Social Media Use and Social Integration

A cross-cultural comparison of Turks and Koreans in Germany using a mixed methods approach

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Alexandra Mittelstädt

Bremen, March 12, 2020

Under the supervision of

Prof. Dr. Özen Odağ, Touro College Berlin, Germany
Prof. Dr. Johannes Huinink, University of Bremen, Germany
Prof. Dr. Leen d’Haenens, KU Leuven, Belgium

Date of Defense: July 31, 2020

Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Ph.D. was a long journey that I was only able to complete with the support of many people. I would like to thank those who helped and accompanied me along the way:

I want to express my greatest gratitude to Prof. Dr. Özen Odağ for her support and positive motivation from the very start throughout all these years.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Johannes Huinink for his insightful feedback and support.

I am also thankful to Prof. Dr. Leen d’Haenens for sharing her expertise by being part of my committee.

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Yonghae S. J. Kim for his kindness to host me at Sogang University in Seoul in 2016.

I would like to thank BIGSSS for having given me the opportunity to pursue this journey with its financial and structural support. At BIGSSS I had the great pleasure of meeting wonderful people who supported and inspired me. I would like to thank our Field C coordinator Franziska Deutsch for always having a sympathetic ear and chocolate in her office. A big thank you to my Field C cohort fellows, above all Catalina for the academic and emotional support, even across geographical borders.

Thank you to all participants who took part in my research.

Thank you, Christel, for taking your time in proof-reading parts of my dissertation.

Thank you, Mauricio, for your unconditional support and patience.

Last but not least I would like to thank my mother who encouraged me to take up this journey and always believed in me.


**LIST OF CONTENTS**

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ................................................................. I

**LIST OF CONTENTS** .................................................................................. III

**LIST OF TABLES** ....................................................................................... VIII

**LIST OF FIGURE** ....................................................................................... XI

**ABSTRACT** .................................................................................................. XIII

1. **GENERAL INTRODUCTION** ............................................................... 1

1.1. Socio-Political Context and Central Concepts .................................. 6

1.1.1. Migration and socio-political climate in Germany ...................... 6

1.1.2. Acculturation, assimilation, and integration .............................. 11

1.1.3. Internet and social media use of ethnic groups .......................... 14

1.2. Research Goals .................................................................................. 19

1.3. Research Design .............................................................................. 20

1.4. Dissertation Outline ....................................................................... 23

2. **SOCIAL MEDIA USE AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN GERMANY: A NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY FRAMEWORK** ........ 25

2.1. Abstract ............................................................................................ 26

2.2. Introduction ....................................................................................... 27

2.3. Immigration and integration in Germany ....................................... 29

2.4. (Social) Media use and integration of ethnic groups .................... 31
2.5. A New Conceptual Integration Approach ...................................................34

2.5.1. Uses and gratifications theory and social media ................................34
2.5.2. Berry’s acculturation model .................................................................35
2.5.3. Esser’s social integration dimensions ..................................................36
2.5.4. Interdisciplinary concept integration ...................................................37

2.6. Discussion ..................................................................................................42

2.7. Conclusion .................................................................................................43

3. MEASURING SOCIAL INTEGRATION ORIENTATIONS OFFLINE AND ONLINE: A MIXED METHODS STUDY ON YOUNG TURKS AND KOREANS IN GERMAN .................................................................45

3.1. Abstract ....................................................................................................46

3.2. Introduction ...............................................................................................47

3.3. Social Integration Offline and Online .......................................................50

3.4. Mixed Methods Study ...............................................................................55

3.4.1. Sampling and participants .................................................................59
3.4.2. Quantitative data collection .................................................................61
3.4.3. Qualitative data collection .................................................................64
3.4.4. Quantitative data analysis .................................................................66
3.4.5. Qualitative data analysis .................................................................68

3.5. Results ......................................................................................................70

3.5.1. Acculturation dimension .................................................................72
3.5.2. Interaction dimension .................................................................78
3.5.3. Identification dimension .................................................................85
3.5.4. Social integration orientations offline and online...............................92

3.6. Discussion ............................................................................................100

3.7. Limitations ............................................................................................104

3.8. Conclusion ............................................................................................105

4. USING SOCIAL MEDIA FOR CONSTRUCTING INTEGRATION ORIENTATIONS: A QUALITATIVE CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF TURKS AND KOREANS IN GERMANY .................................107

4.1. Abstract ...............................................................................................108

4.2. Introduction ..........................................................................................109

4.3. Turkish and Korean Population in Germany .........................................112

4.4. Literature Review ................................................................................118

   4.4.1. Social media and acculturation .........................................................119

   4.4.2. Social media and interaction ............................................................122

   4.4.3. Social media and identification .........................................................125

4.5. Conceptualizing Social Integration Orientations Offline and Online ....128

4.6. Methods ...............................................................................................132

   4.6.1. Sampling and participants ...............................................................132

   4.6.2. Data collection ..................................................................................133

   4.6.3. Transcription ...................................................................................136

   4.6.4. Data analysis ....................................................................................136

4.7. Results ..................................................................................................140

   4.7.1. Acculturation offline and online .......................................................144

   4.7.2. Interaction offline and online ..........................................................164
Appendix 8. Online Questionnaire.................................................................281

Appendix 9. Distribution Ways for the Online Questionnaire..................298

Appendix 10. Overview of Cronbach’s α scores...........................................299

SATUTORY DECLARATION...............................................................................301
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Classification of social media according to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010)........ 17

Table 2. Overview of research questions................................................................. 21

Table 3. Overview of the purpose of the quantitative study and the qualitative study... 58

Table 4. Overview of the questions measuring social integration orientations in the offline context and in the online context................................................................. 66

Table 5. General reasons for using social media ..................................................... 72

Table 6. Code distribution in the acculturation offline dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 74

Table 7. Code distribution in the acculturation online dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 75

Table 8. Code distribution in the acculturation offline dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 77

Table 9. Code distribution in the acculturation online dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 78

Table 10. Code distribution in the interaction offline dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 82

Table 11. Code distribution in the interaction online dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 82

Table 12. Code distribution in the interaction offline dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 84

Table 13. Code distribution in the interaction online dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 85

Table 14. Code distribution in the identification offline dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 88
Table 15. Code distribution in the identification online dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 89

Table 16. Code distribution in the identification offline dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 91

Table 17. Code distribution in the identification online dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 92

Table 18. Overview of mean scores for each social integration dimension offline and online for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 93

Table 19. Overview of code frequencies in the three social integration dimension for the Turkish sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 95

Table 20. Overview of mean scores for each social integration dimension offline and online for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 97

Table 21. Overview of code frequencies in the three social integration dimension for the Korean sample. ........................................................................................................................................ 99

Table 22. Comparison of social integration orientations offline and online based on quantitative results........................................................................................................................................ 101

Table 23. Overview of the ethnic and national background for the Turkish sample. ... 141

Table 24. Overview of the educational background of the Turkish sample. ............. 142

Table 25. Overview of the ethnic and national background for the Korean sample. ... 143

Table 26. Overview of the educational background of the Korean focus groups. ....... 143

Table 27. Overview of codes for the acculturation dimension in the offline context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions. ........................................................................................................................................ 145

Table 28. Categories of reasons for using ethnic language in the offline context. ...... 147

Table 29. Overview of codes for the acculturation dimension in the online context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions. ........................................................................................................................................ 157
Table 30. Overview of codes for the interaction dimension in the offline and online context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions................................................. 165

Table 31. Overview of codes for the identification dimension in the offline and online context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions................................................. 171

Table 32. Aggregated frequencies of codes for each social integration dimension in offline and online contexts for the Turkish sample....................................................... 189

Table 33. Aggregated frequencies of codes for each social integration dimension in offline and online contexts for the Korean sample......................................................... 190

Table 34. Group comparison for the frequencies of codes .............................................. 191

Table 35. Summary of the distribution of the codes for the Turkish sample ............... 195

Table 36. Summary of the distribution of the codes for the Korean sample ............... 198

Table 37. Overview of social integration orientations offline and online for the Turkish sample based on the quantitative results. ................................................................. 213

Table 38. Overview of social integration orientations offline and online for the Korean sample based on the quantitative results. ................................................................. 215
LIST OF FIGURE

Figure 1. Steps of the mixed methods convergent parallel design applied in this research .......................................................... 23

Figure 2. Four acculturation strategies adapted from Berry (1997) .................. 36

Figure 3. Esser’s four dimensions of social integration ................................. 37

Figure 4. Integration of Berry’s acculturation strategies and Esser’s social integration dimensions .......................................................... 38

Figure 5. The role of social media use in social integration orientations .......... 40

Figure 6. New integrated framework for social integration orientations offline and online. ........................................................................................................ 41

Figure 7. New framework assessing the role of social media use in the construction of social integration orientations ................................. 55

Figure 8. Four social integration orientations of ethnic groups in Germany .......... 68

Figure 9. Coding frame used for the Qualitative Content Analysis. ..................... 69

Figure 10. Time spent using social media. .......................................................... 71

Figure 11. Acculturation scores offline and online for the Turkish sample ........... 73

Figure 12. Acculturation scores offline and online for the Korean sample .......... 76

Figure 13. Interaction scores offline and online for the Turkish sample ............. 79

Figure 14. Interaction scores offline and online of the Korean sample ............. 83

Figure 15. Identification scores offline and online for the Turkish sample ....... 86

Figure 16. Identification offline scores for the Korean sample .......................... 90

Figure 17. Social integration orientation offline and online for the Turkish sample. ... 94

Figure 18. Code cloud for the Turkish sample in the offline context ..................... 96

Figure 19. Word cloud for the Turkish sample in the online context ................... 96

Figure 20. Social integration orientation offline and online for the Korean sample. ... 98
Figure 21. Code cloud for the Korean sample in the offline context. ....................... 99
Figure 22. Word cloud for the Korean sample in the online context. ......................... 100
Figure 23. New interdisciplinary conceptual framework of social integration orientations based on Esser (2001) and Berry (1997) ........................................................................ 131
Figure 24. Main categories of the coding frame derived from Esser’s social integration dimensions. ........................................................................................................... 138
Figure 25. Frequency distribution of social integration codes offline and online for the two samples. ................................................................................................................ 188
ABSTRACT

The present dissertation explores the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany. The focus is particularly on young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background. Conceptually, an interdisciplinary framework based on the Uses and Gratifications Theory from communication studies, Berry’s acculturation model from psychology, and Esser’s social integration dimension from sociology, has been developed which distinguishes between social integration orientations offline and social integration orientations online when using social media. Empirically, a mixed methods approach has been employed, combining focus group discussion with an online questionnaire.

This research is the first to extend integration research of ethnic groups to social media use by developing an interdisciplinary conceptual framework to distinguish between social integration offline and online and to conduct a cross-cultural comparison between Turks and Koreans in Germany. The results of this research contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between social media use and social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. This dissertation aims at promoting both more interdisciplinary approaches and methodological variety in this research field. The findings offer important conceptual and practical implications for social media use and integration.

Keywords: social media use, social integration, ethnic groups, migration background, Germany
1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION
In 2010, the former German President Christian Wulff said in his speech on the German Unification Day, “By now Islam also belongs to Germany”\(^1\) (Wulff, 2010), and by this, he acknowledged that a significant number of individuals living in Germany are Muslims. This statement sparked a political and public debate that was picked up in the following years and led to a heated discussion of Germany’s migration and integration policies. In this debate, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel pointed out that the question was not whether Islam belonged to Germany, but whether individuals of diverse religious, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds were integrated into German society (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2010). The ongoing political debate demonstrates the scope of the challenges that modern societies like Germany face in the light of increasing migration and growing diversity.

New information and communication technologies (ICTs) have contributed to new forms of mobility and diversity (Urry, 2007). With the Internet and social media, communication has become more transnational and transcultural. Particularly social media have transformed social interactions in ways that facilitate the building and maintenance of social relations across geographical borders. Spatial distance is no longer an obstacle as communication is possible in almost every corner of the world (Müller & Beisch, 2011; Ogan, Ozaca, & Groshek, 2007; Schroeder, 2018).

With the world becoming more intertwined and societies becoming more diverse, an increasing number of individuals experience cultural change. The process of dealing with cultural change is known as acculturation. One of the most commonly used acculturation frameworks developed by John W. Berry (1997) suggests that individuals with different cultural backgrounds are confronted with two basic issues: the value given to maintaining

\(^1\) Own translation. Original: „Aber der Islam gehört inzwischen auch zu Deutschland.“
the heritage culture and the value given to establishing relationships with the mainstream culture. There are various ways to deal with cultural differences and to integrate into society. As social media have become a central part of our social interactions and social relations, the question arises what role social media play in the social integration of ethnic groups. Do individuals of an ethnic group use social media to connect to individuals of the mainstream culture or do they use social media to connect to other individuals of the same ethnic group? What consequences does social media use have for society? As Schroeder (2018) points out,

The increasing use of social media has prompted debates about whether being online is fragmenting society and isolating people. [...] It is understandable that this should be a concern, since the decline of sociability or of social cohesion has also been a perennial worry in terms of offline life [...]. (p. 93)

Hence the question is in how far the use of social media can contribute to strengthen or weaken social structures of society in terms of their integrative functions. Integration in general means the cohesion of single parts into a whole (Esser, 2001). The integration of individual actors into society is known as social integration. For the social integration of individuals, Hartmut Esser (2001) identified four relevant dimensions: acculturation, interaction, identification, and placement. These dimensions can be applied to individuals or groups to assess their social integration status.

There are various research fields dealing with the relation between media and migrants and in the last three decades, the topic of media use and migrants in Germany has been researched more thoroughly, mostly for traditional media forms such as television and newspaper (e.g. Eckhardt, 2000; Hafez, 2002; Hepp, Bozdağ, & Suna, 2012; Steinbach, 2006; Trebbe, 2007). In the context of media and migrants, Esser’s social integration dimensions have been used to analyze the effect of media use on integration (Brendler, et al., 2013). However, empirical studies that mainly focus on the
Internet and social media use of migrants in Germany are only slowly growing (e.g. Bozdağ, 2014c; Hugger, 2009), showing that it is still a rather young research field full of gaps (Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009). Little attention has been given to social media in the context of the social integration of specific ethnic groups in Germany. Particularly smaller ethnic groups (e.g. South Koreans in Germany) have been neglected in empirical studies so far (Hyun, 2018; Weiß, 2017).

What is missing is, on the one hand, a thematic focus on social media in the context of the social integration of specific ethnic groups in Germany, and on the other hand, a stronger focus media uses (Rubin, 2008; Trebbe, 2009). Here, the Uses and Gratification Theory offers a useful approach as it focuses on the reasons and motivations of individuals for using certain types of media (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974). It assumes that individuals actively and deliberately use media to gratify their needs, and by this it goes beyond simple media consumption. With social media, the individual is no longer a passive consumer only but an active participant, so it is important to understand what the individual does with the media, instead of only looking at what the media do to people (Papacharissi & Mendelson, 2011; Wang, Tchernev, & Solloway, 2012).

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine social media use in relation to the construction of social integration orientations. Specifically, it aims to shed light on the ways social media are used in the context of Esser’s social integration dimensions. The focus lies on social media use among young adults with a migration background living in Germany. Young adults from two specific ethnic groups are selected for this research, namely from Turkey and South Korea. The two ethnic groups serve as contrasting examples to compare the similarities and differences in their social integration orientations in the context of their social media use. Thus the central research question of this dissertation is:
What role does social media use play in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany?

The aim of this research is to expand the existing media use and integration research to social media use as well as to offer a new interdisciplinary and mixed methods approach. Conceptually, a new interdisciplinary approach is proposed that draws on models and concepts from three disciplines. By integrating Berry’s acculturation model from psychology with Esser’s dimensions of social integration from sociology, and approaches from the Uses and Gratifications Theory from media studies, a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework is presented that distinguishes between the offline context and the online context of social integration orientations. Empirically, a mixed methods design is implemented, combining focus group discussions with a cross-sectional online survey to provide the breadth and depth of understanding the link between social media use and social integration. The results of this research offer new insights and a better understanding of social media use for the construction of the social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background in Germany, contributing not only to research but also to society and future integration strategies.

The following sections of this introductory chapter give an overview of the socio-political context, central concepts as well as research gaps in the literature. Based on the gaps in the literature, the research goals of this dissertation are presented in the subsequent section. The next section continues with the description of the methods applied to meet these research goals. Finally, an outline of the overall structure of the dissertation and the following chapters are provided.
1.1. Socio-Political Context and Central Concepts

This subchapter provides an overview of the socio-political context in Germany and an introduction to the central concepts and terms used in this dissertation. The focus lies on the three main research areas of this thesis: (a) ethnic groups, (b) integration, and (c) social media use. An analytical look at commonly used concepts and terms in these research areas is taken and relevant research gaps in the literature are identified.

The first section provides a brief summary of Germany’s recent migration history and its influence on Germany’s contemporary society. It is important to briefly outline the current socio-political climate in order to understand the challenges German society faces with growing diversity. Central terms such as ‘migration background’ and ‘ethnic minority’ are critically discussed. The second section assesses the terms acculturation, assimilation, and integration, by clarifying disciplinary differences and common misconceptions. The third and last section of this subchapter takes a closer look at the societal implications of Internet use and social media use, particularly in the context of ethnic groups.

1.1.1. Migration and socio-political climate in Germany

Germany and its geographic position have made it a country of immigrants long before the recruitment of migrant workers in the 1950s. Nevertheless, the immigration of migrant workers, in particular from Italy and Turkey, had some unforeseen yet not surprising corollary and substantially influenced contemporary German society (Bade, 2011). Today, Germany is characterized by its ethnic and cultural diversity with over 25% of its population having a so-called migration background (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). The recurring public discourse on migration and integration in the past three decades has moved away from the statement “Germany is no immigration country” in the
The lack of political unity of the government with regard to the growing diversity in Germany has given space for the rise of right-wing populists. In the last German federal elections in September 2017 the right-wing party AfD (Alternative für Deutschland), which adopted an anti-Islam party manifesto, succeeded for the first time in gaining seats in the German Bundestag and becoming the third-largest party with almost 13% (Der Bundeswahlleiter, 2017). By October 2018, the AfD was represented in all German state parliaments, revealing a popular discontent with the political course on migration and refugees, and growing xenophobic sentiment in the population (Fiedler, 2018).

These xenophobic trends are not new and occurred in the past as well, often as a reaction to new developments of migration (Bozdağ, 2014b). In a speech in May 2018 for the memorial event of the 25th anniversary Solingen arson attack, which marks one of the most severe cases of xenophobic violence in Germany, the German foreign minister Heiko Maas stated:

I know that many of you, who came themselves or whose parents and grandparents came from Turkey to Germany, even today experience discrimination in your daily life. I would like to tell you: You are not only welcome here, you are a part of our country!² (Auswärtiges Amt, 2018)

---

² Own translation. Original: „Ich weiß, dass viele von Ihnen, die selbst oder deren Eltern und Großeltern aus der Türkei nach Deutschland gekommen sind, auch heute noch Diskriminierungen im Alltag erfahren. Ihnen möchte ich sagen: Sie sind uns hier nicht nur willkommen, Sie sind ein Teil unseres Landes!“
In his statement, Maas pointed out a crucial issue, namely that even after several generations of living in Germany, many people, particularly with Turkish roots, still experience discrimination instead of acceptance in Germany.

Under the hashtag #MeTwo, which stands for the two (or more) identities that people with a migration background have, a new wave of protest emerged on Twitter against the growing discrimination and racism in Germany (Diez, 2018). Following the outrage about a picture in July 2018 of the then German national soccer player Mesut Özil together with the president of Turkey Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the debate about what it means to be ‘German’ sparked once again. The discussion of this picture went far beyond the political controversy and became a personal attack of Özil and his Turkish roots. In his letter of resignation from the German national team which was made public on Twitter, Özil pointed to some crucial issues that many other people with a migration background in Germany experience as well:

I am German when we win, but I am an immigrant when we lose. This is because despite paying taxes in Germany, donating to facilities to German schools, and winning the World Cup with Germany in 2014, I am still not accepted into society. I am treated as being ‘different’. […] But clearly, I am not German…? Are there criteria for being fully German that I do not fit? My friend Lukas Podolski and Miroslav Klose are never referred to as German-Polish, so why am I German-Turkish? Is it because it is Turkey? Is it because I am Muslim? I think there lays an important issue. By being referred to as German-Turkish, it is already distinguishing people who have family from more than one country. I was born and educated in Germany, so why don’t people accept that I am German? (Özil, 2018)

Özil’s statement induced a new discussion on the question of ‘being German’, particularly on Twitter. With the hashtag #MeTwo, the creator Ali Can intended to draw attention to the reality that many people with a migration background living in Germany are still confronted with discrimination in their daily life (Diez, 2018). Many thousands of people reacted and shared their discrimination and racist experiences under this
hashtag, and demonstrated how omnipresent this issue still is (Diez, 2018). What this debate reveals is that there still is a clear distinction made between Germans and non-Germans, between those who ‘look’ German and those who do not appear to be ethnically German. This distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’ has become embedded in the collective subconscious, as Stemmler (2011) observes, and consequently excludes and marginalizes those who live in and feel part of Germany.

The briefly outlined political and public debate reveals the scope of the challenges that modern societies like Germany face in the light of growing migration and diversity. It is a debate across all societal and political levels, in the public and private sphere, in face-to-face interactions and online on social media. It is not only about dealing with diversity but truly embracing diversity that is the biggest challenge for society. This means not only recognizing diverse cultures and ethnicities but also including and accepting them as part of society.

In this context, the issue that occurred for this research project was the dilemma between trying not to use labels with a negative connotation and trying to describe specific ethnic groups without being discriminating or excluding. This led to a struggle of finding the ‘correct term’ for the groups of individuals under research. In Germany, the term ‘person with a migration background’ is officially included in the German micro-census since 2005 to distinguish between individuals with no migration background and individuals who either migrated themselves or who have at least one parent who migrated to Germany. More precisely, “a person has a migration background when they themselves or at least one parent did not acquire German citizenship through birth”3 (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). This is the latest definition used by the German

______________________________

3 Own translation. Original: „Eine Person hat einen Migrationshintergrund, wenn sie selbst oder mindestens ein Elternteil die deutsche Staatsangehörigkeit nicht durch Geburt besitzt.”
Federal Bureau of Statistics (Destatis, Statistisches Bundesamt). ‘Person with a migration background’ is not the handiest term and its definition underwent several changes in the past years, demonstrating the challenge of defining and categorizing groups within a population (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2018; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2014). But for this research, it is the most precise and suitable one and thus is applied in this dissertation. When referring to persons with a Turkish migration background, these comprise persons who did not acquire German citizenship through birth or who have at least one parent who did not acquire German citizenship through birth. In most cases, this means that these persons migrated themselves from Turkey or who have at least one parent who migrated from Turkey to Germany. When referring to persons with a Korean migration background, then these are persons who themselves or of whom at least one parent did not acquire German citizenship through birth. Often this means that these persons migrated themselves from South Korea or have at least one parent who migrated from South Korea to Germany.

Another commonly used term in the literature in this context and research field is ‘minority’ or ‘ethnic minority’. An ethnic minority is defined as a group within a community that has different national or cultural traditions from the ‘ethnic majority’ (Berry, 1997; Laurie & Khan, 2017). Although the term ‘ethnic minority’ was used in the first publication which Chapter 2 is based on, the minority – majority distinction does not fit this research purpose anymore. In this dissertation, the term ‘ethnic group’ is preferably used for a group that shares a common cultural background or origin. Referring to an ethnic minority and an ethnic majority, this dichotomy already assumes a socio-political dominance of one over the other, thereby consolidating inequalities and power structures. By adopting the term ethnic group over ethnic minority it is attempted to abolish the inferior notion and to break open the idea of a rigid ‘national culture’ associated with the
majority group to which the minority group is expected to adapt (Berry, 1997). In a world of increasing diversity, the *minority – majority* distinction is becoming inaccurate and politically problematic. For these reasons, the terms ethnic group or Turkish group and Korean group are used in this research. The same applies when the Turkish or Korean culture or language are described. It is referred to their heritage culture or ethnic language to indicate the cultural roots.

1.1.2. Acculturation, assimilation, and integration

In the research field of migration and cultural diversity, common terms that are employed are acculturation, assimilation, and integration. Often these terms are not clearly defined and are used interchangeably, especially in the public discourse. At other times, there are disciplinary differences in the use of these terms that can lead to confusion (Geißler & Weber-Menges, 2009; Heckmann, 2015; Trebbe, 2009).

In this research project, theories and concepts from sociology, psychology, and communication studies are applied to examine the role social media use plays for the individual’s social integration orientations. This highly interdisciplinary approach brings about some issues with interdisciplinary differences in the use of specific terms. One key term in this research is acculturation. Berry’s (1997) acculturation model from psychology is applied in this research. This bidimensional model describes two basic issues migrants are confronted with: the degree of maintaining the heritage culture (‘home’ culture), and the degree of embracing the mainstream culture (‘host’ culture). Out of this struggle, four possible strategies emerge: assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization. In Berry’s model, assimilation and integration describe two different acculturation strategies. Assimilation means the heritage culture is given up and the mainstream culture is embraced. Integration defines the case when aspects of both the
heritage culture and the mainstream culture are combined. Hence, the former strategy is an adaptation to the mainstream culture, while the latter is a blend of both cultures.

While in Berry’s acculturation model integration describes a specific strategy, in sociology integration describes the cohesion of single parts as a whole. For society, integration means the (conflictual or orderly) relationships among the citizens as well as their relationships to the state (Esser, 2001). The German sociologist Hartmut Esser (2001) points to social integration when speaking about the degree to which the individual integrates into society. Social integration describes the degree of individual embeddedness into a network of social relations and social structures of society. Esser distinguishes four social integration dimensions: acculturation, interaction, identification, and placement. Here, acculturation is one out of four social integration dimensions. It has elements of Berry’s acculturation model, but Esser extends his model to three more dimensions. Besides cultural aspects (acculturation), aspects of social relationships (interaction), feelings of belonging (identification), and citizenship and status (placement) are included. Similar to Berry’s model, the individual negotiates between the heritage context and the mainstream context for each dimension, out of which four possible outcomes emerge: assimilation, multiple inclusion, separation, and marginalization. With the four social integration dimensions, Esser extends Berry’s model by including more aspects than only the cultural dimension. Furthermore, in Esser’s conceptualization assimilation presents a possible outcome for each of the four social integration dimensions. This means that assimilation is the case when the mainstream culture is embraced (acculturation dimension), social relationships with members of the mainstream culture are preferred, (interaction dimension) a strong feeling of belonging towards the mainstream society is present (identification dimension), and a high position in the mainstream society is held, for instance through education or citizenship (placement
The multiple inclusion outcome is equivalent to the integration strategy in Berry’s model. It refers to the combination of aspects from both the heritage and mainstream culture (acculturation dimension), social relationships with both members of the ethnic group and the mainstream group (interaction dimension), feeling of belongings to both the ethnic group and the mainstream society (identification dimension), and high status in the ethnic group as well as in the mainstream society, for instance through dual citizenship (placement dimension).

With respect to the integration of ethnic groups into the German society, both in the public discourse and in research, successful integration is often equated with the assimilation of the ethnic group to the mainstream society. Researchers such as Geißler and Weber-Menges (2009) criticize the fact that the concept of integration in Germany is often used to describe the adjustment of the ethnic group to conform to the mainstream group, thereby neglecting the fact that integration actually refers to a mutual process of adjustment of all groups involved with no predefined direction (Berry, 1997; Esser, 2001). It is a misconception that integration only affects those who migrated to another country. Integration is a process, a constant negotiation that affects all actors within a society (Heckmann, 2015). A society with increasing diversity can best achieve social cohesion if integration is understood as a mutual process of convergence by all actors involved (Heckmann, 2015; Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019).

The focus of this dissertation lies on the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. Social integration orientations here describe the degree of an individual’s orientation towards the ethnic group and the mainstream society. By integrating Berry’s acculturation model with Esser’s social integration dimensions an interdisciplinary perspective on integration is provided that allows to explore how social integration orientations are constructed and to examine what
social integration orientations are present. Furthermore, this research includes social media and explores the role social media use plays for the individual’s social integration orientations. The next section provides a brief overview of the recent developments of the Internet and social media and assesses their social implications.

1.1.3. Internet and social media use of ethnic groups

The media environment has experienced a drastic transformation in the past three decades. Decreasing costs of information and communication technologies (ICTs) have contributed to the fast proliferation of new media forms. Particularly the Internet has brought a shift in media consumption and media use and has become one of the fastest-growing communication tools. While in 2007 about 65% of private households in Germany had Internet access, this number increased to 89% in 2017 (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2017). With further technological advances, the majority of Internet users in Germany accesses the Internet through their mobile phones (87%), often using network access outside their homes or workplaces (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2017).

Much of the online time nowadays is spent on social media (Kemp, 2018b; Schroeder, 2018). The label ‘social media’ is often used to refer to sites like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. The number of different social media sites and social media applications has grown incredibly in the last years, and although these sites are different in their contents and structures, they are all referred to as social media (Lindgren, 2017; Schroeder, 2018). Despite their popularity both in the public and in research, there is a lack of a clear definition of what social media actually are. The issue may lie in the ever-evolving nature of what we consider social media. Different social media forms have developed and emerged throughout the past years and have significantly influenced the media environment. Therefore, as Papacharissi (2015) argues, a definition of social media can only be dynamic and context-specific.
In this research, the focus is not so much on what social media are and which social media are used, but more on how social media are used. Nevertheless, in order to answer the *how* a definition of what defines social media is important. As Schroeder (2018) points out, “social media always involve interaction and social selves, never one-way communication” (p. 84). Thus, to get to the ground of what defines social media, first its basic function or purpose needs to be considered, which is being ‘social’. The social media researcher Christian Fuchs (2014) raises the questions: “What is social about social media? Are not all media social?” (p. 4). Bruns (2015) points out, “All media are social, but only a particular subset of all media are fundamentally defined by their sociality, and thus distinguished, for example, from the mainstream media of print, radio, and television” (p. 1). Along these lines, Fuchs (2014) thus concludes that defining social media requires an understanding of sociality. Understanding the ‘social’ is important as phenomena such as the Internet and social media do not simply exist, but are outcomes of social relations between human beings.

Just as described in Max Weber’s concept of social action, social relations are constituted by a certain form of action. According to Weber (1978), an action is social “insofar as its subjective meaning takes account of the behavior of others and is thereby oriented in its course” (p. 4). More precisely, social action “may be oriented to the past, present, or expected future behavior of others” (Weber, 1978, p. 22). Similarly, activities on social media, such as sharing, messaging, and liking, can be considered social actions (Lindgren, 2017, p. 34). However, not every kind of action is social, and one must distinguish between actions mutually oriented towards each other (social actions) and reactions of a crowd in the same way (crowd actions). This is also where much of the debate on the social contribution of social media is rooted. The Internet and social media have been criticized for simply promoting mindless crowd behavior, such as ‘clicktivism’
or ‘slacktivism’, that are easily performed online but do not aim at influencing processes offline (Christensen, 2011). But just as any kind of action, may it be online or offline, its social aspects need to be assessed first in order to evaluate its contribution to society.

Societies are social systems that are constituted of social relations (Marin & Wellman, 2011). The growing digitalization has influenced the formation and quality of social relations and has thus transformed social interactions and has contributed to new forms of social networks. Marin and Wellman (2011) define a social network as “a set of socially-relevant nodes [network members] connected by one or more relations” (p. 11). The term network is commonly used to describe structural or organizational modes of sociality in which ties are looser and more heterogeneous, whereas a community often refers to a particular type of sociality in which ties are more dense and homogenous. With the Internet, and particularly with social media, different kinds of networks have emerged online. But just as traditional social networks, digitally networked social media are about sociality, in other words about social actions and social relations (Lindgren, 2017).

Schroeder (2018) explains that “people engag[e] in mediated, though asynchronous, encounters where they manage the impressions about themselves (‘news’ about oneself and how one sees the world) and responses by their audiences (posting a reply), and so there is bi-directional impression management in a ritual of social (here, sociable) interaction” (p. 84). At root, the key aspects of social media are social actions and social interactions, with an emphasis on impression management or self-presentation. For Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) self-presentation is one key aspect of social media. To distinguish the various social media forms in a systematic way, they classified different types of social media along two dimensions depicted in Table 1: self-presentation/self-disclosure and social presence/media richness.
Table 1. Classification of social media according to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-presentation / Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Social presence / Media richness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Blogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking sites (e.g. Facebook)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual social worlds (e.g. Second Life)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Collaborative projects (e.g. Wikipedia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content communication (e.g. YouTube)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual game worlds (e.g. World of Warcraft)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table based on Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), p. 62

Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) argue that in any kind of social interaction people are concerned with their impression on others and therefore want to control their self-presentation. Underlying this aspect is also a form of self-disclosure in order to provide a coherent image of the Self one wants to display. The second dimension is social presence. Social presence is influenced by the intimacy (interpersonal vs. mediated) and immediacy (asynchronous vs. synchronous) of the medium and is closely linked to media richness. Media differ in the degree of richness they possess, meaning the amount of information they allow to be transmitted in a given time.

Along these two dimensions, Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) classify six social media types depicted in Table 1. Some social media types allow for high self-presentation but low social presence, like blogs, other types are classified low on self-presentation but high on social presence and media richness, like virtual game worlds. Social networking sites, such as Facebook, are classified as high on self-presentation and medium on social presence and media richness. The two dimensions lead to an interesting classification, although some of the social media types need to be updated as they have further developed and their purposes and uses have shifted. For instance, the content communication platform YouTube is classified as being medium on social presence and media richness and low and self-presentation and self-disclosure. Looking at the popularity of YouTube personalities or ‘YouTubers’ and their growing social and political influence in the recent
years, the classification of YouTube needs to be updated (Ferchaud, Grzeslo, Orme, & LaGroue, 2018). This once again underscores Papacharissi’s (2015) point that a definition of social media can only be dynamic and context-specific.

Nevertheless, it can be pointed out that the key aspects of social media are social actions and social interactions, involving self-presentation and user-generated content. McCay-Peet and Quan-Haase (2017) provide a good summary of these key aspects. They define social media according to specific characteristics that all of the different social media sites and applications have in common. Two main characteristics of social media can be pointed out: 1) Social media allow individuals and groups to connect, interact, and collaborate and 2) social media enable people to create, share, and engage with user-generated content (McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017, p. 17). Though it might still be unclear in what ways the transformations of social interactions and social relations through social media are affecting social processes and societies at large, knowing these key characteristics is an important starting point for exploring the ways and reasons social media are used and examining their social implications.

What this brief overview of social media has shown is that this research field is at its beginning and still lacks theories of the Internet and more specifically of social media (Schroeder, 2018). Fuchs (2017) criticizes that there is a tendency in Internet studies to engage with theory only on the micro-level, leading to a focus on single online phenomena that neglect the larger picture of society as a whole. Furthermore, Fuchs (2017) argues that the hype of the Internet and social media has led to mostly quantitative studies and big data analyses, and thus calls for a paradigm shift and a more critical approach to Internet and social media studies. The aim of this dissertation is to bring both a more theoretical and more qualitative approach to research on the Internet and social media.
1.2. Research Goals

The overall aim of this dissertation is to explore the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. What is missing in the available research is, on the one hand, a thematic focus on social media in the context of the integration of specific ethnic groups in Germany, and on the other hand, a stronger emphasis on media uses in this context (Rubin, 2008; Trebbe, 2009). These gaps are addressed in this dissertation with the following research goals.

The first research goal of this dissertation is to expand integration research to social media use and to develop a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework that allows to explore the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations in both offline and online contexts. The research takes on a media uses and gratifications perspective, focusing particularly on the reasons and motivations behind social media use. By integrating theories and concepts from media and communication studies, sociology, and psychology, a new framework appropriate for assessing the relationship between social media use and integration is presented. The conceptual framework clearly distinguishes between social integration orientations formed in face-to-face situations (the offline context) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated settings (the online context). This conceptual distinction is important in order to explore the relationship between the two contexts and to examine whether there is a difference in the construction of social integration orientations offline compared to online.

The second research goal is to focus on specific ethnic groups in Germany and to make a unique cross-cultural comparison between young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background living in Germany.
The two ethnic groups share a similar migration history, but while the Turkish group was and still is very present in the public perception of contemporary German society and in the historical depiction of the worker migration, the Korean group has neither been discussed extensively in the public eye nor been the focus of many research studies. Drawing this cross-cultural comparison between the Turkish group and the Korean group contributes to a more distinguished perception of ethnic groups and diversity in Germany on the one hand, and on the other, offers a better understanding of the social integration of the two ethnic groups by pointing out intergroup differences and intergroup similarities.

The third research goal is to provide a methodological variety much needed in an emerging field by implementing a mixed methods design. Combining quantitative and qualitative research methods allows to explore and explain this interdisciplinary and cross-cultural research project from different methodological and epistemological perspectives, thereby contributing to both a broader and deeper understanding of the research topic. In the following subchapter, the details of the mixed methods design are described.

1.3, Research Design

In this research project, a mixed methods approach is applied in which quantitative and qualitative methods are combined. A mixed methods approach was chosen because of the “breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007, p. 123). As this dissertation focuses on a rather new and highly interdisciplinary field, a mixed methods approach allows both exploring and explaining the research questions at hand from different methodological perspectives (Snelson, 2016). More precisely, this research follows a convergent parallel design in which
quantitative and qualitative data are collected in parallel and analyzed independently first. Quantitative and qualitative results are then interpreted together. The quantitative and qualitative research strand each answer different aspects of the overall research question, thereby contributing to a more complete picture. Table 2 provides an overview of the research questions that each research strand aims to answer.

Table 2. Overview of research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What role does social media use play in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background in Germany?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUANTITATIVE PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intragroup comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. What social integration orientations do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct offline and online?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.1. What are the similarities or differences between their social integration orientations offline and online?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Are there differences between young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background and their social integration orientations offline and online?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.1. In which dimensions are there group differences in their social integration orientations offline and online?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quantitative part aims to answer what social integration orientations are constructed offline and online. In this context, similarities and differences between social integration orientations offline and online within one ethnic sample are examined. Furthermore, the quantitative part draws an intergroup comparison examining whether there are differences between the Turkish and Korean sample in their social integration
orientation offline and online. The qualitative part aims to answer *how* social integration orientations are constructed offline and online. It explores which aspects are stressed for the construction of social integration orientations offline and online with each sample. Then differences in how the two ethnic samples construct their social integration orientations offline and online are examined.

The first step is data collection which is executed in two parallel strands. The quantitative data is collected by means of an online survey. For the qualitative data collection, focus group discussions are conducted. The second step of the mixed methods research is to analyze the qualitative and quantitative data independently from each other. In the third step, results from the quantitative data are compared and merged with results from the qualitative data. The final step is the interpretation of merged results. Figure 1 summarizes the steps of the mixed methods design.
**Step 1**
Collect quantitative data
*Online survey*
and
Collect qualitative data
*Focus group discussions*

**Step 2**
Analyze quantitative data
*Mid-point split, correlations*
and
Analyze qualitative data
*Qualitative content analysis*

**Step 3**
Compare and merge quantitative and qualitative results

**Step 4**
Interpret merged results

*Figure 1. Steps of the mixed methods convergent parallel design applied in this research.*

1.4. Dissertation Outline

This dissertation is structured into five chapters. Following this General Introduction (Chapter 1), the next chapter (Chapter 2) presents the conceptual novelty of this research. It introduces the newly developed conceptual framework which distinguishes between social integration orientations offline and social integration orientations online. Chapters 3 and 4 present the empirical studies of this research. Chapter 3 presents the results from a mixed methods approach, interpreting the results from the quantitative study with the results from the qualitative study. Chapter 4 focuses solely on the qualitative study and provides a more in-depth analysis of the results from the focus group discussions. Finally, the General Discussion (Chapter 5) summarizes the main findings of this research project and points out the significance of the findings. Furthermore, the chapter elaborates on the conceptual contribution and practical implications. The last part offers suggestions for future research and some concluding remarks.
2. SOCIAL MEDIA USE AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF ETHNIC GROUPS IN GERMANY: A NEW INTERDISCIPLINARY FRAMEWORK

This chapter is based on the article:

2.1. Abstract

Faced with an increasingly diverse population, Germany is challenged with the integration of different ethnic groups into its society. Previous studies have shown that mass media can play a crucial role in this integration process. However, what has not been extensively researched in this context yet are social media. What is missing in research is a conceptual framework appropriate for examining the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations. Therefore, this chapter focuses on social media use and the social integration of ethnic groups in Germany from a conceptual perspective. What is proposed here is a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework that clearly distinguishes between social integration orientations constructed in the face-to-face context (‘offline’) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated context (‘online’). The aim of this chapter is to expand integration research to social media use as well as to offer a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework for further empirical research.

*Keywords:* social media use, social integration, ethnic groups
2.2. Introduction

With increased migration, many societies, including Germany, have become more ethnically and culturally diverse. In 2018, about 25% of the German population had a so-called migration background (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). A migration background includes persons who themselves or at least one parent did not acquire German citizenship by birth (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). The percentage even rises to over 35% when only the population under 35 years is taken into account (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). This indicates a trend that Germany’s society will become more ethnically and culturally diverse in the future. It is a development that offers opportunities but also poses challenges to German society with regard to the integration of different ethnic groups.

Previous research has shown that mass media can play a significant role in the integration of ethnic groups into society (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Peeters & d'Haenens, 2005; Steinbach, 2006; Trebbe, 2009; Weiss & Trebbe, 2001). With further technological advances, new media forms emerged that have substantively changed our ways to communicate and interact. Particularly the proliferation of social media have influenced our social lives and have become an essential part of everyday life (Müller & Beisch, 2011; Ogan, Ozaca, & Groshek, 2007; Schroeder, 2018). Social media are available on smartphones, tablets, and notebooks, making them a convenient and easy way for communication. They facilitate the building and maintaining of social relations even at a distance (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Hampton, 2004; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). With the world becoming more interconnected and societies becoming more diverse, cultural differences become more salient. Research has shown that social media are useful sources for cultural information and cultural orientation, thereby facilitating adaptation and acculturation processes (Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016). Using social media can also facilitate the expression of certain aspects of cultural or ethnic
identity by offering different forms of experience spaces and orientation sources (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Enders & Weibers, 2009).

Although research has shown that social media and their specific features are influencing various aspects of everyday life, it is still unclear how individuals with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds use social media and how this relates to integration. Germany is one of the countries facing the challenge of growing diversity and integrating different ethnic groups into its society. As the ways and reasons social media are used differ from culture to culture (Gezduci & d'Haenens, 2007; Jackson & Wang, 2013; Ji, et al., 2010; Kim, Sohn, & Choi, 2011), it is important to understand how individuals with different ethnic backgrounds living in Germany use social media and how this relates to their social integration orientations.

So far, research on social media and the integration of ethnic groups into society is lacking interdisciplinary approaches, especially in the German context this research field is still full of gaps (Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009; Worbs, 2010). Early research has often framed the Internet as a separate space, independent from the ‘real world’, assuming two distinct social systems (Hampton, 2004, p. 222). More recent findings have shown that offline and online spheres overlap and interrelate, and thus cannot be researched independently from each other but need to be researched in relation to one another (Barkhuus & Tashiro, 2010; Ellison & boyd, 2013; Subrahmanyama, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008). What is also missing is conceptual clarity. Different disciplines have taken different conceptual and methodological approaches to studying social media use of ethnic groups. There currently are hardly any interdisciplinary approaches, combining conceptual frameworks and models from different disciplines.

Therefore, a new interdisciplinary framework is proposed in this chapter that helps to examine the relationship between social media use and social integration orientations.
This framework takes a Uses and Gratifications Theory approach (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974) from communication studies, draws on Berry’s (1997) acculturation model from psychology and combines it with Esser’s (2001) social integration dimension from sociology. Furthermore, this interdisciplinary framework conceptually distinguishes between social integration orientations constructed in face-to-face interactions, the so-called ‘offline’ context, and social integration orientations constructed in mediated interactions when using social media, the so-called ‘online’ context.

The aim of this chapter is to extend integration research to social media use and to promote a more interdisciplinary conceptual approach. This chapter is structured as follows: First, Germany’s immigration history of the labor recruitment period and the integration discourse are outlined briefly, followed by a review of recent research on (social) media use and integration of ethnic groups. Second, the new conceptual integration approach is introduced. The three main models are described separately before the integrated framework is presented. Finally, this chapter concludes with a critical discussion of the framework and some final remarks.

2.3. Immigration and integration in Germany

Germany’s society today is characterized by its ethnic and cultural diversity. Its geographic position has made Germany a country of immigrants long before the recruitment of migrant workers in the 1950s. Nevertheless, labor recruitment presents one of the most significant immigration periods for Germany in the 20th century. Labor recruitment agreements between Germany and countries such as Italy, Spain, Turkey, and South Korea, were considered temporary solutions to worker shortages. The incoming workers were seen as temporary migrants and therefore called ‘guest workers’ (Bozdağ, 2014b; Hunn, 2005). In light of this temporary state, German authorities did not attempt
any efforts to integrate these migrant workers into German society, despite the fact that a high number of migrant workers stayed in Germany and brought their families. By the end of the 1980s, about 3.6 million foreigners lived in Germany (Heckmann, 2015).

This “reluctance in accepting the impact of migration”, as Bozdağ (2014b) observes, “resulted in the lack of systematic policies to foster integration and cultural diversity for a long time” (p. 290). It was not until the 1990s that Germany recognized the fact that it is an immigration country (Bade, 2011, p. 161; Heckmann, 2015, p. 23) and started to discuss the concept of a multicultural society (Bozdağ, 2014b). Since then the integration of its migrant population has become a central topic in the political and public discourse in Germany. Integration is a "complex, multilayered concept subject to contradictory interpretation", as Geißler and Weber-Menges (2009, p. 27) point out. What Geißler and Weber-Menges (2009) and other researchers (e.g. Bozdağ, 2014b; Esser, 2001; Trebbe, 2009) criticize is that the concept ‘integration’ is often mistaken as ‘assimilation’, which is predominant in the public discourse but also in migration research in Germany. Assimilation, however, refers to the adjustment of the ethnic group to conform to the mainstream group. Integration, on the other hand, refers to a mutual process of adjustment of all groups involved with no pre-given direction. It entails opportunities and intentions of actions that result in certain forms, of which one outcome can be assimilation (Esser, 2001). Such a mis-conceptualization leads to misunderstandings not only in research but also in political discussions. Researchers and politicians may describe successful integration when migrants fully adapt to the mainstream society and reject their cultural roots when this is really assimilation and not integration. By this, Germany is neglecting the idea of multiculturalism and holding on to the idea of preserving the ‘national culture’ or ‘German culture’ (Ditlmann, Purdie-Vaughns, & Eibach, 2011; Stemmler, 2011). Culture, however, is a process under constant change and migration is an important part.
of cultural development (Heckmann, 2015). With increasing diversity, it becomes essential for the functioning of society to understand that integration is a reciprocal process that must involve the mainstream group as well (Heckmann, 2015; Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019).

The openness of the mainstream society towards migrants is a central prerequisite for integration, as Heckmann (2015) states. This includes reducing prejudices and discrimination towards migrants. Studies have shown that discrimination and exclusion experiences with the mainstream group hampered members of ethnic groups to identify with and develop a positive orientations towards the mainstream society, fostering a stronger heritage orientation (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Diehl, Fischer-Neumann, & Mühlau, 2016; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). To promote an open and multicultural society, it is important to move away from the still persisting narrative of Germany as a non-immigrant country and the ethno-cultural understanding of German identity as being exclusionary and related to German ancestry (Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). The identification with Germany is an important aspect of integration but members of ethnic groups need to feel accepted by the mainstream society to feel part of it (Diehl, Fischer-Neumann, & Mühlau, 2016).

2.4. (Social) Media use and integration of ethnic groups

Research on the media use of ethnic groups and their integrative functions in the German context has been frequent since the 1990s (Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009). The growing interest in this field, particularly in recent years, can be explained on the one hand by the increasing diversity of society and on the other hand by the growing role media play in everyday life. This has led to a growing number of studies that examine the media use of ethnic groups in relation to their integration (Piga, 2007; Sūna, 2013; Worbs, 2010).
So far, research has shown that there is a relationship between media use and the integration of ethnic groups. Studies have shown that media use could be considered a consequence of the integration status of a person (Trebbe, 2007; Trebbe, Heft, & Weiß, 2010; Weiss & Trebbe, 2001). For instance, Trebbe (2007) found that a high level of interaction and participation in German society led to a higher level of German media use. This means that an assimilative or integrative orientation favors mainstream media choices. Other studies, for instance by Brendler, Jöckel, Niemann, Peter, Schneider, and Weber (2013), and Peeters and d’Haenens (2005), discovered a different direction of influence, namely that media use had effects on the outcome of the integration status of a person. The study conducted by Brendler et al. (2013) showed that adolescents used media as a source for cultural orientation and peer interaction. The consumption of German media content and media communication with peers in German had positive effects on the social integration of adolescents. This means that the consumption of certain media content influences the integration orientation of a person.

The direction of causality is not straightforward since most empirical studies are not longitudinal but only reflect one point in time and are limited to correlational findings (Bonfadelli, Bucher, & Piga, 2007). As Bonfadelli, Bucher, and Piga (2007) point out, “it is not clear if a better social integration is really the result of media use or if preferred use of domestic media is the result of a higher level of social integration” (2007, p. 147). Furthermore, these studies have mostly focused on traditional mass media, such as television and newspapers. With the growing digitalization, the media landscape has changed tremendously and thus have media uses. Particularly social media have contributed to these changes. The growing availability of social media and their specific features are influencing social relations and society at large (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Castells, 2004; Mejias, 2010). Unlike traditional mass media where communication
is one-directional and from one source to many, the direction and levels of communication are blurred on social media (McQuail, 2010). Social media are web-based and focus in particular on social interaction and user-generated content. This allows for interpersonal communication as well as for communication on a large scale reaching a wider audience. Users can easily connect to others and share content regardless of the geographical distance (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). This has been further reinforced with the proliferation of mobile technologies, such as smartphones and tablets that have made it possible to be online almost at any place and at any time.

Research has identified that integration within traditional social networks, e.g. into a local community or society, is related to social connectedness (Grieve, Indian, Witteveen, Tolan, & Marrington, 2013). Current forms of social media provide the tools for such social connectedness (Androutsopoulos, Şahin, Hsieh, & Kouzina, 2013). For members of an ethnic group, this means that social media can facilitate the building and maintaining of social relations with members of the same ethnic group but also with members of the mainstream group (Park, Song, & Lee, 2014; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). Findings show that this “digital togetherness” (Marino, 2015, p. 6) provides important social and emotional support and can be beneficial for the adjustment to the mainstream culture (Bozdağ, 2014a; Gruzd, Wellman, & Takhteyev, 2011; Lim & Pham, 2016). Social media can further facilitate the adjustment to a new culture by providing useful sources on cultural information and cultural orientation (Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016).

What research has shown so far is that social media can facilitate the adjustment to a new culture by supporting intra- and inter-ethnic social relations and providing access to cultural information. However, studies on ethnic groups in Germany and their social media use is still limited. Furthermore, what has not been examined yet is the role social media use plays for ethnic groups in Germany and the construction of their social
integration orientations. What is missing is a single conceptual framework that allows to approach this from an interdisciplinary perspective.

2.5. A New Conceptual Integration Approach

To better understand the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of ethnic groups, a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework is proposed here. Drawing on theories from three different disciplines, namely media studies, sociology, and psychology, approaches from the Uses and Gratifications Theory (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974), Esser’s (2001) dimensions of social integration, and Berry’s (1997) acculturation model are integrated into a single framework which allows for an application to the online context of social integration. Each approach is described briefly first and then integrated into a new single conceptual framework.

2.5.1. Uses and gratifications theory and social media

A central theory which frames the overall approach proposed in this chapter is the Uses and Gratifications Theory (U&G Theory). This theory originates from the communication studies and is particularly concerned with the reasons and motivations of media use. Its main assumption is that individuals actively and deliberately use media to gratify their needs. Thus, it helps to explain how people use media to gratify their needs, their motives for media use, and the consequences that follow from these needs (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974; Rubin, 2008). In their study, Reece and Palmgreen (2000) found that American television played an important role in helping Indian student sojourners to adapt to the American culture. Their results showed a strong and significant relationship between the need for acculturation and Indian students' television viewing motivations in the US. This in line with the findings by Yang, Wu, Zhu & Southwell (2004). They found that individual acculturation needs were not only important with
regard to media use but also that various media outlets played different roles in fulfilling those needs.

Concerning social media, which allow for much more interactivity and user-generated content, the U&G Theory offers a useful approach to go beyond simple media use habits and explore the needs and gratifications behind social media use (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Wang, Tchernev, & Solloway, 2012). Research has shown that people receive different gratifications to varying degrees when using social media (Ku, Chub, & Tseng, 2013; Mao, 2014). Studies have shown that most commonly social media use is motivated by personal and social needs, such as keeping in touch with friends (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Ku, Chub, & Tseng, 2013; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). In the context of integration, findings show that social media gratify the need of intra- and inter-ethnic communication (Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016; Damian & Van Ingen, 2014). Social media use was also found to help explore and negotiate identities, thereby fulfilling the need to belong (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Hugger, 2009). The U&G Theory is selected as part of this new integrated framework to focus on the reasons for social media use and examine the gratifications resulting from social media use.

2.5.2. Berry’s acculturation model

A commonly used model in psychology for studying processes of cultural change is the acculturation model by John Berry (1997). In this model, Berry focuses on possible acculturation strategies of immigrants when they are confronted with the culture of the new country of residence. Immigrants in this situation face two basic issues: the value given to maintaining the culture of origin (or heritage culture) and engaging with the new culture (or mainstream culture). From a combination, these two independent dimensions
result in a bidimensional model with four possible acculturation strategies: (1) assimilation, (2) integration, (3) separation, and (4) marginalization (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assimilation</th>
<th>Integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ accepts mainstream culture</td>
<td>+ accepts mainstream culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- rejects heritage culture</td>
<td>+ maintains heritage culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation</th>
<th>Marginalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- rejects mainstream culture</td>
<td>- rejects mainstream culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ maintains heritage culture</td>
<td>- rejects heritage culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2. Four acculturation strategies adapted from Berry (1997).**

The first possible strategy is assimilation. This is the case when the immigrant accepts the mainstream culture of the country of residence and rejects the heritage culture. The second strategy is integration. This strategy, according to Berry, is the most desirable one, because it reflects the desire to maintain the heritage culture but also adapt to the mainstream culture. The third strategy is separation. This is present when the immigrant holds on to the heritage culture and rejects the mainstream culture. The fourth strategy in this model is marginalization. This strategy describes the rejection of both mainstream and heritage cultures.

2.5.3. Esser’s social integration dimensions

Integration, generally speaking, is the cohesion of single parts as a whole (Esser, 2001). Applied to society, Lockwood (1964) makes two distinctions: system integration and social integration. System integration refers to "the orderly or conflictful relationships between the parts", whereas social integration means "the orderly or conflictful relationships between the actors" of a social system (Lockwood, 1964, p. 245). Thus, the focus in system integration is on the integration of the society’s system as a whole, while social integration focuses on the integration of individual actors into the system.
Conceptually, system integration and social integration are independent of each other and can, therefore, be researched separately (Esser, 2001).

The focus of this research is on social integration. Esser identifies four dimensions of social integration: acculturation, interaction, identification, and placement. These dimensions are illustrated in Figure 3.

![Social Integration Dimensions](image)

**Figure 3. Esser’s four dimensions of social integration.**

These four dimensions contain the key aspects of social integration. The first dimension depicted in Figure 3 is acculturation which includes cultural knowledge and language competencies needed for interaction and is part of the socialization process into a society. Interaction refers to building and maintaining social relationships in daily life. Identification encompasses the emotional relationship between the actor and the society, a subjective feeling of belonging. Placement here means the position in society and the rights gained with it, may it be by citizenship or an economic position (Esser, 2001).

2.5.4. Interdisciplinary concept integration

The three approaches presented in the previous sections are now integrated into a single framework and applied to the social media context. This means that Esser’s social integration dimensions are combined with Berry’s acculturation strategies, while the U&G Theory helps to better understand the reasons for social media use and the gratifications resulting from social media use.
The approach of combining Esser’s social integration dimensions with Berry’s acculturation strategies is as such not a new approach. In one of his studies, Esser (2009) applies Berry’s acculturation strategies to his social integration dimensions and empirically tested this integrated model using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) (Esser, 2009). To avoid conceptual confusion, Esser re-named Berry’s acculturation strategy outcome ‘integration’ into ‘multiple inclusion’. Furthermore, Esser and Berry both use the term acculturation. Berry focused on the aspect of acculturation to define four strategies to deal with a new culture. In the framework presented here, however, acculturation describes one dimension out of four social integration dimensions referring to cultural knowledge and language skills.

In this chapter, combining Esser’s social integration dimensions with Berry’s acculturation strategies results in a typology of social integration orientations with four dimensions (acculturation, interaction, identification, placement) and four possible orientation outcomes in each (assimilation, multiple inclusion, separation, and marginalization) as depicted in Figure 4.

![Figure 4. Integration of Berry’s acculturation strategies and Esser’s social integration dimensions.](image)

For each of Esser’s social integration dimension, one of the four outcomes described by Berry can be assigned. For instance, in the interaction dimension, the outcome of assimilation would be assigned if a person only has social relations with members of the
mainstream group and no social relations with members of the same ethnic group. The opposite case would be separation, which means that a person has no social relations with members of the mainstream group but only with members of the same ethnic group. The social integration dimensions are closely interlinked, for instance, social relations with members of the mainstream group depend also on skills in the mainstream language. The order of the dimensions, however, does not equal a hierarchical order.

The combination of Esser’s social integration dimensions and Berry’s acculturation strategies has been applied to the context of media use and migrants to analyze the effect of media use on integration (Brendler, et al., 2013). The novelty presented in this chapter is to apply this interdisciplinary framework to the online context when using social media. The online context is seen as a space where social integration orientations are formed as well. Thus, the framework proposed here conceptually distinguishes between social integration orientations constructed in face-to-face interactions (offline context) and those constructed in mediated interactions when using social media (online context). Social media might offer sources for gratifying needs online that might not be gratified offline, resulting in different social integration orientations online than offline (see Figure 5). Therefore, it is important to make a clear conceptual distinction between the offline and online context to be able to examine potential differences and similarities in the construction of social integration orientations offline and online.
Three of the four social integration dimensions applied to the offline context can be transferred to the online context. The acculturation, interaction, and identification dimensions are included, while the placement dimension is deliberately excluded in this new interdisciplinary framework. The three dimensions that are included are horizontal dimensions and are applicable to both the offline and online contexts. The acculturation dimension, which encompasses cultural aspects, can be assessed for instance through the language that is used both in the offline and online environment (Androutsopoulos, Şahin, Hsieh, & Kouzina, 2013; Esser, 2006). The interaction dimension, which refers to social relations, can be measured by asking about face-to-face friendships and online communication partners, always with reference to the ethnic background of these social relations (Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977; Zentarra, 2014). As for the identification dimension, this can be measured through the subjective feeling of belonging to a certain ethnic group in the real world and to a specific ethnic online community (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Hugger, 2009). Unlike the other three dimensions, the placement
dimension represents a vertical dimension and includes hierarchical orders and positions, for instance in the workforce or rights gained through citizenship. To apply the placement dimension to the online context and to find the online counterparts to the hierarchical positions in the offline context is a conceptual and practical challenge. Hierarchical orders and positions of individuals are more difficult to determine in the online context than offline, and therefore the placement dimension is deliberately excluded here.

The result is a new integrated framework with three social integration dimensions and four social integration orientation outcomes for the offline and online context (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6. New integrated framework for social integration orientations offline and online.**

By having these two conceptually distinct contexts it is possible to examine the relationship of social integration orientations constructed in the offline and online context in terms of similarities, differences, or even direction of influences. This interdisciplinary approach with the specific distinction of social integration orientations offline and online allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of ethnic groups.
2.6. Discussion

The aim of this chapter was to introduce a new framework that examined the role of social media use in the social integration orientations of ethnic groups and promoted a more interdisciplinary conceptual approach. Drawing from different disciplines, the presented framework integrated approaches from communication studies, psychology, and sociology. The bicultural distinction introduced by Berry’s acculturation model was maintained in this framework. This means that social integration orientations are examined only in two cultural contexts, namely the heritage culture and the mainstream culture. In a world of growing migration and increasing diversity, limiting the approach to two cultures is also limiting the social integration orientation outcomes. On the one hand, the bicultural approach makes the framework more feasible, on the other hand, it might lead to too simplified results ignoring important nuances. For instance, the outcome of multiple inclusion does not further differentiate in what way the two cultures are integrated or combined. Similarly, the marginalization outcome might overlook details because it only focuses on the rejection of heritage culture and the mainstream culture but does not include other socio-cultural contexts.

Furthermore, the interdisciplinary conceptual framework clearly distinguished between social integration orientations constructed in the offline context and social integration orientations constructed in the online context. Social media allow for different forms of communication and social interactions and offer different options for engaging in a virtual community. The variety and diversity offered online might differ from what is offered offline, and might results in different social integration orientations online than offline. Therefore, a clear distinction between social integration orientations constructed in the offline context and in the online context is crucial for exploring and understanding
the role social media use plays in the integration of ethnic groups. The distinction is an analytical one laying the ground for studying interrelationships.

2.7. Conclusion

The interdisciplinary concept integration proposed in this chapter attempted to expand current integration research to social media use of ethnic groups and to provide a framework adequate for further empirical research in this field. By applying the U&G Theory and merging Berry’s acculturation model with Esser’s social integration dimensions, a new conceptual framework appropriate for assessing the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations was presented. The integration of approaches from different disciplines and the distinction between social integration orientations in the offline and online contexts make this framework a novelty in this field of research. The overall aim of this chapter was to enrich the conceptual foundations of integration research and to provide a framework for more interdisciplinary empirical research in the field of social media and social integration.
3. MEASURING SOCIAL INTEGRATION ORIENTATIONS OFFLINE AND ONLINE: A MIXED METHODS STUDY ON YOUNG TURKS AND KOREANS IN GERMAN
3.1. Abstract

In light of the growing diversity of many modern societies, in which an increasing number of individuals are confronted with cultural differences, the integration of various ethnic and cultural groups under the umbrella of one society has become a key challenge. This is further amplified by the transnational availability and the specific characteristics of social media which have transformed social interactions and social relations and influenced societies at large. Although previous research has started to examine social media and their acculturative functions, what is still missing is 1) a concrete approach to measure social integration orientations offline and online and 2) a focus on young adults exposed to two cultures in the German societal context. This chapter presents a new conceptual and empirical approach to both exploring and explaining the role of social media use in the construction of social integration orientations. To conceptually distinguish social integration orientations constructed offline from those constructed online, a new interdisciplinary framework was applied. To measure social integration orientations offline and online, a mixed methods approach was implemented, combining focus group discussions with a cross-sectional online survey. The results revealed that social media use could help to construct and re-construct existing social integration orientations offline by offering alternative sources of gratifications online.

*Keywords*: mixed methods, social integration, ethnic groups, social media
3.2. Introduction

Increased migration flows have shaped Germany into an ethnically and culturally diverse society. Migration of people, and consequently also the migration of cultures, is not a new phenomenon (Heckmann, 2015; Schlögel, 2006). However, with recent technological advances, the process of migration has been significantly accelerated and created new challenges. Advances in transportation and communication means have transformed social life and brought new forms of mobility; not only the mobility of people, but also of ideas, information, and cultures (Urry, 2007).

The Internet and particularly social media have contributed significantly to new forms of mobility and connectivity (Marino, 2015; Willson, 2010). Social media have transformed social interactions from face-to-face communication to increasingly more device-mediated communication (Mejias, 2010), allowing the building and maintaining of social relations even at a distance (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). With the world becoming more interconnected, societies are becoming more diverse hosting different cultures and ethnicities. Research has shown that social media are useful sources for cultural information and cultural identification, facilitating adaptation and acculturation processes (Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). Studies have found that social media could facilitate interethnic relationships between the ethnic group and the mainstream group in terms of bridging social capital, but could also strengthen same ethnic relationships that are important for bonding social capital (Baym, 2010; Damian & Van Ingen, 2014; Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018). In light of the rising cultural and ethnic diversity of many societies, the social implications of social media use by specific ethnic groups have become more relevant and have gained growing interest. A rising number of studies examine the social media use of ethnic groups in different cultural and societal contexts (e.g. Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim
& Pham, 2016; Mitra & Evansluong, 2019; Son, 2015) but research on the social media use of ethnic groups in the German societal context is still limited (Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019; Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009).

Research shows that various forms of social interactions among different kinds of individuals and groups are facilitated and supported by social media (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). Social media provide the structures for maintaining social relationships, for finding users with similar interests, and for locating content and knowledge that has been contributed or endorsed by other users (Baym, 2010; Schroeder, 2018). Together with the growing cultural and ethnic diversity, this transformation of social interactions brings new opportunities but also poses new challenges to society. So far, little attention has been paid to social media use by specific ethnic groups in relation to social integration. Considering the social, cultural, and technological transformations experienced by German society, examining the relationship between social media use and the social integration orientations of ethnic groups is of high societal and political relevance. The current study, therefore, examines the social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany in the context of their social media use. Two ethnic groups are selected for a cross-cultural comparison: young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background. To measure social integration orientations, a new framework is applied which makes a conceptual distinction between social integration orientations constructed in face-to-face situations (the offline context) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated settings (the online context). More precisely, this study examines whether social integration orientations in face-to-face situations are similar to or different from social integration orientations in social media mediated settings. Furthermore, intergroup differences are examined
between young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background. Following from this, the research questions aimed to be answered with this study are:

RQ1: What social integration orientations do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct offline and online? And how do they construct these orientations?

RQ2: Are there differences between social integration orientations offline and online within each group and between the two groups?

To answer these research questions, an empirical mixed methods design is applied, combining an online survey with focus group discussions. The goal of this methodological approach is to examine the relationship between social media use and the construction of social integration orientations from different perspectives. The online survey provides an overview of what social integration orientations are present offline and online in the two selected ethnic groups, while the focus group discussions explore how social integration orientations are constructed offline and online and the reasons behind them. The data of the quantitative part and the qualitative part are analyzed independently and merged in the final interpretation phase to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role social media plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. The results provide on the one hand insights into the nature of the relationship of social integration orientations in the offline and online context, and on the other hand, a better understanding of cross-cultural differences in social media use in relation to social integration orientations. The overall purpose of this chapter is to lay out measures for social integration orientations in the offline context and online context by studying this highly interdisciplinary topic from a mixed methods perspective.
This chapter is structured as follows: The first part puts this research into context by providing the theoretical background and introducing the new interdisciplinary framework for measuring social integration orientations offline and online. The second part of this chapter outlines the research design of this study. The methodological approaches for the data collection and the data analysis are described here. Subsequently, in the third part, the results of the mixed methods study are presented and discussed. Finally, this chapter concludes with a brief discussion of the findings and some critical remarks pointing out the limitations of the study.

3.3. Social Integration Offline and Online

Social integration refers to the nature of relationships between individuals of a society (Esser, 2001; Lockwood, 1964). The German sociologist Hartmut Esser (2001) describes four social integration dimensions: acculturation, interaction, identification, and placement. The acculturation dimension refers to cultural practices and language skills. The interaction dimension focuses on social relationships. Identification refers to the subjective feeling of belonging to a group or community. And placement described the economic position in the workforce and rights gained with citizenship. With increasing ethnic and cultural diversity, the relationships between individuals become more complex and social integration becomes a challenge.

In the past couple of decades, German society underwent a demographic change in which its population has become increasingly more ethnically and culturally diverse (Heckmann, 2015; Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). Currently, about 25% of Germany’s population has a migration background. This means that roughly 21 million inhabitants were either born with foreign citizenship or have at least one parent who was born with foreign citizenship. Looking at the population under 35 years, almost 35% have a
migration background of which almost two-thirds were born in Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). Therefore, the younger population more often has early experiences of growing up with two cultures: the German culture as the culture of residence or mainstream culture and their parents’ culture as the heritage culture. Particularly for these individuals, the challenge lies in managing two (or more) cultures.

Research has shown that individuals who are exposed to two cultures develop different strategies in dealing with cultural differences. These strategies have been described in Berry’s (1997) bidimensional acculturation model which evaluates the struggle between maintaining the heritage culture and adapting to the mainstream culture. Combining these two dimensions results in a bidimensional model with four possible acculturation strategies: assimilation, integration, separation, and marginalization. The assimilation strategy reflects the full adaptation to the mainstream culture and the neglect of the heritage culture. Integration refers to the desire to maintain aspects of the heritage culture, while also adapting to parts of the mainstream culture. Separation describes the maintenance of the heritage culture and the rejection of the mainstream culture. And marginalization refers to the rejection of both cultures.

With technological advances, culture is no longer bound to the physical world. For individuals with a migration background, new information and communication technologies (ICTs) allow them to explore cultural information, express different aspects of cultural identities, and build and maintain ethnic relationships regardless of geographical distance (Baldassar, Nedelcu, Merla, & Wilding, 2016; Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007). Particularly social media have transformed communication and the media landscape. Social media are web-based services that allow for different forms of communication and interaction (McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017). In a world of growing migration and diversity, social media provide ways to connect beyond national
borders (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Baym, 2010; Lim & Pham, 2016). This has led to the formation of online social networks independent of a physical location.

A social network, in general, describes a set of network members that are tied by various types of relations (Marin & Wellman, 2011). Previous research suggests that online social networks mirror already existing offline social networks, meaning that social media are used to maintain offline social relationships (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006). Other studies have shown that offline and online social networks are connected but not necessarily identical, meaning that social media are used to selectively interact with different people from the offline world, thereby strengthening offline relationships that may not be strong in the offline context (Subrahmanyama, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008). The different structures and features of social media allow users to actively and deliberately gratify their needs, in this case either to strengthen already existing social networks or form new ones (Mejias, 2010; Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008). Therefore, an online social network can simply be a mirror of social relations already existing offline, or social media can provide an extension of the offline social network facilitating new social relations otherwise not likely or possible (Baym, 2010; boyd & Ellison, 2008). What has emerged from this development is what Baym (2010) calls ‘networked individualism’ in which each person sits at the center of his or her own personal community.

Social networks and embedded social relationships are important aspects of the social integration of an individual into society (Esser, 2001; Peeters & d'Haenens, 2005). In light of the growing ethnic and cultural diversity in Germany, the emergence of social relationships and social networks in the online space might bring new opportunities or pose new challenges to the social integration of individuals. It is not yet clear what role
social media use plays in the social integration of individuals, particularly those with a migration background.

One way to understand the reasons and motivations behind social media use is to apply the Uses and Gratifications Theory (U&GT). This approach focuses on the user and assumes that individuals actively and deliberately use media to gratify their needs (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974). As social media enable high interactivity, social interactions, and user-generated content, the U&GT offers a suitable perspective to explore the needs users are meeting on social media (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Wang, Tchernev, & Solloway, 2012). Research has shown that for individuals experiencing cultural change, media use could fulfill acculturation needs and facilitate the adaption to the new culture (Reece & Palmgreen, 2000; Yang, Wu, Zhu, & Southwell, 2004).

To examine and explore the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany, an interdisciplinary approach is needed. Existing frameworks are insufficient or inadequate to capture the relationship between social media use and social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. Moreover, there seems to be a lack of conceptual approaches assessing the relationship between the offline and online context of social integration. Therefore, a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework is introduced in this research that allows assessing social integration orientations offline and online. The new interdisciplinary framework applies the Uses and Gratifications Theory from communication studies and integrates Berry’s (1997) acculturation model from psychology with Esser’s (2001) social integration dimensions from sociology. For the purpose of this study, only three of the four social integration dimensions by Esser, namely acculturation, interaction, and identification, are included in the new framework.
while the placement dimension is deliberately excluded. The reason for this is the challenge of transferring this dimension to the online context. The placement dimension is a vertical dimension referring to hierarchical orders, including economic status and citizenship. Assessing this in the online context with adequate counterparts to the hierarchical positions in the offline context is a conceptual and practical challenge that would exceed the scope of this study. The result is a framework with three social integration dimensions and four possible social integration orientations. To examine the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations, a conceptual distinction between social integration orientations constructed in face-to-face situations (the offline context) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated settings (the online context) is made. More precisely, it is examined whether social integration orientations in face-to-face situations are similar to or different from social integration orientations in social media mediated settings. It is assumed that unfulfilled needs in the offline context lead to the deliberate use of social media to obtain gratifications online (see Figure 7).
The offline – online distinction does not imply that the two contexts are independent of each other. On the contrary, it is an analytical distinction that helps to better understand the relationship between social integration orientations offline and online.

### 3.4. Mixed Methods Study

The present study followed a mixed methods convergent parallel design. This means that the quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed independently and subsequently merged during the interpretation phase (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The purpose of this mixed methods approach was to get both a broader and deeper understanding of how social integration orientations of the two selected ethnic groups were constructed in the offline and online context. The mixed methods approach offered a more multilayered examination of the uses and motivations of social media in the
context of social integration (Snelson, 2016). Furthermore, a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods was considered highly adequate for the interdisciplinary conceptual framework applied in this research.

Employing a cross-cultural comparison, the focus of this study was on young adults from two ethnic groups in Germany: Turkey and South Korea. Based on the sampling logic of *diverse cases*, the Turkish group and the Korean group were selected for a cross-cultural comparison. Following Seawright and Gerring (2008), the primary objective of the sampling logic *diverse cases* is the achievement of maximum variance along relevant variables. The two ethnic groups share a similar migration history, but they differ in two integration relevant variables: 1) ethnic group size and 2) educational background of the parents. The relative ethnic group size is in so far a relevant aspect as it determines the likelihood of practicing the ethnic language and heritage culture, establishing ethnic relationships, and developing a sense of belonging to the ethnic group (Abrams & Giles, 2007; Androutsopoulos, 2006; Bozdağ, 2014a). The educational background of the parents is another relevant aspect here as it determines the learning environment of the children in terms of language spoken at home and values and norms imparted by parents (Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2016; Esser, 2001; Mansel, 2007).

Both variables were taken into account when examining the construction of social integration orientations of young adults from the two ethnic groups. The Turkish group represented a large ethnic group with a low educational background of the parents. With about three million individuals with a Turkish migration background, the Turkish group is the largest non-German ethnic group in Germany. The average educational background of the Turkish group in Germany is relatively low as compared to other ethnic groups or to the population with no migration background in Germany (Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2016; Tepecik, 2011). The gap is slowly closing, particularly
younger generations have gained higher education levels compared to their parents (Kristen, Reimer, & Kogan, 2008; Söhn & Özcan, 2006). The Korean group represented a small ethnic group with a high educational background of the parents. An estimated number of about 50,000 individuals with Korean roots live in Germany today (Hartmann, 2016; Hyun, 2018). Already the migrant workers that came to Germany had a relatively high educational background, with most having at least a high school degree and some having a university degree (Kim Y.-H., 1986).

The quantitative study and the qualitative study approached the overall research question from different angles and provided different perspectives on the construction of social integration orientations. Table 3 provides an overview of the research questions, the advantage of the applied method, and the overall goal of the quantitative and qualitative study.
Table 3. Overview of the purpose of the quantitative study and the qualitative study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative study</th>
<th>Qualitative study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-sectional online survey</td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions answered

**Quantitative study**

*What* social integration orientations do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct offline and online?

Are there group differences between young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background and their social integration orientations offline and online?

**Qualitative study**

*How* do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct their social integration orientations offline and online?

In which aspects do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background differ in their construction of social integration orientations offline and online?

Advantage of the applied method

**Quantitative study**
The advantage of an online survey is the broad range of questions that can be covered in a comparatively short time period. The distribution of the survey link is time- and cost-efficient and provides anonymity of respondents.

**Qualitative study**
The advantage of a focus group discussion is the interaction among participants and therefore the collective construction of understanding and meaning related to social integration within an ethnic sample.

Goal

**Quantitative study**
The goal of the online questionnaire is to detect patterns and to allocate types of social integration orientations offline and online. It allows to establish correlations between known concepts.

**Qualitative study**
The goal of the focus group discussions is to get a deeper understanding of the reasons for constructing certain types of social integration orientations. It also allows to explore unknown interrelations.

The quantitative study aimed at answering *what* social integration orientations were constructed offline and online in the two selected ethnic groups. A cross-sectional online survey was implemented which allowed covering a range of different questions and items assessing social integration orientations offline and online. The goal was to detect patterns and apply a typology of four different social integration orientations. For the qualitative study, focus group discussions were conducted which explored *how* social integration orientations were constructed offline and online. The advantage was the interaction
among participants which provided meaningful insights into the collective construction of social integration orientations within an ethnic sample. The goal of the qualitative part was to understand the reasons for constructing certain types of social integration orientation offline and online. The overall aim of the mixed methods study was to find and understand different types of social integration orientations in the offline context and in the online context in the two samples.

The following sections of this subchapter provide more details on the methodological approach of this mixed methods study. First, the sampling strategy and the participants of the quantitative and the qualitative are described. Then the data collection for the quantitative part and qualitative part are explained in more detail. Following this, the approach for the quantitative data analysis and then the qualitative data analysis are presented.

3.4.1. Sampling and participants

Participants for the online survey and the focus group discussions were recruited following criterion and snowball sampling. Participants had to (a) be between 18 and 35 years, (b) have a Turkish or Korean migration background, meaning that either they themselves migrated to Germany or at least one parent migrated from either Turkey or South Korea to Germany, (c) speak German, and (d) have their main residence in Germany. Participants were recruited through personal contacts, email lists, postings in specific Facebook groups, printed flyers, and were asked to recruit further participants that would meet the given criteria.

For the online survey, in total 80 respondents (51 female, 29 male) between 18 and 33 years ($M = 24.54, SD = 3.93$) completed the questionnaire. Of those, 45 respondents had a Turkish migration background (35 female, 10 male) and were between 18 – 33 years ($M = 23.78, SD = 3.40$). 35 respondents had a Korean migration background (16
female, 19 male) and were between 18 – 33 years ($M = 25.51, SD = 4.39$). The education level, with scores ranging from 1 (no schooling completed) to 6 (university degree), was similarly high in the Turkish sample ($M = 4.84, SD = 0.95$) and Korean sample ($M = 4.97, SD = 1.01$). There was a difference in the education level of the parents. Parents in the Turkish sample had a lower education level (mothers $M = 2.96, SD = 1.77$; fathers $M = 3.24, SD = 1.71$) than in the Korean sample (mothers $M = 4.83, SD = 1.29$; fathers $M = 5.23, SD = 1.15$).

For the focus group discussions, 26 participants (14 female, 12 male) between 20 and 31 years ($M = 24.96, SD = 3.24$) were recruited. In total, four focus groups with participants with a Turkish migration background and four focus groups with participants with a Korean migration background were conducted. The group size of each focus group ranged between two to six participants. Among the 26 participants were 15 participants with a Turkish migration background (age range: 20 - 30 years, $M = 23.73, SD = 3.26$) and 11 participants with a Korean migration background (age range: 23 – 31 years, $M = 26.63, SD = 2.46$). The education level was high both in the Turkish ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.03$) and Korean sample ($M = 4.91, SD = 1.04$). The education level of the parents in the Korean sample was higher (mothers $M = 5.64, SD = 0.81$; fathers $M = 5.64, SD = 0.81$) than in the Turkish sample (mothers $M = 3.46, SD = 2.22$; fathers $M = 3.00, SD = 1.41$).

There was an overlap between the respondents of the online survey and the participants of the focus group discussions, as some participants of the focus group discussions also filled out the questionnaire. But as the online survey was filled out anonymously, no direct link between participants in the focus groups and the survey data could be made.
3.4.2. Quantitative data collection

For the quantitative part, a cross-sectional online survey was implemented that was available in German only. The online survey was created using the web-based software Unipark. The survey was voluntary and anonymous and took about 25 minutes to complete. To encourage participation, respondents had the option to take part in a raffle by submitting their email address to a separate site and win one of three Amazon vouchers (worth 15€, 10€, and 5€). The advantages are that an online survey is easy to access and inexpensive in distribution (Callegaro, Manfreda, & Vehovar, 2015). The link to the online survey was distributed using three major strategies (for details see Appendix 9):

(1) *Distribution via social media:* The link to the web survey was made available on different social media platforms, including Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. In addition, the link was posted on public and semi-public online forums (e.g. Schwarzes Brett Bremen).

(2) *Email distribution:* Several associations and organizations, including Turkish specific ones (e.g. Türkische Gemeinde in Deutschland) or Korean specific ones (e.g. Deutsch-Koreanische Gesellschaft e.V.), were contacted and asked to distribute the survey link through their mailing lists. Furthermore, an email list of personal contacts was used.

(3) *In-person distribution:* Printed flyers containing the survey link and a QR code were distributed in public spaces, including university cafeterias and libraries in Bremen and Berlin.

The questionnaire was designed following the three social integration dimensions described by Esser (2001), meaning that each question related to the acculturation, interaction, or identification dimension. Furthermore, the questionnaire aimed to assess social integration orientations in the offline and online context. Thus, the same questions
have been used for offline and online contexts to assure comparability. The questions aimed at attitudes and behaviors in face-to-face situations and in social media mediated settings. The questionnaire included adapted questions and items from previous studies that were translated from English to German (for the complete questionnaire see Appendix 8). Furthermore, questions were included to measure general social media use. Also, socio-demographic variables were included. The questionnaire was pilot-tested in two rounds and improved and adjusted accordingly. The final version of the questionnaire included additional questions and items which were not included here as they would go beyond the scope of this study. The questions and items used in this study can be grouped into five categories:

a) **Acculturation offline and online:** The acculturation dimension was measured using adapted questions and items from the *Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics* (Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987), the language subscale from the new *Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics* (Marin & Gamba, 1996), migration and integration items from the German socio-economic panel (GSOEP) (TNS Infratest Sozialforschung, 2014), and items from the language use acculturation subscale (Wallen, Feldman, & Anliker, 2002). In total, six questions were used to measure acculturation offline. These questions were presented twice, once for the German context and once for the Turkish or Korean context. These questions were then framed for the online context. For instance, a question included was “How much do you like speaking German [Turkish/Korean]?” which had to be rated on a 5-point scale, from 1= not all to 5= very much. In the online context, this was then phrased as “How much do you like using German [Turkish/Korean] on social media?” with the same 5-point Likert scale.
b) Interaction offline and online: The interaction dimension aimed at measuring intra- and intergroup relations. The first question was an adapted version of the friendship patterns from Bochner, McLeod, and Lin (1977). The respondents had to count how many of their five best friends were German with no migration, and how many of them were Turkish or Korean or had a Turkish or Korean migration background. For the online context, this was phrased as with whom they like chatting the most online using social media. The second question asked more specifically to name five people they spend most of their leisure time or social media time with and their ethnic background. This was used to construct a small scale friendship network offline and online. In addition, respondents had to indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) with four items regarding the interaction with Germans and people with a Turkish or Korean migration background. These have been adapted from the Other-Group Orientation items used in Phinney’s (1992) Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measures (MEIM). For instance, one item read “I often spend time with Germans who don’t have a migration background”. The equivalent for the online context was “When using social media, I often chat with Germans who don’t have a migration background”.

c) Identification offline and online: The identification dimension was measured in two parts. The first question asked the respondents how much they felt part of a German [Turkish/Korean] community or a German [Turkish/Korean] online community (5-point Likert scale from 1= not at all to 5= very much). The second part asked about how much they would agree or disagree with two statements from Phinney’s (1992) MEIM Ethnic Identity Achievement Items. For instance, one statement read “I have spent time finding out more about my Turkish/Korean
origin, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs”. For the online context, this was framed as “I have used social media to find out more about my Turkish/Korean origin, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs”.

d) **General social media use:** To measure social media use, an open-ended question was included where participants could list their three most frequently used social media platforms or applications. Respondents were then asked to indicate how frequently they used social media (all the time, several times a day, once a day, several times a week, once a week). In addition, adapted items from the Facebook Intensity Scale (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007) were used to assess the reasons for social media use. Here, respondents indicated their agreement on five statements on a 5-point Likert scale (e.g. “I use social media to stay in contact with friends and family”: 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree).

e) **Socio-demographic variables:** The questionnaire included socio-demographic questions, including age, sex, citizenship, country of birth, marital status, education level, current employment status, the federal state (Bundesland) they currently live in, the number of inhabitants of their current place of residence (from more than 1,000,000 to less than 5,000 inhabitants), and their current living situation (e.g. living with parents or alone). Furthermore, socio-demographic questions were asked about the respondents’ parents. These included items on their current country of residence, citizenship, country of birth, ethnic background, education level, and employment status.

3.4.3. Qualitative data collection

For the qualitative part, focus group discussions were conducted. The advantages of focus groups are especially the group interactions and group compositions. Participants in a focus group can follow up on comments, share opinions, and discuss among each
other (Barbour, 2007; Morgan, 1997). This can provide meaningful insights into the social construction of opinions or beliefs of a group (Marshall & Rossmann, 2011, p. 149). Furthermore, the composition of the focus group is an important factor for the group dynamic. It is important that participants feel comfortable to contribute to the discussion. To achieve a group composition participants feel comfortable with, Morgan (1997) suggests having a homogeneity of background. In this study, the homogeneity was in the migration background of the participants. The group composition of each focus group consisted of participants with a Turkish migration background or with participants with a Korean migration background. This homogeneity of migration background within each focus group not only aimed for a comfortable discussion environment for the participants, but also for exploring the shared experiences within an ethnic group (Fern, 2001).

All focus group discussions were held in German and followed a semi-structured focus group guide with 12 key questions (see Appendix 1). These key questions aimed at the three social integration dimensions: acculturation, interaction, and identification. Questions evolved around language uses, friendship relations, and personal feelings of belonging, in the offline context and in the online context. For instance, one key question relating to the acculturation dimension was: “In which situations do you prefer to speak German, in which situations Turkish/Korean? Are there differences between the language you prefer to use on social media and the one you prefer to use in everyday life? Can you describe a corresponding situation?” The questions aimed at personal reasons and motivations for specific cultural preferences. Furthermore, the semi-structured focus group guide allowed a certain degree of flexibility and follow-up questions on topics brought up by the participants but not covered by the focus group guide.
3.4.4. Quantitative data analysis

For analyzing the data from the cross-sectional online survey, the open-source statistics software JASP was used. In order to measure scores for the four social integration orientations, the scores of the questions presented Table 4 were used to calculate the mean scores for each social integration dimension in the offline and online context.

Table 4. Overview of the questions measuring social integration orientations in the offline context and in the online context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item OFFLINE context</th>
<th>Item ONLINE context</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>How often do you speak German or Turkish/Korean with family?</td>
<td>How often do you use German or Turkish/Korean on social media with family?</td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often do you speak German or Turkish/Korean with friends?</td>
<td>How often do you use German or Turkish/Korean on social media with friends?</td>
<td>1 = almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = almost always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How confident do you feel when you speak German or Turkish/Korean?</td>
<td>How confident do you feel when you use German or Turkish/Korean on social media?</td>
<td>1 = not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general, how much do you like speaking German or Turkish/Korean?</td>
<td>How much do you like using German or Turkish/Korean on social media?</td>
<td>1 = not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In general, how acquainted are you with the German or Turkish/Korean culture?</td>
<td>How acquainted are you with the German or Turkish/Korean online culture?</td>
<td>1 = not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How attached do you feel to the German or Turkish/Korean culture?</td>
<td>How attached do you feel to the German or Turkish/Korean online culture?</td>
<td>1 = not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = quite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 = very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interaction**

Think of five of your best friends:

How many of them are Turks/Koreans or have a Turkish/Korean background?

How many of them are Germans without a migration background?

Think of five people you like to chat with most on social media:

How many of them are Turks/Koreans or have a Turkish/Korean background?

How many of them are Germans without a migration background?

How much would you agree with the following statements:

- I often spend time with Germans who don’t have a migration background.
- I am not interested in friendships with people who are not Turkish/Korean or who don’t have a Turkish/Korean background.
- When I use social media, I often spend time chatting with Germans who don’t have a migration background.
- I am not interested in online friendships with people who are not Turkish/Korean or who don’t have a Turkish/Korean background.

**Identification**

How much do you feel part of the German or Turkish/Korean community?

How much do you feel part of the German or Turkish/Korean online community?

How much would you agree with the following statements:

- I have spent time finding out more about my Turkish/Korean origin, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs.
- I have spent time finding out more about Germany, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs.
- I have used social media to find out more about my Turkish/Korean origin, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs.
- I have used social media to find out more about Germany, like e.g. about its history, traditions, and customs.

**Note.** ¹ Scale transformed from a 4-point scale to a 5-point scale: \((5-1)*(x-1)/(4-1)+1 = 4*(x-1)/3+1 = (4/3)x-(4/3)+1 = (4/3)x - (1/3); ² Scale transformed from a 6-point scale to a 5-point scale: \((5-1)*(x-1)/(6-1)+1 = 4*(x-1)/5+1 = (4/5)x-(4/5)+1 = (4/5)x + (1/5).

The scales were transformed into 5-point scales where necessary. Each question and item assessed the German preference and ethnic preference. This resulted in two scales ranging from 1 to 5. A cross-section of the two scales and splitting at the scalar midpoint (in this case 3) resulted in four quadrants of social integration orientations reflecting Berry’s acculturation model (see Figure 8).
Figure 8. Four social integration orientations of ethnic groups in Germany.

The scores were assessed and aggregated for each social integration dimension offline and online. This allowed a more differentiated assessment of the orientation constructed within the acculturation, interaction, and identification dimension. The overall social integration orientation offline and online was determined by calculating the mean of the scores from all three dimensions.

3.4.5. Qualitative data analysis

Based on audio recordings, the focus group discussions were transcribed using the software f4 and analyzed by applying Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) using the software MAXQDA 2018. Since this chapter aims at integrating quantitative and qualitative results, applying QCA had several advantages as it “shares and combines features of both qualitative and quantitative research” (Schreier, 2012, p. 35). The aim of QCA is to reduce the data to the relevant dimensions by applying a coding frame. To link
the qualitative results to the quantitative results, the coding frame applied to the qualitative data was both concept-driven and data-driven. The main categories of the coding frame were concept-driven and conformed with the three social integration dimensions (acculturation, interaction, and identification) which were also applied to the online survey and in the focus group guide. The subcategories specified details of the main categories and were data-driven. After building the coding frame, it was tested on parts of the material, then evaluated and revised. To ensure reliability, a second coder was consulted who coded 10% of the material. The percentage of agreement was about 82% and the inter-coder reliability kappa score was at .63. In this case, the agreement level was sufficient.

The final coding frame consisted of eight main categories and 33 subcategories. Two of the six main categories aimed at the personal understanding of social integration and the potentials and challenges of social media use for social integration. As these categories would go beyond the scope of this mixed methods study, it was decided to exclude them for the analysis. In the end, six of the main categories and 28 subcategories were included in the final analysis (see Figure 9).

![Figure 9. Coding frame used for the Qualitative Content Analysis.](image)

The complete coding frame with the subcategories can be found in the Appendix 5. Visualization of the Coding Frame

Within each social integration dimension, the
subcategories were then arranged according to cultural orientation: Turkish/ Korean, German, both, and neither. Subcategories were assessed as “Turkish/ Korean” when they specifically referred to aspects of the Turkish or Korean culture, community, or identity. When subcategories related directly to the German culture, community, or identity, these were assessed as “German”. Subcategories that referred to mixing or switching between the Turkish/ Korean and German culture, community, or identity, were labeled as “both”. Subcategories referring to the rejection or feeling of detachment from the Turkish/Korean and German culture and identity were assessed as “neither”. This classification of the subcategories allowed us to assess the construction of the orientation within each dimension and the overall construction of social integration orientations offline and online.

3.5. Results

The aim of this mixed methods study was to examine and understand the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a Turkish and Korean migration background. The quantitative part aimed at examining patterns and applying a typology of four different social integration orientations, while the qualitative part aimed at exploring the motivations and reasons behind the construction of these social integration orientations and their social media use. Overall, the mixed methods study aimed to find and understand different types of social integration orientations in the offline and online context in the two ethnic samples.

In the following sections, the results of the mixed methods study are summarized and presented. The results are structured along the three social integration orientations: acculturation, interaction, and identification. The first section presents the results for the acculturation dimension offline and online for each ethnic sample. The quantitative
results are presented first, then the qualitative results. The second section presents results for the interaction dimension in the same structure, followed by the third section presenting the results for the identification dimension. The final section of this subchapter presents the overall social integration orientations constructed offline and online for each ethnic sample. However, before presenting the results for the social integration dimensions, a brief overview of the general social media use of the respondents is provided.

**General social media use.** The quantitative part of this mixed methods study showed that respondents in both ethnic samples were high social media users. In the Turkish sample, 22% said they use social media all the time and 62% said they use social media several times a day. This was similar in the Korean sample: 20% said they use social media all the time and 71% said they use social media several times a day (see Figure 10).

*Figure 10. Time spent using social media.*

In addition to the time spent on using social media, respondents were also asked to name their top three most frequently used social media platforms and applications. The results showed that among the top two most frequently used social media platforms in
both ethnic samples were Facebook and WhatsApp. In the Korean sample, Facebook appeared 32 times in the top three most frequently used social media platforms, while WhatsApp occurred 18 times. YouTube was mentioned 15 times, as well as KakaoTalk. In the Turkish sample, WhatsApp was mentioned 39 times, Facebook 29 times, and YouTube 28 times.

Concerning the reasons for using social media, Table 5 shows that staying in touch with friends and family and getting information were the top two reasons for using social media in both ethnic samples. Overall, the reasons for using social media were quite similar between the two samples.

**Table 5. General reasons for using social media.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I use social media because...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to inform myself</td>
<td>4.09 1.10</td>
<td>4.26 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to stay in touch with friends and family</td>
<td>4.13 1.12</td>
<td>4.34 0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to feel less lonely</td>
<td>1.84 0.98</td>
<td>2.43 1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is part of my habit</td>
<td>3.60 1.05</td>
<td>3.60 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can relax</td>
<td>2.82 1.25</td>
<td>2.89 1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Turkish sample n=45; Korean sample n=35; scale from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree.

3.5.1. Acculturation dimension

In the quantitative part, acculturation orientations were assessed with six items: 1) language use with family, 2) language use with friends, 3) confidence in speaking a language, 4) liking a language, 5) cultural acquaintance and 6) cultural attachment.
For the Turkish sample, the results for the acculturation dimension showed a multiple inclusion orientation in the offline and online context. As visualized in Figure 11, the average mean score for acculturation offline (German $M = 3.83$, Turkish $M = 3.86$) and acculturation online (German $M = 3.79$, Turkish $M = 3.34$) were above three on both cultural preference scales. This means that the German and Turkish culture and language were to a similarly large part involved in the offline and online life of the respondents.

![Figure 11. Acculturation scores offline and online for the Turkish sample.](image)

Taking a closer look at the scores of the individual items in this dimension revealed a more nuanced picture. In terms of language use, respondents differentiated between family and friends both in the offline and online contexts. In the offline context, Turkish was more often used in the family context ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.12$) than German ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.40$). With friends, however, German was much more often used ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 0.78$) than Turkish ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.23$). When using social media, a similar language pattern was shown. When communicating with family online, Turkish was more often used ($M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.40$) than German ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 1.45$). When communicating with friends, German was more used ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.21$) than Turkish ($M = 3.10$, $SD = 1.29$).
Relating the heritage language to the family context was also reflected in the results of the qualitative part of this mixed methods study. Participants pointed out that Turkish was especially spoken with the family. One participant said: “[…] I couldn't speak German with my son. It just comes across very unnaturally. It's like Turkish is still the language of the family and of... of intimacy, somehow...”\(^4\) The Turkish language was an aspect frequently discussed in the focus group discussions. Over 40% of the coded segments in the acculturation offline dimension referred to the Turkish language. Generally, participants in the qualitative study mentioned more aspects relating to the Turkish culture and the Turkish language than to the German culture and German language (see Table 6). Two-thirds of the codes in the acculturation offline dimension referred to Turkish culture aspects, while 19.1% of the codes referred to combining or mixing the two cultures or languages, and only 14.9% referred to German culture aspects.

**Table 6. Code distribution in the acculturation offline dimension for the Turkish sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation offline</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Turkish sample n=15; the category “both” included codes of mixing and switching between the Turkish and German culture and language.*

Similarly, in the acculturation online dimension, most of the codes related to aspects of the Turkish language or consuming Turkish content online. However, aspects of switching and mixing languages were more often mentioned in the online than offline

\(^4\) Original: „Deswegen konnte ich mit meinem Sohn auch nicht […] auf Deutsch reden. Das kommt einfach sehr unnatürlich rüber. Das ist so, Türkisch ist immer noch die Sprache der Familie, und der...der Innigkeit, irgendwo...“ [DT01, P6 (m, 28), 356]
context. The codes *switching languages* and *mixing languages* occurred each 6 times and were summarized under the category “both” (see Table 7). Interestingly, the code of *mixing languages* only emerged in the online context. When asked about languages used on social media, one participant explained:

*It’s always a mix. So I use Turkish and German. [...] With family it’s Turkish, with siblings it’s always some Turkish-German mix. Sometimes you have both languages in one sentence, too [laughs].*

Table 7. *Code distribution in the acculturation online dimension for the Turkish sample.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation online</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Turkish sample n=15; the category “both” included codes of mixing and switching between the Turkish and German culture and language when using social media.*

For the Korean sample, the results of the quantitative study showed overall a multiple inclusion orientation in the acculturation offline dimension (German *M* = 4.18, Korean *M* = 3.33) and a slight assimilation orientation in the acculturation online dimension (German *M* = 4.00, Korean *M* = 2.92). Looking at the scores of the individual items visualized in Figure 12, a difference in the language use with family and with friends is visible again. In the acculturation offline dimension, Korean was used with family (*M* = 3.55, *SD* = 1.46) slightly more than German (*M* = 3.10, *SD* = 1.59), while with friends

---

5 Original: „Das ist immer so ein Mix. Also ich benutze Türkisch und Deutsch. […] Mit der Familie halt eher Türkisch, mit Geschwistern ist es immer so ein Türkisch-Deutsch-Mix. Hat man auch mal im Satz beide Sprachen.“ [DT04, P3 (f, 21), 47]
German was much more often spoken \((M = 4.58, SD = 0.71)\) than Korean \((M = 2.45, SD = 1.23)\).

Figure 12. Acculturation scores offline and online for the Korean sample.

In the acculturation online dimension, a similar distinction was observed. When using social media with family, Korean was more often used \((M = 3.27, SD = 1.76)\) than German \((M = 2.83, SD = 1.77)\). With friends, the online communication was more often in German \((M = 4.20, SD = 1.03)\) than Korean \((M = 2.64, SD = 1.41)\).

The results from the qualitative part provided more insights into the acculturation dimension. Looking at the code occurrences in the acculturation offline dimension depicted in Table 8, more aspects relating to the German culture and language were mentioned than aspects relating to the Korean culture and language. Particularly participants born and raised in Germany mentioned being more familiar with the German culture and language. The level of language proficiency determined language use in daily life. For instance, in one focus group, the limited vocabulary in Korean hampered the participants’ expression of certain emotions and therefore fostered German language use. One participant said: “Well, I wouldn’t be able to really swear in Korean. Where were we
supposed to learn it anyways? Surely our parents did not teach us that.” On the other
hand, for those participants who migrated themselves to Germany to attend university,
German culture and language specifics were more salient and therefore were also pointed
out more. For instance, one participant pointed out:

There are cultural differences and, uh, this emotion is also different, very, very different.
Then I have to try because I live here, and that way I can learn the culture, learn German.
And I came here to study, I can study because of that.  

The reasons for using German over Korean in daily life for those born and raised in
Germany was a matter of proficiency. For those who migrated themselves to Germany,
the German language was seen as a necessity for their life in Germany.

\textit{Table 8. Code distribution in the acculturation offline dimension for the Korean sample.}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acculturation offline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Note.} Korean sample n=11; the category “both” included codes of mixing or switching between the Korean and German culture and language.

For the acculturation online dimension, the qualitative results showed that more
aspects referring to the Korean culture and language were mentioned (see Table 9). The
most frequently mentioned code was \textit{heritage culture specifics online}. Here, participants
pointed out Korean specifics when it comes to online communication. For instance, one

\textit{6 Original: „Also ich würde nicht auf Koreanisch fluche können so richtig. […] Wo hätten wir das auch
lernen sollen? Unsere Eltern haben uns sicher das nicht so beigebracht.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 210-213]} 

\textit{7 Original: „Es gibt kulturelle Unterschiede und, äh, diese Emotion ist auch anders, ganz, ganz anders. Dann
muss ich es muss versuchen, weil ich hier wohne, und dadurch kann ich die Kultur lernen, Deutsch lernen.
Und ich bin hierhergekommen für das Studium, ich kann studieren dadurch.“ [DK04, P1 (m,28), 791]}
participant explained that in the online context “the Korean culture is a bit more emotionally rich as just the ‘hehe’, ‘haha’, ‘hoho’. There are different smilies on KakaoTalk that show a more diverse form of emotions.”

Compared to the offline context, more aspects of combining both cultures and languages were mentioned online. The second most frequently mentioned code in the acculturation online dimension was switching languages online. While the code switching languages only occurred 3 times in the offline context, it occurred 9 times in the online context. This code was applied when participants mentioned using a specific language in a specific context. For instance, concerning the language use online, one participant said: “I mainly use German. But I use KakaoTalk in Korean sometimes.”

**Table 9. Code distribution in the acculturation online dimension for the Korean sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation online</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Korean sample n=11; the category “both” included codes of mixing and switching between the Korean and German culture and language when using social media.

3.5.2. Interaction dimension

The interaction dimension included two items: 1) best friends and 2) friendship attitudes. The first item assessed the ethnic background of the respondents’ five best friends. Each respondent had to think about five close friends and indicate how many of

---

8 Original: „Ich glaube, man merkt das manchmal, wenn man sich halt so Nachrichten schickt oder so, dass, die koreanische Kultur ein bisschen emotionsreicher ist als nur das ‘hehe’, ‘haha’, ‘hoho’. […] Es gibt bei KakaoTalk unterschiedliche Smilys, die eine etwas vielschichtigere Art von Gefühlen zeigen.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 50-52]

9 Original: „Ich auch eher hauptsächlich Deutsch. Aber KakaoTalk mache ich manchmal auf Koreanisch.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 43]
them had a Turkish/Korean migration background and how many of them were Germans with no migration background (on a scale from 1= no friend to 6= five friends that was later transformed into a 5-point scale). The second item was problematic because it used a positive phrasing for the German scale (“I often spend time with Germans who don’t have a migration background” on a scale from 1= strongly disagree to 5= strongly agree) and a negative phrasing for the ethnic scale (“I am not interested in friendships with people who are not Turkish/Korean or who don’t have a Turkish/Korean background”). The two items did not capture the same meaning in the two cultural contexts and thus skewed the results for the interaction dimension.

The results from the quantitative part for the Turkish visualized in Figure 13 showed a marginalization orientation for the interaction offline and online dimension.

![Figure 13. Interaction scores offline and online for the Turkish sample.](image)

On average, respondents in the Turkish sample named more close friends with a Turkish migration background ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 1.40$) than German close friends with no migration background ($M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.08$). Overall, 42.2% indicated having no German friends among their top five friends they interact in their daily life (offline), while only 8.9% said to have no close friends with a Turkish migration background. Although
the respondents indicated to have more close friends with a Turkish migration background, they indicated to often spend time with Germans who did not have a migration background (\(M = 3.60, SD = 1.01\)). On the other hand, respondents strongly disagreed with the statement to be not interested in friendships with people who are not Turkish or who don’t have a Turkish background (\(M = 1.22, SD = 0.52\)).

In the online context, respondents indicated to interact more with Turkish friends (\(M = 3.51, SD = 1.27\)) than with German friends (\(M = 2.14, SD = 1.11\)). Concerning the second item, there was a low agreement with the statement “I often spend time with Germans who don’t migration background” (\(M = 2.80, SD = 1.08\)) and strong disagreement with the statement “I am not interested in friendships with people who are not Turkish or who don’t have a Turkish migration background” (\(M = 1.62, SD = 1.09\)).

The qualitative results helped to get a clearer picture of the interaction offline dimension and to better understand the results from the quantitative part. Two subcategories emerged from the qualitative data in the interaction offline dimension: 1) having friends with a similar background and 2) having German friends. As

The quote above illustrates how the shared migration history was seen as an important emotional bond between Turks across generations. Having a shared migration history and mutual understanding were important aspects affecting their friendship relations. As one participant observed: “I have a lot more Turkish friends. Probably because they are more likely to approach me. It might also be me looking for them. But, I mean, I don’t make a distinction.”

Table 10 shows, 80% of the coded segments for this dimension related to having friends with a similar background which referred to the importance of having Turkish friends. As one participant shared:
Here at the university it’s like that I -, I’ve also transferred here [to Bremen] from Hannover and didn’t know so many people. And I have to admit that I was rather looking for… Turkish-speaking friends. But not because I like the Turks more, but because we have more in common. You -, because you have more to talk to each other.\textsuperscript{10}

With regard to friendships, having shared cultural practices and experiences in common were important aspects pointed out by the participants. This was further elaborated by another participant:

I think, no matter what, no matter whether you have, so to speak, nothing in common with the Turks, it’s enough that you’ve basically had the same migration experience. So somehow in the family, somehow it will be similar with us. Our parents came here to work, or our grandparents and so on. I think it's this emotional -, in the back of one’s mind this: We have a historically -, historically we're kind of together, kind of belong together.\textsuperscript{11}

The quote above illustrates how the shared migration history was seen as an important emotional bond between Turks across generations. Having a shared migration history and mutual understanding were important aspects affecting their friendship relations. As one participant observed: “I have a lot more Turkish friends. Probably because they are more likely to approach me. It might also be me looking for them. But, I mean, I don’t make a distinction.”\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Original: “Hier an der Uni ist es dann so, dass ich -, ich bin ja auch aus Hannover hergewechselt und kannte noch nicht so viele. Und da muss ich schon ehrlich zugeben, dass ich eher... türkischsprachige Freunde gesucht habe. Aber nicht weil mir die Türken eventuell sympathischer sind, sondern weil man auch mehr Gemeinsamkeiten miteinander hat. Man -, weil man mehr zu bereden hat miteinander.” \cite{DT02, P3 (m, 21), 125}

\textsuperscript{11} Original: “Ich glaube, egal was ist, egal, ob mit den Türken sozusagen gar keine Gemeinsamkeit hat, es reicht, dass man quasi die gleiche Migrationserfahrung gemacht hat. Also irgendwie in der Familie, irgendwie wird das schon ähnlich bei uns sein. Unsere Eltern sind ja zum Arbeiten hergekommen oder unsere Großeltern und so. Ich glaube, das ist dieser emotionale -, im Hinterkopf dieses: Wir haben eine historisch -, historisch sind wir irgendwie zusammen, gehören wir irgendwie zusammen.” \cite{DT02, P4 (f, 30), 161}

\textsuperscript{12} Original: „Ich habe viel mehr türkische Freunde. Wahrscheinlich weil die dann eher auf mich zukommen. Kann auch sein, dass ich die suche. Aber, ich meine, einen Unterschied mache ich da nicht.” \cite{DT02, P3 (m, 21), 235}
Table 10. Code distribution in the interaction offline dimension for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction offline</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15.

In the online context, communicating with friends with a similar background was only mentioned in 3 instances. Overall, the most frequently mentioned code in the interaction online dimension was staying in contact with family and friends via social media (see Table 11). This code referred to persons already known from the offline context and included a diverse group of people. When asked about whom they communicated with on social media, one participant answered: “With me, it’s often people I know from university or from work at home. But also my cousins from Turkey or also from America some friends of mine”\(^{13}\). Social media provided important tools to keep in touch with offline relationships, regardless of geographical distance.

Table 11. Code distribution in the interaction online dimension for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction online</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15; the category “both” included the code of staying in contact with family and friends of diverse backgrounds.

\(^{13}\) Original: „Bei mir sind es oft Leute, die ich jetzt auch von der Uni kenne oder von der Arbeit daheim. Aber halt auch meine Cousinsen und Cousins aus der Türkei oder auch aus Amerika ein paar Freunde von mir.“ [DT04, P1 (f, 20), 42]
For the Korean sample, the quantitative part revealed an assimilation orientation for the interaction offline and online dimension (see Figure 14).

![Figure 14. Interaction scores offline and online of the Korean sample.](image)

The average number of close friends with a Korean migration background (M=2.58, SD=1.27) and German close friends with no migration background (M= 2.87, SD= 1.24) was quite similar. Interestingly, 25.7% indicated having no close friends with a Korean background among their top five best friends in their daily life, while only 11.4% indicated having no German close friends in that context. Once again, the second item on friendship attitudes skewed the results as the two statements were not ideally formulated. On the German statement most respondents strongly agreed (M = 4.17, SD = 1.04), while most strongly disagreed with the Korean statement (M = 1.23, SD = 0.65).

In the online context, the number of German friends online (M = 2.74, SD = 1.09) and Korean online (M = 2.67, SD = 1.31) were quite similar again. On the second item, respondents agreed with the statement “I often spend time with Germans who don’t have migration background” (M = 3.77, SD = 1.06) and disagreed with the statement “I am not interested in friendships with people who are not Korean or who don’t have a Korean migration background” (M = 1.77, SD = 1.31).
The results from the qualitative part added some useful information to the interaction dimension. The results revealed the importance of having friends with a similar background for the participants in the Korean sample. The code distribution summarized in Table 12 shows that 7 out of 8 code occurrences in this dimension referred to having friends with a similar background. When asked how important friends with a similar cultural background were one participant promptly answered “very important”\(^\text{14}\). Another participant who moved to Germany to attend university did not think at first that it would be important for her to meet other Koreans. But with time she came to appreciate the social interactions with other Koreans in Germany as she explained:

In Bremen, I started working at a Korean school where I met some people. And the time I spend in the Korean school is very nice. That’s good. When I first arrived, I didn't think that I would really need contact with Koreans.\(^\text{15}\)

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lrrrr}
\hline
 & Interaction offline \\
 & Korean & German & both & neither \\
\hline
Number of codes & 7 & 1 & / & / \\
Percentage & 87.5\% & 12.5\% & / & / \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Code distribution in the interaction offline dimension for the Korean sample.}
\end{table}

\textit{Note.} Korean sample \(n=11\).

In the online context, communicating with persons with a similar background on social media was mentioned in 6 instances (see Table 13). For the participants, it was

\^\text{14}\ Original: „Ganz wichtig.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 219]
more important to stay in contact with family and friends from both cultural backgrounds via social media which was referred to in 11 instances in the focus group discussions.  

**Table 13. Code distribution in the interaction online dimension for the Korean sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction online</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Korean sample n=11; the category “both” included the code of staying in contact with family and friends of diverse backgrounds.

3.5.3. Identification dimension

The quantitative study measured identification offline with two items: 1) feeling part of a community and 2) interest in history and traditions.

The results of the quantitative study for the Turkish group presented a multiple inclusion orientation offline and a marginalization orientation online (see Figure 15). For the identification offline dimension, respondents showed a similar level of interest in the history and traditions of both Germany ($M = 3.60, SD = 1.14$) and Turkey ($M = 3.84, SD = 1.19$). When asked about how much they felt part of a community, respondents felt more part of a Turkish community ($M = 3.53, SD = 1.23$) than a German community ($M = 3.11, SD = 1.07$).
In the online context, respondents in the Turkish sample did not use social media much to find out more about the Turkish ($M = 2.60, SD = 1.25$) or German ($M = 2.44, SD = 1.06$) history and traditions. With regard to feeling part of an online community, respondents indicated belonging to both a German online community ($M = 3.29, SD = 1.12$) and a Turkish online community ($M = 3.02, SD = 1.27$).

The qualitative study exposed a different picture from the quantitative data. More than half of the coded segments in the identification offline context related to aspects of feelings of conflict and exclusion (see Table 14). Most frequently mentioned in this category (labeled as “neither” in Table 16) was the issue of being perceived as different. As one participant clearly stated: “So in Turkey, I’m foreign […] but also in Germany. So where do I actually belong, that’s the question then.”\[16\] This quote demonstrates the struggle young adults with a migration background face, namely the need to belong but

---

\[16\] Original: „Also ich bin in der Türkei fremd […] oder auch in Deutschland fremd. Also wo gehöre ich eigentlich hin, ist dann die Frage.“ [DT04, P2 (f, 21), 113]
the lack of acceptance by neither of the countries. This was closely related to discrimination experiences. As one participant shared:

I would say there are always moments when I feel foreign. So, where I think, if I had another name now, I could become Federal President or something. I don’t know. Or a constitutional judge, right? Well, that's a thought that just comes to me every now and then [...].

This issue was further reflected in the focus group discussions when participants mentioned the issue of *conflicting identities* and aspects of *feeling detached from the Turkish community or Turkey*. These two codes only emerged in the Turkish sample. One participant pointed out the difficulty of combining his German with his Muslim identity and said they were incompatible. Religion was a topic that emerged from the qualitative data and was neither introduced in the focus group guide nor the online questionnaire. The other aspect concerned the political situation in Turkey. When asked about the role of Turkey in his life, one participant answered:

I find the political situation worrying, and Turkey could go down now. And then to come to what that would mean for me in concrete terms, because I mean, sure, somehow my relatives are there, who live there, but I am simply *here* [in Germany].

The political situation in Turkey was mentioned in several focus groups and led to a feeling of detachment from Turkey among some of the participants.

18 Original: „Zumal hat die deutsche Identität mit der islamischen Identität nicht vollständig zu vereinbaren ist.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 254]
19 Original: „Die politische Situation finde ich bedenklich, und die Türkei könnte jetzt untergehen. Und dann aber darauf zu kommen, was das für mich konkret bedeuten würde, weil ich meine, klar, es sind irgendwie meine Verwandten da, die da leben, aber ich bin einfach *hier* [in Deutschland].“ [DT03, P1 (m, 24), 154]
Table 14. Code distribution in the identification offline dimension for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification offline</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15; the category “both” included codes of feeling part of the Turkish and German community and combing the Turkish and German identity; the category “neither” included codes of identity conflicts and feeling detached from Turkey or the Turkish community.

In the online context of the identification dimension, only one code merged from the data, namely the feeling of attachment to Turkey or the Turkish community via social media which occurred 3 times in the focus group discussions (see Table 15). In this context, it was mentioned that social media played an important role in transmitting political information from Turkey. One participant pointed out:

You are much faster involved in the current events in Turkey. For example, the Gezi Park movement back then was also very often promoted through Facebook. This, for example, has brought us much closer to Turkey. I think, also in general, politically and socially, and everything that happens there, social media have created much more closeness. 

Social media served as a bridge between Turkey and Germany, creating a feeling of closeness to Turkey by being informed about the political situation.

---

20 Original: „Man ist viel schneller, sozusagen, am aktuellen Geschehen in der Türkei dabei. […] Hier zum Beispiel, die Gezi-Park Bewegung damals, die ja auch oft sehr über halt Facebook auch vorangetrieben worden ist, die hat zum Beispiel die Türkei viel näher an uns herangetragen. […] Ich finde, auch überhaupt politisch und gesellschaftlich und alles was da passiert, da haben die sozialen Medien viel mehr Nähe geschaffen.“ [DT02, P4 (f, 30), 285]
Table 15. Code distribution in the identification online dimension for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification online</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15.

For the Korean sample, the respondents of the quantitative study constructed a multiple inclusion orientation for the identification offline dimension and an assimilation orientation for the identification online dimension (see Figure 15). The respondents’ interest in the German ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.94$) and Korean ($M = 3.83$, $SD = 1.07$) history and traditions was similarly high. Looking at the item assessing the feeling of being part of a community, respondents showed a stronger belonging to the German community ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.10$) than the Korean community ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.22$).

For the online context, respondents used social media to a similar degree to find out about German ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.15$) and Korean ($M = 3.49$, $SD = 1.25$) history and traditions. Respondents felt more part of German online community ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.23$) than to a Korean one ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 1.16$).
The results from the qualitative study supported the multiple orientation construction in the offline context. As depicted in Table 16, over 42% of the coded segments in the identification offline dimension related to combining or blending the Korean and German identity. One participant tried to define her identity and said, “Well... well, like German-Korean simply. Eh, I think somehow you can’t put it in percentages or anything and it’s dynamic, the process, anyway”. In the Korean sample, it was less of an issue to combine the two cultural and ethnic identities than in the Turkish sample.

Nevertheless, the qualitative results also revealed difficulties. The code of being perceived as different was mentioned 8 times in the Korean sample. One participant explained:

Original: „Also schon... schon so Deutsch-Koreanisch, einfach. Äh, ich finde irgendwie, man kann das nicht so in Prozentzahlen oder so angeben und das ist sowieso dynamisch der Prozess.“ [DK03, P2 (f, 25), 122]
One is never completely German. On the one hand, because that's not really your background. On the other hand also because you don't look like one and because you are not accepted as such. Right? 22

The perception and acceptance by the mainstream society played an important role here. As the participants pointed out, because of his ethnic background and his outer appearance he would never be completely German. Underlying this statement is the feeling that he would never be accepted by the mainstream society as German.

*Table 16. Code distribution in the identification offline dimension for the Korean sample.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification offline</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Korean sample n=11; the category “both” included codes of feeling part of the Korean and German community and combing the Korean and German identity; the category “neither” included codes of identity conflicts and feeling detached from the Korean and German community.

In the online context of the identification dimension, only one participant in the focus group discussion of the Korean sample mentioned that social media helped to strengthen the feeling of attachment to the Korean community in Germany by being able to connect to other Koreans through a common interest in music (see Table 17).

---

22 Original: „Man ist halt nie komplett deutsch. Einerseits, weil man das halt wirklich nicht ist von seinem Hintergrund. Andererseits auch, weil man halt auch nicht so aussieht und weil man halt auch nicht so angenommen wird. Ne? [DK02, P1 (m, 23), 389]
Table 17. Code distribution in the identification online dimension for the Korean sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification online</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of codes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Korean sample n=11.

3.5.4. Social integration orientations offline and online

Taking the scores from the three social integration dimensions together, the social integration orientation offline and online for each ethnic sample was determined.

The quantitative results for the Turkish sample are summarized in Table 18. They show that the mean scores for the social integration orientation offline are above the scalar midpoint of 3 on the German ($M = 3.55$) and Turkish ($M = 3.50$) scale. The results are similar for the social integration orientation online, though the mean scores are a bit lower. For the online context, the mean score on the German scale ($M = 3.36$) was a bit higher than on the Turkish scale ($M = 3.06$).
Table 18. Overview of mean scores for each social integration dimension offline and online for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use with family</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use with friends</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in speaking a language</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking a language</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural acquaintance</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural attachment</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation mean score</strong></td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friends</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship attitudes</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction mean score</strong></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of a community</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in history and traditions</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification mean score</strong></td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social integration orientation**  
Mean: 3.55 / 3.50 / 3.36 / 3.06

*Note.* Turkish sample n=45.
Overall, this means that respondents in the Turkish sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation in the offline as well as in the online context (see Figure 17).

![Figure 17. Social integration orientation offline and online for the Turkish sample.](image)

The qualitative data provided more insight into how social integration orientations offline and online were constructed. Table 19 shows the distribution of code frequencies in the three social integration dimensions offline and online.
Table 19. Overview of code frequencies in the three social integration dimensions for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offline</td>
<td>online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15.

Most of the coded segments occurred in the identification offline dimensions. In the focus group discussions, participants particularly emphasized aspects relating to identity and feelings of belonging. The need to belong and to feel accepted were central aspects mentioned in this context. In the online context, most of the coded segments emerged in the acculturation online dimension. Here, aspects relating to the Turkish language were pointed out but also mixing and switching between the Turkish and German languages were frequently mentioned.

With regard to the most mentioned codes across all dimensions, the code cloud depicted in Figure 18 provides a good overview. The larger the code is presented, the more frequently it was mentioned in the focus group discussions. As can be seen in the code cloud, having friends with a similar background (20 times) was the code mentioned the most. This is followed by instances of using the ethnic language (19 times) and sense of belonging to the ethnic group (14 times).
In the online context, the most frequently mentioned code was *staying in contact with family and friends* (16 times), followed by *instances of using the ethnic language* (8 times) and *consuming ethnic related content* (8 times) (see Figure 19).

The quantitative results for the Korean sample are summarized in Table 20. Regarding the social integration orientation offline, the mean scores were above 3, though the score was higher on the German scale ($M = 3.97$) than on the Korean scale ($M = 3.06$). For the social integration orientation online, the mean score on the Korean scale dropped below the scalar midpoint 3 ($M = 2.71$), while it was still high on the German scale ($M = 3.74$).
Table 20. Overview of mean scores for each social integration dimension offline and online for the Korean sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use with family</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use with friends</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in speaking a language</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking a language</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural acquaintance</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural attachment</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation mean score</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best friends</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship attitudes</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction mean score</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling part of a community</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in history and traditions</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction mean score</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social integration orientations</td>
<td><strong>3.97</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Korean sample n=35.
Overall, respondents in the Korean sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and an assimilation orientation online (see Figure 20).

![Figure 20. Social integration orientation offline and online for the Korean sample.](image)

Regarding the qualitative results, Table 21 summarizes the code frequencies in the three social integration dimensions offline and online. For the Korean sample, most of the coded segments occurred in the acculturation online dimension. Above all, heritage culture specifics were mentioned the most when using social media. Also switching between languages when using social media was frequently mentioned. In the offline context, most of the coded segments emerged in the identification offline dimension. Here, particularly combining aspects of the German and Korean identity were frequently mentioned.
Table 21. Overview of code frequencies in the three social integration dimension for the Korean sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Korean sample n=11.

The codes that occurred across all dimensions in the offline context are visualized in a code cloud in Figure 21. The most mentioned code here was combining identities (14 times). This was followed by German culture specifics (10 times) and being perceived as different (8 times).

Figure 21. Code cloud for the Korean sample in the offline context.

In the online context, as visualized in Figure 22, the most frequently mentioned code was staying in contact with family and friends (11 times), followed by heritage culture specifics online (10 times) and switching languages online (9 times).
Applying a mixed methods approach, this research combined quantitative and qualitative methods to examine and explore the link between social media use and the construction of social integration orientations in a cross-cultural comparison. Only by combining quantitative and qualitative methods, interesting similarities and differences in the construction of social integration orientations offline and online could be observed within each ethnic sample and between the two ethnic samples.

The aim of the quantitative part was to answer *what* social integration orientations young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background constructed offline and online, while the qualitative part explored *how* these orientations were constructed. The results showed that respondents with a Turkish migration background constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and online. Respondents with a Korean migration background constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and an assimilation orientation online. However, looking at the results of each social integration dimensions, interesting patterns in the construction offline and online within and between the samples became visible (see Table 22).
Table 22. Comparison of social integration orientations offline and online based on quantitative results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offline</td>
<td>online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acculturation</strong></td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification</strong></td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social integration orientation</strong></td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=45; Korean sample n=35.

As depicted in Table 22, different orientations were constructed in the three social integration dimensions offline and online. In the acculturation dimension, respondents in the Turkish constructed a multiple inclusion orientation both offline and online. The language use in their daily life was also reflected online when using social media. Both German and Turkish was used frequently, however, respondents distinguished between family and friends context. Turkish was more often used in the family context, while German was more commonly used with friends. This was also reflected in the qualitative data. The distinction between family and friends in terms of language use is also in line with previous research (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003). Respondents in the Korean sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and an assimilation orientation online. When using social media, German was more common in the Korean sample. This might reflect incompetence in the Korean language as online communication often also involves written communication (Androutsopoulos, 2006; Hinnenkamp, 2003).

For the interaction dimension, respondents in the Turkish sample constructed a marginalization orientation offline and online. Respondents indicated to have mostly
Turkish friends among their close friends offline and online. This was also in line with the qualitative data. Participants in the focus groups pointed out the importance of having friends with a similar background. But they also indicated a positive attitude towards friendships with Germans. The two extreme scores resulted in a marginalization orientation. For the Korean sample, respondents of the survey constructed an assimilation orientation both offline and online in the interaction dimension. One aspect might be the small ethnic group size that makes face-to-face interactions with other individuals with Korean roots less likely.

In the identification dimension, the Turkish sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and a marginalization orientation online. Although the quantitative results showed a multiple inclusion orientation for the identification offline dimension, the qualitative results revealed a different picture and uncovered underlying issues. The focus group discussions showed that there was a need to belong and to identify with the German and Turkish group. However, participants pointed out difficulties in gratifying this need within the offline context. Participants mentioned difficulties in combining the German identity with the Turkish identity. In this context, religion and Muslim identity were brought up. Participants perceived the German identity as conflicting or even incompatible with their Turkish and Muslim identity. This feeling of incompatible identities only came up in the Turkish sample. This might reflect the socio-political climate particularly the Turkish group sees itself confronted with in Germany. The Turkish group in Germany is perceived differently than other ethnic groups. More often, the Turkish group is confronted with negative stereotypes and discrimination, often also because the Turkish group is often equated with Islam (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). Here, using social media helped participants to explore and negotiate different aspects of their identities. This finding is in line with
previous research that has shown that social media offered alternative sources of identity gratifications (Bozdağ, 2014a; Hugger, 2009). For the Korean sample, a multiple inclusion orientation for the offline context and an assimilation orientation for the online context was assessed. This was also confirmed by the qualitative data. Participants mostly mentioned aspects of combining German and Korean identity. They mentioned fewer difficulties with bringing their two identities together.

The findings show that the two ethnic samples were well integrated into German society. But there was a difference between the Turkish and the Korean sample. For the Korean sample, combining aspects of the Korean and German culture, social relations, and identity offline and online was unproblematic. The Turkish sample encountered more difficulties in feeling part of German society. The results uncovered underlying integration issues. The ethnic group size played an important role here. More precisely, the perception of the ethnic group by the mainstream society was an important aspect affecting the integration orientations. The Turkish group is the largest ethnic group in Germany and has been confronted with negative stereotypes and stigmatization (Bozdağ, 2014b). The result is what Verkuyten (2016) calls the integration paradox. It refers to the phenomenon of highly educated and structurally integrated migrants are turning away from the mainstream society, rather than turning towards it. The explanation is that there is a higher perception of discrimination among higher educated migrants. In this study, especially the Turkish sample reported experiences of discrimination and exclusion. This resulted in a lack of identification, particularly with German society.

Another interesting aspect the findings show is that the marginalization orientation is more complex than first assumed. According to Berry (1997), the marginalization orientation would mean that the heritage and mainstream cultures were rejected. However, the findings of this mixed methods study showed that the marginalization
orientation is much more complex than the simple rejection of two cultures. What participants in the Turkish sample pointed out was they felt accepted by neither the ethnic group nor the mainstream society from which this lack of belonging resulted. So this is not an active choice by the participants to reject a culture, but it is the result of the members of both cultures failing to accept them. The bicultural approach to social integration orientations based on Berry’s model seems to be inadequate to capture the complexity of identification issues young adults with a migration background deal with.

3.7. Limitations

The presented mixed methods study implemented a new conceptual and methodological approach to study social media use and social integration. The study and its findings are limited in several regards.

First, the questionnaire of the quantitative part relied on existing questions and items from previous studies and adapted them to fit the context of the current study. However, the selected questions and items were not completely suited for this study. The questions and items used in the acculturation dimension worked quite well and had a good Cronbach’s alpha score (see Appendix 10). But for the interaction and identification dimensions, the items showed poor scale reliability. Thus, quantitative data analysis was limited to descriptive statistics. Nevertheless, the descriptive statistics provided some interesting insights.

Second, the cross-section of the two cultural orientation scales and the applied midpoint split for allocating social integration orientations in one of the four quadrants is debatable. It has been criticized for its technical and practical approach, rather than for its statistical power (Demes & Geeraert, 2014). By this, underlying, more complex data might be missed and could lead to false results (Demes & Geeraert, 2014; Ward &
Geeraert, 2016). However, in this study, the midpoint split was sufficient as the aim was a categorization of the respondents into one of the four social integration orientations based on the theory (Donà & Berry, 1994). As the categorizations were interpreted together with the results from the qualitative study, the midpoint split provided a good starting point for interpretation.

Third, the bidimensional approach assessing the orientation towards the mainstream and the heritage culture applied in this study might have limited the orientation frame of the respondents and participants. The results indicated that the marginalization orientation might not be a rejection of the mainstream and heritage culture but rather a different orientation beyond the two cultures. In light of increasing migration and diversity, the bidimensional perspective has become too simplistic. Future research should consider more open-ended cultural orientation options and allow for self-description outside the bidimensional approach.

Finally, the focus was on two ethnic groups with specific characteristics. This made sampling very difficult and resulted in a low response rate for the survey and in small numbers of participants in the focus group discussions. The small sample size in the qualitative and quantitative study and the culture-specific context limit the transferability of the results. Nevertheless, the mixed methods approach still provided data-rich findings that could be a good starting point for future large-scale research.

3.8. Conclusion

The mixed methods study presented in this chapter aimed at providing different perspectives on the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations. The study examined the social integration orientations of young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background living in Germany. On the one hand, the
study provided insights into the nature of the relationship of social integration orientations offline and online. On the other hand, this study offered a better understanding of cross-cultural differences in the construction of social integration orientations.

The findings of this mixed methods study showed that social media use could help to construct or re-construct existing social integration orientations offline that would result in similar or different social integration orientations online. The two ethnic samples utilized social media to negotiate between the heritage culture and the mainstream culture. Social media could offer alternative sources of gratifications for needs left unfulfilled in the offline context.
4. USING SOCIAL MEDIA FOR CONSTRUCTING INTEGRATION ORIENTATIONS: A QUALITATIVE CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF TURKS AND KOREANS IN GERMANY
4.1. Abstract

Social media have become a central part of our daily life, having radically transformed communication behaviors and the nature of social relations. Social connectedness is no longer bound to geographic locations but can be maintained beyond distances through social media. In the context of growing migration and increased diversity of societies, social media have contributed to a transnational interconnectedness that affects individuals and societies as a whole. Research has shown that social media can facilitate cultural adjustment and integration into society. What is not yet clear is how social media are used to construct social integration orientations by individuals of specific ethnic groups. Therefore, the present study explores how social integration orientations are constructed through social media use of young adults from two selected ethnic groups living in Germany: Turkey and South Korea. Conceptually, an interdisciplinary framework was applied based on Berry’s acculturation model and Esser’s social integration dimensions and approaches from the Uses & Gratifications Theory which distinguished between social integration orientations offline and social integration orientations online. Empirically, focus group discussions were conducted using a semi-structured question guide. The results from the qualitative content analysis showed that using social media helped participants in this study to construct and re-construct social integration orientations online by providing additional or alternative sources to gratify social integration needs that are repressed or restricted offline.

Keywords: social media use, integration, identity, ethnic group, Germany
4.2. Introduction

Social media have influenced our social life tremendously. Particularly for the younger generation, social media have become an essential part of their everyday life, from streaming music to reading the news to communicating with friends (Müller & Beisch, 2011; Ogan, Ozaca, & Groshek, 2007; Schroeder, 2018). With the fast proliferation of the Internet and mobile communication, social media are practically accessible from everywhere and from any device. The latest statistics show that there are over four billion Internet users worldwide. More than three billion are active social media users, and most of those users access social media on their smartphones (Kemp, 2018b, p. 7). The most popular social media platforms in 2018 were Facebook with over two billion, YouTube with one and a half billion, and WhatsApp with over one billion monthly active users (Kemp, 2018b, p. 59).

The popularity of social media lies in their affordance. Social media do not simply offer an alternative way of communication and interaction, but they also “provide a number of notably different communicative dynamics and structures” (Seargeant & Tagg, 2014, p. 2). Two key elements are subject to all social media. First, social media provide the means for people to connect and communicate across distances and time since interaction can be synchronous or asynchronous (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Hampton, 2004). Second, social media allow people to create content, so-called user-generated content and share this with their social network or a semi-public (Ellison & boyd, 2013; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010). There are different forms of social media, such as instant messaging applications (e.g. WhatsApp), social networking sites (e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn), or micro-blogging (e.g. Twitter). But often several functions are merged, making classifications difficult (e.g. Tumblr). Since there are many diverse forms, a clear definition of what social media are, is still missing (boyd, 2015). Based on
an analysis of a selection of definitions found in the literature, McCay-Peet and Quan-Haase (2017) thus propose the following definition:

Social media are web-based services that allow individuals, communities, and organizations to collaborate, connect, interact, and build community by enabling them to create, co-create, modify, share, and engage with user-generated content that is easily accessible. (p. 17)

While the growing popularity of social media is a common phenomenon across many countries, the ways and reasons social media are used differ from culture to culture (Gezduci & d'Haenens, 2007; Jackson & Wang, 2013; Ji, et al., 2010; Kim, Sohn, & Choi, 2011). As Schroeder (2018) points out, “The growing uses of social media do not erase cultural differences” (p. 98). With societies becoming more and more culturally and ethnically diverse, it is of central concern to understand how individuals with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds use social media and how this relates to integration. Germany is one of the countries facing the challenge of growing diversity and integrating different ethnic groups into its society. Media play an important role in the integration process as previous studies on traditional mass media, such as television and print media, have shown (e.g. Peeters & D’Haenens, 2005; Steinbach, 2006). However, research on ethnic groups in Germany and their media use is still insufficient in terms of interdisciplinary approaches and methodological variety (Geißler & Pöttker, 2006; Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009). Although there is a growing number of studies on integration and mass media use of ethnic groups in the German context (e.g. Geißler & Pöttker, 2006; Hafez, 2002; Weiss & Trebbe, 2001), only a few studies specifically focus on the Internet and social media use of ethnic groups (e.g. Bonfadelli, Bucher, & Piga, 2007; Enders & Weibers, 2009; Hugger, 2009; Trebbe, Heft, & Weiß, 2010). In an ever-changing media environment where 91% of the German population now uses the Internet and 46% are active social media users (Kemp, 2018a, p. 122), it is of rising significance to examine
social media use of ethnic groups in relation to their social integration orientations. Research has indicated that social media seem to affect integration, but empirical findings are still limited to draw any conclusions on the actual effects and the direction of influence (Mitra & Evansluong, 2019; Shuter, 2011).

Despite the growing research on media use of ethnic groups and a gradually emerging number of studies particularly on social media use, the extant literature does not provide a suitable framework to study social media use in the context of social integration orientations of ethnic groups. Existing models and frameworks so far have not attempted to capture social integration orientations in the online context and are thus insufficient to examine the relationship between social media use and social integration orientations of ethnic groups. Therefore, the present study uses an interdisciplinary framework that draws from the Uses and Gratification Theory from communication studies (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974), and combines Berry’s (1997) acculturation model from psychology with Esser’s (2001) dimensions of social integration dimensions from sociology to examine the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany. To illustrate the ways in which young adults with a migration background manage, combine, and experience different aspects of social integration, a qualitative cross-cultural comparative approach was implemented. Conducting focus group discussions, two ethnic groups in Germany were compared: the Turkish group and the South Korean group. By applying this new interdisciplinary conceptual framework, this study is the first to focus on social media use in the construction of social integration orientations of ethnic groups in Germany in a cross-cultural comparison using a qualitative approach.

The current qualitative study is part of a mixed methods research. Due to the richness of the data, it was decided to present the qualitative part in an additional chapter. The aim
of the qualitative study is to explore the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background in Germany. This results in the following research questions:

RQ1: How do young adults with a Turkish migration background and young adults with a Korean migration background construct their social integration orientations online compared to offline?

RQ2: How do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background differ in their construction of social integration orientations offline and online?

To address these research questions and to contextualize this study, this chapter first starts with a brief introduction to the migration history of the Turkish and Korean population in Germany. This is followed by a literature review on social media research in the context of acculturation, interaction, and identification. Then the interdisciplinary conceptual framework of this study is presented. The next part of this chapter describes the methods applied here. The results of the study are then presented for each of the three social integration dimensions. This is followed by a discussion section in which the results are evaluated in light of previous research and the limitations of this study are discussed. This chapter finishes with a conclusion section that outlines the implication of this study for theory and future research.

4.3. Turkish and Korean Population in Germany

About 25% of the current German population has a migration background, meaning that these individuals with a migration background have either migrated themselves or they have at least one parent who migrated to Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). Taking into account only the population under 35 years, the share of those with a migration background increases to 35%. The percentage further increases in metropolitan
areas, such as Frankfurt and Berlin (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). This is in part also the result of the labor recruitment agreements of the so-called ‘guest workers’ between Germany and several countries, including Turkey, Italy, and South Korea, in the 1950s up until the 1970s. Although a lot of migrant workers returned to their home countries, as anticipated by German authorities, a remarkable number stayed in Germany, brought their families, and substantially influenced German society (Bade, 2011; Bozdağ, 2014b).

Between 1961 and 1973 about 866,000 Turkish migrant workers came to Germany (Janzen, 2009, p. 36). Most migrants from Turkey worked in the mine and steel industry (Hunn, 2005). Initially seen as only temporary migration, integrating the Turkish migrants was not on the political agenda (Bozdağ, 2014a). However, with the family reunification, the number of Turkish migrants in Germany increased steadily and today they comprise the largest non-German ethnic group with almost three million individuals with a Turkish migration background living in Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). About half of them hold Turkish citizenship, while the other half holds German citizenship, and about 240,000 hold dual citizenship (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2019). The Turkish group was and still is very present in the public perception of contemporary German society and in the historical depiction of the guest worker migration (Bade, 2011; Bozdağ, 2014b; Schneider & Arnold, 2004). Due to the rapid increase in the size of the Turkish community and missing integration strategies, political tensions and social discontent have grown in which the ‘Türkenproblem’ (the Turkish problem) has become the focus of the public discourse (Bozdağ, 2014b). Unfortunately, negative media coverage has dominated the public discourse and the Turkish community sees itself confronted with negative stereotypes and stigmatization (Bozdağ, 2014b). The Turkish group in Germany is often perceived as “academically distant” and German-Turkish bilingualism and Islam are de-valued by the mainstream society (Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). This has been
further amplified by a growing Islam hostility in the Western world (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017; John, 2019).

The public focus has led to an increasing research interest in the Turkish group living in Germany. This is visible in numerous publications and research studies that focus on the Turkish group in Germany in different fields and across different disciplines (e.g. Hafez, 2002; Hugger, 2009; Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018a; Schneider & Arnold, 2004; Trebbe, 2007).

Another group of migrant workers came from South Korea to Germany in the 1960s and 1970s, mostly as nurses or mine workers, though in smaller but not insignificant numbers (Hartmann, 2016; Hyun, 2018). Currently, about 30,000 individuals with South Korean citizenship live in Germany (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2016). This number does not include those who acquired German citizenship and those who were born in Germany with German citizenship. There is no concrete number, but it is estimated that in total about 50,000 people with a Korean migration background live in Germany today, making it the second-largest Korean diaspora in Western Europe, after the UK (Hartmann, 2016). Nevertheless, the Korean group in Germany so far, contrary to the Turkish group, was neither discussed extensively in the public eye nor has it been the focus of many research studies (Hartmann, 2016; Hyun, 2018; Weiß, 2017).

Therefore, this study draws on a cross-cultural comparison of the Turkish group and the Korean group in Germany. These two ethnic groups were selected for a cross-cultural comparison based on the sampling logic of diverse cases. Following Seawright and Gerring (2008), the primary objective is the achievement of maximum variance along relevant variables. In this study the two relevant integration variables are 1) ethnic group size and 2) educational background of the parents, with the Turkish group representing a
large ethnic group size and low educational background of parents, and the Korean group representing a small ethnic group size and high educational background of parents.

The size of an ethnic group is an important aspect for the construction of social integration orientations as it influences the internal understanding and positioning of an ethnic group within the mainstream society. The relative ethnic group size determines the likelihood of practicing the ethnic language, building intra-ethnic contact, and developing a sense of belonging to an ethnic group (Androutsopoulos, 2006; Bozdağ, 2014a). Thus, it “influences the processes of ethnic community building and identity construction” (Bozdağ, 2014a, p. 144). Related to ethnic group size is the concept of group vitality. Group vitality refers to a group’s relative position in society. According to this concept, large groups should possess more group vitality and are therefore more likely to “survive and thrive as a collective entity in its prevailing intergroup context” (Abrams & Giles, 2007, p. 120). This means that the likelihood to practice the heritage language and to build and maintain ethnic relations is higher for larger ethnic groups and therefore easier for them to uphold their heritage culture and form a stable ethnic community.

In this study, the ethnic group with persons with a Turkish migration background which forms the biggest non-German ethnic group was selected to contrast the comparably rather small ethnic group of persons with a Korean migration background. It is assumed that the different group sizes of the two selected ethnic groups influence their social integration orientations and thus lead not only to group differences concerning the construction of social integration orientations but also to differences in the construction of social integration orientations offline compared to online. For instance, the Turkish group might have a higher number of same ethnic social relations in their face-to-face interactions than the Korean group due to the difference in the group size. But the Korean group might have a higher number of same ethnic social relations on social media than
the Turkish group to compensate for the lack of same ethnic social relations encountered in daily life.

The second relevant integration variable selected for this study, educational background of the parents, is also a relevant factor influencing the integration orientations of ethnic groups. Research has shown that the higher the education level, the better the structural and social integration of the group in question (Esser, 2001; Steinbach, 2006). Important for the educational achievements of children is the educational and socioeconomic background of parents. In no other industrialized country is the relationship between educational success and socioeconomic background stronger than in Germany (Entorf & Minoiu, 2005; Heckmann, 2015). Pointing to a strong ‘inheritance’ of institutional and social inequality across generations, Germany is one of the few Western countries together with the UK and the US, in contrast to the Scandinavian countries and Canada, where social inequality continues over generations and social mobility is rather rigid (Arens, 2007; Entorf & Minoiu, 2005; Mansel, 2007). This affects particularly the population with a migration background, as the share of those with a lower socioeconomic status is higher than in the population with no migration background. As a result, there is a significant gap in the educational achievements between the population with a migration background and population with no migration background (Entorf & Minoiu, 2005; Steinbach, 2006). Studies have shown that there is a significant difference in the educational success of children with a migration background and children without a migration background in Germany, while those with a migration background reach lower degrees (Tepecik, 2011).

The two ethnic groups under research here differ in the educational backgrounds of their parents. One reason for this difference lies in the type of migrant workers that came to Germany in the 1950s to the 1970s. From South Korea, many educated nurses came
along with educated Korean mine workers. A study by Young-Hee Kim (1986) showed that over 87% of Korean women and about 95% of Korean men that came as migrant workers to Germany had at least a high school degree or higher (p. 154). These Korean migrant workers were part of the middle class back in South Korea (Hartmann, 2016; Kim Y.-H., 1986). This is in contrast to the mostly uneducated mine workers from the rural areas of Turkey who came to Germany in the 1950s and 60s (Hunn, 2005; Tepecik, 2011). This aspect is a relevant factor for the following generations in Germany as the education level of parents also plays an important role for the educational achievements of their children (Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2016; Mansel, 2007).

Despite the strong inheritance of institutional and social inequality across generations in Germany, recent studies have shown that educational achievements of the following generations of individuals with a migration background have increased compared to their parents’ generation and compared to the native German population over the past years (Autorengruppe Bildungsberichterstattung, 2016; Kristen, Reimer, & Kogan, 2008; Söhn & Özcan, 2006). Nevertheless, the focus of many studies on the population with a Turkish migration background in Germany has often been on educational disparities in primary and secondary schools (e.g. Mansel, 2007; Steinbach, 2006), thereby neglecting highly educated young adults with Turkish roots as their focus of study (Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). There is also very little recent empirical research on highly educated young adults with Korean roots in Germany (Hartmann, 2016).

Thus, this study focuses particularly on educated young adults from these two ethnic groups. Included are highly educated young adults with a Turkish or Korean migration background and with at least a completed high school degree (the German “Abitur” or similar) or higher (e.g. Bachelor’s or Master’s degree). Previous research has shown a positive relationship between education level and integration status (Esser, 2001;
Steinbach, 2006), however, here the social integration orientations of the young adults are also examined in light of the educational background of their parents. The educational background of parents affects the learning environment of children with regard to language (e.g. language spoken at home) and cultural practices (Esser, 2001). Therefore, a positive relationship between the educational background of parents and their children’s social integration orientation is assumed. This means that in case of a high educational background of the parents an assimilation or multiple inclusion orientation should be observed. In case of a low educational background of the parents, a stronger orientation towards the heritage culture should be observed, resulting in either a multiple inclusion or a separation orientation. In what ways these orientations are associated with media use practices is an open question of the current study.

4.4. Literature Review

This subchapter provides a brief literature review on social media research in relation to the three relevant social integration dimensions: (a) social media and acculturation, (b) social media and interaction, and (c) social media and identification. The first section looks at current research on social media specifically in the cultural context of ethnic groups. Particularly the transmission of cultural knowledge and language usage are regarded. The second section presents empirical findings on social media use and social relations of ethnic groups and the societal implications. The third section addresses the topic of identifying with an ethnic group and feeling part of a virtual community in the context of social media. It should be pointed out that the three sections are closely interlinked and overlap thematically. This distinction into the three focus areas is only an analytical one that helps to structure this literature review.
4.4.1. Social media and acculturation

Social media are more than mere communication tools, as Li and Tsai (2015) point out, “social media are cultural institutions that influence users’ cultural orientation” (p. 204). Therefore, social media can serve as sources of information and orientation for ethnic groups by providing knowledge on values and norms of the society’s mainstream culture, thus facilitating the adjustment and integration into the mainstream culture (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007). This process of dealing with cultural change is known as acculturation. One of the most commonly used acculturation frameworks developed by John W. Berry (1997) suggests that immigrants are confronted with two basic issues: the value given to maintaining the heritage culture and the value given to engaging with the mainstream culture.

What research has shown so far is that ethnic groups can utilize social media to negotiate between the heritage culture and the mainstream culture of their place of residence. An important aspect here is the linguistic diversity offered online which provides a non-threatening linguistic environment within which the heritage and mainstream cultures can be explored and language skills attained or improved (Alencar, 2018; Elias & Lemish, 2009). Language is a significant aspect of media use. Findings show that traditional mass media offerings, especially television programs, convey information, such as language and norms, about the mainstream culture, thereby facilitating integration into the society (Moon & Park, 2007; Reece & Palmgreen, 2000; Yang, Wu, Zhu, & Southwell, 2004). On the other hand, consuming ethnic mass media can provide a connection to the heritage culture and thus support cultural maintenance (Croucher, Oommen, & Steele, 2009; Rios & Gaines Jr., 1998). A study by Steinbach (2006) examined the media use of migrants in Germany and its integrative effects. Using the acculturation framework based on Berry (1997), Steinbach (2006) analyzed the use
of German language media and the use of ethnic language media. The results showed that migrant families tend to use both languages for traditional media forms (e.g. newspapers, television). However, children in migrant families tend to use German language media significantly more often than ethnic language media. In this case, a positive correlation was found between German language media use and integration, nevertheless, the direction of causation was not clear. In line with this finding is the study by Moon and Park (2007) which found that exposure to American mass media was a significant predictor of the acceptance of American cultural values, but exposure to Korean mass media was not related to either affinity to Korean or American cultural values. Another study by Peeters and d’Haenens (2005) also found a positive correlation between integration and general media use (newspaper, radio) among Turks, Moroccans, Antilleans, and Surinamese in the Netherlands. However, watching television was found to be negatively related to integration: the less integrated, the more time was spent watching television, especially from the heritage country. Other studies have shown that the use of mainstream and heritage media among young adults with a migration background was largely independent of their integration status (Trebbe, 2007; Trebbe, Heft, & Weiß, 2010).

With technological advances, the media environment has changed towards more digital media forms. In a study by Son (2015) the use of the Internet of Korean American women, including consuming Korean dramas and reading Korean news online, resulted in strengthening cultural maintenance and diminishing the need for assimilation. Another study by Li and Tsai (2015) looked particularly at social media usage and acculturation of Hispanics in the USA. Their findings showed that English social media usage helped Hispanics develop a strong orientation toward the mainstream American culture, while Spanish social media consumption reinforced their ethnic Hispanic cultural identification.
In light of the growing diversity of societies, an increasing number of people are exposed to and live with two or more cultures. There are different ways on how one can deal with cultural differences between the heritage culture and the mainstream culture of the society one lives in. Research has shown that those who are part of two cultures often engage in cultural frame switching, a practice where they actively switch their behavior depending on the cultural context (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; West, Zhang, Yampolsky, & Sasaki, 2017). This implies that bicultural individuals have access to two cultural meaning systems between which they switch in response to situational cues (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). Another related phenomenon among bicultural individuals is code switching which refers to the practice of using two languages in a conversation or even within one sentence (Auer, 1999; Muysken, 1995). The code switch is a ‘symbol of change’ and a redefinition of the interaction by adjusting the language to the situational setting (Auer, 1999). Androutsopoulos (2006) examined the language use of multiculturals on specific online platforms and found that code switching was common practice online. Due to the broad reach and wide range of social media and other online platforms, an individual’s social network online can be much more heterogeneous than offline, thus enabling different language uses. By employing and integrating two languages, bicultural individuals respond to the demand of the mainstream culture to adapt, while at the same time preserving the heritage culture. However, this does not mean that they are equally fluent in both languages. The incompetence in one language is balanced out with the other language. This often results in a ‘third’ language, a We-code, which implies both deficit and competence, but first and foremost, however, difference and autonomy” (Hinnenkamp, 2003, p. 36). This makes code switching an expression of a particular identity (Androutsopoulos, 2006; Bolander & Locher, 2010; Hinnenkamp, 2003).
4.4.2. Social media and interaction

Society, and therefore also social integration, is constituted of social relations, including social contacts, interactions, and communication (Esser, 2001). Social media facilitate the building of social relations. Consequently, building and maintaining social relations of a certain kind via social media can be relevant for overall social integration. As social media and other digital media forms have become more interactive, immediate, and intercultural, they have considerably influenced the nature of social relations which are no longer geographically bound and allow for communication and interaction between people from the same or different cultures (Antoci, Sabatini, & Sodini, 2014; Peeters & d'Haenens, 2005).

In the context of the social integration of ethnic groups, social media provide communication channels that allow ethnic groups to maintain close social relations with members of the heritage culture in terms of Putnam’s (2000) concept of bonding social capital. Bonding social capital describes the benefits and social support derived from close relationships and strong ties and refers here to the link between members of the same culture. Social media can reinforce intra-cultural and intra-ethnic communication and relationships, as online people can choose to form social ties based on shared interest or shared culture than on shared physical location (Baym, 2010; Hristova, Musolesi, & Mascolo, 2014). This pattern of social relations is referred to as homophily, the assumption that ‘birds of a feather flock together’ as people have the desire to associate with similar others (Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018; Hampton, 2004; Reynolds, 2007; Zentarra, 2014). The facilitation processes that social media provide for strengthening ties within a cultural or ethnic group is often related to the fear that social media actually hinder integration and lead to separation (Alencar, 2018; Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018). This fear was especially strong in the literature on media use of migrants in Germany in the 1990s.
up until the 2010s (Geißler & Pöttker, 2006; Trebbe, 2009). This media separation in terms of consumption of mainly ethnic media content was also referred to as media ghettoization (Schneider & Arnold, 2004; Trebbe, 2009). However, research has shown that such a media ghettoization could not be observed among the migrant population in Germany (Trebbe, Heft, & Weiß, 2010; Worbs, 2010). The role of social media for bonding social capital is actually a key aspect for the adjustment and successful integration. For instance, Lim and Pham (2016) examined migrant students in Singapore in order to understand the role of technologically mediated communication in their acculturation orientations. They found that social media played a significant role in maintaining relations to the heritage country but also for communicating with peers from the heritage culture living in Singapore. This “virtual companionship” helped migrants to better adjust to the mainstream culture in Singapore (Lim & Pham, 2016, p. 2184). This “selective interaction” (Castells, 2003, p. 37) with others from the same or similar cultural background results in important strong ties that provide social and emotional support and the feeling of being part of a group (Bochner, McLeod, & Lin, 1977; Furnham & Alibhai, 1985). By using social media as a space for socialization, support is created online that helps to maintain ethnic ties and to create a sense of what Marino (2015) calls “digital togetherness” (p. 6). The online space enhances the formation of an imagined community that is no longer bound to one’s physical place but that is based on shared cultural experiences and a subjective feeling of belonging (Bozdağ, 2014a; Gruzd, Wellman, & Takhteyev, 2011; Hugger, 2009). The topic of belonging and identification is covered in more detail in the next section.

On the other hand, social media also facilitate relationships between members of the mainstream culture and members of the heritage culture in terms of Putnam’s (2000) concept of bridging social capital. Bridging social capital refers to the benefits derived
from casual acquaintances and weak ties (Granovetter, 1973; Putnam, 2000). New forms of device-mediated communication via social media support the formation of larger and more diverse social networks and facilitate interaction and coordination, as the social risk of communicating is lower online than in face-to-face situations (Baym, 2010; Hampton, 2004). This development from face-to-face to device-mediated communication, where each individual creates its own network of social relations, is what Mejias (2010) calls “a technologizing of society through social networking services” (p. 604). Castells (2004) argues that with these technological advances of the Internet and increasing mobile communication, social relations have shifted from tight communities to loose networks, thus facilitating relationships in terms of bridging social capital. Baym (2010) describes this formation of online relationships as the following:

[…] [N]ew relationships are often between categories of people who would not have as much of a chance to form relationships offline. People communicating in different locations, relying on textual and digital nonverbal cues, are more likely to form relationships that blur the social boundaries between groups and hence challenge social norms of appropriateness. This is another way in which new relationship formation online challenges conventional notions of what relationships are and should be. New media make it easier to have ‘pure relationships’ in which the relationship is its own reward instead of serving a useful function in maintaining the social order. (pp. 146-147)

In the online environment, the threshold of initiating the first contact is much lower, and therefore interethnic contacts are more likely. In their study on migrants in the Netherlands, Damian and Van Ingen (2014) found a positive relationship between social media use and the number of ties to members of the mainstream culture. By enabling these intercultural and interethnic relationships, ethnic groups have better access to resources and information beyond their own community, supporting the adjustment and integration into the mainstream society (Elias & Lemish, 2009; Peeters & d'Haenens,
Furthermore, interethnic contact helps to break social and cultural barriers and reduces interethnic prejudice (Elias & Lemish, 2009; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).

Other recent findings have shown that migrants and ethnic groups in a society use social media to form new relations with the members of the mainstream culture as well as to maintain relations with members of the heritage culture, thereby simultaneously developing both bridging and bonding social capital (Alencar, 2018; Codagnone & Kluzer, 2011; Sawyer & Chen, 2012). This is in line with what Peeters and d’Haenens (2005) conclude from their study on Internet use among migrants in the Netherlands:

As a matter of fact, in practice integration does not entail the loss of one’s own cultural identity but rather a deeper involvement in the other culture. In this way bridging and bonding go hand in hand. This is best exemplified in the use of the Internet […] (p. 227)

Therefore, social media offer tools for ethnic groups to build, strengthen, and maintain these various social relationships (Sawyer & Chen, 2012). By this, ethnic groups are given new opportunities to integrate into a society while still maintaining their relations to their ethnic origins. They also provide support in terms of better understanding the mainstream culture by communicating with others about the issues they encounter (Alencar, 2018; Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018). Thus, social media play a significant role in the transformation of social relations and in creating “a sense of belonging to a greater social network other than one’s local community” (Sawyer & Chen, 2012, p. 154).

4.4.3. Social media and identification

Social media can facilitate the expression of certain aspects of identity by offering different forms of experience spaces and orientation sources (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Enders & Weibers, 2009). Identities are not fixed but rather flexible, and can be seen as
a process and a constant negotiation that depend on action and interaction context, providing important sources of meaning (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Castells, 2010). As ethnic diversity increases in societies, the question of ethnic identity becomes more salient for both members of the mainstream group and members of other ethnic groups. Here, social media allow for alternative ways to deal with multiple ethnic and cultural identities as they offer diverse spaces for identity exploration (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Hugger, 2009). Particularly individuals with a migration background find themselves negotiating between the heritage culture and the mainstream culture, and often have difficulties to integrate the two cultures into their identity. These individuals are confronted with the expectation from the mainstream society to assimilate, while their parents often expect them to preserve the heritage culture (Kim Y.-H., 1986). This can develop into an internal conflict that can disrupt their identity development, as these individuals have in most cases neither fully internalized norms of the heritage culture nor of the mainstream culture (Kim Y.-H., 1986, p. 227). In her study on Koreans in Germany, Kim (1986) examines the identity formation of Korean children born in Germany and discovers that even when these children identified with being German, there was the issue of not being accepted as being German by society. This was not much of an issue at an early age but became an issue when these children grew older.

A crucial aspect for the case of Germany is that ‘being German’ is still equated with being ‘white’, so it is often a question of ethnicity and ancestry (Bade, 2011; Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). German identity is often seen as heritage-based and associated with exclusionary norms making it difficult to embrace German identity for ethnically non-Germans or ethnically mixed individuals (Ditlmann, Purdie-Vaughns, & Eibach, 2011). This can result in a conflict of identities and a feeling of identity incompatibility that can lead to separation and marginalization of an ethnic group and hamper their
integration into society (Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a). Research has shown that the level of perceived identity compatibility can predict the extent of contact with mainstream society (Saleem, Dubow, Lee, & Huesmann, 2018) and that perceived identity incompatibility can even foster political radicalism among migrants (Simon, Reichert, & Grabow, 2012).

Social media can be an important source for resolving identity incompatibility by providing alternative cultural orientations and a space for identity formation and expression. As Hampton (2004) points out:

> Freedom from the constraints of place provides Internet users with the opportunity to explore aspects of individual identity and interest that may have been repressed or lacked a critical mass of others. (p. 218)

Baym (2010) refers to identities that exist only in action and word online as “disembodied identities” (p. 148). These identities do not necessarily have to mean a ‘fake’ identity but should rather be seen as an expression of specific identity features not possible or restricted offline, thus presenting segmented or selected parts of self-identity online (Baym, 2010). This is supported by empirical findings made by Bolander and Locher (2010) who show in their study that identities on Facebook reinforce or add new elements to offline identities rather than creating them from scratch. The online sphere can provide spaces for constructing and negotiating ethnic and cultural identities in exchange with others (Bozdağ, 2014a; Hepp, Bozdağ, & Suna, 2012). This is also in line with the study by Hugger (2009) that focuses on young Turks in Germany and examines the relationship between multiple ethnic cultural identities and the use of online communities. The findings show that the use of online communities helped young Turks to explore and negotiate their multiple ‘precarious’ identities in the natio-ethno-cultural hybrid environment of the Internet, thereby facilitating a hybrid identity construction. Further studies have shown that this form of bicultural identity integration is most
beneficial for those individuals and positively related to their well-being (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002; Yampolsky, Amiot, & de la Sablonnière, 2013). Overall, these findings show that the online space provides important resources for meaning production and identity negotiations (Bozdağ, 2014a).

4.5. Conceptualizing Social Integration Orientations Offline and Online

The literature review has shown that social media play parts in different aspects of social integration. But what is missing in the literature is a single framework encompassing all social integration dimensions and making the distinction between the offline and online context, in order to be able to explore the role social media use plays in the construction of social integration orientations. Therefore, this study draws upon a new interdisciplinary conceptual framework (as described in Chapter 2.5). This framework applies the Uses and Gratification Theory (U&G Theory) and combines Berry’s (1997) acculturation model with Esser’s (2001) dimensions of social integration. Each theory, model, and concept is explained briefly first before the new integrated framework is described.

U&G Theory frames the current approach by focusing on the reasons and motivations of individuals’ media use. It offers a perspective shift from the traditional media effects approach to a more user-oriented approach (Katz, Blumer, & Gurevitch, 1974). It assumes that individuals actively and deliberately use media to gratify specific needs. Studies have shown that media use facilitated the adaptation to a new culture by fulfilling acculturation needs (Reece & Palmgreen, 2000; Yang, Wu, Zhu, & Southwell, 2004). This could also be applied to the use of social media. Social media allow a high degree of interactivity and user-generated content, and therefore demand a user-oriented theoretical approach (Raacke & Bonds-Raacke, 2008; Wang, Tchernev, & Solloway, 2012). Studies found that especially in migrant population social media use gratified needs of intra- and inter-ethnic
communication (Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016; Damian & Van Ingen, 2014) and of belonging and identification (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Hugger, 2009). As U&G Theory is rooted in media and communication studies, applying this theory to social integration research is a new approach in this field that offers an original and interdisciplinary perspective.

The second part of the interdisciplinary framework is the acculturation model by the psychologist John W. Berry (1997). It is a bidimensional model that is concerned with two basic issues that migrants face, namely the value given to maintaining the heritage culture and the value given to engaging with the mainstream culture. Four possible acculturation strategies result from a combination of these two dimensions; (1) assimilation, (2) integration, (3) separation, and (4) marginalization. Assimilation is present when high value is given to engaging with the mainstream culture, while low value is given to maintaining the heritage culture. The opposite case would be separation where low value is given to engaging with the mainstream culture but high value is given to maintaining the heritage culture. Marginalization is when there is no engagement in neither the heritage nor the mainstream culture. The integration strategy is considered the most desirable for migrants, as value is given to maintaining the heritage culture as well as engaging with the mainstream culture. This was found to be related to lower levels of stress and higher levels of subjective well-being (Donà & Berry, 1994; Ward & Geeraert, 2016).

The third part of this framework is the social integration dimensions described by the sociologist Hartmut Esser (2001). Social integration refers specifically to the integration of the individual into society. To be able to measure the social integration of an individual, Esser describes four relevant dimensions: (1) acculturation, (2) interaction, (3) identification, and (4) placement. The acculturation dimension encompasses cultural
knowledge and language competencies. The interaction dimension includes social relations and social capital. The identification dimension describes the subjective feeling of belonging to a group or community. And the placement dimension refers to the position in society and the rights gained with it, may it be by citizenship or an economic position in the workforce.

In this study, the three presented parts are integrated into a single framework. The U&G Theory serves as the theoretical viewpoint and helps to better understand how individuals of the two ethnic groups under study use social media to gratify their needs (e.g. need to connect with others), what their motives are (e.g. to connect with members from the mainstream culture to practice language skills), and the consequences that follow from their needs (e.g. assimilation). The choices individuals of an ethnic group make concerning their mediated interactions are likely to be linked to underlying social integration orientations. Furthermore, an adapted version of Berry’s (1997) acculturation model is extended with Esser’s (2001) social integration dimensions. Only three of the four social integration dimensions (acculturation, interaction, and identification) are included in this new conceptual framework while the placement dimension is deliberately excluded. The reason for this lies in the comparability and applicability of this dimension to the online context. The placement dimension includes economic status in the workforce and civic rights gained with citizenship, thereby representing a vertical dimension, while acculturation, interaction, and identification represent horizontal dimensions. Applying the placement dimension to the online context with its vertical attributes is not only a conceptual but also a practical challenge that would go beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, only the three horizontal social integration dimensions are included in the framework.
The result is a typology of social integration orientations with three dimensions (acculturation, interaction, and identification) and four possible orientation outcomes (assimilation, multiple inclusion, separation, and marginalization) as depicted in Figure 23. For each of Esser’s (2001) social integration dimensions, one of the four outcomes described by Berry (1997) can be assigned. Taken the outcomes of each dimension together an overall social integration orientation can be determined.

Figure 23. New interdisciplinary conceptual framework of social integration orientations based on Esser (2001) and Berry (1997).

The idea of such an integrated typology has been applied before in research (Brendler, et al., 2013; Esser, 2009). However, what has not been done yet is to apply this interdisciplinary social integration typology to the online context, and thereby clearly distinguishing between social integration orientations formed in face-to-face situations (the offline context) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated settings (the online context). Previous research presents ambiguous results about the relationship between the offline and online world. Some studies suggest that online connection simply mirror offline friendships, meaning that people connect to others online only when they already have an offline connection (Dunbar, Arnaboldi, Conti, & Passarella, 2015; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfield, 2006; Reich, Subrahmanyam, & Espinoza, 2012). Other studies show that
online networks differ from offline networks and even influence one another (Lehdonvirta & Räsänen, 2011; Subrahmanyama, Reich, Waechter, & Espinoza, 2008). Therefore, it is considered crucial for the present research to make a clear conceptual distinction between the offline and online context in order to be able to explore how social integration orientations are constructed offline and online and to examine potential differences and interrelationships in the construction of social integration orientations offline and online. The underlying assumption here is that by using social media, gratifications can be obtained online that might not be obtained in the offline context, resulting in different (but related) social integration orientations online than offline. By applying the U&G Theory and merging Berry’s acculturation model with Esser’s social integration dimensions, this interdisciplinary conceptual framework helps to explore how social integration orientations are constructed in offline and online contexts.

4.6. Methods

This subchapter presents the methods applied in the qualitative part of the mixed methods study. The first section (4.6.1) provides details on the sampling technique and the selection criteria for the participants. Section 4.6.2 describes the data collection process. This is followed by a brief description of the transcription system (4.6.3). The final section (4.6.4) of this methods chapter explains how the data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis.

4.6.1. Sampling and participants

The sampling strategy employed in this qualitative study was both criterion and snowball sampling. The criteria on which participants were selected included: (a) being between 18 and 35 years old, (b) having a Turkish or Korean migration background, meaning that either the participants themselves have migrated to Germany or at least one...
parent migrated from either Turkey or South Korea to Germany, (c) speaking German, and (d) having the main residency in Germany. Participants were recruited through personal contacts and postings in specific Facebook groups, and were then asked to recruit further participants that would meet the given criteria.

In total, eight focus group discussions with a total of 26 participants (14 female, 12 male) across all focus groups were conducted, of which five were conducted in Bremen and three in Berlin (see Appendix 3). The participants were between 20 and 31 years old ($M = 24.96, SD = 3.24$). Four focus groups included participants with a Turkish migration background ($n = 15$) and four focus groups included participants with a Korean migration background ($n = 11$). The number of participants in each focus group ranged from two to six participants. It was difficult to reach out and coordinate a larger number of participants for this study as there was no financial incentive or other forms of assistance. Furthermore, the very specific sampling criteria (age, ethnic background, residency, language) also limited the number of potential participants. Nevertheless, for the purpose of this study the small sizes of the groups were of an advantage as each of the focus group participants had a chance to contribute and elaborate on aspects they felt important. Furthermore, participants in each focus group knew at least one other participant in the group, contributing to a familiar and comfortable atmosphere. This was due to the snowball sampling strategy where the contacted participants were asked to contact persons in their network who would be interested in participating.

4.6.2. Data collection

Data for this study was collected through focus group discussions. The strength of focus groups lies in the interaction possibilities and group composition. Other than in interviews, participants in a focus group can exchange opinions among each other and follow up on comments made by others (Barbour, 2007; Morgan, 1997). This creates a
group dynamic that can be fruitful for the discussion and provide meaningful insights into
the social construction of opinions or beliefs of a group (Marshall & Rossmann, 2011, p.
149). In addition, group composition can contribute to a more comfortable environment.
As Morgan (1997) points out, the group composition should ensure that the participants
feel comfortable with voicing their opinion in front of each other. One way to achieve
this is to have homogeneity of background (Morgan, 1997). In this case, homogeneity of
migration background within a focus group not only ensured a comfortable environment
for the participants but also allowed me to examine the shared experiences within one
ethnic group (Fern, 2001). All focus group discussions were held in German and followed
a semi-structured focus group guide (see Appendix 1). The semi-structured focus group
guide included focused questions and allowed for some flexibility and follow-up
questions on topics not covered by the focus group guide. The focus group guide focused
on the three social integration dimensions: acculturation, interaction, and identification.
Questions revolved around the use of languages, friendship relations, and feelings of
belonging, always differentiating between the offline and the online contexts. Some
questions were adapted from Hugger’s (2009) interview guide on the Internet use of
young Turks in Germany (see Appendix 2). In total, twelve key questions guided the
focus group discussions. Before the start of each focus group discussion, participants were
briefed about the audio and video recordings and the confidential treatment of the
material, and gave their verbal informed consent prior to participating. At the beginning
of each focus group discussion, the researcher introduced the general topic and started
with an ‘ice-breaker’ question (Morgan, 1997). The ice-breaker question was to name
their favorite food or dish, and by this, participants could also briefly introduce
themselves. This ‘ice-breaker’ question helped to start the discussion in a very loose and
unforced way in all focus group discussions. To guide the discussion to the key questions,
transition questions relating to culture-specific food and posting food pictures on social media were asked which further helped to encourage the conversation within the focus groups. Each focus group discussion ended with a closing remark by the moderator and the opportunity for participants to ask questions. After the focus group discussions, the participants were asked to fill out a brief demographics questionnaire. Participants who took part in the focus group discussions did not receive any monetary compensation but could choose from a selection of chocolates.

In all eight focus group discussions, the researcher took the role of the moderator. This turned out to be a good choice as the researcher has a migration background herself. From the researcher’s physical appearance it was not easy for participants to put her in a specific ‘ethnic’ box which was seen as an advantage for the focus group discussions. This helped the participants to relate to the researcher making it easier for them to talk about the topics at hand (Fern, 2001).

The site of the focus group discussions varied from group to group, but all sites fulfilled the basic needs of the participants and the researcher by having a table and comfortable seating arrangements (Morgan, 1997). As an example, one focus group discussion was conducted in a seminar room of a university building, while another focus group discussion was conducted in the private living room of one of the participants. The researcher always made sure that the participants felt comfortable in the selected site and provided drinks and snacks.

After having conducted the first three focus group discussions with a Turkish sample and the first three focus group discussions with a Korean sample, no major new insights relevant for answering research questions at hand were provided. The researcher decided to conduct one more focus group discussion with a Turkish as well as one with a Korean sample. After having conducted four focus group discussions for two ethnic groups, the
data collection was completed as additional data collection no longer generated new understandings on the topic, and thus a sufficient degree of saturation had been reached (Morgan, 1997).

4.6.3. Transcription

Focus group discussions were audio-recorded, in some cases, video recording was implemented as well to ensure that statements were attributed to the person speaking. The researcher transcribed all focus group discussions using the software f4. The names of all participants were changed in the transcriptions into pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. The focus group discussions ranged from 29 minutes to 70 minutes in length (M=50.5), resulting in a total of 6.7 hours of audio material. The audio material was transformed into verbatim transcriptions and include utterances and fill words, such as ‘um’, ‘euh’, pauses, stuttering, and para-verbal behaviors, such as laughter. Context information or additional words that were added for clarity were put in square brackets (see Appendix 4 for the transcript system). As Roulston (2014) points out, including these aspects into the transcriptions can provide additional useful sources for interpreting the data. However, in cases where these aspects were considered not to contribute meaning to the topic, excerpts included in this chapter were edited for clarity, for instance grammatically incorrect words have been corrected, ‘um’ or ‘uh’ have been deleted, and word repetitions were removed. Quotations and excerpts included in this chapter were translated from German to English by the researcher. The original versions of shorter quotes are included as footnotes, while longer quotes and excerpts can be found in Appendix 7.

4.6.4. Data analysis

The data was then analyzed applying qualitative content analysis (QCA) and using the software MAXQDA 2018. QCA is a suitable method as it helps to reduce the material
Data analysis comprised three phases: building and testing the coding frame, evaluating and revising the coding frame, and analyzing the relationship between the main categories and subcategories.

The first phase comprised building the main categories and subcategories of the coding frame and subsequently pilot testing it. The coding frame was developed from a mix of concept-driven and data-driven approaches (Marshall & Rossmann, 2011; Schreier, 2012). The main categories of the coding frame drew from the social integration dimensions of the conceptual framework (see Subchapter 2.5 and 4.5) which were also followed in the semi-structured focus group guide. In addition, the focus group guide included questions on the personal understanding of integration in general and the personal opinion on the potentials and concerns of social media use for integration. In total, eight main categories resulted from this, as depicted in Figure 24 below.
The subcategories, or codes specifying details of the main categories, were developed from the data. All relevant aspects that came up for each question relating to the dimensions of social integration were first paraphrased, then summarized and grouped together (Schreier, 2012), resulting in 24 subcategories. This coding frame was piloted on part of the material. The material selected for the trial coding was based on Schreier’s (2012) advice to ensure variability of material and variability of opinions to be able to test the entire coding frame (p. 149-150). Thus, the entire transcripts of one focus group discussion with a Turkish sample of six participants (all born in Germany) and one with a Korean sample of three participants (all born in South Korea) were pilot coded. After the pilot phase, the coding frame was evaluated and adjusted. The pilot testing of the coding frame on the selected material showed that within some main categories, there was a high coding frequency for one subcategory compared to other subcategories within
the main category. This is often a sign that the coding frame is not sufficiently differentiated and is an indicator of “low face validity” of the coding frame (Schreier, 2012, p. 187). Face validity refers to the extent to which the coding frame gives the impression of what it is supposed to measure, and it is particularly useful to assess the validity of data-driven coding frames (Schreier, 2012, p. 186). The material was thus examined for additional differentiation within the subcategories that had comparatively high coding frequencies and adjusted the coding frame accordingly. This generated nine new subcategories. In total, 33 subcategories emerged from the data (see Appendix 5).

The second phase was the main analysis phase. All eight focus group discussions were coded based on the final coding frame. Single mentions of codes were coded in cases where participants talked specifically about themselves and their experiences and opinions. In cases where one code was mentioned by one participant and followed up by other participants by agreeing, this was considered as a section of conversation and thus coded as one mention or one count (Morgan, 1997, p. 60). In the final analysis, the frequencies of given codes both within the focus groups of an ethnic group (intragroup comparison) as well as between the two ethnic groups (intergroup comparison) were considered (Morgan, 1997, p. 63).

To assess reliability, Schreier (2012) suggests looking at the consistency of the coding “by comparing coding across persons or across points in time” (p. 167). The researcher decided to code the selected material in two rounds with 4 weeks in between. The percentage of agreement was then calculated by taking the number of units of coding which were assigned the same codes in both rounds and dividing it by the total number of units of coding of the selected material. This number was then multiplied by 100 and resulted in a percentage of agreement of 91%, showing that the final coding frame was sufficiently reliable. In addition, coding across persons was applied. For the inter-coder
reliability, a second independent coder who was familiar with the research topic and the research method was consulted and coded about 10% of the material. To ensure variability of material and variability of opinions to be able to test the entire coding frame, the second coder received material from one focus group with a Turkish sample and from one focus group with a Korean sample. Both, the percentage of agreement and Cohen’s kappa coefficient are reported here because as Schreier (2012) points out, the first one is often overestimating, while the later score is often underestimating reliability. The percentage of agreement was about 82% and the inter-coder reliability kappa score was at .63. In this case, the agreement level was sufficient. According to Schreier (2012), “a simple percentage of agreement will often be sufficient, as long as you guard against over-interpreting high percentages” (p. 192).

4.7. Results

The aim of this qualitative study was to explore how young adults with a Turkish or a Korean migration background construct their social integration orientations both offline and online. In the following subchapter the results of the qualitative study are presented. In the first section, a brief overview of the composition of each focus group, including key information on the socio-demographic background of the participants, is provided. In the next sections, the results of the qualitative content analysis for each of the three social integration dimensions are presented, first in the offline context, subsequently in the online context. In addition to results concerning the three social integration dimensions, results relating to personal understanding of integration are presented as well to get an insight into the participants’ own opinions on integration.
The last section of this subchapter presents the results of a frequency analysis which was run to determine differences in the occurrences of codes between the offline and online contexts of a sample, and between the two samples.

The compositions of the focus groups for the Turkish sample and the Korean sample are presented first. Four focus groups were conducted with participants with a Turkish migration background. The group size of each focus group ranged from two to six participants. Among those, nine were female and six were male, all between 20 and 30 years old ($M = 23.73$, $SD = 3.26$). Table 23 provides an overview of the ethnic and national background of the participants and their parents from the Turkish sample.

**Table 23. Overview of the ethnic and national background for the Turkish sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s country of birth</th>
<th>Participant’s citizenship</th>
<th>Mother’s country of birth</th>
<th>Mother’s citizenship</th>
<th>Father’s country of birth</th>
<th>Father’s citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Turkish sample n= 15*

The majority of participants in the Turkish sample, namely 12 out of 15, was born in Germany. Those born in Turkey, migrated to Germany at an early age, meaning that all of the participants attended a German school. Among the parents, 14 of the mothers and 14 of the fathers were born in Turkey. Two out of the 15 participants had parents where one parent was born in Germany and one in Turkey. The ethnic background of the parents was also checked in addition to place of birth, however, in this case, place of birth was congruent with ethnic background. An interesting aspect is that in the Turkish sample dual citizenship was indicated by three participants. Furthermore, two fathers and two mothers also had dual citizenship.
Looking at the education level (see Table 24), all participants had at least a high school degree (German “Abitur”), seven indicated to have a completed university degree. For the parents’ education level, the picture is much more diverse. It ranged from no completed school degree to university degree.

Table 24. Overview of the educational background of the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participant’s education</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>Father’s education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No completed school degree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n= 15

Most of the participants, precisely 12, in the Turkish sample were full-time students, one participant was full time employed, and two participants were self-employed. The living situation varied from two participants living alone, four in a shared apartment, and two living with their partner. Almost half of the participants, namely seven, indicated to live with their parents.

For the Korean sample, four focus groups were conducted with a total of 11 participants across all focus groups, among which five were female and six male. The age ranged between 23 and 31 years ($M = 26.64$, $SD = 2.46$). The number of participants ranged from two to three participants per focus group. The small number of participants in each group is an interesting issue. It was very difficult to get participants for a focus group with Korean-heritage individuals. This was on the one hand an issue with contacting and reaching a larger number of young adults with a Korean migration background. On the other hand, this also seemed to reflect also a cultural issue. As it was pointed out to me by two participants in two different focus groups, in the Korean culture, these kinds of group discussions are not common and therefore people with a Korean
background do not feel comfortable discussing issues in a larger group. Nevertheless, I felt that the small group size did not impair the quality of discussions, but rather allowed for more in-depth conversations with each of the participants and among the participants themselves.

Concerning the ethnic and national background of the participants and parents in the Korean sample, a slightly different picture than in the Turkish sample appeared (see Table 25). More than half of the participants were born in South Korea, of which six migrated themselves to Germany to study at a university. One of those participants migrated at the age of one with the parents. In total, five out of 11 participants had German citizenship. All of the participants’ parents were born in South Korea. Those parents living in Germany, which are five mothers and five fathers, all have acquired German citizenship.

**Table 25. Overview of the ethnic and national background for the Korean sample.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s country of birth</th>
<th>Participant’s citizenship</th>
<th>Mother’s country of birth</th>
<th>Mother’s citizenship</th>
<th>Father’s country of birth</th>
<th>Father’s citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Korea</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Korean sample n= 11*

The education level among the participants in the Korean sample, like in the Turkish sample, was high, most of them having at least a completed high school degree or university degree (see Table 26). In contrast to the parents of the participants in the Turkish sample, the education level of the parents of the participants in the Korean sample was also very high, the majority having a completed university degree.

**Table 26. Overview of the educational background of the Korean focus groups.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s education</th>
<th>Mother’s education</th>
<th>Father’s education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Korean sample n= 11*
Similar to the Turkish sample, the participants in the Korean sample were mostly students, while two participants were full time employed. Concerning the living situation, most of the participants, namely six, indicated to live in a shared apartment, four stated to live alone, while only one participant said to live with the parents.

The following sections present the results for each of the three social integration dimensions. The main findings are summarized for each dimension at the end of each section, first for the offline context and then for the online context. Within each dimension, similarities and differences between the two ethnic groups under study are examined.

4.7.1. Acculturation offline and online

The acculturation dimension captures the cultural practices and expressions of behavior in daily life in both offline and online contexts. For this dimension six codes in the offline context and eight codes in the online context emerged from the data, resulting in 14 codes in total. The acculturation dimension, taken the offline and online context together, was the dimension with the most units of coding, in total 147 units. The number of coded segments was quite similar for acculturation offline (n=78) and acculturation online (n=67). However, the frequency of codes and also the content of some codes in the offline and online contexts differed, as did the code distribution between the two samples. Table 27 (p. 145) provides an overview of the codes and their frequency for the two samples in the offline context and Table 29 (on p. 157) for the online context. First, the codes that emerged in the offline context are presented, then the codes in the online context of the acculturation dimension.
### Table 27. Overview of codes for the acculturation dimension in the offline context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
<th>Exemplary quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation offline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78 (100)</td>
<td>“Depending on what kind of person I talk to, it’s clearly in a specified language.” [DK03, P1 (m, 28), 48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switching languages offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 (11.5)</td>
<td>“When I go home, we only speak Turkish at home.” [DT04, P2 (f, 21), 60]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instances for using ethnic language offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24 (30.8)</td>
<td>“I speak German because it’s easier for me.” [DK02, P3 (f, 27), 131]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instances for using German language offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 (14.1)</td>
<td>“I think it’s difficult to differentiate, because it has mixed already, well, the cultures have mixed.” [DT03, P2 (m, 24), 112]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixing cultural practices offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (3.8)</td>
<td>“With Korean people, it is often that they have a collective thinking.” [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 95]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage culture specifics offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19 (24.4)</td>
<td>“I’m also somewhat already used to the German culture. Using the informal ‘du’ or formal ‘Sie’. But I still have difficulties when a quite old professor addresses me informally and I should do the same.” [DK01, P3 (m, 26), 75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German culture specifics offline</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 (15.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15; Korean sample n=11.

**Switching languages offline:** This code was applied when participants mentioned changing from one language to another language depending on the context or the person.

23 Original: „Je nach dem mit was für einer Person ich spreche, ist klar in einer festgelegten Sprache.“ [DK03, P1 (m, 28), 48]
24 Original: „Also bei mir, wenn ich nach Hause gehe, wir sprechen zu Hause nur Türkisch.“ [DT04, P2 (f, 21), 60]
25 Original: „Ich rede Deutsch, weil es mir leichter fällt.“ [DK02, P3 (f, 27), 131]
26 Original: „Ich glaube hält, das ist schwierig, das zu unterscheiden, weil, ähm... weil sich das schon gemischt hat, also so die Kulturen haben sich so gemischt.“ [DT03, P2 (m, 24), 112]
27 Original: „Und, hm, bei koreanischen Leuten ist es oftmals so, dass die ein Kollektivdenken haben.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 95]
28 Original: „Ja und, ähm, ich bin auch... einigermaßen daran gewöhnt schon an die deutsche Kultur. Duzen und siezen. Aber immer noch habe ich Schwierigkeiten, wenn ein ziemlich alter Professor mich duzt und ich auch duzen soll.“ [DK01, P3 (m, 26), 75]
they talk to in face-to-face interactions. In total, there were nine instances where this code was applied. In the Turkish sample this was mentioned twice as often as in the Korean sample (six times compared to three times).

When asked about what languages they use in their daily lives, participants in the focus group discussions of both ethnic groups pointed out that their language use depended on the context and the people. As one 24-year-old male participant from the Turkish sample explained: “I just always speak German, except with my father, then I always talk in Turkish. Or with my Turkish friends when I communicate with them. Well, those who live in Istanbul. I just don’t like to mix it.” 29 He clearly stated that the German language was what he used in daily life, however, he then pointed out exceptions, such as when he talked to his father or his Turkish friends. Here, he felt the need to specify that with Turkish friends he meant those who live in Turkey. A participant in one of the Korean focus groups pointed out that the language he used depended on the person he talked to (see Footnote 23).

Both examples from the Turkish and the Korean group illustrate that depending on the context and persons, a specific language is employed and languages are not mixed. In most cases, participants distinguished between the family context which was always related to the ethnic language and the general daily life context which was related to using the German language. One reason why this code occurred more frequently in the Turkish sample than in the Korean sample could be that six of the 11 participants in the Korean sample migrated themselves to Germany and had their close family (e.g. parents, siblings) still in Korea, so that the switching of languages in the offline context is not as salient to

29 Original: „Ich spreche halt immer Deutsch, außer mit meinem Vater, da rede ich immer Türkisch. Oder mit meinen türkischen Freunden, wenn ich mit denen kommuniziere. Also mit denen, die in Istanbul leben. Ich mische das halt ungern.” [DT03, P2 (m, 24), 81]
them as it is for participants in the Turkish sample who were confronted with two
languages from an early age on.

Instances of using ethnic language offline: The most frequently mentioned code that
emerged from the data for the acculturation dimension in the offline context was related
to using the ethnic language. Using the ethnic language was more frequently mentioned
in the Turkish sample than in the Korean sample: about 79% compared to 21% of the 24
coded segments. When looking at the reasons provided by the participants for using the
ethnic language, four categories of reasons could be distinguished: 1) expressing positive
emotions, 2) swearing, 3) family, and 4) practicing language skills. Table 28 shows the
frequency distribution of the specific reasons across the two samples.

Table 28. Categories of reasons for using ethnic language in the offline context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for using ethnic language offline:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Expressing positive emotions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Swearing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Practice language skill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Turkish sample n=15; Korean sample n=11.

The first and most frequently mentioned reason for using the ethnic language was for
expressing positive emotions. Both ethnic groups connected the ethnic language with
emotions, particularly with expressing positive emotions such as joy or pleasure. As it
was expressed in one Korean focus group:
Excerpt 1: DK03 (191-197)

1  P3 (f, 26): Yes, of course. However, rather when it’s funny. [laughs] When laughing!

2  P2 (f, 25): Yes, with positive [emotions], I would almost rather say that in Korean.

3  P3 (f, 26): Yes.

4  P2 (f, 25): Like tebak. [...] There are some terms that only exist in Korean. There I would rather be able to say it.

5  P3 (f, 26): Korean.

6  P1 (m, 28): Wassa and such.

7  P2 (f, 25): Yeees. [laughs]

Excerpt 1 illustrates how the participants in this focus group shared their similar use of Korean words and how they connected the ethnic language to positive emotions. Similar to the Korean sample, a focus group of the Turkish sample pointed out: 
**Excerpt 2: DT02 (191-203)**

1. P3 (m, 21): I think, the Turkish language is also a bit more emotional.
2. P2 (m, 27): Yes, exactly.
3. P3 (m, 21): Well, especially vocabulary-wise.
4. I: Hmhm.
5. P3 (m, 21): Because... Well, I often feel that when I for instance want to compliment someone in German, it sounds nevertheless very unemotional. And not so... ehm, personal.
7. P3 (m, 21): Well, I think in Turkish, especially when you want to express joy or pleasure, the Turkish language is much more emotional.

Excerpt 2 from the Turkish sample illustrates that participants also connected the ethnic language to emotions. In the Korean sample, this was predominantly mentioned in the context of expressing positive emotions, whereas in the Turkish sample using the ethnic language was not restricted to a specific emotion. On the contrary, participants in the Turkish sample mentioned using the ethnic language for expressing a range of different emotions. For instance, swearing in the ethnic language was mentioned as expressing negative emotions. In one of the Turkish focus groups, the following was said:
Excerpt 3: DT02 (82-87)

1 P3 (m, 21): Yes, absolutely. Well, especially when it comes to swearing. [laughs]

2 P2 (f, 30): Hmhm. [agreeing]

3 I: In which language rather…?

4 P3 (m, 21): Turkish.

5 P4 (f, 30): Turkish. [laughs]

6 P3 (m, 21): Well, we have -, you are quite creative here. And we have many, many, many options.

Swearing as a form of expressing emotions in the ethnic language was mentioned in two incidences in the Turkish sample and only mentioned in one incident by participants of the Korean sample whose first language was Korean. This was the case in the following focus group where all participants in the discussion migrated themselves to Germany:

Excerpt 4: DK01 (143)

1 P1 (f, 31): When I, ehm, insult someone [laughs out loud] then I speak Korean, yes. Right? [laughing]

3 P3 (m, 26): Oh, yes, it’s right. That is right.

One participant in the Korean sample who was born and raised in Germany explained the use of Korean for mostly positive emotions and thus the lack of swearwords as follows: “Well, I wouldn’t be able to really swear in Korean. Where were we supposed
to learn it anyways? Surely our parents did not teach us that."³⁰ There was a clear difference in the use of the Korean language for the group born and raised in Korea and the group born and raised in Germany. The language context for the latter group was mostly through parents and family and therefore swearwords were not common. This was different for the Turkish sample. One reason for this could be the fact that the Turkish group in Germany is much bigger in size than the Korean group and thus the socialization with the Turkish language in daily life is not limited to parents and family but stretches beyond these ties from an early age on. Furthermore, by providing more reasons for the use of the ethnic language, it can be assumed that the ethnic language in the Turkish sample is used more frequently in daily life than it would be the case for the Korean sample.

A difference in the use of the ethnic language cannot only be pointed out between the Turkish and the Korean sample but also within the Korean sample. This was due to the fact that in the Korean sample six participants were included who lived most of their lives in South Korea and then migrated themselves to Germany to pursue a university degree. These participants naturally have a different relation to the Korean language than those participants born to Korean parents but raised in Germany. One male participant who lived in Germany for four years at the date of the focus group discussion underlined his relation to the Korean language as follows:

³⁰ Original: „Also ich würde nicht auf Koreanisch fluche können so richtig. […] Wo hätten wir das auch lernen sollen? Unsere Eltern haben uns sicher das nicht so beigebracht.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 210-213]
Quote 1: DK01 (79)

P3 (m, 26): I have the feeling that a foreign language cannot really carry or convey my feeling. Maybe, well, feelings most likely don’t want to be carried, but when someone hears my word, they feel something. But I as the speaker have the feeling that my feeling is not really expressed. So when I want to be emotionally deep with someone, I have the desire to speak Korean.

Hence, participants who were born and raised in South Korea use Korean in more (emotionally) diverse ways because they have the language skills. This is also supported by the data. Out of the five units of coding for the reasons of using the ethnic language, three were mentioned by participants born and raised in South Korea, referring to expressing positive emotions but also swearing in Korean. The other two units of coding were mentioned by participants born and raised in Germany and referred to expressing positive emotions in Korean and speaking Korean in the family context. Their socialization with the Korean language in daily life was often limited to parents and family, resulting in restricted language skills. On the other hand, this also influenced their relation to and use of the German language because this specific sub-group within the Korean sample had a different approach and starting point of learning German which the results of the next code will show.

**Instances of using German language offline.** This code was applied when participants described situations when they used German or even preferred using German over the ethnic language. In total, this code was assigned 11 units of coding.

When asked about the use of the German language, most participants in both ethnic groups mentioned that it was easier for them to use German. One female participant in
one of the Korean focus groups said, “I speak German because I find it easier”\textsuperscript{31}. Similarly, another female participant from a Turkish focus group said: “Well, at my home we almost only talk in German because I can’t speak Turkish that well. I didn’t really learn it.”\textsuperscript{32} In this case, ethnic language proficiency also defined the use of the German language. The German language was not directly connected to expressing emotions like it was with the ethnic language, but rather as a practical fact that most of the participants’ first language was German and therefore they felt more confident using German in their daily lives. For the participants within the Korean sample who recently migrated to Germany, speaking German was a matter of necessity. The German language was an important aspect of their lives in Germany to interact and communicate.

Overall, for most participants using the German language in daily life was rather for practical reasons. For the participants who spent most of their lives in Germany, it was a matter of language proficiency because they went through the German school system and thus found German easier to speak. For those participants who recently migrated to Germany, German was seen as a necessity to manage their daily life.

	extit{Mixing cultural practices offline.} This code was applied when participants described how their ethnic and German cultures have mixed in daily life which is expressed in different ways such as food, customs, or other practices. Though this code only occurred in three instances and only in two Turkish focus groups, it still provides important insights that contribute to the overall interpretation. One 21-year old participant stated: “I mean, to be honest, I was born and raised in Germany. Just as the Turkish culture is my culture, 

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Original: „Ich rede Deutsch, weil es mir leichter fällt.“ [DK02, P3 (f, 27) 131]
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Original: „Also bei mir daheim reden wir fast nur Deutsch, weil ich kann nicht so gut Türkisch. Ich habe es nicht so gelernt.“ [DT04, P1 (f, 29), 62]
\end{itemize}
by now also the German culture is my culture. And I don’t actually differentiate.”

Another participant mentioned that it was difficult for him to differentiate between the German and Turkish culture because the two cultures have mixed in his daily life. The results from this code show that in the daily lives of some of the participants there were no clear cultural distinctions internalized. Contrary to the ethnic language use, there was no context-dependent frame switching between the cultures when it came to food, customs, or other practices. In this case, they rather took ‘the best of both worlds’.

*Heritage culture specifics offline.* Participants in both ethnic groups pointed out specific aspects of their heritage cultures that they encountered in their daily life. Within the acculturation dimension, this was the second most frequently mentioned code (n=19). Particularly when confronted with two cultures, the specifics of the heritage culture in contrast to the mainstream culture of the society one lives in becomes salient. Being aware of cultural differences is an important aspect of understanding cultures and adapting accordingly. As one focus group of the Korean sample discussed:

---

33 Original: „Ich meine, um ehrlich zu sein, ich bin ja in Deutschland geboren und aufgewachsen. Und genauso wie die türkische Kultur meine Kultur ist, ist jetzt mittlerweile auch die deutsche Kultur meine Kultur. Und da mache ich eigentlich keine Unterschiede.“ [DT02, P3 (m, 21), 116]
34 Original: „Ich glaube halt, das ist schwierig, das zu unterscheiden, weil, ähm... weil sich das schon gemischt hat, also so die Kulturen haben sich so gemischt. Ich würde nicht mehr sagen so, wenn ich jetzt zu Hause bin und mit der Familie irgendwas mache, das ist so typisch türkisch. Sondern es ist einfach gemischt.“ [DT03, P2 (m, 24) 112]
Excerpt 5: DK03 (96-105)

1 P1 (m, 28): What’s also important: In Korean, you really have to be able to read between the lines. Well, the Koreans, they can’t say things directly, but they always say it in a roundabout way and somehow… they don’t voice it clearly, especially not criticism. They never voice negative things clearly, but somehow there is an underlying tone and you need to be able to hear it. And when you don’t understand it, then, eh…

2 P3 (f, 26): Then you quickly turn into the one who has no clue about interpersonal relationships. [laughs]

[...]

3 P2 (f, 25): So showing no respect or being not well-bred. [...] Well, there is this nun-chi in Korean which means something like eyes for...

4 P3 (f, 26): Or something like extending one’s antennas, somehow in-between...

5 P2 (f, 25): Exactly, this, when… having sensitivity.

This excerpt points out the importance of understanding not only verbal but also non-verbal communication. Developing a sensitivity of the heritage cultural specifics is important for the social interactions within the ethnic group but also for one’s acceptance as part of this ethnic group. For most of the participants, both in the Turkish and Korean sample, who spent most of their lives in Germany, it took more effort to learn these heritage culture specifics. They did not experience the heritage culture first-hand but rather through their social network which was mostly through their families.

German culture specifics offline. This code was mostly mentioned by those participants who recently migrated from Korea to Germany (nine out of 12 instances). It shows that the German culture specifics were more salient to those participants who were
rather recently confronted with the German culture. One male participant from the Korean
sample remembered the issues he encountered in the beginning of his time in Germany:

**Quote 2: DK01 (62)**

P3 (m, 26): For me in the beginning it was not so… eh… familiar that I can use
the informal ‘du’ with the elderly. Well, in Korea it is asymmetric. So the older
people always use the informal ‘du’ for me and I nevertheless use the formal
‘Sie’. But in Germany, it is often the case that when one side uses ‘du’ then the
other one, so the conversational partner should also use ‘du’.

For those participants who moved to Germany rather recently, the German cultural
specifics were more apparent as they were more aware of the cultural differences
encountered only recently. This was in contrast to the participants who spent most of their
lives in Germany where German culture specifics were not as salient because they were
exposed to the German culture for a longer time.

In the online context of the acculturation dimension, there were in total seven codes,
of which three codes were also mentioned in the offline context and four new codes
emerged for the online context from the data. Table 29 provides an overview of these
codes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
<th>Exemplary quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Acculturation online                        | 32   | (47.8)         | 35 (52.2)     | 67 (100)    | **Switching languages online** 6 9 15 (22.4) “Friends from Turkey. Then I write in Turkish of course. But when it’s a German group then I write in German.”...
| Instances of using ethnic language online   | 8    | 2              | 10 (14.9)     |             | “I do from time to time write some phrases in Korean. Ehm, like phrases that are difficult to express in German.”...
| Instances of using German language online   | 3    | 1              | 4 (6.0)       |             | “My circle of friends, those are all Berliners. And consequently, we write exclusively in German.”...
| Mixing languages online                     | 6    | 2              | 8 (11.9)      |             | “[Online] With siblings it’s always some Turkish-German mix. Sometimes you even have both languages in one sentence. [laughs]”...
| Language acquisition online                | 0    | 3              | 3 (4.5)       |             | “Well, I’ve learned the Korean language also a lot through KakaoTalk and such.”...
| Heritage culture specifics online           | 1    | 10             | 11 (16.4)     |             | “I think you sometimes realize it when you send messages or the like that the Korean culture is a bit more emotionally rich than ‘hehe’, ‘haha’, ‘hoho’.”...
| Consuming heritage culture related content | 8    | 6              | 14 (20.9)     |             | “I only use social media with the Turkish side actually only when I watch YouTube videos. Well, I also watch Turkish bloggers. A bit also for not losing the Turkish part because I just want to know what the Turkish youth is up to.”...
| Consuming German culture related content    | 0    | 2              | 2 (3.0)       |             | “Like certain Facebook pages created by Korean students. For example, how to survive in Germany.”...

*Note. Turkish sample n=15; Korean sample n=11.*
Switching languages online. Similar to the offline context, this context-dependent use of language was also mentioned in the online context when talking about communication on social media. As one 28-year old male participant from the Korean sample said, “With me, it really depends on the person”43. In another focus group discussion with a Turkish sample the language use on social media was further elaborated:

Excerpt 5: DT01 (95-96)

1 P2 (f, 21): Depends on the target group. Who you want to reach.

2 P1 (f, 24): Yes, that’s true. Exactly. Otherwise, I can’t say that I only use German or only Turkish, well, sometimes English, Spanish. Well, we do switch sometimes. But I try to stick to one language.

When using social media, participants were well aware of their language use and had in mind who they communicate to in which language. Similar to the offline context, participants associated certain languages with specific people and thus switched accordingly.

35 Original: „Freunde aus der Türkei. Dann schreibe ich natürlich auf Türkisch […] Aber wenn es eine deutsche Gruppe ist, dann schreibe ich auf Deutsch.“ [DT01, P2 (f, 21), 99]
36 Original: „Ich schreibe schon ein paar Sätze immer mal wieder auf Koreanisch. Ähm, so Phrasen, die schwer auf Deutsch auszudrücken sind.“ [DK02, P3 (f, 27), 111]
37 Original: „Meine Freundesgruppe, das sind halt alles Berliner. Und dem entsprechend schreiben wir ausschließlich auf Deutsch.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 92]
39 Original: „Also ich habe auch die koreanische Sprache […] viel über KakaoTalk und so gelernt.“ [DK03, P1 (m, 28), 254]
40 Original: „Ich glaube, man merkt das manchmal, wenn man sich halt so Nachrichten schickt oder so, dass, die koreanische Kultur ein bisschen emotionsreicher ist als nur das ’hehe’, ’haha’, ’hoho’.“ [DK03, P3 (f, 26), 50]
42 Original: „So bestimmte Facebook-Seiten, die von koreanischen Studenten gemacht wurden. Zum Beispiel, wie man in Deutschland überlebt.“ [DK02, P2 (f, 24), 364]
43 Original: „Bei mir ist es wirklich Personen abhängig.“ [DK03, P1 (m, 28), 63]
Instances of using ethnic language online. When talking about the instances of using the ethnic language on social media, most of the participants referred to the communication with family members. One male participant from the Turkish sample said, “I write in Turkish now rather using Messenger or the like, Facebook Messenger or WhatsApp, then it’s with family members of friends from my semester abroad”\textsuperscript{44}. Like in the offline context, ethnic language use is closely associated with specific persons.

Instances of using German language online. This code was applied when participants pointed out specific situations where they used German or even preferred using German over their ethnic language on social media. There were only four mentions in total that were coded under this category. Similarly to the offline context, the reasons for using German on social media were rather of practical matter, as it was pointed out by one male participant: “My circle of friends, those are all Berliners. And consequently, we write exclusively in German, because we are a multicultural group.”\textsuperscript{45} German was pointed out here as the language that was most available to them, thus making German also the connecting language in a group of multicultural friends.

Mixing languages online. This code was applied when participants mentioned mixing both German and the ethnic language on social media. This code did not emerge in the offline context but only in the online context. When asked about language use on social media, one participant pointed out:

\begin{quote}
Original: „Türkisch schreibe ich eher jetzt über den Messenger oder so, Facebook Messenger oder WhatsApp, dann mit Familienangehörigen oder Freunden aus dem Auslandssemester.“ [DT03, P2 (m, 24), 59]
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Original: „[…] meine Freundesgruppe, das sind halt alles Berliner. Und dem entsprechend schreiben wir ausschließlich auf Deutsch, da wir eine multikulturelle Gruppe sind.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 92]
\end{quote}
**Quote 3: DT04 (47)**

P3 (m, 20): Well, I think it’s difficult to say. It’s always a mix. […] With siblings it’s always some Turkish-German mix. Sometimes you even have both languages in one sentence, too [laughs].

The mixing of languages within a conversation or within a sentence, known as code switching, was only mentioned to be practiced when using social media. This is an interesting aspect. On the one hand, social media provided a platform where the expression of both cultures through mixing two languages was easier to be practiced. On the other hand, mixing two languages could also be a sign of incompetence in one of the languages thus resulting in a ‘third language’ which implies both deficit and competence that is expressed online (Hinnenkamp, 2003).

*Language acquisition online.* This is a further code in the acculturation dimension that only emerged in the online context. This code was applied when participants mentioned how they learned a language (often German or the ethnic language) through social media, either by practicing direct communication via social media or by finding persons via social media for studying the language. This was only mentioned in three instances and only in the Korean sample. Nevertheless, this code gave an interesting insight into the use of social media in relation to language acquisition. One of the participants in the Korean sample specifically referred to KakaoTalk, an instant messenger service that is particularly popular in the Korean community. He explained:
Quote 4: DK03 (254-264)

P1 (m, 28): Well, I learnt the Korean language a lot through KakaoTalk and such […] There were both German-Koreans and Korean-Koreans, right. And I remember in the beginning, it was roughly before I finished high school, that my Korean was also not so good yet. Well, I couldn’t write that well and read only really slowly. Yes, KakaoTalk definitely helped me, so I could write with those friends.

In this case, social media provided a platform for exchange and language practice. On social media, the threshold of communicating with other people in a specific language is lower which makes it easier to practice a language than in face-to-face interactions. Social media here helped to improve ethnic language skills.

Heritage culture specifics online. This code was applied when participants pointed out specific aspects of their heritage culture that they experience when using social media and which they perceived as different from the German culture online. In total, 11 mentions were coded under this category, of which 10 mentions occurred in the Korean sample only. Many of the participants in the Korean focus groups referred to KakaoTalk and pointed out specifics of that instant messenger that allowed them to express culture-specific aspects. As one female participant explained, „Most of the people are somehow on KakaoTalk. It’s really yet another culture with its own emoticons and such”⁴⁶. In another Korean focus group a participant elaborated:

---

⁴⁶ Original: „Die meisten sind irgendwie auf KakaoTalk. Es ist echt noch mal so eine eigene Kultur mit diesen eigenen Emoticons und so was.” [DK02, P3 (f ), 98]
**Quote 5: DK03 (42)**

P3 (f, 26): I think you sometimes realize it when you send messages or something that the Korean culture is a bit more emotionally rich as just the ‘hehe’, ‘haha’, ‘hoho’. There are different smilies on KakaoTalk that show a more diverse form of emotions. So not only anger and sadness but also this embarrassment in between or a little awkward or all these things. A bit more multilayered, so, well, you can express a bit more multilayered ways.

Social media, in this case KakaoTalk in particular, provided a channel online for expressing culture-specific emotions that they were familiar with offline and wished to express also online. KakaoTalk serves this purpose by offering Korean culture-specific emoticons. The heritage culture specifics which are salient in the offline world are wished to be expressed also in the online world through social media. The expression of these heritage culture specifics was particularly important for participants in the Korean sample.

*Consuming heritage culture related content online.* Another topic that emerged from the data was the consumption of heritage culture-specific content. Under this code, all mentions were coded in which participants talked about using social media for consuming specifically heritage culture content (e.g. online series, news). This includes not only content from the heritage country but also information or news about the heritage country. Especially in the Turkish sample, the political situation in Turkey in relation to social media was a much-discussed topic. One participant said:
**Quote 6: DT04 (36)**

P2 (f, 24): Well, recently I think that in this way you simply get a lot of political information. So when something bad happened in the world, I always heard about it on Facebook first and then I read more about it, I don’t know…There are bomb attacks and the like, now also in Turkey especially […]. Yes, it is sad on the one hand, but of course on the other hand it’s good how fast it spreads.

Consuming heritage culture related content on social media, such as political news on Facebook, was mentioned as an important and immediate way of keeping up with the current situation in the heritage country. This was also mentioned in the Korean sample. For instance, one participant clearly stated the importance of Facebook for political information:

**Quote 7: DK01 (185)**

Well, I don’t visit websites of Korean media that often explicitly but when I go on Facebook, I go through the Facebook newsfeed at least once a day. And there I already see the posts that Koreans post. And by this, I quite often get the most important information on the political situation in Korea. Yes, for this it plays an important role, Facebook.

For the participants of both ethnic groups, social media provided an important source of information on the heritage country. Often news spread faster on social media than on traditional mass media like television, and in some cases social media also provide an alternative source for news not covered by traditional media channels. This makes social media important sources for the consumption of heritage culture related content.
Consuming German culture related content online. In only two instances participants mentioned using social media for consuming specifically German content (e.g. online series, news), this included not only content from Germany but also information or news about Germany. These instances were only mentioned in the Korean sample by two participants who recently moved to Germany. One pointed out an online networking site and said, “BerlinPort is known. Well, I think almost every Korean who lives in Germany knows this website. And there you can get mainly pure information or they do experience exchange there”. Consuming German culture related content was more relevant to those who were not completely familiar with the German culture and thus they turned to online sources to familiarize themselves with cultural specifics.

4.7.2. Interaction offline and online

The dimension of interaction includes friendship relations and family contacts. In the offline context of the interaction dimension, two codes emerged and in the online context, three codes emerged from the data. Table 30 provides an overview of all five codes of the interaction dimension.
Table 30. Overview of codes for the interaction dimension in the offline and online context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
<th>Exemplary quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction offline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having friends with similar background offline</td>
<td>25  (75.8)</td>
<td>8  (24.2)</td>
<td>33 (100)</td>
<td>“Well, it’s important to me. Because my closest friends are also German-Turks.”(^{47})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having German friends offline</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27 (81.8)</td>
<td>“In school, I mainly had only German friends which was also because -, I was at a pure German school the only Turk in the whole cohort.”(^{48})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying in contact with family and friends via social media</td>
<td>25  (54.3)</td>
<td>21  (45.7)</td>
<td>46 (100)</td>
<td>“WhatsApp basically only for two groups: family group and friends group. Ehm, and Facebook exclusively to stay in touch.”(^{49})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating with friends online with similar background</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27 (58.7)</td>
<td>“Yes, well, KakaoTalk is important for me to stay in contact with other Koreans, also those who still live in Korea. So this is a really important communication tool.”(^{50})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing content with one’s online social network</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9 (19.6)</td>
<td>“WhatsApp I sometimes send friends pictures, when I want to share something with them, because I am abroad or something.”(^{51})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n=15; Korean sample n=11.

\(^{47}\) Original: „Also wichtig ist es mir schon. Weil meine engsten [Freunde] sind auch Deutsch-Türken.“ [DT01, P2 (f, 21), 343]
\(^{48}\) Original: „Während der Schulzeit hatte ich hauptsächlich nur deutsche Freunde, weil es auch daran lag, dass -, ich war auf einer reinen deutschen Schule die einzige Türkin im ganzen Jahrgang.“ [DT02, P1 (f, 25), 139]
\(^{49}\) Original: „WhatsApp im Prinzip nur wegen zwei Gruppen: einer Familiengruppe und einer Freundesgruppe. Ähm, und Facebook ausschließlich um Kontakt zu halten.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 86]
\(^{50}\) Original: „Ja, also, KakaoTalk ist, für mich wichtig mit anderen Koreanern, auch denen die noch in Korea wohnen, Kontakt zu haben. Also, das ist wirklich ein wichtiges Kommunikationsmittel.“ [DK01, P3 (m, 26), 97]
\(^{51}\) Original: „WhatsApp schicke ich manchmal Freunden Fotos, wenn ich das mit denen teilen will, weil ich meinetwegen im Ausland grade bin oder so.“ [DK03, P2 (f, 25), 33]
For interaction offline, 33 segments were coded. Looking at the two samples, a big difference in the distribution of the code counts was observed. Over 75% of the coded segments occurred in the Turkish sample. For interaction online, 46 segments were coded. Here, the distribution of code counts was similar for both samples: 25 counts in the Turkish sample compared to 21 counts in the Korean sample. Looking at the results of each code will help to understand and interpret the distribution of code counts in the two samples. First, the results of the codes for the offline context are presented, then the results for the online context.

*Having friends with a similar background offline.* Under this code, participants pointed out the relevance or importance of having friends with a similar cultural or ethnic background or with similar (migration) experiences in their daily life and face-to-face interactions. With 27 coded segments, this was one of the two most frequently mentioned codes across all dimensions and across both samples. Interestingly, there was a substantial difference in the number of mentions of this code between the Turkish sample and the Korean sample. Whereas this code was mentioned in 20 instances in the Turkish focus group discussions, it was only mentioned in seven instances in the Korean focus group discussions. Nevertheless, having friends with a similar background was considered important in the samples of both ethnic groups. As one male participant from the Turkish sample explained:
**Quote 8: DT04 (108)**

P3 (m, 20): Important I would say, yes. Well, I would say -, well for me it would be important that I have... though it might not be many, but at least one person that has a Turkish migration background, well that they... yes, that they can speak Turkish. Okay, they don’t have to speak Turkish but at least understand me, well, understand my culture, how it is to be Turkish. That is rather very important to me.

What this excerpt illustrates is that the importance of having friends with a similar background lies in the feeling of mutual understanding. The shared experience of a culture creates a bond between people. To share similar experiences is also a way to deal with the difficulty of integrating two cultures. As one female participant from the Turkish sample stated:

**Quote 9: DT04 (110)**

P2 (f, 21): I wouldn’t say that this is somehow important to me, but somehow it shows that over time I get along better with those people with a migration background. Not because I do it intentionally but because it simply emerges. I don’t know whether it’s the feeling. Well, sometimes you feel better understood when the other person also knows what it’s like to be foreign in a country.

This was stated by a 21 year old participant who was born and raised in Germany. It demonstrates that despite being in this country for such a long time, she still felt foreign and sought friends who could relate to that feeling. Thus, the importance lies not so much in the same cultural background but more in similar experiences, such as having a migration background and growing up with two cultures that are valued in friendships.
Having German friends offline. When asked about the importance of friendships, in only six instances participants pointed out the role of having German friends in their daily life and face-to-face interactions. Out of these six coded segments, five occurred in the Turkish sample. Most of them referred to having German friends simply because of their work context or study context. As one participant said, “In general, now in Bremen I almost exclusively have only, let me say ‘organic German’ friends. […] I don’t know why that’s the case now, but… yes”\(^\text{52}\). In this case, it was not an active deliberate choice but rather due to the circumstances that friendships to Germans developed. This was confirmed by another statement that said, “In school, I mainly had only German friends which was also because -, I was at a pure German school the only Turk in the whole cohort”\(^\text{53}\). The living context here determined the circle of friends. In the beginning, this was mostly through school, whereas later university or work environments fostered contact and friendships with Germans with no migration background.

Staying in contact with family and friends via social media. Social media play an important role in staying in contact with family and friends and in total 27 segments on this topic were coded in the focus group discussions. Taking both samples together, this was the most frequently mentioned code (next to ‘having friends with a similar background’) across all dimensions. In the Turkish sample, there were 16 segments assigned to this code, and in the Korean sample, there were 11 coded segments. Most frequently, participants referred to instant messaging, such as WhatsApp, to stay in touch with family in friends. Here both ethnic groups pointed out the advantage of social media

\(^{52}\) Original: „Generell jetzt so in Bremen habe ich eigentlich fast ausschließlich nur noch, ich sage mal, "bio-deutsche" Freunde. […] Ich weiß gar nicht warum das jetzt so ist, aber… ja.“ [DT03, P2 (m, 24), 115]

\(^{53}\) Original: „Während der Schulzeit hatte ich hauptsächlich nur deutsche Freunde, weil es auch daran lag, dass -, ich war auf einer reinen deutschen Schule die einzige Türkin im ganzen Jahrgang.“ [DT02, P1 (f, 25), 139]
to easily keep in touch with friends close by or family far away. When describing the communication partners on social media, one participant said, “With me, it’s often people I know from Uni or from work at home. But also my cousins from Turkey or also from America some friends of mine”\(^{54}\). The main purpose of social media use is to stay in touch with the people they already know from face-to-face interactions and not to meet new people. This was further illustrated with the next statement: “I find those social media always help me not getting to know new people and also not getting in touch with new people, but rather to stay in touch with old friends. This is important.”\(^{55}\) For the participants, the value of social media lied in maintaining existing social relations in their offline world through communication on social media.

*Communicating with friends online with similar background.* The topic of communicating with friends online who share a similar background occurred in nine instances among both ethnic groups. As previously described, social media were mostly used to stay in touch with existing social relations. But here it was further emphasized that social media are important to communicate particularly with friends with a similar background. As one participant from the Korean sample explained, “Well, no matter whether my conversation partners or acquaintances live in Korea or Germany, most of the time I usually use KakaoTalk when I communicate with Koreans”\(^{56}\). Furthermore, it was pointed out that social media provided a way not only to stay in touch with friends but also to connect to others with a similar background. This was what another participant

---

\(^{54}\) Original: „Bei mir sind es oft Leute, die ich jetzt auch von der Uni kenne oder von der Arbeit daheim. Aber halt auch meine Cousinen und Cousins aus der Türkei oder auch aus Amerika ein paar Freunde von mir.“ [DT04, P1 (f, 20), 42]

\(^{55}\) Original: „Ich finde, diese soziale Medien helfen mir immer dabei, also nicht neue Leute kennenzulernen und auch mit neuen Leuten Kontakt zu [haben], sondern eher so mit alten Freunden noch in Verbindung zu setzen [bleiben]. Das ist so wichtig.“ [DK01, P1 (f, 31), 218]

\(^{56}\) Original: „Also, egal, ob meine Gesprächspartner oder Bekannte in Korea wohnen oder Deutschland wohnen, benutze ich meistens nur KakaoTalk, wenn ich mit Koreanern kommuniziere.“ [DK01, P3 (m, 26), 108]
from the Turkish sample described when they created a Facebook group targeted especially at Turkish students on their campus: “On Facebook, we just created this Turkish group for the new cohort. Ehm, so we can connect to the people who speak Turkish here. And, well, next week we have this celebration, so we can come together and go out together. This is how you can connect.” In this case, social media facilitated intra-ethnic relations as they allowed to reach beyond one’s immediate surrounding and network.

*Sharing content with one’s online social network.* In total, 10 instances emerged from the data in which participants mentioned to use social media for sharing content (e.g. pictures, links, etc.) with their own social network. When it came to sharing content, most often participants mentioned sharing pictures with their social network. For example, one female participant said, “WhatsApp I sometimes send friends pictures, when I want to share something with them, because I am abroad or something”. When some of the participants talked about sharing content on social media, it was emphasized that the sharing was with friends and family, and thus limited to the people they also knew from the offline context. In this case, the online social network mirrored the offline social network when it came to sharing personal content online.

4.7.3. Identification offline and online

The identification dimension encompasses the subjective feeling of belonging to a group or a place, may it be in the physical world or in a virtual space. In the identification dimension, eight codes in the offline context and only one code in the online context emerged from the data. In total, 96 mentions were coded for the offline context and four mentions for the online context. Table 31 provides a detailed overview of all codes in the identification dimension.
Table 31. Overview of codes for the identification dimension in the offline and online context based on Esser’s social integration dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main dimension</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
<th>Total n (%)</th>
<th>Exemplary quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification offline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct / conflicting identities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (6.3)</td>
<td>“Particularly since the German identity is not completely compatible with the Islamic identity.”57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining identities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 (24.0)</td>
<td>“Well, it’s both home and I always miss the other part.”58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being perceived as different</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19 (19.8)</td>
<td>“What is also annoying is always this ‘looks Asian but speaks German’ or in Korea ‘looks Asian but speaks Korean with an accent’.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of detachment from ethnic group / heritage country</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9 (9.4)</td>
<td>“Well, you are also emotionally distant because of the political situation:”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging to ethnic group / heritage country</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20 (20.8)</td>
<td>“I realize that, for example with Turkey, it does mean something for me, that there is a connection because I engage myself again and again with it.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging to German community / Germany</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (8.3)</td>
<td>“Well, euh, I actually feel completely German.”59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging to a religious community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (8.3)</td>
<td>“Me personally I feel more Muslim than Turkish.”60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of belonging to a local community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 (3.1)</td>
<td>Bremerin? I think, too, it’s somehow appropriate. Yes.”61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57 Original: „Zumal die deutsche Identität mit der islamischen Identität nicht vollständig zu vereinbaren ist.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 254]
58 Original: „Also es ist beides Zuhause und ich […] vermis se immer jeweils die andere Seite.“ [DT03, P1 (m, 24), 152]
59 Original: „Also, euh, ich fühl mich eigentlich komplett deutsch.“ [DK02, P1 (m, 23), 185]
60 Original: „Ich fühle mich persönlich mehr muslimisch als türkisch.“ [DT01, P5 (m, 28), 231]
61 Original: „Bremerin? Finde ich auch, ja, irgendwie passend.“ [DK01, P1 (f, 31), 193]
Distinct/conflicting identities. One aspect that was only addressed in the Turkish sample and only in two of the four Turkish focus group discussions was the issue of having distinct or even conflicting identities. Here, participants expressed that their ethnic, German and/or other identities were seen as separate or even incompatible. In one of the focus groups it was discussed:

“Then I often see [on social media] what my friends are doing in Istanbul. And, uh, yeah, I get a bit attached to the culture.”

Note. Turkish sample n=15; Korean sample n=11.

62 Original: „Ich sehe dann häufig [in den sozialen Median], was meine Freunde in Istanbul machen. Und, ähm, ja, das verbindet mich dann so ein bisschen mit der Kultur.“ [DT03, P2 (f, 28), 205]
Excerpt 6: DT01 (254-258)

1  P5 (m, 28): Right. Particularly since the German identity is not completely compatible with the Islamic identity.
2  P6 (f, 28): Well, neither necessarily the Turkish one.
3  P5 (m, 28): Yes and no.
4  I: In how far? In how far is it not compatible with the Turkish or German identity?
5  P5 (m, 28): With the German culture it simply doesn’t work. […] Eh… eh… right, no alcohol, you have problems with the food, also going out in the evenings […]. But even when my young German friends want to go out, want to go to the disco, also that I can’t do as a Muslim. This means a lot is eliminated. And my German friends are Muslims.

A topic that was not included in the question guide or addressed by the moderator was religion. This was a topic that emerged from the data. In the excerpt above a conflict between the Muslim identity and the German identity was described. The feeling of exclusion, particularly based on ethnicity and religion, negatively affected the feeling of belonging of the participants towards Germany and resulted in a feeling of incompatibility of their different national, ethnic, and religious identities. The issue of conflicting identities was only discussed in the Turkish sample. This feeling of incompatibility or conflict is further consolidated by negative stereotypes and discrimination encountered in daily life, as the next excerpt describes:
Excerpt 7: DT02 (457-463)

1 P1 (f, 25): They don’t notice that I’m Turkish. And then there are comments from people who outside if there was a Turk, would never say anything like that.

2 Person 4 (f, 30): Hm-hm.

3 P1 (f, 25): And you get so see this. But because they don't assume from your appearance, okay, she could be Turkish or something else, they think I'm a German. And then you hear such backbiting.

4 P4 (f, 30): Hm.

5 P1 (f, 25): And then you hear how they would talk differently in public, when they then know, yes, okay, there are Turks here now, we have to talk differently here.

6 P4 (f, 30): Yes.

In this excerpt a female participant in the Turkish sample described how based on her appearance she was not perceived as being Turkish and therefore could hear the negative opinions others voiced about Turks. The participant was perceived as German, but being exposed to the negative opinions about Turks made it difficult to develop a bicultural or multicultural identity and rather fostered distinct identities and reinforces a feeling of conflicting identities.

Combining identities. In the identification dimension, this was the most frequently mentioned code. Participants talked about how they negotiate between different identities, often between their ethnic identity and the German identity, and how they try to combine different aspects of these identities. One participant described it as following:
Quote 10: DT04 (79)

P3 (m, 21): With me, it’s the case that I actually feel a sense of belonging to both. So I feel also as a German, but at the same time also as a Turk. With me it’s not like, oah, I’m only a Turk, or something, because I was born and raised here and…yes, I don’t know. Well, it belongs to -, is also a part of me now this German [side]. So I don’t know.

This excerpt illustrates how there is a desire to combine the German and Turkish identity but it is an ongoing negotiation. Similar negotiations between the German and ethnic identity were voiced in the Korean sample. For example, when asked about how she would describe herself one participant explained, “Well… well, like German-Korean simply. Eh, I think somehow you can’t put it in percentages or anything and it’s dynamic, the process, anyway”63. For the participants in both ethnic groups combining identities was considered an ongoing process and constant negotiation between the German identity and the ethnic identity.

Being perceived as different. Another topic that frequently occurred in the focus group discussions in the context of identification was the issue of being perceived as different by others. Participants in the Turkish sample as well as in the Korean sample mentioned this issue of being perceived as different by both the ethnic group and also the mainstream society. One participant clearly pointed out the conflict she felt about her belonging: “So in Turkey, I’m foreign […] but also in Germany. So where do I actually

63 Original: „Also schon... schon so Deutsch-Koreanisch, einfach. Äh, ich finde irgendwie, man kann das nicht so in Prozentzahlen oder so angeben und das ist sowieso dynamisch der Prozess.” [DK03, P2 (f, 25), 122]
belong, that’s the question then.” This quote demonstrates the difficulty of having two cultural backgrounds being further amplified by the lack of acceptance of both the German society and ethnic group which resulted in feeling excluded and alienated. Closely related to this was the outer appearance. In both ethnic groups, outer appearance played an important role in the perception of being different. One participant in the Korean sample described a common situation: “So mostly with people, when older patients tell me ‘Woah, you speak German quite well. Where are you from?’, I mostly say, ‘I’m from Cologne’ because I can’t be bothered.” This lack of acceptance by the German society or the ethnic group is further illustrated by the next quote:

**Quote 11: DT04 (79)**

P3 (m, 20): So with, I have to say honestly, in Germany I’m a foreigner, in Turkey, I’m a foreigner. So in Turkey, everyone realizes immediately: Oh, he is from Europe or from abroad. And when I’m here, yes, you can see directly, okay, he’s not a German, no, he is also from abroad.

In both the Turkish and the Korean sample participants described a feeling of being stuck between two cultures and being not accepted by either one. This lack of acceptance and perceived otherness turned in some cases into discrimination experiences made by some participants. For example, one participant said, “How I was seen by my environment. […] When I was bullied by people on the street because of my looks. Ching, chang, chong and then they showed me the slitted eyes and so on”.

---

64 Original: „Also ich bin in der Türkei fremd […] oder auch in Deutschland fremd. Also wo gehöre ich eigentlich hin, ist dann die Frage.“ [DT04, P2 (f, 21), 113]

65 Original: „Wie ich von meiner Umwelt gesehen wurde. […] Wenn ich auf der Straße von Leuten gehänselt wurde aufgrund meines Aussehens, äh, Ching-Chang-Chong und es wurden mir Schlitzaugen gezeigt und so weiter.“ [DK02, P2 (f, 27), 252]
quotes illustrate how the outside perception influenced the inside construction of belonging. Being perceived as different from both the mainstream society and the ethnic group and being discriminated based on one’s appearance makes it difficult to develop a sense of belonging to either of the groups.

*Feeling of detachment from ethnic group/ heritage country.* Another code that only occurred in the focus group discussions of the Turkish sample was the feeling of detachment from the heritage culture or country. In this case, it was related to the political developments in Turkey which had affected their sense of belonging to Turkey. When asked about what they associated with Turkey participants in one focus group discussed:

**Excerpt 8: DT01 (319-321)**

1. P1 (f, 24): I just realized, really, it's just family now. If they are no longer there, then I would be less... So now, especially since it is so chaotic in Turkey, I have no longer the urge to really travel there. The beauty fades...

2. P6 (f, 28): Well, you are also emotionally distant because of the political situation.

At the time of the data collection between 2015 and 2017, the political situation of Turkey was affected by the aftermath of the Gezi Park protests in 2013 and ongoing civil unrest against the authoritarian regime in Turkey. The political situation of Turkey was reported and discussed in Germany as well, because of the geographical closeness and political ties between Germany and Turkey. This affected the participants’ sense of belonging to the heritage country, resulting for some participants in distancing themselves from the heritage country and in a feeling of detachment from the heritage country.
**Sense of belonging to an ethnic group/heritage country.** This code was applied when participants expressed a sense of belonging to or talked about identifying with their ethnic group or heritage country, and in some cases provided reasons for this. In total, 20 mentions were coded under this category. One participant said that, “Because for me it's always a matter of the heart, concerning my identity […]. Even though I grew up in Germany […]. I’m Korean at heart”66. By saying he was Korean at heart, the participant expressed a deep emotional connection to the heritage country. This emotional connection was also observed in other statements. One participant in the Turkish sample said:

**Quote 12: DT04 (106)**

P3 (f, 21): Well, I don't just associate holidays with Turkey now. We generally go there to see family again, um... Well, okay, we are on holiday, but it's more like that when you are there, you get used to everyday life and to your family, then it's not like a holiday anymore, then it's a piece of home again.

Here, the emotional connection to family in the heritage country played a central role in the feeling of belonging to the heritage country. Similar to most of the statements under this code, the feeling of belonging to the ethnic group or heritage country was closely related to family and involved an emotional attachment.

**Sense of belonging to German community/ Germany.** Under this code, participants expressed a sense of belonging to or talked about identifying with Germany. Eight statements were coded under this category. One participant clearly stated: “Germany is my home after all. Weird, huh. Also, Korea is somewhat part of my home, my roots. But

---

66 Original: „Weil für mich ist es auch immer eine Herzensangelegenheit, was mit meiner Identität angeht […] Auch wenn ich in Deutschland aufgewachsen bin […]. Nee. Im Herzen bin ich Koreaner." [DK03, P1 (m, 28), 153]
when you tell me, where is your home, it’s definitely Germany.”

The participant clearly stated that her home was Germany. All the statements under this code were made by participants born in Germany and they stated Germany as their home because they grew up in this country and knew the customs and conventions.

**Sense of belonging to a religious community.** A topic that emerged from the focus group discussion and that was not included in the focus group guide was religion as a form of identification. In another code, religion or religious identity was seen as distinct or even incompatible with the German identity. The code captured aspects of feeling part of a religious community. Both in the Turkish and Korean samples religion was mentioned as a defining aspect of their identity. In eight instances participants expressed a sense of belonging to or talk about identifying with a religious community. For the Turkish sample, this was closely related to Islam and in the Korean sample, this was related to Christianity. A participant in the Korean sample said that “Within the faith when we founded a church camp. That’s the first time I really felt part of people I could identify with. […] Well, I can really say, through faith in the community… mixed with the Korean culture […]. I really used to think that only Koreans were Christians.”

The feeling of belonging to a religious community was often related to an ethnic-specific religious community. This was also mentioned in the Turkish sample. For example, one participant said: “So here I have my Turkish, but rather very Islamic influenced

---

67 Original: „Deutschland ist meine Heimat trotz allem. Merkwürdig halt, ne. Auch Korea ist irgendwo ein Teil meiner Heimat, von den Wurzeln her. Wenn man mir aber sagen würde, wo bist du zu Hause, wäre es eindeutig Deutschland.“ [DK02, P3 (f, 27), 208]

68 Original: „[…] Innerhalb des Glaubens, also eine Gemeindefreizeit gegründet haben. Da habe ich mich wirklich zum aller ersten Mal als Teil von Leuten gefühlt, mit denen ich mich identifizieren konnte. […] Also ich kann wirklich sagen, über den Glauben in der Gemeinschaft… vermisch mit der koreanischen Kultur […]. Ich habe früher echt gedacht, dass nur Koreaner Christen wären.“ [DK02, P3 (f, 27), 333]
community. I don’t have a purely Turkish community that has no religious interests. “69

The religious community was often also an ethnic community.

_Sense of belonging to a local community._ Beyond the sense of belonging to a specific ethnic group, in three instances participants voiced a sense of belonging to a local community. As one participant stated, “Is Germany your home? That’s too abstract for me because I don’t feel at home in Munich. In Istanbul, I feel at home. In Hamburg, I feel at home. But Munich has nothing to do with me“70. Expressing this feeling of belonging to a local community or a local place could be regarded as an attempt to break free from any ethnic or cultural attachments of belonging and try to define a more acultural sense of belonging.

_Feeling of attachment to ethnic group/ heritage country via social media:_ Four mentions were coded under this category where participants talked about how using social media created a feeling of attachment to their ethnic group or ethnic country. One participant explained:

**Quote 13:** DT02 (285)

P4 (f, 30): You are much faster involved in the current events in Turkey. For example, the Gezi Park movement back then was also very often promoted through Facebook. This, for example, has brought us much closer to Turkey. I think, also in general, politically and socially, and everything that happens there, social media have created much more closeness.

69 Original: „Also habe ich hier meine türkische, aber eher sehr islamisch geprägte Community. Also eine rein türkische, nicht mit religiösen Interessen verbundene Community, habe ich zum Beispiel nicht.“ [DT01, P6 (f, 28), 302]

Social media in this case provided an important channel for political news, involvement and thereby created closeness to and solidarity for Turkey. In other instances it as mentioned in more general terms that social media provided useful information on the heritage country and would increase the feeling of attachment to the heritage country.

4.7.4. Personal understanding of integration

In addition to questions relating to the three social integration dimensions, participants were asked to describe their personal understanding of ‘integration’ in general, and to voice their opinion on possible potentials and concerns of social media use for integration. This was a very open and flexible question. In some focus group discussions, the understanding of integration was directly asked in relation to social media use, in other cases the general topic of integration was more focused on. This depended on the flow of the discussions and the participants, as some participants wanted to discuss their understanding of integration in general, and others preferred to discuss integration in the context of social media use. Nevertheless, including this question helped to get insights into how integration was understood which would help to better understand the construction of their own integration orientations.

In the focus group discussions of the Turkish sample, the emphasis was mainly on their general understanding of integration. The descriptions provided by the participants all occurred in the Turkish sample and can be summarized into three categories: (a) integration as a reciprocal process, (b) integration as a personal negotiation, and (c) integration as adaptation.

Integration as a reciprocal process. In four instances integration was described as a reciprocal process, meaning that both sides, members of the mainstream society, here Germany, and members of an ethnic group, should approach and accept each other. As
one female participant said: “Integration for me is a mutual approach.”  

Another participant further pointed out:

**Quote 14: DT02 (485)**

P3 (m, 21): I think in order to be able to be integrated, now from my point of view as a Turk in Germany, one has to accept the German system: Accept or tolerate the democracy; deal with the language and master it. But also the other way round, by the state as well. So we should be respected as we were -, as we had no darker skin, black hair, and brown eyes. As if we were -, as if there were no difference between us and the *Bio-Deutschen* (‘organic’ Germans).

The quote above illustrates that the participant understood integration as a mutual approach: from the individual of the ethnic group and from the mainstream society. On the one hand, he described individual efforts (e.g. learning the language), and on the other hand, he referred to the role of the state, which is in this context the mainstream society. By stating that ‘we’ should be regarded like there was no difference between ‘us’ and what he calls ‘Bio-Deutsch’, showed that he felt a strong differentiation between Germans and non-Germans. It once again underlines the issue of the German identity still being closely associated with heritage and ethnicity, resulting in a feeling of alienation. This was also observed when the participants in the Turkish sample described aspects of their identification when codes such as *being perceived as different* or *distinct/conflicting identities* emerged from the data.

*Integration as a personal negotiation.* A further understanding of integration that was mentioned by the participants in the Turkish sample was integration as a personal negotiation.

---

71 Original: „Integration ist für mich das Annähern von gegenseitiger Seite.“ [DT01, P2 (f, 21), 376]
negotiation. To the question of what integration means to them personally, a participant explained:

**Excerpt 9:** DT02 (478-484)

1. P4 (f, 30): A constant process of negotiation.
2. P3 (m, 21): Okay… a constant process of negotiation… What do you mean?
3. P4 (f, 30): Eh. Well, hm… […] It’s a daily negotiation with different things. […] And I think integration is […] a negotiation process that never ends. […] Society will also change. […]
4. P3 (m, 21): Yes.
5. P4 (f, 30): So it’s a constant process of negotiation because life is vivid and every part, every person and everything has to adapt somehow, so to speak. And that is also somehow automatic, it swings itself into place, so to speak.

In this case, integration was seen as a constant process and was regarded as the adjustment to changes in society and in daily life. This understanding of integration was also reflected in the code *combining identities* where participants described the ongoing personal negotiation between the German identity and the ethnic identity.

*Integration as adaptation.* Integration was also described as adaptation. One participant pointed out the importance of adapting to German society:
Quote 15: DT02 (490)

P1 (f, 25): For me, it’s also especially adaptation, i.e. accepting the German basic rights and values, uh, mastering the German language and, above all, getting along generally, being able to work here. But which language I speak, especially at home, and which religion I practice should actually be my thing and not concern anyone else.

On the one hand, the importance of adapting to German society was pointed out. On the other hand, a clear distinction was made between the public context and the private context. Adaptation in the public context was considered important but the private context was seen as a space of free expression. Thus, adaption as a form of integration was applied only to the public context. Similarly, when talking about cultures and languages participants made the distinction between the daily life context and the family context: the former was related to the German culture and German language, and the latter was related to the heritage culture and ethnic language.

Potentials and concerns of social media use for integration. When asked about possible potentials and concerns of social media use for integration, one main aspect was pointed out: networking. The easy way to connect and organize via social media was seen as having both positive and negative sides. In the focus group discussions of the Korean sample, four instances occurred where the positive sides of social media use were pointed out. These were mostly linked to aspects of being connected and getting connected as the following quote illustrates:
**Quote 16: DK03 (268)**

P2 (f, 25): That is what I noticed most of all: how crassly networked one is via media. I mean really via WhatsApp and Facebook and all those events. All they do now is send invitations through Facebook events. [...] Well, Facebook messenger and especially also with the people who are not in Germany. It's just easier [...] Also somehow it seems to be more personal if you send a message via Facebook than if you send an email to the person.

In the focus group discussions of the Turkish sample, one instance referring to the potentials of social media use for integration was pointed out and two instances voicing concerns of social media use for integration. The potential of social media use for integration was similar to what was mentioned in the Korean sample, pointing out the advantage of connecting people and cultures. But the advantage of easy networking was also pointed out as a concern and danger to integration. One participant in the Turkish sample explained:
Quote 17: DTK03 (282)

P3 (m, 21): Negatively in the sense that I think social networks are also - and this is clear - abused. Abused to create their own groups and to divide people. For example, by spreading half-knowledge or spreading complete lies. The people who then read it and simply don't know any better believe it and then immediately form an opinion. [...] I also see many posts from relatives from Turkey - whether they are cousins or uncles - who usually post political stuff that is simply not true. If you read up on something, it is simply not true. But they post it, write their propaganda on it, and spread it. And I find it... um... in Germany, of course, that happens, too. And I think that social networks are also extremely abused.

This participant was very concerned with the misuse of social media particularly for political matters. Here the network structure was seen as problematic as it allowed to seek for information specifically confirming one’s opinion and to connect to others sharing the same opinion. This could be abused to spread misinformation. This statement shows that just as easily as the structures of social media allow to connect beyond one’s immediate surroundings and interest groups, they also allow strengthening one’s in-group and to live a filter bubble.

4.7.5. Frequency analysis

The qualitative content analysis and the emergence of different sub-categories provided first insights into the ways participants in the Turkish sample and participants in the Korean sample construct social integration orientations in the offline context and in the online context. In order to determine differences between the offline and online
contexts, and between the two samples in how often specific aspects of social integration were mentioned, frequency counts and subsequent chi-square tests were implemented.
Note. Abbreviations: A= acculturation; I= interaction; ID= identification

**Figure 25. Frequency distribution of social integration codes offline and online for the two samples.**
In Figure 25 differences in the frequency counts between the two samples, but also within one sample between the offline and online contexts are noticeable. A chi-square test of homogeneity confirmed that there was a significant difference between the frequency counts in the offline context and the frequency counts in the online context for the Turkish sample ($\chi^2 (2), 56.70, p < .05$) and for the Korean sample ($\chi^2 (2), 34.92, p < .05$). Table 32 shows the aggregated frequencies of the codes for each social integration dimension for the Turkish sample, pointing to the dimensional differences. Table 33 shows the aggregated frequencies of the codes for each social integration dimension for the Korean sample. The results of chi-square test should be treated with caution, as in some cases the observed frequency was smaller than 5. Nevertheless, the results contribute useful information for the overall interpretation of the data.

Table 32. Aggregated frequencies of codes for each social integration dimension in offline and online contexts for the Turkish sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social integration dimension</th>
<th>Offline context</th>
<th>Online context</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45.69</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $F_o$ = observed frequencies; $F_e$ = expected frequencies; SR = standardized residual; df = degree of freedom; $\alpha = 0.05$; Significant tests are displayed bold and in italics. N=15.
Table 33. Aggregated frequencies of codes for each social integration dimension in offline and online contexts for the Korean sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social integration dimension</th>
<th>Offline context</th>
<th>Online context</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( F_o \) = observed frequencies; \( F_e \) = expected frequencies; SR = standardized residual; df = degree of freedom; \( \alpha = 0.05 \); Significant tests are displayed bold and in italics. N=11.

To determine whether there was a significant difference between the Turkish sample and the Korean sample in the distribution of the frequency counts, meaning how often certain social integration aspects (codes) both in the offline and online contexts were mentioned, an additional chi-square test of homogeneity was performed. A statistically significant difference between the two samples in the frequencies was found (\( \chi^2 (28), 67.46, p < .05 \)). Also here should the results of chi-square test be regarded with caution, as in some cases the observed frequency was smaller than 5. Looking at the distribution of each code in the two samples, it can be seen that the significant differences are in specific aspects. These are summarized in Table 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social integration codes</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
<th>Korean Sample</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1: switching languages</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2: instances of using ethnic language</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.609</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3: instances of using German language</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4: mixing cultural practices</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5: heritage culture specifics</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A6: German culture specifics</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I1: having friends with similar background</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.174</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I2: having German friends</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID1: distinct / conflicting identities</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID2: blending identities</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID3: being perceived as different</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID4: feeling of detachment from ethnic group/heritage country</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.954</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID5: sense of belonging to ethnic group/heritage country</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID6: sense of belonging to German community/Germany</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID7: sense of belonging to a religious community</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ID8: sense of belonging to local community</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>switching languages online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>instances of using ethnic language online</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.638</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>instances of using German language online</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>mixing languages online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>language acquisition online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.535</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>heritage culture specifics online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>consuming ethnic related content</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>consuming German related content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>staying in contact with family and friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>communicating with friends online with similar background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>sharing content with one's social network</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID9</td>
<td>feeling of attachment to ethnic group / country via SMU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $F_o$ = observed frequencies; $F_e$ = expected frequencies; SR = standardized residual; df = degree of freedom; $\alpha = 0.05$; Significant tests are displayed bold and in italics. N=26.

Table 34 shows significant differences between the two samples in the frequencies for the offline context as well as for the online context. It should be noted, however, that with the high number of tests, the probability for a Type 1 error increased and thus the results should be treated with caution. For the offline context, German culture specifics was the code from the acculturation dimension where there was a significant difference between the two samples. This was significantly more often mentioned in the Korean sample than in the Turkish sample. This is due to the fact that in the Korean sample participants were included
who moved to Germany themselves in order to pursue their university studies. Thus, they are more likely to be aware of German culture specifics. Furthermore, different aspects were stressed in the identification dimension. For participants in the Turkish sample, the code *distinct/conflicting identities* was significantly more often mentioned than by participants in the Korean sample. This shows that the difficulty of combining different identities is a salient issue in the Turkish sample but not in the Korean sample. In contrast, in the Korean sample, the code *blending identities* was significantly more often mentioned than in the Turkish sample. Thus, it seems to be easier for participants in the Korean sample to combine different aspects of their culture into their identity. The last code where there was a significant difference was the *feeling of detachment from the ethnic group/heritage country*. This was only mentioned in the Turkish sample and reflected the difficult feelings some of the participants had about the political situation in Turkey. In the online context, significant differences were in the *language acquisition online* and in *heritage culture specifics online*. These aspects were more frequently mentioned in the Korean sample than in the Turkish sample. These codes were mentioned in relation to the use of KakaoTalk, a Korean instant messaging app. As mentioned before, KakaoTalk allows to connect to other Koreans living in South Korea or abroad and includes Korean specific emoticons. Having a culture-specific social media app facilitates language acquisition but also the expression of heritage culture specifics online.

Overall, the frequency analyses demonstrated significant differences within each group and between the two groups. Participants in both Turkish and Korean samples mentioned or emphasized different aspects of social integration in the offline context compared to the online context when using social media. Furthermore, differences between the two samples
became visible, as each group mentioned or emphasized different aspects of social integration offline and online.

4.8, Discussion

Using focus group discussions, this study explored the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background in Germany. More specifically, this study implemented a cross-cultural comparison between young adults with a Turkish migration background and a Korean migration background. In order to explore the relationship between social media use and social integration orientations, a conceptual distinction between social integration orientations constructed in the offline context and social integration orientations constructed in the online context was introduced. The study aimed to answer first how social integration orientations were constructed online compared to offline within a sample (RQ1), and second what differences could be observed in the construction of social integration orientations between participants in the Turkish sample and the Korean sample (RQ2).

The qualitative content analysis and the subsequent frequency analyses revealed differences in the construction of social integration orientations offline compared to online when using social media within each sample (RQ1). Following Esser (2001), the acculturation, interaction, and identification dimensions were examined in the offline and online context. The results showed that participants in the Turkish sample constructed different social integration orientations in the offline context than in the online context. Table 35 summarizes the code distribution according to cultural preference and illustrates the differences between the offline and online context for the Turkish sample.
Table 35. Summary of the distribution of the codes for the Turkish sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of codes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the code distribution in the offline context presented in the table, it can be seen that almost half of the codes (48.2%) the participants mentioned were related to the Turkish culture or Turkish group, while only about 13% were related to the German culture and another 13% related to combining both cultures. What stood out in the offline context was the difficulty of the participants in identifying with either of the two cultures or groups. One-quarter of the codes mentioned in the offline context were related to aspects of having difficulties with feeling part of a group because of being perceived as different, particularly from the German mainstream group, or feeling detached from the Turkish group or Turkey, a code only mentioned in the Turkish sample. Further, they described the two identities as being distinct or even conflicting. This was also mirrored in other dimensions in the offline context. Participants presented the Turkish culture and German culture often as separate spaces where the Turkish culture was part of the family space, while the German culture was part of the public space. This distinction between the private and public domain among ethnic groups was also found in previous studies (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003; Yampolsky,
Amiot, & de la Sablonnière, 2013). Overall, participants in the Turkish sample constructed a separation orientation in the offline context.

This was different in the online context. Over half of the codes (51.8%) participants mentioned in the online context were aspects of combining the two cultures or mixing the two languages. Nevertheless, aspects relating to the Turkish culture were also mentioned frequently (42.6%), while aspects relating to the German culture were barely mentioned (5.6%). In the online context, participants did not mention any aspects relating to feelings of exclusion or a lack of belonging to the two cultures. Overall, participants leaned more towards a multiple inclusion orientation online.

There were clear differences in the construction of social integration orientations offline compared to online. For participants in the Turkish sample, aspects of the two cultures and identities were kept more distinct and seen as separate spaces in the offline context, whereas in the online context the boundaries between the two cultures and identities were more fluid. The online context seemed to facilitate the blending of the two cultures and identities which was restricted in the offline context. In the offline context, participants reported experiences of discrimination and exclusion based on their ethnic heritage or physical appearance, resulting in difficulties of combining the Turkish culture and identity with the German culture and identity. In some cases, participants referred to these identities as being conflicting or incompatible (Bauer, Loomis, & Akkari, 2013; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). The Muslim identity was particularly seen as incompatible with the German identity. The conflict between the Muslim identity and the mainstream identity was also found in previous studies (Hutchison, Lubna, Goncalves-Portelinha, Kamali, & Khan, 2015; Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a). The issue of conflicting identities was only discussed in the Turkish sample and reflects the influence of the present socio-political climate in Germany and Western
societies. Since the 9/11 attacks, the depiction of Islam in the media and the public discourse has been mostly negative, contributing to a growing Islam hostility in the Western world (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017; John, 2019). Furthermore, the Turkish group in Germany is confronted with negative stereotypes and discrimination (Bozdağ, 2014b; Hugger, 2009). These were also experienced by the participants and fostered a perceived incompatibility of national, ethnic, and religious identity that led to a stronger orientation towards the Turkish culture and identity, resulting in a separation orientation. This finding is also in line with previous studies that have shown that perceiving high levels of discrimination led to less bicultural orientations, a stronger heritage orientation, and disidentification with the mainstream culture (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Hutchison, Lubna, Goncalves-Portelinha, Kamali, & Khan, 2015; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). The perception of discrimination is even higher among highly educated and structurally integrated migrants and results in what Verkuyten (2016) calls the integration paradox. It refers to the phenomenon of highly educated and structurally integrated migrants turning away from the mainstream society, rather than turning towards it.

In the online context, however, the difficulties of combining the two cultures and identities were not mentioned. The use of social media helped participants to explore and negotiate their multiple identities in the online context without the restrictions of the offline context (Hepp, Bozdağ, & Suna, 2012; Hugger, 2009). The use of social media mitigated some of the issues encountered in the offline context by offering tools to gratify social integration needs not gratified offline. Particularly with respect to the identification dimension, social media use helped to reduce the feeling of conflicting or incompatible identities experienced in the offline context by providing an alternative space to explore and express their identities and cultures (Bozdağ, 2014a; Hugger, 2009). Thereby, the online
space could be regarded as an *expansion* of the offline space for participants in the Turkish sample.

The results for participants in the Korean sample also revealed some differences in the construction of social integration orientations offline compared to online. As Table 36 presents, the codes participants in the Korean sample mentioned in the offline context were not strongly inclined towards one cultural orientation.

**Table 36. Summary of the distribution of the codes for the Korean sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th></th>
<th>Online</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>both</td>
<td>neither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of codes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aspects relating to the Korean culture or Korean group constituted 34.7% of all codes, while aspects referring to German culture made 26.4%, and 23.6% were related to aspects mentioning combining the two cultures. Only 15.3% of the codes mentioned in the offline context were related to neither of the cultural orientations and included aspects relating to being perceived as different. In the offline context, the Korean sample mentioned instances of integrating aspects of the Korean and German culture in their daily life. In contrast to the Turkish group, they did not perceive the Korean and German cultures and identities as conflicting or incompatible. On the contrary, they described more instances where they
mixed and blended the two cultures and identities than participants in the Turkish sample. Although they also experienced feelings of being perceived as different, most of the participants in the Korean sample mentioned a form of blending their identities. Overall, the results showed that the participants in the Korean sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation in the offline context.

In the online context, a slightly stronger tendency towards the Korean culture was observed, although combining both cultures and identities was also still pronounced. In total, 51.9% of all codes that were mentioned in the online context referred to the Korean culture and identity, while 42.3% of the codes referred to combining the two cultures and identities. Only 5.8% of the codes in the online context related to aspects of the German culture or identity. In the online context, the mobile instant messenger KakaoTalk which originated in South Korea played a central role for participants in the Korean sample. Participants mentioned using KakaoTalk because it connected them to other Koreans (in Germany and South Korea) and offered Korean culture-specific emoticons. Overall, the results indicated a slight leaning towards a separation orientation in the online context.

In general, similar aspects of social integration orientations were mentioned offline and online, only the emphasis shifted resulting in slight differences in the social integration orientations offline compared to online in the Korean sample. The results showed a small shift from a multiple inclusion orientation offline to a separation orientation online. In the online context, participants mentioned more aspects of the Korean culture and identity. Nevertheless, contrary to previous findings, the use of Korean specific social media (in this case KakaoTalk) and the stronger heritage culture orientation online did not hamper the integration of the participants into the mainstream society offline (Lim & Pham, 2016; Son, 2015). The use of social media offered participants more options to engage with the Korean
part in the online context without diminishing the integration of the German part in the offline context (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Enders & Weibers, 2009). Overall, social media was used to gratify similar needs but to a different extent online than offline. In this case, the online space could be regarded as a continuation of the offline space for participants in the Korean sample.

What needed to be taken into account when interpreting the data was the diversity within the Korean sample: Six of the 11 participants in the Korean sample migrated themselves to Germany to attend university. These participants voluntarily migrated to Germany after they finished high school and thus had a different approach to the German culture but also to the Korean culture than those who were born and raised in Germany. On the one hand, the German language and German culture specifics were more salient to this sub-group. These participants were motivated to learn the German language and to get to know the German culture. This explained in part the relatively pronounced orientation towards the German culture in the offline context, particularly in the acculturation dimension. On the other hand, this sub-group relied more on social media to keep in touch with family and friends in Korea and used social media to express their Korean culture and identity online. This might explain in part the leaning towards a separation orientation in the online context.

In regard to group differences in the construction of social integration orientations, the qualitative content analysis and the subsequent frequency analyses showed a significant difference between participants in the Turkish and the Korean sample (RQ2). The results showed that participants in the Turkish sample mentioned different aspects for the construction of social integration orientations than participants in the Korean sample. The Turkish sample and the Korean sample differed in two relevant integration variables: 1) ethnic group size and 2) educational background of the parents.
The relative **ethnic group size** determined the likelihood of practicing the ethnic language and building and maintaining ethnic relationships (Abrams & Giles, 2007; Androutsopoulos, 2006; Bozdağ, 2014a). These were important aspects for the construction of social integration orientations as they influenced the internal understanding and positioning of an ethnic group within the mainstream society. The Turkish sample represented the large ethnic group, while the Korean sample presented the small ethnic group. The assumption was that the likelihood of practicing the ethnic language and building and maintaining ethnic relationships would be higher for the Turkish sample than for the Korean sample. This could be confirmed by the results. They showed that in the offline context participants in the Turkish sample mentioned more instances of using the Turkish language, pointing out Turkish culture specifics, and having friends with a similar background than participants in the Korean sample. For the Korean sample, the results confirmed the assumption that participants would mention less Korean culture related aspects in the offline context.

The relative ethnic group size also plays a role in the perception of the ethnic group by the mainstream society. As the largest ethnic group in Germany, the Turkish group is very present in the public perception of contemporary German society and in the historical depiction of the guest worker migration (Bade, 2011; Bozdağ, 2014b; Schneider & Arnold, 2004). Unfortunately, the Turkish community sees itself increasingly confronted with negative stereotypes and stigmatization (Bozdağ, 2014b; Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a). This was also reflected in the data. Only participants in the Turkish sample reported the feeling of conflicting identities or incompatible identities. In this case, the large group size made the Turkish group more salient to the mainstream society and subject to discrimination. Thus, being part of a large ethnic group might strengthen the heritage culture orientation, but it was
the lack of acceptance of the ethnic group as part of the mainstream society that might have fostered a separation orientation instead of multiple inclusion orientation.

With the use of social media, the relative ethnic group size within the German society played less of a role in the construction of social integration orientations. In the online context, the use of social media helped participants in the Turkish sample to gratify the need to belong and feel accepted by providing a space to negotiate different aspects of their identities (Hugger, 2009). The online space mitigated the perceived incompatibility of their identities and facilitated the construction of a multiple inclusion orientation. For participants in the Korean sample, social media provided more options to engage with the Korean culture and identity and could compensate for the fewer opportunities encountered in the offline context (Mehra, Merkel, & Bishop, 2004).

The second variable the two samples differed on was the educational background of the parents. Research had shown that the educational background of the parents affected the learning environment of the children with regard to language (e.g. language spoken at home) and cultural practices (Esser, 2001). Therefore, a positive relationship between the educational background of the parents and their children’s social integration orientation was assumed. This meant that in case of a high educational background of the parents a stronger orientation towards the mainstream culture should be observed, resulting in an assimilation or multiple inclusion orientation, while in case of a low educational background of the parents a stronger orientation towards the heritage culture should be observed, resulting in either a multiple inclusion or a separation orientation.

The educational background of the parents in the Turkish sample was very diverse. Among the 15 mothers and 15 fathers, the majority ranged from no completed school degree to middle school degree, while five of the mothers and two of the fathers held a university
degree. In the Korean sample, out of 11 mothers and 11 fathers, the vast majority (18 out of 22 parents) held a university degree, while the remaining two mothers and two fathers held a high school degree. The results were in line with the assumptions showing that participants in the Turkish sample, representing a low educational background of the parents, revealed a stronger heritage orientation, while participants in the Korean sample, representing a high educational background of the parents, presented a multiple inclusion orientation in the offline context. The effect of the educational background of the parents on the learning environment of the children should be even stronger when they share a household. Seven of the 15 participants in the Turkish sample indicated to live with their parents. Among the participants in the Korean sample, only one participant lived with their parents. Particularly participants in the Turkish sample made a clear distinction between the Turkish language and culture being part of the family context and the German language and culture being part of the public context, supporting the assumption of the parents’ influence on the construction of social integration orientations in the offline context towards a stronger heritage orientation.

Looking further into the parents’ background, further differences became visible that help to explain the different construction of social integration orientations of the participants in the two samples. The participants were asked to name their parents’ place of birth and the country of their citizenship. In the Turkish sample, 14 mothers and 14 fathers were born in Turkey, and one mother and one father were born in Germany. All parents had their main residency in Germany. In the Korean sample, all 11 mothers and 11 fathers were born in South Korea. Five of the parents lived in Germany, while six of the parents lived in South Korea. The parents’ country of citizenship was striking. Among the Turkish parents, nine mothers and 10 fathers held Turkish citizenship, while six mothers and five fathers held German citizenship, and for two mothers and two fathers no citizenship was specified.
Looking at the parents in the Korean sample, six of the mothers and six of the fathers held Korean citizenship, while five of the mothers and five of the fathers held German citizenship. Those parents who lived in Germany all held German citizenship. While the parents’ educational background provided some indications of the cultural orientation, the parents’ citizenship provided indications of the level identification with a country (Esser, 2001). Among the parents of the participants in the Turkish sample, the majority had a stronger emotional attachment to Turkey and their Turkish citizenship (Esser, 2001). This might reflect a stronger heritage orientation of the parents and might have contributed to a stronger heritage culture orientation offline of the participants in the Turkish sample (Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019). For the Korean sample, it was important to differentiate between the parents living in Germany and those living in South Korea. The fact that all parents living in Germany held German citizenship might reflect a high level of identification with Germany or at least a high acceptance of German society which might have contributed to the multiple inclusion orientation offline among the participants in the Korean sample. The close relational context of the parents provided important sources for the construction of social integration orientations of the participants (Bauer, Loomis, & Akkari, 2013; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018).

In the online context, the close relational context of the parents as sources for the construction of social integration orientations played less of a role. By having access to a broader and more diverse space through social media, participants could explore and express aspects of their cultures and identities that might have been repressed or restricted offline (Baym, 2010; Bolander & Locher, 2010; Hampton, 2004).
4.9. Limitations

It should be noted that this study was the first to extend integration research to social media use by applying a new interdisciplinary framework and making a cross-cultural comparison between the Turkish group and the Korean group in Germany. Thus, there are some limitations to this study that need to be addressed but which can offer suggestions for future research.

First, this study consisted of two small and highly educated samples. This was both a strength and a weakness of this study. Having highly educated participants in both samples proved to be a strength for this study. So far research suggested that education was positively related to integration, however, the findings of this study showed that the direction was not straightforward. The highly educated participants in this study, particularly in the Turkish sample, voiced difficulties in feeling accepted by the German society which affected the construction of their social integration orientations. The findings based on the small sample sizes and the specific characteristics of the participants do not allow to draw conclusions beyond the scope of the study, but they provide suggestions and directions for future studies. Future studies could include other ethnic groups with different characteristics. To broaden this research to other ethnic and social groups would provide further insights and contribute to this research field.

Second, this study only addressed social media use in general and did not differentiate between the uses of different social media types. Future research should consider differentiating between specific social media types and their specific characteristics, and in how far certain types facilitate or encourage certain aspects of social integration orientations.
Third, the subcodes of the coding frame emerged from the data making the applied coding frame highly data-dependent and limiting the transferability of the results. The frequency analysis included observed frequencies of 0 when expected frequencies have to be $> 5$, thereby limiting the explanatory power of the results of the frequency analysis. This is in part the result of the small sample size and in part because of the coding frame that was built from the theory and the data. The subcategories were developed from the data and resulted in very specific subcategories that did not always emerge in both samples. Future studies could consider a more refined coding frame with a bigger sample.

Finally, the results indicated that in case of high perceived incompatibility of cultures, using social media provided an alternative source of identification and helped to re-construct social integration orientations in the online context, thus mitigating or even diminishing the perceived incompatibility experienced in the offline context and facilitating culture integration in the online context. However, whether this in turn would transmit from the online to the offline context, thereby affecting the construction of social integration orientations offline, could not be answered with the findings of this study presented here. Although the transferability of results are limited as the findings of this study are restricted to the specific context and the two specific samples, they provide important insights in the construction of social integration orientations offline and online.

4.10. Conclusion

The aim of the study presented in this chapter was to explore and understand how young adults with a migration background constructed and negotiated social integration orientations offline compared to online. This study was the first to focus on social media use in relation
to the construction of social integration orientations of ethnic groups in Germany and to apply a qualitative cross-cultural approach.

The results of the qualitative study showed that social media provided useful means to gratify certain needs relevant to social integration. The use of social media helped participants in this study to construct and re-construct their social integration orientations by providing additional or alternative sources to gratify specific needs. For participants in the Korean sample social media offered additional sources to gratify similar needs but to a different extent online than offline. Social media, in this case, provided an online space that could be regarded as a continuation of the offline space. For participants in the Turkish sample, social media provided alternative sources to gratify needs online that were not gratified offline. Social media, in this case, provided an extension of the offline context, complementing ungratified offline needs online.

Overall, the study underscored the important and different roles social media play in the construction of social integration orientations for young adults with a migration background living in Germany.
5. GENERAL DISCUSSION
Social media today are more than mere communication tools. With ongoing technological advances, social media have become increasingly interactive, immediate, and intercultural, overcoming geographical borders and cultural spaces. Social media allow individuals and groups to connect, interact, and collaborate. Furthermore, they enable people to create, share, and engage with user-generated content (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010; McCay-Peet & Quan-Haase, 2017). They have proliferated across the world, but the ways social media are used and the reasons for their use differ from cultures and societies (Gezduci & d'Haenens, 2007; Jackson & Wang, 2013; Ji, et al., 2010; Kim, Sohn, & Choi, 2011). As modern societies are growing more culturally and ethnically diverse, it has become even more important to understand how individuals with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds use social media and what implications social media use has for the individual and society as a whole.

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine the link between social media use and social integration. In particular, this research explored the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background from two selected ethnic groups living in Germany: Turkey and South Korea. Germany is one of the countries facing the challenge of growing diversity and integrating different ethnic groups into its society (Bozdağ, 2014b; Heckmann, 2015). So far, only a few studies have focused particularly on the Internet and social media use of ethnic groups in the German context relating it to integration (e.g. Bonfadelli, Bucher, & Piga, 2007; Enders & Weibers, 2009; Hugger, 2009; Trebbe, Heft, & Weiβ, 2010). Although research in the international context has indicated a link between social media use and integration (e.g. Damian & Van Ingen, 2014; Li & Tsai, 2015; Lim & Pham, 2016; Mitra & Evansluong, 2019), empirical findings are still limited to draw any conclusions on the actual effects and the direction of influence (Mitra & Evansluong, 2019; Shuter, 2011).
This research aimed to contribute conceptually and empirically to the field of social media use and the integration of ethnic groups in Germany. The aim was to promote more interdisciplinary approaches and methodological variety in this research field (Geißler & Pöttker, 2006; Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009). Conceptually, a new interdisciplinary framework was introduced and applied in this research. Empirically, this research followed a mixed methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative methods. Overall, the findings contributed to a better understanding of the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background living in Germany.

This chapter first summarizes the main findings of this research and discusses the significance of the findings. The conceptual and practical contributions are then assessed. Subsequently, some limitations of this research are pointed out and suggestions for future research are offered. This chapter ends with some concluding remarks.

5.1. Summary of the Main Findings

In this dissertation, a mixed methods approach was applied because it allowed both exploring and explaining the present interdisciplinary research topic from different methodological perspectives (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007; Snelson, 2016). The quantitative part consisted of a cross-sectional online survey aiming at assessing types of social integration orientations offline and online. In the qualitative part, focus group discussions were conducted that aimed at exploring the reasons and motivations for constructing certain types of social integration orientations offline and online.
The quantitative study examined types of social integration orientations offline and online within each ethnic group first. More precisely, the quantitative part aimed to answer the following research question:

RQA1: What social integration orientations do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct offline and online?

RQA1.1: What are the similarities or differences between their social integration orientations offline and online?

The results of the survey showed that respondents in the Turkish sample constructed overall a multiple inclusion orientation both offline and online. Respondents in the Korean sample constructed a multiple inclusion orientation offline and an assimilation orientation online. Further, the orientations within each of the social integration dimensions (acculturation, interaction, and identification) were examined to get a more distinguished picture. Here, the findings of the survey revealed interesting patterns across the three social integration dimensions within each ethnic sample.

In the Turkish sample, the results summarized in Table 37 showed that in the acculturation dimension a multiple inclusion orientation was constructed both offline and online. In the interaction dimension, a marginalization orientation was constructed also both offline and online. In the identification dimension, however, different orientations offline and online were constructed: multiple inclusion orientation offline and marginalization orientation online.
Table 37. Overview of social integration orientations offline and online for the Turkish sample based on the quantitative results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social integration orientation</th>
<th>Turkish sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Turkish sample n= 45

The results from the Turkish sample showed that in terms of language skills and cultural knowledge, respondents included Turkish and German aspects in their lives both in the offline and online contexts. By expressing both languages and cultures, they responded to the demand of the mainstream culture to adapt, while at the same time preserving the heritage culture in the family context. This was equally done offline and online. The distinction between the public and family context was also observed in previous studies (Arends-Tóth & van de Vijver, 2003). The findings are also in line with the literature that has shown that bicultural individuals have access to two cultural systems between which they can switch (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinéz, 2000). In the online context, research has observed especially language switching among biculturals (Androutsopoulos, 2006). In terms of social relations, respondents indicated to have more close friends with a Turkish migration background than German friends both offline and online. However, they also indicated that they were not against friendships with Germans. This resulted in a marginalization orientation offline and online. The marginalization orientation is more complex than Berry’s
bidimensional model allows to examine. On the one hand, the results showed close intra-ethnic ties, on the other hand, interethnic ties were not rejected. As other studies have shown that there seems to be an ethnic boundary between individuals with Turkish roots and Germans, making friendships between them less likely (Windzio, 2010; Zentarra, 2014). The tendency to homophily, meaning choosing friends with similar backgrounds, is a common phenomenon (Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018; Reynolds, 2007; Zentarra, 2014) but studies have also shown that homophily can be a result of discrimination (Windzio, 2010). In the identification dimension, respondents indicated similar belonging to both the German and Turkish community. In the online context, the bidimensional approach to culture was inadequate. The online space offers identification orientations beyond national or cultural contexts, thus the marginalization orientation might indicate a transnational or transcultural orientation online. Other studies have demonstrated the transcultural aspects of identification online (Bozdağ, 2014c; Hugger, 2009; Hepp, Bozdağ, & Suna, 2012).

In the Korean sample, the results summarized in Table 38 showed that in the acculturation dimension a multiple inclusion orientation was constructed offline and an assimilation orientation online. In the interaction dimension, an assimilation orientation was constructed also both offline and online. In the identification dimension a multiple inclusion orientation was constructed offline and a marginalization orientation online.
Table 38. Overview of social integration orientations offline and online for the Korean sample based on the quantitative results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social integration orientation</th>
<th>Korean sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>offline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Multiple inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Korean sample n= 35

The results from the Korean sample showed that aspects of the Korean and German language and culture were both included in the offline context. In the online context, a stronger emphasis on the German aspects was made. One reason for this was the weaker skills in the Korean language, particularly as online interactions often involve written communication. In this case, both deficit and competence in the two languages determined the language use online (Androutsopoulos, Şahin, Hsieh, & Kouzina, 2013; Hinnenkamp, 2003). Regarding social relationships, respondents indicated close ties with many Germans offline and online. A relevant aspect here might be the relatively small group size of Koreans in Germany, reducing the likelihood of building intra-ethnic friendships offline (Androutsopoulos, 2006; Bozdağ, 2014a). However, this pattern was also observed online. This might imply that offline friendships are further maintained online, instead of finding new friendships online. This would be in line with research that suggests that online social networks mirror already existing offline social relationships (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007; Lampe, Ellison, & Steinfeld, 2006). Concerning the identification dimension, expressed similar belonging to the Korean and German community offline. In the online
context, a stronger belonging to the German online community was expressed. Online orientations in the acculturation and interaction dimensions might have affected the identification orientation. Language and social relations play important roles for identification (Esser, 2001), and as in these dimensions assimilation orientations were already constructed, this also resulted in an assimilation orientation in the identification dimension.

The quantitative part further examined group differences with the following research questions:

RQ.A2: Are there differences between young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background and their social integration orientations offline and online?

RQ.A2.1: In which dimensions are there group differences in their social integration orientations offline and online?

Overall, the results showed that the Turkish and the Korean group were well integrated into German society. A closer look at the three social integration dimensions showed interesting differences between the two ethnic samples. For respondents in the Korean sample, there were no difficulties in combining the Korean and German culture and language, social relationships, and identity offline or online. Respondents in the Turkish sample included the Turkish and German culture and identity in the offline context. Difficulties occurred in terms of social relations with the mainstream group. Both offline and online, the indicated to have more friends with Turkish roots than German friends. On the one hand, the relatively large group size of the Turkish community compared to the Korean community in Germany make it more likely to build and maintain intra-ethnic ties (Abrams & Giles, 2007; Bozdağ, 2014a). On the other hand, the perception of the Turkish group by German society is affected by negative media representations, stereotypes, and stigmatization (Bozdağ,
2014b; Hugger, 2009; Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). This influences interethnic contact and reduces the likelihood of interethnic relations (Windzio, 2010). The Korean group so far has not been discussed extensively in the public eye and thus does not encounter the issues to the same degree as the Turkish group (Hartmann, 2016; Hyun, 2018; Weiß, 2017).

The qualitative study explored how social integration orientations were constructed offline and online and aimed to answer the following research questions:

RQ.B1: How do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background construct their social integration construct offline and online?

RQ.B1.1: Which aspects are stressed for the construction of their social integration orientations offline and online?

The findings showed that different aspects were stressed for the construction of social integration orientations offline and online within and between the two ethnic samples. In the offline context, participants in the Turkish sample stressed mostly aspects relating to the ethnic language, heritage culture (acculturation dimension), and intra-ethnic relationships (interaction dimension). What stood out in the offline context was the difficulty participants expressed in identifying with the Turkish and German communities. The majority of the codes in the identification dimension related to aspects of having difficulties with feeling part of a group. These included codes such as being perceived as different, feeling of detachment from the ethnic group, and conflicting identities. This was reported with experiences of discrimination and exclusion based on their ethnic heritage or physical appearance. They mentioned difficulties in combining their German and Turkish, and in some cases Muslim identities and referred to these as conflicting identities. These results confirm findings showing that perceiving high levels of discrimination led to less bicultural orientations and
disidentification with the mainstream society (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018; Yağmur & van de Vijver, 2012).

In the online context, more than half of the code participants in the Turkish sample mentioned referred to aspects of combining the Turkish and German cultures and languages. Codes such as *switching languages online* or *mixing languages online* were mentioned. Participants did not mention difficulties in combining the two cultures or identities in the online space. The use of social media helped participants to explore and negotiate their multiple identities in the online space without the restrictions and difficulties encountered in the offline context (Bucher & Bonfadelli, 2007; Hepp, Bozdağ, & Suna, 2012; Hugger, 2009).

In the offline context, participants in the Korean sample mentioned equally frequent aspects relating to the Korean and German culture and languages (acculturation dimension). Concerning social relationships, participants stressed the importance of having friends with a similar background in their daily life (interaction dimension). In contrast to the Turkish sample, participants in the Korean sample did not perceive the Korean and German identity as conflicting. On the contrary, in the identification dimension, they described mostly instances of *combining identities*. Nevertheless, they also referred to some instances when they were *perceived as different*. However, these seem to affect their identification orientation to a lesser extent than the Turkish sample.

In the online context, aspects relating to the Korean culture and language were mostly mentioned (acculturation dimension). Particularly expressing *heritage culture specifics online* were frequently discussed. In this context, the use of KakaoTalk played a key role. The use of the Korean specific social media application allowed participants to express aspects of the Korean culture and language online. Also, aspects of combining the two
languages online and communicating with family and friends from both cultural backgrounds were frequently mentioned (interaction dimension). The identification dimension in the online context was only mentioned in one instance and did not play a role for the construction of the social integration orientation online. Contrary to previous findings, the stronger heritage culture orientation online did not hamper integration orientations of participants in the offline context (Lim & Pham, 2016; Son, 2015).

The qualitative part also looked at group differences with the following research questions:

RQ.B2: How do young adults with a Turkish and a Korean migration background differ in their construction of social integration orientation offline and online?

RQ.B2.1: In which aspects are there group differences for their construction of social integration orientations offline and online?

With regard to group differences, the qualitative content analysis and the subsequent frequency analyses showed significant differences between the Turkish and the Korean sample. This was especially pronounced in the identification offline dimension. Significantly more often mentioned were the codes conflicting identities and feeling of detachment from the ethnic group by participants in the Turkish sample than in the Korean sample. On the other hand, the code blending identities occurred significantly more often in the Korean sample than in the Turkish sample. In the online context, significant differences emerged in the codes language acquisition online and heritage culture specifics online. These codes were more frequently mentioned in the Korean sample than in the Turkish sample.
Overall, the findings of the mixed methods study offered important insights and different perspectives on the role social media use played on the construction of social integration orientations. Only the combination of the quantitative and qualitative results provided a valuable ground for interpretation. The findings demonstrated that social media provided important means to gratify unfulfilled needs. Using social media helped participants in this study to construct and re-construct their social integration orientations by providing additional or alternative sources of gratification. For these young adults, social media provided a socio-cultural space to explore and express different aspects of their cultural and ethnic backgrounds. This was where differences between the two ethnic groups became visible. For participants from the Turkish sample, social media offered an extension to their offline environment. By using social media they could gratify social integration needs that were not gratified offline. This was particularly the case for the need to belong and identify with a group. In the offline environment, participants from the Turkish sample expressed a discrepancy between their subjective feeling of belonging and the acceptance by the ethnic or mainstream group as part of the group. The lack of such acceptance resulted in an unfulfilled need to belong and identify. As this was neither provided by the German group nor the Turkish group, participants sought to gratify this need online. Using social media helped to gratify the need to belong and to strengthen their identification with a group, and thus mitigating the perceived incompatibility of their bicultural identity. For participants from the Korean sample, social media served as a continuation of their offline environment. They used social media to gratify similar social integration needs online as offline. Participants in the Korean sample did not perceive the two cultures and identities as incompatible, thus they did not experience unfulfilled needs to the same extent as participants in the Turkish sample.
Overall, the results showed that social media play different roles in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background. On the one hand, social media can offer similar gratifications and serve as a continuation of the offline world. On the other hand, social media can offer alternative gratifications and thereby serve as an extension of the offline world. By using social media, participants of this study actively and deliberately sought gratifications online, enabling them to reinforce or reconstruct their social integration orientations online.

5.2. Conceptual Contributions

The aim of this dissertation was to expand integration research to social media use and advance the theoretical and empirical understanding of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background in Germany. Research on social media and integration so far was lacking interdisciplinary approaches, especially within the German context empirical findings were rather limited (Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009; Worbs, 2010). Different disciplines had taken different conceptual and methodological approaches to studying social media use of ethnic groups (e.g. Androutsopoulos, Şahin, Hsieh, & Kouzina, 2013; Brendler, et al., 2013; Hugger, 2009). What was missing was an interdisciplinary approach combining conceptual frameworks and models from different disciplines. Therefore, this dissertation proposed a new interdisciplinary framework integrating theories and concepts from media studies, psychology, and sociology. By applying the U&G Theory and merging Berry’s acculturation model with Esser’s social integration dimensions, a new conceptual framework was presented that allowed to assess the role social media use played in the construction of social integration orientations of young adults with a migration background.
background. Furthermore, by drawing a comparison between the Turkish group and the Korean group this research promotes more cross-cultural research in the field of social media uses and gratifications (Odağ & Hanke, 2019).

A unique aspect of this framework was the conceptual and analytical distinction between social integration orientations offline and online. The new framework distinguished between social integration orientations constructed in face-to-face situations (offline) and social integration orientations constructed in social media mediated settings (online). This distinction between the offline and online context helped to better understand what and how social integration orientations were constructed when using social media, and examine similarities or differences between social integration orientations constructed offline and online.

Moreover, this dissertation contributed to a methodological variety much needed in the emerging field of social media and integration (Geißler & Pöttker, 2006; Mitra & Evansluong, 2019; Piga, 2007; Trebbe, 2009). For the interdisciplinary approach of this research, a mixed methods study was considered most adequate. A mixed methods approach allowed both exploring and explaining the research questions from different methodological perspectives. By combining quantitative and qualitative research methods, a broader and deeper understanding of social media use and social integration orientations was presented. While the quantitative results helped to examine types of social integration orientations offline and online, the qualitative results provided insights into the reasons and motivations for these social integration orientations.

Overall, the interdisciplinary framework and the mixed methods study applied in this research offered a new approach to conceptualizing and analyzing social integration orientations offline and online.
5.3. Practical Implications

As societies are becoming more culturally and ethnically diverse, governments face challenges of migration and integration (Heckmann, 2015; Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019). For a long time, Germany was reluctant to accept the impact of migration and recognize the fact that it was an immigration country (Bade, 2011; Heckmann, 2015). Today, 25% of Germany’s population have a migration background. One of the key challenges Germany faces is the integration of diverse cultural and ethnic groups under the umbrella of society.

Drawing a cross-cultural comparison between the Turkish group and the Korean group this research contributed to a more distinguished perception of ethnic groups and cultural diversity in Germany. The findings of the qualitative study demonstrated that the construction of social integration orientations was also influenced by how the mainstream society perceived the ethnic group. The Turkish group in Germany is often perceived as “academically distant” and German-Turkish bilingualism and Islam are de-valued by the mainstream society (Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). Even after several generations living in Germany, the Turkish group is confronted with negative stereotypes and stigmatization, resulting in discrimination and racist experiences (Bozdağ, 2014b; Hugger, 2009). These negative perceptions by the mainstream society make it difficult for individuals with Turkish roots to feel part of German society. As previous studies have shown, perceiving high levels of discrimination leads to a disidentification with the mainstream society (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Hutchison, Lubna, Goncalves-Portelinha, Kamali, & Khan, 2015; Vietze, Juang, Schachner, & Werneck, 2018). In this study, social media use mitigated the disidentification with the mainstream society by offering alternative sources to explore and
express a bicultural identity. However, this does not solve the main issue, namely that German society does not only need to recognize the fact that it is an immigration country but needs to accept its culturally and ethnically diverse members as part of its society.

Social media can be a facilitator in this process. They offer numerous and diverse ways for intercultural encounters and exchanges (Damian & Van Ingen, 2014; Odağ & Hanke, 2019). As social relations and social interactions are at the heart of society and social cohesion, increasing social interactions between members of ethnic groups and members of the mainstream group can be supported by social media. Governments and policymakers could increasingly include social media into integration projects. Social media could provide new ways to actively facilitate integration processes by connecting diverse groups of people. The threshold of interaction is lower online than in face-to-face situations, making larger and more diverse social networks more likely (Baym, 2010; Hampton, 2004). Diverse social networks could reduce negative stereotypes and discrimination towards ethnic groups (Damian & Van Ingen, 2014; Elias & Lemish, 2009; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). What is important is that online interactions are linked to offline interactions in order to be effective in society (Mitra & Evansluong, 2019).

What the findings of this research showed is the importance of acceptance in the integration process. The focus here was on two ethnic samples with highly educated individuals. Despite research showing a positive relationship between education level and integration status (Esser, 2001; Steinbach, 2006), the findings demonstrated the difficulties young educated adults with a migration background are confronted with in Germany. They confirmed the integration paradox that refers to the disidentification of highly educated and structurally integrated migrants (Verkuyten, 2016). Integration needs to be understood as a process involving all members of society. And it is crucial for a society to create a setting
where everyone can become and feel part of that society. In light of growing racist sentiments in Germany, it has become even more crucial to demonstrate an inclusive society. If individuals with diverse backgrounds do not feel accepted by the mainstream society in their offline environment, they can seek out social media to find acceptance in online spaces. However, the danger here is that they might get into online spaces that are not supporting integration but rather a radicalization of different kinds (Simon, Reichert, & Grabow, 2012). To prevent disidentification with the mainstream society and radicalization in online spaces, the offline environment needs to offer alternative sources of identification that go beyond ethnic origin.

5.4. Limitations and Future Research

With the increasing digitalization of everyday life, it has become even more important to understand how social media are used and how they affect not only individuals but societies as a whole. In this research, the focus was on two very specific and small ethnic samples in a specific socio-cultural context. Future research could include larger samples and more ethnic groups in other socio-cultural contexts to examine cross-cultural similarities and differences. This would provide further insights and might allow to draw more general conclusions on social media use and social integration orientations.

Furthermore, the findings indicated that the bicultural approach to social integration orientations might be limiting the orientation options for individuals with a migration background. Instead of maintaining the bicultural approach future studies could take up a stronger transcultural or transnational approach to social media use and social integration orientations offline and online (Hafez, 2002; Hepp, 2009; Hugger, 2009). In addition, future
studies could examine the influence of identification with a (trans-) cultural group influences social media uses.

An aspect that was not considered when designing this research was religion as a source of identification. Follow-up studies should focus stronger on integration orientations linked to religious identity and social media use. It could be examined how religious identity is explored and expressed online. In this context, discrimination experiences based on religious identity could be included in future research (Hutchison, Lubna, Goncalves-Portelinha, Kamali, & Khan, 2015; Pollack, Müller, Rosta, & Dieler, 2016).

The focus of this research was on how social media were used and not so much on what types of social media. Thus, only general social media use was addressed. Future research should differentiate between different social media types and link specific characteristics to supporting or hindering certain aspects of social integration orientations.

Finally, the quantitative part of this mixed methods study included many questions and items based on previous studies that did not all fit the purpose of this research. This made the online questionnaire very long and resulted in high dropout rates. Future studies should include fewer items and create questions more suitable for assessing social integration orientations in the online context. Moreover, there should be a stronger focus on designing questionnaires that are easily accessible on mobile phones. This might support a faster and higher response rate.
5.5. Concluding Remarks

The research presented in this dissertation contributed to a better conceptual and analytical understanding of social integration orientations in the offline and online context. The findings of the mixed methods study emphasized the important and different roles social media play in the construction of social integration orientations for young adults with a migration background living in Germany. Using social media helped participants in this study to construct and re-construct their social integration orientations by providing additional or alternative sources of gratifications. Particularly in case of perceived identity conflict or incompatibility, social media provided alternative sources of identification and diverse spaces for exploring and expressing different aspects of identity.

In light of increasing diversity on the one hand, and growing discrimination and racist attacks on the other hand, Germany needs to re-define integration (Govrin, 2020; Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a). It is essential for the functioning of society to understand integration as a reciprocal process that must involve the mainstream group as well (Heckmann, 2015; Imani Giglou, d’Haenens, & Van Gorp, 2019). The openness of the mainstream society towards diversity is a central prerequisite for integration and includes reducing prejudices and discrimination towards diverse individuals (Heckmann, 2015; Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a).

The findings of this study underscore the importance of being accepted by and identifying with the mainstream society for integration. For the two ethnic samples in this study, social media use offered gratifications online and helped to mitigate identity conflicts experienced offline. Social media can provide useful means for the integration process but they cannot determine socio-political practice. To become a multicultural society, Germany
needs to move away from an ethno-cultural understanding of German identity as being exclusionary and related to German ancestry (Moffitt, Juang, & Syed, 2018b). Individuals with diverse backgrounds need to feel accepted by the mainstream society to feel part of and identify with German society (Diehl, Fischer-Neumann, & Mühlau, 2016; Moffit, Juang, & Syed, 2018a). Therefore, Germany does not only need to find ways to include but fully accept individuals with diverse backgrounds as members of its society. To conclude with the words of John W. Berry (1997):

Integration can only be ‘freely’ chosen and successfully pursued by non-dominant groups when the dominant society is open and inclusive in its orientation towards cultural diversity. Thus, a mutual accommodation is required for integration to be attained, involving the acceptance by both groups of the right of all groups to live as culturally different peoples. (p. 10)
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1. Focus Group Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description and Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Welcoming the participants, introduction of the moderator, the study, and its purpose. Introducing the participants to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening question</td>
<td>Ice-breaking question about the participants’ favorite food or dish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory question</td>
<td>Asking about culture-specific food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition questions</td>
<td>Asking about posting food pictures online using social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key questions</td>
<td>1. Wenn ihr soziale Medien nutzt, spielt die türkische/koreanische Kultur dabei eine Rolle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Wo in eurem Leben kommt ihr in Kontakt mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur, z.B. Urlaub in der Türkei/Korea, Kontakt zu Verwandten, Familie, türkisch/koreanisch Kochen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Wie ist das mit sozialen Medien? Stellen soziale Medien für euch eine Verbindung zur türkischen/koreanischen oder deutschen Kultur her?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Wenn ihr an die Verwendung von Sprache in sozialen Medien denkt: Wann benutzt ihr deutsch und wann türkisch/koreanisch?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. In welchen Situationen sprecht ihr lieber deutsch, in welchen lieber türkisch/koreanisch? Gibt es Unterschiede, welche Sprache ihr eher in sozialen Medien nutzt und welche eher im Alltag? Könnt ihr mir eine entsprechende Situation beschreiben?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Wie wichtig ist es für euch, dass eure Chat-Partner auf sozialen Medien mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur vertraut sind oder sogar aus ihr stammen? Könnt ihr Gründe hierfür genauer darlegen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Welche Bedeutung hat es für euch, in eurem Umfeld Freunde zu haben, die ebenfalls mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur vertraut sind oder sogar aus ihr stammen?

8. Welche Bedeutung hat Deutschland in eurem Leben? Was verbindet ihr mit Deutschland? Welche Bedeutung hat die Türkei/Korea für euch? Was verbindet ihr mit der Türkei/Korea?

9. Wie ist das, wenn ihr soziale Medien nutzt? Gibt es online eine besondere Verbindung zu Deutschland oder der Türkei/Korea?

10. Was bedeutet es für euch Teil einer Community zu sein?
   Fühlt ihr euch Teil einer deutschen oder türkischen/koreanischen Community?

11. Was ist für euch Identität oder kulturelle Zugehörigkeit?
   Wenn ihr soziale Medien nutzt, gibt es Situationen, die euch in eurer kulturellen Zugehörigkeit oder Identität bestärken?

12. Was bedeutet Integration für euch?
   Was sind eurer Meinung nach die Potenziale oder Hürden sozialer Medien, wenn es um Integration geht?

| Ending questions | Closing remarks by the moderator. All participants are allowed to express any additional comments or ask additional questions. Moderator thanks all participants. |
### Appendix 2. Focus Group Questions with References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Offline</th>
<th>Original item (Hugger, 2009, p. 312):</th>
<th>ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welche Bedeutung hat Deutschland in eurem Leben? Was verbindet ihr mit Deutschland?</td>
<td>• Was ist für dich das Besondere an der türkischen Kultur? Wo in deinem Leben kommst du in Kontakt mit der türkischen Kultur (z.B. Urlaub in der Türkei, Kontakt zu Verwandten, Familie, türkisch Kochen etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welche Bedeutung hat die türkische/koreanische Kultur für euch? Was verbindet ihr damit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wo in eurem Leben kommt ihr in Kontakt mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur, z.B. Urlaub in der Türkei, Kontakt zu Verwandten, Familie, türkisch Kochen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In welchen Situationen sprecht ihr lieber deutsch, in welchen lieber türkisch/koreanisch? Gibt es Unterschiede, welche Sprache ihr eher in sozialen Medien nutzt und welche eher im Alltag? Könnt ihr mir eine entsprechende Situation beschreiben?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wenn ihr soziale Medien nutzt, spielt die türkische/koreanische Kultur dabei eine Rolle?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wo in eurem Leben kommt ihr in Kontakt mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur, z.B. Urlaub in der Türkei, Kontakt zu Verwandten, Familie, türkisch Kochen? Wie ist das mit sozialen Medien?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction OFFLINE</td>
<td>Welche Bedeutung hat es für euch, mit anderen Personen, die ebenfalls einen türkischen/koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Interaction ONLINE  | Welche Bedeutung hat es für euch, mit anderen Personen in sozialen Medien zu chatten, die ebenfalls einen türkischen/koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben?  
|                     | Wie wichtig ist es für euch, dass eure Chat-Partner auf sozialen Medien mit der türkischen/koreanischen Kultur vertraut sind oder sogar aus ihr stammen? Könnt ihr Gründe hierfür genauer darlegen? |
| Identification OFFLINE | Welche Bedeutung hat Deutschland in eurem Leben? Was verbindet ihr mit Deutschland?  
|                     | Was verbindet ihr mit der Türkei/Korea?  
|                     | Fühlt ihr euch als Türke/Koreaner oder als Deutscher oder Sowohl-als-auch? Könntet ihr mir eine Situation erzählen, an der für euch der Unterschied – bzw. das „Sowohl-als-auch“ – deutlich wird?  
|                     | Was bedeutet es für euch Teil einer Community zu sein?  
|                     | Fühlt ihr euch Teil einer deutschen oder türkischen/koreanischen Community?  
|                     | Was ist für euch Identität oder kulturelle Zugehörigkeit? |
| Original item (Hugger, 2009, p. 312): | Welche Bedeutung hat Deutschland in deinem Leben? Was verbindest du mit Deutschland?  
|                     | Welche Bedeutung hat dich Türkei für dich? Was verbindest du mit der Türkei?  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification ONLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Gibt es Situationen in sozialen Medien, wo ihr euch eher deutsch oder eher türkisch/koreanisch oder beides fühlst?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wenn ihr soziale Medien nutzt, gibt es Situationen, die euch in eurer kulturellen Zugehörigkeit oder Identität bestärken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was sind eurer Meinung nach die Potenziale oder Hürden sozialer Medien, wenn es um Identität und kultureller Zugehörigkeit geht?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original item (Hugger, 2009, p. 312):

• Gibt es Situationen in sozialen Medien, wo du dich eher deutsch oder eher türkisch oder beides fühlst?
Appendix 3. Overview of Focus Group Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.12.2015</td>
<td>FGD_DK01</td>
<td>n=3 (1x f, 2x m)</td>
<td>ca. 36 min.</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Korean)</td>
<td>P1 (f, 31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (m, 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (m, 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.02.2016</td>
<td>FGD_DT01</td>
<td>n=6 (5x f, 1x m)</td>
<td>ca. 60 min.</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Turkish)</td>
<td>P1 (f, 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (f, 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (f, 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4 (f, 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P5 (m, 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P6 (f, 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.03.2016</td>
<td>FGD_DK02</td>
<td>n=3 (2x f, 1x m)</td>
<td>ca. 70 min.</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Korean)</td>
<td>P1 (m, 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (f, 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (f, 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.04.2016</td>
<td>FGD_DT02</td>
<td>n=4 (2x f, 2x m)</td>
<td>ca. 67 min.</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Turkish)</td>
<td>P1 (f, 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (m, 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (m, 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4 (f, 30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05.2016</td>
<td>FGD_DK03</td>
<td>n=3 (2x f, 1x m)</td>
<td>ca. 41 min.</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Korean)</td>
<td>P1 (m, 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (f, 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (f, 26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.06.2016</td>
<td>FGD_DT03</td>
<td>n=2 (2x m)</td>
<td>ca. 46 min.</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Turkish)</td>
<td>P1 (m, 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (m, 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
07.09.2016  FGD_DT04  3 (2x f, 1x m)  ca. 29 min.  Bremen
(Turkish)  P1 (f, 20)
            P2 (f, 21)
            P3 (m, 20)

19.10.2017  FGD_DK04  2 (2x m)  ca. 55 min.  Bremen
(Korean)  P1 (m, 28)
            P2 (m, 25)

\[4 \text{ FGDT} + 4 \text{ FGDK} \]
\[N_T=15 + N_K=11 \]
\[404 \text{ min} \]
\[3 \times \text{ Berlin} \]
\[\text{TOTAL} = 8 \text{ FGD} \text{total} \]
\[N_{\text{total}}=26 \]
\[= 6.7 \text{ hrs} \]
\[5 \times \text{ Bremen} \]

Note. FGD= focus group discussion; DK= deutsch-koreanisch (German-Korean); DT= deutsch-türkisch (German-Turkish); P= participant; f= female; m= male; age in brackets.
Appendix 4. Transcript System

- Verbatim transcription including filling sounds (e.g. um, er, etc.)
- Breaking off words or sentences –, e.g. “I was really ang-, I mean, really upset.”
- Repeating or stuttering words =, e.g. “I don’t=don’t know, really.”
- Longer breaks within or after sentences …, “So I was thinking… like, do I really want this?”
- Laughing sounds by one person or by the group [laughter]
- Words or context information that have been added for clarity are in square brackets [ ]
Appendix 5. Visualization of the Coding Frame

- **Acculturation**
  - switching languages
  - instances of using ethnic language
  - instances of using German language
  - mixing cultures
  - heritage culture specifics
  - German culture specifics

- **Interaction**
  - having friends with similar background
  - having German friends
  - conflicting identities
  - combining identity
  - being perceived as different
  - feeling of detachment from ethnic group
  - sense of belonging to ethnic group
  - sense of belonging to German community
  - sense of belonging to religious community
  - sense of belonging to a local community

- **Identification**
  - integration as reciprocal process
  - integration as personal negotiation
  - integration as adaptation
  - switching languages online
  - instances of using ethnic language online
  - instances of using German language online
  - language acquisition online
  - heritage culture specifics online
  - consuming heritage culture related content
  - consuming German culture related content
  - staying in contact with family and friends
  - communicating with friends online with similar background
  - sharing content with one’s online social network
  - feeling of attachment to ethnic group via SMSU

- **Personal opinion on social media and integration**
  - potentials
  - concerns
### Appendix 6. Coding Guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Main category w/ description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description w/ example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social Integration OFFLINE | Acculturation  
This category captures cultural practices and expressions of behavior in daily life. | A1: switching languages  
(frame switching) | This code applies when participants mention changing from one language to another (German vs ethnic language vs other) depending on the context or the person they talk to. This implies that languages are connected to specific contexts and persons.  
**Ex.**: DK03_P1m: “Je nach dem mit was für einer Person ich spreche, ist klar in einer festgelegten Sprache.” |
| Social Integration OFFLINE | | A2: instances of using ethnic language  
This code applies when participants provide reasons for their ethnic language use or point out specific situations where they use their ethnic language or even prefer using the ethnic language over German.  
**Ex.**: DK03_P2f: “Ja, bei positiven [Gefühlen], da würde ich dann fast schon manchmal auf Koreanisch eher sagen.”  
| Social Integration OFFLINE | | A3: instances of using German language  
This code applies when participants provide reasons for their German language use or point out specific situations where they use German or even prefer using German over their ethnic language.  
**Ex.**: DT04_P3m: „Oder in der Türkei genau so. Da sprechen wir auch Deutsch zischendurch neben unseren Verwandten, so dass sie uns dann nicht verstehen. Dass wir, ja, eine bisschen geheime Sprache haben. [lacht]” |
|   | **A4: mixing cultural practices** | This code applies when participants describe how their ethnic and German cultures have mixed in daily life which is expressed in different ways such as food, customs, or other practices. 
**Ex.** DT03_P2m: “Ich glaube halt, das ist schwierig, das zu unterscheiden, weil sich das schon gemischt hat, also die Kulturen haben sich so gemischt. Ich würde nicht mehr sagen so, wenn ich jetzt Zuhause bin und mit der Familie irgendwas mache, das ist so typisch türkisch. Sondern es ist einfach gemischt. So, da sind da deutsche - , also was man deutsch nennt, ist da drinnen. Elemente daraus und Elemente aus der türkischen Kultur [...]” |
|---|---|---|
|   | **A5: heritage culture specifics** | This code applies when participants point out specific aspects of their heritage culture that they experience in their daily lives which are perceived as different from the German culture. 
**Ex.** DK03_P1m: “Was auch wichtig ist: Im Koreanischen, da muss man unglaublich zwischen den Zeilen lesen können. Also, die Koreaner, die können Sachen nicht direkt sagen, sondern die sagen es immer hintenrum und irgendwie... die sprechen es nicht ganz klar aus, vor allem Kritik nicht, so was. Negative Sachen sprechen sie nie ganz klar aus, aber irgendwie schwingt das mit und man muss es hören können. Und wenn man es nicht versteht, dann, äh...” |
|   | **A6: German culture specifics** | This code applies when participants point out specific aspects of the German culture that they experience in their daily lives and which are perceived as different from their heritage culture. 
**Ex.** DK03_P3f: „Und, äh, die Deutschen, oder was man verallgemeinern und sagen kann, haben-, viele Deutsche haben eher ein um-unabhängiges Denken. Also ein gewisses-, also nicht eine Ich-Bezogenheit, aber rein bisschen so, dass man halt-, dass jeder für sich selber bisschen schauen muss wo er hinkommt, was er denkt und wie er gewisse Sachen unterschei-, entscheidet.“ |
|   | **Interaction** | This category captures the social relationships built and maintained in daily life. 
**I1: having friends with similar background** | This code applies when participants point out the relevance or importance of having friends with a similar cultural or ethnic background or similar (migration) experiences in their daily life and face-to-face interactions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Identification</strong></th>
<th><strong>ID1: distinct / conflicting identities</strong></th>
<th><strong>ID2: blending identities</strong></th>
<th><strong>ID3: being perceived as different</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category captures the personal feelings of belonging influenced by the experiences made in daily life in the context of the ethnic and German culture and society.</td>
<td>This code applies when participants express that their ethnic, German, and/or other identities are incompatible. Ex.:</td>
<td>This code applies when participants talk about how they negotiate between different identities, often between their ethnic and German identity, and how they feel attached to several groups, integrating and blending this into a hybrid identity. Ex.: DT04_P3m: “Bei mir ist so, ich fühle mich eigentlich zu beiden zugehörig. Also ich fühle mich auch als Deutscher, aber auch gleichzeitig als Türke. Also bei mir ist da jetzt nicht so, oah, ich bin nur Türke, oder so, weil ich bin hier geboren und aufgewachsen und... ja, weiß ich nicht. Also das gehört halt -, ist auch ein Teil von mir jetzt dieses Deutsch. Deswegen, weiß ich nicht.”</td>
<td>This code applies when participants describe how they are seen by others and are perceived as different, or when they describe feeling foreign. This includes also experiences of discrimination Ex.: DT04_P3m: “Also, bei mir ist es so, muss ich ehrlich sagen, in Deutschland bin ich Ausländer, in der Türkei bin ich Ausländer. Also in der Türkei merken sofort alle: Oh,”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
der kommt aus, ähm, Europa oder aus dem Ausland. Und wenn ich hier bin, ja, sieht man schon direkt, okay, der ist kein Deutscher, ne, der kommt auch aus dem Ausland.”

**ID4: feeling of detachment from ethnic group / ethnic country**
This code applies when participants describe feeling detached from their ethnic group or ethnic country.

*Ex.: DT01_P1f:* „Ich habe nur festgestellt, eigentlich nur noch Familie. Wenn die nicht mehr da sind, dann würde ich weniger, also, jetzt vor allem seit dem es so chaotisch in der Türkei ist, habe ich auch gar nicht mehr den Drang so wirklich dahin zu verreisen. Also die Schönheit vergeht...”

**ID5: sense of belonging to ethnic group / ethnic country**
This code applies when participants express a sense of belonging to or talk about identifying with their ethnic group or ethnic country and may provide reasons for this.

*Ex.: DK03_P1m:* „Weil für mich ist es auch immer eine Herzensangelegenheit, was mit meiner Identität angeht und wenn ich... Jetzt ganz einfach gesagt, wenn jetzt, äh, ein Fußballspiel, wenn ich, ich wollte früher Fußballprofi werden, würde ich jetzt die Entscheidung haben oder die Wahl haben zwischen Deutschland und Korea, ich würde Korea wählen. Und alle solche Sachen, also Korea ist, steht für mich über Deutschland. Auch wenn ich in Deutschland aufgewachsen bin, auch wenn ich hier, ja, alles genossen habe, was=was man in Deutschland genießen kann, trotzdem. Nee. Im Herzen bin ich Koreaner.”

**ID6: sense of belonging to German community / Germany**
This code applies when participants express a sense of belonging to or talk about identifying with Germany and may provide reasons for this.

*Ex.: DK02_P3f:* “Und mit Deutschland, ja, Deutschland ist meine Heimat trotz allem. Merkwürdig halt, ne. Auch=äuch Korea ist irgendwo ein Teil meiner Heimat, von den Wurzeln her. Wenn man mir aber sagen würde, wo bist du zu Hause, wäre es eindeutig Deutschland. Ähm, genau. Aber da auch wirklich nicht überall. Sondern halt wirklich nur so in großen Städten, viel Kultur, viel... bunte, buntgemischte Bevölkerung... dort, genau. Würde ich Deutschland dann als mein Zuhause definieren.”
| ID7: sense of belonging to a religious community | This code applies when participants express a sense of belonging to or talk about identifying with a religious community and may provide reasons for this.  

Ex. DK02_P3f: „Aber innerhalb des Glaubens, also eine Gemeindezeit gegründet haben. Da habe ich mich wirklich zum aller ersten Mal als Teil von Leuten gefühlt, mit denen ich mich identifizieren konnte. Also, die, wie Person 1 schon vorher gesagt hatte, den gleichen Hintergrund haben. Vor allem den gleichen Glauben. Ähm, genau. Also ich kann wirklich sagen, über den Glauben in die Gemeinschaft... vermischt mit der koreanischen Kultur ist... so gewesen. Ich habe früher echt gedacht, dass nur Boseoer Christen wären.” |

| Personal understanding of “integration” | This category captures the personal understandings and definitions of the term “integration”. |
| PO1: integration as reciprocal process | This code applies when participants describe integration as a reciprocal process.  

Ex. DT02_P3m: „Ja, ich meine, Integration ist auch nicht nur eine Anpassung von uns aus, sondern auch ein entgegenkommen von der deutschen Seite aus.” |

| PO2: integration as personal negotiation | This code applies when participants describe integration as negotiating between adapting to a new culture or the German culture and society and maintaining their ethnic roots.  

Ex. DT04_P2f: „Ja, also für mich bedeutet Integration, also der erste Schritt wie [Person 3] schon gesagt hat, ist auf jeden Fall die Sprache lernen. Dass man sich kom-, also dass man sich verständigen kann mit den Leuten in dem Land. […] Ähm, was ich auch wichtig finde ist, dass man nicht irgendwie sich - , also seine Wurzeln dabei vergisst und dass man die Wurzeln trotzdem hat, aber sich in dem Land trotzdem auch zurecht finden kann und dort normal leben kann.” |

| PO3: integration as adaptation | This code applies when participants describe integration as adapting to a new culture, specifically to the German culture and society.  

Ex. DT04_P3m: „Mit Integration verbinde ich persönlich einfach, dass man […] sich halt an die Verhaltensweisen der anderen schon versucht sich zu orientieren. […] Kommunikation ist sehr wichtig. Also die Sprache zu lernen, so wie wir jetzt Deutsch gelernt haben.” |
# Social Integration ONLINE

| Acculturation | **A7:** switching languages online (frame switching) | This code applies when participants mention changing from one language to another (German vs ethnic language) depending on the context or the persons they address on social media. This implies that languages are not mixed but used separately.  

| --- | --- | --- |
| Social Integration ONLINE | **A8:** instances of using ethnic language online | This code applies when participants provide reasons for their ethnic language use or point out specific situations where they use their ethnic language or even prefer using the ethnic language over German on social media.  

| --- | **A9:** instances of using German language online | This code applies when participants provide reasons for their German language use or point out specific situations where they use German or even prefer using German over their ethnic language on social media.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>mixing languages online (code switching)</td>
<td>This code applies when participants mention mixing both German and ethnic language on social media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex.: DT04_P3m: “[…] mit Geschwistern ist es immer so ein Türkisch-Deutsch-Mix. Hat man auch mal im Satz beide Sprachen. [lacht].”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>language acquisition online</td>
<td>This code applies when participants mention how they learned a language (often German or ethnic language) through social media, either by practicing direct communication via social media or by finding persons via social for studying the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex. DK03_P1m: “Also ich habe auch die koreanische Sprache -, habe ich auch über... viel über KakaoTalk und so gelernt.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>heritage culture specifics online</td>
<td>This code applies when participants point out specific aspects of their heritage culture that they experience when using social media and which are perceived as different from the German culture online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex.: DK03_P3f: “Ich glaube, man merkt das manchmal, wenn man-, wenn man sich halt so Nachrichten schickt oder so, dass, ihm, die koreanische Kultur ein bisschen emotionsreicher ist als nur das &quot;hehe&quot;, &quot;haha&quot;, &quot;hoho&quot;. Es gibt bei KakaoTalk unterschiedliche Smilies, die eine etwas vielschichtigere Art von Gefühlen - also nicht nur Wut und Trauer, sondern halt so das Peinliche dazwischen oder ein bisschen unangenehm oder diese ganzen Sachen. Ein bisschen vielschichtig der so darzu-, also, kann man ein bisschen viel=vielschichtiger darstellen.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>consuming heritage culture related content online</td>
<td>This code applies when participants mention using social media for consuming specifically heritage culture content (e.g. online series, news from heritage country), this includes not only content from the heritage country but also information or news about the heritage country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|        |                                                                             | Ex. DT04_P2f: “Also in letzter Zeit finde ich auch, dass man dadurch voll viele politische Informationen einfach mitbekommt. Also, wenn irgendwas Schlimmes in der Welt passiert ist, habe ich das immer erst über Facebook erfahren und dann habe ich mir darüber halt mehr angelesen, keine Ahung... Es gibt ja Bombenattacken und sonst was, jetzt auch mit der Türkei vor allem, wenn wir jetzt gleich den Bezug herstellen wollen. Also da
habe ich auch viel mitbekommen. Ja, was einerseits traurig, aber natürlich andererseits gut ist, dass es so schnell sich verbreitet.“

**A14:** consuming German culture related content online

This code applies when participants mention using social media for consuming specifically German content (e.g. online series, news from ethnic country), this includes not only content from Germany but also information or news about Germany.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category captures the social relationships built and maintained by using social media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I3:** staying in contact with friends

This code applies when participants mention using social media for staying in contact with family friends.


**I4:** communicating with friends online with similar background

This code applies when participants mention using social media for communicating with friends who have a similar cultural or ethnic background.

Ex: DK01_P3m: „Ja, also, KakaoTalk ist, ähm, für mich wichtig mit anderen Koreanern, auch denen [die] noch [in] Korea wohnen, Kontakt zu haben. Also, das ist wirklich [ein] wichtige[s] Kommunikationsmittel.”

**I5:** sharing content

This code applies when participants mention to use social media for sharing content (e.g. pictures, links, etc.).

Ex. DK03_P2f: “WhatsApp schicke ich manchmal Freunden Fotos, wenn ich das mit denen teilen will, weil ich meinetwegen im Ausland grade bin oder so.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This category captures the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ID9:** feeling of attachment to ethnic group / country

This code applies when participants mention that using social media creates a feeling of attachment to their ethnic group or ethnic country.
| Personal opinion on social media and integration | PO4: potentials | This code applies when participants voice positive aspects of social media use for integration.

Ex. DT02_P4f: “Man ist viel schneller, sozusagen, am aktuellen Geschehen in der Türkei dabei. […] Hier zum Beispiel, die Gezi-Park Bewegung damals, die ja auch oft sehr über halt Facebook auch vorangetrieben worden ist, die hat zum Beispiel die Türkei viel näher an uns rangetragen. […] Ich finde, auch überhaupt politisch und gesellschaftlich und alles was da passiert, da hat -, haben die sozialen Medien viel mehr Nähe geschaffen.” |

| | PO5: concerns | This code applies when participants voice negative aspects of social media use for integration.

Ex. DT02_P3m: “[…] negativ in dem Sinne, ich finde, soziale Netzwerke werden auch - das ist klar also - missbraucht. Missbraucht, um auch eigene -, um auch, äh, Gruppen zu bilden und Leute zu spalten. Indem man zum Beispiel Halbwissen verbreitet oder komplette Lügen verbreitet” |
Appendix 7. Cited Quotes and Excerpts in the Original Language

Quote 1: DK01 (79)

P3 (m, 26): Ich hab das Gefühl, ähm, dass eine Fremdsprache mein Gefühl nicht tragen kann oder vermitteln kann. Vielleicht, also, Gefühle wollen wahrscheinlich nicht getragen [werden] sondern, wenn jemand mein Wort hört, dann empfindet der Hörer irgendetwas. Aber ich als Sager habe das Gefühl, dass mein Gefühl nicht irgendwie wirklich ausgedrückt wurde. Also wenn ich emotional tief mit jemanden sein möchte, dann habe ich den Wunsch auf Koreanisch zu sprechen.

Quote 2: DK01 (62)

P3 (m, 26): Das war für mich auch am Anfang irgendwie nicht so...ähm... vertraut, dass ich ältere Menschen auch duzen kann. Also, in Korea ist es, ähm, asymmetrisch. Also, die älteren Leute sagen immer 'Du' zu mir und ich sage trotzdem immer noch 'Sie'. Aber in Deutschland ist es meistens so, wenn jemand, also eine Seite duzt, dann sollte die andere, also der Gesprächspartner, auch duzen.

Quote 3: DT04 (47):

P3 (m, 20): Also ich glaube, das ist schwierig zu sagen. Das ist immer so ein Mix. […] Mit Geschwistern ist es immer so ein Türkisch-Deutsch-Mix. Hat man auch mal im Satz beide Sprachen [lacht].
**Quote 4: DK03 (254-264)**

P1 (m, 28): Also ich habe auch die koreanische Sprache viel über KakaoTalk und so gelernt. […] Das waren beides, Deutsch-Koreaner und Koreanisch-Koreaner, genau. Und ich weiß auch am Anfang von der Zeit, das war Ende vom Abi ungefähr, da war mein Koreanisch auch noch nicht so gut. Also, ich konnte nicht so gut schreiben und sehr langsam lesen. Und, ja mit der Zeit ging es halt immer besser. Ja, KakaoTalk hat auf jeden Fall geholfen, dass ich mit den Freunden auch schreiben konnte.

**Quote 5: DK03 (50)**

P3 (f, 26): Ich glaube, man merkt das manchmal, wenn man sich halt so Nachrichten schickt oder so, dass, die koreanische Kultur ein bisschen emotionsreicher ist als nur das 'hehe', 'haha', 'hoho'. Es gibt bei KakaoTalk unterschiedliche Smilies, die eine etwas vielschichtigere Art von Gefühlen, also nicht nur Wut und Trauer, sondern halt so das Peinliche dazwischen oder ein bisschen unangenehm oder diese ganzen Sachen. Ein bisschen vielschichtiger, also, kann man ein bisschen vielschichtiger darstellen.

**Quote 6: DT04 (36)**

P2 (f, 24): Also in letzter Zeit finde ich auch, dass man dadurch voll viele politische Informationen einfach mitbekommt. Also, wenn irgendwas Schlimmes in der Welt passiert ist, habe ich das immer erst über Facebook erfahren und dann habe ich mir darüber halt mehr angelesen, keine Ahnung... Es gibt ja Bombenattacken und sonst was, jetzt auch mit der Türkei vor allem […]. Also da habe ich auch viel mitbekommen. Ja, was einerseits traurig, aber natürlich andererseits gut ist, dass es so schnell sich verbreitet.
Quote 7: DK01 (185)


Quote 8: DT04 (108)

P3 (m, 20): Wichtig, würde ich sagen, ja. Also ich würde sagen -, also für mich wäre es schon wichtig, dass ich so... auch wenn es nicht viele sind, aber wenigstens mindestens schon eine Person habe, die türkischen Migrationshintergrund hat, halt, dass sie... ja, dass sie Türkisch reden kann. Okay, sie muss auch nicht Türkisch reden können, aber wenigstens mich verstehen, was -, also meine Kultur verstehen, wie es ist, ähm, ein Türke oder eine Türkin zu sein. Das ist für mich schon sehr wichtig.

Quote 9: DT04 (110)

P2 (f, 21): Ich würde nicht sagen, dass das mir irgendwie wichtig ist, aber es zeigt sich irgendwie, dass so im Laufe der Zeit ich mit denen Leuten besser klar komme, die auch einen Migrationshintergrund haben. Nicht, weil ich das irgendwie willentlich machen, sondern weil sich das einfach so heraus kristallisiert. Ich weiß nicht, ob es an dem Gefühl liegt. Also manchmal fühlt man sich besser verstanden, wenn die andere Person auch weiß wie es ist fremd in einem Land zu sein.
Quote 10: DT04 (79)

P3 (m, 21): Bei mir ist so, ich fühle mich eigentlich zu beiden zugehörig. Also ich fühle mich auch als Deutscher, aber auch gleichzeitig als Türke. Also bei mir ist da jetzt nicht so, oah, ich bin nur Türke, oder so, weil ich bin hier geboren und aufgewachsen und... ja, weiß ich nicht. Also das gehört halt -, ist auch ein Teil von mir jetzt dieses Deutsch. Deswegen, weiß ich nicht.

Quote 11: DT04 (79)

P3 (m, 20): Also, bei mir ist es so, muss ich ehrlich sagen, in Deutschland bin ich Ausländer, in der Türkei bin ich Ausländer. Also in der Türkei merken sofort alle: Oh, der kommt aus, ähm, Europa oder aus dem Ausland. Und wenn ich hier bin, ja, sieht man schon direkt, okay, der ist kein Deutscher, ne, der kommt auch aus dem Ausland.

Quote 12: DT04 (106)

P3 (m, 20): Also ich verbinde jetzt mit der Türkei auch jetzt nicht nur Urlaub. Wir fahren da halt generell eigentlich hin, um Familie wiederzusehen, ähm... Halt, okay, wir machen zwar Urlaub, aber mehr ist es auch so, wenn man da dann ist, gewöhnt man sich an den Alltag und an die Familie, dann ist es jetzt nicht mehr so wie Urlaub, dann ist es schon wieder so ein Stück Heimat.
**Quote 13: DT02 (285)**

P4 (f, 30): Man ist viel schneller, sozusagen, am aktuellen Geschehen in der Türkei dabei. […] Hier zum Beispiel, die Gezi-Park Bewegung damals, die ja auch oft sehr über halt Facebook auch vorangetrieben worden ist, die hat zum Beispiel die Türkei viel näher an uns herangetragen. […] Ich finde, auch überhaupt politisch und gesellschaftlich und alles was da passiert, da haben die sozialen Medien viel mehr Nähe geschaffen.

**Quote 14: DT02 (485)**

P3 (m, 21): Ich finde, um integriert sein zu können als, jetzt von meiner Sicht aus als Türke in Deutschland, muss man das deutsche System akzeptieren. Die Demokratie akzeptieren oder tolerieren. Sich mit der Sprache auseinandersetzen und sie beherrschen. Aber andersrum auch, vom Staat aus genauso. Also sollten wir genauso beachtet werden als wären wir -, also als hätten wir keine dunklere Haut, schwarze Haare und braune Augen. Also als wären wir - als gäbe es keinen Unterschied zwischen uns und den Bio-Deutschen.

**Quote 15: DT02 (490)**

**Quote 16: DTK03 (268)**

P2 (f, 25): Das ist mir am allermeisten aufgefallen: wie krass vernetzt man ist über Medien. Also wirklich über WhatsApp und Facebook und diese ganzen Events. Es werden nur noch Einladungen über Facebook-Events geschickt. […] Also, Facebook-Messenger und halt grad auch mit den Leuten, die eben dann nicht in Deutschland sind. Es ist halt einfacher […] Auch irgendwie scheint es persönlicher zu sein, wenn man über Facebook eine Nachricht schickt als wenn man eine Email an die Person schickt.

**Quote 17: DTK03 (282)**

Excerpt 1: DK03 (191-197)

1  P3 (f, 26): Ja, doch schon. Doch, aber, wenn lustig. [*lacht*] Beim Lachen!
3  P3 (f, 26): Ja.
5  P3 (f, 26): Koreanisch.
6  P1 (m, 28): *Wassa* und so.
7  P2 (f, 25): Jaaa. [*lacht*]

Excerpt 2: DT02 (191-203)

1  P3 (m, 21): Ich glaube, die türkische Sprache ist auch etwas emotionaler.
2  P2 (m, 27): Ja, genau.
3  P3 (m, 21): Also vor allem vom Wortschatz her.
4  I: Hmhm.
5  P3 (m, 21): Weil... Also, ich habe meist das Gefühl, wenn ich zum Beispiel auf Deutsch jemanden ein Kompliment machen möchte, klingt das trotzdem sehr sachlich. Und nicht so... ähm, nicht so persönlich.
6  I: Hmhm.
7  P3 (m, 21): Also ich finde, im Türksichen, vor allem wenn man auch, äh, Freude oder Spaß ausdrücken will, ist die türkische Sprache sehr viel emotionaler.
Excerpt 3: DT02 (82-87)

1 P3 (m, 21): Ja, auf jeden Fall. Also beim Fluchen vor allem. [lacht]
2 P4 (f, 30): Hmhm. [zustimmend]
3 I: Welche Sprache ist da eher...?
4 P3 (m, 21): Türkisch.
5 P4 (f, 30): Türkisch. [lacht]
6 P3 (m, 21): Also da haben wir -, da ist man echt einfallsreich. Und da haben wir sehr, sehr, sehr viele Möglichkeiten.

Excerpt 4: DK01 (77-69)

2 [lachen]
3 P3 (m, 26): Oh, ja, das stimmt. Stimmt das schon.

Excerpt 5: DK03 (96-105)

1 P1 (m, 28): Was auch wichtig ist: Im Koreanischen, da muss man unglaublich zwischen den Zeilen lesen können. Also, die Koreaner, die können Sachen nicht direkt sagen, sondern die sagen es immer hintenrum und irgendwie... die sprechen es nicht ganz klar aus, vor allem Kritik nicht, so was. Negative Sachen sprechen sie nie ganz klar aus, aber irgendwie schwingt das mit und man muss es hören können. Und wenn man es nicht versteht, dann, äh...
2 P3 (f, 26): Dann wird man halt auch schnell zu demjenigen, der so, der so keine Ahnung hat von zwischenmenschlichen Beziehungen. [lacht]

[...] 

3 P2 (f, 25): Also kein Respekt zeigt oder, ähm, nicht richtig erzogen ist. [...] Also es gibt ja diese nun-chi im Koreanischen, was so viel heißt wie Augen für....

4 P3 (f, 26): Oder so=so seine Antennen auszufahren, irgendwie so zwischen...

5 P2 (f, 25): Genau, dieses, wenn... Sensibilität haben.

**Excerpt 6: DT01 (254-258)**

1 P5 (m, 28): Genau. Zumal hat die deutsche Identität mit der islamischen Identität nicht vollständig zu vereinbaren ist.

2 P6 (f, 28): Na ja, aber auch die türkische nicht unbedingt.

3 P5 (m, 28): Jein.

4 I: Inwiefern? Inwiefern kann man das nicht vereinbaren mit der türkischen oder deutschen Identität?

5 P 5: (m, 28): In der deutschen Kultur funktioniert es einfach nicht. [...] Ähm... äh... genau, kein Alkohol, mit dem Essen hat man Probleme, auch abends mit dem Ausgehen [...]. Aber selbst wenn dann meine jungen deutschen Freunde dann mal ausgehen wollen, in die Disco wollen, auch das kann ich als Muslim nicht machen. Das heißt, da schließt sich vieles aus. Und meine deutschen Freunde sind Muslime.
**Excerpt 7: DT02 (457-463)**

1. P1 (f, 25): Die merken nicht, dass ich Türkin bin. Und dann kommen da Kommentare von Leuten, die außen, wenn da ein Türke dabei wäre, so was nie sagen würden.

2. Person 4 (f, 30): Hm-hm.


4. P4 (f, 30): Hm.

5. P1 (f, 25): Und dann hörst du aber wie sie in der Öffentlichkeit anders reden würden, wenn sie dann wissen, ja, okay, hier sind jetzt Türken dabei, hier müssen wir anders reden.


**Excerpt 8: DT01 (319-321)**

1. P1 (f, 24): Ich habe nur festgestellt, eigentlich nur noch Familie. Wenn die nicht mehr da sind, dann würde ich weniger… Also, jetzt vor allem seit dem es so chaotisch in der Türkei ist, habe ich auch gar nicht mehr den Drang so wirklich dahin zu verreisen. Also die Schönheit vergeht...

2. P6 (f, 28): Also man ist auch emotional distanziert durch die politische Lage einfach.
Excerpt 9: DT02 (478-484)

1 P4 (f, 30): Ein ständiger Aushandlungsprozess.

2 P3 (m, 21): Okay... ein ständiger Aushandlungsprozess... Wie meinst du das?

3 P4 (f, 30): Ah. Also, hm... […] Es ist ja ein tägliches-ein tägliches Aushandeln mit verschiedenen Dingen. […] Und ich finde, Integration ist, äh, sozusagen, dieser -, es ist ein Aushandlungsprozess, der auch nie endet. Es wird auch -, die Gesellschaft wird sich ja auch ändern […].

[…]  

4 P3 (m, 21): Ja

5 P4 (f, 30): Also es ist ein ständiger-ständiger Aushandlungsprozess, weil das Leben einfach lebendig ist und jedes Teil, jeder Mensch und alles muss sich irgendwie sozusagen anpassen. Und das ist auch irgendwie automatisch, es schaukelt sich sozusagen zurecht.
Appendix 8. Online Questionnaire

Questionnaire version for Korean Migration Background


Zu den Menschen mit einem (sud)koreanischen Migrationshintergrund zählen alle, die

- aus Südkorea nach Deutschland eingewandert sind
- in Deutschland als Südkoreaner geboren sind
- in Deutschland als Deutsche geboren sind, bei dem mindestens ein Elternteil in Südkorea geboren ist

Wenn du zu dieser Zielgruppe gehörst, wende ich mich freuen, wenn du dir 15-20 Minuten Zeit nimmst und die folgenden Fragen beantwortest.

Deine Teilnahme an dieser Umfrage bleibt vollkommen anonym und die Daten werden nur für wissenschaftliche Zwecke genutzt.

Vielen Dank!
Alexandra Mittelstädt

PhD Fellow
Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences
Jacobs University Bremen
Campus Ring 1 | D-28759 Bremen | Germany
amittelstaedt@bigiss.uni-bremen.de

* Zu den Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund zählen, laut Definition des Statistischen Bundesamtes, "alle nach 1949 auf das heutige Gebiet der Bundesrepublik Deutschland Zugewanderten, sowie alle in Deutschland geborenen Ausländer und alle in Deutschland als Deutsche Geborenen mit zumindest einem zugewanderten oder als Ausländer in Deutschland geborenen Elternteil".

Frage 1: Welche Sprache(n) gebrauchst du täglich?
Bitte kreuze alle zutreffenden Sprachen an.

- [ ] Deutsch
- [ ] Koreanisch
- [ ] eine andere Sprache, nämlich:
Frage 2: Wie oft sprichst du Deutsch oder Koreanisch?
Bitte versuche einzuschätzen, wie oft du im unten genannten Kontext Deutsch oder Koreanisch sprichst.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wie oft sprichst du Deutsch zuhause (wo du momentan deinen Hauptwohnsitz hast)?</th>
<th>Fast nie</th>
<th>Manchmal</th>
<th>Oft</th>
<th>Fast immer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft sprichst du Koreanisch zuhause (wo du momentan deinen Hauptwohnsitz hast)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft sprichst du Deutsch mit Familienmitgliedern, die nicht mit dir zusammen in einem Haushalt leben?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft sprichst du Koreanisch mit Familienmitgliedern, die nicht mit dir zusammen in einem Haushalt leben?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft sprichst du Deutsch mit deinen Freunden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft sprichst du Koreanisch mit deinen Freunden?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft denkst du in Deutsch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie oft denkst du in Koreanisch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 3: Wie sicherfühlst du dich, wenn du Deutsch bzw. Koreanisch sprichst?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsch</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreanisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 4: Wie gerne sprichst du im Allgemeinen Deutsch bzw. Koreanisch?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsch</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreanisch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frage 5: Wie vertraut bist du im Allgemeinen mit der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Kultur?

Deutsche Kultur

Koreanische Kultur

Frage 6: Wie verbunden fühlst du dich der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Kultur?

Deutsche Kultur

Koreanische Kultur

Frage 7: Denke an 5 deiner besten Freunde.

Wie viele von ihnen sind Koreaner oder haben einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund?

Wie viele von ihnen sind Deutsche ohne Migrationshintergrund?

Frage 8: Mit welchen 5 Freunden verbringst du die meisten Freizeit "offline" in Deutschland?

Trage hierfür bitte die Initialen der Namen deiner Freunde ein (Bsp.: für den Namen "Tim Müller" trägst du die Buchstaben TM ein) und gebe ihre Herkunft an.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>deutsch ohne Migrationshintergrund</th>
<th>mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund</th>
<th>koreanisch (Wohnsitz nicht in Deutschland)</th>
<th>andere Herkunft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Frage 9: Wie sehr stimmst du den folgenden Aussagen zu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aussage</th>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich treffe und leme gerne Leute kennen, die weder Koreaner sind, noch einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchmal denke ich, es wäre besser, wenn Deutsche und Koreaner nicht versuchen würden, sich zu vermischen.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich verbringe oft Zeit mit Deutschen, die keinen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich bin in Aktivitäten sowohl mit Deutschen ohne Migrationshintergrund als auch mit Leuten mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund involviert.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe kein Interesse an Freundschaften mit Leuten, die weder Koreaner sind, noch einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich genieße es, sowohl von Deutschen ohne Migrationshintergrund als auch von Leuten mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund umgeben zu sein.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frage 10: Wie zugehörig fühlst du dich der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community in Deutschland</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Community in Deutschland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreanische Community in Deutschland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koreanische Community in Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frage 11: Wie würdest du dich selbst beschreiben?
Ich fühle mich als...
- Deutsche/r
- Koreaner/in
- Deutsch-Koreaner/in
- Deutsche/r mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund
- Weder, noch. Sondern: 

Frage 12: Wie sehr stimmst du den folgenden Aussagen zu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aussage</th>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe Zeit damit verbracht, mehr über meine koreanische Herkunft herauszufinden, wie z.B. über ihre Geschichte, Traditionen und Brauche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe Zeit damit verbracht, mehr über Deutschland herauszufinden, wie z.B. über seine Geschichte, Traditionen und Brauche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe nicht wirklich Zeit damit verbracht, mehr über die koreanische Kultur und Geschichte herauszufinden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe nicht wirklich Zeit damit verbracht, mehr über die deutsche Kultur und Geschichte herauszufinden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 13: Welche sozialen Medien hast du in den letzten 3 Monaten am meisten genutzt?

1
2
3

*Wenn Facebook unter deinen 3 Nennungen ist, mache bitte mit Frage 14 weiter. Ansonsten gehe bitte zu Frage 17.
### Frage 14: Du hast Facebook in deiner Auflistung genannt. Wie viele Facebook-Freunde hast du ungefähr?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anzahl der Facebook-Freunde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 oder weniger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frage 15: Wie viele Minuten bzw. Stunden pro Tag hast du im Durchschnitt in der letzten Woche auf Facebook verbracht?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pro Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weniger als 10min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frage 16: Wie sehst du die Facebook-Nutzung zu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facebook ist Teil meiner Alltagstätigkeit.</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich bin stolz darauf Leuten zu erzählen, dass ich auf Facebook bin.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook ist Teil meiner täglichen Routine geworden.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich fühle mich abgeschottet, wenn ich mich eine Zeit lang nicht bei Facebook eingeloggt habe.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich fühle, dass ich Teil der Facebook-Community bin.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich würde es bedauern, wenn Facebook abgeschaltet werden würde.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frage 17: Wie oft nutzt du soziale Medien im Durchschnitt?

- Rund um die Uhr
- Mehrmals am Tag
- Einmal am Tag
- Mehrmals in der Woche
- Einmal in der Woche
- Weniger als einmal in der Woche

### Frage 18: Aus welchen Gründen nutzt du soziale Medien?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weil ich mich informieren möchte</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weil ich mit Freunden und Familie in Kontakt bleiben möchte</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damit ich mich weniger einsam fühle</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weil es aus Gewohnheit dazu gehört</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weil ich dabei entspannen kann</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anderes:</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Frage 19:** Welchen Sprache(n) gebrauchst du hauptsächlich bei der Nutzung von sozialen Medien? Bitte kreuze alle zutreffenden Sprachen an.

- [ ] Deutsch
- [ ] Koreanisch
- [ ] eine andere Sprache, nämlich: __________

**Frage 20:** Wie oft verwendet du Deutsch oder Koreanisch bei der Nutzung von sozialen Medien? Bitte versuche einzuschätzen, wie oft du im unten genannten Kontext Deutsch oder Koreanisch verwendest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wenn du soziale Medien nutzt, wie oft chattest du mit Freunden auf Deutsch?</th>
<th>Fast nie</th>
<th>Manchmal</th>
<th>Oft</th>
<th>Fast immer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wenn du soziale Medien nutzt, wie oft chattest du mit Freunden auf Koreanisch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenn du soziale Medien nutzt, wie oft chattest du mit deinen Familienmitgliedern auf Deutsch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenn du soziale Medien nutzt, wie oft chattest du mit deinen Familienmitgliedern auf Koreanisch?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frage 21:** Wie sicher fühlst du dich, wenn du bei der Nutzung von sozialen Medien Deutsch bzw. Koreanisch gebrauchst?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsch</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreanisch</td>
<td>gar nicht</td>
<td>ein wenig</td>
<td>mittelmäßig</td>
<td>ziemlich</td>
<td>sehr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frage 22:** Wie gerne gebrauchst du Deutsch bzw. Koreanisch bei der Nutzung von sozialen Medien?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsch</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreanisch</td>
<td>gar nicht</td>
<td>ein wenig</td>
<td>mittelmäßig</td>
<td>ziemlich</td>
<td>sehr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frage 23: Wie vertraut bist du mit der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Online-Kultur (z.B. Netzjargon, Emoticons)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsche Online-Kultur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koreanische Online-Kultur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 24: Wie verbunden fühlst du dich der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Online-Kultur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsche Online-Kultur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Koreanische Online-Kultur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 25: Denke an 5 Personen, mit denen du am liebsten auf sozialen Medien chattest.

Wie viele von ihnen sind Koreaner oder haben einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund?  ---  
Wie viele von ihnen sind Deutsche ohne Migrationshintergrund?  ---  

Frage 26: Mit welchen 5 Personen chattest du am häufigsten auf sozialen Medien?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in Deutschland, deutsch ohne Migrationshintergrund</th>
<th>in Deutschland, mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund</th>
<th>in Korea, koreanisch</th>
<th>anderer Wohnsitz und/oder andere Herkunft</th>
<th>Wohnsitz und Herkunft unbekannt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Frage 27: Wie sehr stimmst du den folgenden Aussagen zu?**

"Ich nutze soziale Medien..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...um mit meinen Freunden in Kontakt zu bleiben, die in Deutschland leben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um mit meinen Freunden in Kontakt zu bleiben, die in der Korea leben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um mehr über die Leute, die in meiner Umgebung leben, zu erfahren.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um mehr über jemanden zu erfahren, den ich gerade kennengelernt habe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um neue Leute kennenzulernen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um mit meinen Familienmitgliedern in Kontakt zu bleiben, die in Deutschland leben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...um mit meinen Familienmitgliedern in Kontakt zu bleiben, die in Korea leben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frage 28: Wie sehr stimmst du den folgenden Aussagen zu?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Über soziale Medien treffe und lerne ich gerne Leute kennen, die weder Koreaner sind, noch einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchmal denke ich, es wäre besser, wenn sich Deutsche und Koreaner nicht versuchen würden, sich in den sozialen Medien zu vermiscen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenn ich soziale Medien nutze, chatte ich oft mit Deutschen, die keinen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich bin in Online-Aktivitäten sowohl mit Deutschen ohne Migrationshintergrund als auch mit Leuten mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund involviert.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe kein Interesse an Online-Freundschaften mit Leuten, die weder Koreaner sind und noch einen koreanischen Migrationshintergrund haben.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frage 29: Wie zugehörig fühlt du dich der deutschen bzw. koreanischen Online-Community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deutsche Online-Community</th>
<th>gar nicht</th>
<th>ein wenig</th>
<th>mittelmäßig</th>
<th>ziemlich</th>
<th>sehr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreanische Online-Community</td>
<td>gar nicht</td>
<td>ein wenig</td>
<td>mittelmäßig</td>
<td>ziemlich</td>
<td>sehr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 30: Wie würdest du dich selbst im Kontext von sozialen Medien beschreiben?
Online fühle ich mich als...

- Deutsche/r
- Koreaner/in
- Deutsch-Koreaner/in
- Deutsche/r mit koreanischem Migrationshintergrund
- Weder, noch. Sondern: [ ]

Frage 31: Wie sehr stimmst du den folgenden Aussagen zu?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ich habe soziale Medien genutzt, um mehr über meine koreanische Herkunft herauszufinden, wie z.B. über ihre Geschichte, Traditionen und Brauche.</th>
<th>Stimme voll und ganz zu</th>
<th>Stimme eher zu</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Stimme eher nicht zu</th>
<th>Stimme überhaupt nicht zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe soziale Medien genutzt, um mehr über Deutschland herauszufinden, wie z.B. über seine Geschichte, Traditionen und Brauche.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soziale Medien habe ich nicht wirklich genutzt, um mehr über die koreanische Kultur und Geschichte herauszufinden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soziale Medien habe ich nicht wirklich genutzt, um mehr über die deutsche Kultur und Geschichte herauszufinden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Frage 32:** Denkst du, dass deine Nutzung von sozialen Medien dein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zu der deutschen bzw. koreanischen ("Offline")-Community beeinflusst?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meine Nutzung von sozialen Medien hat mein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zur deutschen (&quot;Offline&quot;)-Community in Deutschland...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht beeinflusst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meine Nutzung von sozialen Medien hat mein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zur koreanischen (&quot;Offline&quot;)-Community in Deutschland...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht beeinflusst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meine Nutzung von sozialen Medien hat mein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zur koreanischen (&quot;Offline&quot;)-Community in Korea...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht beeinflusst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frage 33:** Wenn ja, in welcher Weise hat die Nutzung von sozialen Medien dein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zu der deutschen bzw. koreanischen ("Offline")-Community beeinflusst?
Frage 34: Denkst du, dass dein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl zu der deutschen bzw. koreanischen ("Offline"-) Community deine Nutzung von sozialen Medien beeinflusst (z.B. Nutzung von bestimmten sozialen Medien, Sprachgebrauch, u.ä.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl hat meine Nutzung von sozialen Medien…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gar nicht beeinflusst</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frage 35: Wenn ja, in welcher Weise hat dein Zugehörigkeitsgefühl deine Nutzung von sozialen Medien beeinflusst?
(z.B. Nutzung von bestimmten deutschen oder koreanischen sozialen Medien, o.a.)

Frage 36: Zum Schluss noch ein Paar Fragen zu deiner Person und deinem Hintergrund:
Dein Alter

Frage 37:
Dein Geschlecht

weiblich

Frage 38:
Deine Staatsangehörigkeit (Mehrfachauswahl möglich)

☐ deutsch
☐ südkoreanisch
☐ anderes Staatsangehörigkeit, nämlich:

Frage 39:
Dein Geburtsland

☐ Deutschland
☐ Südkorea
☐ anderes Geburtsland, nämlich

Frage 40:
Wenn du nicht in Deutschland geboren wirst, wie viele Jahre lang lebst du schon in Deutschland?
Frage 41:
Familienstand
- ledig
- verheiratet
- geschieden
- verwitwet
- keine Angabe

Frage 42:
Dein (bisher) höchster Bildungsabschluss
- ohne Abschluss
- Hauptschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Realschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Abitur oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Fachhochschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Universitätsabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss

Frage 43:
Deine momentane Beschäftigung
- arbeitssuchend
- Hausfrau / Hausmann
- in Ausbildung / Lehre
- Schüler/in
- Student/in
- teilvertragsbeschäftigung
- vollzeitbeschäftigung
- selbständig
- Wehrdienst / Zivildienst
- Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr
- Mutterschaftsurlaub / Elternzeit / sonstige Beurlaubung
Frage 44:
Das Bundesland, in dem du momentan wohnst:

☐ keine Angabe
☐ Baden-Württemberg
☐ Bayern
☐ Berlin
☐ Brandenburg
☐ Bremen
☐ Hamburg
☐ Hessen
☐ Mecklenburg-Vorpommern
☐ Niedersachsen
☐ Nordrhein-Westfalen
☐ Rheinland-Pfalz
☐ Saarland
☐ Sachsen
☐ Sachsen-Anhalt
☐ Schleswig-Holstein
☐ Thüringen

Frage 45:
Dein Wohnort hat...

☐ mehr als 1.000.000 Einwohner.
☐ mehr als 100.000 Einwohner.
☐ mehr als 20.000 Einwohner.
☐ mehr als 5.000 Einwohner.
☐ weniger als 5.000 Einwohner

Frage 46:
Deine momentane Wohnsituation

☐ Ich wohne alleine.
☐ Ich wohne bei meinen Eltern / bei einem Elternteil.
☐ Ich wohne in einer Wohngemeinschaft (oder ähnlichem).
☐ Ich wohne mit meinem Partner / meiner Partnerin zusammen.
☐ Weder, noch. Sondern: ____________________________
☐ keine Angabe
Frage 47:
Der derzeitige Wohnsitz deiner Mutter
- Deutschland
- Südkorea
- ein anderes Land, nämlich:
- keine Angabe

Frage 48:
Die Staatsangehörigkeit deiner Mutter (*Mehrfachauswahl möglich*)
- deutsch
- südkoreanisch
- andere Staatsangehörigkeit, nämlich:
- keine Angabe

Frage 49:
Das Geburtsland deiner Mutter
- Deutschland
- Südkorea
- anderes Geburtsland, nämlich:
- keine Angabe

Frage 50:
Die ethnische Herkunft deiner Mutter (*Mehrfachauswahl möglich*)
- deutsch
- koreanisch
- andere ethnische Herkunft, nämlich:
- keine Angabe

Frage 51:
Der höchste Bildungsabschluss deiner Mutter
- ohne Abschluss
- Hauptschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Realschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Abitur oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Fachhochschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
- Universitätsabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
Frage 52:
Die momentane Beschäftigung deiner Mutter

☐ arbeitssuchend
☐ Hausfrau / Hausmann
☐ in Ausbildung / Lehre
☐ teilezeitwerbstätig
☐ vollzeiterwerbstätig
☐ selbstständig
☐ Mutterschaftsurlaub / Elternzeit / sonstige Beurlaubung
☐ Renter/in

Frage 53:
Der derzeitige Wohnsitz deines Vaters

☐ Deutschland
☐ Südkorea
☐ ein anderes Land, nämlich:
☐ keine Angabe

Frage 54:
Die Staatsangehörigkeit deines Vaters (Mehrfachauswahl möglich)

☐ deutsch
☐ südkoreanisch
☐ keine Angabe
☐ andere Staatsangehörigkeit, nämlich:

Frage 55:
Das Geburtsland deines Vaters

☐ Deutschland
☐ Südkorea
☐ anderes Land
☐ keine Angabe

Frage 56:
Die ethnische Herkunft deines Vaters (Mehrfachauswahl möglich)

☐ deutsch
☐ koreanisch
☐ andere ethnische Herkunft, nämlich:
☐ keine Angabe
Frage 57:
Der höchste Bildungsabschluss deines Vaters

☐ ohne Abschluss
☐ Hauptschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
☐ Realschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
☐ Abitur oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
☐ Fachhochschulabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss
☐ Universitätsabschluss oder vergleichbarer Abschluss

Frage 58:
Die momentane Beschäftigung deines Vaters

☐ arbeitssuchend
☐ Hausfrau / Hausmann
☐ in Ausbildung / Lehre
☐ teilzeiterwerbstätig
☐ vollzeiterwerbstätig
☐ selbstständig
☐ Mutterschaftsurlaub / Elternzeit / sonstige Beurlaubung
☐ Renter/in

Frage 59: Hättest du Interesse, an einer weiteren Befragung im Rahmen dieses Forschungsprojektes teilzunehmen?

☐ Ja, ich würde gerne an einer weiteren Befragung teilnehmen. Meine Email-Adresse lautet:
☐ Nein, danke.

Vielen Dank für deine Teilnahme an der Studie!

Für weitere Informationen oder Fragen, kannst du mich gerne per Email kontaktieren:
amittelstaedt@bigss.uni-bremen.de
### Appendix 9. Distribution Ways for the Online Questionnaire

#### via social media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facebook                          | • Message to friends, asking to post on their wall, in groups or to forward to friends  
                                       • Post on own wall                                                          | 26.02.15 | Thu, 10:56 |
|                                   |                                                                          |          | Thu, 13:48 |
|                                   | • FB message to: Türkische Gemeinde Schleswig-Holstein                   | 02.03.15 | Mon, 12:11 |
|                                   | • FB message to: Koreanische Zentrale für Tourismus                      | 04.03.15 | WED, 11:43 |
|                                   | • FB Group: Deutsch-Koreanische Gesellschaft                             |          | 11:47      |
|                                   | • FB Group: Europa-Universität Viadrina                                 |          | 11:51      |
|                                   | • FB message to: endaX                                                   | 19.03.15 | Thu, 14:56 |
|                                   | • FB group wall post: Uni Bremen                                        | 31.03.15 | Tue, 12:00 |
| Twitter                           | Tweet from own account                                                  | 26.02.15 | Thu, 13:55 |
| LinkedIn                          | Post on own profile                                                    | 26.02.15 |            |

#### via online forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meet-korea.de – Das deutsch-koreanische Forum</td>
<td>Forum post on <a href="http://forum.meet-korea.de">http://forum.meet-korea.de</a>, category: Sonstiges/off-topic</td>
<td>05.03.15</td>
<td>Thu, 13:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudIP Universität Bremen</td>
<td>Post on Bulletin Board on <a href="https://elearning.uni-bremen.de/">https://elearning.uni-bremen.de/</a>, category: Umfrage zu Studienzwecken</td>
<td>05.03.15; 24.04.15</td>
<td>Thu, 11:40 / Fri, 11:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwarztes Brett Bremen</td>
<td>Inserat unter „Gesuche: Bildung &amp; Nachhilfe“</td>
<td>07.04.15</td>
<td>Tue, 10:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schwarzesbrett.bremen.de</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### via email

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Türkische Gemeinde in Deutschland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tgd.de/">http://www.tgd.de/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@tgd.de">info@tgd.de</a></td>
<td>26.02.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.korea-dkg.de/">http://www.korea-dkg.de/</a></td>
<td>Via contact form</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.02.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea Verband</td>
<td><a href="http://www.koreaverband.de/">http://www.koreaverband.de/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mail@koreaverband.de">mail@koreaverband.de</a></td>
<td>26.02.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum für Interkulturellen Dialog Berlin e.V.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dialog-berlin.de/">http://www.dialog-berlin.de/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@dialog-berlin.de">info@dialog-berlin.de</a></td>
<td>26.02.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutschlandstiftung Integration</td>
<td><a href="http://stiftung.geh-deinen-weg.org/">http://stiftung.geh-deinen-weg.org/</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:kontakt@geh-deinen-weg.org">kontakt@geh-deinen-weg.org</a></td>
<td>26.02.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch-Koreanische Gesellschaft Hamburg e.V. (DKGH)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dkgh.de/index.php/">http://www.dkgh.de/index.php/</a></td>
<td>Via contact form</td>
<td>05.03.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 10. Overview of Cronbach’s α scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation offline (German components)</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation offline (ethnic components)</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation online (German components)</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation online (ethnic components)</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction offline (German components)</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction offline (ethnic components)</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction offline (German components)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction online (ethnic components)</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification offline (German components)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification offline (ethnic components)</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification online (German components)</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification online (ethnic components)</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n= 80
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