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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

This article analyses network organizations founded by descendants of Turkish migrants in the Netherlands and France. By surveying members of two such organizations and interviewing several of their board members, we learn how these organizations function, their success in building and extending social networks, and their efficacy at improving labour market prospects for young second-generation professionals of Turkish descent. Our findings reveal a hybrid structure, whereby the organizations gear many of their activities towards mainstream society. In comparison to traditional immigrant organizations, their attitude is more open to other social groups, yet they still have a clear stronghold in the ethnic immigrant community. We conclude that ethnicity is not the main element in the successful second generation’s organizing process. Factors such as educational trajectories, professional ambitions, feelings of responsibility for other members and newly acquired socioeconomic status are the main reasons for this group to organize.
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\section*{Introduction}

Social networks have proven crucial to success on the labour market. They often provide information about points of access to employment and opportunities for individuals to improve their position on the market. Research has shown that the networks of immigrants and their children are more homogenous and limited in reach than those of people of native origin (Lancee 2012\textsuperscript{a}). This diminishes their actual efficacy in helping people advance their careers. However, young professionals from...
an immigrant background have recently begun to address this issue by creating network organization for individuals like themselves (Agius Vallejo 2012). These organizations tend to be professionally orientated, promoting career-related activities and prioritizing the development and consolidation of professional contacts.

In this article, we examine two network organizations recently founded by descendants of migrants from Turkey. Located in the Netherlands and in France, these associations set out to marry the strengths of traditional immigrant organizations (bonding members through social capital and cultivating a safe, familiar environment) with the utility of bridging organizations (potentially connecting members to helpful contacts on the labour market). Currently, we have little knowledge of how such organizations function, their success rates for building and extending social networks, or just how effective they are at improving labour market prospects for young second-generation Turkish professionals. Our article is a first step towards understanding the nature and inner workings of these new organizations. We focus on the perceptions held by young professionals of immigrant descent belonging to these organizations. We ask to what extent they recognize their organization’s dual capacity to bond and bridge and which function is more valuable to them. These probes inform our overarching research question: how do network organizations of descendants of migrants provide/combine the advantage of a traditional immigrant association (its strong ethnic bonding ties) with the advantage of a professional network association (its weak bridging ties)? We also seek to learn how these new associations differ from more traditional immigrant associations across different country settings. To address these questions, we used both quantitative and qualitative data. Online surveys, distributed in 2014, gave us feedback from members of both organizations. We also relied on information from qualitative interviews conducted with the organizations’ members as part of the ELITES project (2013–14).

The following literature review has three purposes. First, it discusses the importance of social networks for labour market integration of immigrants. In doing so, it describes the often-used distinction between strong bonding ties with co-ethnics and weak bridging ties with natives. The second purpose of the literature review is to identify the specific organizational needs of successful second-generation immigrants. What motivates this group to build bonding ties (for identity formation) and/or bridging ties (for professional development) within the context of a professional network organization? Finally, the literature review touches upon the different contexts in France and the Netherlands in which second-generation Turks organize. This helps us to formulate expectations on how network organizations for this group might differ in each country. The literature review is followed by an empirical analysis and ends with a discussion of our findings.
Networks and labour market integration

The value of social connections for labour market integration has been widely acknowledged (Granovetter 1973; Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993). Past studies show that a strong social network can provide greater access to employment; a better position on the labour market; a better match between a jobseeker’s skills and a hiring employer’s expectations; less time spent job-seeking and more individual mobility on the labour market (De Graaf and Flap 1988).

Just like people of native descent, immigrants rely on social networks to succeed on the labour market (Menjivar 2000; Sanders 2002). These networks sometimes prove even more important for immigrants. As they often have a marginalized position on the labour market and underdeveloped networks, they are in more urgent need of information about work opportunities. Social networks can provide crucial information that cannot be tapped elsewhere. Drawing on their family and co-ethnic friends, first-generation and second-generation immigrants access knowledge, assistance and other resources that smoothen their economic integration into the receiving society. These networks remain vital for more settled immigrants and their children (Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993).

A major discussion concerning the position of immigrants on the labour market and their networks revolves around their type of social connections. Frequently, these translate into strong bonding ties with co-ethnics and weak bridging ties with people of native origin. In general, discussions about strong and weak ties are central to understanding the value of social connections for labour market integration. Granovetter (1973) stresses the importance of weak ties in this regard. Weak ties can be described as loose connections to a set of individuals who are unlikely to know each other well, with whom contact is less frequent and whose personal characteristics may differ significantly. Weak ties increase opportunities to access valuable resources, such as job-related information, mainly by serving as a bridge between previously unconnected networks.

Some scholars argue that for immigrants the key advantage of participation in a network with strong ties is the superior information and high degree of ethnic solidarity that this provides. There is evidence that such networks are particularly useful for migrants and their children as they provide important sources of information about the labour market that facilitate finding a job and which may improve their labour market position (Zhou 1992; Menjivar 2000; Sanders 2002). On the other hand, strong ties with co-ethnics can lead to isolation, reinforcing a disadvantaged labour market position (Portes 1998; Ryan, Erel, and D’Angelo 2015; Toma 2016). Links with other migrants rarely produce the critical resources that come with social connectedness. Fellow migrants may not know the host country’s labour market as
well as people of native descent do, or they may possess less knowledge about work opportunities. In some circumstances, working in an ethnic enclave economy as a result of being part of a strong tie network with co-ethnics, may even lead to forms of exploitation (Sanders and Nee 1996) or lower wage levels (Kazemipour 2006).

Having strong ties with co-ethnics — whether that has a positive or negative effect on labour market integration — can be influenced by participating in organizations. An important factor for migrants is the extent to which the organization primarily involves co-ethnics. Such organizations will mainly work to fortify strong ties and expand ethnic social networks and can provide safe, familiar environments that make members feel supported within the host society. This so-called cushioning function has been cited as the main reason some newly arrived groups establish separate associations (Schrover and Vermeulen 2005). As already mentioned, however, these organizations and networks may not yield the most relevant resources for improving the position of migrants on the labour market. One might assume that the organization will offer largely redundant information about the labour market as its members all belong to the same ethnic social network, isolating and segregating migrants and their children from the rest of society. This finding also points to the temporality of such networks (Ryan et al. 2008); they might be useful at the time of the arrival but lose their relevance over time or even become disadvantageous because of their redundant nature.

The benefits of weak and bridging ties with people without an immigrant background tend to be less contested and perceived as being more positive (Lancee 2012b; Morosanu 2015). Seibel and van Tubergen (2013) state that bridging ties with people with no immigrant background is advantageous for job-seeking migrants because it can yield new information about labour market opportunities. Lancee (2012b) shows that ties with people of native descent positively affect immigrants’ employment and income outcomes. Voluntary associations often provide opportunities for forming these bridging ties as they are underpinned by heterogeneous networks (Vermeulen, Tillie, and van de Walle 2012). Heterogeneous networks indicate weak and bridging ties. In their study in Germany, Griesshaber and Seibel (2015) found that voluntary organizations are crucial information pools for people of immigrant background. Such networks, moreover, seem more valuable to migrants than to natives when it comes to obtaining appropriate employment and labour market information.

Ryan (2011) argues that rather than attempting to differentiate between bonding and bridging on the basis of how similar or dissimilar people are, it is more useful to think about the nature of the relationship. Bonding with “similar” people may be more complex and nuanced than it first appears (Ryan 2011, 721). Shared interests, similar careers and educational backgrounds, common interests or ambitions all shape strong ties. Weak ties
may depend on the specific resources that someone can access and is willing to share, rather than a connection between two persons who are different in ethnic terms (see also Morosanu 2015). Echoing Ryan’s (2011) request to take the interpretations and relationships of actors as the starting point of the analysis, in the empirical section we concentrate on the perspective and interpretation of the members regarding ties provided by the organizations rather than assuming the existence of bonding and bridging ties.

Building strong and weak ties, developing identities and “giving back” among successful members of the second generation

The organizing process of migrants and their descendants is closely related to processes of identity formation (Schrover and Vermeulen 2005). Studying the organizational activities of highly educated descendants of migrants, we also look into the role of identity formation in the networking activities of this particular group.

Once successful members of the second generation move into high-status professions and find themselves in related social settings, they scarcely encounter other migrants or ethnic minorities (see the Introduction and Conclusion to this special issue). As frontrunners, they frequently find themselves facing issues without the help of an extended social support system. Their own network falls outside the social and professional environment they have recently entered, confronting them with a setting perceived as unknown or even hostile. They lack points of reference, mechanisms and support to handle the situation. Neckerman, Carter, and Lee (1999) argue that being the only minority in a white-dominated setting often results in a psychological burden of loneliness and isolation in addition to social disadvantages such as exclusion from information networks. All this needs to be compensated by establishing strong ties that shield this group from these problems. Schneider, Crul, and van Praag (2014) explain how these challenges regularly trigger “social negotiation”, whereby new individual and collective identities are constructed. The context fundamentally differs from the familiar ethnic community. Yet, that does not preclude the frontrunners from using, or attempting to use, resources culled from their community to reconstruct an identity that strengthens them in the new environment.

The successful second generation therefore needs both strong and weak ties. The weak ties enable them to make further progress in the labour market. The strong ties protect them from the hostile environment they encounter. Building strong ties is also a process of developing a strong sense of identity that can function as glue to bind strong ties with “similar” people. Successful members of the second generation do not simply exchange one identity (the old ethnic identity) for another (the new social
professional identity). Rather, they tend to construct a hybrid social identity that taps into various sub-cultures, at least one of which prominently features their migrant background (Slootman 2014).

Another development often visible among successful members of the second generation is what Neckerman, Carter, and Lee (1999) posit as the “minority culture of mobility”. This refers to a set of cultural elements that is associated with a minority group, and that provides strategies for managing economic mobility within the context of group disadvantage. In this process, successful minority members maintain a strong sense of a collective identity, and define their self-worth by the extent to which they give back financially and socially to less fortunate members of their group. Agius Vallejo and Lee (2009) have found this to be the case among successful second-generation Mexicans in the United States. What drives them to give back is not a sense of linked fate with poorer co-ethnics but their subscription to the migrant narrative based on struggle and upward mobility.

**Network organizations of successful second-generation Turks in the Netherlands and France**

Toma (2016) argues that that the role and development of bonding or bridging networks is shaped by the opportunity structures encountered in the country of settlement and the migrant community living there. She argues that the presence of a resourceful and established community might explain why bonding ties in a particular context lead to better labour market integration. In contrast, bonding networks in other, less resourceful contexts have negative effects and lead to the perpetuation of ethnic niches, isolation and continued economic segregation (Toma 2016). Vermeulen (2013) illustrates that open, resourceful environments lead to an increase in associational activities of migrants and their children, whereas closed environments with few organizational resources not only lead to fewer organizations and associational activities, but also to fewer and smaller organizational networks. In this article, we are interested in the establishment and development of network organizations of successful second-generation Turks in the Netherlands and France as a way to build and expand both strong and weak ties for this group. Below we describe the different organizational contexts of both countries with regard to Turkish migrants.

Turkish migration to the Netherlands and France took place in the same period under the guest worker migration scheme (Keskiner 2016). Today both countries accommodate around 500,000 Turkish migrants and their descendants. While the absolute group size is similar, the visibility and density of the groups differ due to the size of these countries. The polarized nature of Turkish civil society is comparable in both countries.
Civil society organizations in Turkey have been characterized as being strong in numbers but weak in influence. Ideological division seems to be a major factor leading to social weakness, as virtually all dimensions of Turkish society are deeply fragmented along political and ideological lines. These ideological divisions are also reflected in Turkish migrant organizations in Western Europe (Vermeulen 2013).

Turkish migrants started to organize later in France than in the Netherlands. According to a report by the Turkish ministry of Work and Social Affairs, more than 400 associations have been established by Turkish migrants in France, whereas the Netherlands has more than 1,100 Turkish organizations (Van Heelsum 2004). The distribution of types of organizations is similar in both countries. Around eighty per cent of these organizations are religious, and most of them have links with the Turkish Ministry of Religious Affairs; the rest are political, socio-cultural, commercial or regional organizations.

In France, political organizations encompass a wide range of ideologies from Kurdish organizations and left-wing groups to ultranationalist right-wing organizations (Petek 2009). This is also the case in the Netherlands. Socio-cultural organizations also adopt an active stance to promote the integration of Turkish migrants. In contrast to the religious and political organizations, they receive public funding (Petek 2009). The descendants of Turkish migrants have recently begun to play a prominent role in such organizations. Some have opted to reform first-generation organizations and make them more accessible to other groups and more accountable to the needs of descendants of migrants (Petek 2009). Other descendants of Turkish migrants living in France have set up diverse organizations (Petek 2009), such as youth organizations, sports organizations and organizations providing cultural activities. Student organizations for higher education students with Turkish origins not only create an environment for exchanging and building social capital, but also operate homework programmes to help younger generations. Some of these organizations have continued their activities after their members started work but they are still in their infancy (Petek 2009).

The number of Turkish migrants belonging to an organization is much higher in the Netherlands than in France. In the Netherlands the figures are above forty per cent (Michon and Vermeulen 2009, 2013), whereas a report by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) illustrated that participation of migrant groups and their descendants in organizational activities was lowest among Turks: eighteen per cent of the Turkish migrants and their descendants compared to thirty-six per cent of the French population of native parentage (INSEE 2012). According to the same report, membership is highest in religious organizations and much lower in other type of organizations.
The professional network organization studied in the current paper is a clear product of the conditions of Turkish migrant organizations in France. There are very few organizations to address the needs of second-generation groups, and the highly educated descendants of migrants are an even more specific group. Similar tendencies were observed among highly educated descendants of migrants in other countries: in her study on highly educated second-generation Mexicans, Agius Vallejo (2012) illustrated the need to establish professional network associations to expedite social mobility. Such business organizations served to build social and human capital resources for middle-class second-generation Mexicans and connect further with the community (Agius Vallejo 2012, 146–147). This seems much less the case in the Netherlands, which has a much more developed and extensive landscape of Turkish organizations, including organizations for the second generation.

Data and methods

This study grew out of the ELITES Project, which studied highly educated descendants of Turkish migrants in high-status positions in four different countries. The ELITES Project surveyed significant network organizations in which highly educated descendants of Turkish migrants participated. In the Netherlands and France we discovered two organizations that had been established by second-generation Turks. As they had comparable aims and activities, this made for an interesting comparison. The organizations were selected because they have comparable aims, serve similar interest groups and address an important topic for the ELITES Study: professional networking activities of highly educated second-generation Turks.

To gain more insight into the two network organizations, we conducted an online survey among their members. We used identical questionnaires, which examined membership (membership length, function within the organization and activities); reasons for joining; frequency and content of their contact with other members; the level of participation in and appreciation of organizational activities; how important they deemed the organization for expanding members’ business networks and current labour market position; and a number of personal background traits. The online survey took place between 24 January and 23 February 2014 for the Dutch network organization and between 15 June and 15 July 2014 for the French organization. On our behalf, a board member emailed an invitation to all members of the organizations and a reminder followed two weeks later. Both organizations have about 80–100 active members. There are formal selection procedures to become a member of one of the organizations. As an incentive, participants received a cinema voucher or joined a lottery for an Ipad. Twenty-seven members in the Netherlands and forty-five members in France completed the questionnaire. No random sampling was used, due to the small sample.
size. It is therefore difficult to claim that the survey data are representative for all the members of the organization. Nevertheless, we managed to collect a considerable number of respondents from each organization to get a sense of organizational activities. We have only provided a descriptive analysis of the survey data to acquire more information on the activities of the members who participated in the survey.

We conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with members of each organization. Selection criteria included possession of a higher education diploma; occupying a high-status position, and membership of the organization. We conducted four semi-structured interviews with board members in the Netherlands and six in France. We also selected active members: respondents had either established the organization or were running it at the time of the survey. The questionnaire not only focused on the respondents’ organizational behaviour, but also on their individual upward mobility pathways and how the organizations contributed to this. This approach gave more insight into what kind of value (especially regarding bonding versus bridging ties) the respondents attributed to their organizations. The same semi-structured questionnaire was used in both settings.

Findings

Network organizations of highly educated second-generation Turks: two case studies

The network organization in the Netherlands was established in 2000 by a group of students of Turkish descent who wanted to keep meeting up after they graduated. One of the most important reasons for founding the organization was their belief that, as highly educated second-generation Turks, they shared a particular history, background and position in Dutch society. The aim of the founders, as described in the organization’s stated goals was to support each other in pursuing successful careers. Over the years, the organization has grown beyond a circle of friends. Several of its members now hold prestigious positions in business, academia and politics. New recruits join by invitation from the board, which first conducts interviews to determine whether a candidate will be an asset to the network. At the time of our research, the organization had about eighty active members, four of whom we interviewed. Over the years the organization has maintained its primary objectives: helping members to develop professional networks and providing an environment in which they can promote themselves and further their skills. Activities breed inter-organizational support, strengthening members’ position and skills in the process. Building an informal network among members is crucial as it increases trust and reciprocity. Greater trust allows information streams to travel through the network, facilitating
members’ acquisition of labour market information. During the interviews, several respondents mentioned that members try to actively support others who are finding it difficult to gain employment. Members may also support people seeking to improve their position by getting in touch with useful contacts outside the organization.

The French network organization was founded in Paris by highly educated children of Turkish migrants. From its start in 2009, its objective was to form a network of professionals among French Turks. Its mission statement emphasizes the importance of social networks in today’s economy. It makes explicit reference to members who are alumni of the Grandes Écoles, and emphasizes the importance of associations for individuals’ upward mobility. The organization’s founders clearly aimed to build a professional association whose members could share expertise and contacts. Networking was the starting point and has remained its primary motive. It helps members to develop professional networks by furnishing an environment where they can promote themselves and further their skills. Over time, another raison d’être, which is useful to both French society and migrant communities over a longer period, came into being. The organization, which comprised highly educated people who have achieved both academic and professional success, encourages its members to serve as role models to young people from a low socioeconomic (i.e. migration) background. The objective is to support the younger generation by providing networks to assist their entry into the labour market.

Perceived aims of the organization by the members

In both countries, almost all the members are highly educated second-generation Turks with double nationality. This indicates that these network organizations are especially attractive for this specific group. In the French organization, members work for private companies, while in the Netherlands most are employed by governmental or semi-governmental organizations. We assume that this is the result of the unique nature of each country’s labour market and the extent to which opportunities for second generation are distributed.

The Dutch network organization is not affiliated with a specific ideology or religion. One of its board members explained how they value ideological diversity, which is especially significant in the highly polarized Turkish community.

We have a diverse set of members. Some are Muslims, others Alevi, pro-Ataturk, secular or left-wing. Our organization’s image has no set affiliation. Sometimes, we take a more left-wing position in a particular debate, other times, a more right-wing stance. In our press statements, we focus on policies of both the
Dutch and the Turkish governments. This is what we are appreciated for. We are independent. This is also why we do not accept any form of state subsidy.

Although the French organization engenders a secular environment, it also touches on issues of religion and problems encountered by the Muslim population in French society. Thirty per cent of the respondents mentioned connecting people with a similar religious affiliation as a reason for participating (see Table 4), which was not the case for the Dutch organization. Our survey respondents emphasized that this network organization was the only organization they knew of that united descendants of migrants from Turkey who were highly educated and employed in a professional sector. The organization was even mentioned by ELITES respondents, who did not participate in its activities. They unanimously viewed it as a hub, or network, that was unprecedented in France. Not all the members we spoke to were active in the organization.

According to the members, the main goals of both organizations are social. One of the founders of the Dutch organization explained how it had fulfilled both social and societal functions from the beginning.

The organization members like to have informal conversations with each other. In these conversations, we start to look for common ground, for societal projects to get involved in. Together, we try to see what we can and should do. Sometimes we’ll submit a letter to a newspaper. Sometimes we’ll give a media interview. Sometimes we’ll participate in a particular social project. Sometimes the goal is broad and sometimes it is very focused. But the main idea is for highly-educated individuals with an important position in the labour market to do things together for others. We mainly focus on Dutch society, but with [an awareness of] our Turkish roots, as most members have parents who were born in Turkey. We try to bear our share of responsibility for Dutch society.

In France, the organization’s main objective is pursued through activities such as seminars, outings and trainings. During these events, members not only share their expertise, but also enhance their knowledge of issues in their own field and related sectors. The second aim takes the form of outreach, which involves members visiting suburban youth, especially those from deprived backgrounds, and giving them messages of encouragement. As one of the members puts it:

What really interests me is the exchange with others, what we can bring each other. [There are] many volunteers, and we bring youth information about their education options, which I think is good because many youth do not know what academic opportunities are available to them. [I appreciate it] when I have students who eventually can say: “Thank you”, because they have found their calling. Or if we see their eyes light up because they hear about a wage they can earn – that’s motivating. Also, they are shocked that Turkish people just like them – who grew up like them, who have similar parents – have succeeded, and that motivates them to continue. Nowadays,
unfortunately, you need a network to advance. I remember when I was at medical school, only the Jewish students had their own network. They all had parents who worked in that world, they were in the same courses together and we were there alone.

Despite the emphasis on its professional dimension, the organization in France also underscores how it has quickly attracted members, thereby establishing an environment that fosters not only professional, but also friendly and familiar ties. By highlighting this feature alongside its professional networking objectives, the association resembles a classic migrant organization, which aims to create a familiar and home-like environment for its members. While the founders of the association are second-generation Turks, as was its president during the time of our survey, the organization emphasizes that it is open to all groups and people of all ethnic origins.

Another major feature is its orientation towards France. This mostly takes the form of talks and seminars on French issues, though the topic of French-Turkish relations is also popular. The organization values its relations with prominent figures in French politics, and elite business professionals and experts. To further its aims, the French organization works via sub-departments, known as “clubs”. Each club concentrates on a particular subject, such as education, engineering, law, finance, energy and the environment. Members organize activities through the sub-departments. The finance club, for instance, might host a dinner to encourage members to network internally, or invite a speaker from the French treasury or some other corporate establishment. The organization arranges for members to visit schools and educational institutions in the suburbs. All events are advertised and held in French, which is the language used at the meetings.

**Bonding or bridging ties?**

Using the information from the online survey, Tables 1–5 share details about the organizations’ capacity to increase labour market opportunities for members and the type of contacts and networks — bonding or bridging — they yield.

We first tried to determine what kind of connections the organizations produce. Are they weak ties that expand labour market information and contacts? Or are they strong ties, based on bonding social networks that provide

**Table 1.** Are you in touch with fellow members outside the organization’s activities? in per cent (number of respondents in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>82.6 (38)</td>
<td>17.4 (8)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>79.3 (23)</td>
<td>20.7 (6)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a safe, supportive environment to help members overcome obstacles in a new professional environment? Table 1 illustrates the extent to which members maintain regular contact with each other beyond the scope of the organization, something which would indicate the presence of strong bonding social networks. Respondents in both France and the Netherlands indicated having frequent and close contacts, with around eighty per cent reporting that they meet with fellow members outside the organizational activities.

Table 2 reveals that a majority of the French members and about half of the Dutch members recruited other individuals to join their organization. The recruitment of new members for voluntary organizations is a function of existing social networks of ethnically, socioeconomically and ideologically similar people. This also applies to Turkish migrant associations, which tend to recruit from the strong bonding social networks of existing members (Vermeulen 2013). Combining the results of Tables 1 and 2, we conclude that both network organizations in France and the Netherlands are structured on and, in turn, produce bonding social networks of highly educated second-generation Turks.

Our interviews with the Dutch respondents gave further insight into why such strong bonding organizations are attractive. One board member described his faith in the power that ethnic communities have to help others to succeed in Dutch society.

I believe that you [as part of the second generation] can only provide a positive contribution to society if the group to which you belong is a strong minority. And you must not forget your [ethnic] roots – that makes you powerful and keeps you from taking the position of underdog. Personally [this is my opinion], simply because I do not accept [discrimination].

Another Dutch board member explained why it was meaningful to form his organization.

We founded this Turkish organization to show Dutch society that Turkish migrants can be academics. This could have been a Turkish-Moroccan organization, but for practical purposes and to be as strong and visible as possible, we decided to focus on individuals from a Turkish background.

One of the French board members described how his organization unites people of similar descent.

### Table 2. Have you helped other individuals join the organization? in per cent (number of respondents in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>69.6  (32)</td>
<td>30.4  (14)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>48.3  (14)</td>
<td>51.7  (15)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our organization has managed to connect successful and highly-educated people like ourselves. The members really know each other. The organization has really established a network of like-minded people.

This reflects a similar situation to that described by Slootman (2014) for the Netherlands. Successful second-generation Turks tend to come together to share experiences. In doing so, they create strong bonding social networks, constructing and/or reinventing identities that enable them to better their social position and help others to succeed. This experience differs from that of their parents. The first generation’s classic migrant organizations largely provided practical assistance, particularly during the initial phase of settlement when newcomers found it difficult to obtain access to housing, work and education. This organization brings like-minded people together, who, in line with the minority mobility thesis, identify strongly with the minority group from which they originate. They wish to emphasize this collective identity on their own terms in order to strengthen the group.

Table 3 illustrates that the effects of such bonding social networks are limited in the Dutch organization. Personal support, such as help with practical matters, is not always available in the network organization, especially in the Dutch case. Over sixty-two per cent of Dutch members found it unlikely or very unlikely that a fellow member would help them with personal matters. The situation was significantly different in France, where respondents perceived fellow members more as friends willing to help them with personal matters outside organizational activities. Two-thirds of the members said it is likely or very likely that they would help other members in personal matters, an illustration of the strong bonding ties provided by the organization. This illustrates that the content of the bonding networks in both organizations differ and that the French members see their bonding networks as close personal networks to a greater extent than their Dutch counterparts.

In Table 4, we once more see how the organizations provide bonding social networks that connect second-generation Turks with very similar socio-cultural characteristics. Table 4, however, also shows that it is important to differentiate between different forms of bonding networks. Although members consider it important that the organization links them with like-minded people, different similar characteristics are relevant here. The majority of respondents in France and the Netherlands said that their organization linked them to individuals of a similar socioeconomic status. In the Netherlands similar educational level and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>6.5 (3)</td>
<td>26.1 (12)</td>
<td>43.5 (20)</td>
<td>23.9 (11)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>13.8 (4)</td>
<td>48.3 (14)</td>
<td>31.0 (9)</td>
<td>6.9 (2)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. How likely are you to ask a fellow member for help with personal matters? in per cent (number of respondents in parentheses).
ethnicity were also listed in addition to socioeconomic status. Linking people of similar professional orientation was not listed as a primary motivation in either France or the Netherlands. The network organizations therefore connect people in similar occupational fields to a lesser extent, a trait observed in more voluntary professional network organizations, most likely because members work in different economic sectors. Voluntary organizations generally tend to connect people from different sectors of the labour market. The network organizations in the Netherlands and France also appear to do this. The Dutch organization does not function in the way that a more transnational migrant organization would by connecting its members with individuals in other countries, namely Turkey. The French one does, albeit to a very limited extent: thirteen per cent of its members said that the organization brings them into contact with people abroad.

Another point the survey addressed, although it is not illustrated in the tables, was which organizational activities members found most appealing or relevant. Respondents perceived their organization mainly as a supplier of professional activities, although they still recognized the value of social bonding. From the list of topics and activities members reported enjoying, it is clear that professional subjects with a scope wider than their own career prospects hold the greatest appeal. One observable difference is that international and political topics are slightly more appealing in the Netherlands than in France. Individuals cited similar reasons in the interviews. As one Dutch board member suggested, some people also find other reasons to invest time and energy in the organization although it does not directly enhance their professional life.

All the work I do for the organization is not important professionally, but has social relevance for me [personally] as well as in a broader context. I must admit that I am currently in a luxurious position, as I have enough customers for my own company. I am sure that there are other networks and organizations

---

**Table 4.** Does the organization help you connect with certain groups? in per cent (number of respondents in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes (n)</th>
<th>No (n)</th>
<th>Total (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>France</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar educational background</td>
<td>34.8 (16)</td>
<td>65.2 (30)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar economic status</td>
<td>60.9 (28)</td>
<td>39.1 (18)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar professional orientation</td>
<td>34.8 (16)</td>
<td>65.2 (30)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar religion</td>
<td>30.4 (14)</td>
<td>69.6 (32)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar ethnicity</td>
<td>43.5 (20)</td>
<td>56.5 (26)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in other countries</td>
<td>13.0 (6)</td>
<td>87.0 (40)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Netherlands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar educational background</td>
<td>58.6 (17)</td>
<td>41.4 (12)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar economic status</td>
<td>58.6 (17)</td>
<td>41.4 (12)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar professional orientation</td>
<td>44.8 (13)</td>
<td>55.2 (16)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar religion</td>
<td>13.8 (4)</td>
<td>86.2 (25)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar ethnicity</td>
<td>62.1 (18)</td>
<td>37.9 (11)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals in other countries</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>100.0 (29)</td>
<td>100 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that are beneficial for my work. I just have not found the time to participate in these networks.

In line with the literature on minority mobility culture, other board members indicated that they do not need the organization for professional purposes, but enjoy how it lets them help others. Enjoying their own success, they feel a responsibility to do this. A French board member explained it as follows:

I have managed to have a different life [from my parents or peers]. I have been successful professionally. In view of my own success, I wanted to help others [through our organization], mostly out of a sense of responsibility to others.

Table 5 demonstrates how this feeling that the organization does not primarily lead to bettering one’s professional position is also applicable to the organizations’ regular members. Although about nineteen per cent of the French and fourteen per cent of the Dutch respondents indicated that their membership had some degree of positive effect on their working life, it is clear that the organization did not make a major contribution to this. Clearly, other positive effects of membership were responsible for their remaining in the organization. These reasons seem largely social. Meeting like-minded individuals fosters their development and collectively allows them to establish a structure that will provide a safe, supportive environment for others. Together, they do things that are important for people outside the organization and even for the migrant community.

For some Dutch board members, it also seems that the need to organize with co-ethnics is slowly disappearing. This also indicates the temporal nature of bonding ties with co-ethnics (Ryan et al. 2008). As one board member put it:

The importance of having an organization like this is less present and pressing than 10 years ago. Then it was an important signal. Today the Turkish community is more empowered, which makes it less important to have an organization like ours. I am also part of another network organization, which includes native entrepreneurs and people of Chinese and Moroccan descent. It is a really diverse mixed [network] organization.

Diverse mixed organizations like the ones described here are likely to function more as traditional professional network organizations, which provide weak ties with beneficial professional purposes. But the Turkish community in France does not yet seem ready for such diversity. Comparing the function

---

**Table 5.** Contribution of network organization to individuals’ position in the labour market in per cent (number of respondents in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>To some degree</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>39.1 (18)</td>
<td>39.1 (18)</td>
<td>19.6 (9)</td>
<td>2.2 (1)</td>
<td>100 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>50.0 (14)</td>
<td>32.1 (9)</td>
<td>14.3 (4)</td>
<td>3.6 (1)</td>
<td>100 (28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of network organizations in both countries, a French member drew the follow-
ing conclusion:

The successful second-generation Turks [in France] are unable to find each other because they are so few. […] In my observation, the [Turkish community] in the Netherlands is much more organized in this respect. The same goes for Germany.

Conclusion

The network organizations of successful second-generation professionals in our study seem to be operating as bonding organizations. They strengthen ties between like-minded individuals from similar backgrounds and provide a safe, familiar environment that supports people of migrant descent as they overcome obstacles in a new environment that is often perceived as hostile. They allow members to share experiences, while creating new social identities. The crux of the organizing process consists of the network members’ co-ethnicity; comparable educational trajectories; overlapping individual ambitions and a shared feeling of responsibility for fellow individuals of migrant descent. These organizational characteristics were highly visible in both settings.

Activities for members seeking to improve their position on the labour market is one added value. Seemingly even more consequential, though, are the opportunities they present for supporting others. A principal motive for some successful second-generation professionals to participate in such organizations is because they promote the collective shaping, construction and/or reinvention of their social identities (Agius Vallejo 2012). Here ethnicity and background are relevant, but their roles intertwine with professional identity. In that sense, these network organizations of the successful second generation both mirror and differ from those of the first generation. Both generations’ associations offer a cushioning function, allowing newcomers to settle in and access the labour market. But the second generation’s organizations have a more hybrid structure. Their activities are geared towards mainstream society and they adopt a much more open attitude to other social groups. Ethnicity is not the main, much less only, element in the organizing process. Socioeconomic factors such as educational trajectories, professional ambitions, feelings of responsibility for other members and newly acquired socioeconomic status are also prominent. This calls into question whether the bonding ties provided by highly educated descendants of migrants are of a different nature than those provided by first-generation migrants. The highly educated second generation is an established group that is informed about labour market conditions. Its members therefore have more potential to provide valuable information. Future studies of these organizations will demonstrate whether such ties will become exclusive and isolating for this group in the long run.
Regarding the comparative design of the study, we found bonding to be a valuable tie for both organizations, even though the context for descendants of migrants from Turkey is rather different in the two countries. In France this group does not have a similar dense and well-connected organizational infrastructure as in the Netherlands. In both countries, however, we found that the network organization tends to primarily connect like-minded people with similar backgrounds and ambitions. Furthermore, both organizations have a similar focus on social issues in which members further develop strategies to give back to those with whom one feels connected but are in less fortunate circumstances. We feel that the similarities found in the two countries illustrate the specific position of this group of young professionals. They look for a safe environment in which they can together with peers develop strategies and identities that help them to be successful in the labour market and at the same time remain connected with the group they originate from. We did also find some minor differences between the two countries. In France, bonding ties were appreciated and developed even more than among members in the Dutch organization. For the young professionals in France, probably due to the scarcity of a well-developed ethnic organizational network, such network organizations and the ongoing need to bond is even more relevant than for those living in the Netherlands. While bonding with co-ethnics was an important motivation in the Netherlands as well, it seemed also slowly to lose its significance over time, as such roles are being fulfilled by other new organizations in which Turkish roots are less central.

The new upwardly mobile generation is neither largely interested nor involved in retaining old habits, worldviews or values attached to their parents’ countries of origin. Its members are actively finding, constructing and/or reinventing better-fitting social identities that enable them to function comfortably and successfully in new environments. Weak ties will undoubtedly remain important for this group of ambitious young professionals. These connections provide valuable resources to improve their positions in high-status contexts. Yet even though the organizations we studied set out to provide professional networks for their members, our findings illustrated that the respondents did not think that they derived much added value from them in terms of their professional careers. Instead, they use these organizations to strengthen bonding ties with like-minded individuals. These contacts encourage them and others to continue their journey into unknown and potentially highly rewarding territory, while increasing opportunities for others who are less fortunate.
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