Avrupa Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi
Sayı 15, S. 237-251, Mart 2019

Araştırma Makalesi

www.ejosat.com ISSN:2148-2683

European Journal of Science and Technology
No. 15, pp. 237-251, March 2019

Research Article

Review on the Social, Collective and National Identity Areas of Third Generation Turkish Young Adults Living in Germany

Adnan Kulaksızoğlu[1*], Besra Taş[2]

[1] Biruni Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department, Istanbul/Turkey (ORCID: 0000-0001-9620-0856)
[2] İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department, Istanbul/Turkey (ORCID: 0000-0002-1273-4429)

(First received 26 August 2018 and in final form 4 March 2019)

(**DOI:** 10.31590/ejosat.535156)

ATIF/REFERENCE: Kulaksizoglu, A. & Tas, B. (2019). Review on the Social, Collective and National Identity Areas of Third Generation Turkish Young Adults Living in Germany. *European Journal of Science and Technology*, (15), 237-251.

Abstract

It is stated that the largest portion of immigrant origin living in Germany consists of people of Turkish origin. It is mentioned that Germany has a population of 82.4 million in 2016. Of these, 18.6 million are of immigrant origin. Migrants from Turkey are 2.8 million. These constitute 3.4 percent of the general population. Turkish people living in Germany, while maintaining their religious, national and ethnic identities on the one hand, form collective identities on the other. Immigrants who want to adapt to Germany among the Turkish people living in Germany aim to develop a collective identity in order to adapt more easily. Turkish people who live in Germany or come to Turkey as workers shows much difference in terms of culture, value and religion compared to the individuals who live in Turkey. This is because they are immigrants. As a result of the study, it is seen that there is a significant difference between the gender variable and the scale total score and the collective sub-dimension. Nevertheless, when the question "What are the problems of citizens of Turkish origin living in Germany?" is asked, the answers related exclusion, discrimination and cultural differences are collected. When the most suitable nationality is asked to the participants, all participants answered as "I am Turkish." Nonetheless, it is seen that the participants with German citizenship, Turkish citizenship and Turkish and German citizenship are involved. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that the participants' citizenship status has not changed their answer regarding the most suitable nationality.

Keywords: National Identity, Third Generation, Turkish Young Adults, Germany.

[*] Corresponding Author: Biruni University, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Department, Istanbul/Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0001-9620-0856, akulaksizoglu@biruni.edu.tr

1. Introduction

Turkish people started to come to Germany as workers in 1960s. Since then, the Turkish population in Germany has been in a continuous increase. In 2002, Germany had a population of 82 million, and the population of Turkish people there had reached 2.5 million, including 500,000 Turkish, who were German citizens until 2002. 32% of Turks in Germany are under 18 years old and 71% are under 35 years old. Most Turkish youth living in Germany in 2000s are born in Germany (Goldenberg, 2000:9).

It is stated that Germany's population will be 82.4 million in 2016. Of these, 18.6 million are of immigrant origin. 9.6 million of immigrant individuals have German citizenship. The oldest of the foreigners of immigrant origin are of Turkish descent. Migrants from Turkey are 2.8 million. These constitute 3.4 percent of the general population.

In the second place, there are 1.9 million immigrants from Poland. The reasons why the Polish people come to Germany are different. It is stated that these reasons are mostly asylum, defection, family, education and work. (Schu, 2017).

Whether they are German citizens or not, Turkish people living in Germany have difficulty because they do not know the language of the country they live in sufficiently or they are unemployed, they have economic troubles or they cannot adapt to the German society for one reason or another. Another reason why individuals, especially young people, have problems is their parents' attitudes towards them. In traditional Turkish society, strong parent-child relationships are very common in the family. In the study regarding the relationships between the attitude and problems of parents, Kulaksızoğlu (2002/2003) revealed that 71% of third generation Turkish young adults state that they miss their relatives in Turkey even though 83% of them were born in Germany. This shows that the family ties and kinship relations of Turkish society are strong.

43.3% of participants stated that they are afraid of sexual diseases. Germany, which experienced a more open and comfortable relationship of girls and boys than Turkey, is a country of young people begin sexual activity at an early age. The increasing prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases and the lack of treatment of certain diseases frighten young people who have active sexual life.

Öztunç, Bilge and Bilge (2015) found that there is a difference in gender and income level variables in terms of personality disorders in their study on whether there is a difference between the interaction of gender, income level and personality disorders.

In some Turkish families in Germany, parents may show excessive protection or pressure and control over the child. Researches that study parent-child relationship between child rearing attitudes and children's responses have focused on two different parental attitudes: democratic attitude and authoritarian attitude.

Parents who demonstrate democratic attitudes towards children recognize and value them as separate individuals and encourage an independent personality development. Parents who behave in a democratic way respect the child as a person and pave the way for appropriate behavior according to the level of development. The child is granted equal rights within the family. The child's needs are met and unrequited love is shown. Parents who behave democratically use their reward and punishment in an intelligent way to control their children's behaviors and have healthy expectations about their behavior (Sprinhall ve Collins, 1884:218).

Parents who have authoritarian attitude set standards for their child's behavior. He believes that the words of parents should be accepted as truth. In authoritarian families, the parent is strict, rigorous and controlled. Children are taught to be respectful to authority (Sprinthall and Collins, 1984:217). Children who grow up with authoritarian attitudes are children who do not think flexibly and behave in an emotional way. This structure of thinking alienates the person to his/her environment and those who grow up with an authoritarian attitude are more likely to get along well with those who think like themselves (Daresh, 1978:479).

It is widespread that the Turkish population's personality disorders can be explained by demographic characteristics that people have.

It is a matter of curiosity as to how the attitudes of child-rearing are in Turkish families living in Germany, whether their attitudes change with their stay in Germany or with their parents' education.

1.1. Identities of Turkish Immigrants Living in Germany

Definition of immigrant in Germany include “Migranten” (Immigrant), “Zuwanderer” (A resident from a different area), “Person mit Zuwanderungsgeschichte” (A resident with history) and “’Person mit Migrationshintergrund” (A person with immigration history) in the federal departments. Individuals with a migrant background are defined as people who have an immigrant history and whose parent settles in Germany after 1949 and people who are raised or born in Germany (InterIkultur, 2011). Turkish people living in Germany, while maintaining their religious, national and ethnic identities on the one hand, form collective identities on the other. Immigrants who want to adapt to Germany among the Turkish people living in Germany aim to develop a collective identity in order to adapt more easily. The collective identity means to carry an individual’s own identity and to develop an identity which belongs to the society he/she lives in. Turkish people who live in Germany or come to Turkey as workers shows much difference in terms of culture, value and religion compared to the individuals who live in Turkey. This is because they are immigrants. Sackmann, Schultz, Prümm, Peters (2005) state that immigrants are classified into their roots and nationalities, while explaining the collective identities of immigrants. This leads to the immigrants defining themselves and “self-reflection” occurs. However, collective identity is not only due to immigration process. What is decisive for the self-definition of immigrants is their self-positioning in the new society. Collective identity is the goal of immigrants to integrate themselves with the new society as well as to preserve their national roots. Furthermore, the formation of collective identity differs from ethnic, religious and national identity (Quoted by Akkaş, 2009/2010, p. 113f).

1.2. Purpose of the Study

This study aims to examine the personal, social, collective and national identity fields of third generation Turkish young adults living in Germany and mostly in the ages of 15-30.

2. Method

2.1. Research Methodology

This study aims to examine the personal, social, collective and national identity areas of Turkish people living in Germany. In this study, the screening model is based on quantitative research methods. Screening models are studies of a whole group of the universe or a group or sample taken from this universe in order to reach a general opinion about the universe in a phase consisting of a large number of elements (Karasar, 2015). The research has a quantitative methodology because numerical data is obtained as the result of the scale used in the research.

2.2. Data Collection Tool

In the study, Personal Information Sheet and an Individual Identity Scale are applied on the participants. 21 questions are asked on the personal information form. Personal information form questions are prepared by the authors.

Individual Identity Scale:

Identity Questionnaire, from which the scale questions applied are adapted and prepared by Cheek ve Tropp (1995), is translated to Turkish by Çoşkun (2004).

2.3. Data Analysis

When the scale data are analyzed, the SPSS 23.0 package program is used. According to the analysis results, tables are created. Comments are made using the data in the tables.

It is analyzed whether the data obtained in the study are normally distributed and it is seen that the data have normal distribution when the p value is greater than .05. Variance analysis and correlations or T-tests are prepared and applied according to the level of variables with descriptive analysis.

3. Findings

Table 1. Participants' Demographic Data

Group	Variable	N	f (%)
Gender	Male	106	63,9
	Female	60	36,1
Marital Status	Married	49	29,5
	Single	101	60,8
	Divorced	16	9,6
Education Status	Illiterate	0	0
	Primary School	0	0
	Middle School	0	0
	High School	4	2,4
	College	50	30,1
	University	61	36,7
	Master/Doctorate	51	30,7
Receiving Education in Germany	Yes	93	56,0
	No	73	44,0
Do you have a job?	Yes	84	50,6
	No	82	49,4
Occupational Certificate Status	Yes	73	44,0
	No	93	56,0
Vocational Learning Course/School Completion	Yes	94	56,6
	No	72	43,4
Working Status	Yes	86	51,8
	No	80	48,2
Citizenship	I am a German citizen	57	34,3
	I am a Turkish citizen	58	34,9

	German and Turkish citizen	51	30,7
Generation Living in Germany	First Generation	0	0
	Second Generation	79	47,6
	Third Generation	87	52,4
Knowledge of German	Very Good	51	30,7
	Good	52	31,3
	Intermediate	63	38,0
	Poor	0	0
Knowledge of Turkish	Very Good	66	39,8
	Good	53	31,9
	Intermediate	47	28,3
	Poor	0	0
Frequency of Visiting Turkey	Every year	78	47,0
	Every 2-3 years	86	51,8
	Every 4-5 years	2	1,2
The Most Appropriate Expression to You	I am Turkish	166	100
	I am German of Turkish origin	0	0
	I am German	0	0
Father's Educational Status	Illiterate	29	17,5
	Primary School	25	15,1
	Middle School	22	13,3
	High School	20	12,0
	College	34	20,5
	University	36	21,7
Mother's Educational Status	Illiterate	46	27,7
	Primary School	37	22,3
	Middle School	41	24,7
	High School	42	25,3
	College	0	0
	University	0	0
Family Income Level	Poor	0	0
	Lower Middle Income	2	1,2
	Middle Income	82	49,4
	Upper Middle Income	82	49,4
	Rich	0	0
TOTAL		**166**	**100**

When Table 1 is examined, the findings of individual personal data are listed as follows:

- ✓ 63.9% (106) of the participants are male while 36.1% (60) are female.
- ✓ 29,5% (49) of the participants are married, 60,8% (101) are single and 9,6% (16) are divorced.
- ✓ When the participants' educational status is observed, it is seen that 2.4% (4) are high school graduates, 30.1% (50) are college graduates, 36.7% (61) are university graduates and 30.7% (51) are master/doctorate graduates.
- ✓ 56% of the participants studied in Germany while the others did not.
- ✓ 50.6% of the participants have a profession while the others do not have a profession.
- ✓ 56% of the participants do not have an occupational certificate while the others have a certificate.
- ✓ 56,6% of the participants have finished a course/school for vocational learning course/school while the others have not.
- ✓ 51,8% of the participants work while the others do not.
- ✓ It is seen that 34,3% (57) of the participants are German citizens, 34,9% (59) are Turkish citizens and 30,7% (51) are both German and Turkish citizens.
- ✓ The rate of participants who state that they are the second generation living in Germany is 47,6% (79) and the rate of those who say that they are the third generation is 52,4% (87).
- ✓ 30.3% of the participants state that their German is very good, 31.3% state that their German is good and 38% state that their German is intermediate.

✓ 39,8% of the participants state that their Turkish is very good, 31,9% state that their Turkish is good and 28,3% state that their Turkish is intermediate.

✓ 47% of the participants state that they go to Turkey every year, 51,8% state that they go to Turkey every 2-3 years and 1,2% state that they go to Turkey every 3-5 years.

✓ All of the participants state that the expression of "I am Turkish" is suitable for them.

✓ It is stated that 17.5% of the participants' fathers are not literate, 15.1% are primary school graduates, 13.3% are middle school graduates, 12% are high school graduates and 20.5% are college graduates and 21,7% of them have university/masters/doctoral education.

✓ It is seen that 27.7% of the participants' mothers are not literate, 22.3% are primary school graduates, 24.7% are middle school graduates and 25.3% have high school education.

✓ The income level of the participants' families perceived as 1.2% of middle income, 49.4% of middle income and 49.4% of income level. The income level perceived by the participants' families are lower middle income for 1,2%, middle income for 49,4% and upper middle income for 49,4%.

Table 2. Scale Total Score and t Test Table between Sub-Dimensions and Gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Male	106	28,7170	5,04976	-2,889	164	,004
	Female	60	30,9500	4,27220			
Social	Male	106	20,6698	3,32586	-2,050	164	,042
	Female	60	21,8667	4,07750			
Collective	Male	106	23,6792	4,43266	-1,178	164	,240
	Female	60	24,5000	4,08594			
Total Scale Score	Male	106	103,0377	8,25305	-3,329	164	,001
	Female	60	107,5167	8,46026			

In Table 2, gender and scale total scores are checked by t test analysis to see whether there is a significant difference between personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, the homogeneity of group variances is controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variances test and it is seen that the groups are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference between personal and social sub-dimensions regarding gender and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p<0,05). Nevertheless, there is no significant difference between gender and scale total score and collective sub-dimension score (p>0,05). It is possible to state that the significant difference is favorable to women as a result of studying the mean scores ($\bar{X}$). This data shows that the genders of the participants differentiate the scale total score and the collective sub-dimension score as a factor, but not the personal and social sub-dimension scores.

Table 3. Correlation Analysis Table between Age of Individuals and Scale Total Score

		Age of the Individual	Total Points	Personal	Social	Collective
Age of the Individual		1	,122	,038	,034	,093
			,118	,626	,661	,233
		166	166	166	166	166
Total Score		,122	1	,550	,469	,563
		,118		,000	,000	,000
		166	166	166	166	166
Personal		,038	,550	1	-,011	,020
		,626	,000		,886	,803

	166	166	166	166	166
Social	,034	,469	-,011	1	,069
	,661	,000	,886		,374
	166	166	166	166	166
Collective	,093	,563	,020	,069	1
	,233	,000	,803	,374	
	166	166	166	166	166

**Correlation value is at 0.01 level.

The relationship between the age of the individual and the scale total score was reviewed by Pearson Correlation analysis. Relationship level interpretation in Pearson correlation (r) analysis is carried out as follows;

- ✓ r= 0,00 – 0,25 very poor,
- ✓ r= 0,26 – 0,49 poor,
- ✓ r= 0,50 – 0,69 medium,
- ✓ r= 0,70 – 0,89 high and
- ✓ r= 0,90 – 1,00 very high (Büyüköztürk vd., 2009).

When the Table 3 is reviewed, it is seen that there is a very poor and positive (r=,122: p>0,05) relationship between the age of the individual and scale total score and sub-dimensions.

Table 4. ANOVA Test Table between Marital Status and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Marital Status	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Married	49	2,822	2	1,411	,058	,943	-
	Single	101	3942,582	163	24,188			
	Divorced	16	3945,404	165				
Social	Married	49	30,053	2	15,027	1,130	,325	-
	Single	101	2167,206	163	13,296			
	Divorced	16	2197,259	165				
Collective	Married	49	21,967	2	10,984	,587	,557	-
	Single	101	3051,936	163	18,724			
	Divorced	16	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	Married	49	196,773	2	98,386	1,342	,264	-
	Single	101	11946,655	163	73,292			
	Divorced	16	12143,428	165				

In Table 4, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between marital status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 4 is reviewed, it is found that there is no significant difference between marital status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). This data can be interpreted as indicating that the marital status of the participants does not significantly change the scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimension scores.

Table 5. ANOVA Test Table between Educational Status and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Educational Status	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	High School	4	38,085	3	12,695	,526	,665	-
	College	50	3907,318	162	24,119			
	University	61	3945,404	165				
	Master/Doctorate	51						
Social	High School	4	21,444	3	7,148	,532	,661	-
	College	50	2175,815	162	13,431			
	University	61	2197,259	165				
	Master/Doctorate	51						
Collective	High School	4	91,564	3	30,521	1,658	,178	-
	College	50	2982,340	162	18,410			
	University	61	3073,904	165				
	Master/Doctorate	51						
Total Scale Score	High School	4	384,310	3	128,102	1,765	,156	-
	College	50	11759,117	162	72,587			
	University	61	12143,428	165				
	Master/Doctorate	51						

In Table 5, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between education status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 5 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between educational status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). Participants' educational status and scale total scores and personal, social and collective sub-dimensions are similar to each other and participants in married, single or divorced groups gave similar answers.

Table 6. t Test Tables Between Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions and Educational Status in Germany

Dimensions	Educational status in Germany	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Yes	93	29,6774	5,06943	,455	164	,650
	No	73	29,3288				
Social	Yes	93	20,9892	3,55850	-,450	164	,653
	No	73	21,2466	3,78146			
Collective	Yes	93	24,1290	4,33696	,515	164	,607
	No	73	23,7808	4,31163			
Total Scale Score	Yes	93	104,7204	7,93912	,108	164	,914
	No	73	104,5753	9,38663			

In Table 6, it is checked by t test analysis whether there is a significant difference between the educational status in Germany and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 6 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no meaningful difference between the educational status in Germany and the scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). The data can be interpreted as the total score of the identity scale and the scores of personal, social and collective sub-dimensions do not vary in the case of receiving or not receiving education in Germany and the answers are similar.

Table 7. t Test Score between Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions and Occupational Status

Dimensions	Occupational Status	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Yes	84	29,5833	5,00652	,158	164	,875
	No	82	29,4634	4,79762			
Social	Yes	84	21,2143	3,59408	,399	164	,691
	No	82	20,9878	3,72345			
Collective	Yes	84	24,1905	4,54821	,647	164	,518
	No	82	23,7561	4,08116			
Total Scale Score	Yes	84	105,1548	8,33702	,756	164	,451
	No	82	104,1463	8,84171			

In Table 7, it is checked by t test analysis whether there is a significant difference between occupational status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that there is no significant difference between occupational status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). Participants with and without profession can be interpreted as having answers that are similar to scale questions and their scores are similar to each other.

Table 8. t Test Table Between Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions and Having a Vocational Certificate

Dimensions	Having a Vocational Certificate	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Yes	73	30,1781	5,23435	1,533	164	,127
	No	93	29,0108	4,56474	1,508	143,578	,134
Social	Yes	73	20,6438	3,57215	-1,439	164	,152
	No	93	21,4624	3,68770	-1,445	156,912	,151
Collective	Yes	73	24,1370	4,34075	,425	164	,671
	No	93	23,8495	4,31616	,425	154,361	,672
Total Scale Score	Yes	73	104,6986	8,46510	,056	164	,956
	No	93	104,6237	8,71270			

In Table 8, the presence of a vocational certificate and the scale total scores are checked by t test analysis to see whether there is a significant difference between personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 8 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between scale status scores and sub-dimensions when there is a vocational certificate (p>0,05). This data can be interpreted as the fact that whether the participants have a vocational certificate or not does not differentiate the answers to the questions on the identity scale.

Table 9. t Test Score between Course/School Completion Status to Learn Profession and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimension

Dimensions	Course/School Completion Status to Learn Profession	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Yes	94	29,6277	4,94917	,311	164	,756
	No	72	29,3889	4,84275			
Social	Yes	94	21,1064	3,55742	,016	164	,987
	No	72	21,0972	3,79087			
Collective	Yes	94	23,5745	4,02543	-1,373	164	,172
	No	72	24,5000	4,64515			
Total Scale Score	Yes	94	104,3723	8,71531	-,487	164	,627
	No	72	105,0278	8,44364			

In Table 9, it is checked by t-test analysis whether there is a significant difference between the course/school completion to learn profession status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 9 is reviewed, it was found that there is no significant difference between the course/school completion status to learn profession and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). It is possible to interpret that for the participants to complete their course/school to learn profession does not differentiate in a way to cause a significant change in the answers to the questions on the identity scale.

Table 10. t Test Table between Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions and Employment Status

Dimensions	Employment Status	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Yes	86	30,0465	4,97028	1,432	164	,154
	No	80	28,9625	4,76921			
Social	Yes	86	20,9419	3,73018	-,587	164	,558
	No	80	21,2750	3,57550			
Collective	Yes	86	24,0233	4,35208	,146	164	,884
	No	80	23,9250	4,30418			
Total Scale Score	Yes	86	105,5233	8,11640	1,353	164	,178
	No	80	103,7250	9,00770			

In Table 10, t test analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between the employment status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 10 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the employment status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). This data can be expressed as there is no significant difference between the scores regarding whether the participants work or not.

Table 11. ANOVA Test Table between Citizenship Status and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Citizenship Status	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	German citizen	57	3,807	2	1,904	,079	,924	-
	Turkish citizen	58	3941,596	163	24,182			
	German and Turkish citizen	51	3945,404	165				
Social	German citizen	57	55,394	2	27,697	2,108	,125	-
	Turkish citizen	58	2141,866	163	13,140			
	German and Turkish citizen	51	2197,259	165				
Collective	German citizen	57	72,460	2	36,230	1,968	,143	-
	Turkish citizen	58	3001,444	163	18,414			
	German and Turkish citizen	51	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	German citizen	57	253,288	2	126,644	1,736	,179	-
	Turkish citizen	58	11890,140	163	72,946			
	German and Turkish citizen	51	12143,428	165				

In Table 11, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between citizenship status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 11 is reviewed, it is found that there is no significant difference between citizenship status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). The fact that the participants are German, Turkish or both German and Turkish citizens does not affect the answers given to the identity scale.

Table 12. ANOVA Test Table between the Generation Living in Germany and the Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Generation Living in Germany	N	$\bar{X}$	ss	t	Sd	p
Personal	Second Generation	79	30,0380	5,12020	1,293	164	,198
	Third Generation	87	29,0575	4,65147			
Social	Second Generation	79	21,2025	3,64931	,336	164	,737
	Third Generation	87	21,0115	3,66788			
Collective	Second Generation	79	23,7848	4,24467	-,542	164	,588
	Third Generation	87	24,1494	4,39749			
Total Scale Score	Second Generation	79	105,6076	9,10117	1,365	164	,174
	Third Generation	87	103,7931	8,03066			

In Table 10, t test analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between the generation living in Germany and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 10 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between the generation living in Germany and total scale scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). The scores the participants receive from the answers to the scale questions regarding which generation they are in Germany do not significantly differentiate.

Table 13. ANOVA Test Table Between Knowledge of German and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Knowledge of German	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Very Good	51	50,261	2	25,130	1,052	,352	-
	Good	52	3895,143	163	23,897			
	Intermediate	63	3945,404	165				
Social	Very Good	51	10,333	2	5,167	,385	,681	-
	Good	52	2186,926	163	13,417			
	Intermediate	63	2197,259	165				
Collective	Very Good	51	19,964	2	9,982	,533	,588	-
	Good	52	3053,940	163	18,736			
	Intermediate	63	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	Very Good	51	29,114	2	14,557	,196	,822	-
	Good	52	12114,314	163	74,321			
	Intermediate	63	12143,428	165				

In Table 13, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between knowledge of German and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>,05). When Table 13 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between knowledge of German and scale total scores and sub-dimensions (p>0,05). It can be expressed that the participants' knowledge of German and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 14. ANOVA Test Table between Knowledge of Turkish and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Knowledge of Turkish	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Very Good	66	,042	2	,021	,001	,999	-
	Good	53	3945,362	163	24,205			
	Intermediate	47	3945,404	165				
Social	Very Good	66	2,832	2	1,416	,105	,900	-
	Good	53	2194,427	163	13,463			
	Intermediate	47	2197,259	165				
Collective	Very Good	66	103,595	2	51,798	2,842	,061	-
	Good	53	2970,309	163	18,223			
	Intermediate	47	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	Very Good	66	86,299	2	43,150	,583	,559	-
	Good	53	12057,129	163	73,970			
	Intermediate	47	12143,428	165				

In Table 14, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between knowledge of Turkish and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>, 05). When Table 14 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between knowledge of Turkish and scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be expressed that the participants' knowledge of Turkish and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 15. ANOVA Test Table between the Frequency of Visiting Turkey and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Frequency of Visiting Turkey	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Every year	78	26,399	2	13,199	,549	,579	-
	Every 2-3 years	86	3919,005	163	24,043			
	Every 4-5 years	2	3945,404	165				
Social	Every year	78	38,555	2	19,277	1,456	,236	-
	Every 2-3 years	86	2158,705	163	13,244			
	Every 4-5 years	2	2197,259	165				
Collective	Every year	78	60,835	2	30,418	1,646	,196	-
	Every 2-3 years	86	3013,069	163	18,485			

	Every 4-5 years	2	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	Every year	78	173,049	2	86,524	1,178	,310	-
	Every 2-3 years	86	11970,379	163	73,438			
	Every 4-5 years	2	12143,428	165				

In Table 15, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between frequency of visiting Turkey and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>, 05). When Table 15 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between frequency of visiting Turkey and scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be expressed that the participants' frequency of visiting Turkey and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 16. ANOVA Test Table between the Father's Educational Status and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Father's Educational Status	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Illiterate	29	89,648	5	17,930	,744	,592	-
	Primary School	25	3855,756	160	24,098			
	Middle School	22	3945,404	165				
	High School	20						
	College	34						
	University/ College/Doctorate	36						
Social	Illiterate	29	145,647	5	29,129	2,272	,050	-
	Primary School	25	2051,612	160	12,823			
	Middle School	22	2197,259	165				
	High School	20						
	College	34						
	University/ College/Doctorate	36						
Collective	Illiterate	29	36,497	5	7,299	,385	,859	-
	Primary School	25	3037,407	160	18,984			
	Middle School	22	3073,904	165				
	High School	20						
	College	34						
	University/ College/Doctorate	36						
Total Scale Score	Illiterate	29	670,828	5	134,166	1,871	,102	-
	Primary School	25	11472,600	160	71,704			
	Middle School	22	12143,428	165				
	High School	20						
	College	34						
	University/ College/Doctorate	36						

In Table 16, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between father's educational status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>, 05). When Table 16 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between father's educational status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be expressed that the participants' father's educational status and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 17. ANOVA Test Table between the Mother's Educational Status and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Mother's Educational Status	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Illiterate	46	76,143	3	25,381	1,063	,367	-
	Primary School	37	3869,261	162	23,884			
	Middle School	41	3945,404	165				
	High School	42						
Social	Illiterate	46	44,303	3	14,768	1,111	,346	-
	Primary School	37	2152,956	162	13,290			
	Middle School	41	2197,259	165				

	High School	42						
Collective	Illiterate	46	3,024	3	1,008	,053	,984	-
	Primary School	37	3070,879	162	18,956			
	Middle School	41	3073,904	165				
	High School	42						
Total Scale Score	Illiterate	46	155,236	3	51,745	,699	,554	-
	Primary School	37	11988,191	162	74,001			
	Middle School	41	12143,428	165				
	High School	42						

In Table 17, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between mother's educational status and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>, 05). When Table 17 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between mother's educational status and scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be expressed that the participants' mother's educational status and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 18. ANOVA Test Table between the Income Level Perceived and Scale Total Score and Sub-Dimensions

Dimensions	Income Level	N	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	Significant Difference
Personal	Lower Middle Income	2	34,757	2	17,379	,724	,486	-
	Middle	82	3910,646	163	23,992			
	Upper Middle	82	3945,404	165				
Social	Lower Middle Income	2	7,491	2	3,745	,279	,757	-
	Middle	82	2189,768	163	13,434			
	Upper Middle	82	2197,259	165				
Collective	Lower Middle Income	2	16,318	2	8,159	,435	,648	-
	Middle	82	3057,585	163	18,758			
	Upper Middle	82	3073,904	165				
Total Scale	Lower Middle Income	2	112,391	2	56,196	,761	,469	-
	Middle	82	12031,037	163	73,810			
	Upper Middle	82	12143,428	165				

In Table 18, ANOVA analysis is used to check whether there is a significant difference between the income level perceived Turkey and scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions. Furthermore, homogeneous distributions of the groups controlled by the Test of Homogeneity of Variance test, in which group variances are homogeneously distributed (SH>, 05). When Table 18 is reviewed, it is seen that there is no significant difference between income level perceived and scale total scores and sub-dimensions. It can be expressed that the participants' income level perceived and the answers to the scale do not differentiate.

Table 19. Analysis of Answers to Identity Scale Questions

S.N.	Questions	Average	Level of Participation
1	Things you have, my stuff	3,0783	Very Important
2	My values and moral standards (criteria)	3,0723	Very Important
3	Popular formation according to others	3,0361	Very Important
4	Becoming a member of family generations (family tree)	2,9518	Generally Important
5	My dreams and aspirations	2,8373	Generally Important
6	Behavioral patterns that the others have shown to the things I say and do	3,1084	Very Important
7	My race or ethnic background	2,9096	Generally Important
8	Personal goals and anticipations for the future	2,7410	Generally Important
9	Physical appearance: height, weight and body shape	2,9518	Generally Important
10	My religion	3,0060	Very Important

11	My excitements and emotions	2,8434	Generally Important
12	What others think about me, my reputation	2,9940	Generally Important
13	Places I live or grow	2,9096	Generally Important
14	My thoughts and opinions	3,0663	Very Important
15	My attraction according to others	2,9819	Generally Important
16	Formation regarding to my age group or generation	2,9518	Generally Important
17	My ways of coping with fear and worry	3,0000	Very Important
18	My gender as a male or female	2,9157	Generally Important
19	The feeling that I am a unique person as someone different from others	2,9337	Generally Important
20	I belong to lower, middle or upper economic class	3,1566	Very Important
21	The fact that I will continue to stay the same even though life causes many changes in my appearances	3,0542	Very Important
22	Impression and style I made on others with my gestures and movements	3,0663	Very Important
23	My sense of belonging to society	2,9880	Generally Important
24	Self-knowledge, my thoughts on what kind of person I really am	3,0000	Very Important
25	When I get together with other people, my social behavior as the behavior I display	2,9639	Generally Important
26	To be proud of my country, to feel proud as a citizen	3,2711	Very Important
27	My physical abilities/skills, which are good and coordinated in activities	2,9036	Generally Important
28	Personal self-worth, personal opinion about myself	2,9759	Generally Important
29	Formation of a sports fanatic identified with a sports team	2,9217	Generally Important
30	My professional preferences and career plans	3,0000	Very Important
31	My interest in political issues	2,8916	Generally Important
32	My academic talents and performances, such as the advice and the grades I earned from my teachers	3,0542	Very Important
33	Knowledge of regional accent, pronunciation or second language	3,0482	Very Important
34	My role in the university as a student	3,0120	Very Important
35	My sexual orientation as heterosexual or homosexual	3,0602	Very Important

The answers that individuals gave to the questionnaire on identity scale are analyzed in Table 19 and the levels of participation are determined. When Table 19 is reviewed, it is seen that the average scores of the participants in the overall questionnaire survey are generally important (between 2 and 3) or very important (between 3 and 4).

Conclusion

When reviewed in general, there is no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) in scale total scores, personal, social and collective sub-dimensions except participants' gender. There is a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) between the gender variable and the scale total score and the collective sub-dimension. Nevertheless, when the question "What are the problems of citizens of Turkish origin living in Germany?" is asked, the answers related exclusion, discrimination and cultural differences are collected. When the most suitable nationality is asked to the participants, all participants answered as “I am Turkish.” It is seen that the participants with German citizenship, Turkish citizenship and Turkish and German citizenship are involved. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that the participants’ citizenship status has not changed their answer regarding the most suitable nationality.

References

Akkaş, H. : (2009 /2010) Mediale Integration türkischer Migranten in Deutschland. Masterarbeit. Universiteat Siegen

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2009). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.

Coşkun, H. (2004). Kimlik Ölçeğinin bir Türk örnekleminde geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları Dergisi, 7*(14), 49-60.

Cheek, J. M., & Tropp, L. R. (1995). *The aspects of Identity Questionnaire: History and Bibliography* (2nd ed.). Wellesley College, MA.

Daresh, H.B. (1984) The Authoritarian Family and Its Adolescents. Canadian Physchiatry Association Journal. Vol: 23,87. Ottowa

Kulaksızoğlu, A. (2002/2003) Probleme der türkischen Jugendlichen der dritten Generation in Deutschland. Der Zusammenhang zwischen dem Erziehungsverhalten der Eltern und den Problemen der Jugendlichen. Essen /Deutschland

Karasar, N. (2015). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi* (28. Baskı). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Schu, C. (2017). Sachverstandigenrat deutscher Stiftunggen für İntegration und Migranten, Fakten zur Einwanderung in Deutschland. Hrsg, Sachvertandigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für İntegration und Migranten (SVR) GmbH.

Öztunç, H., Bilge, Y., Bilge, Y. (2015) Kişilk Bozuklukları ile Gelir ve Cinsiyet Değişkenlerinin İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Sosyal Bilimleri Dergisi /Journal of Social Sciences. Cilt / Volume VIII.Sayı / Number 1

Goldenberg, A. (2000). Kuzey Ren Vestfalya Eyaletlerinde Türk Gençliği. Türkiye ve Avrupa'da Gençlik TDV-Türk Demokrasi Vakfı, Adenauer Vakfı Ankara.

Sprinthall, N.H., Collins., (1984). W.A. Adolescent Psychology, New York: Rondom House.

Impressium interIkultur (2011). İnterkultur erscheint als regelmassige Beilage zur Zeitung politik und kultur, herausgegeben von Olaf Zmimmermann und Theo Geissler. ISSN 1867-5557