

Speaking the Same Language: Turkish Emigrants' Attitudes towards Turkish Television Advertising in Germany

İÇTEN DUYGU ÇALLI, PhD

Yaşar Üniversitesi, Selçuk Yaşar Kampüs

Faculty of Communication

Public Relations and Advertising Department

İzmir / Turkey

Abstract

This study aims to evaluate Turkish emigrants' attitudes towards Turkish television advertisements. Within the framework of this research, first of all, a questionnaire was structured and applied to 404 people who live in Frankfurt am Main and Berlin. Data gathered was quantified to reach the results. To analyze the data, One Way ANOVA test was used. Results show that 43.6% of respondents think that Turkish advertisements are remembered easier than German advertisements. Despite this, it cannot be said that language used in advertisements has an influence on consumers' buying process. For the buying process, 44.5% of respondents indicate Turkish advertisements are not more effective than German ones. At last but not least, advertising in Turkish does not affect 41.8% of participants' buying decisions.

Keywords: Television advertising, Turkish emigrant, language, advertising appeal, mediatic ghetto

1. Introduction

"We asked for manpower and people came".

(Max FRISCH)

After the Second World War, war-torn European countries were also very weak in terms of labour. In order to improve the economy, it was clear that some support needed in the labour force. For this reason, since the early 1960s, Turkey had signed recruitment treaties with a variety of European countries. The recruitment treaties, which had allowed Turkish citizens to settle down to European countries, signed between Turkey and Western Europe in 1960s. Whilst emigrants applied to the offices established for providing labour force, they also asked for help from their relatives or townsmen who migrated before. It can be said that chain migration has created the basis for the Turkish ghettos in Europe. Today, it is seen that emigrants living in various European countries are not equal in terms of the distribution of population. The population of Turkish immigrants in Europe, who are eligible for dual citizenship, is more than the total populations of Luxembourg and Malta (Akman, 2007). Scanning the distribution of Turkish emigrant population, it is seen that most of the Turkish population is in **Germany**.

Starting point of the chain migration to Germany was a recruitment treaty, which was signed between Germany and Turkey in 1961. After that, The German Federal Labour Offices (Bundesanstalt für Arbeit – BFA) were founded in many countries, which signed the contract mentioned (Kaya & Kentel, 2005). At first, Turkish emigrants had the status of guest workers (gastarbeiter). They stayed in factory dormitories called *heim* or lived in ghettos away from German society (Tezcan, 2000). "By the late 1970s Germany had effectively become an immigration country where immigrants settled together in certain areas, notably in cheaper sections of the big cities" (Marshall, 2000). From a socio-cultural aspect, emigrants in these regions have created ghettos and become introvert groups by establishing their own neighborhood. This process ended up with having difficulties in integration. In 1990s, in certain districts of some of the big cities, foreigners made up over 50 per cent of the population, with their own shops, mosques, restaurants, etc. (Marshall, 2000).

With the amendment in May 1999, citizenship in Germany freed from the concept of *jus sanguinis* (right of blood) to *jus soli* (right of soil). In accordance with this change, political citizenship has come into prominence. *Jus sanguinis* requires to be born in Germanic race. With the *jus soli* principle, Germany provides citizenship to people who were born in German territory (Somersan, 2004). This significant change opened a new way for all emigrants living in the country during the integration process and encouraged them to be a part of the social life.

2. From Nomads to Emigrants

The traditional nomadic way of life in Turkish culture has transformed into a universal form today and known as *global mobility*. However, the impact of nomadism on Turkish culture has been accepted for centuries. Halman (2005) explains the impact mentioned in an effective way: “Nomadic people take their own language, songs, games with them. They take them as elements of intangible cultural heritage. Certainly, during the process of migration, they cannot create concrete works, architectural creations, but in terms of non-material culture such as art, sounds, words; nomads create a vibrant literature. They always keep their non-material culture alive”. Carrying their own cultural elements to places, where they migrate, nomads both cherish nomadic culture and enrich the culture of the country of immigration.

Economic, social and cultural aspects of migration change both the target country and the country of origin. Results of these changes in Germany and Turkey are also seen in language, literature, music and cinema. Nevertheless, considering Spohn’s study, Dellal quoted that (2002) there are many words in slang as well as the language used in radio and television derived from perceived Turkish image. Many interesting examples can be given about the relationship between cultural exchange and language. For instance, a Turkish slang word “hanzo” is said to be derived from a German name, Hans. On the other hand, another slang word “türken” is used for “cheating”, which is related to perceived Turkish image (Arslan, 2011). In that respect, the interaction between two cultures follows many different paths, while constructing a cultural exchange, such as language.

The transformation of immigrant groups into subcultures are frequently used as a significant factor in advertisements which target the groups mentioned. Cultural and subcultural elements play a deterministic role in perceiving and interpreting verbal, audial and visual cues in a brand's advertisement. By the time consumers see their own cultural values and symbols in advertisements, they may develop positive attitudes towards the brand. This process begins with establishing a relationship between target consumer and a brand, generating positive attitude towards a brand, and continues with influencing purchasing behaviour, changing brand consumption habits, even creating brand loyalty.

2.1. Mediatic Ghettos in Germany

Immigrants’ efforts on simulating their native habitat symbolically also reflected on media consumption habits. Such a way of life influenced development and consumption of media habits. At this point, Abadan Unat remarks the *mediatic ghetto* concept. Mediatic ghetto “eases to internalize the climate of unilateral ideas instilled by Turkish daily press and Turkish television programs” (Abadan Unat, 2006). Hence, immigrants live an introvert life, which complicates the adaptation process. Certainly, living in ghettos and mediatic ghetto preferences made the integration progress to German society difficult for Turkish emigrants. Despite this, individuals, who adapt to the society they live in, freed from becoming *other* in mainstream media and many different alternatives for the representation of immigrants has been formed considering this situation: Turkish TV broadcasts, which are watched via satellite in Europe, have become platforms that individuals can express themselves in a free manner.

As technological advances increase, it can be claimed that media consumption habits also change. According to Şen (2007), “By the late 1980’s, communication technologies evolved rapidly. Turkish people, especially the ones who have audio-visual communication habits, have restrengthened their ties with the popular culture of their own country”. Turkish emigrants living abroad have become aware of their culture and recent developments in their countries by means of communication technologies.

Satellite broadcasting has greatly simplified the lives of citizens living abroad. They have been informed about recent news from Turkey through satellite broadcasting without any delay. Hence, media consumption habits of emigrants have changed in this respect. Television, leaving the newspapers behind, has been the first choice and most widely used tool. Kutay Erdem and Ruth Ä. Schmidt (2008) deduce that the media usage behaviour of Turkish immigrants is changed with the introduction of satellite TV, and therefore, the most common media for the Turkish population in Germany is television.

Based on Abadan Unat’s statement (2006), various researches made in European countries resulted that mass media is insensitive about the problems of emigrants. Thereby, native/local broadcasting preferences arise from the lack of dialogue and disconnection between media rather than being introvert. It is evident that another component in structuring media-ghettoisation is the apathy of mass media to emigrants. These two different aspects play an important role in shaping emigrants’ media consumption habits.

3. A Research on Turkish Emigrants' Attitudes towards Turkish Television Advertising in Germany

In 1970s, Turkish advertisements of basic products, which satisfy Turkish consumers' needs and wants, relieved emigrants that were not proficient in German. As the demands and needs of the target group increase and communities that are seen as "minority" become a part of social life, German advertisers started to advertise in Turkish as well as Turkish advertisers.

Culture, if evaluated as a set of symbols, then the relationship between culture and language, literature and words will come out. According to Bahar (2008), the most obvious symbols are words; this fact cannot be changed whether words are visible or oral. Words declare an object, an emotion, event or action. It can be said that culture can be enriched by combinations of many different symbols, and words are one of the most important elements of this structure. Advertising copies consist of words, copywriters use linguistic components to reach the target audience effectively. In this context, Turkish and German advertisers prefer to use one of the most important cultural elements for Turkish emigrants: Their mother tongue. In that case, this research aims to evaluate the effects of linguistic components on target audience.

3.1. The Aim, Scope and Limitations of the Research

Today, both Turkish and German advertisers use Turkish language as an ethnic marketing tool. In this case, the aim of this research is to measure the effectiveness of Turkish language in advertising messages that target Turkish emigrants who live in Germany. The survey was applied in the cities of Berlin and Frankfurt am Main. According to Akman (2007), Frankfurt, Berlin, Cologne, Hamburg, Düsseldorf and Munich are the main cities where Turkish minorities live in. Besides, Günther Glebe (1997) states that— the Turkish populations are especially large in metropolitan areas, such as the Stuttgart – Mannheim agglomeration, the Nürnberg region, the Frankfurt metropolitan area, the Rhine – Ruhr area, and the city of Berlin. Glebe also indicates that Berlin is the largest Turkish city outside Turkey. Due to this reason, the field study was limited with two cities mentioned in Glebe's and Akman's researches and carried out only in Berlin and Frankfurt am Main.

3.2. Research Questions and Hypotheses of the Research

This study examines the effects of language in Turkish emigrants' attitudes towards Turkish television advertisements. In this context, the research questions and hypotheses tested in this research are listed below:

RQ₁: Are programmes broadcasted in Turkish watched more by Turkish emigrants?

RQ₂: Do Turkish advertisements influence consumers' buying process?

RQ₃: Are Turkish advertisements more credible than German advertisements?

RQ₄: Do Turkish advertisements affect brand preference?

H₁: If Turkish emigrants have better proficiency in Turkish, then they believe that they remember Turkish advertisements more than German advertisements.

H₂: If Turkish emigrants have better proficiency in Turkish, then they believe that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish.

Considering the research questions and hypotheses remarked above, a questionnaire was structured. Then, the questionnaire was filled by 38 people from the sample group. Hereby, validity of the research was tested and re-edited considering the results taken. After all, between 20th January – 19th February 2012, the edited questionnaire was applied to 404 people who live in Berlin and Frankfurt am Main. The sample group mentioned was selected by convenience sampling technique. Data gathered were quantified with SPSS 17.0 and measured with One Way ANOVA test. Nonetheless, the last section of the questionnaire was found to be highly reliable (6 items; $\alpha = .85$).

Before mentioning about Turkish advertising in Germany, it would be useful to have a look at earlier studies regarding to Turkish emigrants' media consumption habits. As seen in Table 1, there are different studies conducted on different sample groups that focus on the relationship between Turkish emigrants and Turkish media. Even if the percentages vary from one research to another, it can be claimed that Turkish emigrants mostly follow Turkish media. On the other hand, it is seen that the chain of mediatic ghettos has been broken recently.

Similar researches show that, with the support of technological developments, Turkish media is still effective on Turkish emigrants' media habits. Consequently, both German and Turkish advertisers utilize the advantages of Turkish media while targeting Turkish individuals living in Germany.

3.3. Turkish Emigrants' Attitudes Towards Advertising in Turkish

Ethnic marketing executions, which target ethnic minorities in different countries, have developed rapidly in recent years. Advertising professionals generally use cultural elements such as language, religion and other cultural components during ethnic marketing facilities.

This study aims to have an opinion about Turkish emigrants' attitudes towards Turkish advertisements. Whether the advertiser is Turkish or German, some brands like to reach their target audience by using their mother tongue. Therefore, a questionnaire was structured to specify whether or not using the language as a cultural element is effective for Turkish and German brands. The questionnaire consists of two main parts. In the first part, basic demographic information and some more information about language proficiency – such as gender, age, birth place (Turkey or Germany), marital status, citizenship, duration of living in Germany, educational level, and proficiency in both Turkish and German – were asked.

The demographic information was based on a study of TÜBİTAK, namely “A Research on Consumer Acculturation and Consumption Patterns of Turkish Immigrants in Germany”. Unlike the project, the answers to marital status were changed as “married” and “not married”. By all means, language is one of the most important elements in disseminating and sustaining cultural heritage. In order to adapt to different host cultures, proficiency in language is important. In that sense, participants were asked to state the level of proficiency for each language. Thus, the effect of the use of Turkish language in advertisements on individuals will be investigated.

The last question is formed considering DAGMAR model to have an opinion about Turkish emigrants' attitudes towards advertising in Turkish. DAGMAR is an acronym for “Defining Advertising Goals for Measured Advertising Results” and consists of four levels, namely awareness, comprehension, conviction, and action. Sample group's participation levels to the statements are measured by using five point Likert scale.

The first statement of the last question is based on SASH (The Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics) scale, which was used for measuring acculturation levels of Hispanics living in the United States. SASH is made up of three main parts: language use, media, and ethnic social relations (Marin et al., 1987). Starting from here, the first variable was defined as “*I prefer to watch Turkish television programmes*”.

The second variable was “*I remember Turkish advertisements easier than German advertisements*” to gain an opinion about the ease of recalling advertisements that were broadcasted in Turkish more than German ones. Language is one of the most important cultural factors in terms of ethnic marketing. The third variable, “*Turkish advertisements are more effective than German ones during the buying decision process*”, was structured to understand the effects of language on consumer behaviour.

In the process of purchasing and consumption, consumers tend to evaluate a product's or service's not only physical/functional properties. In other words, it cannot be said that consumer's buying decisions are solely rational. “Consumers generally have a significant and positive attitude towards advertising within their field of interest” (Çakır, 2006). Within this context, encoding Turkish advertising messages, developing a positive attitude towards the brand, and reflecting these to buying decisions are examined by the variable “*I like to buy brands that advertise in Turkish*”. Persuasion is an important characteristic of an advertisement as well as creating attention and interest. The effect of conviction, which is the third step of DAGMAR model, is examined with “*Turkish advertisements are more credible than German advertisements*” variable.

Adem Aydın, the marketing manager of TUWA Media Marketing, explains that companies like Volkswagen, Vodafone, Deutsche Post, Deutsche Bank and Mercedes focus on ethnic marketing facilities recently. The companies mentioned prefer to advertise in Turkish. Yet another German company, E-Plus, developed a sub-brand “Ay Yıldız” that targets Turkish emigrants in Germany. In this respect, “*I believe that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish*” variable will reflect the ethnic marketing executions from consumers' standpoint.

4. Evaluation and Results

Considering the results from the survey, some clues can be found about the attitudes of Turkish emigrants towards Turkish advertisements broadcasted in Germany. Demographic data of the sample group of 404 people are indicated below.

According to demographic data, male-female ratio of the sample group is 50.5-49.5%. The sample group included 251 people (21.3%) under the age of 25, 93 (23.1%) between 25-34, 108 (26.8%) between 35-44, 63 (15.6%) between 45-54 and 53 (13.2%) over the age of 55. 270 people (66.8%) were born in Turkey, whereas 134 individuals (33.2%) were born in Germany. Only 234 people (57.9%) are married.

As specified in Table 2 and Table 3, 48.5% of the sample group are Turkish, 35.7% are German and 15.1% are dual citizens. Only 3 people have different countries' citizenships - Azerbaijan, Bosnia - Herzegovina and Iran. In addition, 32.9% of them stay in Germany for more than 30 years, 31.5% stay for 20-29 years, 22% stay for 10-19 years and 13.6% stay less than 10 years. The longest duration of stay is 49 years.

Sample group's educational level was shown in Table 4. According to the table, 193 people were educated in Turkey, while 211 people studied in Germany. Individuals studied in Turkey mostly graduated from high school and university. Similarly, high school and university education is prevalent among individuals who studied in Germany. On the other hand, primary school graduates from Turkey also have a high percentage. This result may be related to the first generation of Turkish emigrants.

As seen in Table 5, 84.7% of the participants are proficient in Turkish, while 66.8% of the participants are proficient in German. Intermediate level of proficiency is higher in German. Only 0.7% of the participants stated that they do not know Turkish. On the other hand, 1.5% do not know German.

According to Table 6, 59.9% of Turkish emigrants ($M = 3.66$) prefer to watch Turkish television programmes. The result of this statement also supports the concept of mediatic ghetto and answers RQ_1 . Therefore, *programmes broadcasted in Turkish are watched more by Turkish emigrants*.

43.6% of the sample group ($M = 3.25$) indicate that they remember Turkish advertisements easier. However, remembering the advertisement is not enough, the effects on buying decision process and brand preferences are also important. The effects of Turkish and German advertisements ($M = 2.86$) do not differ significantly in buying decision process of Turkish emigrants. Due to this reason, advertising in Turkish does not affect sample group's brand preferences ($M = 2.79$). Therewithal, 49.5% of individuals think that Turkish advertisements are not more credible than German ones, while 31.4% are neutral ($M = 2.54$). At last but not least, participants believe that "*German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish*" ($M = 3.47$).

Considering One Way ANOVA results, it can be claimed that there is a significant difference between participants' levels of proficiency in Turkish and the statement about remembering Turkish advertisements easier than German ones ($F: 4.711, p < 0.05$). Individuals, who stated they were proficient in Turkish, also pointed out that they remember Turkish advertisements easier.

Another One Way ANOVA result shows that there is a significant difference between participants' levels of proficiency in Turkish and their belief about German advertisers on advertising more in Turkish ($F: 5.296, p < 0.05$). Individuals, who remarked that they were proficient in Turkish, also indicated that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish. Whilst comparing the statements with citizenship (Table 8), it is found that there's a significant difference between citizenship and only one statement: "*I believe that German advertisers should advertise more*" ($F: 4.892, p < 0.05$). Accordingly, the Turkish citizens' participation level to the statement is significantly higher than that of German citizens.

5. Conclusion

Target audience, especially individuals who were born in Turkey, generally like to watch television programmes that are broadcasted in Turkish. However, not every individual proficient in Turkish prefers to watch Turkish television channels. Proficiency in language is important for understanding the message well, but it loses its importance during the buying decision process. Individuals, who are proficient in Turkish, stated that they remember Turkish advertisements easier and believed that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish. On the other hand, Turkish advertisements are not effective neither in buying decision process nor brand preference.

Participants think that advertisements broadcasted in Turkish are not credible. This result shows that speaking the same language may be remarkable, but not sufficient. From another aspect, using the words of a native language or cultural elements gets the attention of ethnic minorities.

Finally, from the advertising professionals' point of view, it is likely to be claimed that advertising in Turkish creates awareness and comprehension, but fails in the conviction step of DAGMAR model. As a result, speaking the same language with the target audience is not enough to take them into action.

6. References

- Akman, V. (2007). Küresel Göç Hikayeleri. İstanbul: Yakamoz Yayınları.
- Arslan, T. (2011). Gurbete İşçi Göçünün 50. Yılında Türk Sinemasında Almanya. Sinema Dergisi, October 2011, No: 2011 - 10, İstanbul: Turkuvaz Gazete Dergi Basım A.Ş., 76 – 85.
- Bahar, H. İ. (2008). Sosyoloji. (2nd ed.). Ankara: Uluslararası Stratejik Araştırmalar Kurumu (USAK) Yayınları.
- Çakır, V. (2006). Reklam ve Marka Tutumu. Konya: Tablet Yayınları.
- Dellal, N. A. (2002). Alman Kültür Tarihi'nden Seçme Tarihi ve Yazınsal Ürünlerde Türkler. Ankara: T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları, No: 2937, Kültür Eserleri Dizisi, No: 378.
- Erdem, K. & Schmidt, R. Ä. (2008). Ethnic Marketing for Turks in Germany. International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management, Vol: 36, No: 3, Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 212 - 223.
- Glebe, G. (1997). Housing and Segregation of Turks in Germany. In Ş. Özükren, & R. van Kempen (Eds.), Turks in European Cities: Housing and Urban Segregation. Utrecht: European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations.
- Gökalp, M. (2008). Yurtdışında Yaşayan Türklerin Birlikte Yaşam ve Kültürel Uyum Problemleri. In İ. Aydoğan, & F. Yaylacı (Eds.), 1st International Congress of European Turks. (pp. 403 – 417). Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Halman, T. (2005). Kaç / Göç: Göçebe Kültürü ve Türk Kültürü. In Gönül Pultar, Tahire Erman (Eds.), Türk(İye) Kültürleri. İstanbul: Tetragon Yayınları.
- Hanna, N. & Wozniak, R. (2001). Consumer Behavior – An Applied Approach. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kamuoyu, Yayın Araştırmaları ve Ölçme Dairesi Başkanlığı (2007). Almanya'da Yaşayan Türklerin Televizyon İzleme Eğilimleri Kamuoyu Araştırması. Ankara: Radyo ve Televizyon Üst Kurulu Yayınları (Radio and Television Supreme Council).
- Kaya, A. ve Kentel, F. (2005). Euro – Türkler: Türkiye ile Avrupa Arasında Köprü Mü, Engel Mi? İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Marin, G. et al. (1987). Development of a Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, Vol: 9, No: 2, Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, 183 - 205.
- Marshall, B. (2000). Europe in Change: The New Germany and Migration in Europe. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Nuruan, M. et al. (2005). Federal Almanya'da Yaşayan Türklerin Aile Yapısı ve Sorunları Araştırması. Ankara: Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü (Prime Ministry Directorate General of Family and Social Research).
- Öztürk, S. A., Suğur, N. & Timur, N. (2011), Almanya'daki Türk Göçmenlerin Tüketim Davranışları ve Tüketici Kültürleşmesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma. TÜBİTAK Project No: 108K051, [Online] Available: http://uvt.ulakbim.gov.tr/uvt/index.php?cwid=9&vtadi=TPRJ&ano=121920_f905afbf80cb9433940091111680fd1e (November 6, 2011).
- Somersan, S. (2004). Sosyal Bilimlerde Etnisite ve Irk. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Şahin, B. (2010). Almanya'daki Türkler: Misafir İşçilikten Ulusötesi (Transnasyonel) Bağların Oluşumuna Geçiş Süreci. Ankara: Phoenix Yayınları.
- Şen, F. (2007). Euro Türkler: Avrupa'da Türk Varlığı ve Geleceği. İstanbul: Günizi Yayıncılık.
- Tezcan, M. (2000). Dış Göç ve Eğitim. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Unat, N. A. (2006). Bitmeyen Göç: Konuk İşçilikten Ulus – Ötesi Yurttaşlığa. 2nd Edition, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- (2011), Türklerin Almanya'ya Uyumunu Bazı Klişeler ve Araştırma Sonuçları. T.C. Berlin Büyükelçiliği (The Embassy of Berlin), Yayın No: 1, Kasım 2002, [Online] Available: http://www.bteu.de/download/2002_tc_buyukelciliği_turklerin_almanyaya_uyumu.pdf (October 28, 2011).

7. Tables

Table 1. Media Consumption of Turkish Emigrants in Germany

Person /Company That Carries Out The Research	Results
Nermin Abadan Unat (1999)	Among the emigrants under the age of 30; 95% watch both German and Turkish TV channels, 36% listen both Turkish and German radio channels, 50% read both German and Turkish newspapers.
The Embassy of Berlin (2002)	70% watch Turkish TV channels while 68% watch German ones, 60% read Turkish newspapers whereas 59% read German newspapers, 44% listen to Turkish radio channels when 44% listen to German radio channels.
Prime Ministry Directorate General of Family and Social Research (2005)	Sample group made up of 1525 people: 37.2% watch Turkish TV channels, 6.3% watch German TV channels, 54% watch both Turkish and German TV channels.
Radio and Television Supreme Council (RTÜK) (2007)	Among 1005 individuals; 66,3% watch Turkish TV channels more, 17% watch German TV channels more, 16,4% watch both Turkish and German TV channels.
Birsen Şahin (2007 – 2008)	Among Turkish individuals living in Germany, average Turkish media usage is higher than German media usage. Nevertheless, German media usage cannot be underestimated.
Murat Gökalp (2008)	Among 320 Turkish emigrants; 66,8% believe that following Turkish television and radio channels is the best way to keep our cultural heritage alive. 12% are neutral. 21.1% disagree.

Table 2. Citizenship of Sample Group

Citizenship	Number of People	Percent
Turkish Citizens	196	48.5
German Citizens	144	35.7
Dual Citizens	61	15.1
Others	3	0.7
Total	404	100

Table 3. Sample Group's Duration of Living in Germany

Duration of Living in Germany	N	Percent
< 10 Years	55	13.6
10 – 19 Years	89	22.0
20 – 29 Years	127	31.5
>30 Years	133	32.9
Total	404	100

Table 4. Educational Level of Sample Group

Turkey			Germany		
Educational Level	N	%	Educational Level	N	%
Literate	4	2.1	Hauptschule	28	13.3
Primary School	41	21.2	Realschule	60	28.4
Secondary School	26	13.5	Gymnasium	20	9.5
High School	63	32.6	Vocational School/ Fachhochschule	48	22.7
University	51	26.4	Universitat	55	26.1
Masters Degree – PhD.	8	4.2			
Total	193	100	Total	211	100

Table 5. Proficiency in Turkish and German Languages

		Very Proficient	Proficient	Intermediate	Nonproficient	I Don't Know This Language
Proficiency in Turkish	N	214	128	39	20	3
	%	53.0	31.7	9.7	5.0	0.7
Proficiency in German	N	168	102	99	29	6
	%	41.6	25.2	24.5	7.2	1.5

Table 6. Statements Regarding Turkish Emigrants' Attitudes towards Television Advertising in Turkish

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean
I prefer to watch Turkish television programmes.	N	142	100	79	47	36	3.66
	%	35.1	24.8	19.6	11.6	8.9	
I remember Turkish advertisements easier than German advertisements.	N	97	79	109	68	51	3.25
	%	24	19.6	27	16.8	12.6	
Turkish advertisements are more effective than German ones during the buying decision process.	N	62	80	82	91	89	2.84
	%	15.3	19.8	20.3	22.5	22	
I like to buy brands that advertise in Turkish.	N	50	74	111	80	89	2.79
	%	12.4	18.3	27.5	19.8	22	
Turkish advertisements are more credible than German advertisements.	N	33	44	127	105	95	2.54
	%	8.2	10.9	31.4	26	23.5	
I believe that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish.	N	114	79	121	64	26	3.47
	%	28.2	19.6	30	15.8	6.4	

Table 7. Comparison between Statements and Levels of Proficiency in Turkish

	Proficiency in Turkish	N	Mean	SD	F	P
I prefer to watch Turkish television programmes.	Proficient	23	3.35	1.335	0.684	0.505
	Intermediate	39	3.69	1.260		
	Nonproficient	342	3.67	1.308		
I remember Turkish advertisements easier than German advertisements.	Proficient	23	2.52	1.082	4.711	0.009 **
	Intermediate	39	3.03	1.460		
	Nonproficient	342	3.33	1.315		
Turkish advertisements are more effective than German ones during the buying decision process.	Proficient	23	2.48	1.410	1.685	0.187
	Intermediate	39	2.59	1.409		
	Nonproficient	342	2.89	1.369		
I like to buy brands that advertise in Turkish.	Proficient	23	2.22	1.445	2.690	0.069
	Intermediate	39	2.67	1.284		
	Nonproficient	342	2.85	1.298		
Turkish advertisements are more credible than German advertisements.	Proficient	23	2.39	1.118	0.754	0.471
	Intermediate	39	2.36	1.203		
	Nonproficient	342	2.57	1.201		
I believe that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish.	Proficient	23	2.83	1.154	5.296	0.005**
	Intermediate	39	3.15	1.136		
	Nonproficient	342	3.55	1.233		

Table 8. Comparing the Statements with Citizenship

	Citizenship	N	Mean	SD	F	p
I believe that German advertisers should advertise more in Turkish.	Turkish Citizen	196	3.64	1.263	4.892	0.008**
	German Citizen	144	3.22	1.179		
	Dual Citizen	64	3.53	1.181		