different language. Now she feels that she is equally fluent in both her father’s mother tongue as well as her mother’s mother tongue, although more comfortable speaking her father’s language. Subject 1 lived here from the age of nine to 13 and even the home language was the mother’s language again. Father’s country of origin was visited once a year; alternating between visiting the grandparents and the father. Mother’s country was visited more often and subject 1 had a close relationship with the maternal grandmother.

Subject 1 feels that she does not have a home and yet home is nowhere and anywhere. She mentioned the continent that includes her mother’s country as home ‘country’. This is also the continent where she finds her sense of belonging, rather than in one particular country. But she does not know ‘what’ she is, she has no sense of national identity. She dislikes the societies of both her mother’s and her father’s country of origin, yet in international championships she supports the team of her mother’s country.

4.2.2 Subject 2

The parents of subject 2 have different cultures and come from different countries. Her mother, however, acquired the same nationality as her father. Subject 2 was born in the home country of her mother where they were really close to her maternal family. She was raised bilingual until the age of five, yet both home and educational languages were her father’s mother tongue during this period. When they left the country, subject 2 never went back nor has she seen her mother’s family members because of family issues. There was also limited
contact with her father’s family. Between the age of five and 13, she lived in two different countries, neither of which was her father’s or her mother’s home country. Her father did not allow much interaction with locals and did not allow any cultural influence from her mother’s country. Both educational and home languages were her father’s language and family traditions celebrated were those from her father’s culture. Her father was very strict about subject 2 being from his country and having that country’s nationality. At the age of 13, her parents got a divorce and subject 2 moved with her mom to her father’s home country. As she was always told that she had the national identity of this country and did feel that she did; she was surprised to find that she found herself to be an outsider. She described herself undergoing an identity crisis as at that point in her life she did not know who she was anymore. Before and after the move to her father’s country, she has never been close to any family of her father’s side.

To subject 2 home is anywhere where it is comfortable and where her husband and children are. Home is the current country she lives in, but she still reckons herself to be at home in her father’s country, despite the cool relationship with her father. She feels that she belongs with her husband and children. Considering identity, she feels to be an international citizen. But asked where she is from, she will say that she is from her father’s country. Her mother’s country is to her the country that she was born in and where her grandparents are from.

4.2.3 Subject 3
Subject 3 and her parents are all from the same country and have the same nationality. Her parents were missionaries and because of this, she spent only six years of her childhood living in her passport country. The remaining years she lived in the country where her parents did missionary work. She would live one year in her passport country followed by three or four years in the mission country, where they lived in many different locations. While living in the mission country, the contact with the family at home was limited as it was expensive back in those days to telephone. Subject 3 and her family never went home for vacation and they never had visitors. This was not an issue for the children, as they always knew that they would go back for a year within the near future and eventually they would move back for good. From the age of seven, subject 3 went to boarding school 160 kilometers away from her parents. This caused the relationship between her and her parents to become more difficult. She felt that her parents were never there for her; that they had left her. She saw her parents twice a year during holidays. As a young adult, subject 3 dealt with a lot of
unresolved grief because of it and it took many years for her to be able to be in the same room as her parents again.

The home language has always been her mother tongue. While being in the mission country, the communal language was the local language as was the educational language until the age of six. After that they educational language was her mother tongue.

To subject 3, home is not a geographical spot. It is living somewhere long enough to hang up pictures. Home is about the people, not the place. She is home when she is with people with similar upbringing. She feels at home in the mission country, but that country is still not home to her although she spent most of her childhood years there. During all that time her passport country was defined as home; it was the place where they would ‘go home’ to one day. Subject 3 defines a sense of belonging as to feel at home. She feels she doesn’t belong anywhere completely as she always feels being different unless she is with other TCKs. Although she feels that she belongs more in her passport country than in the mission country, she always misses the mission country, as it is a large part of her identity.

Subject 3 always knew that she was from her passport country. That was ‘who’ she was. But she feels that she is more than that. She says to have a mixed identity. Her appearance is different than that of most people in the mission country, but in her heart she is from there. She lives in her passport country, but she is from the mission country. If you ask her where she is from, she can give at least five different answers. The answer given will depend on time and context. As many other TCKs she finds this an annoying question.

In international sport championships, she will always support and cheer for the mission country and she still follows the political situation of that country.

4.2.4 Subject 4

Subject 4 is a military brat born out of a bicultural marriage. Her parents have different nationalities. She was born in the country of her father. They moved to his mother’s country when she was three, then moved back when she was seven years old. They moved again to her mother’s country when she was nine. At the age of 14, the family moved to another country where they stayed until she was 18.

Subject 4 was not raised bilingual. Both parents spoke the father’s language. The educational language, just as the home language, had always been the father’s language. The communal language has been the mother’s language when they lived in the mother’s country. Home to subject 4 is the particular city where her mom and sisters live. This is also in the same country where she was born and where she lived to the age of two and from the age of
seven to nine. Her sense of belonging however, are not to be found in this location. She feels that she belongs in an international environment.

She only lived in her father’s country for four years during her childhood. Yet, asked where she is from, she will answer that specific country. Her sense of national identity is the same country as is her passport country. In fact, she is so proud to be from her father’s country that she joined the military there as an adult. Yet, in the case of any kind of world championship, she will cheer for her mother’s country, as it is a big part of who she is. After all, she lived in that country for nine years of her childhood. Her family celebrated traditions from both her father’s as well as her mother’s country. The relationship with family members from both countries was close, no matter where they lived.

4.2.5 Subject 5

The parents of subject 5 are from two different countries on the same continent. They have different nationalities. Subject 5 lived in her father’s country during her entire childhood, but she and her family visited her mother’s family and country of origin very frequently, at least every summer. The relationships with her mother’s family were tight. She was raised bilingual and is fluent in both her father’s and mother’s language. Besides being raised with the two different languages, the family also celebrated traditions from both countries and ate food traditional to both countries as well. With the strong presence of the two cultures during her upbringing, subject 5 feels at home in both her father’s and her mother’s country. She describes a ‘home’ as a “warm feeling” and “a specific place.” Whenever she enters the country her mother originated from, she feels not just at home, but that “that is my culture, my language and my people.” Although her sense of belonging is with the country she was brought up in, her mother’s country is a big part of her identity as many of her beliefs and behaviors are not in line with those of her country of upbringing. Despite the big part her mother’s country plays in her life, in international competitions, she will always support her father’s country.

4.2.6 Subject 6

The parents of subject 6 are both from the same country and share the same nationality. Before subject 6 was born, they moved to another country and considered this move temporarily, even though they eventually never moved back home. Subject 6 was born in the country that her parents had moved to, yet she received her parent’s nationality. The home language was always that of her parents while both educational and communal languages were the national language of the country of residence. Her parents were extremely strict and
consequent in the maintenance of the home language, primarily because they were still planning on moving back home one day. She received home language lessons, she had to read books in the home language and she wrote letters and made cassettes in the home language to send to the family ‘back home’. The traditions celebrated by the family were those of ‘home’, the country her parents had moved from. As subject 6 mentions: “my parents were always on the way home, so we were not supposed to stay in the new country that long. As a child, you wait for that day to come and believe that your identity equals your nationality and that you will go home one day. So you never fit in completely. You feel like a foreigner. It was traumatic.” At the age of 15, subject 6 decided to move to the home country of her parents, as she always believed this place to be perfect. Although her parents did not encourage the move, they allowed her to go. She moved in with her grandparents and stayed there until she was 19. She loved living in the home country of her parents. She did not want to go back to visit her parents during the summer and the Christmas period, yet “my parents made me.” She does not know where home is, yet she feels at home in her house. Where her children and husband are. This home is where she belongs. She does not feel a sense of belonging in the city where she lived with her grandparents, nor in the city where she grew up. She always felt to be different in both cities. Although she does not feel part of the culture of her parent’s country and her language skills are not fluent enough to converse at a deeper level, she will name this country when asked where she is from. She said: “every time I come there, I feel very proud. It is the most beautiful country in the world. That is me, my country.” Yet she also states to feel detached from the people and the language.

When asked about her national identity, subject 6 feels more that she is from her parents’ country than from the country she was born and lived in until the age of 15.

4.2.7 Subject 7
The parents of subject 7 are from the same country. This country consists of several islands. Her parents divorced when she was just 18 months old and she never saw her father again. After the divorce, her mother moved to the main island in the same country to study leaving subject 7 with her grandparents. She stayed with her grandparents on the island she was born until the age of nine. The communal language was the local language of the island, while both the educational and home language were the language of the main island of this country. At the age of nine, she was sent to the main island by airplane to live with her mother. Her mother had remarried a man that originated from the same island as her and that worked as a soldier in the military force of the main island. A week after her arrival, she and the family
moved to another country where she went to an international school. The home and educational language stayed the same, yet the communal language was of course the national local language. At the age of 15 the family moved back to the main island of her country of origin. Her birth island had gained its independence by now. At the age of 18 she joined the military of the main island of the country that her birth island no longer belonged to. She moved back to the country where she lived from the age of nine to 15 and of which she had learned to speak the language fluently.

The relations with the family from the island she was born on in her country of birth always remained very strong, despite the fact that she never went back until the year 2000. Asked where she is from, she mentioned that her answer depends on the context of the conversation. But asked where ‘home’ is and she will name her birth island if she is in a romantic mood. An alternative for another ‘mood’ was not given. However, later in the interview she mentioned that going to the country where she lived from the age of nine to 15, is like going home. She can feel at home anywhere and feels a sense of belonging wherever she is. Although she follows the news on all three countries she lived in during her childhood, she will cheer for a sports team of her birth island any time of the day! Traditions celebrated in the family were always the traditions from the island of birth.

Subject 7’s sense of national identity is singular despite the fact that it consists of two countries: birth country – birth island. Her national identity is that of the birth country, with the addition of the birth island to specify which island of that country she connects her sense of national identity to. She explains that everybody born on her birth island before the independence would a sense of national identity of the birth country. Those born on the birth island after the independence feel to have the identity related to just the birth island as a sovereign country. She feels that her sense of national identity is more connected to the birth country because of the history than because she lived there part of her live. Although influenced by the third country, she does not feel that country to be part of her identity.

4.2.8 Subject 8

Subject 8’s parents are from different countries within one sovereign state. During her childhood, there always seemed to be a clear distinction between both regions. She was born in her father’s country, but the family moved to a country outside the state when she was

---

4 With the term ‘birth island’ I refer to island that she was born on and to the sovereign country it is today. With her birth country I refer to the set of islands that her birth island once was part of and of which she received the passport by birth.
three months old. Being a military brat, moving around was normality. Until she turned 18, the family lived in four other countries and spent two additional periods in her father’s country. Except for in two countries, subject 8 always went to local schools. The home language was the national language of her parents. Her mother also spoke the dialect of the country she was from, but not to subject 8.

These international experiences formed subject 8 as a person. She still feels ill at ease in an environment where everyone is from the same country, whether overseas or within the country. Not only can’t she identify a home, she also never felt at home anywhere she lived or felt that she belonged. To the question where she is from, she answers that her answer depends on her mood; sometimes she will answer with the home country of her mother and sometimes the her passport state, but never the country where she was born and lived again during her childhood for two different periods. Asked what country of the state of her nationality she is from, she will answer that she is from the country her mother originated from, although she never lived there, nor was she born there. This area feels familiar to her and yet it does not. She was raised with the rich history of the area and the culture, yet not with the dialect or the traditions. Even though she does not feel a sense of belonging to this country, she states to have this country’s identity.

4.2.9 Subject 9
The parents of subject 9 came from different parts of the country that she was born in. Not only did these areas have different cultures, they also had different languages. The home language however, was the national language, which was nor her father’s nor her mother’s language. Subject 9 lived in the country of birth her whole life, but she and her parents lived in another part of the country than either one of the parts her parents were from. The communal language here was different than the national or her parent’s languages. Although subject 9 understands the communal language where she was raised, as well as both her parents’ languages, her mother tongue, and the only language she is fluent in, is the national language of her home country.

She expresses that she can’t identify what the regional culture she was brought up with. Regional cultures in this country differ immensely. Subject 9 was uncertain about which regional culture was dominant at home. Although not sure, she expects to be more influenced by her mother’s culture as the family visited that part of the country and not her father’s region of origin. There were no ties to her father’s family. The connection to this part of the country as well as to her paternal family is one of curiosity, because, as she says, she is
rooted there as her father grew up in that region. She used to feel very emotional attached to the region her mother came from, but now that region feels just like the place where family was. Now that grandparents, aunts and uncles are passing away, the emotional connection seems to be gone as well.

Subject 9 does now live in another country. When she visits the country that she grew up in, she feels angry and frustrated. She expects that this is because she does not feel accepted there. She considers home to be a physical place where she feels comfortable and where her family is. She feels a sense of belonging in any country where she feels accepted. So she does not feel that she belongs in her country of origin, yet she felt she belonged in several other countries that she lived in. She will name the country she grew up in as to where she is from. If someone from within that country would ask her the same question, subject 9 would mention the city she lived in her entire childhood, rather than the region as where she is from. She does not recognize anything in that city anymore; therefore she now only sees it as a connection with the past. She relates her national identity to the country she was born in.

4.2.10 Subject 10

Subject 10’s parents have the same nationality. But subject 10 was not born in her parent’s country and during her childhood she only lived there 1 year, from the age of 17 to 18. The rest of the time she moved six times to three different countries. Before the move to her parent’s home country at the age of 17, the educational and communal language had always been different than the home language. Yet the EL and the CL have always been the same language. From the age of 17 to 18, HL, EL and CL were the same. Subject 10 is bilingual; she is fluent in both the language of her parents (the HL) and the EL and CL she grew up with until the age of 17. Subject 10 is now most comfortable speaking the EL and CL of her childhood.

Subject 10 is very clear about where home is. Home is the country she currently lives in with her husband and children. This is not a country where she lived as a child. But to the question where she feels she belongs, she answers that she is most comfortable in the city she lived in from the age of five to seven. She says she is happiest there, but yet she doesn’t feel that she belongs there. She says she doesn’t belong anywhere. To the question where she is from, she answers that she is from two countries; her parent’s country where she lived from the age of 17 to 18 and the country she was born in and lived in from birth to the age of five; from nine to 13 and from sixteen to seventeen. She also carries both these nation’s passports.
Despite only living in her parent’s country for one year during her childhood, she still feels she is ‘from there’ as that country was always so present in her life. They were always close connected to the family there and visited frequently. The family celebrated traditions from both home and host cultures. During world cups of any kind, she cheers for either one of the two countries she feels she is from, she has no preference for the winner. The country she cheers from depends on her company at that time.

Subject 10 has no sense of national identity; rather she has a sense of continental identity, the continent she lived on from birth to the age of 17.

4.3 Analysis

4.3.1 National identity

David Polluck (2009) states that when parents decide to move to another country, it is likely for their children to wind up with a broader sense of cultural identity. In my research I found that the same applies to national identity as four of all ten subjects have a sense of singular national identity, while three expressed that they feel like having two national identities. For this latter group they may feel closer to one than the other but would still not exclude the second national identity. Two of the remaining three subjects consider themselves as international citizens without linking their sense of identity to any specific country.

The remaining subject (subject 1) is the 18 year old as discussed before. Most respondents mention dealing with identity crisis at some point when they were in their teens and/or early twenties and subject 1 confirmed this. While subject 1 is still struggling to find her identity, the other subjects all seemed to have found peace with their (lack of a) sense of national identity, whether singular or more complex. Although subject 1 said to feel detached from any culture, her identity is still developing for a few more years to come. As stated before, the main part of our identity develops between the age of 12 and 25 (Lievegoed, 2011), hence, the identity forming process is not yet completed for the 18 year old. The relation between identity crisis and national identity will not be analyzed any further as this is not the scope of this thesis. The possible relation between identity crisis and national identity development requires separate research.

4.3.2 Sense of national identity in relation to passport country

Nine of the subjects have the same passport(s) as both their parents. For three of them this means they have dual citizenship. Six of these subjects name their passport countries in
relation to their sense of national identity. Two of them are the only subjects that mention a second country (of which they don’t have a passport) in relation to their sense of national identity. Two other subjects did not claim a national identity similar to their nationality. The two subjects that acquired an additional passport later in life, other than that of their parents, are the two subjects that claim to have an international identity.

Four subjects have a singular national identity based on one nation. Three of which mention their passport country as their national identity while one subject mentions a country that is part of her passport issuing state as her national identity. The parents of another subject have passports issued by different countries. This subject only carries the same passport as her father and this is also the only country she mentions in relation to her national identity. The fourth subject has a passport of her birth island as well as her birth country. She names both in relation to her identity.

Of the remaining six subjects, only two had dual citizenship while growing up. They share nationality with both their mother and father. One of these subjects for example, has parents with different nationalities; she has both nationalities: “My national identity relates to my father’s country, but a big part of my identity is also related to my mother’s country.” In paragraph 4.3.5 I will further analyze this statement of subject 5. The other four only have one passport, the same as both parents. Yet they claim a national identity that is more than their passport.

According to the research sample of this study, there seems to be a linkage between passport country and the sense of national identity. Those who acquired an additional passport have an international identity. Those that share only nationality with one parent, claim this country as their national identity unless they acquired an additional passport. Finally, whether or not the parents are of different nationality, when the subjects share nationality with both parents, the same country (if parents have the same passport country) or countries (if parents have different passport countries) are mentioned in relation with their national identity. The only exception in the above mentioned is subject number 1 who is still in the phase of developing her identity.

---

5 The birth island of subject 7 used to be part of her birth country (see footnote 2). “Anyone born on the birth island before 19xx would relate the national identity to the birth country. Those that were born after the independence relate their national identity to the birth island” (subject 7).
4.3.3 Sense of national identity in relation to the countries of residence

In this paragraph I identify three variables that I consider a possible influence on the identity development; these are: 1) The number of countries of residence 2) Countries of residence during the identity development phase 3) Residency in countries of passport. There might be more, but I will limit my analysis to these three variables. The possible relation of a sense of national identity with (lack of) residency in the countries of the subjects’ parents’ countries of origin will be discussed in paragraph 4.3.4.

4.3.3.1 Number of countries of residence

Nine of the subjects have had anywhere between one and four different countries of residence. Seven of these subjects have a sense of national identity; while two of these subjects do not; they have an international identity. Only one subject (subject 1) has lived in more than four different countries. Although she is still in the age range (12 – 25) during which her identity is continuously changing (Lievegoed, 2011), the number of different countries she lived in (six), might also be part of the reason why she is not sure of what her national identity is at this point in her life. Another reason might be that she never lived in her mother’s country of origin and in her father’s country of origin only at a very young age (2 – 4). Either way, considering her age, it is hard to tell if any of these reasons will indeed impact her sense of national identity that she may develop later on.

Based on the data in this research, it seems that subjects that lived in three or less countries during their childhood have a sense of national identity. This is true for six of the subjects. Of the four subjects that lived in four or more countries during their childhood, three subjects do not have a sense of national identity. As there is only one person that lived in more than four countries, and this person is also still in the identity development phase, it is not possible to draw any conclusion of this. Further research is necessary to determine if living in more rather than a few countries indeed complicates the identity formation process as to result in not having a sense of national identity.

4.3.3.2 Countries of residence during identity development phase

As stated before, the age range of 12 – 25 is the most important age range for identity development (Lievegoed, 2011). Therefore, it is likely that the countries of residence during this age bracket have the greatest influence on the national identity development. This

---

6 The number of countries of residence does not necessarily equal the number of moves. Some subjects moved out of and back to particular countries, while others moved within countries.
research only focuses on factors during childhood that might be of influence on the sense of national identity; therefore this paragraph will only focus on the countries of residence during the period in which the subject was 12 to 18 years old. Whether or not the countries of residence during this period are the passport countries will not be discussed in this paragraph, but in paragraph 4.3.4.

As one subject does not have a sense of national nor international identity, it is difficult to identify if the countries she lived in when she was between 12 and 18 influence this. These countries could have contributed to the confusion, but this is difficult if not impossible to determine. Two subjects lived in respectively 2 and 3 countries during this phase and have a sense of international identity. These countries might have influenced why they have an international rather than a national identity. This is true for one of these subjects, as we will see in paragraph 4.3.4. The other subject lived in two different countries on a particular continent (from age 12 to 17) and spent her 18th year in her country of nationality, which is on a different continent. The fact that she relates the continent where she lived from age 12-17 to her national identity, and the fact that she lived in two different countries on that continent during this time might have influenced her sense of international identity.

Two subjects having the national identity (NI) of their passport country, while also feeling connected to a second country, lived in their passport country from the age of 15 to 18. They lived in the country they also feel connected to, from the age of 12 to 15. There seems to be a likely relation between their national identity and the countries they lived in. Three subjects lived in two countries between the age of 12 and 18, yet they name another country in relation to their national identity. There does not seem to be a relation between these countries of residency and their national identity.

Two subjects with the NI of their passport country, while one of them also feel connected to a second country, only lived in their passport country when they were between 12 and 18 years of age. The same country they mention in their relation to their national identity. So there seems to be a relation between country of residence and national identity in this case.

For six subjects there seems to be a relation between their (lack of a) national identity development and the countries they lived in when they were between 12 and 18 years old. That is more than half of the research population. For three subjects there does not seem to be a relation. However, both a false relation and a false non-relation between national identity development and countries of residence between the age of 12 and 18 are good possibilities. It is impossible to tell if a subject would have the same or a different national identity if she
hadn’t live in the countries she lived in. Also, not living in a particular country can strengthen a sense of nationality, which we saw with subject 8.

4.3.3.3 Residency in countries of passport

All subjects have lived in their passport country, but the duration varies between one year and 18 years. Four subjects don’t name this country in relation to their sense of national identity, three of which say not to have a national identity. For two subjects this could be explained by the limited time they lived in their passport country, respectively two (age 2 – 4) and one (age 17 – 18) years. These are the lowest number of years that any of the subjects have lived in their passport country. However, the two other subjects (one of which claims to have an international identity) lived for 5 years in their passport country, even within the age frame for identity development, and yet they do not mention these countries in relation to their national identity. The six remaining subjects all named their passport country in relation to their national identity. They lived in their passport country for respectively three, five, six, nine and 18 (2x) years.

The duration of living in the passport country thus seems to be a factor in national identity development; with only a couple of years not being enough to develop a national identity; yet any number of years longer than a couple seems to be sufficient to develop a national identity consisting of the passport country with or without another country.

It is interesting that one subject lived in her mother’s passport country for nine years, yet it is her father’s passport country she names in regards to her national identity, the very country that issued her passport. She does not have a passport of her mother’s country. Though she only lived in her passport (and her father’s) country for four years, living in her passport country seems to have had a larger influence than living in her mother’s country for nine years.

Does living in the passport country for more years lead to a greater possibility of developing a singular national identity (e.g. I am Dutch rather than Dutch-American)? Based on my analysis, this seems unlikely. The four subjects that have developed a singular national identity related to their passport country lived in there for respectively three, five, nine and 18 years. Yet two other subjects that lived in their passport country for quite some years (six and 18), do not feel an identity solely based on that nation.

I can only conclude from the above that there seems to be a relation between national identity development and residency in the passport country. It is however, difficult to determine whether living in the passport country actually influences the national identity.
development or that the national identity would have developed similarly also if not having resided in the passport country. Living in the passport country might influence identity development, but this might as well only be in relation with other factors, such as family relations, language and others. Additional research is necessary to confirm this.

4.3.4 Sense of national identity in relation to language

Five of the ten subjects have parents that speak different languages, but only one of these subjects was raised bilingual (father’s and mother’s language) during the entire 18 years of her childhood. As she lived in her father’s passport country for all those years, it is not surprising this subject states her NI to be related to her father’s country, yet she also feels connected to her mother’s country, which can be explained by fluency in her mother’s language. As I discussed in the theory chapter, language offers a connection between people (Lievegoed, 2003). By learning her mother’s language in addition to her father’s language, she not only acquired a language to communicate needs, experiences and emotions; she became part of her mother’s country and culture while simultaneously developing the worldview, concepts and emotions of her mother’s country (ibid.). Storti (2001) described that the mother tongue forms us. She is “equally fluent in my two mother tongues”, that both formed her.

Three subjects acquired a second language during their childhood that was the first language of either one of their parents; this was either the communal (for one subject) or the educational language (for the two other subjects) for respectively 11, 15 and 17 years. Two of these three subjects developed an NI that consists of their passport country, while also feeling connected to a second country. Their mother tongue is the language of their passport country. Their second language is the language of the country they also feel connected to. The third subject acquired a local language of the continent she lived on until the age of 17, the same continent she mentions in relation to her sense of international identity.

One subject that also has an international rather than a national identity, was raised bilingual for the first five years of her life. Another subject (also without national identity) was raised bilingual for the first two years of her life. Her mother decided to speak her language to her again when she was aged 9 – 13 years, as they lived in a country where this language was spoken. Although this subject became quite fluent in that language, she is still uncomfortable speaking it. After the family moved again, the home language was her father’s language, even though the father did not live with them anymore. The four remaining subjects have one mother tongue and did not acquire additional language fluency during their
upbringing. They all have a singular national identity. Two of these subjects have parents that speak different languages, but it seems that this is of no influence on identity development unless the child is actually raised with that particular mother tongue.

All subjects had exposure to different communal languages. Except for one subject, this has not seemed to have any influence on the identity development. For this subject, this communal language is actually her second language that she acquired while in the mission area. Language learning is considered necessary for the bonding process between missionaries and the local population (Reed, 1985). Gaining language proficiency is considered normal for the missionary who is deeply contexted in the new community (ibid.). The communal language became her second language and thus she became part of the country while developing it’s worldview.

Language seems to be of great influence on the development of national identity: those who only acquired one mother tongue (and thus worldview) have a singular national identity while those who were raised bilingual (even only for a limited number of years) developed a sense of national identity that included two or more nations. This corresponds with findings of Joseph (2004) and Edwards (2009) who both agree that language is an important identity marker: language reveals a speaker’s membership in a national group. Edwards (2009) also pointed out that the multiplicity of identities is matched by a range of speech styles and behavior. Although he meant the multiplicity of all sorts of social identities an individual can possess, this also seems to be true for national identities as shown by this research. The ability of speaking multiple languages results in multiple national identities, while the ability to speak only one language results in one singular national identity.

4.3.5 Sense of national identity in relation to sense of home and sense of belonging
The majority (six) of the subjects could not identify a place to call home, yet all but two, have a sense of national identity. This is not in accordance with what Macgregor Wise (2000) states in his article Home: Territory and Identity. Wise states that home and identity are inseparably linked and that home is a place we are. However, in my study, the majority of the subjects are not able to identify a particular place as home. Four subjects have a place they call home, but only three subjects do identify a place as home that somehow relates to their national identity. All three of these subjects name a place in their passport country as home and all three name their passport country in relation to their national identity. One subject has never even lived in this place, but it is the place where her mother and sisters live. One subject names specifically the neighborhood in her passport country where she lived during
her whole childhood as home. The third subject calls her birth island home, “when I am in a romantic mood”. The fourth subject that identified a particular place as home, yet a place that is not related to her national identity, calls the country where she currently lives with her husband and children, home. What is seen as home, according to this study, is not necessarily a symbol of rootedness (Brickell 2012).

Five out of the ten subjects said that home is wherever you are comfortable and where your family is. With ‘family’, four of these subjects mean their husband and children, while one subject refers to her mother and sisters. The presence of loved ones is generally considered an important marker of the home (Wise 2000). My findings confirm this as for five of the ten subjects family is a marker of the home. Wise (2000) concludes that the home is basically the creation of a space of comfort that can originate in a place, material collection or relations. This description of the home fits the answers of eight of the subjects. These findings correspond not only with Wise’s (2000) description of the home, but also with Luke’s (2003) argument that CCKs find a sense of home in relationships rather than in place. One subject for example mentions that home is when she is with people with the same upbringing; she creates a space of comfort (home) by surrounding herself with either other AMKs or people from the country where she resided most of her childhood. Two subjects can’t identify a home at all. If there is an inseparable relation between identity and home, it explains why one subject doesn’t have a sense of national identity as she also can’t identify a home. Another subject can’t identify a home either, yet she clearly has a sense of national identity. For her there is no linkage at all between the home and her national identity.

Carmen Luke (2003) mentioned that many CCKs generally find a sense of belonging in relationships rather than in place, just like they find a sense of home in relationships rather than in place. Only one of the subjects named an actual location as the place where she belongs. She named her father’s country as the place where she belongs as well as her mother’s country, yet in a lesser extent. Interesting is that the subject who does not have a sense of national identity nor a sense of home, says that she feels like she belongs in the continent that includes her mother’s country. Two subjects mentioned that they do not feel that they belong anywhere. Similarly to what Ahmed (1999) argued, the remaining six subjects mention a sense of belonging in their refusal to inhabit a particular space. The answers to the question where they belong, vary: “my family”; “wherever I am, it is a military thing”; “I feel I belong in any society that accepts me for who I am, so that is not my passport country”; “wherever I feel at home” and “I belong in an international environment.”
Where seven of the subjects have a sense of national identity, only three name an actual location as home and only one subject names a location as a place where she belongs. Therefore I have to disagree with Wise’s view (2000) that home and identity are inseparably linked. The sense of belonging seems even less linked with the sense of national identity. The sense of home and belonging seems to be linked to the cross-cultural lifestyle experienced as a child. The sense of home and the sense of belonging seem to be found more in relationships than in geography. While national identity is more likely to be linked to geography. This is contrary to the view of Carmen Luke (2003) who claims that geography is not the place where CCKs find their identity. As we have seen in previous paragraphs; the geography does not necessarily have to be a place that has been inhabited by the CCK at a certain time, but the geography is determined by passport and by language fluency.

4.3.6 Sense of national identity in relation to different aspects of family life

During the interviews I got the impression that also personal factors may play a large role in the identity development. What makes it hard to compare the different interviews is that nothing can be categorized in the same way. Each personal story has its twists and subtleties. Despite being unable to categorize some of the data, these data are interesting enough to legitimize a special paragraph to analyze if there is indeed a relation between the sense of national identity and different aspects of family life; such as the quality of family relations or being part of a specific business or expat community. Because this is about the personal stories of the subjects I will discuss their stories separately, and only those, which I believe to contain more information that is worth analyzing than already done. I will also use this paragraph to look at some questions that arose while writing the previous paragraphs.

Subject 1 lived neither in her mother’s nor in her father’s country of origin again after they left her father’s country at the age of two. The relation with her father was not very close. She only saw her father and paternal grandparents once every two years. Although there was limited contact with her mother’s family as well; she had a good relation with her maternal grandmother. The limited relation with her father and paternal grandparents might have influenced her lack of connection to this country and its culture. The reason she also did not connect with her mother’s culture, at least not enough to develop a sense of national identity, might be caused by the fact that she did not learn to speak her mother’s language until the age of nine; that she had limited connection with her mother’s family as well as limited access to the culture of her mother’s country. Llamas (2010) states that language is a key ingredient in the process of national identity formation. She describes how older
speakers, but also the media, arts and so on, transmit their culture and identities to the young. Language tends thus to mark out the social features on which national belonging will come to be based (ibid.). Without formal education, bilingual children cannot acquire language fluency in a particular language (Braun in Varcasia 2011). By not speaking to her daughter in her own language, the mother of subject 1 not only kept her from learning that language, but also from getting to know her culture.

The father of subject 2 was always “very strict about me being his country and not from my mother’s country.” The family had a “home culture that was purely influenced by my father’s country without any influences from my mother’s country, dad wouldn’t allow it.” When she was 13, her parents divorced and she moved with her mother to her father’s country. “I knew I was from my father’s country and thus far, I had related my national identity to that country, it was what I was told my whole life and how I was raised. But after finally moving there, I got an identity crisis; I just didn’t fit in. I didn’t feel my national identity was related to that country anymore, I didn’t know what or who I was.” After the move, the relationship with her father deteriorated and she has not seen him very often since. Despite the facts that subject 2 had (and still has) a passport from her father’s country and that she lived in that country during her identity developmental years, she did not develop a sense of national identity related to that country. Instead she considers herself an international citizen. Her father’s insistence on her identity being related to his country was not just limited to the denial of the heritage of her mother’s country, but he also denied her access to the local cultures where they resided. Outside her father’s country, she always lived in an expat bubble with a maid and driver. There was no playing in the streets with local kids or going to a local school. The change from this different lifestyle to being a ‘normal’ local child herself, led to the fact that she didn’t feel that she fit in when she finally did move to her father’s country. Also, she was never submerged in any local culture enough to develop a connection to these cultures. The above as well as the deteriorated relationship with her father seem to have influenced her national identity development. She had the following to say about this: “I have been very angry with my father, I feel part of me was stolen; my mother’s culture, my language, but also an international upbringing, the joy of learning new languages and being submerged in those other cultures.”

If numbers of years spent in each country of residence were of sole influence to the development of a sense of national identity, subject 3 would have named the country where she resided for her father’s work for 11 years in relation to her national identity. Yet she does not. A few factors may explain this. From the age of seven, she spent her time in that country
in a boarding school founded and run by her parent’s country. Both her and her parents have the same national passports and she always knew that one day they would move back to that country for good. The home language had always been the language of her parents. Her educational language was the same as her parents’ language since the age of six. One factor that might have been of influence as well is that the mission country had a complete different culture than her parents’ culture. The appearance of the people was also very different. Standing out by appearance, language and culture could have played a major role in her not identifying herself solely as coming from the mission country. Whether or not the huge difference in cultures was in fact a factor for her not to develop a sense of national identity solely related to the country where she lived for so many years can only be established by additional research. However, especially because her different appearance, language and culture and considering her time in boarding school and the fact that they were one day going home, another interesting question is why she does not relate her national identity to just her parent’s country. The lack of quality of family relations might be an explanation of this. The relationship with her parent’s was very cool and the relationship with other family members back home was almost non-existing. The absence of visitors, phone calls and home visits did not contribute to a better relationship either.

Once again, if the number of years lived in a particular country would be a strong influence on someone’s identity development, it would be quite possible for subject 4 to name her mother’s country in relation to her national identity; especially considering the fact that she grew up with a strong relation to her mother’s relatives and with her mother’s language (although not raised bilingual), traditions and food. Yet, she feels very strongly about her identity: “I am proud that my national identity is related to my father’s country.” The lack of national identity related to both her parent’s countries, shows that a close relationship with a particular parent as well as his or her relatives and the upbringing with the culture, traditions and food, do not necessarily result in a national identity related to country of this parent. Subject 4 only has a passport of her father’s country, and she never lived in that country during her identity developmental years. It may therefore be assumed that holding a certain passport is of stronger influence than years lived in a country, living in a country during identity developmental years, or good family relations. However, in the story of subject 4 there might be another very strong influence on her national identity development. As said, she is a military brat. She was born on a military base, which symbolizes the life of a military brat. The first world a military brat comes to know is the Fortress (Edwarts Wertsch, 2006). The Fortress is how Mary Edwarts Wertsch (2006)
describes the military institution: Military brats overseas often live on the military compound, go to (in this case) international schools and they live according to all rules and regulation of the military. The military institution dictates their social as well as their family life. The military subculture is very different from that of the civilian population around them, no matter where they live. As a result a particular lifestyle develops in which the national flag plays a central role (Edwards Wertsch, 2006; Polluck and Van Reken, 2009). It seems quite likely that besides her passport country and her being monolingual (father’s language), the military upbringing was a big factor on her national identity development. The two other military brats I interviewed (subject 7 and 8) have grown up with the military lifestyle as well (subject 7 from the age of 9). All three interviewed adult military brats choose to join the military themselves. All three served the country of their nationality. Subject 7 and 8 did not develop such a straightforward sense of national identity as subject 4. However, it comes close. Subject 7 grew up in her parents’ country and therefor relates her national identity to that country although her nationality is another. It was the country of her nationality whose military forces she joined, just like her stepfather. Subject 8 lived the state’s military lifestyle, even though she relates her national identity to her mother’s country, which is part of the sovereign state, whose military her father served. The military lifestyle thus seems to be of influence on the national identity development.

Subject 5 relates her national identity to her father’s country, but “my mother’s country is also a big part of my identity.” The culture and language of that country had played a big role in her upbringing, although she never lived there. Also, she had very close relationships to her maternal grandparents and other family members. It seems that contact and relation with external paternal or maternal family does seem to be of influence on national identity development.

Subject 6 lived in a country other than that of her parents until the age of fifteen. Even though she was born there, went to local schools and is fluent in the language, she still relates her national identity more to her parents’ country than to her country of upbringing. She only has a passport of her parents’ country. Once again, it seems that the years of living in a country does not influence the sense of national identity in a major way. As she relates her national identity to mainly her parents’ country, but also feels a connection to the country of her upbringing, part of that identity is obviously developed because she lived there and learned the language. Typical for Subject 6’s story is that her parents only

I also speak of my own experience here, as I am former military myself as well as a military spouse and mother of a military brat.
moved to the country where she grew up to stay there temporarily. As they always planned to go back home, her parents kept her “in a home culture bubble, we read books from there, had language lessons.” Growing up with traditions and the culture from her parents’ country in the home, she longed for this country that she expected to be the perfect place. At the age of 15, she moved there to live with her grandparents. Although she considers it indeed “the most wonderful country in the world”, she “always felt different in both countries.” Similar to the story of subject 2, subject 6 was always told that her identity was related to her parent’s country and thus she felt that that was who she was. Yet when she moved there, she felt different there too. Subject 6, unlike subject 2, still considers her national identity to be related to her parent’s country, while subject 2 feels she is an international citizen. They both grew up with traditions and food of their passport country, they both were told what identity to have and they both lived in their passport country during the identity developmental years. Yet, they have incomparable sense of national identity. This can be caused by the fact that subject 2 was born in a cross-cultural marriage and that she had lived in her mother’s country as well. But as we have seen already, living in a particular country does not seem to be much of a factor in identity development, it is more likely that this is caused by the close relation subject 6 has with both parents, the lack of a relation between subject 2 and her father and the fact that subject 2 was born out of a cross-cultural marriage.

Interesting in the story of subject 8 is that she states to have an identity related to her mother’s country rather than a State’s one. Raised as military brat, “The state always played a big role in my life.” Though both her and her parents have the nationality of the state, her mother is a strong nationalist. There was always a clear division made between her father’s and her mother’s country. Subject 8 was raised with the history and culture of her mother’s country, yet not with the language and traditions. There was no contact with her paternal family, even though they lived in her father’s country. The relation with her mother’s family was good and she visited them often. “My mother’s country was the continuity during my childhood, even when we were living in my father’s country.” The disconnection with her father’s country and the attachment to her mother’s country lead her to relate her identity to her mother’s country rather than to her parents’ state. It seems that because she has the same nationality as both her parents and because she grew up as a military brat; she has developed a sense of national identity that is related to her nationality but in particular to her mother’s country. This can only be explained by the emotional connection she has to her mother’s country (family, visits, vacations and her nationalist mother) as she never lived there, does not speak the language and does not carry a passport from that country. Family relations and
cultural influences seem to have had an influence on her national identity development. In this case, not living in her mother’s country might also have been a factor in her sense of national identity development.

According to my data, living a particular country appears only to have influence on the identity development if the subject lived in a country her entire childhood (subject 5 and 9). This also seems to be true for subject 10, who lived in one continent for 17 years, thus almost her entire childhood. She moved five times within this continent, living in three different countries, before she moved to her parent’s country, the country of her nationality, for the last year of her childhood. Her sense of national identity is continental. Her educational language was a continental language, different from her parents’ language. She grew up with traditions form both her parents’ country as well as from the continent. The fluency in the local language, the upbringing with traditions and the 17 years she spent there, must have contributed to her sense of Continental identity.
Chapter five

CONCLUSION

This study set out to investigate the variables that lead to a sense of national identity of the research population, being ACCKs living in Stavanger. This study also sought to reach the following research objectives:

RO1: To identify if there is a relation between the first language of both parents and the subject’s feeling of national identity
RO2: To identify if there is a relation between the relationships between subjects, their parents and their family and the sense of national identity
RO3: To identify if there is a relation between the actual time spent in a passport country and the sense of a particular national identity
RO4: To identity other factors that might be of influence on the sense of national identity

In this final chapter, I will present the conclusions of this research. I will also suggest some future research directions that could provide the next steps in gaining knowledge in the field of identity development.

5.1 Findings relating to research objective 1

This research agrees with Llamas (2010), Joseph (2004) and Edwards (2009) that language is a, if not the most, important identity marker and that language and identity are ultimately inseparable. Being raised bilingual (including EL and CL), even just for a limited amount of time, seems to result in a multiplicity of national identities; while the ability to speak only one language results in one singular national identity. Although I have shown that language is a very important marker for identity development, there are also other factors of influence.

5.2 Findings relating research objective 2

Being close to (a) parent(s) does not necessarily mean that a sense of national identity in relation to the parents’ home country will develop. In the majority of the cases where a sense of NI is non-existing, there is no relationship with one of the parents. In the majority of the
cases in general, a national identity developed for those subjects with a close connection to one or both parent(s). Although there are exceptions, there seems to be a connection between good relationships between parents and (A)CCKs; in cases of a good relationship, the relating country is part of the national identity and in cases of bad or non-existing relationships, the relating country is not, or to a lesser extent. Having a good relationship with both parents (when from different countries) make it more likely that ACCKs develop a dual national identity, while broken relationships may distance the ACCKs from a particular national identity.

An important factor of the relation with parents with regards to national identity development is the conviction of the parents of what the national identity of the child should be. Always having been specifically told to be of a certain nationality; knowing that living in a country is temporarily and knowing which country one is supposed to move back to appear to be of importance. The particular nationality turns out to be of great influence on the sense of national identity, but only when the relationship with the parents with this particular nationality is good. The worse the relationship with the parents is, the less a sense of national identity in relation to the nationality seems to exist in this case. When there is no existing relationship, the country of nationality is not a part of the national identity.

Relationships with extended family in the home country of the parents and submersion in a culture also impact the strength of the sense of national identity. In most cases, a stronger presence of a particular culture (e.g. celebration of national traditions; eating national food), lead to a greater influence on the national identity by the relating country. The scale of the presence of cultural aspects in the upbringing of the CCK seems to be a greater influence than the scale of the presence of relations with the extended family in the life of the CCK. A good relationship with relatives shows a positive relation with a sense of national identity. When these relationships fade, or are non-existing to begin with, the country of origin of these family members seems to have no part or a smaller part in the national identity of the ACCKs.

5.3 Findings relating to research objective 3

Based on the data in this research, there seems to be a positive relation between the passport country and the sense of national identity. In most cases where a national identity developed, the passport country was mentioned in relation to the national identity. A country, of which no passport was held, was only named in relation to the national identity in very few cases
and only as an addition to the passport country. When no national identity developed, additional passports were acquired. In cases of dual citizenship, both countries are considered part of sense of the national identity. When the CCK does not have the same passport as one of the parents, the country of this passport is also not mentioned in relation to the national identity.

Another relation was found between the duration of residency in the passport country and national identity development. Living in the passport country for only a couple of years seems to be a factor in the non development of a sense of national identity; yet any number of years of residency in the passport country longer than a couple seems to be sufficient to develop a singular or multiplicity of national identities.

While living in the passport country might influence identity development, this might as well only be in relation to other factors, such as family relations, language and others.

5.4 Findings relating to research objective 4

5.4.1 Other influential factors on the sense of national identity

Other factors that might be of influence on the development of a national identity have been identified. One possible factor was found in the number of countries that the ACCKs lived in during their childhood. When the ACCKs lived in three or less countries, a sense of a national identity developed. This is especially the case when the CCK lived in just one country her entire upbringing. When the ACCKs lived in four or more countries during their childhood, only some of them developed a national identity.

Also the particular countries ACCKs lived in during their identity development phase seem to be a factor in the development of national identity. For the majority of the research population there seems to be a relation between their (lack of a) national identity development and the countries they lived in when they were between 12 and 18 years old. However, I have to be careful drawing any conclusions. Both a false relation as well as a false non-relation between national identity development and countries of residence between the age of 12 and 18 are good possibilities. It is difficult to determine, if not impossible, whether or not a subject would have the same national identity if she had lived in different countries during the mentioned timeframe. Also, not living in a particular country can strengthen a sense of nationality, which one subject proved.

Another factor in the development of a national identity seems to be the military lifestyle. Children growing up as military brads all develop a national identity related to the
country of their parent’s military service. The reason for this can be found in the particular military environment of the family in which both the social network as well as the educational system is often part of that of the military’s nation. MBs also know that their stay in any country is just temporarily and that they will eventually go ‘home’. We see similar influences on MKs when they go to (boarding) schools set up by the sending nation.

5.5.2 Non-influential factors on the sense of national identity

A sense of home or a sense of belonging do not seem to be factors in the national identity development. This research disagrees with Carmen Luke (2003) that geography is not the place where CCKs find their identity as the majority of the research population names one or more countries in relation to their national identity. This is contrary to their sense of home and their sense of belonging, which CCKs do not find in geography. Both the sense of home and the sense of belonging seem to be linked to the lifestyle led as a child and can be found in relationships rather than in geography. Therefore this research has to disagree with Wise’s view (2000) that home and identity are inseparably linked.

5.5 Recommendations for further research

By using the method of grounded theory, conclusions have been built from the ground up, in this case from the stories and experiences of adults that grew up as CCKs. This study was thus highly exploratory. Further studies that expand on the conclusions here or identifies further factors to influence national identity development is recommended.

The following recommendations for further research are made:

• It would be very interesting to further research the level of influence great cultural or racial differences have on national identity development. Not only differences between parents if that is the case, but also between the parent’s home country and the host country.

• Not all CCKs face an identity crisis, however quite a few do. In this research only the three subjects that said not to have a national identity, mentioned an identity crisis at some point in their life. The possible relation between identity crisis and (the lack of) national identity development would be an interesting topic for further research.

• Additional research is necessary to determine if living in more than four countries indeed results in not having a sense of national identity.
• Additional research is also necessary to confirm that living in the passport country might influence identity development, but that this might as well only be in relation with other factors, such as family relations, language and others.

For future research I recommend a minimum age of the research population of 25. By doing so, all subjects should be beyond the identity development phase, which take place between the age of 18 and 25. During this research, one of the subjects was 18 years of age and thus at the very beginning of her identity development. It would be interesting to interview her again when she is 25 years or older, to see if her (lack of a) national identity development is in line with the findings of this research.

5.6 Final words

This research agrees with David Polluck (2009, p.232) that “when parents decide to move to another country, it is likely for their children to wind up with a broader sense of cultural identity.

This research however, has also shown that some ACCKs may develop a broader sense of national identity. While some ACCKs do develop a singular national identity, this does not seem to be related to living in a specific country as some live in one country their entire developmental years, yet develop a broader sense of national identity. While others live in several countries yet develop a singular national identity of a country they never lived in. While the home is often seen as a symbol of rootedness (Brickell 2012), this research shows that that does not seem to be the case for ACCKs.

Edwards (2009 p.19) said that “The essence of identity is similarity” (Edwards 2009 p.19). I have shown that for national identity, this similarity can mainly be found in language, but also in relations, traditions, nationality and countries lived in.

In the introduction, I expressed my wondering about my son’s national identity development. These questions of my son’s sense of national identity lead me to do this research. With this thesis I wish to make a contribution to the general knowledge on identity development among (A)CCKs. As the available literature on the subject of national identity development in CCKs is inconclusive, this research aimed to contribute to the existing literature. I hope that the results of this research will be used as information source by (other parents of) ACCKs and ATCKs about their (lack of or complicated) national identity or the (lack of) development of one. I also hope that this thesis will help them to get insight in their own process of identity
development. As a bare minimum, this research can give parents inside in the identity development of their children. Hopefully it will help them in supporting their children in this difficult phase of identity development.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Delfos, Martine F. (2009) Ik heb ook wat te vertellen; Communiceren met pubers en adolescenten. Amsterdam: B.V. Uitgeverij SWP


McCardle, Peggy and Hoff, Erika (2006) *Childhood Bilingualism; Research on Infancy through School Age.* Clevedon, Tonawanda and Ontario: Multilingual Matters Ltd


Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002) “Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research” in *International Journal of*


