

# Emotional Integration across Immigrant Generations in Baden-Württemberg, Germany: the Role of Discrimination

Oshrat Hochman\*, Anna Stein\*\*, Noah Lewin-Epstein\*\*\* and Thomas Wöhler\*\*\*\*

## ABSTRACT

Immigrants' integration is a multi-faceted process, involving structural, cultural, social, and emotional dimensions. This study focuses on the emotional dimension of integration, investigating immigrants' emotional attachments to their national origin and their host country. Specifically, we ask what role perceived discrimination plays in shaping identification preferences among immigrants and immigrant descendants in Germany. The contribution of this study is twofold: First, we present results for three generations of post-WWII labour migrants of Turkish and Italian descent. Second, we estimate the consequences of perceived individual discrimination for national and ethnic identification separately. The findings indicate that while discrimination is not related to ethnic identification, it is negatively correlated with national identification. Regarding future challenges, we believe that our findings suggest that the German society can come closer to achieving integration of migrants by reducing perceptions of rejection by the immigrant population, or better yet, fighting off discrimination against immigrant minorities.

## INTRODUCTION

Assimilation is a multidimensional process that occurs across different spheres of social life. Four main domains of assimilation are distinguished in the literature: structural assimilation refers to assimilation into the social structures of society; social assimilation refers to assimilation into social networks, cultural assimilation implies assimilation into the culture of the receiving society; and emotional assimilation is manifest primarily in the identificational affinities of immigrants (Esser, 2007). In the current study, we focus on emotional assimilation - ethnic and national identification preferences - of immigrants and immigrant descendants in Germany with the aim of expanding current knowledge on this important dimension of assimilation (Diehl and Schnell, 2006; Hochman, 2010; Schulz and Leszczensky, 2015). In particular, we wish to shed light on the role that perceived discrimination plays in shaping ethnic and national identification among individuals of Turkish or Italian immigration background.

The association between perceived discrimination and ethnic, as well as national identification, has been at the heart of the debate about the new second generation, not least due to empirical indications for retention of ethnic identification among immigrant offspring (Golash-Boza, 2006; Maliepaard et al., 2010; Skrobanek, 2009). Some studies also show resistance to emotional assimilation

---

\* GESIS Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim

\*\* Tel Aviv University and Tür an Tür Integrationsprojekte gGmbH, Augsburg

\*\*\* Tel Aviv University

\*\*\*\* University of Konstanz

(Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Maxwell, 2010) and rising boundaries between second generation immigrants and the receiving society (e.g. Alba, 2005). Based on the link between rejection and identification preferences denoted by social identity theory, we hypothesize that perceived discrimination will moderate the effect of generational affiliation on national and ethnic identification.

The contribution of this study is twofold. First, we investigate the association between perceived discrimination and emotional assimilation while distinguishing two separate, but related, dimensions of identification; namely, the ethnic group and the receiving society. Second, using a newly assembled dataset, we are in a position to study the ethnic and national identification of three immigrant generations.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The roots of the debate about the new second generation can be traced to empirical evidence from the US indicating that the new second generation challenges the dominant theory of assimilation developed by Park (1950) and others (Warner and Srole, 1945). These findings paved the way for the emergence of the segmented assimilation theory (Portes and Zhou 1993; Rumbaut, 1994; Zhou, 1999), which proposes that not all immigrant offspring assimilate into the mainstream of American society. Instead, some members of the new second generation assimilate into the underclass; and yet others present a combination of ethnic retention and structural integration (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001).

In terms of emotional integration the debate between the classical and the segmented assimilation theory can be largely defined in terms of two distinct but interrelated processes: Using concepts like ethnic competition and selective assimilation, segmented assimilation theory pointed out that the new second generation does not follow patterns of assimilation and retains high levels of ethnic identification. Framing such processes as symbolic ethnicity, Gans (1979) proposed, however, that the retention of ethnic identification does not necessarily imply a break in the process of assimilation. A more central question for the proponents of classical assimilation theory was what happens with the national identification of the new second generation. The main concern here was that ethnic competition and Mainstream perceived discrimination will hinder national identification and decrease the perceived permeability of the boundaries of the mainstream, which may reduce identification with the receiving society (Alba and Nee, 1997; Alba, 2005; Gans, 1997).

### **Ethnic and national identification**

In the current study, we adopt the view of contemporary assimilation theory, stressing the importance of decreasing dissimilarities between immigrants and natives, and of increasing similarities between them (e.g. Alba and Nee, 1997). We thus acknowledge not only the importance of ethnic but also that of national identification for the understanding of trajectories in emotional assimilation (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Verkuyten and Yildiz, 2007). In so doing, we adopt the multicultural perspective inherent in Berry's (1990) model of acculturation, where social, cultural and emotional integration are portrayed as a bi-dimensional process along two analytically distinct but related axes (Berry, 1997). The first dimension concerns the attachment of the individual to the culture of the minority group he or she is part of (ethnic identification). The second dimension concerns the attachment of the individual to the culture of the dominant group (national identification).

### **Discrimination and identification preferences**

Drawing on Social Identity Theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1986) and ample empirical evidence found in its support (e.g. Badea et al., 2015; Verkuyten and Reijerse, 2008) two models have evolved to

address the association between discrimination, and ethnic, as well as national identification among disadvantaged minorities and immigrant groups. Both models rely on the implications of impermeable group boundaries for individuals' identity management strategies.

The *Rejection-Identification-Model (RIM)* suggests that perceived prejudice positively influences in-group identification among devalued groups (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey, 1999: 138). The model is based on the notion that identification and support received from membership in a cohesive group might be protective against the psychological stress of discrimination, and thus provide a mechanism for coping with the harm of social exclusion (Pak et al., 1991; Birman and Trickett, 2001).

The *Rejection-Disidentification-Model (RDIM)* proposes that perceived biased and unjust treatment from members of the dominant group negatively influences minority members' identification with the dominant group (De Vroome et al., 2014; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009; Phinney et al., 2006; Verkuyten and Martinovic, 2012; Sanders Thompson, 1991). According to this model, the motivation of minority group members to belong and emotionally commit to the dominant group is largely determined by the way they are treated by its members (Tyler and Blader, 2003).

Applying these models to the situation of structurally disadvantaged immigrant groups in a receiving society, perceived discrimination can have two outcomes regarding ethnic and national identification. According to the RIM, subjectively perceived experiences of discrimination will likely increase levels of identification with the immigrants' ethnic group (H1) while according to the RDIM, such experiences of discrimination will weaken the identification with the national majority in the receiving society (H2). Neither hypothesis presupposes the other hence it is possible that only one of them will be corroborated by the data, or that both will be corroborated but to a different magnitude. We therefore examine the correlation between perceived discrimination and ethnic as well as national identification separately.

### **Emotional assimilation across generations**

A central issue we wish to investigate in this study is the differential relationship between perceived discrimination and national and ethnic identification across immigrant generations. Among immigrants of the first generation, ethnic identification is expected to be relatively strong. Schnell (1990) for example, explains this phenomenon by referring to a so-called "problematization" process immigrants go through. The problematization process describes immigrants' increasing awareness of their differences from members of the receiving society, due to the framing of their everyday behaviours as "ethnic" behaviours. The position of the second generation, the children of immigrants, between the culture of their parents and that of the receiving society makes them most susceptible to structural conditions pushing them out of or pulling them into one of these social entities. Rumbaut (1994) thus stresses that in the US, differences in ethnic identification patterns were found within second generation youth of the same ethnic group. For the third immigrant generation, those whose parents were born in the receiving country, there is a reason to assume a stronger influence of the receiving society and a weaker affiliation to their heritage culture regarding membership, and cultural knowledge (Isaak, 1989).

Before we elaborate our hypotheses regarding the generational status of the respondents, it is important to clarify that we use the term generation status to differentiate individuals who migrated themselves from their children and grandchildren who were born in the receiving country. We thus do not differentiate the first, from the 1.5 or 1.75 generation, nor do we distinguish the second from the 2.5 generation (Rumbaut, 2004). Unlike the first generation, the immigrants, their children, and grandchildren were born in the receiving country, and thus may have a stronger sense of a claim to membership of it. Particularly for Turks, who gain their German citizenship based on place of birth, and not based on their European citizenship, generational differences in their sense of belonging

are to be expected. These intergenerational differences in similarity, proximity and situational salience imply that individuals of the second and third generation are likely to view the receiving society as more relevant for social comparison and, consequently, may suffer a stronger sense of rejection when discriminated against.

According to SIT, the consequences of social comparison are likely to be more pronounced the more relevant the group of comparison (Mummendey and Wenzel, 1999). Thus, we hypothesize that the negative correlation of perceived discrimination with national identification will be stronger among respondents of the second and third immigrant generations (H3). One could also expect that these respondents will show higher levels of ethnic identification. However, this is not necessarily the case, since second and third generation immigrants may not see their ethnic group as one that can better secure their positive self-concept.

## THE STUDY SETTING

In the year 2012, Germany was home to some 16.3 million people with a migration background,<sup>1</sup> constituting 20 per cent of the total population. The extent of their integration into society has become a significant social issue. In the current paper, we focus our attention on Turkish (the largest group with a migration background) and Italian so-called “labour migrants” and their descendants. The main reasons for this selection are (1) our wish to limit our investigation to a specific context of integration that these groups share, and (2) our interest in intergenerational assimilation for which we wish to observe three immigrant generations.

The recruitment of labour migrants, in the aftermath of World War II, began with an agreement between Germany and Italy in 1955. Other Mediterranean and North African countries followed, among them Turkey in 1961. The low selection criteria of labour recruitment and the long lasting reluctance of the German society to integrate permanent immigrants gave the offspring of labor migrants a particularly disadvantaged starting position (Stanat, 2006; Kristen and Granato, 2007; Granato and Kalter, 2001). The persistently disadvantaged position of children from Turkish and Italian immigrant families in the education system is well documented (e.g. Bender and Seifert, 1996; Diefenbach, 2008; Kalter and Granato, 2002; Kristen, 2006). The unequal distribution of educational achievements is reflected primarily in the vocational and professional degrees (e.g. Von Below, 2007).

Moving beyond structural integration, Diehl and Schnell (2006) report an increasing rate of German language proficiency and a decreasing rate of ethnic-cultural practices between the first and the second generation among individuals with Turkish, European, and (former) Yugoslavian origin. They also show that the number of individuals of Turkish and other migrant backgrounds who have at least one German friend among the people they meet often increases between the first and the second generations. Looking into interethnic marriage, Schroedter and Kalter (2008) report that 40 per cent of the first generation and 51 per cent of second generation Italian male immigrants married a native spouse. Among the Turkish ethnic group, the situation is significantly different with 8.5 per cent of first generation men and 10 per cent in the second generation married to a native spouse, (Mushaben, 2010).

To what extent can discrimination explain the persistent disadvantages between natives and immigrants in the second and third generation in Germany? Biased treatment was observed in the education system, the labour market, the housing market, and other spheres of everyday life (Klink and Wagner, 1999, for a meta-analysis). Kristen and Granato (2007) for example, found that educational and social background is not sufficient in explaining the low representation of Italian young adults in the highest secondary track. Similar findings for the second generation of immigrants with

Turkish background suggest ethnically motivated discrimination (Von Below, 2007). Ethnic discrimination was also found in the context of the German housing market (Auspurg et al., 2017).

One aspect contributing to the social distance of the native population towards immigrants with Turkish origin is the Muslim faith. Indeed, the larger distance toward Turkish immigrants is partially explained by the dominant role of Christianity in conservative as well as mainstream articulations of German national identity. Further, in the aftermath of 9/11, the categories *Muslims* and *Turks*, have become representative of an ultimate “other” – and are used interchangeably in the German discourse (Breger, 2012). Undifferentiated public representations of Islam and Muslims in Germany significantly contribute to salient boundaries between natives and certain immigrant minorities (Foroutan, 2012) and lead to more frequent expressions of prejudice toward them than toward other immigrants (Blohm and Wasmer, 2013). The multi-generation study of the Turkish and the Italian ethnic groups that immigrated to Germany under similar conditions presents, therefore, a useful case for investigating emotional assimilation and its relationship to perceived discrimination.

## DATA AND MEASUREMENT

### Data

The sample was drawn from a phone-based survey initiated and funded by the Ministry of Integration of Baden-Württemberg and conducted by researchers at the Department of Sociology at Konstanz University (Fick et al., 2014). Over the years Baden-Württemberg received a large number of labor immigrants, and currently, some 28 per cent of its residents are individuals with an immigration background (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2016). The survey respondents are immigrants and natives aged 14 and above, residing in private households in the state of Baden-Württemberg. Immigrant respondents were selected in two steps. First, a sample of “potential” immigrant households was drawn from publicly accessible telephone directories, using names for a pre-categorization of possible countries of origin. This procedure was followed by a screening interview to assess the personal migration biography of all members of the household. Respondents were then randomly selected from the pool of individuals with the respective migration history and country of origin. Interviews were conducted in the language preferred by the respondents.

The response rate varied between 20 per cent among the sample of native Germans, and 15 per cent among those with a migration history (Fick et al., 2014). Our analysis refers to respondents with Turkish and Italian background ( $n=544$  and  $534$  respectively). Although a probability sample, the sample used is not entirely representative of the immigrants in Baden-Württemberg or in Germany. For the descriptive analysis, we thus weighted the data based on the German Microcensus data, to account for sampling probabilities of individuals from different generations, and for the individual and not household-based sampling.

### Measurement

To measure identification preferences, we used one item for each dimension: ethnic (Turkish or Italian) identification and national (German) identification. The wording of the corresponding items was “*how strong is your sense of belonging to Germany/[respective country of origin]?*” with five response levels ranging from *none* (1) to *very strong* (5).<sup>2</sup> Our measure of perceived discrimination was constructed in two stages. First, respondents were asked whether they felt discriminated against in four different spheres of their social life, using a Likert-type response scale with five ordered response levels from (0) *very often* to (4) *never*. Then, respondents were asked whether they think

this discrimination is associated with their *skin color, origin, ethnicity, citizenship, religion, and language or accent*. Respondents who mentioned one or more of these causes for discrimination, were considered to report perceived ethnic discrimination.

To test the unidimensionality of the variable set we used exploratory factor analysis (principal component factoring) that indicated one common factor with an Eigenvalue of 1.99, explaining 50 per cent of the total variance observed. Satisfying factor loadings of the variable set (*discrimination in everyday life* 0.63; *in labour market* 0.74; *lodging* 0.75, and *by public authorities* 0.70) suggest the suitability of the constructed personal discrimination scale. The four items assessing personal discrimination were then combined to construct a summated scale ranging from *never experienced discrimination* (0) to *experienced discrimination often/very often* (3).<sup>3</sup>

The information collected allows us to differentiate respondents by immigration generation. Respondents born outside Germany are considered in our study to be first generation immigrants. If one or both parents were foreign-born, respondents were classified as second generation, under the condition that both parents of the German parent were foreign born. Third generation respondents are individuals with two German-born parents. In order to count as third generation, respondents could also have one parent born abroad, as long as the other parent was German-born to at least one German-born (grand) parent. Respondents for which we could not establish the origin of any grandparent were coded in a separate category we named “mixed”. Unfortunately, the data used here does not allow us to apply a more detailed generational classification (e.g. Rumbaut, 2004)

Various individual characteristics may affect the correlation between perceived discrimination and ethnic, as well as national identification. Therefore, in our statistical models, we control for indicators of cultural and social integration, as well as exposure to the receiving society, and socioeconomic status (Hochman and Davidov, 2014; Leszczensky, 2013; Lubbers et al., 2007; Skrobanek, 2009). We additionally control for whether or not respondents have German citizenship.

Social integration was indicated by whether or not respondents have native Germans among their close friends. Cultural integration was measured using self-reported language use. Specifically, we relied on respondents’ reports regarding the language they use most often at home, with friends, and at work. We distinguish among individuals who use only or mostly German in two of three venues; individuals who use only or mostly their mother tongue in two of the three venues; individuals who use both languages in two of the three venues; and individuals for whom we could not identify a clear pattern across the different venues (mixed). To reduce non-response on the language-use items we incorporated into this variable the language the respondents grew up with (self-reported). Thus, we treated individuals growing up in a German-speaking home as if they reported using mostly or only German, and individuals who grew up in a Turkish/Italian speaking home as if they reported using mostly or only their respective mother tongue. Individuals who reported growing up in a bilingual home were coded as using both German and their respective mother tongue.<sup>4</sup>

Respondents’ socio-economic status was measured by two indicators: the highest levels of high school respondents report to have finished, and their occupational position. For respondents still in school, we used their current high school type as an indicator of their (completed) high school level. The occupational position was measured using the Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik (2003) autonomy scale that measures the level of autonomy and responsibility on the job based on the type of occupation, the size of the firm (respective workplace), and the level of specialization on the job. We included the measure in the form of dummy variables to control also for those individuals missing on the scale who are still at school. Finally, we created an indicator of exposure to the host society based on years since migration for the first generation and age for respondents born in Germany.

TABLE 1  
RESPONDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS (WEIGHTED FOR BW POPULATION)

|  | 1st                | 2nd                | 3rd                | Mixed             |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Mean national (German) identification (std. deviation) | <b>2.63 (1.0)</b>  | <b>2.90 (0.9)</b>  | <b>3.00 (0.8)</b>  | <b>3.29 (0.6)</b> |
| Mean ethnic identification (std. deviation)            | <b>2.72 (1.1)</b>  | <b>2.64 (1.1)</b>  | <b>1.62 (1.3)</b>  | <b>1.91 (1.2)</b> |
| Mean age/years since migration (std. deviation)        | <b>35.2 (13.3)</b> | <b>30.1 (11.2)</b> | <b>31.3 (17.9)</b> | <b>34 (12.2)</b>  |
| Individual discrimination:                             |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| Never  | <b>46%</b>         | <b>58%</b>         | <b>84%</b>         | <b>86%</b>        |
| Rarely   | <b>35%</b>         | <b>32%</b>         | <b>16%</b>         | <b>14%</b>        |
| Sometimes  | <b>13%</b>         | <b>5%</b>          | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>         |
| Often/very often                                       | <b>6%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>         |
| Ethnic origin  |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| Italian  | <b>46%</b>         | <b>42%</b>         | <b>89%</b>         | <b>83%</b>        |
| Turkish  | <b>54%</b>         | <b>58%</b>         | <b>11%</b>         | <b>17%</b>        |
| Gender   |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| Male   | 51%                | 57%                | 57%                | 71%               |
| Female   | 49%                | 42%                | 43%                | 28%               |
| High school completion:                                |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| No high-school   | <b>17%</b>         | <b>8%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          | <b>0%</b>         |
| basic high-school                                      | <b>59%</b>         | <b>52%</b>         | <b>47%</b>         | <b>49%</b>        |
| Intermediate high-school                               | <b>12%</b>         | <b>24%</b>         | <b>27%</b>         | <b>23%</b>        |
| Tertiary level high-school                             | <b>11%</b>         | <b>15%</b>         | <b>24%</b>         | <b>28%</b>        |
| Occupational Autonomy Scale                            |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| Low  | <b>36%</b>         | <b>15%</b>         | <b>1%</b>          | <b>11%</b>        |
| 2  | <b>27%</b>         | <b>33%</b>         | <b>36%</b>         | <b>22%</b>        |
| 3  | <b>12%</b>         | <b>13%</b>         | <b>26%</b>         | <b>24%</b>        |
| 4  | <b>7%</b>          | <b>9%</b>          | <b>5%</b>          | <b>14%</b>        |
| High   | <b>2%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          | <b>1%</b>          | <b>4%</b>         |
| Friends:   |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| No natives among close friends                         | <b>24%</b>         | <b>11%</b>         | <b>9%</b>          | <b>7%</b>         |
| Natives among close friends                            | <b>76%</b>         | <b>89%</b>         | <b>91%</b>         | <b>93%</b>        |
| Language use:  |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| Mostly or only German                                  | <b>29%</b>         | <b>60%</b>         | <b>98%</b>         | <b>95%</b>        |
| Both German and mother tongue                          | <b>35%</b>         | <b>27%</b>         | <b>2%</b>          | <b>5%</b>         |
| Mostly or only mother tongue                           | <b>24%</b>         | <b>5%</b>          | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>         |
| Mixed language use patterns                            | <b>12%</b>         | <b>8%</b>          | <b>0%</b>          | <b>0%</b>         |
| German Citizenship:                                    |                    |                    |                    |                   |
| No   | <b>73%</b>         | <b>62%</b>         | <b>11%</b>         | <b>5%</b>         |
| Yes  | <b>27%</b>         | <b>38%</b>         | <b>88%</b>         | <b>95%</b>        |
| n  | 334                | 524                | 119                | 101               |

Significant differences tested with the unweighted data are marked in bold; Source: Integration Gelungen

## FINDINGS

### Descriptive analyses

The (weighted) socio-demographic characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1. In line with our focus on intergenerational assimilation, we present the information by generation. Statistically significant differences (tested with the unweighted information using  $\chi^2$  or one-way ANOVA) are presented in bold. Notably, respondents of the second immigrant generation show on average higher levels of German identification compared with the first immigrant generation and

lower levels of German identification compared with the third immigrant generation. Levels of ethnic identification among the second immigrant generation are lower compared with the first, and higher compared with the third (and the mixed) immigrant generation. Overall, the findings reveal a clear pattern of assimilation across the generations.

Looking at perceived discrimination across generations, it is evident that respondents of the first immigrant generation report that they experienced discrimination more often than respondents of the second and third immigrant generations. One possible explanation for the difference in discrimination experiences may be related to the age of the respondents across the different generational groups. Specifically, immigrants of the first generation are slightly older than those of the second and third generation and may have had more opportunities (e.g. in the housing or labor market) to be discriminated against. Given the small variance in frequency of experiences of discrimination, we dichotomized this variable for the regression analyses, distinguishing between respondents who never experienced discrimination, and the rest.

The descriptive findings reveal differences in the ethnic composition of the generational groups. In particular, a higher proportion of Italians is found among the third and the mixed generation groups. This is not surprising considering that Italian labour migrants arrived in Germany earlier than the Turkish labour migrants. Information regarding socio-demographic similarities and differences between the Italian and Turkish groups is found in Appendix 1.

While in the first immigrant generation the share of males and females is relatively similar, in the second and third immigrant generation men are a clear majority. Respondents of the second and third immigrant generations are more likely than the first generation immigrants in the sample to have completed high-school. With regard to occupational position, there is also an indication for intergenerational improvement, with the share of respondents in the lowest autonomy category decreasing across generations. These findings must be interpreted with caution because some of the participants, particularly in the third immigrant generation, are still at school.

The vast majority of the respondents in our sample report having Germans among their close friends. The wide use of German language among the respondents is in line with their ability to sustain such networks. Indeed over 60 per cent of the respondents in the first generation report using either both their mother tongue and German or only German in different domains of their everyday life. Among immigrant offspring, the use of German is even more widespread. Finally, the rate of naturalization increases across generations: about 88 per cent of the respondents of the third generation (and 95% of respondents of the mixed category) reported holding a German nationality. The findings thus far seem to be in line with Diehl and Schnell's (2006) observations and point to intergenerational social and cultural assimilation that follows the path of classical assimilation theory in most respects.

### **Multivariate analyses**

Although revealing in their own right, these descriptive statistics do not provide a rigorous evaluation of the patterns of relationships between the experience of discrimination as well as other predictors and levels of German or ethnic identification. We thus estimated the relationship using multivariate linear regression models. Table 2 presents four linear regression estimation models referring to national identification. Table 3 presents the parallel models referring to ethnic identification. Model 1 includes only generational affiliation and ethnic origin. To test hypotheses H1 and H2 in Model 2 we added perceived discrimination. This stepwise inclusion of perceived discrimination also allows us to reveal possible mediation effects of perceived discrimination in the relations between generational affiliation and ethnic origin, and national or ethnic identification. In Model 3 we added the control variables and in Model 4 the interaction terms between generational affiliation and perceived discrimination are added to test our moderation hypothesis (H3).



TABLE 2  
OLS REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (SE) FOR NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION<sup>1</sup>

|                            | Model 1             | Model 2             | Model 3             | Model 4             |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| First Generation           | -0.178***<br>(0.07) | -0.141<br>(0.07)    | 0.039<br>(0.07)     | 0.145<br>(0.10)     |
| Third Generation           | 0.010<br>(0.10)     | -0.026<br>(0.10)    | -0.095<br>(0.10)    | -0.059<br>(0.11)    |
| Mixed                      | 0.316**<br>(0.10)   | 0.279**<br>(0.10)   | 0.189<br>(0.11)     | 0.194<br>(0.12)     |
| Turkish origin             | -0.176**<br>(0.06)  | -0.107<br>(0.06)    | 0.049<br>(0.07)     | 0.046<br>(0.07)     |
| Discrimination             |                     | -0.259***<br>(0.06) | -0.235***<br>(0.06) | -0.161*<br>(0.08)   |
| German citizenship         |                     |                     | 0.091<br>(0.07)     | 0.097<br>(0.07)     |
| Exposure (Age/Residency)   |                     |                     | 0.006*<br>(0.00)    | 0.006*<br>(0.00)    |
| SES 2                      |                     |                     | 0.171<br>(0.09)     | 0.165<br>(0.09)     |
| SES 3                      |                     |                     | 0.107<br>(0.10)     | 0.102<br>(0.10)     |
| SES 4                      |                     |                     | 0.197<br>(0.12)     | 0.189<br>(0.12)     |
| SES 5                      |                     |                     | 0.324<br>(0.17)     | 0.335*<br>(0.17)    |
| Missing SES                |                     |                     | 0.088<br>(0.10)     | 0.081<br>(0.10)     |
| Basic high-school          |                     |                     | 0.032<br>(0.14)     | 0.016<br>(0.14)     |
| Intermediary high-school   |                     |                     | -0.045<br>(0.15)    | -0.063<br>(0.15)    |
| Tertiary level high-school |                     |                     | -0.108<br>(0.15)    | -0.125<br>(0.15)    |
| Has German friends         |                     |                     | 0.155<br>(0.09)     | 0.160<br>(0.09)     |
| Use both languages         |                     |                     | -0.148*<br>(0.07)   | -0.146*<br>(0.07)   |
| Use mostly mother tongue   |                     |                     | -0.757***<br>(0.12) | -0.739***<br>(0.12) |
| Use mixed language         |                     |                     | -0.197<br>(0.10)    | -0.192<br>(0.10)    |
| 1. Gen*discrimination      |                     |                     |                     | -0.217<br>(0.13)    |
| 3. Gen*discrimination      |                     |                     |                     | -0.112<br>(0.23)    |
| Mixed Gen*discrimination   |                     |                     |                     | 0.071<br>(0.24)     |
| Intercept                  | 2.966***<br>(0.06)  | 3.035***<br>(0.06)  | 2.587***<br>(0.19)  | 2.573***<br>(0.19)  |
| R <sup>2</sup> (adjusted)  | 0.03                | 0.05                | 0.11                | 0.12                |
| N                          | 968                 | 968                 | 968                 | 968                 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001 Source: Integration Gelungen

We first examine the models predicting respondents' German identification, to test whether perceived discrimination is negatively correlated with national identification. The first row of coefficients in Model 1 indicates that respondents of the first generation show lower levels of national

identification than those reported by respondents of the second generation ( $b=-0.18$ ). Contrary, however, to the hypothesis of generational progression, German identification in the third immigrant generation does not differ significantly from that found among respondents of the second generation. The strong significant effect for the mixed generation ( $b=0.32$ ), indicates that individuals in this group show a stronger national identification than second-generation respondents. One reason for this effect might be that respondents in the mixed category could also be classified as natives. Respondents with a Turkish background show in this model a significantly lower level of national identification than respondents with an Italian background ( $b=-0.18$ ). Model 2 confirms our hypothesis that rejection will lead to dis-identification with the out-group (RDIM) net of generational affiliation and country of origin ( $b=-0.26$ ).<sup>5</sup> Notably, net of perceived discrimination the respondents' origin does not seem to matter for their German identification levels. Although still significant, the generational effects observed in Model 2 are weaker indicating that perceived discrimination has a small mediating role.

The findings presented in Model 3 indicate that the difference in estimated levels of German identification between first and second generation respondents is not statistically significant once our control variables are included. The discrimination penalty decreases slightly but is still significant ( $b=-0.24$ ). The effect of perceived discrimination does not vary by generational affiliation, as revealed in the non-significant interaction terms (Model 4). Hence our third hypothesis is not confirmed. In line with previous studies (e.g. Hochman and Davidov, 2014), we also find a positive association between German language use and German identification. Specifically, compared with respondents who use mostly or only German, other patterns of language use imply lower levels of German identification ( $b=-0.15$  and  $-0.74$  for using both mother tongue and German and for using only or mostly the mother tongue, respectively).

Table 3 pertains to ethnic identification. In Model 1, the findings confirm the expectations of the classical assimilation theory, indicating that compared with respondents of the second generation, first generation respondents hold higher levels of ethnic identification, and third-generation respondents hold lower levels of ethnic identification ( $b=0.30$ , and  $-0.82$  respectively for first and for third-generation). We did not find significant differences by ethnic origin in the respondents' ethnic identification levels. Inserting perceived discrimination in Model 2 indicates first, that perceived discrimination implies a significant increase in ethnic identification among the respondents ( $b=0.16$ ), corroborating the *Rejection-Identification-Model*. The generational effects are also here somewhat weaker compared with Model 1 yet, the decrease is very small.

In Model 3 we included the control variables in the regression. While the differences between the first and second generation are here no longer significant, the lower level of ethnic identification in the third generation holds but is weaker in size. The correlation between perceived discrimination and ethnic identification is no longer significant. We also did not find any indication of an interaction effect between generational affiliation and perceived discrimination on ethnic identification (Model 4). As might be expected, German citizenship status is negatively correlated with ethnic identification whereas the use of mother tongue either solely or in combination with German is positively associated with ethnic identification.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this study, we aimed to explain the emotional integration of individuals with an immigrant background in Germany. Specifically, we set out to theorize and study the relations between perceived discrimination and sense of identification with the host society and with one's own ethnic origin group. We argued that given the different processes implied by the *Rejection-Identification* and *Rejection-Disidentification* models, one should theoretically distinguish between these two

TABLE 3  
OLS REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS (SE) FOR ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION<sup>1</sup>

|                            | Model 1             | Model 2             | Model 3             | Model 4             |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| First Generation           | 0.303***<br>(0.08)  | 0.280***<br>(0.08)  | 0.124<br>(0.09)     | 0.036<br>(0.12)     |
| Third Generation           | -0.822***<br>(0.12) | -0.799***<br>(0.12) | -0.498***<br>(0.13) | -0.518***<br>(0.15) |
| Mixed                      | -0.468***<br>(0.13) | -0.446***<br>(0.13) | -0.151<br>(0.14)    | -0.228<br>(0.15)    |
| Turkish origin             | 0.015<br>(0.08)     | -0.027<br>(0.08)    | -0.052<br>(0.09)    | -0.049<br>(0.09)    |
| Discrimination             |                     | 0.158*<br>(0.08)    | 0.114<br>(0.08)     | 0.035<br>(0.10)     |
| German citizenship         |                     |                     | -0.338***<br>(0.08) | -0.340***<br>(0.08) |
| Exposure (Age/Residency)   |                     |                     | -0.008*<br>(0.00)   | -0.007*<br>(0.00)   |
| SES 2                      |                     |                     | 0.152<br>(0.12)     | 0.151<br>(0.12)     |
| SES 3                      |                     |                     | 0.078<br>(0.13)     | 0.076<br>(0.13)     |
| SES 4                      |                     |                     | -0.003<br>(0.15)    | 0.007<br>(0.15)     |
| SES 5                      |                     |                     | 0.340<br>(0.22)     | 0.346<br>(0.22)     |
| Missing SES                |                     |                     | 0.034<br>(0.12)     | 0.041<br>(0.12)     |
| Basic high-school          |                     |                     | -0.198<br>(0.18)    | -0.185<br>(0.18)    |
| Intermediary high-school   |                     |                     | -0.153<br>(0.19)    | -0.143<br>(0.19)    |
| Tertiary level high-school |                     |                     | -0.168<br>(0.19)    | -0.157<br>(0.19)    |
| Has German friends         |                     |                     | 0.132<br>(0.11)     | 0.134<br>(0.11)     |
| Use both languages         |                     |                     | 0.386***<br>(0.09)  | 0.384***<br>(0.09)  |
| Use mostly mother tongue   |                     |                     | 0.551***<br>(0.15)  | 0.540***<br>(0.15)  |
| Use mixed language         |                     |                     | 0.437***<br>(0.13)  | 0.435***<br>(0.13)  |
| 1. Gen*discrimination      |                     |                     |                     | 0.183<br>(0.16)     |
| 3. Gen*discrimination      |                     |                     |                     | -0.009<br>(0.29)    |
| Mixed Gen*discrimination   |                     |                     |                     | 0.326<br>(0.31)     |
| Intercept                  | 2.518***<br>(0.07)  | 2.476***<br>(0.07)  | 2.696***<br>(0.25)  | 2.710***<br>(0.25)  |
| R <sup>2</sup> (adjusted)  | 0.09                | 0.09                | 0.14                | 0.14                |
| N                          | 968                 | 968                 | 968                 | 968                 |

\*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001 Source: Integration Gelungen

sentiments. It is possible that only one of the two processes is underway, or that the two processes are of different magnitude. Following the social identity theory, we additionally predicted that the effects of discrimination would be more pronounced in the second and third immigrant generations,

in light of the expected increased relevance of the German society for their social comparison processes.

With regard to the correlation of perceived discrimination with ethnic and with national identification, our findings provide consistent support for the second hypothesis. Namely, that perceived discrimination is negatively correlated with national identification. We find weaker and inconsistent support for the first hypothesis that perceived discrimination is positively correlated with ethnic identification. These findings underscore the relevance of modeling ethnic and national identification as separate processes.

In line with previous research, we find that ethnic identification weakens over the generations, most noticeably in the third generation. This is not the case with respect to national identification where differences between the second and the third generation are not significant. Our findings with regard to the first and second generation reveal an intergenerational process of assimilation. National identification increases in the second generation while at the same time ethnic identification decreases. The differences between the second and third generations follow a more complex pattern that challenges the straight-line view of assimilation. While members of the third generation report lower levels of ethnic identification than second-generation respondents, the level of national identification does not differ between the generations.

Our findings provide limited support to the theoretical expectations regarding the different strength of the correlation between perceived individual discrimination and national identification across generations. The direction of the interaction effects in the national identification model indicated that the negative correlation between perceived discrimination and German identification is, as expected, stronger among respondents of the third generation than among respondents of the second generation. However, contrary to our predictions, the effect of perceived discrimination seems to be strongest among first generation respondents. We did not find any generational differences in the strength of the correlation between perceived individual discrimination and ethnic identification. This finding reflects the fact that discrimination does not seem to affect ethnic identification as it does national identification. In this regard, our findings underscore the value of theoretically distinguishing national from ethnic identification, and investigating processes occurring in these two dimensions separately.

The differences in predicted levels of national and ethnic identification associated with language use are also noteworthy. Specifically, our findings indicate that the use of one's respective mother tongue is positively associated with one's ethnic identification and negatively with one's national identification. Interestingly, citizenship status does not enhance national identification, but it does reduce the sense of identification with one's ethnic group. This finding might indicate the difficulty in maintaining an ethnic identification measured here as identification with the country of origin, after formally becoming a citizen of the host country.

Most empirical investigations of emotional integration in Germany observe the first and the second immigrant generation. These accounts have thus far shown support for the assimilation approach (e.g. Diehl and Schnell, 2006). Our findings indicate that while an increase in German identification is observed between the first and second generation, this assimilationist trend is not observed among members of the third generation. To the contrary, among members of the third immigrant generation, we find that ethnic and national (German) identification are relatively low. This finding may, in Gans's terminology (1992) represent a "bump" in the assimilation trend of immigrants in Germany in the third generation. It is also possible that national as well as ethnic categories are not salient for the self-identification of third generation immigrants, testifying to the "blurring" (Alba, 2005) of ethnic boundaries in Germany as a whole.

Emotional integration is an important component of immigrants' incorporation into receiving societies in general and for contemporary Germany in particular. In this respect, our findings identify an important barrier to integration, as discrimination by the majority group forestalls immigrants' and their offspring's identification with the host society. In terms of future challenges, we

believe that our findings suggest that the German society can come closer to achieving emotional integration by reducing perceptions of rejection by the immigrant population. Another important challenge for the German society is to mobilize its revised naturalization process for the increase of immigrants' emotional attachment to the German society.

Importantly, this study is based on cross-sectional data and is thus not suitable for causal inference. To better understand the processes underway in the German society, longitudinal data that allows an estimation of assimilation trajectories is required. Another limitation of this study is that it focuses attention on a specific federal state in the German republic and not on the entire German population. The results can thus be generalized only for Baden-Württemberg. Future studies should aim to enlarge the sample to include all German federal states. Finally, in this study we focused solely on individuals with Turkish and Italian background. Future studies should include other groups, particularly immigrants who are considered to be ethnic Germans and who may demonstrate different identification preferences altogether.

Over the past two years, about a million asylum seekers arrived in Germany, many of them likely to make Germany their new home. The asylum seekers encounter a different receiving context to that the labour migrants experienced. The lessons drawn from this and other studies on the integration of Germany's labour migrants can and should deliver valuable insights regarding their integration.

## NOTES

1. According to official definitions, persons with migration background are born outside of the Federal Republic of Germany. Two generations of immigrant descendants, born in Germany to at least one grandparent with a personal migration history, are also considered to have a migration background. German citizens with a migration history in the third generation who live outside their parents' homes are not identifiable in the yearly census (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2013).
2. Similar measures were used in several studies (e.g. Schimmer and van Tubergen, 2014)
3. The categories "often" and "very often" were combined into one.
4. Comparing the imputed models with models where we did not impute the data on language use, we found no meaningful differences in the main effects
5. To better understand the role of discrimination in our model, we also estimated a logistic regression model with discrimination as a dependent variable. The model confirmed the descriptive statistics described above showing that compared with second generation respondents, first generation respondents are more likely to experience discrimination and third generation respondents are less likely to report such an experience. Moreover, respondents with Turkish ethnic origin, are more likely than Italian respondents to report a discrimination experience. The analysis is available from the authors upon request.

## REFERENCES

- Alba, R.  
2005 "Bright vs. blurred boundaries: second-generation assimilation and exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28: 20–49.
- Alba, R. and V. Nee  
1997 "Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration", *International Migration Review*, 31: 826–874.
- Auspurg, K. T. Hinz, and L. Schmid  
2017 "Contexts and conditions of ethnic discrimination: evidence from a field experiment in a German housing market", *Journal of Housing Economics*, 35: 26–36.

- Badea, C. A. Er-rafiy, P. Chekroun, J.-B. Légal, and P. Gosling  
2015 "Ethnic in-group evaluation and adhesion to acculturation ideologies: the case of Moroccan immigrants in France", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 45: 47–55.
- Bender, S. and W. Seifert  
1996 "Zuwanderer auf dem Arbeitsmarkt: Nationalitäten- und geschlechterspezifische Unterschiede", *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 25: 473–495.
- Berry, J.W.  
1990 "Psychology of acculturation", in J. Berman (Ed.), *Cross-Cultural Perspectives: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE: 201–235.  
1997 "Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation", *Applied Psychology*, 46: 5–34.
- Birman, D. and E.J. Trickett  
2001 "Cultural transitions in first-generation immigrants: acculturation of Soviet Jewish refugee adolescents and parents", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32: 456–477.
- Blohm, M. and M. Wasmer  
2013 'Einstellungen und Kontakte zu Ausländern', in *Datenreport 2013: ein Sozialbericht für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Bonn: 205–211.
- Branscombe, N.R., M.T. Schmitt, and R.D. Harvey  
1999 "Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: implications for group identification and well-being", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77: 135–149.
- Breger, C.  
2012 "Christian universalism? Racism and collective identity in twenty-first-century immigration discourses", in B. Becker-Cantarino (Ed.), *Migration and Religion. Christian Transatlantic Missions, Islamic Migration to Germany*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, New York: 155–175.
- De Vroome, T., M. Verkuyten, and B. Martinovic  
2014 "Host national identification of immigrants in the Netherlands", *International Migration Review*, 48: 1–27.
- Diefenbach, H.  
2008 *Kinder und Jugendliche aus Migrantenfamilien im deutschen Bildungssystem* (2nd ed.). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.
- Diehl, C. and R. Schnell  
2006 "'Reactive Ethnicity' or 'Assimilation'? Statements, arguments, and first empirical evidence for labor migrants in Germany", *International Migration Review*, 40: 786–816.
- Esser, H.  
2007 "Does the 'new' immigration require a 'new' theory of integration?", in A. Portes and J. DeWind (Eds) *Rethinking Migration: New Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives*, Berghahn, New-York: 308–341.
- Fick, P., T. Wöhler, C. Diehl, and T. Hinz  
2014 *Integration gelungen? Die fünf größten Zuwanderergruppen in Baden-Württemberg im Generationenvergleich: Ergebnisse einer Mehrthemenbefragung im Auftrag des Ministeriums für Integration Baden-Württemberg*, Ministerium für Integration Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart.
- Foroutan, N.  
2012 *Muslimbilder in Deutschland. Wahrnehmung und Ausgrenzung in der Integrationsdebatte. WISO Diskurs*.
- Gans, H.J.  
1979 "Symbolic ethnicity: the future of ethnic groups and cultures in America", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 2: 1–20.  
1992 Comment: Ethnic invention and acculturation, a bumpy-line approach", *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 12(1): 42–52.  
1997 "Toward a reconciliation of 'assimilation' and 'pluralism': the interplay of acculturation and ethnic retention", *International Migration Review*, 31(4): 875–892.
- Golash-Boza, T.  
2006 "Dropping the hyphen? Becoming Latino(a)-American through racialized assimilation", *Social Forces*, 85: 27–54.

- Granato, N. and F. Kalter  
2001 "Die Persistenz ethnischer Ungleichheit auf dem deutschen Arbeitsmarkt", *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 53: 497–520.
- Hochman, O.  
2010 *Ethnic Identification Preferences among Germany's Immigrants and their Descendants: A Comprehensive Perspective*, Mannheim University, Mannheim.
- Hochman, O. and E. Davidov  
2014 "Relations between second-language proficiency and national identification: the case of immigrants in Germany", *European Sociological Review*, 30: 344–349.
- Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, J.H.P.  
2003 "„Stellung im Beruf“ als Ersatz für eine Berufsklassifikation zur Ermittlung von sozialem Prestige", *ZUMA-Nachrichten*, 27: 114–127.
- Isaak, H.R.  
1989 *Idols of the Tribe: Group Identity and Political Change*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., K. Liebkind, and E. Solheim  
2009 "To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination", *Applied Psychology*, 58: 105–128.
- Kalter, F. and N. Granato  
2002 "Demographic change, educational expansion, and structural assimilation of immigrants: the case of Germany", *European Sociological Review*, 18: 199–216.
- Klink, A. and U. Wagner  
1999 "Discrimination against ethnic minorities in Germany: going back to the field", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29: 402–423.
- Kristen, C.  
2006 *Ethnische Diskriminierung im deutschen Schulsystem? Theoretische Überlegungen und empirische Ergebnisse* (No. SP IV 2006-601). Berlin.
- Kristen, C. and N. Granato  
2007 "The educational attainment of the second generation in Germany: social origins and ethnic inequality", *Ethnicities*, 7: 343–366.
- Leszczensky, L.  
2013 "Do national identification and interethnic friendships affect one another? A longitudinal test with adolescents of Turkish origin in Germany", *Social Science Research*, 42: 775–788.
- Lubbers, M.J., L. Molina, and C. McCarty  
2007 "Personal networks and ethnic identifications: the case of migrants in Spain", *International Sociology*, 22: 721–741.
- Maliepaard, M., M. Lubbers, and M. Gijsberts  
2010 "Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation", *A study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33: 451–472.
- Maxwell, R.  
2010 "Caribbean and South Asian identification with British society: the importance of perceived discrimination", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32: 1449–1469.
- Mummendey, A. and M. Wenzel  
1999 "Social discrimination and tolerance in intergroup relations: reactions to intergroup difference", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3: 158–174.
- Mushaben, J.M.  
2010 "From Ausländer to Inlander: the changing faces of citizenship in post-wall Germany", *German Politics & Society*, 28: 141–164.
- Pak, A.W., K.L. Dion, and K.K. Dion  
1991 "Social-psychological correlates of experienced discrimination: test of the double jeopardy hypothesis", *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 15: 243–253.
- Park, R.E.  
1950 *Race and Culture*, The Free Press, Glencoe.
- Portes, A. and R. Rumbaut  
2001 *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*, Russel Sage Foundation, Berkely: 147–189.

- Portes, A. and M. Zhou  
1993 "The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530: 74–96.
- Phinney, J.S., J.W. Berry, P. Vedder, and K. Liebkind  
2006 "The acculturation experience: attitudes, identities, and behavior of immigrant youth", in John W. Berry, Jean S. Phinney, David L. Sam and Paul Vedder (Eds) *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition. Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation Across National Contexts*, Psychology Press, New York, London: 71–116.
- Rumbaut, R.  
1994 "The crucible within: ethnic identity, self-esteem, and segregated assimilation among children of immigrants", *International Migration Review*, 28: 748–794.
- Rumbaut, R.G.  
2004 "Ages, life stages, and generational cohorts: decomposing the immigrant first and second generations in the United States", *International Migration Review*, 38: 1160–1205.
- Sanders Thompson, V.L.  
1991 "Perceptions of race and race relations which affect African American identification", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(18): 1502–1516.
- Schimmer, P. and F. van Tubergen  
2014 "Transnationalism and ethnic identification among adolescent children of immigrants in the Netherlands Germany, England, and Sweden", *International Migration Review*, 48: 20–49.
- Schnell, R.  
1990 "Dimensionen ethnischer Identität", in H. Esser and J. Fridriechs (Eds) *Generation und Identität: Theoretische und Empirische Beiträge zur Migrationssoziologie*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen: 43–72.
- Schroedter, J.H. and F. Kalter  
2008 "Binationale Ehen in Deutschland. Trends und Mechanismen der sozialen Assimilation", in F. Kalter (Ed.), *Migration und Integration*, VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden: 351–379.
- Schulz, B. and L. Leszczensky  
2015 "Native friends and host country identification among adolescent immigrants in Germany: the role of ethnic boundaries", *International Migration Review*, 50: 163–196.
- Skrobanek, J.  
2009 "Perceived discrimination, ethnic identity and the (re-) ethnicisation of youth with a Turkish ethnic background in Germany", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35: 535–554.
- Stanat, P.  
2006 "Disparitäten im schulischen Erfolg: Forschungsstand zur Rolle des Migrationshintergrunds", *Unterrichtswissenschaft Zeitschrift Für Lernforschung*, 34: 98–124.
- Statistisches Bundesamt  
2013 *Ergebnisse Des Mikrozensus* (Vol. 49). Wiesbaden.  
2016 *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund. Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2015* (Vol. 1). Wiesbaden.
- Tajfel, H. and J.C. Turner  
1986 "The social identity theory of intergroup behavior", in S. Worchel and W.G. Austin (Eds) *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Nelson Hall Publisher, Chicago: 7–24.
- Tyler, T.R. and S.L. Blader  
2003 "The group engagement model: procedural justice, social identity, and cooperative behavior", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7: 349–361.
- Verkuyten, M. and B. Martinovic  
2012 "Immigrants' national identification: meanings, determinants, and consequences", *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 6: 82–112.
- Verkuyten, M. and A. Reijerse  
2008 "Intergroup structure and identity management among ethnic minority and majority groups: the interactive effects of perceived stability, legitimacy, and permeability", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38: 625–634.



- Verkuyten, M. and A. Yildiz  
 2007 "National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslim", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33: 1448–1462.
- Von Below, S.  
 2007 "What are the chances of young Turks and Italians for equal education and employment in Germany? The role of objective and subjective indicators", *Social Indicators Research*, 82: 209–231.
- Warner, W.L. and L. Srole  
 1945 *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups* (vol. 3). Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Zhou, M.  
 1999 "Segmented assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation", in C. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz and J. DeWind (Eds) *The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience*, Russell-Sage Foundation: New-York.

## APPENDIX 1

## DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION BY ETHNIC ORIGIN

|  | Italian origin | Turkish Origin |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Mean national (German) identification (std. deviation) | 2.39 (1.21)    | 2.66 (1.02)    |
| Mean ethnic identification (std. deviation)            | 2.39 (1.21)    | 2.71 (1.16)    |
| Mean age/years since migration (std. deviation)        | 35.51 (14.36)  | 30.24 (11.50)  |
| Generation   |                |                |
| 1  | 45%            | 54%            |
| 2  | 31%            | 43%            |
| 3  | 17%            | 2%             |
| Mixed  | 6%             | 1%             |
| Gender   |                |                |
| Male   | 58%            | 52%            |
| Female   | 42%            | 48%            |
| Education  |                |                |
| No high-school   | 16%            | 8%             |
| Basic high-school                                      | 50%            | 60%            |
| Intermediary high-school                               | 20%            | 18%            |
| Tertiary high-school                                   | 14%            | 15%            |
| Occupational Autonomy Scale                            |                |                |
| Low  | 21%            | 27%            |
| 2  | 32%            | 28%            |
| 3  | 20%            | 8%             |
| 4  | 8%             | 8%             |
| High   | 2%             | 1%             |
| Missing  | 18%            | 27%            |
| Individual discrimination:                             |                |                |
| Never  | 67%            | 44%            |
| Rarely   | 28%            | 35%            |
| Sometimes  | 4%             | 13%            |
| Often/very often                                       | 1%             | 8%             |
| Friends:   |                |                |
| No natives among close friends                         | 16%            | 18%            |
| Natives among close friends                            | 84%            | 82%            |
| Language use:  |                |                |
| Mostly or only German                                  | 66%            | 33%            |
| Both German and mother tongue                          | 24%            | 32%            |
| Mostly or only mother tongue                           | 2%             | 26%            |
| Mixed language use patterns                            | 9%             | 9%             |
| German citizenship                                     |                |                |
| No   | 69%            | 52%            |
| Yes  | 31%            | 48%            |
| N  | 534            | 544            |