

# **Turkish Return Migrants from Netherlands and Austria: Data Assessment Based on Expert Interviews\***

**Hilal Arslan, Simay Özlü Diniz, Alanur Çavlin, Ayşe Abbasoğlu Özgören, Sinan Türkyılmaz**

## **Extended Abstract**

In the last decades there has been a trend of return migration among Turks living in Europe (Durugönül, 2013; İçduygu, 2008). This is due to partially right wing rise in the EU (Çelik, 2021) and partially to personal choices related to identity (Ayaz, 2017). This research aims to understand second generation return migration trends especially from Netherlands and Austria among micro (cultural, familial, emotional) and macro (economical, political, historical) reasons and their impact on regional development through expert interviews with academics, bureaucrats, and association leaders as well as second generation migrants. Focus questions' intention is to unveil the profile of the Turkish return migrants and their motivations, socioeconomic, political conditions and policies of the countries, duration and course of migrant mobility and its impact on local development as well as exploring further reliable data sources and key contacts. The primary questions aim to reveal the socioeconomic characteristics of second-generation Turkish migrants, their connections to their home country, and their patterns of mobility, which may include circular, mobile, or permanent movements.

Qualitative expert interview is a dialogic-discursive method that combines problem-centered interview and expert knowledge to explore individual perspectives (Döringer, 2021). This method is used in this research to expand migration perspective, fill the gap for missing data and to link macro, mezzo, and micro levels of analysis (Soest, 2023). As an interdisciplinary method, expert interview is useful in enlightening the quality of a groups' identity through their specific place (indigeneity) (Libakova, 2015). It is usually conducted in a semi-formalized structure with respondents that possess deep knowledge about the research object to gather additional and reliable information (Ibid).

This research mainly focuses on migration through mobility theories that argue all places are tied into a thin network of connections (Sheller & Urry, 2006). This concept of "liquid modernity" stated by Bauman (2000), redirects current static research structure to a network of

movement (Güzel, 2016) . In the contemporary era, liquidity is based on uncertainty, instability and lack of commitment (İbid). Today, individuals construct (respatialize & resocialize) identities across geopolitical borders shaped by relations between local and global powers as mobilities are indeed embedded into immobile structures (Sheller & Urry, 2006). Contemporarily, as a result of spatial connectedness home has a plural meaning that sprung in the urban and global context determined by spatial belonging and identification of one's self (Kochan, 2016). Today, individuals create unique identities based on choice (idiotope) rather than geographical ones granted by birth (idiotopy) (Pascual-de-Sans, 2004). Additionally, the network society, suggested by Castells, creates global dynamic identities free of borders and that quest economic and social opportunities through the use of technology (Ampuja & Koivisto, 2015).

Especially young immigrants' economic, professional, educational and social welfare preferences are significant in determining their place of living. In this contemporary setting, migrants with multiple identities are considered as assets as population change and development are closely related (Lutz et al., 2018). Mobility is important for the labor force, local employment and so regional development is closely linked to the social and human capital of the region (İbid). Policies have a great impact on migrants' decision making process while comparing their home and host countries (Adda, 2022). National integration policies and the cultural structure of the country is significant in determining international mobility (Kolbaşı Muyan, 2019). Even though young migrants are considered as productive and reproductive assets for a country, the second generation is more likely to quest for international opportunities. Second generation migrants are likely to be mobile who possess dual citizenship, have higher education, strong transnational ties and more than half of them consider emigration to Turkey (Wieke de Jong, 2022). Additionally, migrants that do not acquire jobs equivalent to their education level are more likely to return to their home country and seek further opportunities (İbid). When they face economic difficulties, encounter xenophobia and have stronger national identities there is a higher possibility of returning (Tezcan, 2019). Finally, marriage is another reason for return migration especially among young women as men are more likely to get engaged in intercultural marriage (Wieke de Jong, 2022).

The expected result of this study is that return migrants' decisions are influenced by strict rightist European policies as well as occupational and marital reasons and return migration is a part of a wider life span mobility route rather than an endpoint. Additionally, second generation migrants are motivated by investment and commercial opportunities, the level of social welfare of the country and educational aspects. The study also aims to shed light on new mobility trends among Turkish migrants in Europe, including ongoing migrant movements such as return migration, seasonal migration, and circular migration and their relationship with the regional well-being both within EU and Türkiye.

**Key Words:** Turkish return migrants, second generation, Netherlands, Austria, expert interview

### References:

Adda, J., Dustmann, C. & Görlach, J-S. (2022). The dynamics of return migration, human capital accumulation, and wage assimilation, *The Review of Economic Studies*, 89 (6): 2841–2871. (<https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdac003>)

Ampuja, M. & Koivisto, J. (2015). From “post-industrial” to “network society” and beyond: The political conjunctures and current crisis of information society theory, *TripleC*, 12(2): 447-463.

Ayaz, B. (2017). Return migration to Turkey and identity problems of Turkish migrants. *Turkish Studies*, 12 (21): 73-88.

Çelik, G. (2012). Turkey pulls, Netherlands pushes? *Turkish Review*, 4: 94-99.

Döringer, S. (2021). ‘The problem-centred expert interview’. Combining qualitative interviewing approaches for investigating implicit expert knowledge, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 1-14.

Durugönül, E. (2013). Turkish return migration from Europe. *European Review*, 21 (3): 412-421.

Güzel, E. (2016). Dijital kültür ve çevrimiçi sosyal ağlarda rekabetin aktörü: “Dijital habitus”. *E-Gifder*, 4(1): 82-103.

İçduygu, A. (2008). Circular migration and Turkey: An overview of the past and present - some demo-economic implications, *CARIM Analytic and Synthetic Notes*,10.

Kochan, D. (2016). (Re)placing migrants' mobility: A multi-method approach to integrating space and mobility in the study of migration. *Migration Studies*, 1–23.

Kolbaşı Muyan, G. (2019). *Hollanda Göçmen Entegrasyonu Politikaları: Liberalizmden Neoliberalizme*. Sosyal Güvenlik Dergisi 9(1), 177-192.

Libakova, N. M. & Sertakova, E. (2015). The method of expert interview as an effective research procedure of studying the indigenous peoples of the North, *Journal of Siberian Federal University*, 1(8), 114-129.

Lutz, W., Goujon, A., K.C., S., Stonawski, M. and Stilianakis, N. (2018) Demographic and human capital scenarios for the 21st century: 2018 assessment for 201 countries (online)

Pascual-de-Sans, A. (2004). Sense of place and migration histories Idiotype and idiope. *Area*, 36(4), 348-357.

Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning*, 38, 207-226. Doi: 10.1068/a37268

Soest, C. (2023). Why Do We Speak to Experts? Reviving the strength of the expert interview method, *Cambridge University Press*, 21(1), 277-287.

Tezcan, T. (2019). Return home? Determinants of return migration intention amongst Turkish immigrants in Germany. *Geoforum* 98: 189-201.

Wieke de Jong, P. (2022). Patterns and drivers of emigration of the Turkish second generation in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Population*, 38: 15-36.

*\* This study is funded by the project numbered 101094345 and titled "PREMIUM-EU Policy REcommendations to Maximise the beneficial Impact of Unexplored Mobilities in and beyond the European Union (PREMIUM\_EU) funded by the EU within the Horizon Europe programme. Authors are among the Team of the Project, and their affiliation is one of the partners of the Consortium.*