

Cross-Border Activities and Transnational Identification of Turkish Migrants in Europe

Pötzschke, Steffen; Duru, Deniz; Cesur, Nazli Sila; Braun, Michael

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Pötzschke, S., Duru, D., Cesur, N. S., & Braun, M. (2014). *Cross-Border Activities and Transnational Identification of Turkish Migrants in Europe*. (EUCROSS Working Paper, 7). <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395374>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

EUCROSS

Crossing borders making Europe

a research project financed by the EC 7th Framework Programme



**The Europeanisation of Everyday Life:
Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identifications
Among EU and Third-Country Citizens**

Cross-Border Activities and Transnational Identification of
Turkish Migrants in Europe

Steffen Pöttschke, Deniz Duru, Nazli Sila Cesur and Michael Braun

EUCROSS Working Paper # 7

January 2014

This series of working papers originates from the research project *The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens* (acronym: EUCROSS).

The EUCROSS research project is funded as part of the European Commission's 7th Framework Programme ('Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities', activity 8.5: 'The Citizen in the European Union'; call identifier: FP7-SSH-2010-2; Funding scheme: collaborative project – small and medium-scale focused research projects; grant agreement: 266767). The project started on April 1, 2011 and is scheduled to end on March 31, 2014.

The research consortium is formed by:

- Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara, Italy (coordinator: Ettore Recchi);
- GESIS–Leibniz Institut für Sozialwissenschaften, Mannheim, Germany (coordinator: Michael Braun);
- Aarhus Universitet, Denmark (coordinator: Adrian Favell);
- IBEI–Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Spain (coordinator: Juan Díez Medrano);
- University of York, United Kingdom (coordinator: Laurie Hanquinet);
- Universitatea din Bucuresti, Romania (coordinator: Dumitru Sandu).

The EUCROSS project and this working paper series are coordinated by Ettore Recchi at the Università 'G. d'Annunzio' di Chieti-Pescara.

For additional information: www.eucross.eu.

This is Deliverable D9.11 of Workpackage 9 (Dissemination and exploitation strategies)

Release date: January 30, 2014

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	5
<i>Data collection</i>	5
<i>Main characteristics of the sample</i>	7
<i>Cross-border activities</i>	12
<i>Supranational identification</i>	20
<i>Regression analysis</i>	25
<i>Conclusion</i>	29
<i>References</i>	32

Executive summary

This paper reports preliminary results on the interplay of cross-border practices and transnational identifications for Turkish migrants living in Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania and the United Kingdom surveyed in the FP7 EUCROSS project. Quantitative data were collected by telephone and face-to-face surveys with 250 Turkish migrants in each of the five countries of residence. In addition, qualitative interviews were conducted with 10 Turkish migrants in each country.

We find remarkable differences between Turkish migrant groups in the surveyed countries both with respect to background variables, such as duration of sojourn, education and migration motives, and cross-border activities, such as travel experiences, friendship networks and communication abroad. Our analysis shows that the experience of cross-border activities did not influence the respondents' stance towards supra national entities, such as the European Union or the World as such. This might be due to the fact that the individuals surveyed here did not differ in the most important mobility experience: the migration to another country. A specific "Schengen area" effect on European identification did not emerge from our data. Quite the contrary: those respondents who live outside the Schengen zone (i.e., in the United Kingdom and Romania) are among those who identified most strongly with Europe. Moreover, most of the interviewed Turkish nationals were more likely to state a pronounced cosmopolitan stance than a strong identification with Europe. However, this might not come as a surprise, as the full rights associated with European citizenship have not yet been awarded to Turkish nationals in EU member states.

Cross-Border Activities and Transnational Identification of Turkish Migrants in Europe

Steffen Pötzschke, Deniz Duru, Nazli Sila Cesur and Michael Braun

Introduction

This working paper aims to present a first overview of the data collected on Turkish migrants as part of the project “The Europeanisation of Everyday Life: Cross-Border Practices and Transnational Identities among EU and Third-Country Citizens” (EUCROSS) funded by the European Commission in the 7th Framework Programme. After a general description of the data used (sampling procedures, sample sizes, etc.) the paper consists of three main sections.

The first part begins with the presentation of socio-economic background information on the samples. In line with the main research questions of the EUCROSS project (see Favell et al. 2011; Hanquinet and Savage 2011) the second section will examine the Turkish EUCROSS respondents’ involvement in cross-border activities and major indicators of their “transnational human capital” (Kuhn 2011).

In the third section we will present an analysis of the respondents’ identification with different entities and in particular Europe. In both section we will take advantage of the mixed methods character of the EUCROSS project which collected quantitative as well as qualitative data.

Based on a regression analysis, using the identification with Europe and the World as dependent variables, the fourth section finally discusses the correlation between cross-national activities and transnational identifications. Besides the general examination of these connections the paper aims furthermore to shed light on the questions as to whether a possible identification with Europe is in fact “only” a specific sign of a larger, more universal cosmopolitan stance or whether it is a significant phenomenon in its own right.

Data collection

As part of the EUCROSS study approximately 250 interviews were conducted with migrants from Turkey and Romania in Denmark, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. In Spain, only Romanian migrants were included due to the low number of Turkish migrants. Finally, in Romania, a Turkish sample was drawn. This makes up for a total of 2,500 migrants. Furthermore, 1,000 interviews were conducted within each of the national populations of the six countries (Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania, Spain and the United Kingdom). This paper concentrates on the data of Turkish migrants, while Salamońska et al. (2013) as well as Hanquinet and Savage (2013) discuss different questions with respect to the survey of the national populations.

To be included in the migrant sample respondents had to possess Turkish citizenship without being naturalised in the respective countries of residence (CoR). Only those persons who fulfilled these criteria and were also not born in the country of residence were surveyed. Hence, our sample was based on persons who hold only Turkish citizenship regardless of their ethnicity (including Turks, Kurds, Zazas¹ and so on, but excluding Turkish Cypriots with a Cypriot passport). Throughout the working paper, we employ the term “Turkish nationals” to refer to immigrants who hold Turkish citizenship and currently reside in Europe. Therefore, the terms “Turk” and “Turkish” when used together with “migrants”, “sample” or “respondents” throughout the paper do not have an ethnic meaning but refer to nationality in a legal sense.

The sampling procedure itself was realised via linguistic screening of names in telephone directories (the so-called "onomastic procedure", Humpert and Schneiderheinze 2000). Potential respondents were asked if they were born in Turkey and if they hold Turkish nationality. However, the number of Turkish respondents who could be recruited by these means in Italy, Romania and the United Kingdom was entirely insufficient. This was mainly due to a considerable lack of registered telephone numbers owned by the target populations and, in the case of Romania, by the general lack of a comprehensive telephone register. Additionally, in the latter country the name-based recruitment procedure had been complicated by a long established Turkish minority and, more generally, by the fact that, to our knowledge, very few quantitative surveys on Turkish migrants were realised in Romania before so that there were few earlier experiences that could have been built on.² Furthermore, Romania and the United Kingdom allow double citizenship in contrast to Denmark, Germany and Italy where the migrants have to renounce their Turkish citizenship in order to be naturalised. Among the Turkish sample in the Romania and United Kingdom, as we excluded the holders of double citizenship, the number of potential respondents was smaller and it was much harder to find persons who exclusively hold Turkish passports. Therefore, additional means were employed and personal interviews were performed. For financial reasons, best practices of sampling had to be sacrificed in order to get the necessary number of respondents. For instance, the Turkish sample in Romania was to more than ninety per cent generated through a network-driven recruitment process. However, considerable efforts were made to achieve at least some balance by requiring interviewers to follow diverse recruitment strategies and by specifying additional sampling criteria (for example regarding the age and gender distributions). Nevertheless, with respect to the British, Italian and Romanian samples it should be kept in mind that some of the distributions described below might - at least partially - be influenced by the alternative sampling strategies that had to be employed.

¹ An ethnic identification referring to being Zaza and speaking Zazaki. There are many Zazas living in the eastern part of Anatolia which includes the cities of Dersim/Tunceli, Bingol and Erzincan. The majority of them are Alevi while Sunni constitute a minority.

² A noteworthy exception is the study of Bucharest's Turkish community by Ecirli, Stănescu and Dumitru (2011). Ahmet Ecirli also worked as an expert consultant for SUZ (Sozialwissenschaftliches Umfragezentrum GmbH), which was responsible for the fieldwork of the project and organized the collection of data on Turkish migrants in Romania.

A standardised questionnaire in Turkish language was administered by native speaking interviewers in computer-assisted telephone interviews and face-to-face interviews. The average duration of the interviews was slightly less than half an hour. The aims were to collect quantitative information about migration experiences, political behaviour, attitudes and identification with Europe. The survey began in early summer 2012 and, due to problems in some of the fields, was completed only in early 2013. Pötzschke (2012) provides detailed information on the instruments which were used to measure key constructs and variables.

This quantitative survey was complemented with a number of semi-structured qualitative interviews in order to explore cross-border practices and identifications in greater depth. In the qualitative part of the project, we interviewed a total of 50 Turkish nationals living in Denmark, Germany, Italy, Romania and the United Kingdom. We chose 10 Turkish migrants per country (five male and five female, with different ages, migration motives and education backgrounds) who had previously participated in the EUCROSS quantitative survey.³ We can therefore use the qualitative data and additional literature to illustrate and complement the results obtained from the quantitative data.

In the following, we will first describe the different samples of Turkish migrants with regard to demographic information and transnational behaviour and then turn to questions of identification with and attitudes towards Europe in a wider sense.

Main characteristics of the sample

Table 1 presents information on the current age, age at migration, duration of sojourn in the countries of residence and gender of the Turkish nationals in the different countries.

Table 1: Age, age at migration, duration of sojourn, gender

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Age (mean in yrs)	Age at migration (mean in yrs)	Duration of sojourn in CoR (mean in yrs)	Gender (female in %)
Denmark	41.2	20.8	20.4	47.2
Germany	46.2	19.1	27.1	56.1
Italy	33.9	24.9	9.0	43.8
Romania	40.7	29.0	11.7	31.2
United Kingdom	38.5	26.1	12.4	43.0

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1235

Turkish EUCROSS respondents are, on average, between 34 and 46 years old. While the respondents in Italy have the lowest mean age those in Germany have the highest one.

³ Due to the aforementioned sampling problems and privacy concerns in Romania qualitative interviews in this country had to be conducted with individuals which did not participate in the quantitative study.

Age at migration varies between 19 and 29 years. Comparative analysis of Turkish and Romanian migrant groups in EUCROSS (Pötzschke and Braun 2014) shows that Turkish migrants interviewed during the survey were typically younger than Romanian citizens when they moved to their countries of residence. The only exception is Turks in Romania who are in this respect more similar to the Romanian migrants than to the Turkish samples in other countries. Apart from the Italian sample, Turks have already spent a considerably longer period in their countries of residence than the Romanians.

The above stated figures indicate that most respondents of all groups migrated when they were already of working age. Moreover, their average age at the time of the survey still positioned them in the typical age range of the working force.

Furthermore, the duration of sojourn of the Turkish nationals in Germany is by far longer than that of all other groups and, in particular, three times as high as that of the Turkish respondents in Italy. The longer duration of sojourn in Germany and Denmark is related to Turkish labour migration which began in the early 1960s to Germany and in the late 1960s to Denmark (Icduygu, Sirkeci and Muradoglu 2001; Liversage 2009). As mentioned above Turkish migrants in Germany and Denmark have to choose between holding the citizenship of their host country and that of their country of origin. Therefore, a considerable share of migrants never got naturalised in these countries even though they have been living there for several years or decades. As Turkish migrants are allowed to hold dual citizenship in the United Kingdom, many more of them became naturalised British citizens over the years. Hence, the duration of the sojourn of Turkish migrants who hold only Turkish citizenship is much lower despite the history of Turkish migration to the United Kingdom since the 1970s (see King et al. 2008; Düvell 2010). Turkish migration to Italy is a much more recent phenomenon compared to Germany, Denmark and the United Kingdom. Hence the sojourn in the country of residence is much lower.

The gender distribution is rather balanced in four of the five samples. Nevertheless, the German one shows a slight overrepresentation and the Danish, Italian and British a small underrepresentation of women. On the contrary the Turkish sample in Romania shows a strong underrepresentation of women, who constitute less than one third of this sample. Qualitative data show that there are a remarkable number of young Turkish businessmen in Romania who are single or married to locals.

The overview of educational titles acquired by the respondents of our sample shows that there are some similarities between the groups in the different countries of residence (see Table 2). First of all, in Denmark, Germany and Romania Turkish migrants who received only lower secondary education or less constitute the biggest group of the sample, followed by those who acquired a diploma of higher secondary education. On the contrary, in Italy and the United Kingdom the biggest groups are constituted by those who hold a university degree, while respondents with lower secondary education or less are the second largest groups. Education and high-skilled migration have become the driving force of migration for Turkish migrants who choose to live in Italy and the United Kingdom; hence their education level is much higher compared to other Turkish migrants in Europe. Of all samples, Turkish migrants who were interviewed in Germany show the

lowest education level: half of them are in the most basic category while less than 10 per cent received a university diploma. At the same time only in Germany the group of respondents in-between lower and higher secondary education surpassed 10 per cent. In contrast, in the United Kingdom (76 per cent) and in Italy (62 per cent) the clear majority of Turkish EUCROSS respondents received higher secondary or even university education.

Table 2: Education in per cent

	Lower secondary education	In-between lower and higher secondary education	Higher secondary education	Tertiary education
<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>				
Denmark	42.6	5.1	31.1	21.3
Germany	50.4	11.5	28.7	9.4
Italy	34.6	3.7	19.9	41.9
Romania	47.8	7.7	29.2	15.4
United Kingdom	21.7	2.1	19.6	56.7

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N= 1212

One fifth of the Turkish migrants who participated in EUCROSS were not in a relationship at the time of the survey (see Table 3). Country specific rates vary between 11.5 per cent in Denmark and 29 per cent in Italy. The samples in Denmark and Germany include the lowest number of single persons. At the same time 77 per cent of the respondents in both countries are in a relationship with someone coming from their country of origin. The same is true for 63 per cent of the surveyed Turkish migrants in Romania and 51 per cent of those in Italy. However, less than half of the respondents in the United Kingdom were in a relationship with another Turk at the time of the survey. For all groups taken together nearly two thirds of the respondents have a partner coming from their country of origin. While the second biggest group (of those in a relationship) is constituted by people whose partner is a national of their country of residence, the size of this group lags – with 12.4 per cent – far behind the former. Regarding individual samples this pattern is only broken by Turkish respondents in Italy who more often have a partner from another EU country than from Italy. Unsurprisingly, most relationships with partners from the country of origin had started before the migration took place, while most of the relationships with country of residence partners were established once the respondents resided in the respective country (Table not presented).

Table 3: Origin of the partner in per cent

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Country of origin	Country of residence	Other EU country	Other country	No partner
Denmark	76.5	10.3	0.8	0.8	11.5
Germany	76.6	6.9	0.8	0.8	14.9
Italy	50.8	7.3	10.1	2.8	29.0
Romania	63.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	16.1
United Kingdom	45.5	17.1	6.5	2.4	28.5

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1215

The data on migration motives of Turkish migrants gives a very nuanced picture (see Table 4). On the one hand, Turkish migrants in Denmark and Germany, for instance, stated “family/love” as their main migration motive. At the same time those two samples also show the lowest average age at migration and the longest duration of their stay. However, the fact that these respondents stated family reasons behind their migration does not entirely come as a surprise. For instance, in Germany three quarters of the interviewed Turkish nationals immigrated since the mid-1970s. This means that the majority of this sample arrived after the Federal Republic had ceased its labour recruitment policy in 1973. Following this political decision, migration from Turkey did not end but its character changed, as many Turkish workers decided not to return to their country of origin for the time being. Instead family reunifications became a much more important migration pattern since those Turkish nationals already living in Germany started to invite their families to join them in a considerably higher number than before (Herbert 2003; Soysal 2003). The same was true for Denmark. After the 1973 recession, Denmark closed its borders to migrants except for those who came for marriage, through family reunification or as asylum seekers (Liversage 2009).

Table 4: Migration motives in per cent

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Work	Education	Quality of life	Family/love
Denmark	27.2	0.8	6.0	69.6
Germany	20.6	2.8	2.8	72.6
Italy	45.6	25.2	7.2	25.2
Romania	67.6	4.4	4.4	21.2
United Kingdom	28.2	33.9	19.8	32.3

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N = 1250

We should add here that the “family/love” category includes both family reunification (e.g., with parents who came as guest workers or with the spouse who had already left Turkey earlier) as well as marriage migration. Marriage migration is quite complex because it includes, for instance, not only Turkish citizens who migrated as spouses of

country of residence nationals but also the Turkish citizens who were raised and brought up in Turkey, had no previous relationship with the host country and who only migrated there after marrying another Turkish citizen who had already been living in Europe. Such brides and grooms could be, for example, the childhood or youth love from the village of origin, cousins or somebody that was introduced and suggested by relatives in Turkey (including arranged marriage, e.g. a marriage with a cousin could be arranged but could also be the choice of the groom and the bride) (Liversage 2009; 2012; Huschek, Valk and Liefbroer 2012). Among the 10 respondents who took part in qualitative interviews in Germany, five moved to join their parents who had come to work as guest workers. Two out of these five participants were in fact admitted under the guest worker category. Four out of ten respondents moved because of marriage reunification, with three of them marrying their cousins from Turkey. There was only one person who came to work as a teacher and married a German of ethnic German origin. In the 10 qualitative interviews conducted with Turkish migrants in Denmark, six respondents stated marriage as the motivation for migration. Marriage included getting married in Turkey with a Turkish migrant living in Denmark and then migrating to Denmark or marriage with ethnic Danes. Unfortunately, among the participants of the semi-structured interviews, the ones who married Danes stated that their marriages ended up in divorce.

On the other hand, “work” was cited as main migration motive by many Turkish respondents in Italy and Romania. Especially with respect to the latter, an examination of the main migration periods brings interesting insights. A majority (72.4 per cent) of the Turkish sample migrated to Romania between 1995 (the year in which Romania officially applied for EU membership) and 2007 (the year in which it joined the EU). Thus, this migration could, at least partially, have been motivated by the prospect of the future EU membership of this country. This is all the more plausible as in none of the other samples a majority migrated in this particular time period. Furthermore, among interviewees in the qualitative study in Romania there were many young businessmen and women who stated that the pre-accession period provided them with economic opportunities to launch their businesses. There are also bilateral agreements between Turkey and Romania in place facilitating economic cooperation. Another remarkable point is that most of these entrepreneurs run family businesses. Some participants’ fathers moved to Romania in the 1990s, during the communist era in search of work. Following their fathers’ footsteps, this young generation of business people came to Romania during the post-communist era to continue their family businesses and to benefit from the ever closer ties between this country and the EU.

The Turkish citizens who choose Italy and the United Kingdom as a place of residence did so for education (especially to undertake Master’s degree and PhD studies) and/or for occupations which require high skills. The number of Turkish migrants in Italy is much smaller (19,068 in 2010 according to official figures, ISTAT 2013) compared to other destination countries we explored. Furthermore, these migrants stated more often specific reason for their migration (such as moving to Italy as refugee, in order to work as architects, artists, designers, PhD students, etc.) than respondents in the other countries. As in the quantitative part, the sample with the highest level of education in the

qualitative survey was the one in the United Kingdom. The Turkish migrants chose the United Kingdom either to learn English or to undertake postgraduate or doctoral studies. Their PhD degrees are either funded by the Turkish government (which is a new trend of migration to the UK) or self-funded. It is also not uncommon for Turkish migrants to come to the United Kingdom with a student visa in order to learn or improve their English and then remain, either by getting married, moving on to further education or getting into paid employment. For instance, out of the ten Turkish migrants of the qualitative study, three came to study English. One stayed in the UK in order to work under the so called Ankara agreement⁴ between Turkey and the United Kingdom. The other two respondents got married to EU nationals living in the United Kingdom. Four interviewees migrated for education (PhD and Master's) and are either still in education or work. One came as a skilled migrant after having completed a PhD in the US, to accept a job offer in the UK. One respondent migrated because of her children's education. One came to work.

Within the United Kingdom, in terms of work-related migration, there are mainly two trends. One is the Ankara agreement, which allows Turkish business people to set up their businesses in the United Kingdom, or to continue working if they have already been working in the United Kingdom. There are specific conditions and restrictions to obtain work permit via the Ankara agreement. The other option for labour migrants is Tier 2 (previously Tier 1) - under the category of skilled migrants. It requires employer's sponsorship and a relatively high level of salary. If migrants work as self-employed under the Ankara agreement, or if they work as Tier 1 or Tier 2, they can apply for permanent residence after five years of living in the United Kingdom. However, if they work for somebody else under Ankara agreement, or have been studying then they have to be living for 10 years in the country before applying for permanent residence. One year after getting permanent residence, they can apply for UK citizenship.

Cross-border activities

An overwhelming majority of the respondents in all countries visited their country of origin within the last 24 months before the survey (see Table 5). The lowest value in this regard is shown by Turkish nationals in Italy (76 per cent) while all others are between 82 (Germany) and nearly 90 per cent (Romania). Compared to that, it is clearly less common for Turkish migrants to visit other EU member states. Nevertheless, nearly half of the migrants in Denmark and the United Kingdom and over 60 per cent of the Turkish nationals in Italy undertook such trips. On the contrary not even one in ten of the Turkish immigrants which were interviewed in Romania visited another EU country within the same period. However, the respondents of this sample reported the second highest rate of visits to countries outside the EU and the highest rate of journeys to Turkey. Possible reasons for this larger number of trips are, on the one hand, the geographical position of Romania, which puts it closer to Turkey than all other countries under investigation. Furthermore, Romania shares borders with four non-EU countries but only with two other EU member states (Bulgaria and Hungary). On the other hand, Romania is not yet a

⁴ Turkish European Community Association Agreement (ECAA).

member of the Schengen agreement which means that third country citizens who hold a residence permit of this country might not travel as easily to other EU countries as those who live in Denmark, Germany or Italy. Further data show that Turkish nationals who live in Romania and the United Kingdom, on average, travelled twice to their country of origin in the 24 months preceding the survey, while all others were more likely to realise only one such trip (Table not presented).

Table 5: Recent trips (within last 24 months) in per cent

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Trips to ...		
	Turkey	EU countries	Countries outside the EU
Denmark	88.0	48.8	12.8
Germany	82.5	28.2	9.1
Italy	76.0	61.6	22.8
Romania	89.2	9.2	17.6
United Kingdom	87.1	44.4	14.1

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N = 1250

In conclusion, interviewed Turkish migrants are – also in addition to the migration process itself – everything but internationally immobile. According to the quantitative data more than three-fourths of them left their country of residence at least once within the two years before taking part in the EUCROSS survey. In addition to visits to Turkey, moderate mobility is also apparent with regard to other EU countries, which were visited on average by 38 per cent of the surveyed Turkish citizens. This rate is considerably lower than the corresponding average of EU nationals who were surveyed in EUCROSS (51 per cent, Salamońska, Grifone Baglioni and Recchi 2013, p. 25).

However, in the qualitative interviews, many respondents spoke about repeated car journeys from the country of residence to Turkey (and back). Especially amongst the Turkish migrants in Germany and Denmark – who have a more modest life – going by car is more common since it is less expensive than air travel. During such road trips, which lasted on average 3-4 days, the respondents had of course to traverse numerous states. However, when they calculated the number of “visited countries”, they did not count or mention those which they passed on said trips. A memorable experience shared by many respondents who undertook such trips was that of having to bribe the Bulgarian police while transiting this country.

Another reason why the Turkish migrants show less mobility than European citizens is their visa restrictions. As the United Kingdom and Romania are not members of the Schengen agreement, Turkish migrants cannot travel to the Schengen area without a visa. Vice versa, those living in the Schengen area cannot travel to non-Schengen countries without a visa (depending on the country’s border rule). With regard to the reasons for

travel/cross-border practices, the Turkish migrants in Germany and Denmark stated more often that they visit family and relatives who live in different parts of Europe. However, those living in Italy and the United Kingdom more frequently mentioned travelling for holidays/leisure or for work as the main reasons.

Table 6 provides a picture of the respondents' social networks, both in the country of residence and abroad. The figures focus on the percentage of those migrants who stated that they have "a lot" of family members, in-laws and/or friends (in the following "contacts") in a specific country or region. While reviewing the data it is important to keep in mind that the shown categories are not exclusive and that overlaps are possible and actually very likely. Furthermore, it should be taken into account that the definition of "a lot" is relative and also depends on the total size of the individual network.

Table 6: Social networks
(Percentage of respondents with many contacts of the mentioned nature)⁵

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	In the country of residence			Outside the country of residence		
	People from Turkey	People from CoR	People from 3 rd countries	Turks who live in Turkey	Turks who live neither in Turkey nor in CoR	People from 3 rd countries
Denmark	81.6	27.2	10.8	74.4	26.4	9.2
Germany	80.2	19.8	8.3	58.3	14.3	6.4
Italy	54.0	46.8	24.8	52.0	32	14.8
Romania	76.0	13.6	4.8	97.6	0.4	0.0
United Kingdom	72.6	22.6	12.9	72.6	17.3	4.8

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N = 1250

Unsurprisingly, most of the respondents in all samples indicated that they have a high number of Turkish contacts in the country of residence. With the exception of Italy this concerns an overwhelming majority. As in the case of the nationality of the respondent's partners the values of the samples in Denmark and Germany are the highest and nearly identical. In Italy, however, 46 per cent of the respondents do not have many Turkish contacts while the same share of them knows a lot of Italians. This is noteworthy especially if it is taken into consideration that this group has the lowest duration of sojourn of all Turkish EUCROSS samples (see Table 1). While in the United Kingdom, Germany and Denmark, the Turkish migrants mentioned, during the qualitative interviews, the citizens of the host country to be culturally quite different and more

⁵ During the interview respondents were asked how many family members, in-laws and/or friends of different ethnic backgrounds they had in the country of origin, country of residence or in third countries. Possible answers were "none", "a few", "a lot". The table shows values of the latter category only.

distant, the opposite was true in Italy. Turkish migrants in Italy stated to have very good relations – including friendships – with natives. According to them a reason for this is that Italy is also a Mediterranean country and that Italians are as warm and friendly as people in Turkey. However, several Turkish migrants also expressed the opinion that Italians are somewhat lazy while, in direct comparison, Turks are more hard-working. Many of them gave examples of long lunch breaks and stores being closed on Sundays. For example, one male Turkish informant following an undergraduate degree in Italy said:

“The thing I don’t like is, they [Italians] have too many holidays. During my first year I went to the international office [at university], they work between 3.00-5.00pm. I went there at 4.55pm, to ask something; the guy told me ‘Come tomorrow!’. [He replied to the employee:] ‘Listen to me for a minute, why are you acting like this? How do you know that I am available tomorrow?’ Turks, even if they have closed shutters, if a customer comes, they reopen the shop and sell stuff. It is definitely not like that here, this is one of thing I dislike (in Italy) ...”

With respect to their working environment Turkish respondents complain about a perceived unpunctuality of Italians. They find it easier to work with non-Italians, for example with other migrants who, according to them, work much harder.

Nevertheless, the respondents in Italy more often mentioned similarities with Italians (such as family relations to be important for both Turks and Italians) while the Turkish migrants in Denmark and Germany focused more on differences between themselves and the native populations (e.g. Germans and Danes are more organised and punctual than Turkish people). Turkish migrants like a lot the modesty of Danes and the fact that there are few class differences in Denmark. In the qualitative interviews, the respondents give examples of politicians and famous people who cycle to work, or take public transport, which in turn makes respondents happy and feeling on more equal terms with them. One highly educated female stated:

“There is no status or class difference (in Denmark). For instance, you can chat on the street with the Prime Minister. She might even go to work by bike.”

On the other hand, Turkish migrants find Germans somewhat distant in terms of neighbourhood relations. Turkish migrants would prefer to have coffee and tea or meals with their German neighbours and visit each other at home. They like the hospitality and the warmth of Turkish people and they tend to say that a combination of Turkish hospitality and warmth with the German organisation and order would make a great symbiosis. They have learnt a lot from the German’s way of organising, being on time and meticulous and they say that the Germans could also learn from the neighbourhood relations, generosity and the hospitality of Turkish people.

In Germany roughly one in five respondents has a larger network of country of residence acquaintances, which is more than in Romania but less than in all other countries (Table 6). Nearly a quarter of all Turkish respondents in Italy also know a comparatively high number of people from third countries. This is nearly twice the percentage of the Turkish migrants in the United Kingdom, who score second highest on this indicator. The

qualitative data shows that the Turkish migrants who live in London have more interactions with people from diverse backgrounds due to the diversity of the British capital. The ones who live in smaller cities have more contact with white British people. Turkish nationals in the United Kingdom have good relations with British people and see themselves a part of the United Kingdom, which has also come up in the quantitative results. The respondents mentioned in qualitative interviews that British people are more tolerant towards migrants and diversity and that, in terms of social interactions, British people exclude migrants less than Germans. One female respondent in England, who lived in Germany with her family before coming to the UK, mentioned that she and her family felt more excluded in Germany than in the UK. She stressed that compared to her life in Germany, she has more possibilities to enjoy an enriched and sociable life in the UK through partaking in community services. She noticed that:

“There were not as many social activities [in Germany] as there are in England. I don’t know about how things are now. I am talking about at that time [when I lived in Germany]. There are many activities here [in the UK] thus, we attend many social activities ... There weren’t activities like these in Germany. I am talking about [the mid-1990s], I don’t know about how things are there right now.”

Regarding contacts in other countries, Turkish nationals in Romania stand apart as nearly all of them have a high number of contacts in Turkey and virtually none knows Turkish people in third countries or even third country nationals abroad (Table 6). Thus, the roots of their personal networks are of a bi- rather than of a multi-national character. As already mentioned with respect to the country of residence, members of the sample in Italy have to a smaller extent than the other groups strongly developed contact networks in Turkey. On the contrary, they score highest of all groups when it comes to knowing a larger number of Turkish people or third country nationals abroad (i.e., who neither live in the country of residence nor the country of origin). It is likely that there is a causal link between this fact and their comparatively high education (Table 2). That particularly few respondents in Germany have a high number of Turkish family members and friends back in Turkey or in third countries corresponds to the fact that they often migrated to be with their families in Germany. Both aspects taken together indicate that in comparison to Turkish migrants in other countries a larger (or more significant) part of their families lives in their country of residence as well and not anymore in the country of origin.

A considerable share of Turkish EUCROSS respondents in all five surveyed countries seem to be in frequent contact with people in other countries (Table 7). With the exception of Turkish migrants who live in Romania at least half of all samples talk to someone abroad once a week or even more often. Such telephone (or telephone-like) conversations present the most frequently used channel of communication with friends and family abroad in four of the five samples. The high frequency indicates that talking to people in other countries is a mundane activity for these survey respondents. It is, furthermore, in line with the assumption of a growing transnationalisation of migrant communities worldwide. Since it is unlikely that respondents have dramatically good or bad news to report each week, it is safe to assume with Ludger Pries (2008) that for most migrants, at the beginning of the 21st century, long-distance calls have lost their main character as

emergency signals or short live signs to those left behind in the country of origin. In fact messages send via social networking sites, which are the second most often used means of international communication for the migrants analysed here, are likely to be send in such cases today (without being limited to this function). E-mails and letters, which are usually much longer than the aforementioned messages and substantially less direct than telephone calls, are send least often.

Table 7: Communication with family, in-laws and friends abroad
(Percentage of respondents who use the respective means of communication at least once a week)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Telephone or VoIP (Skype etc.)	Mail or e-mail	Social networking sites
Denmark	54.4	17.2	42.4
Germany	48.4	13.5	20.2
Italy	59.2	34.8	56.4
Romania	10.0	18.0	33.6
United Kingdom	58.1	33.1	51.6

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N = 1250

Turkish respondents in Italy constitute the group which makes most use of all three ways to communicate with people in other countries. However, respondents in the United Kingdom are nearly as active in this regard. On the contrary, the migrants in Romania have considerably less contact with people abroad, which is not self-evident keeping in mind that nearly all of them indicated that they have many family members and friends in Turkey.

Means of communication which make use of the internet are used less frequently by Turkish nationals in Germany than by those in Denmark, Italy and the United Kingdom. The qualitative interviews revealed that several respondents in Germany even confuse “computer” with “internet”. Some of them said that they do not use the internet, when they apparently meant to say that they do not use a computer. We come to this conclusion since they named programs such as Whatsapp, Viber or Tango which allow them to get in touch with friends and family abroad, when asked explicitly for the names of applications they use on their mobile phones. It seems that some of these respondents are not even aware that these applications require the use of the internet.

While in Germany, limitless credit (called “flat rate”) to call landline or mobile phones in Turkey is very common, in Denmark, Italy and the United Kingdom, the use of social media, especially Facebook, is more frequent.

Nearly half or more of the respondents in all countries studied at some point of their life a third language (besides Turkish and the country of residence language) (see Table 8). Viewed on a national level, the percentage of respondents who did so is lowest in Germany and highest in Italy. However, this does not come as a surprise if the distribution

of educational titles is taken into consideration. Most of the highly educated Turkish migrants in Italy, especially those who hold a Bachelor's degree, speak English as a second language and have learnt or improved Italian after moving to Italy. As discussed above, lower education is predominant amongst the Turkish respondents in Germany while generally higher educational titles are achieved by those in Italy (see Table 2). In fact, the average education of Turkish respondents is only in the United Kingdom higher than in Italy. The additional languages most often mentioned are English (by 35 per cent of the Turkish respondents), German (by 13 per cent) and French (by 9 per cent) (Table not presented). Thus, this data is underlining the dominant role of English as foreign language and also explains the lower value of additional language abilities in the United Kingdom.

Table 8: Additional foreign language knowledge and foreign media consumption in per cent

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Language Ability	Watch foreign TV
Denmark	56.4	56.8
Germany	46.8	23.8
Italy	70.4	60.8
Romania	63.2	75.2
United Kingdom	49.2	48.8

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N= 1250

Not included in the figures above is the native language of those 148 respondents (11.8 per cent of our Turkish sample) who stated that their mother tongue was not Turkish. Nearly all of them (143) identified as native Kurdish speakers and the biggest group – in our sample – is to be found in Denmark (44 individuals) (Table not presented).

Less than one in four Turkish migrants in Germany watches TV contents in a different language than the country of residence and country of origin language compared to three in four Turkish nationals in Romania.⁶ The other countries of residence are in between: approximately half of the respondents in the United Kingdom and roughly six out of ten in Denmark and in Italy do so. However, if only frequent users of foreign-language TV content are concerned (i.e., those who watch TV content which is neither in Turkish nor in the country of residence language at least once per week), the figures are much lower and a partially different ranking of the countries of residence results. Italy, with 42 per cent and Denmark, with 29 per cent, are far ahead of Romania, with 20 per cent and the United Kingdom, with 18 per cent. With nearly 12 per cent Germany shows again the lowest value (Table not presented). The low value of the Turkish sample in Germany could, in addition to their relatively low foreign-language proficiency, also be a consequence of the fact that foreign TV products are mostly dubbed in Germany.

⁶ The item in question referred to TV content that was neither in the country of residence language nor in Turkish. It also included different media (TV, internet, DVD).

Table 9 indicates the relative share of respondents who send regularly (i.e., at least once a year) money back to Turkey and whom they send it to. The figures show, that a considerable number of Turkish migrants send remittances, mostly to close relatives. The Turkish nationals in Denmark and Romania are most active in this regard with more than 30 per cent of them regularly sending money back. It is interesting to observe that considerably more Turkish migrants in Romania than in all other countries frequently send money to their partners or an own bank account in Turkey. If less frequent remittances (i.e., such which are send less than once a year) are included the values of remittances to the partner or an own bank account are rising to nearly 10 per cent for the Turkish migrants in Romania while they remain nearly the same for all other samples (Table not presented). Even though these figures are still relatively low, they further demonstrate that there are still particularly strong ties between the Turkish nationals in Romania and Turkey.

Table 9: Remittances

(Habit to send money and beneficiaries in per cent, multiple answers possible for the latter)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Regularly send money	Beneficiaries				
		Partner	Close Relatives	Other Relatives	Other Persons	Own Bank Account
Denmark	32.0	0.0	20.0	4.4	12.4	0.4
Germany	23.0	0.0	14.3	2.0	8.7	0.0
Italy	21.6	2.0	15.6	1.6	3.2	0.8
Romania	30.4	6.4	22.8	0.4	1.2	5.2
United Kingdom	25.0	0.8	19.8	2.4	2.8	2.8

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N= 1250

Strong links with the country of origin are also reflected by the number of Turkish migrants who own property in Turkey (Table 10). More than half of the respondents in Romania do so, compared to roughly one third of those living now in the other countries of residence. What is more striking is that more Turkish nationals in Romania own property in the country of residence itself, than in the country of origin.

Table 10: Property ownership in per cent

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Country of Residence	Country of Origin	Another Country	No Property
Denmark	13.6	32.0	0.0	55.2
Germany	22.6	35.3	0.4	42.5
Italy	20.8	31.2	1.2	54.0
Romania	59.6	52.4	0.0	7.6
United Kingdom	16.9	31.0	4.0	55.7

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1250

It is very difficult to properly interpret these data, because several factors might be relevant. In addition to the duration of the sojourn (and perhaps the prospects of a protracted stay), there are the country of residence specific habits to own property and the financial accessibility of real estate.

Supranational identification

Now we turn to questions of identification with and attitudes towards Europe in a wider sense. The identification of all Turkish groups with the local and regional levels is intermediate, with one notable exception: the Turks in Romania (see Table 11). They identify extremely with both the town and the region they live in, but they have at the same time an extremely low identification with Romania as such. Identification with the country of residence is relatively low for the other Turkish groups as well, in particular for those living in Germany. Identification with Turkey is high in all of the groups, as could be expected. In four out of five groups the mean value of identification with the country of origin is even higher than those with all other entities. Identification with Europe is again on an intermediary level, as it was for local and regional identification, for all groups but the Turks in Romania, for whom it is again extremely high. Finally, there is a strong cosmopolitan orientation of all Turkish groups but most pronounced once more for the Turks in Romania. With the only exception of this latter group, cosmopolitanism is markedly stronger than European identification.

Table 11: Identification with geographical units
(means, where 1 stands for “strongly disagree” and 5 for “strongly agree”)⁷

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Town	Region	CoR	Turkey	Europe	World
Denmark	3.4	3.3	1.7	4.5	2.7	4.1
Germany	3.4	3.3	1.3	4.7	2.9	3.8
Italy	3.1	3.0	2.0	4.4	3.0	4.0
Romania	4.8	4.7	1.0	4.8	4.7	4.9
United Kingdom	3.4	3.2	2.8	4.3	3.0	4.1

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1209

Correspondingly, when asked whether they feel Turkish or European and, if they do feel both at the same time, in which order, approximately 75 per cent of the interviewed Turkish nationals in all countries refer to Turkey only or put Turkey first (see the first two columns of Table 12). Hardly anyone feels European only. The differences between the various groups are not very pronounced.

⁷ The item read: “On a scale from one to five, where one means “strongly disagree” and five means “strongly agree”, please tell me how much you agree or disagree with the following statements?: I feel as a citizen of the town where I live; I feel as a citizen of the region where I live; I feel [CoR]; I feel Turkish; I feel European; I feel as a citizen of the world”.

Table 12: Do you consider yourself as being... (in per cent)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Turkish only	Turkish and European	European and Turkish	European only	Other
Denmark	31.9	42.6	17.9	3.0	4.7
Germany	33.2	48.6	13.8	2.0	2.4
Italy	29.6	42.1	22.9	2.9	2.5
Romania	28.5	50.8	19.8	0.0	0.8
United Kingdom	25.4	43.8	21.2	2.8	6.9

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1181

However, this also means that one in four Turkish migrants consider Europe central for his or her conscious identification when presented with the above mentioned choices. In more general terms, two thirds of all surveyed Turkish migrants state that they feel European as well (columns 2-4 of Table 12).

The qualitative interviews are very helpful in classifying the background of the different forms of identification shown by the Turkish nationals in the surveyed European countries. Identification has a relationship with the ways in which respondents have been treated in the country of residence, both in terms of socio-economic benefits from the governments as well as by the citizens of the country of residence.

Religion and Turkishness play a significant role in the experiences of Turkish migrants in Germany and Denmark. Especially in Germany, for most of the participants in our qualitative interviews, being Muslim is significant and has an impact on their daily lives in terms of praying while working, wearing a headscarf, not eating pork during work meals or not drinking while socialising with Germans. Compared to the other Turkish migrants in Europe, the Turkish migrants in Germany mention going to Mecca as a significant practice and they tend to say that they feel discriminated because of being a Muslim and being from Turkey. They in a way “victimise” themselves as well. While they recall an event of feeling discriminated, they reflect that they were discriminated because they were from Turkey, or because they were Muslim or because they were an immigrant. One of the many examples of discrimination is the issue of wearing a headscarf. One male informant complained that his daughter had been unemployed for a couple of years and the reason for that was that she was wearing a headscarf. He recalled his daughter was asked to take her headscarf off in order to be employed. As she kept wearing a headscarf, she was still unemployed at the time of the interview. In Germany, there is a discourse of “assimilation” among the Turkish migrants. Most of the participants see Western culture as a danger to the Muslim way of life. They mostly refer to the consumption of alcohol and some of them even believe that people lose themselves when they drink alcohol. Another common example is female-male intimacy in Europe. For instance, many respondents claim that if they behave like Germans or Danes, they fear losing their Turkish identity. If Turkish migrants behave like Germans (like drinking beer for instance), they feel they have become less Turkish. This discourse of immigrants points out their

distinctiveness and mutual exclusion in relation to European culture. However, the very same people somehow connect themselves with being German/Danish/European through practising economic and social rights. When we asked in the qualitative interviews what the Turkish migrants liked about living in Europe, they stated that they enjoyed the socio-economic rights they had in Europe. They added that they would not have such rights if they lived in Turkey. It seems that enjoying the socio-economic rights provided by Germany and Denmark enhances their identification with Europe. They appreciate the welfare state in Denmark and Germany and they get help from the government when unemployed or they receive benefits. Especially the German health system is explicitly appreciated. However, many Turkish migrants in Germany narrated stories and memories of discrimination in this context as well. In this sense, some focused on the fact that the German government did not welcome Turkish migrants, nor helped them during or after they had arrived. A low educated man used a quote from Max Frisch during the interview:

“It is like in the famous saying ‘We wanted a labour force, but human beings came’. In sum, this is what they [Germans] said, that they never thought of us as humans but as workers. Is the person a social being? Will his family, his children join him? Will they need schooling? Will they have language problems? None of these were taken into consideration.”

Turkish nationals in Denmark feel much less discriminated and more welcome when compared to how Turkish migrants feel in Germany. Even though Turkish nationals also came as workers to Denmark, following a similar agreement as that with Germany, or via family reunification, they recalled experiencing a more welcoming attitude (e.g. Danish authorities coming to pick up a newly migrated child to take her or him to school, providing translators, assigning a personal tutor who helps the migrant with his/her job applications or any bureaucratic problems).

The Turkish nationals in Italy associate more with Italy, hence Europe, in the sense of living in the country where the Roman Empire was rooted. Especially the ones living in Rome feel history engrained in the architecture of the city. This translates into a positive attitude towards Europe. However, they complain about corruption, the inadequate way of governing the country and the extreme tardiness of the bureaucracy. In contrast to Turkish migrants in Germany and Denmark, Islam is not an issue for the Turkish migrants living in Italy. Most of the respondents do not follow Islamic practices. Even though the qualitative interviews were conducted in Ramadan in Italy, most of the informants had not been fasting and most of them complained about the religiosity of the Turkish government.

The Turkish nationals in the United Kingdom are those who showed, during the qualitative interviews, the highest sense of identification with the country of residence compared to other countries. One important reason is the relatively more tolerant attitude of British people towards diversity. It should be pointed out that even though the UK Border Agency and the immigration policies have become much more restrictive towards migrants and the borders have become much more rigid, the British people have

a relatively more “open” attitude compared to the UK Border Agency. A few of the Turkish respondents in the UK mention that they identify with Europe because they feel culturally European. Having migrated from a big city such as Istanbul, Ankara or Izmir and being highly educated contribute to being culturally European. However, several of them see themselves as world citizens because they do not want to restrict themselves to being only European or only Turkish. Only one of them was an extreme Turkish nationalist, who feels strongly Turkish and Muslim, which is an extreme and not representative case.

Turkish nationals in Romania show the lowest sense of identification with the country of residence (Table 11). Considering the qualitative data, this is an interesting result since none of the participants in these interviews ever felt discriminated because of being a foreigner or, more specifically, because of their Turkish origin. Indeed, they claimed, on the contrary, that Romania welcomed them very much. They are also highly integrated into Romanian society, in the sense that they have Romanian friends and work with Romanians, they even employ Romanians. Also some of them are married to Romanians, or have/had Romanian partners. However, almost all of them see Turkey as a more developed country than Romania and attribute this difference to the Romanian socialist history. In other words, they see Romania as a less developed country because of its late introduction of a market economy. Actually Turkish immigrants believe that Romanians still have a socialist mentality in many aspects of the socio-economic life. However, they remark that the younger generation born in post-socialist Romania is not like that and much more integrated with today’s world system. It must be also stressed that they find Romania less developed only in economic terms. They emphasise that Romanian people, especially the younger generation, are very well educated and cultured. In this sense, most of the interviewees are able to make a comparison regarding the social and cultural changes in Romanian society, a young highly educated Turkish migrant stated that:

“... [T]here’s an immense gap between those who lived during the communist era and the new generation. My mother-in-law points this out, the new generation is being educated, they are raised in schools and they are self-confident. On the contrary, the old generation people have been trained as apprentices. They didn’t go to school. So what happens is that the old ones know the work better than the new generation, but the young people have the diplomas and they claim superiority over the elders, which provokes conflicts between the two generations. For the old generation, the youth is insolent, and the old are uneducated in the eyes of the young.”

Following this quote and considering other interviewees’ responses, we can say that Turkish migrants culturally feel closer to this new young generation. As participants of the qualitative interviews mostly see themselves as world citizens or Europeans, this might be the main reason why they do not have strong identification with Romania, otherwise they are all happy living in Romania and they like Romanian people and have good interaction with them.

Though they have a very high level of European identification in general, the Turks in Romania think much more than those in the other countries that the EU should not

continue to accept new member states and that the EU institutions should transfer some of their decision-making power back to the member states (see Table 13). There are only small differences between the Turks in the remaining countries. All in all, the surveyed Turkish migrants tend to be sceptical (though not extremely) about further enlargements and also support the idea of the EU shifting some of its competencies back to the member states.

Table 13: Enlargement and power transfer
(means; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	The EU should not continue to accept new member states	EU institutions should transfer some of their decision-making power back to member states
Denmark	2.5	3.6
Germany	2.3	3.5
Italy	2.6	3.7
Romania	4.2	4.4
United Kingdom	2.7	3.6

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N= 1068

In principle a majority of the respondents noted that it would be a good idea if the EU would admit Turkey.⁸ However, with the exception of Turks in Romania this support was far from enthusiastic.

When asked whether they find it a good idea that EU countries pool national state funds to help EU member states in need (see Table 14), the Turks in Romania were again least convinced of this kind of intra-EU solidarity. The strongest supporters of such a policy among the Turkish migrants are those in Italy, the country which currently would profit most from such a policy among those included in our sample.

Table 14: EU bail out
(means; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Level of agreement with the financial support of other (indebted) EU member states
Denmark	3.2
Germany	2.9
Italy	3.7
Romania	2.2
United Kingdom	3.4

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1042

⁸ The specific item read: „Would it be a good or a bad idea to admit Turkey to the EU”. On a scale from 1 (very bad idea) to 5 (very good idea) the means were: DK 3.8, D 3.4, I 3.4, RO 4.4 and UK 3.3.

An entirely different picture emerges again (as with the identification question), when it comes to the Turks' reaction to a hypothetical dissolution of the European Union. Nearly 90 per cent of the Turks in Romania would feel sorry in this case, while in the other countries only between 37 and 47 per cent would do so (see Table 15).

Table 15: If you were told that the EU had been dissolved, would you feel ... (in per cent)

<i>Turkish sample in ...</i>	Sorry	Indifferent	Relieved
Denmark	39.2	45.3	15.5
Germany	46.9	29.8	23.3
Italy	43.8	40.0	16.2
Romania	88.6	7.7	3.6
United Kingdom	37.4	42.9	19.8

Source: EUCROSS (2013). N=1179

The biggest group of those who would be relieved if the European Union ceased to exist is to be found in Germany, however, with nearly 47 per cent the relative size of the same sample's subgroup who would feel sorry about it is still twice as big. Interestingly, Germany is also the country in which the number of respondents who have neither strongly positive nor negative feelings with regard to this question is smallest, besides the extreme case of Romania.

Regression analysis

In the following section we restrict ourselves to two variables, identification with Europe and identification as citizen of the world. We are mainly interested in how these attitudes can be explained by the variables we have discussed before, that is the socio-demographic variables and the information on transnational behaviour. Two regression models are presented and discussed. In the first one, identification with Europe serves as dependent variable whereas it is the self-description as citizen of the world in the second one (see Table 11).

The regressions include several, though not all, of the previously discussed variables. However, in order to control for background effects and, for example, to allow a more nuanced measurement of mobility effects some alternative variables are added. Accordingly, the following description is restricted to such items which were not discussed thus far.

The subjective economic situation at the age of 14 and at the time of the interview were measured by the questions: "Which of the following descriptions comes closest to your feelings about how well off the household you were living in was when you were 14 years old?" and "Which of the following descriptions comes closest to how you feel about how

well off your household is today?”. The response categories were: “We are/were living very comfortably on the money we have/had”, “we are/were living comfortably on the money we have/had”, “we make/made ends meet”, “we find/found it difficult” and “we find/found it very difficult”.

Information on previous sojourns of three months or more in countries other than the country of origin and the country of residence were collected by the use of two items. The first one asked for stays realised before the age of 18 and the second one for those realised later in life. Since the respondents were asked to specify the country in which they stayed, a differentiation following geographical criteria is possible. The answers to both mentioned items were combined and are entered as dummy variables for previous sojourn in another EU country and in any other country (i.e., which does not belong to the European Union). No previous stays of at least three months serves as the baseline.

The participation in exchange programmes is measured by the dichotomous item: “Have you ever (e.g. as student or during your professional career) participated in an international exchange program that has been funded or co-funded by the European Union?”.

The number of trips to the country of origin and such trips to third countries which included at least one overnight stay (both within the last 24 months) are included in the analysis by means of two separate quantitative variables.

The national origin of the partner is entered as three dummy variables for partner from the country of residence, partner from another EU country and partner from a third non-EU country. Those whose partner is from the country of origin or who do not have any partner serve as the baseline.

The previously discussed extent to which respondents have contacts in the country of residence, country of origin or third countries (Table 6) were measured by a series of specific items which contained the answer categories “none”, “a few” and “a lot”. These variables are treated as quantitative variables, although they were measured on an ordinal scale only.

Besides the existence of a transnational network the data also allow an assessment of the frequency in which different forms of communication are used (Table 7). Respondents were asked whether they used a specific form of communication “every day”, “at least once a week”, “at least once a month”, “less often” or “never” to communicate with their contacts abroad. The mentioned categories are reverse-coded. The same logic applies to the item measuring the consumption of foreign language TV content (Table 8).

Discrimination experience was measured by the question “Have you ever felt discriminated against in [CoR] because you were born in another country?” Response categories were “no, never”, “yes, sometimes” and “yes, frequently”. This variable is treated as a quantitative variable, although it was measured on an ordinal scale only.

Table 16: Regression models for identification with Europe and the World (regression coefficients)

	Europe	World
Sample ⁹		
Turkish migrants in Germany	0.450**	-0.048
Turkish migrants in Italy	0.304	-0.029
Turkish migrants in Romania	1.953***	0.795***
Turkish migrants the United Kingdom	0.317*	0.042
Education ¹⁰		
Intermediary secondary	0.054	0.077
Higher secondary	0.026	0.171
University	0.176	0.102
No information given	-0.224	0.602*
Economic household situation (age 14)	-0.135**	-0.055
Economic household situation (currently)	0.117*	0.111*
Female	0.213*	-0.100
Age	0.004	-0.002
Duration of stay in CoR	0.012	-0.004
Migration motives ¹¹		
Education	0.195	0.031
Quality of life	0.163	0.441**
Family	0.081	0.221*
Physical mobility		
Previous sojourn in an EU country	-0.029	0.069
Previous sojourn in a non-EU country	-0.133	-0.038
Recent trip/s to other EU country/-ies	-0.162	0.079
Recent trip/s to non-EU country/-ies	0.066	0.204
Number of recent trips to CoO	0.042	-0.014
Number of recent trips abroad (except CoO)	0.087	-0.047
Participation in an EU exchange programme	0.133	-0.001
Partner ¹²		
from CoR	-0.137	-0.080
From another EU country	0.358	0.293
from a non-EU country	0.327	-0.467

⁹ Turkish nationals in Denmark serve as baseline.

¹⁰ Lower secondary education or less constitutes the baseline.

¹¹ Work motives serve as baseline.

¹² Respondents whose partner is from the country of origin and those who do not have a partner serve as baseline.

Continuation of Table 16

	Europe	World
Social contacts in CoR - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO	-0.046	0.036
from CoR	0.222**	0.095
from third countries	-0.033	0.137*
Social contacts abroad - Number of family members, in-laws and friends originally		
from CoO and living there	0.129	0.107
from CoO living neither there nor in CoR	-0.068	0.001
from third country living in any country but CoR	0.030	-0.153*
Frequency of communication abroad via		
Telephone or VoIP (Skype ect.)	-0.084	-0.062
Mail or e-mail	0.018	0.045
Social networking sites	0.070*	-0.016
Knowledge of additional language/s	0.279**	0.094
Consumption of TV content in a third language	0.096**	0.053
Discrimination experience	-0.074	0.022
Constant	1.324**	3.444***
N	1,117	1,118
Adj. R ²	0.253	0.090

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

The figures in the first lines of Table 16 show that, with regard to the identification with Europe, it makes a difference in which country the respondents are living. If we control for cross-border experiences and social-economic background, Turkish nationals in Germany, Romania and the UK show a significantly higher identification with Europe than those migrants of the same group who live in Denmark. This might partially be due to the influence of the host society, which is in the case of Denmark usually considered to be sceptical towards the European Union. Pöttschke and Braun (2014) found in fact further evidence of such an influence in the comparison of the data presented here with that of nationals and Romanian migrants who were surveyed as part of EUCROSS, as well. The fact that the Turkish respondents in general seem to think highly of Danish society could have strengthened such an effect and might also be part of the answer why the more pro-European stance of Italians did not have a strong positive impact, since – as detailed above – the Turkish EUCROSS respondents there seemed to have a more sceptical view on the host society.

Unfavourable economic conditions in the youth of the migrants and favourable conditions at present increase European identification. This means, the more Turkish migrants assess their migration project as an economic success, the more likely they are to identify with Europe. Thus it seems that they attribute such positive developments and aspects, at least partially, to opportunities provided by the European Union.

Furthermore, women have a stronger attachment to Europe than men. This is especially noteworthy since it is the contrary of what previous research on stayers (Fligstein 2009) and movers (Braun and Müller 2012) within the European Union showed. It is an open question whether this is related to an additional emancipation process which these women might have experienced due to the influence of European societies on their private lives.

None of the mobility variables has a significant effect.

Social integration in the country of residence, measured here by the number of family members, relatives and friends who are natives, has a strong positive impact on European identification. Other than that, personal networks do not show such significant correlations.

In consistency with earlier research (Gerhards 2012), additional language knowledge has a positive effect on European identification. The same holds true for the consumption of foreign-language TV. Finally, discrimination experiences have no significant effect.

With respect to cosmopolitan attitudes it is largely different variables which show significant correlations with the dependent variable. At the same time, and in more general terms, the variance explained by our model is much lower than for the identification with Europe.

In the cosmopolitanism model, only the Turkish migrants in Romania differ strongly from those in Denmark. As in the former model, a currently favourable economic situation shows a positive correlation. However, the retrospective judgement of the economic security at a younger age does not. On the contrary, migration for quality of life and family reasons are positively correlated to the identification as world citizens.

While the negative relationship between such a self-assessment and sustained contact with third country nationals abroad is puzzling, the same kind of contacts within the country of residence has a positive influence, which was to be expected.

Conclusion

The presented analysis concentrated on the Turkish migrant samples of the EUCROSS study, combining both quantitative and qualitative data.

A very basic, though not surprising, observation is that there are remarkable differences between these migrant groups in the surveyed countries. This is the case both with respect to background variables, such as duration of sojourn, education and migration

motives, as with regard to cross-border activities, i.e. travel experiences and communication abroad. However, it should be noted that some of these differences are probably due to (or at least reinforced by) the design of the study and, more particularly, by the strict concentration on non-naturalised migrants of Turkish nationality.

The analysis showed that a considerable number of respondents are involved in transnational activities or relations which are typically associated with migrants. For instance, about one fourth of them regularly transfer money to Turkey and one in three respondents (in Romania even one in two) holds property in the country of origin. At the same time this means that it is still only a minority of the respondents who participates in such activities. However, research on other migrant groups shows that that is rather the rule than the exception.

Most of the respondents have contact with people who live in other countries. However, these international networks are not extremely heterogeneous when it comes to the origin and current country of residence of its members. Most of them are other Turkish nationals and the overwhelming majority live in Turkey. Regression analysis showed that there is no positive correlation between the existence or size of such networks and either identification with Europe or the self-description as world citizen.

Leaving aside visits to Turkey, the quantitative data suggests that Turkish immigrants in Europe are considerably less mobile within the EU than the nationals of the respective countries of residence. However, the qualitative data shows that the figures which were given by respondents when they were asked about the number of visits to other European countries within the last two years tend to be understatements. There are clear indications that respondents in general were likely not to count countries which they travelled through on their way to Turkey, even though they experienced first-hand the advantage of borderless travel within the Schengen zone and the more formal border crossings outside of it as part of the same journey. While our analysis showed that the immediate experience of this type of mobility did not influence the respondents' stance towards supra national entities and concepts it has to be kept in mind that all participants of the sample shared the most important mobility experience which has, therefore, been held constant: the migration to another country. A specific "Schengen area" effect on European identification did not emerge from our data. Quite the contrary: those respondents who live outside the Schengen zone (i.e., in the United Kingdom and Romania) are among those who identified most strongly with Europe.

The interviewed Turkish nationals were more likely to state a pronounced cosmopolitan stance than a strong identification with Europe. They are also rather sceptical with regard to further enlargements of the European Union and, in principle, support the notion that the EU should transfer some of its decision making powers back to the nation states. However, there is only very small fundamental opposition to the Union since only a minority of respondents would be relieved if it would be dissolved.

Stronger cosmopolitanism does not come as an absolute surprise, as the full rights of European citizenship have not yet been awarded to Turkish nationals in EU member

states. Furthermore, those migrants who reside in Great Britain and Romania do not even enjoy the advantages of the Schengen zone. The latter otherwise is an aspect of European unification which is beneficial to (almost) all legal residents of the other surveyed countries independently from their nationality.

The presented regression analysis also showed that a higher identification with Europe and a higher cosmopolitan self-assessment are associated with different independent variables. We might therefore conclude that both concepts are not congruent in the case of Turkish nationals living in EU member states. This finding is consistent with first results from analysis of the EUCROSS data on country of residence nationals presented by Hanquinet and Savage (2013).

References

- Braun, Michael and Walter Müller. 2012. "National and Transnational Identities of Intra-European Migrants." In *Crossing Borders, Shifting Boundaries. National and Transnational Identities in Europe and Beyond*, edited by Franz Höllinger and Markus Hadler, 265-287. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.
- Düvell, Franck. 2010. *Turkish Migration to the UK*. http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/Reports/6_Turks_UK.pdf (accessed 2013/02/15).
- Ecirli, Ahmet, Iulian Stănescu and Mihai Dumitru. 2011. *The Turkish Community in Bucharest. A Sociological Overview*. <http://www.inovatiassocila.ro/index.php/jurnal/article/view/129> (accessed 2013/01/14).
- Favell, Adrian, Ettore Recchi, Theresa Kuhn, Janne Solgaard and Juliane Klein. 2011. *State of the Art Report*. EUCROSS Working Paper 1. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=35&Itemid=157 (accessed 2012/01/13).
- Fligstein, Neil. 2009. *Euroclash. the EU, European Identity and the Future of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gerhards, Jürgen. 2012. *From Babel to Brussels. European Integration and the Importance of Transnational Linguistic Capital*. Studies on the Sociology of Europe. Vol. 28. [Mehrsprachigkeit im vereinten Europa. Transnationales sprachliches Kapital als Ressource in einer globalisierten Welt]. Translated by Maureen Metzger. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Hanquinet, Laurie and Mike Savage. 2013. *Europeanisation and Globalisation*. EUCROSS Working Paper 6. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=70&Itemid=157 (accessed 2013/09/20).
- . 2011. *Operationalisation of European Identity, Cosmopolitanism and Cross-Border Practices*. EUCROSS Working Paper 2. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=57&Itemid=157 (accessed 2012/02/20).
- Herbert, Ulrich. 2003. *Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik in Deutschland. Saisonarbeiter, Zwangsarbeiter, Gastarbeiter, Flüchtlinge*. Schriftenreihe Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung. Vol. 410. Bonn: C. H. Beck.
- Humpert, Andreas and Klaus Schneiderheinze. 2000. "Stichprobenziehung für Telefonische Zuwandererumfragen. Einsatzmöglichkeiten der Namensforschung." *ZUMA Nachrichten* 24 (47): 36-63.

- Huschek, Doreen, Helga A. G. Valk and Aart C. Liefbroer. 2012. "Partner Choice Patterns among the Descendants of Turkish Immigrants in Europe." *European Journal of Population / Revue Européenne de Démographie* 28 (3): 241-268.
- Icduygu, Ahmet, Ibrahim Sirkeci and Gü Muradoglu. 2001. "Socio-Economic Development and International Migration. A Turkish Study." *International Migration* 39 (4): 39-61.
- Istituto nazionale di statistica (ISTAT). "Demography in Figures. Foreigner Citizens. Resident Population by Sex and Citizenship on 31th December 2010". http://demo.istat.it/str2010/index_e.html (accessed 12/17, 2013/12/17).
- King, Russell, Mark Thomson, Nicola Mai and Yilmaz Keles. 2008. "'Turks' in the UK. Problems of Definition and the Partial Relevance of Policy." *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 6 (3): 423-434.
- Kuhn, Theresa. 2011. "Individual Transnationalism, Globalisation and Euroscepticism. An Empirical Test of Deutsch's Transactionalist Theory." *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (6): 811-837.
- Liversage, Anika. 2012. "Gender, Conflict and Subordination within the Household. Turkish Migrant Marriage and Divorce in Denmark." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (7): 1119-1136.
- . 2009. "Life Below a 'Language Threshold'? Stories of Turkish Marriage Migrant Women in Denmark." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 16 (3): 229-247.
- Pöttschke, Steffen. 2012. *Measuring Transnational Behaviours and Identities*. EUCROSS Working Paper 4. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=66&Itemid=157 (accessed 2013/11/27).
- Pöttschke, Steffen and Michael Braun. 2014 (forthcoming). "Comparing Romanian and Turkish Migrants' European Identification. Does EU Citizenship make a Difference?"
- Pries, Ludger. 2008. *Die Transnationalisierung der Sozialen Welt. Sozialräume Jenseits von Nationalgesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Salamońska, Justyna, Lorenzo Grifone Baglioni and Ettore Recchi. 2013. *Navigating the European Space. Physical and Virtual Forms of Cross-Border Mobility among EU Citizens*. EUCROSS Working Paper 5. http://www.eucross.eu/cms/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=69&Itemid=157 (accessed 2013/09/20).
- Soysal, Levent. 2003. "Labor to Culture. Writing Turkish Migration to Europe." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102 (2/3): 491-508.