

## **The Motives and Problems of Turkish Immigrants in UK**

Serpil AYTAÇ  
saytac@uludag.edu.tr

Veysel BOZKURT  
vbozkurt@istanbul.edu.tr

Kuvvet LORDOĞLU  
klordoglu@gmail.com

### **İngiltere'de Yaşayan Türklerin Sorunları ve Dönüş Eğilimleri**

#### **Abstract**

The paper presents research findings on cause of the return intentions of Turkish residing UK. The aim of this paper to examine the immigrated Turkish origin people's motivation/causes for immigration and the adoption/integration problems, return intentions and their perceptions about UK and Turkey. In this study, we used questionnaire forms with easy sampling method. The survey carried out the Turkish people, who live in UK, by the social network of authors. The study uses a descriptive framework to establish the validity of several proposed models of non-return. Correlation analysis and Logistic regression analysis used to examine the relationship between return intentions and various factors that may affect this intention.

**Key Words** : Immigration, Turkey Migration, Turkish Immigrant in UK, Return Intentions.

**JEL Classification Codes** : F22.

#### **Özet**

Bu çalışma, İngiltere'de ikamet eden Türklerin, ülkelerine geri dönüş niyetlerine ait araştırma bulgularını sunmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngiltere'de yaşayan Türk göçmenlerin yurda dönüş eğilimleri üzerinde etkide bulunan faktörleri ölçmektir. Bu doğrultuda, bu göçmen kesimin İngiltere'de karşılaştıkları sorunların ne olduğu ve yurda dönüş motivasyonları üzerinde ne ölçüde etkide bulunduğu tespit edilmek istenmiştir. Bu çalışmada, yazarların sosyal iletişim yoluyla, Londra'da yaşayan Türk vatandaşlarına basit örnekleme yöntemiyle anket uygulanmıştır. Türk göçmenlerin Geri dönüş niyetleri ve bu niyetlerini etkileyebilecek çeşitli faktörler arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için Korelasyon analizi ve Lojistik regresyon analizi kullanılmıştır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler** : Göç, Türkiye, Göçmen, İngiltere'deki Türk Göçmenler, Geri Dönüş Eğilimi.

### **Acknowledgement**

This study is not published before but it was presented at *IInd International Congress of European Turks “Education and Integration”* (ICET) 14-16 May 2009 - *Elzenveld Cultural Centrum – Antwerp – Belgium*.

### **Beyan**

Bu çalışma daha önce hiçbir yerde basılmamış olup, Belçika'nın Antwerp kentinde 14–16 Mayıs 2009 tarihleri arasında *Elzenveld Kültür Merkezi* tarafından düzenlenen “*Eğitim ve Entegrasyon*” konulu *II. Avrupalı Türkler Kongresinde* sunulan bildiriden derlenmiştir.

## **1. Introduction**

When we examine the various incidences of immigration that took place in the past, we see that it is impossible to collect them under the same category. It is important to note that immigration that appeared especially in 1900s in the form of labor immigration had a different characteristic. The process of immigration in essence is the case of encountering of the two communities and two cultures. The Turkish labor immigration to Europe that commenced in 1950s has been the subject of research in studies in terms of labor and employment. However, it is commonly acknowledged that this case leads to some developments causing a series of problems occurring in the form of encountering of the two cultures.

The wave commencing with the immigration of the first labour force was composed of people who failed to find jobs or were dissatisfied with their jobs in Turkey, of people in the cities who sought better opportunities and life standards and largely of people living in the various rural areas of Anatolia, who had the idea that there were great opportunities. The urban unemployed in the first group or those relatively qualified but in search of a more satisfactory job constitute the small minority among the immigrating communities that have adopted the urban culture as a mass. However, it is clearly seen that throughout the immigration process that lasted for 20 to 25 years, the great majority of the people who immigrated were composed of countryman with either no or very little experience of urban life ( Bilgin,2007).

## **2. Historical Development of Turkish Migration**

The Western Europe of the 1950s is when the pessimism of the Second World War and the atrocities it caused were left behind and a new era of development started. The Western societies after the second part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century began to experience a period, in which they fast became a welfare society, experienced a growing phase again and the economic activities started to gather dynamism. The first problem they encountered at the very beginning was the lack of labor supply to meet the labor demand. On such an occasion, the immigrant workers were regarded as an important source to meet the deficit (Bilgin, 2007). Therefore, we understand that the European countries with Germany leading the way after the Second World War not only had social, economical policies expansions appropriate to welcome the immigrant workers but also possessed a social psychology to assimilate them socially (Taşçı, 2009).

As the immigrant workers, that is, the first groups of foreign worker groups started to feel themselves alone in an environment in which they did not speak the language, did not know the religion and the customs, in short, knew nothing about the

culture, they began to feel the need for new styles of dialogue and relationships of camaraderie and exhibited it in various ways. (Taşcı, 2009)

The immigration of workers to Europe began in 1960, despite the fact that it stopped in 1974 due to an economic crisis, the flow of immigration from Turkey never stopped and the outgoing workers either took their families along with them or got married over there. Immigration in 1980s continued as immigration of families and marriage, and the immigration of asylum as a way of immigration carried thousands of people of Turkish origin to Europe (İçduygu, 2008).

The immigration movement first began in Istanbul. It was observed that the developed regions such as Marmara, Central Anatolia and the North and Western Anatolia were the ones that sent the immigrant workers the most (Mutluer, 2003). On the one hand the fact that the 2.5 million immigrant workers of Turkish origin in Europe have relative in Turkey, the availability of the means of transport made possible through globalization, the Turkish TV channels possible to watch in Europe made it possible for the people in Turkey to establish close bonds with those immigrant workers of Turkish origin in Europe.

Since 1980s, the 80% of immigration from Turkey has been inclined to Europe. It also needs to be noted that mostly university educated people have moved to North America and Canada in the last 10 to 20 years, and the population of about 250 hundred thousand people which is a considerable amount have established a human connection (İçduygu, 2006).

After 1980s, an important part of immigration from Turkey has taken place due to political asylum. It has been noted that about one million people in Turkey, since 1980, have applied for political asylum in Europe. Between 1997 and 2002 although reduced in recent years, 23 389 people applied for asylum seekers to EU member states from Turkey (Cumhuriyet, 2002).

Since Turkey commenced the regime of what we call double citizenship and even multiple citizenships in early 1980s, the Turkish citizens have had the right to have double citizenship in the country where they reside and work, or become the citizen of that country. It is commonly acknowledged that there are about one million immigrants of Turkish origin who are now the citizens of their host countries.

Given the immigration tendencies in the past and the development of the Turkish economy is to be acknowledged to be in the range that is underway today, it is envisaged that from 2004 to 2030, a total of one million Turkish citizens will be moving to Europe (This is an econometric study carried out by Refik Erzan at Bosphorus University, Erzan, 2005, Erzan-Kirisci, 2004, Erzan et al, 2006).

It is now understood that about 100 thousand people in Turkey have immigrated to Europe one way or another, an important part of those have immigrated in an attempt to live there for a while and then come back, and some others for family reunification, marriage and for education.

### **3. The Problems of Migration**

First and foremost, immigration is a social phenomenon. The phenomenon of immigration, beyond the personal or social change of location, obtains this particular characteristic due to the observed reflections of the change of place on the social structure, the reasons that force people to immigrate and the consequences of immigration.

Of the three significant agents in international immigration, the country that lets in the immigration is one, the country whose citizens immigrate is the other and the immigrants themselves are the last agent. It is necessary to consider the reasons and consequences of immigration as a relationship amongst these three agents. Historically, immigration is one of the basic founding phenomena of societies.

Today, from the point of view of individuals, due to such reasons as living abroad, being away from home and the family, homesickness, breaking up of the family, it is possible to talk about the negative aspects of immigration. The image of immigration is theoretically not very positive. It is true for the country whose citizens immigrate that there is a loss of labor force of its citizens. On the other hand, it is also possible to say that the activity of the change of location brings about affluence to individuals and societies.

There are many reasons why people from the Developing Countries immigrate “permanently” to the Developed Countries. The most important reasons are the following:

1. Unemployment, 2. To obtain much better life standard. 3. Pretension. 4. Unable to find an appropriate job in line with one’s education, 5. Non appreciation of the work produced, 6. Bad working conditions. 7. Unable to do research. 8. Political (ethnic isolation, political instability, etc.) 9. Social problems (for instance, blood feud) 10. Corruption- lack of confidence (Erman, 1998; Mutluer, 2003; Kurtuluş, 1999; İBB APK Daire Başkanlığı Araştırma Müdürlüğü, 2004; Sönmezler, Yuruk, Uzunoğlu, 2007).

The first three above are the most important reasons of voluntary immigration. As long as the gap of income and welfare between the Developing and the Developed Countries continue to exist, immigration will also be inevitable.

#### **4. Immigration to England**

Turkish immigration to England first began in 1950s with the immigration of Turkish Cypriots, and after the division of the island into the Greek and Turkish Cypriot parts, which once was an English colony, there was a marked increase in the number of the Turkish and Greek Cypriots to England. In 1960s and during the incidences of 1974, thousands of Greek and Turkish Cypriots went to England (Laçiner, 2001). According to BBC, the second biggest wave of immigration faced by England started after the military coup of September 12<sup>th</sup> 1980 through political immigration to England and other European countries. According to BBC, the immigration which started due to political reasons later changed direction and started to have economic reasons as well. The immigrant who set up their own businesses and thrived in England constituted a driving force for the Turks in Turkey who wished to start a new life.

The fact that the Turkish immigrants were able to be employed first in the sector of textile and then in the sector of food led later to the concentration of the flow of immigration in certain regions. In the article on BBC's website entitled "Turkish London", it is reported that there are more than 200 000 'Turkish speaking' immigrants across Great Britain. It is also reported that the majority of those people are settled in London (Ekingen, 2008).

On the other hand, on the website of the London Consulate General of Turkey, in the section where the piece of information under the title "The Turkish Community in England (or The English Turkish Community)", there is the estimation that there are about 150 thousand Turkish citizens living in England. This figure, however, varies according to various sources. While some sources say the Turkish population is 200 thousand, some other even put the figure to 500 thousand. The Consulate General that stated that immigration to England intensified after 1960s, also reported that while 75% of Turkish citizens settled in London, the rest of them lived in central England in such cities as Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds leading the way and a small part in Scotland and Northern Ireland. According to the statistics of Home Office in England, it is reported that every year approximately 8 thousand Turkish citizens with a student visa, about 1000 citizens with an 'au pair' visa made an entry to England and more or less 50 thousand Turkish citizens earn the right for 'double citizenship'.

#### **5. The Turkish Face of London**

A great majority of the Turks living in England are settled in London. The figures related to the Turks who are mostly in the food sector are also approximate. The number Turks who own about 1000 businesses according to London Development

Agency, is actually more 10 thousand, according to some sourced released by Business Link for London of the English Ministry of Trade and Commerce. There is no clear information about their economical potential; however, the “doner kebab” businesses of the Turks expand to the furthest corners of England. According to the data of the ready-made “doner kebab” factories and the food wholesalers, on the other hand, the number of Turkish businesses in London only is about 2500 ([http://www.ekonomi.co.uk/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=28&Itemid=2](http://www.ekonomi.co.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=28&Itemid=2))

A majority of the Turks living in London concentrate in the particular parts of the city such as Haringey, Edmonton, Hackney and Tottenham. The failure to successfully complete the integration and the language barrier is stated to constitute a problem that prevents the Turkish community in England to integrate first to the English community and then to other communities. The Turkish community that has established its own neighbourhood in their regions of residence exhibits an image of a closed community. In his study titled ‘To live in Turkish in England’, the sociologist Tayfun Atay, who once live in England, made the following remarks after accounting some anecdotes of various human stories in the Turkish neighbourhoods:

‘The chain of anecdotes accounted from Green Lanes can be multiplied easily and smoothly. Similar tales and stories can easily be collected in this neighbourhood as well as from ‘traditional’ coffeehouses located on the Hackney, Dalston, Stoke Newington and Tottenham line, from the rival and even hostile mosques, from the Turkish origin leftwing and rightwing social clubs which are only a few hundred meters away from one another, from the Turkish and Kurdish supermarkets that have recently mushroomed, from the “doner kebab restaurants that have at last got “the kebab culture” adopted by the English people and finally from the recently widespread Turkish bars. All these can be recorded as striking photo frames from the lives of an immigrant minority “with three ethnics” welcoming the millennium “in Turkish” in a cosmopolitan global capital. The Turkish population in London has now reached a considerable level. As a result of this, as the Turks walk around in North London from Green Lanes to Seven Sisters and from Haringey to Dalston, they feel themselves “at home”. In such a case, the social terrain on which people live becomes more “familiar”, and this eventually stimulates movement towards identities in the sub and narrow categories. Therefore, the point of reference as identity moves away from being “Turkey” and becomes, for instance, “Kayseri”, “Kelkit”, “Aksaray”, “Maraş” etc. This phenomenon, despite being annoying on the surface as a tendency of intra community division/disintegration, is indicated as a positive development that, via deeper analysis, that the Turkish immigrants

stop themselves feeling “foreign” to the London (Western) social and cultural environment in which they live and partly arrogate this environment to themselves (Atay, 2008).

Leaving the Turks aside who went to England as investors and for education, it is possible to say that the reason of immigration for most of them is the hard living conditions in Turkey and some other political reasons.

## **6. A Study on the Effects of the Turkish Immigrants’ Problems on Their Inclination to Return Home**

The aim of this study is to measure the factors that affect the inclination of the Turkish immigrants in England to return home. Accordingly, we aimed to determine the problems faced by these immigrants in England and the impact those problems had on their motivation to return home.

The Material and Method: This study was applied to Turkish immigrant citizens living in England, but the Turkish Cypriots were excluded in this study. This is a limitation on this research. The questionnaire form prepared was sent to the individuals and institution we were in communication with in London and were administered to 30 Turkish citizens living and working in London and then were sent back to us via mail. The questions that did not work and were incomprehensible were revised and the necessary corrections were made. In the questionnaire that was composed of the total of 71 questions related to reasons of immigration and the difficulties encountered abroad, the five-point Likert type scale was used which organized by ourselves.. However, in terms of appropriateness to the objectives of this study, in addition to the questions of identity based on the data obtained, only the part of the questionnaire enquiring about the difficulties encountered abroad was analyzed.

Direct help was obtained from a Turkish citizen who had been living and involved in education in London for 7 years and the questionnaire was administered to Turkish citizens determined through random selection living in London and in the neighbouring towns. As a result of the study administered in the January 2009-March 2009 period, 417 valid questionnaire forms were received. The data obtained were analyzed through the SPSS statistical program, the reliability analysis at the beginning, and then descriptive statistics, cross correlations, factor analysis and binary logistic regression analysis were applied.

After the data in the questionnaires forms were entered into the computer and data cleaning process, the Likert type 17 questions geared to determine the difficulties

encountered especially by the individuals in England were subjected to reliability analysis. Since the Cronbach  $\alpha$  value was obtained as 0, 83, it was concluded that the scale was reliable.

## **7. The Hypotheses of The Study**

The following hypotheses have been tested in the study;

H1: There is a correlation between the problems faced by the immigrants in England and their opinions of returning home.

H2: There is a significant correlation between their satisfaction of living in England and their inclination of returning home.

H3: Homesickness enhances their inclination to return home.

H4: As the duration of their stay in England increases, their inclination to return home decreases.

Assumptions: It is assumed that the participants of this study perceived the questions in the questionnaire correctly and answered them truthfully.

Limitations: Since this study aimed to measure the immigrants' inclination to return home, it was only administered to the Turkish citizens who emigrated from Turkey and lived in England and the Turkish Cypriot citizens were excluded from the study.

Population and Samples: The population of the study is constituted by the Turkish citizens who emigrated from Turkey currently living in England. 150 thousand people actually can be included in the population of the study. These data were obtained from the internet site of the London Consulate of Turkey.

While choosing the sample group, a simple random sampling method was used. In order to determine the sample volume, the following values of the table were used.

**Table: 1**  
**The Main Sizes and Determining the Volumes of Samples with Respect to the Level of Reliability**

Main Size	Reliability of the sample size			
	± %1	± %2	± %3	± %5
1.000	*	*	473	244
2.000	*	*	619	278
3.000	*	1.206	690	291
4.000	*	1.341	732	299
5.000	*	1.437	760	303
10.000	4.465	1.678	823	313
20.000	5.749	1.832	858	318
50.000	6.946	1.939	881	321
100.000	7.465	1.977	888	321
500.000	7.939	2.009	895	322

*Note: In cases of \*, it is essential to take more than the 50% of the main aggregate.*

It was determined that for this sample group, the responses of the 417 subjects with a level of 5% significance was sufficient. (Aggregate)

### The Findings

Within the framework of the study, the following descriptive results related to the subjects were obtained. 92% of the subjects were male and 8% were female. While 26% of the female subjects were under the age of 26, 38% were between 26 and 29, 22% between 30 and 33, 14% between 34 and 37 and 20% 38 and above. While the percentage of the married subjects was 60%, the percentage of single ones were 35% and that of the widow and divorced was 5%. While the percentage of those married to Turkish citizens was 90%, the percentage of those married to a foreigner was 8% and that of those with double citizenship was 2%. It turned out that the husbands/wives of the majority of those reported to be married to a foreigner were English. While 6% of the subjects were born abroad, a majority with 27% of the subjects were from the Central Anatolian part of Turkey. 12% of the subjects reported that they lived abroad more than they did at home country. 25%, on the other hand, reported that they lived longest in the Marmara Region of Turkey.

While 5% of the subjects were graduates of technical schools (with two- year education period after high school), 2% were then-still undergraduates, 51% university graduates, 2% then-still M.A. students, 14% M.A graduates, 10% then-still Ph.D. students and 4% Ph.D. graduates. Nonetheless, while 22% of the subjects' fathers had higher education, 15% of the subject had mother who had higher education.

**Table: 2**  
**Findings (N=417)**

	(n)	(%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Woman	31	7.4
Man	386	92.6
<b>Age</b>		
-26	18	4.6
26-29	158	38.6
30-33	90	22.0
34-37	57	13.9
38 +	94	20.9
<b>Marital status</b>		
Single	146	35.0
Married	250	60.0
Widow	21	5.0
<b>Nationality</b>		
Turkish	229	54.9
English	20	4.8
Dual nationality	6	1.4
No responds	162	38.8
<b>Birth Place</b>		
City	200	48.3
Town	82	19.8
Village	132	31.9
<b>Education Level</b>		
High School	82	19.7
University for 4 years	211	50.6
MsC or PhD	124	29.7
<b>Happiness of living to England</b>		
Yes Happy	247	60.4
Be irresolute	139	34.0
No not happy	31	5.6
<b>Thinking of return home to Turkey</b>		
Yes	187	45.2
Be irresolute	94	32.9
No	136	22.0

While 4% of the subject reported that during the period of the education they had received, the income level of their parents was very good, 22% reported, it was good, 48% average, 20% bad and 6% very bad. While the percentage of those who went to high school in Turkey was 72%, 13% went to high school abroad. While the percentage of those who had a degree in Turkey was 58%, 43% had a degree abroad. While the percentage of

those who went to high school whose medium of language was a language other than Turkish was 47%, the percentage of those who had a degree from a university whose medium of language was a language other than Turkish was 70%. While 14% of the subjects reported to have live abroad less than five years, 56% reported that they live abroad for 20 or more years.

On the other hand, 13% of the subjects studied Languages and Literature, 11% Mathematics and Science, 3% Medical Studies, 31% Social Sciences, 37% Technical Studies and the rest of them other fields of study. When their then-current lines of jobs were examined, it turned out that 37% had their own businesses, 37% did jobs that did not require any skills.

60% of the subjects stated that they were happy to be in England, 6% were not happy and 34% were no sure about it. In contrast, while 45% of the subjects thought about going back to Turkey, 33% had no idea of going back and 22% were not sure about it. 38% of the subjects stated that they had plans to return home to Turkey within the following three years.

### **The Problems Faced by the Turkish Immigrant in England and their Inclination to Return Home to Turkey**

The sort of difficulties faced by the Turkish immigrants in England were regarded as cultural differences, the problem of adopting to the Social Environment, the problem of Language, the problem of Religion, Homesickness, Longing for the family and relatives, Financial difficulties, Food habits, Residential problems, Transportation, Habits: General Life Style, whether conditions, being regarded as a second class citizen, problems of social contact (unable to make friends easily) and communication and the feeling of loneliness.

**Tablo: 3**  
**The Problems**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Cultural differences	409	3.13	1.041
The problem of adopting to the Social Environment	407	2.87	1.054
The problem of Language	406	2.74	1.251
The problem of Religion	378	1.99	1.144
Homesickness	401	3.41	1.174
Longing for the family and relatives	398	3.51	1.293
Economics problems	382	2.37	1.156
Food habits	399	2.54	1.241
Accommodation	383	2.08	1.094
Transport	379	1.95	1.087
Customs general	394	2.45	1.145
Life stiles	388	2.45	1.164
Climate problem	383	2.40	1.289
Social discrimination	388	2.02	1.236
Friend and communication problems	396	2.23	1.147
Loneliness	394	2.47	1.284

In order to be able evaluate their inclination to return home to Turkey; the Mann Whitney U test was used.

**Table: 4**  
**The Inclination of the Turkish Immigrants in England to Return Home with Regards to the Problems Encountered**

	<b>Will Return</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean Rank</b>	<b>Sum of Ranks</b>
Cultural differences	No	130	152.32	19801.00
	Yes	186	162.82	30285.00
The problem of adopting to the Social Environment	No	130	156.53	20349.00
	Yes	186	159.88	29737.00
The problem of Language	No	131	155.06	20313.00
	Yes	184	160.09	29457.00
The problem of Religion	No	123	152.19	18719.50
	Yes	171	144.13	24645.50
Homesickness	No	128	143.81	18407.50
	Yes	183	164.53	30108.50
Longing for the family and relatives	No	130	144.24	18751.00
	Yes	178	161.99	28835.00
Economics problems	No	127	169.81	21565.50
	Yes	174	137.27	23885.50
Food habits	No	129	155.92	20113.50
	Yes	180	154.34	27781.50
Accommodation	No	125	161.38	20173.00
	Yes	174	141.82	24677.00
Transport	No	129	155.17	20017.00
	Yes	168	144.26	24236.00
Customs general	No	127	134.85	17126.00
	Yes	179	166.73	29845.00
Life stiles	No	127	137.96	17521.50
	Yes	176	162.13	28534.50
Climate problem	No	126	154.64	19484.50
	Yes	170	143.95	24471.50
Social discrimination	No	127	143.15	18179.50
	Yes	172	155.06	26670.50
Friend and communication problems	No	129	140.65	18143.50
	Yes	177	162.87	28827.50
Loneliness	No	123	136.09	16738.50
	Yes	181	163.65	29621.50

According to the Mann Whitney U test results done for each and every item, those who stated that they felt homesick wished to return home most (Sig. 0.039). Those who reported that they had financial difficulties did not wish to return home (Sig: 0.001). On the contrary, the inclination to return home increased in those who reported to have some problems related to their intrinsic habits and life styles. Similarly, those who

experienced problems of social contact (unable to make friends easily) and communication were also inclined to return home.

**Table: 5**  
**The Inclination of the Turkish Immigrants in England to Return Home**

	<b>Mann-Whitney U</b>	<b>Wilcoxon W</b>	<b>Z</b>	<b>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</b>
Cultural differences	11286.000	19801.000	-1.045	.296
The problem of adopting to the Social Environment	11834.000	20349.000	-.332	.740
The problem of Language	11667.000	20313.000	-.497	.619
The problem of Religion	9939.500	24645.500	-.857	.391
Homesickness	10151.500	18407.500	-2.065	<b>.039</b>
Longing for the family and relatives	10236.000	18751.000	-1.783	.075
Economics problems	8660.500	23885.500	-3.317	<b>.001</b>
Food habits	11491.500	27781.500	-.157	.875
Accommodation	9452.000	.005	-2.029	.042
Transport	10040.000	24236.000	-1.163	.245
Customs general	8998.000	17126.000	-3.215	<b>.001</b>
Life stiles	9393.500	17521.500	-2.442	<b>.015</b>
Climate problem	9936.500	24471.500	-1.094	.274
Social discrimination	10051.500	18179.500	-1.273	.203
Friendship and communication problems	9758.500	18143.500	-2.261	<b>.024</b>
Loneliness	9112.500	16738.500	-2.777	<b>.005</b>

### **Factor Analysis**

The scale aimed to measure the problems. in other words. the difficulties experienced by the Turkish citizens living in England was subjected to factor analysis. Five factors were created from the factor analysis. The item of time difference was removed from the questionnaire. Thus. 16 items were evaluated. These factors respectively are; F1. cultural factors, F2. life style, F3. financial and physical factors, F4. psychological factors and F5. homesickness.

**Table: 6**  
**Reliability of Factors**

<b>Factors</b>	<b>(Cronbach Alpha)</b>
<b>General Reliability</b>	0.83
Factor 1( <b>cultural</b> )	0.76
Factor 2( <b>life style</b> )	0.73
Factor 3 (Economic- <b>physical</b> )	0.67
Factor 4 ( <b>psychological</b> )	0.72
Factor 5( <b>homesickness.</b> )	0.66

As it is clear from the Factor Analysis of the Problems Faced by the Turkish Immigrants Living in England. the results of the reliability analysis of each factor are at an acceptable level.

**Table: 7**  
**Factor Analysis**

	Component				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5
<b>F1. CULTURAL FACTORS.</b>					
The problem of adopting to the Social Environment	.801				
Cultural differences	.793				
The problem of Language	.756				
The problem of Religion	.543				
<b>F2. LIFE STYLE</b>					
Life stiles		.838			
(Customs) general habits		.793			
Climate problems		.619			
Food habits		.485			
<b>F3. FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL FACTORS</b>					
Economic problems			.798		
Accommodation problems			.774		
Transportation problems			.632		
<b>F4. PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS</b>					
Loneliness				.829	
Friendship and communication problems				.820	
Social discrimination				.450	
<b>F5. Homesickness.</b>					
Homesickness.					.824
Longing for the family and relatives					.821

The factors obtained in our study were subjected to Correlation analysis seeking the correlation between the variables.

### **Correlation Analysis**

As is illustrated on the Table 8, there is a positive correlation between the inclination to return home and what's called F2 factor consisting of such elements of life style, habits, climate and gastronomically habits. As the incompatibility in such issue increase, the inclination to return home also increases.

Similarly, there is a positive correlation between F4 factor which is a psychological factor consisted of those who suffered from loneliness, had problems of social contact and communication, and thought of themselves as being regarded as second class citizens and the inclination to return home.

Similarly, those who suffered from longing for the family and homesickness (F5) also had a higher inclination to return home.

In contrast, the F3 factor comprising transport, residence, financial factors is in negative correlation. Basically, it is because they tend to make a comparison between themselves living abroad with their own country (with Turkey), they conclude that they are better off there. In addition, as they do better financially (as there are less financial problems), they are more inclined to return home. It is possible to interpret this particular finding as their wish not to want to return home.

Moreover, as the duration of stay abroad is prolonged, their inclination to return home weakens. In other words, there is a negative correlation between the duration of stay in England and the inclination to return home. However, the strongest correlation is among the level of satisfaction with living in that country. As the level of satisfaction decreases, the inclination to return home increases.

**Table: 8**  
**Correlation Tables**

	Will RETURN	F1 Culture	F2 LIFE	F3 ECO.	F4 PSYCH.	F5 Homesickness	Happiness to live in UK	Age	How many years living in UK
F1Cultur	.022	1							
F2Life	.120 (*)	<b>.404 (**)</b>	1						
F3Ecoi	-.159 (**)	.306 (**)	<b>.450 (**)</b>	1					
F4psycho	.158 (**)	<b>.454 (**)</b>	.366 (**)	.278 (**)	1				
F5Homesicness	.148 (**)	.252 (**)	.312 (**)	.199 (**)	.304 (**)	1			
Happiness	<b>-.421 (**)</b>	-.138 (**)	-.041	.134 (**)	-.216 (**)	-.078	1		
Age	-.105	.220 (**)	-.090	-.116 (*)	.096	-.056	-.194 (**)	1	
Living Year	-.260 (**)	.083	-.225 (**)	-.050	.033	-.117 (*)	.039	<b>.586 (**)</b>	1
Wage	-.099	-.027	-.148 (**)	-.071	.090	.024	.095	.215 (**)	.279 (**)

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

We used to binary logistic regression analysis to find to identify of the factors effect on tendency to return home of Turkish migrants in the UK.

**Table: 9**  
**Logistik Regresyon Model Summary**

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	279.767(a)	.235	.320

a Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

**Hosmer and Lemeshow Test.** Chi-square=6.005. df=8 . Sig. = .647

**Table: 10**  
**Classification Table (a)**

	Observed		Predicted		
			Will return home		Percentage Correct
			No	Yes	No
Step 1	Will Return home	No	58	43	57.4
		Yes	27	135	83.3
Overall Percentage					73.4

*a The cut value is .500*

**Table: 11**  
**Lojistik Regresyon Analysis**

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
F1 Cultur	-.161	.190	.717	1	.397	.851	.587	1.236
F2 Life	.257	.201	1.637	1	.201	1.293	.872	1.916
F3 Eco	-.352	.206	2.912	1	.088	.703	.469	1.054
F4 psycho	.075	.180	.173	1	.677	1.078	.757	1.535
F5 Homesicnes	.314	.154	4.192	1	<b>.041</b>	<b>1.369</b>	1.014	1.850
Age	-.040	.034	1.342	1	.247	.961	.899	1.028
Living Year	-.047	.024	3.947	1	<b>.047</b>	.954	.910	.999
Satisfied (1)	2.100	.381	30.329	1	<b>.000</b>	<b>8.167</b>	3.868	17.244
Wage	.000	.000	.007	1	.933	1.000	1.000	1.000
Constant	.913	1.143	.638	1	.424	2.493		

*a Variable(s) entered on step 1: F1Cultur. F2Life. F3Eco. F4psycho. F5Homesicness. Age. living year. satisfied4. Wage*

In binary logistic regression model was established, the most important indicators on the back home to the trends, the satisfaction level of the country experienced (Sig. 000. ExpB 8.167). Also family and longed-for homeland provide other indicators to return to trend after the most important is experiencing dissatisfaction in the UK. Another determinant indicator is the period of the stay abroad. Back to the tendency trend decreasing to prolonged duration of stay is reduced.

At the end of the survey, all hypotheses of the study was been verified. (H1, H2, H3, H4)

## 8. Discussion

The financial and social opportunities and appeals offered by the developed countries expedite immigration, the opportunities of employment, finance; in short, better living standards in the immigrated country decrease the chances of going back. In summary, the immigration of qualified people can be viewed as a reflection of underdevelopment and the differences in the international distribution of income and wealthy.

There has been a nonstop immigration to England since 1960s. Nowadays it is known that most of the individuals go to the UK with the aim of education, to find job, particularly in order to have MA (Master of Arts), MSc (Master of Science) or PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) degrees at universities or to learn a foreign language. According to a report prepared by The Board of Higher Education, lots of Turkish young people have already been studying in the England. Turkish work power has gradually been increasing in the UK. The recent economic crises in Turkey have negatively affected return intentions. Therefore it is needed to reveal the profiles of these people.

The Turks who immigrated there took together with them their cultures, religions and political views. Within the few decades, the Turks set up their own businesses and had the possession of their own properties. However, they constantly had problems in education, speaking the language of the host country and in issues of cultural and religious differences. Living in another cultural geography led the immigrant Turks to some ephemeral troubles. The Turks, who had their unique way of attitudes, beliefs and sources in terms of maintaining their habits of faith and opinions, probably due to the feeling of loneliness and shelter in a foreign land, felt the need to draw closer to one other in public spaces such as their work places and the traditional coffee houses despite their different views of politics, religion and origins. In this way, the problem of harmony was resolved.

The reasons of going back exhibit a very complicated composition; they may vary with regards to time, the level of social economical development and area of expertise.

According to the results of our study, it appeared that the majority of those who immigrated abroad were well educated; they immigrated abroad for a better life standard; the line of jobs they had were mostly in the food sector (doner kebab restaurants etc.); some of them went to England via the invitation of their relatives living in England or for university, master or language education.

It also turned out that the majority of those who were inclined to return home thought about returning home due to homesickness or longing for the family and relations; they never thought about returning home until they earned financial prosperity; and the longer they lived abroad, the weaker it became for them to return home.

In conclusion, considering the economic factors such as unemployment as one of the biggest reasons of immigration, it is possible to state that the binary composition regarded as developed and underdeveloped between the economies may enhance particularly the immigration in the future. The efforts and performances of the politicians and administrators, in a country in order to encourage people to volunteer to return home, should be in the direction of their improvement and the regional efforts and initiations should be stimulated.

### References

- Atay, Tayfun (2006), *İngiltere de Türkçe Yaşamak*, Dip Not Yayınları, Ankara.
- Bilgin, Vedat (2007), “Göçün Kültürel Sonuçları”,  
<[http://akademik.semazen.net/article\\_detail.php?id=360](http://akademik.semazen.net/article_detail.php?id=360)>, 18.07.2010, ss. 33–40.
- Carrington, William. J. & Enrica Detragiache (1999), “How Extensive is The Brain Drain”, *Finance and Development*, June, Vol: 36, Number 2.
- Çelik-İş (2003), *Beyin Göçü*, Yıl: 3, Sayı: 11, Mart.
- Ekin, Nusret (2001), “İşsizlik Sorununa Yeniden Bakış”, *TÜHİS İş Hukuku ve İktisat Dergisi*, Cilt:16, Kasım 2000-Şubat.
- Ekin, Nusret (2002), “Türkiye’de İşsizlik: Yoksulluğa Dönüşen Yapay İstihdam”, *Endüstri İlişkilerinin Güncel Sorunları Semineri*, 10-13. Mayıs, Ankara.
- Ekingen, Timur (2008), “İngiltere’deki Türkler ya da Londra’daki Türkiye”,  
<<http://genelce.com/ingilteredeki-turkler-yada-londradaki-turkiye-2>>,  
25.05.2010.
- Erman, Tahire (1998), “Göç Olgusunda Kalitatif Yöntem Olarak Etnografik Araştırma: Bir Gecekondu Araştırmasının Düşündürdükleri”, Konferans: *Türkiye’de İçgöç*, 6–8 Haziran 1997, İstanbul. Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, Ocak, ss. 56–66.
- Erzan, Refik & K. Kirisci (2004), “Turkish Immigrants: Their Integration within the EU and Migration to Turkey”, *Turkish Policy Quarterly*, Vol.3. No. 3. pp. 61–68.
- Erzan, Refik & K. Kirisci (2006), “Determinants of Immigration and Integration of Turkish Immigrants in the EU”, *Turkish Studies, special issue. (ed.)*, Vol. 7, No.1 – March.

- Erzan, Refik & U. Kuzubas & N. Yildiz (2006), “Immigration Scenarios: Turkey – EU”, *Turkish Studies, special issue. R. Erzan and K. Kirisci (ed.). Vol. 7. No.1 – March*.
- Erzan, Refik (2005), “Projections on EU Labor Force. Migration Needs and Migration from Turkey”, (*OSIAF*), September.
- Gençler, Ayhan & Aytül Çolak (2002), “Türkiye’den yurtdışına Beyin Göçü: Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etkileri”, <[http://www.google.com/beyin\\_gocu.html](http://www.google.com/beyin_gocu.html)>, 12.05.2007.
- İçduygu, Ahmet & İbrahim Sirkeci (1999), “Cumhuriyet Dönemi Türkiye’inde Göç Hareketleri”, *75. Yılda Köylerden Şehirlere*, Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, İstanbul, ss. 249–267.
- İçduygu, Ahmet (2006), *Türkiye-Avrupa Birliği İlişkileri Bağlamında Uluslararası göç Tartışmaları*, TÜSİAD-T/2006–12/427, İstanbul.
- İçduygu, Ahmet (2008), “Uluslararası Göç Hareketinin Türkiye’ye Etkileri Tartışması”, Koç Üniversitesi, *AB ve Türkiye arasındaki Sivil Toplum Diyaloğu’nun Geliştirilmesi Projesi*, çerçevesinde hazırlanan “Uluslararası Göçün Kentsel Alanlarda Düzenlenmesi: Türkiye-İtalya-İspanya (Managing International Urban Migration: Turkey-Italia-Espania - MIUM-TIE)” başlıklı proje tanıtım toplantısı.
- İstanbul Zeytinburnu Belediyesi (2006), “Türkiye’den Göçler”, IV. Oturum Değerlendirmesi: *Uluslararası Göç Sempozyumu Bildiriler*, 8-11 Aralık 2005, ss. 327–330.
- Kapusuz, Ayşegül, *Taşı Toprağı Altın mı?*, <<http://www.netyorum.com/aysegulk/20011075.htm>>, 05.04.2005.
- Kaya, Muammer (2002), *Beyin Göçü*, <<http://www.ogu-tekamsitemynet.com/yazilar/>>, 07.02.2004.
- Kaya, Muammer (2003), *Beyin Depremi/Erozyonu*, <<http://www.isguc.org/cilt:5.sayı:2>>, 22.03.2005.
- Kurtuluş, Berrak (1999), *Amerika Birleşik Devletleri’ne Türk Beyin Göçü*, Alfa Yayınları. İstanbul.
- Laçiner, Sedat (Der). (2001), *Bir Başka Açıdan İngiltere*, Avrasya-Bir Vakfı, Asam Yayınları: 27, Avrupa Araştırmaları Dizisi: 1.
- Mutluer, Mustafa (2003), *Uluslararası Göçler ve Türkiye*, Çantay Kitabevi, İstanbul.
- Shilshanic (2002), *Study of Concepts and Causes of Brain Drain-Annual Report*, <<http://shilshanic.nic.in/cd50years/z/8T/H3/8>>, 18.07.2005.
- Tansel, Aysıt & Nil Demet Güngör (2003), *Türk Öğrenci Beyin Göçü: Bir Ön Değerlendirme*, <[http://www.google.com/beyin\\_gocu.html](http://www.google.com/beyin_gocu.html)>, 25.09.2005.
- Taşçı, Faruk (2009), “Bir Sosyal Politika Sorunu Olarak Göç”, *Kamu-İs*, C: 10, S: 4/2009.

- Y.Ö.K. (2003), *Yüksek Öğretim Sisteminin Bugünkü Durumu*,  
<[www.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart2003/baslik.pdf](http://www.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/mart2003/baslik.pdf)>, 14.10.2004.
- Yatsko, Pemala (2003), "Brain Drain", *Forbes*,  
<[www.forbes.com/global/2002/0916/058.html](http://www.forbes.com/global/2002/0916/058.html)>, 28.11.2010.

