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Abstract

This study aimed to investigate whether the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany has changed over time. The theoretical framework led to believe concepts such as transnationalism and the integration of the immigrants influence the national identification. After a thorough literature analyses two hypotheses were constructed. The first stating an expectation of a negative cohort effect due to transnational practices, meaning successive cohorts were expected to have a lower level of German identification. The second hypothesis stated an expectation for a negative age effect, meaning that the years since immigration had a negative effect on the national identification of the Turkish immigrants. To test the hypotheses, the German Socio-Economic Panel was used. The results led to the rejection of both hypotheses due to a positive age and a positive cohort effect. This led to the conclusion that Turkish immigrants in Germany increased their German identification over time, and successive arrival cohorts had a higher level of German identification.
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1. Introduction and relevance

1.1 General introduction

"In the eyes of [Reinhard] Grindel and his supporters, I am German when we win, but I am an immigrant when we lose. This is because despite paying taxes in Germany, donating facilities to German schools and winning the World Cup with Germany in 2014, I am still not accepted into society. I am treated as being 'different'." (Deutsche Welle 2018). This is a quote from Mesut Özil, Turkish-German footballer, from his public statement where he announces his retirement from the German national football team as a consequence of the commotion he faced after taking a picture with Turkish president Erdoğan in July 2018. Reinhard Grindel, the president of the German Football Association (DFB), firmly criticized Özil for taking that picture. In a statement the DFB interpreted this matter as following: “[...] it is not a good thing that our internationals [Özil and Gündoğan] have let themselves be misused for his [Erdoğan’s] election campaign stunt. It certainly has not helped the DFB's integration efforts." (Deutscher Fussball-Bund 2018). To which Özil responded: "What I cannot accept, are German media outlets repeatedly blaming my dual-heritage and a simple picture for a bad World Cup on behalf of an entire squad. [...] They did not criticize my performances, they did not criticize the team's performances, they just criticized my Turkish ancestry and respect for my upbringing.” (Deutsche Welle 2018). This matter represents the continuing struggle between the Turkish immigrants\(^1\) in Germany and the natives\(^2\) over their integration, their national identification and commitment to the German society. As the DFB stated, they interpret the fact that their athletes posed with the Turkish president as a token of ongoing (strong) ties with their country of origin and refusal to (fully) integrate into and commit to the German society.

The present study aims to gain more insight in this complex relationship and the dynamics between the Turkish immigrants and the German society. In particular, it will focus on the extent to which the German national identification of the first-generation Turkish immigrants has developed and changed over time. In order to be able to contribute to the discussion and the understanding of the circumstances under which national identification

\(^1\) Even though the term immigrant can be highly controversial, a definition and conceptualization is necessary in order to study and understand the experiences of immigrants. Countries use different connotations and definitions for the term immigrant. Even within academia there seems to be a lack of consensus. Within this research, the term immigrants will be used to refer to individuals who have migrated, or individuals whose parents have migrated to Western countries.

\(^2\) The same controversy can be seen when defining the term natives. However, it is necessary to define and conceptualize the term. Therefore, within this research, the term natives will be used to refer to individuals who were born Germany, and whose ancestry can be traced back to Germany.
develops, multiple (theoretical) concepts will be elaborated. The transnational practices, the integration process of the immigrants and the (formal) process of becoming a German citizen are believed to have an influence on the formation of identities (Ehrkamp 2005), and these concepts will therefore be expatiated in the theoretical framework. Additionally, the patterns of change in the development of national identification will be unveiled by using age and cohort effect analyses.

The central research question is as follows: How did the first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany develop their German national identification over time? The focus herein will lie on the combination of the transformation of the Turkish immigrant population as a community and the transformation of individual immigrants and their ongoing negotiations between them and the native population. This study can therefore be seen as an examination of individual and social change. Social change studies are relevant in sociology because they shine light on the transformations of social institutions, cultures, social relationships and patterns of behavior. It is crucial to examine and explore how social change affects societies to gain historical, social, cultural and even economic knowledge. The information that can be gained from studying the change in national identification can provide valuable information in a time where migration and the integration of immigrants are becoming central and important topics in societal debates. Wingens, de Valk, Windzio and Aybek justly point out that life course studies have a pre-eminent orientation in social science and studies of change (2011). However, unfortunately, the combination of migration studies and the life course method have been limited (Ibid.). In general, social scientific research on the topic of migration has mainly focused on education and the labor market participation of the immigrants, rather than their identification with the host society and their own perspective on this (Ibid; Simonsen 2016). This is at least puzzling because in order to understand the position of immigrants and their behavior and how these are embedded in the (social) institutions of the receiving society, it is required to conduct dynamic research as the life course approach provides (Wingens, et al. 2011).

Because the perspectives of the immigrants have been long overlooked, I argue it is important to study the national identification of the first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany from their own perspective and attempt to fill the gap and depict whether and how the identification changed over time. I desire to contribute to the academic debate and discourse on immigrant and host society relations. In order to find these existing patterns of change throughout the life course of the immigrants, this study will focus on the within person change that is defined as the years since their migration (individual change) and
between-person change will be analyzed in the form of arrival cohorts (social change). Panel data will be used to elucidate these changes. A further elaboration on the particular dataset and chosen sample will be listed in the methodology section.

1.2 General context and background information

As the present study aims to depict the situation of Turkish immigrants in Germany, it is important to get an understanding of the historical and societal context of Germany during and since the time the immigrants have arrived.

Around the 1950s and 1960s, a vast economic boom flourished in Germany which resulted in a growth and expansion in jobs on the labor market (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018a). During this time the domestic labor force was no longer able to cover the demand. Especially low skilled jobs that did not require any training but were physically highly challenging, were not covered by the locals (Ibid). As a consequence, Germany started recruiting guest workers from multiple countries. The majority of them were located in the West of Germany as a result of the lack of labor immigration in East Germany before 1989 (Faas 2010). In the fall of 1961, the recruitment agreement with Turkey was signed and Turkish guest workers started migrating to Germany (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003). Even though Germany had stopped actively recruiting the immigrants in 1973 as a consequence of the global oil crisis and increasing unemployment, a large stream of immigrants kept coming by way of family unification (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018a). Since then, the Turkish immigrant community has grown over two million and they make up the largest immigrant population in Germany (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003). The German society can no longer be conceived without the presence of Turkish immigrants (Kaya 2007:483).

The first-generation immigrants had initially wished to one day return to Turkey, but for the majority that changed as leaving Europe for Turkey meant losing the possibility of coming back (Kaya 2007:484). Eventually they were joined by their families, and their children and grandchildren grew up in Germany (Halfmann 1997:261; Ehrkamp 2005:345 & Kaya 2007:484). The presence of these Turkish immigrants has brought about a lot of changes in both the Turkish immigrant community as the German society. The social and cultural landscape changed by the coming of Turkish mosques, teahouses, cultural institutions, restaurants, and traditional and religious attire such as women wearing headscarves (Ehrkamp 2005:345; Slootman & Duyvendak 2015:147). The visibility of the Turkish immigrant population, their traditional Turkish appearances and behavior have been broadly represented in German news. Their identities have been labeled as transnational –
that is, “[their] ability to maintain ties and create new social spaces that are multilocal and span national borders” (Ehrkamp 2005:346; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2006:1591). This transnationalism results in a new type of experience for the immigrants. It means they no longer have to choose between their home and receiving country. Ehrkamp states that the immigrants therefore experience ongoing negotiations between the local attachments and the transnational belonging which results in them constructing their identities across societies and nations (2005:362). Even though these transnational practices are meant to keep in touch with their country of origin by creating space for their traditions, the immigrants simultaneously seek for acceptance by the host country according to different studies (Ehrkamp 2005; Bennett 2014; Leszczensky 2014 & Simonsen 2016). Belonging to the host country is essential in the daily conversation and interactions with people of the native population (Bennett 2014), and inter-ethnic friendships have a positive influence on the development of national identification by the immigrants (Leszczensky 2014). However, the efforts to keep in touch with the homeland are not interpreted as qualities by a great deal of the native population. They are rather seen as a failure of integration and a sign of lack of desire to integrate into the German society (Caglar 2001). Nonetheless, it is also important to note that it is believed that immigrants show a higher sense of belonging to the host country when that country and its society pose acceptable and achievable criteria for national membership (Simonsen 2016). Consequently, the sometimes-hostile tendency in Germany towards the Turkish immigrants could have a negative influence on their sense of belonging and national identification (Caglar 2001). In order to understand the tendencies and trends in Germany towards the immigrants it is important to take a deeper look into the politics and policies that have been implemented.

In many European countries, among which Germany, the integration of immigrants plays a central role in the (political) discourse and is mainly viewed as problematic and a failure more than a success (Simonsen 2016). Martinovic and Verkuyten pose that German chancellor Merkel has stated that multicultural policies of European countries have failed (2012). For many years the national identification of immigrants was undermined by focusing on the differences and diversity instead of the similarities between them and the native population (Ibid.). There has been a renewed emphasis in policies on the traditional norms and values of the host society to which the newcomers have to adapt in order to be considered integrated (Ibid.; Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018b). When they fail to do so, this has an influence on the sense of commitment and belonging, and the functioning of society as a whole, which are believed to be important for a unified society (Martinovic &
Verkuyten 2012). Before further elaborating on the theoretical concepts that are crucial for national identification of immigrants, it is important to expatiate the type of research that will be conducted.

Even though the literature on immigrants, their integration, national identification and host society acceptance are broadly represented in academic fields, the change during immigrants’ life course is still rather scarce (Wingens, et al. 2011). Especially in combination with the age and cohort analyses.

1.3 Age and Cohorts
This study uses a unique German dataset that has been collecting data for over 30 years. The core advantage of using panel data is being able to conduct longitudinal age and cohort studies and discover possible trends in shifts between and within different cohorts. It enables to work with multiple observations of the same individuals over a large period of time. These studies therefore extend from cross-sectional data and short-term longitudinal studies which is a vital advantage. Because, even though cross-sectional and longitudinal studies can contribute to the academic discourses, they do lack the capacity to study life course patterns and change between generations of cohorts.

The first-generation Turkish immigrants migrated to Germany from the beginning of the 1960’s and a large number of them still lives there. To investigate how their national identification has evolved and how it has changed over the years, panel data is the best fitting option to conduct a thorough analysis. In addition, when using age and cohort analyses it is possible to distinguish between individual and social change and to see how these changes develop separately and how they may interact. Elder Jr. and George define cohort as: “a group of individuals who experienced an event of interest at the same time. Cohorts can be defined on the basis of any of event […]. In the social and behavioral sciences, unless otherwise specified, cohort generally refers to a birth cohort- to individuals born at the same or approximately the same time.” (2016:60). Despite the definition given by Elder Jr. and George (2016), in this specific study it is important to look at the different cohorts of immigrant flows, not necessarily the different birth cohorts. Meaning that between-person change will be categorized in arrival cohorts. It is, however, important to note that cohort studies indirectly visualize change in the life course of individuals, they provide information on social changes and historical contexts that add to the understanding of the life course (Ibid.,65). In addition, it is believed that cohort differences from year-to-year are rather small, but when added they can show a substantial shift over time (Ibid.,68). The arrival cohorts say
more about the time the immigrants arrived and the influence of different concepts in that specific time period. When looking at birth cohorts, this again says less about the time during which they migrated. The changes in the German society have also influenced the Turkish immigrant population and their national identification, Ryder argues this type of study can illuminate which cohorts were mainly influenced and it what directions (1965). Furthermore, this study will use within-person change expressed in years since immigration rather than age. It is believed that the actual age of immigrants says less about the development of national identification than the number of years they have been in the Germany. This is assumed to be more suitable when examining the development of national identification of the Turkish immigrants.

The operationalization of immigration cohorts and the years since immigration will be further elaborated in the methods section of this study. For the sake of clarity and consistency, the terms age and cohorts will still be used, despite the different definition in this particular study.

It is also necessary to point out that in age and cohort studies it is common to investigate whether a period effect is present. A period effect is usually used to test whether, during the scope of the study, a significant event has occurred that had an influence on the outcome variable (Elder Jr. & George 2016). Major significant events, such as an economic recession or a war, can have an effect on the participants of the study, which can result in changes in their behavior, or answer patterns. The advantage of using the period effect is that it could explain misrepresentation in the data (Ibid.). However, within the scope of this research and the particular sample chosen, the expectation is that there were no events of such magnitude that it affected the national identification of all immigrants simultaneously. Therefore, the period effect was not used or analyzed in this study.

2. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is intended to clarify the complex concepts that are believed to have an influence on or affect the national identification of the first-generation Turkish immigrants. This chapter will focus on the concepts that are believed to initiate change in national identification. Even though the different concepts that will be discussed in this section are convoluted and interrelated to each other, it is still important to address them separately as well. Specifically, because in order to get a better understanding of their definition, the way the concepts have developed over time and how they evolved in the German context in particular, it is important to zoom in on each and one of them.
This chapter is divided into different sub chapters, that will consecutively discuss the following subjects: transnationalism, integration, national identification and citizenship. Each of these sub chapters will conclude with how they affect the national identification of the Turkish immigrants in light of age and cohort effects.

2.1 Transnationalism

During the earliest research on migration and the identities of immigrants, the main focus was on the adaptation of immigrants and their in- or exclusion from the receiving society. It was not before the last part of the twentieth century that scholars started to focus on immigrants from a different perspective that accents their attachments to their heritage and country of origin (Vertovec 2001:574). It was clear that immigrants reconstruct their identities when it comes to the formalities such as gaining formal citizenship, but now it started to prevail that immigrants were also becoming increasingly able to forge new social and cultural spaces and identities that are linked to both the host society as their country of origin. As Portes states: “Immigrants comprise dense networks across political borders they have created in their quest for economic advancement and social recognition. Through these networks, an increasing number of people are able to live dual lives. Participants are often bilingual, move easily between different cultures, frequently maintain homes in two countries, and pursue economic, political and cultural interests that require their presence in both.” (1997:812).

This portrays how immigrants started to engage in multiple public areas beyond national borders. This ability is defined by many scholars as transnationalism (Portes 1997; Vertovec 2001; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003; Ostergaard-Nielsen, 2003; Ehrkamp 2005; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2006 & Sert 2012). Transnationalism forces to focus on the immigrants to get a better understanding of their cultural identities, needs, experience, further desires, as well as the diversity between them (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2006:1592). Consequently, the core advantage of transnationalism seems to be that the immigrants are able to maintain ties with both their home and host societies in different ways. The connections are familial, political, economic and social (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2006:1593), and are – in a modern society – maintained through telecommunication, (air) travel, satellite television and the internet (Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003:16).

The economic transnational practices by immigrants mainly consist of money remittances and are widespread according to Vertovec (2001:575), however, this generally is not the main economic transnational practice of the Turkish immigrants in Germany. Ehrkamp’s research on Turkish immigrants in Marxloh, a neighborhood in the City of
Duisburg in Germany, shows evidence for economic transnationalism in the way of owning businesses. Ehrkamp states: “In Marxloh, transnational consumption is highly visible in the urban landscape through store signs and shop fronts. Marxloh’s two main shopping streets convey the impression of a well-established Turkish economy that offers a variety of stores and services. […] Many of them have opened fast-food restaurants that serve simple meals (Döner Kebab) or greengroceries. Specialized businesses are importing jewelry, textiles and clothes, music CDs and videos, as well as household goods and satellite dishes from Turkey.” (2005:351). Respondents in Ehrkamp’s research explained how their everyday life revolves around the Turkish businesses in their neighborhoods and how they consumed their fresh products sold by the Turkish markets (Ibid.:352). The last part of the citation by Ehrkamp shows the connection to the social and cultural impacts of transnationalism described by Vertovec (2001). The immigrants intensify their links between them and their country of origin by arranging marriages, religious ceremonies, media and trade consumption (Ibid.).

The political aspect of transnationalism has stimulated fierce debates in receiving countries. As mentioned before, the immigrants are a central theme within national politics, and especially when they show commitment and loyalty to the politics of their country of origin, in the same manner as Özil did. The fact that some immigrants hold a dual citizenship status is the most common indicator of membership of different political communities (Ibid:575). However, the (dislocated) loyalty also functions as a test of prior assumptions of the host society that nation-states and their politics operate as a container for social, economic and political unity and all native citizens feel part of that unity (Ibid.). Another central concept in transnationalism is the creation of (new) spaces by the immigrants. This concept of space is both material and metaphorical in a sense that it is rooted in the public and political discourse of the host country. Immigrants generate new spaces for themselves, even (and maybe especially) when the receiving country provides a hostile environment (Ehrkamp 2005:348; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2005:1591). Apart from that, these new spaces enable the immigrants to alter their environments by positioning their own identities into the receiving country and generating local belonging (Ehrkamp 2005:346). The focus on space forges to think of different contexts that influence the experience of both immigrants and the receiving society. Up until the first decade of the twenty-first century, academic research had been paying little attention to the experiences of immigrants in creating new spaces for themselves in new societies. These new spaces of belonging may have significant influence on how immigrants feel in their new ‘homes’ and to what extent they actually identify with their new home country. It is therefore important to consider how transnationalism can be beneficial or
Ehrkamp argues the immigrants’ identities are weightily reconstructed during times of globalization (2005:347). The importance of transnationalism and transnational practices when conceptualizing immigration and immigrant behavior lies in the notion that according various scholars, transnationalism interferes with national identification and withholds the immigrants from adapting to their new home environment (Ehrkamp 2005:346). They also stress the dichotomies between the transnational and local when it comes to the integration of immigrants (Ibid.). Transnationalism and integration are frequently viewed as mutually exclusive, and a shared commitment stands in the way of (necessary) adaptation (Ibid.). When zooming in on the public discourse and natives’ attitudes on immigrants, Ehrkamp and Leitner argue that many natives experience the transnational practices of the immigrants as a divided interest and commitment, and as a threat to the national collective identity (2006:1593). A sizeable part of the natives experience concerns on immigrants’ ‘otherness’ in terms of culture (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2006:361). Othering is seen as confirming one's own position, to the detriment of another's position. It is often a matter of distancing yourself, on the grounds that your own historical or cultural background, ethnicity or social position is "better". As mentioned in the introduction, the clash between Özil and the DFB is a depiction of the national discourse in Germany on immigrants and their integration process based on their ability of transnationalism. The Turkish immigrants are still frequently viewed as ‘the other’ and this, among other matters, is the result of the concerns on the openness of national borders and the transnationalism of immigrants by a considerable part of the native host society (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003:1591).

Nevertheless, Ehrkamp argues that immigrants cannot solely draw upon their active ties with their country of origin, and have to engage with the host society as they live there (2005:360). Especially because the Turkish immigrants started actively investing in their lives in Germany instead of focusing on their hometowns in Turkey. This is demonstrated by the fact that they started owning houses and started businesses for their communities and contributed to the urban transformation of contemporary German cities (Ibid., 346). This is an example of how place can function as both symbolic and material in the expression of the immigrants’ identities and translocal connections (Ibid.). It is not only creating a physical place in which the immigrants can feel at home together with other Turkish immigrants, it also concerns contributing to the receiving country and attaching meaning to the places they now occupy.
2.1.1 Transnationalism and the life course

As we have seen from the previous section, transnationalism grew out to be a central term in migrant studies. It is believed it has an influence on the way immigrants develop their sense of belonging and national identification in the receiving country (Ehrkamp 2005; Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003). However, the translation of this influence into an age and cohort analyses is still limited in academic research. As mentioned before, cohorts in this study refer to the different arrival cohorts rather than birth cohorts. Both host nation identification and transnationalism develop over a larger period of time and therefore cohort effects can elucidate the possible changes. The investment of resources and development of social identities by the immigrants into the receiving country may not (always) be a conscious process and are better visible when examined over generations. Especially the first-generation immigrants can contribute to the knowledge on how transnationalism affects the extent to which immigrants identify with the host society.

For the first arrival cohorts of guest workers around the 1960s and 1970s there was no expectation to engage actively in the host society or identify as a German. The immigrants were rather invisible during this initial phase and they did not feel the need to invest in active ties with Germany because of their temporary jobs and residence (Kaya 2007:483). However, as mentioned earlier, the plan to return eventually shifted into a permanent stay in Germany and their status went from guest workers to immigrants as they were no longer ‘guests’ (Ibid.). As the immigrants decided to stay and started actively engaging and investing in the German society, they became visible. The transnational practices that resulted in the opening of different Turkish businesses and the foundation of social institutions put the immigrants in plain sight in various contemporary German cities (Kaya 2007). It resulted in them keeping ties with their heritage, while simultaneously investing in Germany and seeking acceptance by the host country (Ehrkamp 2005; Bennet 2014 & Simonsen 2016).

By creating a new (social) space for themselves by their active engagement, the immigrants tried to position their own identities into the German society and feeling more at home in it (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003). These new spaces of belonging and identification may influence how the immigrants feel in their new ‘homes’ in terms of national identification now that they have combined their own identities with the German society. The expectation for these early cohorts is therefore that they have a rather positive increase in national identification.

For successive cohorts from the 1980s and onwards however, the course of development of national identification in light of transnationalism may be different. As the
first arrival cohorts started at a low level of national identification because they were
supposed to stay temporarily, the expectation is that the successive cohorts had different
reasons for starting at a low level of national identification. This is because upon their arrival,
the Turkish immigrant community in Germany had already been founded. This meant they
were welcomed into a familiar and identifiable environment of Turkish culture in Germany.
It should be noted however, that literature on this topic is scarce, and the difference between
successive cohorts and their national identification in terms of transnationalism is limited and
therefore this is solely an assumption. In order to be able to argue whether the successive
cohorts will have a lower, higher or the same course of development of national identification
as previous cohorts, the theoretical concept of feeling at home by Duyvendak (2011) will be
used.

According to Duyvendak, the public discourse has a significant influence on the
emergence of the term ‘belonging’ and the popularity of it in academic research (2011).
Immigrants who allocate different parts of themselves to different or combined identities are
frequently perceived as not committed enough to engage in the national community with the
shared culture and, perhaps most importantly, undivided identification (Ehrkamp & Leitner
2006:1592). Many politicians and other government officials are convinced of the notion that
a nation can only thrive when it consists of citizens that actually feel at home in the nation
(van der Graaf & Duyvendak 2009). The debates usually revolve around the questions when
and how citizens feel at home and to what extent the government is responsible for
facilitating this idea of ‘home’. Belonging, however, is not only a public or politicized term.
Martinovic and Verkuyten explain how groups and belonging to a group that share a
collective identity gives citizens the impression of belonging and provides meaning in their
everyday life (2012:894). Based on this, the assumption would be that later arriving cohorts
would initially have a stronger feeling of belonging to their ethnic community, than the native
population and their identity. People have the basic need to be part of a greater whole and are
willing to conform to certain types of behavior in order to be accepted into and be part of it
(Ibid.)

In addition, Duyvendak provides three concepts of feeling at home. He distinguishes
between familiarity of a place, home as a haven and home as a heaven (2011:38). In order to
be able to generate feelings of belonging in the first place, the presence of familiarity is key
in a sense that the neighborhood people live in needs to feel familiar. For earlier arrival
cohorts this feeling of familiarity in their neighborhood is more present than successive
cohorts in a sense that earlier cohorts have actively invested in making their neighborhoods
more their own. Feeling familiar in a particular place consists of knowing the place, the norms, the values, the people that live nearby, and a certain degree of predictability of behavior that is common (Ibid.). This feeling of familiarity in a certain place allows people to feel safer. The aspect of familiarity that accents the norms and values that are present would indicate that the later arrival cohorts settling in neighborhoods such as Marxloh, with a well-established Turkish community, would feel safer because the level of predictability and the highly visible Turkish culture feels familiar. This would also indicate that these new arriving immigrants would feel less of a need to engage outside of that community where the familiarity is not present. In addition, Duyvendak described the concept of home as a haven which refers to a symbolic place that is used to describe the neighborhood people live in where they have connections to other people as well (2011:39). One could argue that for later arriving cohorts, where the neighborhood with other Turkish immigrants has a symbolic meaning of a safe haven where they can feel at home in a public place in an otherwise unknown environment. The element of heaven, however, is more intimate and is used to express the feeling of connection and actually feeling at home (Ibid.).

Duyvendak argues our ways of determining our own belonging becomes increasingly relational and dependent on others and their behavior in our neighborhood (2011:30). This would implicate that successive arrival cohorts would feel at home in their neighborhoods because of the large number of settled Turkish immigrants, which has less to do with the German society and its identity. Also, the Turkish immigrants are perceived as the ‘other’ by a great deal of the native population which could explain their often-hostile attitude towards the immigrants (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003:1591). These attitudes illustrate how it can be hard immigrants to create their own familiarity in a place that is different than their home country when they first arrive and therefore lean more towards the Turkish immigrant community that feels more familiar. The various contexts in which the complexity of transnationalism unfolds present a wide range of constructing negotiating and reproducing of (social) identities (Vertovec 2001:578).

This all leads to the expectation that the first arriving cohorts started at a rather low level of national identification, however, as they started investing in their life in Germany, they positioned their own Turkish identity in their neighborhoods and combined it with being an immigrant in Germany and therefore developed a positive trend in their national identification. For successive cohorts the expectation is that they start at a low level of national identification and have a different course in their development of the German national identification because they settled into a well-established Turkish community.
H1: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases with successive cohorts, due to a well-established (transnational) Turkish community upon their arrival which leads to expect a negative cohort effect.

After painting a clear picture on how transnationalism influences the different immigrant arrival cohorts in their course of the development of their host nation identification, it is important to elucidate and dig deeper into the relation between the immigrants, their integration and its effects on their national identification. In contemporary (academic) debates transnationalism and integration are inextricably connected. Especially because the national discourse in Germany still mainly moves towards the idea that the immigrants that utilize this ability of transnationalism are seen as a threat to the host country’s homogeneity and culture (Kaya 2007; Caglar 2001). Therefore, the next chapter will elaborate the relevant literature on this topic to get a comprehensive and reified understanding of both theoretical frameworks and their application to the case of Turkish immigrants in Germany.

2.2 Integration
Heated debates on immigrants’ process of assimilating and integrating\(^3\) into the receiving countries in combination with transnationalism are still very present in Western Europe. This often happens in combination with the rise of right-wing parties and their fear of the threatening ‘other’ (Duyvendak, Pels & Rijkschroeff 2009; Slootman & Duyvendak 2015). Within this chapter the different approaches to integration policies in general will be discussed followed by an elaboration on the Turkish immigrants in the German context. This approach will on the development of the German national identification of the immigrants.

Bertossi and Duyvendak argue that policies function as a national model which can be seen as our public philosophies (2012:239). Our ideas on how our social reality should function, our nation’s way of understanding itself and the ideas of our social interactions are all embedded in the policies we form (Ibid.). Citizenship and integration are defined in the public. According to van Reekum, Duyvendak and Bertossi models of integration are no different than models of culture (2012:417). They state: “At every juncture they [policies] fulfil a double role: making and representing the world at one and the same time. They help people make realities, as they inform normative assumptions about what is good and right,\(^3\)

\(^3\) Immigrants’ incorporation into the receiving society is defined differently within immigrant literature. Usually integration and assimilation are the two dominant terms. Assimilation is frequently used within the context of the United States of America, whereas the term integration is more dominant in Europe. Therefore, within this study, the term integration will be more dominantly used.
and to represent realities as they encompass a variety of phenomena” (Ibid). They do not only represent the (public and political) discourses that are present in the societies, but also function as powerful drivers of action (Bertossi & Duyvendak 2012:241). Additionally, the common lens through which policy-making is seen, is the idea that it is power dependent, because of the fact that a small group of politicians and policymakers get to decide what approach is taken in a policy (Ibid.). This idea implies that the policies that are made by a few, can still represent the needs and ideas of the entire society. In the case that these few people have flawed indicators that will eventually result in the wrong type of policy.

When it comes to integration policies it is important to note in the first place that immigration policies affect integration policies that follow them up in the sense that it determines the size and the composition of the group of immigrants that enter the particular country and therefore different types of policies are formed (Bauer, Lofstrom, Zimmermann 2001:8). Traditional immigrant countries, such as Germany, received a large number of labor force immigrants, which has implications for the policies they later constructed. However, the actual impact of the immigration policies by the receiving countries do not only depend on the formation of the group of immigrants which is determined largely by the policy, but also by the willingness of the immigrants to migrate (i.e. whether they are forced to move by the country of origin). This shows that the outcomes and effects of specific integration policies and the actual integration process of the immigrants can be opaque and difficult to recognize and classify (Ibid.).

A large number of researches has been done on the integration of immigrants, however a majority of them mainly focused on the socio-economic aspects (e.g. labor market participation and income) and lack an in depth look into the policies that led to certain (social) movements in these societies (Ersanilli & Koopmans 2011:208). The general supposition that is derived from these researches implies that immigrants who were designated based on their skills often succeed better in their integration (when compared to refugees for example) (Bauer, Lofstrom, Zimmermann 2001:9).

However, recent policies in the last twenty years have changed in a way that they do focus on the socio-cultural aspects of immigrant integration (Ersanilli & Koopmans 2011:209). These new policies mainly concentrated on the adaptation of immigrants to the host society (Ramm 2010:188). They now focus on civic integration which involves a naturalization test for example. In addition, there is an emphasis on language skills of the immigrants, the identification with the receiving society, and religion (Islam in particular) (Ibid). These (relatively) new obligatory rules were a result of the growing fear of lagging
cultural adaptation and function as conditions for a successful (socio-cultural) integration. With this the main discourse in researches shifted to complex discussions on the malfunction of integration policies and the place of Muslim immigrants in the country. The main stream of reasoning is based on the question whether Muslim minorities have (sufficiently) integrated in the host societies and whether they have their loyalty in the right place (i.e. loyal to the host society). Often this loyalty is presumed to be dislocated and this, too, is one of the reasons political parties and integration policies have shifted to a new focus on obligatory categories in mandatory integration programs (e.g. language sufficiency, identification with the receiving country) (Bertossi & Duyvendak 2012:242). Ramm also argues that integrationist policy makers and politicians have a hard time understanding why immigrants would not want to integrate fully and whole heartedly into the host society. Often because this would result in becoming a full and equal citizen of the society (2010:194).

The study done by Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann shows that when studying immigrant policies it is important to consider the design of the particular policy in order to understand how it effects the actual integration process of the immigrants, their labor market participation and the success of it, but also the attitudes of the natives concerning the immigrants (2001:16). In order to do so, the next section will focus on the particular case of German immigration and integration policies and their effects on the Turkish immigrants.

2.2.1 The integration of Turkish immigrants in Germany

Germany is traditionally an ethno-national country which means that the society shares a set of characteristics exclusive for and acknowledged by the community (Bertossi & Duyvendak 2012:237). The characteristics include a shared national identity, language, heritage and physical traits. This has implications for the public and political discourses within the country. However, Germany’s population has changed drastically by the coming of immigrants and now 20% of the population consists of citizens with a migration background (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018a). Nonetheless, Germany took a long time upholding the notion that it was not a country of immigration. This had implications for the integration policies. The government made sure other organizations were occupied with the integration of immigrants despite the urgent call for governmental integration policies by political actors since the 1970s (Ibid.)

Initially, the guest workers in Germany were not expected to invest in their integration because of the fact that they were supposed to stay temporarily. The immigrants just fulfilled an economic role in the German society (Fischer-Neumann 2014:340). The
policy of maintaining their own identity and culture was not a celebration of diversity. The implementation of the policy purely functioned as a facility of returning home one day (Slootman & Duyvendak 2015:148). Nonetheless, the (majority) of the guest workers eventually stayed and that changed the expectations of the host society.

Germany introduced an assimilatory approach in their integration policies (Ramm 2010:187). This implied that the ‘Ausländer’, which stands for foreigner, had responsibility in his own integration process and could therefore be held accountable and be blamed for a failed adaptation of the norms and values if needed (Ibid.). In 1998 a conservative German daily paper wrote about the integration of immigrants in the sense that it not only required the acceptance of the native population, but first needed the readiness of immigrants to adapt to the German society. According to their observations however, the ability if immigrants to integrate was diminishing and they were deliberately putting cultural boundaries up (Ibid.). This illustrates the type of sentiments that were common during that particular time. The German native population introduced the term Leitkultur which can be best translated as the dominant culture. It is an ambiguous term because it represents both the ‘leading culture’ and the embedded cultural values of being German. Even though this term might have been controversial, the underlying idea became very successful. The general discourse by a great deal of the native population argued that immigrants constructed ‘parallel societies’ in which they refused to assimilate to the German culture (Ibid.). It could be argued that this idea of parallel societies comes from the immigrants’ tendency to use transnationalism to maintain ties to their own heritage. Germany tried to maintain the cultural hegemony and moral superiority of western values and democracy as a discipline that needs to be obtained when immigrants arrive and start their integration process (Ibid.). Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann argue that integration policies are designed to prefer one group over others, and it can be argued that in Germany the preference was provided to ethnic Germans (2001:1). This became more visible with the introduction of the term Leitkultur.

Another shift in the attitudes towards Turkish immigrants in Germany occurred when the focus shifted from ethnic hostility to the rejection of Islam. The public discourse gradually replaced the notion of immigrants as foreigners with the idea of immigrants as Muslims (Ramm 2010:188). The allegedly slow process and even failure of integration was now attributed to the fact that the immigrants were holding on to a religion that cannot go hand in hand with the (liberal and western) values of Germany and was seen as their own shortcoming (Ibid.).

As mentioned before, the focus of integration policies has shifted to an assimilatory
approach in which the immigrants had to fully integrate into the German society. Ersanilli and Koopmans tested a set of five hypotheses on integration policies and their efficiency based on theoretical perspectives to test what approaches to integration work best in favor of whom (2011). They did this through the case of Turkish immigrants in Germany. Based on the first hypothesis that countries who tolerate and facilitate diversity in society promote ethnic retention, the expectation would be that in Germany, ethnic retention is low because there has been a lack of the promotion of cultural diversity for a very long time. On the other hand, another hypothesis by Ersanilli and Koopmans suggested that the lack of ethnic legal equality, also promotes ethnic retention, and therefore Turkish immigrants in Germany would have a high level of retention, because Germany does not provide equal legal rights for all ethnicities (2011:219). The results of their study, however, showed that Turkish identification was very strong among Turkish immigrants in Germany, which would lead to the rejection of the first above mentioned hypothesis. The researchers also found that religious retention was lowest in Germany (compared to the Turkish immigrants in France and the Netherlands), which is conflicting to their last hypothesis which expected that reactive ethnicity is not only a response to experiences of immigrants themselves, but also witnessing others of their ethnic group being discriminated and marginalized, which according to them is the case in Germany (Ersanilli & Koopmans 2011:220).

As discussed in this chapter, immigrant and integration policies have been debated fiercely in immigrant countries over the last decades. Different kinds of policies have had different implications for both the host society as the immigrants themselves. The right kind of policy can influence immigration and integration problems in a suitable way; however, the wrong type can have calamitous effects (Ibid., 225). The perception on which policies are right and which are wrong differ as illustrated by the literature. Nonetheless, the literature indicates consensus on the idea that policy is necessary (Ibid.). Likewise, the academic field cannot seem to agree on the right immigration and integration policy approach (Ibid.).

In the case of the German society and their rising sentiments of anti-Islam, it is important to consider the changed understanding of their national identity as a result of the discussions on multiculturalism during the late 1990s (Ramm 2010:193). Integration gained a new meaning and united the conservatives and drew the immigrants further away from the collective native population (Ibid.). Liberal German integrationists argued that the adaptation of the German values had to be one of the conditions to be able to truly belong in their society (Ibid., 194). When framing these values in terms of Leitkultur, they made an imaginary separation between the Western/German natives and the Muslim/Turkish
immigrants, because in their opinion the Islam did not have a vision compatible with the liberal western values. (Ibid., 194). Not only the politicians are concerned with the incompatibility, a significant part of the native citizens are repeatedly anxious of the implications of Islamic practices, such as the use of religious symbols like the headscarf, the building of mosques and the call to prayer, might have for their society (van Reekum, Duyvendak & Rijkschroeff 2009). Moreover, the recent terrorist attacks around Europe do not contribute to the acceptance of the Muslim communities in European countries (Maliepaard, Lubbers & Gijsberts 2009).

The general debate on immigrant integration in Germany mainly focuses on the preservation of its national community and its ideals (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2005:1592), and this in itself is not a preposterous quest. When it comes to integration policies it is natural for receiving countries to observe the immigrant communities on a macro, governmental level. As van Reekum, Duyvendak and Bertossi state, the purpose of integration policies is to forge newcomers into a direction of national unity (2012:418). It can be considered valid and the sole purpose of policy making to add to the cohesive national citizenship (Ibid.). The problematic issues arise when a successful integration means fully committing and assimilating to the German society without maintaining (visible) ties to the country of origin. Which, as described in the previous chapter, the immigrants actively invested in. As a result, the society cannot be unified in the eyes of many native citizens when the immigrants fail to fully commit. Maybe the most important contradiction in the discourse on immigrant integration is the fact that the hostile attitude of the native population and the high expectations implemented in the policies make that the immigrants feel less like they belong to the society, while these strict integration rules are made to make them part of the unified whole in the first place (Simonson 2016:1154).

### 2.2.2 Integration and the life course

As seen above, there have been quite a few changes in direction when it comes to integration policies of immigrants in Germany. However, when thinking of integration and its effects on the national identification of the Turkish immigrants in Germany in light of the life course, the following line of reasoning was used.

During the initial period of guest workers, the German government had no expectation or policy indicating that the Turkish immigrants had to conform to a certain integration process. One of the reasons was the fact that the German government rejected the notion of being an immigration country for quite some time up until the turn of the century
This resulted in the immigrants having the freedom to maintain their own culture and ethnic heritage. This is in line with the aforementioned hypothesis that initial national identification of the Turkish immigrants was rather low. However, this changed after the implementation of the integration policy of 2005 which determined that integration was now officially a task of the German government (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018c). It also meant that immigrants now had the responsibility of integrating into the German society (Ramm 2010:187). They were obligated to take courses that taught them the German language, the German legal system, the culture and history (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018c). The mandatory principle resulted in notion that immigrants were to accept the German society and respect its fundamental values in order to be perceived as a German citizen (Ibid.). Nonetheless, as discussed earlier, the immigrants were heavily engaged in transnational practices by this time which meant they were already investing in their life in Germany, creating their own social space where they combined their Turkish heritage with life in Germany. This would lead to the expectation that immigrants increased their national identification. However, as we have seen, a majority of the society experienced the immigrants as actively creating a parallel society in which they put up cultural boundaries (Ramm 2010:187). The anti-Islam sentiments became more prevalent after recent terrorist attacks such as 9/11 (Maliepaard, Lubbers & Gijsberts 2009). Acceptance of the host society is believed to have an influence on the national identification of the immigrants. With the new obligatory rules, the immigrants that could not conform to these, were not accepted by the German society. This would lead to the expectation that even though the immigrants had spent many years in Germany, they did not increase their German national identification.

When deriving an expectation from the abovementioned it becomes clear that the literature does not show a clear direction of development of national identification in light of integration of the immigrants. However, the following line of reasoning was more prominently present and will be used to derive the second hypothesis of this study.

The initial freedom of maintaining their own heritage and culture, followed by a hostile attitude leading to obligatory integration policies and the rising negative sentiments from the native population towards the immigrants has led to believe that the years that the immigrants spent in Germany did not positively affect their national identification. 

H2: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases over time, which leads to the expectation of a negative age effect.
2.3 National Identification and Citizenship

As noted in the introduction, the main research question of this study is how the national identification of the Turkish immigrants has changed over time. In order to get a proper understanding of the many aspects that have an influence on the national identification of immigrants, it is important to realize how interconnected the concepts of transnationalism and the integration processes are with the national identification.

2.3.1 National Identification

As the literature indicates, the national identification of the immigrants is dependent on a series of factors. One of them being the acceptance of the native population. It could be argued that when someone is not seen nor accepted as a ‘real’ German, it is more of a challenge for immigrants to perceive themselves as one. The aforementioned studies imply that the German society has not always been accepting of the immigrants and their process of integrating into the society. Martinovic and Verkuyten pose that when this uncertainty about immigrant acceptance occurs, they tend to identify and present themselves more strongly as a member of certain (ethnic) group (2012:893). The majority of the time this happens in combination with transnationalism, which is often viewed as an act of resistance to integration, and this too results in less acceptance from the host society. However, it is still a challenge to determine how this influences and changes the national identification of immigrants over time. Martinovic and Verkuyten argue immigrants cope with the ongoing challenge of combining or choosing between two different identities and multiple belongings (2012:893). Especially when these different identities and belongings are incompatible or at least conflicting, which has been the case in Germany as seen in the previous chapters. Fischer-Neumann even argues the Turkish immigrants in Germany face severe identity threat and the absence of positive distinctiveness of their ethnic identity facilitates the notion of ingroup favoritism even more (2014:344). The (Muslim) Turkish immigrants in Germany have faced different forms of discrimination. According to Fischer-Neumann social identity and longitudinal studies on immigrants have repeatedly shown that (perceived) discrimination is positively related to ingroup identification and lower national identification (Ibid.). In addition, as shown by Ramm, a shift took place where Turkish immigrants faced religious rejection instead of just ethnic hostility (2010:188). This implies that immigrants are now not only an ethnic minority in a marginalized position, but also a religious minority (Martinovic & Verkuyten 2012:894). They are continuously being scrutinized for their loyalty to the host society and the extent to which they successfully integrated the core
The cultural and religious background of the Turkish immigrants, principally Muslim, draws a boundary between them and the host country (Fischer-Neumann 2014:344). On the other hand, they cannot integrate too well, because their loyalty to the ethnic and religious group is continuously assessed as well. Not being able to juggle these different identities can result in the uncertainty of group membership and even rejection by one group and that can be unpleasant (Ibid., 984). In order to make sure that rejection will not take place immigrants are motivated to act in the right ways and identify even more strongly with the groups they feel they belong to. According to Martinovic and Verkuyten this leads to a stronger identification with the ethnic/religious groups rather than the host national identification in most cases, because the religious groups tend to be more distinguishing and provide social cohesion (2012:894). The role of value incompatibility is key in the process of (national) identification. It is often claimed that the values of Islam are not compatible with Western European standards and values (Bowen, Bertossi Duyvendak & Krook 2011:1). Values are important to people in a sense that they give direction to the way we live, to the way we behave, how we understand other people, how our social reality is constructed and is central in decision making processes. Other than that, our values determine who we are and want to be and what distinguish right from wrong (Ibid.). When value incompatibility occurs, it insinuates that the two different cultures are not to be judged by the same standard of living and have no common standard. This incompatibility might also influence the relation between the host and ethnic identification (Martinovic & Verkuyten 2012:895). As the Islam and Turkish culture are framed in a way that they are incompatible with the German values, the implication arises that the immigrants by definition have to choose between the two. The latter means that the many different policy approaches Germany has seen over time stress the importance of integration. However, instead of motivating the immigrants to actually integrate into the receiving country, it results in them further distancing themselves from the receiving nation and identify more strongly with their ethnic background (Ibid., 900). In this sense, the public and political discourse that blame the (Muslim) Turkish immigrants for their (in their eyes) failed integration results in the exact opposite of the initial intention of the integration policies (Ibid.). A longitudinal study on Turkish immigrants in Germany showed four different types of ethnic identification and their influences on the national identification. These different identities ranged from integrated/dual identity meaning the immigrants identify (equally) with both groups, to the marginalized identity meaning they have a low identification with both groups (Fischer-Neumann 2014:342). Because the immigrants are faced with the rejection of their...
ethnic/religious identities and this often results in them identifying with their ethnic and religious identity even more, they start to feel more Turkish, and less German (Verkuyten & Yildiz 2007). The abovementioned studies have led to the expectation that the years since their immigration do not necessarily positively influence the national identification. In contrast, it only fuels the discourse of failed integration and growing hostile attitudes towards their culture and religion, leading them to feel more alienated over time. This provides even more ground for hypotheses two stating that the national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany did not increase over time, which leads to expect a negative age effect.

2.3.2 Citizenship

According to Brubaker citizenship is formed by the legal obligations and rights pertaining to a nation / state and conceding to that nation’s authority, power, influence, jurisdiction and control (1990). Halfmann adds that it consists of an exclusive legal relationship and permits inclusion into the nation (1997:263). Another form of citizenship described by Halfmann accentuates the bond between citizens and the importance of a unified, solidary community where its members belong together and share their heritage, language, culture and territory (Ibid., 264; Miller-Idriss 2006:542). It is exactly these semantics that cause frictions between members of the state (‘real’ citizens) and foreigners that gained access to the state but are not yet officially part of that unified community (Ibid., 265; Marshall 1997). Not only the formation of the German state, but also the transformation that the immigrants have brought made it complicated to get an understanding of the conceptualization of citizenship, especially since Germany had been relatively homogenous after World War II (Miller-Idriss 2006:541). It is clear that the many different branches and concepts of citizenship and the different times through which nations had to think of this term and its meaning make it harder to define when an individual can obtain full recognition as a member of the state.

Since the unification of the two states in the 1980s, Germany has been engaging in public debates on their definition of citizenship (Halfmann 1997:260). It is important to note that in this period of time, Germany was not particularly concerned with the national identification of immigrants (Ibid.). However, after the 1980s, Germany had built one single nation state with a legitimate structure, nonetheless still struggling with the idea of defining citizenship. During the same time, immigrants were still safe from hostility based on a lack of national identification with Germany (Ibid., 261). This did not last long and from the 1990s on citizenship and its implications gained an ethnic accentuation. The substantial number of
immigrants in Germany that had legal status, but no legal citizenship resulted in a conflict with a serious ethnicist undertone (Ibid., 261). Slootman and Duyvendak argue that an emotionalization and culturalization of citizenship took place (2015). Meaning that citizenship has become less about legal formalities and more about conforming to the norms and values of a nation. This also (partially) explains how the heated debates over how much and what kind of cultural mix the immigrant societies will permit in their nation (2015:147). And possibly their resistance towards transnationalism as well. Even though this research by Slootman and Duyvendak (2015) was conducted in the Netherlands, it is nonetheless informative about the context in Germany. Apart from the similar guest worker history, the same issues surrounding the integration and assimilation of immigrants play a major role in Dutch society. That is why the literature dealing with this problem can be carefully included in this study.

Germany provides a rather uncomplicated process for native-born Germans to obtain citizenship in comparison to foreigners. This has resulted in the fact that there were millions of people in German society that regardless of the fact that they were born in Germany, still could not acquire and had no right to legal citizenship for a very long time (Brubaker 1990; Miller-Idriss 2006). This however changed in 1999 when the state changed the law in favor of children born in Germany to foreign parents. They automatically obtained German citizenship provided that at least one parent has a permanent right of residence (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung 2018c). This had been the case in other European immigrant countries, among which France and the Netherlands, long before Germany introduced this adapted law (Brubaker 1990). However, Miller-Idriss argues that even after this law, immigrants (and especially their children) still faced the narrative of not being ‘a real authentic’ German and having to earn that title persisted (2006:542). Which is in line with the argument Slootman and Duyvendak stressed about the increasingly emotionalization of citizenship (2015). Also, studies show that even though this new law should provide these German-born (second generation) immigrants citizenship, the Turkish immigrants were more often denied citizenship than any other group of immigrants (Fischer-Neumann 2014:344). So, it could be argued that Germany still had a principle of exclusion in place with their policy on obtaining legal citizenship, mainly towards the first-generation immigrants. Miller-Idriss’ research on the perception on the everyday understanding of citizenship in Germany shows that young Turkish immigrants still encounter discriminatory behavior from native-born individuals who refuse to acknowledge the immigrants can ‘feel’ German (2006:559). With this she also concluded that, when examining citizenship and its influence on the
society it is important to consider how the citizens themselves experience the understanding of citizenship and viewing oneself as part of the society (Ibid., 561). While the official processes of citizenship may be in hands of the elite and politicians, the reflection of the actual members of the society can reveal important experiences (Ibid.).

This again shows more evidence for the reasoning of both the first and second hypotheses leading to expect that the national identification of first-generation immigrants decreased over time in terms of years since their immigration, as well as a decrease between successive cohorts.

2.4 Expectations and hypotheses
As seen from the literature, there is a good reason to expect the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany changed over time as a consequence of several factors among which, first and foremost, the decision to settle down in Germany instead of returning to Turkey as was the initial plan (Kaya 2007:484 & Halfmann 1997:261). This meant that they started investing in their lives in Germany by building different cultural and social institutions. But also changing their labor and engaging in different kind of occupations by opening up restaurants and retail businesses (Ehrkamp 2005). In this process of investing in a new life in a foreign country the native population and the political climate of Germany have had an influence on the way immigrants experienced their stay. They developed of the ability of transnationalism which allowed them to maintain ties with their home country while simultaneously investing in and starting a new life in the receiving country (Ehrkamp 2005). Because the initial plan was for them to return, the Germans did not immediately expect nor demand the immigrants to integrate into their society. However, the plans changed and so did the policies concerning their integration (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung 2018c).

While at first multiculturalism was a goal and the notion that diversity needed to be celebrated was still in place, this eventually changed into a full-assimilatory approach with which the immigrants were expected to (fully) integrate into the society. This process did not go by trouble-free, because the immigrants increasingly utilized their ability of transnationalism. The process of their transnationalism is frequently portrayed as an act of refusal to integrate because it resulted in the immigrants not committing themselves completely to Germany and its society. Within the earlier discussed public discourse, the immigrants are still portrayed as ‘the other’ despite having been in Germany for decades (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003). Literature on national identification shows that the acceptance and the attitudes of the receiving country are one of the key influencers for immigrants
These attitudes of the receiving country have changed as well. As they did not expect the immigrants to integrate immediately, because they were ‘guest’ workers, the native population did not invest in engaging with the immigrant population either. When the immigrants eventually did decide to stay, it required time for both populations to get used to that.

The fact that Turkish immigrants were, however, increasingly seen as Muslims instead of just foreigners, they occupied a doubly marginalized position. That is a reason to suspect that there could be a distortion in the attitudes of the native population on immigrants because of the rising islamophobia and events such as terrorist attacks that have been happening since 9/11 (Maliepaard, Lubbers & Gijsberts 2009; Norris & Inglehart 2012).

In short, as what seems from the literature, the acceptance of the native population does have an influence on the national identification by the immigrants. It is important to note however, that this study does not focus on the attitudes of the native population on the immigrants, but it is of importance to mention their attitudes and development in order to get a clear picture of the experiences of the immigrants. Fischer-Neumann describes how the Turkish immigrant community faced severe identity threat because of (perceived) discrimination by a part of native-born population and the absence of positive distinctiveness based on the immigrants’ ethnic and religious identities (2014). This shows how the acceptance of the native population would have a positive influence on the immigrants (Ibid.). In addition, the meaning of citizenship is now increasingly about the emotions of belonging to and the own culture of the specific country. When the immigrants cannot measure up to these conditions, they may not feel like they truly belong there as a citizen of Germany. Furthermore, the shift from only foreigners to Muslim foreigners and the bad connotations the terms have, the boundaries between the native population and immigrants did not deteriorate, they were drawn further apart. Additionally, the immigrants are engaged in ongoing negotiations and experience pressure from both sides. On the one hand they are expected to integrate in order to be accepted by the vast majority of the host country and being able to feel at home in Germany by viewing oneself as such. Which is only permitted when integrated properly and adapting to the norms and values. Yet, on the other hand, integrating too well will be experienced as disloyalty by the ingroup community. Other than the host population, the political and legal policies that had different focuses on the integration and that had effects on how well they “fit into the society” over time.

In short, the different factors influencing the national identification of immigrants do
point to the direction of a negative development of national identification. The following hypotheses will be tested in this study:

H1: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases with successive cohorts, due to a well-established (transnational) Turkish community upon their arrival which leads to expect a negative cohort effect.

H2: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases over time, which leads to the expectation of a negative age effect.

3. Research Methodology
3.1 Data and Sample
A quantitative research was conducted to test the hypotheses on the change in national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany. To do so the 33th version of the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) dataset was used including data from 1984 up to 2017. This longitudinal study on German households has been repeated yearly ever since it started (Wagner, Frick & Schupp 2007). The dataset stands out for its unprecedented largeness and quality and is the only panel data in Germany (if not in the world) that has been running this long. The dataset includes more than 15,000 households and interviewed over 30,000 respondents that have been selected on a basis of stratified sampling (Wagner, Frick & Schupp 2007; SOEP 2019). The topics included in the questionnaires vary from household configuration, social position, employment and earnings, health, personal opinions and attitudes, and satisfaction indicators (SOEP 2019). Since the same households have been included more than once and some even from the very first wave in 1984, the dataset provides the possibility to make comparisons between successive cohorts and certain ages. In this particular study it allows to compare different arrival cohorts of immigrants and the years since their immigration.

In addition, panel data is the only qualified kind of data that allows longitudinal studies by reason of multiple observations of the same respondents over a large period of time (Torres-Reyna 2007). Furthermore, it allows to study factors that are unfeasible with alternative research designs, such as generational effects (Ibid.). The use of this dataset will assure the quality of the sample and the study will be more representative than could have been achieved in the present study in the short time and the little resources given.

The SOEP has been including immigrant samples since the beginning of the study in
1984. However, the item needed to study the national identification was not included every wave. Further specification of the outcome measure will follow in the next section.

The starting sample contained 84,862 respondents measured over 33 years resulting in 619,718 observations. This starting sample includes several samples that are redundant for this study. Therefore, several cuts were made in order to prepare the data for analyses. The specific cuts and the exclusion criteria are listed in ‘Table 1’ below. Firstly, all waves of the SOEP that did not include the item measuring national identification were excluded, which resulted in the omission of 66,534 (78.40%) of the respondents and 565,314 (91.22%) of the observations. This study solely focused on the first-generation Turkish immigrants, which consists of immigrants that were born in Turkey. In order to make an adequate selection sampling was based on the self-reported country of origin and includes both males and females. All other immigrants and the native German population were therefore omitted from the sample which resulted in a cut of 15,992 (18.85%) respondents and 46,633 (7.52%) observations. The Turkish immigrants were selected independent of their age at the time of their arrival. Next, missing values on the immigration year were omitted which resulted in a loss of 112 (0.13%) of the respondents and 520 (0.08%) of the observations. Also, immigrants that migrated before 1960 were removed, for the reason that the study focused on the migration flow of guest workers since the 1960s and onwards. Immigrants that migrated after 2009 were also removed from the sample, since their migration falls beyond the scope of this study and there were very few observations which could lead to a distortion of the data. These cuts resulted in the removal of 26 respondents (0.03%) and 43 observations (0.007%). The same goes for immigrants that migrated longer than 45 years ago. It is undesirable that these few observations negatively influence the data. The scarcity of the observations of respondents that migrated longer than 45 years ago, is probably due to the fact that these immigrants are already reasonably old and therefore no longer want or can participate in the yearly survey. The cut resulted in the loss of 4 respondents which is 0.005% of the initial sample and 51 observations (0.008%) were omitted. Lastly, respondents younger than 17 were omitted from the study which resulted in the loss of 4 respondents (0.005%) and 6 observations (0.001%). These several cuts resulted in a final sample of 2,186 respondents which is 2.58% of the initial starting sample including 1152 males and 1038 females. The final sample includes 10,150 observations (1.64% of starting sample) with an average observation duration of 4 waves. No distinction has been made between immigrants living in the East and West of Germany. Even though literature shows the initial waves of immigrant
moved to the West of Germany because the East side lacked labor immigration, it is believed that it makes no difference in the analysis of national identification of these immigrants.

**Table 1: Sample selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
<th>N (respondents cut)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N (observations cut)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting sample:</td>
<td>84862</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>619718</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing on outcome variable</td>
<td>66534</td>
<td>78.40</td>
<td>565314</td>
<td>91.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration background not Turkish</td>
<td>13994</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>46633</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing on immigration year</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated before 1960 and after 2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrated longer than 45 years ago</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected sample:</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>10150</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: SOEP, v33, release 2017.*

**3.2 Measurements**

**3.2.1 Outcome measure**

The dependent variable in this research was national identification. This variable was measured with a self-reported level of feeling German / German identification. The item on the questionnaire that was used was constructed as follows: To what extent do you view yourself as a German? The answers were measured on a five-point scale with the options “not at all”, “hardly at all”, “in some respects”, “for the most part”, and “completely”. This item has been included in the questionnaire 17 times, however the estimations in the analyses cover a period of 33 years. Between 1984 and 1987 it was included in the questionnaire every year. After that it was included every two years until 2003. Then, the item was left out for six years and got included again in 2010. After that it was asked in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016 and 2017. For the sake of the analyses a new variable was generated which consisted of recoded answer categories. 1 standing for not feeling German at all, up to answer category 5 which stood for feeling German completely. Table 2 shows that the continuous variable Feeling German had an average mean of 2.10 with a standard deviation of 1.13.
Table 2: Descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N(obs.)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling German</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 2 = hardly at all, 3 = in some respects, 4 = for the most part, 5 = completely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>17-84</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>Age in years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Gender (1) male, (2) female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measures of change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N(obs.)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean values</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>Years since immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>4477</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2633</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohorts</th>
<th>N(obs.)</th>
<th>Arrival cohorts combined into 10-year intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>1 516</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>5 465</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>1 760</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>1 016</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SOEP, v33, release 2017. obs., observations

3.2.2 Measure of change

The independent variable in this study were social and individual change measured by the concepts of age and cohort effects on the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany. As previously mentioned, the concepts of cohort and age differ in their definitions that are otherwise common in social change studies. In this study the age effect refers to the years since the immigrants have migrated. The rationale behind this different operationalization of the ‘age’ effect is that it is assumed that the amount of years spent in the host country is a better indicator of the development of national identification than the actual age. An example of this could be a respondent that is 40 years old and has spent 10 years in Germany is expected to have a different level of national identification than a respondent that
is 30 years old but has been in Germany for over 25 years. The expectation is that there would be a difference not because there is an age difference, but because one of them has been in Germany for a longer period of time. In order to calculate the years since immigration (age), the actual immigration year was subtracted from the year of the survey. As mentioned, immigrants that have been in Germany for longer than 45 years have been excluded from the study. To gain more insight in the descriptive statistics of the variable ‘Age’ (years since immigration), a categorical variable was generated. The categories run from 0-9 up until 40-49. Even though the immigrants that migrated longer than 45 years ago were cut from the sample, the categories were still combined into 10-year intervals to show the differences in a clearer way. As can be seen in Table 2 there is a positive increase in ‘Feeling German’ with every successive category of years since immigration. Ranging from 1.74 for the first category of immigrants having been in the country between zero to nine years, to a mean of 3.03 for immigrants that have been in the country for at least 40 years. These descriptive values describe the contrary oh hypotheses 2 stating a negative age effect was expected.

The measure of cohorts used in this study also subtly deviates from the usual definition in a way that it uses immigration cohorts, rather than birth cohorts. However, these slight changes to the definition do not influence the ability to conduct the statistical analysis. The following cohort categories were used: 1960-1969, 1970-1979, 1980-1989, 1990-1999, 2000-2009. The cohorts start at 1960 because the Turkish immigrants were recruited from the 1960s onwards, so using earlier cohorts would distort the scope of the study. The cohorts go up to 2000-2009 because of the very few observations for the time period after 2009. The cohort variable will be used to examine whether social change has an influence on the outcome variable. Table 2 also shows that the averages for ‘Feeling German’ differ for every successive cohort and increase from 1.91 for the first cohort of 1960 up to 2.52 for the last cohort of 2000. This initial descriptive finding seems to contradict H1 expecting a negative cohort effect.

In addition, a graph was drawn with the descriptive data to visualize these initial findings, see figure 1. This graph reports the averages of ‘Feeling German’ for every cohort and the years since immigration. What can be seen from this graph is that later cohorts start on approximately the same level of national identification, with exception of the last cohort, which starts on a higher level. This is not in line with the hypothesis stating that later cohorts show a lower level of identification because of the well-established Turkish community in Germany by that time. The cohort of 1960 seemed to be reaching a plateau at 2.8 on a scale of 1 to 5 after 40 years of immigration, while the cohort of 1970 reaches its plateau at 3.1.
And an even later cohort, 1980, stagnates at almost 3.2. Then something notable happens, the cohort from 1990 has a steeper increase between the first 5 to 10 years compared to earlier cohorts. The last cohort of 2000 starts higher than the previous cohorts and starts at a level of 2.4 and ends at 2.6 after 16/17 years, that is an increase of .02 in approximately 15 years, whereas earlier cohorts had a relatively higher increase within the first 20 years.

It should be noted that this data is purely descriptive and does not yet include a model of analysis and can therefore not accept or reject the hypotheses. It does however provide a pretty clear indication on the trends in the data.

![Figure 1: Descriptive life course and cohort trends of Turkish immigrants and their German national identification. Note: SOEP v33 (1960-2009), release 2017.](image)

### 3.3 Models

In order to run the analyses on the development of national identification the generalized least squares method with the random effects model was used to set up a multivariate model. In contrast to the more common least square models, the multivariate model allows variables to be dependent of each other, because respondents have numerous observations since they are measured multiple times throughout the years. Terros-Reyna explains another characteristic of this model by stating: “The rationale behind random effects model is that, unlike the fixed effects model, the variation across entities is assumed to be random and uncorrelated with the predictor or independent variables included in the model.” (2007:25). When there is a good reason to expect that the entities have influence on the dependent
variable, in this case the influence of individual and social change on national identification, there is enough reason to choose the random effects model over the fixed effects model. Additionally, it is suitable for cohort studies since it assembles individuals in one group, in other words a cohort. The specific characterizations of a group can be elucidated with this model and the varying effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable can be discovered.

In the following section the steps that were taken to find the best fitting model will be elaborated. ‘Feeling German’ was the dependent variable in all models and arrival cohorts (‘cohorts’) and years since immigration (‘age’) were added as independent variables. Central in the development and construction of the models was to test for different terms of age (linear, quadratic and cubic) and cohort (categorical and linear). In order to find the best fitting model, they were adjusted in the sequence from simple to complex. The best model was chosen on the basis of the significance, the coefficients of all the variables, the graphs and the highest overall $R^2$. It should be noted that the initial hypotheses stated a negative cohort and negative age effect. However, since the descriptive data showed a positive trend in both, the models were based on the descriptive data rather than the initial hypotheses derived from the literature.

Each model included a graph which are located through the text and in the appendices. In each graph the visual representations of the outcome of the models were gained through the random effects generalized least squares. The lines in the graphs represent the different arrival cohorts combined into ten-year intervals. The length of the lines on the x-axis indicate the average of years since the immigration of every arrival cohort. The predicted extent to which the different arrival cohorts and the corresponding years since immigration feel German can be read from the y-axis.

In the first model, the analyses was rather simple. It only included a linear age term and a categorical cohort term. This model presumes that with every change in cohort and age, the effect on ‘Feeling German’ is the same. However, as is seen from the theoretical framework and the descriptive graph, the expectations did not imply a linear change in national identification regardless of the years since immigration and immigration year. It is rather assumed that the development of national identification is more complex. Also, as can be seen from figure 2 (appendix A), it does not appear to reflect the descriptive data. For that reason, the complexity of the model was adapted to quadratic age and categorical cohort. Adding the quadratic term to the model allows the effect of years since immigration to change when the number of years since immigration increases. Figure 3 shows the slight
curve in the regression line (see appendix B). An example of this could be that the first model, as seen in table 2, shows that a linear age term results in an increase in national identification with .04 on a scale of 1-5 with every year an immigrant stays longer in Germany. When adding the quadratic age term, the effect becomes negative, implying that the relationship between years since immigration and the national identification is concave and non-linear. As stated in table 2, the quadratic age term is in fact negative yet significant. In this case it implies that for low values of years since immigration (meaning few years) the relationship with national identification is positive, however, for higher values of years since immigration (meaning more years) it becomes negative. The positive effect of years since immigration on ‘Feeling German’ becomes less strong with a bend around 40 years. However, the effect size did not increase considerably ($R^2 .143$) and therefore the fit of the model was still not considered sufficient. In order to further improve the fit, a third model with a cubic age term and a categorical cohort term was introduced. The cubic age term allows yet another change in the line of the regression when the years since immigration increase further. Meaning that, after the negative quadratic term indicating that ‘Feeling German’ might decrease, another bend could take place. As seen in figure 4, it seems that there is a slight positive effect between 35 and 40 years. Nonetheless, the effect size again did not increase considerably ($R^2 .144$). The first three models showed that the addition of the quadratic and cubic age terms did not provide a sizable increase in the effect size of the model. When looking at the figures of the first three models it seems the positive cohort effect is quite linear with an exception of the last cohort of 2000-2009. This led to believe that a model with a linear cohort term could be a sufficient fit. Therefore, the fourth model included a linear cohort term and linear, quadratic and cubic age terms. At last, the fifth model included the interaction of (cubic) age and (linear) cohort. It is crucial to examine interactions because the extent to which the Turkish immigrants feel German can differ for different cohorts. Especially, since the literature led to the expectation that later cohorts would have a lower level of national identification. As the fourth model was used to evaluate the hypotheses, it will further be elaborated in the following section.

4. Results

The main results that were obtained through the generalized least squares method are shown in table 4 including the model that was used to test the hypotheses. In order to evaluate the hypotheses, the best fitting model was chosen. The model included four successive arrival cohorts (combined into ten-year intervals) and the years since immigration (0-45). As
mentioned in the methods section, the best fitting model was evaluated based on the highest overall $R^2$, the coefficients of the variables and significance. All previous models are shown in table 3 (Appendix D) and 4. In addition, figures 2, 3, 4 (Appendix C) and 5 visualize the models in graphs.

Figure 5: Predicted life course and cohort trends of German national identification of Turkish immigrants. Note: SOEP v33 (1960-2009), release 2017.

4.1 National identification and the cohort effect
Figure 5 shows the predicted average of feeling German for every cohort and the years since immigration of model 4. The distance between the colored cohort lines indicate the difference between successive cohorts. In this case, it means that the further the lines are apart, the bigger the difference between them. The results of model 4, including a linear cohort term, show that there is a positive cohort effect. The linear increase in ‘Feeling German’ between cohorts is significant ($\beta = .34$, SE $1.1e^{-2}$ $p < 0.05$). Table 4 shows that for every successive cohort, the average increase in feeling German is .34, which can be also seen in figure 5 below. The lines in the graph visually represent how the successive arrival cohorts have a significantly higher level of German national identification. Especially when the first arrival cohort of 1960 is compared with the last cohort of 2000. Hypotheses 1 stating that the national identification decreases with successive cohorts can therefore be rejected. Even
though later cohorts seem to start at a lower initial level of national identification, the positive cohort effect is significant. Nonetheless, for some cohorts the lines lie further apart. As can be seen the lines of cohorts 1990 and 2000 lie slightly closer to each other than the lines of cohorts 1970 and 1980.

**Table 4.** Random effects GLS models 4 and 5, predictions of Feeling German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.9e-2</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age x Age</strong></td>
<td>-.2e-2*</td>
<td>.4e-3</td>
<td>-.1e-3*</td>
<td>.1e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age x Age x Age</strong></td>
<td>.3e-4*</td>
<td>7.59e-6</td>
<td>.1e-4*</td>
<td>.1e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohort</strong></td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.1e-2</td>
<td>.6e-2*</td>
<td>.7e-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age x Cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2e-2*</td>
<td>.1e-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.29*</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R²</strong></td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observations</strong></td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>10 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
<td>2 186</td>
<td>2 186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* p < .05
4.2 National identification and the age effect

As can be seen from the tables including the models, the first three models did not show a considerable increase in the overall $R$-square. All models reject the hypothesis stating a negative age effect, meaning that the years since immigration have a positive effect on the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany. Because the values shown in table 4 are harder to interpret than was the case with the cohort effects, the graph in figure 5 that resulted from the model will be used to interpret the changes.

The reference arrival cohort is 1960 and had an average level of Feeling German of .50 ($p < 0.05$). The linear age term shows that with every year an immigrant is in Germany longer (years since immigration) the level of ‘Feeling German’ increases with $\beta = .09$ (SE $9e^{-2}$, $p < 0.05$) indicating a positive age effect. When including the quadratic age term, it resulted in a negative coefficient ($\beta = -.2e^{-2}$ SE $4e^{-3}$) indicating that the increase in Feeling German slows down and the effect of years since immigration on feeling German becomes smaller. The effect however, is bigger than the effect of the linear age term. When looking at figure 5 it is visible that this change in effect happens between 10 and 15 years since immigration. After adding the cubic term, the age effect became positive again with $\beta = .3e^{-4}$, SE $7.59e^{-6}$. The size of the coefficient indicates that the positive effect becomes visible later on in the life course of the immigrants. Indicating that the years since immigration has a positive effect again. Figure 5 shows this change in direction happens around the years between 30 and 35 since the immigration of the immigrants.

In addition, model 5 included an interaction between the cohorts and the age term. However, as can be seen in table 4, even though the interaction effect was significant, it only increased the overall $R$-square conservatively. This is not in line with the expectation that the years since immigration might have changed across successive cohorts.

5. Discussion and conclusion

This study examined whether the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany has changed over time. In order to investigate this age and cohort analyses were conducted. Immigrant integration and host national identification have proven to be controversial topics in many Western European societies (Maliepaard, Lubbers & Gijsberts 2009; Norris & Inglehart 2012). Especially since the rise of right-wing parties that promote anti-Islamic attitudes (Ibid.), and the increase in the use of transnationalism by the immigrants (Ehrkamp 2005). The literature shows contrasting directions when elaborating on the integration of immigrants and whether transnationalism stands in the way of it. However, reasoning by
Ehrkamp and Leitner stating that the notion that transnationalism enables immigrants to also maintain ties with their home country while also simultaneously investing in their new country, which makes them complementary rather than mutually exclusive, and therefore does not stand in the way of their integration of the first arrival cohorts was mainly used (2003).

In addition, many different approaches to integration policy have been implemented throughout the last few decades. Whereas the Germans initially did not expect the immigrants to integrate because they would turn back to Turkey (Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung 2018a), this gradually changed into the policy that promoted multiculturalism and eventually changed into the policy discourse of full adaptation and integration. Not only the integration process and public discourses have been turbulent, the meaning and definition of citizenship have changed through the years as well. Germany had been one of the stricter Western European countries when it comes to granting citizenship to (Turkish) immigrants and their (grand-)children for decades in comparison to other European immigrant countries such as the Netherlands and France (Miller-Idriss 2006). The literature also showed that citizenship became less about politics and more about the emotional and cultural meaning of belonging to the country (Bowen, Bertossi, Duyvendak & Krook 2011). Which made it harder for the Turkish immigrants to comply to that and ‘earn’ the citizenship. However, Germany changed the laws in 1999 granting citizenship to German-born children of immigrants (FFO 2019). Nonetheless, the public discourse on belonging to the country had an influence on the national identification of the first-generation immigrants.

These findings of earlier researches have led to a set of two expectations, which were tested with the statistical analyses. The hypotheses were as following: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases with successive cohorts, due to a well-established (transnational) Turkish community upon their arrival which leads to expect a negative cohort effect (H1). The second hypothesis stated: The national identification of first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases over time, which leads to the expectation of a negative age effect (H2).

The results from the multivariate model pointed out that first of all, there was change present in the course of development of the national identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany as was expected. The direction, however, was not as expected. The negative cohort effect stated in hypothesis 1 was not present. In contrast, the cohort effect is positive. This led to the rejection of the first hypothesis. When explaining this contrasting result it is important to consider how the expectation of the first hypothesis came to be. The literature showed that
the first arrival cohorts initially did not integrate or invest in their lives in Germany due to their expectation of a temporal stay. However, as the decision of staying in Germany changed the situation, the immigrants started actively investing in their life in Germany by practicing transnationalism. This meant they actively maintained ties with their home country while also building a new life as an immigrant in Germany. This resulted in the establishment of a well-founded Turkish community, which was highly visible in the German cities they lived in (Ehrkamp 2005). The immigrants combined their Turkish identity with their life in Germany and created a new social space for themselves. This led to the expectation that, even though the initial arrival cohorts may have started at a low level of national identification, they developed a positive trend later on. For successive cohorts the expectation was that they started at a low level of national identification and had a different course of development of national identification than the previous cohorts. This was due to a well-established Turkish community in Germany upon their arrival. As Martinovic and Verkuyten showed in their research, citizens have the need to belong to a certain group that shares a certain identity, and this helps them give meaning to life (2012). I argued that for successive cohorts this meant that they felt more belonging to their ethnic group, that was already well-established and visible in society. Now that the results show the contrary is true, it is interesting to develop a line of reasoning to explain this. It could be argued that transnationalism was not the right concept to construct a hypothesis for a cohort effect. It could be that the transnational practices of the initial arrival cohorts worked the other way around. Meaning that instead of them interpreting the well-established Turkish community as a way to lean towards the familiar, they got inspired to invest in a life there as well. Even though the integration process was not used to formulate the first hypothesis, it could explain why the cohort effect is positive. There is a considerable chance that the full integration policies that were later implemented had a positive effect on the successive cohorts and their national identification. Despite the statement by Simonsen (2016) arguing that the integration policies result in a contradiction as hostile attitudes of some natives and the stricter rules of the new policies made the immigrants feel less as a citizen of Germany and made them turn to their ethnic groups even more. It was also stated that the acceptance of the native population is an indicator on how well the immigrants perform in society (Fischer-Neumann 2014). It could be argued that, even though literature shows otherwise, the later arriving cohorts of Turkish immigrants did feel like they were being accepted, as the stricter policies made them take language courses and taught them on the German culture. It could well be that these new criteria to become a German citizen, did not push the new arriving Turkish immigrants in the
direction of their own ethnic groups. Simonsen (2016) stated that the integration of the Turkish immigrants was viewed as a failing process, however, the cohort effect shows the immigrants do feel increasingly more German.

This leads to my conclusion that the transnational practices and the full integration policies resulted in a positive cohort effect and the successive arrival cohorts do not develop a lower sense of national identification because of it.

The second hypothesis stated: The national identification of first- generation Turkish immigrants in Germany decreases over time, due to societal factors such as hostility from the host society and the increasing disapproval of their culture and religion. Leading to the expectation of a negative age effect. The results from the multivariate model pointed out that, despite the expectation, the age effect is positive. This again resulted in the rejection of the hypothesis. It is important to go back and take a look at the development of this expectation in order to get a better understanding of the contradicting results.

The integration process of the immigrants was the core concept in developing the reasoning behind the negative age effect. As the literature showed, the integration of immigrants has become one of the central topics in societal debates (Duyvendak, Pels & Rijkschroeff 2009; Slootman & Duyvendak 2015). There have been quite some changes in the directions of integration policies (Ersanilli & Koopmans 2011). The new policies mainly focused on civic integration and the adaptation to the host society (Ramm 2010). This led to the narrative that the immigrants had to adapt to the German culture and leave their ethnic heritage behind (Ibid.). But as shown, the immigrants were heavily invested in transnational practices (Ehrkamp & Leitner 2003; Ehrkamp 2005) by the time these new rules were implemented. This also resulted in a great deal of the native population to interpret the new social space of the immigrants as parallel societies in which they did not have to invest in their integration into the German society (Ramm 2010). Germany tried to keep the cultural hegemony with the introduction of these new integration policies (Ibid.).

Another shift in attitudes towards the immigrants that led to expect a negative age effect, was the increasing hostile attitudes towards the religion of Islam (Maliepaard, Lubbers & Gijsberts 2009; Norris & Inglehart 2012). According to Ramm (2010) this led the immigrants to be perceived as Muslim immigrants, instead of just immigrants. The alleged failed integration process was now partly attributed to their religion (Ibid.).

This is all led to expect that the immigrants did not increase their national identification, despite the fact that some of them had spent decades living in Germany. However, as mentioned before, the age effect turned out to be positive. One of the reasons for
this effect could be that, as mentioned before, the integration did have a positive influence on the level of national identification of the immigrants. Given the fact that the immigrants now had to learn the German language and conform to more rules that were designed to make them part of the German society, it could well be that it worked. Another reason could be that the transnational practices resulted in a social space that was not a parallel society in which the immigrants did not feel the need to integrate. As Ehrkamp (2005), the immigrants cannot solely engage with their own community without interacting with the native German society. The possibility of this effect to be quite large is plausible in a way that the immigrants, after spending years in Germany, engaged with the native population in such frequencies that it positively affected their national identification. It could also be that the sometimes-hostile attitudes from the natives have not been of such magnitude that it affected the Turkish community as a whole.

It should, however, be noted that these conclusions, even though well substantiated, are not backed up by the statistical analyses because they were not included. Which brings us to the next section.

5.1 Limitations of the study
Even though this study aimed to contribute to the academic debate on migration and host nation relations while making use of a high-quality dataset, it contains some shortcomings.

Firstly, the research did not include the second-generation population in its analyses. The inclusion could have made generational changes more visible and would lead to the addition of more respondents and observations.

Secondly, the theoretical framework provided substantiated arguments why transnationalism and integration have an effect on national identification. Nonetheless, they were not included as variables in the analyses. The incorporation of these control variables may have resulted in a higher overall fit of the models. Which leads to the third limitation.

There were no control variables included in the study. Because the study did not differentiate between males and females, or high and low educated immigrants, there were no control variables added in the models. The inclusion of these variables may have provided a more substantiated argument on the changes in national identification and how they may differ for men and women, or highly educated immigrants versus low educated immigrants.

Adding up, the sample consisted of Turkish immigrants arriving in Germany between 1960 and 2009. However, the initial guest-worker population were recruited until the 1973. Family unification resulted in a wave of family members entering Germany until
approximately 1995. After that the arriving immigrant population may have had very
different reasons to migrate, which could have led to very different answer patterns on
national identification. The Kurdish-Turkish refugees for example. Being a refugee might
have led to a different development of national identification than the previous cohorts of
immigrants. It is important to distinguish the immigrants included in the sample in order to
better explain the results.

To conclude, further research should take into account that flows of Turkish
immigrants may differ in their reasons to migrate and therefore may develop a different
course of national identification. Also, the inclusion of the second-generation of Turkish
immigrants could provide a clearer change in generations and cohorts. Furthermore, the
addition of control variables could help differentiate between men and women and how they
may differ in their national identification, which could be a valuable contribution.

5.2 Conclusion
In conclusion, as this research tried to amplify the course of development of the national
identification of Turkish immigrants in Germany in order to contribute to the discourses on
immigrant and host society relations, it becomes clear that various factors have an influence
and it is rather complex. The expectations derived from the literature suggested negative
relationships for both the age and cohort effects on the national identification of the Turkish
immigrants/. This, however, was not backed up by the data. This could have implications for
the ways in which countries develop their narrative surrounding the immigrants and their
integration process, transnational practices and citizenship. As the Turkish immigrants show
an increase in ‘feeling German’, it implies that, even though the reasons to suspect a decrease
in national identification, the immigrants feel increasingly at home in Germany.
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7. Appendix

Appendix A.

Figure 2: Predicted life course and cohort trends of German national identification of Turkish immigrants.

Appendix B.

Figure 3: Predicted life course and cohort trends of German national identification of Turkish immigrants.
Appendix C.

Figure 4: Predicted life course and cohort trends of German national identification of Turkish immigrants.  
## Appendix D.

**Table 3.** Random effects GLS models 1, 2 and 3, predictions of Feeling German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1e-2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.9e-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>.99*</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>1.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>1.14*</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
<td>1.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x Age</td>
<td>-.3e-3*</td>
<td>-.2e-3*</td>
<td>-.3e-3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.9e-4</td>
<td>.4e-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x Age x Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>.3e4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.7e-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>10 150</td>
<td>10 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>2 186</td>
<td>2 186</td>
<td>2 186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>