Journal of Economy Culture and Society

ISSN: 2602-2656 / E-ISSN: 2645-8772

Research Article

Intergenerational Differences in Communication Processes with the Homeland: Turkish Immigrants Living in Australia

Duygu TOSUNAY GENCELLİ[1]

[1]Dr. Anadolu University, Department of Communication Design and Management, Eskişehir, Turkiye

ORCID: D.T.G. 0000-0002-2576-3106

Corresponding author:
Duygu TOSUNAY GENCELLİ,
Anadolu University, Department of Communication Design and Management, Eskişehir, Turkiye
E-mail: dtosunay@anadolu.edu.tr

Submitted: 23.05.2022
Revision Requested: 24.09.2022
Last Revision Received: 15.10.2022
Accepted: 04.11.2022
Published Online: 05.06.2023

Citation: Tosunay Gencelli, D. (2023). Intergenerational differences in communication processes with the homeland: Turkish immigrants living in Australia. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, Advance Online Publcation. https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2021-1120087

ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is the first-generation Turkish immigrants who went to Australia to work after the bilateral agreement signed between Australia and Turkey in 1968 and their second and third generation relatives. The objective is to reveal the communication processes of different generations of Turkish immigrants living in Australia with Turkey in terms of transnationalism. The research was designed as a holistic single case study in accordance with the qualitative method. Accordingly, triangulation was ensured by using data collection tools such as online observation, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. The field research was carried out in Sydney, Australia between September 2018 and January 2019. During the research, semi-structured interviews were held with 30 participants who were reached by snowball sampling. Of the 30 participants, 14 are from the first generation, 13 are from the second generation and 3 are from the third generation. Findings show that the means of communication and engagement with their homeland, which have evolved significantly since the beginning of Turkish immigration to Australia, directly affected the migrants' lives. Additionally, it has been observed that transnational ties are strengthened by the choice of communication tools that provide instant communication. It was also revealed that the developing technology and historical conditions had different effects on different generations of migrants.

Keywords: Intercultural communication, Migration, Transnationalism, Australia, Multiculturalism

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1. Introduction

The establishment of economic, political and socio-cultural ties between the country where immigrants live and their homeland is explained with the concept of transnationalism. It is known that the idea of transnational spaces considers the migratory system as a boundary-breaking process in which usually two or more nation-states are penetrated by and become a part of a singular new social space (Kivisto & Faist, 2009, p. 139). In this context, one of the most important auxiliary factors that enable the establishment of transnational ties or support the formation of transnational social spaces is communication. Identifying how the communication processes of migrants take place and how they change over time also helps to better understand the transnational ties established and the transnational spaces that are formed.

The purpose of this study is to reveal the communication processes of different generations of Turkish immigrants living in Australia with Turkey in terms of transnationalism. The study focuses on the first-generation immigrants who went to Australia to work after the bilateral agreement signed between Australia and Turkey in 1968 and their second and third generation relatives. The fieldwork was conducted in Sydney, Australia as a part of the research for the doctoral thesis called "Communication processes of Turks living in Australia in the context of transnationalism" and it was funded by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) with the scholarship called "2214-A International Research Fellowship Program for PhD Students". The year 2018, when the field study was conducted, was celebrated as the 50th anniversary of the Turkish immigration to Australia. There is no doubt that there are great changes in communication in a migration process that has left behind half a century.

The expatriate psychology of living far away creates the need for immigrants to communicate with their homeland in order to overcome their longing and sense of belonging. In the case of Australia, distance emerges as a factor that complicates this situation. Technological advances gain importance in the daily lives of transnational migrants, especially in places such as Australia where distance can create serious communication problems. In the early years of labor migration to Australia, immigrants often turned to letters to establish interpersonal communication with their loved ones in their homeland. In the following years, even if the means of communication by telephone became easier, it took decades for the use of this type of communication to become economically widespread. When we look at the issue of getting news from the homeland, it is known that audio and video tapes have been the most common communication tools in the hands of immigrants for many years. Unlike in Europe, the distance and the large time difference have prevented tools such as radio and newspapers from being an effective source of information for immigrants in Australia.

Considering the years when television started to become widespread, it was said that "close is far, far is close" (Türkoğlu, 2015, p. 2). However, due to the time difference, the prevalence of satellite subscriptions has never been as much as the demand for videotapes. The whole process described regarding the use of communication tools has undergone a transformation with the widespread use of internet technology. With internet technology, humanity has now had the opportunity to interact one-on-one instead of seeing the distance closely.

With this perception, the question of what kind of identities Turkish immigrants in Australia produce is deeply related to both Turkey's relationship with these immigrants in the transnational area and the ground provided by Australia's multiculturalism policy (Şenay, 2010, p. 284). For this reason, it is necessary to examine the transnational spaces created by these immigrants in terms of social communication. Through this analysis, it can be possible to understand how the commu-

nication of immigrants with the homeland has transformed compared to the past decades and how this transformation has shaped their social identities.

2. Background

Looking at Turkey, we can say that in the rapid urbanization process that followed the international migration movements in the early years of the Turkish Republic, there was an intense rural to urban migration. Then, with the articulation of the urbanization process to the international labor market, an intense labor migration was observed (İçduygu et al., 2014, p. 173). This labor migration from Turkey abroad was primarily directed towards Western Europe, especially Germany. Since the period of this new mass migration movement is also a process in which industrialization accelerates and the effects of globalization are seen, the aforementioned labor migration has different characteristics than the previous ones (Şahin Kütük, 2017, p. 86). The mutual agreement of the states and the fact that the immigrants are mostly workers has affected the structure of this migration wave and the way the countries are affected by this movement.

As Mortan & Sarfati (2014, p. 33) explain, immigration from the Turkish-speaking world to Australia took place in five waves (Table 1).

Table 1. The migration waves from Turkey to Australia

Waves	Years	Explanation
First wave	1945-1974	The migration of the Turkish Cypriots
Second wave	1968-1975	The labor migration due to the bilateral agreement
Third wave	1969-1975	The migration of the Western Thrace Turks
Fourth wave	1980's-today	The brain drain due to developments in Australia's mining industry
Fifth wave	2000's-today	The economic migration by entrepreneurs from Turkey

The first of these started with the Turkish Cypriots in 1945 and continued until the 1974 Cyprus Operation. The second wave covers immigrants from Turkey as a result of the agreement signed between Turkey and Australia in 1968. The migration of the Western Thrace Turks, the third wave, started in 1969 under the *Australia-Greece Human Immigration Agreement*. The fourth wave of immigration is a brain drain due to developments in Australia's mining industry. The increasing importance of Australian coal mines around the world, as well as the intensive extraction of oil, especially oil, led to the need for expert petroleum and mining engineers in the 1980's. The fifth wave, on the other hand, still continues with the businesses and active economic relations established by entrepreneurs from Turkey after 2000. Only one of these five waves occurred under a formal agreement. The negotiations of this agreement began in 1965 and were signed in Canberra on 5 November 1967. After this agreement, there has been an intense demand from candidates who wanted to work in Australia. Upon this intense demand, it was thought that it would be healthier to establish Australia's own consulate in Turkey in order to carry out migration procedures more easily (Inglis, 2011, p. 50). Thus, the Australian Consulate General was opened in Ankara in a short time, and after a heavy workload, the first delegation set out to Australia six months later (Inglis, 2011, p. 55). From 1968 to 1975, a total of 22,558 people from Turkey settled in Australia, 14,192 of whom were within the scope of the special support program (Special Passage Assistance-SPAP) (Mortan & Sarfati, 2014, p. 32).

The fact that Australia paved the way for the spouses and children of people who wanted to immigrate caused married couples to choose Australia instead of Europe (Şenay, 2010, p. 266). It can be said that the most important reason for the preference here is the idea that immigrants

could return to Turkey after working as a family and earning more income. However, some of the immigrant candidates applied to go to Australia due to the difficulty of going to Germany compared to previous years and the very long waiting lists (Şenay, 2013, p. 41). An extremely ironic point to be noted here is that many people who came to Australia from Turkey following the 1967 agreement lacked the knowledge that they were taken to this new country as permanent migrants (Şenay, 2010, p. 266). So much so that, in the agreement signed in 1967, there was not a single article expressing the permanent aspect of the migration in question (İçduygu, 1994, p. 76). From the very beginning, Turkey wanted this to be a temporary migration, objected to the use of expressions such as «immigration» and «settlement» in the title of the agreement during the negotiations, and demanded that the terms «residence» and «employment» be used instead (Şenay, 2010, p. 267). This reluctance can be explained by the main concern in Turkish politics that if people moved to Australia as immigrants, they would not be able to provide foreign currency to Turkey. Those who left expected to return to Turkey as qualified manpower and foreign capital after two years.

Therefore, even when the immigrants completed all their paperwork and set foot in Australia, there had been no indication to let them know that they were actually immigrating permanently. Since the agreement in question imposed a two-year working obligation, the immigrants also thought that they would return after the two-year mandatory serving time (Mortan & Sarfati, 2014, p. 35).

The initial desire of immigrants to be guest workers kept the idea of return in their minds for a long time and, unlike the immigrants in Europe, and the restriction of communication by long distance further strengthened this idea (Mütercimler, 1998, p. 43). According to İçduygu (1994, p. 77), only 18 percent of the Turks who went to Australia between 1968 and 1974 thought to stay in Australia, while by 1987, more than half of them decided to stay. While there were reasons, such as owning real estate and adapting their children to Australia, the benefits of the Australian government in terms of social rights were also important in the increase of the number of people who had considered staying in Australia. As an indicator of immigration policies that support persistence, the Australian government offered citizenship to all children of immigrants, not just those born in Australia (Inglis, 2015, p. 53). The recognition of dual citizenship by both Australia and Turkey has enabled immigrants to become Australian citizens without endangering their Turkish citizenship. Seeing that they were staying permanently, Turks started to take root by investing in real estate and encouraging their children to have a better education instead of putting them into business life as soon as possible, and they have also accepted to acquire Australian citizenship (Inglis et al., 2009, p. 110).

The biggest commonality between Turkish migration to Australia and Germany is that migration movements to both countries started through bilateral agreements. The main difference, as mentioned before, is that most countries in Western Europe, especially Germany, consider immigrants from Turkey as temporary immigrants, whereas Australia was in search of permanent immigrants from the very beginning of the process. This situation has brought about differences in many aspects in the practices towards immigrants.

The most important difference of the Turks who migrated to Australia from those who migrated to Europe is that they benefited from rights such as citizenship and voting after the legal period, since they were accepted as immigrants, and many legal and social problems were solved more easily (Mütercimler, 1998, p. p. 28). In Germany, a special legal status was introduced against foreign workers, which restricts family reunification, limits the labor market and social righ-

ts (Castles and Miller, 2008, p. 291). For this reason, while Germany continued to insist on citizenship based on blood ties and refused to recognize dual citizenship status, Australia gave the right to dual citizenship to those who came from the first immigrant convoy that set foot in Sydney in 1968 (Mortan and Sarfati, 2014, p. 37). At this point, it is seen that the policies of the two countries are quite different from each other.

3. Methodology

This research is designed as a holistic single case study due to its nature. Therefore, it is suitable for a qualitative paradigm. In these kinds of studies, cases are more or less already "out there" and discoverable; as theoretical constructs, cases serve the research interests of the investigator (Schwandt & Gates, 2014, p. 601).

The research in Australia took place from 17 September 2018 to 11 January 2019. With the help of institutions such as Turkish associations and consulates, documents were scanned, observations and semi-structured interviews were made by visiting the areas where Turks live. The data collected at all stages in the research data collection process were tried to be consistent with each other in terms of providing triangulation. Observations, interviews, researcher diaries and observation reports were created and recorded. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 30 people within the scope of the research (Table 2.). The participants consist of the first-generation immigrants, their children and grandchildren who migrated to Australia between 1968 and 1975 through the previously mentioned special support program (SPAP) and continue to live in Australia today. Accordingly, 14 of the participants are from the first generation, 13 from the second generation and 3 from the third generation. Two of the first generation participants are accepted as a 1,5 generation since they migrated with their family in their adolescent years. Of the 30 people interviewed, 19 were women and 11 were men. During the interviews, 25 participants preferred to speak in Turkish and 5 participants in English.

Table 2. Participants

#	Name	Generation	Age	Occupation	Education Level	Preferred Language
1	Kâmil	1	78	Retired	Primary school	Turkish
2	Kadriye	1	65	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
3	Şevvâl	1,5	62	Housewife	Middle school	Turkish
4	Besim	1	72	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
5	Semra	1	65	Retired	High school	Turkish
6	Adalet	1,5	65	Retired	University	Turkish
7	Ercüment	1	55	Job hunting	University	Turkish
8	Fikret	1	64	Shop owner	High school	Turkish
9	Gülnaz	1	66	Retired	High school	Turkish
10	Feriha	2	58	Housewife	High school	Turkish
11	Saliha	1	62	Retired	High school	Turkish
12	Yeliz	2	34	Job hunting	University	Turkish
13	Şenol	2	48	Café owner	University	Turkish
14	Hayrullah	1	67	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
15	Raziye	1	66	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
16	Kemal	1,5	52	Private sector employee	High school	Turkish
17	Alpay	3	23	Private sector employee	University	English
18	Özge	2	40	Private sector employee	University	English
19	Didem	2	50	Private sector employee	High school	Turkish
20	Gülbin	2	48	Housewife	High school	Turkish

21	Sinem	3	25	Private sector employee	University	English
22	Gül	2	44	Private sector employee	High school	Turkish
23	Meltem	2	40	Civil servant	University	English
24	Gülten	1	70	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
25	Berrin	1	69	Retired	High school	Turkish
26	Emir	3	23	Student	University	English
27	Cevdet	1	75	Retired	Middle school	Turkish
28	Fatma	2	49	Private sector employee	High school	Turkish
29	Kadir	1	50	Private sector employee	University	Turkish
30	Melek	2	51	Civil servant	High school	Turkish

The collected data were analyzed with a narrative analysis approach. In this type of analysis, the research product is a story—a case, a biography, a life history, an autobiography, an autoethnography—that is composed by the researcher to represent the events, characters, and issues (Bochner & Riggs, 2014, p. 204). During the analysis process, the opinions of more than one field expert were obtained and triangulation was provided, as stated before. Written transcripts of the interviews were analyzed using NVivo 12. The method suggested by Bryman (2012, p. 597) was followed in the coding stage of the data. Accordingly, the transcripts of the interviews were read through, the codes that could be relevant were planned, and finally, by going back to the interview transcripts, each interview was coded on NVivo.

As a result of the analysis of the interviews, 27 codes emerged under five main themes (Table 3).

Table 3. Distribution of the codes

Migrating to Australia	Life in Australia	Means of Communication	Socio-cultural dimensions	Political dimensions
Adaptation period	Perception of migration	TV	Masculinity	Political view
	Living conditions	Newspaper	Family	Legal rights
	Discrimination	Radio	Belonging	National values
	Distance problem	Internet	Language	Voting
	Returning to Turkey permanently	Cinema	Interacting with other Turks	Australia's current state
	Australia-Turkey comparison	Book		Turkey's current state
	Longing for Turkey	Telephone		
	Traveling to Turkey			

These themes are: migrating to Australia, life in Australia, means of communication, socio-cultural dimensions and political dimensions.

4. Findings

4.1. Migrating to Australia

The aspects in which Australia differs from other European countries in terms of immigrants have been mentioned before. In order to better understand how conscious immigrants are of these differences and the reasons for choosing Australia for their decision to migrate, it was necessary to learn about their migration stories before talking about their life in Australia.

One of the most striking points about the arrival stories of the participants, who are especially first-generation immigrants, is that they did not think about Australia in detail while making the decision to migrate. In applications made with the idea of going abroad, it is seen that Australia was recommended to the participants by public employees or by their relatives who had gone to Australia before. In fact, most of the first-generation participants stated that they actually made

applications to go to Germany at first. However, as mentioned previously, the fact that Australia accepts immigrants as a family stands out in terms of being preferred. Feriha, one of the first generation participants, touched upon this situation while talking about the departure process of her family: "*My father applied to the employment agency to go to Germany. The officer there said, 'If you are married and have children, I will send you to Australia.' I guess it was our fortune to come here.*" Some expressed their uneasiness about distance and going to a country they have never known. However, they mostly emphasized that migration was inevitable due to their conditions of living. After all, it is a common belief that the intention of a person who leaves their home to work is not to embark on an unknown adventure, and that they make such a choice in order to leave their struggle behind. Therefore, the decision to migrate can be a step taken with hope for a better future, or it can be seen as a reluctant separation. Raziye (1,5 generation) talked about her hopes of starting a new life for the future of her children and said, "*I did not come here willingly. Because it is a country that is far away and we did not know anything about. We thought about it a lot, but we were enthusiastic in the end. Because the conditions in Turkey were not good. We came here for a better future.*" Also, Adalet's (1,5 generation) accounts show the reflections of the two-year rule of not returning to Turkey: "*We had such a different life there (Turkey)... I'm talking about 45-46 years ago from now. I didn't put my hand in cold water from hot water there, I was a student. We had come here for two years. With the plan of working hard and going back...*"

As it is understood from the stories, Turks who could not go to Germany or another European country as workers saw Australia as an alternative to those countries. It has been understood that most of them had in mind to return after two years of working and improving their economic conditions. None of the participants stated that they had researched Australia and consciously wanted to live there for the rest of their lives. This situation confirms the difference in attitude between the two countries in the bilateral agreement.

4.2. Life in Australia

For those who want to go abroad as a worker and return after a while, saving as much money as possible in a short time is the first priority. This is also observed in the participants who went to Australia. Raziye, one of the first generation participants, said, "*My husband worked at night and I worked during the day. We saved money for a car and house. We felt a longing for our homeland and family for 6-7 years. Now I won't leave, even if they shoo me away. It's been nearly fifty years.*" Another first generation participant, Hayrullah, talked about the opportunities offered by the state while evaluating the living conditions he is in today: "*In Turkey, when you work hard all your life, the pension you receive will barely make a living. Now, even if you retire here, they don't let you struggle. You're not desperate for anything. For example, you go to the doctor, you do not pay.*" It was also seen from the researcher's point of view that what Hayrullah said was compatible with his lifestyle. In the researcher's diary, the entry on the visit to the Hayrullah's house dated October 8, 2018, said, "*Their living conditions are very good. They live in an Australian style house with a garden which they bought 35 years ago. The house is decorated in Turkish style with the TV in the main corner. Photographs of children are lined up.*"

Since the primary purpose of the first-generation immigrants coming to Australia is to work, it is not hard to predict that they come by accepting their immigration status in some way. However, for the second generation, even the third-generation, who went to Australia at a young age or was born there, it seems that there may be a more mixed perception of immigration than the first

generation. Therefore, second and third generation participants were asked about their first memories of immigration were rather than the immigration story. Accordingly, most of the participants stated that the perception of immigration is formed in the primary school age. Özge, (second generation) established a connection between the perception of migration and the spoken language: "*Since my parents always spoke Turkish to me, there was never a question for me whether you were Turkish or Australian. I guess I was not aware of the nationality distinction until I was 8-9 years old*." Didem, one of the second generation participants, said, "*In school, for example, they can tell when your name is foreign. They used to say 'You're a wog' and used to make fun of my name, but such things did not upset me much*." According to these statements, both the feeling of not belonging to society and the feeling of being excluded as a stranger first occur in the school environment. In this context, if the school environment provides a cultural environment close to home, it can be said that the difficulties in adaptation decrease much more quickly. Looking at the third generation in addition to the second-generation examples above, it is seen that upbringing causes a difference between generations. Alpay (third generation) clearly explained the situation of not feeling like an immigrant:

> *Honestly, I've never had an adjustment problem because I was born here. I was good at school; my English was good. My mother put a lot of effort into this. Actually, I didn't feel very Turkish until I was 6-7 years old. I was going to a regular public school. One day we were told that there would be a class about religion. I didn't even know there were separate religions. Since most of my friends were Croatian or Bosnian, I went to the Catholic class with them.*

From what Alpay tells, it is seen that cultural conflicts can be postponed when there are no language and communication problems.

One of the most important problems faced by immigrants is discrimination. Feriha, one of the first generation participants, said, "*It may seem like there is a boring life in Australia, but we are living peacefully. Nobody interferes with your race or religion*." She clearly expressed her views about not witnessing discrimination, especially in Sydney. Meltem, a second generation participant, confirms the statements above: "*When we first came, no one with different ethnic origins lived on our street other than us. Sometimes we would hear things like, 'Go back to your country.' Over time, Macedonian, Yugoslavian and even Asian families began to move in. As the cultural diversity increased, we became much more comfortable*." Here, it is seen that the multicultural structure of Australia is also given importance by the immigrants. Although it is possible to say that people's peace of mind increases as cultural diversity increases, this situation does not provide data that can claim that there is no discrimination.

The most important difference of Australia from the other country that hosts labor migration is its distance from Turkey. This problem has caused many negativities in transportation, communication and economic issues since the beginning of migration. In addition to these, one of the most important negativities is the psychological effects caused by being far. While the participants were talking about many different topics the distance problem always came up when they were sharing their feelings. One of the most expressed things about the distance problem is being away from family. Kadriye (first generation), shared the pain of her experience by crying saying, "*When I heard that my mother had cancer, I thought that I wouldn't be able to make it in time. They would have buried her until I spend so much money on tickets and go all that way so I didn't go*." Berrin (first generation) also experienced a very similar situation. She said, "*When my father passed away, I couldn't attend his funeral. When my mother died, this time I didn't go because I realized that I wouldn't be able to attend anyway. I thought that would upset me even more*."

Regarding longing for one's homeland, the entry in the researcher's diary dated October 26, 2018, states, "*There is a such thing called 'bringing Turkish air'. I experience this a lot. People tend to get very happy when I tell them that I came from Turkey recently.*"

4.3. Means of communication

After the bilateral agreement, 53 years have passed since the first immigration to Australia. In these 53 years, there have been rapid developments in communication technologies and these developments have directly affected people's lifestyles. Especially for those living in a country like Australia, which is at the other end of the world compared to Turkey, it can be thought that every development has the potential to bring them closer to their country.

The interviewed participants also stated that the developing technology helps them to keep up with life in Turkey better than before. Regarding this topic, Adalet (first generation) established a direct link between developing technologies and longing for homeland by saying, "*We have the chance to follow the news every day... We didn't have such a chance in the past. The advancement of technology has been very good in this respect. Maybe that's why we don't miss Turkey as much*." Kemal (1,5 generation), on the other hand, summarized the impact of developing technology on their lives: "*Our Turkish television is always connected. Turkish TV did not exist here before. When we first came here, there were videotapes. At that time, for example, you would go to a Turkish grocery store and they had Turkish movies to rent. Everyone used to gather in somebody's house to watch old Turkish movies*."

Due to the fact that Australia is seven hours ahead of Turkey, participants with broadcast subscriptions are forced to watch only daytime television. On the other hand, people who do not experience problems such as time differences or subscription fees seem to watch Turkish television over the internet.

Şevval (1,5 generation) said, "*I don't watch TV much. It's mostly from the internet. I turn on the computer in my room and stretch my legs*." Melek, also a second-generation participant, contributed to this view by saying, "*I watch TV series and other programs that I am interested in whenever I want. The internet is enough for me*." Thus, it is possible to say that the problem of accessing television has disappeared with the development of technology. It has been observed that the younger second generation and third generation participants are more distant to Turkish television. Özge (second generation) explains:

> *I don't like watching Turkish television. I find it very simple. We have live broadcast at home. Whenever I am at home, there are programs for housewives because of the time difference. Gossip programs or programs to find missing people... I don't care about them because I don't understand the culture. What interests me are the travel channels, programs showing different parts of Turkey. I can't say that I follow the news in Turkey either because I don't know how accurate the news is. The (Turkish) media is mostly right slanted. I don't think there is a balance. I also get lost in the details on the ones that slope to the left.*

From this explanation, it can be understood that she has a conscious choice of keeping a distance from Turkish media.

From the first years when Turks went to Australia, the newspaper has been one of the communication tools that have transformed with the developing technology. It is known that it was difficult for newspapers to go to Australia in the years when the internet was not yet widespread. Over the years, it has been seen that Turks started to print their own newspapers. It can be said that local Turkish newspapers, which are usually published weekly, and national newspapers from

Turkey have lost their popularity with the spread of the internet. It has been observed that there are more participants who no longer find it logical to follow the weekly newspapers.

When asked about newspapers, most of the respondents mentioned the internet. However, just like television, it was observed that Turkish newspapers were not preferred among young second-generation and third-generation participants. Özge (second generation) said, "*It is very difficult for me to read Turkish. I can understand Turkish very well, but I cannot speak it like them. That's why I prefer to read the Guardian rather than something like Hürriyet. Also, I am more interested in what is going on in America or Europe than in Turkey.*"

It would not be wrong to say that in the pre-internet era, the radio was a means of communication through which Turks living in Australia could receive the most up-to-date news from their homeland. All of the interviewees who commented on the radio are first-generation participants. Feyyaz (first generation), on the other hand, expressed his reaction to the fact that Turkish radio is not preferred by Turks living in Australia. "*Look, our radio has been reduced from seven days to four days. In the future, maybe it's going to decrease to three or even two!*"

Undoubtedly, the wide use of the Internet for people living away from their own countries has led to changes in many issues. It has been seen that the internet has come to the fore in various issues mentioned so far. Among the interviewees, all but one of the first-generation participants stated that they use the internet. When the topic of the Internet was brought up, most of the participants talked about how much it made their lives easier. Adalet (1,5 generation) stated that she communicates with Turkey much easier than before by explaining, "*We used to try to talk on the phone and it was very difficult. Now, my internet gives me the chance to talk on a regular phone for 250 minutes a month. Besides that, I have WhatsApp. It's very comfortable*."

Participants especially emphasized the importance of social media to them. When talking about social media, Feriha (second generation) said the following: "*In the past, when we went to Turkey, we used to see the people had changed. Now, at least we can see photos from time to time. I remember in the past, we used to pay 20-30 dollars to talk for five minutes. It's not like that anymore. We have all kinds of communication like WhatsApp and (Facebook) Messenger*."

Some of the participants emphasized that the internet not only facilitates communication with their relatives, but also makes them feel closer to their country. While Saliha (first generation) describes this situation, she said, "*After the video chat, you feel like you went there*." Fatma (second generation), on the other hand, said, "*You don't feel distant when you know what's happening*."

4.4. Socio-cultural dimensions

When talking about social life, one of the most recurring statements of the interviewees was about families. A family is a group of people closest to a person. Family ties can have effects that can determine or restrain the goals in people's lives. In this research, while the participants talked about their life in Australia, their future plans or what they could not achieve, the idea was always shaped around the family. Therefore, it would not be wrong to say that one of the most important factors triggering the immigration status of immigrants or the feeling of being abroad is family ties.

While discussing the participants' arrival to Australia, it was noticed that women had almost no say in the decision to migrate. This is a situation that manifests itself in the stories of both female and male participants. This situation coincides with the views of Castles and Miller (2008, p. 38) that women are expected to obey men in making immigration decisions. In the findings

obtained in this study, it was understood that men make important decisions about their families by themselves and women only implement the decisions taken.

Another prominent matter is belonging. It is known that belonging is one of the important concepts in the subject of transnationality. In this study, it was observed that the majority of the participants felt that they belonged to Australia. However, in this sense of belonging, the number of those who emphasize being caught between two cultures is significantly high. Explaining the in-betweenness as a second-generation participant, Didem (second generation) said, "*Everything is difficult for the second-generations like us because we are stuck in the middle. I don't feel like an Australian here at all. I am Turkish, but when it comes to where I want to live, this is my home. But I can't give up my Turkishness*." We see that the situation described as "being stuck in-between" mentioned here is generally the common discourse of the older second-generation participants. It can be said that this is due to the fact that they do not see themselves as fully Australian and on the other hand, they cannot connect with Turkey as well as their parents. Regarding this, Kaya (2007, p. 494) suggests defining this situation as hybrid cultures, rather than as «being stuck in between». It was seen that the in-betweenness of the younger second-generation and the third-generation is slightly different. For this, it would not be wrong to define being stuck as being a little more Australian.

The biggest obstacle to be overcome in order not to experience communication problems in the lives of immigrants is undoubtedly language skills. It was seen that most of the first-generation participants were sensitive to their children and grandchildren about speaking Turkish, but they are not happy with the results. Second-generation participants are more understanding and flexible about language than first-generation participants. This can be explained by the fact that they speak less Turkish than the first-generation. It is also clear that language skills create a generation gap between the first and third generations. The fact that many first-generation participants have similar complaints supports this situation. Didem (second generation) accepted the language problem between generations and said, "*I think they will lose their Turkishness a little in each generation. We speak English most of the time with my husband so the children don't get to learn Turkish either. But it wasn't like that in our time. Our mothers always spoke Turkish, we had no other choice*."

4.5. Political dimensions

During the interviews, it was observed that the participants often needed to express their thoughts about Turkey. Although these thoughts generally manifest themselves in the form of homesickness, they also include the participants' thoughts on Turkey's agenda. Similarly, participants' views on Australia were also included. From what has been mentioned so far, it can be said that the participants are integrated into living in Australia, do not experience discrimination and have a generally positive view of their life in Australia. To clarify this situation, interviewees were asked what they thought about the current situation in Australia. Melek (second generation) said, "*I am at peace here. There is no favoring here, you manage things with your own effort. You lead a quality life as a human being. You can trust that the state and you are not afraid of being unemployed,*" underlining her reasons for being peaceful in Australia.

The opinions of the participants about Turkey, who live in a geography far from Turkey, are important in terms of understanding how they perceive their homeland and whether their thoughts are affected by the forms of communication they establish. Contrary to the mostly positive opinions about Australia, it was noteworthy that the participants' opinions about Turkey's current

situation were extremely negative. The economic situation of Turkey is one of the main issues addressed by the participants who have negative thoughts about the situation in Turkey.

It is seen that the third-generation participants evaluate Turkey as foreigners and with a much more objective view. Alpay (third generation) explains how he sees Turkey from an outside perspective by saying, «*I am a third-party observer. I see and read from an impartial point of view, but what I understand here is very sad. I am proud to be Turkish, but Turkey›s current situation embarrasses me.*" We can see that third-generation participants also have a negative point of view.

During the interviews, it was observed that the participants made comments on national values while talking about many subjects. It is noteworthy that the expressions of "being Turkish" and "protecting Turkishness" are frequently included in the discourses of the participants. Although they do not explain what these expressions mean in more detail, it is possible to deduce from the observations that these expressions mean to keep the Turkish culture alive in Australia and to live as Turkish as possible. As an example of the aforementioned statements, Feriha (second generation) said, "*My husband is from Turkey. I didn't bring him, but he had come just before we got married. We have two sons, they were born and raised here. My eldest son is very Turkish, he is a Kemalist. He always has the flag in his hand. The little one doesn't care much but he also preserves his Turkishness*." It is worth pointing out that Turkishness was used here as something measurable.

It is known that the political views of the Turks living in Australia differ from the Turks living in other countries, and they even show a polarization much more similar to that in Turkey. Depending on the course of the interviews, the participants were also asked for their political views if they talked about political issues. Talking about this issue was continued only with those who wanted to respond. When the answers given by the participants are compared with the results of the 24 June 2018 Presidential and 27th Term Parliamentary Elections, it is seen that they are compatible with the results of the polls in Sydney, where the research was conducted. In addition, Şenay's (2013, p. 57) study confirms that the Turks living in Sydney are polarized within themselves politically. Most of the participants especially first and older second-generations defined themselves as Kemalists who follow Ataturk›s ideas. Some of the participants had reservations about pronouncing a party›s name, even though they were not asked.

Among the participants, there are also those who support the AKP. Gülbin (second generation) talked about her voting habits instead of her political views: "*Actually, Turkey is similar to most countries like Russia, China, even America. There are countries that are in a worse situation than us and I think Turkey is doing very well. I vote for Tayyip Erdogan. Erdogan is a very successful man. For example, his attitude towards Russia... I also like his morals.*

It would not be wrong to associate the aforementioned polarization with the participants' media consumption habits. During the interviews, it was observed that each participant's interpretation of their political view was coherent with the political tendency of the media organs they declared they followed. In the entry dated September 28, 2018 in the researcher's diary exemplifies the atmosphere of polarization: "*The gentleman who runs the Turkish market tried to understand my political view through the Turkish newspapers I was holding. He pulled back a little when I commented neutrally. I realized that he felt more and more comfortable as we spoke*." It would not be wrong to state that the prominence of the political polarization affected the relations that were tried to be established with immigrants during the research.

5. Conclusion

In the fifty-year period of immigration to Australia, there have been two major turning points in the communication processes of immigrants with the homeland. The first of these is the possibility of accessing current news and simultaneous television broadcasts that come with internet and satellite technology. It would not be wrong to say that this coincided with the beginning of the 2000s. Since the 2000s, immigrants living in Australia have had easier access to television broadcasts, and their dependence on video tapes has begun to decline. The second turning point was the spread of social networks. With social networks, immigrants have turned into participants instead of being remote viewers. With this process, the obligation to follow the news and developments in their homeland or their relatives from afar disappeared. In other words, it is now possible to bring what is far closer. It is seen that social networks are widely used not only for younger generations but also for first generation participants. A remarkable detail here is that the most preferred communication tools are social networking tools that allow instant communication. This shows that immigrants give importance not only to easy communication but also to be able to communicate with their homeland whenever they want. Thanks to the means of communication, a resemblance of the homeland can be created symbolically, even if it is far away, but this is not considered a real reflection (Şanlıer Yüksel, 2008, p. 206). Satellite television subscriptions and reading local Turkish newspapers and the periodic screening of films made in Turkey also support this symbolic creation. The fact that this creation is not a real reflection is due to the fact that no alternative can overtake instant communication tools.

An important point that the participants emphasize is that they see themselves as more distant than other immigrants. It can be said that the phrase “bringing Turkish air” is related to this. For them, reaching their homeland “at the other end of the world” is seen as a major obstacle to be overcome in itself. For this reason, someone who has just come from Turkey gives them happiness. In this respect, it is possible to say that developing technology creates a similar happiness for them. Being able to reduce distances also means establishing stronger transnational ties. The easier they communicate, the more engaged they get about their homeland. This engagement thereby determines their voting decisions in Turkey, financial investments about Turkey and frequency of visits to Turkey. This situation also explains the fact that immigrants are in a race for gaining information about Turkey. Having information about the current affairs literally represents the level of Turkishness in their minds. This shows us the connection of communication processes with identity formation.

Another important distinction of the generations is second and third generation being less engaged with the Turkish media. It is clearly seen that the first generation participants see themselves as torn off or exiled from their homeland and always experience a longing for Turkey, while second and third generation participants are clearly integrated to their life in Australia and returning to Turkey is not a possibility on their agenda.

When we look at how immigrants define their own identities, it is seen that the belonging they feel towards Australia does not affect their commitment to their own culture. Participants show a similar approach to definitions such as “being Turkish” and “Turkishness”. On the other hand, it is said that transnational media dulls the feelings of nostalgia for transnational immigrants’ countries. Karanfil (2009, p. 898) argues that this situation also brings alternative approaches to the idea of being Turkish. Because, according to them, being Turkish is a more appropriate definition for their real daily life in Australia, but it does not overlap with being Turkish within the borders of Turkey. Therefore, communication processes lead to a new definition of identity.

In today's Australia, taking on a singular, monolithic cultural identity, called "Turkish" or "Australian" or even "Turkish-Australian" are not in question (Hopkins, 2009, p. 244). Furthermore, it can be said that Turks living in Australia do not need religious references when defining their own identity. Although the existence of a patriarchal structure has been observed, it is not possible to say a similar situation for the younger generation, especially in terms of this study. However, factors such as the design of the immigration scheme in Australia as being permanent, the effects of geographical distance, and the multicultural structure may explain the differences in the findings from the examples in Europe.

Perhaps, the words of Özge, one of the second generation participants, express this situation perfectly: "*If they asked me, 'Who is an Australian?' I'd probably say, 'Someone like me.' Like, a second generation, someone whose parents weren't born here*." A comment very similar to the one here was made by a Lebanese participant in Koleth's (2015) research: "*I was born here, but I obviously don't look like I was born here. And it's really stupid, because how many years does Australia have to have had a multicultural community for them to stop asking that question 'Where are you from?' . . .? We need to accept that we're Australian and move on*." (Koleth, 2015, p. 250)

This can also be seen as a result of Australia's multicultural policies. The terms "multicultural Australia" or "Australian multiculturalism" have long been the focus of debate (Jakubowicz, 2015, p. 222). Despite this, it is known that Australians have an embracing attitude towards multiculturalism. So much so that instead of seeing multiculturalism as the unity of groups, they see it as a mixture of different individuals and accept this as the identity of the country (Modood, 2013, p. 162). The attitudes of the participants in this study also support this idea.

It was observed that the communication processes of the participants with their homeland also reinforced their political views. It is known from previous studies (Şenay, 2013) and election results that the Turks living in Sydney tend to a more leftwing "Kemalist" political view compared to migrants living in other cities of Australia. Similar density can be seen in the distribution of the participants of this study. It is noteworthy that during the talks about Turkey, the conversation is shaped around today's politics. Particularly, the level of preoccupation with the developments in their homeland of the participants, who have integrated into the life in Australia, who consider themselves permanent in Australia, and who state that they do not experience any problem of belonging, is surprising.

It is possible to say that the indicators of transnationality are gradually decreasing with the younger generation. While the ties and communication efforts of the first generation with the homeland are stronger, this situation decreases as the generations get younger. The first generation participants are more engaged with Turkish media, they are eager to follow the current affairs regularly. Another important result about this topic is that the participants who own property or have financial investments in Turkey are also the older participants. These participants either have received retirement benefits from Turkey or are planning to receive them. We can comment that the younger generation participants do not have any financial interest about Turkey. Their family ties are also not as strong as the older generations. The older generations prioritize family on their visits to Turkey while the younger generations occasionally visit Turkey only for vacations.

The point that needs to be emphasized in this regard is that when it comes to the definition of generations, it is not possible to make a clear distinction as first, second and third generations. In this respect, it is necessary to take a closer look at the second-generation immigrants. As seen in

the findings, it is possible to talk about the existence of two different groups among the second-generation participants. This distinction was made in the findings as "older" and "younger" second generation groups. To define these two groups, it can be said that the older second-generation participants are those who migrated to Australia at a very young age with their first-generation parents, or those who were born in Australia in the first years of migration and were over the age of 40. The younger second generation can be defined as individuals who are in their 40s or younger and are mostly born in Australia, often the youngest children in their families. Markus (2017, p. 110) mentions that there have been significant improvements in the socio-economic status of Turkish society as the second generation who were born in Australia started to mix with daily life since the 1980s. This confirms the existence of two groups related to the second generation. The main difference between these two groups is that the younger second generation has similar characteristics with the third generation. It has been observed that the older second generation defines themselves as «stuck in-between» more than other generations. Similarly, Vasta (2015) emphasized in his study that there is a distinction between the elder and the younger in the second-generation immigrants of Italian origin. According to this study, while older second-generation immigrants think that they should behave more like Australians, younger second-generation immigrants can be proud of their ethnicity and cultural backgrounds (Vasta, 2015, p. 292).

An important similarity between the younger second generation and the third generation is that although they embrace their Turkish identities, their communication processes with the homeland are negligible. Compared to older generations, these participants follow the news about Turkey less, travel to Turkey less, and hardly include Turkey in their future plans. The number of immigrants displaying such characteristics is actually not as few as is supposed. Contrary to popular belief, the vast majority of immigrants still do not keep in constant and frequent contact with their homeland and do not make any effort to establish new ties (Özkul, 2016, p. 489). Thus, it turns out that the way immigrants communicate with their homeland allows us to better understand their transnational ties.

Acknowledgement: This research has been completed thanks to the scholarship received from The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK).
This research is a part of the doctoral dissertation named "Communication processes of Turks living in Australia in the context of transnationalism" which was completed in 2020 in Anadolu University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Ethics Committee Approval: Since the dataset of the study was obtained from a secondary source database such as the "World Values Survey", this research is among the studies that do not require the approval of the ethics committee.
Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.
Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support: The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) 2214-A International Research Fellowship Programme for PhD Students.

References

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. (4th Ed.). New York, USA: Oxford University Press

Bochner, A.P., & Riggs, N.A. (2014). Practicing narrative inquiry. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research*. New York, USA: Oxford University Press, 195–222.

Hopkins, L. (2000). Turkish transnational media in Melbourne. *International journal on multicultural societies*, *11*(2), 230–247. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol11/issue2/art7

Inglis, C. (2011). *Türkiye to Australia: Turkish settlement in Victoria*. Melbourne, Australia: Moreland Turkish Association Pty. Ltd.

Inglis, C. (2015). Australia Turkey connections: Traders, foes and citizens. In M. S. Michael (Ed.), *Reconciling cultural and political identities in a globalized world: Perspectives on Australia-Turkey relations*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, 45–62.

Inglis, C., Akgönül, S., & De Tapia, S. (2009). Turks abroad: Settlers, citizens, transnationals–Introduction. *International journal on multicultural societies*, *11*(2), 104–118. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/shs/ijms/vol11/issue2/intro

İçduygu, A. (1994). Facing changes and making choices: Unintended Turkish immigrant settlement in Australia. *International migration*, *32*, 71–93. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2435.1994.tb00516.x

İçduygu, A., Erder S., & Gençkaya, Ö. F. (2014). *Türkiye'nin uluslararası göç politikaları, 1923-2023. Ulus-devlet oluşumundan ulus-ötesi dönüşümlere*. Istanbul, Turkey: Koç Üniversitesi Göç Araştırmaları Merkezi.

Jakubowicz, A. (2015). 'In the beginning all is chaos . . .': Roaming the dystopic realm in Australian multiculturalism. In: S. Castles, D. Özkul, & M. D. Cubas (Eds.), *Social transformation and migration: National and local experiences in South Korea, Turkey, Mexico and Australia*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 221–236.

Karanfil, G. (2009). Pseudo-exiles and reluctant transnationals: Disrupted nostalgia on Turkish satellite broadcasts. *Media, culture & society*, *31*(6), 887–899. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443709343793

Kaya, A. (2007). German-Turkish transnational space: A separate space of their own. *German studies review*, *30*(3), 483–502. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/27668369

Kivisto, P., & Faist, T. (2009). *Beyond a border: The causes and consequences of contemporary immigration*. Thousand Oaks, USA: Pine Forge Press.

Koleth, E. (2015). Multiculturalism at the margins of global Sydney: Cacophonous diversity in Fairfield, Australia. In S. Castles, D. Özkul, & M. D. Cubas (Eds.), *Social transformation and migration: National and local experiences in South Korea, Turkey, Mexico and Australia*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 237–254.

Markus, A. (2017). Australia's immigrants: Identity and citizenship. In J. Mann (Ed.), *Citizenship in transnational perspective: Australia, Canada, and New Zealand*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 225–244.

Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. London, UK: Polity Press.

Mortan, K., & Sarfati, M. (2014). *Vatan olan gurbet II Avustralya'ya işçi göçünün 45. yılı.* İstanbul, Turkey: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

Mütercimler, E. (1998). *Avustralya örneğinde Türk göçü ve sorunları*. (Doctoral Dissertation). İstanbul University, Turkey. Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=biL2P3cCsPgUNjVdV2BsGAyYXpUMoFU6RxYXs6mjhsqKbGuJQk2FnGDD2-RE0mro

Özkul, D. (2016). Ulus-ötesi göç: Uluslararası göç yazınında yeni bir paradigma. In S. Ihlamur-Öner, & N. A. Öner (Eds.), *Küreselleşme çağında göç: Kavramlar, tartışmalar*. Istanbul, Turkey: İletişim Yayınları, 483–500.

Schwandt T. A., & Gates E. F. (2018). Case study methodology. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. London, UK: SAGE Publications. 600–630.

Şahin Kütük, B. (2017). Turkish migration to the Netherlands and transnational activities. *Istanbul Journal of Sociological Studies*, *55*, 85–106. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iusoskon/issue/30651/328315

Şanlıer Yüksel, Ö. İ. (2008). *Türkiye'den Amerika Birleşik Devletleri'ne göç eden birinci kuşak göçmenlerin yararlandığı kitle iletişim ortamlarının ulusaşırı kimlik dönüşümüne etkileri*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Anadolu University, Turkey. Retrieved from https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/TezGoster?key=-Z0vbSUgrhM9fXoGkRe6Q5j-79aKsAHTc_3pcX3cQ2GC9lrXb5dQFB7Q4GrhzaJT

Şenay, B. (2010). Ulusaşırı toplumsal alanlar, ulusaşırı kimlikler: Avustralyalı Türkler örneği. In R. Dönmez, P. Enneli, & N. Altuntaş (Eds.), *Türkiye›de kesişen-çatışan dinsel ve etnik kimlikler*. Istanbul, Turkey: Say Yayınları. 255–287.

Şenay, B. (2013). *Beyond Turkey›s borders: Long-distance Kemalism, state politics and the Turkish diaspora*. London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd.

Türkoğlu, N. (2015). *İletişim bilimlerinden kültürel çalışmalara toplumsal iletişim: Tanımlar, kavramlar, tartışmalar*. Adana, Tukey: Karahan Kitabevi.

Vasta, E. (2015). Generations and change: Affinities old and new. In: S. Castles, D. Özkul, & M. D. Cubas (Eds.), *Social transformation and migration: National and local experiences in South Korea, Turkey, Mexico and Australia*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 283–298.