

# Social realities of everyday multiculturalism

*Personal narrations of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish  
migrants on their everyday life in Germany*

---

**Thesis for Bachelor of Science Tourism  
Wageningen University & NHTV Breda**

By Hanne Wiegel

Student no. 910630949020

Submitted on June 25, 2014

Supervisor: Dr Karin Peters

# THESIS TITLE PAGE

Thesis title: Social realities of everyday multiculturalism

Subtitle: Personal narrations of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants on their everyday life in multicultural Germany

Author name: Hanne Wiegel

Bachelor degree program: Bachelor of Science Tourism

Educational Institute: NHTV Breda University of Applied Science and Wageningen University

## **Authorship statement**

I hereby declare that this thesis is wholly the work of Hanne Wiegel. Any other contributors have either been referenced in the prescribed manner or are listed in the acknowledgements together with the nature and the scope of their contribution.

Where I have consulted the published work of others this is always clearly attributed. Where I have quoted from the work of others the source is always given. A list of the references used, is included. An appropriate referencing style is used throughout. With the exception of such quotations this thesis is entirely my own work. I have read and understand the penalties associated with plagiarism as stated in the Student Charter.

## **Declaration of Partial Copyright**

I hereby grant to NHTV Breda University of Applied Science ("NHTV") and Wageningen University ("WU") the non-exclusive, royalty-free right to include a digital copy of my thesis and associated supplemental files ("Work") in the Library Catalogue at NHTV. NHTV and WU may use, reproduce, display, convert, sublicense and distribute the Work for purposes of a scholarly or research nature, in any format and any medium, without prior permission or charge, provided that the Work is not altered in any way and is properly acknowledged, including citing the author, title and full bibliographic details. (Note: this corresponds to the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives, or CC BY-NC-ND Creative Commons license)

I further agree that NHTV and WU may keep more than one copy of the Work for purposes of back-up and security; and that NHTV and WU may, without changing the content, translate, if technically possible, the Work to any medium or format for the purpose of preserving the Work and facilitating the exercise of NHTV and WU's rights under this license. I understand that work deposited in the NHTV Library Catalogue will be accessible to a wide variety of people and institutions - including automated agents - via the World Wide Web. Copying, publication, or public performance of the Work for commercial purposes shall not be allowed without my written permission.

While granting the above uses to NHTV and WU, I retain copyright ownership and moral rights in the Work, and may deal with the copyright in the Work in any way consistent with the terms of this license, including the right to change the Work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the Work in whole or in part, and licensing the content to other parties as I may desire.

I represent and warrant that I have the right to grant the rights contained in this license and that the Work does not, to the best of my knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright. I have obtained written copyright permission, where required, for the use of any third-party copyrighted material contained in the Work. I represent and warrant that the Work is my original work and that I have not previously assigned or relinquished the rights conferred in this license.

Date: June 24, 2014

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "H. Wiegel". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped 'H' and a long, sweeping tail on the 'l'.

## ABSTRACT

This research explores the experiences young 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants living in Germany have made with everyday multiculturalism. A special focus is laid on how this multiculturalism is reflected in different social layers, how it influences their feelings of belonging and the self-perception of their role in society. By conducting semi-structured interviews with five 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants, it was found that the interviewees generally perceived mundane multiculturalism as positive, but were aware of negative discourses and prejudices against immigrants prevalent in some layers of the German society. These were also partially reproduced in self-identifications and descriptions of other individuals with a migration background. It was illustrated how practices of *othering* are sometimes employed by both native Germans and the interviewees to distance themselves from each other, as well as to create a distance to other individuals of Turkish background. Social networks were found to include individuals with similar education levels and interests rather than those of Turkish descent. Despite often presenting the Turkish and German culture in dichotomous terms, the interviewees combined aspects of both cultures in their self-identifications through processes of negotiation, which led to individual hybrid conceptions of these cultures. The research's findings indicate the complexities of the interviewees' feelings of belonging.

*Keywords: 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, Turkish migrants in Germany, everyday multiculturalism, difference, belonging, identity, othering, social networks*

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	3
The multiculturalism approach to immigration .....	3
A discussion of the concepts ‘identity’, ‘ethnicity’ and ‘culture’ .....	4
Everyday Multiculturalism.....	7
Leisure spaces and social network formation in the multicultural society.....	11
Chapter 3: Research Context.....	13
Chapter 4: Research Question.....	19
Chapter 5: Ontology & Methodology .....	20
The philosophical approach to knowledge construction .....	20
Data collection and analysis .....	20
Limitations of this research .....	21
Short overview of the research participants.....	22
Chapter 6: Living with Everyday Multiculturalism – and analysis of the different social layers.....	25
The wider society – everyday multiculturalism and everyday discrimination in Germany .....	25
The interviewees and their wider social environment.....	33
The social networks of the interviewees.....	36
‘Elements of Turkishness’ in everyday life .....	42
The interviewees’ perceptions of themselves and their belonging to the Turkish and German society .....	46
Practices of othering throughout the different social layers .....	52
‘Everyday difference’ as a constraint and a resource .....	54
Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion.....	55
Answering the research question.....	58
Recommendations for future research .....	59
Policy implications.....	60
References.....	62
Appendix.....	66

## Chapter 1: Introduction

“The approach of multiculturalism has failed, has absolutely failed” – this provocative verdict was announced in October 2010 by German chancellor Angela Merkel to describe the contemporary situation in Germany, a country which has attracted immigrants since several decades (“Merkels Multikulti-Absage”, 2010). Such utterances are not new in the German political sphere, especially not by members of the rather conservative Christian Democratic Party. Despite all the political debates, however, the question remains what such statements actually mean for the everyday life of German citizens, many of whom have non-German roots, in an environment where the multiplicity of cultures has become a matter of course.

The largest group of immigrants in Germany is of Turkish origin. Today, about 2.5 million individuals of Turkish descent live in Germany, and a significant proportion has taken up German citizenship (Şen, 2003). The presence of this group dates back to the 1960s and early 1970s, when large numbers of young Turkish males were invited to work in Germany in the course of the guest worker program. Of these, many have subsequently decided to settle permanently in Germany together with their families, instead of staying only temporarily as initially (and naively) intended by the German government (Şen, 2003). Today, about 50 years after the guestworker programme, the presence of German citizens of Turkish descent has become an integral part of everyday life in Germany, and the demographic composition of the immigrant group has changed significantly over the years. Many of the individuals of Turkish descent now living in Germany were in fact born in Germany, and can be counted as 2<sup>nd</sup> or even 3<sup>rd</sup> generation migrants.

Although academic research about Turkish migration to Germany has been established for a long time, only from the 1990s onwards these new generations have been of interest for academic research (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). While most of these studies have focused on aspects of structural integrations, such as educational success or occupational attainments of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants, socio-psychological aspects such as feelings of belonging, self-identification and perceptions of their role in the German society have been somewhat neglected (*ibid.*).

This so far rather limited insight of the social realities of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants in Germany is unfortunate, as scholars like Colombo (2010), Noble (2009) and Werbner (2013) have found that 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants have unique abilities to live and communicate within multicultural contexts, such as in Germany. This is, according to these scholars, a result of growing up between two cultures: In many cases, 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants learn about the culture of their origin and its norms, values and traditions through their parents or larger family, while at the same time they socialize into the society of the immigration country through educational institutions and social contacts outside the home. Because of this experience, this generation of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants is “accustomed to complexity and

interchangeability of languages and models to the continuous moving between [social] contexts characterized by different rules” (Colombo, 2010, p.459). This ability, Colombo (2010) argues, is an important resource in the culturally complex societies of our globalized world, as the ability to flexibly adapt to, understand and communicate within different socio-cultural contexts is necessary.

To study how 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants in Germany make use of their abilities to negotiate different contexts, the approach of everyday multiculturalism is particularly appropriate. This approach is about “how cultural diversity is experienced and negotiated on the ground in everyday situations” (Wise & Velayutham, 2009, p. 18), outside of pre-determined categories of ethnicity and belonging. This allows to observe how individuals deal with and combine different feelings of belongings. Of special interest is here how wider social, cultural and political discourses are reflected in the interactions of individuals and their individual perceptions of themselves and their role in society. Using this approach, the social realities of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants and their experiences with multiculturalism in quotidian situations can be studied.

The general research objective of this research is to present subjective accounts of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants about their everyday life in the multicultural German society. These narrations shall serve to analyse how everyday multiculturalism is reflected in different aspects of their (daily) lives, as well as how their Turkish roots and the dominant discourses about Turkish migrants in Germany influence their perception of themselves and their role in the society.

The outline of this paper is as follows: Chapter two, following this introduction, gives an overview of the relevant literature about everyday multiculturalism, such as the origin of this approach, its main aspects and concepts, including everyday discrimination, the special role of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, the importance of place and context-dependency. Furthermore, the role of leisure spaces and theories on social network formation in the multicultural society shall be described.

Thereafter, in chapter 3, the research context is described. This includes a brief summary of the immigration history of Turkish individuals to Germany, a description of the political perspective on this development as well as of the opinions common in the (native) German public and media, an overview of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation of Turkish migrants in Germany, their structural integration and persisting inequalities as well as a brief account of counterpublics in Germany that challenge the dominant discourses about Turkish migrants.

Based on these two chapters and the research gaps identified, the specific research focus is determined, including a range of aspects that shall be considered in the data analysis.

In chapter 5, the methodology section, the philosophical approach to knowledge creation taken in this study is explained, followed by a description of the acquisition of research participants, data collection and analysis and a range of limitations which are a consequence

of the chosen methods. The last part of chapter 5 contains a brief description of the five research participants, which aims to enable the reader to better understand the individual contexts of the interviewees.

Chapter 6 contains an extensive description, analysis and discussion of the five different narrations collected during the interviews; thematically ordered so as to demonstrate how identity and belonging are integrated in different social layers, such as the wider society, social networks and the family. In the last chapter, the main findings of this study are discussed conclusively, the research question is answered and some recommendations for future research and policy design are given.

As a last point in this introduction I want to make two remarks about the terminology used in this paper: By referring to individuals whose parents migrated from Turkey to Germany as '2nd generation Turkish migrants', I do not aim to reduce them to the migrant status and neglect other demographic or personal characteristic that are considered more important for their self-definition; instead, this shall only be considered as a simplification of speaking. Furthermore, the term 'migrants' is used in the denotation of 'individuals with migration background' to describe that the individuals themselves or their close ancestors (i.e. parents or grandparents) have migrated to Germany. With this, I do not mean to exclude such individuals from being full members of the German society, but rather want to highlight that in some cases these individuals might have different sets of norms, values and beliefs compared to native Germans, that influence their self-perception and self-identification.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

In this chapter, the relevant concepts for this study, namely multiculturalism, identity, ethnicity and culture, difference, everyday multiculturalism and everyday racism, as well as theories about the special role of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants in multicultural societies and the formation of social networks in multicultural contexts shall be explained and discussed. Furthermore, current policies and practices are described and analysed. The chapter ends with an overview in how far these concepts and themes are relevant for the study at hand.

### ***The multiculturalism approach to immigration***

Multiculturalism is a policy approach employed by the governments of some immigration countries which is not based on the necessity of homogenization of differences into the dominant society, but is a framework that valorises diversity over homogeneity (Stratton & Ang, 1994). Ang (2014) defines multiculturalism as the more or less harmonious and "peaceful coexistence of multiple ethnic groups and communities within the nation"



(p.1184) that leads to “unity in diversity” (*ibid.*, p.1185) in immigration societies, which are basically considered as conglomerates of equal ‘ethnic’ communities (Zhou, 1997; Wimmer, 2004). Frisina (2010) describes multiculturalism as a form of place-sharing: the framework “implies layers of ethnically different individuals” co-inhabiting urban environments (Wise, 2005, p.172).

Multiculturalism as a discursive tool might be either demanded in a bottom-up manner by minority groups who perceive themselves as excluded from the dominant society (as for example in the USA) and who use it to claim their space (Stratton & Ang, 1994; Pardy & Lee, 2011), or it might be used as a macro-theoretical approach in a top-down manner, e.g. in form of policies, as in Australia where inclusion of ‘ethnic’ minorities traditionally used to be an essential part of the national immigration policy (Stratton & Ang, 1994; Wise, 2009).

Under policies of multiculturalism, immigrants are encouraged and expected, sometimes even forced (Stratton & Ang, 1994), to ‘keep their ethnicity alive’ and to preserve ethnic traditions and differences over generations (Wimmer, 2004). Thereby the groupist thinking is retained by presuming that ‘ethnic communities’ are stable, clearly defined, internally homogeneous and externally bounded groups (Wimmer, 2004; Brubaker, 2002, in Ang, 2014). According to Ang (2014), the expectation that differences are ‘kept alive’ might lead to identity pressures, and the continuous reinforcement of cultural differences and retention of ‘ethnic’ groups even generations after the actual migration (Ang, 2003) “exalts racial and ethnic pride at the expense of social cohesion” (Stratton & Ang, 1994, p.124) by favouring the preservation of different cultures in subgroups rather than creating a feeling of togetherness in the whole society.

Furthermore, it was observed that the theoretical equality of distinct ‘ethnic’ groups does not hold true in practice. Instead, these groups and communities seem to compete about the ranks in the hierarchy closest to the dominant group (Pardy & Lee, 2011); for example, in the case of Australia, the Anglo-European white Australians. Summarizing these critiques, Pardy and Lee (2011) claim that multiculturalism is both a descriptive and a prescriptive tool. Its most controversial aspect is the normative encouragement for ‘cultural maintenance’ and the separation of ‘ethnic groups’ (*ibid.*), which are maintained from below and from above (Ang, 2014).

## *A discussion of the concepts ‘identity’, ‘ethnicity’ and ‘culture’*

### Identity

The concept of identity is difficult to encapsulate in a single definition as there are diverging opinions about what it exactly includes. Nevertheless, there seems to be an agreement that identity is a highly significant concept. Most of the times, identity is understood as “a sense of the self” (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006, p.71). This is created in a sense making

process, which, as several scholars have recognized, is highly influenced by the surrounding environment (Baumeister, 1986). Identity, it seems, exists thus only in relation to the different layers of society, social networks, family etc. Consequently, identity development can be considered as a dynamic interplay between the core, i.e. 'the inner self', and the context (Grotevant, Dunbar, Kohler, & Lash-Esau, 2000).

Erikson (1968) argued that there are two types of identity, the personal identity and the social identity. Whereas the personal identity comprises personal beliefs and values that differentiate the person from others and make him/her a distinct individual, social identity refers to the incorporation of elements from groups one is part of. This includes ideas, values, norms and behavior that one adopts due to his/her belonging to the group. According to Schwartz, Montgomery and Briones (2010), a part of social identity is also the cultural identity as it refers to "a sense of solidarity with the ideals of a given cultural group and to the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors manifested" (p.6). With regard to migrants, Phinney (1990) has argued that "individuals may have independent identities with respect to their cultures of origin and to their societies of settlement" (in Berry et al., 2006).

For the sake of simplification, in this paper the term identity is used mainly in terms of self-identification.

### Belonging, Ethnicity and Culture

In academic literature on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, the concept of 'ethnicity' is highlighted as a crucial factor influencing the individuals' identity and sense of belonging (Ang, 2003). Belonging is understood by Ang (2003) as a connection with others, a self-identification as being part of a bigger group. In the past, scholars assumed that belonging would be exclusive, such as national belonging (Noble, 2013), whereas in contemporary research scholars recognize the possibility of multiple belongings (Colombo, 2010).

The concept of 'ethnicity' is defined as "a process of construction or intervention which incorporates, adapts and amplifies pre-existing communal solidarities, cultural attributes and historical memories" (Zhou, 1997, p.982) and is understood as a boundary, be it steady or blurry, between the immigrant and his/her descendants, and the receiving society (Alba, 2005). 'Ethnicity' is often perceived as an intrinsic characteristic (Colombo, 2010) and is used both by governments and institutions as the determining feature which lays at the base of the creation of bureaucratic 'ethnic' categories, as well as by individuals belonging to 'ethnic communities' (Ang, 2003).

The concept of culture is employed by multiculturalism scholars like Colombo (2010) as similar to that of ethnicity, or sometimes even as synonymous. It might be used to describe manifestations of ethnicity, such as social behaviour, traditions and customs, but also norms, values and ideas. Significant criticism has challenged the conservative understanding of culture as something pure and steady. Contemporary scholars acknowledge that culture is

always hybridized (Stratton & Ang, 1994; Colombo, 2010), constantly recreated and changing, and that its spread is not identical with national borders (Zhou, 1997).

In this research, the concept is used mainly with a very similar denotation as ethnicity.

### Criticism to these concepts

The concepts of ethnicity and culture, which are the underlying elements of the multiculturalism framework, have been heavily criticized for being too static. This rigidity reinforces the division between different 'ethnic groups' in a multicultural society (Ang, 2014), for example when individuals are expected to behave according to their 'cultural ethnic heritage', however this is interpreted. Referring to his research in the United States, Zhou (1997) remarks that "seeing migrant cultures as American microcosms of other nations, however, involves overlooking the historically dynamic nature of all cultures" (p. 993), and also presumes the prevalence of national cultures. Indeed, the essentialist view on ethnicity neglects that culture and ethnicity are by no means the natural, homogeneous entities as they are often represented in dominant discourses in politics and academic literature. Instead, these differences and boundaries between 'ethnic groups' are constantly and actively (re-)created (Colombo, 2010), both on the individual, societal and institutional level (Alba, 2005) and hence also constantly evolving and changing (Colombo, 2010). Therefore, 'ethnic groups' can be considered as imagined communities (Ang, 2003).

Wimmer (2004) claims that ethnic/cultural differences are not necessarily relevant in everyday life and quotidian practices of immigrants. He argues that instead 'ethnicization' is taking place mainly due to the discourses of exclusion manifested in the 'integration policies' of (para-)state institutions (*ibid.*). This creates strictly defined, ethnicized groups that are understood to be outside of the (non-ethnic) receiving society (*ibid.*). For example, policy-designing and governing institutions in Western Europe often categorize migrants and their descendants primarily based on ethnicity (Ang, 2003; Wimmer, 2004), neglecting other aspects of possible categorization that in fact would be equally or more important to the targeted individuals. Wise and Velayutham (2009) pointedly state that "objectification in terms of a single ethnicity [or culture] is often experienced as a kind of 'boxing in', which excludes other identities felt to be more important, such as age, subculture, gender" and so forth (*ibid.*, p.6) and ignores the complicated interplay between these factors (Wimmer, 2004). Furthermore, by focusing merely on containing ethnical differences, no or only little attention was paid to the development of relationships across these ethnical or cultural differences (Wise & Velayutham, 2009).

It has been found that the current discourses of 'ethnicity' and 'culture', as well as the multiculturalism framework based on these discourses fail to adequately capture "how [ethnical/cultural] diversity is experienced and negotiated on the ground in everyday situations" (Wise, 2009, p.2) in the culturally complex societies of our time (Noble, 2009). Semi et al. (2009) observe that there exists a gap, if not even a clash, between interpreting the political discourse of 'ethnicity' and the "empirical recognition of diversity within

contemporary societies” (p.66) in terms of dynamics, tensions, intentions and meanings of those who produce the difference in everyday mundane situations. This might be because in the political discourse ‘ethnicity’ and ‘culture’ are considered as pure, steady, and exclusive in terms of belonging, whereas individuals living in multicultural societies experience a far greater diversity and creatively adapt different cultural elements. Hence, Semi et al. claim that the debate is too often taking an “ideological character” (2009, p.66) rather than attempting to represent the social realities in society, and that ‘ethnicity’ and ‘culture’ should be seen in “processual and relational terms” rather than in essentializing, categorical terms (Ang, 2014, p.1186; cf. Semi, Colombo, Camozzi & Frisina, 2009), since these categories are not adequate to represent real groupings of belonging (Ang, 2003).

### ‘Difference’ as the answer to the critiques of ethnicity and culture

Based on these critiques, the concept of ‘difference’ was developed to replace the category ‘ethnicity’ in the debate around migrant incorporation and everyday life in internally diverse societies. The ‘difference’ describes a person’s “specific baggage” that constitutes the basis for his/her identity (Colombo, 2010., p.456), but instead of only considering the individual’s ethnicity, ‘difference’ additionally incorporates factors like gender, age and religion (*ibid.*). Furthermore, unlike the conservative notion of ‘ethnicity’, ‘difference’ is not considered to be an intrinsic characteristic of a person, it is “not derived from ontological conditions of a natural or transcendental nature” (Semi et al., 2009, p. 68). Instead, ‘difference’ develops through practices and performances in a social environment (Wise, 2009) and exists thus, like identity, only in relation to the social environment.

‘Difference’ is ambivalent and can be both a political constraint and a resource, a tool for claiming power as well as a stigma (Colombo, 2010; Semi et al., 2009), and its meaning is very much determined by the specific, situated context (Colombo, 2010). In everyday practice, this ‘difference’ becomes an important element in constructing social realities and the meanings attached to these in embedded, specific situations of social interaction (Colombo, 2010), and hence, when analysing ‘difference’, the focus has to be on the banal and mundane situations in everyday routine where such situations can be found.

### *Everyday Multiculturalism*

The study of “how cultural diversity is experienced and negotiated on the ground in everyday situations” (Wise & Velayutham, 2009, p. 18), based on the sociology of everyday life, including ethno-methodology, everyday social orders and rituals, social interactionism and so forth, has been coined ‘everyday multiculturalism’ (*ibid.*). This approach focuses on situations where individuals and groups with “different values and normative frames of reference” (Semi et al., 2009) co-habit the same social space and experience ‘interethnic’ interactions and encounters in an unreflected manner on a daily basis in everyday routine (cf. Werber, 2013; Wise, 2009; Wise & Velayutham, 2009). Instead of focusing on ‘ethnic

groups' as bounded communities, everyday multiculturalism takes a decentralized view and aims to analyse the areas where different individuals meet, interact, come into conflict and practise exchange (Semi et al., 2009). To be able to gain a deeper understanding of what living in multicultural societies means to different persons, the emphasis in everyday multiculturalism is on micro-practices, individual processes and personalities rather than on generalizing categories such as 'ethnic groups' (Semi et al., 2009; Wise & Velayutham, 2009).

Scholars of everyday multiculturalism study how 'difference' is constructed in these daily encounters, how it is practiced, utilized and contested, by whom, for whom, in what context, with what aim and with which results (Semi et al., 2009; Wise & Velayutham, 2009). Thereby, the performative nature of 'difference' is highlighted (Semi et al., 2009). "Examining these practices and relations allows us to explore the ways in which cultural complexity gets negotiated, the ways difference and sameness participate in the processes of exchange" (Noble, 2009, p.47); and hence, everyday multiculturalism can be considered as a grounded approach to understand individuals' lived experiences of diversity (Wise & Velayutham, 2009). According to Semi et al. (2009), there are three dimensions of analysis in the study of everyday multiculturalism that are equally important, namely practices, context and subjective experiences. Just as the original multiculturalism framework, everyday multiculturalism is a category of both analysis and practice (Wise & Velayutham, 2009), but avoids the prescriptive character of the multiculturalist policies established in a top down manner.

Although the analysis of everyday multiculturalism focuses on the micro-sociology of embedded contexts, these situations are not merely simplified fragments of the macro-context; they are neither isolated nor independent of it (Semi et al., 2009). Instead, by looking for reoccurring patterns on the different levels, it is analysed how wider social, cultural and political discourses as well as structures are translated down to these micro-contexts (Wise & Velayutham, 2009) and therefore impact the actions and attitudes of the individuals in their banal, everyday routines.

In short, this approach can be understood as an attempt to grasp the social realities of individuals who experience and practice everyday multiculturalism on the ground, without employing pre-set, rigid categories of ethnicity and belonging.

### Everyday Racism

An underlying assumption of the everyday multiculturalism approach is that the social co-existence of ethnically/culturally diverse individuals fosters familiarity with differences, interaction despite cultural differences and thus a negotiation of these differences. Despite this positive stance, however, it should not be neglected that in multicultural societies also stereotypes, discriminating practices and racism can be created through social tensions (Wise, 2005), which develop through regular encounters.

According to Essed (1991, p.50, in Velayutham, 2009), “everyday racism is the integration of racism into everyday situations through practices (cognitive and behavioural) that activate underlying power relations. This process must be seen as a continuum through which the integration of racism into everyday practices becomes part of [...] what is seen as normal by the dominant group”, hence, it becomes naturalized. This reinforces and thereby confirms the underlying power relations that exist between the different groups within one society (Velayutham, 2009). Ranging from name-calling and jokes to insulting remarks, deeply-rooted distrust and stronger forms of discrimination, everyday racism takes multiple forms (*ibid.*) and demonstrates at a very quotidian level that everyday multiculturalism does not eliminate intolerance against the allegedly ethnically different, and that categorizations are still often made along ethical/cultural lines. Also, the analysis of mundane discriminating practices shows the complex hierarchical power relations between the different ethnical/cultural groups within a multicultural society. Hence, while emphasizing the positive aspects of multicultural co-existence, one should not ignore the mundane mechanisms that (re-)create a distance between individuals of different backgrounds.

#### The special role of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants

As described above, everyday multiculturalism is about the social co-existence of various individuals that differ regarding their age, gender, social class, origin and several other factors. Noble (2009) identified that especially 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants possess the abilities to live and communicate successfully in multicultural contexts. As the descendants of first generation immigrants, these individuals have often spent the largest part of their lives in the receiving country, have obtained their education in that country and have been socialized in the local society, while at the same time being aware of their parents’ cultural background. Because of this experience, these individuals are “accustomed to complexity and interchangeability of languages and models to the continuous moving between contexts characterized by different rules, to links and interconnections that go beyond the nation-state or local context” (Colombo, 2010, p.459). They often identify with or feel a belonging to two or more cultural heritages and are confident in acting in different milieus and dealing with different social groups in society (Noble, 2009).

In his qualitative research on the everyday realities of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrant teenagers in Italy, Colombo (2010) found that ‘ethnic differences’ were considered as an “important element in constructing social reality” in concrete situations of everyday-life social interactions (*ibid.*, p.458), but nevertheless individuals have much agency in interpreting the ‘difference’ and in adopting it flexibly to the specific conditions in the conviviality of everyday multiculturalism. He found that his interviewees considered it as more important to fit the specific context than to display one strong, exclusive belonging. Werbner (2013) supports that by stating that having multiple identities does not necessarily imply a ‘painful contradiction’ as assumed for example in the assimilation theory, because identity matters in context (*ibid.*).

Despite these findings, in academia and politics this group of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants is still often considered as marginalized and confused in their feelings of belonging (Colombo, 2010). However, recently a number of scholars have recommended to instead focus on the positive aspects of such multiple belongings: The ability to move between social groups, to equally understand, interpret and communicate in different social contexts, and to quickly adjust to them should be seen as a resource rather than a disadvantageous condition (Werber, 2013; Colombo, 2010), especially in the culturally complex societies in the contemporary globalized world.

To combat negative encounters in everyday multiculturalism, such as everyday racism (see above; Velayutham, 2009) and multiple inequalities (Werber, 2013), 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants are observed to employ their 'difference' as both tactical and strategical resources for resistance and negotiation (Zhou, 1997). Tactics refer to individual actions by exploiting a temporary opportunity in order to achieve short-term effects (Zhou, 1997; Semi et al., 2009), whereas strategies are genuine, well-planned challenges to the prevalent power relationships that legitimize the dominant frames (Frisina, 2010). Through tactics or strategies, 'difference' can also be employed by 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants as a political tool to claim the legitimacy of their presence (*ibid.*), to gain power and recognition as well as access to decision making processes. Colombo (2010) found that 'difference' was either downplayed or emphasized, depending on the context, to demonstrate the "firmness or shakiness of the boundaries separating 'Us' and 'Them'" (p.463) and was thus flexibly employed to achieve one's goals, often reactive to a specific situation (Stratton & Ang, 1994). This illustrates how young 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, consciously or not, are able to adapt to various contexts, interpret their difference in relation to the surrounding environment and utilize it when it is of advantage.

### The importance of place in everyday multiculturalism

An aspect not discussed so far, but of utmost significance for everyday multiculturalism is the importance of spatial embedding (Semi et al., 2009). In the paragraphs above, the importance of the specific context in which the social encounter is taking place has been emphasized several times, and now it is time to link situational and spatial context. The urban context, especially metropolitan areas that constitute "worlds of strangers, rather than foreigners" (*ibid.*, p.79), are typical settings of 'difference' and everyday multiculturalism, as there "otherness is perceived as continuous presence" (*ibid.*, p. 74).

The encounters typically take place in mundane places of 'difference' in the culturally complex societies, such as streets, neighbourhoods, schools, churches and other places (Pardy & Lee, 2011; Wise & Velayutham, 2009; Noble, 2009), the so-called "contact zones" (Wise, 2009, p.21). There is a disagreement in academic literature as to how far these places need to be scripted, i.e. specifically designed for these encounters to take place. Ang (2014) and Werber (2013) argue that for example public space and multicultural public housing are typical places for everyday multiculturalism as they trigger physical proximity of individuals

from diverse backgrounds. Semi et al. (2009) speak of the 'grammar of place': streets and buildings need to be constructed as frames that imply the encounters that will inhabit these spaces in interaction with the physical environment (p.79). Amin (2002, in Wise, 2009), however, claims that such 'scripted places' cannot enforce a 'togetherness', but that it is rather the "micro-publics of workplaces, schools, youth centres, sport clubs and gardens", which, as sites of interdependence, facilitate engagement and negotiation (p. 40).

These diverging opinion show that more research is necessary to gain a better understanding of the importance of space in the everyday life in multicultural societies, as this might improve urban geographers' and city planners' possibilities to create places that trigger mundane multicultural interactions and thus contribute to improving social co-existence in culturally diverse locations.

### *Leisure spaces and social network formation in the multicultural society*

#### Leisure spaces as spaces of everyday multiculturalism

Following Amin's argumentation, it becomes clear that next to educational institutions and work, leisure places are an important part of people's lives where everyday multiculturalism is experienced and practiced (Amin, 2002, in Wise, 2009). However, the multiculturalist research conducted so far in leisure settings is very limited (Harinen, Honkasalo, Ronkainen & Suurpää, 2012). This is astonishing since leisure spaces, especially in organized forms, can be conceptualized as places of civic education, peer membership and active citizenship and constitute significant spheres of life (*ibid.*). In Wise and Veluyatham's book on everyday multiculturalism (2009), which was certainly path-breaking in this field of study, only two articles were included that deal explicitly with leisure activities as settings of everyday multiculturalism: One is Sherman's chapter about multiculturalism in a Brooklyn bodybuilding gym, where she ethnographically explores the construction of power relations across ethnical differences (Sherman, 2009). Goodall et al.'s chapter, on the other hand, focuses on different fishing habits displayed around Georges River, Australia, and how diverse groups of migrants and non-migrants attach meaning to them. Furthermore, it is explored how the activity of fishing is considered to be out-of-place, how it is used as a claim of belonging and how it is utilized to 'produce locality' (Goodall et al., 2009).

Apart from these chapters, only few academics have focused their research on everyday multiculturalism in leisure. One of the exceptions is for example Peters (2011), who conducted research on the importance of public space, such as shopping streets and parks, in multicultural neighbourhoods. Also Harinen et al. (2012) attempt to close this gap in research: Without employing the specific conceptualization and wording introduced by everyday multiculturalism scholars, Harinen et al. (2012) have explored how 'multicultural youth' (describing their varying ethnic backgrounds and their utilization of multiculturalism



as a strategy to counteract ethnic inequalities) experience leisure participation in Finland, especially in terms of spaces of leisure (*hang-around* places and organized sport clubs being the most popular ones) as well as obstacles to leisure participation (especially prejudices of peers and organizers as well as the oppressive pressure to 'similarity' in local youth cultures). What they do not focus on, however, is how the 'difference' might be utilized in a positive way by the 'multicultural youth', which remains a subject to explore.

### The formation of social networks

Colombo (2010) and Wimmer (2004) both mention the importance of social networks for overcoming 'differences'; however, they do not elaborate on how these are constructed in leisure settings which, according to Harinen et al. (2012), are just as important as the educational and professional spheres that have been much focused on in research.

Several theories have been developed about the construction of social networks of migrants. Based on semi-structured interviews with 39 first generation immigrants to the United States, Stodolska (2007) developed the framework of ethnic enclosure which describes how a number of push factors (such as lack of knowledge of the local culture, lack of language skills, experiences with discrimination and fear of the unknown) as well as pull factors (similar (immigration) experiences, common culture) favour ethnic enclosure, i.e. the creation of in-groups consisting exclusively of members with the same ethnic background (*ibid.*). This ethnic enclosure has both positive consequences, such as emotional comfort, economic benefits and the avoidance of discrimination, as well as negative consequences, such as delayed assimilation, difficulties in acquiring language skills and problems with securing employment and advancement at the work place. These consequences in turn influence the causes, i.e. the push and pull factors, which lead to ethnic enclosure. A range of broader factors, such as societal, personal and ethnic-group particularities, condition the scope of ethnic enclosure (Stodolska, 2007).

Hence, according to Stodolska, ethnicity and culture are the major factors influencing the construction of social networks. For the development of her framework, she took a conservative stance on the concept of ethnicity, as her basic assumption is that ethnicity is stable, pure and clearly distinguishable from other ethnicities/cultures.

In contradiction to Stodolska (2007), Wimmer (2004) claims that "ethnic group formation is only one possible dimension of social reality" (p. 26), and that other social or demographic factors might be of equal importance in the creation of social networks. By studying group formation patterns in immigrant neighbourhoods in Switzerland, he found that in the everyday lives of immigrants, even among those who experienced migration at a later stage of their lives, sharing the same 'ethnicity' is not necessarily a pivotal factor for feeling connected to other individuals. Instead, he claims that groups are also formed among gender, professional/occupational and especially social class lines (*ibid.*), as these are more meaningful in determining "similar cognitive dispositions and similar networking strategies of people that occupy a comparable position in the social space" (*ibid.*, p. 31). Being in a

social network with other individuals of the same ethnic background might, according to him, rather “result from everyday pragmatics of adaptation rather from a conscious strategy of ethnic enclosure” (*ibid.*, p.18). Hence, without denying that social networks are often constructed along ethnic or cultural lines, Wimmer (2004) highlights that there are more factors influencing the formation of social groups than those identified by Stodolska (2007).

### Conclusion

In the paragraphs above, an overview was given of the conceptual and theoretical roots of the everyday multiculturalism approach, which result from the critique of the rigid understanding of ethnicity employed in the original conception of multiculturalism. Thereafter, important concepts and aspects concerning the everyday multiculturalism approach have been introduced, such as everyday racism, the specific role of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, their multicultural practices, complex feelings of belonging as well as their utilization of their ‘difference’, the importance of place in general and leisure spaces in particular for everyday multiculturalism and, last but not least, different theories about social group formation in multicultural societies.

From the gathered information about the origin and characteristics of the everyday multiculturalism approach, it can be concluded that many aspects need further research in order to gain deeper insights into their specific importance for the everyday life in multicultural societies. Of special interest is here the interplay between the different factors, such as everyday racism, complexities of belonging and the utilization of ‘difference’ by 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants, and how exactly wider power structures and political, social and cultural discourses influence individuals living in multicultural contexts in the different social levels (Wise and Velayutham, 2009).

Together with the following chapter, in which the research context is identified and described, this literature review serves to determine the specific focus of this study and how the data is collected and analysed.

## **Chapter 3: Research Context**

### History of Turkish migrants in Germany

Turkish migrants constitute the largest foreign population in the European Union (Şen, 2003). The majority of them, 2.5 million in 2009, live in Germany (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2012), many of whom were born and raised there. Of those 2.5 million, which make up 3.1% of the total German population, about half a million has obtained German citizenship (Şen, 2003).

The presence of high numbers of Turkish migrants in Germany dates back to 1961, when in the course of the temporary *Gastarbeiter* (guest-worker) programme young men from Southern and South-Eastern European countries moved to Germany to meet the demand for low-skilled workers in production sites like car manufacturers (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). Most Turkish work migrants came from central or northern Anatolia, mainly from villages, and prior to their migration had obtained only little education (*ibid.*). The guest worker programme lasted until 1973, and a total of 910,500 Turkish migrants came to Germany, the majority between 1971 and 1973 (*ibid.*).

The global oil crisis in 1973 led to an economic downturn in Germany, which resulted in a stop of the official *Gastarbeiter* programme (Şen, 2003). Then, a period of family reunification migration started, during which the wives and children of the Turkish guest workers also migrated to Germany. Furthermore, the majority of the Turkish guest workers who had not married prior to their migration to Germany also married spouses from their home country, which resulted in another wave of migration due to family formation (*ibid.*). Hence, even after the stop of the guest worker programme, migration from Turkey to Germany continued for about two decades, and significantly changed the demographic structure of the formerly male-dominated migrant group.

In the 1980s, also politically motivated migration from Turkey to Germany increased rapidly as well, especially for ethnic Kurds, whose situation in Turkey had worsened significantly. Nowadays, about half a million Kurds live in Germany, of whom 90% have their roots in Turkey (Şen, 2003).

Initially, the guest worker programme and thus the presence of Turkish work migrants in Germany were designed to be of temporary nature. However, several factors such as better education for their children and limited possibilities back home in Turkey prompted many guest workers to prolong their stay in Germany, until after some time, returning seemed more and more unlikely (Şen, 2003). The increasing size of the Turkish communities in Germany furthermore allowed for building up an infrastructure that “provides for the special demands and needs” of Turks in Germany (*ibid.*, p. 293): Mosques as well as Turkish shops, newspapers, TV channels, organizations and cultural services were established (Şen, 2003), which again made life in Germany more comfortable.

### The political perspective on Turkish migrants in Germany

Since the 1960s, the German government adhered to the conviction that Germany was not an immigration country, a view rooted in the initially temporary nature of the *Gastarbeiter* programme (Pécoud, 2002). Hence, the social consequences of mass immigration had not been considered adequately (Şen, 2003), which caused educational institutions, public authorities as well as health services to be not well-equipped for the new kind of clients. Many of the contemporary problems are especially linked to the ageing 1<sup>st</sup> generation of Turkish migrants, who often do not find appropriate elderly care in Germany (Şen, 2003).

The German policy applied to the incorporation of migrants is that of assimilation. Interestingly, in German language the term *Integration* (integration) is widely used; however, as Ehrkamp notes, “German language conceptions of immigrant integration are thoroughly rooted in US conceptions of assimilation” (2006, p.1675). The assimilation discourse describes the absorption of ethnical diversity into the predominant, often ‘national’, culture, the diminishing of diversity (Ang, 2013; Zhou, 1997) and the unquestioning erasing of difference in favour of conformity (Wimmer, 2004; Pardy & Lee, 2011). Initially based on observations of the assimilation of Western European migrants to the USA, it has been the “dominant model for immigrant incorporation in [...] Europe since the early 20<sup>th</sup> century” (Ehrkamp, 2006, p.1674; Zhou, 1997). According to the prescriptive aspect of the assimilation model, migrants are expected to homogenise into the receiving society, which is based on the two underlying assumptions that certain ‘cultures’ are inferior to others, and that ‘cultures’ are internally homogeneous (cf. Zhou, 1997; Frisina, 2010; Stratton & Ang, 1994).

However, what exactly is expected by Turkish migrants’ *Integration* (or assimilation) is also contested within German politics: some politicians claim that knowledge of the German language, acceptance of the German constitution and political culture are sufficient, whereas others demand that migrants should adhere to the *Deutsche Leitkultur* (‘German guiding culture’) by adopting Christian occidental culture (Ehrkamp, 2006). One politician even claimed there would be no space for “multicultural arbitrariness” (*ibid.*, p.1679) in the German society. Although differing in the ‘extent’ assimilation is demanded, all these exclamations show how “assimilation discourses allow naturalization of the native majority’s identities and realities” (*ibid.*, p.1677), which creates social norms that “become a convenient mode of dealing with immigrants without disturbing the identity of the majority” (*ibid.*, p.1678).

This conviction was also for a long time reflected in the Germany citizenship law: As this was based on *ius sanguines*, the ‘right of blood’, even individuals born in Germany to Turkish parents did not automatically obtain German citizenship and had to undergo lengthy naturalization procedures at a later stage in life. Hence, institutional exclusion was also manifested in German law (Alba, 2005). The 1998 social-democratic government finally acknowledged that Germany had indeed become a country of immigration, and ever since immigration debates are on the political agenda (Ehrkamp, 2006). In 2000, the citizenship law was changed and individuals born in Germany receive double citizenship until the age of 23, after which they have to decide for one (Alba, 2005).

### Opinions in the German public and media on Turkish migrants in Germany

Among the German public and in the media, similar discourses on immigrant assimilation can be found. Interestingly, or rather fatally, *Integration* is often constructed in opposition to what is perceived as ‘typical Turkishness’. According to Ehrkamp, this makes assimilation almost impossible and is used as a justification for deeming Turkish migrants “unassimilable”

(2006, p.1678) or even “one of the toughest groups to integrate” (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003, p.970). Scholars argue that such resentment might be rooted in non-migrant Germans’ fear of Turkish migrants’ Muslim background and the religious devoutness of some (Şen, 2003), which is a contrast to the secularization ideology dominant in Germany (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2012). Fleischmann and Phalet (2012) observe that in the EU’s (and also in Germany’s) discourse of immigration assimilation, religion is commonly represented as an obstacle to assimilation which has to be overcome, and it is thus no surprise that it is especially debated about the visibility of Islam (such as the construction of a new mosque etc., cf. Kuppinger, 2014), when German xenophobia is displayed openly (Ehrkamp, 2006). Since 2001, when it became public that an al-Qaeda cell in Hamburg played a key role in planning and organizing the attacks of 9/11, suspicion and resentment towards Muslims, a group which Turkish migrants are generally counted to, have increased (Ehrkamp, 2006; Stehle, 2012).

Another dominant issue linked to Turkish immigrants was the observation of an increasing development of immigrant neighbourhoods from the 1970s onwards (Stehle, 2012), in German politics a highly problematized process called ‘ghettoization’ (Ehrkamp, 2006). This is widely presented as a lack of *Integration* (assimilation) from the migrants’ side (*ibid.*) and linked with a threat to social cohesion and security (Stehle, 2012). However, as Ehrkamp’s research has revealed, increasing resentment of native German citizens towards Turkish migrants or Germans with a Turkish background have strongly contributed to this ‘ghettoization’, by causing discrimination in the housing market and a personal reluctance among native Germans to interact with the ‘foreigners’, like Turkish migrants are still called (Ehrkamp, 2006; Stehle, 2012; Şen, 2003). Hence, although the German government is eager to place discrimination and racism “on the periphery of society” (Stehle, 2012, p.169), intolerance towards individuals with non-German roots might also be found in the German mainstream society.

This resentment of the German public towards Turkish immigrants is fuelled by the media, where immigrants are typically presented as “problems” (Inthorn, 2007, in Stehle, 2012, p.169). The German mainstream media, including newspapers, magazines and TV channels, tends to generally represent Turkish immigrants and Muslims in negative terms, and frequently links them to fundamentalists and terrorism, which increases “prejudices, fear and unease towards Muslims in Germany” (Richter and Hafez, 2009, in Stehle, 2012, p.169) and to Turkish immigrants or Germans with Turkish descent, as they are generally assumed to be of Islamic faith. Stehle claims that such individuals have “typically appeared as objects rather than subjects” (2012, p.930), and the focus is mostly directed on honour killings, the headscarf debate and generally oppression of women in Islam, rather than on differentiated and subjective accounts of their lives in Germany.

According to Ehrkamp’s findings, the “failure of the German society to come to terms with its immigration reality” (2006, p.12) is one of the main causes of today’s problems. Multiculturalism, she claims, needs to be accepted as normal, and efforts have to be made

on both sides (not only among the Turkish immigrants) to make social co-existence possible (Ehrkamp, 2006). This is according to her inevitable in order to accept the transformation of the German society to a multicultural society (*ibid.*).

Despite all claims for migrants' assimilation to a 'German occidental Christian' culture, multiculturalism is a "social fact that emerges in places where people live with cultural plurality as an inevitable consequence of a globalized world, where mundane, everyday bodily engagement with cultural difference is not negotiable" (Pardy & Lee, 2011, p.300). To promote the realization of multiculturalism within the German society and to change the common representation of ethnic minorities, several local and city governments have started campaigns, which also aim to counterbalance xenophobia and nationalistic ideals among native Germans (Pécoud, 2002) and to show that Turkish immigrants and their offspring are an integral part of the German society.

### The Turkish guest workers' descendants: the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation in Germany

As Turkish migration to Germany began more than 50 years ago, there are today also numerous 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> generation Turkish migrants, or, if naturalized, Germans of Turkish descent. The research specifically focussing on these generations developed in the 1990s (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). According to the classical assimilation theory, the successive generations are typically more assimilated than their parents, especially as their socialization and education have been taking place in the immigration country (Zhou, 1997). Diehl and Schell (2006) therefore argue that time and generational succession are needed for the successful *Integration* (i.e. assimilation) of migrants. In the following paragraphs I attempt to provide a short overview of studies conducted to measure the structural assimilation of especially 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants.

Şen, (2003), for example, highlights that through being educated in Germany, most of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants have overcome the language barrier that was and continues to be wide-spread among their parents' generation. As the typical guest workers was rather low-educated and came to Germany for manual production work, his achievements in the German labour market after the end of the guest worker programme were rather limited. The 2<sup>nd</sup> generation, however, is increasingly moving towards jobs that require higher levels of education and training (Şen, 2003). However, there are still structural inequalities:

Compared to France, Belgium and the Netherlands, the gap between the educational achievement of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants and native Germans is bigger, which can be attributed to late schooling, relatively few contact hours and early selection for the higher education track which are characteristic of the German education system (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). Hence, 2<sup>nd</sup> generation immigrants are following mainly lower-level secondary education and are underrepresented in the highest secondary education level, the *Gymnasium*.

However, as 60% to 75% of the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants receive a vocational training in the apprenticeship system, there is a relatively smooth transition to the labour market, where Turkish migrants have a secure position (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). Pécoud (2002) also highlights the importance of the 'Turkish economy' for Germany, and the high number of self-employed individuals with a Turkish background which has significantly increased in the last years (Şen, 2003). Nevertheless, Şen (2003) notes that unemployment is in general a major problem in the German economy, and that immigrants and their descendants tend to be affected over-proportionately by economic downturns. This inequality, he suggests, is the result of ongoing (structural) discrimination and insufficient vocational skills.

Although most research has focused on the structural integration of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, some scholars have also analysed their so-called social assimilation: Regarding interpersonal relations, Diehl and Schnell (2006) have found that the percentage of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants who have at least one non-migrant German among their closest relations is up to 60%, which is significantly higher than for the 1<sup>st</sup> generation migrant. Hence, the authors claim, members of this generation are contributing to building relationships across 'ethnic' differences (Şen, 2003), which is also reflected in an increasing number of bi-national marriages. This is, according to Diehl and Schnell (2006), a sign for increasing assimilation through generational succession (Zhou, 1997), and might be seen as an indicator that especially 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants are an integral part of German society.

### Challenging the dominant discourses: counterpublics in Germany

Aspects that have not yet found much attention in academic literature are the everyday experiences of Turkish migrants in Germany, and their multiple, creative ways to contest the popular representation of migrants as a "problem" (Stehle, 2012), to challenge the reductionist categorization as 'Turks' (with all the stereotypical connotations attached to it) even generations after the migration, and to criticise the predominance of conservative assimilation theories and the various hostilities many experience in their everyday lives. By collecting in-depth interviews with 28 bloggers of Muslim belief (the majority of whom were of Turkish descent), Stehle (2012) found that online blogs constitute alternative space where such individuals that are often excluded from mainstream public media are able to "contest mainstream representation, offer oppositional counter-discourses, and engage with the public sphere [and thereby] represent an emerging counterpublic that hopes to challenge the hegemonic structures represented by German mainstream media and society" (p.168). These blogs are furthermore spaces that allow for self-definition and "self-representation that [is] denied [...] within the German public sphere" (*ibid.*, p.173), where fixed stereotypical identities, which mainly focus on the migration status, are typically ascribed by dominant discourses. Hence, through the use of media marginalized individuals create an active counterpublic and thereby contest the dominant discourses about Turkish immigrants in German society, and claim the right for self-definition outside the 'Turkish-German' dichotomy.

This short overview of the research context, the 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants in Germany, allows concluding that although these individuals have for a long time been part of the German society and are increasingly becoming structurally integrated in terms of educational and occupational achievement, there are still structural inequalities, often triggered by prevalent and actively re-enforced discriminating discourses. These have to be overcome in order for the second generation Turkish migrants to become fully accepted members of the German society.

## Chapter 4: Research Question

What is remarkable in academic literature on Turkish migrants in Germany, or Germans with Turkish backgrounds, is the generalizing nature of many of the studies. The Turkish community (in terms of the sum of individuals with a Turkish background in Germany) is often presented as homogeneous, although there are significant differences and internal conflict between groups of certain age or generations, the area of origin, the religious and political orientations as well as between Kurds and Turks (and again subdivisions within these groups) (Ehrkamp, 2005). Furthermore, there has been much focus on structural integration, citizenship issues and the role of Islam for assimilation, whereas other aspects of social life have been neglected. Therefore, it is necessary to learn more about the socio-psychological importance the 'migration background' has for individuals, how their 'ethnicity' is reflected in their daily lives, especially in their leisure time outside of educational institutions and work. This can serve to develop adequate policies and measures to improve the social co-existence of different group in the multicultural German society. Hence, qualitative research is needed to learn more about the personal social realities of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants in Germany.

Furthermore, little research has been conducted about positive examples, where co-existence works more or less smoothly due to the everyday pragmatics of living together in culturally diverse neighbourhoods. Here, the everyday multiculturalism perspective could prove appropriate to analyse how conviviality works in specific situations, and what lessons could be drawn from those to be applied in more conflict-laden areas.

To address these shortcomings in current literature, I want to focus this research on how 2<sup>nd</sup> Turkish migrants living in German urban areas experience everyday multiculturalism. Through analysing the narrations on everyday social realities of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants in Germany with a special focus on everyday multiculturalism, I aim to illustrate how everyday multiculturalism is reflected in different social layers, and how their Turkish background is influencing the research participants in these different layers.



The following aspects, which are derived from the literature review and context analysis, shall be considered in the analysis: the interviewees' experiences and practices of everyday multiculturalism, their abilities of flexible adaption to various contexts, their awareness of social problems in the German multicultural society, experiences of everyday racism, the use of stereotypes and the dichotomous discourse of 'Turkish' and 'German', the composition of their closer social networks and leisure activities, individual complexities of belonging and how their 'difference' impacts them in each of the different social layers, as well as how it is utilized as a (political) tool in everyday life.

## **Chapter 5: Ontology & Methodology**

### ***The philosophical approach to knowledge construction***

The perspective on knowledge construction taken in this study is that of social constructivism. According to this approach, there is no objective reality beyond the human mind (Weber, 2004) and hence no definite knowledge; instead 'social reality' is only a projection of individuals' consciousness. The goal of this approach is to understand as much as possible how knowledge is constructed in specific circumstances by different individuals rather than simply explaining generalizable facts (Smith, 1998). In the constructivist perspective it is realized that science is never neutral nor value free, that it is on the contrary affected and shaped by the researcher's previous experiences and values.

In this approach, an emic (insider) view on the research object is taken, i.e. social phenomena are described using the categories, perceptions and concepts of the research participants (Smith, 1998). Regarding qualitative data collection through for example interviews, it is acknowledged that not only research participants but also the researcher himself/herself has agency power which influences the data collection. As researcher and research participant act in relation to each other (Smith, 1998), the researcher affects for example what is said during an interview simply through his/her presence.

Applied on this specific study, taking the approach of social constructivism means that the subjectivity of the personal narrations is recognized, and that the aim of this research can only be to gain an understanding into the specific situations the participants of this research describe, and not to derive generalizable results.

### ***Data collection and analysis***

This study can be considered as explorative, as its main aim is to gain a better understanding of the social realities of everyday multiculturalism for young 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants in

Germany. Based on the information about everyday multiculturalism, ethnicity, feelings of belonging, difference etc. described in the literature review and context description, it was decided to conduct semi-structured interviews for this study. Semi-structured interviews are “interviews with an interview guide containing primarily open-ended questions that can be modified for each interview” (Adler & Clark, 2011, p.487). This was deemed the most suitable method as it enables the researcher to obtain specific data on a variety of topics, while allowing for situational flexibility and adaptation to the individual research participant (*ibid.*). The interview guide was developed based on the literature review and covered the aspects of self-identification and belonging, difference, everyday multiculturalism, leisure as well as politics, media and representation. The interview guide can be found in the Appendix.

Interviewee acquisition was carried out through convenience sampling (Adler & Clark, 2011), as all of the five research participants are friends of the researcher’s friends or acquaintances. The only selection criterion was that the research participant is part of the demographic group of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish immigrants. Because of the convenience sampling, all interviewees are relatively young, with their age varying from 21 to 27. The interviews were conducted in places of the interviewees’ choice: Two interviews were conducted at the research participants’ homes, one at a café and two via the internet using the program ‘Skype’. The interviews lasted between 1:15 and 1:43 hours, and were transcribed verbatim after all five interviews had been completed.

For the data analysis, open coding was applied: In the first step of analysis, the interview transcripts were analysed paragraph by paragraph. Inductively, open codes were applied in order “to identify recurring ideas and categories” (Eckert & Chadha, 2013, p.931). Thereafter, these open codes were ordered according to the different topics (such as belonging, self-description, upbringing, etc), an intermediate step that had to be undertaken considering the broad variety of aspects covered in the interviews. In the last step these codes were analysed for reoccurring themes, which are to be analysed and discussed in the next chapter.

### *Limitations of this research*

Based on the above-described research methods and the perspective on knowledge construction, this research has the following limitations:

#### Based on the ontological approach

The constructivist approach used in this research implies that all data collected are subjective narrations which cannot be generalized to a broader group. However, as this was realized from the beginning of the research project, this is not necessarily a limitation of this study. Using the constructivist approach implies recognizing that the researcher is neither passive nor neutral, but actively influences the research participant through his presence or, in case of semi-structured interviews, also through the formulation of questions and the choice of topics covered. This is termed the interviewer effect (Adler & Clark, 2011).

That the role of the native German, non-Muslim researcher has clearly influenced the interviewees is reflected in some remarks made during the interviews, some more explanatory (as it was not expected that the researcher is aware about certain religious rules), others more in form of requests to empathize into specific situations. However, it is not possible to exactly determine to what extent the researcher has influenced the narrations through presence and questions.

### Sampling and interviewees

As mentioned before, the scope of this research is very limited, including only five interviewees who fulfil the criteria 'young second generation Turkish immigrant'. All of them received an above-average education, compared to other individuals matching these demographic criteria, and are thus not representative. This is a consequence of the sampling method: as convenience sampling was chosen to acquire potential interviewees, no criteria were applied on selecting the interviewees apart from the requirement that they match the above-mentioned demographic characteristics. It has to be kept in mind that this has certainly influenced the results of this research, as the interviewees were very reflected about the importance of their Turkish roots in daily life, and two have already conducted academic research on related topics.

### Data collection

As this study is part of a bachelor thesis project, the researcher has not yet gained much practical experience in undertaking individual research projects, especially not in this field of study. Despite a sufficient theoretical background and some practical experience collected in a variety of smaller research projects, this study proved as a major learning experience for the researcher. Therefore, it might be argued that the last three of the five interviews were somewhat better structured and collected more information than the first two, as the researcher became more experienced with the topic itself (i.e. which questions of the original interview guide to focus on most) and with the methodological and empathic skills needed for conducting interviews.

These limitations have equally affected this research and the quality of the results, although again it has to be highlighted that it is impossible to determine exactly to what extent. What measures could be taken up to avoid or minimize these limitations in future research shall be discussed in the last chapter.

## *Short overview of the research participants*

Before the chapter on the analysis and discussion of the collected data starts, a short overview with background information about the five research participants is given to enable the reader to better understand individual contexts described in the following chapter.

### 1<sup>st</sup> interviewee:

Serhat<sup>1</sup>, male, is 21 years old and is studying for his bachelor degree. Originally from a small town, he is now living in a bigger German city to attend university. His family is originally from South East Turkey. His mother, daughter of a guestworker, came to Germany around the age of twelve, his father after his marriage at the age of 25. The religion of Islam has been an important part of Serhat's upbringing, as it has become an important part in his parent's lives, especially after their migration. Although he does not practice his religion actively at the moment (i.e. no regular prayers, no fasting during Ramadan etc.), Serhat sees himself as a religious Muslim.

At birth Serhat obtained Turkish citizenship, but changed to the German citizenship when he was in his early teens. His upbringing was bilingual, with mostly Turkish spoken within the home (but not exclusively), and German in the social institutions of education (kindergarten, schools) and with peers. Hence, he is fluent in both languages, although according to his own account, his German language skills are noticeably better than his Turkish language skills. Serhat used to play soccer regularly, although he is not playing in a club anymore, and likes meeting and going out with friends. The family owns a house in their Turkish hometown and pays regular visits to the part of the family living in Turkey, as well as doing touristic trips to different destinations in Turkey.

### 2<sup>nd</sup> interviewee:

Elif, female, 23 years old, grew up in a village and moved to a bigger German city for her studies after graduating from the local high school. She is currently following a master programme.

Her mother, herself a daughter of Turkish immigrants who came to Germany because the father found employment as a guestworker, was born in Germany and grew up in a very German environment, as Elif describes it. Her father was born in Turkey and lived with his grandmother until the age of ten, when he joined his family who had migrated to Germany earlier. Hence, both Elif's parents obtained their education in Germany. As most members of her wider family had moved to either Germany or Holland in the past, trips to Turkey were mostly for purely touristic reasons to popular tourist destinations rather than visiting relatives.

Elif is not fluent in Turkish, as her parents considered it more important for her to master the German language. Muslim religion did not play any significant role in her upbringing, and Elif describes herself as not religious. Elif considers her family to be rather modern. Next to her studies and work, Elif likes to hang out with friends, to go out from time to time, to do sports

---

<sup>1</sup> All names pseudonyms

(she has been in a handball club for 13 years) and to travel. By birth, Elif had the Turkish citizenship but changed to the German citizenship in her early childhood.

### 3<sup>rd</sup> interviewee:

Zeynep, female, 27, is currently working as a full time social pedagogue in a German metropolitan area. She grew up in a very catholic village, but left home with 21 and completed her bachelor and master studies in different German cities. She considers starting a PhD in the field of structural integration of migrants in the near future.

Zeynep describes herself as coming from a Turkish-speaking family. Her mother, daughter of a Turkish Anatolian guestworker who came to Germany in the 1960s, migrated to Germany in the early 70s at the age of 11. Zeynep's father came to Germany only after his marriage with her mother in 1980. For her parents, it was very important that their children would have a lot of interaction with native Germans to learn the language and get 'well integrated'. Zeynep describes herself as believing, although she is not practicing her religion in everyday life.

Zeynep obtained Turkish citizenship at birth, but applied for German citizenship when turning 18, as she thought this was necessary for becoming a civil servant. She likes to travel, especially to Turkey, both to visit family as well as to explore more of the country, and likes meeting friends and going to concerts.

### 4<sup>th</sup> interviewee:

Ayça, female, 24 years old, grew up in a mid-sized German town and moved to the Netherlands for her studies after graduating from the *Gymnasium*. She lives in one of the bigger cities in the Netherlands and is currently following a master programme.

Her father grew up in Istanbul, where his mother worked as one of the first female teachers appointed by Atatürk. He moved to Germany around 1970, when he was in his early twenties, in order to study there. After graduation, he opened his own business which is part of a larger Turkish corporation. Ayça's mother is native German and has no migration background. Since her parents separated, she grew up mainly with her mother, but had regularly contact with her father, and went on holiday with him and his second wife to Turkey every summer. During her bachelor studies, Ayça has spent one semester in Istanbul.

She is not fluent in Turkish. In her upbringing, religion was of no importance (neither Christianity nor Islam), and she does not consider herself as religious. Travelling is one of her favourite leisure activities.

### 5<sup>th</sup> interviewee:

Sedef, female, 24 years old, is currently following an apprenticeship in the tourism sector. She lives with her parents and three younger siblings in a relatively small German town. Her mother came to Germany at the age of five, when her father found employment as a

guestworker. Sedef's father came to Germany after the marriage to her mother. The family is of Alevi Muslim belief.

Sedef has both the Turkish and the German citizenship. She speaks Turkish almost fluently, as this is the language she mostly communicates in with her father. Although in her childhood the family has paid regular visits to relatives in Turkey, she has not been there for 14 years now. Her father, however, flies to Turkey regularly to visit his family. Her hobbies include meeting friends, cooking and baking.

## **Chapter 6: Living with Everyday Multiculturalism – and analysis of the different social layers**

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis are presented and discussed in the following order: Starting with an analysis of the interviewees' narrations regarding the positive aspects and problems in the wider multicultural German society, the discussion then focuses more and more on aspects directly connected to the interviewees' lives, such as their wider social environment, experiences with discrimination, their social networks and 'traces' of their Turkish roots in daily life. This serves to illustrate the complexities of belonging and self-identification, which are analysed and discussed in the last part of the chapter. By choosing this order, which was derived from the interviewees' narrations, I aim to emphasize how belonging and identification are nested in these multiple layers of society, such as family, peers, wider social environment and the society as a whole, and how the individual's complexities are a consequence of this embedded-ness into these different layers.

### ***The wider society – everyday multiculturalism and everyday discrimination in Germany***

#### **Positive experiences of everyday multiculturalism**

In the interviewees' narrations, the overarching theme concerning the social co-existence of people with different backgrounds in the German society is that this experience is considered to be very positive and enriching, yet normal and mundane. When asked about their opinions regarding multiculturalist societies, the interviewees used exclusively positive terms to describe this social phenomenon, which is termed *multikulti* in German colloquial language, such as interesting, great, beautiful etc. All interviewees agreed that such multiculturalism is a natural part of everyday life in Germany, which is most clearly visible in the appearance of streets. Several interviewees gave examples such as:

“Let’s assume, you walk through the city and there is the [Turkish] kebab shop next to the Italian restaurant, and next to it is the [German protestant] church” (Sedef, 24) or

“[My city] is completely *multikulti*. You can find everything here. Here, where I live, there is a kiosk on the street, which is owned by a Turk. On the other side of the road there is an Italian [restaurant]. Around the corner there is another Turk[ish store], and then a Greek [store/restaurant]. It is really mixed here. And on the main road there is a Chinese [restaurant], and so on... [My city] is really *multikulti!*” (Elif, 23)

Here, the examples given refer to the existence of shops and restaurants owned by people of different origins, who sell products or dishes considered typical for their region. The availability of such international stores and restaurants, and their location next to other international or German stores/restaurants/buildings are seen as indicators for multiculturalism by the interviewees. The ‘multicultural’ appearance of the street is understood as evidence for the presence of a multiplicity of distinct ‘cultures’ (Semi et al., 2009). The physical proximity of shops or restaurants from different parts of the world, possibly situated next to a church, is understood as an indicator that these ‘distinct cultures’ are interacting and altogether are part of the contemporary society. Multicultural streets with a variety of shops and restaurants, as also Duruz (2009) writes, “offer opportunities to cross culinary and cultural borders” and thus trigger an interaction between individuals with various backgrounds. Hence, such streets as described by the interviewees constitute the ‘contact zones’ (Wise, 2009, p.21) where multicultural encounters, be it with people or products from ‘distinct cultures’, are taking place.

Quite often, the interviewees also referred to food as an indicator of multiculturalism. Sedef answered the question about her understanding of everyday multiculturalism as follows:

“For me, this is when you can feel all the cultures simultaneously, or that [for example] a Turkish family sits at the table and eats Spaghetti. [...]. But I think the lines are blurring, what is typically Turkish, typically German, typically Italian... the distinctions are blurring, or at least the people are not aware anymore. Simply the things you eat; Mozzarella, that’s an Italian cheese, or you go to a café and eat Tiramisu, that’s also Italian. But you don’t notice it, the lines are blurring” (Sedef, 24)

Zeynep also referred to food as an indicator for multiculturalism:

“I think this [multiculturalism] is inevitable in our society, because everything is multicultural. I think in everyone’s fridge or in the kitchen you can find something multicultural, and food is where it starts to be multicultural. What is offered, not only the people you can see on the streets. I don’t always notice it, it simply is like that, we’re such a society and that [multicultural aspect] doesn’t

have any special meaning for me in my everyday life because it is normal. [...] But what I like is that when I walk through the streets here and see a mosque, I find it great that we've come so far that this is accepted. Of course there are many who are against it, unfortunately, but I really like that it works and everybody accepts it. I also like when I shop at the Turkish store and see very bourgeois [native] Germans there, or at the Asian store [...]. I really like that there are so many different people who shop at the same store because they like the cuisine.” (Zeynep, 27)

Here, both Sedef and Zeynep refer to this available variety of traditional dishes as ordinary and mundane, and highlight that their consumption is often happening in an unreflected manner. As Sedef emphasizes, people are often not aware that the food they consume has different cultural origins, but take this variety of products and dishes for granted.

The reason that for the interviewees food constitutes one of the most obvious examples of everyday multiculturalism might be its tangibility. The importance of food has also been recognized by Wise and Velayutham (2009), who devoted a whole chapter to this topic in their book on everyday multiculturalism. According to Duruz (2009), through the constant availability of food items from 'distinct cultures', traditional boundaries blur, which suggests “subtle movements between and within established [group] identity categories” (p.105). This blurring of boundaries is clearly reflected in the interviewees narrations, who state that people, although certainly appreciating them, take such varieties for granted and are hence not always fully aware of the multicultural character of their food consumption.

Being in contact with individuals of non-German origin has been an integral part of the interviewees' lives, and school classes, university seminars, sport clubs, social networks, shops and bars are examples of places where such encounters are usually taking place. Because of the internationality of public spaces, daily encounters, although mainly on a superficial level, are normality in German cities. This confirms that multicultural encounters typically happen in mundane places of difference and togetherness, where physical proximity and interdependencies trigger interaction and engagement (*cf.* Pardy & Lee, 2011; Amin, 2002, in Wise, 2009). Elif highlights that especially younger generations have grown up with such multiculturalism, and assumes they are generally somewhat more tolerant than older generations. This might be due to the fact, she assumes, that many of the younger generation individuals have friends or acquaintances with non-German background, which is increasing openness and tolerance.

Two interviewees mentioned that political decisions against multiculturalism are disconnected from reality, and that instead multiculturalism needs to be accepted as normality, as a 'social fact' (Pardy & Lee, 2011). Ayça compared anti-multicultural attitudes to “stubborn children”, i.e. to denying the obvious social realities. Frictions, all interviewees admitted, are an integral part of living in such contemporary multicultural societies; however, the dominating theme apparent in the narrations was that in general, social co-



existence of individuals with different backgrounds is “simply working” (Elif, 23) and is in most instances an enriching experience.

In conclusion, it can be stated that multicultural practices are normal and mundane for the interviewees, and are such an integral part of their everyday lives that often these practices are performed unconsciously and in an unreflected manner, which is according to Wimmer (2004) and Wise (2009) one of the characteristics of the everyday multiculturalism approach.

#### Awareness about problems in the multicultural society

Despite the mainly positive responses about their stances on mundane multiculturalism in Germany, all interviewees were very aware of the problems, conflicts and negative stereotypes that complicate and sometimes even hamper the social coexistence of individuals with different backgrounds. Considering the amount of time spent talking about these problems during the interviews, one can assume that it is an issue that emotionally affects the interviewees (although to a different extent). Consequently, a lot of data was collected about such issues; however, only the most frequently mentioned and most important issues shall be illustrated here.

According to the interviewees, there might be similar “mechanisms in power” (such as stereotyping, having prejudices, etc) in all immigration societies which lead to the social construction of a “problematic group”, consisting of the (allegedly culturally different) immigrants, which might be “rooted in a social fear of otherness” (all quotes from Ayça, 24). This, she assumes, is especially common among the older generation, as they usually have not been accustomed with cultural diversity since birth. Zeynep argued that one of the causes of certain negative attitudes against guestworker immigrants and their descendants might be rooted in a deficient realization of the government that it is their responsibility to clear the facts about the changed immigrant situation (instead of insisting that Germany is no country of immigration) and to promote openness and tolerance among German citizens. This, she argues, is also reflected in the inadequate policies that were implemented already from the beginning of the guestworker programme in the 1960s, such as insisting on the temporally limited stay of guestworkers in Germany and the creation of ‘ghettoization’. In her view this development, which was problematized as early as 1970 (Ehrkamp, 2006), is actively re-created today with the ongoing construction of new inexpensive urban districts where mainly non-native German families will find a home and socially deprived and economically underachieving individuals will agglomerate. Hence, according to her these mistakes are repeated, with all their negative consequences, due to a lack of learning from the past and short-sightedness from the public officials’ side.

#### Stereotypes and ‘typically Turkish’ behaviour

All interviewees seemed very well aware of the widespread negative stereotypes about Turkish individuals or Germans of Turkish descent living in Germany and outlined typical

characteristics during the interview. It was found that four interviewees also applied the stereotypes themselves at some points and thereby reinforced them.

According to this stereotype, the male *Klischeetürke* (stereotypical Turk) is a man who does not speak German well and his social environment consists mostly of other Turks. His job is rather low-paid, he might be counted as socially deprived and is dependent on German governmental welfare payments. He is very religious, suppressing his wife's and daughter's freedom of decision-making and forces them to stay mostly at home, and when out of the house, to wear a headscarf. Because his wife is even less able to communicate in German, she has to take her children, who learn some German in school, to all official errands and is very much dependent on them in the public sphere. The son has far more rights than the daughter, who basically "isn't allowed to do anything" (Sedef, 24). The children have very low grades in school, attend the lowest high school level and have few chances for a good, secure employment in the future. But the daughter is supposed to be married off early anyway, and the son will just rely on the social security system just like his father. Both are mostly hanging out with other Turkish children, the girls preferably wearing "blingbling" style (Ayça, 24) and the boys being little machos, who are impolite, disrespectful, sometimes violent and simply "asocial" (Sedef, 24).

This picture is the sum of all 'typical' characteristics of the *Klischeetürke* mentioned during the five interviews. It presents individuals of Turkish origin as unwilling to assimilate, as exploiting the German social welfare system and as caught in a strict and patriarchal system where women are systemically suppressed. As exaggerated this image drawn here might be, at least some aspects of this are wide-spread prejudices against fellow citizens of Turkish origin in the German society (Stehle, 2012). Four interviewees highlighted that they "know some Turks" who confirm this picture, and who might be seen as the 'culprits' of the creation and constant re-enforcement of this negative discourse. This might be also because, as Sedef puts it:

"I think this is like this everywhere, that the negative aspects are shown more often and rather stay in mind of the people than for example Turkish families that live a normal life, who are really integrated and... you also know that [...]. I think that the media and also many Germans, although I don't want to generalize here, but I think that... they have a negative image [of Turks]." (Sedef, 24)

According to her, the negative image individuals of Turkish descent living in Germany have in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* (loosely translated as dominant public sphere) is triggered by the misbehaviour of some persons, but is projected onto all individuals with Turkish roots. In her narration, feelings of anger towards such individuals who behave "asocial" (Sedef, 24) in public can be found. Furthermore, by describing not assimilated individuals indirectly as 'abnormal' (in contrast to the "normal", fully assimilated families), she reinforces the negative categorization and stereotyping.

Indirectly based on the conceptions of *Klischeetürken* is also the distinction between 'typically Turkish' and 'typically German', employed both by native Germans and those of Turkish descent, such as the interviewees for this research. 'Typically Turkish' is here not understood as negative as the stereotypical characteristics of Turks, and was also used by the interviewees to describe for example their own behaviour or that of their family. Nevertheless, it also contributes to a perception of an alleged incompatibility of the two cultures.

During the interviews, most respondents used the categories of 'Turkish' and 'German' as self-evident, distinct categories, but could not clearly define them on my enquiry. Nevertheless, the interviewees seemed to be aware of what is 'typically German' and 'typically Turkish'. Aspects that have been termed 'typically Turkish', either related to themselves or to others, are for example conservative notions about family and pre-marriage relations, religiousness, being respectful towards elders and especially the family, having many social rules and being strict, having close-knitted family ties and constantly being around other persons. On the other hand, 'typically German' aspects are being modern, not religious or taking religious rules not strictly, taking the freedom to go to festivals and ride motorbikes, the need for privacy, being distanced towards other people who are not very close to oneself and in general everything opposite to the description of 'typical Turkishness'.

As these aspects are certainly not enough to describe the contrast between the allegedly very distinct cultures, it is likely that there are more characteristics that the interviewees did not mention as examples, but which they are very aware of when making their judgement of whether something is 'typically German' or 'typically Turkish'.

### Practices of othering

The tendency that also the categories like 'immigrant' and 'Germanturk' (*'Deutschtücke'*) often have negative, pejorative connotations was observed by all interviewees. The use of such terms in politics, the media or by members of the *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* to categorize problematic groups was considered as undifferentiated and too generalizing, and several mentioned that often incorrect information or negatively exaggerated stories are connected to the use of such categories. Anger, sorrow and frustration are what the interviewees feel about such misrepresentations. Ayça criticized that these categories are employed for the "practice of *othering*", when different individuals of non-German or specifically Turkish descent are homogenized into one category based only on their common ethnic roots to create a difference to native Germans.

This is especially true when the religion of Islam is involved, as four interviewees highlighted. In German politics and media, Islam is widely associated with problems such as the suppression of women as well as stories about terrorists; however, this is, as several interviews emphasized, not quotidian Turkish reality. Sedef speculates that:

“especially when you are ... Muslim or Turkish or something like that [in Germany], that is a blatant difference. Then religion is involved. If someone came from Brazil, which is also a Christian country, than it would not be so blatant. They are also Christian. They might have some other traditions, as Christianity is also a little bit different in different parts of the world. But it wouldn't be such a blatant difference. With Turkish people, there is always the religion that comes into play, and that is alienating them [=native Germans].” (Sedef, 24)

According to her, there is a specific social fear in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* against the religion of Islam, which is projected to men and women of Muslim faith. As, however, in many situations ethnic Turkish roots are equated with Muslim faith, this fear might be even projected against all individuals with Turkish roots living in Germany, independent of their own faith and degree of religiosity. Sedef assumes that the fear of Islam might be rooted in insufficient knowledge about this religion and in how many different ways it can be integrated in everyday Muslim life. This leads to a lack of understanding of ‘normal’, everyday Muslim social realities in Germany and misrepresentations in media and politics might heavily influence the negative image about Muslim practices in everyday life which some native Germans have in mind.

In the German politics, media and in the *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, ‘Turkishness’ (associated with being Muslim) is often negatively connoted, which is especially severe as individuals of Turkish descent are not given any chance to be proud of their roots, which might cause identity conflicts, as Ayça noticed. Why, two interviewees asked, are the bilingualism and intercultural communication skills, which individuals with non-German roots who grow up in Germany acquire from early childhood onwards, not considered as an enrichment, as a gain for the wider society and as important skills in today's globalized world (as, one might argue, would be the case if for example Anglo-Saxon, French or Italian roots would be involved)? With younger individuals of non-German background, who have not yet internalized a more relaxed stance of this issue, one interviewee argues, this *othering* might lead to a reaction of anger about being excluded based on ethnic roots and not being accepted as a full member of the German society. Ayça supports that with her observation that she made when talking to a friend in Turkey:

“And with [her] I once talked and she said ‘well, there are these Turks from Germany who sometimes come here [= to Turkey], for a holiday, and then they speak Turkish and behave as if they were Turkish, but they are no *real* Turks’. And I know myself that we're sometimes also like that in Germany: well, the Turks, they are no *real* Germans. And then I thought: Man, this is a really awful situation when you are not really accepted as belonging to either of these two nations” (Ayça, 24)

She continues that especially as a child, you might not be aware of your *otherness* in relation to your native German friends, but if you are perpetually confronted with your *otherness* in a

negative way, you might at one point start to react on this. Being not fully accepted in neither of the societies might cause such strong inner conflicts that need to be expressed, and anger and violence are possible trajectories for that. This, again, confirms the negative stereotype of the angry, violent immigrant youth that is prevalent in some individuals of the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*. This 'vicious circle' of provocation, anger and confirmation of stereotypes was mentioned by three interviewees as one of the mechanisms causing problems and social tensions in the social co-existence of native Germans and descendants of Turkish migrants.

As already mentioned above, three interviewees argued that the negative perception of individuals of Turkish descent in the German society "developed not without a reason", and that they indeed know of people with Turkish roots who, although born in Germany or at least living there for many years, are not able to speak the language well, do not have (much) contact with non-Turkish people, and in case of the male youth, "behave asocial" (Sedef, 24). Especially the mastering of the German language as well as knowledge and acceptance of (but not necessarily assimilation to) 'German culture' were seen by all interviewees as basis for integration. However, they also emphasized that integration is an act of "giving and taking", and immigrants can expect to be met with tolerance and acceptance by the native German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*. This, the interviewees argued, is the basis for more or less conflict-free social coexistence in multicultural societies.

These descriptions show that despite the positive aspects that were mentioned regarding everyday multiculturalism, the interviewees are very aware of the negative attitudes and stereotypes that are pervading some parts of the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, not only on the 'periphery' (Stehle, 2012). The more or less subtle everyday confrontation with such negative attitudes might lead everyday discrimination. Everyday discrimination or everyday racism, as Velayutham (2009) terms it, might be thus deemed as 'the other side of the coin', an intrinsic element of 'cultural' multiplicity in society.

Although the concept of ethnicity was not explicitly mentioned during the interviews, which might be because the term is generally less common in the German language than for example in the English language, the contextual use of the terms 'Turkish' or 'Turk' made clear that it was understood as description of ethnicity rather than of e.g. the legal status of the individual described. By considering ethnicity as an intrinsic characteristic obtained by birth, the interviewees contradicted the criticisms to these concepts established by Colombo (2010), Ang (2003) and Wimmer (2004). By constantly employing these terms for categorizations, they instead highlighted the importance attached to them as markers for distinction or identification. Through judging behaviour, even one's own, as 'Turkish' or 'German', both the boundaries between ethnicities and cultures, and the alleged incompatibility are reinforced.

## *The interviewees and their wider social environment*

Following from the above-described negative attitudes existent in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, the next section is about how the interviewees themselves have been confronted with such perceptions, and whether they have had negative experiences due to being of Turkish descent.

### Personal experiences with discrimination in everyday life

None of the interviewees reported severe incidents of discrimination, or regular exposure to such, during the interviews. However, it seems to be the smaller, on first sight maybe less meaningful incidents, subtle jokes and comments that perpetually demonstrate that the German society is not yet generally accepted to be multicultural, and that despite having the German citizenship, being born and educated in Germany, the Turkish roots are used by some native Germans for practices of *othering*. One example three interviewees reported is the incredulousness they are met with when they identify as coming from Germany. Mostly, such questions about origin, when asked within Germany (in German), are not about the legal status, but about one's ethnicity or ethnic roots.

Another example is the experience Zeynep made when searching for a new apartment: Due to her Turkish name (both first name and surname), she has been exposed to discrimination in the housing market. She recalls her experience when talking on the phone to a potential landlord:

“You call those people, then you talk about yourself, say you are an academic, employed in the municipality in civil service. But when you say your name, you can really hear their reaction. Not because they say ‘uuh’ or something like that, but you can really hear their facial expression and gesture” (Zeynep, 27)

This negative reaction by the potential landlord, despite, as she implies, her high level of education and secure employment which are usually welcomed by landlords, shows that there is a persistent negative attitude towards non-native Germans, possibly especially focused on those expected to be of Islamic religion. Zeynep reported that independent of her personal description, mentioning her Turkish name prompted the potential landlord to immediately consider her as a “stereotype Turk” (i.e. unwelcomed tenant), and she assumes that this eventually weighted stronger in his decision than for example her secure employment. Zeynep further reports that she was forced to accept this mind-set as very common in the German society, as undesirable it might be, and has developed personal tactics such as using her (native German) boyfriend's name, with whom she is sharing the apartment, for such situations.

This incident is a good example on how individuals of Turkish descent living in Germany are judged based on the stereotype described in the first part of this chapter, especially in

situations where the counterpart does not personally know the individual with Turkish roots very well.

In other situations, when the counterpart knows a little more about the individual of Turkish descent, two interviewees reported that they deliberately highlighted their Turkish roots or self-identified as Turkish to challenge the stereotype-based misperceptions of the other. This was done especially in situations when people insulted Turks, Germans of Turkish descent or generally anyone associated with Turkish ethnicity (summarized as “*the Turks*”) in a very generalizing, undifferentiated manner, or when insulting jokes at the costs of “*the Turks*” were made (apparently a distinct and well-known category of jokes named *Türkenwitze* in German). After the interviewees expressed their own identification with or connection to the Turkish ethnicity, the offender usually revised the universality of his utterance by remarks such as “But *you* are a great Turk!”, or “I didn’t mean you, *you* are not that typically Turkish!” A ‘great Turk’, it can be argued, might be understood as an individual of Turkish descent who is well-assimilated to the German culture, and in public shows hardly any visible traces of adhering to Turkish traditions in daily live.

Serhat mentioned one incident that happened to both his brother and him at a very decisive stage of their educational career: Despite having sufficient grades to proceed to the highest high school level (*Gymnasium*) after the last year of primary school, the teacher advised Serhat’s parents in both cases to send their sons to the intermediate high school level (*Realschule*), as he considered the *Gymnasium* as too difficult for them. Although not completely sure whether this was not simply a misjudgement of the teacher based on the grades, Serhat indicates that the teacher might have been led by the misconception that he and his brother might be less smart than native German students, and more importantly, lack parental support in their education. However, his parents insisted on sending their sons to the highest high school level (which they both completed successfully), and there, he did not encounter such prejudices anymore.

Despite the above described examples, all interviewees but one emphasized that these incidents discussed here took place in the childhood or early youth (with the offenders being of young age as well and therefore less mature and reflected), and have mostly not been repeated since then.

The tactics developed by the interviewees to cope with such incidents differ significantly: Serhat prefers to directly address and educate the offender, whereas other interviewees prefer to avoid such incidents and individuals that might have anti-multicultural views. According to Sedef and Elif, people with such opinions are so narrow-minded and unteachable that any efforts to convince those people otherwise would end in vain. This is illustrated by the following quote:

“Until now, [developing tactics to cope with discrimination] was not necessary, but I think what I would do is to ignore that. Because, if I reacted, that wouldn’t lead to anything. Because simply the fact that this person says something like

that shows me that he is really dumb in this regard and that he would not accept my arguments anyway, and that he doesn't think about what he's saying. That's why I avoid such discussions, because I know that wouldn't lead anywhere and would find no end." (Sedef, 24)

One incident was mentioned by three of the interviewees when asked about their experiences with discrimination or with being disadvantaged in their daily life. However, none described the incident itself as discriminating, but rather as confusing: Several times, they have heard remarks about their ability to speak fluent, accent-free German, such as: "Oh, I can't hear that!" (referring to the Turkish roots of the interviewee) or "Your German is really good!" As for the interviewees themselves speaking fluent German is a matter of course, considering their country of birth and upbringing being Germany, and their above-average education level, Sedef reported that she felt "extremely confused about this", and also the others did not know how to respond.

#### "When diversity is welcomed" – accepted aspects of 'otherness' in German multiculturalism

The question whether they have experienced preferential treatment due to their Turkish roots was negated by all of the interviewees, by two of them in a very convinced manner without even taking the time to think about this question. However, in her narration, Zeynep highlights food as an aspect where 'Turkishness' is very much welcomed:

Turkish traditional dishes and eating habits were mentioned by her as considered to be 'positive' cultural elements by the native Germans in their social environment. Food is here seen as an enriching exotic aspect individuals with (partly) non-German roots bring with them and share with the native Germans in their social network. Zeynep recounted that her (mainly native German) colleagues once requested her to prepare traditionally Turkish dishes for them, which she cynically commented on as request to "give them something from [her] culture", with the unspoken addition "but actually it is really great that you are so well integrated" (Zeynep, 27).

Considering the German use of the word *Integration*, which is very similar to the American notion of assimilation, i.e. the homogenizing into the host society (Ehrkamp, 2006), she indicates that there is an invisible hierarchy of cultural aspects, some are considered to be positively 'exotic' and are more welcomed in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* (such as food), whereas others are not desirable and are used to exemplify insufficient integration. As an example of such an unwelcomed aspect Zeynep mentioned visible practices of religiosity, especially women wearing the headscarf. Although her social environment requests her to share *some* [i.e. not specified] 'typically Turkish' elements with them, she assumes that it would be considered affronting and alienating if she decided to wear a headscarf to show her religiosity openly. However, as none of the female interviewees is wearing a headscarf, this issue could not be further explored.



The interest Zeynep's colleagues expressed to try traditional Turkish food could be interpreted as a hesitant willingness to learn more about a different culture through food, which has already been analysed as one of the most tangible aspects of cultures (see above). Without leaving their 'comfort zone' and challenging own beliefs, norms and values, the colleagues thereby can explore a 'different culture'. Indirectly, they confirm the discourse that immigrants and their descendants should conform to 'Christian occidental culture', as demanded by several politicians (Ehrkamp, 2006), as only those aspects that do not necessarily challenge the common belief system are welcomed. By giving the example of what would probably not be accepted by her environment, namely wearing a headscarf to openly express Muslim faith, Zeynep indicates that she has realized this unspoken hierarchy of cultural aspects. With her cynical remark about the unspoken 'but it is actually really great that you are so well integrated', she classifies her colleagues as what Hage calls "'white cosmopolites', who, for example, can typically be found eating and admiring 'ethnic cuisines' and 'culture' as a means of acquiring and displaying cultural capital, while having little in the way of real, day-to-day inhabited interaction with 'ethnic others'" (Hage, 1997, quoted in Wise, 2009). This superficial inclination for multiculturalism that does not challenge 'Christian occidental culture' could simply be deemed as insufficient and inadequate, as Hage indicates between the lines. On the other hand, it could be seen as a first step of those native Germans who are not yet very open and tolerant to the 'culturally other' to open up to new experiences, prompted through everyday interaction with (well-assimilated) non-native Germans.

### *The social networks of the interviewees*

Moving away from the wider social environment and less personal contacts of the interviewees, the next section is about closer, more personal connections and friendships and the role the Turkish background plays in everyday life situations.

#### Friendships with native Germans

All of the interviewees reported that for most of their lives, their social networks have consisted mainly of native Germans without any migration background. A common theme developed from the five interviews was that the Turkish roots of the interviewees were never considered as an obstacle to build those friendships. As most typical ways to find friends, educational institutions such as kindergartens and schools were mentioned, as well as to a lesser extent the neighbourhood environment and sport clubs. All interviewees recalled that at least in the educational institutions there were mostly "only a handful" of other children or teenagers with non-German roots, which might be interpreted as a sign of ongoing inequality and structural discrimination of non-native Germans in the educational institutions (Şen, 2003).

As three of the interviewees are now attending university (and one has already graduated), where the environment might be considered as more international, their general composition of social networks is changing to some extent by including more individuals of non-German origin, but close connections to people of Turkish descent are still the minority. This was no deliberate choice, as Zeynep and Ayça highlighted, but because “it just never happened” (Zeynep, 27).

Opposing the above mentioned stereotype about groupist behaviour based on shared Turkish ethnicity, the tendency observed in the interviewees’ narrations is more towards group formation based on educational levels and shared interests. This is conform to the findings of Wimmer (2004) who, by analysing the structure and composition of migrants in Switzerland, found that social networks are formed along gender, professional/occupational and social class lines, rather than purely based on ethnic/cultural aspects. Building social network might result rather from “everyday pragmatics” than from “a conscious strategy of ethnic closure” (Wimmer, 2004, p.19) and ethnic group formation. Building social networks mainly among fellow students, which were in most cases native Germans, might be counted as such ‘everyday pragmatics’ (to which for example the aspect of physical proximity could be counted).

#### Obstacles to building friendships with other people of Turkish descent

Several interviewees mentioned that they have always known other individuals in their age with Turkish roots, but that friendships did not (or only rarely) develop for several reasons that can be summarized into three groups: firstly, two interviewees mentioned that barely any family of Turkish origin was living in the area, and that there were thus physical/logistical obstacles to the development of such friendships. Secondly, if there were other families with Turkish roots living in the same area, their children usually followed a lower-level secondary education which did not bring them into daily contact with the respondents of this research, and might also indicate different spheres of interests. Both these reasons can count as everyday pragmatics (Wimmer, 2004). Thirdly, the interviewees often reported with the few individuals of Turkish descent they knew, that the interpersonal connections were not good enough to serve as a basis for friendship. The following quotes serves to illustrate how these factors can be entangled:

“To be honest, I have few, almost no Turkish friends at all. I think that is quite unusual. But that might be because I never really got along with the girls in my age who were foreign or Turkish. Uhm, they were too... I don’t know.. sometimes too childish. I also have to say, most of the Turkish girls I know went to the *Hauptschule* [= lowest German highschool level]. Some can’t... I mean, they still don’t speak German well. I think that’s a no-go. I don’t know... I have rather... Somehow I’ve always had only German friends. I mean, there were some, when they visited us or when we are there because our parents are in contact, then I also spend some time with them, that’s no problem. But best

friends... no. [...]. These girls might be quite ok, I'm not saying anything against that, but there were never any with whom I would have liked to become friends." (Sedef, 24)

With this statement, Sedef shows that she is aware of the stereotype that individuals of Turkish descent often perform groupism based on their ethnic roots, and highlights that it is "unusual" that this is not the case with her. Analysing the aspects given here as reasons for not building friendships with other individuals of Turkish descent (such as lower level education, insufficient German language skills), one could argue that there might be a slight notion of disdain involved on Sedef's side, which might be represented in her description of them as being "childish", implicitly comparing them to her more mature self. In this quote, Sedef also reproduces the discourse of the 'stereotype Turk' by describing other Turkish girls with stereotypical characteristics, such as their insufficient knowledge of the German language, their low education level and the typical groupist behaviour. This again shows the complexities and multi-layeredness in her feelings of belonging to the Turkish community, as she tries to distance herself from it in this quote, while at other points of the interview clearly identifying with the Turkish community.

Another illustration is the following quote from the interview with Zeynep:

"Well, in our area, in my youth, I think that didn't work out [= building up friendships with other children of Turkish descent] because I grew up in a relatively German neighbourhood. I think, over time... especially in bigger cities like Cologne... well, you have a certain image in your head. And for... only because I am Turkish that doesn't mean... I mean, I also have prejudices and things that were confirmed by my compatriots. For example, the Turkish girls... I don't know, like the Turkish guy is a macho, the Turkish girl is totally spiffed up... And I have only met a few who... [...] with whom the interpersonal connection was right, where it worked out. That was not on purpose." (Zeynep, 27)

Considering the obvious struggle the interviewee had to formulate the reasons for not having many friends of Turkish descent in her closer social networks, one could argue that this is a very complicated issue that is not easy to convey to others. Although Zeynep self-identifies as Turkish by referring to other people of Turkish descent as her "compatriots" (a finding which is also to be analysed in section on belonging), she herself employs the stereotypes common in the wider German society to distance herself from other individuals of Turkish descent and to explain why, on an interpersonal level, such friendships have rarely developed. This seems to be a practice of identification and othering at the same time, which shall also be discussed later.

Additionally, the 'degree' of adhering to the 'typically Turkish' norms and values is seen as an obstacle to developing friendships with individuals of Turkish descent, although the opinions of the interviewees strongly diverged on this aspect: Elif, who considers herself as rather

modern and does not identify as Turkish, explained the following about fellow students of Turkish descent:

“Well, sometimes I just don’t like how they still... what kind of mind-set they still have. You can notice it with many, although they are studying, although they are modern, what a mind-set they have. [...] And that’s where the problem is, then the interaction is reduced to small talk, and that’s it. [Request by interviewer to elaborate] It starts with the religion, they are all still very religious and generally not very modern. On the outside, they are modern. They are well-dressed and study. You would think they are modern Turks, but the mind-set is... well, I don’t know, I just don’t like it. [...] Yes, they are so religious, and then additionally they say: no boyfriend. And I think [grimacing to express dislike]. Well, I’m not like that. I’m very easy-going, and my parents as well. I remember when I walked through the university holding hands with my boyfriend, the other girls [of Turkish descent] were giving me strange looks. That’s still like this. And that’s how you notice that in their head they are not as modern as their appearance. [...] A friend of mine once said: When the Turkish girls pass by, they always really look you over. And not just simply that, by really deprecatingly. [...] I’m not really interacting with them. But they see: ok, that’s a Turkish girl. Why does she dress like this, why is she hanging out with boys, why is she drinking alcohol?” (Elif, 23)

As another example, I want to quote what Sedef says about judging other girls of Turkish decent based on how much they adhere to ‘typically Turkish’ norms and values:

“Oh well, first, I would diplomatically say ‘no, that’s not important to me’, but then the second thought would be: well, somehow it is important. [Some girls are raised] more strictly, others less strictly, and there are some who just do what they want. And, well, I find them... then I say ‘Hey, you don’t do something like that’. In general I don’t find it bad if she has for example a German boyfriend or goes out with friends... The German in me says ‘That’s completely ok, no problem at all!’ and so on. But the Turk in me says ‘You don’t do this!’ [laughing]. That’s why... well, this girl would for me... that sounds mean, but [...] she is more German in that sense. That sounds as if it was bad... [Interviewer: Do you mean distanced from the Turkish traditions?] Yes, that’s it. [...] Somehow, that’s what I internalized. And especially because we grew up in such a small town, where it is always important what others think about you, especially the Turkish people who live here. That nobody talks bad about you is super important. And a part of this is how you behave in your free time and outside your home. And if you then disregard your Turkish traditions and behave like all other [native] Germans, then this is not looked at positively, then they are talking a lot about you, then they say ‘Look, their daughter is so and so’ which is not really nice. Well, that’s why it is really important, especially here, what others think about you. And that’s why I

don't like it [when others do not adhere to Turkish norms and values]" (Sedef, 24)

First of all, these two extensive quotes by Elif and Sedef illustrate that different standards might be applied for the judgement of individuals with Turkish roots than for native Germans, who constitute the majority in their daily environments. This could be understood as an indicator for the complexities of belonging, as applying different standards might be seen as a sign for self-identification with the Turkish ethnic community. Elif implies that personal decisions about how 'Turkish' one behaves in public should be simply accepted by others and not considered with disdain, as she experiences it herself as more or less subtly expressed by some of her fellow students. At the same time, however, she disregards these fellow students for their more 'traditional' mind set and behaviour. Sedef personally thinks that one's behaviour should not be judged by others, but emphasizes that in her environment this is always the case, and that one should aim to avoid negative talks as it also affects the image of the family.

What is striking is how Elif uses the terms "unmodern" and "they are still ..." to express that to her, individuals of Turkish descent who adhere to the Turkish norms and values more strictly are backward and lagging behind the individualist societal developments in Germany, and she looks upon them somewhat disdainfully. Based on the above mentioned quote, one could argue that for her religion is incompatible with a modern lifestyle, and opposite to what she called "easy-going". This is despite the fact that these girls of Turkish descent are practicing some aspects considered as "modern", such as studying (i.e. in gender-mixed universities) and wearing modern clothes (i.e. no headscarves).

When analysing the quote of Sedef, one has to recall first of all that she is the only interviewee involved in this research who is living with her family and is, mainly through her parents' connections, involved into the local Turkish community (not as an actual organization, but as the sum of the families with Turkish roots living in the same small town). This might be a reason why she is the only interviewee who mentioned that adjusting one's personal behaviour to what is expected from the local Turkish community, what is considered as "becoming" and "not becoming" for Turkish girls, in order to not harm the reputation of her family. What is striking in her narration are her expressions "the Turk in me..." and "the German in me...", which indicate the complexities of her belonging and self-identification as German and/or Turkish. This shall be analysed and discussed further below.

#### The need for friends of similar family situations

A repeating theme was the perception that interaction with other individuals who have made similar experiences of being brought up by a Turkish family in a German environment is easier than with other individuals who have not made this experience. This is because displaying certain behaviours or adhering to family traditions and unwritten rules are simply understood by the other, and do not need extra explanation or justification. This is

illustrated by the following quote by Serhat (answering the question whether friends who also have a Turkish background understand him better):

“Yes, yes, that is the case. That you don’t have to explain things 300 times and so on. [...] But that doesn’t need to be Turkish, that can be every other nationality with which you grow up, that is mostly very similar. Because in most cases you are brought up traditionally, no matter from which country you come. I believe that. [...] And that makes it easier to explain things, really. [...] That is a totally different level we [= he and friends with Indian and Greek roots] can communicate on, definitely. [...] That is simply because you grow up with two cultures. [Many] things are very similar, and then it is much easier to communicate with these people, because they know exactly how that is.”  
(Serhat, 21)

He considers it as not of great importance whether the other person has a Turkish background or any other and assumes that all parents attach much importance to conveying their traditions to their children who grow up in the country of immigration. This, he assumes, in most cases results in a stricter, more traditional upbringing than it is common in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*. As an example he mentioned that two of his good friends, one with Greek and one with Indian roots, fully understand the rule that he must not bring home any girlfriends except for the one he eventually wants to marry, without asking for detailed explanations, which is what he assumes native German friends would do. He states that it is possible to communicate on a different level with them as with people who have not made the experience of growing up in a more traditional family.

However, another interviewee explains that having such friends “might make life easier”, but that she has always been willing to explain different traditions to her native German friends, such as rules or habits that are a matter of course for her, but might seem unusual for friends with different family backgrounds. She states that she

„never had problems with explaining why [she acts] in this or that manner, because [she is] very open about this” (Sedef, 24)

Another theme emerged in the interviewees which is quite similar: Three interviewees mentioned that in some periods of their lives, when having Turkish roots in a largely native-German environment was considered as more problematic and caused inner conflict for the interviewees, they felt the wish for having a friend who was in the same situation. This was expected to be helpful as this friend would completely understand their feelings, which, they felt, their native German friends did not always do to 100%. This view is supported by four interviewees, although there are variations as to how urgent this wish was felt. This, it appears, is dependent on the extent the interviewee problematized his/her belonging and went through times of inner conflict (again, an issue to be discussed in the last section of the result and discussion chapter). However, now, at a later stage of life, the urgency of this wish is decreasing as the interviewees, including those undergoing times of severe inner struggle

in their youth, have come to terms with their issues of identity. This process is illustrated in the following quote:

“The older I get, the less this [wish] is in the foreground. For me, this torn-ness is less extreme now, it is less negatively connoted. It was really bad when I was a teenager, then I wished dreadfully much for a Turkish (female) friend who also knows that. But now I don’t consider this as negative, and that’s why I don’t feel the need to talk about this with anyone.” (Zeynep, 27)

The interviewee who, as opposite to all the other interviewees, has only one parent of Turkish origin, explained that although she has never undergone this process of questioning her feelings of belonging, she is really grateful to have a friend, who is also “half-half”, i.e. whose parents come from Korea and Germany, as there is a mutual and deep understanding about feelings of there being “more than just German”, and the need to spend some time in Korea and Turkey respectively to “search for the roots” of the non-German parent (all quotes by Ayça, 24).

Summarizing all these experiences and perceptions explained above, I want to conclude that the general opinion regarding having friends with similar family situations seems to be that this is a positive experience in some situations. However, this friendship is not something the interviewees were specifically searching for, as they managed to cope with problems and torn-ness themselves, or by explaining them to native German friends.

### *‘Elements of Turkishness’ in everyday life*

In this section, the influence of their Turkish roots in the interviewees’ everyday personal lives shall be analysed and discussed: considering aspects such as food, media and traveling (the last point being, admittedly, not a daily part of the interviewees life, but at least a regular one), this section aims to illustrate the practices of Turkishness in their everyday social realities.

#### Food and media consumption

Reflecting on how their Turkish roots are affecting everyday life situations, two interviewees named Turkish food as the aspect most integrated in their daily lives. This was not first and foremost mentioned in context of certain cultural/religious rules about what not to eat (such as the ban on pork meat for Muslims), but rather in relation to their daily food that they actually consume. The preparations and consumption of Turkish dishes as well as cultural eating habits were highlighted as the most prominent Turkish aspects in everyday life, and the first aspect they mentioned when asked about the role of their Turkish roots in everyday life. The following quote from Sedef, where she talked about whether she grew up traditionally, serves as an example:

“The aspect I notice most of my Turkish descent is, I think, the cuisine, that we cook many Turkish dishes, and also use the ingredients. Or we eat somewhat spicier, something like that... But very traditionally... I don’t know” (Sedef, 24)

That the aspect of food was one of the first that came into her mind when being asked about ‘traditional practices of Turkishness’ in her daily life, might be because it is an aspect she is confronted with daily or on a regular basis. Also, it could be because of the fact that food is a very tangible aspect of a culture and immediately visible, and also more immediately understandable for outsiders (such as the interviewer) than for example deeply rooted, less obvious norms and values.

The same can be applied to media consumption: another aspect mentioned by four interviewees was the consumption of Turkish media, such as reading Turkish newspapers and watching Turkish television. Although no respondent reports that this is a very important part of their own lives nowadays, it is common practice when spending time with the family. One interviewee, whose Turkish father is in her conception rather ‘modern’, assumes that he includes only selected aspects of Turkishness in his life, based on what he needs to feel comfortable, such as Turkish dishes and newspapers. Thereby he creatively mixes elements that are considered ‘typically Turkish’ or ‘typically German’ into a hybrid form to create a pleasant environment for himself:

“I think my dad, he feels more German. He is still watching Turkish TV and buys things from Turkish stores, thus all the good things, but he’s leaving out all the smaller and bigger problems. [...] [He mixes] what he needs to feel good. The food, obviously, and watching television is also important, because he wants to follow what happens there.” (Ayça, 24)

Although it is arguable to what extent consuming Turkish media and food can be interpreted as an indicator for one’s feelings of belonging, as it could also simply be a matter of habit or of taste (considering the example of Ayça’s native German mother who prefers to cook Turkish dishes over German dishes), it might be understood as an indicator for a certain connectedness to the Turkish roots.

Regarding the importance of the categories ‘typically German, typically Turkish’, I want to quote the following paragraph from Ayça’s narration:

“I don’t think I have this strong... that I draw such a strict border between the Turkish and the German aspects. [...] Here it is more like an amalgam. It is not like [my Turkishness] is standing out.” (Ayça, 24)

According to her, the elements that could be considered more Turkish or more German are not clearly separated in Ayça’s thinking and behaviour, but are rather blended into a set of habits and character traits that as a whole define her, and hence are not clearly identifiable as either Turkish or German. Thus, one could conclude, in everyday life she does not make



strict divisions between the Turkish aspects and the German aspects she unifies, which might indicate that such differentiation is not considered as important for her.

Other interviewees; however, seem to make a more rigid distinction between 'typically Turkish' aspects and 'typically German' aspects, although they are combined in hybrid forms: Sedef mentions that she needs 'typically German' privacy, but has 'typically Turkish' notions on topics such as the family, or justifies conflicting opinion by emphasizing that one is coming from the 'German' or 'Turkish side' (see quote above: "the German in me", "the Turkik in me"). Also Elif described how her fellow students of Turkish origin perform 'typically German' practices, such as studying at a mixed university and wearing modern clothes, but are 'typically Turkish' in their mind-set.

Zeynep states that in her view, Turkish and German cultures are incompatible, that there is a "severe distinction" between the two cultures. However, the following example illustrates how individual interpretation of what is typical for either of them can lead to hybridized forms of behaviour: Zeynep deems it "disrespectful" to consume alcohol during Ramadan, when her parents are fasting; however, consuming alcohol at other times of the year, when this practice is still forbidden according to the Qur'an, is not seen as a problematic practice by her. Hence, she combines the non-Muslim practice of consuming alcohol, but has adopted the Muslim practice of refraining from consuming alcohol during Ramadan. What, it can be asked, makes it more "disrespectful" to consume alcohol during Ramadan although this practice is forbidden all year round? It might be argued that her attitude to this is a result of an individual process of negotiating what is deemed 'typically Turkish' (here equal to Muslim), i.e. the fasting during Ramadan, and 'typically German', i.e. secularization (Fleischmann & Phalet, 2012) and the social acceptability of consuming alcohol. Her personal interpretation of how to follow certain rules has led to an individually hybrid combination of 'typically Turkish' and 'typically German' aspects.

This example shows that on the one hand, Zeynep is confirming the dominant discourse of the alleged incompatibility of Turkish and German culture that was described earlier by deeming both as very distinct from each other. On the other hand, however, she feels the need to make sense of them as she is experiencing both cultures in her (daily) life. This results in personal endeavours to unify what Zeynep understands as two distinct cultures within one individual, and leads to individual creation of hybrid interpretations of these cultures. This reasoning is in line with Colombo's findings from his study of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation young migrants in Italy, where he argued that the individuals have much creative freedom to interpret their difference in everyday life situations (Colombo, 2010).

#### Everyday Cosmopolitanism: Travelling to Turkey and elsewhere

In their childhood and youth, all interviewees regularly spent their summer holidays in Turkey; however, the purpose of such trips varied. Whereas three of them mainly went to visit family and relatives with only some shorter trips to the Turkish coast for recreational purposes, two mainly went to Turkish tourist destinations for recreation, not or only shortly

visiting relatives. Obviously, this depended to a large part on whether there were still some relatives living in Turkey, but also on the closeness of their connection to them. Although four of the interviewees explicitly said they could never imagine living in Turkey on the long term, the country has played a more or less important role as a holiday country in their youth.

One observation made was how one interviewee tended to glorify Turkey while at the same time stating that she could never live there in the long term. After not having been to Turkey for a relatively long period of time, she stated:

„I think I can't bear it any longer, I really miss it, I have to be *there*. [...] Even one day would be enough. I need to be there, breathe in deeply. That smells differently, that is different, that is beautiful, and then spending one day with those people, then I'm ready to leave again. I'm always happy when I find some place in Germany, like in Hamburg or Berlin, which is completely Turkish, smells Turkish – that is like being in Turkey for one day. I had this experience recently, in February I was one day in Kolbstraße. That is *the* Turkish street in Cologne. And simply everything there is Turkish, everything, that was just really awesome. You were even served in Turkish, that was really great.” (Zeynep, 27)

While she rationally acknowledged at another point in the interview that ghettoization is a hindrance to integration, the personal experience of being in a place that “feels completely Turkish” is very positive, and might be perceived as a substitute for a short trip to Turkey. Furthermore, although Turkey is glorified as a “great”, “beautiful” country, living there is not considered as an option. It can be concluded here that this illustrates Zeynep's personal struggles in negotiating the different contexts, and is another indicator for the complexities of belonging, which shall be discussed in greater detail in the following section on belonging and self-identification.

Another tendency observed in the interviewees' accounts is an inclination towards cosmopolitanism. Two interviewees have studied abroad or are currently doing so, one is working in the tourism sector and the other two at least mentioned travelling as one of their favourite free time activities. Although one should certainly not over-interpret this as a consequence of their non-native German background, as probably also large parts of native German individuals with similar demographic characteristics, especially regarding age and education level, mention travelling as typical leisure activities and spend part of their studies abroad, I want to emphasize what one interviewee commented on this issue:

“I think that with me it is rather the travelling that gave me this cosmopolitanism, because you get to know other cultures through that. And maybe this is because I had this other culture already as a child [...]. Otherwise you might start travelling with about 16 years, but for me it was normal to travel to Turkey every year and to be accepted there. [...] I think it is really the

travelling that gives you this cosmopolitan world view. Maybe it is the case that I also wanted to find my roots.” (Ayça, 24)

By travelling more intensively from an early age on, Ayça is arguing, she has obtained a cosmopolitan world view and the ability to cope with living in different cultural spheres. Although this is not a direct consequence of having non-native German parents, it is indirectly connected to it and prompted her to gain more intercultural experience, also outside of Turkey.

### *The interviewees’ perceptions of themselves and their belonging to the Turkish and German society*

After analysing the wider and closer social environment as well as ‘traces of Turkishness’ in everyday life of the interviewees, this section now describes their personal feelings and perceptions of belonging. As self-identification is very much embedded in the social environment the interviewees live and act in (Baumeister, 1986), many of the aspects described above are also mirrored in this section, such as how relations to others influence perceptions of the self. In the following paragraphs it shall be analysed and discussed how self-identification is reflected in self-descriptions, the use of language (especially pronouns), categorizations and in employing stereotypes.

#### Own feelings of belonging, self-description and use of language

One dominant theme that reoccurred in four of the narrations is that the interviewees have no clear feeling of belonging to either Turkey or Germany. While growing up, they have experienced elements from both the Turkish side and the German side, which were often perceived as very distinct from each other and hardly compatible. The Turkish side is usually seen as connected to the (extended) family environment, whereas the German side was represented by the social environment and educational institutions. Both aspects are inevitably part of the interviewees’ identities, which is also illustrated in the following quote about feelings of belonging:

“But this question, you can’t answer it immediately, do you belong there or there, that doesn’t work. It’s definitely both. Through your roots, which you don’t want to lose, and you have your German side, friends, how you grew up and everything” (Serhat, 21)

At a younger age, one is less reflected about one’s own feelings of belonging, because, as Ayça says:

“you don’t think about it, am I Turk, am I German or whatever, what am I?”  
(Ayça, 24).

While growing up, however, individuals undergo a period when they reflect on their origin, and this might cause inner conflicts and a feeling of torn-ness between the two. Two interviewees mentioned that they experienced feelings of shame due to their ‘otherness’:

“And I remember that as a kid, I was always ashamed that I am half Turkish, and I always tried to hide it. It was really the case that as a kid I thought: God, I don’t want to be different from the rest. And in the puberty it started that I [saw it as something rather positive]” (Ayça, 24)

Such feelings were not necessarily triggered by negative comments or experiences of discrimination, but rather came from the inside, from a wish to be just like the other kids (i.e. being native German, considering that the interviewees never had many individuals of Turkish descent in their social networks). However, when growing up, a process of reflection and pondering about one’s roots and descent started, which for some interviewees brought with it a painful feeling of torn-ness, but eventually resulted in coming to terms with it. They accepted that both Turkish and German aspects are part of their identity, and now this is considered as normal, banal, mundane:

“And I always say that honestly. [...] This is something really banal for me, no problem. Yes, definitely, I always say that, [...] I see it as a matter of course.”  
(Serhat, 21)

Most interviewees stated that their behaviour patterns and the typical course of their everyday life could be considered as more German than Turkish; however, their self-identification significantly diverged. Two interviewees self-identified as ‘German’, two somewhat in between and one as Turkish. This is illustrated in the following quotes:

“For me, German is really the base, my solid base, and the Turkish aspect is really more like a ‘cherry on top’. Maybe it is stronger with food [referring to her preference of Turkish over German dishes], but... I think for me it is really only a positive addition [to my ‘German-ness’].” (Ayça, 24),

“I’ve already thought about it several times. I like to call myself ‘European’, because actually I am too German to be Turkish, and too Turkish to be German. [...] Because I grew up here, I’m more German sometimes, for example privacy or something like that, that is important to me. I really need my privacy. [...] This is something that doesn’t fit into our culture, I think. But there are also aspects where I noticed over the course of years, some opinions that I have, they are rather Turkish.” (Sedef, 24) and lastly,

„Am I German, am I Turkish? I notice it myself, even if I don’t have any connection to that [= Turkey] and in my passport it says ‘German’, but according

to my feelings I am Turkish, with heart and soul. Even if would never move there, [...] I try to take this culture with me, but I somehow feel that I am better at living the German culture, because I grew up here, was born here. But nevertheless I have the feeling that I always have to defend it, the Turkish culture, and therefore feel I belong more to that. And I know I can't really explain it, especially when other people say to me 'You are a German', I find it horrible. I'm not German because Mum and Dad are both Turkish, so I can't be German" (Zeynep, 27)

These quotes illustrate the complexities of individual feelings of belonging and self-identification. Ayça, despite being ashamed of her partly Turkish roots during her youth, has now come to terms with it and considers her Turkish-ness as a "positive addition" which she is "proud of", but nothing that could challenge her self-identification as German. For her, this is an exclusively positive addition to her identification as German, which also distinguishes her from other 'fully native' Germans and makes her more 'exotic'. She argues that this solely positive conception of her 'otherness' is because she has always been sure of her "German base", due to which she never had to undergo a painful process of reflecting on her identity and feelings of belonging regarding this aspect. Also, she reports to have always been accepted as completely German by her social environment and never experienced any ethnicity-based discrimination directed at her. Although having a Turkish father certainly influenced her identity, she does not feel any belonging to the Turkish culture.

On the other hand, Sedef does not identify as neither Turkish nor German, because in her perception she has internalized too many aspects of the German culture to identify as completely Turkish, and vice versa. However, instead of identifying as both Turkish and German, she identifies as neither of them, referring instead to the identification as "European" as a category that unifies the diverse aspects. This allows for a self-identification outside the discourse of the 'typically German', 'typically Turkish' dichotomy. Nevertheless, in her narration she also refers to the Turkish culture as "our culture", which indicates a clear identification as Turkish. This is also further discussed below.

Zeynep notices herself how complex her feelings of belonging are, and possibly not fully comprehensible through rational thinking. Despite preferring Germany as the country to live in, where she knows about societal rules and adequate behaviour, she is emotionally very much connected to her Turkish roots, and identifies clearly as Turkish as this is also her parents' ethnicity. As she states, her own belonging could not be independent of her parents' roots. Another factor she mentions as contributing to her identification as Turkish is the constant need for (self-)defence both of her own belonging to this culture, and Turkishness in general, which has to do with the negative associations and stereotypes described extensively above. This need for defence might have triggered her to reactively self-identify as Turkish.

In the narrations a tendency was found that the degree of self-identification as German or Turkish was somewhat dependent on the way the interviewees were brought up, and especially the importance their parents attached to conveying traditions, Turkish cultural norms and values and the language to their children. This was an assumption expressed by one of the interviewees, and also my observation based on the descriptions given by this limited sample: the tendency that individuals from more conservative, “traditionally Turkish” and more devout families tend to identify more with their Turkish roots and descent than those from mostly Western-oriented families who did not valorise the Turkish-Muslim traditions, cultural norms and values in the upbringing of their offspring. Another indicator for that might be the language: those research participants who were not able to speak Turkish, or only to a limited extent, identified more clearly with Germany and expressed their belonging to the German society, whereas those that spoke Turkish reasonably well or fluently, and who also used it regularly to communicate with at least some of their closest family members expressed that their Turkish roots played a more substantial role in their identity and feelings of belonging than for those who did not. However, this is certainly not a generalizable rule, as it neglects the individual complexities of belonging.

An analysis of the use of personal pronouns and labels of group identification also supported that. Firstly, it has to be noted that often, the categories ‘German’ or ‘Turkish’ were, when applied to others, used to describe the others’ ethnicity or ethnic roots, not necessarily their legal or citizenship status. This was applied for “Turks” (meaning those with a Turkish background), “Germans” (native Germans without migration background), and also for “Greeks” and “Indians” (where legal status remained unclear in the interviews). It could be argued that because labelling the ethnicity or family background was often considered as more important than correctly depicting the legal status, these short forms (“Turks”) might simply be understood as a simplification of describing a ‘person with Turkish roots’.

Zeynep, who in the above cited quote explained her identification as Turkish despite feeling more connected to the German cultural environment, used the pronouns “we” and “our” to describe individuals of Turkish descent, and the terms “compatriots”, “our culture”, “our religion” to express a belonging to the Turkish community. Sedef, who used the term “European” to express her belonging when explicitly asked for that, also made use of these first person pronouns to identify with Turkish community in Germany. Different traditions were explained using the phrase: “Here, *you* do [...], and at ours, *we* do [...]”. “Here”, describing Germany and thus a location where mostly native Germans live (the group she in this case does not identify with (“*you*”)), is contrasted with “at ours” (in German: *bei uns*, which can be understood as ‘at our place’ or as ‘in our country’, and as this is used to show a contrast to ‘here’, the latter is more appropriate). Considering that she expressed no close personal relationship to the country of Turkey, ‘Turkey’ here serves as a synonym for the Turkish culture, according to which “we”, the Turkish people, behave. This use of the pronouns “we” and “our” as indicators for identification with an (imagined) community of ethnic Turks was consistent throughout the whole interview, not only when specifically talking about feelings of identity and belonging.

Individuals who identified more as “Germans”, possibly “with Turkish family” or “a Turkish father” tended to use the pronoun “they” and the expression “the Turks”, which showed that they might see themselves rather outside this group although also identifying to some extent with their Turkish background.

Answering the question about how they usually describe themselves to new people, three of the interviewees explained that when this question is asked to them in Germany, by Germans, the reason for this inquiry is often rooted in the interviewees’ darker complexion and hair, which is not seen as typical for native Germans. Or, the reason for asking could be the not typically German names all interviewees bear. Being fully aware of this, they often give the expected answer: “I am Turkish”, which in this case can be understood as a simplification for “I am German with Turkish descent and that’s where my name and appearance come from.”, as the inquiry was targeted at their ethnicity and the place of origin of their family. However, when being asked this question while abroad, all interviewees describe themselves as German (because this is the country of residence; or because this is their self-identification) with Turkish roots or a Turkish background.

The following example serves to illustrate how self-identification is also very much context-bound and specific to the situation: When asked about her personal religiosity, Zeynep describes herself as believing, although not necessarily within the category of Islam:

„Religion is me... I mean I believe. I don’t know whether it needs to be in the category of Islam, that is not relevant for me. But I believe in God, that is really important for me.” (Zeynep, 27)

However, at another point of the interview, when talking about emphasizing her Turkish roots, she became more emotional about this topic:

“And when they talk about Islam, for example, I always get really involved. [...] Generally, because I always talk about *my* religion. And I explicitly say that so that people notice it is not the Christian belief. And when it is negative, it is completely over. I mean, then I get really involved. Although, when I think about it, in my behaviour you don’t always see that I’m Turkish, or that I am of Muslim belief... I think if you know me, you’ll not notice or only with a few aspects. But as soon as it is criticized, I’m really turning into a patriot. [...] For example all these terror stories they show in the TV and which happen all over the world, that is not normality, that is not the normal Muslim. And then I really stand up for this, it feels I stop at nothing. I get really affected and angry. [...] I always feel so affected that I really have to pull myself together, and sometimes I’m so affected that I almost start crying and then have to explain to this person the he hurts *me* with that. And when he says ‘I don’t mean you’ [...], that doesn’t matter because my religion is dragged into the mud, and I can’t stand that. [...] I noticed that I quickly join this discussion, and comment on things, without being asked to do so. But when I see what comments other people make, I find it really silly and

think: Have a better look in that topic you're talking about! They just pick out random crap" (Zeynep, 27)

What might at first sight look like an inconsistency in Zeynep's narration is instead a sign for the contextuality of identity, as the two situations described above are completely different: The first quote is about Zeynep's rational, personal description of the meaning of religion to her. Here, she does not relate this religion to anyone else but herself. In the second quote, however, she describes the need to defend her religion and the religious community that comes with it (possibly relating to the Turkish community, which she identifies with) from non-Muslims who make negative generalizations. Such negative remarks affect her personally to a high extent, and trigger a far more emotional reaction than the rather unemotional, rational description in the first quote.

### Self-description in relation to stereotypes

A common theme regarding how the interviewees described themselves or their close family members was the frequent reference to what is categorized as 'typically Turkish' (see above). This served as a point of reference, against which they contrasted themselves, their family and their actions, or which they unwillingly confirmed. The following examples serve to illustrate that. The first quote is by Zeynep, who explains the role religion plays for her parents' daily life:

"They also pray, five times a day, and join the Ramadan fasting, and well.., but my mum is not wearing a headscarf. She looks like a normal person... there's nothing eye-catching about her... I mean you... don't really notice by [the way she dresses or behaves] that she is of Muslim faith, neither with my father." (Zeynep, 27)

A similar remark was made by Sedef when she answered the question whether she considered her upbringing as traditional:

"I mean, we cook Turkish. [...] But otherwise, traditions, I mean we don't wear a headscarf or something like that. And we don't belong to those Turks who go to mosque." (Sedef, 24)

For both, the questions regarding traditions and religiosity, asked by a native German, non-Muslim interviewer were immediately connected to the common stereotype of Turkish women wearing headscarves to express their religious devoutness. Instead of describing in what kind of mundane activities religiosity or Turkish traditions are expressed, both interviewees employed a negative definition of what is not done, i.e. wearing a headscarf, and thereby aim to distance themselves (and their family members) from the 'typically Turkish' stereotype. This is also expressed by Zeynep in describing her mother's appearance as "normal", in the sense that she does not differ much from native Germans.



Using the stereotype as a reference point for self-descriptions was also reflected in other contexts: Sedef considered the fact that she does not have many friends of Turkish origin in her social networks as rather “unusual”, and thereby she reproduces the stereotype of strong ethnicity-based groupist behaviour among people of Turkish descent living in Germany through distancing herself from it. A more complex relation to the stereotype is visible in the following quote about the somewhat more conservative views of her father:

“But this is again this annoying stereotype people have: The Turkish girls are not allowed to do anything, must not wear short clothes, must not do this, do that. And that is always a little bit stupid if you then confirm this stereotype. Although it is really not like that.” (Sedef, 24)

Here, Sedef admits that in her family some of the aspects included in the stereotype are confirmed by her father’s more conservative attitude. However, she emphasizes that in reality “it is not like that”, meaning although some aspects might be confirmed to some extent, the stereotype as a whole is not applicable to her family.

A fourth example can be found in Zeynep’s narration about her educational career:

“And now I might start with my PhD if everything works out. Certainly, one has somewhere deep inside: Then *you all* see that a migrant can also do that!” (Zeynep, 27)

For her, being an academic is not only the fulfilment of a personal or maybe parental goal, but also gives her satisfaction by proving wrong the stereotype she was always confronted with (though mostly subtly). Her wish to demonstrate that also individuals with a (2<sup>nd</sup> generation) migration background can reach the highest levels of German education might be deeply rooted in a feeling of being underestimated, of being confronted with a sense of impossibility that she could achieve such level of education. It could be interpreted that in this statement, Zeynep also expresses a negative attitude against “you all”, the native Germans, as proving them wrong gives her some satisfaction.

This last section has served to illustrate the complexities of individual belongings by analysing how explicit self-identifications and unconscious use of terms that express belonging or distance were used by the interviewees, and how self-identification is often very much bound to a specific context.

### *Practices of othering throughout the different social layers*

By discussing themes that draw through the different social layers in the last two sections of this chapter, I aim to illustrate how wider social, cultural and political discourses and structures are translated down to these micro-contexts (Wise & Velayutham, 2009) and

therefore impact the actions and attitudes of the individuals in their banal, everyday routines.

A theme that has drawn through all the different social layers is that of *othering*, of distancing oneself from a collective other. The narrations contained information about how native Germans distance themselves from immigrants and their descendants, a tendency also referred to in the literature review (Ehrkamp, 2006; Eckert & Chadha, 2013). Also, such practices of othering were used by the interviewees to distance themselves from other individuals of Turkish background, and at some instances from native Germans.

The most obvious example is that throughout all layers, 'typically Turkish', 'typically German' was mostly seen as a dichotomy, as distinct from each other. The interviewees employed this distinction often as self-evident, although they were not always able to outline the distinction clearly. That these categories are considered as opposites becomes obvious when looking at Elif's description of Turkishness as "unmodern", whereas typical German behaviour is regarded as "modern" by her. By employing such categories, the legitimacy of such categorisation is reinforced.

In the wider social environment of the interviewees, such practices of *othering* could be found for example in everyday discrimination, both in openly hostile remarks and insults, as well as in compliments about their good knowledge of the German language, as this also emphasized that those persons who make such remarks might not see the people of Turkish origin as integral part of the German society (and therefore for example do not expect them to be fluent in German). One interviewee also mentioned the example of being discriminated when looking for an apartment, where she was assigned to the stereotypical categorization of 'Turks as unwelcomed tenants' only by mentioning her name.

In the social networks, the interviewees employed practices of *othering* to distance themselves from other individuals of Turkish descent to illustrate why friendships between them have never developed. Some use the negative stereotype developed by the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* and claim that they know individuals who justify such a negative image.

In their daily life, the interviewees mention 'typically Turkish' and 'typically German' aspects of their behaviour, although here a certain hybridization of these aspects becomes obvious, which results from an individual interpretation of what is typical for each of the cultures. One interviewee remarks that she barely makes any distinction between that in daily life, whereas other interviewees do so. Through explaining 'typically Turkish' practices with "Here, *you* do [this], and at our's, *we* do [that]", also the interviewee distances also herself and the Turkish community in Germany from native Germans, as the 'you' refers to the interviewee and thereby also to the native German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*.

On the personal level, self-descriptions also often come along with practices of othering, such as the use of first or third person pronouns (I and we versus he/she and they) that

indicate the interviewees' identification with neither the one nor the other group. Furthermore, by using the stereotype and 'typically Turkish, typically German' categorizations as points of reference for self-descriptions, although mostly distancing oneself from that, these categories are being reinforced.

This short overview of examples from the different layers illustrates how the dominating discourse of the distinctiveness and alleged incompatibility of the two cultures is drawing through all levels and affects the interviewees in the different levels of social relations and self-understanding.

### *'Everyday difference' as a constraint and a resource*

Having feelings of belonging to more than one culture, although both are not always equally important to the individual, is closely connected to the concept of 'difference' (Colombo, 2010). Being 'different' from the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, not solely, but most importantly in the aspects of ethnicity and religion, constitutes both a constraint as well as a resource for the interviewees. The constraints, such as experiences with discrimination etc. have been extensively discussed and shall not be repeated here. Difference as a resource, however, is a theme that has occurred at several points of the result section, but has not been comprehensively discussed yet.

The interviewees expressed or indicated that they highlight or downplay their 'difference' flexibly and situation-bound, for example in order to avoid discrimination or to challenge stereotypes, for example by identifying as Turkish when insulting remarks about 'the Turks' are made. This corresponds to the findings of Colombo (2009). 'Difference' is also used as a resource to educate others about everyday Turkish or Muslim practices, to challenge prejudices and to spread openness and tolerance through interaction and building friendships with others. By being an integral part of the German society despite one's non-German roots, the normality of multiculturalism in everyday society is highlighted.

Furthermore, knowing different behavioural patterns proves as a resource for the interviewees themselves in various situations: For Zeynep, growing up with both the German and the Turkish culture increased her intercultural empathic skills, which is according to her very helpful in her job as a social pedagogue. For Ayça knowing cultural habits results in a more intensive kind of travelling, as she can understand, interpret and employ different body languages, for example also in the Arabic area. Being confronted with a different culture from an early age onwards has also affected her to become cosmopolitan and open towards the new and unknown, which is an important resource in today's globalized world (Werbner, 2013).

These examples illustrate how particularly 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, who are "accustomed to complexity [and] to the continuous moving between contexts characterized by different rules, to links and interconnections that go beyond the nation-state or local context" (Colombo, 2010, p.459), have obtained the skills to flexibly adapt to different contexts and to

deal confidently with different social milieus in society from an early age onwards, which gives them a clear advantage over individuals who have not had this experience.

All in all, this chapter served to describe, analyse and to some extent also to discuss the narrations of the five research participants. A broad variety of topics and diverging opinions have been covered. The most important findings shall be further discussed in the following chapter.

## Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter contains a discussion of the broader, more general findings of this research, sets this study into relation to other academic research on everyday multiculturalism and 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, answers the research question and, after some concluding remarks, gives some recommendations for future studies and policy makers. Although this study differs in the research setting from most studies on everyday multiculturalism by not focusing on practices and perceptions of different individuals living within one specific area (see for example Wimmer, 2004; Goodall et al., 2009 and Wise, 2005), many of the findings of this study confirm some of the broader themes and discussion found in academic literature on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants and everyday multiculturalism.

This study aimed to apply the relatively new approach of everyday multiculturalism (Wise & Velayutham, 2009) on the German context, with emphasis on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants living in Germany. Instead of focusing on structural integration, the importance of Islam or citizenship issues, which have all been extensively covered by academic research (*cf.* Crul & Vermeulen, 2003; Şen, 2003), this study attempts to add to the literature by focussing on individual social realities and feelings of belonging based on five subjective narrations. The interviewees' narrations, with special regard to the different layers of social interaction, served here as a means to illustrate how dominant discourses of multiculturalism and *othering* draw through the different social levels and influence the interviewees in various aspects (Semi et al., 2009). This provided more insight into the very personal aspects of living in and being part of the multicultural society.

The research focus was on 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants, as they are according to Noble (2009) exceptionally well equipped for living and communicating in contemporary multicultural societies: through growing up living with elements from both the culture of their parents' origin as well as the culture of the host society (or rather, also *their* society), 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants are assumed to be able to flexibly move between contexts and cultures and being able to adapt to communicating with different social groups (Colombo, 2010; Noble, 2009). All the interviewees of this research but one consider themselves as having grown up with both the Turkish and the German culture, and as being able to flexibly switch between and

yet equally understand different contexts, which confirms Noble's assumption. The research also confirmed Colombo's findings about the ambiguity of (not exclusively, but most importantly ethnic) 'difference', which can be perceived both as a constraint (such as everyday discrimination) as well as a resource (as for example being able to successfully communicate in different (cultural) contexts) (Colombo, 2010). Remarkable is here that the interviewees considered ethnicity and origin as very important factors for categorization, which contradicts the academic criticisms to these concepts (*cf.* Wimmer, 2004). This might be partly a result of the prevailing popularity, and therefore importance, that are given to those factors have in the German immigration debates in the public, media and political sphere.

Considering their social environment, it was found that the interviewees' social networks consist of individuals from the same educational institutions and to a lesser extent from the neighbourhood or sport clubs rather than based on ethnicity, which confirms the findings of Wimmer (2004) and demonstrates that theories about groupist behaviour, such as ethnic enclosure (Stodolska, 2007), are not applicable in the case of the five 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants interviewed in this research. Following the argumentation of Wimmer (2004), this might be rooted in a will to surround oneself with people of a similar educational level and "cognitive disposition" (p.31), who are equally mature, self-reflected and have comparable interests. Hence, when searching for friends, one might be looking for individuals who, independent of their origin, have a similar position or role in the social space (*ibid.*) rather than taking only shared origin as a criterion.

In several cases, practices of *othering* were also used by some of the interviewees to distance themselves from other individuals of Turkish descent, which indirectly confirmed and as such also reproduced negative stereotypes and categorizations. At the same time, however, three interviewees used labels and personal pronouns that indicated a belonging to and identification with the Turkish community in Germany. Furthermore, it was shown that also self-descriptions were not always conforming to the feelings of belonging which were expressed more implicitly during the interview. For example one interviewee considered herself as "too German to be Turkish, and too Turkish to be German", whereas she at other points used terms like 'we' and 'our culture', which expresses a certain belonging to the Turkish community.

By contrasting and discussing differences between explicit self-descriptions, implicit expressions of belonging and practices of othering, I aimed to show that feelings of belonging are complex and situational, i.e. depending on the specific context, rather than exclusive (Colombo, 2010). Additionally, this served to illustrate that ethnicity and origin are very important points of reference for the interviewees in order to categorize and make distinctions, and also more generally to make sense of and describe their everyday life and social environment, possibly reactive to the fact that they were interviewed by a non-Muslim native German.

The interviews have revealed that multiculturalism is indeed a normal, mundane aspect of the research participants' lives in the German contemporary society, and that it is often experienced in an unreflected, unconscious manner. Thereby, this study confirms the approaches applied by Wise and Velayutham (2009), Wise (2009) and Werber (2013). Here, one might argue, the interviewees are ahead of the political leaders in Germany and significant parts of the German society, who sometimes tend to deny that in German cities, everyday multiculturalism is a social reality (Pardy & Lee, 2011). Through everyday practices, the interviewees have realized that multicultural social realities exist relatively unaffected from changes in the political discourse.

However, by using examples of the variety of cuisines and products from different regions of the world, the interviewees highlighted that also for many native Germans multicultural variety has become a mundane part of their everyday lives, including living together with individuals of various backgrounds in urban contexts. This was confirmed by the fact that the interviewees (with the exception of one) highlighted that they did not have many or, in their perception, severe experiences with discrimination, and that their migration background has not prevented them from building social networks with native Germans. This might be seen as an indicator that a substantial part of the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft* is more or less open towards individuals with non-German roots and has accepted the presence of co-citizens with Turkish roots as normality.

At the same time, however, the interviewees were often considered as and even complimented for being 'well-assimilated', considering that they are higher-educated, have German language abilities on a mother tongue level and show (in case of the more religious interviewees) no openly visible traces of their religion. This confirms Ehrkamp's (2006) and Fleischmann & Phalets's (2012) findings that assimilation, i.e. the homogenising into the majority group, is the dominant discourse on *Integration* in Germany. Hence, those individuals of Turkish descent who fully comply with this discourse and do not show much of their 'Turkishness' in public spheres are considered as 'well-assimilated'. It could be speculated that they might be met with less tolerance or might experience more everyday discrimination if they adhered more openly to Turkish (and Muslim) customs and traditions.

Thus, despite their own mainly positive experiences of openness among many individuals of the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, all interviewees were very aware that there is a continuing resentment and negative attitudes against 'foreigners' in Germany (*cf.* Ehrkamp, 2006; Fleischmann & Phalet, 2012; Crul & Vermeulen, 2003), which is also constantly reproduced and recreated through practices of *othering* and everyday discrimination. This discourse was deemed by the interviewees to be 'the other side of the coin' of multicultural co-existence. As described by the interviewees, native Germans' practices of *othering* can be both consciously and unconsciously, but in both cases creates a distance between native and non-native Germans.

One repeating example regarding unconscious practices of *othering* was that the interviewees received compliments for their German language abilities; although for them speaking German is a matter of course which in their opinion does not deserve any compliments. This could be interpreted as a sign for the prevalence of the stereotype that 'the Turks', which in the eyes of some native Germans also include the interviewees and generally everyone of Turkish descent, are not able to speak German, so the persons were positively surprised by the interviewees' language abilities. Alternatively, it could be understood as an indicator that it has not been recognized by these persons that individuals of Turkish descent have been an integral part of the German society for a long period of time, and that the descendants of 1<sup>st</sup> generation migrants have lived all their lives in Germany and followed the German education system. In either case, such incidents could be interpreted as a form of everyday discrimination, where with seemingly positive remarks (i.e. compliments about their language abilities) native Germans, consciously or not, express that individuals of Turkish descent are not yet considered as equal co-citizens.

Not only in the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*, but also among politicians and in the mainstream media, examples can be found where practices of *othering* are used to depict migrants and their descendants living in Germany as one homogeneous group, characterized first and foremost by their migrant status rather than other, more personal characteristics. Migrants and their descendants are often represented in public German discourse as a 'problematic group' (cf. Eckert & Chadha, 2013; Kuppinger, 2014; Ehrkamp, 2006; Fleischmann & Phalet, 2012) which is clearly separated from the German *Mehrheitsgesellschaft*.

### *Answering the research question*

The goal of this research was to describe and analyse individual social realities of young 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants in Germany as detailed as possible within the scope of this study. Furthermore, the aim was to focus on narrations about personal experiences of living in the multicultural German society outside of quantitative research on structural integration.

Although the German society can be described as multicultural, especially in urban contexts, there are significant differences to what extent it has been realized by the native German public, the media as well as politicians that Germany is an immigration country, that citizens of (Turkish) origin have long been an integral part of the society and that it is impossible to deny multicultural social realities. The interviewees had in general a very positive stance on the multicultural society, which might be also due to the fact that the (mainly native German) individuals in their closer social environment are rather open and tolerant. Nevertheless, they are very well aware of the existence of less tolerant individuals, of stereotypes and negative generalizations, which also affect their own perception of their position in the German society. To some extent, these categorizations are also employed by

the interviewees themselves to judge other individuals with a Turkish migrant background, which proves that the Turkish community in Germany is far from internally homogeneous. Also the German and Turkish cultures are often deemed incompatible, or even opposite to each other.

Through growing up between and living with both cultures, as several interviewees said about themselves, it is specifically this group of second generation migrants that was born and raised in Germany by parents significantly closer connected to Turkey than their offsprings, who manages to unify the allegedly distinct cultures within their identity. In this process of negotiation, individual interpretations of cultural elements lead to hybrid forms of how these are combined. This shows the creativity (Colombo, 2010) 2<sup>nd</sup> generation migrants use in interpreting difference in everyday life situations. Although sometimes difficult, such as in periods of inner torn-ness between the cultures or through negative confrontation with their *otherness* by others during their youth, it is now normal and mundane for the interviewees to have both cultures in their daily lives, sometimes more, sometimes less consciously - "It's always both", as Serhat remarked.

### *Recommendations for future research*

As shortly mentioned above already, most of the research on everyday multiculturalism has been in form of case studies, where one specific area, such as a building complex, street or neighbourhood was the focus of the research. This allows adding the dimension of personal interactions between the research participants to the research and hence brings the analysis to a deeper level. Therefore, I would recommend that future research about everyday multiculturalism in German urban contexts should be more location bound, such as Ehrkamp's research on Turkish migrants' assimilation in Duisburg-Marxloh (2006) or Kuppinger's (2004) on Muslim spaces in Stuttgart.

One of the major limitations of this research, as discussed earlier, is the limited sample of only five 2<sup>nd</sup> generation Turkish migrants who due to their above-average education level cannot be considered as representative. To avoid this in future research, conducting more interviews with a broader range of research participants over a longer period of time is advisable if time and funding allow for it. By including follow-up interviews, trust between the researcher and research participants could be enhanced (Adler & Clark, 2011) and the interviewer gains more insight into individual social realities and perceptions.

By positioning this study in the field of neighbourhood studies and urban sociology (*cf.* Wise & Velayutham, 2009; Peters, 2011), the focus could also be broadened to not only include the perceptions and narrations of second generation migrants, but also a variety of other individuals living in the specific research area, be it migrants or native Germans of various backgrounds, social classes and with diverse (migration) histories. The result of such research would be an in-depth case study (Adler & Clark, 2011) on one particular neighbourhood, representing a significant part of its inhabitants, which, although not



generalizable, could very well serve to inform context-specific policy design to improve the social co-existence of individuals and families of diverse backgrounds.

### *Policy implications*

This study, although limited in scope and certainly not generalizable, has drawn attention to several aspects in the German society and politics where significant changes need to be made in order to improve the social co-existence of individuals with and without migration background in the German multicultural society.

Earlier, it was stated that there is still much structural inequality between native Germans and those with a migration background, even if the migration happened several generations before (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003). This is especially obvious in educational institutions, and urgently requires the development of adequate policies to achieve parity in the chances and possibilities for the descendants of migrants and native Germans. Nevertheless, as the research participants of this study have all achieved a high level of education, they were not personally affected by this inequality.

However, a recurring theme and major element influencing the interviewees' narrations and perceptions is that intolerance towards *otherness* is still rather wide-spread, which manifests itself in the stereotypes and prejudices individuals with a (Turkish) migration background are met with, and which to some extent they have come to apply themselves.

I want to highlight here some of the positive approaches to counteract such negative perceptions that were mentioned by the interviewees: As a first step, open dialogues to educate native Germans about everyday social realities of Turks/Muslims in Germany should be facilitated, as well as educating individuals from a young age onwards about being an active citizen in a multicultural society in the contemporary globalized world. One example could be to change the curricula of the various school systems to focus not only on Christianity in the religious education, but to pay equal attention to different religions such as Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism etc., and how they are practiced by different individuals. Through this, already school children could get more realistic images of for example the everyday social realities of being a Muslim in Germany (although this certainly depends on the individual's degree of religiosity).

Another, more political recommendation made by one interviewee would be to improve the political representation of individuals with non-German backgrounds, as they are currently under-represented in the current political system. This would allow for more participation and power of those having an interest in more progressive immigration policies and especially migrants living in Germany to influence policy-making, particularly when it is targeted at them. Although one should certainly not make the mistake of homogenising

individuals with a Turkish immigration background into one group, this could be considered as a first step into the right direction.

There are of course many more aspects of this deep-rooted problem that need to be addressed by policy makers, but more detailed studies are necessary as a basis for these.

## References

- Adler, E. & Clark, R. (2011). *An Invitation to Social Research: How it's Done*. Belmont: Wadsworth
- Alba, R. (2005). Bright vs. blurred boundaries: Second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(1), 20-49.
- Ang, I. (2014). Beyond Chinese groupism: Chinese Australians between assimilation, multiculturalism and diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(7), 1184-1196.
- Ang, I. (2003). Together-in-Difference: Beyond Diaspora, Into Hybridity. *Asian Studies Review*, 27(2), 141-152.
- Baumeister, R. F (1986). *Identity: Cultural change and the struggle for self*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berry, J.W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L., & Vedder, P. (2006). *Immigrant youth in cultural transition: Acculturation, identity and adaptation across national contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Colombo, E. (2010). Crossing Differences: How Young Children of Immigrants Keep Everyday Multiculturalism Alive. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 31(5), 455-470.
- Crul, M. & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The Second Generation in Europe. *International Migration Review*, 37(4), 965-986.
- Diehl, C. & Schnell, R. (2006). "Reactive Ethnicity" or "Assimilation"? Statements, Arguments, and First Empirical Evidence for Labor Migrants in Germany. *International Migration Review*, 40(4), 786-816.
- Duruz, J. (2009). Eating at the Borders: Culinary Journeys. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eckert, S. & Chadha, K. (2013). Muslim bloggers in Germany: an emerging counterpublic. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35(8), 926-942.
- Ehrkamp, P. (2005). Placing identities: Transnational practices and local attachments of Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 31(2), 345-364.
- Ehrkamp, P. (2006). "We Turks are no Germans": assimilation discourses and the dialectical construction of identities in Germany. *Environment and Planning*, 38, 1673-1692.
- Erikson, E H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

- Fleischmann, F. & Phalet, K. (2012). Integration and religiosity among the Turkish second generation in Europe: a comparative analysis across four capital cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(2), 320-341.
- Frisina, A. (2010). Young Muslims' Everyday Tactics and Strategies: Resisting Islamophobia, Negotiating Italianness, Becoming Citizens. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 31(5), 557-572.
- Goodall, H., Wearing, S., Byrne, D. & Cadzow, A. (2009). Fishing the Georges River: Cultural Diversity and Urban Environments. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grotevant, H.D., Dunbar, N., Kohler, J.K., & Lash-Esau, A.M. (2000). Adoptive identity: How contexts within and beyond the family shape developmental pathways. *Family Relations*, 49(4), 379-387.
- Harinen, P., Honkasalo, M., Ronkainen, J. & Suurpää, L. (2012). Multiculturalism and young people's leisure spaces in Finland: perspectives of multiculturalism youth. *Leisure Studies*, 31(2), 177-191.
- Kuppinger, P. (2014). Flexible topographies: Muslim spaces in a German cityscape. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 15(6), 627-644.
- "Merkels Multikulti-Absage" (October 19, 2010). *Lob und Empörung: Merkels Multikulti-Absage sorgt für weltweites Aufsehen*. Spiegel Online. Retrieved on June 23, 2014, from <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/lob-und-empoeerung-merkels-multikulti-absage-sorgt-fuer-weltweites-aufsehen-a-723993.html>
- Noble, G. (2009). Everyday Cosmopolitanism and the Labour of Intercultural Community. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Noble, G. (2013). 'It is home but it is not home': habitus, field and the migrants. *Journal of Sociology*, 49(2-3), 341-356.
- Pardy, M. & Lee, J. (2011). Using buzzwords of belonging: everyday multiculturalism and social capital in Australia. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 35(3), 297-316.
- Pécoud, A. (2002). "Weltoffenheit schafft Jobs": Turkish Entrepreneurship and Multiculturalism in Berlin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), 494-507.
- Peters, K.B.M. (2011). *Living together in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods. The meaning of public spaces for issues of social integration*. Wageningen: Wageningen Academic Publishers.

- Semi, G., Colombo, E., Camozzi, I., Frisina, A. (2009). Practices of Difference: Analysing Multiculturalism in Everyday Life. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Şen, F. (2003). The Historical Situation of Turkish Migrants in Germany. *Immigrants & Minorities: Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora*, 22(2), 208-227.
- Schwartz, S.J., Montgomery, M.J., & Briones, E. (2006). The role of identity in acculturation among immigrant people: Theoretical propositions, empirical questions, and applied recommendations. *Human Development*, 49(1), 1-30.
- Sherman, J. (2009). The Colour of Muscle: Multiculturalism at a Brooklyn Bodybuilding Gym. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, M.J. (1998) *Social Science in Question*. London: Sage.
- Stehle, M. (2012). White ghettos: The 'crisis of multiculturalism' in post-unification Germany. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 15(2), 167-181.
- Stodolska, M. (2007). Ethnic enclosure, social networks and leisure behaviour of immigrants from Korea, Mexico and Poland. *Leisure/Loisir*, 31(1), 277-324.
- Stratton, J. & Ang, I. (1994). Multicultural imagined communities: Cultural difference and national identity in Australia and the USA. *The Australian Journal of Media & Culture*, 8(2), 124-158.
- Velayutham, S. (2009). Everyday Racism in Singapore. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weber, R. (2004). The Rhetoric of Positivism vs. Interpretivism. A personal view. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), 3-12.
- Werbner, P. (2013). Everyday Multiculturalism: Theorising the difference between 'intersectionality' and 'multiple identities'. *Ethnicities*, 13(4), 401-419.
- Wimmer, A. (2004). Does ethnicity matter? Everyday group formation in three Swiss immigrant neighbourhoods. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(1), 1-36.
- Wise, A. (2005). Hope and Belonging in a Multicultural Suburb. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 26(1-2), 171-186.
- Wise, A. (2009). Everyday Multiculturalism: Transversal Crossings and Working Class Cosmopolitanism. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). Introduction: Multiculturalism and Everyday Live. In Wise, A. & Velayutham, S. (2009). *Everyday Multiculturalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zhou, M. (1997). Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 975-1008.

# Appendix

## Interview guide

Loosely based on Harinen et al. (2012), Eckert & Chadha (2013), Colombo (2010), Goodall et al. (2009), etc;

### Self-Identification, Belonging

- Self description
- What is defining you, which characteristics?
- Open about Turkish roots? Important when introducing yourself?
- Sometimes emphasizing of Turkish roots? When, why?
- Sometimes downplaying of Turkish roots? When, why?
- What environment do you feel you belong to? Dependent on situations?
- Opinion about belonging to a country/culture
- Do you think belonging is exclusive?

### Difference

- Feeling ‚different‘ from German friends? (e.g. reactions, behaviour, opinions)
- Why, where does that come from?
- Reflection in everyday life
- Experiences with discrimination because of Turkish background?
- How to you react? Strategies to react?
- Advantages because of Turkish background?
- Is ‚difference‘ (esp. regarding ethnicity) considered as too important? Or completely normal, and therefore doesn´t need to be discussed?

### Everyday Multiculturalism and Space

- what kind of neighbourhood do you live in?
- how, with whom?
- Daily contact with people of different backgrounds? How?
- Opinion about cultural diversity?
- Experiences with miscommunication due to different backgrounds?
- Confidence in communicating in different contexts (e.g. elderly Turkish neighbour etc  
→ contexts where native Germans would not necessarily know how to act)

### Leisure Activities and Social networks

- Normal leisure activities?
- Where, with whom, what social environment?
- Involved in Clubs or migrant/cultural organizations?

- Friends/partner with migrations background?
- Much contact with people of Turkish descent? Important?
- Experiences with discrimination in leisure?
- Importance Turkey (travelling, VFR tourism)

#### Politics, media and representation; counterpublics and activism

- Opinion labelling as 'immigrant' (of 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> generation), 'German with migration background', 'Germanturk'
- Belonging to these categories
- Adequate labels or not? Why (not)?
- Impressions of the representations of migrants in German media, politics, public sphere?
- Feelings, emotional responses?
- Labels reflected in own life?
- How can it be changes? Do you contribute to that?
- Experiences with discrimination in education/work
- Politically active?
- Is this topic discussed with family and friends?
- Understanding of everyday/mundane multiculturalism, opinion
- Experiences with that in daily life?