Journal of Economy Culture and Society
JECS 2023; 68 : 60–73
DOI: 10.26650/JECS2023-1266523

Research Article

Varieties of Belonging Among Migrants: Turkish Migrants in Norway

Meltem YILMAZ ŞENER[1]

[1]Senior Researcher (Forsker II), VID Specialized University, Norway

Corresponding author : Meltem YILMAZ ŞENER
E-mail : yilmazmeltem@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines different ways of belonging among migrants of Turkish origin who were born in Türkiye and are currently living in Norway (in/around Oslo and Drammen). The discussion in the article is based on the findings of semi-structured interviews conducted between March 2019 and August 2020 with 71 Turkish migrants as part of a qualitative study. Different categories of responses to the questions about belonging and the meanings respondents attached to belonging/not belonging are discussed. The paper aims to demonstrate the heterogeneity and complexity of feelings of belonging among the members of an ethnic group that is assumed to feel belonging to their country of origin rather than the destination country in the context of Europe. Additionally, the paper also aims to elaborate on what migrants actually mean when they talk about their belonging (or not belonging) to territories such as the country of origin or destination country, and collectivities like nations. Here it is argued that questioning and criticizing migrants' feelings of belonging (especially to their countries of origin) as a part of civic integration agendas is an effort to intervene in and have control over their emotions. This claim to the right to intervene in migrants' emotional lives is approached critically.

Keywords: ways of belonging, transnational belonging, Turkish, Norway, civic integration

Submitted : 16.03.2023
Revision Requested : 14.05.2023
Last Revision Received : 31.07.2023
Accepted : 05.08.2023
Published Online : 27.11.2023

1. Introduction

According to Yuval- Davis (2006, p. 198), belonging has been among the major subjects out of which classical sociology and psychology emerged. Many psychological studies deal with the significant negative effects on babies when they cannot take belonging for granted (Over, 2016). Belonging is a major human need that almost all individuals aim to satisfy (Leary & Kelly, 2009). Also, sociological theory, from its very beginning, has largely focused on the question of, in what ways do people belong to different collectivities. In that sense, questions about belonging stand at the very center of our endeavors for understanding individuals' connections with the groups around them. The relationship between self and society is a major interest for sociology, and a sense of belonging plays a significant role in linking the person to the social (May, 2011). However, despite this central importance of the notion of belonging for social sciences, it is, most of the time, vaguely defined and insufficiently theorized. Scholars usually take it for granted, considering its meaning as self-explanatory. Antonsich (2010, p. 644) argues that "we, as geographers and social scientists actually know very little about what belonging stands for and how it is claimed", and that belonging is used as an alternative concept for national identity, ethnic identity, or citizenship without much elaboration on their conceptual differences. In fact, belonging is multidimensional and includes "citizenship, nationhood, gender, ethnicity, and emotional dimensions of status or achievement" (Bhimji, 2008, p. 414). There are also other scholars who think that the vagueness of belonging as a term is, in fact, what constitutes its usefulness (Crowley, 1999; Sicakkan & Lithman, 2005). As Sicakkan & Lithman (2005, p. 27) argue, the notion of belonging enables to include emotional, cultural, and symbolic dimensions while looking at "what ties a collectivity together".

The belonging of migrants has also gained a key place in the debates on civic integration in the context of Europe. Civic integration programs for non-European migrants, which allegedly aim to facilitate the entry of migrants into their new societies, are becoming more and more common in Europe. With the "civic integration turn", immigration and integration policies have been merged and integration requirements have been used to choose those who are considered more likely to integrate smoothly. As Bonjour & Duyvndak (2018, p. 895) argue in relation to the Dutch context, some groups have been identified as unlikely to "fit" in the host society and the widespread implicit assumption has been that the "migrant with poor prospects" is a Muslim. What is argued here is not a peculiarity of the Dutch context, but relevant for Europe in general. Muslim migrants are considered "unwilling to integrate" and "unable to integrate" (Schellenberg, 2013). Feeling belonging to the destination country is considered a crucial component of successful integration. In this context, Muslim migrants' senses of belonging to the destination country are also questioned. It is widely argued that migrants coming from countries like Türkiye do not develop feelings of attachment and belonging to their new countries in Europe but continue to feel belonging to their countries of origin. This is regarded as one indication of their inability to integrate to their new countries.

This paper looks at different types and understandings of belonging among Turkish migrants who were born in Türkiye and were living in Norway (in/around Oslo or Drammen) when this research was conducted. The two connected questions that the paper aims to answer are: 1) To which territorial units or collectivities do Turkish migrants living in Norway feel belonging? 2) What do they mean by belonging to these territorial units or collectivities? The paper argues that among Turkish migrants who claimed to feel belonging to their country of origin in the context of Europe, there is a heterogeneity and complexity of feelings of belonging in the context of Norway. The paper also argues that questioning and criticizing migrants' feelings of belonging (especially to their countries of origin) is, in one sense, trying to intervene in and have control over their emotions. It is problematic when states or social collectivities claim their right to intervene in other people's (in this case migrants') emotional lives. Additionally, the paper also aims to elaborate on what migrants mean when they talk about their belonging (or not belonging) to territories such as the country of origin or destination country, and collectivities like nations. In the following section, there will be a review of the literature on different types of belonging among migrants. It will be followed by another section that gives information about the empirical research for this paper. Different categories of responses to the questions about belonging and the kinds of meanings respondents attached to belonging/not belonging will be discussed under separate sections. Finally, there will be a conclusion where the main findings of the paper are discussed.

2. Varieties of Belonging

In migration studies, belonging is becoming an increasingly important field of inquiry. Migrants' identifications with and attachments to their countries of origin and destination countries have been crucial questions for both researchers and policymakers. During the last couple of decades, it has been recognized that as migrants' lives are shaped by complex relationships which are established across more than one country, their belonging cannot be understood only with reference to the countries of origin or destination. As a "symptom" of our increasingly globalized lives, there are

now transnational families, and belonging is one of the key dimensions of these transnational families (Skrbis, 2008). There is a transnational space that includes ties and relationships that span across sending and receiving societies (Schiller et al., 1992; Portes, 1997; Levitt, 2001; Vertovec, 2001), and many migrants belong to that transnational space; they develop transnational belonging (Somerville, 2008; Dahinden, 2012; Klok et al., 2017; Nititham, 2016).

With increasing numbers of transnational migrant communities whose members engage in transnational identities and practices, questions emerge regarding the integration of migrants to their new societies, and their rights and responsibilities of citizenship. In Western countries, the integration of migrants has become a crucial issue not only in the academic area of ethnic and migration studies, but also in politics and the media. Studying migrant integration has largely meant investigating to what extent migrant groups are participating in the economic and social institutions of the destination country, especially by considering structural issues like educational achievement, participation in the labor market, and discrimination, in addition to their individual characteristics. The integration policies of different countries focus on different aspects. Specifically, in the case of Norway, the aim of the integration policy is stated as ". . . to provide opportunities for refugees and other immigrants to participate in the Norwegian labor market and community life" (Norwegian Ministries, 2022, p. 8). Dahinden (2012) argues that especially with regard to the cultural aspects of integration and belonging, the existing explanations have three major limitations:

> First, these models largely neglect the intertwined nature of processes of incorporation and transnational forms of identification and belonging. Second, most theories are more or less blind to non-ethnic forms of identification because they use ethnicity as an unproblematic *explanans* for both describing and explaining processes of integration. Finally, they fail to take into account all types of mobility that go beyond migration-cum-settlement as a one-way process and have varied effects on migrants' sense of belonging and identity. (p.118)

In other words, Dahinden criticizes the neglect of i- transnational forms of belonging, ii- non-ethnic forms of belonging, and iii- the impact of diverse forms of mobility on migrants' belonging in the current discourses and theories on migrant integration. In the public discourses, there is a growing perception that transnationalism and transnational belonging make social cohesion in societies difficult to achieve. Moreover, those migrants who engage in transnational identities are considered as practicing a "thin" citizenship, having limited active citizenship in and belonging to their host countries (Wong, 2008). There are hierarchies of belonging, some groups being considered as belonging more, so they are assumed to deserve more than others (Skey, 2014). Van Bochove et al. (2010) emphasize that although politicians are the ones who are more likely to point out the risks of transnational ties, this type of discourse can also be observed in Dutch social science literature on migration and citizenship. "The dominant view in the literature is that homeland ties impair local and national feelings of belonging." (Van Bochove et al., 2010, p. 345) Belonging is assumed to be a zero-sum game and migrants' spatially multiple belonging is contested (Erdal, 2021). Ambivalence of migrant belonging (Palmberger, 2019; Boccagni & Kivisto, 2019; Erdal, 2021) is ignored. As Erdal (2013) argues, although studies of migrant transnationalism on the one hand and integration of migrants on the other hand potentially have much in common, in the existing studies, these two literatures have opposing points of departure. While studies on transnationalism recognize the existence of a social field that transcend national boundaries and follow an actor-centered approach, research on migrant integration mostly follows an approach that focuses on the challenges migration creates for migrant-receiving societies and looks at migration from a nation-state perspective. This paper is situated in the first group of studies, with its attempt to stay away from what Wimmer and Schiller (2002) call methodological nationalism, or "the assumption that the nation state society is the natural social and political form of the modern world" (p. 217). Nevertheless, this does not mean that ethnicity and nation states have lost all their importance for questions of belonging. Although nation states are going through transformations in terms of their ability to regulate socio-economic realities, when it comes to membership and identification, nation states and ethnic categories still play crucial roles. As Skey (2013) argues, nations still matter in terms of identification and belonging.

As people can belong in different ways and to different objects of attachment, it is crucial to make distinctions between different analytical levels on which belonging is established. The first analytical distinction that scholars make is between belonging and the politics of belonging : The former referring to a personal feeling of being 'at home' in a place, and the latter corresponding to "belonging as a discursive resource which constructs, claims, justifies, or resists forms of socio-spatial inclusion/exclusion" (Antonsich, 2010, p. 645; see also Yuval- Davis, 2006; Fenster, 2005; Bauböck, 2005; Kryzanowski & Wodak, 2008 for similar distinctions). Yuval-Davis (2006, p.199) also distinguishes between three analytical levels at which we can look at belonging: The first level is about social locations (belonging to a gender, race, class, ethnic group, etc.); the second concerns people's identifications and emotional attachments to different collectivities; the third is related to ethical and political value systems according to which people evaluate their own and others' belonging(s). Although these levels are connected to each other, they refer to different areas of concern and it will be mistaken to reduce them to each other.

Sicakkan & Lithman (2005) argue that a belonging perspective suggests the possibility of plural belongings; individuals can have various attachments:

> In operational terms, modes of belonging can be seen as constituted of a large spectrum of emotionally engaging attachments to territory (locality, neighborhood, region, motherland, continent, globe), to social groups (humanity, nation, culture, ancestry, ethnicity, religion, community, family, interest groups), to particular human features (e.g. generation, gender, sexuality, disability, talent) or to political ideologies (e.g. religious fundamentalism, socialism, nationalism, feminism, cosmopolitanism, etc.).

Rather than trying to cover all dimensions of belonging, the research for this paper has queried the territorial dimension by asking questions related to their notions of belonging to the country of origin and the destination country, as well as to other localities like neighborhood, city, or the globe. The paper elaborates on what they mean when they say that they belong to one of these territorial units. Nevertheless, attachments to territory are often expressed together with attachments to social groups/collectivities. While expressing belonging to the country of origin, for instance, individuals often talk about belonging to the nation at the same time. It is not easy to distinguish between these two dimensions of belonging in the expressions of individuals who talk about their attachments. Consequently, this paper mainly focuses on attachments to territory and social groups while looking at migrants' belonging.

3. Research

The research for this paper is based on semi-structured, in-depth interviews with 71[1] Turkish migrants who live in/around Oslo and Drammen in Norway. I got an ethics approval from the NSD (The Norwegian Center for Research Data)[2] to conduct this research and I conducted interviews between March 2019 and August 2020. I also became a member of several groups on Facebook, which have been established by Turkish migrants who are currently living in Norway. I have also attended a variety of social activities organized by these groups, like dinners, parties, seminars, etc. I have had participant observations during these events. When I started my research, I was a new arrival in Norway, with less than two years of living experience in the country. My research process went in parallel with my learning and socialization processes in the country. I have conducted this research on Turkish migrants in Norway as a Turkish migrant-researcher who lives in the same country. In one sense, I can be considered an "insider" of the group that I have studied. Insider research, where the researcher studies those like her, her own community, or society, has increased recently, although it is not a new phenomenon (Greene, 2014; Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2013; Naples, 2003). Insider researchers may face methodological and ethical issues that may be considered irrelevant for other researchers (Breen, 2007). They will have aspects of their self or identity that are associated or in common with their research participants (Chavez, 2008). However, many times, the borders between insider and outsider statuses can be unclear, and the insider or the outsider does not necessarily have "a monopoly on advantage or objectivity" (Chavez, 2008, p.476). Although sometimes there are debates about the objectivity of insider research, even early research (Lewis, 1973) had challenged the claim that only an informed outsider can reach the objective reality about other cultures. Additionally, feminist scholars have been criticizing the dominant notions of objectivity for decades now. In my case, although I had the common aspect of being a Turkish migrant in Norway in common with my participants, not all of them perceived me as a "total insider" because of factors like my short duration of stay in Norway, that I came to Norway from Istanbul, or their perception of me as a secular Sunni Muslim woman. During my interviews, I have noticed that most of my respondents had collected some information about me in advance. On the one hand, the fact that I am a Turkish migrant whose native language is Turkish was an important advantage while recruiting my respondents. On the other hand, I had difficulty reaching those Turkish migrants who did not consider me as "similar enough" to their group. For instance, fewer religious people volunteered to be interviewed. This is also one of the limitations of my study. As a qualitative study, my research aims to gain understanding about the different notions of belonging among Turkish migrants in Norway without claiming to be representative of all Turkish migrants in Norway.

I used several different channels to recruit respondents to my interviews. I shared my call on the Facebook groups of Turkish migrants in Norway. I also used my own networks to reach people who meet the criteria for my research, and I did snowball sampling: I asked my respondents to give names of people that I could interview. Before the pandemic, I conducted the interviews face-to-face at those places where my respondents chose and received their written informed consent. During the pandemic, I conducted the interviews online and my respondents gave oral consent, which was recorded. The interviews lasted 1.5 hours on average. I conducted the interviews in Turkish, but my respondents

[1] I interviewed a total of 72 migrants. However, I excluded one respondent during my analysis, as I noticed during the interview that he is a second-generation person who was born in Norway. This study focuses only on first generation individuals who were born in Turkey and migrated to Norway.

[2] NSD ref: 757919

sometimes also used Norwegian and English during the interviews. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. I have anonymized the respondents. Each respondent has been identified with the letter M and a number.

For the analysis of semi-structured interview data, I have used McCracken's (1988) five-step method and the method's interpretation by Piercy (2004). According to this method, the first step includes reading and reviewing each transcript twice and making notations in the margins. These notations are short phrases that aim to capture what the respondent is discussing in that section. In the second stage, observations are transformed into initial categories based on what is presented in the transcripts, the literature review, and the theoretical frameworks (Piercy, 2004, p.4). At the third stage, there is a comprehensive examination of the initial codes to see connections and develop pattern codes (p.5). At the fourth stage, basic themes are determined by looking at groups of comments by respondents (p.6). Finally, at the last stage, the dominant themes in the data are discovered and explained (p.6).

Validity and reliability are important criteria for the positivist research paradigm. While positivism is relevant to much quantitative research, it has less relevance for qualitative research. "Positivists separate themselves from the world they study, while researchers within the other paradigms acknowledge that they have to participate in real-world life to some extent so as to better understand and express its emergent properties and features." (Healy & Perry, 2000, p.119). There are qualitative researchers who argue that validity and reliability are criteria for quantitative research, and they cannot be applicable to or misleading for qualitative studies. As Stenbacka (2001) argues, the basic question behind validity is whether "the intended object of measurement actually is measured" (p.551). According to this definition, the issue of validity becomes useless in the case of qualitative research, as qualitative research does not have the aim of measuring. Reliability, which is another important concept for quantitative research, refers to how consistently a method measures something. Hence, it also becomes irrelevant for guaranteeing the quality of qualitative research for the same reason. Qualitative studies have different criteria for research quality. Validity and reliability can only be relevant if interpreted in the broadest sense, "validity referring to the integrity and application of the methods undertaken and the precision in which the findings accurately reflect the data, while reliability describes consistency within the employed analytical procedures" (Noble & Smith, 2015, p.34). This research is valid as the findings accurately reflect the data which is guaranteed through the method of analysis and it is reliable due to the consistency within the employed analytical procedures.

Although currently, there is expanding literature on the Turkish diaspora in Europe (Akçapar & Aksel, 2017; Yaldız, 2019; Hoffman et al., 2020; Yabancı, 2021; Özbilgin & Yıldız, 2022; Kolbaşı-Muyan, 2023), different types of belonging among Turkish migrants have not been sufficiently investigated. This paper focuses on the respondents' statements about belonging/not-belonging to the country of origin (Türkiye), the country where they are currently living (Norway) or to other territorial units, and discusses in what ways and for what reasons they feel belonging, and what they understand from belonging. In addition to their responses to the direct questions about belonging, I have also analyzed their other statements where they talked about their notions of belonging. It is possible to talk about six categories of responses:1) I belong to neither Türkiye nor Norway; 2) I belong to both Türkiye and Norway; 3) I belong to Türkiye, but not to Norway; 4) I belong to Norway, but not to Türkiye; 5) I have local belongings (to neighborhoods, towns, cities) or partial belonging; 6) I belong to the globe/world; I am a world citizen.

Focusing on Turkish migrants is crucial for several reasons. First, as Kaya (2011) argues, especially in the context of Europe, Turkish migrants have largely been perceived as unwilling to integrate in their countries of settlement. "To put it bluntly, the European public, by and large, believe that Turkish migrants do not integrate." (Kaya, 2011, p.499) Moreover, in the literature on different forms of civic participation, there are studies which demonstrate that for Turkish migrants, participation in civic life especially takes place through ethnic communities (Ataman et al., 2017). Finally, there is research which demonstrates that, among many migrant groups, Turks make up a migrant group which has the strongest will to live transnational lives (Duru et al., 2019). According to the findings of the TRANSWEL (Transnational Lives in the Welfare State) Project, Turkish migrants in Norway represented the group where most wanted to live in both the country of origin and the destination country. Nearly half of Turkish people living in Norway wanted this[3]. Therefore, researching Turkish migrant communities in Europe means focusing on a group which is claimed to have high levels of transnational orientation and membership in ethnic communities, and low levels of integration to their host societies. It is usually assumed that they mostly feel belonging to their country of origin, not to the destination countries. In this paper, I aim to demonstrate that for Turkish migrants living in Norway, as well as other groups of migrants, belonging is a much more variegated issue that requires conceptualization beyond a simple framework of belonging-here-or-there. Moreover, it is crucial to understand what migrants refer to when they talk about belonging or not belonging.

[3] https://www.prio.org/projects/1660 (Accessed May 30th, 2023)

4. "I feel belonging to Norway"

The first factor mentioned by those who think that they belong to Norway is that they feel belonging because they are making contributions to the Norwegian society through their economic, social, and political participation. The feeling that they are contributing to Norwegian society by working, paying taxes, being active in labor unions, voting and active political participation, and acting as role models for especially the minority youth, were mentioned as the major factors that increase their sense of belonging to Norway.

The second factor that has a positive role in their sense of belonging to Norway is their perception that their children have been well-integrated into Norwegian society. They stated that their children's jobs, friends, networks, and their future are in Norway. Even though as first-generation migrants, they do not feel attachment to Norway to the same extent as their children, seeing the strong and permanent links of their children with this society makes them feel that they belong to Norway. Additionally, some of my respondents made references to the social values that are emphasized in Norway and argued that the kinds of values that are underlined are in line with their own personal values.

For a couple of them, feeling belonging was about having routines. As a certain amount of time has already passed since they came to Norway, they now have new routines living in this new country. Additionally, some places have already become familiar. This increasing familiarity gives them a sense of belonging.

Finally, some of the respondents who are married to Norwegians said that they feel belonging as they have participated actively in social life thanks to their spouses/partners. The fact that their children are "half Norwegian" and they have Norwegian family members and relatives makes them feel that they also belong to the Norwegian society.

> I especially feel belonging through my husband. . . When it comes to following a Norwegian tradition, doing some of those things. . . I feel that I am actively involved in them. When I talk to some people, I can say "We have done it", "We have also cooked that", "We have celebrated as well." Then I feel that I belong. (M23)

If we summarize the responses of those who feel belonging to Norway, we can argue that belonging takes place when they feel that:

- they participate in Norwegian society and contribute to it;
- their children are well-integrated into the society;
- their personal values are in line with the values that are emphasized in Norway;
- they have established routines in daily life;
- they participate actively in social life due to their Norwegian partners/spouses.

Therefore, their own and families' active participation in society, as well as the similarity between their own values and the society's underlined values are key to their sense of belonging to Norway.

5. "I don't belong to Norway"

Those of them who think that they do not belong to Norway mentioned several reasons for that. In parallel with those who expressed that they belong to Norway because they work in Norway, participate in economic life, and pay taxes, the ones who could not find a job that is in line with their qualifications stated that they do not feel belonging to Norway.

> If I get a job, a regular, permanent job, I will feel belonging. . . I believe that without participating in the work life, it is not possible to feel belonging. . . I have always thought that if you cannot make an economic contribution to a society, you cannot take part in it. (M9)

Not having enough friends and social connections, not being able to speak the language or not being able to express oneself sufficiently in the language of the country, and the feeling that it is not their culture/it is too different from their own culture lead them to feel that they do not belong to Norway. Some of them also feel that they do not support or embrace some of the values that are emphasized in Norway, and this makes it difficult/impossible for them to develop a sense of belonging to Norway:

> I do not really feel much belonging to Norway. We were raised in a different way. We have very different expectations from life. We have different values, different priorities. . . For instance, for me, family is very important. I am the type of person who likes giving and sharing. The individualism in Norway, the fact that even in families, they try to calculate everyone's shares. . . These are problematic concepts for me. The fact that I am now a citizen, I work here, pay taxes, etc. . . . These do not necessarily bring a sense of belonging. (M63)

> I do not feel that I belong to Norwegian society. I am new here, but I do not think that this will change in the future. I know it for sure, because I was not feeling belonging in (another country) either while I was living there. I am myself only when I am in Türkiye. In other countries, I do not really feel like myself. I will not belong here. Considering all the strange things I see in Norway, I know that I cannot feel belonging. (M65)

In some cases, at what age they came to Norway also had an influence on their sense of belonging. Those of them who

came during later stages of their lives tended to think that it is not possible to develop belonging to a new country after that age. The projected duration of their stay in Norway also had an impact on belonging: Those who see themselves as temporary in Norway or who cannot foresee how long they will stay talked about not having developed a sense of belonging. Not being competent in the language of the country also had a negative impact on feelings of belonging:

> I feel that because of the language issue, I cannot feel belonging here. As I am not competent in the language, I feel that I cannot follow the social developments either. Additionally, I need to feel that I can express myself fully to be able to develop a sense of belonging. That is not how I currently feel. I feel temporary, like I am passing by. . . (M27)

There were also cases in which the person's lack of a sense of belonging to Norway was mainly connected to the perception that one is discriminated against, excluded, marginalized, and is not recognized by Norwegian society. In this group, there are those who think that Norwegians do not see them as Norwegian and constantly treat them as different.

> How should I say it. . . I would want to feel belonging, but I am not sure how they see me. If I am with my friends, we speak Norwegian and we get along quite well. We have a lot in common, we went to school together, etc. I know a lot of things, I know the cultural codes, where to go, what to eat. . . But I also always know that, in their eyes, I am not Norwegian. As they say, if you have not been Norwegian for several generations, you are not Norwegian. For that reason, I should say I belong 60%... (M14)

There is also the feeling that what is demanded of them is not integration but assimilation. Some of them believe that those components of their identities which make them different make it impossible for them to be considered Norwegian:

> The problem with Norway is that they want people to be assimilated, although they call it integration. For that reason, even if you get totally adapted to this society, learn everything, learn the language, have education, work, and pay taxes, they do not see you as Norwegian as long as you are not assimilated. . . If you do not celebrate Christmas, go to church, eat pork, celebrate May 17^{th} with those traditional clothes, they do not see you as integrated. (M34)

Some of them also stated that although they contribute to Norwegian society in many ways, they do not have the right to make demands in Norway. They feel that having Norwegian citizenship and a Norwegian passport does not make them Norwegian in the eyes of the society. When they are not recognized, they do not see it as possible to develop a sense of belonging.

To sum up, those who think that they do not belong to Norway think that it is because:

- they cannot participate actively in social life (due to being unemployed/ underemployed or lack of social networks);
- they cannot express themselves sufficiently in the language of the country;
- Norwegian culture and values are "too different" from their own culture and values;
- it is "too late" for them to belong to a new country due to their age;
- the temporary nature of their stay makes it impossible to feel belonging;
- experiencing discrimination, non-recognition, and pressure for assimilation deters feelings of belonging.

6. "I Belong to My Country of Origin, Türkiye"

For those of them who came to Norway at later stages of their lives or who have not been living in the country for a long period, the answer to the question of their belonging to the country of origin was obvious: They feel that they belong to Türkiye. Even for some of those who have lived in Norway from early ages or who have stayed for extended periods of time, their sense of belonging to Türkiye is quite strong. The fact that they were born in Türkiye and still have many family members and friends in the country make them feel that they have a strong connection to Türkiye. Even some of those who had many negative experiences living in Türkiye and currently have strong criticisms about the country still think that Türkiye has shaped them and even if they do not like everything about its current state, they are a part of that society. About the negative aspects, one of the respondents also said "I had heard this from someone. The country for which you feel ashamed is where you belong. I really liked it when I heard it. I belong to Türkiye in that sense. I still feel ashamed for Türkiye when I hear about the negative incidents." (M42) Consequently, feeling belonging to the country of origin is linked to feeling a part of that culture and society as a result of being born and having early socialization, and having many family members, friends, and relatives there.

7. "I Don't Belong to My Country of Origin"

In response to the question about whether they feel belonging to their country of origin, Türkiye, several of them stated that they do not feel belonging. The first reason that was mentioned is that they do not accept or embrace some of the cultural values and social norms in Türkiye. There were also those who were very critical of the current state

of the country in the political and social sense, and who said that the country to which they belonged does not exist anymore; they do not feel belonging to "this new country".

> I am really sorry to say this but no, I do not belong to Turkish society anymore. How can I belong to a society that keeps silent despite all this unfairness, all these violations of democracy? I am not saying that I am not Turkish anymore. I am just saying that I do not belong to Turkish society. This was not how we were in the past. This is not what we learned about Turkishness in our history classes. (M49)

One of my respondents explained that the loss of his sense of belonging to Türkiye happened not after but before he left Türkiye, and this loss is a major reason why he decided to leave the country to live in Norway. He emphasized that losing one's sense of belonging to the country of origin is not peculiar to emigrants:

> It is not necessarily about leaving a country and settling in a new one. I know many people who are still living in Türkiye, who have lost their sense of belonging... My sister, many of my close friends, my closest friend who is gay... They do not feel belonging either. It is really strange. It feels like we were living on a land, but some other people have invaded it. On that land we really want to love, they now have their own reign. That is how I am feeling about Türkiye now. (M61)

The ones who are critical of the country's transformation also talked about not feeling comfortable in Türkiye when they visit. The ones who have been living in Norway for extended periods of time think that they are feeling less and less familiar with the dominant cultural codes in Türkiye. They also feel increasingly less competent in expressing themselves in Turkish. Therefore, their sense of not-belonging is mostly linked to their perception of their loss of cultural-linguistic competence. They also believe that they are not accepted as a part of the culture and society in Türkiye anymore. Additionally, their feeling that they are not making any contribution to Turkish society also adds to their sense of not belonging:

> I do not feel belonging to Turkish society. I rather see Türkiye as my vacation country now. We go to Türkiye for our vacations and we are always in a vacation mode when we are there. I do not feel like a part of that society because I do not have any contributions to its development, its improvement. (M43)

> I do not feel belonging anymore... I guess this is due to having lived here for a long time as of now. I am not a part of the Turkish society any longer. I follow the social changes in Türkiye from a distance. Even the language is changing. People now use different slang words. (M16)

Those who are members of minority groups in Türkiye (Alevis, Kurds, etc.)[4] talked about how they have always had problems in terms of having equal rights and recognition in the context of Türkiye. They have also stated that they have never felt belonging to mainstream society because of being different in the ethnic/religious sense.

Accordingly, those who do not feel belonging to Türkiye think that:

- they do not accept some of the social norms in the country;
- the country has changed in negative ways and the country that they felt belonging does not exist anymore;
- they have been living in Norway for a long time and they have lost their cultural-linguistic competence;
- they are not accepted as a part of Turkish society any longer;
- being a member of a minority group in Türkiye, they have never felt belonging to the mainstream society.

8. "I Belong to Both Societies" and "I Belong to Neither"

In the previous sections, the meanings of belonging to Norway and Türkiye have already been discussed. Additionally, in some cases, my respondents talked about their senses of belonging to both contexts and societies. Some of them expressed that what they have experienced and learned in both Türkiye and Norway have become crucial components of their identities and consequently, they feel belonging to both. Having double citizenship was also mentioned as contributing to their sense of belonging to both countries/societies.

> I can say that I am a Turkish Norwegian. All the values that make me who I am... I have received them from my family and my country. I came here when I was 25-26. I have spent the rest of my life here. I believe that I have also embraced many things here. I do not want to brag but I think I could successfully blend them all. Now I do not know which of my characteristics are Norwegian and which ones are Turkish. It is hard to distinguish between them anyway. The moral values that I was taught also exist here. I did not need to come to Norway to become a better person. I just learned the Norwegian names for those notions after coming here... And although I sometimes feel excluded in different environments while living here, I still feel that I belong to Norwegian society as well as to Turkish society. (M37)

> I have double citizenship. I feel comfortable in both contexts. I am comfortable in my country when I go there, and I am also comfortable here. (M47)

[4] According to the dominant political-legal definition in Türkiye, "minorities" refer to those non-Muslim communities in Türkiye, whose presence were recognized by the Lausanne Treaty in 1923. However, in this study, I rely on a sociological definition of "minority" and use relative power or social status as a criterion for defining minority and majority group membership.

On the other side, most of those who feel belonging to neither society talked about feeling like a "foreigner" in both contexts and being "in limbo". After staying in Norway for extended periods of time, they have started feeling that they are not familiar with the Turkish context anymore. They also think that Turkish people living in Türkiye perceive them as different. On the other side, despite having lived in Norway for a long time, they do not feel fully recognized as Norwegian. Additionally, a lack of what they consider as full competence in the cultural codes makes them feel that it is not possible to feel belonging to Norway.

Some of those who stated that they feel belonging neither to Norway nor to Türkiye talked about their reluctance to feeling belonging to a national collectivity, as this type of belonging brings responsibilities that they do not want to accept. M13, for instance, explained that from very early ages, she never wanted to celebrate any national or religious days or festivities, as these celebrations made her uncomfortable. She feels concerned that when large numbers of people come together for common goals, their actions will be attributed to her if she is regarded as a member of that group. As will be discussed in the following sections, for these individuals, local belonging (to the city where they grew up, for instance) made more sense.

9. "I Feel Like a World Citizen"

In some cases, the statement that one feels a world citizen refers to having connections to both contexts. We can argue that especially those who talk about being world citizens live transnational lives and develop transnational belonging. For instance, when M24 says that he is a world citizen, he explains that for him and his family, it is not possible to think of a life in a single country anymore. His children completed their education and have established themselves professionally in Norway. He doesn't see it likely that his children will go "back" to Türkiye in the future. He doesn't want it either. For him, this also means that he has a permanent connection with Norway. However, his link with Norway is not only because of his children. His health insurance in Norway is another thing that he emphasized while talking about his connection. In terms of his own plans for future, he sees himself spending more time in Türkiye when he gets older. He says that he misses the Mediterranean climate and the "warmth of Mediterranean people", and he wants to live those things that he missed living away from Türkiye. However, not having health insurance in Türkiye, he realistically assesses that he may not be able to realize his plans of spending more time in Türkiye in his old age if he has serious health concerns. His statement about being a world citizen does not necessarily refer to feeling at home everywhere, but rather to the impossibility of living a life in only one country and having links to both Norway and Türkiye, even though he has more emotional attachment to Türkiye.

There are also other cases where the statement that one feels like a world citizen means that the person does not identify with or feel belonging to any national collectivity, in a similar way with the previous category that I discussed above. Therefore, identifying as a world citizen becomes a way of non-identification with any national community. These individuals also criticized the restrictions that are imposed by borders and boundaries and emphasized that "they are humans above all".

> In fact, I do not feel belonging to any national society, including Türkiye. I have never felt that kind of belonging. I have always felt like a world citizen. (M11)

> Even when I was in Turkey, I was always feeling like a world citizen. I always found the borders meaningless. I always used to say, why do we need to define ourselves with our nationalities. . . I still feel the same. I feel like a world citizen. (M26)

10. Local and Partial Belongings

In response to the questions about belonging, some of the respondents said that the notion of national belonging does not really make much sense to them. They rather emphasized their sense of belonging to their city, town, or village in Türkiye and/or city, town, or neighborhood in Norway. M13, for instance, mentioned that rather than feeling belonging to Türkiye or Norway, she feels belonging to Izmir where she lived during her childhood. There were also those who talked about their sense of belonging to smaller social groups like their families or groups of friends, rather than feeling national belonging.

> The only feeling of belonging I have to Turkish society is my sense of belonging to my family and friends. During the last four-five years, I have felt disgusted by all the things people who call themselves Turkish have done. So, I am now questioning my Turkish identity and my feelings of belonging. (M68)

As exemplified by some of the quotations in the earlier sections, while answering the questions about belonging, in some cases, the respondents expressed their belonging, especially to Norway, in terms of percentages. This implies that they feel belonging in certain spheres and in terms of some issues, but not in others.

> It is hard to say that I feel 100% belonging. I feel belonging regarding issues like benefiting from its nature, voting in the elections, and paying taxes. But on May 17th, on the national days here. . . I cannot celebrate them with genuine enthusiasm. Or sometimes I feel really sad. I graduated from a teacher training school. When I was at the school, for four years, we sang a teachers' anthem. "My homeland, I swear that I will glorify you." But here, I do not feel like saying "My homeland Norway, I will glorify you." I know that I should also do my best to contribute to the development of children here, the children of Norway. . . I am trying to create new notions and ideas about developing the children of the world, not the children of my country. . . I want to say, "The world, I swear that I will glorify you." But unfortunately, I am not there yet. (M39)

Looking at this example, if one thinks of belonging in terms of formal practices of participation like voting or paying taxes, we can argue that migrants find it easier to belong to a new country/ a national collectivity in this sense. However, when we focus on the emotional components and attachment to symbols, they find it hard to talk about belonging with respect to them. Moreover, it seems to create tensions and internal conflicts for them when they feel pressured to feel belonging to national symbols and celebrations, or to replace their notion of homeland with a new one. Rather than replacing their homeland with a new one, they find it more viable to totally abandon the ideal of working for the improvement of a country/a national collectivity and to replace it with the ideal of working for the entire world/humanity. Nevertheless, as we see in this example, although this ideal looks convincing intellectually, it is quite abstract and hard to embrace at the practical level. Hence, this person replaces the abstract ideal of "working for the children of the world" with a more concrete one: working for migrant children in Norway regardless of their ethnic backgrounds:

> Children of migrants, from Syria, Thailand, Somalia, or Türkiye. . . They have similarities. They are children who are trying to adapt to a new place. Many of them are quite angry with Norwegians. Especially those who are originally from Muslim countries. When I say, "I am also Muslim, but being Muslim does not necessarily mean doing that.", I see that those children soften a little bit. Then maybe I can be a role model in such issues. It is an ideal that I can embrace here. (M39)

11. Their Children's Senses of Belonging

Many of my respondents said that their children were born and raised in Norway, and they mostly feel belonging to Norway and Norwegian society. They explained it with reference to factors like their large networks, active participation in social life, membership in organizations, and fluency in Norwegian. Comparing their sense of belonging with their children's, most of them stated that their children feel belonging to Norway more than they themselves do. Those who have more than one child mentioned differences between their children in terms of their levels of attachment to Türkiye, even though they have grown up in the same family. Therefore, there seem to be individual differences between their children regarding senses of belonging to Türkiye. Nevertheless, many of them also emphasized that for their children, Turkishness and components related to Turkish culture are also part of their identities and they feel belonging to Türkiye, although at a lesser level than their attachment to Norway and the Norwegian society.

> Belonging to Norway, it is 100%... Because she knows a lot of people here. It is not only that she was born here; she is very active in a lot of groups. She is a student representative, for instance. . . I don't know if she thinks about Türkiye in terms of belonging. As she speaks Turkish, she enjoys having conversations in Turkish with the people at the Turkish shop. . . . She has a group of friends here. Last year, the seven of them travelled to Cuba. This year, she is going to take them to Istanbul. But I do not think that she feels 100% belonging to Türkiye. There are many things that she does not understand about Türkiye. . . (M5)

> As my son also has Turkish citizenship, he has this military obligation in Türkiye. Some people suggested that he should give up his Turkish citizenship not to have this obligation. He got really furious about that suggestion. Why would I do that, he said, that is part of my identity. I did not ask him this question (about his identity) but most probably, he thinks of himself as a Norwegian person who has roots in Türkiye. But the Turkish roots are not insignificant. (M15)

> My children are well-integrated into Norwegian society. They have good jobs, good positions. . . But my daughter has a tattoo on her ankle, which says "Made in Türkiye". But that was something that she had in her early youth. I believe my children feel belonging to both countries. But compared to me, their attachment to Norway is more dominant. (M24)

A few of my respondents talked about their children's belonging to Norway as *belonging as a minority*, as a person with a foreign descent. This means that having been born and raised in Norway, they consider Norway as their country. However, they consider themselves different from "Norwegians" and similar to the other people whose families are of foreign descent: "When my son talks to others, he talks about "Norwegians", which means that he does not consider himself as one. I think he feels belonging here, but he belongs as a person of foreign descent." (M33) As discussed in the section on partial belongings, this suggests that belonging to Norway may not necessarily indicate belonging to mainstream society, but may suggest belonging to alternative spheres, in this case to the group of people whose parents are of foreign origin.

Finally, when it comes to their own expectations regarding their children's attachment to their country of origin, most

of them expect or hope that their children will continue having some attachment to Türkiye. Those whose children were born in Norway or came to Norway at an early age generally know and accept that their children mostly identify as Norwegian and have their main attachment to Norway. However, they consider it important that they maintain and transfer their Turkish heritage to the next generation, and they feel proud when they perceive themselves successful in that respect:

> I am happy that they also feel belonging to Türkiye. I would feel really sorry if they did not feel that way. I have done my best to prevent them from getting totally disconnected from Türkiye. During the 1980s, there was simply nothing here. No books, no games. . . I used to bring them cassettes from Türkiye and watch with them. I had a major role in keeping them connected to Türkiye. Not all families are like this. . . (M24)

12. Conclusion

With the civic integration turn in European countries, migrants' sense of belonging is increasingly being questioned and migrants coming from Muslim-majority countries like Türkiye are portrayed as not developing belonging to their new countries in Europe, as well as not willing and able to integrate. This paper has demonstrated the variety in the ways of belonging for Turkish migrants who are currently living in Norway. It has revealed the heterogeneity and complexity of feelings of belonging among the members of an ethnic group that is assumed to feel belonging to their country of origin while they are living in European countries. It has also elaborated on the variety of meanings these migrants attach to the notion of belonging (or not belonging) to territories such as the country of origin or destination country, and collectivities like nations. Belonging to the destination country, Norway, has been tied to a variety of issues such as participating actively in social life, contributing to the society, their perception that they/their children have been well-integrated, the alignment between their personal values and the values that are emphasized in society, and having established routines. On the other side, not belonging to the destination country was explained with reference to not being able to participate actively in social life, not being able to express themselves sufficiently in the language of the country, the distance between their own culture/values and the Norwegian culture/values, migrating at a later age, the temporary nature of their stay, and the perception of being discriminated against. Belonging to the country of origin has been mainly linked to feeling a part of that culture and society because of being born and having early socialization, and having many family members, friends, and relatives there. Not feeling belonging to the country of origin has been associated with not accepting some of the social norms in the country, the perception that the country has changed in negative ways, having lived in Norway for a long time, having lost cultural-linguistic competence, the feeling that they are not accepted as a part of Turkish society any longer, and being a member of a minority group in Türkiye.

The findings of this research show that in addition to those who feel belonging to only their country of origin or only destination country, there are also those who feel belonging to both. What they have experienced and learned in both Türkiye and Norway have become crucial components of their identities and subsequently, they feel belonging to both countries. Having double citizenship was also mentioned as contributing to their sense of belonging to both countries/societies. Additionally, there are also those who feel belonging to neither one of the two countries. Some of them have lost familiarity with the Turkish context while not being able to fully participate in Norwegian society, whereas others question the notion of national belonging and have global, local, or partial belongings. Overall, this paper aims to contribute to the debates on migrants' attachments as a warning against simplifying migrants' realities for nationalist political purposes. It demonstrates that it is mistaken to approach migrants' belongings in the form of "belonging either to here or there", which is a general tendency in the literature on migrant integration.

Belonging is a central concept for reflecting on individuals' connections with the groups around them. It is multidimensional, referring simultaneously to categories like citizenship, nationhood, ethnicity, as well as emotional dimensions. It includes emotional, cultural, and symbolic dimensions while looking at the question of what brings together a collectivity. Hence, it is problematic when such a concept that also includes strong emotional elements becomes the subject of collective and state scrutiny and intervention when migrants are in question. Migrants' right to privacy is violated when their emotional attachments are questioned as a part of political debates. Currently, there is a lot of research on migrant integration which mostly follows an approach that focuses on the challenges migration creates for migrant-receiving societies and looks at migration from a nation-state perspective. This paper has rather followed the approach of the studies on transnationalism which recognize the existence of a social field that transcends national boundaries and follows an actor-centered approach. It has attempted to stay away from methodological nationalism and has not considered the nation state society as the natural social and political form of the modern world. However, as the findings of this research demonstrates, this does not mean that ethnicity and nation states have lost all their importance for questions of belonging. When we talk about membership and identification, nation states and ethnic categories still play important roles.

	Gender	Age	Civil Stat	Arrival Norway	Citizenship	Education	Occupation
M1	M	45	Married	2013	N	2-year college	Technician
M3	F	43	Married	2000	N, T	MS (UiO)	Sales Man.
M4	M	49	Divorced	2000	N	Left secondary	Auto Mech.
M5	M	63	Married	1985	N, T	MS (UiO)	Engineer
M6	F	52	Married	1988	N, T	Vocat. high-school	
M7	M	68	Married	1969	N, T	Vocat. high-school	Entrepreneur
M8	F	39	Married	2014	T (res.perm)	MS (USA)	Legal degree
M9	F	39	Married	2015	T (res.perm)	MS (UiO)	Educ. Consult.
M10	F	46	Divorced	1999	N, T	High school	Sales
M11	F	55	Single	2018	T (res.perm)	MS (USA)	Head of NGO
M12	F	34	Single	2015	T (res.perm)	MS (Turkey)	Comp.engineer
M13	F	51	Married	1990	N	PhD (UiO)	Academic
M14	F	46	Single	2016	T (res.perm)	MS (USA)	Engineer
M15	M	67	Married	1976	N, T	PhD (UiO)	Engineer
M16	F	58	Married	1988	N	MS (Norway)	Economist
M17	F	36	Single	2017	T (res.perm)	PhD (Turkey)	Academic
M18	M	46	Married	1981	N, T	MS (UiO)	Senior engin
M19	F		Married		N, T		Child educ
M20	F	47	Married	2003	T (res.perm)	University (Turkey)	Chemist
M21	F	79	Widow	2002	N,T(blue c)	University+pediat	Doctor
M22	M	44	Partner	1987	N, T	Grunnskole	small enter.
M23	F	44	Married	2016	T (perm.res)	University (Turkey)	Architect
M24	F	56	Married	1985	N, T	University(Turkey)	Teacher
M25	F	25	Married	2018	T, res.perm	Vocat. high-school	Dj,Organizator
M26	F	29	Married	2018	T (res.perm)	University (Turkey)	Merc.allocator
M27	F		Married	2018	T (res.perm)	PhD	Engineer
M28	M	27	Single	2019	T (res.perm)	2-year college (T)	Cook
M29	F	27	Married		N, T	University (N)	Teacher
M30	F	54	Divorced	1991	N, T	University (T&N)	Barne.teach
M31	F	34	Married	2006	N	Highschool(Turkey	Health person.
M32	F	27	Single	2011	T (perm.res)	MS (UiO)	
M33	M	56	Married	1974	N, T	University (UiO)	Degree in soc.
M34	M	50	Married	1976	N, T	MS (Norway)	Engineer
M35	M	32	Single	2020	T, Bulgaria	2-year college (T)	Media tech.
M36	F	50	Married	2004	N, blue card	University (Turkey)	Health person.
M37	F	55	Married	1991	N, T	Univ+pedag in N	Pedagog
M38	M	43	Married	2004	T, perm.res.	Vocat. high-school	Technician
M39	F	28	Married	2016	T, perm.res.	University (Turkey)	Degree in law
M40	M	34	Single	2019	T, res.perm	PhD (Turkey)	Academic
M41	F	49	Married	2011	T, perm.res.	MS (Turkey)	Hum.res.man
M42	F	41	Married	2018	T, res.perm	MS (Turkey)	Consult NGOs
M43	F	40	Single	1983	N,T	MS (Norway)	Teacher
M44	F	19	Single	2020	N,T	high school grad	
M45	F	52	Married	1972	N,T	Vocat. high-school	Insurance
M46	M	28	Married	2018	T, res.perm	University (Turkey)	Engineer
M47	M	47	Married	1999	N,T	Second.school	
M48	M	41	Divorced	1988	N,T	Second.school	
M49	M	29	Single	2018	T, refugee	MS (Turkey)	Academic
M50	F	38	Married	2007	N	MS(Turkey+Nor)	Engineer
M51	F	47	Married	2005	N, blue card	University(Turkey)	Engineer
M52	M	43	Married	2018	T, res.perm	MS	Consultant
M53	F	33	Divorced	2012	T, perm.res.	Univer(Norway)	Accountant
M54	M	46	Divorced	1999	T,N	Highschool(Turkey	at restraurant
M55	F	34	Married	2016	T,N	University(Turkey)	Teacher
M56	F	52	Divorced	1995	T,N	Vocat. high-school	Custom.Rep.
M57	F	50	Married	2017	T, res.perm	MS (US)	Artist
M58	F	52	Married	1974 (when 7)	N, blue card	PhD (Norway)	Academic
M59	F	45	Married	1983 (when 6)	N,T	Second.school (N)	Worked in sales
M60	F	44	Married	2001	N	Vocat. high-school	
M61	F	30	Married	2019	T, res.perm	University(Turkey)	Engineer
M62	M	25	Single	2019	T	University(Turkey)	
M63	F	37	Married	2015	N,T	MS (Turkey)	Degree in psyc
M64	F	43	Divorced	2003	N, blue card	2-year college(T)	Tourism
M65	F	36	Married	2019	T, res.perm	University(Turkey)	Artist
M66	M	62	Divorced	1980	N	High school(T)	Driver
M67	M	41	Married	2016	T, res.perm	High school(T)	Acounting-fin
M68	M	37	Married	2018	T,refugee	University(Turkey)	Police
M69	M	30	Single	2005	N	University(Norway	Degree econ.
M70	F	55	Married	1985	N,T	Highschool(Turkey)	
M71	M	62	Partner	1988	N,T	High school	Writer
M72	M	57	Married	1987	N,T	High school	

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee approval was received for the study from the Norwegian Center for Research Data.

Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all participants for the study.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author have no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

ORCID :

Meltem YILMAZ ŞENER 0000-0003-2333-3396

REFERENCES

Akçapar, Ş. K., & Aksel, D. B. (2017). Public diplomacy through diaspora engagement: The case of Turkey. *Perceptions: Journal of International Affairs, 22*(3), 135–160.

Antonsich, M., 2010. Searching for belonging–an analytical framework. *Geography Compass, 4*(6), 644– 659.

Ataman, A., Sener, T., Noack, P. and Born, M., 2017. Political participation beyond borders: a comparative analysis of Turkish youth living in home country, Germany and Belgium. *Journal of Youth Studies, 20*(5), 565– 582.

Bauböck, R., 2005. Theorizing identity politics, belonging modes, and citizenship. In H.G. Sicakkan & Y.G. Lithman (eds.) *Changing the Basis of Citizenship in the Modern State: Political Theory and Political Diversity* (pp.iii-vii). New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Bhimji, F., 2008. Cosmopolitan belonging and diaspora: second-generation British Muslim women travelling to South Asia. *Citizenship Studies, 12*(4), 413– 427.

Boccagni, P., & Kivisto, P. (2019). Introduction: Ambivalence and the social processes of immigrant inclusion. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 60(1-2), 3–13.

Bochove, M., Rusinovic, K. and Engbersen, G., 2010. The multiplicity of citizenship: transnational and local practices and identifications of middle-class migrants. *Global Networks, 10*(3), 344–364.

Bonjour, S. and Duyvendak, J.W., 2018. The "migrant with poor prospects": Racialized intersections of class and culture in Dutch civic integration debates. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 41*(5), 882– 900.

Breen, L. 2007. The researcher 'in the middle': Negotiating the insider/outsider dichotomy. *The Australian community psychologist, 19*(1), 163–174.

Chavez, C. 2008. Conceptualizing from the inside: Advantages, complications, and demands on insider positionality. *The Qualitative Report, 13*(3), 474– 494.

Dahinden, J., 2012. *Transnational belonging, non-ethnic forms of identification and diverse mobilities: rethinking migrant integration?* Vienna: Spinger.

Duru, D. N., Favell, A., & Varela, A. 2019. Transnational Turkey: The everyday transnationalism and diversity of Turkish populations in Europe. In E. Recchi, A. Favell, F. Apaydin, et al. (eds.) *Europe: Social transnationalism in an unsettled continent* (pp.225– 254). Bristol: Policy Press.

Erdal, M.B., 2013. Migrant transnationalism and multi-layered integration: Norwegian-Pakistani migrants' own reflections. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 39*(6), 983– 999.

Erdal, M. B. 2021. Migrants' multifocal sedentarism: Ambivalent belonging and desired recognition in transnational social fields connecting Pakistan and Norway. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 42*(5), 643– 659.

Fenster, T., 2005. Gender and the city: the different formations of belonging. In L. Nelson & J. Seager (eds.) *A companion to feminist geography* (pp.242–256). Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Greene, M. J. 2014. On the inside looking in: Methodological insights and challenges in conducting qualitative insider research. *The qualitative report, 19*(29), 1–13.

Healy, M., & Perry, C. 2000. Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative market research: An international journal, 3*(3), 118– 126.

Hoffman, M., Makovsky, A., & Werz, M. (2020). The Turkish diaspora in Europe: Integration, migration, and politics. *Center for American Progress, 10*(12).

Kaya, A., 2011. Euro-Turks as a force in EU–Turkey relations. *South European Society and Politics, 16*(3), 499– 512.

Klok, J., van Tilburg, T.G., Suanet, B., Fokkema, T. and Huisman, M., 2017. National and transnational belonging among Turkish and Moroccan older migrants in the Netherlands: Protective against loneliness? *European Journal of Ageing, 14*, 341– 351.

Kolbaşı-Muyan, G. (2023). Türkiye's diaspora engagement policy: Change in perspective since 2010. *Bilig, 105*, 99–128.

Krzyżanowski, M. and Wodak, R., 2008. Multiple identities, migration and belonging: 'Voices of migrants'. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard & R. Iedema (eds.) *Identity trouble: Critical discourse and contested identities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Leary, M. R., & Kelly, K. M. (2009). Belonging motivation. In M.R. Leary & R.H. Hyle (eds.) *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp.400– 409). New York: Guilford Press.

Levitt, P., 2001. Transnational migration: taking stock and future directions. *Global networks, 1*(3), 195– 216.

Lewis, D. 1973. Anthropology and colonialism. *Current Anthropology, 14*(5), 581– 602.

May, V., 2011. Self, belonging and social change. *Sociology, 45*(3), 363– 378.

McCracken, G. 1988. *The long interview*. London: Sage Publications.

Naples, N. A. 2003. *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse analysis, and activist research*. New York: Routledge.

Nititham, D.S., 2016. *Making home in diasporic communities: Transnational belonging amongst Filipina migrants*. London and New York: Routledge.

Noble, H., & Smith, J. 2015. Issues of validity and reliability in qualitative research. *Evidence-based nursing, 18*(2), 34– 35.

Norwegian Ministries. (2022). *Migration and Integration 2020-2021: Report for Norway to the OECD*.

Over, H. 2016. The origins of belonging: Social motivation in infants and young children. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* B: Biological Sciences, 371(1686), 20150072.

Özbilgin, M., & Yıldız, H. (2022). Turkish academic diaspora in Britain: A scoping review. *Migration Letters, 19*(4), 387– 400.

Palmberger, M. (2019). Relational ambivalence: Exploring the social and discursive dimensions of ambivalence—The case of Turkish aging labor migrants. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 60*(1-2), 74– 90.

Piercy, K. W. 2004. *Analysis of semi-structured interview data*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Family, Consumer, & Human Development, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, United-States.

Portes, A., 1997. *Globalization from below: The rise of transnational communities* (Vol. 98). Princeton: Princeton University.

Schellenberg, B., 2013. Developments within the radical right in Germany: Discourses, attitudes and actors. In R. Wodak, M. KhosraviNik & B. Mral (eds.) *Right-Wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourse*, (pp.149–162). London & New York: Bloomsbury.

Schiller, N.G., Basch, L. and Blanc-Szanton, C., 1992. Transnationalism: A new analytic framework for understanding migration. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 645*(1), 1– 24.

Sicakkan, H.G. and Lithman, Y., 2005. Politics of identity, modes of belonging and citizenship: An overview of conceptual and theoretical challenges. In H.G. Sicakkan & Y.G. Lithman (eds.) *Changing the Basis of Citizenship in the Modern State. Political Theory and Political Diversity* (pp.1– 35). New York: Edwin Mellen Press.

Skey, M., 2014. 'How do you think I feel? It's my country': Belonging, entitlement, and the politics of immigration. *The Political Quarterly, 85*(3), 326– 332.

Skey, M., 2013. Why do nations matter? The struggle for belonging and security in an uncertain world. *The British Journal of Sociology, 64*(1), 81– 98.

Skrbiš, Z., 2008. Transnational families: Theorizing migration, emotions and belonging. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 29*(3), 231– 246.

Somerville, K., 2008. Transnational belonging among second generation youth: Identity in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Sciences, 10*(1), 23– 33.

Stenbacka, C. 2001. Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management decision, 39*(7), 551– 556.

Vertovec, S., 2001. Transnationalism and identity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration studies, 27*(4), 573– 582.

Wilkinson, S., & Kitzinger, C. 2013. Representing our own experience: Issues in "insider" research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*(2), 251– 255.

Wimmer, A. and Schiller, N.G., 2002. Methodological nationalism and the study of migration. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie, 43*(2), 217–240.

Wong, L.L., 2008. Transnationalism, active citizenship, and belonging in Canada. *International Journal, 63*(1), 79– 100.

Yabancı, B. (2021). Home state-oriented diaspora organizations and the making of partisan citizens abroad: Motivations, discursive frames, and actions towards co-opting the Turkish diaspora in Europe. *Diaspora*, 21(2), 139– 165.

Yaldız, F. (2019). A Critical Approach to the Term Turkish Diaspora: Is there 'the' Turkish Diaspora?. *Bilig*, (91), 53– 80.

Yuval-Davis, N., 2006. Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of prejudice, 40*(3), 197– 214.

How cite this article

Yilmaz Sener, M. (2023). Varieties of belonging among migrants: Turkish migrants in Norway. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society, 68,* 60-73. https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2023-1266523