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Abstract

This thesis uses a lifestyle migration lens to explore the second-generation Turkish-Germans’ ‘return’ migration to their ancestral homeland. Disappointed with the post-return lives in their parents’ towns of origin and/or in big cities like Istanbul, the research’s sample group consciously made the decision to remobilise themselves and resettle in Antalya, a tourism hub in the Mediterranean coast of Turkey. The narratives reflect that the second generation’s ‘return’ imaginings and further life choices such as places of settlement are motivated by their goals of ‘living a fulfilling life’ and have a ‘coherent sense of self’. The qualitative study coins a new term, ‘lifestyle return migration’ which offers a hybrid conceptual framework, alternative to conventional migration theories that evaluate ‘return’ as an ‘income-maximising act’, ‘anomaly’ and ‘homecoming’. Based on the thematic and narrative analysis of 44 semi-structured, in-depth life-story interviews, the findings illustrate that ‘lifestyle returnees’ perceive Antalya as a place wherein their multiple identities, ‘alternative’ lifestyles and translocal ties can co-exist. Thus, Antalya’s cosmopolitan setting with many foreign, especially German, tourists and residents are particularly valued. Moreover, they can mobilise their human capital of educational qualifications, bilingual skills and “transcultural capital” to set up or get jobs in the tourism sector, combining work with leisure in ‘tourism spaces’ wherein they can sustain a persistent holiday feeling. In addition, the narratives reveal more existential themes of (re-)discovering their ‘true’ selves and (re-)inventing the meaning of ‘home’ in this international niche. Subsequently, the thesis aims to highlight the relevance of lifestyle migration approaches to explore complex ‘return’ decisions through an agency-oriented approach and with a focus on social fields embedded in specific locales.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Problematising ‘Return’ and ‘Home’ for the Second Generation

This thesis explores the meaning and nature of ‘searching for self’ for the second-generation Turkish-Germans\(^1\) in relation to their ‘return’ migration imaginings and post-return lifestyle decisions in their ancestral homeland. The thesis focuses on a distinctive case, the second-generation Turkish\(^2\) ‘returnees’ from Germany who relocated to Antalya – a Mediterranean tourism hub in Turkey. The empirical evidence is based on the life-story narratives of 44 second-generation Turkish-Germans, interviewed in 2015 in Antalya. The particularity of this group stems from their choice of settlement upon ‘return’, as they had limited or no prior social links, kinship ties and experiences in this tourism place. Hence, the case study calls attention to the significance of personal lifestyle choices and aspirations on how to live and where to live in migratory decision-making processes. The thesis therefore adopts a ‘lifestyle migration’ lens to scrutinise the second-generation’s trajectories to live a ‘better’ and more fulfilling life upon return, as well as how values and lifestyles attached to particular places simultaneously influence their socialisation, ‘self-making’ and ‘home-making’ practices.

Critically, the thesis puts the term ‘return’ in scare quotes since this is not a regular form of return migration: the sample of the thesis were born and raised in Germany, and they ‘returned’ to a country which their parents left in the 1960s and 1970s to migrate to Germany as labour-migrants known as “guestworkers”\(^3\). Hence, for the second generation, the act of resettling to their parents’ country of origin is, in fact, a myth of return and reuniting with the roots (Tsuda, 2003). The second-generation Turkish-German’s ‘return’ migration provokes another theoretical reflection: this is a counter-intuitive form of migration in which push-pull factors that drove the first-generation Turkish labour migrants to migrate to Germany are

---

\(^1\) There are different types of hyphenations for this group: ‘Deutsch-Türken’ or ‘German-Turkish’ (Kaya, 2007); ‘Germany-born Turks’ (King & Kilinc, 2013); ‘Euro-Turks’ (Sirkeci, 2002; Østergaard-Nielsen, 2000; Kaya & Kentel, 2005). Based on the American phrasing of hyphenated identities, the thesis adopts the term ‘Turkish-Germans’ referring to the children of the first-generation Turkish immigrants in Germany.

\(^2\) This thesis avoids the term ‘Turk’ which may denote a singular ethnic identity, instead ‘Turkish’ is used following the argument that, Turkish migration flows refer to those of the Turks, Kurds, Arabs and others as ethnic groups forming the population in Turkey (Sirkeci, et al., 2012).

\(^3\) The widely-used term Gastarbeiter illustrates the German government’s attempt to recognise the contribution of foreigners to the country’s economy, while also emphasising the idea of temporary stay, however guestworker populations became more permanent, maturing into diasporas (Mihajlovic, 1987, pp.188-189).
violated. How, then, the second generation’s reversal of their parents’ trajectory of settling in an economically and socially prosperous country (Germany) has emerged, and thus they ‘return’ to Turkey which is relatively feeble in terms of political cohesion, level of income and social welfare?

The question proposed above is a clear indicator that return migration is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon which cannot be simply explained with a macro-level framework of analysis wherein return decisions are tied to economic opportunity structures per se (Faist, 2000). Thus, individual values, lifestyle choices and expectations on a micro level, and kinship, social ties and networks on a meso-level also effect the decision-making processes (Lee, 1966; Massey, 1990; Massey, et al., 1994). Consequently, return migration flows from Germany to Turkey that have rapidly been increasing since the 1980s might not be compatible with how economic perspectives perceive migrants as “income-maximising actors” (Todaro, 1969), however leaves room to explore other aspirations and motivations beyond the economically-driven and even family-oriented ones.

There is a burgeoning interest in recent return migration research to examine the peculiar case of the second generation vis-à-vis the return phenomenon in relation to re-construction of identities and belonging. These studies provide an explanation for the mentioned paradox regarding the second generation’s reversal of their parents’ trajectories by highlighting the second generation’s more existential motivations for ‘return’. As King and Christou (2008, p.17) explain, the second generation’s ‘return’ is an existential journey to the source of the self, as a return to the ‘cradle’ of a cathartic mission to reclaim its sacred sites, and re-enter its mythic and space and time.

However, the second generation’s expectation of ‘return as homecoming’ is not always experienced (King & Christou, 2010a; Markowitz & Stefansson, 2004; Wessendorf, 2007). Not being able to find ‘home’ in the ‘homeland’ leads to contesting of self-definitions, signalling that diasporic ‘homeland-orientation’ and emotional ties fostered by family narratives and childhood nostalgia of holidays are inadequate to maintain the romanticised idea of ‘homeland’ once they have the lived experiences of ‘return’ places. Such anxieties of return journey are often associated with the duality of ‘home’: on one hand, the second generation long for a discreetly-defined ‘home’, discursively constructed and imagined in their ‘diaspora space’; on the other hand, they trans-locally live and experience places as multiple and uprooted.

Hence, the expectation of homecoming as a “quest for anchorage” (Corcoran, 2002, p.189) is often revised once the second-generation ‘returnees’ experience the gap between their
‘return’ imaginings and actual realities, leading to considerations of re-emigration (Tsuda, 2001; Ley & Kobayashi, 2005; Lidgard & Gilson, 2002). This hiatus was the starting point of the thesis in focusing on the second-generation ‘returnees’ who remobilised themselves to put their quest of ‘searching for self’ into action. The thesis therefore recognises an increasing diversification of migration types based on the characteristics and motivations of the migrants, their life-stages and the directionality of the movement (Halfacree, 2004; King, 2002).

Consequently, it is vital to explore how the second generation ‘returnees’ actively engage themselves in place-attachment practices to construct “the sense of physically being and feeling ‘in place’ or ‘at home’” (Yüksel, et al., 2010, p.275). Nevertheless, there is a glaring gap in the literature regarding the ‘returnee’ second generation’s further movements as a ‘self-seeking’ project, independent from the diasporic denotations of ‘identity’ and ‘home’. Thus, the thesis acknowledges that there is a renewed research interest in return migration and its theorisation (Cassarino, 2004), and offers ‘lifestyle return migration’ as an alternative approach to examine the second generation’s ongoing ‘place-making’ practices and ‘self-seeking’ journeys.

1.2 Self-Seeking as a Bridge Between ‘Return’ and Lifestyle Migration

Lifestyle migration as a new, yet conceptually ambiguous field of research emphasises the paradigm change regarding identities, traditions/cultures and social structures in the post-traditionalist Western societies. Thus, late-modern subjects’ aspirations, motivations and decisions are understood in relation to the processes of individualisation, globalisation and “time-space compression” (Harvey, 1990). Lifestyle migration as a “tourism-informed mobility” (Williams & Hall, 2002) is used to describe the movements of the 21st century “affluent” individuals from “the global North” to “the global South” to have a “better quality of life”, without having economic push factors in their home countries, nor decisive economic pull factors in destination countries such as employment and higher wage rates (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009; D’Andrea, 2007; Korpela, 2009). Instead, the underlying motivation of lifestyle migration is related to the late-modern subjects’ quest of ‘self-actualisation’, in which lifestyle migrants see opportunities to recast their identities and distance themselves from their previous social roles, commitments and personal ties (Amit, 2007; O’Reilly, 2000).

Lifestyle migration research stresses the links between individuals’ evocation of late-modern reflexivity resonated in their lifestyle choices, quest for finding their ‘true’ self and their residing places perceived as ‘authentic’ (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.610). However, the research signals that the notion of ‘authenticity’ is problematic: it often incites a false dichotomy labelling the urban-industrial-capitalist milieu as ‘inauthentic’/‘dystopian’ and the lifestyle-tourist
destination as ‘authentic’/‘utopian’ (Kılınç & King, 2017; Wang, 1999). These conceptualisations of particular places as ‘alternative’ or ‘authentic’ is related to the individuals’ desire to reconstitute ‘the self’ through adopting certain lifestyles, therefore they choose places which are thought to reflect their lifestyles, or provide them with a ‘sense of coherence’.

Nevertheless, the thesis acknowledges the late-modern subjects’ tension of both “having the burden and liberation of constructing their own identities” (Torkington, 2010, p.104) and not being able to have identity “without an orientation in moral space” (Calhoun, 1991, p.238). Hence, the ‘free will’ of individuals becomes problematic, raising the issue of agency/structure dualism – to what extent individuals can act according to their wishes whilst they are constrained by moral stands, family and social norms, national, religious, ethnic, gender and racial discourses; as well as social, political and economic structures that ‘govern’ ‘mentalities’ (Foucault, 1991). Simmel [1903] (2010, p.316) reflects on the individuals’ ‘in-between’ state of autonomy and dependency with the following observation:

The deepest problems of modern life flow from the attempt of the individual to maintain the independence and individuality of his existence against the sovereign powers of society, against the weight of the historical heritage and the external culture and technique of life.

Lifestyle migration which is an “individualised pursuit and structurally reliant” (Benson & O’Reilly, 2016, p.20) is driven by some of the ‘deepest problems of modern life’, indicating “how the apparent ‘free choice’ to pursue a particular way of living through migration identified these migrations as central to identity-making projects” (pp.21-22). Lifestyle migrants are distinct in their structural positioning as they can approach migration as a form of consumption and a response to practical, moral and emotional imperatives (pp.22-24). Thereof, the thesis asks, how the concept of lifestyle can be used as a lens to understand a case of second generation ‘return’ migration which is primarily motivated by a ‘self-seeking’ quest? What would a lifestyle-oriented return migration approach would assume about a) the direction of migration; b) the place(s) of departure and return, and c) the migrants’ agency in relation to internal structures such as self-identity and external structures such as national borders and visa regimes?

In order to find possible answers to these questions, the second generation’s specific contexts need to be understood. In the case of ‘diasporic subjects’ – people who were born and raised in a country in which they do not have ancestral roots from – already complex dynamics of ‘self’ in relation to ‘society’ contain more layers, in which they do not only have attachments to the norms and structures of the society they live in, but through their familial and ‘diaspora space’ as well as transnational ties and activities, they experience and internalise the norms and
structures of a far-away-‘homeland’ which can be both physical and symbolic. Lindholm (2007, p.209) suggests, “self-consciousness builds upon that existential duality of ‘me’ and ‘not me’, and it is the unfolding of this self that ought to be the focus of study”. For the second generation, experiences of such ‘existential duality’ is multiplied, as the notions of ‘me’ and ‘not me’ are hybrid and relational.

The argument here is, evaluating returnees’ feelings, experiences and future routes regarding ‘home’ through grand narratives of nations and diasporas is not sufficient to understand the complex dynamics of the relationship between people and places. Relating the second generation’s motivations for return to their ancestral homeland with their ongoing instability of identity in diaspora (Basu, 2007) limits the understanding of ‘self’ for the second generation as ‘inauthentic’ during their lives in diaspora, and ‘authentic’ in their post-return lives. Instead, following the recent scholarship which perceives the ‘search for self’ in the post-traditionalist era as ‘beyond identity’ and the desire for home as ‘anachronistic’ (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000) the thesis aims to offer an alternative understanding to the second generation’s homing desires beyond the dialectic of “home versus movement” and “home as movement” (Rapport & Dawson, 1998, p.30).

Contrasting how ‘self’ is perceived, constructed, sought and actualised in the lives of the second generation in relation to Western modern subjects (bona fide lifestyle migrants) have the potential of understanding diasporic individual’s agencies beyond national borders and “ethnic groupism/boundaries” (Barth, 1969; Brubaker, 2002). If processes of identity formation and individuals’ roles in societies are argued to be unclear in the contemporary world and that the modern life is defined as “a project of self-realization” (Vink, 2005, p.13), why can this approach not be applied to diasporic individuals as well? Hence, the thesis argues that by focusing on ‘search for self’, late-modern and individualistic trajectories of ‘self’ and diasporic/counter-diasporic formations of identity can be merged. In that sense, the concept of ‘self’ acts as a bridge between lifestyle migration and return migration approaches, but it also requires a theoretical framework which evaluates the self in relation to social identities, specific places and agency (its construction, navigation and transformation in relation to structures). The thesis aims to build such a framework, which is introduced and further elaborated in the next section.

1.3 Entering the ‘Translocal Field’: ‘Lifestyle Return Migration’ to Antalya

The concept of ‘lifestyle return migration’ in this thesis was inductively developed wherein I have engaged with “a continuous dialogue with empirical data” (Becker, 1998, p.109) on the specific case of the Turkish-German second generation’s ‘return’. In recent years, return
migration from Germany to Turkey has gained attention, however links between specific ‘return’ locales and the returnees’ projects of a ‘better life’ remain vague. Nevertheless, some insights can be gained from the following three studies about the ways in which specificities of return places influence the returnees’ sense of self and home: The resettlement of second-generation Turkish-Germans in Istanbul has demonstrated that the lively and eclectic life in Turkey’s metropolis together with vast job opportunities was favourable amongst the returnees, whilst the city chaos, high living expenses, traffic, and changing setting with domestic migration from the rural parts (higher rates of criminality, diminishing of Istanbul manners and etiquette, unplanned urbanisation etc.) created disappointments and frustrations (Kilinc, 2014; King & Kilinc, 2013). This group narrates a strong ‘Istanbul identity’ which they have been proudly embracing whilst living in Germany as well, as a social class status to distinguish themselves from the other members of the Turkish community who fit into the classic “guestworker type”4 – immigrated to Germany from the rural areas of Turkey with limited or no prior education and skills, conservative and protectionist in terms of their traditional values.

The second generation who settled in the rural areas in the Black Sea Coast project their ‘return’ as a reunification with their parents’ places of origin, hence based their choices on family and kinship networks, with the expectation of living in a secure environment (King & Kilinc, 2014). In both cases, ‘return’ is predominantly influenced by the second generation’s family-related decisions – either their parents leading the return project, or encouraging the second generation to return to Turkey to find a partner, and/or to study in high school/university. The places of ‘return’ were therefore either where the parents came from or had their most-established networks through childhood visits and holidays. Furthermore, for both samples, the realisation that Turkey has gone through an immense political, economic and societal transformation since the 1990s – mostly for the better, whilst Germany’s weakening welfare and the gaining popularity of anti-immigrant public and political discourses – acted as rationalisation for ‘return’ decision, despite the second generation’s various disappointments about their lives in the ancestral homeland.

The third strand of research within this topic focused on the tourism districts of Alanya, Side, Kemer and Antalya city in 2014 (Kilinc & King, 2017). The research’s findings highlighted a

---

4 Two common terms are used for this group in the Turkish discourse. One is “gurbetçi”, referring to someone in gurbet (diaspora) – deriving from the word “garaba” in Arabic with the meaning “to depart, to emigrate, to be away from one’s homeland, to live as a foreigner in another country” (Kaya, 2007, p.18). Another is a more derogative term “Almancı”, meaning “Germanised” or “German-like” associated with pretentious behaviour (e.g. showing off with materials such as German-made cars or, with ‘culture’; dressing, eating and living like Germans) and losing one’s “Turkishness” (Kaya & Kentel, 2005, p.3).
different dynamic of second generation ‘return’: the main reason why the second generation settled in the Antalya province was the uniqueness of the place as a touristic region, offering open spaces for manifestation of more liberal and ‘alternative’ lifestyles in an environmentally and culturally attractive setting (Kılınç & King, 2017, p.1493). Their ‘narratives of lifestyle choices’ demonstrated that the second generation in this particular locale projected their ‘return’ to utilise their social, cultural and human capital (mainly German and English language skills) to work in tourism-related jobs. Combined with the naturally beautiful scenery around them, flexible working hours and the social aspects of tourism work, the informants reflected that they could lead more ‘fulfilling’ lives in these relatively affordable and relaxed touristic towns (Kılınç & King, 2017, p.1495).

This particular study showed that lifestyle can be considered as a feature of return migration and provided a layer of nuance to understanding of return and continued settlement beyond economic and political rationalisations (Benson & O’Reilly, 2016, p.31). Hence, in this thesis, the main aim was to further scrutinise the role of lifestyle in return migration with regards to a) what kind of style of life ‘returnees’ imagine will be lived in their return place(s) and, b) how the lived experiences of ‘return’ shape/transform their way of life. Acknowledging that the Turkish-German second generation’s return imaginings can be well or ill-informed, and shaped by social constructions (and social imaginaries) of space and place (Benson, 2012; O’Reilly, 2014), the thesis focuses on understanding how lifestyle aspirations are altered or invigorated in their ‘translocal social fields’ (instead of ‘transnational’, see Levitt & Glick-Schiller, 2004).

1.3.1 Coining a New Term: Who is a ‘Lifestyle Returnee’?

By focusing on the ‘returnee’ second generation’s resettlement in Antalya, the thesis coins a new term ‘lifestyle returnee’ and develops the term through a critical review of the return migration and lifestyle migration literatures and empirical findings. The thesis conceptualises ‘lifestyle returnees’ as the members of the second generation who escape from the given diasporic/national/ethnic identities and gender norms, family/kinship ties and culturally-determined constraints/duties to pursue their individualistic aspirations. Subsequently, they further move from parents’ villages/towns of origin or chaotic cities with high living costs to places where they can find a space of freedom to re-invent their ‘sense of self’ and ‘sense of home’. Thus, for those second generation who has the “reflexive project of the self” (Giddens, 1991) building an emotional link between the self and place too, becomes a personal task.

Hence, the thesis puts seemingly contradicting approaches into dialogue: through utilising Bourdieusian concept of “habitus” and Giddens’ notion of “reflexivity”, the thesis analyses the
quest of ‘searching for self’ in relation to personal attributes, subjectivities and lifestyle choices as well as dynamic structures and social contexts surrounding the informants. Furthermore, the thesis adds a “translocality” angle to this hybrid analytical framework to accentuate that lifestyle returnees’ project of self-seeking requires a focus on specific places. By building on Anthias’ (2008) concept of “translocational positionality” (i.e. understanding identity constructions in the light of intersectionality and specific locations) and Bourdieusian (1990) concept of “habitus” – an unconscious set of dispositions that individuals develop throughout their lifetimes in their social fields (i.e. field) that structure interactions amongst people – the thesis develops the concept of ‘translocational habitus’. Bourdieu understands practice as socially situated and practical mastery as specific to the ‘field’ in which they are located; field referring to “a relatively autonomous network of objective relations between positions, a social space of institutions and forces with its own forms of cultural and social capital” (Noble, 2013, p.351). The thesis suggests that the Turkish-German second-generation as ‘lifestyle returnees’ acquire ‘translocational habitus’, since they were raised with the values and cultures of two (or more) social fields, which can help them shift and adapt their subjectivities across social fields of specific locales.

The thesis further builds on Bourdieu’s “cultural capital” concept, referring to the accumulation of knowledge, skills and learning, the know-how that advantages an individual and gives them a higher status, prestige or authority in society (Bourdieu, 1990, p.138). The research’s overarching premise is that, the second-generation Turkish-Germans embody “transcultural capital” (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006) through life experiences in multiple places/spaces across Turkey and Germany in which their social, cultural, human capitals reflect a ‘dual frame of reference’ (Rumbaut, 2004; Portes & Rumbaut, 2005). Their encounters with multiple socio-cultural spaces across two countries, and their ‘return’ to the homeland and resettlement in a new environment influence their habitus, making its transformation and adaptation both possible and necessary (Thieme, 2008; Nowicka, 2015).

Conceptualising ‘lifestyle returnees’ as active agents and translocal subjects who consciously undertake a ‘self-seeking’ project in their own choice of residential locale has requested to “bring geography back in” to transnational discourse (Mitchell, 1997). Hence, the term ‘translocal field’ refers to three dimensions in this thesis:

Firstly, it is used to conceive lifestyle returnees’ social fields and agencies as transcending national borders and challenging current concepts of citizenship and nationhood (Schiller, et al., 1995). Alternative to ‘transnational space’ discourse which is criticised to be vague and floating with an overemphasis on hypermobility and deterritorialisation of places, the thesis adopts
‘translocal field’ approach for analysing lifestyle returnee’ subjectivities, belonging and place-making practices that emphasises “local-to-local relations” (Guarnizo & Smith, 1998; Ley, 2004). By following such ‘grounded’ sense of transnationalism, the thesis aims to explore the spatio-temporal constructions of lifestyle returnees’ experiences, because as Mitchell (1997) argues, spaces and places are not solely backgrounds, but play active roles in the dynamics of mobility and movement. For that reason, (Brickell & Datta, 2011, p.5) suggest that the focus of translocality as a theoretical tool is on, what they call as “the three axes”, namely space, place and connections. Hence, the thesis focuses on these three aspects of ‘translocal field’, following Brickell & Datta’s (2011, p.6) framework:

We examine translocal geographies as a set of dispersed connections across spaces, places and scales which become meaningful only in their corporeality, texture and materiality – as the physical and social conditions of particular constructions of the local, become significant sites of negotiations in migrants’ everyday lives.

Secondly, Antalya as a ‘translocal field’ is used in relation to the Bourdieusian concept of “field” – a network, structure, or set of relationships which may be based on different ends (e.g. culture, education, profession, religion etc.) (Navarro, 2006, p.18). According to Bourdieu, individuals often experience power differently depending which field they are in at a given moment (Gaventa, 2003, p.6), therefore context and environment are key influences on their “habitus” hence they express and reproduce their dispositions and subjectivities as well as compete for the distribution of different kinds of capital depending on their encounters with different fields (Gaventa, 2003). Conceptualising Antalya as a ‘translocal field’ is, therefore a way to stress the materiality of everyday practices/encounters and to recognise the “power geometries” (Massey, 1993) of translocational relations. The second-generation returnees resettling in Antalya raises the socio-cultural question in which they need to control and contest “power geometries”, because as Bourdieu suggests “cultural capital” plays a central role in societal power relations and that is how the inequalities are constituted. Power is culturally and symbolically created, and constantly re-legitimised through an interplay of agency and structure (Bourdieu, 1984).

The Turkish-German second generation which was raised in the German social order, however who kept their symbolic ties with the ancestral homeland therefore, go through a learning process in Antalya about how the ‘social order’ works in these ‘translocal fields’, as well as how they reflect on social differences and hierarchies which shape their subjectivities on their ‘sense of place’ and behaviours of self-exclusion/self-inclusion (Bourdieu, 2011). In addition,
Antalya as a Bourdieusian ‘translocal field’ contains multidirectional and overlapping networks – created by migration and tourism mobilities – that facilitate the circulation of resources, practices and ideas, with the capacity to transform localities. There is a co-dependency between the lifestyle returnees’ agency and the locale’s field – as much as the individual shapes the place, the place also shape the individual.

This ‘translocal’ adding is highlighting that lifestyle returnees’ “habitus” is not fixed or permanent, but shifts in relation to specific contexts of various fields in Antalya over time (Wacquant, 2005, p.316). According to Bourdieu, habitus is neither a result of free will, nor determined by structures, but created and reproduced unconsciously by a kind of interplay between the two over time (Bourdieu, 1984). However, translocality allows a more flexible approach with its focus on the local with its multiple spaces, therefore the individuals’ subjectivities can be understood beyond structural limitations (Brickell & Datta, 2011). Hence, lifestyle returnees’ agency and habitus is understood as being reflexive and ‘translocational’ which allows them to develop ‘coping strategies’ in their respective locals with their “repertoire and mobilisation of skills and expertise that require the forging of noneconomic, social and cultural allegiances”, even though they might not be ‘affluent’ in the economic sense (Kothari, 2008, pp.501-502). Subsequently, the thesis coins ‘translocal field’ to emphasise an agency-oriented approach for the lifestyle returnees’ daily activities to have a ‘better’ life, and for their project of ‘searching for self’.

At this point, it is vital to highlight how the current thesis recognises certain gaps in the previous research and in what ways it offers an original contribution with the development ‘lifestyle return migration’ as a concept. Firstly, the thesis’ empirical contribution emerges from the unfolding stories of ‘searching for self” as an ontological and existential pursuit. It was mentioned that the second generation’s one main expectation from settling in the ancestral homeland is to ground a ‘sense of self’ (King & Christou, 2010a). Yet, in most cases the lived experiences of the homeland upon return result in frustrations and unsettling experiences regarding self-identity. Nevertheless, the second generation’s post-return strategies and further migratory decisions to cope with these “experience of tension, of living bi-nationally, of being in-between” (England, et al., 2003, p.114) have been rarely explored from an agency-oriented and individualistic angle. The thesis’ premise is that the second generation has taken a further lifestyle migration path after realising that their identities are not destination points but processes in relation to different contexts they dwell in. Here, the research draws direct links between self-identity and place, as these second-generation returnees could not chase their pursuit of ‘search for self’ in anywhere else but Antalya. These research findings are understood through Bourdieu’s
argument that dis-alignment and tension between habitus and field lead to a “double perception of the self, to successive allegiances and multiple identities.”

Moreover, the thesis problematises being “affluent” as the prerequisite of engaging with self-reflexivity and undertaking a lifestyle migration path (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.609) and discusses this in relation to the second generation Turkish-Germans, who often have working-class backgrounds. The thesis illustrates that an analysis solely based on class is a problematic approach in the individualised, hybridised and globalised societies of late modernity, as misalignments can often emerge between one’s economic capital, social class, self-identity and lifestyle choices. Hence, class may no longer “constrain or enable life decisions […] and no longer produces taken-for-granted ways of living that shape behaviour, values, views and identities” (Atkinson, 2010, p.2). Instead, the thesis coins a new term ‘lifestyle returnee’, aiming to elaborate and establish better links between the second generations’ evolving subjectivities based on their “transcultural capital” (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006) and ‘translocational habitus’ in the specific locale of Antalya as a ‘translocal field’. In this regard, the development and usage of ‘translocational habitus’ in this thesis as an analytical tool to understand the notions of self-identity, place and habitus suggest a novel approach to the second generation ‘return’ migration phenomenon.

1.3.2 Researcher’s Positionality in the ‘Translocal Field’

Finally, ‘translocal field’ also refers to the site of field research in which I have collected interviews and observed the lives of my informants in Antalya’s tourism spaces during September-December 2015. Here, the ‘field’ refers to the physical place wherein I could observe the lifestyle returnees’ everyday lives, and to a metaphorical space of tourism in which my respondents invest most of their time for working and socialising purposes. My previous research experience in the Antalya region (2014) allowed me to observe the swift changes in the tourism economy and businesses in Antalya due to the rise of budget travellers and terror attacks in other parts of Turkey. Being able to observe these changing dynamics and having more familiarity with the place and its’ tourism spaces during my second stay, I felt that I was more informed about the rules of the place, knowing how to get access to ‘tourism spaces’ and interact with the lifestyle returnees. Sharing the Turkish background and having lived abroad for 6 years with my own project of ‘searching for self’, I could claim an “insider” role in the sense that I could relate to my informants’ existential narratives regarding ‘the self’ in relation to migration and ongoing identity negotiations and adaptation processes. However, differences on gender, age, educational and
professional experiences, family histories and rural/urban background made me an apparent “outsider”, challenging any simple understanding of my “insider” status (Moroşanu, 2015).

I was too, a part of the “power geometries” in the ‘translocal field’, constantly negotiating and managing my own identities depending on my encounters in this highly diverse city, as well as during my conversations with the informants (Botterill, 2015). As Ryan (2015) argues, both the researcher and her participants actively and in relation to each other negotiate positions during the interactions and, whilst some positions facilitate rapport and mutual trust, some hinder these. Such socially-situated co-creation of the interview dynamics also calls attention to consider interview not only as a text, reflecting the ‘reality’, personality and structures of meanings, but as interactions in which the researcher and informant negotiate the meanings (Silverman, 2015). Hence, adopting the postmodern conceptions of knowledge and critiques formulated by the feminist approaches, I perceive knowledge as “situated” (Haraway, 1988) – embodied, localised, connected and shared, in which the researcher adopts an active role in the process of knowledge production, and facilitates ‘active’ (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003) and “creative” interviews by enhancing narration and assigning an active role to informants as well (Douglas, 1985).

The thesis benefits from an “interdisciplinary thinking about migration” (King, 2012, p.135), combining theories from human geography, social anthropology and social psychology, also offering an eclectic paradigm utilising poststructuralist, feminist and postmodernist perspectives. Hence, adopting qualitative methods – “a form of systematic empirical inquiry into meaning” (Shank, 2002, p.5) the ethnographic fieldwork was designed to gain insights into my informants’ attitudes, value systems, concerns, aspirations, motivations, aspirations, culture and lifestyles prior and in relation to the ‘translocal field’, and enable them to reflect on these matters with in-depth life-story interviews and my own observations through sustained daily interactions with the informants (Willis & Trondman, 2000). The interpretivist stance of this thesis has required developing a critical reflexive awareness of my role as a researcher – the ‘knowledge producer’, and of research as productive of identity; from the data collection stage to the analysis stage of the fieldwork material and theories.

Thus, I did not only undertake “reflection-in-action” – developing my own “continuing theory of practice under real-time conditions” (Argyris & Schön, 1974, p.157) but also carried on the process of reflexivity “to identify, do something about, and acknowledge the limitations of the research: its location, its subjects, its process, its theoretical context, its data, its analysis, and how accounts recognize that the construction of knowledge takes place in the world and not apart from it” (Ruby, 1980, p.154). Therefore, my ‘active’ voice in the text appears mostly in
relation to the methodology, but also through my critical analysis of the data and theories. Hereof, as interpretivism cannot be free from the researcher’s positionalities, “claiming value-free position of neutrality” (Shacklock & Smyth, 1998, p.6) and aiming to be a “shaman’ of objectivity” (Ruby, 1980, p.154) have been avoided, instead, an open, reflexive and ethically mature research practice has hopefully been built on an acknowledgement of the ideological and historical power dominant forms of inquiry exert over me as the researcher and the informants.

1.4 Research Questions and Key Objectives

Based on the introduced theoretical and contextual framework, the main research question of this thesis was developed as the following:

- What kind of meanings do the lifestyle returnees assign to ‘searching for self’ and how do they manifest this quest through their migratory decisions?

This overarching question aims to firstly identify the meanings that the second generation attach to ‘search for self’, secondly how the post-return experiences influence the quest of ‘search for self’ and finally what are the ways in which this ‘self-seeking’ project translates into lifestyle migration to a tourism destination. With these objectives, the thesis aims to offer a re-conceptualisation of the second generation as lifestyle returnees who prioritise lifestyle choices for their ‘return’ to ancestral homeland – a) searching for self b) searching for a more autonomous and fulfilling life c) having work/life balance d) living in an ‘authentic’ place.

The main research question with these three key objectives are explored through sub-questions which are designed to analyse the second generation who ‘returned’ to Turkey as ‘lifestyle returnees’ as well as to reconceptualise the notion of ‘lifestyle migrant’ by comparing the empirical findings on second generation’s lifestyle-driven decisions and quest of ‘search for self’ with the classical lifestyle migration groups as defined in the existing literature.

Hence, the following sub-questions specifically refer to the case study:

1. In what ways do Antalya and its tourism spaces relate to/differ from their lifestyle and self-seeking aspirations?
2. How do their ‘translocational habitus’ and utilisation of different types of capital (especially “transcultural capital”) interplay with their processes of place-making?
3. How does their project of ‘search for self’ evolve in relation to dwelling in Antalya and further mobility – and, how their self-identity and belonging are reshaped during these processes?
Through the exploration of these questions, the thesis brings together two research disciplines which have had little contact: by putting the studies of tourism-informed migration and ‘return’ into dialogue, the research aims to offer novel insights regarding the complex dynamics of ‘return’ as an evolving journey with diverse trajectories and expectations. In addition, by building such link between tourism and migration, the problematic criteria of what distinguishes from ‘permanent stay’ than touristic residence can be developed. This is a vital point for examining both lifestyle migration and ‘lifestyle return’ – whether they need to be understood as tourism-related mobilities or exceptional forms of contemporary migration (Torkington, 2010).

1.5 Organisation of the Thesis

After this Introduction chapter, the thesis provides a critical literature review of the theories of return migration and lifestyle migration in Chapter Two. The first purpose of Chapter Two is to problematise the second generation’s ‘return’. Chapter Two highlights the gaps within the second generation ‘return’ literature, mainly regarding the transnationalism perspectives, and the lack of a life-cycle approach in evaluating the ‘return’ phenomena. The chapter then provides a review of the relevant literature from lifestyle migration field and evaluates return migration through a ‘lifestyle migration’ lens. In this regard, the chapter introduces recurring themes in the lifestyle migration research such as ‘quest for a better life’, ‘searching for self’, ‘work-leisure balance’ and the relevance of tourism places as providing “liminal spaces” in which individuals can ‘escape from’ past lives and constraints. Finally, Chapter Two introduces new terms, ‘lifestyle return migration’ and ‘lifestyle returnee’ and construct these concepts through de-constructing and merging together return and lifestyle migration theories. The theory construction approach benefits from a translocality angle. The chapter highlights that a focus on the ‘self’ for the second generation ‘returnees’ would be a novel approach to evaluate their ‘return’ through a micro-level analysis, hence establishes that it would be important to focus on the notions of ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’, interplay of human agency and structures (habitus), and ‘place’ in relation to the concept of ‘home’.

Chapter Three sets the theoretical framework for the thesis by focusing on the notion of self in relation to identity, place and habitus. Firstly, the concept of self-identity is introduced and discussed with regards to collective identities, i.e. diasporic, ethnic, (trans-)national. There is an emphasis on ‘boundaries’ as erodible or constructible ‘imagined’ markers between groups based on claimed membership. Furthermore, self-identity is introduced as a ‘personal’ and ‘subjective’ concept and evaluated as a ‘reflexive’ condition in late modernity. Chapter Three then introduces the relevance of ‘place’ in construction of identities and argues that in the modern globalised
world, identities are no longer understood as 'place-bound', however it is useful to evaluate them as 'place-based' because individuals' encounters in various social fields in places simultaneously evolve individuals' self-identities and places. The chapter then explores the concept of place as a 'translocal home' for migrant entities e.g. the second generation. Following this discussion, the chapter introduces the Bourdieusian concepts of 'habitus' and 'capitals' as tools of analysis which mediate between identity and place, agencies and structures. Moreover, a discussion on habitus, class and lifestyle is provided in order the highlight the shift from understanding individuals' lifestyle choices from a solely class-based angle (economic capital and social status) to taking into consideration of “institutionalized individualism” of the “liquid modernity” wherein individuals may embrace multiple lifestyles (also those who are not ‘fitting’ into their 'class status'). Finally, the chapter brings the notions of identity, place and habitus together and evaluates these in the specific framework of the second generation’s identities, belongingness and place-attachments. The chapter builds the concept of ‘translocational habitus’ benefitting from Anthias’ “translocal positionality” and Bourdieu’s “habitus” concepts, also explains how the second generation can be perceived to have “transcultural capital”.

Chapter Four presents the methodology and methods used in the thesis. The chapter starts with a discussion section presenting and discussing the epistemological and ontological underpinnings of the research. This discussion is then linked to the methodology wherein the thesis introduces its interpretative stance, and explores the usefulness of narrative inquiry in capturing the individuals’ meaning-making processes regarding the notions in question (e.g. self, belonging, ‘home’ etc.). The chapter then introduces the fieldwork site, Antalya city and discusses the relevance and importance of this particular location. Following this, the chapter gives a detailed overview of the sampling methods and how the in-depth and semi-structured interviews were collected. Then, theory-informed thematic analysis and narrative analysis are presented as methods of data analysis and documentation. This section is accompanied by an account on the researcher’s self-reflexivity throughout the stages of data collection and analysis. Ethical considerations throughout the research is presented. Finally, issues such as methodological rigour and limitations are elaborated in the chapter’s final section.

Chapter Five sets the scene for Turkish-German diasporic spaces in Germany, and through return, the counter-diasporic spaces in Turkey. The chapter starts with a historical overview of the Turkish immigration to Germany as a guestworker (labour migration) phenomenon and follows the stages of how this group evolved into a heterogeneous diaspora involving complex migratory patterns, different ethnic/religious backgrounds. The main debates surrounding the ‘Turkish community’ in Germany are briefly mentioned and the return flows back to Turkey is
highlighted. General characteristics of the return is discussed mainly in relation to first and second generation. This historical/political overview is followed by introducing the research findings of this thesis regarding the profile and characteristics of the informants. However, this profile focuses on main themes, such as the first generation’s influences on the second generation regarding their ‘homeland-imaginings’, the second generation’s ‘Turkish’ upbringing in the ‘diasporic spaces’ in Germany, and their identity transformations and construction of the “transcultural capital” through their various social and familial spaces in Germany as well as Turkey. In order to highlight the importance of ‘imaginings’ and ‘nostalgia’, the chapter also focuses on the second generation’s earlier encounters with the ‘ancestral homeland’ through childhood visits/holidays.

Chapter Six presents the findings regarding the motivations and reasons to return to Turkey. By comparing the informants’ return imaginings and realities in the ancestral homeland, the chapter explores the informants’ initial reflections when they settled in Turkey, either in their parents’ towns/villages or in big cities. The chapter then shows the main reasons why the informants wanted to move to Antalya and work in tourism-related businesses. This chapter ends with a discussion on the concepts of ‘return’ and ‘home’ as myths, also setting the scene for the following chapter that argues ‘homeliness’ and ‘belongingness’ requires active place-making and affect.

Chapter Seven follows the informants’ lives from their settlement to Antalya through their place-making processes and utilisation of their “transcultural capital” and ‘translocational habitus’ to get a sense of place and sense of self in the tourism hub. In this chapter, Antalya is conceptualised as a translocal field, a “third space” in which where there is not one dominant Other, but it is rather a ‘meeting place’. The chapter scrutinises the ways in which the informants act as ‘lifestyle returnees’, through their involvements in tourism sectors, their search for a work-life balance, their reflections on their identities and belongingness and the changing meaning of ‘home’. In this chapter, main issues regarding ‘searching for self’ are presented and these includes narratives of escapism, learning about the self, Others and the world around them.

Chapter Eight then delves into the issues related to escapism in order to show how the informants’ self-reflexivity evolved their self-concepts and the social world surrounding them, what they wish for themselves, what kind of life they live and what dreams they would like to pursue. These narratives connect the informants’ pasts to present time, hence ‘escaping from’ stories are directly linked to the ‘escaping to’ stories. The chapter then argues that lifestyle returnees re-invent the self in Antalya through various types of learning, either about themselves,
learning new skills, learning more about their ancestral homeland but also Germany and Germans, as their tourism-related jobs require them to work/socialise with not only Turkish locals, but also Turkish-German returnees and tourists, German tourists/expats/lifestyle migration communities, and people from other parts of the world. The chapter ends with a discussion on if these experiences of learning and escaping may lead to further migration/mobility paths for the informants.

The thesis’ final part, Chapter Nine starts with a brief reflexive account on the research findings and offers insights about how ‘lifestyle return migration’ can be understood in relation to the notions of ‘self’ and ‘home’. The chapter then reviews the findings in the light of the research aims and questions. After highlighting the academic contribution of this thesis, the chapter proposes possible research directions for the future.
2 Conceptualising Lifestyle Return Migration

The purpose of this chapter is to construct a new term ‘lifestyle return migration’ through drawing insights from return migration theories and lifestyle migration literature. In this regard, this is a critical literature review chapter, nevertheless it also provides theory de-construction and a critical evaluation of the existing research. As Chapter One established, the aim is to employ a lifestyle perspective for return migration to investigate a) the direction of migration; b) the place(s) of departure and return, and c) the migrants’ agency in relation to internal and external structures. The chapter firstly gives an overview of the return migration theories and locates ‘return’ as a problematic phenomenon for the second generation. Key debates within this academic field – transnationalism and diaspora theories – are briefly discussed in order to illustrate how the issues of ‘self’/‘identity’ and ‘home’/‘belonging’ have been studied in relation to migrants’ lives. The chapter then introduces and discusses ‘translocality’ as a useful tool of analysis to understand the second generation’s lives in diaspora and counter-diaspora. After a problematisation of the second generation ‘return’ theories, the chapter moves on to the main themes and issues within the lifestyle migration research. Finally, the chapter establishes ‘lifestyle return migration’ as a concept with a micro-level orientation, however not disregarding the meso and macro-level influences in lifestyle returnees’ migratory and lifestyle trajectories.

After this chapter establishes the concept of ‘lifestyle return migration’, the following chapter brings together the key notions which are discussed in return migration and lifestyle migration. Such conceptual framework will focus on the following:

1. Understanding the meaning and transformation of the self in relation to social identities and in relation to late modernity
2. Understanding the ideologies of self-identity in relation to geographies of place
3. Understanding the individual’s agency in relation to social field(s)

This framework aims to address the main issues in return migration, regarding how an individual’s self-concept is influenced through identity re-constructions and negotiations in their new place of return, and how one’s agency, subjectivities, dispositions and lifestyles are contested or reinforced through dwelling in that specific locale. By investigating these relations, the thesis intends to show how these experiences translate into self-actualisation, constructions of belonging and feeling of ‘homeliness’.
2.1 An Overview of Return Migration Theories

When Hall noted in 1987, “migration is a one-way trip, there is no ‘home’ to go back to” (p. 44), migration was mainly understood as an “income-maximising” act, hence in case that return took place, this was interpreted as an anomaly, meaning that migrants failed to achieve their goals in host countries (Cerase, 1974; Gmelch, 1980; Cassarino, 2004). Initially, return migration was theorised in relation to the post-World War II labour migratory waves, regarding return migrants as “agents of change” – innovators and investors (De Haas, 2007) who would contribute to the national development of their country of origin by transferring their economic capital, skills and knowledge that they acquired abroad (Beijer, 1970; Penninx, 1982; Papademetriou, 1985). Accordingly, return migration has been studied mainly in relation to first-generation immigrants and commonly conceptualised as the “voluntary” movement of migrants to their country of origin, after having passed a significant time-span abroad (Dustmann & Weiss, 2007).

The dominant theories, neoclassical economics and new economics of labour migration (NELM) approaches were criticised for oversimplifying the return migration phenomenon with a success/failure paradigm (Piore, 1981; Galor & Stark, 1991; Constant & Massey, 2002). Instead, migrants were then reconceptualised as “target earners” (Piore, 1981), leaving their homelands on a temporary basis to overcome market deficiencies in their countries of origin and therefore, return was a part of the migration process itself – it was a planned, or ‘calculated’ outcome (Constant & Massey, 2002). The structural approaches on the other hand, disagreed that return decision can be planned properly, as migrants might not have sufficient information about the changed structural and contextual factors in their homelands, hence they would be “ill-prepared for their return” (Gmelch, 1980, p. 143). In addition, return migrants’ success/failure was analysed by their expectations from their homeland’s societal and economic settings and their adjustment process to the ‘reality’ of the area of settlement (Cassarino, 2004).

On the other hand, the scholars could already see the relevance of globalisation in the context of (return) migration, suggesting that improved transportation and communication encourage mobility and the development of a ‘common market’ for brainpower which transcends national borders (Adams, 1968). With the ‘transnational turn’ in the migration studies, migrants were now coined as “transnational agents”, who would sustain their economic and social ties across the national boundaries, and often they would return with relevant human capital that contributes to the local economy, even if they were at retirement age (e.g. the case of Caribbean return migrants, Conway & Potter, 2007). Hence, this newer understanding further claims that
skills and human capital acquired abroad can facilitate economic mobility upon return (Dustmann & Kirchkamp, 2002; Dustmann & Weiss, 2007; Williams & Baláž, 2005), and subsequently, source countries can gain from the opportunities arising from the transfer of these competencies. If migration is viewed as an investment decision to maximise human capital and/or earnings over the life-time, then return is not an anomaly but common outcome of a migration decision (Dustmann, 2003). However, these positive cases are mostly prominent in high-skilled migrants’ return, and leaves certain questions unanswered, such as how returnees utilise different types and levels of capital vis-à-vis their homeland’s structures.

The late 1980s brought new theories for return migration since migration gained complexity with the flows of asylum seekers, refugees, undocumented migrants, highly-skilled migrants, family reunifications and already started return migration of guestworkers. Some scholars prioritised the monetary factors (i.e. remittances) in transnationalism, claiming that “immigrant transnationalism is not driven by ideological reasons, but by the very logic of global capitalism” (Portes, 2001, p.187), and overlooked the ethnic, national and kinship/familial ties. Nevertheless, the dominant discourses within transnational approaches require not to limit remittances and resource flows across borders to money flows, but to expand it to immaterial and social remittances in the form of ideas, identities, behaviours and social capital (Levitt, 2010). This understanding of remittances as a multi-dimensional transnational activity, as scholars argue, is an investment for social re-integration in case return take place (Carling & Erdal, 2014; Adams, 2003; Faini, 2005).

Hence, transnationalism theories which were initially concerned about economic and political activities of migrant groups evolved in focusing on migrants’ social lives. Return migrants were understood in relation to their strategies aimed at maintaining cross-border mobility and linkages embedded in global systems of ethnic and kin relationships (Cassarino, 2004). Common ethnicity, origin and kinship linkages is related to their effects on fostering transnational activities, which also define ‘transnational identities’ (Cassarino, 2004). Thus, transnationalism approaches perceive identity formations, home and belonging constructions, family ties and social relations as the main reference points in understanding return processes.

2.1.1 An Ongoing Debate: Transnationalism vs. Diaspora

Transnationalism is a concept that intersects and used interchangeably with the notion of diaspora. Tölölyan already wrote in 1991 that “diasporas are the exemplary communities of the transnational moment” (p.5), and he further developed his argument by highlighting the vital role of transnational institutions and globalisation in the formation of modern diasporas (e.g. the
Armenian case). Appadurai (1996a) similarly argues, diasporic experience of all mobile persons is “trans-nation”. Diaspora studies have been mainly focusing on the dispersal and scattering, myth of homeland and feeling alienated in the hostland (Safran, 1991; Töloöyan, 1991; Töloöyan, 1996; Cohen, 1996; Butler, 2001). Whilst scholars perceive diaspora organisation (i.e. political and economic influence) as the most concrete form of diaspora, it is also argued that diaspora exists as an abstract form, a “consciousness” and “discourse” (Hall, 1993; Bhabha, 1994; Brubaker, 2005) that is “generated among contemporary transnational communities which is aware of its ‘multilocality’” (Vertovec, 1997, p.281).

On the other hand, transnationalism approaches highlight the competence of diasporas to contest the dominant narratives of nation-states by constructing an alternative au courant national-cultural narrative on a transnational scale (Töloöyan, 2000). As Anthias (1998, p.565) argues contemporary diasporas need to be understood beyond the racial and ethnic definitions:

Identity and cultural narratives of belonging take on ‘ethnic’ forms which are themselves centrally linked to location, in terms of territory and social positioning [and therefore] the bonds that tie, are heterogeneous and multiple.

Similarly, Al-Ali & Koser (2002, p.4) explain, one of transnationalism’s features is to show how “the development of new identities among migrants, who are anchored (socially, culturally, physically) neither in their place of origin nor in their place of destination” and this understanding develops diasporas beyond the duality of “boundary-making” and “boundary-eroding” to formulate identities and loyalties in the hierarchies of power (Brubaker, 2005, pp.12-15).

Despite the difficulty of conceptualising diaspora as a tool of analysis, some contemporary scholars suggest a broad definition. According to Van Hear, et al. (2004, p.3), diaspora is,

populations of migrant origin who are scattered among two or more destinations, between which there develop multifarious links involving flows and exchanges of people and resources: between the homeland and destination countries, and among destination countries.

This capacious definition highlights the blurred lines between the concept of transnationalism and diaspora. Faist (2010a) clarifies the diaspora and transnationalism concepts, claiming that these two are intertwined but do not have the same meaning. Diasporas refer to a group of a population whereas “transnationalism – and transnational spaces, fields and formations – refer to processes that transcend international borders” (p.13). Therefore, transnationalism contains
practices and ties performed in the transnational space, which makes it a broader term than diaspora.

Bruneau (2010) differentiates between diaspora and transnationalism based on their relations to places and territories. The author argues that diasporas involves “an iconography”, the way in which the diasporic subjects re-creating a link with their homeland through territorial markers and places of memory in the host-land. Bruneau further suggests that diaspora’s strong anchoring receives a sort of autonomy from the host-land. Transnationalism however, lacks this autonomy and recognition because the mobilities in the transnational spaces do not necessarily need to be re-rooted elsewhere (2010, p.49). This distinction indeed makes a point but it also disregards that diaspora and transnationalism are interlaced in the contemporary world. However, for diasporas whose imagined homeland is a non-territorial one, transnational practices can be the interactions with the other diasporas in other nation-states.

Following this discussion on diasporas and transnationalism, the thesis suggests that diaspora notion emphasises on longing for homeland that binds nationally and ethnically, and this emotional attachment evokes a romanticised return. Whilst there is an overwhelming discussion on who belongs to a diaspora, and when a group becomes a diaspora (Sheffer, 2002; Cohen, 1996; Brubaker, 2005; Bruneau, 2010), the thesis differentiates diaspora from a transnational community by calling attention to its temporal-historical dimension wherein, “diasporas are multi-generational; combining the individual migration experience with the collective history of group dispersal and regenesis of communities abroad” (Butler, 2001, p.193) and its emphasis on the myth and nostalgia of identity, belonging and home. In addition, what makes diaspora different than other migratory groups is that, diaspora is politicised and therefore advocates certain points for the benefit of the diaspora group as well as the original homeland. However, “diaspora space” might consist of multiple identities regarding religion, gender, class, ethnicity, locality and citizenship, therefore have no unified agendas (Koinova, 2010, p.150).

### 2.1.2 The Second Generation and Translocal Geographies of ‘Return’

Return migration theorisations has been revisited due to the new global migration flows and the ‘transnational turn’ in migration studies; scholars now acknowledging that returnees’ mobilities are both invigorated and limited by complex social, political and economic processes between and beyond the national boarders (Cresswell, 2006; Blunt, 2007; Dustmann & Weiss, 2007). When King (2000, p.7) declared that return migration is “the great unwritten chapter in the history of migration”, he signalled the limited scope of the existing return migration theories and research in understanding the newly emerging return phenomena amongst the subsequent
generations who has diverse return imaginings and relatively problematic and complex relationships with the ancestral homeland compared to their parents.

As King and Christou further argue, the second generation’s return seems to slip into the “interstices between [the] literatures on second-generation, return migration, transnationalism and diaspora” (King & Christou, 2010b, p.170) however this “reflective ambiguity” (King & Christou, 2010b, p.168) can also be treated as the stepping stone to question the boundaries of ‘indigenousness/foreignness’ in relation to ‘homeland/hostland’ and ‘here/there’. For this reason, a more contemporary conceptualisation of return migration is described as “the process of migrants’ return to the country/place of origin, parental/ancestral extraction or to the ‘symbolic homeland’” (Christou, 2006b, p.60). This broader and more detailed description hints that ‘returning to homeland’ for the second generation does not entail a straightforward ‘homecoming’.

For offering a better understanding of why second generation’s ‘return’ is a paradoxical concept, firstly second generation needs to be conceptualised. Second generation is broadly conceptualised as “children born in the host country of one or more immigrant parents or those who arrived before primary-school age” (Thomson & Crul, 2007, p.1038). However, the term ‘generation’ has multiple meanings, therefore the thesis suggests that the concept of ‘second generation’ needs to be evaluated within its specific context. The subject group of this research – ‘the second generation’ can be related to multiple concepts of ‘generation’: the Germany-born Turkish second generation are connected to kinship descent (Kertzer, 1983) referring to the genealogical aspect, when being treated as the children of the Turkish first-generation guestworkers. Thus, the first generation marks the beginning of a migration phenomenon and the second generation is a continuation of it as they have the same parental pattern. Secondly, this group is also linked to generation as cohort (Kertzer, 1983) since most of the second generation was born during a specific span of time, going through similar phases, or in other words ‘life-courses’.

Kertzer’s definitions of generation as cohort and as a historical period overlaps significantly in the case of Turkish second generation of Germany since the members of this

---

5 Rumbaut (2004) made clear distinctions about different generations. First generation is explained as being born in a foreign country and arriving to the host country at the age of 14 or older. 1.5 generation is people who are born in the country of origin and migrated to the destination country when they were less than 14 years of age. Second generation is born in the country of destination with at least one immigrant parent. 2.5 generation is described as having one native parent and one foreign-born parent. Third and higher generations refer to those born in the country of destination to two parents who were also born in the destination country.
group are likely to experience similar historical events that shape their diasporic space and consciousness. However, a clear-cut classification is not always possible because of this overlapping and intertwined definitions of generation. Mannheim emphasises the importance of acknowledging this embeddedness, claiming that social factors play a vital role:

Were it not for the existence of social interaction between human beings – were there no definable social structure, no history based on a particular sort of continuity, the generation would not exist as a social phenomenon: there would be merely birth, ageing and death (Mannheim, 1972, p.291).

Through studying the second generation’s lives and return experiences, there has been a paradigm change in the way of understanding the notions of ‘home(-land)’, ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’. There is a growing literature on the second generation’s distinct experiences in which they are perceived as a progressive generation who have dual lives and transnational attachments, therefore they represent a “post-immigrant generation” (Rumbaut, 2002). Their networks, activities, patterns of life encompass both their place of residence (the so called ‘hostland’ that they were born and raised in) and the ancestral homeland (parents’ country of origin, that they have limited lived experience from) (Schiller, et al., 1992). Living between the blurred lines of ‘homeland’ and ‘host-land’ is a characteristic of the second generation, hence scholars call attention to evaluating their lives within “syncretic notion of culture” (Kaya, 2007, p.483) which also indicates the problematic nature of return and complexity of return migration trajectories.

Despite the second generation’s ‘diasporic’ upbringing in the ‘hostland’ might have generated a sense of attachment to an idealised ancestral homeland, their connections to this homeland has not always been localised. The contemporary research on the second generation ‘return’ expanded on this argument, firstly by claiming that the second generation’s construction of the mythical homeland is often challenged once they get a lived experience of it upon return (Tsuda, 2003; Christou, 2006b; King & Christou, 2010a; Wessendorf, 2007). Secondly, this disillusionment together with the practical hardships of fitting into the society and structural system create a counter-diasporic condition; meaning that the second generation’s idealisation for places is reversed and this time they develop a feeling of longing for the country they left (King, et al., 2011), which is pointed out as the intensification of a ‘reverse transnationalism’ (King & Christou, 2011; King & Christou, 2014). Furthermore, the second generation’s ‘return’ does not only create challenges on the labelling of the directionality of migration, but also demands innovative perspectives on the nature of transnationalism and contestation of the notions of ‘home’, ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’.
Therefore, the thesis problematises the concept of ‘return’ and presents it in apostrophes, signalling that the second generation’s resettling in the ancestral homeland is, in fact, moving to a new country (King & Kilinc, 2013; King & Christou, 2008; King & Christou, 2011). Some scholars venture on this viewpoint by suggesting return is simply another migration and therefore, ‘re’ prefix needs to be removed from terms like “return” and “readjust” (Hammond, 1999). This argument is related to evaluating the concept of return with the theories of cyclical migration and transnationalism in which return emerges as a migratory journey in its own right – rather than simply the reversal or end of another one (Ley & Kobayashi, 2005; Vertovec, 2004; King & Newbold, 2008).

Transnational approaches have introduced a new epistemology and methodology to understand migration by emphasising the multiplicity of involvement that the second generation sustain both in home and host societies, thus creating “transnational social spaces/fields” that surpasses geographic, political and cultural boundaries (Schiller, et al., 1992; Wimmer & Schiller, 2003; Levitt & Schiller, 2004). Transnationalism highlighted the returnees’ multiple ties and activities across borders, hence accentuating a novel approach of understanding home-identity nexus beyond the dichotomies of statis/fluidity, placement/displacement, attachment/detachment and roots/routes (Ahmed, et al., 2003; Morley, 2000; Nowicka, 2007). Thus, ‘home’ is conceptualised as a dynamic process – a ‘space-in-becoming’, entailing continuous habituation of social processes and sets of relationships to both humans and non-humans (Hitchings, 2004; Jacobs & Smith, 2008; Hammond, 2004; Ralph & Staeheli, 2011).

These arguments lead to reconfiguring of return migration as an ongoing journey, in which the idea of ‘home’ becomes blurry and contested, and the returnees’ identities as well as belonging are re-shaped (Faist, 2000; Levitt, 2001). The contemporary research in the field of social-anthropology has brought this understanding of ‘return-place as home(land)’ and ‘return as homecoming’ into focus, challenging the taken-for-granted assumption that returnees’ expectation of being reinserted into a familiar and secure home is assured upon return (Blunt, 2005; Christou, 2006b; Wessendorf, 2007; King & Kilinc, 2014; King & Christou, 2010a). Therefore, another part of the paradox of this ‘counter-diasporic’ migration is played out in relation to how the second generation understands and experiences the complexly nuanced notion of ‘self-identity’ in relation to an ambiguous and ever-changing ‘home’ (King & Kilinc, 2014; Muggeridge & Dona, 2006; Christou, 2002).

Based on the review and arguments presented on return migration, the thesis acknowledges certain gaps. Firstly, the existing perspectives do not follow a holistic approach to
return migration, because each perspective is concerned with a different period within the migrants’ return journey and, types of migrant groups vary to a large extent, involving distinct factors, expectations and experiences. Economic and structural perspectives explain migration with a macro-level framework, and return causes with economic opportunity structures (Faist, 2010), without referring to return migration’s complex and multidimensional dynamics on a meso- and micro-level (Lee, 1966; Massey, et al., 1994). The macro-micro distinction is important because, macro perspectives see migration as being shaped by historical-structural forces such as geography of wealth and power whereas micro-level approaches prioritise analysing migrants’ individual agencies – hence, raising the issue of structure and agency. Therefore, return migration needs to be understood with a multi-method research, as structures are “both the medium and the outcome of the social practices they recursively organise” (Giddens, 1984, p.25).

Furthermore, economic theories ignore the factor of personality towards risk-taking in terms of migration-related decisions (David, 1974; DaVanzo, 1976). As attitudes towards uncertainty and risk (about employment or reaching to a better life in general) differ from person to person, even when the other factors are equal, it is likely that individuals who are less averse have more potential to move (DaVanzo, 2013). De Haas (2008, p.18) criticises push-pull theories for the same reason, arguing that even though these suggest a broader perspective on decision-making processes, they still presuppose ‘ideal’ or ‘perfect’ information that “do not allow for assigning relative weights to the different factors affecting migration decisions.”

King’s (1984) studies on South-North migration called attention to this mismatch between the ‘rational economic optic’ in understanding labour migration and development, ‘macro-level analysis’ and ‘structuralism debate’ by stating that “virtually all the arguments rest on economic theory are largely unsupported by empirical data” (p.146). King further argues,

to see migrants merely as pawns in a game which they neither control nor understand, pushed and pulled by the interests of capital as represented by ruling elites, is an oversimplification (p.147).

Acknowledging that structures influence emigration in areas of origin and immigration to other destinations, it is also important to consider migrants’ agency, because, “not only do migrants make choices, they utilise and manipulate various kinds of networks for their own ends; they are the creators and receivers of well-thought-out rationales for their own behaviour” (King, 1984, p.147). This critique towards economic perspectives has become especially relevant with the expanding variations of migration, i.e. refugees, highly-skilled migrants, asylum seekers, student communities and temporal, circular, seasonal migrant groups.
In her book, *International Migration and Social Theory*, O'Reilly (2012, p.6) admits that a synthesis of theoretical approaches would only bring together existing theories, and continue to overlook aspects that have already been overlooked by those theories, such as culture and politics (Morawska, 2001), gender, transnationalism, multi-locality, translocality and flows (O'Reilly, 2012). Castles (2010, p.1670) also evaluates that there is a “failure to understand the historical character, false assumptions of one-way causality, and an inability to understand the overall dynamics of migratory processes and their embeddedness in processes of societal change.” Hence, O'Reilly (2012) introduces her *practice theory*, a meta-theory informed by broad social theory (building on Giddens’ structuration theory, Bourdieu’s theory of practice and a stronger structuration theory by Stones based on Giddens) which aims to understand the broad social processes that are continually involved in the constitution of social life with regards to migration (p.104). Practice theory deals with the agents in two ways, 1) agent in focus (the agent or group of agents in a given empirical research) and 2) agent in context (those agents within the daily practice of the relevant others). This meta-theory looks at the interaction of “external structures” (upper structures such as historical and spatial forces and cultural shifts, proximate structural layers such as constraints e.g. in Morawska’s work, coal strikes, flood, recessions or laws, rules, local policies, hard structures such as health care institutions, employment structures, housing market, war, famine etc.) “internal structures” (habitus, conjecturally-specific internal structures which focus on meso-level interactions in everyday life such as habits, dispositions, way of seeing and doing e.g. Goffman's symbolic interactionism), “practice” (active agency, everyday engagements, in other words game in the field in Bourdieusian sense, communities of practice and conjecturally-specific external structures which aims to bridge between macro and micro perspectives) and “outcomes” (intended or unintended outcomes based on what and how people do things, their interactions, habitus etc. influence the communities of practice and conjunctionally-specific external structures, hence wider structures are reproduced or transformed depending on the case), so the outcomes show the transformative effects of immigration activities.

O'Reilly's framework is useful for offering a balanced explanation of the interactions of macro and micro processes, without assuming agents always have a ‘dialectic control’ (Stones, 2005, p.29) of their immediate conditions so they have the power of changing things in the last instance as reflexive and self-fashioning individuals (Adkins, 2004). For instance, whilst the mentioned perspectives lack the “crucial meso-level” (Faist, 2010) and micro-level analysis, hence barely questioning the meaning of ‘belonging’, ‘identity’ and ‘home’ for returnees, transnationalism studies tend to overemphasise the fluidity and multiplicity of these concepts and
yet bases these understandings in respect of nations – thus ‘transnational field’ as a space of freedom for individuals to choose ‘who they want to be’ is often overstated. As Dirlik (2002, pp.227-228) points out,

The term “transnationalism” itself derives its meaning from the continued existence of nations, which is built into semic structure. The notion of “deterritorialization” ignores that even transnationals live in places (though they may move from one place to another); and what they understand as transnationality (if they, in contrast to scholars, indeed understand their situation as such) or their cultural self-identification may be impossible to grasp without reference to the particular places they inhabit and particular trajectories of “transnationality”.

Furthermore, the transnationalism angle puts a strong emphasis on the second generation’s dual lives and their multiple attachments across the national borders. As Ghosh & Wang (2003, p.272) explain, transnationalism reflects individuals’ construction of a sense of multiple or hybrid selves through “an abstract awareness of one’s self, diaspora and multiple belonging”. However, the empirical research points out that the outcome of return mostly refers to feelings of alienation and confusion regarding belonging to their ancestral homeland, hence multiple attachments and self-identifications hardly prepare these individuals for the life upon return (Potter & Conway, 2005; Tsuda, 2009; Thomas-Hope, 2002). Hence, there is an overemphasis on self-fashioning in the way migrants are conceptualised as active agents (Adkins, 2004).

An important question is then, why transnationalism does not work as in theories, how come these diasporic individuals are not able to exist, work and live in harmony with what their ancestral homeland constitutes and offers? Because if they have been leading transnational lives, would not they be able to reposition themselves vis-à-vis the idea and experience of ‘belonging’, ‘home’ and ‘identity’ as multiple and fluid? Based on these rather unexplored questions, the thesis argues that the main reason behind these paradoxes lies in the ways in which the existing research tends to limit the agency of the individuals to national and diasporic discourses, disregarding the changing relationship between individuals and specific locales in late-modernity. Much of the current research is intensely concerned with how people feel (post-return experiences of rupture, disillusionment and disappointment) instead of what they do to re-construct and re-negotiate their identities and attachments to places. Moreover, these research studies suggest that return is an ongoing journey, but at the same time they present only a sequence of the returnees’ lives where they are settled in and somehow accepted their destiny. O’Reilly (2012, p.17) reminds us that, “empirical research on international migration needs to pay attention to both the structural and
hermeneutic ‘moments’ of the ongoing relationship between structures and the way they are interpreted and enacted, as well as to meso level of their interaction.”

Some migration scholars highlighted the importance of locality as the place where migrants touch ground (Ley, 2004), hence arguing that ‘transnational social fields’ should be understood in relation to spatial questions in migration studies (Bruneau, 2010; Dahinden, 2009; Dahinden, 2010). Therefore, it is vital to explore the interplay between people’s habitus, different types of capitals and various spaces in these locals, because these social interactions simultaneously re-shape individuals’ worlds of meaning and social fields of places. Hence, perceiving the second generation as acquiring active agency and self-reflexivity, it is possible to understand their further migratory decisions in case they were unsatisfied with their ‘return’ experiences.

The main problematisation therefore, is with regards to gestating ‘ancestral homeland’ as a monolithic representative of national, ethnic and religious identities. Instead, the thesis argues that the notion of return migration needs to be understood in relation to specific locales, because individuals do not only return to a country of origin but in fact experience distinct settings of places (such as cities, villages, coastal towns) (Hatfield, 2011). Place is therefore, needs to be one of the main components of the analytical framework which is often undermined in transnationalism (Guarnizo & Smith, 1998). As Hannez points out (1996, p.6),

there is a certain irony in the tendency of the term ‘transnational’ to draw attention to what it negates – that is, to the continued significance of the national.

Therefore, the thesis suggests that the translocalism optic offers a more conducive framework of analysis to discuss the lifestyle returnees’ everyday activities and social interactions in their project of ‘searching for self’. Translocalism situates and grounds the deterritorialised notions of transnationalism by paying attention to the localised aspects of migrants’ transnationalism. Whilst transnationalism emphasises on simultaneity, persistence and intensity of contact/participation across boundaries, translocality stresses on dual social action whereupon the ‘here and there’ continue to exist and emotional ties persist (Barkan, 2004, p.345). Therefore, the thesis proposes that translocality optic can be employed to understand how the lifestyle returnees develop such “simultaneous situatedness across different locales” during their post-return lives in the ancestral homeland (Brickell & Datta, 2011, p.4).

It needs to be noted however, the argument of this research is not that of the nation and nationality do not matter. It is indeed crucial for the second generation who grew up in the
“diaspora space” (Brah, 1996; Brubaker, 2005), shaping their worlds of meaning, identities and belongings based on a “double-consciousness” (DuBois, 1994) – the sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others and the awareness of being simultaneously ‘home away from home’ or ‘here and there’ (Kaya, 2001, p.2) For this reason, the term ‘country of origin’ appears as an overwhelmingly broad and abstract concept to compare and contrast returnees’ lived experiences. Secondly, understanding the return and place-making through discourses of nations and diasporas result in limiting the human agency to the grand narratives without considering the influence of locales and individuals’ encounters with different spaces based on their lifestyle choices. As White (2011, p.14) argues,
	ransnationalism that is solely concerned with nationality and not with locality tend to narrow the lives of migrants to ethnic and national belonging, obscuring the importance of translocal practices and attachments.

Recent studies focusing on second generation ‘return’ migration illustrate that second generation is given crucial opportunity to reflect on their belonging, attachment, and sense of identity while on visits to the country of origin throughout their childhood years (Oeppen, 2013; Bolognani, 2014a; Lahire, 2003). As Smith (2006) suggests, certain individuals are more successful ‘authors’ of their own lives than others, and in the case of second generation, they seem to be relatively more well-off (compared to the first generation) and thus able to push their imagination to think of mobility and settlement in richer ways.

However, in order to understand these more mobile and ‘reflexive’ paths of second generation, it would be useful to focus on life-cycle theories – which were disregarded by most of the economic perspectives. Life-cycle theories does not treat migration as a finalised project, instead further mobility paths can be taken by individuals as ‘an investment project’ linked to their life-cycles (Polachek & Horvath, 2012). This means that people depending on their life cycles (age plays an important role here) take migration decisions. For instance, young people might move to another country for education and training reasons. Retired people might migrate to a location with mild climate and slower phase of life.

Life-cycle theories put an emphasis on ‘translocality’, illustrating that life-cycle choices are directly linked to location’s characteristics. In other words, the migration decision takes place because a certain destination location offers an asset (e.g. education, health care, good weather, cheaper life, jobs in a certain sector) that the individual wants to invest. One criticism towards this approach might be related to the individual’s sources to reach the information regarding the location and opportunities. Baláž, et al. (2016) show that both information overload and
imperfect information are significant for the young adult international migrant’s search for knowledge gain and education. Their study shows that migration decisions of this group are based on pre-defined and constructed preferences. Their key argument suggests that individuals do not necessarily know/set their goals in advance and therefore, preferences might change during the decision-making process of migration.

2.2 Lifestyle Migration: An Undermined Approach?

Before getting into the scope of lifestyle migration, it is useful to provide a definition for the concept of lifestyle. The term was first introduced by the psychologist Adler (1929) as a person’s basic character as established in early childhood. However, the concept was taken beyond the psychology of the individual and integrated into an analysis of social structure and the individuals’ relative positions within that, e.g. Weber (1978) evaluating lifestyle (or originally as a “style of life”, Lebensführungstyp) in relation to the ‘spirit of capitalism’ and as the most visible manifestation of social differentiation (status quo, prestige). This links to Bourdieu (1984) arguing that lifestyles represent the basic point of intersection between the structure of the field and processes connected with habitus (e.g. relationship between taste, aesthetics and consumption), and to Simmel discussing how lifestyle in relation to consumption in modernity operates in the processes of individualisation, identification, differentiation and recognition (Holt & Seals, 1994). Hence, the term intersects with both personal and group identities such as class and consumption, modern capitalism and culture. A more detailed discussion about lifestyle in relation to class and habitus is provided in Chapter Three, section 3.3.2. However, for the time being, the following formulation of lifestyle is chosen, which is “relatively stable pattern of organising everyday life within the framework of a given life-situation, taking account available resources” (Bögenhold, 2001, p.833). Different forms of organising household work and employment, alternate patterns of consumption, varying living-patterns, how time is used, and even plans for future with their specific planning contents and planning horizons are, on an empirical level, among the most important elements in constructing a lifestyle chart (Bögenhold, 2001, pp.834).

For migration, adding of ‘lifestyle’ demonstrates how lifestyle appears to be a main motivation for some individuals to move either part-time or full-time, permanently or temporarily to certain places which, for various reasons, signify for them something loosely defined as ‘quality of life’ (Benson & O’Reilly, 2016, p.22). Lifestyle migration as a late modern subject’s individualist project of ‘self-seeking’ or/and ‘a better life’, has started to be anticipated by scholars in the 1970s, studies focusing an emerging trend of ‘second home ownership’, in which
individuals from Northern and Western Europe buying properties in the continental South to lengthen their leisure time and change the character of work (Williams & Hall, 2002; Müller, et al., 2004). This trend has been carried out to mid-1980s, when tourism industries have started attracting visitors during ‘out of season’ time with affordable housing opportunities. As O’Reilly (2000) acknowledges, an increase in disposable income, more leisure time, better and more affordable travelling conditions have generated a boom of travel to the South. Tourism studies scholars argue that tourism industries have made the landscapes static and pre-prepared, which normalised and standardised potentially ‘exotic’ or ‘authentic’ experiences, i.e. “staged authenticity” (MacCannell, 1973; Torkington, 2012).

In migration research, lifestyle is used as a wider phenomenon, covering concepts such as retirement migration (King, et al., 2000; Casado-Díaz, et al., 2004), leisure migration, (international) counterurbanisation (Buller & Hoggart, 1994; Fielding, 1982), second home ownership (Halfacree, 2012; Paris, 2010), amenity seeking (McIntyre, 2009; Scott, 2010; ) and seasonal migration (circular) (Vertovec, 2007; McHugh & Mings, 1991; Castles & Özkul, 2014; Bell & Ward, 2000). However, none of these sub-topics offer a definition that grasp the complexity of lifestyle migration. Instead, they act as pieces of a puzzle, providing understanding and answers for case specific issues and expand the literature on lifestyle. For this reason, Benson and O’Reilly (2016, p.33) warns that assuming the role of lifestyle in migration should not be a deductive approach but needs to be drawn out inductively from research, because a) lifestyle migrants do not all seek the same lifestyles; and b) people assign different meanings and lifestyles to different places (Benson, O’Reilly, 2016; Osbaldiston, 2012).

Benson & O’Reilly’s research (2009) can be taken as a pioneering work in bridging the existing gap between lifestyle and migration. They utilise the term lifestyle as an analytical tool to explore the sociological phenomenon of “people’s relocation within the developed world searching for a better way of life” (2009, p.608). This broad definition with an ambiguous assortment of “better life” is further investigated in their research with the concept of “habitus” and class to show how middle and affluent classes construct their imagined ‘good life’ in particular destinations, shaped by cultural imaginaries. The first question can be directed in relation to uniqueness of migrants’ quest for a more meaningful life within the framework of lifestyle. As the previous examples revealed, people migrate to change their lives for the better, with the expectation of gaining better income, social status, family lives and networks (King, 2002). Following this argument, it can be proposed that all migratory trajectories can be related to lifestyle. However, Benson and O’Reilly argue that lifestyle migration is different in the sense that lifestyle migrants are rather affluent individuals who have relatively better opportunities and
therefore, their migration is a lifestyle project which is a continuing search for a better way of life fuelled by a “reflexive project of the self” (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.615) or as Hoey (2005) puts it, “a search for a potential self”. Another reason is that by nature, lifestyle migration is a new pattern of migration that is interconnected with advancing globalisation of travel, technology and rapidly transforming ideas and markets (Spalding, 2013, p.67). In that sense, the thesis suggests the concept of lifestyle needs to be evaluated in relation to one’s class and habitus and in the light of late-modernity, hence it can be understood how lifestyle can be a motivation and pull-push factor for individuals to relocate themselves.

If a broad and traditional definition of migration is accepted as, “permanent and semi-permanent change of residence” (Lee, 1966, p.49), lifestyle migration research shows that there is a wide range of mobility scenarios in which previous paradigms of migration cannot fully grasp. For instance, in ‘new mobilities paradigm’ which studies social and cultural relations within the framework of travel and tourism, scholars call attention to the transformation of social sciences, as the world is evolving into a shrinking and homogenised one with increasingly mobile cultures (Urry, 1999). Due to the reachable travel and communication technologies, individuals have more opportunities to live anywhere and experience enhanced mobilities. McHugh (2000) argues that traditionally studied migration research often fail to consider in-depth perspectives of personal histories and backgrounds to understand the implications of such moves. Benson and O’Reilly similarly claim that lifestyle migration as a concept captures a more nuanced insight into individual circumstances and their influence on the trajectory of lives following migration, while also considering that there are various historical and material prerequisites for this form of migration (2009, p.616).

More recent migration studies have managed to enable the portrayal of migration as a complex process that articulates political economic forces with post-structuralist approaches that explores personal motivations and cultural nuances to explain why people move in search of ‘alternative’ lifestyles (Benson, 2010; O’Reilly, 2007; Benson & Osbaldiston, 2016). As sub-categories of lifestyle migration, these studies commonly emphasise the link between lifestyles and consumption as well as high-skilled labour, retirement, love/marriage and study migrations (Sunil, et al., 2007; Williams & Hall, 2002; Castles & Miller, 2003; Warnes & Williams, 2006; Wood & King, 2001; Koser & Salt, 1997). However, only in Benson & O’Reilly’s work (2009, p.609) lifestyle migration appears as a well-defined and dynamic concept:

the spatial mobility of relatively affluent individuals of all ages, moving either part-time or full-time to places that are meaningful because, for various reasons, they offer the potential of a better quality of life.
This description assumes that the migrants’ new location is invariably contrasted with their past lives, hence imagination of the destination place, expectation and lived experiences make up how life as a result of lifestyle migration is ‘better’ and ‘more fulfilling’ compared to individuals’ previous lives.

Subsequently, on a macro-level analysis (external structures in O’Reilly’s practice theory), lifestyle migration has been evoked by the changing structures throughout the mid-1980s, which is summarised in this thesis as:

1. with the processes of globalisation and time-space compression, the world has become more interconnected, making mobility experiences and places more accessible for people,
2. the spread of mass information and communication technologies,
3. availability and affordability of transportation services (especially the growing networks of routes operated by low-cost airlines),
4. the rise in living standards and flexibility of work markets, Southern European countries gaining EU membership, hence making travel, buying property, settlement and business activities more accessible for Northern Europeans

These factors have created the conditions that enabled the affluent individuals of the West to put their quest for a better and more fulfilling life into practice, as they acquire the necessary resources and rights. Another macro-level change is that individuals in late-modernity are no longer bound to fixed and socially-determined identity positions (Giddens, 1991) and this can be regarded as the most important element in paving the way to such quest of a better life elsewhere. Nevertheless, self-identity as a “reflexive project of the self” (Giddens, 1991) would not be able to put into action if structures on global and national level have not transformed to facilitate “institutionalised individualism” (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002).

Moreover, individuals embracing certain lifestyles which are “processes of self-actualisation in which actors are reflexively concerned with how they should live in a context of global interdependence” (Chaney, 1996, p.86). is also related to certain places. Individuals’ choices of places as lifestyle migration destinations are influenced by the meso-level context as well, because lifestyle is to some extent the imagined style of life after migration. These imaginings have the power to shape reality because people act on them in the way they live after migration. In turn, these shape the destination and help form the social imaginings of new (or return) migrants (Benson & O’Reilly, 2016). On a meso-level analysis, the availability of package tours for individuals in which they could stay in local houses and get a ‘local’ experience of the tourism destination appears as a determinant of how individuals perceive and idealise certain
places as ‘authentic’ or as ‘fitting into’ their romantic imagination of a ‘good life’ (Osboldiston, 2012; Benson, 2011b). For instance, media discourses on certain places as offering the ‘dream life’, websites, social media accounts, blogs, internet forums, magazines and TV programmes increasingly promoting lifestyle destinations construct perceptions about certain places to have the ‘good life’ quality with their climate, landscape, cuisine, community atmosphere, or pointing out less mainstream qualities enabling alternative lifestyles to be manifested (Mai, 2001; Benson, 2012; Morgan & Pritchard, 2006). The meso-level context is a clear indication that lifestyle migration is a “tourism-informed mobility” (Williams & Hall, 2002), it mostly starts with individuals travelling to certain areas for holiday and imagining for their future to perpetually have a feeling of holiday.

The meso-level factors also include social networks, wherein potential lifestyle migrants are helped to make their migration quest happen through visiting their friends and family who are already living in lifestyle migration destinations (Janta, et al., 2015; Torkington, 2010). These social networks may act as providers for work opportunities in the destination places, most of the time the Northern European networks provide jobs for the new comers in tourism-related business in restaurants, bars, pubs, hairdressers, house utility related job (gardening, plumbing, electricians etc.), and as health practitioners. It is especially important for lifestyle migrants to sustain or develop these networks to overcome the language barriers, in cases they could not be employed in the local job sectors, they could take tourism-related jobs as they could utilise their native or second-language capital. There are also cases of entrepreneurial activities, setting up businesses to serve the growing number of tourists and lifestyle migrants, nevertheless as the empirical literature points out, lifestyle migrants prioritise their leisure, thus, responsibility-free and freedom-based daily lives over gaining economic benefits (O’Reilly, 2003). Therefore, they would rather work for someone, or in the case of retired lifestyle migrants, they depend on their pension.

Until this point, it was made clear that lifestyle migration reflects the interplay of notions of self-identity and place related to lifestyles, as well as human agency in relation to individuals’ habitus and class structures as well as organising structures on macro and meso levels. It is also important to note that certain myths about lifestyle-place nexus and trends in certain tourism destinations play a role shaping individuals’ imagination about how and where they would like to live. In that sense, migration provides a useful lens for exploring relationship between imagination and action because, people’s expectations and aspirations for their lives determine their migratory motivations (Benson, 2012). Appadurai suggests that imagination “is the wellspring of increased rates of migration” (Appadurai, 1996b, p.6). Vigh (2009, p.105) similarly
argues, “[m]igration in itself comes to function as a technology of the imagination in which envisioned migratory trajectories open up imagined worlds and possibilities”. Other scholars agree with such statement and propose that collective imaginings of a better way of life, or a possible future, motivate migration (Adams, 2004; Thomson, 1999). Ong criticises this point of view by calling attention to the level of agency that individuals acquire to act based on their imaginings. Ong (1999) argues that, inequalities of power determine whether people act based upon their imaginings.

Ong’s critique of Appadurai’s work is important in the sense that, the wider structural conditions matter in facilitating or hindering the realisation of imagination. For instance, if the European Union did not facilitate freedom of movement, the EU citizens would not have visa-free access to their planned migration destinations and its job markets (Benson, 2012). Smith (2006, p.54) further expands this debate and by focusing on the relationship between imaginations and capital in producing migration, he stresses that the realisation of individual imaginings about future lives is intrinsically intertwined with economic considerations and socio-economic status:

The ability to realise a particular idea of oneself is reliant on access to economic resources and powers of symbolic legitimation, neither of which are distributed equitably... In this respect, certain individuals are much better placed to be successful ‘authors’ of their own lives than others.

Hence, Benson and O’Reilly’s description of lifestyle migrants as “affluent 21st century migrants” supports Smith’s claims on socio-economic statuses. Their description is in line with Beck’s “modern reflexivity” in which there are multiple identities and lifestyles for people in which class as a category does not capture the individuals’ social, cultural and economic choices. Amit (2007) agrees that lifestyle migration is a form of privileged travel and movement but further argues that it must be characterised more with the middle classes than by the very affluent or the very poor. Nevertheless, the thesis argues that the term “affluent” needs to be evaluated critically also because such status may become blurry in certain lifestyle migration destinations as many nationalities and different class groups “live ‘side-by-side’ in complex patterns of settlement” (Olsson & O’Reilly, 2017, p.134). In this regard, Olsson and O’Reilly illustrate that lifestyle migration destinations such as Spain in times of ‘liquid modernity’ are marked by ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007), hence many lifestyle migrants (however affluent or resourceful) “live with an uncertain economic, social, and political migrant status and with no immediate satisfactory provision of medical and care facilities” (p.134).
2.2.1 Tourism Places and Lifestyle Migration/Mobilities

This part focuses on the strong link between lifestyle and ‘tourism places’. Especially in mobility studies this link is well-established by looking at why people choose certain places to fulfil their lifestyle aspirations and how their imaginings of these places are an integral part of their mobility-related decision mechanisms. There is a vast literature on this topic based on backpacker mobilities (Cohen, 2011), second-home ownership by retired individuals mostly in coastal towns and rural areas (Gibler, et al., 2009; Müller, et al., 2004) and construction of identities based on ‘authenticity’ seeking in tourism destinations (Osbaldeston, 2011; Torkington, 2012). The meaning and relevance of place and space will be evaluated in Chapter Three, section 3.2.1., however for now, it is sufficient to state that, within the framework of this thesis, ‘tourism places’ refers to the destination points as geographical and physical places. It can be argued that everywhere can have a tourism value (based on natural beauty, historical and cultural assets etc.), depending on individuals’ aspirations and lifestyles. ‘Tourism spaces’ on the other hand is used as a term to capture both the imaginings of people regarding tourist destinations and all the tourism-related activities. Even though the thesis builds the ‘lifestyle return’ based on ‘migration’, rather than ‘mobility’, lifestyle mobility literature is found to be significantly enriching in understanding how self, place and habitus interplay and in what ways lifestyle-driven migratory paths are related to tourism places and spaces.

Tourism helps lifestyle mobility to be distinguished from temporary mobility in the sense that lifestyle mobility is an on-going fluid process, carrying on as everyday practice over time as well as pertaining physical mobility as a defining aspect of one’s identity (Cohen, et al., 2015) Simply put, “lifestyle mobility differs from permanent migration in the sense that it does not presuppose that there is no intention to return. Instead lifestyle mobility pre-supposes the intention to move on, rather than move back” (Cohen, et al., 2015, p.159). However, as it was discussed earlier, migration in the contemporary world is an unfinished project, blurring the lines between mobility and migration. Much of lifestyle migration is a clear case of what Williams and Hall (2002) have called “tourism-informed mobility”. In such framework, individuals develop a ‘taste’ for a certain way of life while on holiday in an area, and subsequently decide to migrate, encouraged by their imaginings of the place as offering better lifestyles (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.614). Those individuals who pursue a ‘persistent holiday’ feeling in their lives choose migration destinations which are associated with ‘holiday’ and ‘leisure’, however, they actively try to live like ‘locals’ and avoid being negatively stereotyped as ‘tourists’ (Benson, 2010; O’Reilly, 2003). Similarly, lifestyle travellers perceive their engagement with travel and places as a more ‘morally
superior’ alternative to mass tourism, with their aphorism of seeking for ‘authentic’ experiences (Week, 2012; Wang, 1999).

Urry (1990) asserts that subjects of lifestyle mobility idealise a life with a work-leisure balance, living between home and away, every-day and holiday. Lifestyle mobility literature often relates to work and leisure phenomena to escapism from routines and mundane lifestyles. In addition, as a reaction to the late-modern societies’ pressures, rising individualism and increasing risks and threats, lifestyle travellers and migrants search for a community feeling, security, leisure and tranquillity in their lives. In a way, this condition creates paradoxes: On one hand, individuals are able to have such reflexivity about themselves and their lives because late modernity makes these flows of knowledge and awareness possible, on the other hand their quest for a ‘better life’ is entangled with individualism, freedom and autonomy from traditional society structures and roles. However, at the same time, they undertake an anti-modern migration to have community feeling and closely-knit ties between people as a part of “the tourist’s pursuit of authentic experience” (MacCannell, 1973).

It is important to highlight that place and place-branding are significant in lifestyle mobilities and migration (Osbaldiston, 2012). For that reason, certain discourses and narratives have been established for particular places throughout the history, hence they are believed to have an effect on individuals to transform themselves and their lives in a more fulfilling way. Both in lifestyle migration and lifestyle mobility literatures, belonging and place-attachment require individuals’ pro-active engagement with themselves and places they pass or inhabit, because their belongingness to these places are not given or guaranteed. Therefore, where people ‘come from’ and where they are heading (‘roots’ and ‘routes’) have complex relations. Another reason why place matters is related to its ‘authentic’ quality. This is the reason why people from the Western countries migrate to rather ‘authentic’ places to have a more fulfilling life, escaping from the materialist society (Torkington, 2010). Korpela’s (2010) study on the Westerners who migrate to India with the quest of searching for ‘authenticity’, their ‘true’ selves and improvement in their lives is a good illustration of this phenomenon.

Hence, an analysis of social status, class and habitus can reveal that social fields embedded in places have significant role in shaping people’s life chances as it is influenced by an interaction between economic, social and cultural factors. These in turn affect the levels of choice that people can exercise. In a sense, place is one of the structures that shapes (but at the same time being shaped by) people’s identities and belongingness. There is always a place in which a certain lifestyle is expressed and lived. For instance, for sub-cultures or alternative lifestyles, certain
neighbourhoods and districts in metropolitan cities serve as places to live the way they wish for. (Gilligan & Wilson, 2003, p.414) emphasise the collectivity dimension of lifestyles in relation to places with the following:

Based on the idea that birds of a feather flock together, it gives recognition to the fact that people with broadly similar economic, social and lifestyle characteristics tend to congregate in particular neighbourhoods and exhibit similar patterns of purchasing behaviour and outlook.

This statement can be applied to tourism places wherein people’s lifestyles guide their preferences of tourism destinations, or their places of settlement. Main themes within this ‘lifestyle’ framework appear as individuals’ search for escape, freedom, existential authenticity and self-actualisation, leisure consumption and learning through challenge, risk-taking and adventure (Iso-Ahola, 1982; Cohen, 2010a; Cohen, 2010b; Cohen, 1979; Cohen, et al., 2015). As lifestyle is an “on-going quest” (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009), daily life following migration is presented as a journey, which is embedded in mobilities, as the individuals recall their travels through life (Hoey, 2009).

In lifestyle migration literature, ‘imagination’ about the ‘good life’ and having ‘self-actualisation’ are also analysed in the light of certain qualities given to places not only for their geographical and landscape setting but also for specific lifestyles they contain. As Hoey (2005) argues, lifestyle migrants are those who did not only make a choice about how to live but also about where to live. Hence, discourses on certain places as offering particular lifestyles is the core of individuals’ imaginations in creating their lifestyle migration projects. Benson & O’Reilly (2009) discuss lifestyle migration with a typology in which they exemplify types of migrants who “imagine” an ideal life in certain locations as a self-realisation project. According to this, there is a) residential tourism (McWatters, 2009; Mantecón & Huete, 2011); in which lifestyle migrants chose destinations in coastal resorts or islands in the sun. These sub-seeking migrants are portrayed as hedonistic ‘residential tourists’. This type of migratory flow mostly happens from North-to-South, Spain being one of the popular destinations. ‘Mediterranean lifestyle’ is idealised by migrants based on the romantic picture of these places with exciting cuisine, slow pace of life, outdoor living, health benefits and good weather (Casado-Díaz, 2006; King, et al., 2000). O’Reilly (2007) provides a valuable critique towards this type of migration, asserting that desires of these coastal migrants are difficult to distinguish from the social construction of the spaces associated with mass tourism.

The second type is b) rural idyll, as migrants stress the unique and embodied relationship that they have with the landscape (Benson, 2010; Eimermann, 2015). Counterurbanisation is one
of the major topics of this category (Osbaldiston, 2011; Halfacree & Rivera, 2012). Counterurbanisation is a ‘back-to-the-land move’ and it constitutes a lifestyle more relaxed, safer and slower compared to the urban life (Matthews, et al., 2000). The third one is c) *bourgeois bohemians*, where migrants choose destinations that they perceive as spiritual, artistic, or creative aspirations and unique ‘cultural’ experience (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.613). For instance, Mykonos in Greece (Bousiou, 2008) and Florence in Italy (Trundle, 2009) are locations where people acquire bohemian ideals. Benson and O’Reilly (2009) suggest that, such kind of perception building to certain places is a result of complex interaction between prior experiences of a location (though travel, touristic stays), wider culturally-specific imaginings (through media and ‘property pornography’), certain historical and material conditions, and their individual circumstances (including cultural, educational, and economic capital) at the point of migration.

In contrast to those migrating to coastal regions, or the mountains and rural areas, there is also a type of lifestyle migration in which the place of settlement is city (Maile & Griffiths, 2012). Thereby, the thesis acknowledges that cities can be also a source of enlightenment “of possibility, of meeting and movement” (Williams, 1973, p.6), hence suggesting that cosmopolitanism can be regarded as one of the lifestyle migration motives, in which individuals settle in urban areas associated with liberal lifestyles, culture and arts. Parry suggests, cosmopolitanism can be defined as a “freedom from local or national prejudices; an openness to, and tolerance of, others way of life” (2008, p.327). Henceforth, cosmopolitan cities can be conceptualised as urban areas whose cultures emphasise values including autonomy and freedom (Kim & Drolet, 2003; Bauböck, 2003), egalitarianism (Gilroy, 2005), and mutual respect (Appiah, 2006).

Nevertheless, whether it is an urban or rural setting, different individuals have different ‘cultural imaginings’ for places, and expectations from these particular places to offer certain lifestyles or ‘better life’ is context-dependent as much as it requires understanding individuals’ agency, habitus and types of lifestyles as well as identities they associate themselves with. For this reason, the next section pays closer attention to recurring motivations and themes in lifestyle migration research.

### 2.3 Motives/Expectations of Lifestyle Migrants

The previous two sections have illustrated that when comparing lifestyle migration and lifestyle mobilities literatures, it can be acknowledged that lifestyle migrants’ push-pull factors to relocate themselves overlap with those of lifestyle travellers. Hence, this section further introduces a micro-level framework with themes that are commonly studied in lifestyle migration,
also acknowledging lifestyle mobility literature when relevant. These points will then be elaborated with regards to return migration theories, and a framework for understanding second generation ‘return’ as ‘lifestyle return migration’ will be introduced.

2.3.1 Quest for a ‘Better Way of Life’

The chapter has already established that lifestyle migrants are defined as “relatively affluent individuals moving either part-time or full-time, permanently or temporarily, to places which, for various reasons, signify for the migrants something loosely defined as quality of life (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.621). Nevertheless, this motivation broadly put as ‘quality of life’ is not motivated by economic hardships and therefore it is different to ‘rational choice theory’ in which a cost-benefit approach underlines the decision-making processes (Haug, 2008). Therefore, lifestyle migrants do not prioritise maximising their income as industrial or post-industrial migrants seeking employment in labour markets abroad. Instead, lifestyle migrants pursue “the search for the good life as a comparative project” and their comparative project entails, “renegotiation of work and life balance, quality of life and freedom from prior constraints” (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.610).

Benson and O’Reilly (2009) define “better life” by reflecting the narratives of their research participants. According to these, people’s lifestyle migration can be pictured as anticipating a life that is slower with relatively low-costs (such as cheap property), mild climate, health benefits and feeling of community. By the same token, the narratives point to the shortcomings of their lives in their original homes as rising levels of crime, unemployment, lack of community spirit, high-pressured lifestyles (or the ‘rat race’) and low quality life (O’Reilly, 2000; Sunil, et al., 2007). These narratives mention that they romanticised the place of their relocation as a place to escape from these negative lifestyles and traumatic events but also in order to live a life where they are ‘true’ to themselves. In such self-realisation accounts, lifestyle migrants mention certain events and circumstances that led to their decision such as retirement, redundancy or any traumatic circumstances (Benson, 2011a; Hoey, 2009).

It needs to be noted however, what constitutes a “better life” is not homogenously represented in any of the previously mentioned lifestyle migration studies because people’s choices are mediated through their habitus, their embodied class-culture (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.616). For instance, city-dwellers’ imagination of life in countryside as rural idyll refers to the utopic vision of a future home in which people can have a community feeling and security and low-costs living (Benson, 2010; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Little & Austin, 1996), similar in the case of characterising tropical islands as “paradise” where life is slow-paced and relaxed in an
eternally sunny and beach-oriented environment (Williams & Hall, 2002; Halfacree & Rivera, 2012; MacCannell, 1973; O’Reilly & Benson, 2009). As Urry (1999) argues global media and technology enabled the current proliferation of these images and imaginings of places (e.g. in the case of islands, discourse of ‘living in paradise’), strengthening the notion that there is an ideal place (somewhere in the world) to live, while simultaneously making it possible to export material lives into “idyllic landscapes”.

2.3.2 Searching for Self

Within the context of contemporary lifestyle migration, scholars point out that individuals’ quest of ‘self-actualisation’ appear as the dominant motivation to undertake a migration path to an imagined future in which they have a more fulfilling life (Korpela, 2010; Åkerlund & Sandberg, 2015; Kordel, 2016). As argued earlier, this fulfilling life is closely associated with values of “authenticity, implying simplicity, purity and originality” (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.5). Hence, for the project of ‘searching for self’, lifestyle migrants firstly need to escape from their previous ‘inauthentic’ lives, in other words from the materialistic, consumerist Western lifestyles as well as anomic and increasing insecurity in their societies (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.5). In lifestyle migration literature, the rhetoric of escapism reflects on lifestyle migrants’ willingness to escape from individual and community histories as well as from changing political, social and economic circumstances of their home environments. In this regard, escapism is closely linked to the quest of ‘search for self’, to get closer to their ‘true’ self, individuals firstly need to step outside of the boundaries of their past responsibilities, roles and circumstances (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Maoz, 2007; Cohen, 2011).

Therefore, for lifestyle migrants, searching for self is related to finding an ‘existential authenticity’ which requires individuals to be in a process of “being in touch with one’s inner self, knowing one’s self, having a sense of one’s own identity and then living in accord with one’s sense of oneself” (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006, p.300). Without getting into a debate in if there is a ‘true’ self to find, or if one’s ‘authentic’ way of life requires to be moral, it can be said that lifestyle migrants perceive the search for ‘authentic’ self as being about “free choices, not about maintaining traditions or being true to some past concept of individual, social, or cultural identity” (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006, p.311).

Whilst tourism mobility studies cover in length the themes of ‘find one’s self’ and ‘self-actualisation’ as motives or results of travel (Richards & King, 2003; Dann, 1977; Neumann, 1992), there are not many studies which examine the ‘search for self’ in relation to individuals’ settlement in a particular place whilst having multiple links to other, their processes of claiming
belonging to this new environment and re-constructing their self-identities and subjectivities through their everyday interactions (Benson & Jackson, 2013). Hence, exploring identities within lifestyle mobilities can provide an understanding of people’s motivations to circulate, migrate and settle to find their ‘true’ selves. In such motive, travel is found to provide lifestyle travellers with “an environment in which people could test themselves, and a space in which to search for a revitalized sense of self” (White & White, 2004, p.212). Furthermore, Neumann (1992, p.177) notes that tourist sites are, “places where people find themselves working towards forms of self-realisation and meaning, attempting to fill experiential vacancies that run through contemporary life.” Lifestyle travellers therefore value such experiences of risk-taking, adventures, discovering new cultures, meeting new people, facing new challenges and indulging in leisure as means to find themselves. Côté and Levine (2002) argue that such necessity of finding one’s self is a modern construction as well as it is a tough task because modernity replaced the obligational/traditional identity which has been given and stable. Instead, individuals have choices in this modern setting in which most modern Westerners seek an idea of self that reflects unity and purpose, a cultural expectation that one’s identity reflects “a patterned and purposeful integration of me” (McAdams, 1997, p.60).

In lifestyle migration however, individuals’ ‘searching for self’ take place in a new environment they settle on a temporary or permanent basis, in most cases sustaining transnational ties. Hence, escapism, finding freedom in leisure and learning through challenges are not associated with travel as a journey with multiple destination and passing points, expected and unexpected circumstances, adventures and flow of people and geographies. Instead, lifestyle migrants go through their self-actualisation process by actively place-making, being a part of the local community, learning and developing new skills, utilising their capitals to create opportunities for themselves. Their migratory traits sometimes point to limited opportunities, risk-taking and renegotiation of their identities in changing circumstances (Gustafson, 2009). Some scholars illustrate that, relocating themselves in a new environment brings challenges for the lifestyle migrants as they struggle to situate themselves within new power structures resulting in narratives of failure and dissatisfaction (Trundle, 2009). Therefore, the imagination about the ‘authentic’ and ‘fulfilling life’ is mostly contrasted with the lived experiences of reality, in which they may struggle (Oliver, 2008; Huber & O’Reilly, 2004).

On the other hand, lifestyle migration studies show that there are cases in which the migrants utilise their human and cultural capitals and use their opportunities in full capacity to survive in their relocation (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009). In such situations, the migrants follow an approach that is flexible and creative towards the new conditions and as a result, they manage to
sustain their lifestyle motivations. Entrepreneurial spirit, having a work-leisure balance, expanding knowledge for adaptation and sustainment of their lifestyles represent the common characteristics of lifestyle migrants of this rather positive framework. Hoey’s (2005) study on middle-class working families in the US illustrates this with the narratives of professionals from metropolitan areas who moved to rural areas. Hoey interprets this migratory flow as a manner of “personally negotiating tension between experience of material demands in pursuit of a livelihood within the flexible New Economy and prevailing cultural conventions for the good life that shape the moral narratives that define individual character” (p.587). Hence, to gain ‘higher self-awareness’ or ‘personal enlightenment’, lifestyle migrants immerse themselves in leisure which they have more freedom to get insights about themselves, however the physical and cultural challenges also help them to test their capacities and get a better sense of ‘who they are’.

However, lifestyle migration is an ongoing project, hence finding the ‘true’ self cannot be treated as a destination point, or for every individual the experience of self-actualisation would require different paths and experiences. For this reason, other lifestyle migration studies have focused on flexibility as a way to “move forward” because even though migrants claim to find the ‘ideal’ and ‘authentic’ place to live in, they also narrate that they keep their options open for further migration for the reason that lifestyle migration mirrors the individuals’ search for “authenticity”, which, in the process, destroys the authenticity it seeks (MacCannell, 1973).

2.3.3 Work-Leisure Balance

One important element of self-actualisation process is argued as the lifestyle migrants’ approaches towards materialistic lifestyles. Instead of sustaining their 9-to-5 jobs, or having stressful lives in the ‘rat race’ of the modern job market conditions, lifestyle migrants imagine the ‘good life’ as having the freedom to spend time with themselves, families and friends, and use the leisure time to invest in their interests and hobbies, travel or work on ideas/projects to have the ‘fulfilling’ lifestyle they desire. In leisure and tourism studies, scholars point out that when people are on holiday, they enter a phase of ‘liminality’ meaning that individuals step outside of their ‘real’ and ‘everyday’ life structures and experience freedom where they are temporarily freed from the demands of their jobs, household chores, social commitments and generally, the behavioural norms and values of their society (Sharpley, 2003). Hence, tourism places are ‘liminal spaces’, in which individuals can enjoy a sense of freedom and anonymity (Sharpley, 2003)

Lifestyle migrants are however, most of the time part of a (expat-)community in which they have certain responsibilities. They may work, either periodically or on flexible hours, or as the managers of their own businesses. Hence, for lifestyle migrants, life is not based on leisure per
se, (though values as much as financial gain), but it is balanced with a type of work which is more enriching than draining. Hence, lifestyle migrants follow strategies of renegotiation of work-leisure balance for maintaining quality of life and freedom from prior constraints (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.610). However, as they still need to survive and sustain their lifestyles, they are engaged in economic activities to generate income. Stone and Stubbs (2007) present that lifestyle migrants (or ‘self-employed expatriates’) prefer to be their own bosses and therefore they invest in small businesses. There are also cases where migrants work in low-paid jobs to realise the quality of life they aspired to (Hoey, 2005). It is also common amongst lifestyle migrants to undertake entrepreneurial activities that are quite different than their pre-migration careers (e.g. Hoey, 2005 introduces a previously engineer informant who later opened a pie shop). Another case is, when lifestyle migrants go back to their country of origin to save enough money to finance their next trip to the migration destination (Korpela, 2010 on the Westerner migrants in Varanasi).

As lifestyle remains as their main priority (Madden, 1999), they use their businesses to fund their new lifestyles (Stone & Stubbs, 2007; Madden, 1999; Befus, et al., 1988). By being self-employed, lifestyle migrants take control over their lives since “working for others was not a part of the new life that they had envisaged” (Stone & Stubbs, 2007, p.438). One interesting insight by Benson & O’Reilly’s (2009, p.611) study is that lifestyle migrants are often not willing to expand their businesses, fearing that it would disturb the work-leisure balance. This shows that lifestyle migration needs to be treated as a new and unique phenomenon since lifestyle migrants do not prioritise income as other types of migrants who often wish to secure their finances to support themselves and their families.

### 2.4 Lifestyle Return Migration: Emergence of a Non-Economic, Translocal Approach?

The chapter has illustrated that the second generation’s ‘return’ requires a new understanding to simultaneously consider the dichotomous concepts of ‘origin is destination’, ‘return is first-time immigration’, ‘the co-ethnic is the foreigner’, as “second-generation’s return demonstrates the blurring that exists over these dualities and even challenges how they should be framed” (King & Christou, 2010b, p.181). Especially, analysing the second generation’s ‘self-seeking’ projects through ‘return’ lead a conceptual puzzle in which macro and structuralist theories are inadequate to grasp individuals’ agencies in searching, finding or re-inventing themselves. Nevertheless, there is not a theoretical model that can grasp all the underlying motivations, aspirations and circumstances of individuals regarding migration. Lifestyle migration
in that sense, acts as a bridging concept where the interplay of different approaches and theoretical perspectives are recognised and utilised.

Such approach however further demands a reversal of migration research’s prior scope of analysis in understanding how the second generation construct, experience and evolve ‘the self’ throughout their return migratory journeys. Firstly, international migration theories conventionally regard the nation-state’s borders as quasi-naturally given units, and analyse people’s movements as ‘migration’ when they cross the borders of these political territories to have residence. However, alternative to such macro perspectives, lives of migrants as units of analysis can be studied as a micro-level approach. This way, understanding of migration can be reversed because, with macro perspectives of nation-states, migrants are people who enter and leave their territories, and these movements are structured through territorial boundaries. However, for migrants individually, these experiences are perceived as these nation-states (i.e. places) enter or leave their lives, therefore having a research based on the migrants’ perspective needs to focus on a life-course analysis, in which time-space specific life events and stages matter.

Secondly, it is not sufficient to observe and analyse the movement, but also its effects on the migrants’ lives and trajectories. As King argues (2012, p.136), “migrants are not constantly on the move, but what defines them as migrants is that they are […] looking for a place to stop and settle down, at least for a while”. This is the uniqueness of migration compared to other human mobilities – it affects every aspect of human existence, as well as places and contexts they encounter with. Migrants form “grounded attachments, geographies of belonging, and practices of citizenship” (Blunt, 2007, p.687), hence compared to human mobilities, migration is manifested as a kind of ‘stability-within-movement’ (Halfacree, 2012).

However, not many second generation return migration studies consider the more individualistic, self-oriented aspirations and trajectories even though the research studies recognise that there is a clear difference between the first generation’s more economically-driven motivations to immigrate to a different country and return to their homeland, and the second generation’s more existential motivations (King, 2002; Teerling, 2011). “Lifestyle choices” of the second generation, to have a better quality of life in terms of pace, sense of security, climate and cuisine as well as the desire to have freedom and autonomy have not been disregarded, however were mostly analysed next to the ‘grand’ issues of diaspora and counter-diaspora. Hence, it is important to add these rationales to the traditional economic motivations of migration and return migration – lifestyle choices, desire for freedom, searching for self and seeking for self-development – transform the act of migration into a “projection of an individual’s identificatory
experience beyond what are perceived as the restricting confines of his or her own country” (King, 2002, p.95).

Based on these arguments, the thesis offers a new understanding of the second-generation as ‘lifestyle returnees’; socially and spatially situated actors who are simultaneously emplaced and, mobile by rooting the ‘transnational’ in the place-making practices based on the contexts of locales (Benson & Jackson, 2013; Torkington, 2012; Smith, 2005). Hence, lifestyle returnees’ ‘searching for self’ projects require an understanding based on the translocal expressions of identity and place-attachment following the argument that, “translocality draws attention to multiplying forms of mobility without losing sight of the importance of localities in people’s lives” (Oakes & Schein, 2006, p.1). Therefore, it is important to evaluate their experiences, behaviours and modes of movement in relation to places with the stretching and transforming qualities of locales (Castree, 2004, p.135). The challenge is however to provide a rigorous analytical framework for this particular group in developing the etiology of ‘self’ in relation to ‘place as home’; because on one hand, their diasporic condition, memory and nostalgia constitutes a more sedentary and rooted understanding of these notions, and on the other hand, the optic of translocal geographies and positionalities refer to the uprooted and ‘always in-becoming’ experiences. Recent research has been increasingly adopting methods that capture movement itself, leading to the development of the term “moving methods” (Watts & Urry, 2008). As Richter (2012) briefly explains, this term calls attention to the necessity of adopting adequate methods to study and interpret movement.

So, the question arises as how to read return migration through a lifestyle lens? Firstly, lifestyle migration is mainly concerned with a micro-level analysis, although macro and meso-level factors cannot be dismissed to explain individuals’ migratory paths for ‘self-seeking’. An important point regarding micro-level analysis for lifestyle migration is that, the project of ‘better life’ requires active agency of individuals in deciding and acting on their decisions. Throughout their project, they prioritise their personal wishes and desires and take further steps in their migration path. As Korpela (2014, p.27) explains,

[L]ifestyle migrants often present themselves as active agents who have improved their lives by way of their own unmediated choice; they have taken their destiny into their own hands by escaping unsatisfactory circumstances and do not expect others (or societies) to act on their behalf.

Here, it is acknowledged that ‘taking the destiny in one’s hand’ refers to individuals’ lifestyle choices independent from the expectations of their family members, friends and other significant others around them. There are lifestyle migration studies showing that lifestyle
migrants negotiate their decisions with their spouses and children, however most of the time in-family negotiations seem to be the only factors affecting their decisions. In return migration literature however, in most of the cases the second generation’s return is affected by family-related reasons; either the return is planned as a family project in which the first generation lead the return, or if the second generation have their own families, they took the return decision, considering factors such as their spouses’ work, visa conditions, children’s education etc. Therefore, in classical migration and return migration theorisations, family-ties and economic factors dominate the individuals’ decision-making processes. In economic approaches to migration, specifically in the NELM theories, migrants normally seek to diversify the risk attached to household income (Stark, 1991), hence making migration a family strategy. NELM theory is useful in explaining temporary migration and separation of families in the context of the division of labour, the diversification of risks within households, and remittances (Massey, et al., 1994). However, determinants of family reunification and chain migration are not explicitly explained in this model (Haug, 2008).

It is of course not applicable to lifestyle migration, since this type of migration is solely driven by one particular motivation, nevertheless this comparison can highlight to a higher degree how migration motivations, decisions and rationalisations have changed and diversified over the years. For economic approaches as well, it has been already established that people’s intentions to migrate could be accepted as the sum of the expected utilities, with expected utilities categorised according to the dimensions of wealth, status, comfort, suggestion, autonomy, affiliation (i.e. living near family members, or being part of a community) and morality (De Jong & Fawcett, 1981, p.50). Personality factors such as readiness to take risks or adaptability were perceived as important factors for individuals to put their migration project into action.

Furthermore, the utility of the place of origin and the potential place destination together with its opportunity structures would be considered as important factors, because location-specific human and social capitals tie persons to places (Haug, 2008). It is argued that in economic approaches, partial or complete loss of location-specific assets has been little explored (Fischer, et al., 1997, p.89). In lifestyle migration however, the importance of human and social capital is referenced in relation to how lifestyle migrants adapt to their local and their respective communities in their migration destinations, and how they also adapt the circumstances and get jobs in the locales they inhabit. It needs to be highlighted however, lifestyle migration is generally pictured as a type of migration in which economic factors do not matter. In this thesis, it is argued that economic capital plays an important role also for both the lifestyle migrants and
lifestyle returnees, as their ‘affluent’ condition allows them to start a new life elsewhere in the first place, without securing a job in the place of destination.

In second-generation return migration literature, lifestyle link remains vague. One recent migration study focuses on lifestyle as a return migration motivation amongst first and second generation British-Pakistanis (Bolognani, 2014a; Bolognani, 2014b). Bolognani (2014b) uses the term of “imagining” within the framework of return consideration, as it points at a collective wealth of images and options for the migrants (Castoriadis, 1997). The author suggests that individuals can tap into the imaginings of themselves when computing pros and cons about their migratory decisions. Bolognani therefore, agrees with the argument presented earlier about lifestyle as a concept is a useful tool to capture the process of change in class, status, power and position in both home and host countries. Bolognani’s study (2014b) has similarities with Basu’s (2004, p.151) work on North American travellers who visit Scotland – their ancestors’ country of origin through touristic journeys to the original “homeland” appear as a “life-changing experience”. Basu uses the term “roots tourism” to depict this phenomenon and argues that these tourists’ get idyllic memories of their holiday visits. The lifestyle migration research often mentions touristic visits and experiences as an element of building imagination for certain places, and this can be also applicable in terms of second generation’s return imaginary, as their childhood visits and holidays in the ancestral homeland may evoke the ‘return’ project.

Another point in understanding return migration through lifestyle migration would be related to place-attachment and belonging. The understandings of the selves and construction of these are different between lifestyle migrants, travellers and diasporic subjects. In lifestyle migration, belonging is no longer necessarily an attribute of being ‘born and bred’ in a place. But belonging can arise when a chosen place of residence is perceived as valuable due to its congruence with lifestyle and life-story requirements as well as through its connection to other significant places i.e. “elective belonging” (Savage, et al., 2005, p.55). Buying one’s own ‘property’ seems to be an essential part of this type of migration process, stemming from an ideology that associates the concept of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ with land and property ownership and thus staking a claim to place. For, return migrants however, ancestral homeland is often taken for granted, and material homes are inherited through parents, or built in places of origin (villages, towns, cities).

For lifestyle travellers and migrants, the self is an on-going process and therefore lifestyle mobility is an accumulation of daily practices to sustain the “better life” that the subjects wish for. Therefore, travellers do not just wish to go “home”, for most of the part they know that they
might return home at the end of their journey (Germann-Molz, 2008, p.329) or as Cohen (2010b) suggested, “they move forward”. Diasporic subjects on the other hand, long for a self that is either lost or longed for and so, they desire to return to an imagined homeland (Brah, 1996). In other words, travellers are “homeless” voluntarily, whereas diasporic subjects have “homing desires” that seek to put down roots and carve out spaces of belonging in a new home country (Brah, 1996). Lifestyle return migrants in that sense, might be located in between these two types, on one hand they might enact a kind of mobile attachment that allows to feel at home in many places (e.g. “global abode” by Germann-Molz, 2008; or cosmopolitans), but on the other hand, they might have the desire to find home in mobility and be engaged in “home-making” or “place-building” for themselves (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p.131).

The thesis suggests that lifestyle migration theories can be reconceptualised by scrutinising the case of second generation who prioritise their ‘lifestyle choices’ in their return migration. ‘Searching for self’ is explored as one of the main motives of lifestyle migration, nevertheless this quest is mostly studied with regards to the late-modern subjects’ existential struggle in the increasingly individualised and consumerist post-traditionalist societies. In return migration literature that focuses on the second generation, ‘searching for self’ is explored with regards to ‘reuniting’ with the ancestral homeland through the processes of re-constructing identity and belonging. However, research often limits the second generation’s ‘search for self’ to their diasporic, ethnic and national expressions of identity. Whereas lifestyle migration studies focus on ‘self’ as a reflexive project of the late-modern individual and often excludes the influence of ethnic and national structures in the ways individuals perceive, re-construct and negotiate their identities. Hence, conceptualising the term ‘lifestyle return’ instigates a discussion on the notion of ‘search for self’, merging together individuals’ late-modern reflexivity on their identities, lifestyles and place-attachments as well as re-construction of more place-bound identifications and membership to ethnic, national and diasporic collectivities. This poses questions related to active agency and external structures (such as of particular place, nation, global forces etc.) which will be developed under the concept of ‘translocational habitus’ at the end of the following chapter.
3 Tracing the Self: Ways of Being, Becoming, Belonging

The previous chapter has established and discussed lifestyle return migration as a concept which involves those diasporic individuals who prioritise their individualistic goals throughout their return journeys to and in their ancestral homeland. Furthermore, the previous chapter has argued that lifestyle returnees’ migratory paths are fostered by imaginings of certain places due to the destination’s physical and symbolic values. They settle in these places to live in accordance with their lifestyles and goals for the self, such as self-development, gaining new skills, utilising their forms of capital to build social networks, gain income and sustain their lifestyles. In that sense, these processes of identity and belonging constructions are related to the lifestyle returnees’ agency; individual decisions, accumulated practices/social capital in the ‘translocal fields’ further guide their ‘routes’ in life.

Hence, in the triangulated conceptual framework of this thesis, meanings and ideologies attached to the self, home and return are explored through the translocal geographies of identity, place and habitus. Even though, the thesis focuses on ‘searching for self’ throughout the return migration journeys, for the sample group of this research, diaspora consciousness, family narratives and nostalgia of childhood visits to the ancestral homeland shape certain ideas about their self-identity and place-attachments. Hence, in order to understand how their ideas of ‘self’ and ‘home’ are re-constructed with regards to the lived experiences of places and their cultural contexts, this section introduces and discusses the notions of identity, place and habitus through a translocality lens, and offers a novel understanding by evaluating these in the light of reflexive modernity. Finally, this chapter builds upon the idea that the second generation as lifestyle returnees acquire ‘translocational habitus’ and “transcultural capital”; they choose to dwell in spaces that give them a ‘sense of freedom’ in how they would like to re-construct their identities and place-attachments. Therefore, the concept of ‘translocational habitus’ is constructed through the triadic framework of identity, place and habitus.

Giddens’ (1991) usage of the term ‘self-identity’ highlights the difficulty of separating one notion from the other, because identities are “neither wholly collective nor individual, but are formed in the interaction between the individual and the subject positions available to them through discourse” (Breathnach, 2006, p.113). It is argued that people need to integrate the continuous new experiences and situations with the existing aspects of ‘self’ (Erikson, 1968). Hence, identity becomes a process of negotiations between self and context (Grotevant, 1992). It is an ongoing dynamic process whereby individuals re-establish and re-evaluate who they are and not relative to others in their social settings (Erikson, 1968). For a possible answer to the question
of “who am I?” individuals rely on certain sources based on their likes and dislikes, attitudes and beliefs, values and worldviews, as well as their social roles and culturally designated descriptive attributes such as gender, ethnicity, race, class and religion (Chatman, et al., 2005, p.118).

Scholars from different fields put self and identity in the centre of focus because, identities provide a “meaning-making lens” and focus one’s attention on some but not other features of their current context (Oyserman & James, 2009). The thesis adopts Lindholm’s (2007, p.216) interpretation of the notion of self: “[b]y ‘self’ we mean the fundamental manner in which reality is subjectively experienced.” These experiences are not only regarding the physical and social world around, but involves how one perceives oneself. Self-concept is then described as what comes to mind when one thinks of oneself (Tajfel, 2010), one’s theory of one’s personality (Kanagawa, et al., 2001) and what one believes is ‘true’ of oneself (Baumeister, 2010; Forgas, et al., 2003).

Thus, by focusing on self and identity, migratory subjects’ motivations for action, how they think and make sense of themselves and others, their feelings and ability to control or regulate themselves in changing encounters and contexts can be explored (Baumeister, 2010; Higgins, 1989; Oyserman, 2007). These experiences influence people’s perceptions of themselves, their identity negotiation processes and strategies followed to keep a ‘coherent sense of self’. A framework for self and identity can be based on three core notions, self and identity as mental construct; social construct and force for action (Oyserman, et al., 2012, p.75). The interplay of these levels is a highly complex and multidimensional process with regards to migrants as their multiple identities and belongingness create a tension for the self to have continuity and coherence.

Based on this framework, this chapter is mainly interested in self as individuals’ subjective experience of who they are (personal and collective identities), however these subjectivities are examined through how identities as social identifications and discursive practices are internalised at an individual level and translated into belonging as well as manifested with lifestyle choices. Thereby, these three core notions are linked together; lifestyle returnees’ mental construction of self as subjectivities is contrasted with the social construction of their plural identities, and how these are translated into force of action in which they take certain life choices, positionalities and subjectivities for getting a sense of self and place and live a ‘better life’.

Nevertheless, an important challenge can be outlined for the self – the ability to improvise in an ever-changing social world, and in the more specific cases of when an individual takes a migration journey, or as in the case of the second generation, being raised in a ‘translocational social field’ in which notions of identity, belonging and cultural spaces of
interaction are multiple, hybrid and at times acquire contradicting elements. Hence, an uncertainty about ‘who I am’ leads to insecurities about ways of knowing the social world around – because it is the self-knowledge that allows individuals to give meaning, interpret and experience their social worlds. Therefore, the third section in this chapter relates self and identity to habitus, field and game – how individuals proactively navigate in social spaces and negotiate their identities to have a stable sense of self whilst social structures are instable, and in what ways this is an effective way of understanding individuals’ sense of self as ‘force for action’.

It is also acknowledged that the case of the second generation, both during their lives in the country of birth and through their ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland, there can be a ‘self-concept disturbance’ as what social psychologists call – a change in their ideas about themselves may occur as they have been incorporating many aspects of both ‘host’ and ‘home’ country behaviours, values and ways of thinking into their repertoires (Sussman, 2002, p.5). The ‘return’ journey is in fact quite vital in the way it affects the self-concept, the lived experiences of the ancestral homeland may produce an awareness on their cultural identity – an awareness that their everyday behaviours and ways of thinking have cultural origins – hence, they can compare ‘home’ and ‘host’ country patterns and associated identities (Sussman, 2002, p.3). Hence, the thesis puts self-identity and place into a dialogue and evaluates the concept of ‘home’ in relation to the second-generation’ ways of belonging and their in-between positions embodied through the imaginary ties between people and places.

Even though this group is later conceptualised to be translocal subjects who have “transcultural capital”, not all feel that they are cosmopolitans who can easily live inter- and intra-culturally, instead they may struggle with the feeling of being foreigners ‘here’ and ‘there’. Hence, they may go through identity negotiation processes, as these individuals need to mobilise their interaction competencies within situational routines with several others (e.g. members of their kinship/ethnic/religious groups and the dominant Others) to self-regulate – to act in ways that facilitate present or future self-needs and wants (Jenkins, 2008; Oyserman, et al., 2012). In this regard, the thesis argues that the second generation upon return experience a process of “enculturation” instead of assimilation, asserting that individuals would selectively acquire or retain elements of their heritage culture, while also selectively acquiring some elements of the receiving cultural context (Weinreich, 2009; Schwartz & Unger, 2010). Therefore, identity can be perceived as multilateral, emerging from the relationship between self-image and other-defined image, in which “individuals negotiate their identities within the interaction order” (Jenkins, 2008, p.93).
3.1 Self and Identity: Social Constructions and Subjective Positionalities in Late Modernity

This section focuses on the concept of ‘self’ in relation to identities, considering both the individualistic (personal) and collective (social) aspects to shed a light on the ways in which this interplay can be used to understand how the second generation live in their ‘translocal fields’, make choices and construct meanings of their experiences. The section starts with the meaning and relevance of collective/social identities and focuses on ‘boundaries’ created and identified by people. The section then will discuss the ways in which self and identity can acquire continuity and coherence in the late modern era which conceptualises these notions as social products that are transformative. These in turn, will provide a critical framework to understand the relevance and purpose of self and identity in the contemporary world. Finally, the concept of search for the ‘true’ self is presented and discussed in relation to people’s construction of belongingness to certain places, groups and lifestyles which are imagined to be providing ‘authenticity’. The main point of discussion here is built on the modern Western thought suggesting that there is a ‘true’ inner-self to be found and developed.

3.1.1 Self in ‘the Gaze of the Other’: Ethnic Boundaries and Imagined Communities

Scrutinising the issues of self and identity in relation to the second generation and their ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland calls attention to reconsidering diaspora, ethnicity and nationality as reference points for identities. However, the idea is to illustrate how ‘shared culture’ based on ethnicity and nationality is regarded as a marker of ‘difference’ between (counter-)diasporic groups and the dominant others in the “host” and “home” societies. Furthermore, the thesis is interested in how this understanding has been stretched with translocality angle and strengthening forces of globalisation in which boundaries based on “differences” and “similarities” have become problematic to analyse, yet kept being organising principles in the way individuals define themselves in relation to others.

On one hand, the postmodern approaches commonly claim that there is no such whole as a nation, culture, or even ‘the self’ (Bhabha, 1994). This understanding suggests that national, diasporic and ethnic identities need authenticating but their authentication derives from people’s ability to continuously re-invent themselves out of their hybrid cultural condition. On the other hand, as Schrami (2012, p.90) rightfully reminds that “everyday primordialism” and “common descent” as the primary source of ethnic and/or national unity are still dominating discourses and
being reflected through ethnic wars and evaluation of them by journalists, politicians, education systems etc. Hence, having no consensus over these phenomena has not changed the fact that 21\textsuperscript{st}-century-world is immersed in a social, political and economic environment where ethnicity, nationality, diaspora and their effects persistently emerge in identity discourses and political debates.

Moreover, there is an emphasis on nations in ethnicity theories, and on ethnicity in the theories of nationalism with regards to group boundaries. However, postmodern approaches avoid terms such as “group” and “boundary” in the case that they connate a fixed identity, as ethnicity is argued to be “negotiated and constructed in everyday living” (Isajiw, 1993, p.410). Hence, the purpose of this section is not to capture definitions of nation, ethnicity and diaspora, or utilise these as tools of analysis, but offer a critical framework to show how these notions matter for individuals and collectivities, and how boundaries related to these notions function in hierarchies of power. In fact, the thesis acknowledges that these mentioned notions’ definitions and interpretations are divergent and ambiguous (Brubaker, 2005; Hutchinson & Smith, 1996).

Even though ethnicity as a concept is new, it has a long history steeped in issues of power, domination, and inequity. In addition, it serves as a means of uniting and mobilising populations. The paradox here is, the term had not been properly conceptualised and yet, there had been ‘ethnicity’-talk in every corner of the world, nonetheless with multiple understandings. Following Weber’s understanding of ethnic groups as “entertaining a subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or both, or because of memories of colonization or migration” (1978, p.389), the thesis highlights the mythical aspect of similarities/differences embraced by a group. For instance, according to Weber, ethnicity is \textit{künstlich} (artificial), based on a subjective position of sharing \textit{Gemeinschaft} (community)\textsuperscript{6}.

Furthermore, a review over the theories of ethnicity and nation do share several characteristics, including a common etymology (Greek \textit{ethnos} connected to “lineage” whereas nation derives from the Latin \textit{nasci}, “be born”) (Conversi, 2004, p.817). Both deal with in and out groups, “us” and “them” dichotomies and inclined with collective identities. Smith (1991, p.14) considers national identity as a subjective and multi-dimensional entity and interprets ethnic

\textsuperscript{6} Weber [1921] (1978) introduces the dichotomy of \textit{Gemeinschaft–Gesellschaft} to show the key elements of historical and social change. \textit{Gemeinschaft} is the traditional societies (e.g. rural societies) where shared sentiments and values, strong kinship/familial ties permeate the community’s structures. \textit{Gesellschaft} is a type of civil society where individuals are tied by institutional rules, human relations are more impersonal/indirect and constructed in the interest of efficiency and self-benefit.
unification as a necessary condition for the national survival and unity. Moreover, he highlights the importance of shared myths\(^7\) and memory to unite people. Smith’s conceptualisation of diaspora puts an emphasis on ‘roots’ rather than ‘routes’ for the same reason, he claims that memory and myths are important for communities to base themselves on some “authentic” source of certainty regarding their home and belonging.

The thesis acknowledges that, generating myths, glorification and constructing belonging are all related to processes of collective remembering and forgetting (Appadurai & Breckenridge, 1989; Assmann & Czaplicka, 1995). As Anderson (1991, p.204) puts it, “if the identities we have cannot be remembered then they must be narrated”, in other words produce them discursively. It is further argued that these discursive productions through social others and institutions are the main sources of ‘belonging’. Hedetoft (2002, p.6) points out the paradoxical condition of ‘belonging’ as a continuous negotiation of the current state of being and imaginings. Moreover, he calls attention to the institutionalisation of belonging as a political and cultural project in which boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’ are not only symbolic, but also territorial, discursive, and controlled with citizenship. Hence, one’s belongingness can be best understood through persons’ narratives based on self-reflection. This means people make sense of the social world through narrations, as being located and locating themselves in social narrating. Thus, language and identities are mutually constitutive in which people tell narratives of who they are and are not (Yuval-Davis, 2010)

Thus, discourses play a role in the way people construct belongingness towards certain groups, places and identities. For that reason, in theories of ethnicity, nationalism and diaspora, “consciousness” is introduced as an indispensable component, hence “self-awareness” of an individual or collectivity is imperative for boundary-making and maintenance between “us” and “them”, also signifying active participation and engagement of the subjects in certain practices and discourses to bind with other members of their ‘community’, i.e. in diasporas (Connor, 1986; Cohen, 1996; Safran, 1991). Nevertheless, more recent conceptualisations of diasporas recognise the plurality of “ethnicity” as a concept with regards to “shared ethnic consciousness” (Tölölyan, 1991; Appadurai, 1996a). This understanding indicates that grand narratives on cultural identities within a nation-state are, if not fixed, lethargic. Hence, diasporas are not necessarily ‘culturally distinctive’, static and pre-existing groups (Hall, 1990; Gilroy, 2000) but can be “heterogeneous

\(^7\) The myth in this thesis refers to what Hawkes (2003, p.107) defines as “a complex system of beliefs which a society constructs to sustain and authenticate its own sense of being, i.e. the very fabric of its system of meaning”.
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populations that are self-consciously imagined and developed into collectivities through the projects of states and émigrés” (Waldinger, 2008, p.xiv).

With regards to ethnicity, main theories have come from primordialist and constructionist camps and yet, constructionism has been the prevailing paradigm in the most contemporary stage of ‘ethnicity studies’. Today, no academic study on ethnicity is solely based on classic primordialism, but instead the “shift towards the study of identities rather than cultures has entailed an intense focus on conscious agency and reflexivity” (Eriksen, 2001, p.45). In line with the social constructionism philosophies, Eriksen (2002, p.12) highlights that ethnicity is an aspect of social relationship, not a cultural ‘entity’ on its own. It is therefore; 1) relational and makes cultural differences relevant in communication, 2) based on social interaction with ‘Others’, 3) contextually influenced. In this framework, it is important to understand boundary-making and boundary-eroding processes, rather than focusing on if ‘ethnicity’ is primordial or socially constructed; because it is these ethnic boundaries that create ‘imagined communities’.

This major paradigm change has come with the anthropologist Barth’s 1969 essay The Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Barth contests the belief that the social world is made up of distinct named groups and further argues that the identity of the group is not a “quality of the container”. Barth (1969) sees boundary-constructing processes as cultural markers between groups. He argues that, it is “the ethnic boundary that defines the group, not the cultural stuff that encloses it” (p.15). Barth notes that, “culture is nothing but a way to describe human behaviour” (p.9), and illustrates certain boundaries (e.g. language, religion, ritual) become as ‘ethnic markers’, or reference points of ‘difference’ when actors identify themselves with and ascribe themselves to certain categories of behaviour. Hence in an ‘ethnic group’, “the features that are taken into account are not the sum of ‘objective’ differences but only those which the actors themselves regard as significant” (p.14). In summary, Barth’s conceptualisation of ethnic group is relational – it can be what it is only when it becomes aware of the perception or ‘in the gaze of the Other’.

Jenkins (1996) has brought Barth’s work on ethnic boundaries up to date and claimed that ethnic and other identities need to be understood within their specific contexts and as external categories as well as historical constructs. Jenkins acknowledges that ethnic unities might act against their benefit but concludes that the importance of them are found in their defensibility as political goods; because ethnic groups would seek for pursuit of local material interests. Jenkins sees identity as negotiable and changeable, but also claims that ethnicity is not infinitely

---

8 This understanding is rooted in Sartre’s [1943] (2003) theory of existentialism in which he argued a person could only be aware (or be conscious) of himself/herself when confronted with ‘the gaze of other’.
variable or negotiable in the social word of humans. This statement refers to Barth’s idea of the self as ‘rational’ and, in terms of collective action the goal would be both seeking for self-benefit and collective good. This may result in clash of interests between people as individuals and (ethnic) groups. Highlighting the function of identity – whether as ethnic, national and diasporic – as an instrument to improve one’s conditions can be one answer why these identifications still matter in the modern world order. It also justifies Brubaker’s (2014, p.805) concerns about contemporary approaches “overemphasizing the fluidity, contingency and instability of ethnic identifications.”

Brubaker’s recent conceptualisation of boundaries claims that they are either maintained by resisting to assimilation, or unintentionally maintained because of social exclusion. However, Brubaker (2005, p.12) argues that even though diasporas may serve as an alternative to essentialisation of territorialisations belonging, they can also represent a non-territorialised belonging. This means that, the de-territorialisation of identity “still presupposes that there is ‘an identity’ that is reconfigured, stretched in space to cross state boundaries, but on some level fundamentally the same” (Brubaker, 2005, p.12). In other words, as Bruneau (2010, p.49) puts it, “de-territorialisation goes with, or is followed by re-territorialisation” because “in a diaspora, identity pre-exists place and tries to re-create it, to remodel it, in order to reproduce itself”. This is especially important in understanding diasporas in the contemporary context, in which they are conceptualised as “imaginations of community that unite segments of people that live in territorially separated locations” (Sökefeld, 2006, p.267). Hence, the diasporic subjects in the contemporary world experience multiple attachments and identities (Tölölyan, 2012).

Nevertheless, it would be naïve to claim that national identity and borders can be surpassed with diaspora and transnational communities, as the modern world system is based on nation-states and their physical borders. However, a shift in the understanding of ‘nation’ and ‘national identity’ may lead the way for nation-states to free themselves from politics and constitutions that supports ‘primordialism’ which argues that nation derives from a priori ethnic group based on kinship ties and heritage. This ‘great debate’ in nationalism studies and politics between ‘primordialists’ and ‘modernists’ is still ongoing, in which modernists insist that the nation is an entirely novel form of identity and political organisation, which owes nothing to ethnic heritage and everything to the modern dynamics of industrial capitalism (Bellamy, 2010; Gellner, 1983).

Building upon these insights, the thesis focuses on the concept of nation as a modern construct, which can be interpreted as an “imagined political community” (Anderson, 1991) and
“invented tradition” (Hobsbawn, 1983), wherein a national identity is under constant production through “banal nationalism” (Billig, 1995). As Appadurai (1996b, p.4) explains, the ‘imagined’ is used to shape and define group boundaries as a “space of contestation in which individuals and groups seek to annex the global into their own practices”. Appadurai focuses on globalisation and its implications in the national contexts by claiming that people of the modern world can incorporate distant places in their social activities (p.6). With the developing communication technologies, ‘national imaginary’ is carried out through more complex systems of organisation that have transnational implications. Hence, these arguments take the discussion to its starting point, wherein Bhabha (1994) argues that these notions cannot be taken as ‘absolute’; individual and collective identities are always in the production of ‘becoming’ even though imaginings and certain practices can maintain boundaries, but boundaries themselves are open to change.

For this thesis as well, myths and imaginations created through these notions are found more meaningful to explore to understand how individuals and collectivities make/erode boundaries, how they ‘differ’ themselves from the others, and when they feel that they belong to a certain group, place, lifestyle and ‘culture’. Especially, in late modernity and exceedingly individualised societies penetrated by the forces of globalisation, how come and in what ways individuals still hold onto these myths and boundaries (both imagined and physical)?

3.1.2 Self and Identity in Late Modernity and Globalisation

In modernity, conscience collective – sense of common belonging grounded in similarity and in collective ritual – sustained by traditionalist societies was shifting with modern societies being pluralistic and have stronger sense of personal identity and social differences. In this new world order, the important decision of ‘self-identity’ has become the responsibility of the individual (Best & Kellner, 2001). However, changes in mode of production and division of labour, economic development and urbanisation have multiplied social roles which led to identity struggles for the individuals who were required to adapt to these different societal roles and responsibilities (Chase-Dunn, 1998). Durkheim (1984) highlights this crisis by focusing on criminality and social deviance with his theory of “anomie”, referring to the imbalances between
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9 Bellamy (2010, p.14) argues that Hobsbawn’s “invented traditions” are considerably different from Anderson’s “imagined communities” because Anderson indicates that to imagine is not necessarily to fabricate (it can be only to maintain the myths), but Hobsbawn insists that an invented tradition “is largely fictitious”.
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the previously held norms/values and new, evolving beliefs and norms/values. Bauman (2001, p.105) argues that the anomie in society in fact signals modern individuals’ existential crisis:

We are all individuals now; not by choice, though, but by necessity… Many of us have been individualized without truly becoming individuals, and many more yet are haunted by the suspicion that they are not really individuals enough to face up to the consequences of individualization.

However, this breaking point that started with modernity gave birth to another idea about personal identity – the claim that there is a ‘true’ inner self in every individual was also a product of the classical modernist era, which later became one of the main debates about the self in the late modernity. For instance, Foucault has claimed that there is no true ‘inner self’ but only a discourse of such, hence he did not relate the external presentations of the self with individuals’ inner consciousness. Hall (1997, p.56) summarises,

[Foucault’s approach] suggests that discourses themselves construct the subject-positions from which they become meaningful and have effects. Individuals may differ… but they will not be able to take meaning until they have been able to identify with those positions which the discourse constructs, subjected themselves to its rules, and hence become the subjects of its power/knowledge.

Giddens (1991) on the other hand claims that Foucault’s standpoint of “the body plus power equals agency” does not suffice to grasp the modern subjects’ “reflexive project of the self” because according to Giddens, self-identity is beyond a set of traits or observable characteristics – or individuals’ social roles and performativities in the power hierarchies – but it is a person’s own reflexive understanding of their biography (Giddens, 1991, p.53). Giddens (1991, p.54) explains:

The existential question of self-identity is bound up with the fragile nature of the biography which the individual ‘supplies’ about herself. A person’s identity is not to be found in behaviour, nor – important though this is - in the reactions of others, but in the capacity to keep a particular narrative going. The individual’s biography, if she is to maintain regular interaction with others in the day-to-day world, cannot be wholly fictive. It must continually integrate events which occur in the external world, and sort them into the ongoing ‘story’ about the self.

This is an important point to reflect on the birth of concepts such as “self-actualisation” and “self-realisation” that are rooted in the humanist views of modernity which emphasise that there is an “authentic” self that can be searched for (Outhwaite, 2006). However, in the late modernity,

---

10 Whilst Durkheim’s “anomie” referred to a society in which regulations are either absent or not well-defined, in sociology the term was used to denote “normlessness” (Hilbert, 1986).
self was not seen as a unified and actualisable entity, instead self was perceived as “relational” because “the postmodern ‘problem of identity’ is primarily how to avoid fixation and keep the options open” (Bauman, 1996, p.18). This standpoint when compared to Giddens’ “structuration theory” that emphasised reflexivity of the embodied self as simultaneously sustaining coherency of the self’s narratives and continuously revising them, is rather bold in embracing the fragmented and transitory social dynamics which requires the individual to construct and explore the self, leading to the processes of “hyper-individualisation” (Côté, 2002; Outhwaite, 2006).

Similarly, the psychological anthropologist Lindholm (2007) positions “authenticity” as the most valuable notion in the contemporary societies in relation to the debate between searching for ‘true’ self and ways of dealing with fragmentation of self. Lindholm (2007) suggests that the Western modernity has evoked in individuals the desire of searching for an ‘authentic’ and ‘true’ self, however individuals’ belief that they are now in charge of constructing their identities is also the source of anxiety, because whilst they wish to have enough control over their lives, they also have loosening ties with social and cultural guidelines, or the social and cultural structures. Hence, finding a meaningful orientation towards the social and cultural world around them may lead to experiences of multiple identities/personalities or no identity/personality at all, an uncomfortable and unsettling condition for the modern subjects (Lindholm, 2007).

Nevertheless, identity/social identity theories describe the self as including both a stable set of evaluative standards and a fluid, ever-changing description in the moment (Turner, 1956; Tesser, 2000; Campbell, 1990). Some sociological perspectives also argue that both stability and changeability are necessary to maintain a stable and positive sense of self-esteem, emphasising that stability of social interactions would lead to stability of the self over time, as maintaining a self-image requires doing “face work” to convince others of one’s self-presentation (Goffman, 2012). This “face work” and “identity work” are especially relevant in late modernity, since a shift occurred from production towards an economy in which culture and identities are based on consumption, thereafter individuals in the contemporary world adopt ‘lifestyles’ as ways to present themselves, to manifest their identities and ideologies.

Thus, the self is not biologically defined but historically situated, the postmodern subjects assume different identities at different times, and these identities are not unified around a coherent sense of ‘self’. In this regard, Goffman’s “dramaturgical theory” seems to be more applicable than ever before, in which individuals today define ‘who they are’ based on their lifestyles and markers of identities as in ‘taste’, ‘aesthetics’ and way of interpreting the world. Coming to this point in history, in which there are many selves to pick from, to transform and
reinvent could not be possible without the processes of globalisation. The question then arises, how the late modern subjects experience and practice “reflexivity” in order to be engaged in the actions of integration, strategy and subjectifications in the globalised world, in which everything that circulate in the world; goods, capital, technology, people, information, images and culture are in a double and opposing process of de-contextualisation/re-contextualisation (Waters, et al., 1999; Giddens, 1999).

On one hand, the globalised word order is perceived as the emblem of the West, in which the postmodern condition has crashed upon “the ordinary daily experiences of the individual” (Harvey, 1999, p.106) and individuals are increasingly living in a “runaway world” (Giddens, 2000) and “the turbulence of a risk society” (Beck, 1994, p.7) where “all that is solid melts into air” (Berman, 1988). This “reflexive modernity” is marked by increasing individualisation described as “the disintegration of the certainties of industrial society as well as the compulsion to find and invent new certainties for oneself” (Beck, 1994, p.14). With these changing corporate structures, and greater individualisation in the societal level, Beck argues that individuals are less likely to take responsibility for their economic security as the post-industrial Welfare states free them from such constraints (e.g. with unemployment insurance), hence resulting in production of “winners” and “losers”.

Bauman (2005) similarly calls attention to the inequalities that derive from who can benefit from such liquidity, hybridity and (trans-) notions of identity, belonging, citizenship and human rights. Bauman (2005, p.2) asserts, “[l]iquid life is a precarious life, lived under constant conditions of uncertainty”, because in the collapse of the institutions of the solid modernity – of nation, state and territory – only the global elites may feel at home. Bauman (1996, p.92) calls the rich and the ‘secure’ (those with a ‘rightful’ place/citizenship) as “tourists”, who can benefit from the opportunities of globalisation and consumer-led societies. “Tourists” can enjoy “the true or imaginary pleasures of a sensation-gatherer’s life” even if they do not travel because they can imitate “the movement of capital and the liquefaction of bonds through choice” (Tester, 2004, p.180). Bauman uses a counter-metaphor, “vagabonds” (or “underclass) who are not affluent, and hence the liquid modern world is rather a prison for them wherein they “either live or fight against the fate forced upon them” (Tester, 2004, p.180).

This gap between the so-called “tourists” and “vagabonds” is also apparent in the level of encounters with the cultural integration in the globalised world, in which the dominant culture becomes hybrid, and individuals think of their identities beyond the given labels of nationality, territoriality, ethnicity, religion, gender and age. Therefore, in terms of cultural identity, or
individuals’ constructions of their identities based on culture, globalisation offers both a cultural homogeneity through the dominant hegemonic Western culture, and a cultural heterogeneity based on the multiple, complex, hybrid and ambiguous nations of identity. However, individuals’ access to these diverse experiences of globalisation differ also depending on their agencies and subjectivities of their immediate conditions.

Therefore, disregarding human agency, and practices/dispositions embedded in the historical evaluation of locales would be an oversimplification of how global flows and its so-called ‘dominant culture’ are internalised by individuals in local settings. As Lull (2000, p.64) suggests, “people creatively modify the messages they are given from the media and elsewhere to fit their own ways of thinking and living” therein, individuals’ actions and agencies need to be acknowledged in analysing identities and cultures, because individuals actively manipulate texts to suit their local contexts (Appadurai, 2001, p.7). Therefore, scholars who characterise globalisation as the interaction of the global with the local refer to a ‘melting pot’ of cultures, “glocalization” (Robertson, 1995) and “global ecumene”11 at different scales which are dynamic processes of “cultural-give-and-take” (Tomlinson, 1999). This process leads to “creolisation” (Hannerz, 2002, p.127) creating new and original hybrid cultures in which different cultures mingle and blend (Nederveen-Pieterse, 1996, p.1392). Hence, what is meant by hybridity as the marker of the postmodern era is more about an organisation of diversity rather than by a replication of uniformity (Geana, 1997).

As argued previously, a key aspect of cultural identity is the construction of a sense of self based on similarity and difference, on membership and identification with certain groups and not with others and it is the systematic establishment and signification between individuals and collectivities based on boundaries (Jenkins, 2008; Hall, 2008). Hence, people do not only construct and convey identities or orient towards certain groups and communities through their traditionally-given identities but they also draw “upon a wide palette of accessories in the world”, these accessories can be certain consumption rituals based on habits and lifestyles (Brydon & Niessen, 1998, p.24). In other words, even though the globalisation resulted in people being “subjected to intangibles, objects and ideas that lack a definite place” (Niezen, 2004, p.38) some scholars still believe that these claims “simplify very complex cultural processes” (Lull, 2000, 11 Hannerz’s concept is based on Kopytoff’s (1987, p.10) definition of ecumene as “a region of persistent cultural interaction and exchange” (cited in Hannerz, 1989, p.66). This description argues global flows are mediated not only from the West to the Rest but it also involves contra-flows (e.g. from the South to the North) (Thussu, 2007, p.23). Also see McLuhan & Powers (1992) on “global village”.
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Thus, cultures need to be understood as being located along a continuum and “in flux”, involving dichotomies within (Wallerstein, 1990).

The last two points made in this section, one regarding culture being a fluid and eclectic process and globalisation’s role in accelerating it; and secondly locality matters in how globalisation is experienced in relation to human agency and the specific context of locations illustrate the need of evaluating self-identity in relation to place and habitus (human agency, structures, lifestyle). The thesis argues, such dialogue would provide an understanding of how place can still be relevant in people’s processes of belonging in the era of de-territorialised identities, belongings and attachments which transcend national borders and carried out on a virtual level with mass media and high speed internet. Furthermore, a discussion on habitus, class and agency can help the thesis incorporate the previously discussed points related to ethnic/national/diasporic identities and boundaries to understand in what ways these affect the second-generation’s sense of self, processes of becoming and belonging in their post-return lives.

3.2 Unfolding Space, Place, Connections: Self and Identity (Un-)Bound

This section expands on the notions of place and space with regards to the previously introduced debate on how individuals construct place-attachments and ‘homely feelings’ in the late modern era, wherein places embed connections at various scales (e.g. local, global, trans etc.). One of the key arguments of this thesis, that contexts of specific places matter in the way individuals socially interact and construct their positionalities in the power hierarchies is further elaborated. The section then introduces the concept of ‘translocality’ to offer an understanding of ‘home’ as a ‘translocal field’, which can bridge the sedentary/rooted and uprooted/unbound interpretations of ‘home’ for the second generation whose place-attachments are multiple and at times blurred in the lines of ‘here’ and ‘there’. The section concludes that ‘belonging’ to places require the active agency of individuals; hence place-attachment is not a taken-for-granted feeling, but it is developed through individuals’ meaning-making processes of spaces they encounter with in time.

3.2.1 Self, Identity and Place: Social Constructions and ‘Being in Place’

Relating place to people’s subjective experiences call attention to understand place in relation to space which is a more abstract and open concept (Cresswell, 2013, p.8). Tuan (1977, p.7) explains that, “the ideas ‘space’ and ‘place’ require each other for definition”, yet also highlighting that place and space are distinct concepts, having different attributes in relation to people’s mental, physical and embodied practices, as well as meaning-making processes through
emotional attachment, hence place and self-identity are intrinsically linked. Tuan suggests, “place is security, space is freedom: we are attached to the one and long for the other” (1977, p.3).

Tuan’s work that reflects the dialectical relationship between space and place has stressed the relevance of place with its ‘subjective’ and ‘lived’ aspects in understanding creation, maintenance and transformation of social relations (Cresswell, 2003). Studies from human and cultural geography from the late 1980s onwards have reinserted topos in the centre of discussion, by highlighting “the affective bond between people and place”, calling these positive affective ties to place as “topophilia” (Tuan, 1974, p.4). Relph (1976) examined the people’s feelings of being a part of a place and termed “insideness” as having a “sense of place” and “outsideness” as a sense of “placelessness”.

The vital point in Relph’s (1976) insideness/outsideness dialectic is its direct ties with modes of belonging which are important for individual’s place-identity. Nevertheless, Relph’s understanding of place-identity has been criticised for its need for a rootedness in ‘authentic’ places (Seamon & Sowers, 2008; Cresswell, 2006). How people get a sense of place or construct belongingness are argued in more contemporary theories to be more complex and beyond the dualisms of insideness/outsideness, authentic/inauthentic, place/placelessness. For instance, Harvey (1993, p.14) argues that such insistence on the importance of ‘authentic’ places and ‘rootedness’ for acquiring a sense of belonging has the danger of leading to intense nationalism. In this regard, Heidegger’s (1971) framework of place, in which ‘dwelling’ (Wohnen) and ‘rootedness’ (Verwurzeltsein) form the core of “being” (Wesen, “essence”, “entity”, “substance”) and ‘spiritual nourishment’ make an essentialist stance.

Furthermore, scholars call attention to the vagueness of the term ‘place’ as notions of “place-attachment”, “place-identity”, “sense of place” are used interchangeably to refer to one’s affective ties to places (Patterson & Williams, 2005). The political geographer Agnew (2014) [1977] suggests three fundamental aspects of place as a ‘meaningful location’, a) location, b) locale, c) sense of place. Whilst Agnew refers to the simple notion of ‘where’ with regards to location, place does not need to be stationary because location might change, one example can be given as having a voyage on the ship. Locale on the other hand, refers to the material setting for social relations – and even in an imaginary place, there is a level of materiality, for instance imagining a house, or fictional places in books – as this imagination would depend on the human capacity to produce and consume meaning (Cresswell, 2013, p.7). Thirdly, Agnew (2014) [1977] explains ‘sense of place’ as people’s subjective and emotional attachment to place.
The relationship between place and identity remains contested with the influence of globalisation on place-identity, problematising the more essentialist theories on belonging that suggest a sense of self derived from being “born from the soil” (Greek “authochthony”) (Geschiere, 2009, pp.1-2). The role of place has become the centre of discussion in relation to mobility, because the increasingly mobile world we live in led to increasing “placelessness” due to time-space compression (Harvey, 1999). With the ‘spatial turn’ in the social sciences and humanities discourse together with the ‘cultural turn’ in human geography, ‘space’ and ‘place’ were re-inserted in social theory (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986; Soja, 1989; Lefebvre, 1991) to explore the realm of meaning and experience in socio-cultural, economic and political relations (Hubbard & Kitchin, 2010). Moreover, the postmodernist views interpret and utilise space as an instrumental tool in relation to social dynamics, hence describing space as “constituted by the interlocking of ‘stretched-out’ social relations within the place” (Massey, 1994, p.24).

In exploring the many ways in which place and mobility constitute each other, Massey (1991) introduces the concept of a “progressive sense of place”, or a “global sense of place”, in which place is a product of interconnecting flows, it is open and hybrid. This interpretation of place stresses the necessity of understanding place-identity through a new optic because mobility challenges the whole history of place as a centre of meaning connected to a rooted and ‘authentic’. Instead, Massey’s approach calls attention to ‘routes’; people’s interactions with places as hybrid and ever-evolving processes of ‘becoming’. Therefore, she suggests that a progressive and outward-looking reading of a ‘sense of place’ is necessary to understand the contemporary time-space compression beyond its unsettling impact on self-identities and place-identities. Massey (1994, p.156) further argues:

Globalization (in the economy, or in culture, or in anything else) does not entail simply homogenization. On the contrary, the globalization of social relations is yet another source of (the reproduction of) geographical uneven development, and thus the uniqueness of place. There is the specificity of place which derives from the fact that each place is the focus of a distinct mixture of wider and more local social relations... The specificity of place is continually reproduced, but it is not a specificity which result from some long, internalized history.

Massey’s (1991) ideas about the ‘global sense of self’ is a clear contrast to formulating place as ‘bounded’ and static. However, it also raises two vital points which are commonly referred to in postmodernist perspectives: one is that how people still relate to ‘roots’, ‘place as heritage’, or ‘haven’ in which they can have a coherent sense of self whilst they simultaneously experience ‘here’ and ‘there’, changing dynamics and fluid boundaries of different identity groups.
(ethnicity, nationality, citizenship which are all place-based, if not place-bound)? The second is the direct relationship between human agency and place, which also acts as an answer to how people experience grounded-ness whilst being mobile and being embedded in mobility. As it was introduced earlier, for people to attach meaning to spaces, the ‘social’ dimension is indispensable, and for that matter place as social space needs to be understood in relation to power hierarchies, inequalities and people’s different level of access to different spaces in places. This point will be discussed later with Bourdieu’s concept of space as field, wherein interactions, transactions and events occur (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Grenfell, 2008).

With regards to self, contemporary perspectives commonly accept that self and place have reciprocal influence, and therefore “there is no place without the self, and no self without the place” (Casey, 2001a, p.406), then how place insinuate itself into the personal identity requires an analysis that involves human agency and construction of subjectivities. Because, search for self is an active decision, which is also related to searching for a ‘sense of place’. The desire for a level of fixity and security whilst everything changes and moves also requires certain practices – so, even being ‘rooted’ or “rootless” is an active and fluid process. Bourdieu’s concept of ‘field’ will be linked to space in the section on translocality to offer a framework to elaborate how lifestyle returnees’ movements across different spaces in their dwelling places develop their ‘translocational habitus’, and how these are translated into situated practices that are symbolic, material and mediated through power relations in their translocal social fields.

3.2.2 A Translocal Approach to ‘Home’: Migrant-Selves, Place and Belonging

The social processes embedded in mobility – and within the scope of this thesis, the ongoing project of ‘return’ migration – is based on the interconnectedness between people and places, which affects the geography and characteristics of both the sending and receiving countries as well as the individuals’ worlds of meaning (Faist, 2010a; Faist, 1997; Castles & Miller, 2003). For migrant subjects – regardless of its specificity – relationship between self and place as ‘homeland’ or ‘hostland’ appear as the main points of analysis. For the second generation ‘returnees’, relationship with the ancestral homeland in fact reflects the self in its quest for searching for ‘authenticity’, ‘roots’ and stability. Nevertheless, the lived experience of homeland as a dynamic social and cultural landscape lead to the articulation, contestation and negotiation of ‘identity’, ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. However, the argument until this point was, most of the research based on diaspora theories, even when adapting a transnationalism optic perceived diaspora as an alternative to essentialisation of territorialised belonging. This understanding has highlighted Anderson’s affirmation with “imagined communities”, that a sense of community and
belonging rest more in a ‘mythical space’ which traverses both geographic and material borders (Brubaker, 2005, p.12).

However, it is possible to argue that these ‘imagined communities’ are too, ‘place-based’ – because both individual and collective types of belonging are shaped by symbolic and material manifestations of place, where people engage with or create certain spaces that reflect their life-worlds. In other words, these manifestations happen in certain spaces and places, and unlocking which spaces/places these are and how they are influential for individuals/communities to reproduce, sustain and share certain discourses and practices may give a more in-depth understanding of the relationship between self with regards to collective identities and belonging. What is relevant for this thesis is to offer an alternative understanding to the ethnic, diasporic and national reading of identities in relation to places, hence an emphasis on the changing systems and merging of these in locales problematises the ‘already-given’ ties people have with places.

As Appadurai argues, these problematisations result in people lacking ‘easy’ identities in relation to places (1996a, p.195), because people’s current state of ‘being-in-the-world’ is a fusion of “expanded contexts” beyond physical locality (Giddens, 1991, p.146). These “expanded contexts” are for instance the mechanisms of globalised consumerism in which people now express themselves through consuming materials and lifestyles, hence Giddens (1991, p.199) argues that place-based constructions of identity lost to consumption. Based on this argument, it can be said that identity is rather a project which individuals ‘make’ themselves through their life choices and practices, even against the context of place (Taylor, 2010, p.8). The question appears then, how can we understand ways of being and ways of belonging in relation to the complex dynamics in places, what are the ways in which people make places and selves, and to what degree place influences people’s lifestyles.

Firstly, it is important to bring in the previous discussion points with regards to the changing relations between people and places, not only through mobility of people, but also the movement of media, goods, ideas and lifestyles, connecting the ‘global’ to the ‘local’ (Leander et al., 2010). These changing forms of movement, regarded as “cultural flows” (Appadurai, 1996a), “liquid life” (Bauman, 2005) and “network society” (Castells, 1996) is in line with Massey’s (1999, p.22) proposition that within a place, there are many connections which stretch beyond its spatial boundaries. In understanding places as fluid and unbound, culture and identity are also seen as hybrid and dynamic (Escobar, 2001, p.143). Bhabha (1996) coined the term “third space” to posit hybridity as a form of in-between space where subject-positions are translated and negotiated. This stance against the fixity of identity and culture argues that, “all forms of culture are
continually in a process of hybridity” (Rutherford, 1990, p.211). Thus, the “third space” is a mode of articulation, a way of describing a productive, and not merely reflective, space that enables other positions to emerge (Rutherford, 1990) – it is an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation have no primordial unity or fixity (Bhabha, 1994).

For the theories of translocality, the concept of space is integral, as translocation refers to the movement of individuals across different spaces. And these criss-crossing movements of individuals between spaces occur in specific territories (Brickell & Datta, 2011). As a result, these encounters and interactions with the physical place would never leave ‘the self’ unchanged (Urry, 2012). This framework highlights that there is a productive interconnection between space and human agency – as the ‘lived space’ is constructed by human agency, human actions are in turn produced in relation to the dynamic interactions with spaces in places (Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 1994). For the purposes of highlighting how translocality acknowledges different scales and in a place, Oakes & Schein’s (2006, p.20) argument is useful:

Translocality deliberately confuses the boundaries of the local in an effort to capture the increasingly complicated nature of spatial processes and identities, yet it insists on viewing such processes and identities as place-based rather than exclusively mobile, uprooted or ‘travelling’.

Here, Oakes and Schein stress the local-local relations embedded within a place, which is in interaction with different scales such as the global conjecture. Thus, translocality acknowledges the scales and hierarchical structures that operate in co-dependence. Henceforth, Anthias (2008, p.5) suggests, translocational approach can develop the transnationalism angle as it “locates relations between nations and nationally based social hierarchies as well as those on the global level, and then begin to think about how these are transformed when transnational processes are at work”. Therefore, it is vital to look at how transnational activities are localised, instead of limiting the analysis of identities, belongings and place-attachments to grand narratives of nations and diasporas.

Translocality recognises dynamics in different scales and at the same time prioritise the local-local relations, and therefore it is seen to be a form of ‘grounded transnationlism’ – “a space where deterritorialized networks of transnational social relations take shape through migrant
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Featherstone et al. (2007, pp.383-384) explain ‘spatial processes’ as “the diverse ongoing connections and networks that bind different parts of the world together and that are constituted through (and in fact constitute) particular sites and places.”
agencies” (Brickell & Datta, 2011, p.3). Consequently, taking a translocal view of place requires space to be incorporated as one of the different forms of capital valued and exchanged in the field. Hence, the thesis follows Massey’s understanding of place as a dynamic and relational concept:

We know we cannot understand the character of any place without setting it in the context of its relations with the world beyond. This is place as meeting place: different stories coming together and, to one degree or another, becoming entangled. This is the thrown togetherness of physical proximity. And it is even more marked in an age of globalisation (Massey, 2002, p.294).

Place… does change us… not through some visceral belonging… but through the practicing of place, the negotiating of intersecting trajectories; place as an arena where negotiations are forced upon us (Massey, 2005, p.154).

As the quotations above suggests, in this thesis place is referred as culturally negotiated, embodied and material, and that ‘belonging spaces’ cannot be taken for granted. Based on this argument, this section further brings the notion of ‘home’ within the dialogic framework of self, place/space and connections/mobility. These arguments will be brought together in the discussion section with regards to how the second generation’s mobility across time and spaces influence their constructions of ‘translocational habitus’.

As it was introduced earlier, people’s relationships to places are mostly examined with either “rooted belonging” or “rootless mobility” (Ahmed, et al., 2003, p.3), however, home can be understood beyond these dichotomies by asserting place as a flexible construction of people through their attachments and narrative productions of selves, which in turn reflect these multiple identities back to its dwellers (Taylor, 2010, p.10). The latter proposition in Taylor’s understanding of place calls attention to acknowledging that places do not have fixed identities but at the same time, they embody a historical memory which connects the past to the present, having a continued relevance for individual and collective identities (Taylor, 2010, p.11). Therefore, individual and collective belongingness is not only about people’s physical situatedness in place, but also about the imaginary sense of place emerging from individual and collective memories and nostalgia. Richardson (2008, p.19) relates these two dimensions to belonging and identification with the place as ‘home’, and explains that ‘home’ is both a physical locale and set of practices and an existential experience entangled with the materiality of place. Moreover, as Blunt & Dowling (2006, p.23) stress,

Home does not simply exist, but is made. Home is a process of creating and understanding forms of dwelling and belonging. This process has both material
and imaginative elements. Thus, people create home through social and emotional relationships. Home is also materially created – new structures formed, objects used and placed.

This approach is a way to abdicate the polarising debates on home as fixed and static, and home as fluid and fluctuating. It intends to show how individuals mediate between the experience of fluidity and while having a need for certain patterns of order and stability at home (Varley, 2008, p.41; Tolia-Kelly, 2006). Therefore, as Morley (2000, p.41) argues, it is important to re-conceptualise,

the conventional contrast between traditional, place-based notions of home and the contemporary experience of globalization in such a way that we might see this not as a contrast between presence and absence of an experience of homeliness but rather as two different modalities of this experience.

Following this suggestion, the empirical underpinnings of home-making practices for migrants as well as the contemporary meanings of home can be grasped. And such goal can also open space for discussion about whether ‘lifestyle returnees’ perceive ‘home’ in similar ways as other migrant and non-migrant groups, hence their experience of resettlement in the ancestral homeland can provide new ways of understanding the concept of home in contemporary times. These processes of home-making are mainly tied to three dimensions, as Blunt & Varley (2004, p.3) summarise:

current research on the home is often concerned with mobile geographies of dwelling… and the ways in which ideas of home invoke a sense of place, belonging or alienation that is intimately tied to a sense of self.

However, Hedetoft and Hjort (2002, p.5) ask a puzzling question in this regard: “But what, for instance, if where we feel we belong (our ‘cultural’ or ‘ethnic’ home) does not match objective ascriptions of membership (our ‘political’ or ‘civic’ home), because ‘belonging’ separates into its two constituent parts: ‘being’ in one place, and ‘longing’ for another?” Here, the thesis differentiates between identification with the place as ‘home’, having a sense of place and feeling ‘belong to’ a place. Ehrkamp (2006) argues that belonging relates to people’s own ideals of membership to a place, and these refer to contested, uncertain and shifting boundaries of home. There are two dimensions in understanding belonging, first one is that constructions of belonging to home are continuously changing and the second is that people’s own claims for membership to a home needs to be validated by the dominant others, therefore, belonging involves an ongoing internal-external dialectic of self-definitions of oneself offered by others (Jenkins, 2008). These processes of being ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ in a place are related to the
migrants’ capacity to meet the normative expectations of behaviour, language, habits, appearance (clothes, hairstyles etc.) and other context-dependent etiquettes in a place, constructed by the dominant others (Noble, 2005). However, as it was introduced earlier, if these are understood with regards to place as “third space”, where the dominant other’s culture is hybrid, then subjectivities can be even more complex or ambivalent (Bhabha, 1996).

3.3 Positioning Habitus: Bridging Between Self-Agency and Social World

This section brings together the notions of habitus and reflexivity, an increasingly recognised hybrid approach in sociology, used to understand late-modern subjects’ self-identity processes (Adams, 2006; O’Reilly, 2012). As already introduced in the first section of this chapter, self-identity and reflexivity are co-constitutive in late modernity as the individuals now live in societies that lack static structures (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002, p.51), hence “the question of ‘how shall I live?’ should be answered in day to day decisions” (Giddens, 1991, p.14). Hence, the section firstly introduces Bourdieu’s main concepts, and offers a critique of understanding class and lifestyle in relation to habitus and reflexivity. The section’s main argument is that habitus does not need to be understood as durable dispositions, however the interplay of individuals’ active agency and fluid structures can result in transformation of habitus. Locating ‘habitus’ into the discussion of ‘return’ experiences and further mobilities upon return calls attention to the idea that place needs to be evaluated in relation to its ‘cultural’ context, however as culture is found an ambiguous term, the thesis refers to habitus to bridge between agency and culture, and structure and culture divisions (Giddens, 1987; Turner, 1987).

3.3.1 A Bourdieusian Framework: Habitus, Capital, Field and Game

As the purpose of this thesis is to explore the activities of lifestyle returnees in their quest for ‘search for self’ in the ancestral homeland, and their situatedness across scales in multiple spaces and places, the notion of “habitus” (Bourdieu, 2000) is found as a useful tool to understand lifestyle returnees’ subjectivities, navigation practices and negotiation processes. There are several reasons why “habitus”, a highly utilised and yet criticised term serves a great deal of opportunities to understand self, identity and place in relation to the contemporary subjects’ in-betweeness of past/present, roots/routes, stability/mobility, here/there. For instance, Casey (2001b, p.409) argues that, habitus is the “mediatrix” between self and place, ensuring that these terms are co-constitutive, because habitus is a figure of the between:
above all, between nature and culture, but also between consciousness and body, self and other, mechanism and teleology, determinism and freedom, even between memory and imagination. Habitus has a genius for mediation, indeed, “universalizing mediation” […] it is equally a middle term between place and self – and particularly between lived place and the geographical self. This self is constituted by a core of habitudes that incorporate and continue, at both psychical and physical levels, what one has experienced in particular places.

Second reason is that habitus has the potential to provide a conceptual mapping tool for understanding identity in relation to ‘reflexivity’, how contemporary cultures, diverse personal and social productions of differences are experienced and articulated in relation to individual’s biographies of ‘who they are’ and ‘who they are becoming’.

By focusing on habitus in relation to reflexivity, a deeper understanding can be gained about the personal and social dimensions of identity. Furthermore, individuals’ anticipations and choices in how they experience and deal with the processes of ‘transitional identities’ of the late modernity can be explained. The increased degree of diversity, ambivalence and plurality of identities, diasporas, individualism and hybridity create “ontological nomadisms”, but at the same time traditionalism, native or nostalgic culture revivals and ethnic/national essentialism are entangled with late modernity which create tensions for its subjects (Lavie & Swedenburg, 1996; Bauman, 2000; Blunt, 2007). Their belonging and becoming in their personal and social spheres constitute this tension created by the Western “institutionalized individualism” (Beck, 1992), nevertheless, it is rarely explored how much reflexive autonomy individuals have over their dispositions and positions. i.e. their practices, values, representations and identities (Lahire, 2003). Henceforth, going back to Casey’s (2001b) point that habitus acts as a mediation gains more meaning whilst habitus is also understood as agency, a way to explore and understand how individuals navigate in their social spaces, and what they do in terms of their identity-work and place-making.

Habitus incorporates both structure and agency, acting as a “power of adaptation” in the field, through exchange across different types of capital (i.e. social, cultural, symbolic) (Bourdieu, 1993). And within the field, the individuals undertake a process of learning the rules of the game, by utilising and exchanging their different types of capital which create the individuals’ social dispositions and determine their ‘development’ and ‘failure’/‘success’. In this framework of habitus, capital and field, the aim is to explore the ways in which lifestyle returnees build and negotiate between “multi-stranded connections” to achieve their wider goal of living a ‘better life’ and feel ‘at home’ in their places of dwelling (Kelly & Lusis, 2006, p.831).
The question is then, how to explore the processes of actors in formulating projects for the future whilst realising the unforeseen outcomes in the present – and how these structural environments of action are both dynamically sustained by and altered through human agency (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). For possible answers to these questions, and to explore how lifestyle returnees project a ‘better life’ and sustain it with certain decisions, Bourdieu’s key concepts of habitus, capital and field need to be introduced. In Bourdieu’s (1991, p.13) terms, habitus is:

a durably installed set of dispositions, the habitus tends to generate practices and perceptions, works and appreciations, which concur with the conditions of existence of which the habitus is itself the product.

When individuals engage in these acts or practices, they always do so in specific social contexts or settings, i.e. fields. Therefore, habitus is a construction through the interrelations of agents and structures; the social contexts that one experiences shape the individual’s worldview, identities and consumption practices – in this thesis these are later conceptualised under the notion of lifestyle. To begin with, Bourdieu (1985, p.724) conceptualises field as a social space where,

a set of objective power relations that impose themselves on all who enter the field and that are irreducible to the intentions of the individual agents or even to the direct interactions among the agents.

This definition implies that the resources are the various forms of capital that people have or can achieve in a new field. In the case of returnees, a field can be perceived as the new destination setting in which returnees engage in the game, experiencing both the struggles and rewards of it while hoping to achieve a ‘better life’. Within this field, there can be several spaces and the orientation towards one or all the spaces is related to the individual’s decisions. Like Bourdieu who sees the agent’s capacities being limited to the boundaries of structures, Giddens (1991, p.81) also problematises the term ‘choice’ by stressing that people’s choices are related to “routinised practices”:

Each of the small decisions a person makes each day – what to wear, what to eat, how to conduct himself at work, whom to meet with later in the evening – contributes to such routines. All such choices (as well as larger and more consequential ones) are decisions not only about how to act but who to be.

Based on this explanation, it can be problematised, if people make choices based on their habitus, then they supposedly can decide only within the limits of their habitus. Bourdieu himself
has written that habitus might change, though in a slightly slow pace. Hence, habitus is not the fate of certain people, instead it is,

an open system of dispositions that is constantly subjected to experiences, and therefore constantly affected by them in a way that either reinforces or modifies its structures. It is durable but not eternal! (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.133).

But in any case, it is something that preconditions the freedom – and voluntary character – of the agent’s choices. As Bourdieu explains habitus as “spontaneity without consciousness or will”, the question remains as if agency is without consciousness, or with a consciousness that is at best generated “by the structured and structuring structures of habitus” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.133). As Maton (2008, p.51) further explains, habitus is ‘structured’ by one’s past and present circumstances, such as family upbringing and educational experiences; it is ‘structuring’ in that one’s habitus helps to shape one’s present and future practices; and it is a ‘structure’ in that it is systematically ordered rather than random or un-patterned.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p.69) further explain that this statement is related to the understanding of habitus emerge and develop fundamentally in early childhood through a relational dialectic with the surrounding environment. In this regard, habitus is “below the level of consciousness and language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny or control of will” (Bourdieu, 1984, p.466). Therefore, habitus is embodied within its relation to field that produces \textit{doxa}, which is the “undisputed, pre-reflexive, naïve, native compliance with the fundamental presuppositions of the field and a state of the body” (Bourdieu, 1990, p.68). This feel for the “social game” leads agents to subjectively incorporate objective possibilities as they compete within each field for the scarce resource of capital, whether symbolic, cultural or economic. Forms of capital (economic, cultural and social) are the core factors defining positions and possibilities of the various actors in any field. Each social field has a profile of its own, depending on the importance within it of each of the forms of capital. The forms of capital controlled by the various agents define the chances of winning the stakes in the game. As a result, these hierarchies in social contexts also shape people’s class and status within a society.

According to Bourdieu (1985), any property, goods, or resources that are valuable to society can be considered as capital. Moreover, the capital as social resources/power/energy is managed by agents’ habitus that are embodied in them (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Hence, Bourdieu conceptualises habitus as predisposing individuals in generative and creative ways to develop strategies that maximise profits economically and/or symbolically to maintain their position and status within the society (Bourdieu, 2000, p.5). In that sense, forms of capital, their
development and transformation are highly significant for individuals to develop strategies. Bourdieu identifies four main forms of capital which are summarised by Skeggs (1997, p.7):

1. **economic capital**: this includes income, wealth, inheritance and financial assets
2. **social capital**: capital generated through relationships with others, links with influential groups.\(^{13}\)
3. **cultural capital**: this can exit in three forms – in an embodied state, that is in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body; in the objectified state, in the form of cultural goods; and in institutionalised state, resulting in such as educational qualifications
4. **symbolic capital**: this is the form the different types of capital take once they are perceived as recognised and legitimate. Legitimation is the key mechanism in the conversion of power. Cultural capital needs to be legitimated before it can have symbolic power. Capital must be regarded as legitimate before it can be capitalized upon.

The motivation of Bourdieu in creating the concept of cultural capital was to criticise the functionalist definition of human capital, which was portrayed as an economic phenomenon per se (as in the case of education and its benefits as higher earnings) (Becker, 1975). Hence, Bourdieu rejects the understanding of human capital that centres around economism, advocating that human capital must embody social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2011). He classifies cultural capital in three forms: the *embodied state* i.e., in the form of long-lasting dispositions of the mind and the body with its distinctive value known as habitus; the *objectified state*, which is in the form of cultural goods e.g. books and instruments, etc. and modern media such as television and internet; and thirdly, the *institutionalised state*, i.e. sanctioned by educational institutions (Jenkins, 1992, p.79). By exploring cultural capital, one can understand human capital in a great extent as well as the agent’s (individual, institution) cultural background. Bourdieu mentions about investment in the case of cultural capital, e.g. devoting “labour time” or “spare time” to an activity is a way of investment and in the end, it needs to bring future utility such as making profit, or social status, gaining respect etc. (2011, p.54).

It needs to be further noted that, Bourdieu’s formulation of culture differs from the definition of the term usually found in anthropology or cultural studies. In these disciplines, culture is taken to be reflected in ordinary life (Hall, 1993; Williams, 1958). Bourdieu on the other hand uses ‘culture’ to denote that in a society it is perceived as being “the best that has been thought and said, regarded as the summits of achieved civilization” (Grossberg, 1986, p.59).\(^{13}\)

---

\(^{13}\) See Putnam, 1993; Putnam, 2001; Coleman, 1988; Siisiainen, 2003 for a debate on social capital.
Culture is the thought, action and artistic production that a dominant group sees as the most valuable, enabling Bourdieu to reinforce the idea that culture is a form of capital. The everyday practice of ordinary people is habitus that becomes culture in as much as it is imbued with value. Habitus represents an attempt to move away from homogenised, bounded notions of culture, or even class culture, subculture and identity (Hall, 1980), offering a way out of such static notions.

Despite acknowledging certain critique towards Bourdieu’s formulation of habitus with regards to being static or containing paradoxes, ambivalence of level and capacity of human agency, having deterministic tendencies and not functioning in society as a reproductive force (Butcher, 2013; Weik, 2010; Andon et al., 2014; King, 2000, Bottero, 2009) the thesis suggests that it is a useful framework to analyse how agents and structures interplay and shape each other. Brubaker (1993) suggests that Bourdieu’s work is more strategic than theoretical, meaning that Bourdieu did not write to merely explain social conditions but to change the world through changing the ways in which people (especially the sociologists) see the world.

Several migration studies have adopted Bourdieu’s framework which inform the current thesis. In O’Reilly’s (2012) theory of practice, habitus is the main internal structure which may constrain active agency (or the daily actions of agents). However, the author argues that agents’ actions do not necessarily become predictable because of their habitus and conjuncturally-specific internal structures (p.23). Erel (2010) develops the concept of migration-specific cultural capital by looking at the ways in which “migrants actively create dynamics of validating cultural resources as capital, resulting in new forms of intra-migration distinction” (p.656). Noble (2013) focuses on the experience of migrant settlement by using the notions of habitus and field, and how the feeling of ‘homeliness’ is constructed and experienced both in home and host land through ‘learning to be different’ (p.349). Furthermore, there were many habitus informed conceptualisations such as “migrant habitus” (Tabar et al., 2010); “diasporic habitus” (Parker, 2000) and “transnational habitus” (Guarnizo, 1997, p.311). In the lifestyle migration literature, Oliver and O’Reilly (2010, p.51) uses a Bourdieusian analysis to understand the reproduction of class in the self-making migration.

Hence, by adopting habitus, it is possible to offer an understanding of why lifestyle returnees make certain lifestyle decisions in relation to their place-making processes. Furthermore, by engaging in social capital, how lifestyle returnees are engaged in struggle in pursuit of their interests can be studied. Bourdieu (2000, p.19) explains this relationship between habitus and conflict:
Habitus reflects the different positions people have in society, for example, whether they are brought up in a middle-class environment or in a working-class suburb. It is part of how society produces itself. But there is also change. Conflict is built into society. People can find that their expectations and ways of living are suddenly out of step with the new social position they find themselves in... Then the question of social agency and political intervention becomes very important.

There are two issues here: Firstly, Bourdieu argues, one’s habitus is the product of one’s individual history, but also of the whole collective history of family and class (Bourdieu, 1990, p.91). Bourdieu (1984, p.471) therefore explains how material conditions of social class and economic inequality could manifest in culture and in social and psychological organisation of individuals, which then leads to individuals to exclude themselves from certain goods, people and environments. For instance, when it comes to schooling aspirations of people, Bourdieu (1992, p.134) highlights the role of family in shaping one’s cognitive understanding of education in creating self-acclaimed positions, deciding in “success”/“failure” norms. Secondly, habitus is not about exclusion per se, but it is flexible which provides the basis for individuals to experience new circumstances and even to a certain extent, transform their habitus (Reay, 2004). Hence, whilst individuals improvise in the social world, their habitus facilitates “bricolage and other forms of improvising within the limited resources of a given place and its contents” (Casey, 2001b, p.410).

When habitus and reflexivity are put into a dialogue, the main difference between theories of Giddens and Bourdieu appears with regards to consciousness of individuals about their subjective positions and their willingness to change it. Giddens’ ‘self as a reflexive project’ approach has been criticised for giving “short shrift to the structural and cultural factors still at work in fashioning the self” (Tucker, 1998, p.208) and for setting agency free from structure (Lash, 1994, p.119). Hence, scholars argued that a more sophisticated approach to reflexivity was needed, in which freedom and constraint are understood in relation to changing but not disappearing social structures (Craib, 1992; Lash, 1994). Because in Giddens’ “structuration theory”, human agency (micro-level activity) and social structure (macro-level activity) continuously feed into each other; and individuals’ repetition of daily acts have the power of reproducing, replacing, changing and even ignoring the social structure i.e. traditions, institutions, moral codes and established ways of doing things. Whilst Bourdieu’s habitus is an unconscious formation – hence acting as a modus operandi (Bourdieu, 1977, p.79), Bourdieu also argues that individuals get le sens pratique (‘the feel for the game’), getting competent in a particular field. Thus, it can be argued that Bourdieu allows possibility for reflexivity, and transformation of habitus (Adams, 2006; Schirato & Webb, 2003).
However, the late modern persons being reflexive may not necessarily lead to transformation of one’s situation (Craib, 1992; Adams, 2006) nevertheless,

One’s habitus may restrict and condition a proportion of ‘choices’; social change may be facilitating a reflexivity which penetrates the fog of structured dispositions; but identities are formed in the ability to translate the choices which emerge from this complex interplay into meaningful realities (Adams, 2006, p.552).

Henceforth, the relationship between identity, reflexivity and choice needs to be understood as a complex system, because “the relationship between reflexivity and… social transformation can in no way taken for granted” (Adkins, 2003, p.35). Bourdieu (1992, p.131) himself does not disregard reflexivity in relation to habitus, however in his framework, such self-reflexivity (or ‘rational choice’) comes in times of crisis, when there is instability in the social fields. (Farrugia, 2013).

However, as Bauman rightfully suggests, “all of us are doomed to the life of choices, but not all of us have the means to be choosers” (1998, p.86). This statement points out that Bourdieu’s forms of capitals and one’s sense of the game in a field are significant and relevant in understanding how and why some individuals may follow their personal quests whilst others cannot. As Boyne (2002, p.124) illustrates, the poorest are “located within unformed or fractured or multiply chaotic fields”, hence lacking agency to change their conditions. Thus, the ability of reflexivity depends on how much an individual is grounded in their class, location and kinship frameworks, and the level of these influencing/limiting one’s reflexive processes. These embodied tendencies can be found evident in the acquisition of social capital. For instance, migration literature often points at the insecurities of migrants in relation to feeling alone in a new environment. In migration context, ethnicity, nationality and religion are perceived to have a gathering power, but in general feeling of security or trust can be also about other common denominators between people such as economic/social class and lifestyle.

3.3.2 The Links Between Class, Habitus and Lifestyle

This section further link the types of capital with the notion of lifestyle and argues that habitus that are reflected in lifestyle translates as certain choices and decisions for individuals. Additionally, a translocal reading of places are highly relevant, as lifestyle is practiced, reshaped and contested in different spaces in specific places. In contemporary world, the link between lifestyle and capitals are inseparable in which different sources interplay to define choice and agency that people can exercise. Thus, it is argued that people define themselves through their
patterns of consumption but the ways in which socio-economic class and lifestyle interact is a complex process (Featherstone, 2007, p.81). As argued previously, Bourdieu’s framework of the tangible and intangible (cultural, social, symbolic) forms capital can be useful in understanding how these processes work. By investigating the transformation of these tangible and intangible forms, lifestyle migration research can gain greater understanding of individuals’ behaviour in pursuing different life goals both spiritually and physically. As it was argued, lifestyle migration and mobility studies point out, people’s cultural, social and human capital (symbolic capital is often mention as well) appear at all the stages of their journeys and shape their trajectories, however the thesis argues economic capital cannot be disregarded in this framework.

The bridging term between class, consumption and identities, lifestyle widely appears in different disciplines in academic research as well as in daily conversations and popular culture, yet lacking consensus over its meaning (Veal, 1993). Lifestyle was popularised as a term in Adler’s (1964, p.7) book, described as “attitude to life... certain automated attitudes... the individual’s organization... life-plan”, however before that lifestyle had initially appeared in Weber’s *Economy and Society* [1922] (1978) used in relation to class arguing that class situation reflects people’s life chances, which are determined by the market and by people’s position in relation to the market dynamics. Weber explains how lifestyle functions in relation to class but does not explain the term. Therefore, it is important to start from Weber’s conceptualisation of class, summarised by Gerth & Mills (1998, p.181) as the following:

1. [a] number of people have in common a specific causal component of their life chances, in so far as
2. this component is represented exclusively by accompanying interests in the possessions of goods and opportunities for income, and
3. is represented under the conditions of the commodity or labour markets.

Clarke & Critcher (1985) argue that Weber’s concept of lifestyle is one of the manifestations of class membership involving economic capital and power elements in societies. However, economic and social class are not necessarily linked, e.g. a person may have a job that is considered to have a high social class ranking but this occupation might lack economic ranking (i.e. academics). On the other hand, Bourdieu regards ‘economic capital’ the root of all the other types of capital, defining social and cultural capital as the “transformed, disguised forms of economic capital” (Bourdieu, 2011, p.54). Therefore, individuals’ economic and social class can be bridged with their habitus which would be reflected in their lifestyles.
Consequently, instead of adopting ‘class’ that denotes stability and a macro-level discourse, the thesis focuses on habitus and lifestyle to explore the shifts in individuals’ identities and dispositions. Therefore, it is more meaningful to embrace a critical assessment of lifestyle with regards to its uniqueness or individualistic value. For instance, Ruiz’s (1990, p.158) concept of lifestyle is:

the personal way in which each individual organizes his/her daily life, that is, the original individualized way, not only of the personal particularities to do with the individual’s beliefs, values, or norms of daily behaviour, but of the way in which each person lives the norms of the group, class or global society to which he/she belongs.

This description highlight “norms of the group” meaning that lifestyles would be constructed within one’s social fields, highlighting the ‘choice’ element of lifestyles. Thus, lifestyle is not necessarily a choice as the agent can only act within the boundaries of their structures, e.g. women who lack freedom of choice regarding lifestyles living in a society that does not enforce/promote autonomy for women (Rojek, 1989, p.99). Similarly, people who lack economic capital may have limited choices regarding their lifestyles. Every day choices of consumption and investing in certain materials are related to one’s lifestyle, which is termed as *hexis*, referring to a fusion between ‘having’ (possessing an object) and ‘being’ (being capable of an activity that leads the sense of normalcy). As Hage (2013, p.81) further explains *hexis*:

Habitual and ongoing having whereby what is outside of me becomes an inseparable and durable part of me – it becomes me. There is a movement and a fusion between what I have and what I am.

This angle useful in the sense that individuals perform their identities in material forms to reflect their lifestyles, which is an alternative way of thinking “boundary-making” and “boundary-eroding” beyond ethnic, religious and national markers. Objects and any marker in material form can also be used to gain a certain identity, hence lifestyle, identity and consumption or owning always work in relation to each other. People of certain lifestyles may have material markers that may not ‘fit’ into the habitus of certain spaces, hence these are also negotiated in relation to locales.

In his typology of lifestyle, Veal (1993, p.237) evaluates the relationship between consumption, identities and lifestyle under a *market research/psychographics* approach. This is linked to lifestyle in terms of people’s choices of products – consuming materials that are in line with the lifestyle they embrace. In other words, the way in which people consume shape their lives as much as the social structures that people belong to (such as class) lead people to certain
consumption patterns (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu analyses this situation within his concept taste, claiming that “taste classifies the classifier” meaning the social differentiations define people’s consumer choices. In this sense, he argues that as much as people’s economic capital define their capacity to consume, their cultural capital also play a role in shaping people’s consuming identities (Bourdieu, 1984, p.6)

Similarly, Giddens (1991, p.5) illustrates, patterns of consumption and lifestyle are increasingly intertwined in modern times:

In modern life, the notion of lifestyle takes on a particular significance. The more tradition loses its hold, and the more daily life is reconstituted in terms of the dialectical interplay of the local and the global, the more individuals are forced to negotiate lifestyle choices among a range of options.

With this statement, Giddens suggests that people are not simply free agents but exercise a limited autonomy within the given options. This means the structural factors play an important role for people in their process of shaping identities through consumption. Miller (1997, p.19) argues that “consumption is not merely an act of buying goods, it is a fundamental process by which we create identity”.

Henceforth, it can be argued that in the late modernity, lifestyles are hardly coherent, instead they can be commodified in relation to the trends of the global capital culture. Gabriel (2013, pp.77-78) argues, “commodities and brands create narratives for one’s self; they help us make sense of ourselves in the inchoate flux of society and culture by anchoring our personalities in consumer goods”. The role of consumption in identity in the globalised world is therefore interpreted as a cultural obsession with material goods as the way to a ‘good life’, a fulfilment of desires of novelty, a way to gain ‘status’ and projections of how to act and who to be (Soron, 2010, p.173). Similarly, Belk’s (1988) notion of “the extended self” highlights that consuming goods is a direct response to individuals’ needs for a secure sense of self, a confirmation of the identities they redefined for themselves.

By bringing these arguments together, it is suggested that lifestyle is constructed through the complex relations of economic, social, cultural and human capitals, which are open to transformation. As Butcher (2013, p.244) notes,

14 For instance, “McDonaldization of society” (Ritzer, 1983) and “Disneyization of society” (Bryman, 1999) in which consumption and lifestyles are standardised and provide the individuals the tools to develop and express their identities, and confirm and exhibit their status, whilst giving the individuals emotions such as happiness, experienced in “hyper-reality” (Baudrillard & Evans, 1991).
Habitus, identity, discourse and embodiment habitus, described by Bourdieu as a generative and unifying principle of lifestyle, is widely observable but not easily defined. It is an enigmatic trope and thus contestable.

Furthermore, as Beck (1992) suggests, societies are becoming increasingly complex and this situation multiplies the possible lifestyles and life-courses of individuals. Similarly, Zablocki & Kanter (1976) suggest that the choice of lifestyles is connected to the diversification and individualisation of life situation.

For instance, in the case of the second-generation lifestyle returnees, they embed different lifestyles in their ‘translocal field’ interlaced with their habitus i.e. “diaspora consciousness” – family narratives, class and lived experiences of their localities – and the late modern condition of reflexivity through ‘searching for self’ and migratory trajectories. In that sense, their case calls attention to incorporating a spatial approach in relation to how the second generation’ lifestyle choices interplay with the habitus of locales, and how the individuals are mobilised in different spaces with regards to their “translocational positionality” which will be explained in the discussion section. Especially for the specific group of this research who chose to live and work in tourism spaces of Antalya, their approach to a ‘better life’ is predominantly influenced by imaginings of the place to offer leisure-oriented life. This is further linked to Veal’s (1993) leisure style approach that focuses on holiday-makers, tourists and expats based on tastes and values, and the effects of these lifestyles on tourist behaviour. Veal argues that this category is often data-driven and likely to lack theoretical underpinning (p.239), however the thesis argues, a qualitative lifestyle migration approach to ‘return’ can offer a deeper understanding.

3.4 Developing ‘Translocational Habitus’ as an Inductive Concept

Chapter Two has argued that there is not one encompassing theory to understand return migration motivations, trajectories and the way in which the individuals practice active agency. Hence, the final section of Chapter Two had offered ‘lifestyle return migration’ as an analytical tool that mainly focuses on the individuals’ return migration trajectories through their personal quests to have a more fulfilling life and search for the self. The chapter has discussed macro, meso and micro levels in influencing the migrants’ decision-making processes, re-constructions of identity and belonging as well as their expectations from the return experience. Nevertheless, it was highlighted that the main focus of analysis in this thesis would follow a micro approach, aiming to understand the subjects’ actions and practices in relation to specific return places, and the outcomes related to their goals of ‘searching for self’, developing ‘homeliness’ and having a better life in general.
This chapter (Three) then delved into the main concepts discussed in the previous chapter, and showed how self and identity were theorised in relation to group identities and ethnic boundaries (see main discussion in return migration) and in relation to the changing dimensions in the modern and postmodern social order (main discussion in lifestyle migration). Following this the concept of place and space were critically discussed in relation to static and bounded definitions and more fluid and hybrid understandings, offering ‘translocal home’ as a way to understand the migrants’ place-making practices in places where they have ancestral ‘roots’ (in relation to return migration). These were also places which they associate with a certain style of life and authenticity (in relation to lifestyle migration). Finally, this chapter introduced Bourdieu’s practice theory, showing how habitus and field can help us understand the ways in which people navigate with the help of their capitals in certain fields (ethnic, diasporic, family, language etc.) and how their habitus as an internal structure is also influenced by the individuals’ social encounters and practices in these various fields. Giddens’ structuration theory was integrated into this framework of analysis in order to highlight that in ‘liquid modernity’, there is no unity of identities and lifestyles; in addition, the structures can be more fluid or can be transformed more rapidly by advancing technologies.

In this final section, the thesis constructs the concept of ‘translocational habitus’ by bringing together the previous discussions on self and identity, place and space, habitus and field. It further develops this concept in the findings chapters in order to specifically address to the characteristics of the sample group (i.e. Turkish-German second generation lifestyle returnees), the context of their dwelling place(s) and how they utilise their forms of capitals in order to navigate between different field-spaces. As a result of their practices of dwelling and moving between different places in their ‘translocational social fields’, they are assumed to gain practical mastery specific to the fields in which they are located (Noble, 2013, p.351).

Therefore, the thesis further adopts the notions of narration of locations (i.e. places and spaces) and positionality (i.e. habitus and reflexivity) to offer more insights about the second generation’s processes of self-making and place-making in their social fields upon ‘lifestyle return’. Anthias (2013) builds this approach by arguing that lived experiences are vital in shaping migrant subjects’ feelings and emotions towards certain places and notions of ‘identity’ and ‘home’. This is an important starting point to integrate ‘belonging’ into this analytical framework which focuses on understanding how ‘self’ internalises ‘already-given’ identities of nationality, ethnicity, religion, class and gender, as well as positionalities taken in social spaces. Hence, Anthias (2009, p.8) suggests that ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’ have difference in emphasis:
Identity involves individual and collective narratives of self and other, presentation and labelling, myths of origin and myths of destiny with associated strategies, and identifications. Belonging on the other hand is more about experiences of being a part of the social fabric and the ways in which social bonds and ties are manifested in practices, experiences and emotions of inclusion.

Thus, identities refer to positionalities, hierarchies, strategies and perceptions, whereas belonging is tied with feelings of inclusion, familiarity, security and l’affet (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Similarly, Hall (1996) describe identities as temporary points of attachment to subject positions constructed through discursive practices. Anthias (2002) treats these discursive practices – or as she calls them “narratives” – as representational accounts of individuals in terms of their identification of themselves and the social others. She further notes that, “narratives are not only identities being performed; they also feature a dimension of social agency – they are forms of social action that involve certain intentionality in terms of ‘for what’ and ‘for whom’ the narrative is intended” (2002, p.499). On the other hand, belonging is beyond these discursive practices, it is one’s awareness of attachment to certain notions, groups, lifestyles and places. Anthias (2008, p.8) argues,

Belonging is more about experiences of being part of the social fabric and the ways in which social bonds and ties are manifested in practices, experiences and emotions of inclusion... to belong is to be accepted as part of a community, to feel safe within it and to have a stake in the future of such a community of membership.

Anthias discusses ‘belonging’ also in relation to citizenship, which creates boundaries, though this sort of duties/rights linkage lead to inclusion/exclusion of citizens/non-citizens (2008, p.9). Another important point is that boundaries are forms of political practice and therefore they are imposed (2008, pp.8-9). However, she argues people negotiate these identities; they pick and choose the most beneficial identity depending on the context. As it was mentioned earlier, in Goffman’s (2012) terminology, identities are roles that people manifest in daily interactions. For instance, in case of diasporas, ethnic identity can be used to make political, economic and social claims. Importantly, these roles – or performative identities do not necessarily provide or take its roots for action from ‘belongingness’ (Goffman, 2012).

Anthias (2008) calls the earlier mentioned ‘roles’, performativities and discursive practices of identities as “translocational positionality”. According to her, positionality is “placement within a set of relations and practices that implicate identification and ‘performativity’ or action” (Anthias, 2002, p.501). Anthias (2008) further explains that translocational positionality is the space at the intersection of agency – involving social positioning(s) as well as meanings and practices attached –
and structure in which social positions and effects are merged. In this space, identities are embedded within power hierarchies being constructed by narratives both in individual and collective levels. Anthias (2008) debates about ‘identity’ and ‘belonging’ in the light of “translocational positionality”, in which she stresses that the understanding of ‘belonging’ and ‘identity’ is shifting because the national borders are challenged by newer migration flows (with refugees, asylum seekers, skilled migrants etc.) where “there exist complex relations to different locales; these include networks involving social, symbolic and material ties between homelands, destinations and relations between destination.” (2008, p.6). She further elaborates on the term with the following:

The concept of translocational positionality addresses issues of identity in terms of locations, which are not fixed but are context, meaning and time related and which therefore involve shifts and contradictions. As an intersectional frame, it moves away from the idea of given ‘groups’ or ‘categories’ of gender, ethnicity and class, which then intersect, and instead pays much attention to social locations and processes which are broader than those signalled by this (Anthias, 2008, p.6).

In this regard, linking identities to places is essential as people define themselves through certain qualities of places. The structures within places lead people to embrace certain roles. Therefore, place is not only a geographical location but it also carries political meanings in which ethnicity, culture, class act as reference points for certain identities. In this thesis, self is evaluated in relation place, spaces and connections – and how individuals perform certain lifestyles materially and symbolically as the embodiment of their habitus in their every-day lives with ‘routinised practices’.

Anthias (2012, p.104) sees migrant-selves as being “embedded within two social milieus with different and at times competing normative systems, there are two sets of social relations, such as arrangements and expectations that impact their lives”, therefore their constructions of identities and belonging are formulated in the light of their experiences at multiple layers – involving (trans-)national, (trans-)local and global scales, as well as through their encounters with social, economic and political structures (Levitt, 2009). Hence, it can be proposed that the second generation’s lives need to be examined in the light of ‘intersectionality’ referring to norms and behaviours related to not only ethnicity but also gender, sexuality, class and age with regards to “arrangements and expectations”.

Adopting intersectionality is important for going beyond the argument that, the second generation have ‘double consciousness’ of being here and there (physically and mentally) but also the ‘double absence’ of neither being here and there (again, in body and mentally) (Sayad, 2004;
Erel, 2010; Kelly & Lusis, 2006). For instance, in Guarnizo’s (1997, p.311) concept of “transnational habitus”, there is emphasis on the duality of migrants’ dispositions that incline them to act and react to specific situations in a manner that can be, but is not always, calculated, and that is not simply a question of conscious acceptance of specific behavioural or sociocultural rules. However, as this section will argue, it is important to understand the second-generation lifestyle returnees as having cultural capital that is both the product of and productive of differentiations of gender, generation, ethnicity and class (Erel, 2010). Hence a ‘rucksack approach’ (Erel, 2010) that sees their transformation of habitus (their embodied cultural capital) simply as a state of universal disjuncture will not explain how they are able to generate improvised human conduct and practical mastery in certain fields (places or spaces), but have difficulty in re-orienting themselves in other social fields (Noble, 2013).

Of course, it is important to acknowledge the ways in which this ‘dual’ belonging interplays in the lives of second generation. For instance, the term “second-generation migrant” is contradictory to start with. There is an assumption over their belongingness, mostly as ‘non-belonging’ to the country that they live in, but belonging to their ‘native’ or ancestral ‘homeland’. However, for the second generation their ‘homeland’ is a country that they were not born and raised in. It is a mythic place that is constructed in their diaspora space. Therefore, it is important to approach the terms ‘homeland’ and ‘hostland’ critically. These terms, when taken for granted – as in the case of homeland: native and ancestral place, hostland: the diaspora place – offer a limited understanding of the second generation’s experiences. Hence, it would be difficult to argue that the following statement could be held true for the second generation, or any transnational, mobile subjects: “an authentic sense of place, expressed in Heideggerian language, involves ‘being inside and belonging to your place both as an individual and as a member of a community, and to know this without reflecting upon it’” (Berleant, 2003, p.44) – because for these groups self is a reflexive project and notions of attachments involve more active agency instead of holding on to the given identity categories.

This point will be further discussed in relation to the second generation who have multiple identities and belongingness and how these can be understood within the context of ‘translocal field’ – a space wherein, a “proliferation” of identities that subvert the knowledge-power nexus that sustains binary representations, making new kinds of ‘becomings’ possible (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). The notion of ‘home’ can be complicated, as the interplay of ‘place in-the-making’ with daily social activities and practices, an imaginative space wherein the individual’s sense of the self is reflected in relation to the historical and ideological discourses of the collective place-identities, a brick and mortar construction where people materially and
symbolically construct meanings within. All these processes of ‘home’ are relevant in the returnees’ ‘translocal fields’, however based on the framework of this thesis, if home is understood beyond being fixed in place, but at the same time, it requires harmony with one’s capitals and habitus to generate a sense of belongingness, would it be possible that “you can make a home anywhere?” (Rykwert, 1991, p.54).

For offering answers to this question, the thesis explores how the second generation’s subjectivities are placed across multiple spaces in their ‘translocal field’, this way the thesis aims to understand self-making processes as well as identity and lifestyle negotiations *vis-à-vis* particular places, and how they contribute to the making of these place. Because, as Harvey and Braun suggest “places, like space and time, are socially constructed and have to be read and understood in that way” (Harvey & Braun, 1996, p.324). These constructions need to be explored through social and cultural capitals as much as economic capital, because these flows of capitals through social relations, institutions, political and economic practices define how places are re-shaped and experienced (Harvey & Braun, 1996). This puts an emphasis on actors, because “to say something is socially constructed is to say that it is within human power to change it” (Cresswell, 2013, p.109), the thesis connects place-making with active human agency and role of capitals in ‘translocal field’.

Hence, the thesis suggests that second generation’s orientation towards ‘return’ for a ‘better life’ and in relation to their self-reflexive project can be read through their ‘translocational habitus’ wherein their habitus has transformed as a pedagogical process of being in bodily in particular places and navigating between different spaces throughout their lives (Noble, 2013). By doing so, their subjectivities and positionalities can be explored beyond the already given categories of ethnic, national and diasporic categories. This requires incorporating place and space as forms of capitals valued and exchanged in the field, so that habitus can be perceived as a spatially contingent field of meaning, operating through a range of spatial boundaries, making it part of both subjectivities and physical locations (Kelly & Lusis, 2006). Therefore, it is vital to focus on the relationship of the second generation with their locales of dwelling, in other words, their “socio-spatial dialectic” (Soja, 1989).

Thus, it can be said that the second generation acquire “spatial capital” (Soja, 2011) as different places/spaces in their ‘translocal fields’ become critical for them to continuously negotiate their identities, creating an ongoing self-reflexivity. Within the translocal geographies of return, the multi-scalar aspect – different scales of the body, home, neighbourhood, urban, regional, national and transnational require different rules of practice which the second
generation need to learn and internalise in order to be ‘successful’ and reach their goal of having a ‘better life’ because different forms of capital are valued differently across scales, meaning that ‘success’ across one scale of the home, village or city might be marginalised across another scale of the regional or national (Brickell & Datta, 2011, pp.170-171). However, as Hage (2013, p.87) argues,

when we say that a habitus ‘fits’ in its environment, it does not mean there is some kind of imaginary ‘total fit’. Rather, it means that the habitus is part and parcel of an environment where it is capable of generating actions that strives to make us at home.

Based on this argument, it is vital to understand second generation who has become lifestyle returnees as having the spatial capital, who can navigate between different places and spaces to construct their own sense of place. These experiences shape their habitus and thus, imaginings of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. Translocal experiences are especially important to understand their attitudes towards mobility because the second generation observe that places are not bound and exclusive, but dynamic processes.

In exploring the interplay of these different types of ‘place sense-making’ (home/host societies), it is possible to understand how second generation simultaneously perceive and act upon their relationships with towns, cities, nations and the homelands. In Meinhof & Triandafyllidou’s terms, the second generation has “transcultural capital” (2006, p.202), the absorption of two (or more) cultural repertoires, enabling them to move easily between and within different national and international cultural spheres. Hence, it can be fruitful to employ the notion of ‘translocational habitus’ bringing Anthias’ concept of translocal positionality, Bourdieu’s habitus, and Giddens’ reflexivity notions, to understand the second generation’s in-betweenness not only with regards to their “dual frame of reference” (Vertovec, 2004, p.974) in terms of identities and home-places, but also in relation to their mediation between sedentary and rooted understanding of self, identity, belonging and more reflexive, fluid and multiple expressions of these notions. Hence, by using ‘translocational habitus’, it can be highlighted that the structure and agency must be understood beyond dichotomies such as ‘homeland’ and ‘hostland’; instead, social structure and individuals’ strategies are interrelated, interdependent and inter-located (Kelly & Lusis, 2006).

If habitus is the way society, or social structure becomes deposited in individuals in the forms of capitals and trained capacities, thinking patterns and emotional constructions, leading their ‘ways of being and belonging’, then ‘translocational habitus’ is the condition that acts as an antithesis to such understanding, because through their multiple connections and belongings to
(home-)places, the second generation’s life embeds multiple fields. Thus, it is meaningful to perceive their lives as constructed and transformed with their lived experiences of various places, and these new experiences are central to the transformation of their habitus (Cresswell, 2006). Their in-between condition – life between multiple spaces and places have an influence on the places they dwell and build belongingness, and at the same time they will be affected by these places, and this dialogue between the self and place contributes to the formation of their ‘translocational habitus’. Their “dynamic patterns of syncretism” (Kaya, 2007, p.485) mix together elements of Turkish, German, European and global-cosmopolitan culture in a *bricolage* that is ever-evolving – a cultural identity that is as much about ‘becoming’ than ‘being’ (Hall, 1996).

Finally, it needs to be highlighted that there remain certain unanswered questions regarding the unity and transformation of habitus as well as the complicated relationship between habitus and field. However, as Bourdieu argues, his framework would make sense when these questions are addressed empirically, i.e. through engaging in “fieldwork in philosophy” (Bourdieu, 1990). Hence, for this thesis, the development of ‘translocational habitus’ come out of the empirical work which socially contextualises the production of knowledge (Hage, 2013, p.79). Therefore, the concept-building is concluded here, but ‘translocational habitus’ is further elaborated and developed in the upcoming finding chapters.
4 Integrating the Art of Thought and Habitats of Exploration

This chapter presents the key decisions and arguments behind the research’s methodology and methods. The chapter starts with an ontological and epistemological discussion, aiming at offering a justification for the adopted qualitative approaches. Followed by an account on the research approach, the research strategy is introduced in relation to the adopted research philosophies. Based on those philosophies and strategies, the chapter then presents the methods to acquire data and approaches/tools to interpret these findings. Finally, the chapter considers the issues of reflexivity, ethics, and rigour, and discusses the identified methodological limitations.

The thesis acknowledges the ‘cultural turn’ in human geography and migration studies, hence focuses on migration as “a social and cultural phenomenon that is bound up with issues of place, identity and subjectivity” (Ní Laoire, 2000, p.232). Therefore, the research adopts qualitative approaches that aimed at exploring these notions through lifestyle returnees’ narratives. The main reason behind adopting qualitative approaches and prioritising narrative inquiry was built on Fielding’s (1992, p.206) criticism of studying migration through quantitative approaches:

There is something strange about the way we study migration. We know… that moving from one place to another is nearly always a major event. It is one of those events around which an individual’s biography is built. The feelings associated with migration are usually complicated, the decision to migrate is typically difficult to make, and the outcome usually involves mixed emotions… Migration is a statement of an individual's worldview, and is, therefore, an extremely cultural event. And yet, when we study migration scientifically, we seem to forget all this. The migrant is either seen as a “rational economic man” [sic] choosing individual advancement by responding to the economic signals of the job and housing markets, or as a virtual prisoner of his or her class position, and thereby subject to powerful structural economic forces set in motion by the logic of capitalist accumulation.

Like Fielding, several other migration researchers stress that migration studies need to re-integrate the recent developments in social theory, hence recognise migration’s situatedness within individuals’ everyday lives, cultural and social structures in their places of dwellings, and role of human agency in the wider processes of mobility-related decision-making (Silvey, 2004; Halfacree & Boyle, 1993; Brettell & Hollifield, 2008). For understanding migration experiences in relation to these mentioned dimensions, researchers need to adopt humanistic methodologies (Findlay & Graham, 1991, p.160). Hence, the next section address the philosophical standpoints of this research, which determined the concept-definitions, research question formulations, data
analysis methods and the ways in which the phenomenon of migration and its related notions of self/identity, place/home, return/agency are examined (Silvey & Lawson, 1999).

4.1 Interpreting the Constructions of ‘Reality’ and Knowledge

This section presents the ontological argument (paradigm) and epistemological stance (the theory of knowledge) underlying the thesis, which have shaped the research methodology and methods. Methodology is briefly explained as the rationale and philosophical assumptions of a research study (Hughes & Sharrock, 1997; Flick, et al., 2004). Henceforth, the philosophical stance refers to the notion of paradigm, which is defined as “basic set of beliefs that guides action” (Guba, 1990, p.17) and it is the total of a researcher’s epistemological, ontological and methodological premises.

Qualitative research based on constructionist paradigm is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world with a set of interpretive, material practices that make that world visible (Jacobs & Manzi, 2000). These practices are a series of representations of the phenomena in question reflected through field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and ‘the memos to self’ (Maxwell, 2005). At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study their subjects in their natural settings (i.e. field), attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). The authors (2011, pp.12-13) explain that, qualitative methods are useful for:

1. capturing the individual’s point of view: this can be achieved by getting closer to the actor’s perspective through detailed interviewing and observation,
2. examining the constraints of everyday life: through case-based positions, the specifics of particular cases can be explored,
3. securing rich descriptions: rich descriptions of the social world allow the researcher to make sense of the world in a detailed manner.

As this thesis is concerned with understanding the meanings that the informants attach to ‘searching for self’ in relation to their ‘return’ journey to the ancestral homeland and dwelling in the tourism hub of Antalya, it was vital for the research to observe their everyday life interactions and choices, as well as to acquire information based on their subjectivities regarding how they perceive their identity and belonging re-constructions and negotiation processes. It was argued previously that identification is simultaneously an individual and collective action, and the dynamic processes of identity construction and belongingness occur in everyday life in social/communal spaces, forming a component of the inter-activeness of thought, action and
experience (Christou, 2006a). Hence, the research is interested in how the notions of ‘self’, ‘identity’, ‘home’, ‘lifestyle’ are experienced as individuals navigate in socio-cultural environments around them. Therefore, the research seeks to obtain insights that are copious and manifold.

The ontological and epistemological stance of this thesis shaped the research approach, in which the idea that knowledge comes from an “evolved perspective or point of view” is followed (Raskin, 2008, p.13). There have been some key debates regarding the relationship between ontology and epistemology, for instance the claim that ontology is prior to epistemology so that knowledge can be logically generated from their close relationship. Furlong & Marsh discuss on the question of “how can we have a theory about what knowledge is, without some pre-assumptions about the nature of knowledge?” (2010, p.188). Hay (2002, p.63) similarly argues that, “ontology logically precedes epistemology which logically precedes methodology”, hence these concepts should be set apart, considering that “they are inextricably linked” (Grix, 2004). The general claim is not that of ideas or discourses do not affect how the ‘real world’ impacts on agents/groups, but only that these are ideas/discourses about the ‘real’, that is extra discursive (i.e. superstructure) social phenomena (Furlong & Marsh, 2010, p.188).

However, this thesis sides with the poststructuralist understanding of seeing ontology and epistemology as co-constitutive, as Smith (1996) argued, “ontological claims… without an epistemological warrant is dogma… I see neither ontology or epistemology as prior to the other, but instead see the two of them as mutually and inextricably interrelated” (cited in Bates & Jenkins, 2007, p.60). Such understanding is reflected in the research approach of this thesis, in which it follows an abductive approach where phenomena are explored and put in a conceptual framework through an iterative interplay of theory and empirical data. Hence this section further raises some issues related to relationship between theory and empiricism in the following paragraphs.

Kuhn (1970) points out that social sciences are an accumulation of empirical findings rather than creation of theoretical paradigms. Sutton and Staw (1995) similarly criticise qualitative research in the light of theoretical absence. They argue that strong theory is about understanding the systematic reasons for a particular occurrence/non-occurrence by delving into underlying process among phenomena. Simply put, they specify theory as an “answer to queries of why” (p.378). For this thesis, empirical research is argued to be the core of any theory de-construction that would occur in the contemporary era where many themes and topics are already studied and discussed. Through empirical research, one can go deeper with the existing literature and challenge it. Van Maanen, et al. (2007, p.1146) problematise this opinion by arguing that, “many
researchers suggest that more we underpin our theories with empirical observations that more or less fit the theory, the more convincing such theory is.” However, the thesis argues that, with an abductive reasoning theory and empirical data can be evaluated as complementing each other, instead of thinking one is prior to the other.

Van Maanen, et al. (2007) further question the source of interesting theories. According to Kilduff (2006), these arise from researcher’s engagement with problems in the world and not from the gaps in the literature. Kilduff further argues that the interplay of observational and conceptual work in abductive reasoning is the source of interesting theories. Ketner (1995) on the other hand suggests that deduction and induction follow and complement abduction, as logics more suitable for the always-imperfect testing of plausible theories. In this regard, abduction assigns primacy to the empirical world, but in the service of theorising (Kilduff, 2006). It represents a compromise between the arid philosophy of purely deductive logic and purely inductive logic (Atkinson & Delamont, 2005, p.833). The argument in this thesis regarding theory and theory-dependant research – from a postmodernist point of view – is studying knowledge and practice as (trans-)local, rather than fixating it to grand theories and discourses (Geertz, 1983). In a discussion of deductive and inductive approaches vis-à-vis the theory-building processes, the thesis reflects the standpoint is that all research is – to a certain degree – deductive, because the researcher needs to have background information to design the research project. Therefore, this research adopts abductive reasoning, where theory and empirical data interplay throughout the research.

Up to this date, the debates continue about whether theoretical pre-knowledge flows into the data’s interpretation (Strauss, 1987) or, the codes and categories emerge directly from the data (Glaser, 2002). Abduction appears to narrow the research gap that occurs when purely deductive or inductive approaches are followed. To be specific, when I have chosen my research topic, I knew a similar case study was not to be found which was combining return migration and lifestyle migration to understand the notions of ‘self’, ‘home’ and ‘better life’ through an agency-oriented approach based on habitus and lifestyle choices. Therefore, the research with Prof. King acted as a pilot study (2014) and the primary source of knowledge, in which I could examine the phenomena empirically. However, I could only make sense of these new data through my existing theoretical knowledge, hence the empirical findings and theoretical background complemented each other, as I have revisited both to find and bridge the gaps. As a result, my conceptual framework has become a bricolage of theories from distinct fields of migration, mobility and tourism, diaspora, transnationalism and translocality.
Law and Urry’s stimulating article, *Enacting the Social* (2004) is found useful to expand the discussion on the relativist ontology and constructionist-interpretivist epistemology and reflect upon how ‘reality’ is understood and thought to be ‘constructed’. The article discusses three commonly debated points within qualitative research which the thesis finds highly pertinent, to an extent that these helped building of the thesis’ philosophical stance, and have reflexity over the preferred methods. The article’s first point is, social inquiry seeks to ‘legislate’ and ‘interpret’ the social life, and offer an alternative understanding of ‘reality’ as multiple and relative, however it has been criticised for lacking consensus over ‘the social’ and ‘reality’, as well as undermining certainty. Law and Urry argue, “the disciplines of the social are themselves social practices that simply form another part of the social world” (p.391). This statement highlights that all the virtues and vices of the social world are embedded within social sciences, and social sciences themselves partake of that social world’s character. Hence, social inquiry cannot be understood without considering the context in which they are produced. The reason is that social sciences are the tools for understanding societies and ‘the social’ but they are also an important apparatus for the society because social scientists are influential “in the development of official discourses for monitoring, registering, and constructing such inequalities as those of ‘social class’” (p.392). Hence the power of social science and its methods is to get involved in ‘ontological politics’, which can enact realities and think about the worlds it wants to help to create (p.393).

Furthermore, the authors suggest that this condition presupposes two fundamental assumptions: The first assumption is to think that there is an absolute social world that awaits to be discovered. The second is that it is possible to distinguish the social world from social science knowledge. In other words, the premise is that if the researcher gathers relevant data with rigorous methods, the end-result will represent unobjectionable knowledge of the social. The thesis reflects on this, by suggesting that there are no reliable social facts but only subjective interpretations, and therefore there is no social reality to be found out. Hence, the assumption of the existence of an ‘absolute truth’ that cannot be captured – an inflexible reality with fixed, invariable, unaltered facts, as the dominant theory is no longer validated (see Hanna, 1993 on Kantian theory of ‘truth’).

With the development of modernist thinking, differentiating between what is ‘out there’ and human thought has become ever ambivalent so, ‘reality’ is perceived as a relational effect where “the ‘real’ is indeed ‘real’ but it is also made” (Law & Urry, 2005, p.395). As Giddens argues, social inquiry is an expression of, and a ‘reflexive moment’ – it is the continuing elaboration and enactment of social life. Hence, in Giddens’ (2010, p.12) terms, “we create society at the same time as we are created by it.” By the same token, Law and Urry (2005, p.395)
specify that theories and methods of social sciences are “protocols for modes of questioning and interacting, which also produce realities as they interact with other kinds of interactions.”

Law and Urry’s second argument is built upon the first point social sciences are not only an integral part of producing ‘reality’, but they also introduce a moral dimension. In other words, social science methods are performative and have an impact upon what is made ‘real’, or what realities are helped to be strengthen, therefore there are no ‘innocent’ methods (pp.396-397). As methods are related to the ontologies, and different social methods lead to different research findings, the authors argue that the social scientists must acknowledge that, “the world is multiply produced in diverse and contested social and material relations. The implication is that there is not a single ‘world’” and these multiple worlds might be equally valid or ‘true’, “but simply unlike one another” (p.397). The moral dimension gets into the picture when system of interference is considered, indicating that social sciences have the pitfall of making certain forms of the social ‘real’, while eroding others. These have especially political impact in which conscious construction of certain social realities create the local/national/global orders.

Law and Urry’s third point has been highly relevant for this thesis, and concerns the contemporary researchers of social sciences and humanities in general. The authors call for the need of adopting new and robust methods that can capture the (post-)modern contexts which “produce unpredictable and non-linear flows and more mobile subjectivities” (p.399). Globalisation and technological advances require methods that can deal with “fleeting, distributed, multiple, sensory and kinaesthetic nature of our modern society” (pp.403-404). Such suggestion is compatible with the aim of this thesis which seeks to examine and explore lifestyle returnees’ decisions of mobility/settlement in relation to their worlds of meaning through alternative ways of thinking other than theories and discourses which bound individuals to the territorial, discursive and citizenship boundaries of nation-states (Williams, 1958; Billig, 1995; Urry, 2000). Instead, by recognising that ‘the modern social’ is about connection and flow, and that the social space is not homogenous but is performative, complex and interconnected with multiple scales e.g. global (Massey, 1999), the thesis offers new ways of understanding and exploring how “liquid modernity” (Bauman, 2000) is intertwined in the lives of individuals and social spaces.

Hence, the social space is perceived as a “pluriverse” with unpredictable and non-linear flows and mobile subjectivities (Law & Urry, 2004; Urry, 2003). Therefore, the thesis adopts “pluriversality” as an epistemological stance, acknowledging Law and Urry’s suggestion on the methods to ‘capture’ its complexity:
In a complex world, there are no innocent ‘methods’: all involve forms of social practice that… interfere with the patterns of the physical or the social… And the methods necessary to ‘capture’ complexity may well be unexpected and or counter-intuitive. If many social-and-material relations are unpredictable and yet irreversible then research that uses observations taken at a single point in time-space will be representationally inadequate (p.403).

The quote’s final sentence is particularly relevant for the thesis, which brings attention to a vital issue regarding the methods. My experience in the field with several visits within two years show that dynamics change in a place with continuing interactions of people in various spaces. Consequently, the danger is to evaluate return migration through snapshots of people’s lives in which the mobility of people, their changing ideas and plans are unnoticed or undermined. I therefore highlight the message of Law and Urry’s article suggesting that social sciences should embrace the complexity and unpredictability of reality by seeing it as a large entanglement, which cannot be reduced to its individual parts. In other words, the whole is more than the sum of its parts because, “there may be very strong interactions between the components in a system, with no central hierarchical structure able to ‘govern’ outcome”, meaning that “complexity argues against reductionism, against reducing the whole to the parts” (pp.401-402).

Based on these ideas, I have perceived the social world of Antalya and communities within as:

1. diverse systems in complex interconnections with their environments,
2. there are many chaotic effects distant in time and space from their location of origin,
3. order and chaos within these are always intertwined,
4. there are self-organising global networks and global fluids moving systems far from equilibrium,
5. a social order is never accounted for by purified social processes (p.402).

Therefore, structures of Antalya were understood as fluid, and hence this approach helped to deconstruct the agency-structure theories in which structures are reflected as they were solid and unchanging systems. However, as many researchers, I have also found it difficult to embrace “messy methods” that could capture the complexity of ‘the social’ and limited the data-collection methods to face-to-face interviews and daily observations of my interviewees and the ‘tourism spaces’ they inhabit and share with several others such as tourists, colleagues, locals and expats (Law & Urry, 2004).

Based on the afore-mentioned critique and discussion, the thesis suggests that constructionist ontology does not need to be an anti-realist approach (Bury, 1986; Craib, 1997;
Schwandt, 2003) nor that nothing has independent existence beyond language (Bury, 1986). Following the nature-culture dualism introduced by Law & Urry (2004), the ontological approach of this thesis sees reality as a continuum without taking realities for granted but at the same time acknowledging the material existence of the nature surrounding the social contexts. Nevertheless, as the research study is interested in how individuals interpret themselves, their lives and the social contexts around them, it is concerned with finding meaning in relativism instead of realism. At the core of this research, dialogue and conversation are the main sources of realities in the forms of stories and narratives. Therefore, by accepting the constructionist assumption that language makes thoughts and concepts possible and not the other way around, the thesis accepts that socialisation takes place through significant others who mediate the objective reality of society, render it meaningful and in this way, it is internalised by individuals (Berger & Luckmann, 1991).

In theoretical perspectives and discussions, it was already argued that ‘the self’ is a social product that simultaneously shapes, and shaped by the social space (Berger & Luckmann, 1991). Hence, the thesis is mainly interested in how the lifestyle returnees interpret and narrate ‘the self’ and the social world around them, therefore focusing on the dialogue and analysis of narratives, as language predates concepts and provides a means of structuring the way the world is experienced. However, the individuals’ internalisation process wherein “the objectivated social world is retrojected into consciousness” occur during socialisation, where people find personal meanings in their experiences (Berger & Luckmann, 1991, p.61). Nevertheless, Berger and Luckman further argue that an individual may never be able to completely comprehend another’s externalised emotion and meaning, because the interpretation would always go through one’s subjectivity filter. Hence, the thesis’ research design was built to gather information about lifestyle returnees’ subjectivities, in order to understand their meaning-making processes and their lifestyle choices based on their internalisation of experiences whilst also adopting a self-reflexive approach over my subjective positions because, “the immediate apprehension or interpretation of an objective event as expressing meaning, that is, as a manifestation of another’s subjective process which thereby becomes subjectively meaningful to myself” (Berger & Luckmann, 1991, p.61).

The epistemological stance of the thesis is then based on the process of interpreting the meanings and dynamics in the social world of the lifestyle returnees. Therefore, “understanding” is the central concept of this epistemological framework. The Weberian approach of understanding (achieving Verstehen) is described as the following:
Proponents of these persuasions share the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it. This goal is variously spoken of as an abiding concern for the life world, for the emic point of view, for understanding meaning, for grasping the actor’s definition of a situation, for Verstehen. The world of lived reality and situation-specific meanings that constitute the general object of investigation is thought to be constructed by social actors (Schwandt, 1994, p.118).

Similarly, Dilthey’s ‘understanding’ is an emphatic identification, in which interpreting is an act of psychological re-enactment – getting inside the head of an actor to understand what their motives, beliefs, desires and thoughts are (Schwandt, 2003). Simply put, empathy (Einfühlung) is the ability to feel others’ experiences. To understand another’s feelings is not the same as directly to experience those feelings, and does not require experiencing them (Nowak, 2011). Instead of only explaining human behaviour, interpretivist inquiry therefore seeks to understand the human actions, aiming at eliciting in “thick” descriptions of meanings that actors attach to their actions and contexts (Schwandt, 1994). However, Dilthey’s approach was found as a “naïve empathy theory of understanding” embodied in the early 19th century school of “romantic hermeneutics” (e.g. Gadamer, 1981; Habermas, 1988). The main danger of Dilthey’s approach is the possibility of the interpreter to disregard his/her cultural and historical background to produce meaning or intention of the actor (Owensby, 1994; Nelson, 2015). However, in contemporary interpretivist theories, the following approach appears to be more accepted: Geertz (1979) argues that understanding comes more from the act of “looking over the shoulders of actors” and trying to figure out (both by observing and conversing) what the actors intend to. As previously discussed, the researcher’s role is not perceived to chase “thick” descriptions, and “getting inside the head of an actor” appears as a highly-contested goal.

A second way to make sense of the interpretivist understanding is the phenomenological sociology, which is concerned with understanding how the everyday intersubjective world is constituted. The aim is to grasp how we come to interpret our own and others’ action as meaningful and to “reconstruct the genesis of the objective meanings of action in the intersubjective communication of individuals in the social life world” (Outhwaite, 1975, p.91). Potter (1996) introduces two concepts that help these reconstructions. The first one is “indexicality” signifying that a meaning of a word is dependent on its context of use. The second one is “reflexivity” stressing that utterances are not just about something but are also doing something; they are constitutive parts of a speech act. Accordingly, the thesis adopts the following interpretivist approach:
The text or human action is not an ‘object out there’ independent of its interpretations and capable of serving as an arbiter of their correctness (Connolly & Keutner, 1988, p.17).

Such approach indicates that meaning is negotiated mutually in the act of interpretation; it is not simply discovered. Accepting that there is no final correct interpretation leads to a more open way to grasp the content. Bernstein (1983, p.139) summarises Gadamer’s work that criticised the naïve realism and objectivism with the argument below:

We are always understanding and interpreting in light of our anticipatory prejudices and prejudices, which are themselves changing in the course of history. That is why Gadamer tells us that to understand is always to understand differently. But this does not mean that our interpretations are arbitrary and distortive. We should always aim at a correct understanding of what the “things themselves” (the objects of our interpretations) say. But what the “things themselves” say will be different in light of our changing horizons and the different questions we learn to ask. Such analysis of the ongoing and open character of all understanding and interpretation can be construed as distortive only if we assume that a text possesses some meaning in itself that can be isolated from our prejudgements.

Following these suggestions, the thesis expands interpretivism not as an emphatic science with the Others, but also with ourselves as researchers, because without a reflexive approach, the researcher would not be able to identify and re-evaluate the changing horizons. At the same time, the judgements and views of the research subjects change over time. For instance, the informants of this research show a migration behaviour which has a high level of convergence – even though they narrate similar family histories and upbringing in Germany, as well as similar feelings about their journeys, they do not attach homogenous meanings to the notions such as ‘identity’, ‘home’, ‘belonging’, ‘better life’, ‘return’ etc. Instead, as the empirical findings will illustrate, the informants’ narratives present a host of heterogeneities, contradictions and divergences. One key issue worth discussing appears as the evaluating and choosing among competing interpretations of these subjectivities. This raises the question of rational behaviour in choosing the ‘appropriate’ interpretations. The research design therefore adopts “weak holism” claiming that, a background (mediation) of understanding is

not strong enough to act as a fixed limit or to make it impossible to decide normatively between interpretations on the basis of evidence. Indeed, such evaluation will always be comparative, fallibilistic, and revisable, in that yet a better interpretation could come along, encompassing the strengths and overcoming the weaknesses of previous interpretations (Bohman, 1991, p.146).
With this argument, Bohman’s “weak holism” approach allows to reconcile the conditioning which comes through background, context or tradition with the open-ended nature of that situatedness.

In summary, this research adopts three principles: First is, rejecting an anthropology of a disengaged, controlling and ‘instrumental self’ (Smith, 1997; Taylor, 2010). This is to say, the understanding is based on the co-dependent and ongoing construction of the self and the society, as they mutually create each other (Giddens, 1984, p.14). Here, the principle of structure and agency – where social structures and autonomous social actors are mutually constitutive (Giddens, 1990; Giddens, 1991). In other words, social phenomena are informed both by social structure or agency; therefore, it is activity-dependent (“double hermeneutics” in Giddens’ terminology, 1991). Second is that the cognitive requirements involved in understanding others cannot be met through essentialist epistemological assumptions which is a characteristic of logical empiricism (e.g. neutrality of observation, primordial “givenness” of experience, independence of empirical data from theoretical frameworks) (Schwandt, 2003). And finally, rejecting the idea of essentialist, mind-independent, and permanently fixed reality that could be grasped or even sensibly thought of without the mediation of human structuring (Schusterman, 1991, p.103).

4.2 Exploring Vantage Points: Life as Narrative

As previously introduced, the thesis recognises and adopts the idea that social reality is constantly reproduced through social interactions, communicative and discursive practices, thus these needs to be problematised with appropriate arguments that reflects the dynamics of the contemporary world (Risse, 2004). On the other hand, the ‘real’ is real, there are certain settings that have been established throughout a long time-space-place continuum, therefore, I observe these and examine in the light of the existing theories, which results in contesting both the empirical findings and the theoretical literature. The way one could get a sense of these communicative and discursive practices are through narratives, whether in oral or written forms. As this research aims to explore the individual’s lives before and after their ‘return’ migration and understand the phenomenon through a lifestyle lens, the life stories of the lifestyle returnees build the backbone of the data material.

Subsequently, having the formerly stated research questions and standpoints in mind, life-story narrative was chosen as the core research instrument to include various life stages of the informants. Narrative inquiry is found a convenient approach as it helps the researcher to cover the complexity and depth of the world of human experience (Cohen, et al., 2011, p.552). The following paragraphs briefly introduce the narrative inquiry as a research strategy and further
discuss the ways to utilise it as an analytical tool. Within the lines of social constructionism, using narrative inquiry as a tool of analysis is a way to celebrate multiple realities and relativism within the social contexts. Riessman (2005, p.1) defines a narrative as, “sequence and consequence: events are selected, organized, connected, and evaluated as meaningful for a particular audience.” In brief, narrative inquiry is a way to unfold events of life and to make meaning of the experience out of that story. Narratives may be elicited or heard during the fieldwork, an interview, or naturally occurring conversation. In any of these situations, a narrative may be (a) a short topical story about a particular event and specific characters such as an encounter with a friend, boss, parent etc.; (b) an extended story about a significant aspect of one’s life such as schooling, working, marriage, divorce, childbirth and c) a narrative of one’s entire life, from birth to the present (Denzin, 1989; Polkinghorne, 1995). In this thesis, the informants’ entire life stories were collected, starting from their parents’ immigration to Germany until they present-day lives in Antalya.

Furthermore, narratives are commonly described as a form of storytelling. Brock (1995), cited in (Muller, 1999, p.223) conceptualises narratives as stories:

> We see ourselves as storied: Our life narrative is the story we tell ourselves that knits together our recollected past with a wished-for future, thereby influencing our sense of self in the present.

This description highlights the time dimension, which is commonly referred to in main narrative inquiry theories, illustrating that events unfold and usually following a chronological sequence. Hence, there is a start, a development stage and a sense of ending. Consequently, narrative is retrospective meaning-making – the shaping or ordering of past-experience. Narrative is a way of understanding one’s own and other’s actions, organising events and objects into a meaningful whole, and of connecting and seeing the consequences of actions and events over time (Bruner, 1986; Polkinghorne, 1989). What separates narrative from a chronology is, narrative also reports events over time, communicating the narrator’s point of view, as well as including why the narrative is worth telling in the first place. Thus, in addition to describing what happened, narratives also express emotions, thoughts, and interpretations (Plummer, 2000). Unlike editorials, policy statements, and doctrinal statements of belief, all of which also express a point of view, a narrative makes the self (the narrator) the protagonist, either as actor or as interested observer of other’s actions (Polkinghorne, 1996).

Narratives are not independent of cultural conventions and shared formats (Holstein & Gubrium, 2000). This understanding further suggests that narratives are not uniquely biographical
or autobiographical materials, and they do no convey unmediated private ‘experience’ (Plummer, 2000). Hence, experiences, memories, emotions, and other personal or private states are constructed and enacted through culturally shaped narrative types, formats, and genres (Plummer, 2000). Following this argument, Atkinson and Delamont (2005, p.825) suggest that, researchers need to “analyse narratives and life materials so as to treat them as instances of social action, that is, as speech acts or events with common properties, recurrent structures, cultural conventions, and recognizable genres”. Similarly, May (2001) argues that researchers need to evaluate narratives as “performative acts”, as forms of social action like any others. These conceptualisations bring in the questions of, to what extent a ‘narrative’ can be comparable to ‘story’, and do narratives need to be strictly conceptualised as reflector of socio-cultural commonalities? Scholars point out that the precise distinction between ‘narrative’ and ‘story’ is obscure, therefore they have been used interchangeably (Polkinghorne, 1988).

Instead of ‘story’, ‘life history’ appears to be a more specific term that researchers adopt to describe extensive autobiographical narratives, in either oral or written form, covering all or most of one’s life (Chase, 2005). However, life history can also refer to a social science text that presents a person’s biography. In that case, a life story may be used to describe the autobiographical story in the person’s own words. Some researchers treat the terms life history and life story as interchangeable, defining both as birth-to-present narratives (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006). For some others, a life story is a narrative about a specific significant aspect of a person’s life, as in the previously introduced description. A life story may also revolve around an epiphanal event (Denzin, 1989) or a ‘turning point’ in one’s life (McAdams, et al., 2001). Instead of life story, some researchers use ‘personal narrative’ to describe a compelling topical narration (Riessman, 2002). However, ‘personal narrative’ can refer to diaries, journals, and letters as well as to autobiographical stories. In this thesis, the term ‘life-story narratives’ is used to embrace both the individual subjectivities that are unique to each person’s character and the common patterns that reflect the socio-cultural phenomena around them. And the ‘reflexive diary’ kept throughout the data collection and analysis phases is referred to as ‘personal narrative’ which presents my personal perspectives on the settings/events/dialogues during the fieldwork, and throughout the data analysis process.

The theoretical chapters elaborated that, the thesis aims to follow an agency-oriented approach, hence it was important to leave room for narratives that are less ordinary, thoughts and views that are outside of the box. Moreover, I perceive narrative inquiry’s role as an empowering tool for the individual conduct while reflecting an individual’s life experience in detail. Furthermore, the thesis argues that there is a need of necessary adjustments in research methods
to be able to reflect the ‘ongoing’ nature of return, in other words the time-space-place continuum of the return journey. Hence, with life-story narratives, the informants could narrate different phases of their lives, reflecting on their present-day lives and thoughts by referring to the past events, and further link these reflections to their future dreams and aspirations.

The thesis further agrees with the arguments that narratives are nested within cultural contexts and they reflect cultural messages about the nature of reality. However, narrative inquiry is relational in doing so. For instance, in the case of the second-generation Turkish-German ‘lifestyle returnees’, the culture is a hybrid of multiple socio-cultural realities that are constantly negotiated in relation to their encounters with different spaces (e.g. tourism, family, leisure, work spaces etc.) in places. Furthermore, Antalya acts as a “third space”, pluriverse and ‘translocal field’ for its melting pot of cultures, lifestyles and constantly changing social and natural habitats. Hence, the premise before conducting the interviews was that “cultural messages” emerging in the narratives would reflect contested ideas, hybridity and multiplicity of interpretations, and at times confusion.

Therefore, the researcher has an important role in collecting and analysing narratives which can reflect the complexity of storytelling. In each narrative, there are found two parts, a) the content or chain of events, and b) discourse, which are the narrators’ interpretations of events. The discourse resembles a plot, how the researcher becomes aware of what happened, and the order of appearance of events from the narrator’s point of view (Sarup, 1996, p.17). Hence, for this research, the questions were designed following the mentioned logic. The first set of questions aimed at capturing the “what” in the narratives, life stories in detail; the second set were based on “how”, the interpretations of the informants on the events they experienced.

Acknowledging the poststructuralist approach of evaluating language as an unstable system of referents, I have been aware that it would not be possible to completely capture the meaning of my informants’ intentions and stories. Therefore, narratives were approached as a joint production of the narrators and the listener, in which, I had to view myself as a narrator too as I have developed interpretations and found ways to present my ideas about the narratives (Briggs, 2002; Mishler, 1986). On the other hand, I have experienced that the narrator’s story is flexible and variable – narratives are shaped in part by interaction with the audience (Bauman, 1986). This is to say, my presence and the way I communicated, the way I formulated and asked the questions had influenced the ways in which the informants narrated their stories. According to Denzin (2011, p.657) the procedure goes as the following:
The researchers first present the narratives of their informants and then they develop meaning out of, and some sense of order in, the material they studied; they develop their own voices as they construct others’ voices and realities; they narrate ‘results’ in ways that are both enabled and constrained by the social resources and circumstances embedded in their disciplines, cultures, and historical moments; and they write or perform their work for particular audiences.

Moreover, intensive notes were taken related to each informant about their emotions (e.g. surprise, prejudice etc.) evoked during the interviews, also adding my changing interpretations of the settings and informants after re-reading the transcribed narratives. Following this self-reflexive approach, I put effort in acknowledging the various versions of self, reality and experiences that the informants (storytellers) produced through telling. In addition, I treated credibility and believability as something that my storytellers accomplish (Holstein & Gubrium, 2003). Finally, I approached every instance of narrative as particular in their own terms, acknowledging that constructions of self and reality are intelligible within my narrators’ community, local setting, organisational and social memberships, and cultural/historical location (Denzin, 2011, p.657).

4.3 Entering the ‘Translocal Field’

This section firstly introduces the fieldwork location, Antalya to give a background information about the place, the development of tourism and the city’s relevance as a lifestyle migration and return migration destination. The second part of this section then presents the data collection choices in the fieldwork and analysis techniques in relation to the previously outlined narrative inquiry approach.

4.3.1 Locating the Topos: Antalya as a Lifestyle Migration Destination

The research’s ‘pluriverse’ is Antalya (see Figure 1 and Figure 2), the capital city of the wider Antalya province in the Mediterranean region of Turkey. The 2016 consensus shows that Antalya is the 6th most populous city of Turkey, with the population of 2.3 million inhabitants (TUIK, 2016). Antalya is considered as one of the most important tourism destinations in Turkey due to its geographical position, natural and historic sites. Antalya’s coastal length is about 630 km and its southwest coast is bordered by the Taurus Mountains which is a part of the Alpide belt in Eurasia. Besides it’s sandy beaches, rivers that run along near the coastline, waterfalls, caves, mountains and verdant forests, the city had been a crossroad of cultures since 150 BC, firstly home to the ancient Greeks, then got under the Roman Republic (133 BC). Antalya was a major commercial city during the rule of Byzantine Empire. The city was later conquered by the
Seljuk Turks in the early 13th century and only a century later, it has become a part of the Ottoman Empire (except that it was under the Cypriot rule during 1361-1373).

Figure 1: Antalya on the Map of Turkey

Source: Map created with Harvard WorldMap (2017)

The historical accounts show that, during the Ottoman period, the city had been predominantly populated by Turkish and Greek inhabitants alongside a small Armenian and Jewish community (Orbaşlı, 2002, p.123). Before the Independence War which led to the declaration of the Turkish Republic in 1923, Antalya was under the Italian occupation during 1919-1921. In 1923, the governments of Turkey and Greece signed an agreement to exchange their populations; hence about 1.4 million Greeks in the Turkish lands had to migrated to Greece, and about half a million Turkish individuals from Greece came to Turkey (Alexandris, 2003). During this time, the majority of the Greek inhabitants of Antalya had to leave, and 4920 Turkish individuals from Greece were located in Antalya by the Turkish authorities between 1923-1927 (Bahındır-Goularas, 2012). Moreover, the Antalya province (predominantly in the Taurus Mountains and plateau areas) has been a migration route and temporary ‘home’ to yöрук (or yöрук Türkmen) communities for centuries, nomadic and semi-nomadic Turkic tribes who still preserve their cultures. Those who settled in Antalya permanently or temporarily work mainly in agriculture, livestock farming and greenhouse cultivation (Sarı & Demirkaya, 2014). Since 2014, a festival dedicated to yöruk culture and traditions called International Antalya Yöрук Festival has been taking place and the local tourism authorities are planning to utilise the yöрук migration routes for trekking, cycling and camping (with yöрук-style tents called oba) purposes as a part of culture and nature tourism (Sarı & Demirkaya, 2014).
Today, Antalya reflects its eclectic history with its impressive historical ruins such as the Roman theatre of Aspendos, the prosperous trading port of Perge dating back to the rule of Alexander the Great, the ancient mountain city of Termessos, Lycian Way which leads to Olympos and Captain Euromos’s Sarcophagus and Kaleiçi (the central Old Town) area which is a mosaic of the city’s past with Hadrian’s Gate, Kesik Minaret, Korkut Mosque and the Byzantine ruins around it, Hagios Alypios Church, Hidrlık Tower, Yivliminare Mosque and the old city wall alongside the yacht marina. Kaleiçi-Old Town is one of the main fieldwork sites in this research, hence more details will be given in the next section (4.3.2) about the tourism businesses and the social-cultural texture of its ‘tourism spaces’. Another important fieldwork location, Lara-Kardu districts will also be introduced as they are the main areas for mass-tourism activities with all-inclusive luxurious hotels along the coastline. However, firstly the section will give a brief overview of Antalya’s general tourism history and amenities.

Until the mid 1980s, the city was mainly an agricultural land, leading the citrus production of the country. Today, agriculture together with tourism are the main sources of revenue and employment. Initially, the Southern Antalya Tourism Project which was put in action in 1974 played a key role in increasing the bed capacity in the region as well as developing the infrastructure, healthcare and employment opportunities for the local people (Erkuş-Öztürk & Eraydın, 2010). For instance, in order to encourage the domestic tourists and locals to use the coastline, campgrounds were built along the coastline within the scope of this project (Doğantan et al., 2017). In 1982, the Tourism Incentives Law passed through the Turkish Parliament that encouraged investors to benefit from Antalya’s rich natural and cultural assets (Ortaçışme, et al., 2000). The focus on tourism in Antalya in 1980s corresponds with, what Ilkin & Dinçer (1991, p.1) call as the ‘fastest’ period in Turkey during 1980-1990 in terms of tourism development, wherein the bed capacity was increased from 56,000 to 173,000 and the number of tourists visiting Turkey raised from 1.2 million to 5.3 million.

In fact, Antalya city has shown a slower development compared to another coastal district in the Antalya province, e.g. Alanya (see Figure 2). Alanya district is a resort and its population has been gradually rising each year, and was recorded as 291,643 in 2016. Compared to the Antalya city, Alanya is geographically smaller and less populated, however more than 30,000 foreigners (mainly Germans and Danish) own properties in Alanya (Alanya Local Statistics, 2016). Alanya has been a popular destination for the German tourists since 1950s that pushed the tourism development of this small coastal town (Aktaş et. al, 2010). Today, Alanya is one of the most popular tourist destination in Turkey with its 6.5 per cent in the total share of Turkish tourism (Aktaş et. al, 2009).
However, compared to the other districts in the province, Antalya city is considered an exceptional tourism destination for both domestic and international tourists as it can accommodate tourism activities all year round. In addition, the city is well-connected to the other cities via highways and it has wide transportation networks through its seaports and airport which is Turkey’s second largest. Due to the construction of hotels around the coastline (mainly in Lara-Kundu corridor, shown in Figure 2) and increased job opportunities due to tourism incentives, domestic emigration from Eastern and rural regions to Antalya started. In 1985, the city’s population was estimated as 250,000 and this number tripled in 2000, making Antalya the second in Turkey in terms of rapid population growth rate (TUIK, 2002). According to the OECD report, Antalya’s population increased by 27.9 per cent between 2007 and 2015, and these internal migrants were mainly from low socio-economic groups who took low-paid jobs and settled in Antalya’s disadvantaged areas (Akarca & Tansel, 2012; OECD, 2015). Despite the international and socially liberal atmosphere in its touristic parts such as the Old Town/Kaleiçi, Lara-Kundu and Konyaaltı Beach, the city suffers from irregular urbanisation with slum areas and squatter settlements such as in Zeytinköy district, which was commonly mentioned by the interviewees as the drug and crime capital of Antalya.
Until the mid-1990s, tourism policies in Turkey would only focus on the economic dimension, thereof tourism policies and incentives in Antalya as well were based on the Sun-Sea-Sand trio, targeting mass tourism and ignoring the potential alternatives such as culture and nature. In fact, for the domestic tourists and visitors, Antalya has been considered a ‘city of culture’ after Istanbul and Ankara because it has been home to the prestigious Golden Orange Film Festival which happens annually since 1964. In point of fact, more arts and culture events have been organised in Antalya in the last 15 years which helped to consolidate opportunities for participation in public life for the locals, tourists and visitors. For instance, Antalya International Theatre Festival has hosted 32 foreign companies and 19 state theatre groups, reaching to around 80,000 spectators in 2010-2017. In that sense, Antalya is not only a tourism place, but offers a cosmopolitan lifestyle with a vibrant public life throughout the year.

Moreover, Antalya is a university city which boosts youth mobility in and beyond Turkey. Akdeniz University (founded in 1982) which is centrally located in Antalya has approximately 70,000 students, trained in 20 faculties, three schools, one conservatory and 11 vocational schools. The university is also a partner university in the Erasmus Student Exchange programme and have bilateral agreements with over 100 universities in Europe. Having international graduate programmes where the language of instruction is English and having an annual fee of approximately 150 euros attract students from all over the world, especially from the African and Asian continents in the recent years. According to the 2017 data, the Tourism Faculty of Antalya University had set the highest average score for accepting students in entire Turkey, hence making this faculty the hardest tourism faculty to enter in the country (Akdeniz University, 2017). For instance, two of the interviewees from this research’s sample had graduated from Akdeniz University and this brings out another possible research topic for those Turkish-German ‘returnees’ (mainly the third generation) who may choose to settle in Antalya for education and tourism-related employment reasons.

Finally, the university has a key role in several aspects related to tourism in Antalya: Firstly, it educates staff for tourism-related business, secondly it produces scientific knowledge that can be used for planning urban infrastructure, nature and botany tourism etc., and thirdly it assists conference tourism which local tourism authorities would like to develop, through providing venues or organising national and international academic conferences. For instance, the university was one of the collaborating institutions of EXPO 2016 Antalya, a six-month-long international horticultural exposition that aimed at informing the visitors in the topics of biodiversity, history, sustainability and green cities through national and international/national congresses, seminars, panels, cultural and artistic activities. An estimated number of visitors is
reported as 8 million during these 6 months, including locals, domestic and foreign visitors (EXPO Antalya, 2016).

These initiatives, organisations and collaborations between several institutions are important to revive and improve the tourism activities. Due to the economic crises in the EU and Russia followed by the “refugee crisis” within Europe, the political instability within Turkey and neighbouring countries, and the tourists’ growing interests in alternative tourism experiences, Antalya’s tourism services and products have been facing declining prices, hence there have been attempts to boost ‘niche tourism’ in the city through investments for culture, sea, sport, health, winter, golf, conference, nature and trekking & climbing, caravan and camping, cave, plateau, botany, wild life, hunting and faith tourism (Antalya Culture and Tourism Directorate, 2017). The table below shows that Antalya has a wide bed capacity, nevertheless alternative accommodation options such as boutique hotels, camping sites and healthy life complexes are lacking in the city – proving the point that Antalya needs to improve alternative tourism amenities in order to compete with its rivals such as Greece and Spain.

**Table 1: Antalya’s Facility Types (Certified by the Directory of Culture and Tourism) (2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Facility Number</th>
<th>Room Number</th>
<th>Bed Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top-class holiday village</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-star holiday village</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16,793</td>
<td>37,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-star holiday village</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>6,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-star hotel</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>95,820</td>
<td>205,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-star hotel</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>48,677</td>
<td>33,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-star hotel</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>16,053</td>
<td>6,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-star hotel</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>2,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-star hotel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and Breakfast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparthotel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached aparthotel</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2,389</td>
<td>5,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Life Complex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Court</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rest Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>3,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique Hotel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Complex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>2,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training Centre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>868</td>
<td>192,268</td>
<td>412,278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Antalya Province Tourism and Culture Directorate (2012)

Nevertheless, as the tourism infrastructures improved, Antalya has become one of the most popular tourist destinations for Europeans as well domestic tourists who have started buying ‘second homes’ in the region for spending their summer time or in the case of pensioners, living all year round (Kaiser, 2012; Kaiser & İçduygu, 2005). According to Antalya City Culture and Tourism Directory, approximately 12 million tourists visited Antalya region in 2013 (34 per cent of tourists visited Turkey the same year). Most of these tourists were from Russian Federation (3.3 million), Germany (2.8 million) and the Netherlands (550,000). The number points to the dramatic change in Antalya’s popularity as a tourist destination, considering only 1.8 million tourists visited Antalya in 1995 and this number reached to 7.5 million in 2005. The provincial capital of Antalya, the Antalya city has the biggest share of foreign residents and amongst all, the German residents tops the list.

Studies regarding tourism preferences and satisfaction show that, European tourists choose Antalya because of the low extra expenses, all-inclusive resort hotel services, family-friendly environment, hospitable attitude of locals, richness of historical sites and the sun-sea-sand features (Kozak, 2002; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Ayik, et al., 2013). All-inclusive hotels and tours
are in favour because they put no obligation for tracing the extra expenses and holiday is pre-planned. In 2015, 11.9 million tourists visited the Antalya province (a total of 36.3 million tourists visited Turkey in 2015), however this number dropped to 6.5 million tourists in 2016 (Günay & Akıncı, 2017). Table 2 shows the top three countries which sent the highest number of tourists to Antalya in 2015 and this makes up the 59.71 per cent of the total number of tourists. According to the statistics, the remainder 40.29 per cent consists of (and in an order from highest number to lower) the UK, Sweden, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belgium, Poland and Denmark (Governorship of Antalya, 2017).

Table 2: Countries that send the highest number of tourists to Antalya (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourist Numbers</th>
<th>Share in total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3,148,458</td>
<td>28.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>2,838,134</td>
<td>26.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>503,188</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Governorship of Antalya, 2017

As it was mentioned previously, the 2016 statistics reflect a substantial level of decrease in the number of the tourists to Antalya. In general, the number of tourists to Turkey dropped from 36.3 million in 2015 to 25.4 million in 2016 (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism Statistics, 2017). In Antalya, not only that the tourist numbers dropped to almost to half in 2016, there were also changes in the numbers in relation to where these tourists come from. Table 3 below illustrates that Germany is still in the first place as a sending country in 2016, however their numbers were lower. A prominent change can be observed in the number of Russian tourists in Antalya in 2016 wherein there is almost a 72 per cent downturn. The statistics further mention that, after the UK, highest number of tourists came from Denmark, Israel, Sweden, Belgium and Kazakhstan and this group makes up the 36.5 per cent of the total number of tourists in Antalya in 2016. When we look at the political conjecture between 2014 and 2016, we may find certain answers to why the Russian tourists’ interest had been gradually lowering whereas the number of the Ukrainian tourists had been on a rise.
Table 3: Countries that send the highest number of tourists to Antalya (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Tourist Numbers</th>
<th>Share in total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2,017,464</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>575,545</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>492,346</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>350,603</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UK</td>
<td>346,112</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Governorship of Antalya, 2017

Firstly, it is important to mention that the last 16 years of the Turkish-Russian political relations is considered as the best period in the history despite the political tension since the Syrian crisis in 2012 and the Ukrainian crisis in 2014 due to the conflict of interest between the two countries’ foreign policies. On top of the political problems, Russian economic recession in 2015 that negatively affected the oil prices resulted in a 23.3 billion dollar decline in the Turkish-Russian foreign trade volume. Russia and Germany are the main import sources for the Turkish economy, hence the political disagreements with these countries have direct influence on the agricultural and tourism economies of Turkey. For instance, Putin and Erdoğan held a private meeting at the G-20 Summit in Antalya in October 2015 discussing the Russia’s military intervention in Syria and violation of the Turkish air space, however 10 days after this meeting, a Russian warplane was shot down by a Turkish F-16 near the Syrian border (Hürriyet Daily News, 2015). After this, Putin warned Russian citizens not to travel to Turkey and cancelled the 2011 agreement of visa-free entry to Russia for the Turkish citizens. These events are highly influential for Antalya’s tourism as many EU and Russian nationals reside in Antalya. Below, more information on foreign residents of Antalya is given.

In terms of foreign residents, the Antalya province has experienced an ever-increasing influx of EU and Russian nationals since the 2000s (Table 4). One important note is the rising numbers of Russian nationals who reside and work particularly Antalya province (Deniz & Özgür, 2014). Russians are a relatively a younger group compared to the European lifestyle migrants residing in the province (Özgür & Deniz, 2014). It is also important to note that the Russian migrants in Antalya are actively taking part in the tourism-related businesses, mostly in hotels, retail businesses (mostly jewellery and leather shops), tour agencies, real estate and to a
degree in restaurants and bars (Özgür & Deniz, 2014). The statistics presented in Table 3 is from 2013, hence it does not capture the changes in the numbers in the politically stigmatised period in the recent years.

**Table 4: Registered residing-foreign population by leading coastal districts in Antalya province (2008-2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Share in total foreign population in the province (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antalya city</td>
<td>3,115</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>9,095</td>
<td>10,128</td>
<td>15,797</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanya</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>5,330</td>
<td>9,244</td>
<td>8,381</td>
<td>13,633</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manavgat</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemer</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>2,597</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaş</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Turkish Statistical Institute, (2013)

Below, Table 5 illustrates that German nationals make up the biggest foreign population from Europe who are officially registered as residents in Antalya city, excluding the province’s other districts.

**Table 5: Distribution of nationalities in Antalya city (registered and residing) (2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Nordic Countries (Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark)</th>
<th>UK and Ireland</th>
<th>Belgium and the Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>8,015</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Balkır & Südaş, 2014)

According to the 2016 statistics by Address-Based Population Registration System, the number of the residing-foreign population in Antalya is 60,534. The top five sending countries are listed as, Russia (9,035 residents), Germany (8,653), Kazakhstan (5,628), Ukraine (5,328) and
Table 6: Antalya’s In-Migration, Out-Migration, Net Migration, Rate of Net Migration (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>In-Migration</th>
<th>Out-Migration</th>
<th>Net Migration</th>
<th>Rate of Net Migration (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>2,328,555</td>
<td>79,203</td>
<td>73,119</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TUIK, Address-Based Population Registration System (2016)

Balkır & Kirkulak’s (2009) study on the retirees from the EU who settled in the Antalya province show that, the interest of Germans buying property in Alanya and Antalya started in mid-1990s. At the time, the Turkish government has a high interest rate policy in 1990s to attract the foreign currency savings of Turkish labour migrants in Germany, so German citizens too, decided to invest their savings in Turkey (Balkır & Kirkulak, 2009, p.131). Another trigger factor was Turkey gaining EU candidacy status after the 1999 Helsinki Summit, which led to a significant increase in the residential permits in Antalya (pp.131-132). Hence, many German nationals decided to retire in Turkey. The German language has become the unofficial ‘second language’; bars, restaurants and shops use German on their signboards and in their menus, and employing German-speakers.

Due to Antalya’s popularity amongst the German tourists and expats, Turkish who return from Germany choose these areas for settlement for the availability of various job opportunities in tourism-related businesses. According to official Turkish statistics, the province of Antalya received biggest number of returnees from Germany, together with Ankara, the capital of Turkey (Rittersberger-Tiliç, et al., 2013). Numbers of the Turkish returnees in Antalya is not exactly known as those with German citizenship is counted as foreign-residents. The main studies on Turkish-German ‘return’ migration are mostly macro-level studies, and says next-to-nothing on returnees’ engagement in the tourist sector.

For this thesis, Antalya was chosen as a fieldwork site, because of having the highest number of returnees from Germany, who also work in tourism-related jobs. Furthermore, whilst the settlement of the second-home owners, retirees and seasonal workers were researched mostly in Spain, Italy, Portugal and Malta (Warnes, 1994; Williams, et al., 1997; Williams, et al., 1997), more recent research increasingly considers Turkey as a lifestyle migration destination particularly for German, Dutch, British, and Scandinavian retirees (Balkır & Kirkulak, 2009; Williams, et al.,
As Casado-Díaz (2012, p.124) has predicted, “future research on the field of lifestyle migration and, particularly, on international retirement migration, will be characterized by a renewed interest in the geographical distribution and diversification and the transnational practices of these mobile populations”.

Hence, it is argued in this thesis that, Turkey as an emerging lifestyle migration destination can be added to the literature epitomised by ‘Sunset Lives’ (King, et al., 2000). As Nudralı & O’Reilly (2009, p.137) point out, “Turkey provides a unique context for intra-European migration given its economic, political and religious distinctiveness, its ambivalence in the context of EU enlargement and its geographical location between East and West”. However, there is no research based on the Turkish returnees from Europe in this area, hence the thesis recognised this gap and aimed at exploring the ‘lifestyle migration’ phenomenon in relation to the second-generation Turkish-German ‘returnees’.

### 4.3.2 Sampling, Interviewing and Field Notes

As established earlier, this research aims to “understand” the individuals’ processes of the self in relation to their experiences of ‘return’ and place as ‘home’. Hence, this micro-level analysis necessitated the research design to be an exploratory one; however, it is acknowledged that an exploratory design that seeks to investigate the questions of “what”, “why”, “how” has inevitably an explanatory element. In this regard, the research does not overlook the causalities of the social events and their influence on the informants’ lives. However, identifying the causes and effects is not the primary goal of this study – because exploratory design suggests observing, rather than manipulating the variables. Therefore, the research is designed to limit the consequential findings of explanatory kind to the acquired information about the link between the causes and outcomes.

This research was planned as a cross-sectional study, in which data collection took place within the timeframe of three months (September 9–December 3, 2015) in Antalya city. With open-ended and in-depth non-standard interviews, the goal was to capture in detail the lives and experiences of the ‘lifestyle returnees’ in different time-place settings. The interview questions were in-depth and semi-structured, and an interview-guide was present during the interviews. Semi-structured questions are often criticised that they do not lead to direct answers and might frustrate the interviewees in a way that they push themselves to give short answers with well-structured sentences. There was also the risk that interviewees hesitate to ask about the parts they do not understand in the questions due to the restricting nature of semi-structured method.
For lowering these barriers, I adopted a conversational approach that complements the semi-structured questions. This way, the multi-dimensional nature of the research questions could be grasped, allowing the interviewees to be storytellers who remember their lives, acting as auto-biographers, being reflexive on their own stories and reflecting upon the subjects during the conversations in a systematic way. In that sense, I tried to achieve “successful” semi-structured interviews by engaging in conversations with purpose (Smith, et al., 2009). Conversational interviews reduced the possibility of misunderstanding of the questions and intended meanings. The approach is based on a view of communication that requires partners to collaborate, to converse about what is being said until they are confident and they adequately understand each other. Flexibility as the advantage of semi-structured interviews allowed probing questions or additional questions depending on the flow of conversation. This way, the informants could explain or build on their response, adding significance and depth to the data obtained (Flick, 2006).

In line with the exploratory design and abductive reasoning, an interview-guideline (see Annex) was prepared and aimed at covering three main life-stages of the informants. The first set of questions were designed to cover the familial backgrounds and upbringing in Germany, as well as early encounters with Turkey through childhood visits and holidays. The second set of questions focused on ‘return’ stories, the events and decision-making processes that occurred throughout the ‘return’ journeys. The third set of questions were designed to explore the informants’ post-return experiences; how they perceive ‘better life’, what have been their strategies to live in accord with their lifestyle aspirations, and what meanings they attached to their ‘return’ places. Final set of questions had existential underpinnings, offering a space for the informants to reflect on their processes of self and identity constructions from their childhood years to present day. The questions covered phases and themes such as their upbringing as ‘Turkish’ in Germany, generational differences with their parents, their translocal experiences, lifestyle formations and their understanding of ‘home’ with regards to places they inhabited before and after ‘return’.

The sampling strategy was based on non-random sampling and the sample consists of 44 life-story narratives. Initially, 55 interviews were collected, however 11 interviews were eliminated as these individuals were not fulfilling the criteria. The inclusion criteria for the sample was directly linked to the definition adopted for ‘second generation’ and ‘returnee’. First, for the informants to be qualified as ‘second-generation’, they had to be born in Germany or brought from the home country before kindergarten age i.e. five years old, to at least one parent who immigrated to Germany (not limited to being guestworker). Secondly, the informants had to be
living in Turkey for at least one year – meaning they must have migrated to Turkey at least a year ago. People who were working within tourism-related businesses, or who had experience in tourism-related businesses were given priority. Tourism-related businesses was taken as a broad concept including, transportation, travel services, recreation and entertainment, accommodation, food and beverage services, wellness services, clothing and textile goods etc.

The reason for 11 interviews to be eliminated was, when I approached these individuals they would confirm that they were born and raised in Germany, or taken to Germany before the school age. However, as the interview would start and stories unfold, it would be clear that they did not really understand my questions regarding the criteria. Hence, these informants were either taken to Germany after school age, or they were third generation of Turkish, whose parents were also born in Germany. Nevertheless, when I realised that they would not qualify the criteria, I did not stop the interviews, because I could still learn about the Turkish people's lives in Germany and processes of return, hence it would help me understand different backgrounds. More importantly, to maintain friendly relations and out of respect, I continued listening the stories of these individuals. As I spent almost 3 months within the area, and spent around 7-8 hours every day in the same districts, all the shop workers around these areas got to know who I was and what I was doing. Therefore, it was essential that I kept a friendly profile and maintained good relations, so the shop owners would allow me to interview their workers, or in general people would help me find more informants. I eventually stopped interviewing more people “when redundancy with regards to information is achieved” (Jennings, 2005, p.111).

Furthermore, these 44 interviews consist of 15 interviews with women and 29 interviews with men. 26 interviews were conducted in Kundu area, 8 interviews took place in Old Bazaar in central Antalya, and the remainder 10 took place in the Lara district (see Figure 3). The oldest respondent is 53 years of age and the youngest is 23 years of age, majority being in their 30s and 40s. 39 informants are working in tourism-related businesses, one respondent recently quit her job as a tour guide to have some ‘time off’ and the other 4 informants work as German language teachers in a private school, however they all have previous work experience in tourism. These interviews were nevertheless kept within the data pool because these individuals made the transition to teaching recently, and their stories give valuable insights about the possibilities in Antalya to have transitions between jobs, and the difficulty of working in the tourism sector especially for women who have children. 12 respondents are university graduates, there is one female respondent who dropped out from university and another female respondent who dropped out of secondary school. There are also four male respondents who were dropped out of secondary school. The rest of the sample – 26 interviewees – graduated from vocational
schools (*Berufschule*), secondary school (*Hauptschule and Realschule* or *Gymnasium* in Germany) and high school in Turkey (secondary school equivalent in Germany).

**Figure 3: The Research’s Main Fieldwork Districts**

![Map of Antalya](image)

None of the interviewees’ parents come from Antalya, the most common place of origin is midland Turkey, cities, towns and villages around Ankara, the capital and Sivas. Out of 44 informants, 7 of them hold German citizenship, 2 holds double citizenship (Turkish and German), and the remainder 35 informants are Turkish citizens. The interviews took an hour long in general, the shortest interview was 45 minutes and the longest was 2 hours and 15 minutes. The interviews were voice recorded on a digital recorder. As it can be seen, except the ‘second-generation’ criteria, a heterogeneous sampling was adopted (extensive variables of gender, age, social/civic status, educational/professional background, having children, ties to parents and siblings, personal history of migration) to get broader spectrum of views and reflections.

The sample strategy paid close attention to achieve a gender-balanced panel to cover the experiences of both genders evenly. The main reason for seeking a gender-balanced panel was due to these widely-recognised role of gender norms and roles in migrants’ decision-making processes, identity negotiations in power hierarchies within their social fields and the level of autonomy that can be enjoyed (Hondagneu-Sotelo, 1994; Chamberlain, 1997; Mahler & Pessar,
2001; Christou, 2006b). Hence, the thesis adopts gender\textsuperscript{15} as an important component of “intersectionality” in the way individuals’ migratory journeys are understood.

The thesis argues, it is important to pay attention to “gendered geographies of power” in which gender operates simultaneously on multiple “spatial and social scales” (e.g. body, family, state) across transnational terrains where gender ideologies and relations are reaffirmed, reconfigured or both (Mahler & Pessar, 2001, p.445). Building on Massey’s framework of “power geometries”, it can be argued that gender operates at various levels within the hierarchies of class, race, ethnicity and religion. Hence, it is important to understand the context of “social location”, as “power geometry” is argued to be a product of time-space compression which placed people in very distinct locations regarding access to power over flows and interconnections between places (p.446).

However, in this research, out of 44 interviews, only 15 of them were with women. As the analysis chapters will present in detail, tourism is mainly a male-dominated sector, and women, if not completely missing in the picture, rarely work as sales persons in touristic shops. Hence, women were not ‘out there’ and were more difficult to approach compared to men during the fieldwork. Another reason was, as the upcoming empirical chapters will illustrate, Antalya is preferred by mostly those Turkish-Germans who have loose ties with family, or have troubled pasts in comparison to returnees in other parts of Turkey (King & Kilinc, 2013; King & Kilinc, 2014). None of the informants’ parents come from Antalya originally, hence they do not have extended family in Antalya. Therefore, settling in Antalya for the ‘returnees’ has to be a personal and autonomous decision in which family ties do not dominate the decisions. The previous research (King and Kilinc, 2014) and the current narratives reveal that for women, these decisions were more difficult to give, as they were expected to follow family rules and plans in the patriarchal Turkish families.

A detailed table regarding the demographics of the respondents can be found in the Annex, however below, a summary of the interviewees’ key characteristics is provided (see Table 7).

\textsuperscript{15} The thesis adopts Mahler and Pessar’s (2001, p.442) conceptualisation of gender, which is “a human invention that organizes our behaviour and thought, not as a set of static structures or roles but as an ongoing process that is experienced thorough an array of social institutions from the family to the state.”
Table 7: The Summary of the Interviewees’ Profile – Demographics in Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Women (Total: 15)</th>
<th>Men (Total: 29)</th>
<th>Total: 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25 years of age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45 years of age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50 years of age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55 years of age</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>Women (Total: 15)</th>
<th>Men (Total: 29)</th>
<th>Total: 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>Women (Total: 15)</th>
<th>Men (Total: 29)</th>
<th>Total: 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School (in Germany and Turkey)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (in Germany and Turkey)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-Out from Secondary School or University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Women (Total: 15)</th>
<th>Men (Total: 29)</th>
<th>Total: 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Period</th>
<th>Women (Total: 15)</th>
<th>Men (Total: 29)</th>
<th>Total: 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980-1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, the sample was collected through certain gateways. Benefitting from snowball sampling, the following were the sources for reaching to potential informants:

1. **Previous networks:** Having previously undertaken a fieldwork in the area (pilot work, 2014), I have had face-to-face communication with 45 people – 30 of them were the informants and the remainder were locals who had relevance to the research sample. Some of these people were contacted once I was in Antalya for the thesis fieldwork, and they recommended other individuals who have the potential to be research informants. One problem was that, Antalya’s tourism areas had undergone an immense change only in one year. Whilst Kaleiçi area (Old Town) has become more expensive and targeting locals, touristic shops and restaurants have changed in style, and many shops were shut down. Therefore, Turkish-German ‘returnees’ who previously worked in these places moved to Old Bazaar which is in the Old Town, however outside of the Kaleiçi, or to the Kundu area which is the main all-inclusive luxurious hotel and shopping mall district.

2. **Online platforms/Phone Calls:** A background research was done in July-August 2015 to create a data pool including the contact information of relevant governmental, non-governmental organisations, tourism offices and hotels. In terms of finding potential informants, the most effective strategy was to call hotels and asking the Human Resources if they knew anyone who was a returnee from Germany. In addition, informal groups on online platforms such as Facebook, Couchsurfing and LinkedIn were used. Nevertheless, except one Facebook group, this technique was not effective for finding potential informants.

3. **Place visits:** The most effective way of finding potential informants (yet time-consuming) was to pay a visit to shops, hotels and other businesses in Kaleiçi, Old Bazaar
There were no places of visit in the Lara district, however the interviews were conducted there either because a potential interviewee was recommended by somebody or as there are many comfortable cafes, the interviewees preferred it as interview location mentioning that they enjoyed the decent, liberal and to a certain extent posh atmosphere of Lara. In Antalya, social encounters and events happen in spontaneity; phone calls and e-mails to reach people and arrange dates for interviews hardly worked. Hence, once I have approached relevant people face-to-face, I needed to conduct the interview immediately, if not within the same day, we arranged a time for next day.

4.4 Reflexivity, Positionality and Ethical Considerations

This section considers my positionality as a researcher and its influence throughout the research process. As a part of the positionality statement, reflexivity will be discussed as an essential part of the process regarding my identification with my positionality. These accounts on positionality and reflexivity will then be connected to the research’s ethical considerations during the data collection and analysis phases. The scholars within ethnographic research commonly stress upon this strong link between reflexivity, positionality and ethics, arguing that, “It is critical to pay attention to positionality, reflexivity, the production of knowledge and the power relations that are inherent in research processes in order to undertake ethical research” (Sultana, 2007, p.380). Moreover, power relations and hierarchies mentioned in this quote is another important point because it reflects, through what medium I have had access to different social spaces in Antalya and how my social relations influenced the ways in which I have built rapport with the relevant people during the fieldwork and acquired information from my respondents.

The practice of self-reflexivity comes from “[…] what we learn about the self as a result of the study of the ‘other’” (Chiseri-Strater, 1996, p.119), hence it is a dynamic process wherein social interactions and contexts change, hence requiring the researcher to continuously reflect upon the self and their biography (Denzin, 1989, p.12). Even though reflexivity might be misconceived as “narcissistic and egoistic” (Okely, 1992; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p.229), it is critical to the conduct of fieldwork; “it induces self-discovery and can lead to insights and new hypotheses about the research questions” (England, 1994, p.244). Within interpretive research, it is highly important for the researcher to assess his/her own researcher’s position as an insider or outsider, as the interpretations of the empirical findings are likely to stem from the researcher’s position with regards to the ‘culture’ being studied as well as his/her ontological and epistemological assumptions (Herod, 1993). I have previously declared my epistemological and ontological stance in the beginning of this chapter, hence this section will demonstrate how I
situate my world-view and positon with regards to the three major areas within the research, namely a) the research’s topic; b) the respondents and c) the research context and process (Savin-Baden & Howell-Major, 2013, p.71).

Firstly, I would like to address to one of the main debates in research methods, that is, if the researcher is/must be an insider or outsider based on the researcher’s background and affiliations compared to the research’s subjects. “Background and affiliations” here can be a long list, however some main points of reference would be one’s gender, sexuality, age, historical and geographical location, ethnicity, race, religion, political allegiance, sexual orientation, social class and status, (dis-)abilities etc. (Wellington et al., 2005). Adding of “etc.” for scholars has been a way of resisting a fixed notion of relevant lines of difference and domination (Butler, 2003) as well as developing “intersectionality” epistemologically, because it calls for an “open reflexivity and creates perspectives for an engagement with theory based on personal experiences and empirical findings” (Schurr & Segebart, 2012, p.153). Focusing on the “intersectionality” (Anthias, 2013, p.7) and “relationality” (Derrida, 1982, p.262) aspect of these categories are also vital for the researcher to recognise the social relations of dominance that are underexplored in the everyday experience of people in the research field. Correspondingly, qualitative researchers such as Narayan (1993), Griffiths (1998) and Bridges (2001) explain that it is no longer useful to think of researchers as insiders or outsiders. Instead, researchers might be viewed “in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations” (Narayan, 1993, p.671). Narayan (1993) proposes the following argument instead of trying to define an insider or outsider status:

We must focus our attention on the quality of relations with the people we seek to represent in our texts: are they viewed as mere fodder for professionally self-serving statements about a generalized Other, or are they accepted as subjects with voices, views, and dilemmas – people to whom we are bonded through ties of reciprocity (p.672).

This insight brings attention to reflexivity to overcome the ‘crisis of representation’ and hence requires the researcher to place themselves and their practice under scrutiny, acknowledging the ethical dilemmas that permeate the research process and impinge on the creation of knowledge (Shacklock & Smyth, 1998; May, 2001; McGraw, et al., 2000). In other words, reflexivity is not necessarily an instrument to “neutralise” the effects of the social positioning of the researcher (Bourdieu, 1993, p.372), but an attempt to constructively mark scientific knowledge as situated and positional.
Hence, I have acknowledged from the beginning of the research that reflexivity would allow me to be sensitive yet critical to my cultural, political and social context – my ethics, personal integrity and social values as well as my academic and social competencies would influence the research design, execution and interpretation of the research findings (Greenbank, 2003; Bryman, 2012). In addition, it has enabled me to give a continuous effort to read the ‘lived experiences’ of me as the researcher, and my respondents as the researched against theoretically pre-determined categories and concepts (Carstensen-Egwum, 2014, p.267). In that sense, it was essential to have this section in order to openly and honestly disclose and expose my positionality, articulating how and where I believe that I have influenced the phases of the research (Savin-Baden & Howell Major, 2013). Because, as I have already established in the section regarding my epistemological and ontological stance, the thesis argues that what is out there is ‘real’ and there are multiple ‘realities’, but the interpretation of these cannot be value-free, meaning that we cannot ‘objectively’ describe realities as they exist. And it is not the purpose of this research to find rigid or generalised definitions for the notions of ‘self’, ‘identity’ ‘home’, ‘belonging’, instead the thesis considers these notions as social constructs hence relative, context-dependant, changeable and dynamic states of ‘being’ and ‘feeling’. These arguments – as the findings chapters (Chapter 5, 6, 7 and 8) will demonstrate – came into existence as I have embraced a reflexive approach to scientific practice wherein I could push critical social theories through constructively using “subaltern knowledges” (Verne, 2012).

Therefore, this research is concerned with the subjective stances of the informants about these notions, their reflections on how they think and feel about the institutionally and socially-ascribed meanings towards their membership or outsider-ness to certain groups i.e. ethnic, national, religious, class. In that sense, my role as a researcher is not only to interpret the interpretations of my respondents regarding these notions under scrutiny and their experiences but also to interpret the interpretations of scholars as there is an established body of knowledge. Nevertheless, as I have already mentioned, I have tried to understand the social and cultural life in the field on its own terms, rather than subsuming it under an already established social theory or concept (Verne, 2012). Hence, the outcome of the research – the analysis of the research findings – is mediated by my perspective and the interpretative framework through which I have organised my perspectives (Balarin, 2009, p.295) and these will be my and reader’s “jointly agreed best approximations to the truth, these are always open to refutation and replacement by new ‘facts’” (Rolfe, 2007, p.79).

However, my ontological position wherein I seek an emic account based on the idea that recognising behaviour, actions and stances are relative to the person’s culture and the social
context wherein that behaviour or action are both meaningful and rational within that given culture, does not fully make me an insider in relation to the culture being researched. I believe that it was vital for me to have a critical stance towards any simple understanding of myself as an ‘insider’. If insiders are “the members of specified groups and collectivises or occupants of specified social statuses” (Merton, 1972, p.21), then a straightforward answer to my position would be that, I was not an insider because, despite sharing a Turkish national identity with my respondents (besides, on the paper, some interviewees are ‘German’) I was not born and raised in Germany, I did not return to Turkey after a long period of time spent abroad and I did not have immigrant parents who had to change their life circumstances to have a more prosperous life. However, if a more open description of the ‘insider’ is accepted, as someone whose biography gives them a ‘lived familiarity’ with a priori knowledge of the group being researched, then I can list a few aspects within my life that creates such ‘lived familiarity’. In the next paragraphs, I will elaborate on how I have negotiated such ‘insider’ status during the collection of interviews.

To start with, I early on decided that, alongside the interviews as the primary source of information, I had to keep a reflexive diary for two purposes: The first one would be for reflecting on my own understanding of identities, belonging, place-attachments and my personal ‘self-seeking’ journey in the translocal fields between several countries, and what ‘return’ to Turkey would mean to me. Secondly, I could use the reflexive journal to collect extensive notes about my respondents and their social relations with their dominant others such as colleagues, bosses, tourists, friends, locals etc., salient facts, events and my personal impressions on a day-to-day basis during the interviews. As I have started conducting the interviews, I have also noted down my respondents’ thoughts about me and it was interesting to observe that there were areas of me that I was not aware of or have a completely different understanding and when these were brought up by the interviewees, I could see the role of power hierarchies in the way we have communicated and mediated meanings between us. I will give several examples on this matter and will return to the power hierarchies later in this section, however I will now explain how my biography affected the ways in which I conducted interviews.

Prior to this thesis project, I have been working on the Turkish-German second generation’s return to Turkey (specifically to Istanbul and villages in the Black Sea region) in relation to negotiation of gendered identities upon ‘return’ and contesting the meanings of ‘home’ and ‘identity’ as a part of my Master of Arts studies. At that time, I was based in Sweden and I had planned it as my lifestyle migration journey. My interest in the second-generation Turkish-German ‘return’ migration however, had started when I was undertaking my Bachelor studies in Istanbul, when I became friends with German and Turkish-German exchange students in my
university. I had not understood at the time why a second-generation Turkish student from Germany would choose Turkey to have an exchange year whilst they could freely go to any country in Europe. I could not associate with their deep longing and curiosity to experience the life in Istanbul, because I was seeing my future in ‘the West’ as a relatively privileged and educated person.

Through these friendships, I had started visiting Germany and had the chance to experience the Turkish-German space in Kreuzberg and Neukölln in Berlin. In other visits to Frankfurt Am Main, Hamburg, Cologne and Munich, I have observed that the Turkish community in Germany is not a homogenous group, multiple ethnicities, religious beliefs, educational, social-lifestyle and economic backgrounds are represented under the term ‘Turkish diaspora’. With this observation, I saw the necessity to be able to understand German sources to follow what the ‘German’ opinions have been on the ‘Turkish’ community hence I have started learning German and grown an interest in the films of the second-generation Turkish-German director Fatih Akın. I was especially intrigued by his film Gegen die Wand (Head-On) (2004) portraying a young and suicidal Turkish-German woman’s marriage with an older Turkish-German in order to free herself from her restrictive and conservative family life, and the married couple’s journey to Turkey. In an interview with Akın, he was asked to reflect upon the characters’ journey to Turkey as ‘return’ and this dialogue which I quote below resonates with me even today:

Interviewer: At the end, [the two characters] return to Turkey, where their roots are. Is that the only way to find perhaps not happiness but at least some peace and quiet? Is the [film’s] message that migrants can find peace only in where they came from?

Fatih Akın: Well, I don’t know. The tricky thing about all the stuff is that the personal home is Germany. She was born in Germany. He grew up in Germany. He is so German that he does not almost speak Turkish anymore. He does not look even Turkish anymore. They go somehow to a foreign country, or to a new country. Not to their home. That is the general idea. They have to escape… (DW-World, 2004).

The findings of my MA thesis project reflected this argument – going back to Turkey is more of an immigration to a new country than return. What was more interesting for me was that after having lived in Sweden, I have started to see the life in Istanbul with a new eye; I have started appreciating the eclectic culture and history, it’s unique geographic condition and even the cacophony of the city. At the same time, I have become a person who could not fully associate myself with Turkey or Sweden, but I was able to integrate the parts that I liked in these two
cultures into my life. My life in ‘academic diaspora’ has evoked emotions of belonging and a feeling of nostalgia about my childhood and teenage years in Istanbul and I have come to an understanding that I had a stronger local identity based on being from Istanbul, rather than Turkey which I perceive as a highly complex, irregular and heterogeneous geographic, cultural and social identity.

When I moved to the UK to undertake my PhD research, the concept of ‘home’ has become even more problematic and when I was directed the question of “Where are you from?”, I could not resist but always ask back, “What do you mean?” – was it what was written on my ID, my birthplace, my heritage and roots, or where I currently live, or how I feel where I am from? After six years of living abroad in different countries and observing Turkey through rare and short visits and with the help of Internet, I have started to feel that, the notions of identity, ‘home’ and belonging are dynamic processes which may change when one experiences new realities and practice self-reflexivity. Hence, if I decided to settle back in Turkey, I would not consider it as ‘return’ even though I have lived only one third of my life outside of Istanbul and my entire family is still based in there. So, how could I assume that my respondents, the second-generation Turkish-Germans could give direct answers to my questions related to their identities, place-attachments and belongingness whilst they have been experiencing all their lives in a state of mind that Salman Rushdie (1992) beautifully describes with the following lines: “Sometimes we feel we straddle two cultures; at other times, that we fall between two stools” (p.15).

When I came to Antalya for the first time in 2014 for the joint research project with Professor Russell King, I was not expecting to have research findings that are quite different than our previous research findings in Istanbul and villages in the Black Sea region. The existential drive of the respondents to have a ‘better life’ based on self-actualisation and self-development was not an endeavour of the previous sample groups. The ‘returnees’ in Antalya did not want to straddle two cultures or fall between two stools, they wanted to have a space where they could perform their multiple identities and, being employed in the tourism sector and living in an international environment provided them with such ‘third space’ they have wished for in order to reflect on themselves without the pressure of their families, friends and responsibilities. This observation in the field has raised four important questions that can be found in Bakewell’s (2010, p.1703) critical theory which aims to deal with the problem of eclectic mix of migration theories and yet try to inform a coherent theory for migration. I have adapted his general questions to the specific case of this thesis which helped me shape the research’s theoretical framework and analysis of the findings: 1) Who moves from Germany to Antalya and why? 2)
Why these people and not others (the other Turkish ‘returnees’ from Germany)? 3) Why do they move to Antalya rather than another place? 4) Why now or then?

Having the above-mentioned question on mind whilst conducting the fieldwork, I have recognised the need for putting an emphasis on the duality of agency and structure, by focusing on the relationship and interplay between *external structures* such as global/national/local forces and social transformations (O’Reilly, 2012; Castles, 2007; 2010), *internal structures* such as habitus and, conjuncturally-specific internal structures which is how migrants interpret the world around them and act on the basis of their understanding (O’Reilly, 2012; Stones, 2005) *practices* which are the migrants’ actions based on their desires and projections in relation to the negotiation of these within the logic of a particular field (i.e. within the framework of ‘communities of practice’ in Wenger’s terminology, 1998) and *outcomes* which are the transformation of migrants due to their interactions with external and internal structures and transformative effects of migrants’ experiences on the societies they are embedded in (Morawska, 2009, p.6).

However, I was aware that, it would be not possible to focus on all these four aspects of ‘theory of practice’ at the same level of intensity, and there was also the challenge of how to observe and record this particular sample group’s active agency and high level of reflexivity that I was claiming them to acquire. Hence, in terms of methods, I have chosen interviews as the primary source of gaining knowledge, however I have paid attention to tourism spaces where I could observe the knowledge of my respondents on the conjuncturally-specific internal structures such as networks, roles, norms and power relations (O’Reilly, 2012, p.22) through paying attention to their performative agency (Butler, 2010) and symbolic interactionism (Goffman, 2012). Hence, tourism spaces with its own rules, hierarchies, power geometries enabled me to observe my respondents in their everyday life settings, I could observe how my respondents were switching several languages, how they were changing roles depending on whom they were interacting with and what reflections they had about these social relationships. For instance, I could reach to other possible respondents who work in German call centres, however it would be more difficult to observe the ‘doing’ of the returnees in terms of living and working in an environment where they could perform their Turkish, German and/or cosmopolitan identities as well as utilising their various capitals to maintain and/or improve their lifestyles.

Subsequently, I have mainly focused on tourism spaces, and also included education spaces (for those respondents who used to work in tourism sector but then became German teachers) wherein I could observe how the interviews have been adjusting their habits and goals in their new environment, and what their reflections were on their transforming habitus. Other than this
conscious decision to interview ‘returnees’ who are connected to the tourism spaces, I have not set other prerequisites. In that sense, I can say that I did not bestow a privilege upon certain potential interviewees because I got on well with them, or I shared similar lifestyles and worldviews. On the contrary, I have entered all the shops in Kundu, Kaleici and Old Bazaar to ask if there were any Turkish-German returnees working, or if they knew a person which would fit into my research sample. Hence, the selection of the current sample group was not affected by my biography and positionality. For instance, as the Chapter Six will present, there are 10 interviewees who committed crimes in Germany and were deported to Turkey. These stories of crime, drug abuse, depression, discrimination and forced return came up during the interviews, therefore I did not know about these respondents’ backgrounds prior to the interviews. Listening to these unexpectedly-arose narratives, my interpretative understanding i.e. Verstehen of these unique cases was based on the effort to interpret what these events and actions meant for the respondents and understand their intentions. I negotiated on two things with myself: 1) I accepted that I was not able to empathise with these respondents’ actions in the past; 2) I refrained from categorising them as ‘criminals’, hence instead of typifying them and associating them with certain types of behaviour, I have focused on how they have managed to change their lives for the better through settling in Antalya, getting employed or launching entrepreneurial activities in the tourism sector.

The example of the deported respondents is perhaps an extreme case wherein I was an obvious ‘outsider’ as an educated woman who had a trouble-free upbringing. However, during all the interviews, I have kept in mind that, regardless of what techniques or tactics adopted in interviewing, interviews could never be entirely reciprocal (Atkinson & Silverman, 1997; Edwards & Mauthner, 2002) and yet, through my research experience within this topic and having had interviews with over 100 ‘returnees’ prior to the thesis project, I knew that it was possible to blur the boundaries of power hierarchies between the interviewer and interviewee, if the interviewer could channel the feeling to the informant, “This is your private space to reflect on yourself and life, and I am listening to you.” In addition, during the collection of these life-story narratives I gave space for narratives that “reveal multiple and conflicting self-expressions” (McAdams, 2008, p.243) as emphasised in Hermans’ theory of the “dialogical self” (1996, p.119). Another point which is directly linked to the narratives is that the informants who are the narrators of their stories did not always follow a chronological structure; some chose to start from present to past, some preferred to tell their stories from different time periods and sometimes they lead the conversation in a way that it can be off-topic. As Carr (1985, p.115) states, “Perhaps our lives resemble novels, but bad ones, cluttered and undisciplined ones.” In these cases, I mostly allowed
the informants to continue, but also asked questions that would bring them back to the chronological order, nevertheless restraining myself from intervening or interrupting.

In terms of the collection of interviews, power hierarchies were already present at the stage of reaching out to the interviewees. There were certain barriers to be crossed over in order to talk to the potential informants and convince them to participate in the research. 38 interviews took place in informants’ work places, tourist shops, tourism agencies and hotels; hence it was important to establish trust with the informants and their colleagues/bosses. Especially in the Old Bazaar and Kundu district where it is unusual to find locals and domestic tourists, the shop workers would think of me as a tourist, claiming in great surprise that I did not look ‘Turkish’. When I approached the shop workers and explained my study, they would not associate me with a ‘researcher’, thinking that I looked young. For instance, one interviewee that I contacted through a Facebook group and met in a café for the interview told me that he was expecting to see a middle-aged woman with glasses and scruffy hair. Hence, stereotypes or subjective classifications of behaviour and presentation regarding age, occupation, ethnicity were the initial barriers, and I could establish ‘trust’ after giving more information about myself and chatting with them prior to the interview, until finally they could put me in certain categories in their minds, so I was not a suspicious stranger anymore.

What was also new and exciting for me was to realise that the respondents’ understanding of Antalya as providing an ‘authentic’ and ‘fulfilling’ life was mainly influenced by the German cultural imaginary rather than the Turkish one. Hence, in a sense these ‘returnees’ have managed to unlock and get access to a tourism/expat/lifestyle migration space with the help of their human and transcultural capital that the Turkish people cannot easily enter. I was an ‘outsider’ to this space because for my family Antalya has never been a holiday destination, we would choose less touristic places in the Aegean coast or in Fethiye and instead of staying in hotels we would stay in relatives’ summer houses or in camping places. I have interpreted my respondents initial suspicion about me to this aspect; I was in a space which the Turkish people rarely entered, especially as a young woman without company. However, it helped the potential informants to accept joining in the research when I gave more insights about the topic of ‘return migration’ and showed that I was knowledgeable about the Turkish-German migration phenomena. Additionally, my knowledge of the German language, education system and migration laws made the informants feel more comfortable, especially when I spoke German and showed understanding of the history of Turkish immigration to Germany, the informants felt excited to talk to me, as one informants put it, “It feels great to talk about my life to a person who knows the history of Turks in Germany!”
Throughout the fieldwork and the analysis of this thesis, I focused on celebrating personal subjectivity and knowledge both for me as a researcher and for my informants while constantly revising my assumptions and hypotheses from the point of fieldwork to analysis. Hence, it was important for me to adopt a researcher role who is visible in the frame of the research as an interested and subjective actor rather than a detached and impartial observer. I was aware that my gender, age, appearance and ‘cultural baggage’ all matter in the hierarchy of the interview setting depending on the features of the informant. Reflecting upon the power hierarchies was useful in understanding the informants’ behaviour and narratives. For instance, I have observed that the informants paid attention to speak formally and clearly while talking to me, they also paid attention to their dialect; as they could hear that I was speaking with an Istanbul accent, they also tried to speak ‘high Turkish’, even though when they were talking to their colleagues or locals around, they would speak with regional dialects and use more slangs or swear words. These positions in the hierarchy was shifted when the respondents spoke German as they were more fluent than me, and when they had to interact with the German customers – therefore pausing the interview – they would make their conversations longer, joke with the German tourists and even tell them that I was researching about the Turkish people of Germany, and that they were giving me an interview. In these instances, I could observe that they were proving me in practice how the German language, culture and ways of doing things were embedded in their identity and daily lives, and to the German tourists, the respondents were on one hand reminding that they were more than sales men and women; and on the other hand, their experiences and lives in Germany and Turkey were valuable for a scientific research.

In terms of the interview setting, the interviews were mostly held at informants’ work places. Those who worked in shops sat outside of the shop as they would need to interact with the tourists and when they had customers, the recorder was taken on pause. Observing their interactions with mainly German tourists added depth to the collected data, how the informants communicate with especially German tourists and their bosses/colleagues showed the ways in which they actively engage in performativity (the dramaturgical self) and utilise their “transcultural capital” in order to make sales; the informants were switching between Turkish, English, German, and sometimes Dutch and Russian, and communicating/acting differently with different customers to establish friendly relations with the customers and convince them into buying their products. The informants were careful not to have a third party during our conversations, especially they wanted discretion from their Turkish colleagues, as most of the respondents chose to keep their personal stories in private in their new life in Antalya.
There was one incident however, when I was interviewing a young respondent who has been living in Turkey only for a few years and working in a huge textile shop selling the imitated versions of big international brands. My respondent was talking about how he does not comprehend why most textile shops in Antalya sell “fake” brands, instead of using the same high-quality for authentic designs and creating local brands. The store’s boss who was more senior in age, originally from Istanbul and a third-generation trader of his family came and sat down with us, immediately dominating the conversation, because in his opinion, why would I need an “Almanacı’s” uninformed opinion about the tourism sector in Antalya? I smiled at my respondent and told his boss that I was interested in my respondent’s observations, and I would be willing to listen to his expert views as well, so that we could arrange an interview for that. When the boss left after arranging an interview day with me, my respondent said in an expostulated manner, “See, this is how they see us, as Almanaci, like we have no idea about anything in Turkey.”

Conducting the interviews in work spaces was useful in order to observe my respondents’ role identities and how they position themselves in the ‘field’. For that reason, none of the interviews were held in ‘home space’. Homes are endowed with emotional and cultural value through expression of taste and cultural capital, the celebration of historical authenticity, or the observance of modern minimalism (Jackson, 2000). However, this research’s informants have long shifts and they spend most of their time in their working spaces which is also their social spaces. 3 interviews were held in a private school because the informants were working there, with informants who worked in hotels, the interviews were held in the hotels. Only 3 interviews were held in cafes, in their informants’ off times. Public places also embody tacit cultural assumptions – about the classification and processing of people and things, about commercial and professional transactions, about political processes and citizenship (Möller & Pehkonen, 2003). In all cases, careful observation helped me as a researcher to make sense of my informants’ worlds of meaning, behaviour and communication styles. As much as talking and conversing is a way of telling a story, the moments of silence, behaviour during thinking and dealing with somewhat harder stories also gave clues about the person and their life stories. These are accounted as important points of reference to evaluate how the interviewees dealt with the past; therefore, unstructured notes related to these moments were taken during the interviews.

Before getting into the ethical issues and strategies within this research, I would like to give a framework research ethics. Saunders et al. (2009, p.183) refer to ethics as the appropriateness of the researcher’s behaviour in relation to the rights of the subjects of the research. Blumberg et al. describe ethics as the “norms or standards of behaviour that guide...
moral choices about our behaviour and our relationships with others” (2008, p.34). Within such definition, it is important to conceptualise the term ‘norm’ and ‘social norm’ since norms are – as the philosophical stance of this research argues, socially constructed. Therefore, acknowledging the social norms within the research fieldwork is vital as social norms are “the type of behaviour that a person ought to adopt in a particular situation” (Saunders, et al., 2009, p.184). Being aware of the social norms of the given context, researcher can proceed with the study in a prudent manner towards their informants and during observations. In the field of social sciences, the researchers are not so obviously bound to a code of professional conduct as the Hippocratic oath (“First of all, do not harm”), however we must follow the same trait even though our interactions with other humans are different than in medical science research. There are many considerations when implementing a research with other humans. The general ethical issues are collected as the following:

1. Privacy of the participants in the research
2. The participants are free to withdraw and they are not coerced
3. The consent of the participants has to be taken
4. The data provided by the participants has to be kept confidentiality (Saunders, et al., 2009, p.185).

As the interviews covered life-stories of people, the informants were expected to talk about personal stories however, the level of “deepness” were left to their choice. I had printed documents that summarised the study and showed my contact information prior to the interviews. When they accepted to take part in the research, I gave them more information about the recording procedure and that their information would be anonymously presented. The interviews were held on oral consent basis, and the informants were given the right to withdraw or cancel the interview if they wished for. None of the informants cancelled the interviews, there were also no withdrawals.

The second point was confidentiality. Confidentiality is about data protection, for example if the researcher agreed not to share the personal story of the informant with anyone, then he/she needs to follow it. Especially in the tourism setting, most of the informants knew each other, nevertheless they did not know so much about their personal histories. In that sense, I had to assure the informants that I would not share their stories with other informants, therefore I was careful not to give away about other informants’ life-stories even though some asked questions about their colleague’s personal lives. Moreover, within the framework of this research, the informants agreed that the full transcripts of their interviews are only available to
me as the researcher, however the extracted and translated parts would be open to public. All the collected data on the recorder are kept as a folder with a password on my computer. In addition, extracts from the written diaries are kept on the computer space. The transcripts were written on Word and stored electronically. The third and final point is anonymity. The names of the informants were anonymised by using pseudonyms, and the name of their working places are not mentioned. Only the place names (city, village, country etc.) are kept in original.

4.5 Examining and Documenting the Field Material

One of the challenges of qualitative research methods is to make sure that the meaning would not get lost in translation. Following the postmodernist perspectives, this research perceives interpretation as a tool to unravel multiple meanings of notions of self, identities, presence and ‘truth’. The informants of this research are bilingual; hence it was important to give them the freedom to express themselves in their choice of languages. Even though the interviews were mostly held in Turkish, there were some parts in each interview which were in German, and sometimes sentences in English as well. Hence, both myself as the researcher and participants are “fully and fluently bilingual – they slip between the two languages during the interview” (Rallis & Rossman, 2012, p.161). These changes between three languages have occurred naturally, as the informants speak in three languages throughout their days.

In social anthropological research, researchers commonly call attention to the challenges and potential problems regarding collecting data in one language and presenting the findings in another (Regmi, et al., 2010; Temple & Young, 2004; Bradby, 2002). In cases where the researcher is also the translator, scholars suggest that quality of translation is influenced by the researcher-translator’ autobiography, knowledge of the language and culture of the people under study and the researcher’s fluency in the language of the write-up (Vulliamy, 1990). Hence, once the interviews were collected, they were transcribed whilst being simultaneously translated into English. The rationale behind this choice was related to usage of NVivo programme which supports texts in English. However, I benefited from expressions, words and idioms that are specific to the Turkish or German languages by backing up with additional explanations in the footnotes.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is not easy to ‘read’ a culture, especially when it is a mixed one nourishing from two distinct cultures and in some cases more than two. Without getting into details and criticism, I would like to use the literary/literacy metaphor of “culture as text” that Geertz (1973, p.9) popularised and commented on these ‘texts’ by stating, “What we call our data are really our own constructions of other people’s constructions of what they and
their compatriots are up to…” Language is one of these constructions; it is embedded in culture and it is continuously constructed by gender roles, class, ethnicity and religion within cultural contexts. It should be also noted that in the case of diaspora there are different jargons in the languages; certain words and sayings might be alienated from their original meanings and gain their own new meanings. Therefore, each transcription included information of the interview setting: the place of the interview, the emotional and silence moments of the interviewees, my connection to each interviewee and the process of the interviews.

Additionally, the “reflexivity journal” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.93) kept during the interviews and throughout the coding process helped me construct codes and themes. The journal starts with listing the codes along with a description of what each code means and the source of the code. After this preliminary stage, when more comprehensive codes emerged, I noted down on the journal about how and why codes were combined and what questions I was asking to data and how I was relating the codes. Later, the journal provided how the codes were interpreted and led to emerging themes. The next step was to evaluate the themes in the light of the data and theoretical perspectives and taking notes on how they all fit together. Once that was clear and the themes are accurate, I explained each theme with a few sentences on the journal. I also provided notes on why certain themes were found more useful as well as explaining the process of choosing the themes in a transparent manner.

This research study utilised a theoretically-informed thematic analysis, also drawing on certain principles of narrative analysis to further enrich the interpretation of the themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Braun and Clarke (2006, p.79) define thematic analysis as “a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns within data.” Thus, the first step of the thematic analysis consists of the repeated patterns of meaning constructed through initial coding which then will be revised and given theme names. The flexible nature of thematic analysis enables the researcher to understand the lived experience of the informants and their interaction with the structure (Holloway & Todres, 2003). Briefly, the thematic analysis of the interviews followed the stages illustrated below (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.87):

1. **Familiarising with data:** The data was translated, transcribed, read and reread and initial ideas were noted down.

2. **Generating initial codes:** Outstanding features related to the notions of self, identity, home, belonging, lifestyle choices, thoughts on better life were coded across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.
3. **Searching for themes**: These codes were then collated to potential themes, and any data relevant to each potential theme was gathered under these clusters. However, the initially designed themes such as “quest for a better life”; “escapism”; “work-life balance” and “ways and meaning of searching for self” directed the theme-making processes.

4. **Reviewing themes**: The created themes were then reviewed and checked in relation to the coded extracts and the entire data set. Later, a thematic map was generated.

5. **Defining and naming themes**: Each theme’s specifics were refined in relation to the overall story that analysis was telling, and clear definitions and names for each theme was generated. At this stage, theme names were generated in relation to the commonly referred themes in return migration and lifestyle migration, nevertheless original themes that emerged in the data set were also integrated into this framework.

6. **Producing the report**: Extract examples were selected in the forms of quotes from the interviews. The quotes were then related back of the analysis to the research question and return migration, lifestyle migration and lifestyle mobilities literatures, finally producing a report of the analysis. There are short and long quotes chosen, short quotes are used in order to exemplify a statement. The other quotes are long in case the informant is reflecting on an event, referring to the past and present circumstances, actions and emotions. I refrained from picking a sentence or two from transcriptions, just because it is in similar lines with an argument or theory. Instead, I tried to present the respondents’ stories together with their contexts and the cause-effect relationships. In long quotes, such richness of events, actions and emotions can be seen, and I believe this helps the reader to have deeper understanding of the respondents’ characters and worlds of ideas.

Furthermore, Braun and Clarke (2006) argue that thematic analysis conducted within a constructionist framework cannot and does not seek to focus on motivation or individual psychologies. Instead it seeks to theorise the socio-cultural contexts, and structural conditions, that enable the individual accounts that are provided. However, within this research, individual subjectivity and active-human agency is held important, hence, as previously introduced, narrative analysis is combined with thematic analysis to understand not only what the informants say, but also how they said it, also paying attention to individuals’ subjectivities.

There is no consensus on what narrative analysis entails, however Riessman’s (2002) framework is found useful which offers four main characteristics of the approach:

1. **Thematic analysis narrative**: This approach puts emphasis on what is being said, rather than how it is said, meaning that it focuses on the events and repeating patterns, themes
in an interview. With thematic analysis using NVivo software and following Braun and Clarke’s framework, this stage was completed for all 44 interviews.

2. **Structural analysis of narrative:** With this approach, the researcher focuses on the “how” aspect in informants’ stories, hence rather than paying attention to the content of talk, it stresses the ways in which informants narrate their stories. Their usage of words, phrases, choices of languages, their distant to their own stories are important elements to be observed. In this thesis, structural analysis was partially adopted by adding notes about each informants’ conversation styles, nevertheless these were not separately analysed.

3. **Performative analysis of narrative:** This approach places an emphasis on the non-verbal and gestural dimensions of narratives, as well as interruptions and demurrals of the informants during the interviews. This research paid close attention to the paralinguistic expressions, following Goffman’s “role theory” and Anthias’ “translocal positionality” approaches. Hence, the informants’ ‘staged selves’ during their interactions with me and the generalised Others around them were recorded on the ‘reflexive diary’.

4. **Interactional analysis of narrative:** This approach focuses on the interaction and rapport between the informant and the researcher, hence examines the dialogic co-constitution of meaning by both parties in the conversation. As it was mentioned previously, I acknowledged during the interviews and analysis process that the nature of meaning can be only constructed through approaching talk as an interactive practice, hence the details of dialogical co-constitution were also recorded through intensive notes.

### 4.6 Rigour and Limitations to the Methodology

This chapter introduced narrative inquiry as the main research strategy and thematic analysis/narrative analysis as data analysis tools as the main research strategies of this research. However, as it was discussed earlier, main criticism towards qualitative exploratory studies is that, the usage of “gaining a deeper understanding of…” as an objective does not often go further than representing an ill-defined metaphor where the researchers push the analysis until it “works” (Stiles, 1993). This is indeed a legitimate critique, as the readers cannot actually see if the researcher failed at fulfilling the research goals, because for readers, it is impossible to observe the process of research analysis. In addition, the readers cannot also measure the depth of understanding acquired by the researcher and through the methodology.

Salmon (2003) attempts to answer to this complication of what makes a ‘rigorous’ research, by suggesting that the researcher should break down the limitations of qualitative research based on an exploratory design, hence the research needs to have intact and coherent parts. It is
important to acknowledge these concerns and ask questions such as “are we discovering an underlying reality or constructing reality with qualitative research”, however even these highly-critical articles do not give concrete answers or offer methods to overcome these limitations. As the chapter explained, the thesis followed a reflexive and transparent approach to overcome these limitations, in which the reader is continuously informed about the decisions made throughout the research.

Furthermore, going back to Denzin and Lincoln’s statement regarding “rich descriptions of the social world”, this needs to be elaborated in order to grasp what it entails and how the researcher can build strategies to obtain these. Before the postmodern and post-structural turn in the ethnographic history, the dominant duty of the researcher was to search for “thick descriptions”. However, qualitative research with a postmodern stance requires the scholar to “abandon all established and preconceived values, theories, perspectives, and prejudices as resources for ethnographic study” (Vidich & Lyman, 2000, p.37). Similarly, Geertz (1973) suggests that, all anthropological writings are in fact interpretations of interpretations because the departure point of pluralistic and interpretive perspectives is cultural representations and their meanings. Based on this understanding, the researcher as an observer appears to lack a privileged voice in their interpretations of what they document regarding the local situation. Therefore, postmodernists and poststructuralists highlight the subjectivity of the human experience, and that any gaze which seeks to observe the human intentions and actions is always affected by the social world that shapes it. As Denzin (2004, p.37) argues,

There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the worlds of – and between – the observer and the observed… No single method can grasp all the subtle variations in on-going human experience.

The quote calls attention to a “crisis of representation and legitimisation”, in which the questions of “can we ever hope to speak authentically of the experience of the Other? And if not, how do we create a social science that includes the Other?” (Denzin & Ryan, 2007, p.590). Hence, the qualitative researchers need to deploy a wide range of interconnected interpretive methods, learning to adapt from a variety of new interpretive perspectives including hermeneutics, structuralism, phenomenology, cultural studies and feminism (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). However, the researcher’s interpretations of the others’ worlds of experience is “bound within a net of epistemological and ontological premises which – regardless of ultimate truth or falsity – become partially self-validating” (Bateson, 1972, p.314). The challenge of representation here is connected to the crisis of legitimisation, with the question of who has the authority over the final written product – because even though the subjects of the study may modify and
influence the written text, and the researcher may write from the perspective of the subjects – there is a power hierarchy in which the researcher becomes the dominant narrator (Stacey, 1988; Elwood & Martin, 2000).

Moreover, the authority of the text is about claiming what is written is accurate, true and complete – faithful not only to the researcher’s interest and the context of the research but also to the individuals that are represented (Denzin & Ryan, 2007, p.591). This critique to constructionist-interpretive paradigm is worth acknowledging for the researcher to follow a self-reflexive approach and determine their ways to place themselves in the text (Reason, 1994). Accepting that the constructionist paradigm has a relativist ontology with multiple realities, a subjectivist epistemology and a naturalistic set of methodological procedures; terms such as credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability replace the positivist criteria of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p.24). Hence, when setting that realities are multiple and in flux, constructionism makes it clear that generalisations and reaching to absolute facts or objective representations are not the interest of this philosophy.

This research recognises the above-mentioned critique about rigour and representation, however also accepts that there were limitations to the methodological framework adopted. Firstly, the sample could involve more women to have a gender balance, and this would require for me to either spend more time in the fieldwork to find possible candidates, or investigate different districts of Antalya. Moreover, the sample mainly reflects “success stories”, however does not depict those individuals’ lives which had similar intentions as the informants, but ended up in different lifestyles. Finally, the thesis could adopt visual methods to depict Antalya’s tourism spaces where different scales interplay and lifestyle returnees navigate in various spaces to search for self, learn about themselves and others, work and engage in leisurely activities. In that sense, the thesis adopted rather more traditional methods of collecting data with interviews and presenting the findings in textual format, which is nevertheless the expected and obligatory form of thesis submission. Hence, this thesis too, like many other social research consists of,

observing oneself observing, observing the observer in his [sic] work of observing or transcribing his [sic] observations... and... on the narrative of all these experiences which leads, more often than not, to the rather disheartening conclusion that is in the final analysis nothing but discourse, text, worse yet, pretext for text (Bourdieu, 2003, p.282).
4.7 Summary

This chapter has firstly presented the methodology of this research. After a discussion on the social construction of ‘reality’, the chapter has shown that interpretivist/relativist paradigm was followed. The chapter then presented that this thesis embraces the epistemological stance of knowledge as subjective, and it aims to understand the lifestyle returnees’ experiences and meaning-making processes through using qualitative methods. Hence, the chapter discussed that *life-story narrative* was chosen as the core research instrument to include various life stages of the informants. It was also presented that the research has an *exploratory design*, limiting the consequential findings of explanatory kind, but not completely ignoring them as the thesis follows an *abductive reasoning* which includes an iterative interplay of theory and empirical data.

The chapter then introduced the fieldwork location of the research, giving an overview of Antalya’s history and development of tourism industry. The section coming after this overview gave a detailed information about the sampling strategies and data collection processes in the field. The research was planned as a cross-sectional study, in which data collection took place within the timeframe of three months (September 9–December 3, 2015). During this time, 44 life-story interviews were collected, paying attention to *saturation*, rather than having a fixed sample size. The chapter demonstrated that the mono-method qualitative study is adopted that complements the narrative design. With *open-ended* and *in-depth non-standard interviews*, the goal was to capture in detail the lives and experiences of the ‘lifestyle returnees’ in different time-place settings. The interview questions were *semi-structured*, and a questions-guide was present during the interviews. However, there were topical trajectories that strayed from the given guide, therefore, the semi-structured method was supported with a *conversational approach*. Once establishing relations with relevant people, a *snowball sampling* was followed, wherein individuals who became research informants recommended others who fit the criteria. Alongside the interviews as the primary source of information, a *reflective diary* had been kept which collected extensive notes about my personal impressions of the respondents, their interactions and daily events that took place during the interviews.

The chapter continued with a dedicated section where I reflected on my biography in relation to the research’s topic and how my positionality had possibly influenced the data collection and analysis processes. This section ended with an overview of the ethical and risk-assessment guidelines that were followed during the collection of interviews. Following this section, the chapter presented in detail the methods to code and structure the data through *NVivo* programme as well as interpret and document the findings through a *theoretically-informed*
Finally, the last section of the chapter discussed how rigour was achieved in this research and reflected upon the limitations to the research methodology and methods regarding data collection and analysis.

This chapter has presented and explained the research design, strategies, methods of data collection and interpretation, and methodologies embraced in the thesis. The chapter has also introduced the fieldwork site, providing an overview of its characteristics and rationale for choosing it as the research site. The following next chapters present the empirical findings using relevant theories and arguments introduced in the literature review and theoretical perspectives chapters.
5 The Turkish-German Experience: Identity Formations

Through Emigration and ‘Return’

This introductory section aims at providing an initial overview, explaining briefly what the upcoming four finding chapters are about and how they fit together. The chapter starts with a historical overview of the Turkish migration phenomenon and return migration flows that has been taking place since the 1980s. Once the thesis sets the context with this brief informative introduction, it presents the empirical findings about the sample group’s characteristics. This background information about the sample groups aims at offering a better understanding of the second generation’s lifestyle migration to Antalya, how they experience the return journey, what kind of strategies and negotiations that took place and how they further have a personal plan of action, hence it is essential to explore their activities that shape their ‘translocational habitus’. The section then focuses on the second generation’s transnational and translocal practices throughout their upbringing in Germany and childhood visits to Turkey, which all evolve the meanings they attach to the concepts of ‘identity’, ‘home’ and ‘return’.

Once this chapter sets the scene for the evaluation Turkish-German diasporic space and the second generation’s transformation and transfer of these in Turkey through ‘return’, Chapter Six presents the main motivations and decision-making processes regarding the return migration. This is an introductory and rather explanatory chapter for demonstrating the relationship between the respondents’ post-return experiences of dissatisfaction/anxieties/disillusionment and the reason why they wanted to further migrate to Antalya and work in tourism-related jobs. Chapter Six provides a discussion regarding how the meanings and understandings of ‘home’ and expectations from ‘return’ have evolved during the respondents’ early days in Turkey. This is then developed in Chapter Seven which demonstrates that, the informants realise that feeling ‘homely’ and belonging to a group/place/culture/lifestyle cannot be automatically gained, instead identity and place-making require active engagement.

Hence, Chapter Seven focuses on the informants’ lives from the time of settlement to their present day and share their reflexive accounts on the self and ‘better life’ in the light of their past and present experiences. In this chapter, a critical discussion on the relationship between habitus and field is presented following the narratives of the respondents. The chapter shows that, the informants had found a space of freedom in Antalya, a “third space”, wherein their “transcultural capital” has economic, symbolic and social value. In addition, their tourism-related jobs provide them with a relatively salary, new social networks, a sense of community based on working and
dwelling with like-minded people (e.g. other Turkish-German returnees) and flexible working hours where they can enjoy leisure time. Here, how the respondents develop a sense of ‘home’ in Antalya is discussed through the manifestations of their ‘tran locational habitus’ as they navigate between different spaces in and beyond Antalya, build social relations with German and international tourists/expats, speak German, English and Turkish (in some cases other languages) during the day, practice both Turkish and German traditions, and yet focus on freely expressing and living by the rules of their personal lifestyles (hobbies, expression of lifestyle through clothing, accessories, home-decoration, choice of vehicle e.g. motorcycle etc.).

Chapter Eight then gets into the detail of how such harmony between the field and habitus/types of capital are actively constructed through the respondents’ goal of searching for self – firstly by escaping from certain conditions, mind-sets, lifestyles and places in order to have a fresh start to be more autonomous and secondly by practices of learning (about the self, Others, skills and world around them) – and in turn, how such harmony and ‘fitting’ improves the respondents’ general and psychosocial wellbeing, enabling them to realise their competencies, capabilities, desires. This process of self-actualisation and conscious efforts to improve their lives for the better have a positive effect on the respondents’ self-esteem, and they feel more courageous to change their conditions. For instance, some respondents keep their options for further mobility and migration open – as they realise that they are able to work abroad through tourism-jobs. Based on these findings, the chapter concludes that return migration needs to be evaluated as an ongoing project with divergent future mobility/migratory paths depending on the individuals’ structural restrictions, how they perceive their own abilities and capabilities to act to change their environments and living conditions.

5.1 A Historical Overview: From Guestworkers to A Multi-Layered Diaspora

The emigration of Turkish people to Germany was the hallmark of the wider phenomenon of European post-war labour migration, and of its transformation from temporary migrant labourers – ‘guestworkers’ – into settled migrant communities (Castles, et al., 1984). Turkey made labour ‘export’ agreements with Germany (1961), Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands (1964), France (1965) and Sweden (1967). Despite this diversity, Germany quickly became the main destination for Turkish migrants, the Turkish community becoming the dominant migrant nationality in Germany (Martin, 1991). The Turkish guestworkers could be both valorised as a vital contribution to satisfy the labour demand during the post-war economic boom.
The Turkish guestworker community matured into a multi-dimensional diaspora in the last 56 years spanning four generations, due to family reunifications and irregular migration between 1973-1980s, and new migratory flows with refugees, students and highly-skilled migrants during the 1980s due to the political turmoil and the 1980 coup d'état in Turkey (Aydın, 2016). Today, the Turkish community is the largest minority in Germany with 2.851,000 people (making up 16% of the total migrant population) – including dual citizens (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2015). According to the latest statistics, there are 1,506,113 people who hold only Turkish citizenship, even though 440,469 of them were born in Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2015). The figure below shows the current statistics regarding the Turkish residents’ distribution in each federal region in Germany.

**Figure 4: Turkish population in Germany by federal region**

According to diaspora theorists, the Turkish community in Germany was acknowledged as a diaspora group (Safran, 1991). In Cohen’s (1996) typology of diasporas, the Turkish case is a
clear example of labour diasporas, even though this conceptualisation does not reflect the heterogeneity of the Turkish community in its current state. On the other hand, a more recent typology by Bruneau (2010) evaluates diasporas within the categories of entrepreneurial (Chinese, Indian diasporas), religious (Greek, Armenian, Jewish diasporas), political (Palestinian) and racial/cultural (African, or “black diasporas”), however does not put the Turkish case in any of these categories. Bruneau discusses the Turkish case separately, claiming that the Turkish case is a “transnational community” because “the diaspora does not precede the emergence of the nation-state, but comes after it” (2010, p.42). He also finds it a complex case of labour migration and exile (political refugees), involving mixed ethnic backgrounds and religions (and sects).

So, who were these guestworkers, and how did these guests become permanent settlers? Turkish labour migrants were recruited mainly for factory work, filling the shop-floor jobs that German workers were reluctant to do. Most of the early migrant workers were men, who were given temporary contracts and housed in worker hostels. However, some women were also recruited, mainly to work in light industries such as electrical goods and textiles/clothing, and the number of migrant women in the workforce increased when family reunions were allowed in 1972. In 1965, the conservative-led coalition government under Chancellor Erhard responded to the presence of (mostly Muslim) migrant groups, with a ‘foreigner law’ (Ausländergesetz) granting limited rights to ‘guestworkers’. The government, at the time, considered the presence of foreigners as a temporary problem, which would resolve itself over time (Faas, 2009).

It is vital to appreciate that important changes in the socio-educational status and geographical origins of the Turkish migrants took place over the comparatively short span of years between 1961 and 1973. In the first few years of recruitment, the migrants were mainly men from Istanbul in their 20s and 30s who were relatively skilled and educated compared to the average working population in Turkey at that time. Subsequently, between the mid-1960s and 1973, the scale of migration increased and its geographical spread of origins widened to include mainly rural areas, with the result that average educational levels of the migrants markedly dropped.

The peak of Turkish labour migration in Europe was between 1971 and 1973, during which more than half a million Turkish workers came to Western Europe. 90 per cent of them were employed by German industries (Özükren & Van Kempen, 1997). When Germany was hit by the oil crisis in 1973, it decided to stop the intake of foreign workforce. In the same year, the Federal Republic introduced a ‘recruitment ban’ (Anwerbestopp) to halt the inflow of guestworkers. However, this had the unintended result of convincing many Turkish guestworkers in Germany
to stay. Family reunifications started from the 1970, increased the number of children and women. After the ‘recruitment-stop’ in 1973, family reunion, usually of women and children, but occasionally husbands joining already-migrated wives, as well as marriage migration, were the only legal means through which the growth of the Turkish population in Germany could be sustained. No new workers were recruited, except of course that many joining spouses sought and found work, mostly in low-status manufacturing and service jobs.

During this time, and despite the economic downturn triggered by the oil crisis, return migration to Turkey was an option rejected by most of the Turkish migrants in Germany, largely because the Turkish economy remained as underdeveloped. The rapid demographic evolution of the Turkish-origin population in Germany at this crucial juncture can be seen by comparing age and sex data across the period from 1974 to 1985: the proportion of women increased from 35.7 to 42.3 per cent, and of children and young people under the age of 21 (i.e. 1,5 and second generation) grew from 29.6 to 45.6 per cent of the total.

Yet the slowdown in the growth of the number of immigrants was temporary, and the number of new entrants again peaked in the 1980s. A mass migration of refugees was recorded following the 1980 military intervention in Turkey. The second oil crisis resulted into an economic crisis, and long-term unemployment became a serious problem. From that moment on migration from Turkey almost exclusively existed of family and asylum migration (Euwals, et al., 2007). This was first followed by a steady inflow of asylum seekers and later by clandestine migrants until the 2000s (Sirkeci, et al., 2012). Since the turn of the millennium, there has been a continuous decline in Turkish migration to Germany and elsewhere, largely due to strong economic development in Turkey and the fluctuating prospect of EU membership.

Meanwhile in Germany, between 1974 and the early 1980s, the leadership of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt formulated three principles to regulate guest work, namely (1) the ‘integration’ of those who have the right to live in Germany, (2) the continuation of the 1973 ban on recruitment and (3) financial incentives to support the return of migrants to their countries of origin through the 1983 law for the ‘Promotion of Readiness to Return’ (Gesetz zur befristeten Förderung der Rückkehrbereitschaft von Ausländer). Under this law, every guest worker who voluntarily left Germany received a financial incentive of 10.500 Deutsche-Mark but only about 250.000 Turkish migrants responded to this ‘opportunity’ (Bade & Münz, 2000).

In the late 1990s, important steps were taken in terms of integration policies. The victory of the Social Democrats and the Greens in the late 1990s paved the way for a new Nationality Act, which came into force in 2000. German citizenship which based upon the principle of *ius
sanguinis\textsuperscript{16} for most of the twentieth century was reformed, allowing foreigners to obtain German citizenship. This legislation gave the right of citizenship based on the \textit{ius soli} principle to children born in Germany and whose parents had resided legally in the country for the past 8 years. It also temporarily accepted dual citizenship.

Regarding the dual citizenship, the German government of 2001 introduced the Immigration Act (\textit{Zuwanderungsgesetz}) a reduced and compromised version of which came into effect on January 1, 2005. The citizenship laws in this Act allow foreigners to obtain citizenship in a much more proactive stance towards integration. Since January 2000, immigrants’ children born in Germany (who have at least one parent who has been in the country continuously for eight years) gain automatic citizenship (\textit{ius soli} principle). They have the right to hold dual citizenship until the age of 23 when they need to decide between German citizenship and the citizenship of the country of origin (\textit{Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen}, 2000). The new law also includes provisions that ease the acquisition of citizenship for first generation immigrants, by reducing the residency requirement in Germany from 15 to 8 years (Ehrkamp & Leitner, 2003).

According to Rittersberger-Tiliç, et al. (2013, p.90), increased diversification in the origins of the immigrant population in Germany over the past twenty years reduced Turkish’s share of the total foreigner population from more than a third in the late 1990s to one quarter by the late 2000s. Table 5 illustrates how Nationality Act increased the number of Turkish immigrants who followed the naturalisation process. In 2003, 56,244 Turkish immigrants were naturalised. In 2011, this number fell to 28,103. According to Kaya and Kentel (2005), the reason of such a decline could be that Turkish-Germans are already satisfied with ‘denizenship’ status, which gives them civil, social and cultural rights but not political rights. Another reason may be that Turkish-Germans had expected a more liberal citizenship law to be put into effect without any limitation on dual citizenship.

\textsuperscript{16} The Basic Law does not prescribe how citizenship is recognised or conferred, but the criteria are based first and foremost on ethnic nationality. The rules governing the acquisition of citizenship are defined by Basic Law Art. 116, the preamble to the Basic Law and the 1913 Imperial and State Citizenship Law (\textit{Reichs- und Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz}) and provide that citizenship is passed by descent from parent to child (Kaya & Kentel, 2005).
According to the Turkish Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 3,849,360 Turkish citizens were abroad in 2009. This number, which excludes Turks who are naturalised German citizens, included 1,713,551 Turks living in Germany (Sırkeci et al., 2012). The Turkish Ministry of Labour and Social Security data shows that 777,904 Turkish citizens acquired German citizenship between 1972 and 2009 (Aydın, 2016). Undocumented Turkish immigrants are difficult to enumerate, and this makes it impossible to accurately know the size of Germany’s Turkish community, which some estimate may include between 2.6 million (Boomgaarden et al., 2010) to 4 million individuals (Strielkowski & Glazar, 2014).

Today, Turkish immigrants constitute the largest minority in Germany. Yet, Kaya and Kentel (2005, p.6) argue:

There is a lack of awareness in both the homeland and ‘hostland’ concerning the characteristics of migrants and their children. It is still commonly believed in Turkey that migrants of Turkish origin and their descendants in the West are *gurbetçi*, with a strong orientation towards the homeland that will someday bring them home. On the other hand, they are also called *Almanca*, a term that depicts such individuals as being rich, eating pork, having a very comfortable life in the West, losing their Turkishness and becoming increasingly Germanised, Anglicised or Frenchified, etc. They are also stereotypically called ‘foreigner’ in their own countries of settlement.

What the authors mean by being called as “foreigners” is not only found in the social space but also in the legal context. The German statistics widely use the term “migration background” (*Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund*) to refer to those individuals not born in Germany, foreign nationals (even born in Germany), and those with at least one parent not born in Germany.

---

Table 8: Turkish citizens’ number of naturalisation 1990-2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Naturalisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>46,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>103,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>64,631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, the second generation Turkish even though born and raised in Germany, or holding German citizenship are considered as migrants. Such conceptualisation and the statistical numbers reveal a problematic situation for the de facto citizens: they have become German residents with a foreign passport and were demanded to assimilate to the legal, social and economic order and cultural, political values (Ausländergesetz of 1991) (Fischer & McGowan, 1995).

Furthermore, despite similar conditions of recruitment between the Turkish guestworkers and other groups from the Former Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, Portugal and Spain, there have been an especially strong ethnic and religious labelling for the Turkish guestworkers (Faas, 2010). Whilst the immigrants from these mentioned nation-states have increasingly gained rights due to their countries’ membership in the European Economic Community (EEC) (later the European Union), the “Turkish Question” has been exploited in the political discourse based on cultural, educational and religious differences of Turkish people, as well as their inability to integrate into the German society (Fischer & McGowan, 1995). Since the 9/11 and later with attacks in London, Paris, Madrid, the rhetoric evolved into the justification of discriminating the ‘non-Christian other’ which is the strengthening public and political discourse with the recent flows of Muslim refugees to Germany (i.e. Palestinians, Syrians etc.). Despite the policy changes in 1999 regarding the citizenship law (from ius sanguinis, kinship principle to ius soli, territory principle), the highly-criticised political discourse of “Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland!” (“Germany is not a country of immigration”) remained until the Merkel government agreed to adopt the EU’s common principles for immigrant integration policy in 2005 (Brubaker, 2009, p.174).

Moving on with the return migration from Germany to Turkey, it can be claimed that return migration has been an ever-present feature of Turkish migration to Germany. Martin (1991) estimated an aggregate of 1 million returnees during 1960-90, but there have been phases of greater or lesser return. According to Gitmez (1983), 190.000 returned in the wake of the first oil recession (1974-77) and another 200.000 between 1978 and 1983 (second oil crisis). Mainly, the ‘return incentive’ scheme operated by the German government resulted in around 310.000 Turkish to return to Turkey between the end of 1983 and 1985 (Ayhan, et al., 2010). Figure 4 illustrates the recent migratory flows between Turkey and Germany, highlighting that each year between 2006 and 2012 more people moved from Germany to Turkey than in the opposite direction.
Return migration to Turkey has been the subject of number of studies over the past forty years, starting with the detailed field research on the impact of return migration on employment and development in Boğazlıyan district coordinated by the Dutch-Turkish REMPLOD team (Abadan-Unat, et al., 1975) and continuing with several other, shorter contributions over the intervening period (Toepfer, 1985; Razum, et al., 2005; Rittersberger-Tiliç, et al., 2013). There is, however, a blank spot over the ‘return’ of the descendants of the original migrants. Anecdotal evidence, especially from those who ‘know’ the situation on the ground, suggests that this is a growing migratory phenomenon in Turkey nowadays.

A more recent study, which focuses on the return migration of the Turkish guestworkers shows that “return was rarely based on purely economic or health-related motives; value-oriented and emotional themes almost always played a role” (Razum, et al., 2005, p.719). The authors introduce three ‘ideal’ types of returnees:

1. the ‘nostalgic’ returnee who faces socio-economic problems in Turkey. S/he strongly feels that Almancı (Germanised Turks) are being discriminated against in Turkey and has a transfigured notion of life in Germany which they would like to, but cannot resume;
2. the ‘cultural traditionalist’ who considers Turkish culture superior and left Germany without remorse after having made some money;
3. the ‘player of two systems’ who thrives both in Turkey and in Germany. S/he has a more prosaic view of Turkey than the traditionalist and a less transfigured notion of everyday life in Germany than the nostalgic returnee (pp.734-735).

However, this study only explores the return motivations of male labour migrants. It is also a generic typology of the labour migrants’ return. As King and Kilinc (2014) show, one of the
reasons why the first generation returned from Germany was because the German government had introduced a stipend around 10,500 German Marks to encourage the migrants which many Turkish guest workers accepted and returned.

Aydın’s study (2012) with Germany-born Turkish returnees who are highly-qualified shows that these individuals chose to live in Turkey for job-related reasons, for ‘reuniting with the roots’ (culture, identity and belonging motives), family-related motivations, either following their returning parents or marrying a Turkish partner, and for education and research purposes. Aydın (2016, p.10) further explains that, “Most are drawn to Turkish cities, especially the metropolitan city of Istanbul, described by one interviewee as a ‘treasure’ for its rich culture, multifarious traditions, and variety of lifestyles.” Following the introduction of this rather new phenomenon of the ‘return’ of highly-skilled Turkish to Germany, Aydın argues that 2000s marked the ‘circular migration’ rather than permanent returns, in which Turkish individuals are highly mobile and live between two nation-states (including retired Turkish people who seasonally stay in Turkey). Other studies also suggest that highly-qualified Turkish from Germany are internationally more mobile and inclined to move to Turkey than less-qualified and low skilled Turkish individuals from Germany (Sirkeci & Zeyneloğlu, 2014).

Nevertheless, there is no exact data on how many Turkish immigrants returned from Germany. There is also no consensus on what kind of problems Turkish immigrants face when they return to Turkey. The only debate which was introduced on media is about Turkish immigrants who became German citizens and therefore lost their political rights in Turkey. Especially, the lack of research on the second generation return shows that return migration theories need to expand to analyse these contemporary developments within international migration. One issue regarding the Turkish-Germans in Turkey picked up on media is about their social and political rights. For instance, having the ‘roots’ from Turkey is not enough to have political rights in Turkey. This is for instance, one of the problems regarding those Turkish people who return to Turkey but having problems due to not having Turkish citizenship.17 However, as it was stressed, these issues are not often covered in academic research.

17 Turkey has granted special privileges (residence, work, investments) through the “Blue Card” scheme to Turkish migrants who were naturalised in Germany, however it does not grant political rights (Çağlar, 2004; Pusch, 2016).
5.2 The Second Generation’s Transnational Ties and Translocal Practices

This section gives background information about the Turkish second-generation’s upbringing and lives in Germany prior to ‘returning’ to Turkey through the life stories of the informants. In that sense, the section gives insights about the informants’ interactions in various cultural spaces as well as the effects of these processes on their “transcultural capital” and identity formations. The section further puts the notion of ‘culture’ under a critical lens. In order to read through why and how the second generation construct and/or contest belongings to certain places and spaces, it is crucial to evaluate culture as a dynamic process. Within this framework, ‘cultural space’ is not portrayed to consist of an accumulation of the rituals, practices and artefacts of the past. Instead, culture is a changing and constantly occurring phenomenon in which sets of practices are transformed and redefined within the continuum of time-space, hence resulting in complex patterns of cultural hybridity (Nederveen-Pieterse, 2004; Wallerstein, 2005).

As it was discussed in the theoretical discussions, Anthias’ (2008, p.8) notion of “translocational positionality” is highly useful in understanding the second generation’s “relations, divisions and identities” which are pertinent to their lives. Following her argument, it is important to scrutinise the spaces where the informants spent a large amount of time, as these are social spaces produced within contextual, spatial, temporal and hierarchical relations around the intersections of social divisions and identities.

5.2.1 Imaginings of ‘Home’ Through Family Narratives

Turkish guestworkers in Germany, conceptualised as the first generation has pursued the aim of returning to their homeland, once they have acquired the human and economic capital to ensure a prosperous living for their families upon return. This group’s life choices in the hostland had the intention of preparing the right circumstances to put their personal plan of return into action. It is difficult to identify the underpinning motivations for the first generation’s return, as this group is not the focus of this research, however the informants’ narratives affirm that their parents’ return projects reflect the entanglement of economic and psychological aspects to ‘maximise their lifetime earnings’. One explicit example of return preparations is the first generation’s investment in their homeland, commonly through buying property, or land to construct a house or apartment block. In addition, they supported the extended family members and relatives with remittances, who, in turn took over the role of carrying out the construction process. These investments clearly represent the economic aspect of the entire return plan.
however, it also indicates the psychological dimension of fortifying a secured environment in advance. In other words, the first generation were concerned with having an actual home to live in once they return to homeland.

Even though return project did not always take place, the first generation has always had this idea in the back of their minds. As one of the informants put it,

My father’s only worry was to die in Germany. All the people I know from his generation were concerned about this, so they’d buy burial space in Turkey. They wanted to spend their last years in their villages, surrounded by nature… Another fear was their children to forget their roots, forgetting about the motherland (Zafer, M35).

In his narrative, Zafer shows that his father feared dying outside of Turkey. In a way, this may indicate that for the first generation, the place of return would ultimately be their homeland, where they were born and where they would like to die. This is reflected in the second part of Zafer’s narrative wherein he mentions that the first generation was concerned that their children – the second generation – would be alienated towards Turkey. Hence, the first generation did not only want to reunite with their homeland to complete the circle of life, but also wished that their descendants would be loyal to their ‘Turkish’ roots.

Continuing with the meaning of homeland in relation to return, it can be said that the first generation’s return project is attached to the expectation of ‘homecoming’, echoed in their primary prospect of reconnecting with the people and place that they have once left. The informants of this research gave detailed accounts of how their parents had emigrated to Germany, as well as their plans for returning to Turkey. These narratives were articulated with such precision of names, dates, events and locations that, it indicates the informants have been able to gather information about their roots and family stories from different sources. One of the main sources of such accumulated knowledge was oral storytelling in which their parents and relatives communicated their early experiences as guestworkers.

Another source was the personal reflections of the informants on their family lives, observing that their working-class immigrant parents made conscious efforts to save money in order to have more comfortable and affluent living conditions once they resettle in the ancestral homeland. Parents planning and discussing about return with each other, and with relatives or other Turkish families around them was a recurring topic at dinner tables and tea parties. Exchanging ideas about return with other families indicate that the first generation did not want to be the family that has taken the wrong decision. Such anxieties about resettling in the
homeland highlight the complex decision making processes of return in which the immigrants face the challenge of estimating the pros and cons.

Despite the first generation’s apprehension regarding resettling in Turkey, their emotional attachment to the homeland is vigorous. As the previous narrative stated, they had the fear of their children being estranged towards their own culture. In that sense, the first generation put integration to the German society and culture as secondary goal for themselves and their children and they cared firstly and foremost about raising their children with Turkish culture and values. Therefore, many families were protective towards their children to preserve their language, culture and traditions. The narratives portray that the informants tried to be receptive towards their parents’ reservations, but at the same time felt “stuck” between the lifestyle dictated by their families and their social sphere outside of the family space, especially throughout their adolescence years.

For building a ground for understanding the return motivations and the lived experiences of the ancestral homeland, the next section delves into the informants’ ‘Turkish’ upbringing in Germany with the aim of exploring the formation of their ‘translocational habitus’. The findings demonstrate the complex dynamics of the second generation’s identity and belonging, and lifestyle aspirations in relation to these processes. Exploring the interplay of these, the next sections aim to unravel how the informants constructed and alter their homeland-orientation and return imaginings.

5.2.2 Negotiating Identities and Contesting Belongings in Translocal Social Fields

In her work on discursive formations on Turkish immigrants in Germany, Çağlar (1995, pp.3-4) pointed out that,

despite the sheer volume of research on Turkish migrants in Germany, far too little thus known about the cultural preoccupations and visions for the future of second generation Turks. Second, as a result of the social-problem and deviance oriented frameworks adopted in the research, Turkish youth is not approached and studied in terms of its ideals, self-images and “sense of place” within German society… Moreover, there are no studies that seek to disclose the ways Turkish youths in Germany makes sense of themselves, their lives, and the world as a lived-in reality, the way this youth construes commitments around cultural forms and practices, and the ways in which these practices and their “affective commitments” empower young Turks.
Hence, it was important for this research to let the second generation re-tell their stories from their upbringing in Germany, their ‘[Turkish] diaspora space’ and various cultural spaces they have encountered and how these affected their formations of self-concept and place-attachments.

To start with the language aspect, it would be appropriate to claim that the second generation is a bilingual generation, but the question is how this condition affect the ways in which they build and negotiate their identities. In that sense, Turkish community in Europe, compared to other minority groups is found to be “better equipped to maintain its heritage language for a long time” (Backus, 2013, p.771). When the informants were asked about their personal identity formations during their upbringing in Germany, language practices were vocalised as the pillar of building self-identity vis-à-vis the family/home space and other social spaces such as school, work place, neighbourhood. Language is as a robust marker of social and cultural identity at many levels in society (Jaspal & Cinnirella, 2012) and in Durkheim’s terms operates as the “mechanical glue”, intrinsic to cultural expression (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008). In the case of diasporas, language maintenance is essential to preserve the native culture. Hence, language’s purpose is stretched beyond mere communication: language can express group membership (Giles & Johnson, 1987) and solidarity (Jørgensen, 2003; Hua, 2008). The first generation who had limited or no prior knowledge of German upon their settlement as guestworkers naturally felt more comfortable speaking in Turkish in their home space and with other Turkish speakers around them. Furthermore, they communicated with their children in Turkish, because it was convenient but also served the purpose of symbolic attachment to the homeland culture.

The narratives suggest that, even as youngsters, the informants’ agency was social and interdependent, and they had personal strategies to form social bonds and networks through their language capital. This requires conscious utilisation of the languages they can speak, depending on the circumstances. For instance, the respondents helped their parents in learning German, by practicing with them at home. The informants commonly narrated that they used to assist their parents with the German language in hospitals or government institutions. At times, they also had to act as mediators between their German neighbours or landlords and their parents. Some of the informants acted as translators and “para-phraseurs” for their parents when they were as young as 6 and 7 years old. As several research point out, these practices are a commonality amongst immigrants’ children (Orellana, et al., 2003; Moskal & Tyrrell, 2016).

These examples signify how the second generation took on ‘adult’ roles and acted as meditators between two cultures whilst the notions of ‘host’ and ‘home’ culture are intertwined,
and at times blurred (Eskner & Orellana, 2012). The second generations’ integral role in their families appears to be introducing their parents to the customs and practices of the ‘host’ country (White, et al., 2011). Through the experiences of the second generation, the first generation learn how things work in the society, especially in spaces that they would not be able to get a first-hand experience e.g. school. These points of reference are influential in the family decision-making processes and affect the first generation’s plans for staying in the hostland or building a future in the homeland (Hutchins, 2011).

However, their ‘bridging role’ between their Turkish and German spaces was not always easy for the informants, whilst they were figuring out about who they were and the social environment around them, they also had the burden of adopting ‘adult’ roles. As one of the informants put it:

I was trying to integrate myself as a child, and I also had to teach my parents about the German culture. Normally your parents teach you… So, I guess that’s why I couldn’t take my parents seriously. They are good people, but I feel that I raised myself, I learned things on my own (Giray, M42).

Giray’s reflection on how adopting an ‘adult’ role influenced the ways in which he perceived his parents offers insights about the anxieties associated with the second generation: The respondents were aware of the hierarchy shift in their families, hence they started taking their parents’ rules and decisions less seriously. Secondly, in other interviews as well, the respondents commonly revealed that they felt the urge to stand on their own feet at a young age because they believed their parents lacked knowledge about the society they were living in, hence they have been active agents in the formation of social capital, with their ability to build their own social networks (Holland, et al., 2007). This idea of recognising children as active agents in the formation of social capital is rather new and has recently been developed in more contemporary research (Holland, et al., 2007; Tyrrell, 2015; Gardner, 2012; Valentine, et al., 2008).

Furthermore, the narratives portray, the family as being the first and one of the most influential cultural space for the second generation. In a Foucauldian (1991) sense, the family space resembles a micro-cosmos of a nation-state, transmitting the ideas and ideals of its politics, traditions, beliefs and habits. Therefore, the informants evaluate being Turkish, or Turkish culture in relation to what they learn and experience within the family space. However, this is also the root of the problem they face in their later lives, when they realise that there is not a homogenous and unified Turkish culture. On the contrary, lifestyles and cultural practices are diverse, and therefore vary depending on urban-rural setting, and class status.
Their limited interactions with the relatives and other Turkish families only aggregated what the informants imagined to be their ‘home’ culture because these families came from the same village or town as their parents (*hemsehrilik*18); and substantially they all belonged to a working class, both in Turkey and Germany. Majority of the informants were raised in the 1970s and 1980s, in the smaller industrial towns of Germany, which were not ethnically segregated (like the later formation of ghettos in Berlin’s Kreuzberg and Neukölln districts). They commonly stressed that they were one of the few Turkish families in their neighbours, and one of the only or very few Turkish students in their schools. In addition, Turkish restaurants, groceries and kebab houses were not as widespread as today. They also had limited access to Turkish media, except a few hours of Turkish programmes on the radio, and some channels via the satellite TV.

Furthermore, the narratives commonly highlighted the struggle of being raised in a household where parents had long and intensive working hours, mostly in factories. In the absence of parents, the informants were either taken care of nannies (most of the time these were elderly German neighbours), or relatives (grandparents). Older siblings also stayed in with the younger siblings until the parents came home. In several narratives, informants reflected on being left alone in the house, until parents would return from work. What stood out in narratives that, those informants who later were involved in criminal activities, or those who experienced identity crisis that led to individualism and escapism with the quest of ‘search for self’ had been neglected by their parents. The quote below illustrates the striking yet, commonly narrated relationship of the second generation with their parents, which is also seen as the main reason of their uneasy attitude and mismatch of how they feel ‘who they are’ (i.e. hybrid, well-integrated, open-minded etc.) and identities/roles dictated by familial/traditional norms:

I was very well-integrated to the German society. But… My identity problems… they were mostly because of my family. This is common amongst the second generation, because the first generation had serious issues, they were not happy. They worked too much, they were ignorant, and anti-social. They had too many responsibilities on their shoulders, they had to look after their families in a foreign country. My father for instance, he didn’t know about our religion [Islam], or our traditions [Turkish] well, he had no idea about how to raise children. He got married at an early age… Once, I confronted him, “Why are you constantly beating me up? What have I done to you?” And he told me that when he was staying in the *Heim*19, he mentioned his fellow Turkish colleagues that he was soon to become a father, and one guy told him, “Beat your son

---

18 Informants commonly referred to this term *hemsehrilik*, meaning “people from the same town” in Turkish, *Landsmann* in German and compatriot in English (Yurdakul, 2009, p.32).
19 Upon arrival, guestworkers were housed in groups in living quarters or dormitories known as *Heim*. 
occasionally, it will keep him on the right track”. So, this was the mentality… (Nusret, M46).

Nusret’s case depicts one of the extreme cases, but in all narratives, informants pointed out that, one of their parents, also in some cases mothers would be the dominant character and follow tough rules in the house, which led the Turkish second generation to loosen ties with their families already in their teenager years.

Nevertheless, the main social interaction between the informants and their parents were around the dinner time, when all the members of the family gathered, devouring ‘Turkish’ food. The dinner tables come to the forefront as a cultural space, because this is when the informants practiced their mother tongue while socialising with the family members. Almost in all narratives, informants mentioned that they were expected to speak only Turkish during the ‘family time’. The symbolic importance of food and dinners is highlighted by all the informants, their first distinction related to habits in and outside of the family space compared to the German Other. In this regard, diaspora cuisines and eating-related customs appear as examples of Hobsbawm’s (1983) ‘invented traditions’, which reflect a reaction to modernity and change, as well as a boundary-making practice to preserve shared memory and nostalgia of the homeland’s traditions and rituals. For many informants, consuming the food of their locale was their first step outside of the cultural taboos, and a way of crossing to the culture of the Other (for instance eating pork products which are normally forbidden in the Islamic belief).

Roles in the family space was another distinction in relation to parental and gender roles that the respondents observed vis-à-vis the German households. In their houses, they found that their mothers were not expected to have a work life, yet most of the time mothers also worked in the factories. Informants commonly reflected that, they saw in their mothers, a traumatised woman who needs to be protected, uneducated and yet, resilient and determined to survive in a foreign land. It was rare that Turkish mothers had social lives outside of their family and work spaces, except some would socialise with their neighbours. These reflections are important in the sense that, all informants without an exception mentioned “women’s rights” as a human rights problem in Turkey, not supporting the traditional Turkish family structures where daughters are being discriminated, also expressing disapproval on the ways in which women are treated within Turkish societies. One of the main reasons why the sample group chose Antalya as their ‘return’ place of settlement was substantially based on Antalya city’s rather liberal and gender-equal environment, as narratives will illustrate in the upcoming chapters.
Moreover, the Turkish ‘family space’ was where the respondents have experienced strictly-defined gender roles wherein daughters were expected to have a life between home and school, having personality traits of modesty and virtue. Both male and female informants reflected on this discrimination wherein sons could go out, come home late, and if they misbehaved (e.g. in school), parents would tolerate it.

I was of course not allowed to do things as my German friends did, like going to discos. Though, I’ve been to discos, secretly! My parents feared that we’d get into alcohol and drugs, so they were protective. But in those teenager years, I’ve never understood why all my friends were free to have fun but I was restricted. I mostly had German friends, and their parents wouldn’t intervene in their lives. And these rules we had, somehow would only apply to girls, because my brother could do whatever he wanted, he would even bring home his German girlfriends… I’d always argue with my parents, I’d ask them, “Why can’t I do the things my brother does?” and my mother would say, “He’s a boy, he can.” I’d hate it when she’d say that! (Belkis, F28)

Like Belkis, other informants also commonly reflected on these gender roles within the Turkish family space, which they found as profoundly contrasting with the German families. Some informants highlighted that they liked that Turkish people value family ties whereas Germans seemed to have loose family ties. On the other hand, they thought that this was how it looked like at the surface. Even though German parents seemed distant, they were attentive and organised in the ways of transmitting good habits to their children (e.g. going to bed early, eating at same hours, individualism, working for pocket money etc.), also encouraging the children to find their interests and hobbies. However, the informants stated that despite having an authoritarian rule in their house, the parents were rarely around them, or able to help them with their school work, or acted as guides to build their identities and careers.

Outside of the family space, neighbourhood environment appears as an alternative cultural space for the informants. First, they stated that they lived in areas where the residents were mainly German. They also noted that there were residents from other guestworker-sending countries such as Greece, Italy and member states of the former Yugoslavia. Those who grew up in the 1970s called attention to the friendly relations between different groups in their neighbourhoods, especially German neighbours having a welcoming and supportive attitude. What stands out in the narratives is that, in the first two decades of the guestworker agreement, Germans and Turkish, as well as other guestworkers worked side by side in the factories, their children attended the same schools, and they lived in similar conditions. Especially in smaller towns, there was not a significant class division. These early interactions of the Turkish second generation with their German neighbours were considerably beneficial for them in terms of
adapting to the German language before the school age. Experiencing the German traditions such as Christmas and Easter through the German neighbours acted as an introduction to the German culture. In this regard, many narrative accounts have a similar, if not identical statement as the following quote below. This kind of statement is yet again common amongst those who had their childhood and teenager years until the mid-1980s.

We’re raised amongst the Germans, from the day we started speaking, we’re speaking two languages, and we had two cultures around us. We had German neighbours, they’d take care of us when the parents were working. At school, we celebrated Christmas, Easter. We’d even join the church visits. We’d go out with our German friends, invite them to our house, share Turkish food with our friends and neighbours (Helin, F45).

About half of the sample made a distinction between their families, and other Turkish families whom they encountered later in their lives: they mentioned that despite their parents were uneducated and at times conservative, they still put effort in integrating to their society and they did not isolate themselves. For instance, what was prominent in the narratives was, the parents consciously chose areas which were dominated by German residents, and tried to avoid Turkish streets or neighbourhoods. There were no Turkish ghettos at the time, but streets or blocks wherein the residents were mainly Turkish. These ethno-national spaces were purposefully ignored by the parents, because they had the idea that such neighbourhood environments would not make a good impact on their children. Nevertheless, it is common in the narratives that some families had to move to Turkish neighbourhoods, because the class and ethnicity division became more distinct, and segregation started even in smaller towns. The quote below illustrates an unusually-depicted experience in which the second generation and their families would have pressure from the Turkish community, highlighting that, ‘in-group’ dynamics of the Turkish community needs to be understood in relation to diverse and contradicting values and practices.

My parents were open-minded, and they raised us with self-confidence. My father always tried to rent houses in areas mostly surrounded by Germans. We respected the Germans and they respected us. My parents were social, I was good at school. Surely, we didn’t give up on our values, we knew we were Turkish and Muslim. But my first cultural shock happened when another Turkish family moved next door. They were openly showing that they were not approving our lifestyle. Once my younger brother brought his German classmate to our house, and this woman saw them by the door and told her son, “come on, come into the house, öçüt bünülar, bu gavurlara yaklaşma!” This type of Turkish families, they isolate themselves from the German society, but later their children end up being drug addicts or gang members (Zehra, F42).

---

20 “They are boogeymen, stay away from these infidels!”
As this narrative shows, some families tried to avoid Turkish-dominated neighbourhoods to protect their children from the rather self-destructive lifestyles or other Turkish people’s judgements and vilifying. Zehra’s narrative also points out how some Turkish families taught their children about the Germans as people to stay away from, which may lead these youngsters to employ more ‘protest-identities’ towards the German society. Other narratives also reflect that there is a definitive link between those who were raised up in migrant-dominated neighbourhoods and their poorly-made decisions for their lives. Especially the male informants who entered the “ethnic”-neighbourhood environment made social acquaintances with ‘rough’ type of teenagers. Here, the neighbourhood as a cultural space is a hybrid formation, it is not German or Turkish, but it is ‘migrant’ as a general concept.

The narratives illustrate that their gangs were a mixture of Turkish and German boys, as well as other migrant groups. Neighbourhood as a place had different cultural spaces embedded within. For instance, with regards to gangs, the girls were exempt from it – they only knew the existence of such groups through their brothers or rather distant acquaintances and relatives. For boys, neighbourhood was where they met youngsters with similar habitus; same fears and worries and similar curiosities. Moreover, a new language code, a creole semi-language flourished (i.e. Kanak Sprak) in these neighbourhood spaces, characterised by “toughness” and “aggressiveness” (Eksner, 2006). This language space is highly a translocal one and was not only talked by the Turkish second and third generation, but also by other migrant groups and the Germans. Eksner (2006, p.9) focuses on the German youth’s voluntarily choice of using this new slang and suggests that they do so because this language indexes naturalised “foreignness”, thus “toughness”.

School was another important cultural space for the informants because that was the first space where they interacted with other children of their age as a comparison of their capabilities and lifestyles. Especially in smaller towns where there were only few Turkish students in their classrooms, the informants were not given an alternative education route, such as Turkish classes or mixed-language classes which were more recent practices in German schools. For them, the school was a new environment where the German culture was the dominant one. All respondents mentioned that especially in the southern regions, they would attend the church for the first day of school. The following quote portrays the first encounters with the German school system and traditions:
The first day of *Grundschule*… I’m trying to hide between my father’s legs. I’m the only kid with black hair, and I look tinier compared to the other children. I hear my parents talk, “he is apparently the only Turk in his class”. Then I realise all other kids hold something like a cone, and eating candy from it. I panic, what is that, why don’t I have one? In Germany, they call it *Schultüte*, it’s a tradition to bring a cone full of candy on the first day of school, to have a sweet school year. I look at my parents, they look sad, not knowing what to do. My mother promises me to make *baklava* for when I return from school, but no, I want those cheap, shitty German sweets! (laughing). That’s how I realised I was different, we were different, and somehow, events like this either when my parents not getting me presents for Christmas, or not hiding eggs for Easter and so on, I’ve felt different because my friends would talk about these and I didn’t have something to say. I’d sometimes lie about getting Christmas presents from parents (Bedri, M31)

In Bedri’s narrative and several others, it is evident that he saw himself mostly as a ‘guest’ in cultural spaces like church visits, Easter celebrations, Christmas market visits, tree decorating activities and so on. More rarely, some informants’ parents put effort in learning about the German traditions, and they bought Christmas trees for their houses, also bought presents for their children, so they would not feel ‘different’. Others were more reluctant about following Christian traditions, hence they allowed their children to join these events as a part of school activity, under the supervision of teachers. Similarly, most of the informants stated that their parents would allow them to attend the school trips and sports activities. They also observed that other Turkish families around them would be especially restrictive for their daughters, and would not send them to school trips or swimming courses.

A later formation in German schools was the once-a-week Turkish classes, run by Turkish teachers sent by the Turkish government. These lectures mostly took place when the other students were attending the religion class, and Turkish students were exempt from these. Almost all the respondents mentioned that they experienced a completely different style of teaching and learning in these Turkish classes: authoritarian discipline, fact-based knowledge, rote-based learning and following strict manners such as standing up when the teacher enters the room, not sitting cross-legged, being punished with a ruler in case of disobedience etc. These classes were designed to improve the Turkish language skills of the second generation, also to teach them more about the history of Turkey (based on the Republican period and *Kemalist* 21

---

21 Primary school in German
22 A Turkish sweet pastry

ideals\textsuperscript{23}, the Turkish anthem and classic literature. Depending on the teacher, some lectures involved religious teaching, however these were rare until the 1990s.

The informants had limited access to the religious space, because there were no Sunni Turkish mosques in many German states until the 1990s. Religious practices were not common amongst the sample, they only celebrated the religious feast days, meeting with their relatives or other Turkish families. For the Sacrifice Feast (\textit{Kurban Bayram}), the fathers would share the price of a cow or sheep with other families and sacrifice it following the Islamic ethics. Even though their parents might have practiced fasting, only a minority of the sample tried fasting. None of the women involved in this sample wear a headscarf and when they were asked about it, they mentioned that their families never obliged them to cover themselves. Some informants mentioned their mothers wore headscarf but an Anatolian version, a moderately covered hair, instead of a \textit{bijab}. As they grew older, they observed the other Turkish people around them, finding their lifestyle way more conservative and yet degenerated. These observations led them to think that Turkish culture was conservative and restricting. Because of this reason, some of the respondents grew negative feelings towards their ancestral culture, and even justified in their heads that discrimination of these people by the German society was understandable, as the Turkish did not seem to be putting effort in integrating themselves.

5.3 Encounters with the Ancestral Homeland: Childhood Visits and Holidays

In trying to explore how the second generation develop attachments/detachments to certain spaces/places, there is a need of focusing on how memory and identity constructions affect the meanings created and given to certain places (Harvey, 1993; Hoelscher & Alderman, 2004). Places are bound to memories, reproduced and expressed both by individuals and communities, become meaningful for people in their processes of developing a sense of feeling, trust, and co-dependence. In relation to “diaspora consciousness”, the notion of ‘community’ can be perceived as “imagined”, characterising the second generation’s diasporic condition in which they feel part of an “imagined community” consists of a shared sense of identity, belonging and like-mindedness.

\textsuperscript{23} Mustafa Kemal Atatürk was the founder of the Turkish Republic, and his core values, republicanism, nationalism, populism, state socialism, secularism and revolutionism; and his reforms for a Westernised and modern Turkish Republic e.g. alphabet reform from Ottoman to Latin (1928), constitution reform (1924) emancipation for women (1934) are thought in Turkish schools. In social life, Kemalist ideals refer to embracing secular, democratic views and equal rights for every citizen (Mango, 1999).
Following Harvey’s description, the second generation’s lack of lived experiences in their ancestral homeland is substituted by familial and diasporic discourses of homeland in helping them to construct place-attachment towards Turkey. On the other hand, through childhood visits, periodic stays and summer holidays in Turkey, the informants experienced mobility between two countries; their dwellings, identity constructions and negotiations, sense of belonging in these ‘translocal social fields’ denote alternative to stable and bounded notions of ‘home’. The construction of place as a site of belonging or ‘home’ works hand in hand with discourses of collective identity, a collective memory created by the community which shapes their perceptions and longings for these places. The gap between mobility and stability, groundedness and fluidity can be bridged with understanding belonging as an imagined one, that shared-loyalty to a place is highly fragmented, constituting both the imagination of a community and actual connections and communities (Harvey & Braun, 1996; Cresswell, 2006). Hence, it was conducive to explore these imaginations and memory constructions that lie behind the second generation’s notions of place as ‘home’ vis-à-vis mobility and belonging (Cresswell, 2006). By doing so, the formation and transformation of their place-attachments can be understood, and more insights can be gained about how they reproduce their individual and collective identities in shifting social, cultural and territorial spheres (Appadurai, 1996a).

For the informants of this research, childhood visits to Turkey were important in constructing opinions and longing for the ancestral homeland. Narratives illustrate that even though the collective identity of the second generation is based on a common country of origin with its ethno-national and religious features, the ancestral home is remembered differently by everyone and they also develop divergent sense of longing and connection to homeland. Rubenstein (2001) relates these processes of longing and belonging to the notion of nostalgia, in which migrants both live through nostalgia as they simultaneously challenge it. Therefore, nostalgia appears as a fluid, multifaceted and performative force, intertwining remembering and forgetting of certain memories of places and homes, constituting an important means of an interior dialogue with the homeland and ways of creating a sense of belonging (Burrell, 2008).

In the theoretical framework of transnational migration, home is understood either as a physical place, or nodal point of lived experiences and social interactions, or as a symbolic and discursive space of belonging and identification (Rapport & Dawson, 1998; Blunt & Dowling, 2006). This dual conceptualisation can be integrated within the translocal geographies of home, with a focus on a more grounded and rooted understanding of how these constructions occur in specific places. For the interviewees, the idea of ‘homeland’ was nurtured by the nostalgia of their parents, their narratives and, the discourses of homeland through media and social interactions.
not only with Turkish but the Germans around them, and to a certain degree members of other minority groups in Germany. These all count as second-hand information, other people’s interpretations and memories of the ancestral homeland. Especially, in early ages when the second generation would not be able to acquire sources to find more about the ancestral homeland, these pieces of information were the main sources of their imaginings of Turkey. It must be acknowledged that, it is not clear what ‘homeland’ or Turkey means to these people who narrate it for the second generation. Most of the time, when the informants heard the stories of ‘homeland’ from their parents, these were based on the experiences in specific locales i.e. their villages, towns and cities.

Those who attended the Turkish school received a macro-level discourse, the discourse of the nation – which Turkey appears as a unified concept. On the other hand, observations of the informants on the Turkish living around them in their German towns and cities lead them to make assumptions on the culture and traditions of the homeland, and most of the time these mental notes read as the following quote:

You get an idea of Turkish people and how life in Turkey would be like through observing the Turks around you [in Germany]. So, in Germany those rural, conservative and problematic type of Turks stick out the most, and I would think, “if all the Turkish people around me act this way, that’s how people should be like in Turkey too”. Then I remember we were on a visit in Istanbul, I must have been 15 years old, I took a walk from Şişli to Taksim and I was so shocked, everybody was dressed fashionably, women looked elegant, men were well-trimmed. Their Turkish sounded so nice. Taksim was so beautiful, lively, the cafes, restaurants, boutiques, book stores… That’s when I realised Turks in Turkey and Turks in Germany were completely different. Now, as I work in tourism sector I meet many Germans, and they get shocked by the same thing. They say, “People in Turkey are so decent, so friendly!” They get surprised how modern Turkey is, especially places like Istanbul and Antalya, they have European standards (Fethi, M45).

Even though the city life is depicted in this narrative, and therefore it does not reflect the life in rural areas of Turkey, it is common amongst the informants to get a ‘nicer’ picture of Turkey and Turkish people once they get a lived experience. These constructions and imaginings come into perspective when they have a personal experience of the homeland, and these translocal practices of holiday visits to Turkey is significant in the sense that it gives the second generation a space for discussion and reflection for revising and reconstructing their ideas of the homeland in the light of their lived experiences of particular places.

All respondents brought up the holiday visits to Turkey when they were asked about how they started to construct belonging towards the ancestral homeland. Every year, during the 6-
week holidays, they visited the parents’ homeland. These trips required careful preparation. The informants mentioned how their parents saved money for a year so they could afford a family trip to Turkey. Between the period of 1960 to 1990, they travelled by car, where the journey would take up to 2-3 days. They also brought presents for relatives, neighbours and friends as a part of Turkish tradition. The respondents recalled these visits as bitter-sweet memories, on one hand enjoying the warmness of family environment, on the other hand experiencing alienation, as they realise their Turkish was not as good as they thought and their appearance would stand out as “unusual”. The narrative below explains these experiences in detail, also giving insights about how life in Turkey has transformed since their childhood years.

Before 1989, you couldn’t find foreign products in Turkey. I remember my parents’ village, and even Istanbul’s infrastructure was quite poor. In Germany, we were driving Mercedes, BMW, we had central heating systems in houses, we had shopping malls in towns. We used dishwasher, TV, laundry machine. These were considered luxury in Turkey and only the privileged elite would own. In Turkey people used a la Turca toilets 24, I wasn’t used to that, that was one thing I didn’t like in Turkey… My parents would buy many presents for relatives, we would pack our car with electronics like TVs, irons, even a dishwasher and stuff like cola, Nutella, Nivea hand-creams, jeans. I remember, when we would enter the village, kids would start running behind our car shouting “Almancılar geldi!” 25 Relatives and neighbours would wait for us in front of their houses, you feel like a king, because they saw us as better, I mean we were considered rich and modern in Turkey, at least this was the case in 70s and 80s. It would feel nice to come to Turkey, I would always feel so excited when we crossed the Turkish border. Before continuing to our village, we’d stop to have a feast in a restaurant, I still remember the taste of those köfte’s 26 (Sertaç, M47).

As it is reflected in this narrative, the village community would mostly envy the Turkish from Germany, but also feel proud of their achievements, being able to live a good life in a far-away land. The relatives and friends in Turkey would not only be supported through remittances but also with certain materials as depicted in the narrative above.

Furthermore, the second generation learned a term in Turkey where the locals use to define them and their families, Almancı. The narrative below depicts the meaning of this term, and how it was commonly internalised by the informants.

I had had hard time understanding what Almancı meant. I’d always hear people talking about us, using that word. As I got older, I understood that it wasn’t entirely a nice thing to say because they saw us as degenerated Turks, like we became like Germans. I know that some Turkish families would show off when they visited Turkey, so they would on purpose dress like Germans, bring their

24 Eastern-style toilets, also known as squat toilets.
25 “Almancılar’s have arrived!”
26 Turkish meatballs.
shiny Mercedes cars, and they would speak in German with their children just to show off, even though they would never speak in German with their kids in Germany. Almancı is like, you lost your roots, and people saw us like, “their children can’t even speak Turkish, they’re spoiled”. So even though my family was modest, we were still called Almancı. It felt as beneath that whole hospitable atmosphere, our relatives had other feelings towards us, I guess they were envious we had a good life. But they didn’t realise, that so called ‘good life’ was possible because my parents worked double shifts, they always saved money. Alınteriyle oldu her şey.27 (Yalçın, M52).

Except a few interviews, a strong reflection on the language aspect can be found in all narratives which the informants told about how they realised language is not just about channelling one’s thoughts, i.e. tool for communication, but one’s choices of words, dialect, jargon – in other words how one speaks also matters in cultural transmission. The narrative below is a good example of how the informants reflected on speaking their mother tongue in Turkey, as well as reflecting on how culture of specific places matter in language evolution. Hence, in the case of language as well, the second generation is engaged with translocal practices, rather than transnational, because whether German or Turkish, language is spoken differently depending on spaces (family space, diaspora space, public space etc.) and places (rural and urban setting, region etc.).

I thought my Turkish was good. I always used to talk in Turkish with my parents. But in Turkey I have struggled so much. My cousins would laugh at my Turkish. Turkish humour is different, people talk in metaphorical way, expressions are so complex… there are too many idioms and phrases. I realised that Turkish is a language where you can stretch every word. Sometimes, they would joke and I would look with empty eyes. It affected my confidence badly in a way, because I told you, I really thought my Turkish was decent. But then I thought about it, I mean, in Germany with parents we would talk about daily matters, and we would sneak a German word here and there… That wasn’t enough apparently. There are so many dialects in Turkey, people use slangs, and they also reference to other things, like jokes about certain stereotypes or to some characters in a TV show, we did not know these things in Germany, it’s hard to keep up with these when you don’t live in Turkey. Still today, I’m sometimes misunderstood here [in Turkey] and even occasionally offend people, because my sentences are bold and direct, but in Turkish you need to choose those words to sound more refined and polite. But in my case, I construct in my head what I want to say in German and articulate it in Turkish, and it sounds all too harsh (laughing) (Peri, F32).

An important part of the narratives was related to the informants’ summer holidays in coastal towns, mostly in the Aegean and Mediterranean regions. Most of the time they stayed in a

27 “They made all these possible with hard work.”
relative’s summer house, or their own. Less commonly, some families stayed in hotels and hostels. These holidays led the informants to further reflect on Turkey being a country of contrasts, both home to conservative and remote villages with poverty and poor infrastructure but also coastal towns with an international and modern atmosphere, different dress code and ways of living.

Despite feeling alienated at times in their social interactions and in certain cultural spaces, they also appreciated the warm attitude of people, values like sharing, being attentive and caring, respect for the elderly, closer family ties and relationships, appreciation to food etc. Also, they found that despite the poverty and struggles, people in Turkey knew how to enjoy life. Compared to the organised and around-the-clock sort of lifestyle in Germany, they observed that people live in a more relaxed way in Turkey. Coming from rainy and gloomy towns of Germany, the informants especially enjoyed the weather in Turkey, also because they mostly visited Turkey in summer time, they had the idea that it was always sunny in Turkey. These rather positive memories combined with nostalgia guided the informants’ return imaginings and expectations from the life in Turkey, nevertheless as the next sections will illustrate, ‘relaxed attitude towards life’ and ‘persistent holiday feeling’ could not be sustained in their parents’ places of origin, or bigger cities where life was found to be chaotic and expensive.

At the end of these visits, the informants’ parents would this time pack their cars with Turkish goods, mostly Turkish food such as feta cheese, olives, tomato paste etc., also with books, cassettes and films, clothing items and so on. These constant practices of carrying materials from one place to another perhaps best illustrates that the families enjoyed and missed things from both places, these practices of consuming certain products in their ‘translocal social fields’ led them to keep their place-attachment on mind, even if symbolically. Moreover, as it was illustrated, the informants’ holiday experiences were more in line with translocality – the lived experiences of particular locales – however, internalisation of these experiences acted as points of reference for the entire country, leading the informants to have general assumptions about ‘life in Turkey’. Furthermore, their holiday experiences show the importance of holiday spaces as providing ‘liminality’, a pause from the everyday responsibilities and problems, but also that the timeframe designated for holiday is a conscious effort to have some good time. Hence, the informants’ holidays in Turkey stayed as happy memories, constructing their perception that, despite its downsides such as economic, social and political drawbacks, life in Turkey was regarded as exciting and ‘authentic’, hence worth exploring.
5.4 Conclusion: Evaluating the Second Generation’s Habitus as Transformative and Translocational

This chapter aimed at presenting an overview of the respondents’ lives in Germany with a focus on their early memories in Germany and Turkey regarding the ‘family space’, constructions and contestations of ethnic and national identities as well as place-attachments. The chapter called attention to the second generation’s more complex and at times ambiguous relationship with Turkey and the ‘Turkish’ culture compared to their guestworker parents. Here, there can be two points for a critical discussion: The first is that, if a Bourdieusian understanding of “cultural capital” is accepted, then the second generation acquiring “transcultural capital” can be justified because, the cultural capital acquired in embodied, institutionalised and objectified states have different sources. For instance, the respondents have experienced the institutionalised cultural capital through formal education in German institutions (some also attended Turkish schools), and yet they have received informal education through their families, i.e. in a ‘Turkish space’. In terms of their embodied state cultivation, which is the primary concern of this research, we need to focus on their habitus that involves bodily comportment and speaking as markers of distinction (Erel, 2010, p.643).

The chapter demonstrated that the respondents have been exercising agency by creating new forms of migration-specific cultural capital (Erel, 2010, p.643). This is to say that, meaning of ethnic, national and territory-based attachments and identifications change across generations and depending on positionalities such as gender and class (Erel, 2009; Anthias, 2007). For instance, the chapter illustrated that gender played a major role in terms of who can have access to which spaces. The narratives exemplified that whilst the boys could go against their families’ rules and wishes, hence enter other spaces such as the mixed-migrant neighbourhood space, the girls were protected within the ‘Turkish space’ apart from the ‘school space’ if they were under the supervision of their teachers. In that sense, the male respondents could exercise active agency and could incorporate more sources in the formation of their transcultural capital and translocational habitus.

Another example was with regards to class which has two dimensions: One was that, the respondents narrated their parents were able to rent accommodation in migrant or more specifically Turkish-dominated neighbourhoods in Germany as their towns had become ethnically-segregated from the 1980s onwards. Here, the respondents became aware that, they were not only part of a certain ethnic/national group, but also of the working class, associated with non-Germans. Secondly, some narratives pointed out that, in these neighbourhoods they
observed that other Turkish families could be more conservative and protective, showing no interest in adapting to the German society around them. Here, the respondents reflected that, they became aware of the differences within the Turkish community; the practice of ethnic/national and religious values and rules varied depending on the migrants’ educational, urban/rural background and which part of Turkey they associate themselves. These examples take us to the second point of this conclusion section which argues that it would be an oversimplification to “reify cultural capital in ‘rucksack approaches’” (Erel, 2010, p.643) because a migrant group – and in this case the Turkish community in Germany – “does not hold homogenous cultural capital; instead cultural capital is both the product of and productive of differentiations of gender, ethnicity, and class” (Erel, 2010, p.643).

The chapter further showed how childhood visits to Turkey had influenced the respondents’ feelings of attachment and alienation towards their parental homelands. Looking at the narratives regarding the respondents experience as being considered “Almanca” by their extended families and friends in Turkey, it can be argued that group boundaries are contested in struggles over who can define the content and boundaries of a group (Anthias, 2007; Yuval-Davis, 2006). Here, the respondents’ reflections showed that their “Turkishness” was found inadequate or distorted, because as the respondents reasoned, they were not speaking Turkish fluently and they were slipping German words and sentences, they were wearing unusual clothes (German and international brands that did not exist in Turkey), they had different eating habits such as consuming Nutella for breakfast, requiring chips as side dish etc. which were unheard of in their Turkish towns at the time. Hence, it can be argued that habitus should not simply understood as “embodiment of a socio-structural location such as class, gender, ethnicity” (Noble, 2013, pp.344-345) but also as “the capacities which generate improvised human conduct, the ‘practical mastery’ in and of social spaces, manifest in our actions, modes of appearance and bearing – posture, manners, ways of speaking – which make social life possible” (Bourdieu, 1991, pp-86-89). In that sense, the chapter showed, the respondents noticed during these visits that, they were experiencing “between belonging” (Marshall & Foster, 2002) by negotiating the tensions between the Turkish and German habits, lifestyles and manners.

How can we then understand those second generation who, in a way undermined the durability of habitus and showed upward social mobility or/and embraced different lifestyles than their parents and their wider diasporic communities? The narratives showed that, coming from a ‘labour migrant’ background, lacking the support of parents in education and in some ways in the social spaces, the respondents had to rely on their own talent and abilities and additionally they had to find their way into social fields with peers and later colleagues whose habitus were
unfamiliar. Studies which analysed upward social mobility from a Bourdieusian perspective in the case of immigrant groups suggest that it is not the boundaries between social strata that are getting ‘blurred’ by individuals that cross them, but it is the individuals who change instead of the social order (Schneider & Lang, 2014; McNamara-Horvat & Earl-Davis, 2011). Hence, this points out a habitus transformation of the individuals, as some scholars argued resulting in “weakening relationships” with the socio-cultural environment of the native community because “the potentially painful process of habitus cleavage” makes it difficult to “balance” the newly acquired with the old habitus (Lee & Kramer, 2013, pp.31-32).

For instance, when asked about their educational lives, all the informants called attention to the difficulty of crossing the social boundaries in their society, in which they were almost destined to a future like their parents. These findings are not new in the sense that Turkish second generation has been one of the ethnic groups which struggles the most in German education system and their social mobility has been found to be the slowest compared to their peers of immigrant origin from European countries, such as the Greeks, Italians and Spanish (Crul et al., 2012; Wilmes et al., 2011). Nevertheless, the respondents stated, they were aware that the advancement of their educational qualifications was immense compared to their parents, hence this acted as a motivation for them to pursue higher education and aim for professional careers. The informants commonly stated that their parents were supportive of these endeavours with the rationale that as they did not have the same opportunities in life, they wanted their children to get a good education and have respectful jobs. In fact, providing their children a better future was one of the reasons why the Turkish families prolonged their guestworker stay in Germany.

Bourdieu coined the terms “cleft habitus” (2008, p.100) and “habitual unsettledness” (2002, p.46) in the case of the access of students from non-privileged family backgrounds to higher education institutions. Other scholars commonly used the term “habitus cleavage” to imply the radical change in behaviour, taste and language once the working-class immigrant students acquire education in upper-middle class colleges and universities (Torres, 2009; Abrahams & Ingram, 2013; Lee & Kramer, 2013). Although only 12 respondents out of the sample of 44 are university graduates, even those informants who ended up in jail show a clear “habitus cleft” in terms of tastes, hobbies, lifestyles and world views they embrace compared to their parents. Most importantly, the second generation’s almost organic ability of ‘self-reflexivity’ allowed them to segue from their self-destructive pasts and discipline themselves to have a ‘better’ self.
In the narratives, it is apparent that “habitus cleft” did not only occur in relation to social upward mobility that comes with higher education and professional careers. In fact, from an early age, the respondents had access to middle-class dominated educational and residential environments. Later, in their professional milieus, their habitus was further transformed as they inhabited predominantly German environments. Hence, the informants’ moving away from their working-class/immigrant past create a distance to their ‘milieu of origin’ of the family and ethno-national, religious community (El-Mafaalani, 2012, p.319). In some narratives, there was a strong emphasis on the ‘perception of alienation’ towards their working-class Turkish backgrounds as the informants socialise in different social spaces where they interact with the habitus of the dominant others i.e. German and other minority groups. The important question here is, how they incorporate these experiences within themselves and what kind of feelings are evoked in relation to their identity and belonging. Because there emerges a tension between the second generation’s “individual perceptions, appreciations and actions – matrix” – and habitus as a wider, collective “structuring structure” (Bourdieu, 1977, p.95). The same tension can be applied to their identities, on one hand they reflect on their identities as personal tributes, but on the other hand each category of belonging reflects a collectively shared group identity.

This chapter concludes, the respondents’ habitus needs to be understood as transformative and ‘translocational’ – an extended repertoire in which multiple matrices are embodied. When the second generation enter a new world, e.g. instance school, neighbourhood, work-space etc. they learn and adapt the explicit and implicit rules with the help of their ‘translocational habitus’. The respondents’ highly reflexive attitudes and ability to adapt to different and new circumstances are explicit in their narratives regarding their upbringing in Germany. The chapter also brings another question with regards to the theories and hypothesis regarding habitus and social mobility. If the second generation are able to adapt and negotiate their identities in different spaces ‘fields’, then would they necessarily feel ‘alienation’ towards their previous world – in this case their family environment, or Turkish ‘diasporic space’? The narratives reflected that, even though the respondents had difficult time relating themselves to their families, and in some cases their Turkish friends and relatives, they do not completely disregard the “diaspora consciousness” on their identity, hence in most cases they had to and did make peace with their roots and family histories. Especially, for social climbers, their construction of identities and belonging reflect a continuous reflexivity over their past and present lives. The overview of the respondents ‘Turkish’ upbringing in Germany and the further discussion points presented in this chapter will shed light upon the return imaginings and further lifestyle decisions in Turkey, which will be discussed in the upcoming chapters.
6 Exploring the ‘Return’ Decisions, Expectations and Realities

It is not the aim of this research to develop and introduce a typology of the second generation’s ‘return’ reasons to the ancestral homeland, because ‘return’ motivations and reasons are multi-scalar and intertwined. However, the aim is to show that the second generation as ‘lifestyle returnees’ in Antalya has rather unique return experiences which give insights about their further migratory path in Turkey with the quest of ‘search for self’ and have a ‘better life’. Henceforth, this chapter focuses on four dominant themes of ‘return’. These themes are not mutually exclusive and therefore, they need to be understood as complex and multi-dimensional categories which may overlap with each other. The following sections in this chapter will expand on the themes, and finally the chapter will have a discussion section on if the second generation’s ‘return’ to ‘homeland’ was a myth.

Each theme of return is then linked to the returnees’ further reflexivity regarding their motives to resettle in Antalya, their expectations from their lives in this tourism hub, and lifestyle choice they make. Below, there are the main themes and brief introductions to each ‘return’ motivation.

1. **Family return**, or returning in relation to family and kinship ties results in the respondents longing for freedom to give their own decisions. 13 informants explained their ‘return’ as a family decision.

2. **Discrimination**-related return narratives highlight that they do not want to live in intolerant environments either in Germany or Turkey, instead they want to have the freedom to be who they are and be accepted. Only 6 respondents showed discrimination as the most important reason behind their decision to return.

3. **Deportation** narratives appear as a type of forced-return, and it is strongly related to “searching for self” project and reflexivity on morality, with the aim of finding the ‘authentic self’ who is good, who is capable. 10 informants (all of them are men) ‘returned’ through deportation or related to criminal acts.

4. **Self-realisation** is about believing that life in Turkey suits them more, both culturally but also in terms of natural environment, climate, lifestyle etc. They see opportunities in Turkey regarding education and career to build the life and ‘self’ they want. 15 informants are within this category; however, their motivations are more complex and overlap with other motives. For instance, 6 informants clearly called their ‘return’ project as ‘seeking adventure’ whilst the others gave more rounded answers such as ‘leaving the past behind’,
‘starting a new life’, ‘living a better life’. There are also 3 cases in which their holiday in Turkey turned into a settlement.

In the sample, only 6 respondents mentioned that, their first ‘return’ place was Antalya. 7 respondents firstly lived in a different tourism area (most common are Side and Alanya), however they saw this as a transition period, and they moved and settled in Antalya. The remainder 31 respondents either firstly returned to their parents’ villages/cities of origin or tried living in big cities such as Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir. Table 4 illustrates an overview of the pull-push factors that affected the first-time return projects.

**Table 9: Pull-Push Factors in Influencing ‘Return’ Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Push factors from Germany</th>
<th>Pull factors to Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lifestyle Reasons</strong></td>
<td>1. Material-based life (modern capitalism)</td>
<td>1. More relaxed and easy-going pace of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Dull and mundane life setting</td>
<td>2. Lively and outdoor based lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bad climate</td>
<td>3. Pleasant weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Feeling like a ‘stranger’ or feeling like not fitting in</td>
<td>4. Healthy, organic food options, variety and Turkish culinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Limited social environment (especially in the small towns)</td>
<td>5. Closer contact with nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Low quality and expensive food (especially fruits and vegetables)</td>
<td>6. Culturally and historically rich environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Spaces and friendship circles which provoke unhealthy and self-harming lifestyles and/or criminal practices</td>
<td>7. Feeling more ‘secure’ through cultural/religious/ethnic attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family/Relationship Reasons</strong></td>
<td>1. Disputes within the family (with parents)</td>
<td>8. Feeling familiar with sentimental approach to life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Having gone through a bad marriage/relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. A traumatic life event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Losing contact with friends (people moving to different places)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Finding difficult to build close relations with Germans but also Turks living in Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political/Institutional Reasons</strong></td>
<td>1. Political and institutional restrictions as a Turkish citizen</td>
<td>1. Being able to invest in property due to holding citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The growing negative political rhetoric towards foreigners (especially towards Muslims)</td>
<td>2. Having political rights (being able to vote)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The polarisation in the society and groupism amongst the ethnic groups</td>
<td>3. Access to university education through a special test for students coming from abroad (easier route compared to Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>1. Increasing unemployment</td>
<td>1. Market opportunities especially when knowing German (and English in some cases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Limited market opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Costly life expenses (especially rents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Reasons to Settle in Antalya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lifestyle Reasons</th>
<th>Push Factors to Antalya</th>
<th>Push Factors from Cities</th>
<th>Push Factors from Parents’ town/villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Warm weather and year-round sunny days</td>
<td>1. Stressful life</td>
<td>1. Traditional values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being close to the sea/beach</td>
<td>2. Traffic and chaos</td>
<td>2. Religious and social conservatism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clean air and water</td>
<td>4. Eye-sore urbanisation and destruction of green areas</td>
<td>4. Limited social life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being able to balance work and leisure</td>
<td>5. Types of pollution (air, water, noise)</td>
<td>5. Lack of leisure and cultural activities (e.g. cinemas, book stores, cafes and gyms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Slow pace of life and stress-free environment</td>
<td>7. People being judgemental and arrogant</td>
<td>7. Dull and monotonous life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More liberal social setting due to tourism spaces and expats</td>
<td>8. Feeling lonely and disconnected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, the chapter will illustrate that these ‘imaginings’ about how life would be like in Turkey was further contested by the second generation, when they struggled to sustain their lifestyles upon ‘return’. Hence, Table 5 summarises the main reasons why ‘returnees’ left big cities and places of origin and settle in Antalya. The following sections illustrate the specific themes, and how respondents evaluated ‘return’ experience in relation to the notion of ‘self’ and ‘home’ which led to their emigration to Antalya.
| 5. Being able to live as a divorcee or single parent without a problem | establishing connections with other returnees and Germans | where everybody knows each other  
5. Not a promising future for the children |
| 6. More liberated women-men relations | 5. Not having a community feeling  
(poor or limited relations with neighbours and colleagues) |  
|
| 7. Raising children in a more natural and peaceful environment  
Easy way of meeting people due to the open-minded holiday setting |  
|  
| **Political/Institutional Reasons** |  
| 1. Politically liberal views | 1. Bureaucratic chaos  
2. More corrupt system and bribery  
3. Feeling the political instability in a more intense way (since Occupy Gezi protests)  
4. Long waiting times in state institutions  
5. More polarised society in terms of political stances | 1. Not tolerant towards alternative views  
2. Poorly conditioned hospitals, schools etc.  
3. Feeling alienated because not finding people who share similar political values  
4. Poor municipality services and bad infrastructure, slow progress |
| 2. Caring for women rights and animal rights |  
| 3. Better functioning institutions such as hospitals and banks |  
|  
| **Economic Reasons** |  
| 1. Availability of different job options | 1. High costs of city life (especially bills and rents, as well as public transportation)  
2. Difficulty of getting a job that would cover the life expenses  
3. Competition-based working system where social life is at minimum | 1. Limited jobs  
2. Limited potential for ‘new’ things and entrepreneurial activities  
3. Not having tourism-related job environment  
4. Family and relative related businesses and nepotism |
| 2. Flexibility of the tourism-related jobs |  
| 3. Cheaper life (lower rents, cheap markets and clothing options, affordable bills)  
4. Working during the tourist seasons and being able to manage through the winter  
5. Possibility of engaging with entrepreneurial activities |  
|  
| **6.1 Coping with the Family Return: Considering Alternatives** |  
|  
| The informants commonly narrated that their parents’ (first generation) believed that sustaining social networks and bureaucratic ties (e.g. being enrolled on retirement insurance and property contracts) would guarantee a secured life in the homeland in case they return, and many families kept their social, familial and bureaucratic ties with Turkey. However, the first generation put their feelings of ‘longing for home’ on the back burner for various reasons: The narratives point out that the main reason was the lack of job opportunities in Turkey due to underdeveloped industries. Until 1980s, the first generation did not have the intention of leaving |
Germany where they could make a good living. The 1980 coup d'état in Turkey added another dimension to the economic hindrance; going back home in the years of political turbulence and social oppression was not seen as a rewarding plan. Alongside these structural drawbacks in Turkey, the first generation was also concerned with their children’s education in Germany. They did not want their children to go through an immense change, so most families waited until completion of either elementary school or secondary school. The first generation was aware that raising children in Germany was more cost-effective compared to Turkey, with free education system, child benefit schemes and opportunities for higher education. In addition to the considerations regarding the children’s education, the first generation was also concerned about the insufficient health care in Turkey.

Despite acknowledging the disadvantages, some families still took the decision to return, though there had to be a trigger event. The most compelling of such was the German government’s incentive money (1982) granted for the guestworkers who would accept to return to their homelands. Much of the family returns to Turkey occurred during 1980s due to this lump-sum payment of 10,500 DM, which was perceived as an adequate saving to build a new life in the homeland. The following narrative is a good illustration of this decision process for the families to return to Turkey.

We always wanted to return, but my parents didn’t know when would be the right time. My sister and I were studying, they didn’t want to interrupt it. We first had an attempt in 1980, but then the coup d'état happened [in Turkey]. Then finally in 1988 we decided to return because the German government offered a good amount of money. That’s what Germany wanted anyway, immigrants going back to their countries, so we got the money and moved to Turkey. I had to study the final year of high school in Turkey, but it wasn’t a problem for me, because my Turkish has always been good (Haldun, M44).

The family(-oriented) return appears to be most associated with ‘myth of return’ in which the first and second generation’s nostalgia and romantic views of the homeland formulate return journey with the expectation of reaching an end-point, completion of a homecoming (Christou & King, 2010). Zetter (1999, p.7) further argues that “it might be more accurate to recast myth of return as the myth of home”. As the narratives point out, family return plans were heavily based on the myth of home, creating expectations from homecoming and these set of expectations casting a positive projection onto the future (De Souza, 2005). This positive projection involves not only the expectation of a permanent homecoming but also a search for a stable sense of self (Conway, 2005). In other words, return can be projected as a quest to find the authentic self.
(Christou, 2004; Wessendorf, 2007), as people of diaspora often feel an ongoing distinction “between dwelling on and in a place” (Basu, 2007, p.ix). For instance, Haldun further claimed,

I have been always proud of being Turkish, our culture, our land is unique. But sure, I was living in Germany, so even though I didn’t have an identity crisis, I struggled with… always being put in a defensive position, because we were different. So, coming to Turkey was a good decision, I reunited with my real identity. We are originally from Gelibolu (Gallipoli), and when I am there, it feels sacred, and it makes me proud to be the descendent of such brave people.

But then, when I moved to Antalya, I got to know more about myself, and these were new to me. The tourism sector has changed me completely. I find it difficult to stay in places where there are no tourists. I also get bored if I am in the same place, I constantly feel like traveling. I need a lively and international atmosphere around me. But of course, in the end I would always come back to my country (Haldun, M44).

Haldun’s narrative brings together two sides of the ‘search for the self’. On one hand, the longing for the homeland illustrates the diasporic self’s yearning for reuniting with his Turkish identity and land. On the other hand, Haldun’s self-reflexivity had brought him to Antalya to try working in the tourism sector, and eventually he discovered more qualities about himself. In this regard, Haldun’s translocational habitus allows him to ‘unlock’ new destinations and have new experiences. He works in a luxurious leather-fur coat, something he had no interest or experience previously, however he now has a high rank salesmen status and he is able to travel to countries like Russia, Hungary, Bulgaria through his job and establish more business connections.

Nevertheless, some informants reflect that, upon return they developed new anxieties, with regards to the ways in which they imagined ‘home’ and their ‘identities’ in certain ways but realities did not match these. Also, they struggled with practical issues regarding encountering new social ‘fields’, in which they did not know the rules of the game. Familiarities with and alienations towards home-places and self-identity are one dimension of the internalisation of the return, the others are renegotiations of the identities, strategies to find ‘home’ in the homeland, or coming to an understanding that home is not a given, automatically granted notion upon return, but it involves active constructing and making. In case of disappointment and disillusion upon return, the informants have gone through a process of reflection on ‘where’ home is.

The story of Jülide reflects the above-mentioned phases of ‘returning’ to Turkey with the expectation of having a better life, nevertheless return brings more questions about her identity.

28 He refers to the Battle of Gallipoli (25 April 1915 – 9 January 1916), in which the modern Turkey gained independence from the British, Russian and French occupation.
and sense of home. Jülide had faced direct racism from a German classmate at the age of 13, severely beaten up and was hospitalised. As she witnessed her teacher did not intervene and her attacker was not sent to discipline, the doctors also claimed that she was exaggerating the situation. Jülide says, “They did not understand me, they said I was physically fine, after 10 days in the hospital. My heart was broken, I was emotionally broken. Germany was over for me.” However, it took another 4 years for her family to plan their ‘return’ which eventually took place in 1987, and 17-year-old Jülide was hopeful about their new beginning in Mersin, where her parents originally come from.

I can’t tell you how disappointed I was! I had thought I’d feel at home in Mersin, but, I felt like an outsider instead… In Germany, I was in the final year of Hauptschule, attending a special cycle called E-Klasse for students who have talent for languages. In Turkey, they didn’t count it as equivalent, so I had to start from the first year of high school, with students 3-4 years younger than me. Turkish education system was different, it’s all about memorising what’s written in books, you wear uniforms, teachers are so authoritarian… English lectures were a joke, they start from “Hello, how are you?” each year (laughing). My Turkish was horrible, so I struggled at school. In Germany, I used to swim, play football and table tennis, but the high school in Mersin had no sport facilities. Sports was a big part of my identity, and in Turkey that was taken out of my hands. When I complained about the lack of sports activities, my classmates would say, “Girls don’t play football!”, in Germany girls did play football! Mersin was backward, they didn’t have asphalt roads, in winter my boots would be filled with mud. There was no decent public transportation, so the commute between home and school was such a hassle. On top of all these things, my parents became more conservative, they wanted me to cover myself, though moderately, because in village everybody knew each other, and especially my mother really cared about what others would think of us (Jülide, F46).

Jülide’s narrative is covering many common problems the second generation faced upon returning to Turkey, especially those who had to go through the Turkish education system, and those who were settled in rural areas. In her narrative, there can be also found a strong emphasis on how gender norms and roles are assigned and renegotiated depending on the context. Furthermore, when Jülide was asked how she perceived her ‘return’, she reflected disillusionment and dissatisfaction, leading her to employ a reflexive angle about ‘who she is’ with regards to ‘where she is’, which led to her resettlement in Antalya.

[About ‘return’] I see confusion, disappointment and sadness. In Germany, I didn’t know who I was, was I Turkish or German, or Muslim? What did these mean? I had my family but hardly felt like I could relate to them. I had a homeland [Germany] but I wasn’t welcomed. Then we came to Turkey, thinking everything was going to be better. On the contrary, I got more confused than ever about what and who I was. I think every Turk should go to Europe to learn
about being organised, clean, punctual, independent.... Unfortunately, these habits and norms hardly exist in Turkey. So, I might look Turkish, my body, face, maybe my emotional world, my sentiments, but the way I think and the way I live, I mean my lifestyle, that’s more like a German. So, when you are called Turkish, you don’t necessarily feel at home in Turkey. I was used to the German rules, German way of living. So, our return, it opened my eyes to the reality, that’s why I ran away from Mersin and came to Antalya. To be the woman I wanted to be. *Kendi düzenimi karmak içind*29 (Jülide, F46).

Like Jülide’s story, other informants who had a family-return too expressed their feelings of disappointment and disillusionment even though in some cases they saw ‘return’ as a ‘homecoming’ but struggled with the structures in Turkey. Hence, they were soon to find after ‘return’ that the ‘homely feeling’ hardly had any practical value and purpose in teaching them about “the rules of the game” in their new environments such as school, working place, neighbourhood, village or city. Reconnecting with their roots did not necessarily led them to call their return places as ‘home’, they realise that they needed to actively build an environment for themselves where they acquire intimacy, security and a certain level of control over their lives. Jülide’s example of such realisation summarises the common path taken by informants, they firstly settled in their parents’ places of origin and became aware that they were not able to pin down their sense of ‘home’ to these specific locations. The lack of lived experiences in these places was vocalised as one of the reason, but the main reason was that the informants’ idea of an ‘authentic’ home was more about having a space to celebrate and live with their multiple identities and belongings rather than reuniting with a sedentary home-place to be ‘one’ person (i.e. Turkish).

6.2 Discriminated and Broken: Hoping for Acceptance

The informants’ experiences of being discriminated and marginalised in the country they were born and raised have undeniably affected their identity formation processes, and for some, these struggles led to the decision of ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland. The return imagining was mostly tied to the expectation that once they would ‘return’ to Turkey, they would assume to be accepted by their respective community. Narratives suggest that, discrimination per se is unlikely to act as a push factor for the Turkish second generation to move to Turkey. In most cases, discrimination acts as a trigger event unless the discrimination experience was substantial (e.g. direct physical abuse, discrimination at school or in work place etc.) in its effects on the individual. Hence, this section mainly focuses on those informants who faced direct social
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29 Literally meaning, “to set in my ways” however this is used to emphasise that she wants to live the way she wants, and make her own home the way she wants.
exclusion and discrimination which resulted in severe physical and/or mental traumas, and the only way to cope with these consequences was found in returning to Turkey.

Another important point is, the informants and their families were not only discriminated by the ‘dominant’ Other – the Germans, but in some cases, they also received exclusionist and stigmatising behaviour from the members of the Turkish community, based on their difference in terms of lifestyle. Here, it is vital to note that, discrimination is not only based on the ethnic, national, religious differences; social class too appears to be the source of discrimination. Hence, Barth’s (1969) ethnic boundaries can be stretched to the boundaries between class, gender, religion and habitus, and needs to include such ‘intersectional’ understanding. The narratives reflect that the main reason of such marginalising processes within the Turkish community is based on the differences of family’s urban and rural backgrounds. Whilst the families with an urban background (for instance those from Istanbul has a strong local identity) tend to have more secular views and openness to change and integrate into the German society – therefore their practices and way of living were criticised by other Turkish around them, and in certain incidents they were marginalised by their own community. On the other hand, it is also evident in the narratives that, almost all the informants of this research regarded themselves as “different” than the other Turkish around them and hence they distanced themselves with the prejudice of other Turkish people being not as integrated, modern and competent (especially in language competency, manners and etiquette) as themselves or their families.

Such in-group dynamics show that the Turkish community is quite heterogeneous based on regional, urban, rural differences, sects in religious belief (Alevites, non-Sunni Muslims), also on ethnic minorities such as Circassians, Kurdish, Assyrian, Balkan-Turks (Bulgarian, Albanian and Greek roots amongst all), Lazi (from the Black Sea region towards Georgia) and yörüük (semi-nomadic groups found in mountainous regions of Anatolia, also named as Türkmen). However, the narrative accounts point that the major divide in the Turkish community in Germany was on the idea of secularism (Kemalist views) versus more traditional, conservative values (which has been especially on the rise since AK Party came into power in Turkey in 2002). It is difficult to categorise these two camps by claiming the secular lifestyle is only the trait of the urban families, as the identities are more eclectic and chaotic in Turkey – for instance there are informants whose parents have rural background and they are uneducated, however they had strong Kemalist views and they were secular in their lifestyle (especially informants with Alevi background). However, it is safe to say that these Kemalist and secularist views are more common amongst those informants whose families comes from the Istanbul area and Aegean coast of Turkey.
Hence, there are two sides to the coin for the second generation when it comes to discrimination in Germany. On one hand, they face exclusion and discrimination from the German side, and on the other hand they also have a problematic relationship with the Turkish community around them. The empirical research on the second-generation Turkish-German returnees illustrate that discrimination and stigmatisation were not experienced by every individual (King & Kilinc, 2013; Kilinc & King, 2017). Also, the thesis supports this argument, with the note that even though not all the informants faced personal and direct discrimination, they had friends and family, or Turkish people they knew who went through these negative experiences, hence this was a part of their “diaspora consciousness”. This created a tension in which they felt that even if they were accepted on an individual level, their community was stigmatised and the German society was never going to fully accept them. The quote below illustrates the tension of feeling that they belong to the German society, however not receiving full acceptance by the dominant ‘Other’. Narratives like the one below was commonly vocalised by the informants, clearly indicating that these experiences led second generation to have a “self-concept disturbance”.

I consider myself as I’m from Monchengladbach. I’m a German citizen. My life was good in Germany, I’ve enjoyed little bit of everything without passing to the dark side, like some other Turks (laughing). But even if we were very well adapted, we were living like Germans, you still get treated like a second-class citizen. That’s why, deep down I’ve always longed for coming to Turkey, it felt like it was my real home. When we came here for summer holidays, I’d feel such a relief. In Germany, let’s say if I talked on the phone for a job interview, they would not understand that I was not German, because I speak German perfectly. But if they saw my name, or if I went to their office for a face-to-face meeting, they would start asking me awkward questions or immediately treat me differently. The German neighbours would be always a little distant. When we went out, some bars would not let in the ‘Eastern’ looking people. There were so many ways how they discriminated us… When I moved to Turkey 2 years ago, I felt at ease, there is no contra-group that you need to be cautious about, you’re Turkish in Turkey, that’s the best thing you can be. Somehow, it really puts you on ease when you don’t need to constantly explain yourself or protect yourself. Especially in Antalya… You can be who you are, nobody cares! (Sezgin, M35).

According to Aydin (2016), even though public and media discourses highlight discrimination, social exclusion and lack of identification with the German society and values as the main reasons of the increasing return flows from Germany to Turkey since the mid-1980s, he claims that the empirical evidence is also inconclusive on the effects of other forms of discrimination on these emigration trends (Aydin, 2013). Aydin further acknowledges surveys and polls suggesting that Turkish people face discrimination in Germany, especially in the labour and
housing markets as well as in the education system (Faist, 1993; Yurdakul, 2006; Kaya, 2009), however he concludes that there is no strong evidence suggesting that these necessarily lead to the return from Germany to Turkey (Aydın, 2016, p.10). He proposes three important reasons for this rationale. First one is that academic studies and media/public discourses that focuses on discrimination as a reason to emigrate from Germany to Turkey mostly sees migration as a one-way movement disregarding the return movements and transnational circular migration. Secondly, by only focusing on the push factors in emigration countries (in this case, for instance discrimination), they ignore the pull factors in immigrant countries. And finally, the human agency is overlooked because migration is not only an outcome of politics and social structures but it requires the conscious decision of subjects.

The following narrative shows how human agency is significant in the ways in which people react to discrimination. Even though this informant later returned to Turkey with his parents because of facing continuing discrimination in his school environment, he coped with the situation for several years in his own way.

I love Germany, and I find the education system is unbeatable. I’m a teacher myself now, and I still benefit from what we were taught in the German schools. But our school’s principle teacher would clearly indicate that he didn’t like foreigners, especially Turks. I was the only Turkish student in the entire school. He was having a bad influence on my class teacher as well. I was eligible to continue to Gymnasium but this principle called in my parents and class teacher and told them, “Statistics show that Turkish children struggle with such advanced level of education. Maybe he should try Realschule instead?” And he managed to get into my parents’ heads! I was a silent boy, but when I learned about this, I stormed into his room and told him that I was going to be successful and he couldn’t stop me! I don’t know what came out me! (laughing) So, I started Gymnasium, only Turk in the class... My classmates were nice in the beginning but then I heard rumours that their parents were telling them things like “Sprich nicht mit dem Ausländer-Jungen!”. So, I started feeling uncomfortable, and that made my parents upset too. After two years, we decided to come to Turkey, thinking we would have a calmer life, less stress, friendlier environment. I continued high school in Turkey, compared to the German education system it was so traditional. I got beaten up by a classmate because I was wearing a Bayern-Munich uniform during the sports hour, he called me a “dirty German”. So, I was discriminated because I was Turkish in Germany, and German in Turkey. I’ve felt out of place all my life, and it broke my heart to go through the same things in Turkey. I started feeling better once I moved to Ankara to study at the university and then when I came to Antalya and created an international lifestyle for myself where I’m with open-minded people (Bedri, M31).

30 “Don’t talk to the foreigner boy!” Ausländer is a derogative term.
The narrative above, and other ones with the discrimination theme are in line with Aydin’s (2016) argument in the sense that the second generation and their families had diverse ways of coping with discrimination, one of these coping mechanisms will be introduced in the next section, in which some informants rebelled against these stigmatisation practices and feeling of ‘pushed aside’ by joining gangs, grouping with other migrants etc. Hence, instead of taking a ‘return’ path, many Turkish immigrants instead settled in areas where they could live within the Turkish community. Hence, even though this section is themed as discrimination, the return motivations and expectations from the return is more associated with identity struggles that is often the characteristic of the second generation Turkish-Germans. For this group in their daily lives but also at a more conscious level, this sense of ‘in-betweeness’ or ‘double consciousness’ is related to a feeling of being ‘stuck’ between the inward-looking space of Turkish family life in Germany, and the wider, more liberal, but not fully accessible social spaces in their respective German societies (Kılınç & King, 2017). Such confusion, contestation and constant negotiation between different identity repertoires lead some of the informants to seek a fresh start in the ancestral homeland, where they felt that they could focus on improving themselves and their lives. Hence the expectation from leaving Germany was to be surrounded in a new environment in which their vibrant identity mixes, conceptualised as hybrid, transnational or cosmopolitan find a space for expression (Kaya, 2007; Vertovec, 1999).

The narratives point out to diverse reflections about the German society’s perceptions and discriminatory activities towards the Turkish community. However, these reflections too are a product of years of self-reflection and revision of the past with new experiences, new ways of thinking through the experience of return to Turkey, and having the lived experience of Turkey. Almost all the informants stressed that when they returned to Turkey, they changed their own perception towards the Turkish people, and also evaluated the anti-immigrant rhetoric in some parts of the Germany with a new eye. In Turkey, they realise that Turkish people in Turkey are different than those in Germany. They realised that the Turkish in Germany was having the “frozen clock syndrome” (Pickles, 1995, p.107) in which they tried to maintain everything from their homeland and lived in almost a time capsule. Whilst their original homeland has been undergoing great transformation with economic advancement, social and political changes etc. they were unaware of these. Hence, the informants stated that when they returned to Turkey, their idea about the country and its people positively changed. They reflected that some of the Turkish people gave no effort to integrate into the German society, and they did not follow the rules. The informants further evaluate that it is partly the German government’s fault in which
they were slow to establish integration programmes, and they accepted more and more immigrants without preparing the right conditions to accommodate these people.

### 6.3 Deportation: Learning from Mistakes

The Turkish community has reacted to the stigmatisation practices throughout the 1970s by mobilising through diaspora organisations, ethnic neighbourhoods and the Turkish government’s services (e.g. imams – religious leaders – and teachers were sent to Germany for religion, Turkish language and history courses) (Herbert, 1990; Triadafilopoulos & Schönwälder, 2006). Nevertheless, in the long run the lack of perspective about their future in Germany in terms of social, economic and political security has had a negative impact on the integration of the first generation and second generation (Østergaard-Nielsen, 2003). Most of the second generation inherited the experience of marginalisation, non-recognition, and exclusion as well as the structural non-integration in German institutions (especially in schools) (Faist, 2000).

Throughout the 1980s, the Turkish youth has found alternative ways of coping with these integration problems, the birth of Turkish-German hip-hop and the creole language of Kanak Sprak reflected their identity struggles (Kaya, 2002; Soysal, 2004). As one of the informants Gürkan (M30) put it, “Hip-hop is a protest culture, it is strong. Turkish-German rappers rap about the real problems Turks are having, or immigrants in general. It is a critique of the society, and when I listen to it, I feel that there are others out there who can relate to me.” However, whilst Gürkan was not involved in any crimes, some other informants were engaged in gang violence as a rebellion against the majority society in which they experienced discrimination, as well as a reaction to racist attacks towards the members of the Turkish community (Tertilt, 1997). On an individual level, some informants suffered from drug abuse and they were involved in drug-related crimes and robbery. Those who were prosecuted were given the choice of deportation to reduce their imprisonment to half of its initial length. In the case of engagement with criminal activities, the informants faced the consequence of deportation to Turkey (they did not hold German citizenship).

The second generation Turkish-German youth spent their teenager years mostly in the period from mid-1980s through 1990s. These were the times where more immigrants arrived at Germany, not only from Turkey with family reunifications, but also as political refugees, students and highly-skilled migrants. In addition, there were migrant flows from the Eastern Germany with the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989, from former Yugoslavian countries after the 1991 war, and refugees from Middle Eastern countries. These periods were mentioned by the informants as the years of intolerance. They all pointed out that, once they started secondary school, they
encountered with a new reality; they had more immigrants around them and realised that the society was becoming more polarised, more problems arising not only between the Germans and migrant groups, but also between these different migrant groups.

The informants mentioned that, it was important for them to have a protection wall and coping mechanism to deal with the changes happening around them. Some respondents showed the loosening family ties as a reason to their growing insecurity and trying to adapt themselves in the ‘power geometries’ where they develop a “tough” attitude. The informants reflected on the performativity aspect such ‘ghetto identity’, explaining that their involvement in gangs was a way to claim power over the dominant Others (Germans and other migrant groups). As they grew older, they perceived their parents as ‘robots’, working constantly, who are ignorant and incapable of getting outside of their habitus (rural, working-class, patriarchal, income-oriented, having no social life etc.). The informants noted that as they grew older, they felt a growing gap between themselves and their parents. Through school, they were experiencing the ‘German life’, school trips to other European countries, celebrating the festive days, taking part in sports and art activities, having native-level fluency in German and so on. However, not being completely accepted in the German groups, and finding difficulty to associate themselves with their parents, the informants state that they found themselves in a self-destructive cycle.

Those informants who embraced the neighbourhood culture stated that once they started using drugs and involved in minor crimes such as stealing phones, they wanted more. Some respondents mentioned that they even robbed a bank or stole expensive cars, the more money and materials they had, they asked for more. It needs to be remembered that, they were engaged in these criminal activities when they were teenagers, so once they were economically independent, they started seeing no purpose in attending school. This was a prominent theme in the neighbourhood culture, seeing no future and hope for themselves as immigrants, believing that they would never be accepted to schools and jobs that the Germans go to. So, the alternative was shortcuts to the prosperous life. These adventures resulted in life-changing consequences for them, they were caught at some point and ended up in prison. As one deported informant explained,

Who cared about school? At school, they were telling us ‘you Turks belong to the factories!’ anyway. When I was a teenager I had thousands of Marks in my pocket, we were robbing shops. The leader of the gang was a German, when we were caught, they first sent me to jail for 5 years then deported me, but the Germans were sent for social work! (Rüştü, M53).
The narratives of deportation were consistent with Bauman’s division of “vagabonds” and “tourists” and Beck’s division of “losers” and “winners” in Western societies, wherein the second generation were clearly representing the vagabonds. One of the informants reflected on the conditions that lead to criminal activities and it can be found in this narrative that Durkheim’s “anomie” and “normlessness” in the modern societies; the absence of well-defined norms and regulations had an impact on the Turkish-Germans youth’s poorly-made decisions.

Turks like hard-core drugs, like heroin. I think, that momentary, intense happiness is the main reason why Turkish youngsters use it, I was one of them, unhappy, confused, lonely… When your parents don’t take care of you, and when you’re pushed away by the society, it’s inevitable to fall into the void. And whatever we did, we did to fill the void within us… In Germany, drugs were easily available, it’s an individualistic society, nobody intervenes into others’ lives, so there’s no control mechanism. Germans see it as you’re responsible from yourself as an adult, everything is within reach and available, alcohol, drugs, women, gambling, but it’s your duty to discipline yourself. I think in such loose environment, Turks become misfits because we Turks are used to authority, in the absence of control, by family, relatives, neighbours, teachers, police, even by the people on the street, we tend to redo things. That’s why Turkish youth in Turkey weren’t doing what we did in Germany, because in Turkey, “her şey yasak”31, and in Germany, “her şey serbest!”32. So… when you are raised by people who come from everything-is-forbidden-mentality, but when you live in everything-is-allowed-reality, it’s sometimes difficult for yourself to know where to stop. Or, sometimes, you want to stop but it’s too late. I ended up in jail for 2 years because of drug-related crimes, I stole money so I could buy more drugs. And Germany didn’t give me a chance, they deported me to Turkey. I had good friends in Germany, and I see it as my home even today. But Germany did not see me as their child, one mistake, and I found myself at the airport in Istanbul. Does Germany deport German citizens when they commit crimes? No. I tell you, in drug business, there were so many Germans, but they would make the ‘immigrants’ do the risky businesses. We get deported because we’re not German citizens, but Germany doesn’t understand that we’re the product of Germany, not Turkey… I have made peace with myself in Turkey, I stopped using drugs completely. I’ve been living in Antalya for 17 years now, I work hard but I also enjoy the nature here, I meditate, I socialise with tourists. Maybe the deportation did good to me, so I learned to take responsibility for my actions and turn over a new leaf in my life (Kamil, M48).

In Kamil’s narrative, one important part is that, he highlights he is the “product of Germany”, hence he lived a ‘vagabond life’ due to the circumstances in Germany, and not Turkey. This raises an important question about civil society and its responsibility to its people, whether they are citizens or de facto citizens. Moreover, once the informants were sent back to
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31 “Everything is forbidden.”
32 “Everything is allowed.”
Turkey, they went through a ‘double trauma’: on one hand, they were forced to leave their families and the country they were born and raised in; on the other hand, they had to cope with the new environment in Turkey where they became marginalised not only for coming from Germany but also for their criminal past. Hence, in the case of the deported second generation, life in the counter-diaspora entails other hardships, as they need to also erode the boundaries related to their criminal identities.

Furthermore, the narratives reflect on this ‘double trauma’ in relation to having had the urge of ‘searching for self’, leaving the past behind and re-inventing the self through hard work in tourism-related jobs, staying away from hard drugs and other bad habits, and more importantly developing new skills such as learning new languages, following the world news, reading books, specialising in a certain area such as sales, leather, jewellery, water sports, cooking etc. (depends on what is available in their tourism-related job). These practices they engaged themselves with have the purpose of saving them from isolation, and re-integrate into the Turkish society. As Stonequist (1961, p.2) had explained, “the individual who through migration, education, marriage, or some other influence leaves one social group or culture without making a satisfactory adjustment to another finds himself on the margin of each but a member of neither. He is a “marginal man””, hence the deported informants put an effort not to be the marginal men in their new life in Antalya.

Deportation as a forced-return migration phenomena has been overlooked in the literature of ‘the second generation return migration’ and there is a lack of empirical research regarding the post-deportation and social integration experiences of the Germany-born Turkish migrants.33 Although the deported second generation is invisible in empirical research dealing with return migration from Germany to Turkey, they are an integral part of the tourism and hospitality workforce mainly in the Turkish coastal towns and cities in the southern region (Kaya & Adaman, 2011). As the narratives commonly depicted, Antalya has especially been the ideal place for the deported Turkish from Germany with the high demand in tourism sectors for workers who can speak foreign languages. Therefore, employers would generally turn a blind eye to personal backgrounds, as long as the job applicants could speak German and English as well as showing enthusiasm and determination to work hard. In this regard, the informants’

33 One famous case is the story of the notorious 14-year-old Muhlis Ari (or as the German media commonly refer to him as Mehmet) who had committed 60 crimes in the Bayern area and was deported to Turkey in 1998 without his parents. The court decision had created an intense public debate about whether it was fair to deport a minor unattended by parents. Source: Zeit Online, 2013, http://www.zeit.de/2013/41/mehmet-abschiebung-tuerkei-beckstein
“transcultural capital” enable them to take an active part in the social life and work-force in Antalya regardless of their pasts. As their various forms of capitals are in demand, they are given the priority and further opportunities in the tourism sector, and this in turn allow them to ‘re-invent’ themselves and/or discover their better qualities, hence finding their ‘true’ self.

6.4 Pursuing Lifestyle Aspirations: Self-Realisation

Analysing the informants’ narratives, it was apparent that, only around half of the sample had gone through a ‘self-realisation’ process when still living in Germany, whilst the other half needed to firstly experience the ancestral homeland in big cities and their parents’ places of origin to compare their lived experiences with their lifestyle aspirations. There are no major differences between the way these two groups were raised, however those have the “reflexive project of the self” has been more economically independent, they have been mobile, changing cities and countries and travelling to other countries. As a result, these individuals started looking for alternative places to live where they can have freedom of expression and experience, cultural amenities, individuality and self-authenticity (Maile & Griffiths, 2014). Clearly, this group’s habitus evolved in a way that they started seeing themselves as ‘citizens of the globe’, embracing socially liberal views, alternative spiritual beliefs and grew a need of defining themselves beyond the labels of ‘Turkish’, ‘German’ or ‘Turkish-German’. The following narrative depicts how some informants evaluate their understanding of ‘the self’ in relation to collective identities (i.e. Turkish, German).

I finished Hauptschule, and I was waiting for the results of my placement year applications. All my German friends were accepted to a company, but I was getting rejections. I was only 16, but I told my parents, I want to move to Turkey and try a new life there. They couldn’t come with me, my younger brothers were still studying, but I was determined not to victimise myself. If German education system and society taught me one thing, it’s individuality, being self-reflexive and being able to calculate pros and cons, seeing opportunities for yourself. I came to Turkey because there’s one important thing here, maneviyat.34 It is what makes us different than Europeans, and that’s why I’d never live in Germany again, they lack sensitivity, softness inside. It’s dull there, and people are like robots. I learned so much from them, and had a good life in Germany, but I knew that I had to feed my manevi side. Whatever you do, there is a certain level of discrimination there, I wanted to feel human, that’s why since I was 16 years old, I looked for a place where I can feel in tune with myself. My parents’ town didn’t quite work for me. I was hypnotised by Istanbul but no, that city is so stressful and expensive. In Antalya, I built a fulfilling life for myself. And Turkey has caught up with Germany in the last 20 years, so I don’t miss Germany at all (Fethi, M45).

34 Sentiments, spirituality, morale.
For most of this group, Antalya has been an option to settle even before ‘returning’ to Turkey. They were aware of Antalya’s beautiful nature, historical heritage, job opportunities for German speakers and different spaces providing both the lively city life, exciting nightlife but also calm and natural places through their childhood visits as well as Turkish and German friends who have lived or had holidays in Antalya. These narratives reflect deeper motivations to escape from the mundane of everyday life, the struggle to negotiate their identities as being ‘Turkish’ in the German society, costly living expenses and limited job opportunities in their German towns, and feeling restricted in their ‘Turkish’ family space. However, for those who do not hold a German passport, the place options to settle and work elsewhere is not an easy process as Turkish passport requires visa permits for many countries in the world. Hence, Turkey appears as a sensible decision where they could re-connect with the ancestral homeland meanwhile pursing their more adventurous and self-development related goals.

There is an important rationalisation process also with regards to their social, cultural and human capital. In Turkey, they wanted to live in places where they could financially support themselves, however this would be more difficult in places like Istanbul where there are many competent and highly-skilled rivals who also have the language capital. In addition, even though an oversimplification, environmental psychologists argue that, “cities tend to be, relatively speaking, noisy, polluted, dirty, crowded, auto-congested, and spatially complex”, confusing for both long-term residents and newcomers (Proshansky, 1978, p.151). For the informants, Istanbul was perceived almost ‘scary’ place with its size, dense population, traffic and all the typical attributes associated with big cities. In this regard, the informants made it clear that it was not only the city chaos and high living costs that made them look for alternative places, but they perceived the city communities as anomic, referring to diminishing neighbourhood culture, people helping one another and the rapid individualisation and Westernization which they saw as a threat to the good old Turkish values and community spirit. It is also important to note that, whilst this group is highly individualistic and have been seeking for a sense of freedom in their places of settlement, they were nevertheless looking for a community feeling in which they feel secure and included, but not being limited in terms of their lifestyle and self-expression.

Hence, whilst they realised that their forms of capitals were harder to be utilised in Istanbul, they found that in tourism areas like Antalya, there is a gap between the demand for German-speaking and flexible workers and the locals’ types of capital (especially the language and human capital). Being aware of this gap, the informants focused on finding possibilities to settle and work in tourism places. This clearly points out that forms of capital mean and function differently depending on the structural contexts. The story of Gürkan shows how the fit between
their capitals and habitus and the return place’s habitus is important for the returnees to learn ‘rules of the game’ but also have a ‘homely feeling’.

I came to Turkey to start an easy life. My father had invested in several properties here. My father’s side is a known family in Manisa, so I thought I would go there and do whatever I wanted. When I was younger, we used to travel along the Aegean coast and I’ve always thought that I wanted to live in a warm and beautiful place. So, I opened a bistro-style pizzeria in Manisa, in Germany people always go and get pizza, whether when you don’t want to cook or when you have hangover, students... It turns out people don’t do that in Turkey, and in a place like Manisa, such concept failed horribly! I was so disappointed, I mean I am a German citizen, I could go and live anywhere but I wanted to come to Turkey and do something nice here. Then I decided that I had to live somewhere my German mentality, language skills and lifestyle are accepted. That’s why I moved to Antalya (Gürkan, M30).

As Gürkan’s narrative illustrates, the nostalgic and imagined ties and attachments hardly translates into ‘getting a sense of the field’ without having the lived experience of the return place. Furthermore, as the narrative points out, the informants looked for places wherein their habitus and forms of capitals have a certain level of ‘fit’. In Antalya, through their jobs in the tourism-related businesses, they are able to become a part of a ‘community’ wherein business and leisure activities include socialising with Turkish, German and other tourist/expat groups, hence allowing them to enjoy spaces of freedom, as the culture in tourism spaces are found hybrid, inclusive and open.

Secondly, it also shows that second generation can be conceptualised as “affluent” and “privileged” as how lifestyle migrants are defined. Here, being affluent and privileged does not derive from a position of economic advantage, but from the cultural and human capital they acquired during their lives in Germany. Hence, upon ‘return’ to Turkey and in their quest of living in Antalya, their privilege comes from their position in the local social hierarchy (Benson & Jackson, 2013; Benson, 2014). In a populated cosmopolitan city like Istanbul, their qualities could easily be disregarded due to the high number of qualified people. However, in Antalya region, they were needed by the locals in order to do trade with foreigners, work in hospitality-related service sectors like hotels, tour agencies etc. as the second generation can speak German, Turkish and English, in most cases more languages.

6.5 Conclusion: Reflecting on the Self, ‘Return’ and the Myth of ‘Homecoming’

This chapter focused on four recurring themes of ‘return’ in the informants’ narratives. The findings highlighted that, by focusing on the second generation’s habitus, it is possible to
offer a new understanding regarding the notions of identity and belonging in relation to homeland-attachment. As the narratives showed, the informants have been searching for places wherein their personalities, lifestyles and skills are, not only accepted but also useful. Furthermore, to understand the informants’ multiple attachments, Falicov’s question can be a good starting point: “If home is where the heart is, and one’s heart is with one’s family, language, and country, what happens when your family, language, and culture occupy two different worlds?” (2005, p.399). The narratives suggested a clear answer to this query: The informants reflect that their multiple identities and belongingness lead to deeper self-reflection in relation to ethno-national, religious, cultural identity and belonging.

Hence, upon ‘return’ to Turkey, they contest these ‘given’ or ‘static’ notions and search for places where they can re-invent themselves. In this regard, Zetter’s (1999, p.7) analysis of ‘return’ orientation is meaningful, suggesting that “myth of return is in some respects a misconceived shorthand. More accurately, what is mythologized is not return per se, but home. It might be more accurate to recast the myth of return as the myth of home.” For the informants of this research as well, disappointments and disillusionments regarding the ‘return’ was more about their expectations from the ‘homeland’, hence, not finding a ‘homecoming’ upon ‘return’ led them to consider resettlement, and within their capabilities and resources, they chose Antalya.

Moreover, following Anthias’ concept of “intersectionality”, there are other reference points of identities such as gender, social class, education, rural/urban background which interplay with the previously mentioned ones and affect each member of the second generation and their lives differently. The informants’ transnational ties and translocal practices provide a space for reflexivity, in which they can transcend the ‘given’ and ‘static’ understanding of ‘who they are’ and ‘where they belong to’. Consequently, their approach to understanding ‘the self’ and world surrounding them is based upon the awareness of multiple realities. Their perception is the most conspicuous difference amongst others compared to their parents. Whilst the first generation tends to adhere to their homeland’s culture and traditions, the second generation contemplates these as options, discerning that other ways of ‘being’ and living are possible.

Nevertheless, their understanding of the plural dimensions and fluidity of norms does not prevent the informants to long for belonging to one group and acceptance. The narratives highlighted this constant struggle of re-negotiating their identities, and romanticising to live in a place where they do not have to explain themselves, or make additional efforts to be accepted by the others. This desire can be interpreted as the underpinning motivation for the informants to imagine a more fulfilling life in their parents’ homeland. However, longing for living in a dolce
Domum is not always a conscious aspiration or evident motivation for return; it habitually manifests itself because of interactions with the ancestral homeland, experiencing warmth and acceptance in a respective community. Therefore, it is a realisation through lived experience, often through discovering an alternative life is possible, wherein some elements of their identity are safeguarded.

However, the narratives also revealed that, the informants discern that certain attributions of their identities are still open to discussion and negotiation in their ancestral homeland. For instance, “being Turkish” as a part of their identity might not require further questions at the first glance, but how much they fit into the ‘Turkish way of living’ is debated by the local community. Even though there is not one way of Turkish life, certain behaviours are expected of them, which they do not always feel familiar with. Hence, the informants realised that ancestral homeland as a ‘haven’ was an oversimplification; it was in fact an ‘imagined community’ wherein their membership to it was ambivalent, hence upon ‘return’ they kept negotiating their identities in relation to their daily practices and interactions. As Al-Ali and Koser (2002, p.6) depicted, their belonging and homing desires represent a dynamic process, “involving acts of imagining, creating, unmaking, changing, losing and moving ‘homes’”.

The narratives further demonstrated that they embrace this dynamic process because their main goal behind ‘returning’ to Turkey and later settling in Antalya was to live a ‘better and more fulfilling life’. This aim by itself is a novel approach compared to the first generation who prioritised economic benefits and kinship ties which are ‘place-bound’. Contrastingly, the informants’ understanding of a ‘better life’ entails conditions and feelings beyond financial gains and reuniting with their roots. The informants indicated that they resign themselves to the life in Turkey without being fixated with the idea of restoring the ideal ‘homeland’. Their hybrid condition and reflexivity guide them to acknowledge that their attachments surpass the boundaries of the given and strictly defined notions of ‘homeland’. Instead, they are on a journey in which the goal is not to arrive at a destination which is called ‘home’ but formulating their lives for the better with what crosses their paths during this process. Even though the imprint of the first generation’s homeland-orientation is highly influential for the informants, as they acquire the lived experience of the ancestral homeland they incline to their own way of perceiving and processing homing desires and belonging.

Finally, it is important to evaluate the informants’ autonomy with regards to their further migratory paths and settlement in Antalya. The chapter illustrated that women and men had different levels of agency, whilst women were put higher expectations by their families regarding
following the family plans, adaptability and integrating into the social fields of Turkey, men were able to get out of these familial and cultural structures more easily. In return migrations studies, King and Christou’s (2011) research based on the second-generation Greek-American and Greek-German ‘return’ to Greece presents that, “diasporic imaginaries and mobilities, including rootedness and rootlessness, are experienced differently by women and men”. Their research illustrates two important findings, one is that return as a quest for “searching for self” is more widespread amongst men. Latter is, women commonly narrate ‘return’ as an intention to escape from oppressive and patriarchal family environment (p.294).

There are other examples in migration research which point out that often men narrate their migratory decisions as autonomous, whilst women view migration as a collective endeavour and represent the experience within the family context (Chamberlain, 1997; Christou, 2006b). Furthermore, gender identities lead to different migrant experiences between men and women, however the evaluation of gender needs to be within the “intersectionality” because, “being a woman means different things to a young migrant domestic worker and to the wealthy women who employs her” (Carling, 2005, p.3). In other words, the thesis argues that women cannot be depicted as ‘losers’ in relation to migratory dynamics; gender relations are always mediated by other socially constructed categories such as class, age, ‘race’ and ethnicity (Chant, 2000; Tyner, 1996). Whilst this research shows that it is not only gender but also other forms of capital (mainly economic and social) which act as enablers or obstacles for the informants, gender still plays a vital role in the way it determines one’s active/passive agency. ‘Searching for self’ theme was mainly found in male informants’ narratives, however both men and women spoke of ‘tales of escapism’ for different reasons which will be further discussed in Chapter 8.
7 The Second Generation as ‘Lifestyle Returnees’: Towards a Better Way of Life?

This chapter focuses on how the informants enter a new field upon ‘return’ and improvise strategies to transform their lives. The buoyant tourist economy of Antalya allows them to utilise their cultural, social and human capital to earn a good living, for some to launch entrepreneurial activities and provides opportunities for temporary work/travel overseas through tourism-related jobs. Exploring the experiences of lifestyle returnees in such an open and empowering space, the chapter demonstrates how the quest of ‘search for self’ coincide with individuals’ access to certain spaces (tourism spaces amongst all) where they have the freedom to learn more about themselves and their capabilities/limitations.

Hence, the chapter firstly starts with presenting how the informants settled in Antalya, and how they put their personal quests of ‘searching for self’ and living a ‘better way of life’. The theme of ‘work-life balance’ is introduced in relation to how the informants created a new life for themselves in which they combine social work lives with leisurely time where they focus on their hobbies, and/or have calmness and peace of mind in naturally beautiful Antalya. The chapter then focuses on the ways in which the informants reconstruct a translocal place-identity in Antalya, and re-invent a more personal and intimate meaning of ‘home’. Furthermore, in order to show the informants’ involvement in different social fields of Antalya and with various Others, they are evaluated as ‘cultural mediators’ who utilise their ‘translocational habitus’ and “transcultural capital” for economic gain but also to widen their social networks and revise the social hierarchy with their German, Turkish and international Others. Throughout the chapter, meanings given to places and identities are explored, as well as in what ways the informants then translate these into ‘belongingness’ to Antalya or any identities that are embedded in their personal repertoires.

7.1 A Rite of Passage into the World of Tourism: Resettling in the Mediterranean

The case of the Turkish-German second generation who settled in Antalya focus attention on the nature and trajectory of migration in relation to lifestyle returnees’ expectations from this specific locale. As argued previously, lifestyle migration considers both the individualised biographies and actions as well as cultural contexts and structural conditions in understanding the timing, place preference and expectations (in terms lifestyle, life quality, self-development etc.)
throughout individuals’ migration journeys (Benson, 2012). As O’Reilly and Benson (2009, p.3) further argue “[T]he material and social construction of particular places offering an alternative way of living is crucial... revealing the role of imagination, myth and landscape within the decision to migrate.” The informants of this research – ‘lifestyle returnees’ are found to be more dependent on the “structural constraints” compared to other groups researched under the ‘lifestyle migrants’ category. As the previous chapter has presented, due to visa restrictions, criminal records, family-related restraints or lack of economic and human capital (i.e. professional qualifications), lifestyle returnees’ individual agencies were limited by the structures of places they inhabited and wider historical, material and cultural conditions (Amit, 2007; O’Reilly, 2007).

Narratives reflect that, the informants’ emigration to Antalya with the desire of having a ‘better way of life’ as well as their more existential quest of ‘search for self’ needs to be evaluated with reference to the relationship between imagination and forms of capital (Smith, 2006), wherein this particular group’s embodied dispositions i.e. “transcultural capital” and ‘translocational habitus’ as well as human capital such as language skills, social capitals such as contacts within Turkey placed them to be more “successful ‘authors’ of their lives than others” (Smith, 2006, p.54). In that sense, compared to lifestyle migrants, this group’s “affluence” derives from their cultural, social and human capital rather than being “affluent” in economic terms.

Secondly, the narratives support the argument within lifestyle migration literature regarding the “role of imagination” in the sense that, Turkish-German lifestyle returnees has been informed by their social networks in Germany and Turkey about Antalya, or through their childhood visits in this locale which assured them that they could make a decent living in this city by working in tourism-related businesses. Especially for those less privileged groups such as the deported and low-skilled returnees, Antalya was recommended for job opportunities, and for offering more tolerant and social environments due to its tourism spaces. Hence, the rhetoric of “Antalya as paradise” was deeply ingrained on the informants’ minds, this finding approving the scholars’ argument that collective imaginings of a possible better way of life and particular places associated with such ‘better life’ could foster migration decisions (Appadurai, 2001; Ong, 1999; Adams, 2004; Benson, 2012). However, narratives further suggest that, imagination of Antalya as the “ideal” and “authentic” place is not constructed independent from individuals’ self-reflexivity about their capabilities and willingness to take risks. And such reflexivity often flourished once they have acquired lived experiences in Turkey, giving them a vantage point to contest their identities and belongingness towards their “imagined communities”, either in terms of Turkey as “motherland” or specific places such as villages/cities of origin.
Another finding through the narratives point out that the informants’ idea of life in Turkey was romanticised, and the realities hardly matched with their experiences and expectations as they mostly lacked the ‘insider’s knowledge’ about their places of dwelling, hence could not utilise their forms of capitals to live and sustain the life they wished for. However, such experiences of ‘trying and failing’ evoked their reflexivity and re-constructed their nostalgia as *prospective*, instead of *retrospective*, hence they have learned to evaluate past and present simultaneously to actively take future decisions (Boym, 2001). Like lifestyle migrants, they have become “active agents who have improved their lives by way of their own unmediated choice; they have taken their destiny into their own hands by escaping unsatisfactory circumstances and do not expect others (or societies) to act on their behalf” (Korpela, 2014, p.27). Whilst the literature on the second generation’s ‘return’ portrays life upon return as dissatisfactory, hence the returnees as being ‘stuck’ in their new lives in homeland, the informants of this research present active agency to improve their life conditions. Therefore, this group’s distinctive position as ‘lifestyle returnees’ come from their reflexive and active stance for the self and life.

However, different than lifestyle migrants who *retrospectively* reflect, and represent their home societies as “anomic” and who rationalise their migration beyond their economic privileges (hence challenging their depiction as “consumers”) (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.3), lifestyle returnees’ narratives highlight the “bifocality” of home-place (Rouse, 1991) and “syncretic notion of culture” in terms of identities (Kaya, 2007). Therefore, for lifestyle returnees, home is reflected as the proximity of “two images – of home and abroad, past and present, dream and everyday life” (Boym, 2001, p.14). In that sense, and as the selected narratives will illustrate, lifestyle returnees choose Antalya because the city provides spaces where they can have German, Turkish and hybrid culture, they can have a parallel reality of being surrounded by many individuals who share the similar Turkish-German background. In addition, they still prioritise economic opportunities that the tourism sector offers. Thus, different that lifestyle migrants who search for an “authentic” place different than their native homes and who “prioritise quality of life over economic factors like job advancement and income” (Knowles & Harper, 2009, p.11), lifestyle returnees sit somewhere between counter-diasporic individuals, lifestyle migrants and economically-driven immigrants.

Antalya was an attractive destination not only for its cultural, natural and historical richness as the informants commonly mention, but primarily for the various and flexible job opportunities in tourism-related business where the Turkish-Germans would have a privileged condition for the cultural, social and human capitals they acquire. One of the informants explains
how the place needed the Turkish-Germans’ various forms of capitals and eagerness to learn and develop new skills.

Especially in 1990s with the tourism boom, we were considered gold. Whether the locals liked us or not, they couldn’t maintain their businesses without us. Nobody knew German and English, and there were all these rich tourists, coming and newly discovering Antalya, wanting to buy expensive local products such as carpets, jewellery and leather. So, we didn’t only make the trade between tourists and locals possible, but we also built such relations with tourists, so they started visiting Antalya each year, knowing that there were German-speaking Turks who understood their culture, lifestyle and needs. And for locals, we were ideal because many returnees came here to start a new life, and we came by ourselves. I was deported, so I came here to work as much as I could, my customers became my family. So, we were extremely motivated workers, we didn’t see this as a job, we saw it as a way of life (Arif, M45).

The narratives point out that, even though tourism sector was badly influenced after the 2008 economic crisis, and the number of tourist reduced even more with the recent terror attacks in Turkey, Turkish-German returnees still find many job opportunities in Antalya since many of them adapted to the changing tourist profile as they learned extra languages such as Russian, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, and exceptional few learned Arabic and Persian, since Antalya has been recently attracting tourists from Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, offering all-inclusive luxury packages suitable to the Middle Eastern taste. Some informants quit their tourism-related jobs and for instance has become German teachers in schools designed for both Turkish and international students. Thus, despite the political and economic drawbacks influencing the tourism sector, the Turkish-German returnees are able to navigate in the flexible job market.

There were many and intertwining reasons raised by the informants regarding their emigration and settlement in Antalya. However, as it was previously illustrated in the Table 9, the informants saw opportunities in tourism sector, not only for earning money but also for acquiring new skills and being surrounded by a familiar atmosphere, since Antalya is most popular amongst German tourists and expats. In addition, all informants pointed out that, they wanted to live in Antalya, because the city offers a lively city life, as well as calmer, rural and natural areas. Hence, a commonly discussed point in lifestyle migration and mobility studies regarding individuals’ desire to escape from the city to find self-authenticity (Osbaldiston, 2011; Benson, 2011a; Urry, 1999) does not completely apply to lifestyle returnees. Even though the informants vocalised that they could not live in big cities like Istanbul as they see big cities as dangerous, expensive, chaotic and draining, they did not want to isolate themselves, for instance in ‘rural idyll’.
The narrative below belongs to Acun, who owns a clothing store in Kundu area. He had spent a summer holiday in the Mediterranean coast when he was 26 years of age and decided to “take an adventure” in Turkey, which was his ever-longing dream. Despite being only graduated from secondary school in Germany, Acun turned his experience in sales into a business, and he is now managing a two-floor store on the main hotel district of Antalya. His narrative is a good example of how lifestyle returnees acquire the ability to have “reflexive assessment of opportunities” (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.3), therefore, their “individualised pursuit” of living a more fulfilling life is closely tied to seeking places that “will resonate with idealized visions of self” or “the potential self” (Hoey, 2005, p.593).

I had a wider network in Istanbul, my parents come from there, I have many relatives and friends from my childhood, but I’ve never found Istanbul appealing. It’s a mega city, so chaotic and intense. Also, quite expensive. One can hardly afford the rent and transportation even with a decent salary. There are good opportunities in the tourism sector, but tourists there [Istanbul] are a mix bunch, not dominantly Germans. In this part of Turkey, tourists are mainly from German-speaking countries, or Dutch which I also understand. That’s why I came to the South, to Marmaris because I had contacts there through my networks in Germany. However, there are mostly Brits in Marmaris. Also, anywhere else except Antalya, the season ends shortly, but in here tourist season never ends, we have summer tourism, winter tourism. Antalya is such an exceptional place, it also has a lively city life. Days are never dull here. That’s why many foreigners buy houses here, so many German retirees have bought property (Acun, M41).

Whilst Acun represents the majority of informants for not having had higher education degree or previous experience within tourism sector and yet expressing an “entrepreneurial spirit” or “demonstrating their flexibility within the labour market” (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.4), the following narrative depicts different themes which are commonly associated with lifestyle migrants. Sertaç studied tourism management in Germany, however he now works in a hotel in Kundu, renting water-sports equipment for the hotels’ mainly German and Dutch guests. His narrative is more complex in terms of presenting the push-pull factors, however, his ‘return’ and settlement decision to Antalya supports the key themes of lifestyle migration, in which he wanted to free himself from prior constraints and have work-life balance.

I like being mobile, I don’t like monotonicity. That’s why I studied tourism. I could travel the world with my job, what’s better than that? I’ve lived in many different parts of the world, London and Cuba are my favourites. London is so multicultural, like myself! Cuba is an exceptional place, after my shifts I was having my whiskey in one hand, cigar in another, gazing towards the sea, and say “C’est la vie!” Later, I started working as a general manager in a Munich-based hotel, but somehow, I always wanted to come and settle in Turkey. I used to
come to Bodrum and Antalya with family and later with friends. I think Turkish coasts are unique, the nature is amazing, we have the best sand, and the sweetest weather, also I’ve always felt more familiar, people are friendly and I feel comfortable here. But I was waiting for the right time to move here, because at that time I was enjoying my carpe diem life. After we had the child, I could not continue that life, I was stuck in the hotel and I had responsibilities as a parent and husband but at the same time I had no time for anything else than work. Munich is so expensive! Those put such a big pressure on me. My psychologist told me that I had to take a break, otherwise I’d suffer from a burn out. So, we moved to Antalya, because my parents had two houses here. When we moved to Antalya it was such a relief, here the life is easy-going, it’s stress-free. This job is active but it doesn’t put pressure on you. I’m by the sea, I have a therapeutic environment around me. My wife works close to me, we even bring our daughter here, she plays on the sand, take a swim. It’s funny, because I am so over-qualified for this job, and I realised tourism sector is run by amateurs in here, but I don’t care, because that what makes everything chilled (Sertaç, M47).

Like Sertaç, other informants also commented on Antalya’s tourism spaces as offering places for leisure, pleasure and escape from routine (O’Reilly, 2007). Sertaç saw in Antalya the opportunity to have a slower pace of life, to combine his more hedonistic lifestyle with therapeutic yet social tourism spaces by the seaside. In Sertaç’s case, rediscovering his ‘true’ desires and having a sense of freedom was more important than having a higher social status such as working as a general manager in a hotel. Moreover, Antalya’s international atmosphere is found to be ‘fitting’ to his multicultural background, hence he feels comfortable in an environment where he can manifest his multiple identities.

Furthermore, lifestyle migration research often describes people’s migration trajectories as “getting out of the trap”, “making a fresh start” or “a new beginning”, because most of the time they escape from something or somewhere, whether it is a personal experience of divorce, crime or redundancy, or escaping from the consumerist, highly individualistic and unpredictable (in terms of labour market, or societal norms and values) Western cities (O’Reilly, 2007; Benson, 2012; Oliver, 2008). The accentuated theme of escapism is closely linked to the rhetoric of self-realisation, wherein lifestyle migrants take their migration experience as an opportunity to recast their identities, learn from their past-life mistakes, and re-evaluate their family and other social ties/commitments with a new eye (O’Reilly, 2000; Amit, 2007). Comparably, lifestyle returnees narrate their settlement in Antalya as a transformative endeavour where they can focus on bettering their lives by inhabiting spaces in which they can find freedom to develop and re-invent themselves.

Tourism spaces in Antalya offer such freedom where the lifestyle returnees can have greater control over how much they work, how they live, and who they want to be.
‘Mediterranean lifestyle’ associated with Spain, Malta and Italy, incorporating cuisine, warm climate, a slow pace of life, relaxation and outdoor living can be applied to Antalya, where in lifestyle returnees follow similar paths to those coastal lifestyle migrants whose narratives emphasise escapism, leisure, tranquillity and persistent holiday feeling (Casado-Díaz, 2006; King, et al., 2000). The narrative below touches upon all these themes mentioned. Cafer who had drug-related problems in Germany, wanted to have a new start in Turkey and hence his lifestyle migration to Antalya is a way to overcome the trauma of past events, also making his dream of being ‘self-employed’ come true (Hoey, 2005; Stone & Stubbs, 2007).

I can’t think of a better life than Antalya. When I almost ended up in jail in Germany, I wasn’t sure about if I could handle the life in Turkey, but I had to try. I needed a new page in life. My parents’ village was good for a year, it was like a rehabilitation year for me, but I had to settle somewhere that fits me. Coming to Antalya was the best decision ever! I’m a guy who doesn’t have a diploma, I don’t have any qualifications. Yet, I have two stores in the historic part, two big houses, good savings in the bank and I can afford raising two kids in the best way possible. These were all possible because in Antalya I could do sales by using my language skills and of course cultural knowledge. In any other parts of Turkey, the best I could find would be a job in a factory or something of that kind and well, I wouldn’t want such life. I like being my own boss, because I don’t like taking orders from others and I don’t like strict schedules. I like the freedom of telling my wife and kids “let’s go to the beach” or “let’s have a picnic in the park” when I feel like it. Antalya is a relaxed place, and of course because it is a touristic city, it feels like holiday every day. Look around here, this old inn, we’re in the heart of history, walking distance to the beautiful Mediterranean. I love that it’s international here, I meet many Germans, sometimes I hardly speak Turkish during the day. So even though I’m not living in Germany any more it feels like I somehow do, because I’m constantly surrounded by Germans (Cafer, M36).

In his narrative, Cafer makes it explicit that he would not be able to enjoy such high quality of life and freedom anywhere else except Antalya. In a sense, all informants acknowledge that Antalya is a place where their cultural and human capital are in demand, hence whether they start their own businesses or work for the local businesses, they are able to sustain their preferred lifestyles with their incomes. For the informants of this research, similar to lifestyle migrants, tourism itself is a way of life and new experiences, social networks and process of self-realisation in Antalya reassure them that “life after migration is...the antithesis of life before migration, not only generally but also on a more personal level” (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.610). Hence, their narratives reflect that “search for self” is related to having the antithesis of the previous self, especially for those Turkish-German second generation who had self-destructive lifestyles.
As it was argued by lifestyle migration scholars, these processes of realising one’s dreams is informed by their lives before migration, they reflect on how they would like to redefine and reinvent the past self but also their lifestyle choices remain “mediated by their habitus and framed by their levels of symbolic capital” (Benson & O’Reilly, 2009, p.618). For lifestyle returnees, their lifestyle choices of living in places with hybrid culture and diversity – hence, living with tolerance and acceptance appear as an important component of how they define ‘better life’. And it is evident in the narratives that these wishes of dwelling in a culturally rich environment where they can navigate between different spaces (tourism, local, city, rural, coastal, Turkish, international, German, Turkish-German and so on) is closely linked to their ‘translocational habitus’ and “transcultural capital”.

7.1.1 Finding Peace: Intertwining Work and Leisure

Earlier in the theoretical discussions, the thesis has argued that, all migration is different and having a single, economic orientation cannot fully grasp the insecurities, conflicts, co-operations, limitations and tensions surrounding individuals’ decision-making processes (Sirkeci & Cohen, 2016; Faist, 2004). Hence, the thesis focused on lifestyle migration as a new field which reflects the rather privileged individuals’ (mostly middle-class Westerners) prioritisation of living a fulfilling life in places which have symbolic value such as “authentic”, “therapeutic”, “alternative”, “utopic” etc. In lifestyle research, one of the main themes appear as the individuals’ desire to escape from the ‘rat race’ of their highly consumerist and capitalistic societies and instead pursue their dreams of having small-scale businesses (Madden, 1999). As Benson and O’Reilly demonstrates, lifestyle migrants put effort in achieving a work-life balance in their lives (2009, p.611), hence even though many of them could find jobs locally, or they would be their own bosses, they restrain themselves from too many responsibilities and long working hours (Stone & Stubbs, 2007).

For the informants of this thesis as well, the narrated “ideal lifestyle” was to firstly get out of the “9-to-5-o’clock-trap” and have a certain level of control over how much they wanted work. Secondly, those with entrepreneurial aspirations gathered together their transferable skills of speaking several foreign languages, monetary savings, soft skills as being good at human relations, understanding the demand in the tourism environments of Antalya, and started businesses that they can manage on their own, or in some cases with extra staff. However, it needs to be highlighted that lifestyle returnees had to work in order to create and maintain the lifestyle they wished for in Antalya. Many lifestyle migrants depend on their retirement money, or savings which could guarantee them a higher quality of life in relatively cheaper lifestyle migration
destinations. For lifestyle returnees, being employed in Antalya was necessary, so they could buy property and invest in their personal interests such as buying a boat or motorcycle, sending their children to bilingual private schools, travel within Turkey and pay regular visits to Germany and so on.

The following narrative is a good example of why many lifestyle returnees prefer to work for someone else instead of undertaking entrepreneurial activities. Only 6 respondents own a business in Antalya, and the main reason shown for choosing to work for someone else was mainly related to escapism from responsibilities, but also not knowing the rules of the game in terms of bureaucratic procedures. In addition, many respondents vocalised that they would like to cease the day instead of having worries like saving money, therefore they would rather spend their earnings for daily pleasures such as eating out, drinking out, traveling within the region or abroad, buying a house etc.

I have a hairdresser diploma in Germany and I’ve worked as a hairdresser for 16 years in Bamberg. When my husband and I settled in Antalya, I attempted to open a hairdresser with my husband’s cousin. But he cheated, he ripped us off. Both my husband and I are from Germany, we are naïve, we don’t know this Turkish mentality of doing work. If you’re not from here, Turks will take advantage of you, even your relatives! Also, having my own hairdresser was so tiring. It’s not like in Germany here, customers here call you and they try to get appointments at weird hours like 8 pm, or during Ramadan holidays. I can’t live like that, I need balance in my life. So, it’s easier to work for someone else, so you have less responsibilities, you can enjoy life. Especially if you don’t know the Turkish system and ways of doing business, you should not bother at all. I’m happy now, I’ve worked in many touristic shops and now I work for a German call centre. (Zehra, F42).

The next narrative belongs to Süha whose story was previously introduced in relation to social upward mobility. Süha’s settling in Antalya resembles Hoey’s (2005) discovery of the engineer from sunny California who voluntarily dropped out of the corporate lifestyle and settled in northern Michigan, running a pie shop with his wife. With this example Hoey (2005) highlights that for many lifestyle migrants travel lead individuals with corporate backgrounds pass through a period of critical liminality and they relocate to these places which they believe to provide necessary refuge and inspiration for discovering an inner, “authentic” self. However, different than the “pie guy” Süha leaves behind the small coal mining town of Gelsenkirschen in Germany, and works as an engineer in Switzerland for a while. During summers, Süha works as a surfing coach and travels to Northern Germany, France and Spain to spend his summers. For one his summers, he comes to the southern coasts of Turkey and decides that he had to live in his “motherland”. However, he first tries to pursue his scientific career in Turkey, and co-founds a
chemistry lab in Gebze with the help of government funds. The following narrative depicts his physical and mental journey through dwelling in Antalya.

When my science project failed horribly and the laboratory was burned down, I was really upset. But maybe it was for the better. Because then I came to Antalya to start over. I think, Antalya is the ideal place for me. I think it’s the only place to live in Turkey. To a degree, I can forget that I am living in Turkey. Because unfortunately Turkey isn’t going to the right direction [politically]. I don’t see myself living elsewhere. Here I live with my wife, she is also from Germany and our pets, we are happy. We didn’t want children, because that’s too much responsibility. I like my job here. I fix motorbikes, I make jewellery and I sell package tours, I have a calm but social work life. I am living as I wish. I could not really think of a better setting. I love the nature, I love the sea, being close to the sea is great. My wife and I own motorbikes, and we travel in the Mediterranean coastline, we have an organic garden, we even grow bamboos! In Germany, fruits and vegetables were like plastic, but here we can grow our own, we have the climate, space and time for it. Nobody intervenes into your life here, you are free. I’ve worked in different parts of Antalya, Kaleici was a good experience, it has its own aura, it’s like a secured hub, everybody knows each other, you’re a part of a community. I love working in the tourism sector, it’s really doing good to me, I meet and talk to people from all over the world. Definitely more exciting than spending 12 hours in the laboratory! And I earn well here, more than I would in Germany as a chemist (Süha, M48).

Süha’s narrative incorporates themes central to other informants’ ideas about the “authentic” life in Antalya and discovering the potential self through challenging their previous lifestyles. Süha does that by working in tourist shops in the calmer and greener side of Kundu district, and investing in new hobbies such as gardening. In his narrative and similar others, tourism appears to facilitate lifestyle returnees a good foundation for building a community with people of similar worldviews and interests, also providing a space to manifest all distinctions between leisure and work, home and away, every-day and holiday (Urry, 1990; O’Reilly, 2003). Süha’s experiences and lifestyle choices in Antalya corresponds with ‘counterurbanisation’ and ‘rural idyll’ studies, where lifestyle migrants are found to seek for a slow pace of life, peace and quiet, space and greenness (Van Dam, et al., 2002; Buller & Hoggart, 1994). Like Süha, almost all narratives highlighted that they value the life in Antalya for offering a more simple, pure and authentic life wherein they can grow their own vegetables in their gardens, or in general they can buy locally-sourced organic vegetables, fruits, and fish from the local farmers’ markets. In lifestyle migration, these themes are mostly studied in relation to rural areas (Hoey, 2009; Korpela, 2009; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009), however in the case of Antalya, lively city life, rural idyll, coastal retreat and cultural/spiritual attractions are available within reach, hence intertwined expectations and more complicated lifestyle aspirations such as having a career in tourism sector whilst maintaining a calmer and segregated life is possible.
However, some informants also mentioned that they found working in tourism sector demanding, realising that it is especially difficult for those who have families. The narrative below highlights that despite the ‘persistent holiday feeling’, lifestyle returnees’ everyday activities and practices mostly evolve in their work space; therefore, they mediate their social lives and leisure time in their working environments.

I’m not that naïve to think there’s a ‘best’ place, or ‘best’ life. I see what is working and not working in Turkey. But there are good and bad sides in every country, in every lifestyle we choose. For instance, I can say that I’m happy in Antalya. But before working in this shop, I used to work in a hotel, but after having a family I’ve found that too demanding. So, working in the tourism sector is not all about hanging out in the sun, we still do work very hard. It’s not easy to do sales, communicate with dozens of strangers every day. But I can say that, I wouldn’t be able to balance work and my family life or free time in anywhere else than Antalya. So, it does not get better than this in Turkey (Fethi, M45).

It can be said that work and leisure are highly intertwined in the case of lifestyle returnees. Their tourism-related jobs, especially in the case of sales are highly social and, work happens around chatting and having tea/coffee with customers. As many informants expressed, their jobs are busy, but not stressful, hence they do not feel drained or depressed compared to their previous jobs before migrating to Antalya.

7.2 Constructing the Translocal Place-Identity

It has been introduced in the theoretical framework that translocality lens is adopted in relation to dynamics of place, identity and habitus with the argument of the second generation is identified with more than one location and their translocal social fields embeds the wider frameworks of in globalisation, transnationalism, diasporas and cosmopolitanism. By adopting the translocality lens, the thesis suggests readdressing the dichotomies of here and there, home and away, every-day and holiday, local and global whilst also revealing patterns of embeddedness across different locales (Steinbrink, 2009). For understanding lifestyle returnees’ experiences, lifestyle choices and further decisions for their projects of self-making and home-making, it was important to explore the role of socio-spatial interconnections and “in-between” places of dwelling (Easthope, 2009; Oakes & Schein, 2006). For the second-generation Turkish-Germans’ re-construction of identities and place-attachments call attention to their experiences of translocality in multiple locations, hence requires evaluating their identity and home-making processes in relation to liminality, as they experience precarious states of being ‘in-between’ (Cohen, 1992).
The findings illustrate that the informants have been leading mobile lives before settling in Antalya, and for the majority of informants, mobility aspect is still important for their transformation of self. Hence, their mobile lives in space-time underscores both “intermediary arrangements, fluidity and intermingling processes” (Verne, 2012, pp.17-18) and more embedded practices in groundedness. Nevertheless, as this chapter will illustrate, “being grounded is not necessarily about being fixed; being mobile is not necessarily about being detached” (Ahmed, et al., 2003, p.1). Therefore, the chapter focuses on unpacking the main themes emerged in the narratives about self/other, home/away, mobility/rootedness. The narratives indicate that lifestyle returnees acknowledge their liminal states of being “neither here-nor there” and “between-and-betwixt” (Beech, 2011), however they took further decisions such as a new job, hobby, lifestyle, building a family or being a part of a community (mostly related to tourism) to make a transition from their old positions and traverse the liminality which offers a space for reflexivity and unlocking one’s potential to construct a new sense of self and place.

7.2.1 Antalya as a ‘Third Space’: Between Self/Identity and Home/Away

For the informants of this research it was important to transform their lives for the “better”, and this rhetoric of better and more fulfilling life mostly entailed living in a place where they can escape from the pressures of their ‘home’ societies. Of course, in the case of the second-generation Turkish-Germans returnees, the concept of ‘home’ reflects duality and ambiguity, hence the ‘escaping from’ narratives highlight dissatisfaction with their previous lives both in Germany and Turkey. On the other hand, Antalya’s tourism spaces provided them the necessary refuge from the prior constraints and tensions in their lives. Furthermore, tourism and leisure experiences in Antalya can be also understood in relation to their search for self, as tourism spaces allow them to pursue ‘personal growth’ (Iso-Ahola, 1982).

Analysing the narratives and observing the lifestyle returnees’ socialising practices with various Others in Antalya’s tourism spaces, it was evident that informants’ dwelling in such liminal spaces required them “to navigate a sea of complex relationships” (Zabusky & Barley, 1997, p.395) and “develop a strong backward-looking and an equally strong forward-looking consciousness, temporally constructing a sense of self by invoking former and future identities” (Ybema, et al., 2011, p.24). The narrative below portrays how lifestyle returnees found “an authenticity of subjective experiences” (Cohen, 2010a) in Antalya, as the city does not impose an “original or originary culture” (Rutherford, 1990) but reflects “hybridity” in character due to its transcultural environment (Bhabha, 1994). In a way, Antalya resembles Bhabha’s “third space”, an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation have no “primordial unity or
fixity”, hence providing a spatial politics of inclusion rather than exclusion that “initiates new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation” (Bhabha, 1994, p.1).

Antalya is the best! I can do whatever I want here. I can wear whatever I want. Bursa was nice but in a way, it’s still conservative, you must act within certain boundaries. In Antalya, I can wear my shorts and I can dye my hair crazy colours. In Bursa, it’s perceived as extraordinary and peculiar if a woman rides a motorbike. It doesn’t blend well with the place. But in Antalya, it’s completely fine. So, my husband and I travel on our bikes, we go on excursions in the Mediterranean. I feel liberated in Antalya. Also, in here I don’t have the responsibility of being exemplary. In Bursa, there were our relatives around and my [younger] sisters were there as well, so I had to look decent, act decent. Here I’m on my own, I don’t need to fulfil other people’s wishes, I don’t need to be a good example for anyone, I don’t have to live within boundaries that others draw. I don’t need anyone’s approval in here, here it is my own space where I can do and live as I wish. That’s why I think Antalya is my real home. Because Germany is my home but at the same time, I also find it a limiting place. Bursa was my home but at the same time not completely, none of these places were mine, I haven’t chosen them. But Antalya, I chose this place for myself, and I can live both cultures here, I can speak in both languages. It’s a modern and liberal place (Bengisu, F50)

In Bengisu’s narrative, there are traits of finding a space of freedom to experience one’s existential authenticity wherein, she can have a sense of her identity and live in accordance with her sense of self (Steiner & Reisinger, 2006, p.300). Other narratives too reflect this escape from the ‘given’ and ‘static’ identities and societal roles, where the individuals had to perform certain roles e.g. mothers, daughters, workers, etc. to please the significant others. Informants’ desire to get outside of these roles are especially about the responsibilities and certain traits of behaviour and appearance associated with such roles. In Bengisu’s case, colouring her hair to unusual colours, or owning a motorbike were not seen as appropriate in her parents’ city. Other informants too mentioned that they felt free in terms of their appearance in Antalya; for instance, it was common amongst the informants to have tattoos, or male informants to have long hair and wear accessories such as rings and necklaces. Hence, in the various fields of Antalya where they did not have prior family ties, networks and lived experiences offers liminal spaces where lifestyle returnees can seek or rediscover their “true self” (Wang, 1999; Cohen, 2010b), whether it is about their collective or personal identities. Antalya’s tourism spaces are significant in the sense that there are not one dominant Other; tourists, expats, Turkish-German returnees and locals co-dependently live together, hence power hierarchies are ambiguous and transformative. Therefore, lifestyle returnees can manifest their multiple selves depending on the contexts of their translocal fields which in turn allow them to reproduce their identities through a process of “breaking and remaking” (Bell, 2008, p.13).
On the other hand, the narratives reflect the spatial elasticity of ‘home’, wherein the concept of ‘home’ as a physical location of dwelling and a space of belonging and identity (Olwig, 1998) are contested throughout the lifestyle return journeys. When asked about their conceptualisation and orientation towards ‘home’, informants referred to certain locations instead of ‘nation as homeland’, thus pinpointing ‘home’ in a “relationally linked range of localities” (Jacobs, 2004, p.167). In that respect, their relationship and attachment towards Antalya as ‘home’ can be described as translocal, as it is shaped by the informants’ daily practices of place-making such as consumption, building social networks and by actual home-making (i.e. brick and mortar home, living space). Furthermore, a range of connections to their other ‘homes’ in other localities are embedded in their translocal fields, “where cultural difference and ‘otherness’ is constructed, lived, and negotiated through the ambiguous relationship between mobility and migration” (Brickell & Datta, 2011, p.14). One of the informants account reflect all these meaning and place-making processes in relation to the notion of ‘home’, also indicating that feelings of attachments and ‘affect’ in time-space compression is often filtered through reflexivity over past and present – an ongoing debate with the self, regarding who one is, and where one belongs to.

I think being raised in Germany and seeing both countries – as I’ve lived 2/3 of my life there [Germany] and 1/3 in here [Turkey]... it gives me a good vantage point. If I only lived in one country like many people, I’d have one opinion. But for me, there’s not just good and bad, I see things from different angles, and I compare things, because I know that alternatives exist. I think that’s the best way to be a critical person, you test your truths. So, having this double life, double identities, it’s good. Though it makes me a contradicting person sometimes, I’ve been telling you how happy I’m in Turkey, but I’ve been also mentioning all the political problems, human rights problems... Then I praise Germany but also say that I wouldn’t live there. That’s why Antalya is good for me. It’s not really Turkey, one can forget all the problems of Turkey in here. I started a new page in Antalya, I got to know myself better, because I only have responsibility towards myself, so I learned who I was when I’ve been in this free environment (Acun, M41).

Like Acun, other informants’ narratives also illustrate that lifestyle returnees embrace a distinct positionality towards the notions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. Compared to return migrants who mostly strive for a ‘stable’ home in order to secure a sense of self, lifestyle returnees acknowledge their intersecting and overlapping ties to multiple locations and hence, their settlement and integration experiences in Antalya represents an example of the relational nature of home. These findings correspond with other studies where individuals mediate between the experiences of home as fluid and flexible, and simultaneously need for certain patterns of security, stability and control in places they inhabit (Tolia-Kelly, 2006; Varley, 2008). In Antalya,
informants seem to re-invent their sense of ‘home’ which is “neither here nor there, rather, itself a hybrid, it is both here and there – an amalgam, a pastiche, a performance” (Bammer, 1992, p.ix).

Hence, constructing place-attachment is closely linked to informants’ past and future trajectories where in their “transcultural habitus” guide a certain imagination and action based on ‘home’ as a place of self-expression and a meeting point of multi-scalar connections. In this regard, Antalya appears to offer a buffer zone between self/identity and home/away because lifestyle returnees can contest and re-construct their identities as a matter of choice, instead of obligation or tradition (Côté & Levine, 2002), and having this space of freedom, they can view the self as a developmental project (Baumeister, 2010). Finally, lifestyle returnees’ continuing mobility across multiple locations and at the same time place-making practices in Antalya reflect that home can be thought of as a mobile place, which is “implicated within complex networks by which ‘hosts, guests, buildings, objects and machines’ are contingently brought together to produce certain performances in certain places at certain times” (Hannam, et al., 2006, p.13).

7.2.2 Performing as Mediators between Cultures

As the previous chapters illustrated, the informants of this study had been employing a mediator role between their Turkish parents vis-à-vis the German society, but also between their German friends/coworkers and Turkish culture in their various social spaces. Hence, their role as cultural mediators in Antalya is not surprising, but what is more significant is that, the informants take this responsibility of teaching to the several Others about cultures, because since they settled in Turkey, they have discovered their own values and traditions that they really enjoyed. In a way, the narratives reflect that, the informants now have an ‘insider’s eye’ about the life in Turkey and Turkish culture(s), values and traditions. Almost for all the informants, this process of getting to know the ‘Turkish others from Turkey’ has not been an easy approach but involves many moments of disappointment and struggle. However, their process of ‘learning by experiencing’ in Turkey was also narrated as a unique life experience, in which they reflected upon ‘who they were’ and what attributes from the Turkish culture they wanted to add into their repertoire, and by comparing the Turkish and German values, they also scanned through their habits, lifestyles and ways of doing things which they considered to be more German-like.

Furthermore, their tourism-related jobs put them in a position where they can build more intimate relationships with especially German tourists and expats in Antalya. In addition, the informants were all aware of the fact that, in Antalya they have more contact with the German other, as their jobs require close relations with their customers. And these relations reverse the
previous hierarchy of Turkish as immigrants and the Germans as the host society. One informant who was an ex-criminal in Germany and deported to Turkey, who later settled in Antalya and opened his own hairdresser illustrated it by saying the following:

Sometimes I look at my customers, middle-aged, middle class Germans… I dream about this scenario, where we were both in Germany, sitting across each other on the bus, staring each other and probably hating each other instantly. And in here, they come to my shop, we have tea, we hug each other, they don’t have an idea I was a notorious guy in my German hometown (laughing) (Önder, M35).

Önder’s narrative is a good example of showing that Antalya as a ‘third space’ where there is no dominant other, but relationships are built on a personal level. Hence, one’s personal and class background, either Turkish, or tourist and expat hardly plays a major role in the way these people communicate with each other. Nevertheless, the informants constantly perform roles to make sales, to keep good relations with their Turkish bosses and colleagues. However, as much as they play these roles of sales person, or Turkish, or Turkish-German etc. depending on the circumstances, they also act as mediators between the non-Turkish individuals and the Turkish culture. Below, the narrative of pharmacist Bengisu shows that, since she improved her Turkish language skills, she grows a belonging towards the Turkish culture and values, and hence she tries to incorporate these values into her life, by also informing her non-Turkish customers and her husband from Germany:

What I like in Turkey is, sentiments are more important than material. Even when you don’t have enough money, people will give you extra things, or things for free. In this pharmacy too, if my customer has no enough money, I say “Take it, you can bring the money later.” Germans get shocked when I say that, because in Germany that would never happen. Sometimes they ask me, “What if I don’t?”, then I reply, “No problem then”. In Turkish I’d say it as, “onu senin vicdаниna bırakıyorum” but such phrases do not exist in German. But I try to explain my customers these beautiful Turkish sayings. That’s another interesting thing, here [In Turkey] we have many nice idioms, “Koley gelsin”, “Eline sağlık” these are very thoughtful and positive sayings and I love them. It feels like when I moved here [to Turkey] and improved my Turkish, a new chakra opened in my body, I have become more connected with my heart and spiritual side, it’s because of the [Turkish] language. There are so many sayings, all from the heart, you can express yourself in such a mindful and emotional way. So, once I’ve gotten better at Turkish, these sayings became a part of me, then you feel that the language makes you a more thoughtful, humanist person. Sometimes I try to

35 “I let your conscience/moral ground decide on that.”
36 It literally translates as “may it be easy for you”, and it is said when you see someone working.
37 When somebody cooks for you, you say “may your hands be healthy”
translate and express these to my husband or my German customers and friends in here but it’s difficult to find the equivalents in German. They’re missing out so much! (Bengisu, F50)

Furthermore, the lifestyle returnees’ navigations in different spaces and encounters with several generalised others on a day-to-day basis reflect that their identity formations and negotiations do not happen in a vacuum but it is reflective of, and influenced by external factors such as the tourism spaces’ structures and necessities, and the Turkish/international communities around them. In this regard, the lifestyle returnees experience the self as relational. The tourism spaces of Antalya which consist of “entangled social relationships” (Sharp, et al., 2000) require the lifestyle returnees to utilise their “transcultural capital” and ‘translocational habitus’, so they can have access to various spaces of the city. Nevertheless, the narratives illustrate that, the lifestyle returnees are successful to ‘unlock’ not only tourism spaces, but also spaces where the locals and expats inhabit, hence compared to their lives in Germany, lifestyle returnees in Antalya erode boundaries of local and non-local groups with their bilingualism and their ‘in-between’ identities.

The example below shows how lifestyle returnees take their ‘cultural mediator’ role from their childhood to professional careers, but this time, they teach tourists about their ‘homeland’, and the locals about other cultures. Almost in all narratives, similar motivations were vocalised about channelling what they have discovered as ‘heart-warming’ or ‘special’ about the Turkish culture and Turkish places whether natural or cultural/historical sites to especially German tourists and expats; almost assigning themselves this role of showing them that Turkish people are not bad after all, and Turkey is in fact a beautiful and liveable place.

I’ve been working as a professional tour guide for 12 years for German-speaking tourist groups. I’m incredibly happy with my life here, because when I returned to Turkey with my parents, I wanted to do something where I can combine my skills related to both Germany and Turkey. I love Germany, but when we returned to Turkey, I thought “insanım memleketi gibisi yok!”138 But, I’ve always been disturbed by Turkey’s negative image in Europe. So, I wanted to become a mediator between two cultures. It might sound stupid but I don’t see myself as a tour guide, I see myself as an ambassador for Turkey’s PR and international image. Guides need to be knowledgeable, because we have the power of controlling people’s perceptions. Whatever we say whether about politics or any comment related to culture and traditions, tourists take these as facts. My aim is to show the tourists the more intellectual, modern and liberal side of Turkey, to show that Antalya is a paradise, people are friendly and welcoming. My advantage is that I’ve lived in Germany, so I understand their mental state. I can

138 “There is nowhere else like one’s homeland!”
feel what they want, what they think. This is not just about being able to speak their language. You need to also understand what the German lifestyle, humour, daily routines are. But at the same time, I take the tourists to local shops and bazaars and I act as a mediator between the local people and tourists, hence it is also important to understand the Turkish way of doing things. I also teach the locals that they should respect the tourists, and not see them as prays to rip off. So, we are not just guides, we are performers, we are psychologists. Our job is to manage people, and create a community feeling. I try to learn more about the world too, like I have news apps on my phone so I constantly follow Turkish, German, European news, so I can talk about things with my tourist groups. Because Germans love asking questions, but also criticising… So, I must be able to tell them for example, how Turkey is accepting two million Syrian refugees, more than any European country, because they don’t know about these things (Koray, M35).

In Koray’s narrative, the first important part is, when he settles in Antalya, he feels that he reunited with his native homeland, and felt a relief. It is not explicit in other narratives that the informants felt like they had a ‘homecoming’ upon return, in most cases, they feel ‘at home’ once they settle in Antalya and build a life and homely feeling from scratch. Secondly, Koray expresses that he is unhappy about Turkey’s image abroad, which is a commonly shared worry amongst the informants, hence this motivates them to show the ‘good sides’ of Turkey and Turkish people. Another point is Koray’s awareness of their performative roles as guides, or sales people, and to an extend they act as ‘psychologists’ because their success for sales or for customer satisfaction is heavily based on understanding the needs of their customers. This is in fact even more important for the sales people, as the informants highlighted that business in Antalya is based on ‘word of mouth’, if tourists feel that they shopped with fair prices and they built friendly relations with the staff, they tend to shop from same places each year, or recommend these shops to their friends/family who visit Antalya. Informant further explained that this was due to the local shops ripping the tourists off and treating them rudely over the years, hence the tourists now count on each other’s feedback about where to stay, eat/drink and shop.

The final point is with regards to lifestyle returnees’ ongoing process of ‘learning’ which will be elaborated in the next chapter, however it is already apparent through Koray’s narrative that, the informants put effort in keeping up with the Turkish and European news to be informed about the politics, so they can discuss these with the curious visitors. It is prevailed in all narratives that, even informants who have been living in Turkey more than 10 years read the German newspapers, or even watch the German channels to keep up-to-date with the popular culture and news. These points will be further discussed in the next section regarding their translocal ways of dwelling in Antalya.
7.2.3 Practices of Translocal Dwelling

Until this point, the thesis illustrated that the second generation’s notions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ are multi-faceted, negotiated in the in-between spaces of diasporic condition and late-modern reflexivity that produce forms of “transnationalism from between” (Guarnizo & Smith, 1998). As narratives illustrated, the informants have been leading transnational lives however, the ‘national’ element is not always appropriate to process their activities. Instead, their everyday activities, social interactions and dwellings take place in translocal fields, in which their ‘cultural’ experiences do not reflect nations as homogenous entities, but local characteristics where such ‘transnational cultural practices’ are grounded and significantly influential in the way they construct belongingness to certain places.

Following Bourdieu on human agency, the informants then understand their immediate conditions through embodied and affective experiences and negotiate these through particular sets of meanings relevant to the field of power that they are situated in. Thus, their habitus can be extended to a spatial realm in order to reconceptualise locality as a site where forms and degrees of social capital are translated, exchanged and reworked. For instance, prior to return, during their lives in Germany, neighbourhoods where majority of the residents are Turkish, or of immigrant background is one of the translocal spheres in which the homeland culture and familiar cultures are embedded. In Appadurai’s (1996a) terms such neighbourhoods are conceptualised as ‘ethnoscapes’ which acts as a small segment of diasporas, influential in boundary-making in terms of national, ethnic, religious and class-based differences. Habitus also has the function of situating their relationships with different places that “are shaped by individual biographies, access to forms of capital, and the localised spatial contexts in which specific attitudes and behaviours towards others are practised” (Datta, 2009, p.367).

Different spatial contexts operationalised differential access to social and cultural capital which allowed participants to reflect upon their own transnational histories, ethno-national identities, and access to power in these places (Datta, 2008). Everyday places such as neighbourhoods, schools and youth centres were located within wider networks of symbolic capital and social power but were understood through the embodied and corporeal nature of the second generation’s experiences within these places (Datta & Brickell, 2009). These experiences are important in understanding the second generation’s attitudes and motivations towards mobility because translocalism provides a room for new ways of developing a place-based identity that makes limited reference to the nation. Such identities draw on more than one site but retain earlier readings of place as ‘space plus meaning’. A place-based identity can be
characterised as ‘translocal’ if an individual’s notion of their home is constructed out of more than one ‘locale’.

In the informants’ lives, there have been a constant movement in terms of the physical homes – and even the change of place of residence from one neighbourhood to another had a significant effect on the informants’ social environment which changed their prospects regarding education, family, lifestyle and employment. The narratives also exemplified movements to different cities and towns due to the changes in their parents’ jobs, or the informants’ educational purposes. Settling in a different place brought new experiences in terms of reflecting on their identities and belonging. For instance, those who moved to cities with a higher immigrant population acquired new insights about the Turkish and other immigrant communities in Germany and they had gone through a process of reflecting on their own identity as they interacted with these new spaces. Most of the time, when the informants moved to bigger and more multicultural cities, they built their living space in immigrant-dominated parts of the city. Even though they felt more secured in bigger cities because being an ‘immigrant’ or ‘different’ were more tolerated, this sense of security came from having closer ties with the Turkish community.

On the other hand, those who were raised in smaller towns lived side by side with the dominant others – the German locals. Hence, they put more effort to actively integrate into the society. However, with the later settlement of newer immigrant groups especially throughout the 1980s and with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the informants witnessed a growing tension in their local communities regarding immigrants. The narratives point out to marginalisation of immigrants with the emergence of extremist groups against the foreigners in smaller towns. These examples illustrate that, the very identity and characteristics of specific places have a significant role in shaping the second generation’s lives – however as the places are dynamic and evolving, the second generation simultaneously reshape their identities and belongings.

Ehrkamp and Leitner (2003) point out, the second generation are embedded in, identify with, and participate in multiple communities, and are not anchored in one national context. These experiences shape their habitus and thus, imaginings of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. Transnational and translocal experiences are especially important to understand their attitudes towards mobility and their ways of dwelling in places because the second generation observe that places are not bound and exclusive, but dynamic processes. In exploring the interplay of these different types of ‘place sense-making’ (home/host societies), it is possible to understand how second generation simultaneously perceive and act upon their relationships with towns, cities,
nations and the homelands. In other words, the second generation is about to develop “simultaneous situatedness during mobility and across different locales” (Brickell & Datta, 2011, pp.3-4), referring that their social and cultural practices and mobility across various places (fields) and their habitus are interconnected.

Hence, for the second generation who relocated to Antalya as lifestyle returnees, it was important to have a space which gives a ‘sense of freedom’, and enables ‘openness’ for living beyond, 1) social markers (social class, economic status), 2) cultural/ethnic markers (exclusion/inclusion from the local society/community), 3) spatial/geographical and regional markers (those social cultural markers inscribed in spatialities constructed at the local level) (Leontidou, et al., 2005). These boundaries were mentioned in all narratives, informants reflecting on their past lives before the ‘return’ and their earlier experience in Turkey before resettling in Antalya. In this regard, they favoured Antalya as the ‘place to live’ or ‘home’ because community as a social imaginary where its attendants maintain certain boundaries (Cohen, 1990) was rather ambivalent and they had the forms of capitals to have access to cross these boundaries easier than in comparison to their parents’ town of origin or big cities like Istanbul.

In addition, the informants commonly mentioned that they did not perceive themselves as ‘locals’ of Antalya, or had the urge of ‘living like locals’ as lifestyle migrants do in order to withdraw their ‘tourist’ status in their lifestyle migration destinations. Hence, as the informants embraced the ambivalence and intertwining aspects of culture in Antalya, they also embraced their ambivalent status of not being locals/insiders, not being tourists or expats, but somewhere outside of these categories, almost having a ‘fourth space’ beyond dualities and the ‘hybridity’ of the third space. For instance, Zukin (1996, p.1) argues, “culture is a powerful means of controlling cities. as a source of images and memories, it symbolizes “who belongs” in specific places”, and for lifestyle returnees who have the ‘translocational habitus’ and “transcultural capital”, they are able to navigate between these ‘specific places’, hence able to dwell in Antalya translocally.

Whilst half of the informants still lead mobile lives, either through regular visits to Germany, or working seasonally in different countries, the other half are settled in Antalya and cut contact almost entirely with previous places they had lived in. Nevertheless, the both sides have established lives in Antalya that they do not have to pick between cultures, as German or Turkish, but they have spaces where they can be ‘true’ to themselves whilst also enjoying lifestyles and values/traditions specific to Turkey, German, and ‘glocal culture’. In this regard, the informants who mostly experienced marginalisation in their parents’ places of origin and Istanbul
acquire a process of ‘enculturation’ in Antalya where they can selectively enjoy, retain or negotiate elements of both Turkish and German cultures. The following narrative presents how they cross over the social/ethnic/symbolic boundaries in the city and lead their ‘dual’ lives in the translocal social fields. Adile works as a sales person for water sports, and lives in an international gated-community with her husband who is also a second-generation Turkish-German and their daughter who is a German citizen. Hence, her life is between Antalya and Munich, but in Antalya she is able to maintain certain habits and traditions that she used to enjoy in Germany.

Our daughter is German citizen, so we go to Germany periodically… the German government is cautious, they don’t want you to decide for their own citizen (laughing). My family lives in Germany, so it’s nice anyways, but after couple of weeks in Munich, I long for Antalya. In Antalya, we created our own home. My husband is also a Turk from Germany, so we’re alike in many ways. We live in a gated community here, there are families from Germany, Russia, the Netherlands, there’re Turkish people who are married to Germans and there’re Turks from Germany like us. So, we mostly have an international environment. That’s also one of the reasons why we wouldn’t like to live elsewhere than Antalya because here we feel like we live abroad, it’s not like Turkey, it’s this international atmosphere, where you don’t realise where you live, it’s like an international… When it’s Christmas, we buy turkey and stuff it as we used to do in Germany, and have Christmas dinner with our German friends. We bring German bread and deli products from Germany, so in our home you can find many German products. Our house is decorated like a German house, it is minimal. So, I think we combine Turkish, German, Mediterranean values and styles, whatever we like, it’s a mishmash! But I guess that’s why we feel home in Antalya, because we can live the way we want. My husband and I love adventure and extreme sports, so we go to Fethiye and Olympos for camping, parachuting. I don’t know… It’s like everything is available and affordable here, you can do many things (Adile, F38).

Like Adile, some other informants also mentioned their house designs as minimal and functional which they associate with the German style. Hence, they incorporate the translocal element to their brick and mortar houses, which they bring together aesthetics and taste of several places, as in this example Mediterranean style companies German minimalism. Narratives further show that all the informants live in the tourism districts of Antalya either close to their work places, or rather upscale districts close to Lara or Konyaaltı Beach. Those who have families and children (21 informants out of 44) live in gated-communities where mainly international expats own flats/houses. When asked about their social lives informants commonly mentioned that they enjoy going out to pubs that German-speakers hang out and enjoy having occasional beers and pommes (chips), but also go to Turkish/Greek style taverns where they can have seafood and Turkish raki (anise-based liquor). As eating/drinking out is a common part of their lives, they also mentioned that they have many German friends (customers who have become friends in
years, or Germans living in Antalya) and Turks from Germany, and they meet on both Turkish and German occasions such as Christmas, Ramadan celebrations. The informants were also closely following all the Germany-related shops that were opened in Antalya, such as German bakeries, or stores that sell German goods. All these practices show that the informants have access to the so called ‘expat spaces’ which are normally not available to the locals, and local spaces where the lifestyle migrants are mostly excluded.

Furthermore, the informants highlighted that they benefit from social media platforms (e.g. Facebook) to reconnect and keep in touch with their friends in Germany, and they occasionally have German friends and family visiting them in Antalya. Informants mentioned one interesting practice, in which they would check their old houses or view the towns in Germany on Google Maps’ Street View, hence pay a ‘virtual visit’ to the places from the past without physically being there. Nevertheless, practices such as Skyping with friends and family and keeping in touch with them on Facebook shows that, the respondents experience being ‘here’ and ‘there’ not only symbolically but also through virtual reality, and somehow keep their ties with people/places from their past – which illustrates the ‘network societies’ and ‘time-space compression’ of the late-modern times. In summary, it can be argued that the boundaries between home/away, here/there, native/foreign are ‘liquid’, and lifestyle returnees experience the life in Antalya as a translocal one in which they are simultaneously in contact with different scales (national, international, global, transnational) within this locale.

7.3 Conclusion: Home is Where One can be an ‘Inside Outsider’

This chapter demonstrated that, for the sample group of this research, the choice of where to live and how to live was made consciously and intentionally (Hoey, 2005, p.615), once they acquired lived experiences in other parts of Turkey upon their ‘return’. Benson and O’Reilly (2016, p.22) argue that “destinations are often valued because of the contrast they offer to what was left behind, their natural and cultural environments significant because of what these offer by way of improving quality of life” and for the respondents, settling in Antalya has become inherent to the re-construction of their ‘return’ migrant identities vis-à-vis construction of homeliness. However, the chapter also showed that putting Antalya under one lifestyle migration socio-geographical theme is not possible, all the following themes are prominent for the informants’ resettlement into this “Turkish Riviera”: “residential tourism” (Casado-Díaz, et al., 2004; King, et al., 2000; O’Reilly, 2000; Williams, et al., 2000), “rural idyll” (Buller & Hoggart, 1994; Benson, 2011a) and “bohemian bourgeois haven” (Waldren, 1996; Bousiou, 2008). Hence, Antalya offering various distinct spaces was shown as the main reason why the informants felt
that they could start a new life in this location. For instance, it was also shown that, for the informants there was also a desire to live in a large multicultural city with cosmopolitan vibe (Kılınç & King, 2017, p.1496). In Antalya, they could find a unique combination of all these above-mentioned themes as the city provides for different lifestyles, combining rural, cosmopolitan, ‘alternative’ and coastal areas. Hence, in order to explore the informants’ various interactions in different spaces, the chapter adopted ‘translocality’ as a tool to approach how the informants made sense of their place of dwelling next to their attachments and longings for various other places.

Moreover, the chapter presented that, Antalya made a unique destination for the respondents for being able to have fulfilling working lives not only for earning relatively high salaries in the tourism-related jobs but also for the social relationships they build with especially German tourists/expats and the flexibility of working hours (or working during the summer period only) which allow them to enjoy leisurely activities. Hence, for the sample group of this research, the economic aspect play an important role for them to settle in Antalya, because their “transcultural capital” (language skills, knowledge of German and Turkish ways of living etc.) are valued and prioritised in the job market in Antalya. It is suggested in this thesis that the sample group can be conceptualised as ‘lifestyle returnees’, because for instance, in their more recent work, Benson and O’Reilly (2016) indicates that lifestyle migration is an inductive concept, emerging from bottom up hence, even though lifestyle migrants share several important themes in common, these may have disparate threads (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.1). Hence, the authors remind that, economic dimensions exist in lifestyle migration, and the status of being “relatively affluent and privileged is located within wider (global and local) relations of social and spatial inequality” (Benson and O’Reilly, 2016, p.29). In other words, these ‘lifestyle migrants’ might not be “particularly wealthy or privileged in the countries that they leave, it is rather the case that they can mobilise capital, assets and resources in ways that make their aspirations for a better life possible within a particular destination” (p.29). For the sample group of this research, such status of being relatively affluent can be applicable, because they mobilised their forms of capitals in order to settle and work in a place where they could fulfil their goals of having a simpler way of life with slower pace (Benson, 2011b; Oliver, 2007), a more fulfilling working life (Hoey, 2009), a local community ethos (Casado-Díaz, 2009), a more spiritual or ‘authentic’ life (Korpela, 2014).

After demonstrating and discussing the importance of work-life balance for the ‘lifestyle returnees’, the chapter directed its focus to Antalya as a ‘third space’ and how this relationship between the field-space and the respondents’ embodied, socially shared capacities are translated into their reconstructions of national/ethnic and place-based belongingness. In the section 7.2, it
was discussed that upon ‘return’ to Turkey, the respondents had acquired “a corporal and social awkwardness which embodies the learning of the ‘difference of difference’” (Noble, 2013, p.341). This meant that, even though they had ‘Turkish’ roots and ‘ethicised’/‘diasporic’ habitus through growing up ‘Turkish’ in their respective societies in Germany, it took them a while to learn the ‘rules of the game’ when they started living in Turkey in order to reorient their sensory, linguistic and social behaviours. However, the narratives demonstrated that, for the respondents of this research, it is difficult to evaluate habitus as uniform and coherent wherein it transforms the respondents’ positions “into a unitary lifestyle, that is, a unitary set of choices of persons, goods, practices” (Bourdieu, 1998, p.8). Hence, the second generation’s mismatches which produced a “destabilised habitus, torn by contradiction and internal divisions” have been “generating suffering” (Bourdieu, 2000, pp.159-160) during their lives in Germany (in ‘diaspora’) and in their post-‘return’ lives in Turkey (in ‘counter-diaspora’).

However, as the chapter shows, when they settled in Antalya, the respondents could re-orient themselves more easily in relation to Antalya’s social field, making themselves “at home anew” (Bottomley, 1992, p.123). Because as Lahire (2010) suggests, the notion of habitus is not only an abstraction, but it needs to work at the level of the embodied individual, hence how a particular body travels and performs in a particular place needs to be examined. The narratives showed for instance, the female interviewees feel comfortable in Antalya because they can dress the way they want to, or other respondents (for instance the deported ones) who have certain bodily expressions in the form of tattoos and piercings felt that their bodily manifestations of certain philosophies and lifestyles were tolerated. Hence, the mismatch between body and field that they experienced in other parts of Turkey which then led to the feelings of displacement and marginalisation were replaced in Antalya with feelings of homeliness and belonging because in the tourism spaces, they could feel comfortable for being ‘different’, as difference is in fact tolerated, desired and valued in their working environments. Therefore, the difference they manifested through their “transcultural capital” also has a symbolic value and it could be transformed into social and economic capital.

The chapter further developed on this argument by presenting the narratives regarding the ‘lifestyle returnees’ daily practices of cultural mediation and performing as cultural mediators. It was shown that, the respondents were reflexive about their “double absence” (Sayad, 2004, pp-58-74) regarding not being in the homeland, but nor in the host country, which produces a “double consciousness”. Their development of a reflexive and transformative habitus, i.e. ‘translocational habitus’ enabled them to learn to navigate in the new physical spaces but also learn the new social codes in Antalya. They could finally leave their anxieties and feelings of
unfamiliarity and alienation in the past, because their ‘inside outness’ – the position of being an ‘included outsider’ (Noble, 2013) was not only accepted in Antalya but also desired, as they work with Germans and Turkish people (also other nationalities), and that Antalya as a field is dynamic and transformative due to flow of migrations (from Russia, Arabic countries), tourism environments and jobs (rise of the Kundu area, Kaleiçi targeting locals and domestic tourists, need for qualified staff for new tourism jobs in nature/history/culture tourism, sport and health tourism etc.) Hence, the respondents as ‘inside outsiders’ could benefit from their “transcultural capital” in their social relations with others in the tourism spaces where there is no one dominant other. These findings were further discussed and exemplified with narratives, in the respondents’ practices of ‘translocal dwelling’. Here, the chapter demonstrated that, “fields are not simply objectified social spaces, but virtual spaces we carry with us in our embodied, socially shared capacities activated in institutions, occasions and settings” (Noble, 2013, p.355). The narratives presented that, in Antalya the respondents were maintaining certain habits and parts of lifestyles that they acquired in Germany (such as celebrating Christmas, consuming German-types of food and beverages) through the social networks they built in Antalya (friendships with German tourists and expats, as well as other Turkish-Germans). In addition, they could also experience and integrate the parts of ‘Turkish culture’ into their lives. In a way, in Antalya they could get a sense of community feelings through navigating between different fields e.g. they have their ‘counter-diasporic field’ with co-workers who were also returnees from Germany, and such multiplicity and fluidity of fields allow the respondents to have a ‘homely’ feeling in their ‘translocal social field’ integrating social networks and cultures from several locations which have been influential in the formation of their habitus. The next chapter gets more into the detail of how the relationship between the agents, respondents and their dwelling place, Antalya influenced the ways in which the respondents developed a new sense of self through acquiring personal growth (learning about themselves, the Others, new skills, the world around them).
8 Lifestyle Return as a Quest for Re-Inventing the Self

It has been already established in the previous sections that the second generation as lifestyle returnees are a highly reflexive group. The narratives until this point have illustrated that most of the informants developed newer goals and aspirations for their lives throughout the ‘return’ journey given the availability of alternative opportunity structures, and “this capacity to generate a personal biographical narrative free of constraints was perceived as a form of empowerment” (Corcoran, 2002, p.183). Hence, this chapter goes into detail about what the Chapter Six and Seven have established regarding the ways in which the informants initially get out of the limiting boundaries of their previous lives, whether these were familial or professional responsibilities, or their struggles about the ‘diasporic’ and ‘counter-diasporic’ condition wherein they have gone through a period of unsettledness. However, as shown in Chapter Five and Six, once the informants acquired a ‘lived experience’ of certain places in Turkey, they could see their abilities and goals with a new eye. These processes of self-realisation were not possible without their self-reflexivity over the taken-for-granted notions of ‘homeland’ and belonging to a certain place and collective identity (i.e. Turkish). And such level of self-reflection was only possible only when they ‘escaped’ from their previous lives and created a personal space for themselves in Antalya. Thus, the first section of this chapter focuses on the ‘narratives of escapism’.

Based on these previously established ideas and discussions, this chapter follows the informants’ lives through a new phase in Antalya, in which they accepted that their migratory experiences including the ‘return’ and identity struggles in the past in fact had been enriching their lives, and providing them with a development of self-realisation and self-development. Therefore, the chapter focuses on the ‘narratives of learning’ to illustrate the ways in which the informants added new abilities that contributed to their “transcultural capital”. As a result, the informants narrated that they improved their careers and future prospects, they re-evaluated their ‘ancestral homeland’ and they re-invented the self, based on their personal needs and goals in life. In that sense, this chapter also accentuates the lifestyle returnees’ distinct position as “reflexive agents” (Law & Urry, 2005) who could improve the ability to take risks in their lives not only re-invent themselves but also the notions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’.

8.1 Leaving the Past Behind: Escapism

It was already established in the literature review chapter that, the ‘tales of escapism’ appears as one of the main themes in lifestyle migration research, acting as ‘push-factors’ for individuals to overcome certain watershed events in their past lives (O’Reilly, 2000; Hoey, 2009).
In lifestyle mobilities literature as well, lifestyle travellers are found to perceive their home societies as anomic, in which social norms are conflicting or non-integrated (Roberts, 1978). In lifestyle mobilities literature, Cohen (2010b) enumerates the reasons of escape as dissatisfaction with Western way of life i.e. capitalism, modern materialism, conformism and feeling alienated in such social contexts. Cohen (2010a) further argues that poststructuralist approaches criticise escapism by claiming that there is no more than one experiential mode as reality, and therefore there is no all-encompassing reality from which to escape (Rojek, 1993), as Cohen and Taylor (1992) referred to as “paramount reality”. However, individuals keep on trying to escape in any case, as they follow certain ideals in their imaginations and they hope to acquire these through travelling or dwelling in tourism areas.

In the informants’ narratives as well, similar desires of “getting out of the trap” and “making a fresh start” lead up to their migration to Antalya. However, it is argued that as individuals escape from something or things, they also escape to a certain imagination to search for an ‘authentic’ self (Golomb, 2012). In Riley’s (1988, p.317) description of long-term budget travellers, she explains that the travellers were,

[...] escaping from the dullness and monotony of their everyday routine, from their jobs, from making decisions about careers, and desire to delay or postpone work, marriage, and other responsibilities.

This description points out an earlier debate presented on lifestyle migrant’s quest for living in an authentic place where they have a simple-life and that they can be fully “true to themselves” (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009). Nevertheless, as Cohen (2010a) suggests there is a disagreement over the utility of authenticity in understanding tourist experiences and instead, identity and the notion of ‘self’ are explored by the post-structural perspectives. Cohen (2010b) further introduces escapism as a way of individuals to escape from their current ideas of ‘self’ and therefore, ‘being in flow’ means temporarily escaping one’s ideas of self (Baumeister, 2010).

However, compared to lifestyle migrants and travellers, lifestyle returnees do not only escape from previous obligations such as work lives, family-related constraints and more lifestyle-related settings of consumerist societies and mundane daily routines, but also escape from their previous ‘selves’ who used to struggle with identity crisis in relation to ethnic and national collective identities, but also with regards to their individual identities where they could not have a self-realisation about who they were and how they wanted to live, as they could hardly reflect on themselves in their ‘diasporic spaces’. Hence, escapism acts as a vital step to unveil their ‘true’ or ‘potential’ selves, and requires cutting ties with their previous lives.
In all narratives, it is apparent that, informants do not feel that they need to keep ‘escaping from’ in Antalya, and they have established a way of life that satisfy them. However, in order to build this new life, they were required to work hard on themselves as individuals. Different than return migration research, lifestyle returnees seem to embrace performative selves, instead of negotiating identities, this is to say, they take context-dependent and temporal subjective positions for their benefits, however they put effort in not negotiating their identities based on what other people think about, or demand from them. Hence, the rhetoric of being ‘true’ to self is the most important driving force in their new lives. In this regard, narratives of escapism are attached to the stories of freedom, each narrative reflects what was escaped from and what kind of freedom spaces were looked for in Antalya. It can be argued that their identities constitute a process wherein they are always “within the terms of the performance” (Butler, 1990, p.277) so, they “expand the cultural field bodily through subversive performances of various kinds” (p.282).

Escapism-related themes, events and reflections were already discussed to a certain extent in the previous chapters, hence this section focuses on individual stories related to commonly referred themes within escapism and further discusses how lifestyle returnees evolve their lives for the better, through daily practices of learning and reflecting.

8.1.1 Escaping the Mundane of Everyday Life

Compared to lifestyle migrants and travellers who took the migration or travel path in order to get out of the routine and stability in their previous societies, lifestyle returnees seem to conceptualise ‘mundane’ and ‘everyday life’ in relation to the general setting of their previous living places. Until now, narratives reflected that, many second-generation Turkish-Germans had lives far from daily routines, on the contrary most of the time the instabilities, insecurities and chaos in their lives led them to seek for places where they can lead calmer and safer lives. However, especially their living conditions in Germany was dissatisfaction for them as they did not see themselves as fitting into the society where people lead material-oriented lives between work places and homes. The second-generation was especially reactionary towards the work-oriented lives, as they saw their parents working double shifts in factories, not devoting time for family or social events. Hence, it largely appeared that lifestyle returnees wished for a life where they can enjoy themselves and have more unusual experiences during their daily lives.

For many informants travelling had been perceived as a way to get out from their orderly, industrial German towns. The freedom they felt during their holidays in Turkey and elsewhere showed them that an alternative life was possible. Favouring a ‘dynamic’ life was not only in terms of being personally mobile, they also found that life in their German towns were hardly
changing in terms of architecture, which made them to grow tiredness of stagnant settings, friends and family who are stuck in same old lives. The narrative below illustrates how these acted as push factors for the return project. It needs to be noted that, many informants still lead transnational lives, in which they pay regular visits to Germany, hence they are able to compare their lives in Antalya with their previous lives in Germany. One interesting detail which was commonly highlighted by the informants was, when they plan a visit to Germany, they try to arrange it during the Christmas holidays, because they enjoy the festive spirit and liveliness in the German towns which is otherwise not common.

I’ve never regretted the decision of returning, and I’ve never missed Germany. I am genuinely content with my life in Antalya, coming here and becoming a tour guide was the best thing I’ve done. I regularly go to Germany, because my sisters live there. Each time I go there, I get reminded by how life in Germany is so boring. Dark sky, rainy days, people go to offices, come back home… Eating out, going out is expensive. I could never live in Germany again after having my interesting life in Turkey. I live in a city like paradise, I take tourists to cultural, historical and natural gems of Turkey, I get to stay in amazing hotels, I constantly meet new people from different countries, I am teaching them about my country and also learn from them. It’s such an active job, I am mobile, but not only physically but also mentally because I am constantly thinking, and every new encounter, every new place make me realise new things. As a guide, it’s hard to click with people from other occupations, because we have our own language, our lifestyle is niche. They say once you get into the tourism sector, once you get used to this lifestyle it’s incredibly difficult to leave. It shapes you in a certain way. It has many advantages. For example, I’m my own boss, during the week I have the microphone. I’m the one deciding what we’ll do, I can do whatever I want, there is no one on top of me who gives me orders or tell me what to do. That’s a great freedom. And we, guides, we hate being in four walls, we can’t hang out indoors that much. I feel like I constantly need to be on the go. Antalya is a good place to have a base because the climate is warm, so life is outside, people always hang out outside until late at night, you only get into the house to sleep (Koray, M35).

What is important in Koray’s narrative is that lifestyle returnees do not see working as a ‘burden’, on the contrary they believe that their social and creative selves are nourished by their jobs in the tourism sector. In that regard, they do not escape from work, but type of work that would tie them to an office space with a daily fixed schedule. In Antalya, their working lives unfold more spontaneously and each day has the potential of giving them an interesting experience. Antalya facilitating ‘outdoor living’ due to its warm climate supports lifestyle returnees’ desire for dynamic lifestyle, hence they are immersed in the city life on a day-to-day basis, combining work and leisurely activities.
8.1.2 Escaping the Family Expectations: Marriage, Lifestyle, Career

For the second-generation Turkish-Germans, family plays an important role in the way they reflect over their identities and thought process on what constitutes a better life. However, narratives clearly indicate that, the informants do not always evaluate their family members as individuals to look up to, instead they put effort in building lives that are the exact opposite of their parents’. Hence, compared to their parents who got married in their teenager years, who almost always worked, who were uneducated and traditional in their ways of living, the informants had the desire to lead more individualistic and adventurous lives. Nevertheless, almost all the informants mentioned that, they felt ‘trapped in’ within their family space, whether in Germany or Turkey, because their parents assigned them with certain responsibilities such as getting married, getting a job, and even dictated certain ways of behaving and dressing up that should be in accordance with the Turkish values. Even though female informants seem to have had harder time with family pressure, male respondents too commonly mentioned that their families would pressure them to settle down and have a family, or get a job and contribute to the home economy.

Below, the viewpoint of a female informant is presented about her escapist move to Turkey. In Adile’s narrative, it can be found that she tried different ways to pursue her lifestyle aspirations either through work or travel without displeasing her parents. However, at some point whilst she is on holiday in southern Turkey, she realises that she could escape from the family pressure by ‘returning’ to Turkey and settling in Antalya.

My parents were restricting me whilst I was growing up, they come from south east of Turkey, so they are all about traditions and so on. They would not allow me to go out, I had to be at home immediately after school. But I had my own interests, I loved travelling, I loved music. When I was 15 I started working as a part-time ticket collector at the Opera house, I told my parents I was doing it to contribute to the home economy, but in fact I was just into classical music. Later, I started working as a sales person for a publishing house, and through this I have travelled all over Germany, I was always mobile! Being away from that limiting family space and being on the road made me feel free. Finally, I was feeling like a proper German, independent, taking my own decisions. But my family wanted me to become a dentist. I couldn’t, but I’ve become a medical assistant. They wanted me to get married, I was in my late 20s, they thought I was late. So, all these things, they were controlling my life. They couldn’t understand I was different, I had interest in classical music and fine arts, I wanted to travel the world, I wanted to stay forever young. Whilst on holiday in Fethiye, I met my now husband. I’d always wanted to try living in Turkey, it had been always appealing. My sisters never had that, they’re German citizens, and all my family still live in Germany. Luckily, my husband also wanted to try the Mediterranean life, so we moved here in 2013. I still see Germany as one of my
homest, I see myself as half German, I mean I’ve lived there almost all my life, but still, in my heart Turkey has always been my real home. And it’s not because I really fit in here or anything, on the contrary, I realised that I was quite different, and things work differently here. But at least, I’m living by my own rules here, my family or other people are not dictating my life (Adile, F38).

In other narratives as well, it is commonly vocalised that values and practices such as living independently, travelling and post-traditional way of living were associated with the German culture. Moreover, as the narrative makes it clear, lifestyle returnees often valued ‘living by their own rules’ over acquiring a sense of ‘home’ in places they were dwelling. In that respect, they perceived home as the place where they could live as they wished, without external pressures, and where they could be ‘true’ to themselves. Additionally, the informants who have better relations with their parents claimed that their decision to live in Antalya was approved by the family.

8.1.3 Escaping the Identity Crisis: Turkish, German, Ausländer, Almancı

Previously, it has been partially discussed that, when it comes to the second generation’s ‘identity crisis’ there are multiple dimensions. Firstly, with regards to ‘self’, they have been reflecting on their personal identity in the light of the Turkish and German communities around them as well as the conditions and structures of their respective places of dwelling. Secondly, narratives have also illustrated that, even at times that they felt that they could maintain a ‘coherent sense of self’, they experienced ‘self-concept disturbance’ due to how ‘the Others’ defined them. Hence, during their lives in ‘diaspora’ and ‘counter-diaspora’, they have gone through a ‘psychological limbo’ (Erikson, 1968). In addition to their ongoing identity struggle based on the ethnic/national boundaries throughout their adolescent and adult lives, they have also been experiencing a fragmented and fractured sense of self due to the late modern condition of ‘difficulty of committing to an identity’ (Hall, 1996).

Hence, their ‘return’ project was in a sense an escapist project from the personal identity struggle of “who am I?” with a return imagining that settling in Turkey would finally lead them to commit to one coherent identity and get out of how the Others defined them in Germany – as foreigner/outsiders/immigrants (Ausländer, Kanak). Nevertheless, narrative accounts show that, having a ‘coherent sense of self’ upon ‘return’ was a disillusion, because this time, they were not perceived as locals, or ‘originally from Turkey’ and were called as Almancı. As informants point out, this labelling by the ‘Turkish others’ in Turkey was not only due to their insufficiency in the Turkish language, but it was directly related to the informants’ self-presentation in terms of appearance (most of the informants have tattoos, piercings, clothing styles and haircuts that are
considered ‘eccentric’ in Turkey) and lifestyles such as habits of drinking, usage of weed, having interests and hobbies such as travelling, outdoor and adventure sports, being single or divorced, or having a German partner, co-habiting with a partner without marriage, having a criminal background – which are considered as ‘inappropriate’ or ‘strange’/‘unusual’ in certain Turkish contexts (e.g. in rural parts). In all narratives, settling to Antalya is vocalised in relation to ‘finding themselves’ and not feeling excluded or marginalised as in their previous places of dwelling. In a way, the informants were only able to develop their personalities, once they escaped from environments that triggered their ‘inner conflict’. As Stonequist (1961, p.139) argues,

With some individuals, the characteristic inner conflict is a minor problem; in such cases one cannot speak of a ‘personality type’. It is only in those instances where the conflict is intense and of considerable duration that the personality is oriented around the conflict. The individual seems almost to be ‘obsessed’ with his [sic] problem.

Hence, once the informants sought refuge in Antalya to escape from societal structures that made them reactionary people, either because of ethnic/national boundaries or anomic in their previous societies, they could also manage to escape from their anomic at a personal level. In that sense, Antalya resembles a ‘utopia’ in which they can lead individualistic lives and still have a community of like-minded people and other Turkish from Germany who had gone through similar struggles. In their quest of escaping the previous identity struggles and ‘searching for self’ in this ‘third space’, many informants narrated that, they embrace a ‘cosmopolitan identity’ in which “they use diversity in order to create a distinctive self-identity which positively incorporates elements from different settings into an integrated narrative” (Giddens, 1991, p.190). In order to illustrate the points made until now, the following narrative is chosen for its richness, depicting the informant’s life in different time-place settings. What stands out in the narrative is that, despite his mobile life through tourism-related jobs, Rıza had gone through an “exploration and evaluation of self” (Crompton, 1979, p.411) once he experienced in Turkey that he was not considered an ‘insider’ but an Almancı.

Since I was 20 years old I was working as a surf instructor or animator at hotels in different parts of the world, Indonesia, Australia, France, Spain, Mexico… These experiences made me a different person, seeing all these different lifestyles, experiencing different climates, cultures, meeting new people… So, then I realised the life is not about Turkey and being Turkish, or Germany and being German. There is a whole world out there. It changed my world view and that’s how I’ve become a more open-minded person, more experimental and more critical as well. I improved my English language skills, also learned French, Spanish and Russian. Then every time when I went back to Germany and see the Turks there I felt that they were so backward and conservative, being stuck
in two cultures and thinking that the world is between those two. I felt like I moved on and separated myself from that mentality, I didn’t see myself as an immigrant, or son of guestworkers, Turkish or Almanca, I was just myself, the citizen of the world. When I came to Turkey, it felt familiar, work mentality here is like in Spain, it’s relaxed. I didn’t have any culture shock because Antalya is multicultural. I only struggled with speaking Turkish a little. In my parents’ town, Malatya, it was a bigger problem, because people there could not grasp the idea how a Turk could not speak Turkish, and they perceived it as a negative thing, they treated me as if I was a foreigner. In fact, for the first time in my life, in our supposedly real hometown, I entered that cliché state that Turks from Germany experience: feeling like a yabancı in homeland, and not feeling belong to neither Germany nor Turkey. In Germany, of course there were right-wing people who would attack Turks’ houses, disturb Turks, I had to deal with discriminatory acts many times in my life. But I had actively decided not to get provoked by these, I didn’t need their approval, I was a German citizen, born and raised there, they could think whatever about me but it didn’t change the fact that they were not better than me, I contributed to the German society as much as they did, maybe even more. My parents worked in factories day and night, I worked since I was a teenager, I attended the university. No one in our family lived on unemployment money or state help… But then, even here… For instance, the Germans who come here for holiday, they sometimes tell me, “Wow, your German is so good!”, they mean it as a compliment but in fact it is an insult. Like, how come a Turk can speak German so well… Then I just smile and reply, “Your German is good too” (laughing). So, I am German, I am Turkish. Maybe I am none. Maybe I’m my own kind of person. I don’t want to live my life within these categories anymore (Rıza, M43).

In Rıza’s narrative, there is a rationalisation process regarding why he had to ignore the Others’ conceptualisation of himself; as he explains he is a German citizen and he thinks both him and his family contributed to the German society. Nevertheless, in other narratives, informants were not able to cope with such stigmatisation processes as Rıza did, as another informant put it,

You can do all you can, I’m a German citizen, my German is perfect. I was good at school. I don’t even particularly look Turkish. But they hear your Turkish name, and questions start. In Germany, you are either German by blood or you’re not German (Reyhan, F46).

Hence, for many informants, coming to Turkey was an attempt to escape from this excluded and vagabond status. Nevertheless, in Turkey, their identities are contested this time by the Turkish locals, and as Rıza explains, they went through another ‘self-concept disturbance’ this time in their ancestral homeland. Towards the end of his narrative, Rıza shows that, he finds a more open-minded and tolerant environment in Antalya, however he still needs to explain himself to
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his German customers. Similar anecdotes were shared by other informants as well, which they vocalised that the German tourists would ask them about their ‘flawless’ German with a great surprise. Some informants also mentioned that they would on purpose speak broken German, claiming that the German tourists would have more sympathy when they think they learned German in Turkey, but also that the tourists then would not dig into their past-lives in Germany.

In summary, the narratives reflect that the tourism spaces in Antalya give them a certain degree of anonymity and a space to embrace cosmopolitan identities. As the narratives show, lifestyle returnees do not want to live within the ethnic/national labels and identities attached to them by Others. Instead, they utilise the ‘uncertainty’ of their identities in tourism spaces, by engaging with performativity, hence accentuating one of their certain identities in order to get the best out of their immediate situation – which is especially beneficial for them to do sales, having friendly relations with Turkish locals, international tourists/expats and other Turkish-Germans around them.

Furthermore, they focus on discovering and transforming the self through these new experiences in tourism spaces, hence their self-actualisation process involves questions such as “who I am?” related to personal enrichment, rather than their previous mental frameworks contemplating between ethno-national and diasporic identities. In this regard, it can be said that in the case of lifestyle returnees, self-identity needs to be understood as “never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and discourses” (Hall, 1996, p.1). The informants themselves are aware that they need to carve out their identities as a personal task, and even these self-definitions are open to transformations, hence having a ‘coherent sense of self’ is not their primary focus in their new lives in Antalya. These points about ‘exploring and discovering the self’ through learning, new challenges and observing the social world around them will be discussed in the next section.

8.1.4 Reflecting on Escapism: Facing the Realities and Taking Actions

Until now, the main narratives of escapism were outlined which acted as push-factors for the informants to firstly ‘return’ to Turkey and then become ‘lifestyle returnees’ by settling in Antalya and working in the tourism sector. As the previous sections showed, the informants took an escapist path for different reasons and in different moments in their lives; whilst some mentioned that their self-reflexive project was flourished already in Germany, more than half of the informants became determined about ‘what to escape from’ once they acquired the lived experience in Turkey upon ‘return’. It was also apparent that, the informants narrated their stories of ‘escaping from’ in relation to their reflections and experiences of ‘escaping to’, hence
the leisure and freedom spaces in Antalya due to their access to the tourism-sector fulfilled their desire for a more independent and ‘alternative’ lifestyle (Iso-Ahola, 1982).

In this regard, most of the narratives show that their lifestyle return migration to Antalya appear as a lasting relocation and a one-off event (Bell & Ward, 2000). Nevertheless, making a secure and translocal home in Antalya and yet escaping from prior constraints, responsibilities and struggles through the liminal space of tourism is not achievable, or desirable for other informants. Hence, this section focuses on the narratives of those informants which makes one fourth of the sample. The aim here is to also show that the continuing escapism is related firstly continuing mobility, hence some informants either through travel, temporary stays abroad or seasonal tourism jobs, keep being in “the grey zone of the complex forms of mobility which lie on a continuum between permanent and tourism” (Williams & Hall, 2002, p.20). And for others, either new personal problems or recurring old patterns and habits lead them to hedonistic lifestyles which are not difficult to sustain in Antalya. The work-leisure balance especially allows them to stay in their ‘comfort zone’ which they continue escaping from their responsibilities towards the self and closer others around them.

However, narratives also reveal that individuals from both groups are aware that what they call as ‘having the freedom of doing whatever I want’ is not necessarily helping them to be the person they want to be. The first narrative is chosen to reflect being engaged in mobility in order to escape from responsibilities. Aytaç explains, he returned to Turkey for ‘adventure’ with no prior plans, and even though he works as a sales person and lives in Antalya, he is always on the go.

I’m sort of based in Antalya. I mean I have a studio flat here, but I constantly move between Antalya, İstanbul, Alanya, Kemer, Cologne, Berlin and Moscow. I go to other places too, but in these places, I have my networks, so if I’m here for a week, next week you might find me at a nightclub in Moscow. I guess, as I’m getting older, I should get married, have children and let the roots grow somewhere but am I ready to have a stable life, am I ready to be the person with tons of responsibilities? Not sure... And... I don’t like making plans. For me, life should be like a holiday. I’m for love and fun, and as long as I can have both, I can be anywhere (Aytaç, M44).

In Aytaç’s narrative, ‘escape from mundane environments’ (Dann, 1977) and escaping from responsibilities are clearly stated, and despite acknowledging that he might need to have a stable life at some point, Aytaç also does not ‘feel ready’ to follow more conventional life choices such as building a family and settling down. Nevertheless, his self-reflection over his choices show that, he sees Antalya is a stepping stone to a more stable life. He further explains:
I didn’t come to Antalya for work. I came here to start over, to have calmness in my life. In Istanbul, I couldn’t do that because I have friends and family from Germany there, people from my chaotic past. In Antalya, I’m trying to have a more orderly life and I’m trying to be who I want to be. Getting a flat was the first step to settle down, I’m still hanging out here and there, but compared to my previous life, I can say I have a calmer life here (Aytaç, M44).

Similar to Aytaç, other informants also depicted that despite enjoying their mobile lives, they plan to have a transition to a more settled life. One respondent who works in Casablanca for several months each year remarked that even though he is depressed from his divorce with his Iranian wife, and that he cannot see his children, he uses tourism-related jobs to distract himself and momentarily forget about his heartbreak (Giray, M42).

Whilst reflections on escapism in relation to mobility and settlement is entangled with uncertain plans, other respondents who are not privileged with a German passport, hence more prone to a settled life in Antalya show that, they were able to find ‘spaces of escape’ within Antalya. Önder (M35) who was deported from Germany due to bodily harming someone and drug-related businesses stars over in Antalya. In order to escape from his childhood traumas, bad habits and inner conflicts, he dedicates himself to his work and builds a family. However, his divorce with his Turkish-German wife and following bitter events put him in a self-destructive cycle. He now owns a popular hairdresser amongst the Germans, and manages it with her new Turkish partner.

I am really trying. I thought I had everything under control when I came to Antalya. A clean slate… But then I have gone through a consuming relationship, and now I barely see my daughter. I promised myself, I am going to do everything to come clean, quit drugs completely. But some mornings I wake up, and life feels… heavy… Then I end up in the same cycle again. But this time, I must do it for my daughter, I don’t want her to think I don’t care about her, I will do everything to support her (Önder, M35).

Önder’s narrative shows a rather extreme case of escapism through using drugs, however several other narratives also reflected their dilemma of facing the realities and taking actions to have a healthier life and at the same time being haunted by their past-life experiences, hence using drugs, alcohol and having an active nightlife to momentarily forget about their problems and responsibilities. These accounts point out that, escapism is not necessarily finalised for some, and in such cases, Antalya also offers spaces where they can be engaged with hedonistic, and at times self-destructive lifestyles. Nonetheless, it is found in these narratives as well that informants make efforts or plan to overcome such phase, because they think that they came a long way getting out
of their chaotic past-lives, hence this is their chance to be ‘true’ to themselves and take over responsibilities that they have been escaping from.

8.2 Discovering the Self through Learning

This section of the analysis explores the ways in which lifestyle returnees reflect on their learnings regarding skills, the self, ‘homeland’, the Others and the world through dwelling and working in the translocal fields of Antalya. These new experiences, skills and insights they have acquired are argued to give the lifestyle returnees more ideas about ‘who they want to be’ and how they would like to live. Therefore, the aphorism of ‘know thyself’ becomes purposeful, because “it facilitates using the self to make sense and make choices, using the self as an important perceptual, motivational and self-regulatory tool” (Oyserman, et al., 2012, p. 69). In this regard, the thesis sheds a light to the informants’ narratives to understand how they reflect on their personal identities which embed social group memberships and roles, forming a distinguishing point of reference for their self from the others (Thoits & Virshup, 1997). Furthermore, to what extent social roles, collective identities such as ethnicity, nationality and gender take on deeper meaning for the informants’ sense of self is explored through scrutinising their identifications with the shared attributes of a certain social group (what they accept and reject), or what kind of personal meanings they create around their membership in social groups, going beyond the ‘already-given’ meanings they have been exposed to (Casella & Fowler, 2005).

Another point in relation to learning is that, the more the informants learn about themselves, others and the social world around them, they revise and find newer ways of identity negotiation. Identity negotiation theory developed by the social psychologist Swann through the late 1980s regards identity as a negotiation process in which individualised self-conception, cultural context and interaction are involved, and individuals are engaged with negotiation processes because they unconsciously seek for psychological and interactional coherence (Swann & Bosson, 2010). Understanding these processes of negotiations, one can have more insights on how an individual’s self-concept influences their ways of interaction, emotional responses and how in turn the cultural context and interpersonal communication – “the mutual give-and-take” – affect individuals’ self-views and their aspiration for stability of self (Swann, 1996, p. 29). Like Goffman’s argument on individuals seeking for stable self-views, feelings of continuity and coherence about themselves, Swann (1996, p.47) asserts that identity negotiation is highly relevant in understanding social change and cases of social deviance:

When people sense that events in the external world are occurring unexpectedly and capriciously, they take steps to ensure that the chaos on the outside does
not create chaos on the inside; they do something, anything, that seems likely to restore their sense of control over the situation.

Scholars relate identity negotiation with transcultural subjects such as immigrants, as these individuals need to mobilise their interaction competencies within situational routines with several others (e.g. members of their collectivity, the dominant Other etc.) to self-regulate – to act in ways that facilitate present or future self-needs and wants (Jenkins, 2008; Oyserman, et al., 2012). Ting-Toomey (2012, p. 40) evaluates that intercultural identity negotiation is “a transactional interaction process whereby individuals attempt to assert, define, modify, challenge, and/or support their own and others’ desired self-images.” This is especially important for the informants of this research, as they meet people from different countries through their tourism jobs, and in order to establish good trade relations, they constantly undertake an intercultural identity negotiation. These job-related performativities and intercultural identity negotiation however also influence the ways in which the informants evaluated their own identities.

8.2.1 Learning New Skills

In lifestyle migration and mobility studies, the distinction between tourist/expat and workers is ambivalent, hence even these lifestyle migrants or travellers may hold dual motivations of leisure and work, career development is not the primary goal of these type of migration and mobilities (Veijola, 2010). Hence, it is not clear for lifestyle migrants and travellers if discovering the self is related to acquiring new skills through working experience in their destination places. However, the findings suggest that for lifestyle returnees, work spaces and working experiences in Antalya are highly influential in the way they transfer their human, social and cultural capitals to economic capital; and in turn, they acquire new skills, build or develop social networks and expand their human capital by learning new languages and sector-specific qualities.

The narratives show that lifestyle returnees went through a “rite of passage”; in which they firstly entered a “separation phase” when they initially came to Antalya and they felt that they freed themselves from the past-live routines, mundane daily activities, prior constraints and personal problems (Van Gennep, 1960; Graburn & Barthel-Bouchier, 2001). Informants highlighted that in their early days in Antalya, finding a job or having an ambition of getting a career within the tourism sector were not fully-formed aspirations, hence they focused on finding out what they actually wanted to do. Then, narratives point out to a “transitional phase”, wherein the informants started to distance themselves from their previous lives, and in this phase, many of them started working in the tourism sector, which help them to incorporate themselves into the new social field of Antalya. This was also the ‘liminal space’ in which informants felt ‘neither
“here nor there” (Turner, 1974; Nash, 1996), however many informants became determined to make a change in their lives in order to have a significant improvement in terms of quality of life. However, this required stretching their personal boundaries and utilising their “translocational habitus”, which was in the beginning not easy for many informants, as they had limited or no prior experience in the tourism sector.

Many narrative accounts show that ‘reintegration’ (Van Gennep, 1960) comes when the informants face with these new challenges and acquire new skills through working and dwelling in tourism spaces, hence many of them enter more structured lives where they re-gain confidence and focus on their well-being and self-development. Once, lifestyle returnees get into tourism jobs, they discover new qualities about themselves, also find out about new aspirations and motivations. For instance, those informants who works as sales discover that they enjoy doing trade with internationals because they are interested in learning about different cultures, talking to people from different parts of the world. Informants claimed that, their life experiences and skills they acquired in Germany, such as foreign language skills, knowing the ‘European way of doing business’, being professional yet friendly, being disciplined and punctual helped them a great deal for maintaining their jobs, and being promoted or given more serious responsibilities by their bosses. In addition, they have become popular amongst the tourists/expats, hence they gained loyal customers, which is highly beneficial for shops owners since there is high competition in the tourism districts. One of the informants spoke of his experiences, by highlighting that he did not have sales experience, however he has discovered that he was good in human relations and he developed an interest in jewellery sector.

I’ve worked in Berlin, Flensburg, Frankfurt, Munich… In bars, car repair shops… I mean, I’m a guy with vocational training! But when I came to Turkey and started working in Istanbul’s Grand Bazaar, I’ve discovered that I was good at sales. I worked in textile shops in Side later. When I came to Antalya in 1995, I continued sales in textile. Then I started working in this jewellery shop, and I’ve been working in this same shop for 20 years! I decided to become an expert in one thing. I’d experienced in Germany that, when you work in the same place for a long time, it’s better for you because, in time you become the most trustable person, you become the go-to person. 20 years ago, only rich tourists came here. We were selling expensive jewellery like candy. I still have customers from those years, if they come to Antalya, they shop from me. I’ve become so good at what I’m doing, my customers always visit me, we’ve become like a big family. I enjoy the jewellery business, it’s all about taste, beauty, knowing different materials, gems, diamonds, pearls, metals… (Nusret, M46).

What is also interesting in Nusret’s narrative is that, through working in a luxurious jewellery shop, he developed ‘taste’ and ‘aesthetics’ about jewellery, and became a professional
sales person in 20 years. Nusret’s case is rather rare amongst the sample, because other informants took advantage of the flexible job-market conditions and worked in different positions. Or some informants recognised the opportunities and started up their own business. Nedim’s story shows the stages of “rite-into-passage”, and how he transformed himself from an ex-criminal to a real estate agent and owner of two cafes.

After the jail, I felt the urge of leaving Germany, so I came to Antalya… in…1994 for a holiday. And really, when I arrived at Antalya, I instantly fell in love with the place. So, I decided that I wouldn’t go back to Germany. I had travelled all Europe, I’ve been to everywhere, but when I came to Antalya, I don’t know, something kept me here... But I didn’t know anyone in Antalya so I decided that I would start working, because… I was bored after some months, I needed to build a network. There was a jewellery centre at that time close to the port and they were training sales people. I joined their courses for 6 months, they teach you everything about the jewellery sector etc. But I hated it, it was not for me. Because if the product is 1000 liras, you sell it for 10000. The tourism sector is like that here, you need to lie. So, I decided that I want to have my own job, I didn’t want to work for someone else. I had my savings, so it wasn’t a problem. Firstly, I opened a silver store in Belek. I was earning around 7000-8000 [German] Marks a day, that was so much money! I was shocked, I thought, “Why didn’t I come to Turkey long time ago?” but it was because I didn’t know that Turkey had opportunities like this. I was associating Turkey with my parents and Sivas so I had negative thoughts about it. Anyways, in years I made good networks, I’ve realised that German customers really liked me, counted on me. So, as the tourism sector in Belek was weakening, I came back to Antalya and started a real estate office, I mainly work with Germans who want to buy houses here. Then I have this tea house and another café. I surprised myself, I didn’t know I could make a good businessman, I didn’t know that I could follow a disciplined life. I see coming to Antalya as a turning point, not only because I escaped from the drug environments of Germany, bad friendships and depressing family life, but because I learned so much about myself. And now, people respect me here, both my customers and locals (Nedim, M47).

Nedim’s narrative highlights that once he learned new skills and expanded his network, he could become his own boss as he acquired the economic capital. However, in his narrative it is found that, despite his old self, he took a step to further invest in Antalya rather than spending his money, because he enjoyed discovering new sides to himself. Gaining ‘trust’ and ‘respect’ reflect the importance of having symbolic capital, and for Nedim, it is a self-development and an unexpected success compared to his previous life in Germany and education level (he graduated from Hauptschule, and explained that he never enjoyed going to school). It can be said that for lifestyle returnees, acquiring new skills in the tourism spaces of Antalya works as an important source of learning about themselves. For instance, Nedim finds that he does not like to lie to customer about prices, something he learns about himself through the sales experience. As
lifestyle returnees learn more about themselves through new challenges and gaining skills, they also learn about what is important for them in life, which will be discussed in the next section.

8.2.2 Learning about the Self Through the Others

It was illustrated in the previous chapters that whilst a quarter of the sample still lead highly mobile lives and learn about themselves through experiencing different places, cultures and people, the majority of informants experience the “global ecumene” (Hannerz, 1989) in some way in Antalya, as the tourism spaces allow them to perceive and live ‘place’ as a ‘meeting place’ (Massey, 2002), where they can meet people from all over the world, and yet ground these global and transnational scale of connections at a local level. Many informants link this “global sense of place” (Massey, 1991) to the “global sense of self”, as they see that the place is not bound and static, they also perceive ‘the self’ as changing through the negotiations, hierarchies of power and interconnectedness of the place. In that sense, they have an “elective belonging” (Savage, et al., 2005) they consciously build a translocal feeling of ‘home’ for the place based on their lifestyle choices and life-course needs/aspirations. These processes of constructing belonging towards Antalya, or contemplating about settling or continuing to be mobile are important parts of the ‘self-seeking’ journey, as each experience, encounter, success/failure guide this highly reflexive group’s future decisions for themselves.

Their jobs in the tourism sector provide them with a sort of “global village” and many informants claim that these hybrid and multicultural environments taught them about other nationalities and cultures, but also, they had the chance to observe more about the German and Turkish cultures and contest their previous ‘self-conceptions’ about themselves. Many informants declared that they learn something new every day, and each day, they have a dialogue with themselves about what they liked/disliked about this new experience, where they stood in terms of values, and if they wanted to change something about themselves or their environments. In this regard, the constant change in Antalya’s structures, the flow of new people and developments in the area encourages the lifestyle returnees to have a flexible attitude. One example about learning more about the self through the Others’ is reflected in the narrative below:

There are so many Syrians in Antalya now, that’s new. They’re not good for the city, they sleep on the streets, they steal, beg, then they don’t follow the rules, they swim in the sea with their clothes, leave trash everywhere. Then we have Arabic tourists, they have the money, but they don’t have manners. Some weeks ago, I found myself observing some Arabic tourists, and I was condescending. But then I thought, “this is exactly how Germans felt about Turks!” I am now
trying to change my stance about this, nobody in the shops here prefer the Arabic tourists, even though they have the money and shop so much. But we see them as, well... worse than us. I mean I always thought of myself as a tolerant and fair person, but here I learned that I was not, completely. It's a new revelation, so I don't know now... but I have surely learned something about myself (Davut, M38).

In Davut’s narrative, it is apparent that he is learning about himself when he is mirrored with a situation that he is familiar with/suffered from in Germany, hence developing empathy for ‘the Other’. Furthermore, he is comparing his thoughts and behaviours with other sales people around them, and thinking about the reasons behind these attitudes. As it was suggested before, Antalya’s ever-changing social structures allow Davut, and other informants to reflect on these experiences and use them to gain more knowledge about themselves. In this regard, learning by doing and learning by experiencing is one of the advantages of lifestyle migration, wherein individuals face with new conditions. The following narrative highlights the importance of interacting with new people who come from different backgrounds, and how these help the informant to discover what is important for himself in life.

It writes German on my ID, but after having lived here I feel that I have qualities of both. I belong to Turkey, but working here, I have also learned more about the Turkish people and ways. Turks love shortcuts, and talking, there’s always more talk than action. But at the same time, you can have a heart-to-heart connection with a Turk. Also, Turks are more flexible, in fact, I learned to take life lightly here. With Germans, well, they’re materialistic, and not sentimentally developed. They also worry too much, too many rules, principles... I follow German ways about work discipline, but that’s all... This job is like being under the spotlight, I stand here and people come and talk to me. I like interacting with strangers, learning new things every day, having meaningful conversations. So, here there is some work, some social life, all at once, without bothering you. In years, that’s what I learned about myself, I like feeling free and connecting with people based on higher values, my wife and I do charity, we help people, we try to live as green as possible. I think these things are more important than being German or Turkish. I made friends here from different backgrounds, Kurdish, Germans, Dutch, English, Almançıl’s, religious people, and I learned about respecting other people’s opinions, because we all live here, we need to be tolerant (Süha, M48).

Süha’s narrative is a good representative of how lifestyle returnees commonly regard themselves; instead of giving direct and well-defined answers about their ethnic, national identities, they focus on the cultural aspects, and see themselves as combining different aspects from different cultures. However, through their dwelling in Antalya, they find out more about both Turkish and German cultures, hence how they perceive themselves also changes. Furthermore, as Süha, many lifestyle returnees have a rhetoric of ‘moral ground’ and they...
commonly refer to living with ethics as respecting others and allowing the others to be who they are, and expecting a similar level of tolerance and compassion for themselves. These rather ‘humanist’ discourses they embrace involve living without harming themselves, others and the nature. Surrounded by nature in Antalya, many lifestyle returnees develop an environmentalist stance and they are quite reactive towards local politics and business developments which harm the natural habitats of Antalya. Even though, some reflections were given about how lifestyle returnees think about the ‘bigger issues’, the next section will illustrate the ways in which lifestyle returnees reflect on themselves in relation to Antalya, and Turkey in general.

Hence, for the informants, acknowledging divergent way of internalising social group memberships and collective identities seem to be especially critical in the case of ethnic, national, racial and religious identities. The informants face with the challenges of reconciling other aspects of self, whilst continuously assessing their ‘similarities’ and ‘differences’ vis-à-vis the dominant others in their social environments (Chatman, et al., 2005, pp.120-121). The vital point here is to recognise that, at the core of it, in trying to forge an identity that is unique yet not so different from others that one would be viewed as deviant, the informants still seek a sense of belonging to identifiable social groups. Their process of negotiation – deciding for oneself how much and in what ways one fits with a given group – provides them with a sense of achievement in the domain of self-knowledge.

8.2.3 Reflecting on the Self, ‘Home’ and ‘Big Issues’

It was illustrated in the literature review regarding the ‘return’ experience that, ‘return’ is often entangled with feelings of disillusion and disappointment, wherein returnees start developing a “reverse transnationalism” and counter-diasporic longing for the country they were born/raised in and left behind. The second generation’s “double consciousness” consists of simultaneously comparing two countries in many aspects, from daily life to political and economic issues, from gender equality issues to education, environment and culture/traditions, habits and so on. For the informants of this research, dissatisfaction with their ‘return’ places led them to resettle in Antalya, and as the previous chapters portrayed, lifestyle returnees transform a sense of self and belonging, and re-construct the meaning of ‘home’ in this international niche. In this regard, informants vocalised that, constructions of ‘home’ and ‘sense of self’ were personal tasks, wherein they took the first step by escaping from environments of struggle, boundedness and limitations to spaces of freedom, and started discovering about themselves through working in the tourism sector, and dwelling in the hybrid social spaces of Antalya.
Nevertheless, even though lifestyle returnees claim to find refuge in Antalya where they can distance themselves from problems they associate with Turkey, and to a degree embrace a ‘cosmopolitan identity’, all informants were highly articulate about their observations on Turkish politics and society. It is found in the informants’ narratives that, despite seeing themselves as “world citizens” and “free from national doctrines”, they also commonly described themselves as “patriots” (‘vatansever’ in Turkish) who love Turkey and feel upset that the country’s potential has been wasted with wrong leadership and politics. Narratives further revealed that, until moving to Antalya, the informants were mostly debating about and contesting ‘cultural issues’ e.g. differences between social life, household roles, traditions, people’s general characteristics between Turkey and Germany. However, after resettling in Antalya and getting into the tourism sector, many informants started following the Turkish politics closely, and many embraced a “third eye” position, wherein they could be critical about the problems but at the same time develop an emotional response, as they constructed a sense of home in Antalya. Radcliffe and Westwood (Radcliffe & Westwood, 1996, p.132) explain,

Affiliations with multiple places are cross-cut by relations of class, location, gender, age and “race”, in which a sense of belonging is mediated through these power relations and positionings. Popular everyday expressions of relationships to place and national space are in themselves multiple, frequently contradictory and contested.

Along the same lines, how informants depicted their ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland, and how they perceive it over time is closely linked to places of settlement, but also the informants’ “translocational positionality”, their encounters with the power hierarchies and structures within the place. For instance, for female informants, women’s rights in Turkey and women’s place in society have been a concern since they ‘returned’ to the ancestral homeland. Even though they find a relatively liberated space in Antalya, they are aware that they need to negotiate their gender identities depending on the context. One of the informants Helin depicts her experiences in Turkey as a woman:

I’m happy in Turkey, but, because I live in Antalya. As you see, I have a different style (showing her double-side ponytail). I was once in Istanbul, and wearing neon pink shoes and everybody was looking at me on the bus. In Turkey there’s this thing, “act your age”, I’m dressing like a 25-year-old, I’m divorced, having a boyfriend and living with him without marriage. They judge me and think of me as a kolay lokma⁴⁰. I stopped caring, I know who I am… I think it’s difficult to be a woman in this country, and with this government, it’s

⁴⁰ “An easy woman.”
getting worse, there’s more violence towards women than ever before. Women are abused everywhere, in Germany too, but the state enforces strict laws, here there is no enforcement. Even in Antalya, those Turks from the Eastern villages come here as construction workers and so on, they had never seen a woman in shorts before, and they look at women like we are pieces of meat. Turkish guys think of European women as easy, ah... it disgusts me so much, sometimes when I see young Turkish guys here with old German ladies, they use them as “sugar mamas” (said in English), then they spend the money with young Russian girls (Helin, 45).

In Helin’s narrative it is found that, she related gender norms in Turkey with ageism, where women at her age are expected to dress more moderately, and they need to have decent family lives, if not, living with a boyfriend without marriage can be perceived as inappropriate in some parts of Turkey. Nevertheless, Helin takes an active decision to follow her mind and not let anyone influence her, and this is one of the reasons why she lives in Antalya. Many informants, like Helin, compared Turkey to Germany in terms of gender quality and women’s rights, and concluded that it is the state’s responsibility to enforce the rule of law. In this regard, the informants present a deeper analysis, they did not simply suggest one country is worse or better than the other, but evaluated the pros and cons in both countries with regards to governments’ politics and education systems. Helin also points out a commonly exemplified case of Turkish men sexually-objectifying Western women, and in tourism-areas like Antalya, the common case of Turkish men finding foreign partners for various self-interests.

Whilst gender was one of the main points of discussion amongst the informants, another recurring theme appeared as the way in which tourism sector is run in Antalya. Informants were especially disturbed by destructing of green areas in Turkey, and commonly referred to the Gezi Park protests in 201341 in Istanbul to highlights the governments’ attitude towards Turkey’s natural resources. Except a few diverse opinions, most of the informants vocalised their disturbance related to the rather lack of environmental projects in Turkey, and for Antalya, money-oriented initiatives which harms the green areas and beaches of the city. Ceylan’s narrative below depicts two themes, one is related to her opinion that tourism suffers in Turkey because the sector is not run by people with no vision and the necessary rules and regulations are not followed, hence in an environment of chaos, shop and hotel owners focus on easy ways of making money. Secondly, Ceylan stresses that Antalya is not given the care that it deserves.

41 Amnesty International explains the Gezi Park protests as it follows: “On 30 May 2013, police cleared Gezi Park in central Istanbul of a small, peaceful group of protestors opposed to the park’s destruction. The authorities’ reaction was brutal and unequivocal.”  
Turkey was a textile paradise, we have the best cotton. In Antalya, look at all the clothing and shoe shops, they sell the fake versions of big brands. We can imitate them so well, and produce them in Turkey which is better quality than the actual products. Seriously, tourists come year after year, they buy five pairs of the same jeans, saying it’s better quality than the expensive brands’ original jeans. But, we don’t have our own worldwide-known brands. Same reckless attitude with tourism, they filled all the beautiful beaches with concrete all-inclusive hotels, they’re ruining Antalya’s character, all for easy money... It makes me angry. Antalya’s so unique, how many places do you know, where you can ski and then swim in the 30-degrees sea within the same day? Ancient Roman, Greek history is here, nomadic history is here, but we are consuming the place the worst way possible. If it was German’s, Antalya would have been the world’s most popular tourism destination. But in Turkey, nothing has value (Ceylan, F49).

In Ceylan’s narrative, the world “consuming” (türk.etmek) is used, which was also picked by other informants in relation to how tourism sector is proceeded in Antalya. Another commonality between Ceylan’s narrative and others is that, informants thought if Germany had the resources, historical and cultural sites as Turkey did, the natural resources and cultural/historical heritage would be protected and presented to the world in the best way possible. When informants asked, “What do you think about the ways in which locals live in this city?”, informants stated that even though Turkish people could take care of their cities better, they argued that it is the municipalities and schools’ responsibility to raise environmental awareness and take initiatives such as launching a recycling system. Nonetheless, the informants believe that Antalya (also Alanya) is above the Turkish standards when it comes to life quality, because since people from the EU countries started settling in these areas, municipalities put more effort to provide Western European standards (e.g. restaurants and cafes are obliged to have bathrooms and accessible entrances for disabled guests in Alanya, bike lanes are created and certain roads are closed to traffic in certain parts of Antalya).

Following these illustrations and insights from the informants, it appears that lifestyle returnees are not able to have a fixated belonging to one place, because on one hand they vocalise their love and admiration for their ancestral homeland Turkey in terms of humanly values, culture and traditions, and on the other hand they seek the social welfare and well-regulated city/town life that they are used to from Germany. As it was presented, informants find such mix in Antalya to a certain degree, however they do recognise the challenges and obstacles for Turkey. For instance, when asked their opinion about Turkey’s membership to the EU, without an exception, all informants believed that Turkey would not be able to become an EU member. Some informants suggested that the EU was a Christian club and a predominantly Muslim-populated country like Turkey would not be welcomed. The recurring answer was that
Turkey would gain a dominant decision-making vote because of its population, and the EU would not be willing Turkey to decide for the EU politics. All informants argued that Turkey does not need the EU, and should focus on bettering the human rights conditions and education system. When asked about benefits of being in the Schengen zone that would guarantee a freedom of movement, some informants believed it would be beneficial for the Turkish, but this reason on its own does not change their opinion about Turkey not needing to become an EU member.

Informants revealed that they see in Turkey, a country which is on the margins of the European continent, and always focused on catching up with the Western civilisations and modernity; causing complexities and ambivalences for the Turks in terms of identities and lifestyles. The tour guide Koray depicts these dilemmas of ‘not being Western’ and ‘not being Eastern’, but being stuck in the middle as a country.

I don’t know how Turkish, German or European I am… Before living in Turkey, I’d thought only Turks in Germany have identity crisis, but I saw here that every Turkish person has one because Turkey is such a complex and contradicting place. And Turkey is still searching for an identity, is it European, Asian, Middle Eastern? Look at Antalya, it’s so diverse, you can’t label it with one word. We think now we’ve become modern, because we live like the Westerners. But when you have shopping malls, smartphones, when you spend your life between this brunch and that beach, that restaurant and that…. you don’t become civilised. The mind set needs to change. Now in Turkey, people don’t even know their neighbours, because we copied the Western individualism, and we think it’s how you become modern. So… When I stopped focusing on who I really was and instead focus on how I can improve myself to become who I want to be, all my problems dissolved. Turkey should do the same, we must stop being European-wannabees, we should invest in education, and give the young brains hope in this country, brain drain is Turkey’s worst enemy right now. There’s no good in digging identity issues, that just brings more confusion and conflict, look at the Kurdish issue… Or, if Turkey is European? Well, when we had emancipation for women in this country, Belgium, hmm France, Greece, Switzerland, women couldn’t vote. The EU sees ancient Greek and Roman cultures as European’s native culture, well, our country has that history, so we were European before Europe! Santa Claus lived in here, East Roman empire was established in Istanbul, Orthodox patriarchies are located there… Hopefully, I’ll stay here and die in this land. I want to work as a tour guide as much as my health allows me, because we need to show the world how beautiful and special our country is. And education, education, education! If Turks learn about their history, then they can discuss these things with the Europeans (Koray, M35).

Not all narratives are as elaborate as Koray’s, nevertheless most of the informants recognise that Turkey is a country of opportunities and if people are better educated, these is a great potential in the country to leave its identity struggles behind. Koray compares his identity
crisis with Turkey’s as a country and Turkish people, explaining that being stuck between the East and West, individualism and collectivism, modernism and traditionalism, *Gemainschaft* and *Gesellschaft* cause complexities not only for the individuals but for the country’s politics. Informants currently picked up on the ‘Kurdish question’, reflecting that Turkey is a heterogeneous society with many ethnic groups, hence the politicians need to focus on improving human rights in general, whether Turkish, Kurdish, Alevi, informants argued that everybody needs to have equal rights.

Koray further highlights that, his identity problems started diminishing when he started focusing on re-inventing himself to be who he wants to be, instead of investing on an ongoing debate with the self, regarding ‘given’ identities such as ethnic, national, religious identities. In this sense, his narrative reflects Giddens’ (1991) critique of late modernity in which identities have become the ‘projects of the reflexive self’. For Koray, re-inventing the self was becoming a tour guide, hence educating himself about the Turkish history and history of places and, embracing a ‘mediating role’ between the internationals and the Turkish culture. For his ancestral homeland as well, he believes that education needs to be prioritised and Turkey needs to focus on developing the living conditions, basic human rights and education system, and re-inventing itself as a country of its own kind. Hence, it can be argued that lifestyle returnees’ encounters with places in the ancestral homeland, with its social and institutional structures, and changing cultural, traditional and habitual spaces lead them to reflect on their self-identities. In this regard, it appears that their identities are forged within a locational matrix of constraint; in which they contest the meanings of their identities as well as conventions of placing (Massey, 1994). Their spatial relations and social relations are dynamic and these dynamic encounters with various spaces initiate avenues of possibilities for self-improvement, also enriching their social, human and economic capitals.

### 8.3 Discussion: No Strings Attached? Motivations/Challenges for Further Mobility

In return migration theories and empirical research that focus on the second generation, returnees’ further transnational mobility has not been given much attention, even though scholars acknowledge that returnees might want to take advantage of their “transcultural capital” to develop economic or civic activity that is transnational in character (Gropas & Triandafyllidou, 2014, p.15). This mainly unexplored phase after ‘return’ was the main scope of this thesis, hence the ‘returned’ second generation’s further resettlement to Antalya was put under scrutiny, which illustrated that ‘return’ is an ongoing project with complex decision-making processes and diverse
trajectories. In this section, this argument is further developed by giving voice to informants who highlight the possibilities for future mobility or re-settlement elsewhere.

The previous sections and chapters made it clear that, for lifestyle returnees, ‘return’ was no longer seen as a reunification with the ethnic community or a search for an identity that manifests itself within ethnic, national or religious categorisations. Instead, searching for self has become a reflexive project to find/discover/re-invent self-definitions beyond such discursive identifications; as narratives have illustrated, for lifestyle returnees dwelling in translocal fields that promotes freedom, tolerance and motivation for self-development are highly valued. Furthermore, the narratives also highlighted that there is no ‘total fit’ between the second generation and the ancestral homeland; they hence they seek places where they can have a fulfilling life and, constructing belongingness and a ‘sense of place’ are individualistic endeavours, requiring active human agency, place-making practices and learning the ‘rules of the game’.

The narratives illustrated that whilst around 75 per cent of the sample are settled in Antalya, the remainder are still leading mobile lives between Turkey and Germany, but also other countries depending on their social networks and seasonal jobs. The tales of escapism made it clear that, lifestyle returnees search for stability in their lives, and many see themselves as living in Antalya in the future as well. Nevertheless, circumstances change in people’s lives either due to personal life changes or effects of Antalya’s changing structures. For instance, when I came to Antalya for the second time for the thesis project in 2015, I wanted to firstly contact some of the informants of the pilot survey in 2014. When I e-mailed one of the informants I learned that he moved back to Germany because he had a daughter from a German girlfriend, which he articulated the situation as an “unexpected change in the plans”, as he was thinking of buying a house in a rather remote and green part of Antalya when we held an interview in 2014. When I went to the Old Town area close to the port to find the older informants, I was informed that some of them started working in other parts of Antalya, as the Old Town is now being rebranded and mostly locals come to spend time in here. Some other informants moved to Alanya and Side, which are within the Antalya Province, however smaller tourism towns compared to Antalya city.

Hence, even though lifestyle returnees seek stability, security and coherence in their lives, they are open to changes, and many of them keep further mobility and resettlement as an option in their lives. The findings in the first days of the fieldwork regarding lifestyle returnees’ changing life conditions led the research to revise the interview questions, hence questions regarding further mobility and future plans were added into the interview guidelines. The findings show that 17 lifestyle returnees own houses in Antalya, however this does not necessarily mean that
they would be permanently settled in Antalya. Informants see owning properties as good assets, and second home ownership (as a summer house, “yazlık”) is common in Turkey, hence they reflected that they could buy a house elsewhere and keep the one in Antalya. Those informants who were above 40 years old commonly mentioned that they would like to live in a more secluded and natural place in more green parts of Antalya, dreaming of a ‘rural idyll’ life for their retirement years. Couple of informants mentioned that when they get old, they would like to return to their parents’ villages and live the village life and be surrounded by nature. In general, all the informants have a ‘counter-urbanisation’ dream for their later lives, and they believe that this is possible in Antalya, as the outer city offers more secluded and natural areas.

However, for some informants who either have German or double citizenship, or those who still have residence permit in Germany, travelling to other places or making resettlement plans were vocalised. It needs to be highlighted that, restrictions for travel/work for Turkish passport holders is the main obstacle for those returnees who are Turkish citizens, hence for them Antalya seems to be the best place to live within Turkey, given their conditions. Nevertheless, those who do not have institutional and structural barriers, future mobility and resettlement appear as possible plans. One informant with German citizenship explains that despite feeling that he has a ‘fulfilling life’ in Antalya, he might consider moving to somewhere else.

I love Antalya but I’m not happy with the political situation here. I have a house in Canary Islands, I’m thinking, maybe I’d move to Spain if things go extremely bad in here… But Antalya is not like the rest of Turkey, it’s like Spain or southern France, I don’t feel that I am living in Turkey. I don’t have responsibilities towards someone, I’m single, I don’t have children. My parents can take care of themselves, they’re fine in Germany. So, I’m only thinking of my wellbeing. I think there’s more to see in the world, I don’t want to be stuck in one place. But I don’t think I could live in Germany after all the warm places I’ve lived in. Germany would be so dark and boring. I’m used to working in summer places, with international people around me. And that’s why I can live in Antalya, the hotel environment is good, the sun is shining… I met many good people here, and made a nice network. So, at this point I find Antalya quite charming. But I can’t promise anything for the future (Rıza, M43).

From this narrative, it can be understood that future plans such as resettling somewhere else can be more attainable for those who are single or who have no family responsibilities. However, findings suggest that family lives are hardly an obstacle for lifestyle returnees, as their partners also have interest in discovering new places or resettling in parts of the world to have ‘better’ lives. Another respondent vocalised that despite being happy and settled in Antalya, she misses
traveling the world, as she was working as a tour operator in Germany, East Asian and Middle Eastern countries, also working on cruise ships. She said,

My children are old enough now. So, I am thinking, maybe I go back to the mobile life. Even though Antalya makes me forget that I am living in Turkey, I find the political situation in Turkey depressing. Maybe it can be nice to go away for a while (Reyhan, F46).

In Reyhan’s case, she plans to reverse her situatedness, and go back to her mobile lifestyle, this time as an escape from the political stigma and rising anomie in Turkey. Both narratives point out the political problems in Turkey as the main push-factor for a possible re-emigration.

Hence, whilst privilege of freedom of movement and being affluent in terms of economic capital play a role in lifestyle returnees future plans, most of the informants vocalised that they would not want to leave Antalya, even if they were given the chance of living or working elsewhere. As Koray’s narrative highlighted in the previous section, “I’d like to die in this land” rhetoric was a recurring statement in the interviews, which also shows that despite dissatisfaction and disillusionment in the past upon ‘return’, the informants managed to integrate themselves into their ancestral homeland in Antalya, and many believes that they are living a fulfilling life in this tourism hub. However, it is argued in this section based on the field notes and interviews with the informants that lifestyle return is an ongoing journey, where translocal fields intersect and more destinations can be added to this journey, depending on the individuals’ circumstances, motivations and needs.

8.4 Conclusion: Having a ‘Better Life’ through Self-Actualisation and Personal Growth

This chapter focused on the respondents’ reflections on ‘the self’ in the light of their past experiences in Germany and other parts of Turkey, and the ways in which settling in Antalya contributed to their project of ‘searching for self’. To start with, the chapter presented the narratives of escapism, which showed that the respondents needed a fresh start in their lives in a new place where they have no social ties. The narratives reflected that, Antalya offered them a space where they could have a certain level of anonymity, and more autonomy and competency which all helped them to improve their self-esteem. For instance, in narratives related to escaping from the mundane of everyday lives, the respondents explained that, the lively and sociable environment in their tourism space enable them to get a sense of fulfilment as they can build relatedness with many people during the day. In addition, the warm climate and picturesque natural surrounding have a therapeutic effect on the informants. Compared to their living
conditions in Germany wherein days were dark, rainy and monotone, the respondents claimed to have a more positive and energetic attitude towards life in Antalya.

Furthermore, the respondents commonly pointed out that they had to escape from their families’ expectations regarding marriage, lifestyle and career. Especially the female informants felt that they had to change their environment to lower the influence of the family pressure regarding how they are supposed to live. In Antalya, the respondents found a space of freedom, where they could live without the pressure of the others – for instance, Antalya was especially found ideal for those who were divorced or being their middle ages yet being single, those who have a criminal background etc. The chapter linked these findings with the following escapist theme which focused on the respondents’ conscious effort to make peace with their identity crisis. The narratives showed that, the respondents are still stereotyped as “Almancı” in Antalya by their co-workers and the Turkish locals; however different than their previous places of settlement, the respondents are not being confused or badly influenced because a) these social others do not have a direct effect in their lives, b) especially in tourism spaces, there is no one dominant culture or Other, in-group/outgroup definitions and boundaries are flexible c) the respondents’ transcultural backgrounds is valued in the job market but also in the tourism spaces in general, hence the respondents now have a positive perception of their multiple identities.

The chapter then introduced ‘learning’ as an important endeavour for the respondents’ journey of ‘discovering the self’. The previously discussed ‘narratives of escapism’ are directly linked to ‘narratives of learning’, because through learning more about themselves, learning new skills and their capabilities, learning about the Others and the world around them, the respondents claimed to get to know themselves better and learn who they are and who they would like to become. For instance, some narratives showed that the respondents learned that they were capable of having a disciplined life, dedicating themselves to hard-work and stay away from addictive substances. Their experiences in the tourism-related businesses showed them that they were in fact sociable and committed people, which they could not get to manifest either in Germany or in other parts of Turkey due to their anxieties about their respective social conditions. Finally, the chapter presented a discussion regarding the future mobility trajectories of the respondents. The section showed that, despite the majority of the sample would like to invest in Antalya and spend their retirement days there, those respondents who are not limited by the visa procedures keep their options open about living in a different country. These findings can be linked to the meaning and function of escapism: for some respondents, there is a realisation that there is never a total escape, hence constantly changing the living environment is not the answer to a fulfilling life. Instead, they either would like to settle in Antalya, or settle in a completely rural
environment when they get older (the most popular being their parents’ village, a complete ‘back to roots’ move). However, especially for the male respondents who are in their 30s and who are single/divorced, travelling abroad or temporarily living in different countries through working in tourism-related jobs are still appealing. Consequently, it can be argued that the respondents are aware of their immediate conditions and the possible effects of their structural limitations on their mobility trajectories.

Bringing together all these findings and discussion points, this chapter concludes that lifestyle migration as an individualized and structurally reliant pursuit which is also a response to practical, moral and emotional imperatives (O’Reilly & Benson, 2009, p.11) is a useful conceptualisation to understand the return migrants’ motivations to further move and settle in places where they can fulfil their existential, moral and lifestyle goals. Nevertheless, neither in lifestyle migration nor return migration literature, there is an emphasis on the wellbeing aspect of ‘a better and more fulfilling life’. In this chapter especially, the findings pointed out the importance of fulfilling the functional needs (housing, employment etc.), psychosocial needs (self-esteem, autonomy, competency, positive emotions and values) and relational needs (intimate relations and broader social relations) (Wright, 2012; Vathi, 2017) for the respondents to discover themselves, deal with the unpleasant memories of the past and leave behind the feeling of “social marginalisation at ‘home’” (Stefansson, 2004, p.56).

Subsequently, this chapter suggests that, the concept of ‘better life’ can include human wellbeing, which refers to “a state of being with others, where human needs are met, where one can act meaningfully to pursue one’s goals and where one enjoys satisfactory quality of life” (Gough et al., 2007, p.34). Especially for those ‘returnees’ who have the ‘double trauma’ of being deported and having social integration problems upon ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland, and women who had the ‘escape’ from the rigid patriarchal family/social environments, improving their psychosocial wellbeing seems to be a great facilitator of what they perceive as a ‘more fulfilling life’. Moreover, acknowledging that people’s definitions of wellbeing are contextual, informed by the different social networks within which they are entwined, locally, nationally and transnationally (Wright, 2012), the focus needs to be given to the issues of place and scale, i.e. how living well is transformed or reinforced through instances in a transnational social field for the migrant selves. As this chapter showed, fulfilling the goal of living a ‘better life’ was not possible everywhere in Turkey for the returnees, but in Antalya. Thereof, research that focuses on the role of lifestyle in understanding return motivations and trajectories need to firstly understand the social field and wider structural setting of the particular place of return settlement.
9 Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to understand the meanings that lifestyle returnees assign to ‘searching for self’ throughout their ‘return’ journeys in the ancestral homeland and the ways in which they manifest such quest through their migratory decision to Antalya. Based on this overarching aim, the thesis was developed upon the following three objectives: a) understanding the role of tourism places/spaces for the lifestyle returnees to ‘search for self’ and have a ‘better life’; b) exploring the lifestyle returnees’ place-making (belonging) processes towards their place of settlement through their active agency (‘transcultural capital’ and ‘translocational habitus’); c) evaluating how their quest of ‘search for self’ evolve as they dwell/work in Antalya, and how this process influences the lifestyle returnees’ understanding of the self in relation to the notions of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’. Through the narrative-thematic analysis of 44 in-depth semi-structured interviews with lifestyle returnees in Antalya, in September-December 2015, Chapter Five, Six, Seven and Eight presented and discussed the empirical findings in the light of the aforesaid research questions and objectives. Hence, this Conclusion chapter firstly summarises how the thesis addressed at the research aims through its analysis and then it discusses the research’s contributions within the wider academic context. The chapter then details the limitations and future research directions, also providing a brief account on reflexivity.

9.1 Bringing the Pieces Together: The Self and Lifestyle Return

This section demonstrates how each research objective has been met in the thesis. Starting with the objective of understanding the meanings attached to ‘search for self’ by the lifestyle returnees, the thesis has presented that, the second-generation Turkish-Germans’ transformation into ‘lifestyle returnees’ with the quest of searching for, discovering and re-inventing the self is not a straightforward process and each informant has different challenges and self-realisation stages. Chapter Six has presented that, ‘searching for self’ through ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland did not mature into an individualised plan for all the second generation; instead it mostly appeared as the second generation’s romanticised idea of reuniting with the Turkish identity in the ancestral homeland. Hence, the narratives of ‘return’ has highlighted that, before and on its early days of ‘return’, the second generation mostly sought for a ‘coherent sense of self’ and expected to start a new life in the ancestral homeland wherein they could have both a clear and coherent/stable sense of self, and a sense of place.

Nevertheless, Chapter Six has concluded that, the informants have understood that ‘homeliness’ and ‘belonging’ were not feelings they could automatically develop towards their
places of ‘return’ even though most the informants had had familial ties and social networks in these places. Instead the notion of ‘home’ has been subjectively appreciated by the informants. Furthermore, Chapter Six has established that ‘return’ experiences have evoked the second generations’ reflexivity, and even though the ‘return’ reasons and motivations were multiple and at times contradicting, all the informants focused on resettling in a new place where they could ‘escape’ from their prior problems, constraints and responsibilities, and learn more about themselves, learn new skills and add new qualities into their personal repertoires. Hence, the thesis has shown that ‘searching for self’ for the second generation was not a highly-individualised plan free from the structural limitations (family, visa-citizenship, economic, educational qualifications etc.). On the contrary, the second generation had to utilise their various types of capital in order to develop newer strategies to build a life where they could earn a living whilst have the personal leisure space to concentrate on their own self-development.

In summary, the narratives have made it clear that for this group of second generation, the ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland was not a ‘homecoming’, but required ‘home-making’ as an active practice, in which ‘returnees’ had to develop place-attachments through their lived experiences (school, career, family) and learn the ‘rules of the game’, and reconstruct social networks. The narratives have shown that there was a close link for the lifestyle returnees’ narratives of the self and place; hence the informants had vocalised that they could be ‘who they are’ or ‘who they would like to be’ in certain places – particular environments which they believed to offer them ‘spaces of freedom’.

These findings have set the scene for the thesis which then has helped the second objective to be explored, which has focused on the second generation’s reflexivity over their ‘return’ experiences and how these processes of revisiting their ‘searching for self’ guided them to resettle in Antalya and dwell/work in tourism spaces. Chapter Seven has illustrated how the second generation has transformed into ‘lifestyle returnees’ through settling in Antalya, and the ways in which their project of ‘searching for self’ has been translated into constructing a social life in the tourism spaces through working in tourism-related jobs. Here, the thesis has addressed the issues of identity, belonging and ‘home’ through a translocality lens in order to highlight the informants’ multiple attachments to specific locales, which embed various scales such as local, national, global.

Thus, the thesis has shown that, a) searching for a self is an ongoing journey wherein lifestyle returnees simultaneously reshape their goals as they gain more experiences in the translocal fields of Antalya; b) searching for self becomes an individualised plan wherein lifestyle
returnees focus on finding their ‘true’ self (hence focus on the self rather than collective identities) or embrace a “cosmopolitan” identity rather than trying to pick and decide on one identity (e.g. Turkish, or German); c) lifestyle returnees start comparing and contrasting their present lives in Antalya with their previous lives in other parts of Turkey and pre-return lives in Germany, and such reflexivity over ‘who they are’ in relation ‘where they are’ help them put effort in certain practices and habits (for instance, work-related) whereas reducing or completely cutting off others (e.g. self-harming habits and lifestyles, certain social/familial contacts etc.).

As a result, these new experiences in Antalya help them understand themselves better and formulate new strategies to live in accordance with their aspirations and goals. In the domain of self-knowledge, it was illustrated that lifestyle returnees have ‘made peace’ with their translocational condition of having plural, contradicting and fluid identities and in fact realised that they could utilise their “transcultural capital” and ‘translocational habitus’ for building themselves a career in tourism sectors, to gain skills (learning new languages, gaining expertise in a specific field such as teaching, sales, tour guiding etc.) and to assess their immediate conditions from different angles and give certain decisions which are in accordance with their self-interests. For instance, Section 7.2.2. has illustrated that the informants have embraced their ‘in-betweenness’ and started acting as cultural mediators between the Turkish and international locals/tourists/expats in Antalya. Here, the thesis has shown that, instead of searching for a coherent sense of self, lifestyle returnees have learned to benefit from performing identities – rather than interpreting their multiple identities as an identity struggle, they have discovered that they can take advantage of the fluidity of their identities in adapting new circumstances and establishing business relations with international and local people.

For the third objective of the thesis wherein lifestyle returnees’ process of ‘search for self’ is evaluated with regards to their encounters in various spaces of Antalya, and how they perceive ‘the self’ in the light of their revised internalisations of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’, Chapter Eight has delved into the informants’ narratives of escapism and learning. Firstly, the stories of escapism have indicated that, the informants needed to get out of their previous ‘spaces of limitations’, whether it was the family space, or their respective community in the place of settlement upon ‘return’ (i.e. parents’ towns or big cities) in order to find ‘spaces of freedom’. Whilst the majority of the informants have initially tried out different tourism places – smaller towns in the Mediterranean such as Side, Kemer and Alanya, they have eventually found out about Antalya either through recommendations of people they have met, or through their personal visits.
Chapter Seven and Eight have demonstrated that Antalya was found ideal for the informants, for offering different options such as cosmopolitan city, rural idyll, bohemian haven, resort/residential tourist town. Informants have explained that the hybrid culture in Antalya with tourists, expats, domestic emigrants has provided them with a certain level of freedom wherein they did not have interventions by other people, they could have anonymity if they wished for, and they could be ‘true’ to themselves without feeling marginalised. One of the important findings in this regard is that, the Turkish-German second generation’s forms of capital were valued in the tourism sector, hence their employers and colleagues did not dig into their lives, their rather more ‘alternative’ styles in clothing and habits were tolerated. Here, the informants felt that they could make Antalya their ‘home’, because they have realised that their qualities, skills and ways of life fit into the place – hence the habitus of the self and place was perceived to be in harmony. Moreover, Chapter Eight has demonstrated that the informants wanted to escape from their ‘diasporic’ and ‘counter-diasporic’ identities and labels that were enforced by the Others. In this regard, being ‘true’ to the self was no longer seen as feeling Turkish and ‘fitting into’ the Turkish communities in Turkey. Instead, being ‘true’ to the self has become a personal, intimate quest, wherein the informants started putting effort to develop better qualities, habits, relations and lifestyles for themselves. For example, whilst the deported informants put their life on track in Antalya, those who had divorce or family problems focused on developing their careers in tourism and education sectors.

Chapter Eight has reflected the informants’ reflexivity over their lives, their evaluation of the escapist turn in their lives and how they further dedicated themselves to learning in Antalya. In this regard, the thesis has demonstrated that, the informants learned more about the self, the Others and the social world around them, as well as facing new challenges regarding work life. These new experiences in Antalya evolved their understanding of the self, belonging, and place as the following: a) place as ‘home’ is understood as requiring practices of place-attachment. Informants have reflected that ‘being born and bred’ or ‘having roots’ in a place may not make them feel ‘at home’. Hence, even though they did not have prior ties and roots in Antalya, many informants has called Antalya as ‘home’, claiming that it was their choice and effort to settle in this tourism hub and they felt that they could be ‘who they are’ in this location; b) the self is seen as a highly complex, performative, at times contradicting entity, the informants have acknowledged that having multiple identities and attachments, they embed ‘two ways of thinking, living and being’, hence instead of searching for one and stable identity, they tried to benefit from this multiplicity and fluidity; c) informants have realised that ‘ancestral homeland’ is an abstract notion, hence they have felt more at ease seeing the gap in terms of lifestyle, life quality, social
and work environments, mentality and cultural differences in different parts of Turkey, accepting that it was fine if they did not feel familiar with all.

However, the section 8.3. under Chapter Eight brought up a critical discussion on whether the respondents had seen Antalya as a ‘final stop’ in their lives. The findings here showed that, the concept of ‘home’ was open to change and transformation. Hence, those respondents who have less structural limitations such as travel/work freedom abroad through having a German passport, having economic welfare personally or through family, being single thus not having responsibilities towards a partner and/or children reflected that they were open to future opportunities of living elsewhere in Europe, Australia or Canada. Another further migratory plan was narrated by other respondents regarding settling in a completely rural environment when they get older, in almost all cases to their parents’ villages in Turkey.

In conclusion, in Antalya where they could have Turkish, German and international cultures, they could construct a sense of belonging, as they did not have to follow rigid social norms, rules and traditions. As Chapter Six and Seven have illustrated the informants believed that they expected the dominant culture (i.e. Turkish) to also recognise their (Turkish-German ‘returnees’) own terms of belonging and inclusion, however, as this hardly happened in their parents’ towns and big cities, they settled in Antalya because their own ways of belonging and inclusion are tolerated and/or accepted. In that sense, the informants called Antalya as a ‘paradise’ or ‘utopia’ where they can finally be ‘who they are’ in a naturally beautiful environment in which they can find both calmness and liveliness, combine work and leisure, build social networks involving Turkish, Turkish-German, German and other international individuals.

9.2 Contribution to Academic Knowledge

The above-mentioned findings of this research suggest several major theoretical implications for academic work on return migration through focusing on the undermined role of lifestyle issues and on the dominant debates such as agency-structure, class and macro-micro level analysis within lifestyle migration research. Furthermore, the thesis has rather minor contributions to the literatures on self/identity, home/belonging, habitus/human agency and reflexivity. The main theoretical contribution however, has been to understand the second generation’s ‘return’ through a lifestyle migration optic, and construct the concept of ‘lifestyle return migration’ through an abductive approach of combining these two strand of migration fields and collection of empirical data in Antalya. Through the conceptualisation of ‘lifestyle return migration’, the thesis has offered a critique firstly and most importantly for the return migration theorisations. The thesis has shown that the second generation’s ‘return’ had to be
evaluated as a new chronotope (i.e. time-space event); as for the second generation, the ancestral homeland is a new context – a new field despite their imagined ties and belonging to this place through their ‘diaspora spaces’ – hence, ‘return’ is in fact a “counter-diasporic migration” (King & Christou, 2008).

The thesis further raised the issue of adopting transnationalism approaches in understanding the second generation’s lives between two countries and offered an alternative by adopting a translocality angle. Even though translocality approaches are gaining momentum in current migration research, the second generation ‘return’ is still heavily based on their transnational ties, networks, economic and political activities. However, the thesis has argued that, translocality angle which put emphasis on place and mobility can offer more insights on the second generation’s home-making processes and belonging beyond the ethno-nationalist and diasporic discourses, instead translocality focuses on every day encounters in various spaces in a place which embed local, national and global scales (Geschiere, 2009; Guarnizo & Smith, 1998; Ley, 2004; Brickell & Datta, 2011). Analysing the second generation’s post-return lives through a translocality approach has also called attention to focusing on local contexts and situatedness of mobile actors and highlighting the role of human agency vis-à-vis the socio-spatial configurations in the age of globalisation and “liquid modernity” (Bauman, 2000). As the thesis has demonstrated, a translocal reading of the second generation’s dwelling in Antalya and their self-making/home-making practices allowed an understanding of Antalya as a ‘translocal home’, a “space in which new forms of (post-)national identity are constituted” (Mandaville, 2002, p.204). In this regard, the thesis has offered a new perspective for evaluating ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ as concepts that cannot be taken for granted upon return, instead return migration research need to also acknowledge that for certain groups such as the informants of this research, self-identity, home and belonging are ever-evolving concepts which embed multiple meanings and subjective positions.

Another important contribution to the return migration literature was to focus on ‘lifestyle’ as a motivation for return and further migratory, mobility paths in the ancestral homeland. The thesis has argued that an analysis solely based on a macro level is insufficient to grasp individuals’ active/passive agencies, their encounters with changing structures and their decision-making processes wherein micro and meso-level factors also play vital roles (Faist, 2010). The thesis has adopted a micro-level analysis with a focus on human agency, however it aimed at showing that the respondents as individuals are able to understand the surrounding macro-level issues such as economic, political, social structures such as citizenship/rights, educational/professional qualifications etc. and consider these points in their actions. Nevertheless, the thesis has claimed
that focusing on individuals’ personal plans of actions based on their lifestyle aspirations and motivations could offer novel insights about how ‘return’ is understood.

Consequently, this current research has demonstrated that by conceptualising the second generation Turkish-Germans as late-modern reflexive subjects who have their individual plans, expectations and motivations, ‘return’ could be understood beyond the discourse of ‘people returning to where they originally come from’ which is a “mythic place of desire in the diasporic imagination” (Brah, 1996, p.192). Whilst this was held true for some of the informants, most of the narratives have pointed out that ‘return’ has been rather seen as an ‘adventure’, a quest for a ‘better way of life’, and an escapist endeavour to discover and re-invent the self. Hence, different than research and theorisations which approach return as a family or economically-driven event which is fuelled by nostalgia, memories and discourses of the ‘diasporic space’, this thesis has shown an alternative approach wherein the second generation utilise their “transcultural capital” (Meinhof & Triandafyllidou, 2006) and ‘translocational habitus’ to take risks in an unknown journey, prioritise their personal goals and deal with the disillusions/disappointments of the life in their initial return places through undertaking further migratory paths to Antalya.

The thesis has built the concept of ‘lifestyle return migration’ upon a theoretical framework presenting a triangulated approach wherein the concepts of self, home and return were explored through the translocal geographies of identity, place and habitus. In this framework, identity was not only explored with reference to ethnic, national, diasporic identities, but also through embracing the lifestyle migration literature’s approach to identity as a “reflexive project of the self” (Giddens, 1991). Hence, the contribution of the thesis to return migration literature is with regards to understanding ‘the self’ vis-à-vis the return as an active, agency-oriented approach, as the thesis has demonstrated that the second generation ‘returnees’ too can be evaluated as subjects of “liquid modernity” whose lives are mobile, who reflect over the self not only in relation to their ethnic, national or place-based/place-bound identities (e.g. Turkish, German, Muslim etc.) but who wish to discover their personal skills, aspirations and lifestyle choices in their lives.

Therefore, the thesis has put ‘return’ in direct contact with ‘habitus’ in order to highlight the importance of the second generation’s manifestation of their embodied agency which starts with the second generation’s decision to ‘return’ (move countries, and then cities/town) and their both ideological and geographical personal plans of action. Without disregarding the cultural contexts where places are located, the thesis has highlighted that return migration theories could benefit from how the second generation learn “the rules of the game” and how they utilise their
different types of capitals in certain locales, rather than focusing on the cultural implications and
discourses of places especially in the macro scale discourses of the nations. Here, the thesis has
demonstrated that places, but especially tourism places are a “third space” (Bhabha, 1994)
wherein there is no (one) dominant culture, but culture is hybrid, glocal and fluid.

Bringing in habitus and human agency as main discussion points with regards to return and
further resettlement in the ancestral homeland were inspired by lifestyle migration theories, and
the reconceptualisation of the ‘returnee’ second generation as ‘lifestyle returnees’ also has
potential contributions to lifestyle migration research. There are three issues in which the thesis
offers a critique and possible theoretical contribution. The first one is related to reflexivity. As the
conceptualisation of ‘lifestyle migrant’ is divergent based on different empirical research, it is not
explicitly stated in lifestyle migration literature if reflexivity is perceived as a practice or discourse.
However, lifestyle migration scholars also claim that compared to economically-driven migrants
such as labour migrants and refugees who have limited agency, lifestyle migrants have higher
levels of reflexivity, as the empirical research also focuses mainly on Westerner individuals who
are “affluent” (Benson and O’Reilly, 2009). However, this thesis has demonstrated that for
‘lifestyle returnees’ reflexivity appears very much as a practice, it is the second-generation
Turkish-German individuals’ effort to go beyond their class-bound, habitual and cultural
limitations; because as the Chapter Seven and Eight’s findings have shown, ‘lifestyle returnees’
has demonstrated “the capacity to construct practical understandings of the location of self
within a social system, to act accordingly, and to reflect further and refine understandings in
response to events and the consequence of actions taken” (Maclean et al., 2012, p.388).

This point brings another criticism towards lifestyle migration literature that focuses on
reflexivity as encouraged by the Western middle-class or “affluent” culture (Osbaldiston, 2011;
Oliver, 2008; Benson & O’Reilly, 2009), hence lifestyle migrants are understood to find the ‘good
life’ in ‘authentic places’ which are constructs of certain cultural imaginings (Benson, 2012).
Because lifestyle migration emphasises on Giddens’ (1991) claim that in late modernity, lifestyle is
used and developed by people to seek a certain level coherence in terms of their identities and
structure in their lives, lifestyle migrants’ migratory paths are then evaluated in relation to the
individuals’ self and identity-related quests, problems and motivations (Benson & Osbaldiston,
2016). The thesis has problematised this habitus-reflexivity dichotomy by conceptualising the
second generation Turkish-Germans as ‘lifestyle migrants’. This group were originally Turkish,
however they were born and raised in Germany (i.e. “the West”), and even though they were
coming from working-class families who were not educated or highly-skilled, the second
generation were able to step outside of the boundaries of their class and habitus. The only
difference they have with the lifestyle migrants is that, lifestyle return migrants settle in a place where they are familiar with the culture and language, they have Turkish names, they mostly appear as ‘Muslim’ on the paper. However, these similarities and familiarities are only about the ‘collective identities’ and matter in the case of how the local dominant Others would perceive them. The informants have personally demonstrated that they did not necessarily feel familiarity with the culture, people and language in their early days in Turkey.

Hence, the thesis has offered a newer understanding to habitus, not merely seeing it as a non-reflexive and durable aspect of self which is only able to be reflexive in times of crisis, but a transformative aspect. For that reason, the thesis has claimed that the second generation who has “double consciousness” acquire ‘translocational habitus’; hence they have been able to develop critical awareness about their immediate conditions, and even distance themselves from the surrounding definitive social and cultural structures. Hence, the thesis suggests that return migrants can also be understood to develop reflexivity, not only in times when there is no ‘fit’ between habitus and field, but because of their transnational and translocal condition which already evolve them as individuals who simultaneously compare and contrast ‘here’ and ‘there’ enhancing their reflexivity over the self and their decisions (McNay, 1999). The second generation’s reflexivity in that sense also has helped them to overcome their identity struggles through escapism, learning, dwelling in the tourism places which offers ‘liminality’ and ‘freedom’. Hence, the thesis contributes to the literature of the self, or searching for self by having demonstrated that, searching for an ‘authentic’ or ‘true’ self is rather a discourse, but individuals do certain things to get to know their capabilities, skills and interests better by getting more lived experiences in a place, facing new challenges and perceiving their self-identities as relational and transformative, rather than aiming at a stable and coherent sense of self.

The final critique and possible contribution towards the lifestyle migration literature comes from the problematisation of being “affluent” as the necessary condition to be engaged in reflexivity and undertaking migration path without economic push-pull factors. For the second generation who has become ‘lifestyle returnees’ in the ancestral homeland, return decision did not involve economic motivations, however as this group came to Turkey mostly in their 20s and 30s, they looked for opportunities where they could make a living. However, their choices of working in tourism-related jobs show that monetary gains were not their primary concern, however an integral contribution to sustain their lifestyles and develop their life quality. Or in some narratives it was shown that building a career was seen as a part of developing the self and restraining them from falling into the void of the past. Once again, lifestyle migrants are a divergent group hence it is not possible to make generalised claims, however scholars commonly
refer to the lifestyle migrants as individuals who are relatively free from economic constraints. For the conceptualisation of ‘lifestyle return migrants’ however, the thesis has raised the issue of economic factors, arguing that even it is not their primary concern, economy-related issues are still highly important for this group, as they need to support their families and invest in themselves. By raising the issues regarding class, reflexivity, “affluence” and lifestyle in the context of second generation ‘returnees’, the thesis has adopted a unique position in offering an understanding of ‘return’ beyond the scope of diasporic discourses.

Lastly, the thesis offers an empirical contribution in terms of investigating a new context. The research findings demonstrated that ‘return’ to the ancestral homeland is an ongoing process wherein the ‘returnees’ may take further migration paths depending on their personal desires and goals, even if they lack familial ties and social networks in their choices of destination. In that sense, this research is not only the first to focus on the Turkish second-generation ‘return’ and Antalya nexus with a focus on the relevance of tourism sector in providing a space for self-development, expression of multiple identities and experiencing a hybrid culture, but also in putting Antalya under the spotlight as a lifestyle migration destination.

9.3 Limitations and Possible Directions for Future Research

The previous section has introduced several important contributions of the thesis to academic knowledge, however the thesis itself could not answer all the questions and critique raised due to time and space limitations. However, acknowledging the limitations have the potential to study these topics in detail in future research, hence this section presents several ideas for future studies.

Firstly, the thesis partially delved into the informants’ family lives upon return, and their lifestyle migration to Antalya was presented as an individualised plan. Nevertheless, some informants have gotten married and they have children. Even though some narratives were picked to be reflecting the informants’ family lives, their negotiations with their partners about moving to/living in Antalya has not been discussed in detail. Therefore, a possible future research can adopt a meso-level analysis and mainly focus on the informants’ negotiation processes with their partners and children and their parents/siblings in Turkey and Germany.

Secondly, the thesis has introduced a type of ‘return’ migration amongst the second generation which has not been researched before. The deported Turkish second generation’s (or those who have criminal pasts) settlement and social re-integration in Turkey not only as Turkish-Germans but also as ex-criminals is a potential topic which may be further analysed in several future studies. One study can focus on the ‘return migration’ aspect of deportation and this
phenomenon’s conceptualisation, either as a forced or partially forced return. Here, the lack of a German passport as a structural limitation can be discussed, and how both Turkey and Germany do not take responsibility over these individuals’ well-being and social integration. Hence, following an agency-oriented approach, a future research can scrutinise how these deported individuals socially try to integrate themselves, what are the strategies to take care of themselves, and how tourism-related jobs and tourism environments help them start a new chapter in their lives. The thesis has discussed these issues partially, however a more heuristic theoretical framework is necessary to be developed for this group. One suggestion is that, such research can adopt a human wellbeing approach in order to explore how the deported second generation Turkish-Germans negotiate their new contexts in Turkey to achieve wellbeing and heal their ‘double trauma’, the obstacles to their wellbeing and the trade-offs between different dimensions of wellbeing (i.e. objective and subjective dimensions of wellbeing as well as functional, psychosocial and relational domains) (Wright, 2012).

The tourism link is not only important for the deported returnees, but for all the informants of this research. Return to tourism areas is rather an unexplored phenomenon and this thesis aimed at building links between return and tourism. However as mentioned previously Antalya’s structures, tourism environments and residents are constantly changing, especially since the political and economic turbulence in Turkey and the wider European context. Hence, a longitudinal fieldwork study could be beneficial in order to trace the differences in informants’ plans and lifestyles, job preferences and possible future migratory paths (for instance some informants mentioned they would spent their retirement years in naturally beautiful rural parts of Turkey). Hence, either through online communication (via e-mail and Skype) or through face-to-face interviews in Antalya in one year time could provide more insights about the changes within the place and in the informants’ lives.

Furthermore, a future research can be a comparative study. For instance, it was found out during the fieldwork that there are other returnee groups in Antalya, such as Turkish returning from the Netherlands, Austria and Belgium. A fieldwork launched in the future can include interviews with these other groups in order to compare if these groups have access to different spaces in Antalya, how their translocal/transnational practices differ, if there are differences in class, educational backgrounds and human capital. This comparison could also provide with more insights about how Antalya was constructed as the ‘place to be in’ in different ‘cultural’ imaginations, how Turkish groups coming from different European countries imagined the life in Antalya and how they live, with whom they are friends with, who are their partners, how often they travel or invest in Antalya for a permanent stay etc.
Finally, the thesis recognises that a comparison with the second generation who ‘returned’ and settled in other parts of Turkey, such as big cities (Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir) and rural areas can be the topic of a future research. The thesis has elaborated that this group who settled in Antalya show different return dynamics and they have a more reflexive stance in life compared to the second generation who could not move to other places in Turkey even though they have experienced dissatisfaction with their return (King & Kilinc, 2013; King & Kilinc, 2014). An analysis through habitus and human agency can enable a comparison to scrutinise why and how the sample group of this thesis has developed a unique reflexivity, hence they are able to get out of the boundaries of their familial, diasporic, economic, class-based labels.

9.4 Final Words

This thesis gave ‘voice’ to a segment of the many second generation ‘returnees’ who settled in their ancestral homelands, leaving behind their childhood places and memories, sometimes families and friends to build a new life. It has been a difficult process for many in which the ‘return’ lives have required constant evaluation of their pasts and presents, whilst simultaneously feeling ‘out of place’ and ‘out of context’. However, the thesis aimed at highlighting their human agency, not disregarding their diasporic condition however not at the same time not underestimating the dynamic possibilities of human agency as composed of variable and changing orientations within the flow of time (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). The findings of this thesis point out that the second generation are not only ‘in-between’ in terms of identities and place-attachments, but also mediating between habitus and reflexivity. The thesis further claim that the ‘lifestyle returnees’ dwelling in the translocal fields of Antalya show that they display reflexivity and active agency in their everyday lives with several Others and constantly undertake transforming actions for navigating in different spaces with different people and in various contexts (Goffman, 2012). Urry (2012) argues that moving across different spaces would never leave the self ‘unchanged’, and as the thesis has illustrated the ‘lifestyle returnees’ contest the meanings of ‘home’ and ‘belonging’ and revise their ‘self-concepts’ as they gain new experiences in the field. If these findings may have one practical implication, it could be in providing insights for the local authorities, tourism directorates and stakeholders to understand the socio-economic challenges faced by return migrants to tourism areas like Antalya. It may help to offer ideas about that kind of re-integration assistance which is required at the micro and macro levels. There is scope for local authorities to launch courses for returned migrants about sales and marketing, or to arrange informative sessions about how to engage in entrepreneurial activities in Antalya. This would have particular value for those returnees who are unable to utilise their human, cultural and
economic capital, since they do not have ‘the feel for the game’, i.e. they are not knowledgeable about how the system works in terms of starting up sustainable businesses.
## 10 Appendices

### 10.1 Appendix 1: Table 11: Profile of The Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym/ Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Age/ Year of Return</th>
<th>Birth Place</th>
<th>Family’s Immigration Date to Germany</th>
<th>Family’s Return Date to Turkey</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Living condition in Antalya</th>
<th>Education/ Occupation</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arif M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20 1991</td>
<td>Sivas TURKEY</td>
<td>1972 (mother) 1973 (father) 1974 (Arif, when he was 3 years of age)</td>
<td>Father (deceased) Mother &amp; siblings in Germany</td>
<td>Divorced, no kids</td>
<td>Renting</td>
<td>Berufschule (electric)/ Sales in clothing store/tourism in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aytac M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43 2014</td>
<td>Cologne GERMANY</td>
<td>1968 (father) 1971 (mother)</td>
<td>Father (deceased) Father and Older Brother in Germany, other brother in Turkey</td>
<td>Single, Russian girlfriend</td>
<td>Renting</td>
<td>Berufschule (glass and home cleaning)/ Sales in clothing/jewellery store in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bengisu F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25 1990</td>
<td>Munich GERMANY</td>
<td>1956 (mother) 1964 (father)</td>
<td>Parents and sisters returned in 1993</td>
<td>2nd marriage with a German-Turkish, two daughters from a Greek-Turkish</td>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>University (Pharmaceuticals)/ Pharmacist in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acun M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27 2001</td>
<td>Hof GERMANY</td>
<td>1970 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Father (deceased) Mother, brother, sister living in Germany</td>
<td>Married, With children</td>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>Berufschule (Textile)/ Sales in clothing store in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bedri M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17 2000</td>
<td>Münster GERMANY</td>
<td>1965 (mother) 1980, 1983 (father)</td>
<td>Parents returned in 2000</td>
<td>Divorced, no kids</td>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>University (TR) (German language)/ German teacher in a high school</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bade F</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17 2007</td>
<td>Nagel GERMANY</td>
<td>1985 (father, mother)</td>
<td>All family returned in 1990</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>University (TR) (German language)/ Social Media and PR Assistant in a Hotel in Lara</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Cafer M</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Sivas TURKEY</td>
<td>1971 (father) 1979 (mother) 1979 (Cafer, when he was 10 months of age)</td>
<td>Parents in Germany, one brother in Antalya</td>
<td>Married, With children</td>
<td>Own House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Davut M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Hanover GERMANY</td>
<td>1969 (father) 1975 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents and siblings in Germany</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Ethem M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Karlsruhe GERMANY</td>
<td>1969 (father) 1972 (mother)</td>
<td>Father (deceased), mother returned in 2005</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Fethi M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Karabük TURKEY</td>
<td>1972 (father) 1973 (mother) 1973 (Fethi, when he was 2 years of age)</td>
<td>Parents and brother returned in 1989</td>
<td>Married, children</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Gürkan M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Warendorf GERMANY</td>
<td>1968 (father) 1976 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents and sibling living in Germany</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ceylan F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Essen GERMANY</td>
<td>1961 (father) 1962 (mother)</td>
<td>Father (deceased), mother returned in 1984, siblings in Germany</td>
<td>Divorced twice, one child in Istanbul</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Firdevs F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Berlin GERMANY</td>
<td>1982 (mother) 1985 (father)</td>
<td>Parents in Germany, sister in Antalya</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>Sister’s house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Fulya F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Koblenz GERMANY</td>
<td>1969 (mother) 1972 (father)</td>
<td>Parents returned in 1990, sister in Germany, brother in Turkey</td>
<td>Married, with a child</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Haldun M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Gelibolu</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1971 (father) 1974 (mother) 1974 (Haldun, when he was 3 years of age)</td>
<td>All family returned in 1988</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Helin F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1965 (father) 1970 (mother) 1970 (Helin when she was 6 months of age)</td>
<td>All family returned in 1987</td>
<td>Divorced, Dutch-Turkish boyfriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Idris M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Muş</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1967 (father) 1969 (mother) 1969 (Idris when he was 3 months of age)</td>
<td>Mother (deceased) father and sibling in Germany</td>
<td>Divorced 5 times, 8 children, married to a Moldovan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Irfan M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Braunschweig</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1971 (father) 1979 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents in Germany, one brother in Antalya</td>
<td>Married, with a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Koray M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Pforzheim</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1968 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents returned in 1997, 2 sisters in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Nedim M</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Sivas</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1972 (father, mother) 1972 (Nedim, when he was 4 years)</td>
<td>Parents and sister living in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Year Parents Returned</td>
<td>Year Return When Young</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Jülide</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1970 (father)</td>
<td>1972 (father)</td>
<td>Divorced, with one child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 (mother)</td>
<td>1972 (Jülide when she was 2 years of age)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Müjde</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1961 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents and sibling living in Germany</td>
<td>Divorced, with a daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Nusret</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1965 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents and siblings living in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Önder</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>1975 (father)</td>
<td>Mother (deceased)</td>
<td>Divorced, with a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1975 (Önder, when he was 4 years of age)</td>
<td>Father and sibling living in Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Özdemir</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1964 (father)</td>
<td>Parents and siblings living in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Pervin</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1970 (father, mother)</td>
<td>All family returned in 1989</td>
<td>Married, With children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Peri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1980 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Reyhan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1965 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents returned in 1989</td>
<td>Married, With children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Zehra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>1968 (father, mother)</td>
<td>Parents in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with no children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Zelal</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Rasim</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Dusseldorf</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Deceased</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Recep</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Own house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Adile</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Furstenfeld-</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>In Germany</td>
<td>Married to</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Süha</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Gelsenkirchen</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>Married,</td>
<td>Own house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Sezgin</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Monchengladbach</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>Married,</td>
<td>Own house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Rüştü</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Konya</td>
<td>TURKEY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>Renting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Belkis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Own House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Sertaç</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Passed</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Own House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Rıza M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Dusseldorf GERMANY</td>
<td>1968 (father) 1972 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents and sibling in Germany</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Staying at the hotel University (tourism) / Animation Chef in a hotel in Kundu</td>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Zafer M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Frankfurt GERMANY</td>
<td>1969 (father) 1972 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents returned in 2007, one sister in Germany, another sister in Norway</td>
<td>Married, with a child</td>
<td>Own house Beruffschule (Accountancy)/ Info desk staff in a hotel Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. İsmail M</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mainz GERMANY</td>
<td>1969 (father) 1972 (mother)</td>
<td>Parents and siblings in Germany</td>
<td>Having a German girlfriend in Germany</td>
<td>Renting Beruffschule (automobile mechanics) / Sales water sports in a hotel in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Yalçın M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dusseldorf GERMANY</td>
<td>1963 (mother) 1964 (father)</td>
<td>Mother (deceased) father and brother in Germany</td>
<td>Married, with children</td>
<td>Own house Beruffschule (lathe operator) / Sales in Old Bazaar in Kundu</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Appendix 2: Interview Guidelines

A. TIME OF IMMIGRATION
1. Tell me about the circumstances surrounding your family’s immigration to Germany. For instance, when and what factors contributed to their decision?
2. What was their life like before your family left Turkey?
3. Did family and friends immigrate to Germany with them or did they immigrate on their own?
4. Describe your family’s plans once they arrived at Germany. For instance, did they intend on staying there permanently or temporarily?
5. Did you like living in Germany? How was your life in Germany?
6. What has been your experience in terms of self-development in Germany?
7. In what kind of environment did you grow up?
8. Did both of your parents work in Germany?
9. Who raised you until the age of school?
10. Were there other Turkish people in your town/school/neighbourhood?
11. How was your school life in Germany?

B. RETURN MIGRATION
1. Tell me about your decision to return to Turkey. When did you decide this and why? Was this a family decision? How long did you consider this idea? Do you believe this was the right decision? Why is that? Do you have any regrets?
2. Is Turkey the same since your earlier visits? What changes, if any, do you see? What is your opinion about these changes, if any?
3. Have you changed since you relocated to Turkey? What are those changes, if any?
4. Overall, how was the experience of return migration for you and your family?
5. Have you encountered any difficulties in adjusting and if so, what were those?
6. Why did you decide to move to Antalya, in which ways do you find this place ideal or ‘fitting’ for yourself?

C. HOME-PLACE
1. Tell me about the things in a place that make you feel comfortable, or what kind of environments make you feel good about yourself and life?
2. Where do you feel at home?
3. Is Turkey home to you?
4. Was Germany home to you when you lived there?
5. Does the actual geographic location make a difference? If so, can you explain? And have you observed the ways in which your attachments to places change over time?
6. Do you consider Antalya as your ‘home’, why, why not?

D. RETURN-CULTURE
1. Tell me what Turkish-Islam culture and heritage mean to you.
2. What role does your ethnic/cultural background play in your life?
3. Have you spent time trying to learn more about the culture and history of your ethnic group?
4. What is your sense of belonging to your own ethnic/culture group? How do you define belonging?
5. Do you feel proud of being Turkish, Muslim or any component of your ethnic/national background?
6. What would you consider to be the outstanding elements of the Turkish character, positive and negative? And of the German?
7. What are the things you miss about Germany?

E. SELF-IDENTITY AND LIFESTYLE
1. After in-depth self-reflection please describe and explain your sense of self as a second generation Turkish-German who has moved to Turkey.
2. Please give an account of the “who you are” in the “where you are”: what does it mean to you living in Turkey?
3. What does it mean for you to live in this region? What is different about this place?
4. Do you think this place corresponds with your lifestyle? If so, how?
5. How do you define your lifestyle? How would you like to live ideally (if you had all the sources?)
6. To what extent have you been able to live the way you want until now?
7. Can you say you live the way you want right now? If no, why not, what are the limitations?
8. What are your daily activities?
9. What do you enjoy the most? What are your favourite activities?
10. Do you think that your background and your lifestyle are related? How much of your lifestyle is related to the way you were raised, to schools you went etc.?

11. What do you most/least enjoy about working in the tourism sector?

12. Do you think you have a work/life balance, or what would be the ideal working situation for you?

13. What do you think about the life quality in Antalya? How is it better/worse than other places you have lived in?

14. How often do you visit Germany, or travel to other places?

F. ETHNIC INVOLVEMENT

1. Inform me about your family’s use and your use of the Turkish and Turkish/German language. Have you ever thought about how language affects your family relationship?

2. Some people say that when people speak and communicate differently, it is difficult on a relationship. What do you think? Has this been something that has occurred in your family relationship?

3. Some people say that people of first and second generation status have different ideas about communication and that this affects parent-child relationships. Tell me your thoughts on this. In what ways has this been the case in your relationship?

4. Family background: How strong were/are family bonds, friendships, loyalty to mosque/church, attachment to Turkey, Turkish traditions, Islamic traditions? Attitudes towards Turkish language, food, dances, community, mosque, organisations/activities (both in Turkey and Germany).

G. MINORITY GROUP STATUS UNDERSTANDING/PERCEPTIONS

1. Some people say that people who belong to ethnic minority groups have a difficult time because they lack power and advantage. What do you think?

2. Do you view yourself as a minority? Please explain.

3. Tell me how you think this affected your relationships. Has this led you to think about or behave in certain ways in your relationships?

4. Do you interact with other ethnic/cultural groups? In what context: school, work, entertainment, social-family groups?
5. Who are your friends? How easy has it been to make friendships with Turkish people, Germans, Turkish-Germans? (whatever is applicable to each person in each case)

6. How do you think you were perceived as a Turkish in Germany? Did you have any problems? Faced with discrimination?

H. SOCIAL MOBILITY PERCEPTIONS

1. Some people think that education and work are important to their life and their family’s life. What do you think?

2. Sometimes as a result of education or work, people move to a different town or region. And some people say that family relationships can change because of this. Has this occurred in your life? Describe how this shaped your family relationship.

3. Some people believe that when people have more education they are more likely to earn money. And that these lead to more power and advantage. What do you think? Has this happened in your family relationship?

4. Is the level of power and advantage, because of education and income, the same or different in your relationship? In what ways has this led to positive, negative or neutral events in your relationships?

5. To what extend are you concerned about your financial situation? Do you think that you are able to earn enough with the job you have? What would you change about this situation?

I. RELATIONSHIP PATHWAYS AND EXPECTATIONS

1. Some people think that parent-child relationships should have certain qualities. What do you think? What has led you to think about the relationship in that way?

2. In what ways did your experience with your parent(s) or child(ren) contribute to your ideas? What parent-child expectations, if any, are shaped by your Turkish beliefs?

3. In what ways have Turkish/German cultural beliefs shaped your relationship? How would you characterise your family relationship? Tell me about the most satisfying aspect of your relationship. Why is it satisfying?

4. Has migration and/or return migration affected your personal and family relationships? If so, in what ways, positive, negative, both? Please explain.

J. MARRIAGE & INTIMATE PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

1. Do you think one should marry a person from a different nationality, or religion? How do you see this?
2. Did you have German boyfriends/girlfriends? How did your family react to this?
3. How important is ethnic background/religious/nationality when you love someone?
4. Would you be OK if your own child(ren) marry someone who is not Turkish?
5. How do you see the role of woman in the family? As mothers, daughters and sisters?
6. How do you see the role of men in the family? As fathers, sons and brothers?

K. POLITICS
1. Did you use to follow the Turkish politics when you were in Germany?
2. Were you interested in the German politics?
3. Do you vote in Turkey?
4. Do you (or your family) have involvements with Turkish and German politics?
5. What do you see as the main problems in Turkey? Would these affect your plans to stay settled here/or future mobility?
6. Do you think Turkey will ever become a member of the EU? Do you want it? Why, why not?
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