

Is National Citizenship Withering Away?: Social Affiliations and Labor Market Integration of Turkish Origin Immigrants in Germany and France

A. Kayaoglu and A. Kaya

Discussion Paper 2011-33

Institut de Recherches Économiques et Sociales
de l'Université catholique de Louvain



Is National Citizenship Withering Away? : Social Affiliations and Labor Market Integration of Turkish Origin Immigrants in Germany and France^{*}

Aysegul Kayaoglu (Université Catholique de Louvain, IRES)

Ayhan Kaya (Istanbul Bilgi University)

July 2011

Abstract: There are around 3 million Turkish origin migrants in Germany and 400 thousand in France who have already raised their third generations. Nowadays they are even being named with their hyphenated identities, such as German-Turks and French-Turks. In the meantime, they encounter various obstacles in everyday life due to the stigmatization and securitization of migration and Islam. This is why their integration into the receiving societies is of great importance, as better social cohesion helps nurture the economic, political and social contribution of migrants to their countries of settlement. Using the data derived from a recent micro-level survey on Turkish-origin immigrants residing in Germany and France, the determinants of their social affiliations and employment probability as well as the impact of citizenship acquisition on their socio-economic integration will be analyzed in this article.

JEL codes: F22, O15, Z13.

Keywords: Turkish migrants, Citizenship, Affiliation, Economic Integration.

^{*} The first author acknowledge financial support from the ARC convention on "Geographical Mobility of Factors" (convention 09/14-019).
Correspondence: Aysegul Kayaoglu (a.kayaoglu@lse.ac.uk)

Introduction

The contemporary world is being shaped by tremendous flows of both capital and labor more than ever before. These flows brought the need for efficient restructuring in the institutional frameworks of both destination and home countries, and still call for further changes in the structure of existing institutions. International migration of laborers after World War II had an important impact, especially on the institution of citizenship, which was and still is one of the highly debated issues. It is common to start discussing the institution of citizenship before and after the Second World War, which had an enormous impact on its transformation. (Marshall, 1950). In the aftermath of World War II, the right to citizenship was extended to women and children after men (Marshall, 1950). T. H. Marshall sociologically defined the institution of citizenship as an ideological tool employed by the modern capitalist state in order to contain social groups' claims in the civil, political and social domains. In other words, the Marshallian conception of citizenship could also be perceived as a form of *governmentality* in the Foucauldian sense.¹ The focus was on the ingredients of the skeleton of a nation, and therefore citizenship was granted to those who share common ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural identities. Citizenship as a prescribed contract signed between a rights-holder and a certain nation-state was actually an exclusionary one, in the sense that migrants from other nations did not have any chance of having it. This discourse was dominant in the nation-states until the beginning of the 20th century, and especially started to lose its importance after the enormous migration flows emerging in the aftermath of WWII (Marshall, 1950; Brubaker, 1992; Turner, 1990; Bottomore, 1992; Heater, 1999).

Changing forms of Affiliation: inclusive policies make sense!

Citizenship is not only about the enjoyment of rights as a full member of a political community (Marshall, 1950) and the performance of duties; it also confers an identity and a feeling of solidarity with other citizens. Thus, it can be argued that being a citizen is far from the aspiration of having more rights in today's post-modern world. It has also become a tool in the quest for recognition of one's differences, be they religious, ethnic, linguistic or other (İşin, 2008). Citizenship defines who belongs to the political community and who is excluded, who is welcome as a fellow citizen, and who remains an outsider. Besides, new social movements have also brought about the development of different layers of rights apart from

civil, political and social rights, such as cultural and ecological rights (Turner, 1990 and 1993).

Soysal (1994) argues that national citizenship has lost its importance in the post-modern era since some of the basic rights, namely social and civil rights linked to the institution of citizenship, are now given automatically by post-modern membership to those who are not even the citizens of a specific nation-state. This is what Hammar (1990) calls 'denizenship', which is granting migrants civil, social and cultural rights, but not political ones. Apart from political rights, all other rights are secured by international institutions and, therefore, it is argued that the nation-state has recently lost its power-stick of loyalty for its members. Moreover, Soysal (1994) points out the fact that increasing restrictiveness is a common feature of European immigration laws, especially for non-EU migrants. However, the complicated process of citizenship acquisition is still questionable under these conditions.

We believe that an empirical analysis which investigates the impact of citizenship on the socio-economic integration and affiliation of migrants is promising and timely. Besides, it is plausible to deal with migrants with the same country of origin in terms of overcoming the measurement problems raised by comparison of different migrant groups, although general conclusions cannot be drawn without caution from this study with regard to the situation of other migrant groups.

In the light of the literature review, this paper will argue that the institution of national citizenship did not actually lose its importance but has even required further substance for the emergence of a more cohesive and egalitarian society. By providing a link between the two streams of the literature, this paper aims to analyze the impact of citizenship on employment probabilities and different affiliations of Turkish-origin immigrant populations settled in Germany and France together with revealing the link between employment and citizenship status from an empirical perspective. Although it is argued that post-national membership already provides many social, civil, cultural and ecological rights to migrant populations, which causes devaluation in the importance of holding national citizenship for those migrants, we claim that the institute of citizenship still has power over the social, political and economic integration and assimilation of migrants if the subjective evaluations of migrants towards their own affiliations are taken into consideration. Therefore, citizenship continues to be an important instrument for governments to provide incentives for the migrant population to make them more attached to their countries of residence and more active in the economic setting of the host country. Hence, empirical analysis which investigates the impact of citizenship on socio-economic integration is essential. Besides, it is also conceivable to deal

with immigrants with the same country of origin, but with two different countries of residence (Germany and France), in terms of overcoming the measurement problems raised by the comparison of different migrant groups in such analyses, although general conclusions cannot be drawn from it for the situations of other migrant groups.

Since the paper focuses on the impact of citizenship on both social and economic integration of migrants of Turkish origin residing in Germany and France, the following sections will review the relevant literature and the historical developments in the institution of citizenship in both countries. Subsequently, we will describe the data and econometric methodology used in our analysis. Consequently, the results of our analysis will be presented in the last section.

Increasing flows of international migration from the third-world countries to some European countries in the aftermath of WWII gave rise to the formation of a new type of membership in the European nation-states. These flows caused local people to face new ethno-cultural and religious identities in a way that brought about a need for immigrants to be respected through their differences by the receiving majority societies. The increasing intervention of international institutions in securing the social and civil rights of immigrants brings up various doubts about the importance of the national citizenship institution for immigrants themselves. Soysal (1994: 119) claims that "the scope and the inventory of non-citizens' rights do not differ significantly from those of citizens, and the rights of non-citizens are increasingly standardized across host policies." Thus, according to this analysis, it seems that migrant origin workers do not need national citizenship in their destination countries in order to have membership rights and privileges. However, we argue that it should be the aim of destination countries to establish optimal migration policies, which should include easing citizenship acquisition to those immigrants who already have rights and privileges of citizenship via their mode of residence, since this will provide them with greater incentive to be more closely connected to the native society.

<p><i>Hypothesis 1: More inclusionary policies lead migrants and their descendants to be more affiliated with receiving countries.</i></p>
--

Segregationist and Integrationist Models at Work: Germany and France

A question often heard when any revision of citizenship is suggested is: "What about our national identity?" In fact, citizenship and nation are two imbricate institutions. National identity, like all other identities, is dynamic, fluid and syncretic, and should not be

prescribed. Our identity, be it national, individual, political, communal or ethnic, is shaped by the acts of recognition, unrecognition or misrecognition of "others" (Taylor 1994: 25). The human mind develops in a dialogical way, but not in a monological way. We can construct our identities only if we are able to experience others' reactions to our attitudes and behavior. Thus, it is impossible to build an identity without a dialogue with the "other." If a nation prescribes a holistic notion of culture², then it would be remarkably difficult for newcomer groups to incorporate themselves into the existing social and political system without major resistance from the majority society. Prescribing, thus essentializing, the nation may inevitably lead its members not to recognize newcomers whom they consider to be ethno-culturally and religiously different. Unrecognition of newcomers may result in the construction of radical and centrifugal identities, and thus in conflict. In other words, as Kymlicka and Norman have remarked, "immigrant groups that feel alienated from the larger national identity are likely to be alienated from the political arena as well" (2000: 39). Traditional citizenship rhetoric is inclined to advance the interests of the dominant national group at the expense of immigrant origin populations as well as native ethno-cultural and religious minorities.

The idea of the nation-state, originating from the holistic notion of culture, is essentially rooted in a "name," a common ancestry, a set of common historical memories and myths, a national anthem, a common territory for which the "forefathers" have died, a national economy, and a set of common legal rights and duties (Smith, 1995). Accordingly, foreigners such as 'guest workers,' asylum seekers or refugees, who migrated to the West in large numbers during the post-war era, have been somehow excluded from civil, social, political and cultural rights. It should be kept in mind that traditional citizenship rhetoric is inclined to advance the interests of the dominant national group at the expense of immigrant origin populations as well as native ethno-cultural and religious minorities. The model of national citizenship, which is linked to territorialized notions of cultural belonging and primordial loyalty, has been dominant during the period of massive migration since the turn of the twentieth century. However, the recent experience of transnational migrant workers reflects "a time when national citizenship is losing ground to a more universal model of membership, anchored in deterritorialized notions of persons' rights" (Soysal 1994: 3).

Although permanent residents, *denizens*, have certain privileges of having civil, social, ecological and cultural rights, which may lead one to argue that granting them citizenship will

not improve their rights and, therefore, there is no need to privilege them with citizenship, our empirical analysis shows that acquiring citizenship has a positive impact on the social assimilation of immigrants towards their country of settlement.

In Germany, non-EU immigrants and even their offspring were not easily able to obtain citizenship until the year 2000, and this exclusionary discourse of citizenship caused Turkish origin immigrants to strengthen their ethnic capital both in Germany and across the national borders (Kaya, 2009; Joppke, 2005). The new law has partially changed the principle of descent (*jus sanguinis*) that has so far been the country's traditional basis for granting citizenship. Now, it is also possible to acquire German citizenship as a result of being born in Germany (*jus soli*). According to the new law, children who are born in Germany to foreign nationals will receive German citizenship when one of the respective child's parents has resided lawfully in Germany for at least eight years and holds entitlement to residence, or has an unlimited residence permit for at least three years. Under the new law, such children acquire German citizenship at birth. The new law also created a transitional arrangement for children up to the age of 10 who were born in Germany before the 'Act to Amend the Nationality Law' was enacted, according to which those children were entitled to automatic naturalization. In most cases, they also acquire their parents' citizenship under the principle of descent. Such children now have to decide within five years of turning 18 - before their 23rd birthday - whether they want to retain their German citizenship or not. They must opt for one of their two nationalities.³

It is apparent that the number of 'foreigners' applying for naturalization in Germany has greatly increased since the introduction of the new citizenship laws. For instance, while the number of Turkish origin immigrants who were naturalized before 2000 was around 300 thousand, now this number has almost tripled and become more than 900 thousand in ten years. The new citizenship laws permit the descendants of Turkish migrants to acquire dual citizenship for at least a certain period of time. The present legal reforms enable German-born 'foreigners' to go beyond their previously defined 'denizen' status (Joppke, 2005). They can thus enjoy political as well as civic, social, cultural and environmental rights. Hence, the present German citizenship laws have created a possibility for the introduction of a kind of limited "hyphenated" citizenship for non-European 'foreigners' as well as for those of Turkish origin. The partial introduction of the principle of *jus soli* clearly indicates that the definition of Germanness is no longer limited to ethnic descent. It also suggests that ethnically non-German and non-European members of the Federal Republic can be incorporated into the political sphere through civic channels.

One could argue that citizenship reforms in Germany have become more restrictive since 2000 due to concerns about terrorism, Muslim origin immigrants and adherence to Western values. The introduction of the ‘attitude test’ (*Gesinnungstest*) by the state of Baden-Württemberg in 2006 was the first step towards a more restrictive regime of citizenship towards Muslim-origin migrants and their descendants, who are asked for their views on issues like domestic violence, arranged marriages, religious freedom and terrorism.⁴ The citizenship test became a national exercise in August 2007 as the amended Nationality Act came into effect. It was stated by the Federal Ministry of the Interior that knowledge of German civic values will now be required for naturalization. The definition of civic values includes having basic knowledge of the legal and social order and the way of life in Germany as well as competency in the national language (Federal Ministry of the Interior, 2007). The 2007 amendments mark a setback from the 2000 Citizenship Law in the sense that this new civic-based citizenship has now turned the pre-2000 blood-based restriction on citizenship into a restriction based on ‘values’. The so-called civic integration seems to be discriminatory to Muslims, who are negatively targeted as an ethnic group in Europe under the guise of liberalism (Joppke, 2007). Stigmatization of migrants of Turkish origin still remains the same. In his critique of Thilo Sarrazin’s highly polemical book *Germany Does Away With Itself* (*Deutschland schafft sich ab*, 2010), Habermas (2010) states that German *Leitkultur* (leading culture) is recently being defined not by “German culture” but by religion: “With an arrogant appropriation of Judaism — and an incredible disregard for the fate the Jews suffered in Germany — the apologists of the *Leitkultur* now appeal to the ‘Judeo-Christian tradition,’ which distinguishes ‘us’ from foreigners.” Referring to genetic arguments, Sarrazin claims in his book that the future of Germany is threatened by the wrong kind of immigrants, especially from Muslim countries. Although his arguments are based on conventional racist rhetoric, he was highly credited by German society for securitizing citizenship (Habermas, 2010). His racist arguments were later followed by German Chancellor Angela Merkel’s discourse on the end of multiculturalism in contemporary Germany, and Bavarian Prime Minister Horst Seehofer’s hate speech against migrants coming from Turkey and Arab countries (Habermas, 2010).

Unlike Germany, France has historically defined citizenship in political rather than ethno-cultural terms since the French Revolution, and invited all foreigners, "Friends of Liberty", to join the French State. The decree of 26 August 1792 granted French citizenship to foreigners who by their writings or acts had defended liberty and the principles of the revolution. Alongside the principle of *jus sanguinis* attributing automatically citizenship to

those born in France to French parents, the revolutionaries attributed to the principle of *jus soli* specific conditions which guaranteed attachment and loyalty to France. The dominance of the principle of *jus soli* has remained the same since the revolution. While the 1851 citizenship law gave French citizenship to third-generation immigrants, the 1889 citizenship legislation automatically attributed French citizenship to second-generation immigrants (Brubaker, 1992: 85-86). The 1889 law, with small modifications, still exists today. French citizenship law contains two provisions embodying the principle of *jus soli*: Article 23, attributing citizenship at birth to third-generation immigrants, and Article 44, attributing citizenship at age 18 to second-generation immigrants born in France and resident there since aged 13, provided they have not opted out of French citizenship during the preceding year and they have not been convicted of certain crimes. French citizenship law also permits double citizenship.

Despite its embracing integrationist policies vis-à-vis migrants and their descendants, French citizenship law has lately been criticized by nationalists for turning foreigners into French citizens on paper without making sure that they were "French at heart" (*Français de Coeur*). Nationalist critiques of the *jus soli* principle have become even stronger since the early 1990s, when so-called Islamic fundamentalism has been escalating in the West (Kaya, 2009).

For a century, France has defined second generation immigrants as citizens. This practice was uncontested until recently. In the mid-1980s, however, *jus soli* came under sharp attack from the far right. "*Etre Français, cela se mérite*" (To be French, you have to deserve it), proclaimed Jean-Marie Le Pen's National Front. Under pressure from the National Front, the center-right parties took up the theme during the 1986 legislative campaign, proposing in their joint platform to denounce 'automatic' acquisitions of French citizenship. Second generation immigrants would no longer become French *jus soli*, they would have to express a demand for French nationality, which would have to be accepted by the state. In the late 1980s, the government of Jacques Chirac proposed to limit the *jus soli* principle as far as immigrants were concerned. Yet the proposal provoked strong opposition and was eventually withdrawn from the legislative agenda. A commission of enquiry was set up, which put forward the idea of extending rather than further restricting access to French citizenship (Brubaker, 1992: 138). The Commission's report formed the basis for Law No 93.933, in force since July 22nd, 1993. The most important reform introduced the notion of consent by stating that "persons born in France of foreign parents can acquire French citizenship between the ages of 16 and 21 by declaration if the five years residence requirement and the non-

convictions required are satisfied." Persons who have expressly declined French citizenship during the year preceding their majority and persons who have been convicted of certain crimes are excluded from this provision.

In France, naturalization is secondary to the acquisition of citizenship. In contrast to the declaration, the naturalization procedure is discretionary, i.e., subject to the control and approval of the administration. The naturalization procedure in France requires five years of permanent residence, majority, linguistic competence, assimilation into the French community, and good morals and customs, meaning no prison sentences of more than six months or offences or crimes against State security. Unlike many other countries, France does not require candidates for naturalization to renounce their original citizenship. The requirements for naturalization are founded on a presumption of assimilation, attachment and loyalty of foreigners settled in France. Thus, the administration usually rejects demands of naturalization by foreigners whose family members live abroad.

Hypothesis 2: Long-lasting exclusionary migration and integration policies of Germany and inclusionary policies of France make migrants and their descendants make French-Turks more affiliated with France and German-Turks less affiliated with Germany.

Economic Integration: Employment and Citizenship

The literature in political science mainly focused on the importance of the citizenship institution and the concept of citizenship itself for a long time (cf., *inter alia*, Marshall, 1950; Turner, 1990; Brubaker, 1992; Taylor, 1994; and Soysal, 1994). On the other hand, the literature on the economics of citizenship has recently emerged, and mainly explores the impact of political and social integration of immigrants on their economic outcomes without necessarily questioning the determinants of social and political integration (*inter alia*, Bratsberg et al., 2002; Scott, 2006; Zimmermann, 2007). The literature on the economics of citizenship can be divided into two main parts. On the one hand, there is a literature which focuses on the earnings catch-up of immigrants that we could describe as “economic assimilation research.” On the other hand, there is another stream of literature which focuses on the economic impact of citizenship on earnings and employment.

Chiswick (1978) analyzes the economic integration of immigrants in the sense that he looks at the convergence between earnings of native and immigrant workers, and finds out that the positive impact of naturalization on earnings fades away when it is controlled by the years of residence. Besides, Bratsberg et al. (2002) have revealed a positive impact of citizenship acquisition on the earnings of the immigrant male population. All these

implications lead to policy suggestions towards easing the citizenship acquisition of migrants. DeVoretz and Pivenko (2006) also analyze the impact of naturalization on wages in the Canadian case and find a positive relation between citizenship and wages of immigrants. However, they do not control the endogeneity problem. Furthermore, Steinhardt (2008) finds that naturalization plays a crucial role by increasing the labor market opportunities of immigrants in Germany, and he employs both cross-sectional and panel-data settings. Bratsberg et al. (2002) and Scott (2006) also find a positive effect of naturalization on earnings of immigrants in the USA and Sweden, respectively.

Although there is a considerable amount of knowledge about the economic assimilation of migrants and the impact of naturalization on the economic integration of immigrants, there is a lack of information on this issue with regard to the immigrants in European countries. Steinhardt (2008) looks at this impact for Germany and concludes that citizenship matters. In our study, we focus on Turkish immigrants both in Germany and France. Our results for Germany confirm the results of Steinhardt (2008). Last but not least, Euwals, Dagevos, Gijsberts and Roodenburg (2010) try to investigate the impact of citizenship on the labor markets using survey data on Turkish immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands. However, they do not deal with the reverse causality problem in their empirical analysis. To our knowledge, there are no other empirical studies focusing on the impact of naturalization in France. Moreover, as Dustmann (1996) also points out, there is little information about the socio-cultural assimilation of immigrants, although it breaks down the barriers to full economic participation. By exploring the migrants' subjective feelings of integration, he provides an empirical analysis of the determinants of their integration using data on Germany. DeVoretz (2008) focuses on the developments of the research in the economics of immigrants' citizenship acquisition and on the importance of interdisciplinary research on this topic. He also analyzes whether naturalized German citizens earn higher incomes and concludes that there are significant economic gains from citizenship ascension. Since the related literature underlines the importance of the social integration of immigrants, it is necessary to analyze the determinants of affiliations of migrants, which will have a direct or indirect effect on their economic integration together with the achievement of a more cohesive society in the destination countries.

Although there are different aspects of a comprehensive answer to the question, "Why does integration of immigrants matter?" it can be argued that the main reason is to have a more cohesive society, which brings out some positive outcomes like economic and fiscal contributions of migrant origin individuals. Knowledge about the determinants of different

affiliations of immigrants is also important to explain and foresee migrants' return behavior, to shape political, social and migration policy debates. Moreover, the pervasive belief of migrants being problematic for many European countries can only be confirmed with the research on the subject.

Zimmermann (2007), for example, analyzes the economic impact of integration, and concludes that integrated migrants have more global opportunities and better employment and income potentials. Moreover, participation in the labor market can be seen as an indicator of economic success in the destination countries, which also has many positive spillover effects in terms of the integration of migrants to the society, such as improving welfare, becoming familiar with the culture of the receiving society, and so on. Furthermore, Bauböck (2005) argues that political integration of immigrants was the main motivation factor in non-citizen franchise for Scandinavia and the Netherlands. Besides, Walters, Phythian and Anisef (2007) try to identify the link between ethnic identity, economic success and other determinants of ethnic identity using cross-sectional data. They found out that citizenship status has high relevance in adopting the identity of their host country.

Hypothesis 3: Since citizenship ownership sends a signal to employers about the lower probability of return behavior of migrants and their descendants together with the satisfaction of the other eligibility criteria, especially for the first generation immigrants, it increases the probability of being employed.

Data and Methodology

Data used in the empirical analysis is obtained from the results of structured interviews⁵ conducted with 1,065 interlocutors in Germany (2004) and 600 in France (2004). However, the total number of observations is a reduced size of this whole dataset, because we had to exclude from the data people who had already applied but were still waiting for citizenship, so as not to cause any bias in our results. Pooled data is used in the empirical analysis in order to increase the number of observations for the analysis. It is also crucial to note that the questionnaires and the data collection method were the same in both countries, which enables the comparability of the survey data between France and Germany. A detailed description of the data and the manner in which it was collected is provided in the Appendix. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics about the main variables that are used in the analysis.

The aim of the empirical section is to explore the link between citizenship acquisition and socio-economic integration of immigrants in their destination countries after controlling

for a range of individual characteristics and country fixed-effects. In the first subsection of the empirical part, we would like to analyze the impact of having citizenship of the destination countries on the engagement of different affiliation⁶ types of the immigrant population after controlling other potential determinants of a migrant's affiliation. Therefore, our dependent variables will be the four affiliation types which are actually derived from subjective answers to the question, “Do you feel yourself affiliated closer with the destination country or with Turkey?” If the interlocutor who is interviewed answered that s/he feels closer to Turkey, then her/his affiliation is classified as *segregated*. If the answer favors the receiving country instead of the home country, then s/he classified as *assimilated*. If the interviewee says that s/he feels equally close to both destination country and Turkey then s/he classified as *integrated*. Lastly, s/he is classified as *marginalized* if s/he feels equally distant from both countries. As we mentioned earlier, this classification is in accordance with the acculturation model of Berry (1997). Although we know that socio-cultural integration is a more complex phenomenon than what this model suggests, we used it in order to be in line with the literature.

[Table 1 about here]

In the second part of the empirical analysis, we estimate the impact of citizenship on the employment probabilities of immigrants in their destination countries. Employment variable is a dummy variable which is equal to 1 if the respondent reported to be working. Students, housewives and retired people are excluded from this sample even if they may have part-time employment. As it can be realized already, there is a potential problem of endogeneity in estimating both cases. For the impact of citizenship on affiliation types, one can argue that, although a person's status of membership affects her/his attitude towards the society s/he lives in, the opposite may also be true. For example, people who are assimilated in the destination country could be eager to obtain citizenship of the country of residence. Moreover, one can argue that employed people would like to apply for citizenship since it would be easier for them to be naturalized. Due to this potential reverse causality problem, we decided to use second-stage procedure for our multinomial-probit and probit models, which led us to choose a reliable and valid instrument for the citizenship variable. In other words, instruments should have a high correlation with the potentially endogenous variable but should not have a correlation with the error term.

We used a dummy for immigrants who immigrated due to family reunification as an instrument for citizenship variable in both analyses. For both of the countries concerned, family reunification is a facilitating source of naturalization. However, it is not easy to talk

about a direct impact of it, either on affiliation types or employment probability. One may argue that immigrants who came to the host country by means of family reunification would have a better environment in which to be integrated or assimilated, because the people who had immigrated before them can be a good example in showing how to socialize and integrate in the receiving country. However, this mechanism could work in other ways as well, and one may argue that early immigrants could result in segregation of the later-comers if they were not successful in their integration process. We also used other instruments for the robustness analysis, such as the year of eligibility for citizenship considering the minimum years of residence for naturalization in both countries. A similar instrument is also used by Bevelander and Pendakur (2009) in their analysis of the impact of citizenship on the employment probabilities of the migrant population in Sweden. We also used instruments such as dummy variables for the return decisions of migrants and some indicators for the economic well-being of migrants. However, the instrument that we chose to use provides the best statistics in terms of first-stage results and, moreover, it has the advantage in comparison to the other instruments in terms of its economic validity, since the above mentioned instruments have a direct link with the social and economic integration of immigrants. All in all, we can say that lack of availability of a more relevant and valid instrument makes it difficult to talk about a causal link, but rather we can interpret more on the correlation outcomes.

Since we have four separate affiliation groups, the multinomial probit model is employed in analyzing the impact of citizenship on these affiliation types. However, in the analysis of the effect of citizenship on employment probability, we employ the probit model since our dependent variable is a binomial one. Moreover, Mallar (1977)'s procedure is employed in both estimations to find efficient and consistent results from the regression analysis, because the endogenous dummy variable (citizenship status) is a discrete variable. Following Mallar's procedure we first run first-stage probit regressions using the instruments and all the other explanatory variables;

$$P(\text{CITIZENSHIP}|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = P(\text{CITIZENSHIP} = 1|\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{z}) = \Phi\{\text{constant} + \text{FE}_c + \mathbf{x}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}\boldsymbol{\delta}\}$$

where \mathbf{x} represents the vector of exogenous explanatory variables, \mathbf{z} is the vector of the instruments, and FE_c stands for the country fixed effects. Φ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function (cdf), which is strictly between zero and one for all values of the parameters. An index of linear prediction of the endogenous variable is constructed from the first-stage results. It is important to note that index is a linear function of all exogenous explanatory variables but not the predicted probability of a 1-outcome of the first-stage dependent variable. In other words, the index is the estimation of CITIZENSHIP* from the

first-stage probit but not the estimate of $CITIZENSHIP = 1[CITIZENSHIP^* > 0]$. After obtaining the linear index from the first-stage, we substitute this index for the endogenous variable in the second-stage estimation, and then maximize the marginal likelihood function with respect to the structural parameters.

$$P(y|\mathbf{x}, CITIZENSHIP^*) = P(y = 1|x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k, CITIZENSHIP^*) \\ = \Phi\{\text{constant} + FE_c + \mathbf{x}\beta + \delta CITIZENSHIP^*\}$$

This method provides consistent estimates with large samples. However, we need to take care with the reliability of standard errors and t-statistics since performing the second-stage procedure manually is likely to give unreliable standard errors. Re-sampling the whole procedure takes place by means of bootstrap. Thus, valid standard errors are obtained by estimating the same equation using different samples drawn from the original data, which is assumed to be a population; bootstrap standard errors are the sample standard deviations of the parameter obtained from the repeated re-sampling and estimation as the number of bootstrap replications (Wooldridge, 2009). In estimations, we employed 300 bootstrap replications. The number of replications is arbitrarily chosen, however the idea is that the higher the number of replications, the better would be the estimate of standard errors.

Results

In this section, we will present the results of the empirical analysis. Firstly, the impact of citizenship on different affiliations will be summarized. Subsequently, the link between employment probability of migrants and their citizenship status will be revealed.

Impact of Citizenship on Different Affiliations

In our multinomial probit models, we aim to find the determinants of response probabilities, or in other words, if a person defines himself/herself as segregated, assimilated, integrated or marginalized:

$$P(y_i|\mathbf{x}, CITIZENSHIP^*) = \Phi\{\alpha_0 + \alpha_c + \alpha_1 CITIZENSHIP^* + \alpha_2 \text{network} + \alpha_3 \text{gender} + \alpha_4 \text{age} + \alpha_5 \text{agesq} + \alpha_6 \text{foreignlang}_{\text{rw}} + \alpha_7 \text{foreignlang}_{\text{us}} + \sum_{i=8}^{10} \alpha_i \text{educationlevel} + \alpha_{11} \text{socialactivity}\}, i = a, i, s \text{ and } m,$$

where **a**, **i**, **s** and **m** stand for four different affiliation types, respectively for assimilation, integration, segregation and marginalization. **x** is the full set of explanatory variables. α_0 and α_c are constant and country fixed effects, respectively. As in the previous section,

CITIZENSHIP* is the linear prediction of citizenship variable from the first-stage regression. The variable **network** indicates whether immigrants had a member of the family or friend before migrating to the host country. **gender** is a dummy variable, which is equal to 1 if the migrant is male. **age** is a continuous variable for the age of the respondent and **agesq** is the squared transformation of the variable age, which is added to include the concavity of the age value into estimation. Moreover, **foreignlang_{rw}** and **foreignlang_{us}** are, respectively, the dummy variable for the reading and writing ability of the respondent in the language of destination country, and a dummy variable for the understanding and speaking ability of the language used in the receiving country. Furthermore, $\sum_{i=8}^{10} \beta_i \text{education_level}$ stands for the dummy variables stating the latest education diploma for the immigrant (lower secondary, upper secondary and tertiary education). The excluded category for the education level is primary level and, therefore, estimation results for the different categories should be compared to the excluded category. Lastly, the **socialactivity** variable indicates whether or not the respondent is participating in social activities in the host country.

Assuming that response probability will be nonlinear in the set of explanatory variables, and further assuming that this non-linear function will have standard normal cumulative distribution function, we decided to use the multinomial probit model. It is also important to note that our interest in the regressions is not coefficients from the regressions above. Rather, we presented average partial effects for each explanatory. Moreover, it could also be argued that there is a probability for movements among these different classifications of affiliations over time. However, this intermingling will not be considered due to the cross-sectional structure of our data. Being aware of this obstacle, we believe that cross-sectional analysis will provide hints for further research on the same topic. Tables 2a and 2b present the marginal effects from each regression equation.

In Table 2a, we present marginal effects from multinomial probit estimations and in Table 2b, we give marginal effects from two-stage multinomial probit results where we control the endogeneity problem. As can be seen from Table 2a, for those who have citizenship of the country they live in, marginal effect on their segregation is -.129. Thus, citizenship has negative and significant causal impact on segregation of immigrants and their descendants from the destination country. The impact of citizenship on the probability of being assimilated is also found to be significantly positive. The same impact is positive but not statistically significant for the integration of migrants. Lastly, according to IV-multinomial probit results, it is revealed that citizenship possession has a negative impact on the probability of being marginalized after controlling the reverse causality. Thus, it can be

said that citizenship status has undeniable impact on the different affiliation categories of migrants and their descendants, thus our Hypothesis 1 is satisfied.

[Table 2a about here]

Moreover, for those migrants who already have a family member preceding their migration, it is discovered that there is a negative average marginal effect on migrants' segregation, although it is not statistically significant. The same effect is found to be positive and statistically significant for the marginalization probability of migrants when we control the endogeneity in Table 2b. This is an important finding, since it can lead to an argument that ethnic capital may be harmful for the integration process of migrants and, therefore, destination countries could try to find some ways to cope with this issue. In this regard, the exclusionary ghettoization politics of many destination countries is open to revision.

When we look at the impact of gender in multinomial probit regression, it is discovered that men on average have .074 percentage points more probability of being segregated and .066 percentage points less probability of being less integrated into the society in comparison to women. This could be due to the fact that they are more incorporated into ethnic labor markets in destination countries instead of working in mainstream jobs, and thus have less interaction with the receiving society as a whole. Furthermore, the impact of higher level of education (both upper secondary and tertiary levels) in comparison to the primary school educated migrants is positively correlated with segregation, and is found to be negatively correlated with the assimilation of migrants according to the IV-multinomial estimation results.

[Table 2b about here]

Moreover, language proficiency in speaking and understanding is found to have a positive effect on the assimilation probability of migrants. On the other hand, reading and writing abilities have significantly positive impact on the integration probability of migrants. And lastly, all kinds of language abilities were found to be negatively and significantly important for the segregation probability of migrants, which is understandable since it enables immigrants to communicate better with their surroundings. Furthermore, country dummy reveals that, everything else controlled, immigrants in France have less probability of being segregated in comparison to their counterparts in Germany according to the IV-multinomial probit model. Interestingly, it is also revealed that immigrants in France have a higher probability of being integrated in comparison to migrants in Germany. These findings are also in line with our hypothesis 1.

Impact of Citizenship on Employment Probability

In this part, we implement again Mallar (1977)'s procedure of two-stage using probit regressions in the second-stage of the estimation. Dependent variable and regressors are as in the equation below, and their definitions are the same as in the previous section:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\text{Employment} = 1 | \mathbf{x}, \text{CITIZENSHIP}^*) \\ = \Phi\{\beta_0 + \beta_c + \beta_1 \text{CITIZENSHIP}^* + \beta_2 \text{network} + \beta_3 \text{gender} + \beta_4 \text{age} + \beta_5 \text{agesq} \\ + \beta_6 \text{foreignlang}_{\text{rw}} + \beta_7 \text{foreignlang}_{\text{us}} + \sum_{\{i=8\}}^{10} \beta_i \text{education_level} \\ + \beta_{11} \text{socialactivity}\} \end{aligned}$$

In Table 3, we present the marginal effects from the three estimation models. In column 1, probit estimation results are presented, and in column 2, IV-probit results are given. Lastly, in column 3 we repeated the IV-probit estimation by excluding the education dummies as control variables, because there could be strong incentive to acquire human capital if they are planning to apply for citizenship. It can be observed from the comparison of column 2 and column 3 that there is no significant impact of excluding education categories from the regression.

[Table 3 about here]

As can be seen from Table 3, citizenship ownership has a positive and significant impact on the probability of employment for immigrants in IV specifications. For the age structure, it is seen that increase in the average age (see Table 1) has a positive impact on the probability of being employed up to a threshold level, and then affects negatively due to a significant and negative coefficient of age squared. Moreover, men are found to have greater likelihood to be employed. This could be due to the educational difference between men and women, or because of the patriarchal family structure of the Turkish origin immigrants, which is more likely to imprison women at home to deal with housework. Furthermore, education level is found to have a positive impact on the employment probability in probit estimations. For the IV estimations, we could not find significant results for the employment probabilities of migrants. In addition, country dummy indicates that it is easier for migrants to be employed in France than in Germany. This could be due to inclusionary policies of France towards immigrants. To sum up, naturalization has a positive impact on the labor market position of immigrants after controlling for other personal characteristics, and this confirms our Hypothesis 3 above.

Conclusion

As we have discussed earlier, citizenship defines who belongs to the political community and who is excluded, who is welcome as a fellow citizen and who remains an outsider. Therefore, the institution of national citizenship could provide migrants with an incentive to be both socially and politically more attached to the country of residence. As it is well-documented by the migration studies literature, social integration of migrants in terms of having better knowledge of the language of the country they live in, and being more acquainted with the social norms in the society can have positive impacts on their integration to the labor markets in their destination countries. In that sense, it would be interesting to see if citizenship has a positive spillover impact on economic integration by strengthening social integration and/or assimilation. However, this does not necessarily mean that linguistic and cultural integration automatically results in economic integration of immigrant origin populations. One should remember that the unemployment rate in France in the late 1990s among university graduates of French ethnic origin is 5%, and 27% among the North African origin university graduates (Noiriel, 1998; Kaya, 2009).⁷ This ratio is much higher than it is in Germany (4% and 12%), Belgium (5% and 15%), and the Netherlands (3% and 12%).⁸

In the empirical analysis, we have found a statistically significant impact of citizenship on both affiliations and economic integration of immigrant origin populations. These findings render citizenship policies crucial for the incorporation policies of Germany and France vis-a-vis immigrants and their descendants. Citizenship procedures should be eased in both countries, at least for those immigrants and their descendants who have strong affiliation with their country of residence. It was also revealed that loyalty and attachment to the country of residence by means of citizenship attainment is likely to have a great impact on the social and economic integration of migrants and their descendants.

Appendix

TABLE 1: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS*

	Full Sample	Germany	Germany (citizens only)	France	France (citizens only)
# Observations	1544	991	279	553	215
Age**	36.15	36.52	32.48	35.51	30.19
Gender (=1 if male)	54.08	54.79	47.31	52.80	50.70
Language Proficiency					
Reading and writing (good)	53.89	55.60	78.06	50.59	78.31
Speaking and understanding (good)	57.06	57.98	79.57	55.37	82.63
Network (=1 if exists)	79.73	82.44	93.55	74.86	81.86
Education Level***					
Primary	23.19	20.68	7.53	27.67	10.70
Lower Secondary	26.68	32.90	37.63	15.55	12.56
Upper Secondary	35.43	33.70	44.80	38.52	55.35
Tertiary	9.84	8.48	8.60	12.30	20
Social Activities (=1 if participated)	35.30	38.55	40.86	29.48	29.77
Citizenship					
Nationality of the host country	31.99	28.15	100	38.88	100
Employment (=1 if employed)	44.55	38.83	46.95	54.79	55.81
Affiliation Types					
Segregated	45.14	50.35	29.03	35.80	21.86
Assimilated	22.47	21.19	36.20	24.77	29.30
Integrated	29.47	25.63	30.82	48.14	46.98
Marginalized	2.91	2.82	3.94	3.07	1.86
First Generation	66.39	64.89	44.44	69.08	39.53
Second Generation	33.61	35.11	55.56	30.92	60.46

*Values represent percentages out of total population in each sample.

** Mean age for each group.

***Educational level categories are exclusionary but the total may not give 100 percent since there could be some missing in the data or people without a diploma.

TABLE 2a: AVERAGE MARGINAL EFFECTS FROM MULTINOMIAL PROBIT REGRESSIONS

	SEGREGATION	ASSIMILATION	INTEGRATION	MARGINALIZATION
Age	-.003	.005	-.002	-.000
Age squared	.000	-.000	.000	-.000
Gender (=1 if male)	.074**	-.007	-.066**	-.0003
Language Proficiency				
Reading and writing (good)	-.059**	.0001	.057**	.001
Speaking and understanding (good)	-.069**	.051**	.021	-.002
Network (=1 if exists)	-.027	.042	-.025	.010
Education Level				
Lower Secondary	-.013	-.010	.013	.010
Upper Secondary	.050	-.086**	.026	.009
Tertiary	.106**	-.133**	.039	-.012
Social Activities (=1 if participated)	-.023	-.011	.032	.001
Citizenship				
Nationality of the host country	-.129***	.103***	.026	-.001
Country Dummy (=1 if France)	-.140	.030	.107***	.002
# Observations	1485	1485	1485	1485

TABLE 2b: AVERAGE MARGINAL EFFECTS FROM IV-MULTINOMIAL PROBIT REGRESSIONS

	SEGREGATION	ASSIMILATION	INTEGRATION	MARGINALIZATION
Age	-.009	.012**	-.002	-.001
Age squared	.0001*	-.0002**	.000	.000
Gender (=1 if male)	.041	.040	-.066**	-.016
Language Proficiency				
Reading and writing (good)	-.068**	.008	.058**	.001
Speaking and understanding (good)	-.074**	.051**	.024	-.001
Network (=1 if exists)	.033	-.039	-.028	.034*
Education Level				
Lower Secondary	.104	-.160**	.004	.052*
Upper Secondary	.202**	-.285***	.015	.068*
Tertiary	.273**	-.346***	.024	.047
Social Activities (=1 if participated)	-.011	-.027	.032	.005
Citizenship				
Nationality of the host country	-.180**	.228**	.014	-.061*
Country Dummy (=1 if France)	-.086*	-.048	.106**	.027*
# Observations	1485	1485	1485	1485
Bootstrap Replications	300	300	300	255

TABLE 3: MARGINAL EFFECTS FOR EMPLOYMENT PROBABILITY

	PROBIT	IV-PROBIT1	IV-PROBIT2
Age	.054***	.051***	.051***
Age squared	-.001***	-.001***	-.001***
Gender (=1 if male)	.283***	.372***	.340***
Language Proficiency			
Reading and writing (good)	-.016	-.098*	-.069**
Speaking and understanding (good)	.069**	-.008	.023
Network (=1 if exists)	.001	-.089	.046
Education Level			
Lower Secondary	.072*	-.042	--
Upper Secondary	.084**	-.086	--
Tertiary	.034	-.111	--
Social Activities (=1 if participated)	.021	.009	.060
Citizenship			
Nationality of the host country	.037	.347*	.211**
Country Dummy (=1 if France)	.149***	.001	.062*
# Observations	1483	1483	1483
Bootstrap Replications	-	300	300

Data Collection

Survey data were collected for a research project of Kaya and Kentel (2005). Questions of the structured surveys were prepared by Ayhan Kaya and Ferhat Kentel, and later discussed with some colleagues, representatives of the Open Society Institute, Heinrich Böll and also with some related academics during the qualitative research period in Germany and France. The research team, with the assistance of the Veri Araştırma Data Processing Company, set up a quota sampling in both countries, paying particular attention to the density of population of Turkish origin in the urban space and rural space. The quota sampling covered the variables of age, gender, occupation and region in order to gather a representative picture of the Euro-Turks. Interviews resulted in the collection of 1,065 questionnaires in Germany and 600 in France by teams of local research companies, Gelszus GmbH (Hamburg) and Socioscan (Paris), in collaboration with Veri Araştırma. The selection of the interviewers and the methods of interview were supervised by Veri Araştırma in order to ensure that bilingual

Turkish interviewers were employed, and interviews were properly conducted. Veri Araştırma also organized orientation programs in both countries for the interviewers in order to equip them with some essential interviewing techniques and information. The interview consisted of 90 questions. It was been reported that the average duration of the interviews was around 30 minutes. Interviewers were also given a German/French translation of the questions to be used in the event of any participant preferring to communicate in either language. With respect to gender and age, it was attempted to obtain a representative selection of Euro-Turks.

Bibliography

- Bauböck, Rainer. "Citizenship Policies: International, state, migrant and democratic perspectives." *Global Migration Perspectives Paper Series* 19, Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM), Geneva (2005).
- Berry, John W. "Immigration, Acculturation and Adaptation (Lead Article)," *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 46 (1997), 5-68.
- Berry, John W., Jean S. Phinney, David L. Sam and Paul Vedder. "Immigrant Youth: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation." *Applied Psychology* 55(2006), 303-332.
- Bevelander, Pieter and Ravi Pendakur. "Citizenship, Co-ethnic Populations and Employment Probabilities of Immigrants in Sweden." *IZA Discussion Paper Series* 4495 (2009).
- Bottomore, Tom, "Citizenship and Social Class, Forty Years On," in *Citizenship and Social Class*, ed. T. H. Marshall and T. Bottomore (London: Pluto Press, 1992).
- Bratsberg, Bernt, James F. Ragan and Zafar M. Nasir. "The Effect of Naturalization on Wage Growth: A Panel Study of Young Male Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics* 20 (2002), 568-597.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Chiswick, Barry. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men," *The Journal of Political Economy* 86 (1978), 897-921.
- Crul, Maurice and Hans Vermeulen (eds.). "The Future of the Second Generation: The Integration of Migrant Youth in Six European Countries," *Special issue of International Migration Review* 37 (2003), 965-986.
- DeVoretz, Don J. and Sergiy Pivnenko. "The Economic Causes and Consequences of Canadian Citizenship." *IZA DP Series* 1395 (2005).
- DeVoretz, Don. "The Economics of Citizenship: A Common Intellectual Ground for Social Scientists?," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34 (2008), 679-693.
- Dustmann, Christian. "The Social Assimilation of Immigrants." *Journal of Population Economics* 9 (1996), 37-54.
- Euwals, Rob, Jago Dagevos, Mérove Gijsberts and Hans Roodenburg. "Citizenship and Labor Market Position: Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands." *International Migration Review*, Volume 44 (2010), 513-538.
- Foucault, Michel. "Governmentality," *Ideology and Consciousness* 6 (1979), 5-21.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Inclusion of the Other: Studies in Political Theory*, ed. C. Cronin and P. De Greiff. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1999.

- Habermas, Jürgen. "Leadership and *Leitkultur*." *New York Times*, October 28, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/29/opinion/29Habermas.html>.
- Hammar, Thomas. *Democracy and the Nation-state*. Aldershot: Avebury, 1990.
- Heater, Derek. *What is Citizenship?* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999.
- Heisler, Barbara S. "The Sociology of Immigration: From Assimilation to Segmented Assimilation, from American Experience to the Global Arena," in *Migration Theory: Talking across Disciplines*, edited by Brettel, B. C. and Hollifield, J.F, London: Routledge, 2000, 77-96.
- Işın, Engin "Theorizing Acts of Citizenship," in *Acts of Citizenship*, edited by Engin F. Işın and Greg M. Nielsen, London: Zed Books, 2008, 15-43.
- Joppke, Christian. *Selecting by Origin: Ethnic Migration in the Liberal State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Joppke, Christian. "Transformation of Immigrant Integration in Western Europe: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination Policies in the Netherlands, France, and Germany," *World Politics* 59 (2007), 243-273.
- Kaya, Ayhan. *Constructing Diasporas: Turkish Hip-Hop Youth in Berlin*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2001.
- Kaya, Ayhan. *Islam, Migration and Integration: The Age of Securitization*. London: Palgrave, 2009.
- Kaya, Ayhan and Ferhat Kentel. *Euro-Turks: A Bridge, or a Breach, Between Turkey and the European Union*. Brussels: CEPS Publications, 2005.
- Kymlicka, Will and Wayne Norman. *Citizenship in Diverse Societies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Mallar, Charles D. "The Estimation of Simultaneous Probability Models", *Econometrica* 45 (1977), 1717-1722.
- Marshall, T. H. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950.
- Noiriel, Gérard. *Le creuset français: Histoire de l'immigration XIXe-XXe siècle*. Paris: Seuil, 1998.
- Scott, Kirk. "The Economics of Citizenship: Is There a Naturalization Effect". Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis, Working Paper Series 06-16 (2006).
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nations and Nationalism in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Steinhardt, Max Friedrich. "Does citizenship matter? The Economic impact of naturalizations in Germany," *Centro Studi Luca D'Agliano Development Studies Working Papers* 266 (2008).

Soysal, Yasemin. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Taylor, Charles. "The Politics of Recognition," in *Multiculturalism* edited by A. Gutmann, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994, 25-73.

Turner, Bryan S. "Outline of a Theory of Citizenship". *Sociology* 24-2 (1990), 189-217.

Turner, Bryan S. "Contemporary Problems in the Theory of Citizenship. " in *Citizenship and Social Theory* edited by B. S. Turner. London: Sage Publications, 1993.

Walters, David, Kelli Phythian and Paul Anisef. "The Acculturation of Immigrants: Determinants of Ethnic Identification with the Host Society. " Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal Convention Center, Montreal, Quebec, 2006.

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. MIT Press: Cambridge, 2009.

Zimmermann, Klaus F. "Migrant Ethnic Identity: Concept and Policy Implications" *IZA DP Series* 3056 (2007).

¹ *Governmentality* refers to the practices which characterise the form of supervision a state exercises over its subjects, their wealth, misfortunes, customs, bodies, souls and habits. It is the art of governing (Foucault, 1979).

² Anthropologically speaking, there are two principal notions of culture. The first one is the holistic notion of culture, and the second is the syncretic notion of culture. The former considers culture a highly integrated and grasped static 'whole'. This is the dominant paradigm of the classical modernity, of which territoriality and totality were the main characteristics. The latter notion is the one which is most obviously affected by increasing interconnectedness in space. This syncretic notion of culture has been proposed by contemporary scholars to demonstrate the fact that cultures emerge in mixing beyond the political and geographical territories. For further information on this discussion, see Kaya (2001).

³ For a detailed account of the contemporary German Nationality Law, see the German Interior Ministry, http://www.bmi.bund.de/Internet/Content/Common/Anlagen/Gesetze/Staatsangehoerigkeitsgesetz_englisch.templateId=raw.property=publicationFile.pdf/Staatsangehoerigkeitsgesetz_englisch.pdf, accessed on April 2, 2011.

⁴ See <http://www.integration-in-deutschland.de/> accessed on May 3, 2011.

⁵ Structured interviews enable reliable comparative research since they ensure that each respondent is faced with the same questions in the same order.

⁶ The term affiliation is used here to mean psychological contiguity, attachment or sympathy towards a country in comparison to the other. In that respect it reflects the feeling of identity of migrants with the receiving country

relative to their origin countries. Affiliation categories that are described and used in this paper (separation, assimilation, integration and marginalization) are referred to acculturation states or the acculturation process that are commonly used in cross-cultural psychology literature. See Berry (1997) for details.

⁷ In order to cope with institutional racism in the labor market as well as in other spheres of life, migrant origin people tend to give traditional French first names to newborn children. Gérard Noiriel indicates that this practice is rather an old practice among migrants: in a Polish community in northern France, 44% in 1935, 73% in 1945, 82% in 1955, and 98% in 1960 (Noiriel, 1998: 233).

⁸ Insight into the process of migrant youth integration can be gleaned from a study comparing second-generation migrant populations in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden (Crul and Vermeulen, 2003). The study, for instance, found that Muslim-background youth in Germany suffered far less unemployment than Muslim-background youth in France, Belgium and, to a lesser extent, the Netherlands. This is because of the apprentice system linked to vocational school education in Germany. In Belgium, France and the Netherlands, a significant number of Muslim-background youth held professional or white-collar jobs, but many highly qualified and unqualified second-generation Turkish members of the labor force were unemployed owing to the difficult transition from school to employment.

Institut de Recherches Économiques et Sociales
Université catholique de Louvain

Place Montesquieu, 3
1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique

