

'The Integration of the European Second generation' (TIES)
'A comparative study of Turkish and Moroccan youth and young adults in Brussels and Antwerp'

Name of the Applicants:

Prof. dr. Marc Swyngedouw
Full Professor
ISPO (Institute for Social and Political Opinion Research)
Department of Sociology, KU Leuven
Van Evenstraat 2B
3000 Leuven
Belgium
phone: 016 – 32 31 59
email: marc.swyngedouw@soc.kuleuven.ac.be

dr. Karen Phalet
Associate Professor
ICS: Ercomer (European Research Center On Migration and Ethnic Relations)
Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University
Postbus 80.140
3508 TC Utrecht
Netherlands
phone: +31 30 253 14 08 (sec)
k.phalet@fss.uu.nl

Description of the research project:

1. Aim

Immigration and the subsequent integration of newcomers is now one of the foremost challenges for Europe. The integration of the second generation – the children born of immigrant parentage in the country of immigration – is crucial to this process. The oldest group of children born to postwar migrants in Western Europe are now leaving school and entering the labour market. The crossnational TIES-programme was set up to investigate how the integration of the second generation is proceeding by developing a common international standardized survey in seven European countries (Flanders-Belgium, Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, France and Spain). The second generation is compared with a 'native' comparison group within each country while controlling for social background characteristics. Taking into account the differential selection of immigrants from the same sending countries, the TIES programme will analyse the relative effects of institutional arrangements (generic policies) as compared to group-specific integration policies in promoting or hampering immigrant integration. Analysis of secondary data suggests that national contexts have a profound impact (Crul & Vermeulen 2003).

This project is concerned with the second generation in Flanders-Belgium. The complete research design combines cross-national and cross-group comparisons, studying the younger generations in three immigrant groups (Turkish, Moroccan and ex-Yugoslavian). In Flanders-Belgium, the comparison includes Turkish and Moroccan groups who are among the major postwar immigrant communities whose offspring is now entering the labor market. Cross-nationally, Belgium shares significant numbers of Turkish youth with all seven countries except Spain, and of Moroccan youth with the Netherlands, France and Spain. In each host country, two major cities participate in the research so as to complement the cross-national approach and take into account within-country variation between local communities and receiving contexts. In the Belgian case, Brussels and Antwerp will be compared. While both cities share a significant immigrant presence, they differ in socio-economic (old industrial harbour vs urban service economy) and socio-political contexts (Flemish vs multilingual context and presence of extreme right). The survey replicates previously conducted surveys with Turks and Moroccans in both cities (Swyngedouw et al 1999 and Lesthaeghe 2000).

2. Objectives

Research objectives of the crossnational research programme are:

1. To assess the socio-economic position of the second generation, as compared to the first generation and to the same age group of the native population.
2. To describe, analyse and explain similarities and differences of second-generation integration between the seven countries, comparing the 'same' ethnic group in different national contexts. In trying to explain these similarities and differences, we will investigate such factors as institutional arrangements (generic policies), policies specifically directed towards immigrants (immigrant policies), attitudes of the native population towards immigrants, and the composition of immigrant groups originating from the same country.
3. To describe, analyse and explain similarities and differences in second-generation integration *between ethnic groups within* and *across* countries.
4. To describe, analyse and explain similarities and differences between cities in the same country in terms of second-generation integration, and to assess the relative importance of city contexts versus national contexts in explaining such patterns.
5. To describe, analyse and explain similarities and differences between second-generation men and women in terms of integration.

Extending a strong Belgian research tradition in survey research among minorities (cf. Lesthaeghe 2000; Swyngedouw et al 1999) to cross-national comparative research constitutes significant added value. In as far as comparative case studies across European host countries has been undertaken, they do not usually take the perspectives of immigrants and their offspring. Research on the second generation of postwar immigrants is a relatively recent phenomenon. Studies of immigrant integration in the USA and the UK show that the socio-cultural integration of the first generation often remains modest, and that the most important changes occur at the transition between generations (Alba & Nee 1997; Modood et al, 1996). Particularly in the United States, research on the 'new' second generation of postwar immigration has provoked a lively theoretical debate (Kasinitz, Mollenkopf & Waters 2002; Portes & Zhou 1993). Variation in the ways in which different groups integrate into a host society has been a central theme in this debate. Though little disagreement exists about the significance of such variations, the role of migration histories and ethnic community forces in the integration process has received more research attention than the impact of more or less welcoming receiving contexts (Reitz 2002). Also in Europe, the impact of public policies and opportunities on the fates of the second generation has mostly been assumed than researched.

The present comparative research takes a theory-guided approach, starting from a common interactive and multidimensional conceptualization of the integration process. From an *interactive* perspective, the concept of integration refers to mutual interactions between (perceived) treatment and adaptation, which result in more or less harmonious or conflicted ethnic relations between immigrant and host communities (Phalet & Swyngedouw 2003; Swyngedouw et al 1999). Whereas host policies, institutions and societies constitute the treatment side of the integration process, differential resources, perceptions and strategies of immigrant communities make up the adaptation side of the process. The interactive approach qualifies a deterministic notion of integration as a gradual shift towards parity/conformity with the life chances/cultural customs of the national population. Thus, 'straight line' assimilation theory in the US predicts that the second and third generations of immigrant origin will become socio-economically and socio-culturally indistinguishable from the native population (that is after controlling for social class origins). In contrast, and in line with a more general interactive approach of immigrant integration, segmentationalists in the US have predicted second-generation progress or decline, depending on the interplay between more or less resourceful immigrant communities and more or less welcoming contexts of reception (Gans, 1992; Portes & Zhou, 1993).

Furthermore, the integration process is conceived as *multidimensional*. Major dimensions of integration in the European context refer to distinct aspects of an ideal conception of full citizenship (Phalet & Swyngedouw 2003; Swyngedouw et al 1999). Specifically, socio-economic, cultural and political dimensions of immigrant integration refer to the social, cultural and political rights of full citizens (over and above human and civil rights). The multidimensional concept of integration in European migration studies builds on Gordon's (1964) earlier conceptualisation of cultural, structural and identity dimensions of assimilation. In Europe, migration studies have taken a more state-centered approach to integration, emphasising the political participation of immigrants as citizens in public debates and democratic institutions (Faist, 2000). Looking beyond different research traditions in the US and in Europe, 'assimilation' and 'integration' concepts share the same theoretical expectation that distinct dimensions are functionally related (Alba & Nee, 1997). Thus, assimilation theory predicts that immigrant acculturation is associated with upward social mobility. Likewise, integration theory associates political participation with national identification (Faist, 2000). In contrast, alternative segmentationalist or transnationalist positions imply the decoupling of socio-economic, cultural and political dimensions (Bommes, 2002). More in general, a multidimensional concept and measurement of integration allows for the selective

inclusion and exclusion of immigrants and their children in different segments or institutions of the host society. Depending on their access to ethnic resources or transnational opportunities, some immigrants build successful careers without learning the language and culture, whereas others are fully acculturated yet socio-economically excluded from the host society.

3. Design and methodology

The TIES research group was founded two years ago to exchange results and initiate international comparative research in Europe and North America. The TIES network on the second generation includes researchers from eight countries, Germany (Holger Kolb, IMIS), the Netherlands (Maurice Crul and Hans Vermeulen, IMES; Jeannette Schoorl and Ernst Spaan, NIDI), France (Patrick Simon, INED), Switzerland (Rosita Fibbi, FMS), Austria (Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger, Academy of Social Science), Belgium (Karen Phaet, Ercomer – European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations and Marc Swyngedouw, ISPO-KU Leuven), Spain (Rosa Aparicio-Gómez, Institute for Research on Migration IEM) and the United States (John Mollenkopf, CUNY Center for Urban Research).

In 2003, the TIES research group was funded by the Stiftung für Bevölkerung, Migration und Umwelt (BMU) in Switzerland. It met in three international workshops to discuss the creation of a common research design to study the second generation in Europe. We propose to study in detail the influence of local and national institutional arrangements and of group-specific policies targeting the second generation. To this end, the TIES research group proposes the following activities:

- a. An internationally standardised survey in 14 cities and 7 countries focusing on the immigrant second generation and a comparable 'native' group in the same age category.
- b. An inventory of national and regional institutional arrangements and of group-specific policies targeting immigrant youth, with specific reference to education and labour market transition.

The contextualization of comparative surveys should throw light on national and local differences in the advantage or disadvantage, inclusion or exclusion of migrant children of similar ethnic backgrounds (taking into account other background characteristics).

The comparative design combines crosscountry and crossgroup lines of comparison. The cross-group comparison in the Belgian case includes the second generation of Turkish and Moroccan origin, as well as a 'native' comparison group of Belgian children. In line with the comparative design of the Brussels survey (Swyngedouw et al 1999), the 'natives' are included for two main purposes: as a *contrast group* and as an *interacting group*. Structural integration has to be assessed by taking either the native population or the general population as a benchmark. But from an interactive approach to integration, the native population is more than a contrast group in our proposal – it is also a category of people who *interact* with second-generation immigrants. Their mutual relations and the perceptions and attitudes on both sides should therefore receive ample attention in the questionnaire. We define 'natives' as people born in the country where the research takes place to parents who were also born there. This does not exclude people of more distant immigrant origin, but it does exclude naturalised first- and second-generation immigrants. Including the natives, the research will study three (or in one case two) groups per country. We have intentionally not included more groups, in order to ensure reasonably large samples per group

The selection of cases for the crosscountry comparison was guided by the following considerations:

- They should have sufficiently large populations of second-generation immigrants.

- Each ethnic group should be present in sufficient numbers in at least three countries. Since Turkish immigrants are present in most countries on the continent, we began our selection by looking at countries with sizeable Turkish populations.
- Countries to be selected should have high-quality integration research and well-qualified researchers available.

In Flanders-Belgium, we will conduct 750 interviews in Antwerp and 750 in Brussels, divided equally between second-generation young adults of Turkish (500) and Moroccan origin (500) in the 18-to-35 age category and a ‘native’ comparison group (500) of the same age bracket. In total, 1500 randomly sampled respondents within the targeted ethnic and age categories in both cities will participate in the survey.

With a view to enhance comparability, the following choices have been made in defining and operationalizing concepts and categories. The concept of the *second generation* is often used rather loosely. The strictest, demographic definition includes only those offspring of migrant parentage who were born in the receiving country. In a broader, more sociological perspective, the second generation is defined as the offspring of migrant parentage who entered the receiving country before their first year of primary school. We will work with the *strict demographic definition*.

The debate on integration seems to have had a persistent blind spot up to now for the importance of the national and local *contexts* in which the second generation is trying to move forward. Differences between countries are often overestimated, whereas differences *between cities within the same country* may be more pronounced than is often realised. Our chief focus will be on big cities, because that is where, in demographic terms, most second-generation migrants live.

The greatest difficulties for this research will arise in comparing *educational tracks and labour market transitions* because the categories are dissimilar. Even the ISCED coding system designed by UNESCO for the international classification of pupils and students does not permit hierarchical classifications. Instead of synchronising the widely varying educational tracks, we have developed a procedure within the survey instrument to *reconstruct* tracks, borrowing some tools from the life history approach.

The *standardisation of the sampling procedure* is a complicated task. The ideal sample should be drawn from the entire second-generation population, including people that are naturalised or are born of mixed marriages. In some countries, city registers contain the necessary information for drawing such a sample, but in most they do not. To ensure uniformity, we will use the telephone sampling method in all such cases. It was applied in second-generation research in New York, and is now to be used in similar research in Los Angeles. From the resulting sampling frame, we can select appropriate respondents and contact them to arrange face-to-face interviews.

The core questionnaire was constructed in a series of work meetings, incorporating experiences from all participating countries and covering a variety of subjects, including education, employment, housing, culture, identity and social relations. These were grouped into the following modules:

- Module A: Personal details of respondent
- Module B: Educational career
- Module C: Labour history
- Module D: Partners
- Module E: Parents and siblings
- Module F: Housing and neighbourhood
- Module G: Social relations
- Module H: Gender roles and child care
- Module J: Identity, language and transnationalism

- Module K: Religion and religiosity
- Module L: Income of respondent and partner
- Module M: Written question sheet (for more sensitive questions), which respondent completes at end of interview.

The following time schedule and scientific output is envisaged: in 2005-2006 the Belgian version of the common core questionnaire will be developed and adapted and the national and local research context will be documented. In 2006 the fieldwork for the Belgian survey will take place. In 2007 a first report will be issued on each city. In 2006-2008 data will be analysed across ethnic groups and cities within Belgium and two international publications on the Belgian case are planned. In 2008-2009 crossnational comparative analyses and two more joint international publications are planned.

References

- Alba R., Nee, N (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31, 826-874.
- Bommes M. (2002). *Cultural plurality, closure and contextuality: A case against transnationalists and assimilationists*. Paper presented at the ESF-NIAS Conference on 'Transnational ties and identities', December 6-7 2002, Wassenaar, Netherlands.
- Bousetta, H. (2000). *Immigration, post-immigration politics and the political mobilisation of ethnic minorities*. Brussels: IPSOM. (doctoral dissertation)
- Crul M. & Vermeulen H. (2003). The second generation in Europe: Introduction. In 'The future of the second generation' Special issue of *International Migration Review*, Vol XXXVII (4).
- Faist T. (2000). Transnationalism in international migration: Implications for the study of citizenship and culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23, 189-222.
- Favell, A. (2001). Integration policy and integration research in Europe. In T.A. Aleinikoff & D. Klusmeyer (eds), *Citizenship today: Global perspectives and practices* (pp. 349-399). Washington, DC: Brookings Institute / Carnegie Endowment. (forthcoming)
- Gans, H. (1992). Second-generation decline. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15, 173-192.
- Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kasinitz, P., Mollenkopf, J. & Waters, M. (2002). Becoming American/Becoming New Yorkers: Immigrant incorporation in a majority minority city. *International Migration Review*, 36(4), 1020-1036.
- Lesthaeghe R. (2000). *Communities and generations*. Brussels: VUB Press.
- Modood, T., Berthoud, R., Lakey, J. et al. (1997). *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. London: PSI.
- Portes, A. & Zhou M. (1993). The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 530(Nov), 74-96.
- Phalet K. & Swyngedouw M. (2001). National identities and representations of citizenship. *Ethnicities*, 2 (1), 5-30.
- Phalet K. & Swyngedouw M. (2003). Measuring immigrant integration: The case of Belgium. *Studi Emigrazione/Migration Studies*, Vol XL (n. 152), 773-804.
- Reitz, J. (2002). Host societies and the reception of immigrants. *International Migration Review*, 36(4), 1005-1019.
- Swyngedouw M., Phalet K. & Deschouwer K. (1999). *Minderheden in Brussel*. Brussel: VUB Press.