Ayse Guveli, Harry Ganzeboom, Lucinda Platt, Bernhard Nauck,
Helen Baykara-Krumme, Şebnem Eroğlu, Sait Bayrakdar,
Efe K. Sözeri and Niels Spierings

INTERGENERATIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF MIGRATION

Socio-economic, Family and Cultural Patterns of Stability and Change in Turkey and Europe

Intergenerational Consequences of Migration

This page intentionally left blank

Intergenerational Consequences of Migration

Socio-economic, Family and Cultural Patterns of Stability and Change in Turkey and Europe

Ayse Guveli
Professor of Sociology, University of Essex, UK

Harry B.G. Ganzeboom
Professor of Sociology and Social Research Methodology, VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands

Lucinda Platt
Professor of Social Policy and Sociology, London School of Economics, UK

Bernhard Nauck
Professor of Sociology, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany

Helen Baykara-Krumme
Senior Researcher, Chemnitz University of Technology, Germany

Şebnem Eroğlu
Lecturer in Social Policy, University of Bristol, UK

Sait Bayrakdar
PhD Candidate, University of Essex, UK

Efe K. Sözeri
PhD Candidate, VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands

and

Niels Spierings
Assistant Professor, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands

palgrave
macmillan

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 2016 978-1-137-50141-7

First published 2016 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited, registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC, 175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave Macmillan is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978-1-349-56363-0 ISBN 978-1-137-50142-4 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/9781137501424

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Guveli, Ayse, 1971– author.

Title: Intergenerational consequences of migration: socio-economic, family and cultural patterns of stability and change in Turkey and Europe / Ayse Guveli, Harry B.G. Ganzeboom, Lucinda Platt, Bernhard Nauck, Helen Baykara-Krumme, Sebnem Eroglu, Sait Bayrakdar, Efe K. Sözeri, Niels Spierings.

Description: Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Identifiers: LCCN 2015025777

Subjects: LCSH: Turkey – Emigration and immigration – Social aspects. | Turks – Family relationships – Europe. | Immigrants – Family relationships – Europe. | BISAC: FAMILY & RELATIONSHIPS / Interpersonal Relations. | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Emigration & Immigration. | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Minority Studies.

Classification: LCC JV8745 .G88 2015 | DDC 305.894/3504—dc23

LC record available at http://lccn.loc.gov/2015025777

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

We would not have been able to realize this research without the involvement, support and contributions of a large number of people. We would therefore like to take the opportunity to acknowledge them.

Several of our colleagues reviewed an earlier version of this volume and gave valuable feedback during a workshop in Istanbul in May 2014. Those comments significantly increased the quality of this book. In this context, special thanks go to Ahmet Akgunduz, Fatih Aysan, Mathew Creighton, Helga de Valk, Claudia Diehl, Thomas DiPrete, Evelyn Ersanilli, Hartmut Esser, Katherine Ewing, Ruud Koopmans, Karen Phalet, and Edward Telles for their constructive comments and recommendations. We also thank Istanbul Sehir University for providing a welcoming environment and hosting the workshop. In particular, we thank the Head of the Sociology Department, Nurullah Ardic, and the Deputy Director of the Center for Modern Turkish Studies, Muzaffer Şenel, the hosting scholar Ferhat Kentel and research assistants Xavier Palacios, Vefa Kaya, Zelal Karabulut, and Cihad M. Caner. We would also like to thank the Director of the Institute of Eurasia at the Istanbul University, Bekir Günay, the Director of the Centre for Migration Research of Istanbul Bilgi University, Pinar Uyan Semerci, the Chair of the Department of Sociology, Boğaziçi University, Zafer Yenal, the Director of Netherland Institute of Turkey, Fokke Gerritsen, and the Coordinator of the Office of Public Diplomacy of the Republic of Turkey, Cemalettin Haşimi, for providing invaluable support. Last but by no means least, thanks go to Ahmet Icduygu for his early input into the study.

We would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the contribution of our fieldwork teams and interviewers. Heartfelt thanks goes to the manager of the Frekans Research Company, Çağlayan Işık, and researcher Ebru Tetik; for Şarkışla fieldwork, thank you to Fieldwork Superviser Halil Köse and interviewers Aygün Alkan, Gökhan Alkan, Gülsüm Alkan, Keziban Buldu, Orhan Çakmakçı, Mehmet Kavak, Ümit Kuşbakan, Sezgin Meyrili, Tahir Öncül, Şengül Sert, Göksen Uygur and Zeynep Zor, data entry specialist, Mert Teoman, the Mayor of Şarkışla, Kasım Tekin, the Deputy Mayor, Halil Kavlak, the Administrative Districts Editorial Director, Nihat Dursun, the journalist of Kızılırmak, Gazetesi Ali Gül; additional thanks to interviewers in the Berlin pilot team, Burak Alevcan, Fatma Bulaz, Feride Melike Çakmak, Sara Eryıldız, Fatma Göksu-Gevrek, Fatima Güveli, Özge Pınar Sarp, Betül Zehra Şen, Celale Yıldız, Sevtap Yüksel and the University of Essex interview team, Sinan Fahlioğulları, Şebnem Yardımcı-Geyikçi, Özgül Özbak and Ayşe Deniz Ünan. For the main stage fieldwork we would

like to thank IPSOS Mori's team leader, Sara Grant-Vest, IPSOS KMG's team leader, Tonguç Çoban, and senior researchers, İpek Özgül, Toby Cotton, Umut Türkoğlu, Eren Kasapoğlu and Selçuk Akbaş. For Acıpayam, we thank the former Governor of Acıpayam, Numan Hatipoğu, the Governor Uğur Kalkar, the Mayor of Acıpayam, Dr. Hulusi Sevkan, the Mayor of Serinhisar, Hüseyin Gemi, the Mayor of Güney Cemal Altay, those in the governorship, the muhtars of the villages, local media Can Acar and Müzeyyen Savaş, and our field force, Devrim Abşin, Gökhan Çağlar, Diğdem Abşin, Ayşe Aksoy, Himmet Apa, Gözde Atasever, Sinem Balkış, Nazan Bingöl, Burakcan Bozoğlu, Tuğkan Çağka, Pelin Demirtaş, Seval Kesmen, Zeynep Mengi Mustafa Sağlık and Gürkan Yılmaz'a. For Akçaabat, we appreciate the assistance of the Governor of Akçaabat Erol Özkan, the Mayor of Akçaabat Şefik Türkmen, those in the governorship, the muhtars and imams of the villages, local media, Ali Osman Çoban, İsmail Topal, and our field force Hüsamettin Koçkar, Halil Acer, Kerem Büyüklioğlu, Nagihan Büyüklioğlu, Kübra Celep, Melek Çalık, Tuğba Durdu, Temel Eyüboğlu, Mustafa Sağlam, Fatih Şentürk, Ufuk Turan and Ahmet Yalmancı. For Emirdağ, thanks to the former Governor of Bayat, the Governor of Emirdağ, Fatih Kaya, the former Governer of Emirdağ, Zekeriya Güney, the Mayor of Emirdağ, Cengiz Pala, those in the governorship, the muhtars and imams of the villages, the local media, Mustafa Koyuncu, Hacettepe University's researcher Gülhan Yaman, and our field force Cüneyt Darcanve, Nejat Ateş, Gökhan Aydın, Ertan Bayraktar, Ali Bozok, Atilla Alperen Çelik, Ceyhun Ergül, Fatma Göcen, Musa Kuruçay, Oktay Otuzoğlu, Uğraş Sağlam, Semih Taşır and İnanç Tekin. Finally for Kulu, thanks to the Governor of Ayhan Işık, the Mayor of Kulu Ahmet Yıldız, the Deputy Mayor Saim Erel, those in the governorship, the muhtars and the imams of the villages, local media, the journalists from the newspaper Öz Kulu Gazetesi, the Chair of Kulu Education and Charity Association, A. Korkut Yigitalp, and our field force Hüseyin Bekdaş, Merve Arslan, Mustafa Atay, Hilal Atmaca, Alparslan Murat Ayşu, Ayşegül Belin, Hatice Çiftçi, Hatice Göçmen, Sonay Görgülü, Seyma Karaarslan, Mustafa Kayaoğlu, İlker Kılıç, Mehmet Akif Tekin ve Fatoş Ünlü. In addition, we recognise the contribution of the supervisor of the interviewers in the IPSOS KGM's telephone lab, Özlem Tekin and the interviewers Rukiye Aydoğan, Deniz Cem, Arzu Çiçek, Sevilay Doğanay, Çiçek Dündar, Netice Dündar, Mithat Ekşi, Demet Ertaş, Havva İnan, Fernur Kaftan, Ayşegül Karaham, Yasin Köse, Gülseren Özkan, Fikret Terzi, Ayşe Yurdakul, Ayla Zerefsan, and Sema Ayçenk.

Most importantly, we thank the kind and hospitable residents of Acıpayam-Güney, Akçaabat, Emirdağ-Bayat, Kulu and Şarkışla and the family members from these regions of origin living across Europe, without whom this study would not have been possible.

We would additionally like to thank Hacı Yılmaz and Necmettin Yaman for their great hospitality in Şarkışla, Gülnur Güner for her assistance in

pre-testing the study in Sarkisla, Derya Yarıcı and Bülent Hamitci for their substantial contribution to the 2000 Families study, Yavuz Selim Uylaş for making the cover photo of this book, and the editors at Palgrave Macmillan, Philippa Grant, Emily Russell, and Judith Allan for their continued support for the book and seeing it successfully through to completion. Elizabeth Thompson provided rigorous and timely checking of our manuscript, prior to submission: we are grateful for her input.

Our special thanks go to the experts, reviewers and panel of NORFACE (New Opportunities for Research Funding Agency Co-operation in Europe) which funded this research through their Migration Programme. Without their faith in the potential of the study and corresponding financial support, it would never have been realised. We are grateful to Programme Coordinator Christian Dustmann, along with the various participants in the programme who gave useful comments on our study at the NORFACE conferences in London (2011, 2013), Manheim (2012) and Berlin (2013). We also would like to thank the host institution, University of Essex, and the partner institutions, VU University Amsterdam, Chemnitz University of Technology, Institute of Education, and London School of Economics and Political Science for hosting the 2000 Families study and supporting the participating scholars.

We conclude by noting that the authorship of this book is ordered according to the time at which members joined the '2000 Families' project and does not reflect the individuals' contribution to this volume.

Part I

1
Introduction: The Origins of Migration

A short history

Osman worked in a tea factory in Turkey. He was married with three children, two daughters and a son. His father was dead and his brother had moved to Europe. They used to work in the tobacco fields in Acısu, a village in Akçaabat. But in the 1960s, the tobacco fields were badly damaged by blue mould, causing many men to look elsewhere for work. Osman secretly wanted to move to Europe; although his wife supported him, his mother was worried that her sons would lose their belief and get lost in a non-Islamic land. His application was initially declined because he was diagnosed as having anaemia; as luck would have it, the officer said they desperately needed workers, but gave him a very short time to prepare his move. He quickly convinced his mother and said goodbye to his wife and children.

After working for several years in a tin can factory, Osman was injured while trying to rescue the misplaced cans under the machine; he lost two fingers of his left hand. He then found a job as a kitchen cleaner. Osman's brother in Germany returned to Turkey for good in 1978, but Osman stayed in the Netherlands. He bought a house and brought his family. His son worked in the tin can factory for ten years before losing his job. His son married a distant relative from Turkey and is still living in Deventer. Of his four children, three are living in the Netherlands: one is a medical doctor, one is a poet, and one plays soccer. The fourth moved to work in Istanbul as project manager after she obtained her Master's in Engineering.

Osman's older daughter lives and works in Deventer in a beauty specialist shop; she married a Turk she met at high school. One of her four children has completed his studies to become a lawyer and all others are still studying. Osman's younger daughter was sent back to Turkey to study in a Koran school to fulfil a cherished dream of guest workers: 'We will go back one day', they say. After completing her degree, she went to the Netherlands to do her Master's and PhD. She then moved to the US as a university professor.

Three of the husbands of Osman's granddaughters are Turkish in origin, and one is a native Dutch man.

Osman bought a small piece of land and built a little house in Görele, a town in the west of Turkey. After his retirement, Osman and his wife cultivated olive trees there and moved back and forth between Deventer and Görele. They often wondered whether they would have had a hard but peaceful life had Osman stayed in Akçaabat. Osman died in 2000 at the age of 62.

Introduction

This short history is typical for many Turks in Europe. A majority of studies show that labour migrants from poorer countries and their descendants tend to end up at the lower end of the socio-economic ladder in countries of destination, and their cultural, political and religious incorporation remains slow, even in the second generation (Brynin and Guveli 2012; Fleischmann et al. 2012; Gungor et al. 2013; Guveli and Platt 2011; Kogan and Kalter 2006; Kristen, Reimer and Kogan 2008; Phalet and Heath 2010; Platt 2005b; Platt 2007; Platt 2009a; Platt 2009b; van Tubergen 2006a).

Reading these studies, we would be forgiven for thinking migration has no positive impact on migrants themselves. So if migration does not improve migrants' lives or the lives of their children, why do they move, leaving the country and social networks behind? Would it have been better for them and their communities if they stayed put? Alternatively, these conclusions may derive from a tendency in the migration literature to focus on the 'wrong' questions from the point of view of identifying the gains and impacts of migration from the migrant's own perspective.

Many studies miss an important aspect of international migration. The prevalence of return migration, the transnational character of today's migration, and the complexities of migration chains are often studied as separate fields of interest, not as factors that complement studies of international migration. In addition, many studies ignore the comparison with and consequences on those who stay behind (Castles, De Haas and Miller 2014; Harzig and Hoerder 2009; Koser 2007). These lacunae in our knowledge of migration derive from a fundamental flaw in much migration research, particularly research driven by policy concerns (Amelina et al. 2012; Harzig and Hoerder 2009) which limits its perspective to those who arrive and, among these, to those who stay in their new country. The experience of this settler population is interesting and policy relevant, of course, but is limited for explaining migrant outcomes.

If we want to account for who moved, who stayed and who returned, and to map out the consequences of the migration decision on both the migrants and those left behind, we need to start from the population of origin. Most migrants move to improve their life chances and the life chances of their

families compared to what they would have been without migrating. This calls for a causal analysis of migration in a counterfactual framework, asking what the migrants' situation would have been had they decided not to migrate. We must also ask whether migrants, their children and grandchildren continue to display the behaviours and beliefs of their non-migrant counterparts or develop distinctive trajectories in response to the migration experience and destination context. To answer these questions, we develop a unique perspective and make two novel comparisons: first, a comparison across three family generations and second, a comparison of migrants and a control group of non-migrants in the origin society Turkey. Our unique findings allow us to answer the questions posed above.

This book investigates multiple domains of experience and intergenerational transmission, including education, occupation, entrepreneurship, marriage, fertility, friendship, religion, attitudes and identities. These central topics are contextualised by an overview of migration patterns and a detailed discussion of the regions from which the research design and sample derives. The various chapters approach the key question of the volume from different angles, testing relevant hypotheses derived from a general theoretical perspective (*dissimilation from origins*) developed below; they also draw on theories specific to the topic under discussion and to dominant disciplinary debates. In what follows in this opening chapter, we discuss the limitations of international migration studies and note the contribution of our study and its theoretical framework. Next, we discuss the potential of Turkish migration in Europe to fill the gaps in international migration studies. We conclude by outlining the topics of the individual chapters.

Limitations in migration research and our contribution

Scholars are searching for new perspectives across migration research. On the one hand, the limitations in our often-used theoretical and empirical approaches to understand migrant incorporation in destination countries have been the subject of heated debate, with calls made for a new theoretical understanding of the incorporation trajectories of different migrant groups and contexts. On the other hand, numerous discussions consider the new challenges in migrant transnationalism and note the problems of methodological nationalism in international migration studies. Many call for new methodologies to understand the causes and consequences of migration, rather than answering questions for policy purposes.

Another new perspective entering social mobility and transmission studies is the impact of one's grandparents on one's socio-economic attainment, attitudes and values. Generational change has been an important element of international migration studies, although these studies have often used migration and family generations interchangeably and both are predominantly based on two generations. This study extends analysis of

family generations to at least three generations, allowing the incorporation of grandparental influences, among both migrants and non-migrants, as detailed below.

Search for new theoretical perspectives

Even though Thomas, and Znaniecki (1918) offered alternative explanations as early as a century ago, most studies on migration to Western Europe or the US have taken an assimilation (or 'integration') perspective, asking questions about the situation of migrants and their offspring in destination societies, especially the extent to which they become economically, culturally and socially indistinguishable from natives. To this end, they are compared to natives or to other migrant groups assumed to be on the same pathway to integration (albeit at a different stage).

Assimilation theory has recently been revived to incorporate the wider dynamics of American society (Alba and Nee 2003) and, additionally, segmented assimilation theory was developed to address some of the limitations of this theory (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). While the former claims differences between natives and migrants will fade linearly over time and generations, the latter asserts that the pace of acculturation and incorporation depends on the paths migrants and their descendants follow and on the context of reception (Portes and Zhou 1993). The importance of group characteristics has also been given weight in this theory, but explanations of assimilation mechanisms remain within the borders of destination countries.

A major criticism of both theories comes from European scholars noting their limited application to the European context. Schneider and Crul (2010) assert these assimilation theories were developed in and for the US. However, Europe comprises many destination countries with different policies on migration and migrant integration with a range of institutional and contextual diversity across countries (Ersanilli 2010; Koopmans, Michalowski and Waibel 2012). Crul and Schneider (2010) propose and test an alternative 'comparative integration context theory' in their study of the European second generation. Although this development encompasses the diversity of receiving country contexts and of sending countries, it does not bring a country of origin perspective to bear on the study, nor does it explain the changes experienced by the first generation.

Furthermore, theories in migration literature commonly approach migrants and the second generation as 'people without history' (Vermeulen 2010: 1224), implying the 'baggage' migrants bring from the origin countries and pass on to their children is not accounted for sufficiently in existing international migration studies. At the beginning of the 20th century, Thomas and Znaniecki (1918) focused on both destination and origin country contexts and individual characteristics to understand social change among migrants and those left behind. The inclusion of origin country characteristics has recently made a comeback in large-scale quantitative

studies; yet these studies predominantly include fixed-time characteristics of the origin country to explain change in migrant lifestyles in the course of assimilation in the destination countries, as if the origin context were static. Of course, social change has also been taking place in the origin countries among those left behind, but this has rarely been taken into account in these studies on a large-scale.

Search for new empirical perspectives

Discussions of methodology and the search for research designs have mainly focused on transnational migrants and methodological nationalism. Since the last decades of the 20th century, studies of transnational migration have been popular (Waldinger 2013). Many researchers limit themselves to discussing the importance and magnitude of transnational activities, especially with respect to migrants' locations in the destination countries (Guarnizo, Portes and Haller 2003; Levitt, DeWind and Vertovec 2003; Morawska 2003; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003; Portes 2003; Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). Such studies shed light on the substantial consequences of globalisation in migration processes and its effects on individual migrants (Levitt, DeWind and Vertovec 2003; Levitt 2003; Levitt 2007).

Cross-border connections and transnational activities are not new, but their conceptualisation is a relatively new perspective in migration studies (Portes 2003; Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). Many acknowledge the novelty of the transnational perspective in migration studies but argue scholars exaggerate the impact of transnational activities on migrant incorporation in destination and origin societies. Studies show, for example, that in the US, migrants' transnational activities are marginal but this varies for different migrant groups (Portes 2003; Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999; Waldinger 2013).

Transnational migration studies tend to be overwhelmingly limited to qualitatively oriented research and although there are some novel empirical studies (Levitt 2007; Portes, Guarnizo and Landolt 1999), they mostly represent small-scale, ethnographic work. Large-scale surveys are scarce, resulting in a lack of representative data to reveal the scale of cross-border activities. Hence, it is hard to draw conclusions about their impact or relevance to migrants' lives. Simply stated, there is an ongoing need for large-scale research on transnationalism. Although our study is not solely on transnationalism, our unique research design enables us to include transnational activities in our investigation of different domains of interest in order to understand the implications of the whereabouts of migrants and their offspring.

Another key methodological discussion in migration research is found, for instance, in the work of Amelina and Faist (2012) and their colleagues (Amelina et al. 2012; FitzGerald 2012; Horvath 2012; Meeus 2012; Schrooten

2012; Shinozaki 2012; Zirh 2012). These researchers take a critical look at studies on migration and point out the need for new research designs to capture the pathways of causal relationships in international migration. They highlight two key limitations in existing studies.

First, they discuss the difficulties involved in capturing the complexity of international migration and floating populations using limited time and resources to include people who are moving across borders and who do not show up in registers (Meeus 2012; Shinozaki 2012; Zirh 2012). For example, if we only rely on destination country surveys, undocumented and return migrants cannot be found with samples taken from registers or obtained by scanning specific high-density regions. Studies on migration need to include origin, destination and possibly various other sites to examine undocumented and return international migrants and to cover a longer time span if the complexities of international and internal migration are to be unravelled (Meeus 2012). Our study locates men[1] within a fixed birth cohort in multiple sending sides and follows them and their offspring in various destinations.

Second, they note that the nation-state and its policies are at the centre of research on migration, and migration processes are generally explained using the terminologies and categories of destination nations (Amelina and Faist 2012; FitzGerald 2012). Wimmer and Schiller (2002) use the term 'methodological nationalism' to point to the limitations of adopting categories of destination societies; they can be politically loaded, for example, or designed to create a model nation-state. Assimilation and segmented assimilation theories are often implemented to explain the mechanisms and building blocks of a nation-state (Bommes and Morawska 2005), not to reveal the mechanisms behind migration processes and changes in migrant lifestyles. In short, the story of the other *site* – the origin countries and those left behind – has not been told. Our study corrects that omission by comparing migrants and their children and grandchildren with those left behind to reveal the impact of migration and to illuminate the mechanisms behind it.

Multi-generation families

Individual and societal change need time to occur; the speed of the transformation increases with successive generations. In international migration studies, a multi-generational approach is rarely applied, even if it is implicit in the theoretical expectations for patterns of assimilation (Alba et al. 2002). Over time and for subsequent generations, the features of origin are expected to become less relevant in migrants' lifestyles (Zhou 1997). For example, segmented assimilation theory is mainly developed for and overwhelmingly tested on the second relative to the first generation (Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Some early papers address the 'three-generations hypothesis' (Lazerwitz and Rowitz 1964), but in contemporary

analysis, the third generation is rarely investigated (see e.g. Alba et al. 2002; Montero 1981).

A significant exception in the literature is Telles and Ortiz's (2008) study *Generations of Exclusion*. They show European Americans have fully assimilated into the American society by the third generation, but ethnic boundaries among the fourth-generation Mexican Americans remain salient (2008: 266). Extending the focus to the fourth-generation is rare; their study makes a unique contribution, showing the persistence of origin country identities and the exclusions operated by the destination country across multiple family and migration generations. This type of examination could fruitfully be extended to the European context.

Studies typically equate family generation with migrant generation. That is, the second generation are taken to be the children of the first generation on the basis of being born in the destination country (to migrant parents) (Park and Myers 2010). Such studies thereby implicitly accept processes of family transmission without necessarily measuring them directly (Guveli 2015; Guveli and Platt 2011; Maliepaard and Lubbers 2013; Phalet and Schonpflug 2001). However, from an origin country perspective, family generation is central. By tracing the processes of transmission through family generations *regardless* of their migration status, we can fully acknowledge the complexity of migration trajectories (including return and remigration) and accurately identify the impact of migration, including its gains and losses, across multi-family and, potentially, multiple-migration generations.

Migration is a major event or 'interruption' that constitutes a breakpoint in the individual and family life course. Economic, cultural or social capital of parents and grandparents may be devalued or lost, and intergenerational transmission processes of these resources to children may be hampered or, at least, challenged (Nauck 2001). Therefore, transmission of resources across multi-generations is likely to play out differently for migrants and non-migrants.

By combining country of origin and multi-generational perspectives, our work makes a major contribution to the literature: despite the obvious advantages, such a combination has rarely been attempted. In other words, our study constitutes an overdue and significant exception to the rule.

Our perspective: dissimilation from origins

The assimilation perspective and approaches in existing research have accumulated valuable knowledge of migrants within the borders of destination nation-states, but a fundamental problem of such approaches is that they tell us little about the causal mechanisms at work in migration. Comparing natives and migrants or comparing several groups of migrants does not reveal what might have happened had the migrants not migrated. In contemporary science, causality is understood in a counterfactual framework: applied to

migration, a counterfactual and *dissimilation* perspective might argue that migration has an effect on outcomes, if these outcomes would be impossible without migration. Migrants have not typically moved in order to do as well as the natives in the destination countries, let alone to compete with other migrant groups in these destination societies. Simply stated, migrants are seeking *gains* that would otherwise not be possible. This requires a counterfactual point of view, one that compares migrants and non-migrants (and migrants and return migrants).

Our theoretical framework implements and expands on the concept of *dissimilation from origins*. Dissimilation means the processes of becoming different, and it considers the opposite direction to assimilation, which literally means becoming similar. Dissimilation has occasionally been applied to describe the changes in migrants' lives. While assimilation blurs the dividing lines between social groups, dissimilation reinforces the cleavages between migrants (or ethnic minorities) and *non-migrants*.

A few scholars have used this perspective, but to account for different processes (Volkov 2006; Yinger 1981). For example, Yinger (1981) uses the notion to describe how ethnic groups reaffirm and revitalise their earlier ethnic identities and lifestyles after having assimilated into the mainstream. Specifically, he uses it to explain the emphasis various ethnic and religious groups put on their separate ethnic and religious identities after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Volkov (2006) uses assimilation and dissimilation to describe opposite processes among Jews in the historical period before World War II, juxtaposing an 'Era of renewed self-consciousness' (dissimilation) to an 'Era of assimilation'. The period of dissimilation started with a resurgence of anti-Semitism; their resulting alienation caused heightened self-awareness among Jews who began to emphasise the distinctions of their identity, religion and ethnic costumes. Also of interest to the present study, FitzGerald (2012) proposes the notion of homeland dissimilation to trace changes in migrants' lives, especially how they become different from those left behind in the origin country. We adopt this understanding of dissimilation, but expand upon it.

Homeland dissimilation is a useful concept to understand the mechanisms behind the process of changes in migrants' lifestyles and chances. While dissimilation can occur over the life course, it can also prevail over generations. Therefore, we implement the notion of *dissimilation from origins* to trace two processes: changes across the life course and changes over generations. The first entails changes over the life course of migrants in their resources, lifestyles, customs, values and behaviours, whereby they become differentiated from their counterparts in the origin country. The second occurs over generations by means of weakening (or strengthening) generational reproduction of family traits, economic, social, cultural and religious resources and behaviours. Intergenerational change touches on social mobility and changes in values, attitudes and behaviour.

Dissimilation from origins in economic, social and cultural domains

Improving one's life chances is typically the goal of migration. Migrants move because they want to enjoy a better life than their parents and their compatriots in the origin society or to offer this opportunity to their children. This is a basic assumption of the international migration literature (Massey 1998). In this understanding, migrants will try to improve their economic conditions and life chances in the destination country. This is the basis of our argumentation when we compare the economic attainment of migrants to those who stay behind. Labour migrants will not make the expensive and risky journey if conditions in destination countries are worse than those in their origin country. Consequently, dissimilation requires migrants to obtain better economic resources in their destination country than their comparators in the origin country. Of course, other factors such as the extent of the human capital migrants bring with them and the conditions of the receiving society enhance or moderate migrants' socio-economic achievement.

This argument also applies to the descendants of migrants, especially those who are low-skilled and low-educated, for example, guest workers recruited in the 1960s (Akgunduz 2008; Castles, De Haas and Miller 2014). Research on social mobility and intergenerational transmission of economic resources and behaviour is rare (Platt 2005) and to our knowledge there is no study of three-generational transmission of social mobility of migrants. Nevertheless, one motivation for migration is increased educational and labour market outcomes for children and successive generations. Relatively higher equality of opportunity in the destination countries will also contribute to the improvement of migrants' life chances. That is, children and grandchildren will become independent of their social origins, if they acquire more socio-economic status than their parents and grandparents. Consequently, we would expect to find the social reproduction of economic resources is weaker among migrants than among those in origin countries.

We argue that migrants, on average, gain from migration economically, but the changes in their social, cultural and religious lives are not unidirectional. On the one hand, the impact of globalisation is making all societies converge, a process predominantly governed by the Western way of life (Ritzer 1993) and perceived as the natural evolution of Western societies. It is commonly accepted that the American way of life has infiltrated the everyday lives of people in the remotest places of the world. This process brings the social and cultural lifestyles of origin and destination countries closer. On the other hand, we have also experienced a process of localisation, whereby local and ethnic traits become more important in people's lives (Giulianotti and Robertson 2006). Migrants bring their customs, enterprises, food, culture and religion to the West and establish ethno-religious

institutions. These may persist across generations and contribute to changing the socio-cultural landscape of their countries of residence.

As the previous paragraph suggests, even as migrants seek a better life in destination societies, they may retain their social, cultural and religious heritage. As a result of modern media, especially the Internet (Schrooten 2012), and unlike former times when contact with those left behind was difficult and infrequent (Schiller 1999), migrants and their descendants now interact regularly with relatives and friends in their countries of origin. This facilitates the exchange of ideas and lifestyles and bilateral involvement in social processes. This may mean migrants will never become fully assimilated into mainstream destination societies. That is, they may change to the extent they would have changed had they stayed in the origin country. In this case, migration has no impact. However, they may change more and, hence, dissimilate from their counterparts in Turkey, embodying a 'migration effect'. At the same time, stronger or weaker transmission across generations might slow down or increase intergenerational and, hence, socio-cultural change.

Directions of dissimilation

The directions of the dissimilation processes could take three forms. First, we might see a process of *dissimilation toward assimilation*; in this process, migrants and their offspring leave behind the lifestyle and behaviour of their origin society and adopt the traits of their destination country, following the course predicted by assimilation theories. This process includes a migration effect. Second, *dissimilation toward globalisation* could occur in a process parallel to global changes in values, attitudes and behaviour. Changes will also occur in the lives of non-migrants in the origin country and possibilities in the lives of natives in the destination countries. Therefore, migration will not be the cause, and dissimilation toward globalisation will not presuppose dissimilation from origins. To give an example, support for traditional gender-role attitudes might change at a similar pace among migrants and non-migrants in the origin countries because of increasing support for human rights worldwide. Third, migrants and their descendants may encounter no or fewer changes, or the historical features of the origin society may be reaffirmed or revitalised in terms of social, cultural and religious norms, values and behaviour. In this *dissimilation toward revitalisation* process, migration will potentially cause the restatement of traditional lifestyles. For example, religious involvement might increase among migrants in more secular societies because of the needs religion fulfils in their lives and their descendants' lives, such as giving them a sense of belonging or providing a familiar network in an unfamiliar environment.

Stronger or weaker transmission across generations might slow down or increase intergenerational and socio-cultural change. Change across generations is likely to take place more quickly from the first to the second

generation in the migrant lineage because migration is likely to weaken the ability to achieve effective transmission from parent to child. Migration is an event of social and familial disconnection, making it difficult to move resources and skills from the origin to destination country and pass them on to offspring. The alteration of old lifestyles will slow down after the second family and migration generations; that is to say, the consequences of ancestral migration will stabilise in the second generation even if the children of the migrant ancestor have stayed put.

Why study Turkish migration?

It is estimated that between 1961 (when the first labour agreement was concluded between Germany and Turkey) and 1974, almost one million people (mostly young men) migrated for a shorter or longer period to Western Europe. The number of Turkish migrants and their descendants is difficult to determine because it varies by year and by source. Based on the International Labour Organization's 1989 statistics, Martin states 'Turkish nationals' comprised one-quarter of the eight million non-European Community migrants in Western European countries (1991: 1 [footnote 2]). By 2010, estimates from Turkey suggest the number of Turkish *citizens* in Western European countries equalled three million.[2] Today, estimates suggest five million people of Turkish *descent* are living in Western Europe: of these, around 3.5 million are in Germany, close to half a million in each of the Netherlands, France and Austria, with smaller but significant groups in Sweden, Denmark and Belgium and small numbers in Norway and the UK.

Turkish migration is the basis for an enormous amount of social scientific research, ranging from studies of migration flows to detailed investigations of Turks' settlement, labour market outcomes, values, culture, family forms and religiosity. These studies are mostly based on register data and seek to analyse the organisation and the processes of labour migration flows to Europe (Abadan-Unat 2011; Akgunduz 2008; Martin 1991; Paine 1974; Penninx 1982; Sayari 1986; Straubhaar 1986a; Tunali 1996) and the impact of migrants' social and economic remittances to Turkey, including to their villages and relatives (Abadan-Unat et al. 1976; Castles and Wise 2007; Day and Icduygu 1999; Icduygu, Sirkeci and Muradoglu 2001; Straubhaar 1986b). Scholars have also focused on migrants' settlement and organisation (Canatan 2001; Doomernik 1995), their socio-economic conditions using general or specific small- and large-scale surveys (Faist 1993; Kogan and Kalter 2006; Kristen, Reimer and Kogan 2008; Schoeneberg 1985; Simon 2003; Wahlbeck 2007), cultural patterns (Akgonul 2009; Diehl and Fick 2012; Ehrkamp 2005; Fleischmann et al. 2012; Kucukcan and Gungor 2009), political expressions (Ogelman 2003; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003), religious adaptation (Diehl and Koenig 2009; Koenig et al 2017; Guveli and Platt 2011;

Maliepaard and Lubbers 2013), and family processes (Cesur-Kilicaslan and Terzioglu 2008; Merz et al. 2009; Nauck, Kohlmann and Diefenbach 1997; Razum, Sahin-Hodoglugil and Polit 2005; Schoenmaeckers, Lodewijckx and Gadeyne 1999). Turkish migrant women have been studied at some length as well, including the impact of migration on women (Abadan-Unat 1977; Day and Icduygu 1997; Erman 1998; Mirdal 1984; Munscher 1984).

This impressive body of research reflects the significance of Turkish migration as a focus for study. First, Turkish migration should be an important item on the agenda of migration research simply because of its size. Research has repeatedly shown that the size of migrant groups matters as a factor for theorising migrant incorporation (Esser 2004). Second, Turkish migration occurs in a region where mass migration is a relatively new phenomenon. Until 1945, many societies in Western Europe defined themselves as potential sources of out-migration. People from these countries were moving to the US, Canada and Australia (Castles, De Haas and Miller 2014). But after World War II, Western European countries, such as Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and the UK, began actively and extensively recruiting labour migrants, first from Southern European countries and later from Morocco and Algeria, the Caribbean, Turkey, Pakistan and India. These migrants were expected to be temporary (Castles 1985; Castles, De Haas and Miller 2014), and of the many Turkish labour migrants recruited between 1960 and 1974, a substantial number did indeed move back. But many more stayed. After 1974, migrants were often motivated by family reunion, but employment, education and political protection became and/or continued to be important reasons to move (and stay).

At first glance, we see immediate similarities between Turkish migration to Western Europe and Mexican migration to the US.[3] Both involve mass migration from a less developed region to a nearby, economically more advanced society, with the explicit aim of working for (comparatively) high wages in low status manual jobs. The similarities end here, however. Except for the initial period, Mexican migration has been largely illegal, but Turkish migration has mostly been regulated and government sanctioned, starting with Turkish migrant workers in the 1960s. In the subsequent era of family reunion, regulations changed; by and large, however, the flow of people remained structured: illegal migration and undocumented aliens are part of Turkish migration but not its primary characteristic.

Third, as noted, Turkish migrants and their descendent are spread over nine Western European countries. Their dispersion helps to shed light on the importance of different contexts, policies and societal structures in settlement, integration and reception. Crul and Schneider (2010) and their colleagues made good use of this feature of Turkish migration to develop their comparative integration context theory.

Fourth, Islam was not unknown in Europe. In fact, in Spain, it was a major religion until the 15th Century. That said, together with other

migrant groups to Europe after the 1960s, Turkish migrants were largely responsible for introducing Islam to European Christian destination countries. This characteristic may make the Turkish presence and reception in Europe different from other labour migrations, such as the Mexican migration to the US or southern European migration to northern European countries (without considering Moroccans, Pakistanis and many Indians). Religion is considered an important building block for migrant communities, especially in earlier flows from Europe to America (Herberg 1955; Smith 1978). Our understanding of the role of religion in migrants' and their offspring's life comes from the literature on international migration to the US, and except for some very recent studies (Diehl and Koenig 2013; Fleischmann and Phalet 2012; Guveli 2015; Guveli and Platt 2011), it is based on Catholic, Protestant and Jewish migrants. Studying Turkish migration and migrants in Europe broadens our perspective by including Islam in the discussion.

Last but by no means least, Turkish migration has relevance because of Turkey's ongoing attempts to acquire full membership in the European Union. Turkey and wider Europe have a contentious history, but contemporary political constellations have increased the importance of Turkey to the Western world. During the Cold War and in several contemporary theatres of Middle Eastern political conflict, Turkey has been a pivotal ally of Western European (*cum* American) interests. Given its geopolitical location and its position in the Islamic world, Turkey is destined to become an even closer ally. If/when Turkey enters the European Union (and the monetary zone), this will ensure free movement of labour and trade. Since Turkey would then be the second largest member state of the EU, it is crucial to learn more about the changes in Turkish identities and Turkish migrants and their offspring in Europe.

Chapter outline

This volume comprises four sections. The first section gives an overall introduction to the book (Chapter 1) and explains our research design, data and methodology (Chapter 2). It describes the various research sites/sending regions (Chapter 3) and discusses the individual and family factors of (re) migration of Turks in a historical perspective and across three generations (Chapter 4). Sections two to four deal with different dimensions of the main research question. The second section looks at economic outcomes, namely educational outcomes (Chapter 5), occupational status (Chapter 6), and self-employment (Chapter 7); the third section focuses on social aspects: arranged marriage (Chapter 8), fertility (Chapter 9) and friends and connections (Chapter 10); the fourth section discusses cultural aspects, including religion (Chapter 11), gender attitudes (Chapter 12), and identities (Chapter 13). The concluding chapter (Chapter 14) considers how patterns and processes

of dissimilation from origins are similar and different for economic, social and cultural outcomes. Chapter 14 also offers the opportunity to synthesise our findings in the various chapters, notes their contribution to the migration literature, and suggests their value to research agendas.