PERCEPTIONS OF FRENCH CITIZENSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF IDENTITY BELONGINGS: THE CASE OF TURKISH MIGRANTS AND THEIR CHILDREN[*]

Zeynep HİÇDURMAZ[**]

ABSTRACT

Migration refers to an identity process from the country of origin to the host country. In this process, migrants reinterpret their cultural, religious, political affiliations, and this reinterpretation also affects how they perceive the citizenship of the host country. This study aims to analyze the different forms of interaction between identity belongings and perceptions of French citizenship, based on semi-structured interviews. According to this analysis, immigrants and their children's perceptions of French citizenship vary according to their cultural, religious, and political affiliations. In this context, Turkish migrants are not a homogeneous group. Based on the interviews, it is possible to define Turkish migrants' perceptions of citizenship in two ways; one engaged and the other limited. Engaged citizenship is a form of perception based on a reconciling relationship between French citizenship and identity belongings. In this perception of citizenship, the origin community becomes a bridge group in relations with France. In the case of limited citizenship, the migrant has more or less distance from French society due to their subjective/community/universal affiliations. The group affiliation constitutes a source of resistance to French citizenship, both from the idea that citizenship cannot unite all individuals in an egalitarian way and that the individuals develop a strategy to preserve their religious-cultural identity against change. This study aimed to address ordinary citizenship through the perceptions of the participants. Investigating ordinary citizenship perceptions of immigrants will contribute to the debates in host countries in the age of migration.

Keywords: Migration, Identity Belongings, Citizenship, Turkish Migrants, France.

INTRODUCTION

France is the second host country for Turkish migrants after Germany. In France, however, there is no certainty about the number of Turkish migrants. According to the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) sources, there are 248,640 immigrants born in Turkey in France, of whom 216,423 are foreigners (INSEE 2013). Almost a quarter of the Turkish migrants reside in the Paris area (INSEE 2013). Concerning Turkish immigration, in a reference work, Abadan-Unat (2002: 54-85) outlines the five stages of the Turkish migratory movement in Europe: In the 1950s, individual initiatives and private mediators became increasingly important. The first Turkish workers had left to improve their own

---

[*] This article was produced from a Ph.D. thesis defended on 6 December 2017 at the Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne University. Within the scope of the doctoral thesis, there are many sub-categories such as cultural, religious, political affiliations, socialization groups, sociodemographic effects under the theme of two citizenship perceptions. Due to the limitations of the study, not all categories were included.

[**] Dr. Faculty Member, Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Department of Sociology, E-mail: zeynep.demirci@dpu.edu.tr, ORCID Number: 0000-0002-8695-8484

professional experiences. In the 1960s, there was the state-regulated export of labor from Turkey under bilateral agreements. In 1962, Turkish immigration experienced a major change in that it moved from an individual phenomenon to a collective phenomenon with the concept of "guest workers". Also, during this period, the export of labor was managed by the state. In the 1970s, workers invited by European countries were no longer temporary workers but were recognized as permanent workers. After this period, there will be an economic crisis which will contribute to the cessation of the recruitment of foreign workers. In 1972 in Germany and 1973 in France, the Law of massive regularization of foreigners is promulgated leading to the acquisition of the legal status of illegal immigrants −who would have come as tourists. Family reunification also took place during this period. In the 1980s, problems related to immigration began to be highlighted. Foremost among these problems are the problems related to the education of the children of immigrants and ghetto life. Indeed, the poor command of the language of the host country constitutes an obstacle in their education, particularly throughout their educational path. Community groupings of Turkish immigrants in neighborhoods constitute obstacles to their participation in the affairs of the host society. During this period, there was a growing development of associative movements, which in time will be more or less co-opted by politicians. This period has also seen an increase in asylum applications. Another highlight during this period was the introduction of laws to encourage voluntary return. Thus, in 1983, the law on "support for the return of foreigners" was established. In 1984, this law contributed to the return of 250,000 Turkish workers to their country. In the 1990s, new laws on the acquisition of French nationality by foreigners were put in place. It was during these periods that the phenomena of xenophobia and the social exclusion of immigrants began to grow. These attitudes of discrimination and social exclusion of immigrants have fostered divisions among immigrants based on ethnic and religious elements. Over time, Turkish immigrants are an example of inter-ethnic and religious divisions. Even if we can no longer speak of a wave of Turkish immigration to France, we can speak of Turkish immigration which has now become permanent and most of the children of immigrants are French citizens. They live and act as an actor not only in France but also in Turkey through transnational links and in different ways.

Scientific works on the Turkish population in France are generally treated in terms of "exception", "identitarian closure" or "disintegration". For Tribalat (1996), a "Turkish exception" concerning integration into France does exist and Turkish migrants are not full citizens because it is their absence in political life in France which "results from a deliberate

attitude" and "social life in France is often limited to the community circle" (Tribalat et al. 1996: 266-267). According to Rollan and Sourou (2006: 117), the identity withdrawal of Turkish migrants is based on historical and anthropological bases such as pride in being Turkish, in the Ottoman past, and ancestors. Rigoni (2005: 325) believes that Turkish migrants to Europe retain a "material and symbolic attachment to the community of origin". This attachment results according to Kastoryano (1986: 115) from a "defense traditionalism" and according to Rollan and Sourou (2006:212), from a "preservation of identity" which allow one to distinguish oneself from other immigrant populations, in particular, North Africans, thus reinforcing their feelings of religious and national belonging, properly Turkish.

Besides, some studies focus on the attachment of Turkish migrants to their original identity, also studies that try to analyze Turkish migrants from various perspectives. The basis of these works is often related to a Turkish youth, who distinguished themselves from the first generation, weaving strong links with France from which they feel included. Brouard and Tiberj (2005: 135), in their work, conclude that the Turks do not constitute a community detached from French society, not less a group in the margin; on the contrary, "they are indeed French and they are not French against others". For several decades, scientific work on Turkish immigration has focused on a new interest. Turkish migrants are now designated as transnational citizens of their home and host countries (Kaya & Kentel 2005; Abadan-Unat 2002). These works do not deal with Turkish immigration in the context of integration problems but a new context of permanent citizens; that is to say, the Turkish workers are no longer temporary migrants but Euro-Turks (Kaya & Kentel 2005; Kaya & Kentel 2008) who have settled permanently in the host country.

Indeed, beyond generalizations about the Turkish population, from the point of view of identity belongings, one cannot speak of homogeneity of the Turkish population. Rather, it is heterogeneity concerning religious affiliation, ethnicity, and political views (Irtis-Dabbagh 2003: 35). The bond of citizenship, as a sense of identity and political belonging, maintained with France finds its expression by articulating the fields of conflict and conciliation of their identity belonging and which are far from being homogeneous for the Turkish population in France. Beyond generalizations on the question of Turkish immigration, it should first answer this question based on the migratory trajectories of each migrant: What is the meaning of French citizenship for these migrants? The answer varies concerning their various sense of belonging. In this link between migration and identity, it seems necessary to treat immigration not as a

social problem but as a triangular link between immigrants, their country of origin, and their host country in a transnational age.

Method

This study is based on the fact that different religious, ethnic, political affiliations affect the perception of citizenship. The main purpose of the study is how they interpret French citizenship within the framework of these belongings. Therefore, diversity was important in the selection of participants. We start from the main theme which is that of the meaning of ordinary citizenship. In other words, what does it mean for Turkish migrants and their children to be a citizen concerning their identity belonging(s)?

The objective pursued by the field survey is twofold: on the one hand, it is to collect the perceptions and representations that immigrants and their children have about their various affiliation(s) and French citizenship; on the other hand, to take into account the different compositions of these perceptions. This is the first aspect that allows us to understand the "subjectively intended meaning" (Weber 1995: 28-29) by the actor during his actions such as migration, the application for naturalization, and the enjoyment of citizenship. The main aspect of the method of analysis, therefore, consists in conceiving the individual as an actor who is first of all the only one who can give meaning to his action: this is the comprehensive approach. This approach, therefore, focuses on meaning.

This study is based on a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews. In the selection of the sample, two strategic variables (Michelat 1975: 236) were taken into account to achieve the greatest possible variety. On the one hand, variables which have as indicators of belonging to social groups (gender, age, generation, profession, etc.), and on the other hand, variables specific to this study, notably immigration trajectories concerning different identity belongings. Maximum diversity was taken into consideration in participant selection, and the interviews continued until the saturation point was reached. In the diversity of the participants; ethnic, religious, political affiliation, gender, and generation are important variables. Because the sense of belonging can affect the perception of citizenship, the generational effect also provides an important framework for interpreting the sense of belonging. Thus, it will be possible to observe the changing belonging of different Turkish generations living in France. The research, consisting of 86 semi-structured interviews, took place discontinuously between October 2012 and November 2014 in the Paris region. Among the 86 people interviewed, 46 are men, 40 are women, 49 are migrants and 37 are children of migrants. The snowball sampling

technique was used in the selection of the participants. Firstly, key persons from different associations were contacted and other participants were reached through this contact person.

In qualitative surveys conducted from a comprehensive perspective, the number of participants can vary widely to reach saturation of the model (Kaufmann 1996). This type of qualitative method hypothesizes that every individual is the product of a culture or subculture of which he bears the traits and of which he is representative. In this sense, culture is perceived as a set of collective representations that highlight the common codes and practices of a given social group (Michelat 1975). During the analysis of the interviews, the perceptions and the meaning that the individuals give to their actions were grouped. These groupings come from these actors' interpretation of their and others' actions. Our goal is not to build ideal types or categorizations of Turkish migrants and their children, but rather to advance the meanings they give both to their experiences and notions.

The data collected from the interviews were first transcribed in full, which therefore constitutes a database for the analysis of life stories. Then, by conducting thematic analysis, themes and categories related to citizenship perceptions were created. Pseudonyms were used to refer to participants throughout the study. Excerpts from the interviews were translated by the author. In the study, two main themes were classified related to the citizenship perceptions of immigrants: Engaged citizenship and limited citizenship. These themes will be discussed in detail below.

The Perceptions of Citizenship in The Context of The Sense of Belongingness

Citizenship that goes beyond mere membership in the national community, includes both moral obligations, law, status, harmony, contract, community, and individual. Marshall (1992: 8) discuss citizenship in three ways. The civil dimension of citizenship refers to "*individual freedom-liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice*". The political dimension of citizenship refers to "*the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body*". The social dimension of citizenship, in its broadest sense refers to "*live the life of a civilised being according to the standards prevailing in the society*". Being a citizen is also to bind to a community with a destiny, a goal, and a common feeling beyond the rules and the interests. Having an identity card makes it possible to be national, but it is not enough to belong to a

national community. Whether for a foreigner –those who do not have French nationality and regularly reside in France, for an immigrant –those who have French nationality, or for a child of immigrants or even for native French people, belonging to a national community is related to the relationships established at different scales with society and the state beyond requirements and interests. This sense of belonging is an important part –but not all, of being a citizen.

Citizenship is a broad concept that refers to the sense of belonging to the national and political community, which has a legal dimension because of the link it has with nationality and a dimension of role and duty concerning the feeling of commitment (Leca 1986). The concepts of citizenship and nationality primarily define membership of a political community (Kastoryano 1997: 63). Because direct or indirect participation, which constitutes the major point of civic identity, is most often conditioned on obtaining nationality. In the context of debates on the link between particular allegiances and political affiliation, between cultural community and political community, between identity and law, between culture and politics, the immigrant becomes even more problematic concerning citizenship.

Nationality expresses above all the attachment to a nation-state. The state thus poses itself by holding rules which delimit the framework and the institutional conditions of the various effective affiliations of the citizens (Gilbert 2011: 253). Yet nationality cannot be reduced to a simple attachment to the nation-state. The nationality also refers to belonging to national identity. The distinction between cultural and political belonging to the nation is also useful for understanding immigrants' perceptions of civic citizenship based on a contract with the nation-state. The immigrant may develop the civic participation within the legal and political structure without reference to cultural heritage and national identity. The emergence of national citizenship which requires a feeling of loyalty for the benefit of the state puts the actor in a field of confrontation between various affiliations sometimes contradictory with citizen affiliation (Déloye 2007: 65). Despite the presence of a state ideal of uniting its citizens around a common political and cultural identity, in the case of migrants, citizenship becomes controversial when it cannot meld different affiliations in a single entity. The requirements of the nation-state to define its citizens are incorporated into the conditions of being national, which is problematic from the point of view of individuals living on French territory without being natural to the country. Affectively, the construction of the sense of belonging is difficult –even if one is national, which appears as an essential element for the success of state domination over a territory (Duchesne 2007: 72). From the state's point of view, nationality

constitutes a factor of inclusion, because it brings together individuals living on its territory, it also represents a factor of exclusion because it establishes the distinction between nationals and foreigners (Brubaker 1997: 46). From the immigrant's point of view, nationality, therefore, becomes a factor of inclusion insofar as it makes it possible to create equal citizens, but also a factor of exclusion since it requires ethno-cultural belonging in the national community.

Paving the way for civic and civil participation for migrants, the classic link that is often established between the cultural community defined as a source of identification and political affiliation perceived as the right to civic participation is visible in debates on citizenship from an integration perspective. The question is that in the French conception, citizenship is an indivisible whole and organized by a centralized state which, thus endeavouring to integrate populations of foreign origin through individual citizenship, resolves conflicts between social groups according to rules of the common public space (Schnapper 2000: 44, 50). The model of stato-national citizenship is based on the idea of limiting conflicts of belonging. For its part, the citizen-individual agrees to distance oneself from some of their spheres of belonging to better engage in society to acquire a civic identity.

Each citizen belongs to a plurality of membership groups that carry a diversity of normative codes and sometimes contradictory value systems (Déloye 1998: 182). It is therefore a plurality of dimensions of both personal trajectories and assignments suffered –questions about how the person thinks that others consider them and about the situations where they have the impression of being treated differently, in perceptions of citizenship among ordinary citizens. Everyone understands, interprets, and lives citizenship in their way. On this individual perception, we will try to answer these questions: How do Turkish migrants and their children perceive French citizenship within their other affiliations? Is it a conciliation or a conflict between the different affiliations?

It should be said a priori that the individual does not have only a single membership and that citizen membership is not above other affiliations but that it is influenced and oriented by the other particular affiliations which play a role sometimes determining the identity composition through its perception, its lived and its acceptance. Citizenship is therefore a membership reinterpreted by the individual in their world of plural memberships. In this world of interaction, two types of citizenship perception are defined in our study: Engaged citizenship and limited citizenship. Engaged citizenship refers to citizenship perception that corresponds to a conciliatory relationship with France, and limited citizenship expresses a distanced attitude

towards a collective identity shared by the members of French society. It can be said that there are different formations in both types of citizenship. In this regard, first of all, engaged citizenship will be discussed; then later limited citizenship.

Engaged Citizenship: Hyphenated Belongings, Hybrid Identities

Engaged citizenship refers to a kind of commitment by the individual to adhere to French citizenship –but not necessarily in the whole dimension of citizenship, despite their culture and their values of origin which are, initially, different from the values of French society. In this form of citizenship, the hyphenated belonging is formed, in other words, the dual identity. Through the production of different identities integrating various social, religious, or political affiliations in the host country, we can grasp group boundaries in a new way and the individual can choose various solidarities, assume hyphenated identities by getting involved in several networks, speak two languages, in other words, assume various forms of complementary identification. Hyphenated belongings, therefore, make it possible to question excluding borders. Under the theme of engaged citizenship, there are the following subtitles, respectively: A complementary link between the religio-cultural belonging and citizenship perception; perception of citizenship on a territorial and temporal basis: the case of the children of migrant; and a participative citizenship: transnational actors.

A Complementary Link between the Religio-cultural Belonging and Citizenship Perception

In this approach, the religio-cultural interpretation affecting the perception of citizenship is based on relationships with the state and society. These relationships are characterized by honesty in the fulfillment of duties towards the state –paying tax, for example, respecting public rules and laws, solidarity with other citizens, respect for the rights of others, the right attitude in neighborly relations, being beneficial to the society in which they live, etc. In the relationship with society, a human-based and non-discriminatory approach is one of the fundamental principles of citizenship in the context of mutual aid and solidarity. For example, the religious perception of one of the participants contributes to the development of civic and civil behavior based on the concept of both collective and human responsibilities. In his words, "*to have collective behaviors in conformity and in social solidarity with collective existences and not as singular existences, to do what is necessary to help the elderly, to help people poor through the perception emanating from Islamic sources which consolidate the concept of solidarity in society*". In his explanations, the peculiarities of a good citizen are expressed through using

Islam as a cultural religion. In this culture, being a good citizen is appreciated from the point of view of civic citizenship −through the concept of duty, and civil citizenship −through the concept of solidarity.

> "[I]n addition to the social sensitivity, the religious sensitivity put pressure and I said to myself that even if it's one euro, I had to pay and I got up to pass my ticket. This event was a great lesson for me from the point of view of internal calculation. Why? You shouldn't think of honesty as a reward, it's a form of life, you have to think about it. I learned that. You must not have such a goal, whatever happens, the person must be correct, he must follow the law, justice, by as a result it has influenced my life, and as I am a citizen who respects the rules." (Saadettin, 32 years old, migrant, arrived in 2004, Turkish nationality).

Religious affiliation plays a role as an anti-racist mechanism. For Manolya, born in France and who has a feeling of equal belonging to France and Turkey, being a good Muslim is a factor facilitating living together in a society based on moral values.

> "You can take a softer look and understand better, but if you just say I'm Turkish and I have nothing to do with black people or with French people, we couldn't live here. That is to say, our religious values have taught us to live here more easily." (Manolya, 24 years old, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

The concept of fraternity does not have an ethnic meaning, on the contrary, it conveys a meaning encompassing all the individuals with whom they live in the same territory. As we see in Metin's example, Islam also allows overcoming all kinds of extremism, especially religious extremism, by requiring moderation in the faithful's actions. This approach to religion allows individuals to have a moderate religious affiliation which excludes any kind of intolerant and restricted attitude towards the Other. In this sense, to be a good Muslim is to act positively in participation in civil life. As the individual behaves in society concerning internalized moral values, they develop citizenship for themselves and in this perception of citizenship, civil dimension, therefore, becomes an important trait that makes it possible to manage the tension between social differentiation and common belonging through respect for others.

As being a good Muslim relates to being a good citizen at the level of civil and civic practices, it also gives us a clue concerning the perception of others on whether one is a good citizen or not. Being a good Muslim, that is to say, correctly living your religion, is also important for the construction of the Muslim image in French society. Living religion according to the Koran, therefore contributes to giving Muslims a good image of oneself. This image also reinforces their social integration in and for French society.

"If you fully live your religion, people respect you. For example, at work, someone loses their thing, they argue among themselves who is the thief. But they don't doubt me, because they know that I know haram (the forbidden) and halal. I wouldn't do such a thing because I'm a Muslim. Islam gives people confidence." (Nazmi, 42 years old, immigrant, arrived in 2000).

Regarding religious practices; especially among the children of migrants, their religious perception is more individualistic than their parents. Religion is lived in the individual sphere and does not endanger the contractual relationship established with society; nor is it based on a perception that is irreconcilable with French citizenship based on the public and private axis. For those who live their religious belief on a more individual level, belonging to French society does not conflict with religious affiliation. They equate their own identity with Islamic values and these values do not conflict with identification in France. As a Muslim in France, there is the idea of living together by raising one's social status. The main attachment here is more the fact of being a citizen of France than being French. Consequently, the essential objective is to serve France for a common goal without necessarily having the same culture. Belonging to France can therefore coexist with Muslim identity.

"That is to say, I became a Muslim because I come from a Muslim family by identity. And practically, although I am not a hundred percent, I think I am a Muslim. But now there is such a thing. As France is a secular state, and since religion is really a personal thing, it cannot be questioned much. But if I have to think by feeling, I think I am a Muslim." (Ramazan, 23 years old, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

"We have to create spaces where we all unite [...] for example, we are French of Muslim origin, the other is agnostic of Catholic origin, there are atheists, Protestants, Jews, over and over again… but in the end, we have a common country. It's France. We are here. What else are we going to do? We have to work together." (Naci, 35 years old, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

On the one hand, transnational identifications, whether religious or minority, are no alternatives and in no way loosen the national bond (Ribert 2009: 574), on the other hand, religious self-identification is an evolution that tends to refute the idea of irreversible incompatibility between Islam and Western modernity (Rigoni 2005: 331). For this group whose level of education is relatively higher, religious perception does not create a limited identity. On the contrary, the Muslim is a citizen who must integrate oneself by articulating their will in the social field. Their identity belongings do not develop an isolated relationship, they have citizenship perceptions related to rights and responsibilities.

The similar approach is seen in the perception of the participants who define themselves as Alevis. In the sample of this study, we can identify Alevism as a religio-cultural identity that

finds its reflection in belief, lifestyle, and culture. This culture is based on an ideally humanist thought of inter-human relations based on respect for others without looking at their origins; which refers to the idea of civil citizenship. Respect and love for humans and nature and anti-racism are the foundations of this universal perception which contributes to the perception of citizenship among the Alevis.

> "For me, Alevism is first and foremost about appreciating people (…) For us, the most important thing is love and nature." (Selma, 23 years old, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

> "As I said, if you don't look at the 72 Nations with the same look, you can't be an Alevi. That is to say ... it is something difficult, very difficult, Alevism is very difficult. If I say that I am a very good Alevi…it is something difficult." (Saliha, 52 years old, migrant, arrived in 1988, dual nationality).

The perception of Alevism among the participants contributes to being a good citizen notably based on lifestyle and way of thinking. In the examples of Selma and Damla, children of migrant, who consider themselves first Alevi and later French, we can see the reconciled representations between the two affiliations. The country where she lives her religio-cultural affiliation is France and to which she feels an attachment to the concept of universal values. The main community values which bring them closer to the ideal of citizenship are political and cultural freedom, equality, openness, humanism, respect for others, and the laws and cultural lifestyle. In this way of life, "*mastering your hand, your language, and your carnal desires*" is one of the elements specific to the ethics of Alevism and constitutes elements of "*the way of acting*" which affects their civil perception of citizenship. Do not steal, do not lie, do not speak behind people's backs, this is how the community's ties to the outside world must be organized. Alevism, therefore, becomes a mechanism for monitoring the relationships maintained between members of society through its religio-cultural practices. Alevism's field of influence is based on the ethical interpretation of human values.

Perception of Citizenship on a Territorial and Temporal Basis: The Case of the Children of Immigrant

Attachment to the native territory is the first determining factor in the representations of citizenship in the children of immigrants. They identify with France spatially, temporally, and emotionally at the same time without denying their origins in Turkey. There, the element that determines this feeling of attachment is seniority on French territory. They express a

complementary belonging to Turkey and France. Life in France and origins in Turkey are the two pillars of a dual identity.

> "France is a country that welcomed me. It is a country that defines what I am [...] I feel totally French. When asked, I say that I am French of Turkish origin [...] I only belong to Turkey in the original sense. Turkey is a country where my origins are." (Daniel, 37 years old, child of migrant, arrived in France at the age of 3, dual nationality).

The children of migrants identify with Turkey through their origins, but they often define their citizenship in reference to the sense of belonging to France. This sense is undoubtedly reinforced by the secondary socialization networks −a group of friends, school, which gives them a vision of the Western world which they internalize over time. More often, Turkey is named the mother country, and France is the second country. The mother country signifies the country where one finds its origin and its history, with which one maintains a faithful bond, and the second country is the country where one was born, where one lives, where one works, where one earns money, and also the country towards which we assume our duties. It is with two countries that he has an attachment which means not only a sentimental bond but also an ethically assumed bond around the notion of duty and responsibility. They, therefore, develop a dual culture in which the cultural elements of these two societies of belonging can be presented together.

> "When I hear a criticism of Turkey, it bothers me and it is the same for France too. If someone criticizes France, it really bothers me. That means I actually feel like I belong to two countries. Because you were born here, you grew up here, you go to school here, you have a professional life here. I am therefore a Turkish-French woman. […] I cannot say that I am Turkish or that I am French [...] we are both Turkish and French. But that doesn't mean that we come and go between the two cultures. We did not stay between the two cultures but we are the result of the intermingling of two cultures." (Manolya, 24 years old, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

Belonging to origin can sometimes mean belonging to inherited origins which are claimed in reaction to the rise of far-right movements in France. The children of migrants, Daniel and Serpil have started to internalize their origins in recent years. Daniel and Serpil evoke having started to refer to its origin with a passion and a curiosity linked to the question "*where do I come from?*" faced with the rise of right-wing extremist movements. Their concerns about French society are the consequence of self-identification with France, which means a permanent presence in this territory. The concerns of Turkish people in Europe who now become Euro-Turkish are increasingly focused on their countries of residence and are expressed through a natural movement relating to the second generation (s) (Akgönül 2005: 46). All

national, these young people have the will to stay permanently in France. Despite the attachment to origins −especially at the sentimental level, the acquired, accepted and internalized values regulating the way of living and thinking in France make it difficult to achieve the ideal of living in Turkey, which makes evident the presence and permanent settlement of the children of migrants on French territory.

A Participative Citizenship: Transnational Actors

In the host country, migrants generally organize themselves in associations in which they carry out activities aimed at highlighting the link with their country of origin. The objective often sought through these activities is to strengthen community ties and perpetuate cultural values and practices, especially among young people. Here migrants become actors who forge or strengthen ties between the host country and their country of origin. We can interpret Simmel's (1988) "bridge and door" metaphor in discussing group boundaries. This interpretation refers both to rupture and to belonging to the community. On the one hand, the bridge connects the two universes −that of the society of origin and the host society, on the other hand, the door encloses the universes of both, and there −the door, therefore, means values specific to a group that distinguishes it from others. The most important feature of these bridge groups or transnational groups is that they interact in society with the boundaries that separate them from others and at the same time allow them to define themselves while protecting their identity boundaries. This group maintains links with its community −and through that with Turkey, and with France on the other hand. Transnationalism appears as an important concept in the literature to explain the bridge groups in the relationship between here and there. Transnationalism can be taken from several angles. According to Schiller et al. (1995: 48), "*the transnational migration is the process by which immigrants forge and sustain simultaneous multi-stranded social relations that link together their societies of origin and settlement*". The term "*transnational circulations*" refers to "*the physical mobility of people, with their itineraries, the effective and affective practices of the spaces traversed*". With related notions such as those of "transnational networks" and "diasporas", the theoretical and empirical interest of the notion of "migratory circulation" makes it possible to reinterpret the "field of experience" of migrants and the relationships of people to their identity story (Hily 2009: 24). Transnationalism is also used to define the political activities of migrants maintaining ties with their countries of origin. In this sense, the term "transmigrant" originally used by Basch et al.

(1994) insists on the multiplicity of social, political, or economic participation of migrants through different nation-states.

The most important characteristic of this group described by Kaya and Kentel (2005: 155) as a bridge group is that the individuals who compose it maintain relations at the same level between the two countries. Young people who intend to promote a cultural, cosmopolitan, and syncretic –multilingual, identity, therefore, join these types of groups which build transnational spaces by maintaining relations with the mother country and the host country.

This group concerns individuals with dual membership in France and Turkey who take their place in the definition of participative citizenship in France since they appropriate it. This group, which sees its future in France, has also an engagement for their rights in the organizational framework in France based on equal citizenship. Here, the migrant joins the French political organizations, but this membership is characterized by a struggle claiming the rights of migrants. In other words, this adhesion does not mask the original values of the migrant, but on the contrary, constitutes a means for living and promoting multiculturalism in the host society. Citizenship is therefore experienced as a fact that must take into account individuals of different origins who adhere to a republican political ideal. They declare themselves to be citizens and it is in this capacity that the presumption of equality and justice can be asserted.

> "Migrants have now become citizens of here. They have the right to speak in the country [...] We represent Muslims more generally, more particularly the Turks who are discriminated against. In the sense of justice and equality, our first target group is the Turks, the second is the Muslims and finally, the other minorities who are discriminated [...] it is very important for us to live our Muslim values in France." (Adem, 49 years old, child of migrant, arrived in France at the age of 17, dual nationality).

Here, this migrant population claims equal rights with other citizens to promise the values of democratic citizenship. Hayriye, child of migrant, practicing Muslim, thinks that she is always obliged to sacrifice in her relationships with people, in her social life to be able to live with her Muslim identity. But attachment to the French mentality and system is the reason why she chooses a life in France.

The 34 children of migrants perceive active participation in societal life on the one hand as a necessary action to defend the rights of migrants and on the other hand as a way to enjoy their political rights linked to citizenship. Even in the accomplishment of their vote, participating in French political life must be accompanied by an affirmation of their original

identity. Voting is therefore perceived, from a perspective of participatory citizenship as an indicator of citizen engagement and participation. Their perception of participative citizenship is therefore the result of being a demanding citizen.

In the case of certain migrants, the struggle to obtain equal rights in society gives rise to two different approaches: On the one hand, the defense of the rights of migrants in a global manner and on the other hand, the defense of the specific rights of Turkish or Muslim migrants. For example, for Ramazan and Veli, two active members of the Socialist Party (PS), this party struggles for the existence of different cultures and the rights of migrants and is more favorable to the voting rights of foreigners. However, for Gökhan, the most important criterion for voting for a political party is to improve the situation of the Turks.

> "I do not have an ideal in French politics but I choose what is best for my presence and my people. I neither vote for the right nor the left. As I am Turkish, I give a lot of importance to what is done for Turkish people." (Gökhan, 21 years, child of migrant, born in France, dual nationality).

Regarding their perception of participatory citizenship, in the voting of children of migrants, we see a trend: the political party which is more favorable to the rights of migrants is preferable to the other parties. There is an important difference between the political preferences in Turkey and the political preferences of the country where Turkish migrants live in Europe. Turkish migrants who generally prefer parties with left-wing, socialist, green political ideology, etc. in the countries where they live, prefer central-conservative political parties in Turkey. This situation can be explained by the needs and the psychology of a transnational immigrant with multiple identities (Erdoğan 2015: 137). This is not a contradiction but can be defined as a rational preference.

Between universalism and particularism, voting, therefore, becomes a community force. But also the citizenship identity attached to this political participation creates an alloy between political attachment and national feeling because citizenship is systematically attached to the framework of the nation-state where the political and identity dimensions are mixed one to the other.

We see that Euro-Turks don't have limited identities. Young generations cannot be defined only by singular identities such as Turkish, German, French (Kaya 2015: 73). They started to adopt the idea of appropriating different traditions in an enriching perspective and this dual identification is perceived as cultural richness. We observe that the second and third-

generation Euro-Turks feel close to the country in which they live in the same way as Turkey or even that they are closer to the culture of the country in which they live. They feel integrated into France –particularly in the field of education and the profession, they wish to have the same right to speak about their existence here and about the future of France, which reinforces their perception of participative citizenship based on the equal rights of migrants. The space where they live is not just Germany, France, Netherlands, Belgium, and Turkey. They have some transnational links between two countries with the means that globalization provides them, in a sense that can exist simultaneously on both sides. They are no longer migrants but transnational actors.

Limited Citizenship: A Partial Distance from French Citizenship

In an analysis of the conflicting relationships between religious and republican values, Déloye tried to retrace how the principles of separation and hierarchy between civic belonging and social belonging were established (Déloye 1994). Limited citizenship means a form of citizenship in which the individual takes distance from French citizenship. This reluctance towards French citizenship generally relates to the preservation of individual/community/universal values. Under the theme of limited citizenship, there are the following subtitles, respectively: Religio-cultural belonging: citizenship limited to the economic dimension; criticism of the society and state: social exclusion and immigration policies; and universal perception of citizenship: perception based on individual will.

Religio-cultural Belonging: Citizenship Limited to the Economic Dimension

In this group, there is a tension between subjective belonging and citizenship belonging because of their religio-cultural perception. Religio-cultural belonging is expressed based on the contrast between Eastern and Western civilization in the perception of identity. For this group, Eastern collectivism against Western individualism and the place of feelings in Eastern culture against rationality in Western culture constitute the main axes of cultural obstacles to French societal life:

> "When we say European values ... I have thought about this a lot. The main problem is that in European thought, the basis for evaluating information is different from that of Oriental thought, that of Eastern religions. The East, whether it is Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, Muslim, all the religious thought of the East, the basis for evaluating information is the heart, the feeling. For example, respect, love, fear, etc. But in the West, the basis of this mechanism is logic and the brain. In other words, a rational mechanism. The education system is rational. (…) But we cannot be individualistic, this notion is totally against our history, our belief. For example, a Muslim must at least go

to the prayer of Cuma (Friday). "Cuma" means community. The words "Camia" (society) - "Cemaat" (the community) - "Cami" (the mosque) come from the same root. It is to be together. We are always beings are together." (Saadettin, 32 years old, migrant, arrived in 2004, Turkish nationality).

"For me to be a citizen, I have to feel worthy of this. This is inappropriate. The goal is different, the belief is different, the things they laugh at are different, the things they hurt are different, ours are not like that. For example, some things seem strange to us and we laugh, but the French don't… Our culture is different. Even if we want to, we can't do it. But maybe our children will. They grow up here, they grow up with them. For this reason, we want to feel that we belong here, but this is something that is not in the will of the people. For example, why we don't bury our dead here? We can't do it." (Nazmi, 42 years old, migrant, arrived in 2000, Turkish nationality).

For those who have a dominant sense of belonging to their cultural origins, the common point is that the acquisition of French culture is experienced as acculturation, which is a process of assimilation of origin culture. In this sense, Western culture being perceived as opposed to Eastern values then becomes a menace to these migrants, who preserve themselves and their descendants of this culture. Even if they consider France positively on the economic level, they keep a certain distance from France in other fields in particular compared to the culture and individualistic Western values. In particular, the concern for preserving traditional values and transmitting the culture of origin comes before the positive assessment of the host country. There, citizenship is perceived in a reducing dimension which concerns the pursuit of economic well-being.

For this group, citizenship is seen only in its contractual dimensions with an identity reservation relating to religious and cultural belonging. For them, the terms homeland and host country are sometimes recurrent in their identifications. The homeland designates the country of origin to which the immigrant refers concerning the sense of belonging. Indeed, Turkey is often perceived and defined as the homeland, this is where they come from, it is to Turkish society, to its society of origin that they belong. Yet France is the country where the migrant lives and where they rationally build their future.

Criticism of the Society and State: Social Exclusion and Immigration Policies

Another type of limited citizenship is based on the migrant's relationship with society and the state. This relationship is based on a perception of reciprocity. Analyzing the figure of the stranger from an interactionist perspective, Simmel [1908] considers that for the obvious members of the group, the stranger also is part of it but in a form of exteriority, even if they are in the group they are not like the others (Simmel 1994). In the group, they are both near and

far; they live with the other members of the group but are different from them; despite theirs difference, they are part of the group. It is this proximity-distance relationship that defines the condition of the stranger. The stranger is perceived as a certain type of stranger, not as an individual who does not share similar cultural characteristics. This relationship in a group becomes more complex among the children of immigrants.

The belonging of the children of immigrants to France is combined with a series of criticisms against society and the state. In this regard, being a Muslim focuses on the negativity of the collective image of Muslims in social life and public usage. The formation of the negative image creates a feeling of always remaining foreign. Ezgi, for example, who defines himself as Muslim, develops a crucial belonging to the country based on the feeling of not being recognized equally by others.

> "I am attached to this country. I was born and grew up here. My friends are here. And obviously, our culture then becomes French, this is where we study. And I feel like a French woman. But as a Muslim, there is always a risk. They are not open to different things. They judge different people a lot. As I do not hide that I am Muslim, the more I will hide it the more it will go beyond, it will feel as if my religion does not exist, I explain to you what I experienced. For this reason, I do not eat non-halal meat but I tell the canteen that I am a vegetarian." (Ezgi, 26 years old, child of migrant, born in France).

> "Even if you want to be French, you can't. We couldn't be French. Because of your name or your image. Even if you are smarter, more competent than a Frenchman, he will be the chef. You will always feel the difference between you and him. When you bear the name Mohamed, Moustafa, the French put a distance." (Salih, 42 years old, child of migrant, arrived at the age of 11).

The feeling of being discriminated against reinforces transnational ethnic or religious activities among immigrants. We can link "marginalization" to "transnationalism" (Beauchemin et al. 2010). The feeling of being discriminated against among young people pushes them to turn to their countries of origin, which then becomes like a country of help. The appropriation of Islam becomes not only a manifestation of withdrawing into their community but also a source of political ideals. For these ideals, they take on a responsibility: To develop a general policy against discrimination.

> "We are trying to build a policy for Muslims in a broad sense, and Turks in a particular sense. Because our religion teaches us that we are responsible for all those who are oppressed [...] we do not have the goal of upsetting France or Germany. But only we want a liberating constitution. We want to bring justice, honesty, kindness." (Halil, 35 years old, immigrant, arrived in 2002).

A new political interpretation emerges for these immigrants who find themselves at a mutual distance in the individual-state or individual-society relationship. This interpretation is based on a concept of cultural diversity. One of the patterns of cultural diversity that Kymlicka (1995: 10) mentions refers to groups arising from individual and familial migrations that seek to integrate as full members into the larger society, aiming to adapt society's institutions and laws to cultural differences rather than being a separate entity.

Universal Perception of Citizenship: Perception based on Individual Will

In this group, individuals are not in conflict with French citizenship based on an ethnic or religious accent, but they live according to individual preferences and do not assume any religious, ethnic, national identity – even if they refer to their origins, their definition of identity belonging is not expressed with boundaries. They define their belonging by emphasizing universal values. They perceive identity as an element of otherization. For this group, we can speak of citizenship that includes the freedom to make personal choices. They are distant from the idea of the nation-state and defend a structure beyond the nation. The universal questions are the result of a universal Marxist point of view which is politicized within the left. This group consists of individuals who do not feel that they belong to any ethnic or religious origin. Also, they have no sense of belonging to a country, neither to Turkey nor to France. This critique is based on the distance to the nation and national identity, because for them the foundation of the nation rests on the principle of inclusion/exclusion, of the national/foreigner. Their universal identifications are the product of a thoughtful or rational will that manifests itself through reflection and decision-making.

Thus, they conceive of citizenship as a universal datum and stand up against the authoritarianism of states which limit the notion of citizenship within a given territory. Another element that degrades citizenship and hinders its universal conception is nationality. According to this perception, the state protects, gives rights and privileges to certain individuals, but excludes others living on the same territory.

In this case, democracy and the universality of human rights are an illusion, because when distinguishing national and other, there will be an inequality in the context of rights. This perception is reminiscent of the idea of "*a renewed problematic of universal citizenship that can express the plurality of the world, freed from the residual effects of sovereignty that is everywhere in crisis*" (Chemillier-Gendreau 2005: 167).

"Q-Do you feel you belong to a group?

R: No, because I was born and raised in Istanbul. I studied in the French school. I've read all of Kafka's books, I'm trained in this culture [...] my grandparents are very religious, but I cut ties with that kind of thing when I was 15 years old. […]" (Nadir, man, 62, immigrant, arrived in 1988 from Istanbul).

"Q-Do you feel you belong to which country?

R: Maybe Thailand. I think my roots come from there (laughs)

Q-Do you have an identity in which you have positioned yourself as an immigrant, French or Turkish?

R: Ecologist […]

Q-Do you feel close to Turkey?

R: No. I am told that I am an anarchist, moreover, when we hear Greenpeace, we say like that ... it is going to be a semantic answer but when we say citizenship, it is to respect the rules. But since I object to the rules, I am a bad citizen. Long live anarchy. I cannot put myself in a category as an individual." (Gülkan, 33 years old, child of migrant, arrived at the age of 10).

In this perception, citizenship for Nadir is a concept having the meaning about rights and duties such as paying taxes, voting, participating in civilian life; having no connection with the concept of nationality, for Adil, who defines himself as a socialist, citizenship is not related to the concept of nationality and is about feeling like a free individual. The same goes for Sertaç and Cemal, who feel they are citizens even though they do not have French nationality.

"Being a national and a citizen are different things. I feel like a citizen wherever I live in the world, but national is something else. If you have a legal identity in this country, you are national. For example, having the identity card of that country. There is no right to vote in this country but if you are national you will have this right. I feel like a citizen of France because I live here. It is said that "the place where man lives" is his homeland." (Adil, 50 years old, child of migrant, arrived at the age of 17).

"R: I don't want to be French, besides I can't be.

Q-But can you be a citizen?

R: That's another thing, I can be a citizen. I would participate in cultural and social life here, if a person understood the concept of being an individual, he can do it in all societies." (Sertaç, 39 years old, migrant, arrived in 2006).

In fact, at the level of migrants who have adhered to universal citizenship −with a cosmopolitan vision of the world, we can see the concept of citizenship in the sense of criticizing the relationship with nationality. Nationality is criticized as a national link determining the situation of being a citizen. In other words, in their perception, an individual may be or may feel that they are a citizen without necessarily having a nationality. The

important thing is to know how the individual positions oneself in the sense of duty and responsibility, what they contribute to society in the host country, and how they feel.

The foundations of the perception of limited citizenship are the self-identification of the individual, the image that this self-identification has created in society, and the problematic link with society and the state that generated this image. On the one hand, community and religious identifications, on the other hand, universal identifications based on political and community values, oblige us to explain the link that the individual establishes with citizenship around the individual-community-state axis. In this axis, the individual identifies oneself by referring to a community to which they feel culturally and ethnically attached. This identification, in general, forms an obstacle to the complete internalization of French citizenship. The other important point is that the limited space of this group does not concern only self-identification but also, the way of being perceived in the society and by the state.

CONCLUSION

Immigrants' perception of French citizenship is determined, on the one hand, by the bond they establish with their communities of origin and belonging groups, on the other hand, by the way, they relate to France and the French society. In the case of engaged citizenship, the individual has a sense of belonging to the state and society and develops civic, civil, and political perceptions of citizenship. Here, the immigrant community forms a bridge group that establishes a relationship, albeit claiming the rights of its members. In the case of limited citizenship, community and religious identifications on the one hand, and universal identifications based on political and social values on the other, make the bond that the individual establishes with citizenship limited on the axis of individual-community-state. The basis of the limited citizenship of the participants, the way of self-identification of the individual, the image in the society, and the distanced bond with the society and the state engendered by this image. First, in their perception, the image of Islam in society is exclusionary. Second, without belonging to any particular group −ethnic or religious, being a foreigner invites unequal treatment. The perception of these individuals is based on criticism of citizenship perceived as excluding. In limited citizenship, the community allows immigrants to maintain their original identity in the face of a dominant identity. This refers to the identity and political withdrawal of immigrants in French society.

In either case, there is a dynamic interaction between three different elements of a societal whole. The *individual*, who sometimes seeks to preserve their original identity or to reconcile it with that of the host society through a rational strategy; the *community* which establishes a link between individuals, country of origin and the host society –and the state to a certain extent, from a transnational perspective or else constitute a refuge for its members when their identity of origin feels threatened. Finally, the *state* with its national citizenship aims to maintain all individuals within a citizen framework; in this mission, it maintains sometimes conflicting, sometimes conciliatory relations with the immigrant communities.

The fact that the concept of citizenship is problematic, in reality, resides in the ties founded on the individual-community-state relationship. Individuals may prefer to prioritize their religious, cultural, and ethnic affiliations over citizenship affiliation. The state is a strong superstructure that is expected to be accepted by all individuals through citizenship. As the community is a formation carrying the power of negotiation with the state to guarantee the rights of the members, it influences the relationship between the state and the migrants. In the context of this triangle relationship, being an individual, being a citizen, and even being an individual-citizen constitutes an important area of discussion that needs to be examined in the case of immigrants, especially in countries receiving immigration.

Understanding the sense of belonging of Turkish immigrants and their children around these questions becomes essential to discuss the political and symbolic bonds with society and the state. In these relationships, the combination of identity and political aspects manifests itself in individual and collective strategies calling into question the definition and practice of citizenship. On the one hand, these strategies provoke community withdrawal by creating cultural, ethnic, and religious discourses which give form to going beyond the concept of limited citizenship, but on the other hand, they are the expression of "living together" on an equal basis in a society where we belong.

The debates on immigrants in Europe have produced opposing ideas in the sociological and political field regarding integration and the construction of modern political unity (Lapeyronnie 1997). These debates arise in opposition to assimilationist and communitarian approaches. Beyond these discussions, it should be considered that the phenomenon of migration has a liberating nature for the individual. The inclusiveness of citizenship in societies with different cultures has the potential to strengthen immigrant belonging. The principle of total equality of fundamental rights and duties for all citizens regardless of their cultural

background also helps to avoid the risks of the formation of closed communities (Martiniello 2011). The coexistence of communities can only be ensured by the establishment of justice in all social areas. In future studies, citizenship practices of descendants of immigrants who grew up with dual identities in immigration countries constitute an important field of study.

Acknowledgement

REFERENCES

Abadan-Unat, N. (2002). *Bitmeyen Göç: Konuk İşçilikten Ulus Ötesi Yurttaşlığa*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Akgönül, S. (2005). Islam turc, Islams de Turquie : acteurs et réseaux en Europe, *Politique Etrangère,* (1), 35-47.

Basch, L., Glick Schiller, N. & Szanton Blanc, C. (1994). *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*, Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Beauchemin, C., Lagrange, H. & Safi, M. (2010). Entre ici et là-bas : un aperçu des pratiques « transnationales » de la population vivant en France métropolitaine, in *Recherche TeO (Trajectoires et Origines) : enquête sur la diversité des populations en France* (25-31), Paris: INED.

Brouard, S., Tiberj, V. (2005). *Français comme les autres ? : enquête sur les citoyens d'origine maghrébine, africaine et turque*, Paris : Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

Brubaker, R. (1997). *Citoyenneté et nationalité en France et en Allemagne* (traduction de Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany, traduit par Jean-Pierre Bardos), Paris : Belin.

Chemillier-Gendreau, M. (2005). Quelle citoyenneté universelle adaptée à la pluralité du monde?, *Tumultes,* 24(1), 165-178.

Déloye, Y. (1994). *École et citoyenneté: l'individualisme républicain de Jules Ferry à Vichy, controversies*, Paris: Presses de la Fondation nationale des sciences politiques.

Déloye, Y. (1998). De la citoyenneté stato-nationale à la citoyenneté européenne : quelques éléments de conceptualization, *Swiss Political Science Review,* 4(4), 169-194.

Déloye, Y. (2007). *Sociologie historique du politique*, Paris : La Découverte.

Duchesne, S. (2007). Citoyenneté, nationalité et vote : une association perturbée, *Pouvoirs*, 2007/1 n° 120.

Erdoğan, M. (2015). Avrupa'da Türkiye Kökenli Göçmenler ve 'Euro-Turks-Barometre' Araştırmaları, *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 1(1), 108-148.

Gilbert, V. (2011). Régimes d'appartenance. Les sens multiples de l'appartenance selon Hannah Arendt, J. Matas and G.Vincent (Eds.), in *Appartenances : Partir, partager, demeurer*, Strasbourg : Presses universitaires de Strasbourg.

Hily, M. A. (2009). Chapitre 1 : L'usage de la notion de « circulation migratoire », in *Les circulations transnationales : lire les turbulences migratoires contemporaines,* Eds. G. Cortès and L. Faret, Paris : Armand Colin.

Irtiş-Dabbagh, V. (2003). *Les Jeunes Issus de l'Immigration de Turquie en France*, Paris: l'Harmattan.

Kastoryano, R. (1986). *Être Turc en France: réflexions sur famille et communauté,* Paris: l'Harmattan.

Kastoryano, R. (1997). Participation transnationale et citoyenneté : les immigrés dans l'Union européenne, *Cultures & Conflits*, no 28, hiver 1997, 59-73.

Kaufmann, J. C. (1996). *L'entretien compréhensif*, Paris: Nathan.

Kaya, A. (2015). Euro-Türkler, Kuşaklararası Farklılıklar, İslam ve Entegrasyon Tartışmaları, *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 1(1), 44-79.

Kaya, A., Kentel, F. (2005). *Euro-Türkler: Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü, Engel mi? Almanya-Türkleri ve Fransa-Türkleri Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Çalışma*, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Kaya, A., Kentel, F. (2008). *Belçika Türkleri: Türkiye ile Avrupa Birliği Arasında Köprü mü, Engel mi?,* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lapeyronnie, D. (1997). Les deux figures de l'immigré, M. Wievorka (Ed.), in *Une société fragmentée? Le multiculturalisme en débat*, Paris: la Découverte.

Leca, J. (1986). Individualisme et citoyenneté, P. Birnbaum and J. Leca (Eds.), in *Sur l'individualisme : théories et méthodes*, Paris : Presses de la FNSP.

Marshall, T. H., Bottomore, T. B. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*, London: Pluto Press.

Martiniello, M. (2011). *La démocratie multiculturelle: citoyenneté, diversité, justice sociale*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po.

Michelat, G. (1975). Sur l'utilisation de l'entretien non directif en sociologie, *Revue française de sociologie,* 16(2), 229-247.

Ribert, É. (2009). À la recherche du « sentiment identitaire » des français issus de l'immigration, *Revue française de science politique,* 59(3), 569-592.

Rigoni, I. (2005). Migrants de Turquie : un demi-siècle de présence en Europe occidentale, *Outre-Terre,* 10(1), 325-337.

Rollan, F., Sourou, B. (2006). *Les migrants turcs de France : entre le repli et l'ouverture*, Pessac: Maison des sciences de l'homme d'Aquitaine.

Schiller, N. G., Basch, L. & Blanc, C. S. (1995). From immigrant to transmigrant: Theorizing transnational migration, *Anthropological quarterly*, 48-63.

Schnapper, D. (2000). *Qu'est-ce que la citoyenneté?*, Paris: Gallimard.

Simmel, G. (1988). *La tragédie de la culture et autres essais,* Paris: Rivages.

Simmel, G. (1994). L'étranger dans le groupe, N. Gabriel and S. Dayan (Trans.), *Tumultes*, 5, 199-205.

Tribalat, M., Simon, P. & Riandey, B. (1996). *De l'immigration à l'assimilation : enquête sur les populations d'origine étrangère en France,* Paris: La Découverte.

Weber, M. (1995). *Économie et Société, Tome1- Les catégories de la sociologie*, (traduit de l'allemand par Julien Freund, Pierre Kamnitzer, Pierre Bertrand et al.), Paris: Pocket.