

LUND UNIVERSITY

The Second-Generation Turkish-Germans Return 'Home': Gendered Narratives of Renegotiated Identities

Nilay Kılınç

Supervisor: Eleonora Narvselius



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

August 2013

Abstract

Turkish migration to Germany which started in the 1960s as ‘guestworker’ migration soon matured to a permanent settlement. Today, Turkish labour diaspora is the largest migrant group in Germany and Europe. The daughters and sons of the first generation Turkish migrants have a different understanding of ‘home’ compared to their parents. Their upbringing in Germany and transnational links to Turkey create a tension between their constructions of ‘belonging’ and ‘home’. This thesis evaluates the second generation’s constructions of ‘home’ within their ‘Turkish’ upbringing in Germany and their ‘return’ orientations and post-return experiences in Turkey. The special focus is given to gender roles and renegotiations in the second generation’s return journey. The empirical evidence comes from in-depth, semi-structured interviews carried out with a non-random sample of Turkish-Germans, interviewed in and around Istanbul in 2012. The analysis section of the thesis is built around answers and insights into three main sets of research questions. First, how did their upbringing within a Turkish family construct and affect their senses of ‘belonging’ and ‘home’? To what extent are nostalgia and family narratives effective on their ‘home’ constructions? Second, how did their childhood memories from Turkey affect their motivations to return to the parental homeland? Third, how does the second generation renegotiate their diasporic and gender identity in the parental homeland? Do they feel that they belong to Turkey? How do they reflect upon their diasporic past in Germany? The thesis analyses these questions with a reference to diaspora, memory, return migration, generation and gender theories. The findings illustrate that family narratives and Turkish upbringing are important components of the second generation’s ‘home’ constructions. However, the return experiences show that their ‘imagined home’ and ‘reality’ do not always match. Men and women experience the life within diaspora and return differently. The thesis contributes a new case-study to the growing literature on return migration; but also to diaspora and memory studies and gendered dimensions of migration.

Keywords: Second generation, Turkish-Germans, diaspora, return migration, gender, memory.

Acknowledgements

This research project grew out of an earlier programme of research that I conducted in collaboration with Willy Brandt Guest Professor Russell King during my internship at Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Welfare and Diversity (MIM). I would like express my deep gratitude to Prof. King for his valuable and constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this research work. The fieldwork travel and subsistence were also facilitated by Prof. King. Thank you for generously sharing your expertise and resources with me. My special thanks are extended to MIM family for their encouragement throughout my study.

I would like to thank my informants for giving their valuable time, and letting me into their lives. I also thank my father, grandparents, friends and neighbours in Istanbul who helped me with finding my informants.

Thanks are also in order for my supervisor Eleonora Narvselius for her guidance since the beginning of this thesis journey.

I also would like to thank Anamaria Dutceac Segesten for inspirational and eye-opening conversations.

I am indebted to my friends, Anthony Baert for his constructive comments and valuable technical support and, Melanie Klein who helped me with arranging the bibliographical sources.

Finally, I would like to thank my mother, Nilüfer Kılınç for her unconditional love and continuous support in all my endeavours.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Questions and Arguments	3
1.2	Background of Turkish Migration to Germany	4
2	Theoretical Perspectives.....	10
2.1	Problematising the ‘Second Generation’	10
2.2	Diaspora and Memory	13
2.3	‘Home’ and ‘Belonging’	17
2.4	Theories of Return	20
2.5	Gender Perspectives.....	25
3	Methodology	30
3.1	An Overview of the Fieldwork Project.....	30
3.2	Selection of Interviewees	32
3.3	Fieldwork in Urban-Rural Settings: Advantages and Disadvantages.....	33
3.4	Research Ethics and Anonymity	34
3.5	Life-Story Narratives: Language, Translation and Interpretation.....	35
4	Research Findings and Analysis	37
4.1	The ‘Turkish’ Upbringing in Germany.....	37
4.1.1	Family Backgrounds of the Second Generation	38
4.1.2	Constructions of ‘Home’ and ‘Belonging’ in Diaspora Spaces	42
4.1.3	Constructing ‘Home’ and ‘Belonging’ Transnationally	48
4.2	Narratives of Return.....	50
4.2.1	Return through Family Decision	51
4.2.2	Return through Marriage	53
4.2.3	Return as Self-Realisation	55
5	Conclusion.....	57
	Bibliography	60
	Annex 1 – Pilot Interviews List and Main Interviews List	i
	Annex 2 – Personal Narratives Themes – Interview Guide	iv
	Annex 3 – Transcriptions	viii

1 Introduction

This thesis analyses the approaches of the second-generation Turkish-Germans¹ to return to their parental homeland and aims to demonstrate how their return migration project is closely linked to gendered constructions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. People living in diaspora often have a strong attachment to their homeland and national identifications. However, for the second generation, connection to ‘homeland’ is not always localised. The second-generation individuals returning to their parents’ country of origin are actually moving to a country that they were not born and raised in. Most of the time, they do not have any connections in their parents’ country except vague memories of their relatives and neighbours from summer holidays and short visits. Therefore, the second generation *imagines* a ‘homeland’ that is constructed through familial stories and nostalgia. In order to trace the constructions of ‘home’, the analysis part firstly addresses to the upbringing of the second generation in “diaspora space”² and evaluate how they reflect upon the practices of belonging in their narratives. Here, family appears as the major source of belonging which shapes gendered narrations of nation and ‘home’. In addition, by focusing on the second generation’s *diaspora space*, the role of memory for individual and collective diasporic identities is assessed.

Within the second generation’s diasporic condition, the notion of ‘home’ becomes complex and brings up the question; where is ‘home’ for the second generation? On one hand, their ‘home’ is *where they are*; as a “lived experience of locality”³, and on the other hand their ‘home’ is *where they originally come from*; a “mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination”⁴. By focusing on the second generation’s ‘return’ to their parental homeland, the thesis aims to illustrate ‘home’ as a process that undergoes transformations. The returnees are the ones who have life experience in both countries; they retrospectively evaluate their new lives in their new homes, comparing and contrasting the two countries, remembering their romanticised ideas or their childhood memories of their homes that they

¹ There are different types of hyphenations for this group: ‘Deutsch-Türken’ or ‘German-Turkish’ (See Ayhan Kaya, 2007); ‘Germany-born Turks’ (See Russell King and Nilay Kilinc, 2012); ‘Euro-Turks’ (See Ibrahim Sirkeci, 2002; Eva Østergaard-Nielsen, 2000 and 2003b; Ayhan Kaya and Ferhat Kentel, 2005). This thesis avoids the term ‘Turk’ which denotes an ethnic identity. Instead ‘Turkish’ is used with the meaning, ‘a person who comes from Turkey’. Following the American phrasing of hyphenated identities, the thesis adopts the term ‘Turkish-Germans’ referring to the children of the first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany.

² Avtar Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).

³ Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora*, 192.

⁴ Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora*, 192.

had never lived in before. This kind of process of ‘becoming’ and transformation of ‘home’ also prove that identities are in flux and the feeling of ‘belonging’ is a journey with pauses, sometimes receding, sometimes proceeding, collecting the new and the old and constantly renegotiating the self in the light of the new circumstances. The second part of the analysis connects these experiences to the second generation’s ‘return’ and their renegotiation of gender roles in the parental homeland. In order to emphasise that “diasporas are constantly under production”⁵, they create new diasporas and “diasporas-in-the-making”⁶, the thesis employs the term “counter-diasporic migration”⁷ while evaluating the second generation’s narratives about relocation to the parental homeland.

The return migration project has similarities with the migration project in a sense that both are affiliated with one’s strategy for originating a better life and both contain a socially embedded process that they reflect and reinforce social organisation along the lines of gender, race, class, nation, sexuality, caste and religion, among other differences.⁸ The findings of this research illustrate that the first commonality, however, is rather problematic in the case of the second generation’s ‘return’ to the parental homeland. One of the premises of this research is that the second generation’s decision to ‘return’ is not necessarily autonomous, but in some cases through the initiative of their parents; either in the form of being obliged to ‘return’ with parents or fulfilling the expectations of parents who could not return (yet always dreaming of) but wish their children to build their lives in the homeland. This is a highly gendered situation; whereas daughters are expected to obey their parents’ decision, sons can determine their future decisions more independently.

After introducing the research questions and familiarising the reader with the background of the Turkish migration in Germany, Chapter 2 starts with the conceptualisations of the main terms. For instance, when talking about ‘second generation’ it has to be acknowledged that the term is an oxymoron. How can a person who was born in a different country than their parents’ country of origin be classified as ‘second-generation’? If a step is taken back, there arises another question, which simply is; how can ‘generation’ be

⁵ Russell King and Anastasia Christou, “Cultural Geographies of Counter-Diasporic Migration: Perspectives from the Study of Second-Generation ‘Returnees’ to Greece,” *Population, Space and Place*, 16(2) (2010): 114.

⁶ Nicholas Van Hear, *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*. (London: UCL Press, 1998)

⁷ King and Christou, “Cultural Geographies of Counter-Diasporic Migration,”

⁸ Rachel Silvey, “Borders, Embodiment, and Mobility: Feminist Migration Studies in Geography,” in *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, eds. Lise Nelson and Joni Seager (Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 138.

explained? The conceptualisations are followed by theoretical discussions of diaspora, gender, memory and return which are the core instruments of analysis for the second generation's narratives.

Chapter 3 introduces the methods and sources used for this thesis. In this section, the relevance of life-story narratives, selection of interviewees, conversational interviews and the fieldwork are introduced. Chapter 4 firstly illustrates the main findings of the research through the data collected from the life-story narratives. These findings are analysed with the previously introduced theories. Conclusion consists of the summary of the findings and the evaluation and final remarks on the possible future research.

1.1 Research Questions and Arguments

Whilst there is a wide selection of academic work on first, second and third generation Turkish-Germans in Germany, there is a gap in academic research on Turkish return migration. Studying returnees is rather a new trend amongst migration scholars and indeed it has been an underexplored field of migration research. In English-language academic literature, scholars usually examine the immigrant groups' lives, expectations and integration/assimilation processes in the host country. Hence, this thesis aims to contribute to return migration studies in general and also to the specific case of the second-generation Turkish-Germans' return.

The thesis bases the understanding of identity on the notion that identities are points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us.⁹ Following the criticism of Anthias on the traditional classifications of identity as if it were a possessive property, "that a subject has a ready-made story to tell about who they are and where they feel they 'belong'"¹⁰, the research design instead focuses on the explorations of social spaces (e.g. family, work, school, neighbourhood) which are in constant flux as are identities. One of the premises of this study is that gender identity constantly renegotiates itself when incorporated with ethnic and national representations of different time-space

⁹ Stuart Hall, "Who Needs 'Identity'?" in *Identity: A Reader*, eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman (London: Sage, 2000), 20.

¹⁰ Floya Anthias, "Where do I Belong? Narrating Collective Identity and Translocal Positionality," *Ethnicities* 2(4) (2002): 494.

stages. Therefore, the thesis evaluates the research questions by referring to gender roles and power geometries.

The research questions explore three different stages of the second generation's lives; their 'Turkish' upbringing in Germany, the time of return, and their experiences in the parental homeland which is Turkey. The first and second research question aims to explore the constructions of 'home' and belonging through the Turkish upbringing in Germany and their childhood memories from Turkey. The third research question aims to understand how the second generation adjusts the constructions of 'home' and their belongingness once they return to their parental homeland as well as their gendered-self. These questions intent to make a connection between past and present; how these diasporic and transnational experiences shaped the return migration project and what kind of counter-diasporic experiences they led to in the parental homeland. Therefore;

- 1 In what ways do the family narratives and practices construct the imagined and gendered 'home' for the second generation?
- 2 How do the childhood memories from the homeland visits affect the second generation's belongingness and perception of 'home'?
- 3 What are the ways in which the second generation renegotiate their diasporic and gender identity in the parental homeland?

1.2 Background of Turkish Migration to Germany

This section gives an overview of how Turkish migration as a 'guestworker' phenomenon shifted to a diaspora in Germany. The presence of Turkish¹¹ migrants in Germany exceeded half a century by now. Due to the labour shortage in its booming post-war economy, West Germany attracted migrant workers through the labour agreements with various countries in the 1960s.¹² These economic migrants were coined as *Gastarbeiter*, literally 'guestworker'. In terms of scope and volume, migration to Germany has been the

¹¹ Within the context of this thesis, 'Turkish' refers to people with passport of Republic of Turkey. Sirkeci states that, "Turkish migration flows refer to those of the Turks, Kurds, Arabs and others as ethnic groups forming the population in Turkey." See Ibrahim Sirkeci, "Revisiting the Turkish migration to Germany after Forty Years," *Siirtolaisuus Migration*, 29(2) (2012).

¹² "Between 1955 and 1968, the Federal Republic of Germany concluded intergovernmental contracts with eight Mediterranean countries: first Italy (1955), then Spain and Greece (1960), Turkey (1961 and 1964), Morocco (1963), Portugal (1964), Tunisia (1965) and Yugoslavia (1968)." See, Ayhan Kaya and Ferhat Kentel, "Euro-Turks: A bridge, or a Breach, Between Turkey and the European Union," *CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor*, 5 (2005): 7.

hallmark of contemporary Turkish immigration in contemporary Europe, and it has constituted the backbone of the 'Euro-Turk' phenomenon.¹³ Guestworker programmes were designed to solve immediate labour shortages in Germany by recruiting workers on temporary, short-term residence and work permits, yet this temporarily settlement turned into a more or less permanent one in the case of the Turkish guestworkers.

In the early stages of migration, Turkish migrants were mainly men aged between twenty and thirty-nine, relatively skilled and educated compared to the average working population in Turkey, and from the economically more developed regions of the country.¹⁴ The proportion of rural migrants at this stage was just 17.2 per cent. In the second half of the 1960s, recruitment primarily consisted of rural workers.¹⁵ By 1961, a total of 7,116 Turks had immigrated to Germany to become migrant workers.¹⁶ In 1965, the conservative-led coalition government under Chancellor Erhard responded to the presence of (mostly Muslim) migrant groups, with a 'foreigner law'¹⁷ granting limited rights to guestworkers. The government, at the time, considered the presence of foreigners as a temporary problem, which would resolve itself over time.¹⁸

The peak of Turkish labour migration in Europe was between 1971 and 1973, during which more than half a million Turkish workers came to Western Europe. 90 per cent of them were employed by German industries. When Germany was hit by the oil crisis in 1973, it was forced to stop the intake of foreign workforce. In the same year, the Federal Republic introduced a recruitment ban¹⁹ to halt the inflow of guestworkers. However, this had the unintended result of convincing many Turkish guestworkers in Germany to stay. Family reunifications started from the 1970, increased the number of children and

¹³ Şule Toktaş, "Introduction: 50 Years of Emigration from Turkey to Germany - A Success Story?" *Perceptions* 17(2) (2012): 5.

¹⁴ Nermin Abadan-Unat, "Turkish migration in Europe, 1960-1975", in *Turkish Workers in Europe* ed. By Nermin Abadan-Unat (Leiden: Brill, 1976); Philip Martin, *The Unfinished Story: Turkish Labour Migration to Europe* (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1993).

¹⁵ Cited in Ayhan Kaya and Ferhat Kentel, "Euro-Turks: A Bridge, or a Breach, Between Turkey and the European Union," *CEPS Turkey in Europe Monitor*, 5 (2005): 7

¹⁶ Ayça Kılıçlı, "Turkish Migrants in Germany, Prospects of Integration," *Observatory of European Foreign Policy* 16 (2003): 1.

¹⁷ *Ausländergesetz*

¹⁸ Daniel Faas, "From Guest Workers to Citizens? Muslims in Germany," in *Network Migration in Europe* accessed on 15 June 2012 <http://migrationeducation.de/fileadmin/uploads/FAAS.pdf>.

¹⁹ *Anwerbestopp*

women.²⁰ The guesworkers referred to remain in Germany rather than return to uncertain economic conditions in Turkey.²¹ Between 1974 and the early 1980s, the leadership of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt formulated three principles to tackle guest work, namely (i) the ‘integration’ of those who have the right to live in Germany, (ii) the continuation of the 1973 ban on recruitment and (iii) financial incentives to support the return of migrants to their countries of origin through the 1983 law for the “Promotion of Readiness to Return”²². Under this law, every guest worker who voluntarily left Germany received a financial incentive of 10,500 Deutsche Mark but only about 250,000 migrants, particularly those of Turkish origin, responded to this ‘opportunity’.²³

Yet the slowdown in the growth of the number of immigrants was temporary, and the number of new entrants again peaked in the 1980s.²⁴ A mass migration of refugees was recorded following the 1980 military intervention in Turkey. This was first followed by a steady inflow of asylum seekers and later by clandestine migrants until the 2000s.²⁵ At the end of 2003 the Turkish population constituted about 2.3 per cent of the German population and 2.8 per cent of the population of the West German states.²⁶

In the late 1990s, important steps were taken in terms of integration policies. The victory of the Social Democrats and the Greens in the late 1990s paved the way for a new Nationality Act which came into force in 2000. German citizenship which based upon the principle of *ius sanguinis*²⁷ for most of the twentieth century was reformed, allowing

²⁰ In 1974, the percentage of Turkish women in the total number is 35.7 per cent, in 1985, the proportion increases to 42.3 per cent. The number of Turkish youth under the age of 21 is 29.6 per cent in 1974, the number increases to 45.6 per cent in 1985.

²¹ Albert Karcher, “Integrating Turks in Germany: The Separation of Turks from German Society, Discrimination against Turks in the German Labor Market and Policy Recommendations to Integrate Turks into German Society” (Thesis, Duke University), 2010.

²² *Gesetz zur befristeten Förderung der Rückkehrbereitschaft von Ausländer*

²³ Daniel Faas, “The Europeanisation of German Ethnic Identities: The Case of German and Turkish Students in Two Stuttgart Secondary Schools,” *International Studies in Sociology of Education* (UK: Routledge) 17(1) (2007): 46.

²⁴ The second oil crisis resulted into an economic crisis, and long-term unemployment became a serious problem. From that moment on migration from Turkey almost exclusively existed of family and asylum migration. See, Rob Euwals, Jaco Dagevos, Mérove Gijsberts and Hans Roodenburg, “Labour Market Position of Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands: Reasons for Migration, Naturalisation and Language Proficiency,” *Bonn: IZA Discussion Paper* 268 (2007).

²⁵ Ibrahim Sirkeci, “Revisiting the Turkish migration to Germany after forty years,” *Siirtolaisuus Migration*, 29(2) (2012).

²⁶ Euwals et. al, “Labour Market Position of Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands,” 2007.

²⁷ The Basic Law does not prescribe how citizenship is recognised or conferred, but the criteria are based first and foremost on ethnic nationality. The rules governing the acquisition of citizenship are defined by Basic Law Art. 116, the preamble to the Basic Law and the 1913 Imperial and State Citizenship Law (*Reichs- und*

foreigners to obtain German citizenship. The legislation gave the right of citizenship on the basis of the *ius soli* principle to children born in Germany and whose parents had resided legally in the country for the past 8 years. It also temporarily accepted dual citizenship.²⁸ Table 1 illustrates how Nationality Act increased the number of Turkish immigrants who followed the naturalisation process. In 2003, 56,244 Turkish immigrants were naturalised²⁹. In 2011, this number fell to 28,103.³⁰ According to Kaya and Kentel, the reason of such a decline could be that Turkish-Germans are already satisfied with ‘denizenship’ status, which gives them civil, social and cultural rights but not political rights. Another reason may be that Turkish-Germans had expected a more liberal citizenship law to be put into effect without any limitation on dual citizenship.³¹

Table 1: The Number of Naturalisations 1990-2002.

Year	Number of Naturalisations
1990	2,034
1993	12,915
1996	46,294
1999	103,900
2002	64,631

Source: Federal Statistical Office Germany, Weisbaden (2004)

According to the Turkish Ministry of Labour and Social Security 3,849,360 Turkish citizens were abroad in 2009. This number, which excludes Turks who are naturalised German citizens, included 1,713,551 Turks living in Germany.³² Undocumented Turkish immigrants are difficult to enumerate, and this makes it difficult to accurately know the size of Germany’s Turkish community which some estimate may include between 2.6

Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz) and provide that citizenship is passed by descent from parent to child. See Kaya and Kentel, “Euro-Turks,” 2005, 9.

²⁸ The German government of 2001 introduced the Immigration Act (*Zuwanderungsgesetz*) a reduced and compromised version of which came into effect in 2005. The citizenship laws in this Act allow foreigners to obtain citizenship in a much more proactive stance towards integration. Since January 2000, immigrants’ children born in Germany gain automatic citizenship. They will hold dual citizenship until the age of 23 when they have to decide between German citizenship and the citizenship of the country of origin (*Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen*, 2000). The new law also includes provisions that ease the acquisition of citizenship for first generation immigrants, by reducing the residency requirement in Germany from 15 to 8 years. See, Patricia Ehrkamp and Helga Leitner, “Beyond National Citizenship: Turkish Immigrants and the (Re)Construction of Citizenship in Germany,” *Urban Geography*, 24(2) (2003): 127-146.

²⁹ Federal Statistical Office Germany, Weisbaden, 2004.

³⁰ Naturalisation Statistics Germany

³¹ Kaya and Kentel, “Euro-Turks,” 2005, 11.

³² Cited in Sirkeci, “Revisiting the Turkish migration to Germany after forty years,” 2012.

million to 4 million individuals.³³ Today, Turkish immigrants constitute the largest minority in Germany. Yet, Kaya and Kentel argue:

There is a lack of awareness in both the homeland and ‘hostland’ concerning the characteristics of migrants and their children. It is still commonly believed in Turkey that migrants of Turkish origin and their descendants in the West are *gurbetçi*³⁴, with a strong orientation towards the homeland that will someday bring them home. On the other hand, they are also called *Almancı*, a term that depicts such individuals as being rich, eating pork, having a very comfortable life in the West, losing their Turkishness and becoming increasingly Germanised. They are also stereotypically called ‘foreigner’ in their own countries of settlement.³⁵

Health, Wealth or Family Ties? Why Turkish Work Migrants Return from Germany is the only recent academic work which focuses on the return migration. However it only explores the return motivations of male labour migrants. The study concludes that “return was rarely based on purely economic or health-related motives; value-oriented and emotional themes almost always played a role.”³⁶ The paper introduces three ‘ideal’ types of return migrants:

- 1 *the ‘nostalgic’ returnee* who faces socio-economic problems in Turkey. S/he strongly feels that *Almancı* are being discriminated against in Turkey and has a transfigured notion of life in Germany which s/he would like to but cannot resume;
- 2 *the ‘cultural traditionalist’* who considers Turkish culture superior and left Germany without remorse after having made some money;
- 3 *the ‘player of two systems’* who thrives both in Turkey and in Germany. S/he has a more prosaic view of Turkey than the traditionalist and a less transfigured notion of everyday life in Germany than the nostalgic returnee.³⁷

³³ Ibrahim Sirkeci, Jeffrey H. Cohen and Pinar Yazgan, “Turkish Culture of Migration: Flows Between Turkey and Germany, Socio-Economic Development and Conflict,” *Migration Letters* 9(1) (2012): 36.

³⁴ The term *gurbetçi* refers to someone in *gurbet* (diaspora), which is an Arabic word deriving from *garaba*, to go away, to depart, to be absent, to go to a foreign country, to emigrate, to be away from one’s homeland, to live as a foreigner in another country. See Ayhan Kaya, “German-Turkish Transnational Space: A Separate Space of Their Own,” *German Studies Review* 30(3) (2007): 18.

³⁵ Kaya and Kentel, “Euro-Turks,” 2005, 3.

³⁶ Oliver Razum, Nuriye N. Sahin-Hodoglugil and Karin Polit, “Health, Wealth or Family Ties? Why Turkish Work Migrants Return from Germany,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(4) (2005): 719.

³⁷ Razum, Sahin-Hodoglugil and Polit, “Health, Wealth or Family Ties?” 2005, 734-735.

Nevertheless, there is no exact data on how many Turkish immigrants returned from Germany. There is also no consensus on what kind of problems Turkish immigrants face when they return to Turkey. The only debate which has been introduced on media was about Turkish immigrants who became German and therefore lost their political rights in Turkey.³⁸ It should be also noted that, diaspora is a new connotation within the Turkish migration studies. However, this thesis argues that Turkish migration group satisfies the general principles of diaspora. First of all, according to Robin Cohen's typology of diasporas (victim, colonial, trading, labour and cultural), the Turkish case is a clear example of a labour-migration diaspora, although there were also political exiles, and hence also a 'victim diaspora', who left as a result of the military coup of 1960 and 1980.³⁹ Also, accordance with scholars who dealt with diaspora (e.g. Brubaker and Esman) the following characteristics can be found in the Turkish context:

- 1 a shared sense of ethno-national identity;
- 2 dispersion from an original homeland, through forced or voluntary migration for work;
- 3 the maintenance of ethnic boundaries, partly through the shared identity referred to above, and partly because of a sense of separation or exclusion from the host society;
- 4 homeland orientation, either through the maintenance of transnational ties to the country or community of origin, and/or thorough a desire to return there some day;
- 5 historical maturity, so that to the original migrants have been added subsequent generations who share their parents' or ancestors' diasporic identity.⁴⁰

³⁸ In 2011 the Turkish PM Erdoğan held a speech in Düsseldorf where he met thousands of Turkish migrants. Some newspapers picked up on the provocative tone whereas some headlines congratulated him on the basis of his encouraging and motivating attitude towards the Turkish living in Germany. The speculations, indeed, were there for a reason and that is, the PM's promising words did not match the reality: "They call you guest workers, foreigners, or *Almanci*. It doesn't matter what they all call you: You are my fellow citizens, you are my people, you are my friends; you are my brothers and sisters!" However, having the 'roots' from Turkey is not enough to have political rights in Turkey. Translation from Der Spiegel, 2011, available internet source: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/erdogan-urges-turks-not-to-assimilate-you-are-part-of-germany-but-also-part-of-our-great-turkey-a-748070.html>

³⁹ Russell King and Nilay Kilinc, *'Euro-Turks' Return: The Counterdiasporic Migration of German-Born Turks to Turkey* (Malmö: Malmö University, MIM, 2012), 5.

⁴⁰ Cited in King and Kilinc, *'Euro-Turks'*, 2012, 5.

2 Theoretical Perspectives

2.1 Problematising the ‘Second Generation’

This chapter starts with the notions of ‘second generation’ and ‘generation’ to overcome the concept confusion. When we mention ‘first and second generation’; talk about ‘generational relations, gap, conflicts, differences’; point to ‘post-Berlin Wall, 1968 generation’, we use generation in different meanings. What do we need to think about when coming across the term ‘generation’? And how can we make use of it? Marshall argues that “a generation is a sociological reality, consisting of a cohort, significant proportions of whose members have experienced profound historical events ...”⁴¹ Kertzer sets four principles: “generation as a principle of *kinship descent*; generation as *cohort*; generation as *life stage*; and generation as *historical period*.”⁴² Generation as *kinship descent* refers to the genealogical aspect (parents and their children), generation as *life stage* is about a certain phase of life such as childhood, adulthood or younger generation, older generation (not necessarily with a genealogical relation), generation as *cohort*, referring to a group of persons born during a specific span of time, generation as historical period, meaning people sharing specific historical events during their life-course.

Mannheim also problematizes ‘generation’ by referring to its biological (e.g. age) and sociological (e.g. historical events) formulation and explains, “Individuals who belong to the same generation, who share the same year of birth, are endowed, to that extent, with a common location in the historical dimension of the social process.”⁴³ The danger of dealing with generation is using the term without mentioning its meaning. However it is not always easy to choose the right meaning because the concepts of generations are intertwined, and might overlap. In the context of this thesis, the second generation is related to *kinship descent*; involving the children of the first-generation Turkish immigrants into this study as ‘second generation’. It is difficult to orientate second generation into the other conceptualisations of generation for various reasons. However before getting into the evaluation of it, the following paragraphs will debate the concept of second generation.

⁴¹ Cited in David I. Kertzer, “Generation as a Sociological Problem,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 9 (1983): 125.

⁴² Kertzer, “Generation as a Sociological Problem,” 1983, 126.

⁴³ Karl Mannheim, “The Sociological Problem of Generations,” *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* ed. by Paul Keckskemet (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952): 290.

The scholars who wrote about the immigrant groups in the USA came up with some definitions for the notion of second generation.⁴⁴ However these definitions are either not detailed enough to set a standard for the notion, or too precise in a way that it is not applicable to other country-specific case studies. Portes and Zhou conceptualise second as “native-born children with at least one foreign-born parent or children born abroad who came to the United States before the age of 12.”⁴⁵ Thomson and Crul on the other hand suggest, “children born in the host country of one or more immigrant parents or those who arrived before primary-school age.”⁴⁶ The explanations for second generation are vague as some examples state above and raise more questions such as; what if the children moved to the host country with their parents, what if the parents immigrated to the host country with their parents, how about children with one parent from the host country and one parent from the home country, what if the parents of second generation moved to the host country in really different time phrases (such as Turkish guestworkers moving to Germany in 1960s but also non-labour migrants moved to Germany in different times, 1970s, 1980s etc.). Rumbaut suggest the 1.75, 1.5 and 1.25 generations, referring respectively to foreign-born children arriving before age 6, between 6 and 12, and after 12 and up to 17 years of age.⁴⁷

In order to prevent complexities, the thesis suggests that second generation has to be evaluated within its specific context. For instance, in Germany school education starts at an earlier age, it is common for families to send their children to kindergarten. The age for kindergarten can begin from the age of three or four. Therefore, the children who start living in Germany only before the primary school age might have difficulty learning the language and adapt the school system later. So, the paper adopts the definition suggested by Thomson and Crul, with the difference that the children have to arrive to Germany

⁴⁴ See, Irvin Child, *Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943); Vivian S. M. Louie, “Second-Generation Pessimism and Optimism: How Chinese and Dominicans Understand Education and Mobility through Ethnic and Transnational Orientations,” *International Migration Review*, 40(3) (2006); Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, “The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1993).

⁴⁵ Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, “The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1993): 75.

⁴⁶ Mark Thomson and Maurice Crul, “The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(7) (2007): 1038.

⁴⁷ Rubén G Rumbaut, “Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States,” in *Immigration and the Family* ed. Allan Booth, Ann C. Crouter and Nancy S. Landale (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1997).

before kindergarten age. It has to be acknowledged that this thesis uses the term second generation as a group of people who were born in Germany or taken to Germany before the age of kindergarten, to at least one parent who come from Turkey. If the parents immigrated to Germany with their parents, this does not change the second-generation status. As it was hinted earlier, the understanding of 'return' for second generation is problematic because they are 'returning' to a place where they have not lived. 'Homeland' and 'hostland' understandings therefore, are multi-layered and hard to generalise in one or two categories.

For the second generation, understandings of 'home' can be blurry compared to their parents. Even though their diasporic identity is shaped by their parents' desires and diasporic stances, it does not necessarily lead the second generation to follow through the same diasporic practices. They are seen as the progressive generation who have dual lives and 'transnational' attachments; as Rumbaut suggests they are the 'post-immigrant generation'⁴⁸. Therefore, the second generation's lives have to be evaluated within the *syncretic notion of culture*, claiming that mixing and *bricolage* are the main characteristics of culture.⁴⁹ Glick-Schiller, Basch, and Blanc-Szanton emphasise on the shift in international migration and suggest that;

The word immigrant evokes images of permanent rupture, of the uprooted, the abandonment of old patterns and the painful learning of a new language and culture. Now a new kind of migrating population is emerging, composed of those whose networks, activities, and patterns of life encompass both their host and home societies... We call this new conceptualization 'transnationalism' and describe the new type of migrants as 'transmigrants'.⁵⁰

It is no surprise that most of the studies on the second generation are about integration/assimilation in the hostland due to the fact that the second generation is expected to adapt better than their parents. The following section discusses diaspora and

⁴⁸ Rubén G. Rumbaut, "Severed or Sustained Attachments? Language, Identity, and Imagined Communities in the Post-Immigrant Generation," in *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation* ed. Peggy Levitt, Mary C. Waters, (Russell Sage Foundation, 2002):

⁴⁹ Ayhan Kaya, "German-Turkish Transnational Space: A Separate Space of Their Own," *German Studies Review* 30(3) (2007): 3.

⁵⁰ Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Blanc-Szanton, "Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration," in *Migration, Globalization, and Ethnic Relations* ed. Mohsen Mobasher and Mahmoud Sadri (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2004).

memory which is important to assess when dealing with the second generation. The second generation's diasporic practices are highly related to *collective* and *cultural memory* in *diaspora space*. On the other hand, their interaction with their parents and relatives create "motions of attachment" for them in which; "motions of attachment are about fostering intimations of imagined home experiences from the past or projected into the future."⁵¹

2.2 Diaspora and Memory

Diasporas are nurtured by nostalgia; by memories of individual and collective past. The *classical* diasporas are about traumatic exile (e.g. Jewish) from a historical homeland to many other places and the oppression and moral degradation ensuing from this dispersion.⁵² The diasporic entity is attached to myths and memories about an original homeland with a feeling of loss, victimisation and desire for return to homeland.⁵³ Conscious maintaining of *collective memory* is one of the components of *classical* diasporas, it is sustained by reference to an 'ethnic myth', a shared historical experience and ties to a geographic place⁵⁴ while collectively retaining "boundary-maintenance"⁵⁵ vis-à-vis the host society.

Diaspora understanding went beyond the sameness through a focus on common origins, due to the stretching of the term diaspora to immigrant, refugee, guestworker, expatriate and exile communities of the transnational moment.⁵⁶ Hall and Gilroy conceptualise diaspora from a post-colonial point of view with a focus on black cultural identity and approach it as a source of hybridity and heterogeneity. In the case of the enslaved Africans, the notion of diaspora becomes the trace of a memory of separation, enslavement, loss of identity and transplantation.⁵⁷ The African past which was distorted by colonialism and absence of written material about the dispersal therefore, created a new collective memory

⁵¹ Anne-Marie Fortier, *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration* ed. Sara Ahmed et al. (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2003): 131.

⁵² William Safran, "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return," *Diaspora* 1(1) (1991): 83.

⁵³ Robert Cohen, *Global Diasporas: An Introduction* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), 162; Safran, "Diasporas in Modern Societies," 84.

⁵⁴ Steven Vertovec, "Three Meanings of 'Diaspora', Exemplified Among South Asian Religions," *Diaspora* 6(3) (1997), 279.

⁵⁵ Rogers Brubaker, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1) (2005): 6.

⁵⁶ Khachig Tölölian, "The Nation State and its Others: In Lieu of a Preface," *Diaspora* 1(1) (1991): 3-4; Rogers Brubaker, "The 'Diaspora' Diaspora," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1) (2005): 3

⁵⁷ Denise Helly, "History of an Idea," in *Muslim Diaspora: Gender, Culture, Identity*, ed. Haideh Moghissi (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 7.

through cultural hybridization⁵⁸ that emphasises “boundary-erosion”⁵⁹. Driven from the African diasporic experience, diasporic identities are understood as dynamic entities which constantly reproduce themselves through transformation and difference.⁶⁰

According to Anthias, diaspora “references a connection between groups across different nation states whose commonality derives from an original but maybe removed homeland; a new identity becomes constructed on a world scale which crosses national borders and boundaries.”⁶¹ She stresses the importance of understanding diaspora beyond ethnicity and race by arguing that, “identity and cultural narratives of belonging take on ‘ethnic’ forms which are themselves centrally linked to location, in terms of territory and social positioning”⁶² and therefore, “‘the bonds that tie’ are heterogeneous and multiple.”⁶³ In the part Anthias discusses on the post-modern terminology of diasporas, she introduces the term *socio-cultural condition* with reference to Avtar Brah who suggests to attend the “diaspora space” to investigate the practices of belonging constructions by exploring the “homing desires” expressed by diasporic subjects. Brah’s construction of home is temporally and spatially embedded and it is dependent on memory and narratives. Brah notes, “each diaspora is an interweaving of multiple traveling... which may configure into one journey via a *confluence of narratives* as it is lived and re-lived, produced, reproduced and transformed through individual as well as collective memory and re-memory.”⁶⁴

Vertovec refers to diaspora as “type of consciousness” that is generated among contemporary transnational communities which is aware of its “multi-locality”.⁶⁵ This approach departs from Du Bois’ notion of “double consciousness”, and refers to individuals’ awareness of being simultaneously *home away from home* or *here and there*.⁶⁶ The awareness of multi-locality as Vertovec argues stimulates the need to connect the self with the others, both ‘here’ and ‘there’, who share the same ‘roots’ and ‘routes’. Appadurai and Breckenridge evaluate diaspora consciousness and multi-locality in terms of memory by stating that “diasporas always leave a trail of collective memory about another place

⁵⁸ Helly, “History of an Idea,” 7.

⁵⁹ Rogers Brubaker, “The ‘Diaspora’ Diaspora,” 6.

⁶⁰ Stuart Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora,” in *Theorizing Diaspora* eds. Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 235.

⁶¹ Floya Anthias, “Evaluating ‘Diaspora’: Beyond Ethnicity,” *Sociology* 33(2) (1998): 557.

⁶² Anthias, “Evaluating ‘Diaspora,’” 564.

⁶³ Anthias, “Evaluating ‘Diaspora,’” 565.

⁶⁴ Brah, *Cartographies of Diaspora*, 1996, 183.

⁶⁵ Steven Vertovec, “Three Meanings of ‘Diaspora,’” 281.

⁶⁶ Steven Vertovec, “Three Meanings of ‘Diaspora,’” 281.

and time and create new maps of desire and of attachment.”⁶⁷ However they also argue that these *new maps of desire and of attachment* do not always consolidate the diasporic identities, rather it creates “fractured memories”:

More and more diasporic groups have memories whose archaeology is fractured. These collective recollections, often built on the harsh play of memory and desire over time, have many trajectories and fissures which sometimes correspond to generational politics. Even for apparently well-settled diasporic groups, the macro-politics of reproduction translates into the micro-politics of memory, among friends, relatives and generations.⁶⁸

As it is illustrated throughout this section, the theoretical field of diaspora has developed in a way that questions of ‘home’, belonging, memory and identities interplay and construct subject positions. When evaluating the “diasporic space” of the second-generation Turkish-Germans with a linkage to constructions of ‘home’ and belonging, the thesis address to memory and evaluate it within “diaspora consciousness”. Therefore, it is important to look at memory and how it functions. Halbwachs conceptualises memory as “a reconstruction of the past using data taken from the present.”⁶⁹ This definition is reflected in Appadurai and Breckenridge’s relation approach of diaspora and memory; “the diasporic negotiation of desire and memory creates a peculiar temporal ambience, in which past and future are continuously fungible.”⁷⁰ Here, it is important to note that memory became a changing phenomenon through the advancement of technologies in which memory is produced and reproduced within cinema, literature, arts. Therefore, memory is seen as a process where it works differently in different time-space settings.

While discussing the diaspora-memory relation, individual and collective memories were mentioned. Halbwachs argues that the only way memory can be perceivable, meaningful and verifiable is, within the social frameworks.⁷¹ Therefore, collective memory refers to the subjective nature of individual memories which are always shaped and reinforced by the social contexts. Halbwachs prefers to use ‘recollection’ instead of ‘memory’ because it points to collectiveness; because for him there is no individual memory but group

⁶⁷ Arjun Appadurai and Carol Breckenridge, “On Moving Targets,” *Public Culture* 2 (1989): i.

⁶⁸ Appadurai and Breckenridge, “On Moving Targets,” 1989, i.

⁶⁹ Cited in Jerome Turc, *Memory of Places, Places of Memory: A Halbwachsian Socio-Ethnography of Memory* (Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2012), 148.

⁷⁰ Appadurai and Breckenridge, “On Moving Targets,” 1989, iii.

⁷¹ Noa Gedi and Yigal Elam, “Collective Memory – What is it?” *History and Memory* 8(1) (1996): 36.

consciousness. One of these social groups is family, where “there exist customs and modes of thinking within each particular family that equally impose – and even more forcibly – their form on the opinions and feelings of their members.”⁷² Halbwachs does not give a clear theory of how family functions to create “family memory”, therefore, Erll’s and Assman’s and conceptualisations of individual and collective memory are useful to scrutinise the family apparatus. Erll explains, “culturally available narratives and images shape or are refracted by family remembrance.”⁷³ Similar to Halbwachs, Erll also argues that there cannot be an individual memory per se; it is shaped by collective contexts. Erll prefers to use the term “cultural memory” instead of collective memory to point out both social and collective memories are embodied within cultural memory.

Driven from Halbwachs’ conceptualisation of “collective memory”, Assman proposes two types of memory, namely “communicative memory” and “cultural memory”.⁷⁴ Communicative memory is based on language and everyday communication for instance within family and it does not have a fixed point of reference. Oral history therefore, is the vital component. On the other hand, cultural memory is about institutional and symbolic identifications of the past, interpretations of the past in the present time. Cultural memory has a fixed point; its horizon does not change with the passing of time. Memory is maintained through cultural formation (texts, rites, monuments) and institutional communication (recitation, practice, observance)⁷⁵.

As it is presented, diasporas are about remembering and forgetting; memory is the driving force of preserving the past, reshaping the past and interpreting the past in the light of the present. Especially for people living in diasporas, family is the source of national, ethnic, religious and gender representations. Family memory therefore shapes the collective diasporic imaginings of ‘home’ and belonging. Following Halbwachs, the second-generation Turkish-Germans’ constructions of ‘home’ cannot be understood without their family narratives; because even their childhood memories from their visits in Turkey can only be recollected based on the narratives of their parents. The following section concentrate on ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ in order to connect these constructions with

⁷² Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* ed. and trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 58.

⁷³ Astrid Erll, “Locating family in Cultural Memory Studies,” *Journal of Comparative Memory Studies* 42(3) (2011): 312.

⁷⁴ Jan Assman and John Czaplicka. “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity,” *New German Critique* 65 (1995):126-129.

⁷⁵ Assman and Czaplicka. “Collective Memory,” 1995, 129.

familial pasts and how narrations of 'home' in diaspora spaces can be understood within the context of 'belonging'.

2.3 'Home' and 'Belonging'

This section starts with problematizing the notion of 'belonging'; then follows to connect 'belonging' to the notion of 'home'. It explains why the emphasis is on 'belonging' rather than 'identity' and how these can be understood within the specific case of the second generation in *diaspora space* and *counter diaspora*. Hedetoft points at the contradictory relations of two by stating that, "'belonging' denotes 'roots', 'stasis' and 'traditionalism' in the context of bounded territoriality and national identity, whereas 'migration' is linked to 'mobility' and 'postmodernity' in the context of porous borders and the insecurities attendant on globalization."⁷⁶ This contradiction is a good starting-point when scrutinising the 'home' and 'belonging' in the case of second generation because it can also enlighten the paradoxical nature of 'return' to 'home' in this case.

Hedetoft states that, "the English word 'belonging' is a fortuitous compound of 'being' and 'longing', of existential and romantic-imaginary significations and associations, configured in multiple ways by the international system of nationalism as simultaneously a political and a cultural ordering principle."⁷⁷ It is important to note that national identity and ethnic and religious identities embedded in the national identity are imagined and romanticised especially in the case of diasporas, for instance in the form of "banal nationalism"⁷⁸ and "long-distance nationalist"⁷⁹. The second generation brings together their memories from the visits in their parents' homeland, the teachings of their parents and relatives, the consciousness of 'not exactly being from here ('hostland')' but also 'not exactly being from there ('homeland'), perhaps speaking their mother tongue, feeling attached to national symbols such as flag, anthem but not really understanding the jokes and references when they communicate with people in their parents' country of origin because they did not grow up in that context, but at the same time having 'boundaries' in the society they grew up as well, because they think or they are taught or they are perceived by 'the Other'

⁷⁶ Ulf Hedetoft, "Discourses and Images of Belonging: Migrants between 'New Racism', Liberal Nationalism and Globalization," *AMID Working Paper Series 5* (2002): 1.

⁷⁷ Hedetoft, "Discourse and Images of Belonging," 2002, 6.

⁷⁸ Michael Billig, *Banal Nationalism* (London, California, New Delhi: Sage, 1995).

⁷⁹ Benedict Anderson, *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, South Asia, and the World* (London: Verso, 1998).

as 'different', and by collecting all these they formed certain identities that they keep negotiating, but is 'belonging' negotiable or is it a *cul-de-sac*?

Anthias debates about the concepts of 'identity' and 'belonging' in the light of a concept that she developed, called "translocational positionality". She stresses that the understanding of 'belonging' and 'identity' is shifting because the national borders are challenged by newer migration flows (with refugees, asylum seekers, skilled migrants etc.) where "there exist complex relations to different locales; these include networks involving social, symbolic and material ties between homelands, destinations and relations between destination."⁸⁰

The concept of transnational positionality addresses issues of identity in terms of locations which are not fixed but are context, meaning and time related and which therefore involve shifts and contradictions. As an intersectional frame it moves away from the idea of given 'groups' or 'categories' of gender, ethnicity and class, which then intersect (a particular concern of some intersectionality frameworks), and instead pays much attention to social locations and processes which are broader than those signalled by this.⁸¹

She further explains that 'identity' and 'belonging' have difference in emphasis. "Identity involves individual and collective narratives of self and other, presentation and labelling, myths of origin and myths of destiny with associated strategies and identification."⁸² Therefore, when we talk about identities, we talk about positionalities, hierarchies, strategies, perception of the 'self' in the gaze of 'the Other' including "significant other"⁸³ as other individuals, and perception of 'we-ness' in the collective sense against the "generalized other"⁸⁴. But if the identities are labelling as well, to what extent do we have autonomy over our identities? The roles that are given to us, as a 'woman', as a 'Turk', as a 'Christian' are labels but also roles that their cues change by the structural factors due to

⁸⁰ Floya Anthias, "Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality: An Intersectionally Frame for Understanding Identity and Belonging," *Translocations: Migration and Social Change* 4(1) (2008): 5

⁸¹ Anthias, "Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality," 2008, 6.

⁸² Anthias, "Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality," 2008, 8.

⁸³ Mead's term refers to persons who are of sufficient importance in an individual's life to affect the individual's emotions, behavior, and sense of self; such as family members. See, George H. Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962): 154-159.

⁸⁴ Mead's term for society.

different historical periods, politics, locations and norms in different societies, and different interpretations of these roles in different locations.

On the other hand, ‘belonging’ is beyond identification, as Anthias argues, it “is more about experiences of being part of the social fabric and the ways in which social bonds and ties are manifested in practices, experiences and emotions of inclusion... to belong is to be accepted as part of a community, to feel safe within it and to have a stake in the future of such a community of membership.”⁸⁵ Anthias also discusses about ‘belonging’ in relation with citizenship which creates boundaries, though this sort of duties/rights linkage lead to inclusion/exclusion of citizens/non-citizens.⁸⁶ Another important point is that boundaries are forms of political practice and therefore they are imposed.⁸⁷ Political identities and belonging can be used to claim political rights by minorities and diasporas, but also the politicians can use such rhetoric in order to construct certain discourses for the majority/minority of the society. People negotiate their identities; we pick and choose the most beneficial identity in certain contexts. When we know there is a discount for students, we show our student card and hope our student identity will help us. We use the ethnic identity, or political identity while making claims. And these identities do not necessarily provide or take its roots for action from ‘belongingness’.

When ‘identity’ is such a complex notion to deal with, this research dropped the term as a tool of analysis. Instead, ‘belonging’ and its relation to ‘home’ bring more answers and empirical insights about people’s attachments to locations and the norms of these locations. However, it is interesting to explore the shifts in identity, how people renegotiate their identities to maintain or erode boundaries (territorial ones but also imagined ones) which has a direct linkage to their sense ‘belonging’. Hedetoft describes ‘belonging’ in terms of the notion of ‘home’ and suggests that,

‘belonging’ is a concrete, innocent, almost pristine notion, closely interwoven with and imbricated in the notion of ‘home’. In fact, our home is where we belong, territorially and culturally, where ‘our own’ community is, where our family, friends and acquaintances reside, where we have our roots, and where we long to return to when we are elsewhere in the world. In this sense, belonging, as already

⁸⁵ Anthias, “Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality,” 2008, 8.

⁸⁶ Anthias, “Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality,” 2008, 9.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

pointed out, is a notion replete with concreteness, sensuality, organicist meanings and romantic images... In the ways that it circumscribes feelings of ‘homeness’, it is also a significant determinant of individual ‘identity’, that elusive but still real psychological state of feeling ‘in sync with’ oneself under given external conditions. Most importantly, ‘home’ and ‘belonging’, thus conceived, carry affective rather than cognitive meaning; the indicative and simplistic statement above, ‘home is where we belong’, really means ‘home is where we *feel* we belong’.⁸⁸

Right after this conceptualisation, he asks a very important question: “But what, for instance, if where we feel we belong (our ‘cultural’ or ‘ethnic’ home) does not match objective ascriptions of membership (our ‘political’ or ‘civic’ home), because ‘belonging’ separates into its two constituent parts: ‘being’ in one place, and ‘longing’ for another?”⁸⁹ The concept of ‘home’ is related to feeling of belonging that people ‘feel’. This ‘belonging’ might be created through family, school, media, politicians, but it will be assumed that not everyone gets affected by these in the same intensity. This section showed the relevance of dealing with ‘home’ and belonging in the light of diasporas for the fact that “homing desires” and imaginations about the homeland are constantly revised and practiced in the “diaspora space” of the second generation through family narratives, nostalgia, collective and cultural memory. The next section attempts to link these insights to return migration and aims to illustrate that counter-diasporic migration is a new type of diaspora construction in which the second generation compare and contrast their diasporic experiences.

2.4 Theories of Return

Before getting into counter-diasporic migration, the section gives an overview of the theories of return migration. The literature of 1970s and 1980s on the theoretical conceptualisations of return migration was mainly concentrated on the labour migrants who were depicted as first generation.⁹⁰ Neoclassical economics and the new economics of labour migration (NELM) approaches perceived return migration either as an “anomaly, if

⁸⁸ Hedetoft, “Discourse and Images of Belonging,” 2002, 4-5.

⁸⁹ Hedetoft, “Discourse and Images of Belonging,” 2002, 5.

⁹⁰ See, Francesco Paolo Cerase, “Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the United States to Southern Italy,” *International Migration Review* 8(2) (1974); George Gmelch, “Return Migration,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 9 (1980); Russell King, *Return Migration and Regional Economic Problems* (London: Croom Helm, 1986).

not the failure of a migration experience”⁹¹ or a “calculated strategy”. Cassarino criticises these approaches by stating that such a success/failure paradigm cannot be fully explanatory of the return migration phenomenon.

The structural approach on the other hand “brings the success/failure paradigm a step further, while arguing that the area of settlement, once return takes place, shapes the adjustment process of returnee. In other words, return is not solely analysed with reference to individual experience of the migrant, but also with reference to social and institutional factors in home countries. In fact, return is also a question of context.”⁹² Hence, the return migrant’s success and failure is analysed by his/her expectations of the home economy and society and the ‘reality’ of these cases in the homeland. Cassarino introduces Cerese’s typologies for return migrants that show the rather complex relation between the expectations and the ‘reality’. The four categories are:

- 1 *return of failure*: migrants return because of not integrating to the host society due to discrimination from the host society or their personal difficulties about learning the language, getting a job etc.
- 2 *return of conservatism*: migrants’ intention is to preserve the social context they had before leaving their home country and therefore their target is to get property in their home country so they save their money in host country.
- 3 *return of retirement*: migrants return to homeland when they are retired and their aim is to own a land in home country, a property and spend their old ages in their country of origin.
- 4 *return of innovation*: this type of migrants are those who integrated well in the hostland and when they return to their homeland they use the skills that they gained in the host country. They are seen as ‘the carriers of change’.⁹³

Cerese’s typology emphasises that the contextual factors in the ‘homeland’ are important when assessing the return. Gmelch adopted Cerese’s suggestions and brought a new dimension to it by stressing that the motivations of the migrants to return set their expectations from the homeland. These motivations can be fitting into the ‘reality’ in their

⁹¹ Jean-Pierre Cassarino, “Theorising Return Migration: A Revisited Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants,” *EUI Working Paper 2* (2004): 215.

⁹² Cassarino, “Theorising Return Migration,” 2004, 4.

⁹³ Cerese, “Expectations and Reality,” 1974, 245-262.

homelands, but these also can be based on assumed, imagined presumptions. “As situational and structural factors have a certain bearing on the return decision, according to Gmelch, the return decision cannot be planned properly as these situational factors needs to be gauged *a posteriori* by the migrants.”⁹⁴ This statement argues that the migrants might not have sufficient information about the structural and contextual factors (social, economic, political changes in the country of origin while they were away) and therefore, they are “ill-prepared for their return”.⁹⁵

The late 1980s brought new theories for return migration since migration itself gained complexity with the flows of asylum seekers, refugees, undocumented migrants, highly skilled migrants, family reunifications and already started return migration of the guest workers. Transnationalism as an approach to return migration “constitutes an attempt to formulate a theoretical and conceptual framework aimed at a better understanding of the strong social and economic links between migrants’ host and origin countries.”⁹⁶ Portes argues that these links are also related to the identities of migrants and their “transnational activities are implemented by regular and sustained social contacts overtime across national borders.”⁹⁷ Transnationalism perceives migration as a continuing story and, return does not necessarily constitute an end of the migration cycle. Since transnationalism sees migration through transnational mobility and identities, it argues that the migrants who wish to return are not ‘ill-prepared’ because they would have regular visits to their home country.

Transnationalism puts emphasis on double identities instead of conflicting identities; identities negotiate their places in society. Transnationalism further argues that migrants return to their homeland because of their social and historical attachment to the place and they identify with it as their ‘home’ or native soil. Cassarino argues that, “common ethnicity, common origin, common kinship linkages appear to be the main factors which lubricate transnational activities and define transnational identities.”⁹⁸ Along the same lines, Levitt suggests that, “Migrants belong to geographically dispersed groups and feel linked to one another by their common place-of-origin and their shared religious and social

⁹⁴ Cassarino, “Theorising Return Migration,” 2004, 5.

⁹⁵ Gmelch, “Return Migration,” 1980, 143.

⁹⁶ Cassarino, “Theorising Return Migration,” 2004, 7.

⁹⁷ Alejandro Portes, Luis E. Guarnizo and Patricia Landolt, “The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2) (1999): 219.

⁹⁸ Cassarino, “Theorising Return Migration,” 2004, 8.

ties”⁹⁹. However this kind of linkage does not have to be monolithic in its nature. Al-Ali and Koser stress one of transnationalism’s features is also to show how “the development of new identities among migrants, who are anchored (socially, culturally, physically) neither in their place of origin nor in their place of destination.”¹⁰⁰

This is a relevant statement in terms of diasporas, especially when we think about the second generation, ‘belonging’ and the concept of ‘home’ do not necessarily take their roots from the feeling of attachment to their parents’ country of origin. Here, ‘intersectionality’ is an important factor. A second-generation Turkish-German might feel belongingness for religious understanding of Islam and relate more to the religious practices of Turkish people, but the same person might not feel belonging to the gender norms of the Turkish society. On the other hand, these home and host countries we mention are not homogenous in terms of norms, culture, ethnicity and religion either. The person might not feel safe within the gender norms of the general Turkish society, but let’s say he/she might claim that he/she feels safe in a specific city, or a specific community in that city or town. Portes relates the transnationalism to economy rather than ethnic, kinship, national ties. He claims that “immigrant transnationalism is not driven by ideological reasons but by the very logic of global capitalism”.¹⁰¹ Nevertheless, all these theories can explain, perhaps not all, but some factors related to return migration. In the end, each migrant has his/her own story, own goals and destinations.

Cassarino’s final approach is the social network theory which sees the return as a first step towards the completion of the migration project because the return migrant is seen as a social actor who has his/her projects in mind and sees return as an individually-assessed project. These social actors reach the information and sources and plan their return accordingly. They are a part of cross-border networks that involves both migrants and non-migrants. They use the skills that they gained in the hostland for the future projects in their

⁹⁹ Peggy Levitt, “Forms of Transnational Community and their Implications for Immigrant Incorporation: Preliminary Findings” (paper presented at the Conference on Integrating Immigrants in Liberal States, Florence, European University Institute 8-9 May, 1998), 4.

¹⁰⁰ Nade Al-Ali and Khalid Koser, *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home* (London: Routledge, 2002), 4.

¹⁰¹ Alejandro Portes, “Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism,” *Global Networks*, 1(3) (2001): 187.

homeland. "Return is secured and sustained by cross-border networks of social and economic relationships which convey information."¹⁰²

King and Christou introduce the notion of 'counter-diasporic migration' to specifically evaluate the second generation's relocation to the birthplace of their parents. While doing so, they examine the cultural geography of second-generation's return through the notions of identity, home, belonging and place in the specific case of Greek-Americans and Greek-Germans who returned to Greece. They evaluate the second generation's return as a new migration 'chronotope'¹⁰³ in which biographical time which flows in spaces is linked to the genealogical time of the second generation and to the employment of migration events in the second generation's life-story; whereas space and place refer to pairings of countries between which different 'generations' of migrants have moved, as well as to the more specific 'places' (cities, villages etc.) that migrants connect to in their everyday lives. Their findings illustrate that the search for belonging and home are powerful and emotional experience for the second generation. "The second generation's 'return' is... an existential journey to the source of the self, as a return to the 'cradle' of a cathartic mission to reclaim its sacred sites and to re-enter its mythic space and time."¹⁰⁴ However King and Christou show that the second generation do not always experience a welcoming embrace at 'home'; "experiences of return often invoke feelings of disillusionment and rupture."¹⁰⁵

The following academic works are found relevant firstly in terms of discussing the second-generation Turkish-Germans' return and secondly for connecting the previously debated theories together. The first one is Wessendorf's work on the second-generation Italians in Switzerland that she introduces the concept of "roots-migration" to describe the second generation's return to the parental homeland.¹⁰⁶ Her findings illustrate that roots-migration is related to the second generation's transnational practices while growing up and the nostalgic imagination for their parental homeland. However, once they return, the reality in

¹⁰² Cassarino, "Theorising Return Migration," 2004, 15.

¹⁰³ Bakhtin explains 'chronotope' as: "[The chronotope] finds expression predominantly in the special relationship that time has to space in the idyll: an organic fastening-down, a grafting of life and its events to a place, a familiar territory with all its nooks and crannies, its familiar mountains, valleys, rivers and forests, and one's home. Idyllic life and its events are inseparable from this concrete, spatial corner of the world, where the fathers and grandfathers lived and where one's children and their children will live." See, Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* ed. By Michael Holquist, trans. By Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1981): 225.

¹⁰⁴ Cassarino, "Theorising Return Migration," 2004, 17.

¹⁰⁵ Cassarino, "Theorising Return Migration," 2004, 18.

¹⁰⁶ Susanne Wessendorf, "'Roots-migrants': Transnationalism and 'Return' among Second-Generation Italians in Switzerland," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7) (2007).

the parental homeland can be shocking and the returnees' struggle start in order to integrate into the society and culture that they always perceived as their own. The second one is Levitt's *Roots and Routes: Understanding the Lives of the Second Generation Transnationally*. She criticises that it is not only the first generation who practices transnational lives but also the second generation. She argues that the second generation keeps ties with the ancestral homeland, though not with the same intensity as their parents, and the reason is "the strong potential effect of being raised in a transnational social field."¹⁰⁷ She also stresses the importance of understanding the lives of the second generation through family structures, gender relations, religious, class differences and kin-based strategies.

The third one is *The Development of New 'Third-Cultural Spaces of Belonging': British-Born Cypriot 'Return' Migrants in Cyprus* by Janine Teerling. She suggests evaluating the notions of 'home' and 'belonging' beyond the ethnic, national and primordial cultural boundaries. Her findings illustrate that the British-born Cypriot returnees did not only "point out the disadvantages of feeling like 'a stranger', they emphasised some of the benefits of being 'a foreigner', whilst at the same time choosing which parts of their Cypriot heritage to enjoy."¹⁰⁸ Therefore, Teerling suggests that the "second generation's unique articulations of belonging, as shaped by *their* views and experiences *today*, over the more 'traditional' classifications of identity and the essentialised notions of 'culture'"¹⁰⁹ is an alternative to previous studies which evaluate the lives of the second generation based on binary oppositions; instead the second generation create *third-cultural spaces of belonging* through shared experiences, knowledge, interests and values.¹¹⁰

2.5 Gender Perspectives

The final point in the theoretical perspectives is gender. In order to understand how the second generation practices and renegotiate gender roles and how the gendered 'home' constructions affect their return and counter-diasporic experiences, the notion of gender has to be evaluated. Mahler and Pessar base their understanding of gender "on the notion

¹⁰⁷ Peggy Levitt, "Roots and Routes: Understanding the Lives of the Second Generation Transnationally," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(7) (2009): 1226.

¹⁰⁸ Janine Teerling, "The Development of New 'Third-Cultural Spaces of Belonging': British-Born 'Return' Migrants in Cyprus," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(7) (2011): 1080.

¹⁰⁹ Teerling, "The Development of New 'Third-Cultural Spaces of Belonging,'" 2011, 1095.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

that it is a human invention that organizes our behaviour and thought, not as a set of static structures or roles but as an ongoing process that is experienced through an array of social institutions from the family to the state.”¹¹¹ They introduce the concept of “gendered geographies of power” in which gender operates simultaneously on multiple *spatial and social scales* (e.g., the body, the family, the state) across transnational¹¹² terrains where gender ideologies and relations are reaffirmed, reconfigured, or both.¹¹³ Under this concept, they firstly introduce the model of “geographic scales”, giving the example of Haitian migrant women who strive to renegotiate their status transnationally because their gendered status system is linked to national identity on the basis of subordination of women.¹¹⁴

The second model is “social location” in which they refer to “persons’ positions within power hierarchies created through historical, political, economic, geographic, kinship-based, and other socially stratifying factors.”¹¹⁵ For example migrants in a remote area and urban area have different scales of sustaining transnational ties. However they add that gender hierarchies are not built only in national or supra-national level; gender operates at various levels within the hierarchies of class, race, ethnicity and religion. Finally, they explain the concept of “power geometry” taken from Massey’s conceptualisation, which arises as a result of time-space compression which placed people in very distinct locations regarding access to power over flows and interconnections between places.¹¹⁶ Mahler and Pessar stresses the importance of acknowledging individual characteristics of people and therefore suggest that a person who comes from a disadvantageous social location can have similar practices of a person who comes from an advantageous social location due to his/her own resourcefulness.¹¹⁷

¹¹¹ Sarah J. Mahler and Patricia R. Pessar, “Gendered Geographies of Power: Analyzing Gender across Transnational Spaces,” *Identities*, 7(4) (2011): 442.

¹¹² By ‘transnational’ they adopt the definition of Glick Schiller who explains, “I employ the word transnational to discuss political, economic, social and cultural processes that extend beyond the borders of a particular state, include actors that are not states, but are shaped by the policies and institutional practices of states.” See Nina Glick Schiller, “Transmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the US. Immigrant Experience,” in *The Handbook of International Migration* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1998), 96.

¹¹³ Mahler and Pessar, “Gendered Geographies of Power,” 2011, 445.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Mahler and Pessar, “Gendered Geographies of Power,” 2011, 445-446.

¹¹⁶ Mahler and Pessar, “Gendered Geographies of Power,” 2011, 446.

¹¹⁷ Mahler and Pessar, “Gendered Geographies of Power,” 2011, 447.

Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo focuses on the question of how gender differentiated the experiences of men and women in migration in her book *Gendered Transitions*.¹¹⁸ By looking at how gender relations shift in the process of migration, she claims that migration results in a supposed ‘greater gender egalitarianism’ between men and women.¹¹⁹ She suggests that the host society is more gender egalitarian than the home society or sending society that migrants come from. It implies the picture of migrant women escaping a developing but still backwards and traditional country.¹²⁰ While analysing migration and gender, Hondagneu-Sotelo emphasises that men’s stories should also be included in such framework. Studies which only focus on women marginalise migrant women because it retards “our understanding of how gender as a social system contextualizes migration processes for all immigrants” and at the same time stifle our ability to theorise “about the ways in which constructions of masculinities and femininities organize migration and migration outcomes”.¹²¹ Rhacel Salazar Parreñas criticises this insight by stating that “when we speak about women’s gendered experiences, we are always already referring to men.” Carling argues that there are two dangers in the gender studies. First one is that assuming women are oppressed by men everywhere in the world. And the second one is excluding varying relations between men and women; “being a woman means different things to a young migrant domestic worker and to the wealthy women who employs her.”

The conceptualisations and debates above are helpful understanding diasporic experiences from a gender perspective and also sets the scene for evaluation of counter-diasporic migration through the gender lens. Christou’s study on the second-generation Greek-American returnees illustrate that men present the migration decision as autonomous but women view migration as a collective endeavour and represent the experience within the family context.¹²² Christou explains that “we realise that women migrants in their ‘feminisation’ of return migration define their relocation as an identity construction in a gendered perspective that incorporates national representations.”¹²³ According to her findings, “the family is a major site of belonging and the source of other frameworks that

¹¹⁸ Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Migration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

¹¹⁹ Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, “Feminism and Migration,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571 (2000): 116.

¹²⁰ Hondagneu-Sotelo, "Feminism and Migration," 2000, 117.

¹²¹ Pierrette Hondagneu-Sotelo, “Introduction: Gender and Contemporary U.S. Immigration.” *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4) (1999): 566.

¹²² Mary Chamberlain, *Narratives of Exile and Return* (London: Macmillan, 1997).

¹²³ Anastasia Christou, *Narratives of Place, Culture and Identity: Second-Generation Greek-Americans Return ‘Home’* (IMISCOE Dissertations: Amsterdam University Press, 2006): 90.

assign meaning to groups through their aspirations and ideological rhetoric. The family unit is a central component of the female returnees' narratives of return."¹²⁴ Christou suggests that,

[...] the female returnees...simultaneously exemplify their autonomous decision-making perspective in the homeland return as one correlated with:

1. The continuous interplay between the woman returnee as *active agent* and the national construction of 'motherland' as *structure*.
2. The *personal plan of action* of the diasporic journey of return to a national homeland that exemplifies traditional cultural values as safeguarding ethnic identity.
3. The spatial context of appraisal of nation as means to realise a *gendered self* as contextualised through emotional and rational processes of incorporation.¹²⁵

Another important factor Christou highlights is the 'national space' which shapes the women's identification processes and "illuminates specific ways that family can conserve its unity and solidarity within the space of national unity, that is, ethnic and religious homogeneity, national solidarity and common values".¹²⁶

The collective memory of national constructs creates, fuels, and sustains a return-place not only of 'remembering' but also a home-place, a motherland construction where gendered lives of past and present inhabit the return space as signifying actors. The projected meaning of gendered definitions of becoming and being are national identifications, imperatives of ethnicity and gender that interact for a mutual construction of a gendered self. The self is simultaneously ethnicized and gendered while the return migratory project is a process that maintains a terrain of belonging.¹²⁷

King and Christou explore gender relations, power geometries of gender within the context of return migration. By doing so, they present that "diasporic imaginaries and mobilities,

¹²⁴ Christou, *Narratives of Place, Culture and Identity*, 2006: 92.

¹²⁵ Anastasia Christou, "Migrating Gender: Feminist Geographies in Women's Biographies of Return Migration," *Michigan Feminist Studies, Special issue: Gender and Globalism*, 17 (2003c).

¹²⁶ Christou, "Migrating Gender," 2003c, 92.

¹²⁷ Ibid

including rootedness and rootlessness, are experienced differently by women and men”¹²⁸ by referring to the narratives of the second-generation Greek-Americans and Greek-Germans who returned to Greece. Two important findings of their study illustrate that one of the reasons of return is ‘search for self’ which is affected by ‘family narrative’. This is more widespread amongst the males. The second reason of return is the intention of escaping from an oppressive and patriarchal family environment and this is usually narrated by the females.¹²⁹ As it was discussed, gender roles start within the family and shaped by society, belief systems and institutions. By looking at how gendered identity position itself in different phases of life; i.e. diaspora spaces, *transnational* or *translocal spaces*, *counter-diasporic spaces* etc., we can trace a constant renegotiation.

¹²⁸ Anastasia Christou and Russell King, “Gendering Counter-Diasporic Migration: Second-Generation Greek-Americans and Greek-Germans Narrate their ‘Homecoming’ to Greece,” *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 20(2) (2011): 287.

¹²⁹ Christou and King, “Gendering Counter-Diasporic Migration,” 2011, 294.

3 Methodology

3.1 An Overview of the Fieldwork Project

Having the previously stated questions and standpoints in mind, life-story narrative was chosen as the core research instrument in order to cover the different time-place stages of the interviewees' lives. Open-ended and in-depth interviews were considered the best approach to capture the life stories of the interviewees. The semi-structured questions prepared for this research were inspired by King and Christou's study on the second-generation Greek-American and Greek-German returnees¹³⁰. The first set of questions were concentrated on the following phases: a) the migration story of the returnees' parents, b) returnees' upbringing in Germany, c) their childhood memories from Turkey, d) motivations to return to Turkey, e) experiences from their lives in Turkey. The second set of questions aimed to explore the interviewees' thoughts on the following: a) growing up 'Turkish' in Germany, b) generational differences between them and their parents as immigrants, c) transnational experiences, d) self-identity and belonging, e) notion of 'home', f) living in Turkey as a Turkish-German.

Five pilot interviews were held in the summer of 2012 in Istanbul, Turkey. Each interview was tape-recorded with the consent of the interviewees and took about half an hour to one hour. The pilot interviews showed that semi-structured questions do not necessarily lead to direct answers and might frustrate the interviewees in a way that they push themselves to give short answers with well-structured sentences, and also the interviewees hesitated to ask about the parts they did not understand in the questions due to the restricting nature of semi-structured method.

Hence, conversational interviews approach was followed during the second visit. This way, it was aimed to grasp the multi-dimensional nature of the research questions which required the interviewees to be story tellers who remember their lives, acting as autobiographers, being reflexive on their own stories and reflecting upon the subjects during the conversations in a systematic way. Conversational interviews reduced the possibility of misunderstanding of the questions and intended meanings. The approach is

¹³⁰ King and Christou, "Cultural Geographies of Counter-Diasporic Migration," 2010. See Annex 2 for the questions.

based on a view of communication that requires partners to collaborate, to converse about what is being said until they are confident they adequately understand each other.¹³¹

For the second visit, which would be thirty-five days, the projected number of interviews was thirty. The thirty interviews were collected as projected during the period of October-November 2012. These interviews were around one to two hours; a few were much longer, up to three hours. In the end, thirty-five interviews were collected together with the pilot ones. Twenty-six out of thirty-five interviewees were located in Istanbul. The remainder were based in small towns around Black Sea Coast; namely Ereğli, Düzce, Devrek and north-west of Istanbul, Tekirdağ. Thirty-one interviews out of thirty-five were held face-to-face and the remainder were via Skype conference or Gmail chat. There was one interviewee who was based in the UK for the time being but was going to return to Istanbul soon, after finishing his one year study programme. I paid close attention to achieving a gender-balanced panel; in the end fourteen interviews were conducted with male interviewees and twenty-one of them with female interviewees.¹³²

The collected narratives resulted in over 500 pages translated transcriptions.¹³³ Due to the volume of the data, the tape recorded narratives were simultaneously translated while transcribing them; therefore the thesis will not include the quotes in the original language. Each transcription includes information on the interview setting: the places where the interviews were held, the emotional and silence moments of the interviewees, my connection to each interviewee and the process of the interviews. As much as talking and conversing is a way of telling a story, the moments of silence, behaviour during thinking and dealing with somewhat harder stories also give clues about the person and the story. These are accounted as important points of reference to evaluate how the interviewees deal with the past; therefore unstructured notes related to these moments are taken during the interviews.

¹³¹ See, Aaron V. Cicourel, *Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction* (New York: The Free Press, 1973); Herbert H. Clark, *Arenas of Language Use* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Emanuel A. Schegloff, "On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation," in *Structures of Social Action*, ed. J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

¹³² See Annex 1 for the list of interviewees.

¹³³ See Annex 3 for information about the transcriptions.

3.2 Selection of Interviewees

The sampling strategy which was adopted for this research project is based on non-random sampling. The main critique towards the non-random sampling is that this technique might fall into bias and might not be the representative of population. Therefore, to be able to overcome the bias and to comply with the exploratory design of this research project, heterogeneous sampling is adopted in order to get broad spectrum of points of view. In addition, the variables in the context of this research study are extensive; apart from gender, there are people of different age, social and civic status, educational and professional background, having children or not, living in a big city or not. Since this case study is the first of its kind, the thesis aims to present a wide range of opinions, experiences, lifestyles and behaviours.

The selection was directly linked to the definitions of ‘second generation’ and ‘returnee’. First of all, for the interviewees to be qualified as ‘second-generation’, they had to be born in the host country or brought from the home country before kindergarten age i.e. five years old, to two parents who immigrated to the host country. Secondly, the interviewees had to be living in their parents’ country of origin at least for six months to be considered as ‘returnee’. Reaching the target sample was not an easy task regarding the limited timeframe. Snowball sampling failed in some ways when the possible interviewees either did not have time or cancelled the arranged meetings.

As the life-story narratives were the primary source of data collection, personal observations during the fieldwork in the form of written notes and recorded anecdotes helped the documentation of details about the interviewees and the places of the interview. Since there is no academic research on the second-generation Turkish-German returnees, the newspaper accounts and government reports from both Turkey and Germany served as reference points to understand the attitudes of the governments and media discourse. Academic research on Turkish-Germans, especially the second-generation which is usually represented as ‘the in-between’ or ‘lost-generation’, helped this research to build counter arguments against the mainstream images of this group and motivated me to collect data from people who have had different experiences.

3.3 Fieldwork in Urban-Rural Settings: Advantages and Disadvantages

Istanbul was chosen firstly due to the city's richly diverse population; also assuming that the second generation would return to this cosmopolitan city to be able to close to variety of job opportunities. In addition, German foundations and organizations as well as Turkish-German collaborative institutions are mostly based in Istanbul and this would turn as an advantage for the research in order to contact the possible candidates as interviewees. The second reason was rather personal; living almost my entire life in Istanbul, launching the fieldwork in Istanbul would give me confidence and it would anchor the data collection.

Since the interviewees in Istanbul were found through personal, friend and family contacts, there was always a mutual trust between me and the informants from the beginning. I met almost all the female interviewees at their homes, so I made sure that I had a little box of chocolate or dessert when I visited them. Unconsciously set, the interviews with the male informants mostly took place in quiet cafés or at their workplaces. Even though I told my male interviewees that I would pay the bill in cafés, they never allowed me to do so, saying 'you can pay next time' with a smile on their face.

The main disadvantage of fieldwork in Istanbul was not being able to capture the lives of people in rural settings. It was assumed that life in rural areas would be completely different from the second-generation's life in Germany. In order to prevent a single-sided data, even though interviews from Istanbul were diverse in many ways, I travelled to relatively more rural areas in the Black Sea Coast. Düzce and Ereğli have a small city atmosphere, where Devrek is a village. The assumption which was stated above was justified in the way that the life in these relatively rural areas was quite different than in Istanbul. The family and socio-economic backgrounds of the interviewees from Istanbul and outside of Istanbul could easily be contrasted. In that sense, it was a useful strategy to explore other areas than Istanbul to be able to diversify the data collection.

During the fieldwork outside of Istanbul, a local journalist and a worker in a small company in Ereğli assisted me during my stay in Ereğli, Düzce and Devrek. I met these men for the first time in Ereğli and there happened some uncomfortable occasions. Despite the negative parts of my interaction with these locals, I must say that I would not be able to collect seven interviews in two days in three different locations without their assistance.

The positive correlation between the trust/openness level of interviewees and contacting interviewees through a mediator was evident in fieldwork outside of Istanbul as well. However the interviewees outside of Istanbul were more careful and suspicious due to the fact that they did not know the mediators so well.

3.4 Research Ethics and Anonymity

Entering one's private life is not an easy task; on the contrary it is challenging the researcher's role. To what extent can researcher comment or show affection? Most of the guiding books for qualitative research methods recommend that the researcher should stay on an objective zone and try to prevent losing neutrality. During the fieldwork, I have realised that these tips and recommendations are not absolute; each culture has its own dynamics and ways of communication. For example, my interviewees expected me to be involved in the conversations actively. They felt comfortable when I showed feelings or gave my own insight.

When they asked my opinion or asked for approval, instead of affecting their way of thinking with my opinion, I gave examples from the lives of the other interviewees. This was the main method to exempt my involvement in a hierarchical way. The researcher has to break the hierarchical setting in order to reach sincere answers from informants. Therefore, before starting the interviews, I briefly presented myself and my research. After that, I started the conversation with daily subjects, sometimes about the news of the day, or about the mutual person who made the meeting possible.

All the names mentioned in this thesis are pseudonyms except Oktay. Also, the names of the working places are not mentioned in the transcripts. There were some occasions where the female interviewees' boyfriends or husbands joined the interview for a while. At these times, the male partners tended to dominate the conversation and the female interviewees hesitated to answer the questions or they asked the opinion of their partners. In general these men were suspicious about the intention of my research, they openly showed their hesitation and when they heard their girlfriend or wife started to give information which would be personal, they intervened. This attitude was followed by an interrogation-like questions session towards me.

3.5 Life-Story Narratives: Language, Translation and Interpretation

The informants of this research project are not only experiencing hybrid identities and enjoying their transnational lives on a daily basis but also expressing themselves in two different languages i.e. Turkish and German. During my interactions with my informants, I chose to celebrate this hybridity also in terms of language and encouraged them to express themselves in the ways they felt the most comfortable. Almost all the informants narrated their life stories both in Turkish and German, using idioms and phrases in both languages and even using English from time to time.

As a researcher, I adopted the duty to make sure that the meaning would not get lost in translation. However it should be noted that it is not easy to ‘read’ a culture; especially when it is a mixed one nourishing from two distinct cultures and in some cases more than two. Without getting into detail and criticism, I would like to use the literary/literacy metaphor of “culture as text” that Clifford Geertz popularised and commented on these ‘texts’ by stating, “What we call our data are really our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to...”¹³⁴ Language is one of these constructions; it is embedded in culture and it is also continuously constructed by gender roles, class, ethnicity and religion within cultural contexts. It should be also noted that in the case of diaspora there are different jargons in the languages; certain words and sayings might be alienated from their original meanings and gain their own new meanings.

During the fieldwork and the analysis of this thesis, a phenomenological approach was followed by seeking *experience from the experiences* and perspectives of the individuals. This is a way of celebrating personal subjectivity and knowledge both for me as a researcher and for my informants while constantly revising my assumptions and hypotheses from the point of fieldwork to analysis. Hence, following the recent trends in the phenomenological approach in which feminist and humanist researchers suggest, I adopted a researcher role who is visible in the frame of the research as an interested and subjective actor rather than a detached and impartial observer.¹³⁵ During the collection of these life-story narratives I have also experienced that the stories that are narrated by the

¹³⁴ Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 9.

¹³⁵ See, for example Kermit C. Plummer, *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problems and Literature of a Humanistic Method* (London: Allen&Unwin, 1983); Liz Stanley and Sue Wise, *Breaking Out Again : Feminist Ontology and Epistemology* (London: Routledge, 1993).

informants “reveal multiple and conflicting self-expressions”¹³⁶ as emphasized in Hermans’ theory of the *dialogical self*.¹³⁷ Another point which is directly linked to the narratives is that the informants who are the narrators of their stories did not always follow a chronological structure; some chose to start from present to past, some preferred to tell their stories from different time periods and sometimes they led the conversation in a way that it was off-topic. As David Carr once stated, “Perhaps our lives resemble novels, but bad ones, cluttered and undisciplined ones.”¹³⁸

As the aim of this thesis is to explore and explain the experiences of the second-generation returnees in their different life stages, I had to follow a clear path in order to choose themes that would best illustrate the goals of this study. “Narratives are interpretive and, in turn, require interpretation”¹³⁹ and thus an analysis of the raw material is only possible when the researcher maps out the meanings and interpret the material in the light of theoretical perspectives. In order to interpret the narratives and place them in specific themes, I followed the approach of “bathing in the data”¹⁴⁰: that is, reading and re-reading over and again the interview transcripts in order to qualitatively understand the main narrative themes.¹⁴¹ By using the content analysis technique, commonly repeated insights from the interviewees’ narratives are put under the themes along the scope of the theoretical perspectives chosen for the analysis.

¹³⁶ Dan P. McAdams, “Personal Narratives and Life Story,” in *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, eds. John Robins and Lawrence A. Pervin (New York: Guilford Press, 2008), 243.

¹³⁷ Hubert J. M. Hermans, “Voicing the Self: From Information Processing to Dialogical Interchange,” *Psychological Bulletin* 119 (1996).

¹³⁸ David Carr, “Life and Narrator’s Art,” in *Hermeneutics and Deconstruction: Selected Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985), 115.

¹³⁹ Catherine K. Riessman, *Narrative Analysis* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993), 22.

¹⁴⁰ Ivar F. Goodson, “The Rise of the Life Narrative,” *Teacher Education Quarterly* 33(4).

¹⁴¹ Russell King and Nilay Kilinc, *‘Euro-Turks’ Return: The Counterdiasporic Migration of German-Born Turks to Turkey* (Malmö: Malmö University, MIM, 2012), 12.

4 Research Findings and Analysis

4.1 The 'Turkish' Upbringing in Germany

This section attempts to illustrate the first diasporic moment in the lives of the second generation, which is their upbringing within the Turkish diasporic setting in Germany. The section starts with the second generation's 'family narratives' with a focus on the first generation's profile and main characteristics and their disposition to the return project. 'Family memories' narrated by the second generation points out the following:

- 1 Family memories play a vital role in the second generation's constructions of 'home' and 'belonging' with a linkage to their attitudes and motivations towards the 'return' to their parental homeland;
- 2 For the first generation, the notions of home or homeland remain fixed. The dream of an eventual return to homeland is the main theme. Their narratives of 'home' therefore, are the first reference points for the second generation's constructions of belonging. However, the second generation have a more complex relationship towards the parental homeland.
- 3 The second generation has 'diaspora consciousness' which was firstly constructed by their 'family narratives'. They refer to their generation as the 'in-between' and 'lost' generation by claiming that they are stuck in between their parents' world where traditional practices and memories are intertwined and the 'diaspora spaces' where they constantly renegotiate their hybrid identities.
- 4 'Family narratives' are effective on the second generation's understanding of the gender roles both in individual level and on the imaginings of 'home'. The second generation acknowledges that their parents perceive Turkey as the 'motherland' because of the sentimental and emotional attachments and Germany as the 'fatherland' because the monetary attachment. Therefore, mothers symbolise care, love, emotions, sentimentality; and fathers symbolise rationality, money, work, being strong. These gendered perspectives of the self-identity and diasporic identity summarise the second generation's *habitats of meaning*.

The findings on the profile of the first generation contradict the mainstream discourses that are based on the understanding that the first generation is a poorly integrated group of

labour migrants consisted of men who came from the rural areas of Turkey with no prior skills. Such discourses portrayed women as dependant actors who came to Germany due to family reunifications. The following sections aim to introduce an alternative story in which these generalisations do not have such sharp edges. The findings illustrate that the second generation has to be understood in the scope of *fluid cultures* in which their Turkish diasporic identity i.e. Turkish-German hybrid identity constantly interplay in the ‘diaspora spaces’. In addition, the findings challenged the hypothesis of this research in its early stages which linked the return project to lack of integration in Germany. Instead the return is mostly a family-driven project; in some cases as a forced return and in some cases voluntarily.

4.1.1 Family Backgrounds of the Second Generation

The findings illustrate that the majority of the first generation immigrated to Germany in 1960s as guestworkers who were recruited in factories and manufacturers. Most of them came from Istanbul or around Istanbul along the Black Sea coastline. They were coming from the working class and their economic struggles in Turkey led them project their migration to Germany. However they were not the poorest of the poor. Most of them completed their high school education. Despite the mainstream picture of Turkish immigrants’ settlements in the ghettos of big cities, the findings show that the first generation settled in small industrial towns in Germany which did not have a Turkish community, at least during the 1960s.

The story below represents the common characteristics of a working-class family from Istanbul. Nurten’s parents immigrated to Germany in 1961 to work. Nurten’s parents still live in Germany up to this date. In the second part of her narrative, she tells about the environment she grew up in. She vocalises another common characteristic of the first generation, that is, women were involved in the economic life and therefore the second generation spent their early ages within a German environment through neighbours, babysitters and kindergarten.

Both of my parents were born and raised in Istanbul. But they are originally coming from Siirt. My father went to Germany in 1961, my mother followed him soon after. Additional to his work as a mechanist, he also worked as a translator in

the company [in Lollar]. My mother was in the electronics department of the same factory. She worked there for 16 years.

[...]

The first house we had was in a neighbourhood mainly populated by the Germans. We did not have difficulties there. I grew up in a German environment. The number of Turks started to increase later. The second place we lived was a flat in an apartment... We were the only Turkish family. Today that apartment is fully Turkish. It is really bad because no one gives effort to learn German. Everyone speaks Turkish. I and my brothers grew up with Germans, taken care by Germans and so we are good at German because we started learning it in early ages. We do not speak German with accent; no one would think we were Turkish. They thought we were Germans. Also at school, we had only German friends (Nurten, F38, Istanbul).

The second wave of immigration amongst the first generation took place in the 1970s. The narrative accounts portray that the first generation immigrated to Germany in 1970s as guestworkers, students, professionals and political exiles (due to army interventions). This group consisted of those who were raised in Istanbul, coming from middle class, but also as some cases illustrate having elite family origins. The common theme amongst this group is attachment to a strong 'Istanbul identity' that led the interviewees make a distinction between themselves and 'the other Turks', stressing the differences especially in family and education background. Their family backgrounds and diasporic setting in Germany challenge the stereotypical *Almançı* category, but their narratives about 'the other Turks' verified the stereotypical discourses on the Turkish labour diaspora in Germany.

The following account illustrates an example of a highly educated and skilled immigrant who chose Germany for future career. Öykü tells us how his father planned his journey to Germany after receiving his bachelor diploma in electricity engineering.

My father went to Germany in 1972, soon after he graduated from university in Istanbul. He had already known German before moving to Düsseldorf. While he worked in the company [in Düsseldorf], he started studying in master level. My father's story is different than most of the other Turkish people who went to

Germany. My father's decision was a rational choice; he studied in German already in high school and chose a university programme where the language of instruction was German. So, he had already planned living in Germany when he was a student (Öykü, F34, Istanbul).

Interestingly, the interviewees whose parents immigrated to Germany as guestworkers (both in 1960s and 1970s) just as the other Turkish immigrants who came from rural areas, made the same 'we-the other Turks' distinction which was not based on class but based on 'cultural capital' that was believed to be gained by being raised in a cosmopolitan and historically-rich city as Istanbul. This is an important point in terms of understanding the second generation's 'home' and 'belonging' constructions while growing up in Germany which will be scrutinised later. The following quotes represent the mentioned *we-them* distinction that many of the interviewees narrated. Oktay stresses his families' roots in Istanbul and narrates how his father benefited from his 'cultural capital' when he immigrated to Germany.

My whole family is from Istanbul. My family has been living in Istanbul about 140 years. I mean, here [Istanbul] is our village (laughing). So my father... he travelled the world but then heaven knows why, he decided to immigrate to Germany in 1963.

[...]

My parents never mentioned of having difficulties in Germany because they are from Istanbul, born and raised. Also, Bremen is such a small place compared to Istanbul. In general we did not have hard time at all. If we went to Bremen from a small village [in Turkey], and you know in that years many small places in Turkey did not even have electricity, well, then Bremen would be such a new world to us. But we are from Istanbul, and Bremen was not a big deal for us (Oktay, M51, Istanbul).

When the interviewees made the distinction between themselves and 'the other Turks' they commonly mentioned the rather 'liberal' and 'modern' ways of their parents. Some interviewees signified that their mothers were the first to immigrate to Germany. The narratives point out another commonality that, women worked in factories just as men,

socializing with Germans and other guestworker nationalities (e.g. Greeks, Italians, Yugoslavs). The following narrative is a good representative of how the second generation who has their family roots from Istanbul perceives the evolution of the Turkish settlement in Germany, by reflecting upon the migration memories of their parents. Erdem's parents met in Germany and after their marriage, they settled in a small town closed to Hamburg.

My mother went to Germany by herself. And she informed her family after she moved there. So, her parents had to accept it, she was already gone. She worked in a factory in which only women were recruited. The flat she lived was provided by the factory.

[...]

She did not have an adaptation problem. She went to Germany from Istanbul. She comes from a decent family. Istanbul of her times was very modern. When I look at the old pictures of my mother, I see that they were wearing mini-skirts. Turkish society of today would not accept it... In the first stage of the guestworker agreement, people were mostly coming from big cities like Istanbul and they did not have any problems integrating. The problem was the people who followed them. These people came from rural areas, they had big families. Time after time, they created their own communities where they strongly preserved their traditions. They did not integrate on purpose; instead they created ghettos... Therefore, their children became confused people who felt 'in-between'. These kids had different lives at home and outside of home (Erdem, M45, Istanbul).

The narratives call attention to an important commonality amongst the first generation, regardless of their socio-economic background and reasons of settlement in Germany. In all the narratives, it can be detected that the first generation planned their migration project as a temporary settlement which then turned to a permanent stay. The goal was to save some money and buy property in Turkey and return to the homeland once the goal was reached. Didem's narrative illustrates the first generation's determination to return to Turkey. Her father went to Germany as a refugee in 1978, right before the military intervention of 1980. Her mother settled in Germany with Didem's father in 1987. This narrative is selected to represent the common desire of the first generation to return, because Didem's father did not immigrate to Germany voluntarily, he basically had to

escape from Turkey due to his political ideologies. Yet, he always dreamt of returning, even though he became a successful restaurant owner and cook in Germany.

My parents wanted to save as much as money they could and come back to Turkey at some point. Since I know myself, I always remember my family saving money and making plans of return. They really wanted to come back to Istanbul. That's why we never bought a house in Germany. We were always renting. Imagine... I lived there [Germany] for almost twenty years, and we did not have our own house. It was not a matter of money; buying a house meant taking roots in Germany... and I think buying a house in Germany has psychologically and symbolically has a huge effect. It meant a stable life for my parents; perhaps they were afraid that they could never ever leave Germany again. (Didem, F24, Istanbul).

4.1.2 Constructions of 'Home' and 'Belonging' in Diaspora Spaces

In order to trace the process of 'home' and 'belonging' constructions, this section focuses on two types of memory. First one is the *communicative memory*, evaluating the everyday communication between the second generation and their parents, and the practices in the family space regarding Turkish culture and traditions. By focusing on the communicative memory, the thesis aims to find out how the second generation construct their 'belonging' on an individual level within the spheres of *collective memory*. The second one is the *cultural memory*, looking at diaspora spaces of the second generation in which they construct a sense of belonging to the parental homeland through childhood visits in Turkey, media and school education. Here, the second generation's reflections upon the grand narratives of Turkish nation, ethnicity and religion are illustrated. By comparing and contrasting the experiences of the second generation within the constructions of communicative memory and cultural memory, the section analyses the second generation's standpoints towards the parental homeland. This part will later be connected to the second generation's motivations to return and their experiences in the parental homeland, by looking at the possible shifts and renegotiations in their diasporic and gendered identity.

Before getting into the mentioned framework of analysis, the section illustrates the main narratives about 'being from a Turkish family'. According to the narratives of the second generation;

- 1 There is not one type of ‘Turkish’ family. However the common norm is the gender roles in families. The findings show that the interviewees grew up in patriarchal families in which fathers in most of the cases are the highest in the hierarchal order; taking decisions for themselves and for the other members of their families.
- 2 The accounts show that the traditional Turkish father figure was influential on the interviewees’ lives and future decisions. On the other hand, some interviewees mentioned their mothers as the strongest character in the family who were stricter and more protective than fathers. In these cases the traces of matriarchy can be seen; the mothers appear as the decision-makers, guardians of the Turkish way of life through teaching the mother tongue, cooking Turkish food, teaching Turkish history and geography etc. To certain extent religious practices are also taught and encouraged by the parents. Quran courses, *Bayram* celebrations (Islamic fests), teaching of prayers etc. are the main religious practices.
- 3 Another way of learning about Turkey was to go to the *Turkish school* which was once a week and given by teachers who were sent by the Turkish government. They taught basic history of Turkish Republic and geography, literature, the national anthem, the life of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic.
- 4 The parents of second generation arranged their summer holidays in Turkey. All the narratives pointed out that the parents’ main motivation for hard work was linked to the holidays in Turkey. In order to afford the costs of these holidays, parents saved money throughout the whole year. For second generation, these holidays symbolise good weather, relatives, sun, Turkish food, warm welcoming and long car rides between Germany and Turkey.
- 5 Another finding points to the openness of the families towards the host society which is the German society, and its *multi-kulti* formation with other nationalities. The narratives commonly state that the parents encouraged their daughters and sons to go to school and be active during their school lives with extracurricular activities such as sports, arts, school trips etc. In general, all the accounts highlight the good relations with German neighbours.
- 6 The interviewees’ stories start changing when they tell about their lives after high school. The parents who encouraged them to study, have German friends, integrate in the German society then wanted to direct their children into a more ‘Turkish’ life.

Discussing these points through the narratives give a clearer picture about what it means to be a member of a Turkish family and how the second generation experienced gender roles and power hierarchies within this context. These narratives also give insights about how *communicative memory* functioned as a source of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ constructions. The first example is of Figen. It was her mother who first went to Germany and Figen’s father followed them soon after. She returned to Turkey for job-related reasons in 1988. Her mother accompanied her. Her father still lives in Germany. Figen’s story is a good example of a ‘modern’ Turkish family in which both parents worked and the children got educated. However in her narrative, we see the traditional elements of a Turkish family that Figen had to be a good daughter who behaved in ways that her family’s reputation would not be harmed.

My parents were open to the German culture. My mother would cook both Turkish and German food. We used to give each other presents in Christmas. We spoke Turkish at home, but both cultures would go together. But my parents worked so hard, so they did not spend enough time with us.

[...]

People from Turkey think that the Turks in Germany are so free. It is not true! I have never been to a discotheque in Germany. It was forbidden, my father was very tough about this. Everyone knew my father in the town and so he told me that there was no way that I could go to a disco because then people would gossip about me. It was a small town and everyone knew each other so my father wanted me to be careful (Figen, F35, Istanbul).

In another account, Nurten introduces us a little different picture. Even though her parents supported her school and social life, they had stricter rules about Turkish traditions. Additionally, Nurten represents a different Turkish culture, which is the Eastern Turkish culture where her parents originally come from.

My mother had a rule. It was forbidden to speak German at home. I am glad that she forced us to speak Turkish at home. I see new generations [of Turks], their Turkish is horrible. Their German is not well either. They are in-between.

[...]

My mother used to tell, “We are Turkish. We are Muslims. Our traditions, our religion, our culture is different [than the Germans’] and we are just living in this country.” We never forgot that we were Turkish. When my mother came to Turkey, she would buy history books and encourage us to learn more about the history of Turkey.

[...]

My father was in parent-teacher association, he requested Quran courses for Muslim students. So the school arranged religion classes for us on Saturdays and Sundays. In terms of religious matters... My parents tried to teach us about religion as much as they could. They sent us to these Quran courses.

[...]

My family... I think to a certain degree they were also conservative. For example... I started karate when I was 13. They didn’t enjoy the idea but they allowed me. After a year my brother started karate too. It was because my brother was dying to learn karate. It was more like “your sister is a young lady now, don’t leave her alone there.” (laughing) They found a way to protect me. Always! And when I became 18, I started to join the tournaments. I needed to travel and so on. And of course I was with guys. So my parents said “Karate is distracting your studies” so I quit karate (Nurten, F38, Istanbul).

As the narratives illustrate, the ‘family narratives’ strongly affected the second generation’s practices of Turkish culture and traditions. In the family space, Turkish was the main language and the families gave a special effort to teach the second generation about their homeland. Through the *confluence of narratives*, the second generation was aware of their *home away from home* situation by maintaining a *double consciousness*. On one hand, they were integrated into the so called host country, by being successful in their school lives, having German and international friend circles, being fluent in German language and having an understanding of German culture and even, to a certain extent practicing the German traditions via school. But on the other hand, they knew that they were ‘different’ somehow, so they constantly had to renegotiate their Turkish and Turkish-German hybrid identities in the diaspora spaces. Öykü’s narrative illustrates how

confluence of narratives was the main source of getting knowledge about the Turkish history:

Our teacher was a guy from Ankara, he was a typical *Kemalist*¹⁴² teacher. He never taught us about religion. He ended up with complaints from the parents because of this. They wanted their children to learn how to read Quran and be knowledgeable about Islam. The only way for the Turkish children to learn Turkish history was through their parents because Turkish history is not a part of school syllabuses in Germany (Öykü, F34, Istanbul).

When looked at how *cultural memory* shaped the second generation's 'home' and 'belonging' constructions, it appears the second generation highly reflected upon their diasporic identity through the representations in films, documentaries, music and history books etc. Especially, they felt familiar with the representations of the second generation Turkish-Germans and guestworkers. For instance, Taner mentions how he was a fan of Turkish-German hip hop singers, because the lyrics were about the struggles of the second generation Turkish-Germans in Germany.

We were watching Turkish channels on TV. I was a fan of Turkish-German hip-hop culture. Hip-hop is important because it is protest music, it is the voice of people. It makes claims, it shouts the problems (Taner, M36, Düzce).

Most of the narratives are similar to Taner's; the second generation commonly mentioned that they could see similarities between their lives and those representations in different genres of arts and media. However, there is an interesting point in these narratives; that is, while second generation constructed their 'belonging' through the representations of grand narratives about Turkish nation, culture, history, Islam, they did not have a deeper understanding of these, but they were still passionately hanging on to these Turkish representations. One of the reasons of this is, as it is found in the narratives, the shaping of *the Self in the gaze of the Other*. German society and German institutions (mostly by referencing the school system) were not "nationalist enough" in the eyes of the second generation Turkish-Germans. Taner's narrative illustrates this approach the best:

¹⁴² Term used for following the principles of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic. One of the main features of Kemalism is secularism.

Turkishness was so important for me. Germans are so soft; they do not care if someone says something bad to their nation or family. Turks help each other, within a second 15 Turkish guys can gather for another Turk, and you don't even have to know that person so well, you just want to help because you don't want to see that another Turk is having hard time.

[...]

I learnt that my family was *Alevi*s after moving to Turkey because we never talked about it in Germany. I also had really limited knowledge about the Turkish traditions. For example I learnt the Turkish National Anthem in the army [in Turkey]. I learnt about Atatürk and his principles in the army as well. I started reading books about the Turkish history after moving to Turkey (Taner, M36, Düzce).

As Taner's narratives illustrate, the second generation's proud about being 'Turkish' is rather fixed in the scope of *banal nationalism*. On the other hand, their construction of homeland is a gendered one, nationality is something holy and it has to be respected. When the second generation mentioned Turkey, they commonly used the term 'motherland'. 'Motherland' as a gendered 'home', is closely linked to the second generation's understandings of 'mother'. These narratives usually belong to male interviewees; for them mothers are holy. Here as well, just like in the case of nationality, the second generation male interviewees referred to the German society's understanding of 'mothers' and made their points through reflecting on *the Other*, or *significant other*, linking this to the understanding of nation. Batuhan's narratives represent the mentioned understanding very well. Batuhan has German citizenship, he never studied in Turkey. He was born and raised in Berlin, studied Marketing at university. He stated that speaking in Turkish was difficult for him, because he felt more comfortable in German.

Germans don't swear at mothers. Mothers are not holy in Germany. Once a Turkish guy swore at my mother, I knocked him down. But now, Germans started swearing at mothers too. They learnt it from Turks... For Germans, mothers didn't have such a great value. We taught them that mothers deserve the highest respect.

[...]

We also taught Germans that flags are holy. We were carrying Turkish flags with such respect, and they learnt from us. During the World Cup, the Germans weren't waving their flags, we [Turks] were waving German flags! Turkey wasn't in the World Cup, so we were supporting Germany, carrying their flags with the same respect we have for the Turkish flag, Germans were shocked by this! Then, they also started carrying German flags. Germans made news about this case, "Why Turks carry German flags?" It was such a big deal (Batuhan, M32, Istanbul).

4.1.3 Constructing 'Home' and 'Belonging' Transnationally

The second generation's childhood visits to Turkey is the best example of the transnational spaces. Narratives accounts point out that the second generation went to Turkey once a year with their parents during the six-weeks summer holidays. They went to Turkey by car, filling it with especially electronics from Germany such a washing machine, irons, TVs – back in the days Turkey did not have a market for electronics. One important point is that, the experience was rather *translocal* than transnational. First of all, the second generation narrate that they had not been/lived in other towns/cities in Germany than theirs. Secondly, when they came to Turkey, they only visited their parents' city/village of origin and a summer town in the Aegean and Mediterranean. When they were in their parents' city/village, they mostly spent time with their relatives in their neighbourhoods. When they went to summer places, they stayed in a hotel or a summer house of their parents or relatives. Therefore, it is difficult to speak of 'places', it is more coherent to mention 'spaces'. Yet, these childhood memories created mostly a positive picture of 'home' in the eyes of the second generation with a few exceptions. Öykü tells about how she enjoyed the summer holidays in Turkey until she became a teenager:

We would first come to Istanbul to see my grandparents then we would go to our summer house. But these trips weren't enough to see the real life in Istanbul. I enjoyed these summer holidays in Turkey. I was getting really excited before the trips. The road trips felt like they were going to take forever and this would double my excitement. We would bring presents for my grandparents and acquaintances.

[...]

The people from the summer town would always point at me, whispering 'She is from Germany' to each other. I wasn't disturbed when I was a kid. It started to

disturb me when I was around 16 years old. I didn't like the attention. It felt like everyone was interested in me (Öykü, F34, Istanbul).

The rest of the narratives are similar to Öykü's. One of the main themes of the childhood memories from Turkey is that, the second generation could feel that they were not totally belong to Turkey because the locals called them *Almancı* and they treated them as they were tourists or strangers. This was mainly due to the second generation's different looks. Especially before the 1990s, before Turkey started to have a liberal economy, there were no foreign brands in Turkey. The second generation's clothing and accessories, sports shoes and bags made them look different. Another point is that the second generation did not feel comfortable speaking Turkish, because even though they understood what it was told, they had hard time understanding pop culture references, jokes and idioms. This shows an important point; language is dynamic, it changes over time and it is related to cultural contexts. Knowing words and constructing sentences are not always enough for communicative understanding.

The following account is a good example of how the second generation compare and contrast Germany and Turkey and relate their understanding of 'home' to places. It also illustrates how the second generation renegotiated their gendered identity in these transnational spaces.

Before each trip, an excitement grew in me; we were going to our land, to where we belonged to! But when we were in Istanbul, I was missing home – Germany! I was admiring everything in Istanbul. Even though we had the best of everything in Germany, I would be admiring the stuff in Turkey. For example the shitty ice cream made by the local grocery in Istanbul was so valuable to me! My aunt's daughter Selin was my idol. When I met her, I would scan her clothes, hair style and behaviour carefully so I could imitate her. She represented how a Turkish girl should have looked like for me. In Germany youth mostly wore sporty stuff. But the girls around my age in Turkey were so fancy!

[...]

Once Selin told me, "I am going to show you something. You won't believe your eyes!" In the end she took me to a shopping mall which was one of the first in

Istanbul. We got on the escalator and she started to scream “Isn’t it amazing?” So, her surprise was the escalator because it was the first escalator in Turkey. I have never been so disappointed in my life! We had already had escalators everywhere in Germany! In spite of all odds, I liked everything in Turkey. I liked its backwardness, I liked that there was nothing! (laughing) Turkey wasn’t really developed in those years but still it was the best place in my opinion (Lamia, F36, Istanbul).

As the whole section on ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ show that the second generation has been constantly renegotiating their diasporic and gendered identity in different diaspora spaces; and their ‘home’ constructions were directly linked to their ‘family narratives’. The next section evaluates how the second generation’s imagined ‘home’ met the reality and how second generation reflect upon these based on their experiences during and after the return.

4.2 Narratives of Return

This section evaluates the previously analysed phases of the second generation’s life in the light of their return experience. The narratives of return show that the second generation had mixed feelings about the return. Even though most of them felt that Turkey was their ‘home’, they were disillusioned once they return to Turkey. The factor behind is this situation is that, feeling ‘belongingness’ towards Turkey did not make their life easier in Turkey. Once they settled in Turkey, they realised that life was not easy; especially in Istanbul. Most of them coming from small and organised towns of Germany, Istanbul seemed a chaotic place in which the institutions (school, the government, municipalities but also their working places) dysfunctional. The disillusionment narratives are the main theme within the context of ‘imagined homeland’ and ‘reality’. However, after spending years in Turkey, they still dub Turkey as ‘home’, as where they belong to without ignoring the problems and dissatisfactions they have about living in Turkey. The term ‘counter-diasporic migration’ fit into the second-generation Turkish-Germans’ return because the second generation brought their diasporic identity with them when they returned to their parental homeland. Even though they returned to their ‘imagined’ home, it was a new place with new people, with new spaces and therefore the second generation had to renegotiate their identities. The narratives highlight this situation by comparing and contrasting their lives in Turkey and Germany. Briefly, narratives point to three types of return experience:

- 1 Involuntary return through family decision and this led to traumatic experiences in Turkey. Most of the family returns took place in and after 1983, when the German government introduced the grant to encourage immigrants to return their homelands.
- 2 Return related to marriage, relationship. The second generation constantly renegotiate their gendered identity and hybrid diasporic identity in this approach. Especially women returnees had to change their life styles once they settled in Turkey.
- 3 Return as a search for self-identity. This category presents the self-realisation of the second generation who returned to their 'imagined homeland'. They are aware of the problems in Turkey as well as the country's good sides.

The following sections represent each point with narratives and analyses them through the previous research done of the second generation's return and counter-diasporic migration.

4.2.1 Return through Family Decision

As it was stated in the previous sections, the first generation Turkish immigrants had the plan of return since the beginning of their immigration Germany. The narratives show that most of the return took place in and around 1983; the families took the offer of the German government and returned to Turkey. Some other cases show that, families returned because of discrimination they faced with in Germany, though these were rather rare cases. Interestingly enough, none of the narratives fit into the 'ideal types of returnees' that Razum et al. introduces. Instead, Cerese's types are more applicable, especially in the cases of *return of conservatism* and *return of retirement* in the case of the first generation. For the first generation return can be best understood within the *Social Network Theory*, because the first generation because they used the skills they gained in Germany when they returned to Turkey mostly by starting up a new business. They are also a part of cross-border networks in which they got assistance from friends or relatives both in Germany and Turkey to launch their business. Mostly, the return was the end of their migration cycle even though they kept their links with Germany through advancing communication technologies.

For the second generation, the return can be evaluated both within the *Social Network Theory*; because their 'human capital' that was gained in Germany helped them in Turkey

but also within *Transnationalism* because the return is not necessarily the end of their migration journey. Since most of the second generation worked in jobs related to Germany and German language (such as tourist bureaus, translation offices, airline companies) they went back and forth between two countries and they enjoyed the transnational spaces in Turkey in which they spoke German, communicated with German customers or Turkish people who come from Germany.

The following narrative highlights the common characteristics of the second generation return through family decision. This group came to Turkey with their families during their teenage years, so most of the traumatic experiences in Turkey are related to the school life. The narrative also illustrates another commonality in the case of females, in which the families were very protective. Yet, as Fatoş's final part of the narrative presents that the second generation got used to living in Turkey despite the negative aspects and the shift from feeling as a 'stranger' to a local.

We returned in 1984, many Turkish families returned because German government offered money for these families. When I came here I was nervous about studying high school in Turkey, we knew that the system here was different.

[...]

I didn't want to return. I was very upset about my parents' decision. My grandmother was going to stay in Germany and I was telling my parents that I could live with my grandmother. But my parents didn't let me live in Germany alone, they insisted that I would return with them. For the first two years I was quite unhappy even though the high school was nice. I was feeling as I was a stranger in Turkey, everything was new and I was expected to get used to everything. I was missing my friends in Germany, our house there, my school... But as an only child and being female it wasn't possible for me to live alone in Germany. I wouldn't be alone but according to my parents, being far from them meant being alone. So I had to forget about Germany.

[...]

They thought that if they didn't return at that point they wouldn't return at all. Also seeing my aunt marrying to a German and settling in Germany, they thought the

same would happen to me. I think they wanted me to marry someone who is from our culture, they must have had worries about me finding a German husband or something.

[...]

When we returned to Istanbul, my parents always said “Now you live in Istanbul and you have to be careful with everything. It is not as safe as Germany!” All of a sudden I was introduced to fears... Fearing from strangers, fearing from cars, fearing from food sold on the streets... This feeling was something new to me; in Germany I wasn't living a life where I had to watch out what was happening around me.

[...]

Now I think I would never live in Germany again. In my working career, I worked in a company for 14 years which was cooperating with Germany. So I had to go to Germany 4-5 times a year. Every time I went to Germany, I was waiting for the day that I was going to return to Turkey. Now I think that it was a good decision for my family to return to Turkey. I love my country, I love its people. In Germany people have boring lives. The life in Germany is very limited. You go to work, you come back home, you take a walk... I realized these things so much later... So I don't want to live elsewhere than Istanbul. Istanbul is so colourful so its people. When you go out you see people from different ages and looks; there is such a variety! (Fatoş, F43, Istanbul).

4.2.2 Return through Marriage

The second generation's narratives commonly stress that their parents would prefer them to marry a person who is of Turkish origin, being Muslim is another preference. The second generation on the other hand mostly stated that the most important thing to love, nationality comes the second but that they would still prefer someone from their culture. In the case of the females, their marriages were supported and sometimes arranged by their families. For instance, Nurten returned to Turkey to marry her cousin. She was a pharmacist in Germany, having her own economic freedom but once she returned to Turkey through marriage, her husband did not allow her to work. Nurten therefore had to

renegotiate her gendered identity, but also her diasporic identity because her husband restricted her based on her upbringing in Germany.

The idea was that I would return here and get married here [Turkey]. In the beginning it was difficult. I wasn't able to express myself fully. I still have a difficulty with that... sometimes... Or, I would say something and people would misunderstand me. My husband, his family...

[...]

Also... Sitting at home, not working... I was used to work-life, and in Turkey I wasn't able to work. It made me fall into a black abyss. It was hard to be captured at home. My husband didn't allow me to work in here. He said "You can't do it here. You are too nice. Turkey is not like Germany. They would take advantage of you." I really wanted to experience the work life in here. But I can't.

[...]

I was telling my husband that he can't control me because I get bored living under pressure. And he isn't used to such behaviour. We had problems because of this. I sometimes ironically ask him "Do you regret being with me?" and he doesn't answer. I think even though I feel closer to the Turkish culture, I still feel that I am different than people in here. Because, I was born and raised in Germany... I think differently... in terms of parenting... many things... (Nurten, F38, Istanbul).

In another example, Ahu tells us how difficult it is to live in a rural area of Turkey while being more 'Germanised'. She was born and raised in Devrek and she returned to her parents' village Devrek. Ahu owns a translation office that services in German. She is divorced; she raises her son as a single mother. However she complains about how the locals of village have negative thoughts about her ways.

I didn't like Devrek, people were very narrow-minded, they still are... Being a divorced woman in Devrek is difficult. People talk, they constantly talk. Because of my clothes, my behaviour, my way of talk...It would be hard to protect myself from the guys. But I am such a strong person, I am confident and I am stubborn, if

I want to do something, I do it no matter what regardless of what people think or say about me.

[...]

If you are a woman in Turkey, you have to be clever, you have to be careful. I am happy to be a woman, but I am using it carefully. Even in terms of business, people want to work with me because they find me attractive and they think they can get something from me, so I am using the advantages of being a woman but of course in the end they get nothing from me. I need a protection wall, otherwise I would need to deal with problems (Ahu, F35, Devrek).

4.2.3 Return as Self-Realisation

This section is directly linked to the second generation's constructions of an 'imagined' homeland. The second generation who experienced return as self-realisation are those who projected the return themselves as an autonomous decision. In this category we see that some of the second generation first came to Turkey with Erasmus Exchange Programme and decided to stay in Turkey. Some others, came by giving a radical decision and saw the return as an 'adventure'. There are also the cases in which the second generation firstly felt disillusioned but in time they found out that they feel 'belonged to' to Turkey. However self-realisation is a highly emotional term, it is about feeling and sentiments. The second generation still points to the negative parts of their lives in Turkey. For instance they complain about nepotism in business life, the unstructured setting of Istanbul, its traffic, chaos, rote-based education system at schools, high costs of sports activities such as having a membership to gym, air and water pollution etc.

They also narrate that they are aware of the developments in Turkey since their childhood visits; that any product can easily be found in especially in Istanbul, health care system got better, public transportation and roads developed immensely etc. This section will only represent one narrative to summarise the main elements of the second generation's identity crisis in diasporic and transnational setting, imaginings of homeland and renegotiations after their return and self-reflection on their identities and belonging. It also shows that the second generation have their own space, or *third cultural space* in which rather than the binary oppositions, the second generation embrace identities as hybrid, dynamic and fluid.

Turkish culture was dominant in our home. Even though I was lucky that I was a part of such a modern family I still thought that it was hard to balance the home life and outside. It makes you schizophrenic. I had two worlds and I was familiar to both. Everything at home felt normal as it should be, but when I went to school or to my friends' places I would see differences but I was used to it since I had to deal with it from a very early age.

[...]

When I was 15-16, I started feeling more comfortable with the German culture. When my parents got divorced, I was around 14, we didn't have the happy Turkish family life anymore. My father was never around, my mother was never around. I could just be myself and I didn't have that 'living in two different worlds' situation anymore because the Turkish world faded away. There was only German culture left for me from that point on. Because every successful, decent person I know was German and I wanted to follow the German way; I thought that it was better. And even the tiny pressure coming from my parents created a big reaction by my side. That's why, I think the reason of me feeling and being more German is about my character. I think Turkish people care too much about what other people think and say about them. In Germany there is no such culture. Even though people probably judge you they won't vocally express it because they think it is not their business.

[...]

It is hard for me to determine my identity. As my age gets older I feel the necessity to be sure about what I am. Now I am thinking, I am not a child of one country, not only Turkey's or Germany's, I am a world citizen. I am not able to see myself as a German, or as a Turkish, I am just saying that I am a human-being. I came to this conclusion... First I was Turkish, I spoke Turkish I was with my family, then with school I became German and after moving here I had to remember Turkish again and in the end I realized I am none of these identities. Or let's say I am all and none at the same time, I am more than this, I am embracing all cultures and therefore I am a world citizen (Levent, M29, Istanbul).

5 Conclusion

This thesis explored the second generation Turkish-Germans lives in their diaspora and transnational spaces and evaluated the constructions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ in the light of their families’ memories from the homeland, their own childhood memories from the holidays in Turkey and their Turkish upbringing in Germany through school education, arts and media and their relationships with other Turkish people and the German society. The thesis used theories of memory, generation, diaspora and gender while evaluating these life stages in order to emphasize the intersectionality of the case study. The life-story narratives were the main source of information which gave direct insights from the lives of the second generation. The findings illustrated that memories, nostalgia and representations of Turkey in the family space were effective on the constructions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. Based on the gender norms of the Turkish culture, the second generation males and females experienced their process of belonging differently and they constantly renegotiated their gendered agency in different diaspora spaces. The study also presented that ‘home’ was a gendered construction and this led female and male second generation perceive their parental homeland in relation with the gender roles they grew up in.

The paper then, connected the constructions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ to the second generation’s return journey by exploring their motivations to return, their attitudes to return and their experiences in post-return. The findings presented that the second generation experienced alienation in their first and second years in their parental homeland. Even though they thought that they returned to their motherland which they belonged to, they experienced that they were different. Females struggled renegotiating their gendered identity; they had to adapt the new rules of gender roles. In general, the narratives pointed out that the second generation enjoy the lively and colourful atmosphere of Istanbul. However they also referred to the negative parts of living in Turkey; for instance, rote-based education system, nepotism and network-based business life, traffic and chaos in Istanbul.

The main narratives of return were three kind; return through family decision, return through marriage and return as self-realisation. The second generation who returned with their parents were those who came in their teenager years and they had hard time adapting to the Turkish education system. Even though they mostly spoke Turkish at home in

Germany, they had hard times communicating with people in Turkey. This stressed the importance of understanding language as a dynamic process. The second generation who return because of marriage struggled in their new family lives mostly because of their husbands and the mother-wife role that was given to them by the society. This theme could be found in the narratives of females. Return as self-realisation showed that the second generation returned to discover their homeland and find their self-identity. While most of them enjoyed this journey; they also mentioned the struggle they had in their identities. Here, hybrid identity seemed as a crisis; but the second generation overcame this by embracing both cultures and concentrate on their futures. They most of the time kept their transnational links, or translocal links.

This thesis showed that the second generation Turkish-Germans constantly renegotiate their identities. Their belongingness and identities are fluid and related to 'places' as much as memories. Their physical locations affect their positionality. The second generation is also aware of their 'diaspora consciousness'; they are aware of their multi-locality. Therefore, the thesis claimed that their return migration had to be understood as a new chronotope; it is 'counter-diasporic' migration because their parental homeland was a new context for them despite their 'belonging' to the Turkish culture and nation. The specific case of the second-generation Turkish-Germans show similarities between the Italian-Swiss second-generation in terms of gender renegotiations, patriarchal family setting and the impact of memories on the understanding of 'home'. When compared with the British-born Cypriot returnees, the Turkish-German returnees seem not to benefit so much from their diasporic identity in Turkey except the benefits of knowing German which helped them find jobs. The study showed that the second-generation Turkish-Germans' specific case of return cannot be evaluated with the return theories that were designed for the first generation, because the second generation's understanding of 'home' is more blurry compared to their parents.

Due to the space limitations, the thesis did not evaluate other factors deeply; for example differences in rural-urban settings, second generation's future plans, the future of the Turkish diaspora in general, the second generation's economic achievements and motivations, their deeper thoughts on the Turkish and German society etc. Also that, even though slightly mentioned, the thesis did not concentrate on the second generation's thoughts on the re-return to Germany. Did return to parental homeland represented the end

of their migration journey, or are they open to go back to Germany? The thesis claims that this research can be carried out as a doctoral thesis and concentrate on the mentioned aspects in detail.

Bibliography

Abadan-Unat, Nermin. "Turkish migration in Europe, 1960-1975." In *Turkish workers in Europe 1960-1975: A Socio-Economic Reappraisal*, edited by Nermin Abadan-Unat, 1-44. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Al-Ali Nadjie S, and Khalid Koser. *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Anderson, Benedict R. O. *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia, and the World*. London: Verso, 1998.

Anthias, Floya. "Evaluating 'Diaspora': Beyond Ethnicity?" *Sociology* 32(3) (1998): 557-580.

Anthias, Floya. "Thinking through the Lens of Translocational Positionality: An Intersectionally Frame for Understanding Identity and Belonging." *Translocations: Migration and Social Change* 4(1) (2008): 5-20.

Anthias, Floya. "Where do I Belong? Narrating Collective Identity and Translocal Positionality." *Ethnicities* 2(4) (2002): 1-15.

Appadurai Arjun and Breckenridge Carol. "On Moving Targets." *Public Culture* 2 (1989): 5-9.

Assman Jan and Czaplicka John. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65 (1995): 125-133.

Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Brubaker, Rogers. "The 'diaspora' Diaspora." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(1) (2005): 1-19.

Carling, Jørgen. "Gender Dimensions of International Migration." *Global Migration*

Perspectives 35 (2005): 1-26.

Carr, David. "Life and Narrator's Art" In *Hermeneutics and Deconstruction: Selected Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy*, edited by D. Ihde and H. J. Silverman, 108-121. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.

Cassarino, Jean-Pierre. "Theorising Return Migration: A Revisited Conceptual Approach to Return Migrants." *EUI Working Paper* 2 (2004): 1-25.

Cerase, Francesco Paolo. "Expectations and Reality: A Case Study of Return Migration from the United States to Southern Italy." *International Migration Review* 8(2) (1974): 245-262.

Chamberlain, Mary. *Narratives of Exile and Return*. London: MacMillan, 1997.

Child, Irvin Long. *Italian or American? The Second Generation in Conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943.

Christou, Anastasia. "Migrating Gender: Feminist Geographies in Women's Biographies of Return Migration." *Michigan Feminist Studies, Special issue: Gender and Globalism*, 17 (2003c).

Christou, Anastasia. *Narratives of Place, Culture and Identity: Second-Generation Greek-Americans Return 'Home'* (IMISCOE Dissertations: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).

Christou Anastasia and King Russell. "Gendering Counter-Diasporic Migration: Second-Generation Greek-Americans and Greek-Germans Narrate their 'Homecoming' to Greece." *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 20(2) (2011): 283-314.

Cicourel, Aaron, V. *Cognitive Sociology: Language and Meaning in Social Interaction*. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Clark, Herbert H. *Arenas of Language Use*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Cohen, Robin. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997.

Der Spiegel. Last modified February 28, 2011. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/erdogan-urges-turks-not-to-assimilate-you-are-part-of-germany-but-also-part-of-our-great-turkey-a-748070.html>.

Ehrkamp Patricia, and Leitner Helga. "Beyond National Citizenship: Turkish Immigrants And The (Re)Construction Of Citizenship In Germany." *Urban Geography* 24(2) (2003): 127-146.

Erll, Astrid. "Locating family in Cultural Memory Studies." *Journal of Comparative Memory Studies* 42(3) (2011): 303-318.

Euwals Rob, Dagevos Jaco, Gijsberts Mérove and Roodenburg, Hans. "Labour Market Position of Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands: Reasons for Migration, Naturalisation and Language Proficiency." *Bonn: IZA Discussion Paper* 268 (2007).

Faas, Daniel. "The Europeanisation of German Ethnic Identities: The Case of German and Turkish Students in Two Stuttgart Secondary Schools." *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 17(1) (2007): 45-62.

Faas, Daniel. "From Guest Workers to Citizens? Muslims in Germany." *Network Migration in Europe* accessed on 15 June 2012 <http://migrationeducation.de/fileadmin/uploads/FAAS.pdf>.

Federal Statistical Office Germany, Wiesbaden, 2004.

Frontier, Anne-Marie. *Uprootings/Regroundings Questions of Home and Migration*, edited by Sara Ahmed, Claudia Castaneda, Ann Marie Fortier, and Mimi Sheller, Oxford: Berg, 2003.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gedi Noa and Elam Yigal. "Collective Memory – What is it?" *History and Memory* 8(1) (1996): 30-50.

Glick Schiller, Nina. "Transimmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the US. Immigrant Experience," in *The Handbook of International Migration*, edited by Charles Hirschman, Josh DeWind and Philip Kasinitz, 94-119. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1998.

Glick Schiller, Nina and Linda Basch and Cristina Blanc Szanton. "Transnationalism: A New Analytic Framework for Understanding Migration." In *Migration, Globalization, and Ethnic Relations: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, edited by Mohsen Mobasher and Mahmoud Sadri 213-228. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004.

Gmelch, George. "Return Migration." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 9(1) (1980): 135-159.

Goodson, Ivar, F. "The Rise of the Life Narrative," *Teacher Education Quarterly* 33(4) (2006): 7-21.

Halbwachs Maurice, and Coser Lewis A. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Hall, Stuart. "Who Needs Identity?" In *Identity: A Reader*, edited by Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman, 15-30. London: SAGE Publications in association with The Open University, 2000.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Theorizing Diaspora*, edited by Jana Evans Braziel and Anita Mannur, 233-246. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2006.

Hedetoft, Ulf. "Discourses and Images of Belonging: Migrants between 'New Racism', Liberal Nationalism and Globalization." *AMID Working Paper Series* 5 (2002): 1-24.

Helly, Denise. "History of an Idea." In *Muslim Diaspora: Gender, Culture and Identity*, edited by Haideh Moghissi, 3-22. London: Routledge, 2006.

Hermans, Hubert J. M. "Voicing The Self: From Information Processing To Dialogical Interchange." *Psychological Bulletin* 119(1) (1996): 31-50.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. *Gendered Transitions Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1994.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. "Introduction: Gender and Contemporary U.S. Immigration." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4) (1999): 565-576.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. "Feminism and Migration." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571(1) (2000): 107-120.

Karcher, Albert. "Integrating Turks in Germany: The Separation of Turks from German Society, Discrimination against Turks in the German Labor Market and Policy Recommendations to Integrate Turks into German Society." (Thesis, Duke University), 2010.

Kaya, Ayhan. "German-Turkish Transnational Space: A Separate Space of Their Own." *German Studies Review* 30(3) (2007): 1-20.

Kaya, Ayhan and Kentel, Ferhat. *Euro-Turks: A Bridge or a Breach between Turkey and the European Union?* Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies, 2005.

Kertzer, David I. "Generation as a Sociological Problem." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9(1) (1983): 125-149.

Kılıçlı, Ayça. "Turkish Migrants in Germany, Prospects of Integration." *Observatory of European Foreign Policy* 16 (2003).

King, Russell. *Return Migration and Regional Economic Problems*. London: Croom Helm, 1986.

King, Russell and Christou, Anastasia. "Cultural Geographies of Counter-Diasporic Migration: Perspectives from the Study of Second-Generation 'Returnees' to Greece."

Population, Space and Place, 16(2) (2010): 1-30.

King Russell and Kilinc Nilay. *'Euro-Turks' Return: The Counterdiasporic Migration of German-Born Turks to Turkey* (Malmö: Malmö University, MIM, 2012).

Levitt, Peggy. "Forms of Transnational Community and their Implications for Immigrant Incorporation: Preliminary Findings" (paper presented at the Conference on Integrating Immigrants in Liberal States, Florence, European University Institute 8-9 May, 1998).

Levitt, Peggy. "Roots and Routes: Understanding the Lives of the Second Generation Transnationally." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35(7) (2009): 1225-1242.

Louie, Vivian S M. "Second-Generation Pessimism And Optimism: How Chinese And Dominicans Understand Education And Mobility Through Ethnic And Transnational Orientations." *International Migration Review* 40(3) (2006): 537-572.

Mahler Sarah J. and Pessar Patricia R. "Gendered Geographies of Power: Analyzing Gender Across Transnational Spaces." *Identities* 7(4) (2001): 441-459.

Mannheim, Karl. "The Sociological Problem of Generations." In *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, edited by Paul Keckskemet, 276-320. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1952.

Martin, Philip. *The Unfinished Story: Turkish Labour Migration to Europe* (Geneva: International Labour Office, 1993).

McAdams, Dan P. "Personal Narratives and Life Story." In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, edited by John Robins and Lawrence A. Pervin, 243-262. New York: Guilford Press, 2008.

Mead, George Herbert. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Naturalisation Statistics Germany

Østergaard Nielsen, Eva. Turkey and the 'Euro-Turks': Overseas Nationals as an Ambiguous Asset. In *International Migration and Sending Countries: Perceptions, Policies and Transnational Relations*, edited by Eva Østergaard-Nielsen, 77-98. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Plummer, Kermit, C. *Documents of Life: An Introduction to the Problems and Literature of a Humanistic Method*. London: Allen&Unwin, 1983.

Portes, Alejandro. "Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism." *Global Networks*, 1(3) (2001): 181-194.

Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1) (1993): 74-96.

Portes Alejandro and Guarnizo Luis E. and Landolt Patricia. "The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2) (1999): 217-237.

Razum Oliver, Sahin-Hodoglugil Nuriye N. and Polit Karin. "Health, Wealth or Family Ties? Why Turkish Work Migrants Return from Germany." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(4) (2005): 719-739.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1993.

Rumbaut, Rubén G. "Ties that Bind: Immigration and Immigrant Families in the United States." In *Immigration and the Family: Research and Policy on U.S. Immigrants*, edited by Allan Booth, Ann C. Crouter and Nancy, S. Landale, 133-148. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.

Rumbaut, Rubén G. "Severed or Sustained Attachments? Language, Identity, and Imagined Communities in the Post-Immigrant Generation." In *The Changing Face of Home: The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*, edited by Peggy Levitt and Mary C. Waters,

43-95. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2002.

Safran, William. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return." *Diaspora* 1(1) (1991): 83-99.

Salazar Parreñas, Rachel. "Inserting Feminism in Transnational Migration Studies." *Migrationonline.cz* (2009): 4 Accessed August 1, 2013, <http://www.migrationonline.cz/en/inserting-feminism-in-transnational-migration-studies>.

Schegloff, Emanuel A. "On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation." In *Structures of Social action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, 28-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Silvey, Rachel. "Borders, Embodiment, and Mobility: Feminist Migration Studies in Geography." In *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, edited by Lise Nelson and Joni Seager Malden, 138-149. MA: Blackwell Pub., 2005.

Sirkeci, Ibrahim. "Revisiting the Turkish Migration to Germany after Forty Years." *Siirtolaisuus Migration*, 29(2) (2012): 9-20.

Sirkeci, Ibrahim, Cohen Jeffrey H. and Yazgan, Pinar. "Turkish Culture of Migration: Flows Between Turkey and Germany, Socio-Economic Development and Conflict" *Migration Letters* 9(1) (2012): 33-46.

Stanley Liz and Wise Sue. *Breaking out again Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Teerling, Janine. "The Development of New 'Third-Cultural Spaces of Belonging': British-Born 'Return' Migrants in Cyprus" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(7) (2011): 1079-1099.

Thomson Mark and Crul Maurice. "The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for further Research on the European Second Generation?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7) (2007): 1025-1041.

Toktaş, Şule. "Introduction: 50 Years of Emigration from Turkey to Germany - A Success Story?" *Perceptions* 17(2) (2012): 5-9.

Tölölian, Khachig. "The Nation State and its Others: In Lieu of a Preface." *Diaspora* 1(1) (1991): 3-7.

Turc, Gerome. *Memory of Places, Places of Memory: A Halbwachsian Socio-Ethnography of Memory*. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2012.

Van Hear, Nicholas. *New Diasporas the Mass Exodus, Dispersal and Regrouping of Migrant Communities*. London: UCL Press, 1998.

Vertovec, Steven. "Three Meanings of 'Diaspora', Exemplified Among South Asian Religions." *Diaspora* 6(3) (1997): 277-299.

Wessendorf, Susanne. "'Roots Migrants': Transnationalism and 'Return' Among Second-Generation Italians in Switzerland." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7) (2007): 1083-1102.

Annex 1 – Pilot Interviews List and Main Interviews List

The table of the pilot interviews

No	Informant	Sex	Age	Age of return & year	Birth place	Date of Family's Immigration	Family's Date of return to Turkey	Marital Status	Current Living Place	Living Condition	Education/ Occupation	Citizen-ship
1	Ali	M	33	-	Worms	-	-	Single	Istanbul	-	University/Sales and Marketing Engineer	Turkish
2	Erman	M	26	24 2010	Bremen	-	-	Single	Istanbul	-	University/ Economist, Musician	Turkish
3	Berna	F	48	14 1978	Düsseldorf	1961	1978	Married	Istanbul	-	Distanced University/ Housewife	Turkish
4	Akasya	F	24	23 2011	Rinteln	1986	They live in Germany	Single	Istanbul	-	University/ Student	-
5	Kübra	F	30	26 2008	Gelsenkirchen	1971	They live in Germany	Married	Istanbul	-	Working in an Organisation	-

The interviewees list

No	Informant	Sex	Age	Age of return & year	Birth place	Date of Family's Immigration	Family's Date of return to Turkey	Marital Status	Current Living Place	Living Condition	Education/ Occupation	Citizen-ship
1	Oktay	M	51	17 1978	Istanbul	1961 (he was 5 years old)	1978	Single	Fatih/Istanbul	Renting	Gesamtschule/ Retired	Turkish
2	Didem	F	24	19 2007	Hannover	1978 (father) 1987 (mother)	2007	Single	Moda/Istanbul	Living with parents	University/ Unemployed	German
3	Nurten	F	38	27 2000	Lollar	1961	They live in Germany	Married	Fatih/Istanbul	Owning the flat	Ausbildung/ Housewife	Turkish
4	Oğuz	M	47	42 2007	Ingolstadt	1961	1986	Married	Cadde Bostan/ Istanbul	Renting	Berufsschule/ Real Estate	Turkish
5	Özlem	F	33	16 1995	Aschaffenburg	1960 (father) 1977 (mother)	They live in Germany	Divorced	Büyükkçekmece/ Istanbul	Renting	University/ Call Centre	Turkish
6	Fatoş	F	43	15 1984	Frankfurt am Main	1968	1984	Married	Erenköy/Istanbul	Owning the flat	University/ Housewife	Turkish
7	Lamia	F	36	14 1990	Frankfurt am Main	1967	1990	Engaged	Kocamustafapaşa/ Istanbul	Living with parents	University/ Uni. Staff	Turkish
8	Erdem	M	45	15 1986	Augsburg	1964	1986	Single	Levent/Istanbul	Owning the flat	University/ Advertiser	Turkish
9	Eda	F	23	21 2010	Munich	1985	2010 (mother)	Single	Taksim/Istanbul	Renting	University/ Make-Up Artist	Turkish
10	Pınar	F	44	16 1983	Krefeld	1960	1983	Married	Beşiktaş/Istanbul	Owning the flat	High School/ Tourism	Turkish
11	Selin	F	29	10 1993	Hechingen	1978	1993	Single	Bayrampaşa/ Istanbul	Living with the family	University/ Uni. Staff	Turkish
12	Öykü	F	34	26 2004	Düsseldorf	1972 (father) 1975 (mother)	2002 (mother)	Engaged	Nişantaşı/Istanbul	Renting	University/ Sales	German
13	Levent	M	29	28 2011	Düsseldorf	1972 (father) 1975 (mother)	2002 (mother)	Single	Cadde Bostan/ Istanbul	Living with his mother	University/ Architect	German
14	Ela	F	44	15 1983	Cologne	1964 (father) 1965 (mother)	1983	Married	Bakırköy/Istanbul	Renting	University/ Unemployed	Turkish

15	Sevim	F	47	11 1978	Istanbul	1965 (she was 4 months old)	1978	Married	Ümraniye/Istanbul	Renting	High School/ Baby-sitter	Turkish
16	Erhan	M	43	16 1985	Gielingen ander Steige	1960	1985	Married	Tekirdağ	Owning the flat	University/ Sales	Turkish
17	Figen	F	35	21 1988	Lübeck	1966	1988 (mother)	Married	Halkalı/Istanbul	Owning the flat	Realschule/ Retired	Turkish
18	Fatih	M	41	14 1985	Istanbul	1971 (he was 6 months old)	1985	Married	Şişli/Istanbul	Owning the flat	University/ Stock Market	Turkish
19	Kerem	M	24	10 1997	Gravenbruch	1982	1997	Single	Cardiff/the UK	Renting	University/ Writer	German
20	Nahide	F	42	13 1983	Duisburg	1962, 1972	1983	Single	Maltepe/Istanbul	Renting	High School/ Accountant	Turkish
21	Nilgün	F	50	38 2000	Regensburg	1961	1982	Divorced	Bahçeşehir/Istanbul	Renting	Kaufmännische Fachschule/ Exec. Secretary	Turkish
22	Şükran	F	35	23 2000	Duisburg	1961	2002	Married	Ereğli	Owning the flat	Berufsschule/ Housewife	Turkish
23	Şükrü	M	40	36 2006	Duisburg	1961	2002	Married	Ereğli	Owning the flat	Berufsschule/ Electrician	Turkish
24	Taner	M	36	20 1996	Frankfurt	1969 (father) 1972 (mother)	1998	Married	Düzce	Owning the flat	Berufsschule/ Translator	Turkish
25	Filiz	F	37	10 1985	Espelkamp	1968	They live in Germany	Married	Düzce	Renting	Primary School/ Translator	Turkish
26	Murat	M	26	21 2007	Munich	1968	2007	Single	Devrek	Living with parents	Secondary School / Waiter	Turkish
27	Ahu	F	35	11 1988	Berlin	1964	1988	Divorced	Devrek	Renting	University/ Translator	Turkish
28	Hasan	M	43	26 1995	Marburg	1966 (father) 1967 (mother)	Both passed away in Ger.	Married	Devrek	Owning the flat	Berufsschule/ Café owner	Turkish
29	Batuhan	M	32	31 2011	Berlin	1970	They live in Germany	Single	Vefa/Istanbul	Renting	University/ Call Centre	German
30	Yaprak	F	39	13 1986	Wesseling	1971 (father) 1972 (mother)	1986	Married	Gümüşsuyu/ Istanbul	Renting	University/ Project Coordi.	Turkish

Annex 2 – Personal Narratives Themes – Interview Guide

A) TIME OF IMMIGRATION

- 1 Tell me about the circumstances surrounding your family's immigration to Germany. For instance, when and what factors contributed to their decision?
- 2 What was their life like before your family left Turkey?
- 3 Did family and friends immigrate to Germany with them or did they immigrate on their own?
- 4 Describe your family's plans once they arrived to Germany. For instance, did they intend on staying there permanently or temporarily?
- 5 Did you like living in Germany? How was your life in Germany?
- 6 What has been your experience in terms of self-development in Germany?
- 7 In what kind of environment did you grow up?
- 8 Did both of your parents work in Germany?
- 9 Who raised you until the age of school?
- 10 Were there other Turkish people in your town/school/neighbourhood?
- 11 How was your school life in Germany?

B) RETURN MIGRATION

- 12 Tell me about your decision to return to Turkey. When did you decide this and why? Was this a family decision? How long did you consider this idea? Do you believe this was the right decision? Why is that? Do you have any regrets?
- 13 Is Turkey the same since your earlier visits? What changes, if any, do you see? What is your opinion about these changes, if any?
- 14 Have you changed since you relocated to Turkey? What are those changes, if any?
- 15 Overall, how was the experience of return migration for you and your family? Have you encountered any difficulties in adjusting and if so, what were those?

C) HOME-PLACE

- 16 Tell me about your understanding of 'home' in relation to 'place'.
- 17 Where do you feel at home?
- 18 Is Turkey home to you?
- 19 Was Germany home to you when you lived there?
- 20 Does the actual geographic location make a difference? If so, can you explain?

D) RETURN-CULTURE

- 21 Tell me what Turkish-Islam culture and heritage mean to you.
- 22 What role does your ethnic/cultural background play in your life?
- 23 Have you spent time trying to learn more about the culture and history of your ethnic group?
- 24 What is your sense of belonging to your own ethnic/culture group? How do you define belonging?
- 25 Do you feel proud of being Turkish, Muslim or any component of your ethnic/national background?
- 26 What would you consider to be the outstanding elements of the Turkish character, positive and negative? And of the German?
- 27 What are the things you miss about Germany?

E) SELF-IDENTITY

- 28 After in-depth self-reflection please describe and explain your sense of self as a second generation Turkish-German who has moved to Turkey.
- 29 Please give an account of the “who you are” in the “where you are”: what does it mean to you living in Turkey?

F) ETHNIC INVOLVEMENT

- 30 Inform me about your family’s use and your use of the Turkish and Turkish/German language. Have you ever thought about how language affects your family relationship?
- 31 Some people say that when people speak and communicate differently, it is difficult on a relationship. What do you think? Has this been something that has occurred in your family relationship?
- 32 Some people say that people of first and second generation status have different ideas about communication and that this affects parent-child relationships. Tell me your thoughts on this. In what ways has this been the case in your relationship?
- 33 Family background: How strong were/are family bonds, friendships, loyalty to mosque/church, attachment to Turkey, Turkish traditions, Islamic traditions? Attitudes towards Turkish language, food, dances, community, mosque, organisations/activities (both in Turkey and Germany).

G) MINORITY GROUP STATUS UNDERSTANDING/PERCEPTIONS

- 34 Some people say that people who belong to ethnic minority groups have a difficult time because they lack power and advantage. What do you think?
- 35 Do you view yourself as a minority? Please explain.
- 36 Tell me how you think this affected your relationships. Has this led you to think about or behave in certain ways in your relationships?
- 37 Do you interact with other ethnic/cultural groups? In what context: school, work, entertainment, social-family groups?
- 38 Who are your friends? How easy has it been to make friendships with Turkish people, Germans, Turkish-Germans? (whatever is applicable to each person in each case)
- 39 How do you think you were perceived as a Turkish in Germany? Did you have any problems? Faced with discrimination?

H) SOCIAL MOBILITY PERCEPTIONS

- 40 Some people think that education and work are important to their life and their family's life. What do you think?
- 41 Sometimes as a result of education or work, people move to a different town or region. And some people say that family relationships can change because of this. Has this occurred in your life? Describe how this shaped your family relationship.
- 42 Some people believe that when people have more education they are more likely to earn money. And that these lead to more power and advantage. What do you think? Has this happened in your family relationship?
- 43 Is the level of power and advantage, because of education and income, the same or different in your relationship? In what ways has this led to positive, negative or neutral events in your relationships?

I) RELATIONSHIP PATHWAYS AND EXPECTATIONS

- 44 Some people think that parent-child relationships should have certain qualities. What do you think? What has led you to think about the relationship in that way?

- 45 In what ways did your experience with your parent(s) or child(ren) contribute to your ideas? What parent-child expectations, if any, are shaped by your Turkish beliefs?
- 46 In what ways have Turkish/German cultural beliefs shaped your relationship?
- 47 How would you characterise your family relationship? Tell me about the most satisfying aspect of your relationship. Why is it satisfying?
- 48 Has migration and/or return migration affected your personal and family relationships? If so, in what ways, positive, negative, both? Please explain.

J) MARRIAGE & INTIMATE PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

- 49 Do you think one should marry a person from a different nationality, or religion? How do you see this?
- 50 Did you have German boyfriends/girlfriends? How did your family react to this?
- 51 How important is ethnic background/religious/nationality when you love someone?
- 52 Would you be OK if your own child(ren) marry someone who is not Turkish?
- 53 How do you see the role of woman in the family? As mothers, daughters and sisters?
- 54 How do you see the role of men in the family? As fathers, sons and brothers?

K) POLITICS

- 55 Did you use to follow the Turkish politics when you were in Germany?
- 56 Were you interested in the German politics?
- 57 Do you vote?
- 58 Do you have involvement (or your family) with Turkish and German politics?
- 59 What do you see as the main problems in Turkey?
- 60 Do you think Turkey will ever become a member of the EU? Do you want it? Why, why not?

Annex 3 – Transcriptions

Transcriptions available on request.