University of Sussex
Sussex Centre for Migration Research

Second-Generation Turkish-Germans Return 'Home': Gendered Narratives of (Re-)negotiated Identities

Working Paper No. 78

Nilay Kilinc
School of Hospitality and Tourism Management,
University of Surrey
Email: n.kilinc@surrey.ac.uk

November 2014

University of Sussex

Abstract

Turkish migration to Germany, which started in the 1960s as 'guestworker' migration, soon matured to a permanent settlement. Today, the Turkish labour diaspora is the largest migrant group in Germany and Europe. Compared to the first generation, the second generation have a different understanding of 'home'. Their upbringing in Germany and transnational links to Turkey create a tension between their constructions of 'belonging' and 'home'. This paper evaluates the second generation's constructions of 'home' within their 'Turkish' upbringing in Germany and their 'return' orientations and post-return experiences in Turkey. A 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 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'? Second, how did their childhood memories from visits and stays in 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 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. Women and men experience life within diaspora and return differently. The paper 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, life narratives

Introduction

This paper analyses the propensity of the second-generation Turkish-Germans[1] 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, second-generation individuals returning to their parents' country of origin are actually moving to a country that they were not born and raised in. This is because the common definition of the second generation is that they are the children of the 'first generation', the immigrants, and they are born in the host country of their parents' immigration. Most of the time, they do not

[1] There are different types of hyphenations for this group: 'Deutsch-Türken' or 'German-Turkish' (Kaya 2007); 'Germany-born Turks' (King and Kilinc 2013); 'Euro-Turks' (Østergaard-Nielsen 2003; Kaya and Kentel 2005). This paper 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, I adopt the term 'Turkish-Germans', referring to the children of the first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany.

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 of this study will firstly address the upbringing of the second generation in 'diaspora space' (Brah 1996) and evaluate how they reflect upon 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 exactly is 'home' for the second generation? On one hand, their 'home' is *where they are*, as a 'lived experience of locality'; and on the other hand their 'home' is *where they originally come from*, a 'mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination' (Brah 1996: 192). By focusing on the second generation's 'return' to their parental homeland, this research study aims to illustrate 'home' as a process that undergoes transformation. The returnees 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 homelands that they had never lived in before. These processes 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. As we shall see, part of the analysis connects these experiences to the second generation's 'return' and their renegotiation of gender roles in the parental homeland.

The return migration project has similarities with the migration project in the sense that both are affiliated with a personal strategy to attain a better life, and both embody a socially embedded process that reflects and reinforces social organisation along the lines of gender, race, class, nation, sexuality, caste and religion, among other differences (Silvey 2005: 138). 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 key findings of this study is that the second generation's decision to 'return' is not necessarily autonomous, but often comes about through the initiative of their parents. Either the second generation is obliged to 'return' with their parents, or they are fulfilling the expectations of parents who could not (yet) return but want 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.

Research questions

Whilst there is a wide range of academic work on the first and subsequent generations of Turkish-Germans in Germany, there is a gap in research on Turkish return migration. Studying returnees has been an underexplored field of migration research more generally. Scholars usually examine the immigrant groups' lives, expectations and integration/assimilation processes in the host country. Hence, the study aims to contribute to

return migration studies in general and also to the specific case of the second-generation Turkish-Germans' return, with a focus on gender and identity.

Following Stuart Hall (2000: 20), this paper braces the understanding that identities are points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us. Following the criticism of Anthias (2002: 494) on the traditional classifications of identity as if it were a possessive property, i.e. 'that a subject has a ready-made story to tell about who they are and where they feel they "belong'", the research design instead focuses on the narrations and 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 stages and events.

The research questions explore three different stages of the second generation's lives: their 'Turkish' upbringing in Germany, the moment of return, and their experiences in the parental homeland of Turkey. The first and second research questions aim to explore constructions of 'home' and belonging through the participants' Turkish upbringing in Germany and their childhood memories from Turkey. The third research question aims to understand how the second generation adjusts constructions of 'home' and their belongingness once they return to their parental homeland, as well as their gendered-self. These questions try 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 (cf. King and Christou 2010). Therefore:

1 In what ways do family narratives and practices construct the imagined and gendered 'home' for the second generation?

2 How do childhood memories from 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?

Background of Turkish migration to Germany

This section gives an overview of how Turkish migration as a 'guestworker' phenomenon evolved to a diaspora in Germany.[2] The presence of Turkish immigrants in Germany goes back more than half a century by now. Due to the labour shortage in its booming post-war economy, West Germany attracted migrant workers through labour agreements with various

[2] Within the context of this study, 'Turkish' refers to people with a passport of the Republic of Turkey. Sirkeci (2012) states that 'Turkish migration flows refer to those of the Turks, Kurds, Arabs and others as ethnic groups forming the population in Turkey.'

countries in the 1960s.[3] These economic migrants were coined as *Gastarbeiter*, literally 'guestworker'. In terms of scope and volume, migration to Germany has been the hallmark of Turkish immigration in contemporary Europe, and it has constituted the backbone of the so-called 'Euro-Turk' phenomenon (Toktas 2012: 5). Guestworker programmes were designed to solve immediate labour shortages in Germany by recruiting workers on temporary, short-term residence and work permits, yet this temporary settlement turned into a more or less permanent one for the majority of the Turkish guestworkers.

In the early stages of migration, during the early 1960s, Turkish migrants were mainly men aged in their 20s and 30s, relatively skilled and educated compared to the average working population in Turkey, and from the economically more developed regions of the country (Abadant Unat 1976; Martin 1993). 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. In 1965, the conservative-led coalition government under Chancellor Erhard responded to the presence of (mostly Muslim) migrant groups, with a 'foreigner law' (*Ausländergesetz*) granting limited rights to guestworkers. At that time, the government considered the presence of foreigners a temporary problem, which would resolve itself over time (Faas 2012).

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 to Germany. When Germany was hit by the oil crisis in 1973, it was forced to stop the intake of foreign workforce. However, this had the unintended result of convincing many Turkish guestworkers in Germany to stay, rather than return to Turkey. Family reunifications, which had already started during the late 1960s, increased the number of children and women. Between 1974 and the early 1980s, the leadership of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt formulated three principles to tackle the issue of the continuing presence of Turkish and other guestworkers, 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'. Under this law, every guestworker who voluntarily left Germany received a financial incentive of 10,500 DM. About 250,000 migrants, particularly those of Turkish origin, responded to this 'opportunity' (Faas 2007: 46).

Yet the slowdown in the growth of the number of immigrants was temporary, and the number of new entrants again peaked in the 1980s. A large influx 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 (Sirkeci 2012).

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

[3] 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). For details, see Kaya and Kentel (2005: 7).

German citizenship. The legislation gave the right of citizenship on the *ius soli* principle to children born in Germany and whose parents had resided legally in the country for the past eight years. It also temporarily accepted dual citizenship.[4]

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 (figures cited in Sirkeci 2012). Undocumented Turkish immigrants are difficult to enumerate, and this makes it difficult to accurately know the size of Germany's Turkish community which estimates range between 2.6 million to 4 million individuals (Sirkeci et al. 2012: 36). Today, Turkish immigrants still 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*,[5] 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 (2005: 3).

Whilst there have been several older studies on Turkish return migration (the most significant of which was Abadan-Unat et al. 1974), there is little recent academic work which focuses on return. Probably the major recent study is the paper by Razum et al. (2005), which explores the return motivations of male labour migrants (i.e. excluding women and other family members from the analysis). Razum et al. (2005: 719) maintain that 'return was rarely based on purely economic or health-related motives; value-oriented and emotional themes almost always played a role'. They go on to nominate three 'ideal types' of Turkish return migrants:

- the *cultural traditionalist*, who considers Turkish culture superior and left Germany without remorse, having made sufficient money there;
- the *nostalgic returnee*, who faces socio-economic problems in Turkey and feels discriminated against because of his *Almancı* identity; this returnee type has a transfigured, nostalgic view of Germany but this is now a life that cannot be resumed;
- the *player of two systems*, who thrives both in Turkey and Germany: she or he has a more prosaic view of Turkey that the traditionalist and a less transfigured notion of everyday life in Germany than the nostalgic returnee

[4] 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. 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. For details, see Ehrkamp and Leitner (2003).

[5] The term *gurbetçi* refers to someone in *gurbet* (diaspora), which is an Arabic word deriving from *garaba*, which means to go away, to be absent, to live as a foreigner in another country. See Kaya (2007: 18).

As we shall see later, these three types have some resonance with my study of second-generation returnees.

The final point to be made in this overview of Turkish migration to Germany concerns the recognition of this migration now as a *labour diaspora*. Whilst it is true that the term 'diaspora' has only recently been used within the Turkish context, the long-standing and hence multi-generational nature of this migrant presence in Germany (and elsewhere in Europe) makes its designation as a labour diaspora (cf. Cohen 1997) entirely appropriate. During the 1960s and early 1970s, the Turkish migrants were indeed specifically recruited for their labour power, although the second wave of political exiles, associated with the military coup of 1980, clearly fit another diasporic mould – that of the political or 'victim' diaspora (Cohen 1997). The second generation's 'return' to Turkey can thus be conceptualised as a *counter-diasporic* migration – returning to the diasporic homeland (cf. King and Christou 2010).

Literature review

This section of the paper briefly reviews the definitions and theorisations of the key concepts that underpin this study: second generation, return migration, diaspora and memory, home and belonging, and gender perspectives.

The notion of the *second generation* lies at the core of this research. A simple definition was given in the introduction: the second generation are the offspring of the primary or first-generation migrants. This is the definition that is held to here with only slight elaboration as follows. It includes both those offspring born in the immigrants' new host country (Germany) and those born in the home country (Turkey) and taken abroad at a very young age – before the start of formal schooling (Thomson and Crul 2007). The latter category are sociologically indistinguishable from the 'pure' born-abroad second generation, since they will end up with little or no memory of their early months and years in their birth country. The only difference is demographic, in terms of birth-place statistics.

Most studies which focus on the second generation are about their integration/assimilation in the host society: the expectation is that they will adapt better than their parents and make greater progress than their parents up the educational and employment ladders (for a review of this literature, see Thomson and Crul 2007). Until recently, there was little or no expectation that they would 'return' to the country of origin of their parents, although there is now a small, growing, and distinctive literature on second-generation or counter-diasporic return migration (for some European studies see Wessendorf 2007; King and Christou 2010; Oso 2011; Sardinha 2011; Teerling 2011). Studies on *Turkish* second-generation are, however, lacking, except for two other papers which are outgrowths of this research (King and Kilinc 2013, 2014).

The extensive and scattered literature on *return migration* nearly always assumes that the returnees are the primary migrants who are relocating back to where they came from in a kind of U-turn migration. As stated immediately above, relatively few studies have been made of the second generation who 'return'. Indeed, for those born in the host country, there is some doubt as to whether this can be considered as return migration. This paper holds to

the ‘return’ label because, in the feelings of the protagonists of this kind of migration, there is indeed an element of ‘going back’ to the homeland.

What insights can be taken from theorisations of return migration to shed light on second-generation return? The most widely-cited theoretical typology of return migration is that of Cerase (1974), which posits four outcomes:

- the *return of failure*: migrants return home because of a failure to adapt to or integrate into host society, eg. failure to learn the language, get a job etc.;
- the *return of conservatism*: migrants’ target is to save money by working hard in the host country in order to return, buy property, and progress within the home-country social context, which is thus preserved, not re-made or challenged;
- the *return of retirement*: migrants return to their homeland when they retire in order to enjoy their old age amongst friends and family in familiar surroundings;
- the *return of innovation*: these are migrants who have become well-integrated in the host country, so that when they return they can function as ‘carriers of change’ and use the skills and new ideas that they gained in the host country for the benefit of their community of origin.

Cerase’s typology is mainly geared to the potential developmental impact of return migration, which is mainly achieved by the ‘innovation’ route. However, other aspects are, *prima facie*, relevant to this study. Does, for example, the second generation return because of its ‘failure’ to integrate or be accepted by the host society? Retirement return is mainly relevant to the first generation of Turkish migrants in Germany, who, having migrated as young men and women in the 1960s and 1970s, have been reaching retirement age in recent years. Less easy to foresee is whether second-generation returnees can act as agents of innovation for Turkish society, or whether they behave in a socially conservative way. One final point made by Cerase, which is enshrined in the title of his landmark paper, is the dissonance between returnees’ *expectations* and the *reality* they often face when the return takes place. Part of the disconnection is due to the combination of the different motivations that returnees have for their return, and the level of information that they possess about the situation ‘back home’: they may, therefore, be ‘ill-prepared for their return’ (Gmelch 1980: 143).

Following Cerase, and precisely 30 years later, the second landmark paper on (re)theorising return migration comes from Jean-Pierre Cassarino (2004), who introduces two new perspectives which resonate with the specific situation of second-generation return. *Social network theory* sees return migration as resulting from activities developed within a migrant’s social field, including his or her family and kinship links to the origin country. If these links are strong and positive, return is more likely; if the (second-generation) migrant is socially and emotionally detached from the home country, return is much less likely to occur.

Secondly, since the 1990s, *transnationalism* has had a major influence on how international migration is conceptualised and understood. The transnational approach perceives migration as a continuing story: return migration is part of this ongoing cycle, and return does not necessarily constitute an end to the migration cycle. Transnationalism helps to

formulate a conceptual framework aimed at a better understanding of the strong social and economic links between migrants' host and origin countries; and at the individual level too, sustained social contacts between the destination setting and the homeland affect the evolution of (second-generation) migrants' identities (Portes et al. 1999: 219). Hence migrants, or people of migrant heritage, return to their homeland because of their social and historical attachment to that place which, even if they were not born there, is identified emotionally as their 'home' or 'native soil'.

Attachment to the 'home place' is a key constituent of *diasporic consciousness*. Diasporas are nurtured by nostalgia; by memories of both an individual and collective past. Unlike the so-called 'classical' diasporas, which are about displacement due to traumatic exile with a strong sense of 'victimhood' enshrined in diasporic identity (the Jewish diaspora is the 'ideal type' here), the Turkish emigration experience conforms to what Cohen (1997) calls a 'labour diaspora'. Like other types of diaspora reviewed by Cohen (victim diaspora, colonial diaspora, trading diaspora, etc.) the Turkish case satisfies all of the standard criteria for a diaspora definition nominated by key writers such as Safran (1991) and Brubaker (2005), which are:

- dispersion from an original homeland, either forced or voluntary;
- historical maturity, so that to the original migrants have been added subsequent generations who share at least some of their parents' or ancestors' diasporic identity;
- a shared sense of ethno-national identity, separate from that of the host society; and
- a homeland orientation, including a despite to return there some day, to visit, and maybe to settle.

Vertovec (1997) sees part of the etiology of diaspora as a 'type of consciousness' that is generated amongst contemporary transnational communities who are aware of their 'multi-locality'. The awareness of multi-locality stimulates the desire to connect the self with others, both 'here' and 'there', who share the same 'roots' and 'routes' (cf. King and Kilinc 2014).

Memory plays a key, but highly complex, role in the construction of diasporas and the maintenance of diasporic identities. In one of the standard works on the subject of memory, Maurice Halbwachs (1992) prefers to use 'recollection' rather than memory because it points to what he regards as a necessary collectiveness, based on group consciousness. One of these social groups is, of course, the family (eg. The Turkish migrant family in Germany) wherein 'there exist customs and modes of thinking… that impose… their form on the opinions and feelings of their members' (1992: 58). Following on from Halbwachs, Erll (2011) proposes the term 'cultural memory' instead of collective memory in order to stress that memories are culturally embedded, at whatever scale.

Finally, there is the way that memories are communicated. Following Assman and Czaplicka (1995), 'communicative memory is based on language and everyday oral communication, but also has a more constructed and technologically dependent set of channels in the way that it is reproduced through television, cinema, literature, art and social

media. For the target group of this study, as we shall see later, their constructions of 'home' cannot be understood without reference to the family narratives and practices which express ethnic identity, family history and family-organised visits to the homeland.

Second-generationers who 'return' to their parents' country of origin exhibit complex articulations and experiences of *home* and *belonging*. Ulf Hedetoft points out that the English word 'belonging' is a fortuitous compound of 'being' and 'longing' (2002: 1). He then goes on to ask an extremely important question: 'But what if where we feel we belong (our "cultural" or "ethnic" home) does not match objective descriptions of membership (our "political" or "civic" home), because "belonging" separates into its two constituent parts: "being" in one place, and "longing" for another?' (Hedetoft 2002: 5). This question is incredibly prescient for the study of migrants, and especially so of the second generation, who can perhaps be less sure of where 'home' is, and where they truly 'belong', than their first-generation forbears. This existential ambiguity does not necessarily become less when they actually do 'return' to where their spiritual home to be, as we shall see.

The final element in this theoretical jigsaw concerns *gender*, a key constituent in understanding how the second generation experiences and negotiates its various social roles, especially within the transnationally contrasting frames of gender ideologies and practices in Germany and Turkey. Mahler and Pessar (2011: 442) insist that gender is not a fixed biological category but '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'. The standard view of how gender empowerment intersects with migration is exemplified by Hondagneu-Sotelo's (1994) well-known *Gendered Transitions*, where she finds that, at least for Mexican women in the United States, migration results in 'greater gender egalitarianism', because the host society is more gender-aware than the society the migrants come from, which is relatively more economically backward and socially traditional (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2000: 116-117). Of course, for (second-generation) return migration, these relationships are reversed, and migrants are returning to a more gender-unequal society.

Christou's (2006) study of second-generation Greek-Americans indicates that men present the return migration decision as autonomous whereas women view their relocation to Greece more as a collective endeavour actioned within the family context (2006: 90-92). In a separate study, which also included Greek-Germans (arguably the closest comparative group to the Turkish-Germans), Christou and King (2011) explored ways which 'diasporic imaginaries and mobilities, including rootedness and rootlessness, are experienced differently by men and women' (2011: 287). Two key findings were that the 'search for self' (i.e. searching for one's 'true, Greek' identity) in the (often essentialised) refuge of the Greek homeland was primarily a male story-line; whereas the notion of escaping from an oppressive, patriarchal family situation amongst the inward-looking Greek community in a German town or city was usually a female narrative of return (2011: 294).

Methodology

Overview of the fieldwork

Having the above research questions and theoretical standpoints in mind, the 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 questions prepared for this research were inspired by King and Christou's (2010) study on second-generation Greek-American and Greek-German returnees to Greece. The first set of questions concentrated on the following chronological phases: a) the migration of the returnees' parents, b) returnees' upbringing in Germany, c) their childhood memories of Turkey, d) motivations to return to Turkey, e) experiences of their post-return 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, c) transnational experiences, d) self-identity and belonging, e) notions of 'home', f) living in Turkey as a Turkish-German.

Five pilot interviews were undertaken in summer 2012 in Istanbul. Each interview was tape-recorded with the consent of the interviewees and took about half an hour to one hour. The pilot interviews demonstrated that a list of semi-structured questions does not necessarily lead to direct answers and might frustrate the interviewees in that they push themselves to give short answers. It also seemed that the interviewees hesitated to ask about the parts they did not understand in the questions due to the restricting nature of the semi-structured method. Accordingly, a more open, conversational approach was followed for the main interview survey. This way, the multi-dimensional nature of the research questions could be better grasped. Rather than just answering the questions, the interviewees became story-tellers who were remembering their lives, acting as autobiographers, being reflexive on their own stories and reflecting upon the themes of the conversations in a systematic yet creative way. Conversational interviews reduced the possibility of misunderstanding the questions and intended meanings. The approach is 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 (see for instance Cicourel 1973; Schegloff 1984; Clark 1992).

For the second visit, a target quota of 30 interviews were collected during October-November 2012. These interviews were around one to two hours; a few much longer. In the end, 35 interviews were held, including the pilot ones. Twenty-six of them were located in Istanbul. The remainder were based in small towns and villages around the Black Sea Coast; namely Ereğli, Düzce, Devrek, and north-west of Istanbul, Tekirdağ. Close attention was paid to achieving a gender-balanced panel; in the end 14 interviews were conducted with men and 21 interviews with women.

The 35 interview narratives resulted in over 500 pages of translated transcriptions. Due to the volume of the data, the tape-recorded narratives were simultaneously translated while transcribing them; therefore the paper will not include any quotes in the original

language. In order to preserve interviewee anonymity, Pseudonyms were used as well as not giving specific details about workplace.

Interviewees were selected by a respondent-driven non-random sampling approach, based on a diversity of snowballing chains, some of which originated from the personal contacts of the author and her family. 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, and have two parents who immigrated to the host country. Secondly, the interviewees had to be living in their parents' country of origin for at least six months to be considered a 'returnee'. Since the interviewees were mostly found through personal, friend and family contacts, there was always a mutual trust between the researcher and the informants from the beginning. Women participants preferred to meet at their homes whereas the interviews with men mostly took place in quiet cafes or at their workplaces. When the interviews were held at cafes, men insisting on paying the bill, creating a gender hierarchy.

Istanbul was chosen as the main location for the fieldwork on the assumption that the second generation would return to this cosmopolitan city to be close to a variety of job opportunities. In addition, German foundations and organisations as well as Turkish-German collaborative institutions are mostly based in Istanbul. Such organisations offer some, albeit numerically limited, opportunities for employing Turkish-German returnees as well as being good places to contact possible candidates as interviewees.

The main disadvantage of concentrating the fieldwork in Istanbul was not being able to capture the lives of people in other settings. It was assumed that returnees' experiences in rural areas would be completely different. Hence, the fieldwork was extended to relatively more rural areas in the Black Sea Coast, interviewing seven participants in Düzce and Ereğli (small towns) and Devrek, a village. Although some locals were used as mediators to contact interviewees, these interviews were less successful because of their suspicious attitude towards a 'stranger' who wants to investigate their lives. Therefore, the paper draws only a little on these 'Black Sea' interviews; the 'story' that follows is mainly the Istanbul story of second generation return.

Life-story narratives: language, translation and interpretation

The participants of this research are not only experiencing hybrid identities and enjoying or struggling with their transnational lives on a daily basis, but they are also expressing themselves in two different languages, Turkish and German. During the interactions with the informants, the researcher chose to enhance this hybridity by encouraging them to express themselves in the ways they felt the most comfortable. Almost all the informants narrated their life stories in a mixture of Turkish (the main language used) and German, using idioms and phrases in both languages, and even using English from time to time.

The researcher's challenge is to ensure that '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 nourished by two distinct cultures. The literary/literacy metaphor of 'culture as text' that

Geertz popularised reads as follows: 'What we call our data are really our own constructions of other people's constructions of what they and their compatriots are up to…' (Geertz 1973: 9). Language is one of these constructions; it is embedded in culture and it is also continuously constructed by gender roles, class, ethnicity and religion. 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 subsequent analysis, 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 the researcher and the informants, while constantly revising the assumptions from the point of fieldwork to analysis. Hence, following recent trends in the phenomenological approach 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 (see, eg. Plummer 1983; Stanley and Wise 1993).[6] During the collection of these life-story narratives I also witnessed that the stories that are narrated by my research participants 'reveal multiple and conflicting self-expressions' (McAdams 2008: 243), as emphasised in Hermans' (1996) theory of the *dialogical self*. 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 direction that was decidedly off-topic. As David Carr once stated: 'Perhaps our lives resemble novels, but bad ones, cluttered and undisciplined one' (1985: 115).

The researcher who is presented with a mass of narrative data which is in a state of variable coherence faces the challenge of drawing clarity and order out of the 'dis-order'. Even when they appear at first sight not to be so, 'narratives are interpretive and, in turn, require interpretation' (Riessman 1993: 22). In this project, this was achieved by deep immersion in the interview transcripts, reading and re-reading over again, in order to distil, via thematic analysis, the main narrative themes and stories. Following Braun and Clarke (2006: 79), thematic analysis is 'a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data'. It is seen as a flexible approach where it is driven by data or the researcher's interests. This paper followed the steps of Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis, namely familiarising with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes and defining and naming themes. These, in turn, were related and interpreted in light of the theoretical perspectives outlined earlier.

In the research findings and analysis which now follows and makes up the rest of this paper, the three chronologically related stages of the second-generation return process are followed: first the nature of the 'Turkish' upbringing in Germany; second the decision to 'return' to Turkey; and third the experiences of living in Turkey post-return. Across all three

[6] However, there are limits to this subjective and participating involvement. For example, my interviewees seemed to expect me to become involved in their conversations directly and often asked me for my opinions. The danger of the interviewer taking a too-active role is that interviewees' responses are unduly affected. I tried to deflect such direct questioning wherever possible, sometimes by relating some examples from the lives of other interviewees (always, of course, preserving their anonymity).

stages, the *gendered contrasts* in participants' perspectives and experiences will be a prominent part of the analysis and interpretation.

A 'Turkish' upbringing in Germany

This section illustrates the first diasporic moment in the lives of the second generation, which is their upbringing within the Turkish diasporic setting in Germany. The account starts with the second generation's 'family narratives' and a focus on the first generation's background profile and their orientation towards the 'return project'. 'Family memories' narrated by the second generation stress the following:

- Family memories play a vital role in the second generation's constructions of 'home' and 'belonging'. From this, there is often an explicit or implicit linkage to their attitudes and motivations towards the 'return' to their parental homeland.
- For the first generation, the notions of home or homeland remain fixed. The dream of an eventual return to the 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.
- The second generation has a 'diaspora consciousness' (Vertovec 1997) which was firstly constructed by being surrounded by their 'family narratives'. They refer to their generation as the 'in-between' and 'lost' generation; they feel that they are stuck between their parents' world, where traditional practices and memories are intertwined, and the 'diaspora spaces' where they constantly renegotiate their hybrid identities.
- 'Family narratives' have an effect on the second generation's understanding of the gender roles, both at an individual level and regarding their imaginings of 'home'. The second generation acknowledge that their parents perceive Turkey as the 'motherland' because of the sentimental and emotional attachments, and Germany as the 'fatherland' because of the monetary attachment. Therefore, mothers symbolise care, love, emotions, sentimentality; and fathers symbolise rationality, money, work, and 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 to some extent the mainstream discourse that visualises the first generation as a poorly integrated group of labour migrants consisting of men who came from rural areas of Turkey with no prior skills. Such a view portrayed women purely as dependant actors who came to Germany due to family reunification. The following account introduces an alternative story in which these generalisations do not have such sharp edges. The findings show that the second generation has to be understood in the scope of *fluid cultures* in which their Turkish diasporic identity, which is essentially a Turkish-German hybrid identity, constantly interplays in the various 'diaspora spaces' that they inhabit. In addition, the findings challenge one of the key hypotheses of this research in its early stages, which linked the return project to a 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.

Family backgrounds of the second generation

The study finds that the majority of the first generation immigrated to Germany in the 1960s as guestworkers who were recruited for work in factories. 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 to project their migration to Germany. However they were not the poorest of the poor, nor were they illiterate or semi-literate. Most of them had completed their high school education. Despite the mainstream picture of Turkish immigrants' settlements in the 'ghettos' of big German cities, the findings from the fieldwork in Istanbul 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, and they still live in Germany. Two extracts from her interview are presented below. In the first, she describes the work that they did, which included both factory work and higher-level work (translating). They had a family background of internal migration within Turkey before they emigrated to Germany (this is very common in Turkish migration history). In the second part of her narrative, she talks about the environment she grew up in. She vocalises another common characteristic of the first generation, that is, women were involved in economic life and therefore the second generation spent their early ages within a German environment through neighbours, babysitters and the 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 mechanic, he also worked as a translator in the company. 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 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 makes the effort to learn German. Everyone speaks Turkish. My brothers and I grew up with Germans, taken care by of Germans and so we are good at German because we started learning it at an early age. We do not speak German with an 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 to West Germany amongst the first generation took place in the 1970s. The narrative accounts reveal that the first generation migrated to Germany in the 1970s as guestworkers, students, professionals and political exiles. This latter

and more heterogeneous group consisted of those who were raised in Istanbul, coming from the 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 to make a distinction between themselves and 'the other Turks', stressing the differences especially in family origins and education background. Their family backgrounds and diasporic setting in Germany challenge the stereotypical *Almancı* category, but their narratives about 'the other Turks' verified the stereotypical discourse on the Turkish labour diaspora in Germany – as made up of uneducated, poor, rural-origin people.

The following account gives an example of a highly educated and skilled immigrant who chose Germany for his future career. Öykü relates how her father planned his journey to Germany after receiving his bachelor degree in electrical engineering.

> My father went to Germany in 1972, soon after he graduated from university in Istanbul. He already knew German before moving to Düsseldorf. While he worked in the company [in Düsseldorf], he started studying at master level. My father's story is different from most of the other Turkish people who went to Germany. My father's decision was a rational choice; he studied 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) made the same 'we versus the other Turks' distinction which in their case was not based on class but on the 'cultural capital' that they believed they had 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 '*us* and *them*' distinction that many of the interviewees narrated. Oktay stresses his family roots in Istanbul and narrates how his father benefited from his '*cultural capital*'[7] when he migrated 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 migrate to Germany in 1963.
>
> […]
>
> My parents never mentioned 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 a hard time at all. If we went to Bremen from a small village [in Turkey], and you know in those years many small places in Turkey did not even have electricity, well, then Bremen would be such a new world. But we are from Istanbul, and Bremen was not a big deal for us (Oktay, M51, Istanbul).

[7] The paper benefits from Bourdieu's term in order to reflect that cultural and linguistic competence is highly related to family upbringing (1977: 494) and the children of Istanbulite guestworkers stress that their high-class family orientation is the main source of difference between *them* and the *other* Turks.

When the interviewees made the distinction between themselves and 'the other Turks' they often mentioned the rather 'liberal' and 'modern' ways of their parents. Some interviewees said that their mothers were the first to immigrate to Germany, again challenging the standard view of Turkish migration as man-led. The narratives point out another commonality, namely that women worked in factories just as men, socialising with both Germans and other guestworker nationalities (mainly Greeks, Italians and Yugoslavs). The following quote is a good illustration of how the second generation with 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. She only told 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 accounts, it can be detected that the first generation planned their migration project as a temporary project which then turned into a permanent stay. The goal was to save some money and buy property in Turkey, and then return to the homeland once the goal was reached. Didem's narrative below 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 example is selected to represent the generally widespread 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 beliefs. Yet, he always dreamt of returning, even though he became a successful restaurant owner in Germany.

> My parents wanted to save as much as money as they could and come back to Turkey at some point. Since I know myself, I always remember my family saving money and making plans to 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 making roots in Germany… and I think buying a house in Germany has psychologically and symbolically 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).

Constructions of 'home' and 'belonging' in diaspora spaces

In order to trace the process by which notions of 'home' and 'belonging' are constructed, this section focuses on the three types of memory mentioned in the theoretical overview (Assman and Czaplicka 1995; Erll 2011). First 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, my analysis aims to find out how the second generation constructs their 'belonging' on an individual level within the spheres of *collective memory*. The third 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 to Turkey, media and school education. Here, the second generation's reflections upon the 'grand collective narratives' of the Turkish nation, ethnicity and religion are illustrated. By comparing and contrasting the experiences of the second generation within the constructions of collective, communicative and cultural memory, this section of the paper 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 detail of the empirical illustrations, the following points will summarise the main second-generation narratives about 'being from a Turkish family'.

- There is not one type of 'Turkish' family. However the common norm is for there to be clear gender roles in families. Findings show that the interviewees grew up in patriarchal families in which fathers are the highest in the hierarchal order; taking decisions for themselves and for the other members of their families.
- 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, stricter and more protective than fathers. In these cases, 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 feasts), teaching of prayers etc. are the main religious practices.
- 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, geography and literature of the Turkish Republic, the national anthem, and the life of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the founder of the Turkish Republic.

- The parents of the second generation arranged their summer holidays in Turkey. All the narratives pointed out that one of the parents' main motivations for hard work was linked to the holidays in Turkey. In order to afford the costs of these holidays, parents saved money throughout the year. For the second generation, these holidays symbolised good weather, sun, Turkish food, warm welcoming from relatives, and long car rides between Germany and Turkey.
- Another finding points to the openness of the families towards the German host 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.
- The interviewees' stories start changing when they talk about their lives after high school. The parents who encouraged them to study, have German friends, and integrate in the German society then wanted to direct their children into a more 'Turkish' life, afraid, perhaps, that they might become 'too' German and end up marrying a German.

Discussing these points through the narratives gives 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 constructions of 'home' and 'belonging'. The first example is Figen. It was her mother who first went to Germany and Figen's father followed soon after. Figen moved 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 also see some traditional elements of a Turkish family, namely that Figen had to be a 'good' daughter who behaved in ways such 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 at 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 a somewhat 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 good either. They are in-between.
>
> […]
>
> My mother used to say, '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 the school 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 you from your studies' so I stopped karate (Nurten, F38, Istanbul).

As this and other examples 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 made 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 friendship circles, being fluent in the German language and having an understanding of German culture and even, to a certain extent, practising 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 various diaspora spaces of school, friendship and leisure activities. Öykü's narrative below illustrates how *confluence of narratives* was the main source of getting knowledge about Turkish history:

> Our teacher was a guy from Ankara, he was a typical *Kemalist* [i.e. secularist] 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 the 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 constructions of 'home' and 'belonging', it appears that the second generation keenly reflected upon their diasporic identity through its 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 precisely 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 the 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 representations in different genres of arts and media. However, there is another point in these narratives; that is, while second generation constructed their 'belonging' through the representations of grand narratives about the Turkish nation, culture, history, and 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, as was found in the narratives, is 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:

> Turkishness was so important for me. Germans are so soft; they do not care if someone says something bad about 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 Alevis 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 Turkish history only after moving to Turkey.

As Taner's interview extracts illustrate, the second generation's pride about being 'Turkish' is rather fixed in the scope of *banal nationalism* (Billig 1995). 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' as being loving, caring, mostly standing behind the father but still having a weighted place and therefore being admired and respected. These

narratives usually belong to men; for them mothers are holy. Here as well, just like in the case of nationality, the second-generation men 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 interview extracts below reflect this understanding very well. Batuhan has German citizenship; he never studied in Turkey. He was born and raised in Berlin, and studied Marketing at his German 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 do Turks carry German flags?' It was such a big deal (Batuhan, M32, Istanbul).

Constructing 'home' and 'belonging' transnationally

The second generation's childhood visits to Turkey are the best example of the activation of transnational spaces. Interview accounts point out that the second generation generally 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 consumer goods from Germany such as washing machine, irons, TVs – back in the days Turkey did not have a market for these electrical consumer durables. One important point is that the experience was rather *translocal* than transnational (cf. Anthias 2008; Brickell and Datta 2011). 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 resort 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 the summer places, they stayed either in a hotel or in the 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 only 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 our friends.
>
> […]
>
> But the people in the summer town would always point at me, whispering 'She is from Germany' to each other. I wasn't bothered about this 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 were made to feel that they could never fully belong to Turkey because the locals called them *Almancı* and they treated them as if they were tourists or strangers. This was mainly due to the second generation's different looks, clothing and behaviour. Especially before the 1990s, when Turkey started to have a liberal and more open 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 most of what was being said, they had a hard time understanding pop culture references, jokes and idioms. This shows an important point: language is dynamic, it changes over time, and it is strongly related to cultural contexts. Knowing words and constructing sentences are not always enough for a full communicative understanding.

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

> Before each trip, the excitement grew in me; we were going to our land, to where we belonged! 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 young people 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 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).

These considerations on 'home' and 'belonging' show that the second generation has been constantly (re-)negotiating their diasporic and gendered identity in different diaspora spaces; and their 'home' constructions were directly linked to their 'family narratives'. The next sections evaluate 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.

Narratives of return and (re-)settlement

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 often disillusioned once they returned to Turkey. They found that feeling a strong sense of 'belongingness' towards Turkey did not actually make their life easier in Turkey. Once they settled in Turkey, they realised that life was not easy; especially in the huge metropolis that is now Istanbul. For most of them, coming from small and organised towns in Germany, Istanbul seemed a chaotic place in which the institutions (school, the government, municipalities, but also their working places) were extremely dysfunctional. Disillusionment is the main narrative theme within the context of the 'imagined homeland' and the 'reality'. However, after spending many 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' (King and Christou 2010; Christou and King 2011) fits 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 and space with new people, and therefore the second generation had to renegotiate their identities. Especially for the females, they had to renegotiate their gendered identities. The narratives highlight this situation by comparing and contrasting their lives in Turkey and Germany. Briefly, the interview accounts point to three types of return experience:

1 Involuntary return through a family decision. On the whole, this led to traumatic experiences in Turkey. Most of the family returns took place during and after 1983, when the German government introduced the grant to encourage immigrants to return to their homelands.

2 Return related to marriage, or a relationship. The second generation constantly renegotiate their gendered identity and hybrid diasporic identity under these circumstances. 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' to reclaim what they saw as their true 'Turkish' identity. They are aware of the problems of living in Turkey, as well as the country's good sides.

The following subsections take each route to return in more detail.

Return through family decision

As was stated earlier, the first-generation Turkish immigrants had the plan of return since the beginning of their immigration to Germany. The second-generation narratives show that most of the return took place in and soon after 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 in Germany, though these were rather rare cases. Interestingly, none of the narratives that I collected in Istanbul matches the 'ideal types of returnees' that Razum et al. (2005) nominate. Instead, Cerese's types are more applicable, especially in the cases of *return of conservatism* and *return of retirement* for the first generation (Cerase 1974). For the first generation, return can be understood within social network theory (Cassarino 2004), because the first generation used the skills and contacts 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 their increasing use of rapidly-evolving technologies; King and Christou (2011) call this 'reverse transnationalism'.

For the second generation, the return can be evaluated both within *social network theory*, because their 'human capital' gained in Germany helped them in Turkey; but also within *transnationalism* because the return is not necessarily the end of their migration journey (cf. Cassarino 2004). Since most of the second generation worked in jobs in Turkey which were related to Germany and the German language (such as tourist bureaus, trade companies, 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 with Turkish people coming from Germany.

The following narrative example highlights the common characteristics of the second generation who are essentially 'forced' to return through a 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 (see also King and Kilinc 2013: 25-29). The case presented below 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 demonstrates, the second generation eventually got used to living in Turkey despite the negative aspects and the strong initial feelings of being like a 'stranger'.

> We returned in 1984; many Turkish families returned around that time because the German government offered money for these families [to return]. 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 return with them. For the first two years I was quite unhappy, even though the high

> school was nice. I was feeling like 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 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 strangers, fears about cars and traffic, fear 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 constantly watch out what was happening around me.
>
> […]
>
> Now I think I could 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 realised these things so much later… So I don't want to live elsewhere than Istanbul. Istanbul is so colourful, so are its people. When you go out you see people from all different ages and looks; there is such a variety! (Fatoş, F43, Istanbul).

What we find here in Fatoş' series of excerpts is a transition over a long time-span (she had been 15 when brought to Turkey, now she is 43) between a traumatic displacement as a teenager to a situation where, having gone to university in Turkey, had a career and now being a housewife with children, she felt completely settled in Turkey. This long-term transition from trauma to acceptance was a common theme amongst the second-generation returnees who had been brought back, generally against their will (they were never actually consulted), by their families' decision to return. Not so evident in Fatoş' narrative, but clearly evident in others', was a residual feeling of nostalgia for certain aspects of the German way of life – especially in the field of schooling.

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 is love; nationality comes 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, with 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 his somewhat distorted understanding of 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 misunderstood 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. My husband didn't allow me to work 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 a working life here. But I can't.
>
> […]
>
> I was telling my husband that he can't control me because I get bored living under this 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 from people 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 relates 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 has returned to her parents' village. Ahu owns a translation office that provides services in German. She is divorced; she raises her son as a single mother. This is a situation which is not unusual in Germany. However she complains about how the locals of village have negative thoughts about her ways.

> I don't like Devrek, people here are very narrow-minded. 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 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).

Return as self-realisation

The third mechanism is directly linked to the second generation's constructions of an 'imagined' homeland (cf. Anderson 1991). The participants who experienced return as self-realisation are those who projected the return themselves as an autonomous decision. In this category we find some of the second generation who first came to Turkey with the Erasmus Exchange Programme and who then decided to stay in Turkey. Some others came by making 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 found out that they feel after all they '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, the rote-based education system at schools, the high costs of sports activities such as having gym membership, air and water pollution etc.

They also maintain that they are aware of the developments in Turkey since their childhood visits; that any product can easily be found, especially in Istanbul; that the health care system got better; and that public transportation and roads have developed immensely etc. Here only one narrative is chosen to summarise the main elements of the second generation's imaginings of homeland and their self-reflection on their identities and belonging in various diasporic and transnational settings. This account, like many others in our corpus of narratives, also shows that the second generation have their own space, a kind of *third cultural space* (Bhabha 1994: 38), 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 with 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, and 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 knew 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 person, I am just saying that I am a human-being. I came to this conclusion… First I was Turkish, I spoke Turkish when 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 realised 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).

Conclusion

This paper has explored second-generation Turkish-Germans' lives in their diaspora and transnational spaces, and has evaluated their constructions of 'home' and 'belonging' in the light of their families' memories from the homeland, their own childhood memories from holidays in Turkey, their Turkish upbringing in Germany through school education, arts and media, and their relationships with other Turkish people and the German society. The analysis draws on theories of memory, generation, diaspora and gender while evaluating these life-stages in order to emphasise the intersectionality of the case study. The life-story narratives were the main source of information, providing direct and often well-articulated insights from the lives of the second generation. The findings illustrated that memories, nostalgia and representations of Turkey in the family space were effective in creating constructions of 'home' and 'belonging'. Based on the gender norms of the Turkish culture, second-generation men and women experienced their process of belonging differently, and they constantly renegotiated their gendered agency in different diaspora spaces. This was especially a challenge for women. The study also presented 'home' as a gendered construction and this led men and women participants to perceive their parental homeland in relation to the gender roles they grew up in.

The paper's account has connected the constructions of 'home' and 'belonging' to the second generation's return journey by exploring their motivations and attitudes to return, including their lack of agency in contributing to the return decision in many cases, and their experiences post-return. One of the findings illustrated that second generation often experienced alienation in their first and second years in their parental homeland. Even though

they thought that they returned to the motherland to which they belonged, they discovered that they were different. Women struggled to renegotiate their gendered identity; they had to adapt to 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, the rote-based education system, nepotism in accessing employment and in business life generally, traffic and chaos in Istanbul, amongst other complaints.

The main narratives of return were three: return as a 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 difficulties communicating with people in Turkey. This stressed the importance of understanding language as a dynamic process. The second generation who returned because of marriage struggled in their new family lives mostly because of the more rigid views of their husbands, and the mother-wife role that was given to them by the Turkish 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 discovering and expressing their identities. The notion of an integrated 'hybrid' Turkish-German identity seemed to be less a solution and more a site of conflicting values and crisis. To some extent, the second generation overcame this by embracing the best of both cultures and concentrating on their futures. Most of the time they kept their transnational, or rather translocal links.

This paper has demonstrated that 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'; and their multi-locality. Therefore, following King and Christou (2010: 104), this paper argues that their return migration has to be understood as a new migration 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' (Wessendorf 2007). It also demonstrates more similarities than differences to the Greek-German case which has been thoroughly researched by Christou and King (2010; 2011; also King and Christou 2010; King et al. 2011). When compared with Teerling's (2011) study of 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. Finally, this 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, mainly because the second generation's understanding of 'home' is more blurry compared to their parents.

Many questions and areas for further research remain. This has been mainly a case-study based on second-generation return to Istanbul; mechanisms of return and conditions of post-return are likely to be very different in rural and small-town Turkey. The analysis outlined in this paper has hinted at this, via the case of Ahu in Devrek, but not explored this comparative dimension in depth. Other avenues for research might look in more detail at the second generation's future plans (for instance their ideas on a possible 're-return' to Germany), their deeper thoughts on Turkish and German society, and the future of the Turkish labour diaspora in general, both in Germany and other countries where it has settled.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on my MA thesis in European Studies, submitted to Lund University, Sweden, in August 2013. The field research in Turkey was carried out as part of my research-assistant internship at Malmö University (Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare), where I worked under the supervision of Willy Brandt Guest Professor, Russell King. The Willy Brandt travel funds facilitated the fieldwork in Turkey.

References

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

Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Anthias, F. (2008) Thinking through the lens of translocational positionality: a intersectionality frame for understanding identity and belonging. *Translocations: Migration and Social Change*, 4(1): 5-20.

Anthias, F. (2002) Where do I belong? Narrating collective identity and translocal positionality. *Ethnicities*, 2(4): 491-514.

Assman J., and Czaplicka, J. (1995) Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique*, 65: 125-133.

Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism.* London: Sage

Bourdieu, P. (1977) Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In Karabel, J. and Halsey, A.H., eds, *Power and Ideology in Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brah, A. (1996) *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. London: Routledge.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2): 77-101.

Brickell, K., and Datta, A. eds. (2011) *Translocal Geographies: Spaces, Places, Connections*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

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

Carr, D. (1985) 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.

Cassarino, J.P. Theorising return migration: a revisited conceptual approach to return migrants. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, 6(2): 253-279.

Cerase, F.P. (1974) Expectations and reality: a case study of return migration from the United States to Southern Italy. *International Migration Review*, 8(2): 245-262.

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

Christou, A., and King, R. (2010) Imagining 'home': diasporic landscapes of the Greek-German second generation, *Geoforum*, 41(4): 638-646.

Christou A., and King, R. (2011) Gendering counter-diasporic migration: second-generation Greek-Americans and Greek-Germans narrate their 'homecoming' to Greece. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 20(2): 283-314.

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

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

Cohen, R. (1997) *Global Diasporas: An Introduction*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Ehrkamp P., and Leitner H. (2003) Beyond national citizenship: Turkish immigrants and the (re)construction of citizenship in Germany. *Urban Geography*, 24(2): 127-146.

Erll, A. (2011) Locating family in cultural memory studies. *Journal of Comparative Memory Studies*, 42(3): 303-318.

Faas, D. (2007) 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): 45-62.

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

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

Gmelch, G. (1980) Return migration. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 9: 135-159.

Halbwachs, M. (1992) *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hall, S. (2000) Who needs identity? In *Identity*: *A Reader*, edited by P. du Gay, J. Evans and P. Redman, 15-30. London: Sage and the Open University.

Hedetoft, U. (2002) Discourses and images of belonging: migrants between 'new racism', liberal nationalism and globalization. *AMID Working Paper Series* 5: 1-24.

Hermans, H.J.M. (1996) Voicing the self: from information processing to dialogical interchange. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(1): 31-50.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994) *Gendered Transitions: Mexican Experiences of Immigration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

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

Kaya, A. (2007) German-Turkish transnational space: a separate space of their own. *German Studies Review*, 30(3): 1-20.

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

King, R., and Christou, A. (2010) Cultural geographies of counter-diasporic migration: perspectives from the study of second-generation 'returnees' to Greece. *Population, Space and Place*, 16(2): 103-119.

King, R., and Christou, A. (2011) Of counter-diaspora and reverse transnationalism: return mobilities to and from the ancestral homeland. *Mobilities*, 6(4): 451-466.

King, R., Christou, A., and Ahrens, J. (2011) 'Diverse mobilities': second-generation Greek-Germans engage with the homeland as children and as adults. *Mobilities*, 6(4): 483-502.

King R., and Kilinc N. (2013) '*Euro-Turks' Return: The Counterdiasporic Migration of German-Born Turks to Turkey* Malmö: Malmö University, MIM. Willy Brandt Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations, 2/13.

King, R., and Kilinc, N. (2014) Routes to roots: second-generation Turks from Germany 'return' to Turkey. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 4(3): 126-133.

Mahler S.J., and Pessar P.R. (2001) Gendered geographies of power: analyzing gender across transnational spaces. *Identities*, 7(4): 441-459.

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

McAdams, D.P. (2008) Personal narratives and life story. In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, edited by J. Robins and L. A. Pervin, 243-262. New York: Guilford Press.

Oso, L. (2011) Tortoises and elephants in the context of family social mobility: second-generation Spanish migrants in France and their desire to return 'home', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 20(2): 207-230.

Østergaard Nielsen, E. (2003) Turkey and the 'Euro-Turks': overseas nationals as an ambiguous asset. In *International Migration and Sending Countries: Perceptions, Policies and Transnational Relations*, edited by E. Østergaard-Nielsen, 77-98. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

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

Portes, A., Guarnizo L.E., and Landolt, P. (1999) The study of transnationalism: pitfalls and promise of an emergent research field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 217-237.

Razum, O., Sahin-Hodoglugil N.N., and Polit, K. (2005) Health, wealth or family ties? Why Turkish work migrants return from Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(4): 719-739.

Riessman, C. K. (1993) *Narrative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sardinha, J. (2011) 'Returning' second-generation Portuguese-Canadians and Portuguese-French: motivations and senses of belonging, *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 20(2): 231-254.

Safran, W. (1991) Diasporas in modern societies: myths of homeland and return. *Diaspora*, 1(1): 83-99.

Schegloff, E. A. (1984) On some questions and ambiguities in conversation. In *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, edited by J. Maxwell Atkinson and J. Heritage, 28-52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Silvey, R. (2005) Borders, embodiment, and mobility: feminist migration studies in geography. In *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, edited by L. Nelson and J. Seager Malden, MA: Blackwell, 138-149.

Sirkeci, I. (2012) Revisiting the Turkish migration to Germany after forty years. *Siirtolaisuus Migration*, 29(2): 9-20.

Sirkeci, I., Cohen J.H., and Yazgan, P. (2012) Turkish culture of migration: flows between Turkey and Germany, socio-economic development and conflict, *Migration Letters*, 9(1): 33-46.

Stanley, L., and Wise, S. (1999) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge.

Teerling, J. (2011) The development of new 'third-cultural spaces of belonging': British-born 'return' migrants in Cyprus, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(7): 1079-1099.

Thomson, M., and Crul, M. (2007) 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): 1025-1041.

Toktaş, Ş. (2012) Introduction: 50 years of emigration from Turkey to Germany – a success story? *Perceptions*, 17(2): 5-9.

Vertovec, S. (1997) Three meanings of 'diaspora', exemplified among South Asian religions. *Diaspora*, 6(3): 277-299.

Wessendorf, S. (2007) 'Roots migrants': transnationalism and 'return' among second-generation Italians in Switzerland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33(7): 1083-1102.