Determinants of occupational and social integration and of ethnic self-exclusion among young immigrants: 1st Report

Jan Skrobanek
Perceived discrimination and (re)ethnicisation among young Turks$^1$ and Aussiedler$^2$ – First results of a longitudinal study.

Abstract

The paper reports on first results of the Jacobs research project 'Determinants of occupational and social integration and of ethnic self-exclusion among young immigrants'. The project examines the processes involved in (re)ethnicisation of young people with Turkish background and young Aussiedler as a result of perceived discrimination. To give an impression of the research philosophy used in a first step the structure and the research focus are described. To understand and to explain processes of (re)ethnicisation in a second step some theoretical aspects are discussed. In a third step first results from the first wave of interviewing are presented.
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1. Executive summary of the project

In countries with a long tradition of immigration we can observe both smooth and effective integration of young people from second- and third-generation immigrant families and processes of (re)ethnicisation. Very little is known in Germany about the determinants of integration and (re)ethnicisation among young people, particularly those at disadvantage in the education and training systems and on the job market.

Our main hypothesis is that processes of school-to-work-transition, perceived ethnic discrimination or non-discrimination and social integration or exclusion among young immigrants are closely interrelated. Successful educational and occupational integration will promote social integration, and this in turn will foster progress in education, training and employment. Experiencing ethnic discrimination in education, training or employment on the other hand can cause a vicious circle of (re)ethnicisation resulting in further discrimination and finally exclusion from employment and participation in the society.

Because our objective is to learn more about social processes, we investigate social integration and tendencies of (re)ethnicisation among young people from immigrant families in a longitudinal study. Young immigrants are interviewed at four different times to clarify the stages reached in school-to-work-transition, the perceptions of ethnic discrimination that they experienced in that transition and indicators of (re)ethnicisation, that they profess.

One problem with longitudinal designs is that costs tend to be prohibitive. To reduce costs we attached this study to ongoing longitudinal research on school-to-work-transitions of 4,000 graduates of German Hauptschulen (half of whom come from immigrant families). Thus, the difficult and expensive process of gaining access to our sample had already been accomplished successfully. Three waves of interviewing on their first steps of the school-to-work-transition had already been completed. The following steps were undertaken to answer the research questions:

- In a first step we developed and tested instruments for the assessment of perceptions of ethnic discrimination and for the measurement of (re)ethnicisation among young immigrants;

- In a second step we added these instruments to the Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) in our sample beginning with the fifth wave of interviewing;
In a third step we have conducted cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of the relationships between ethnic, socio-demographic and educational backgrounds, processes and patterns of school-to-work-transition, perceptions of discrimination in that process and indicators of (re)ethnicisation.

Studying determinants and processes of integration and exclusion should therefore increase our understanding of how educational, training and employment institutions should modify structures and procedures to avoid (re)ethnicisation. The study provides insights into a variety of areas of importance to educators, administrators and policy makers and the knowledge thus gained will help to promote effective educational, occupational and social integration of young immigrants.


Data collection: school to work transition *
Baseline: Educational and socio-demographic background, individual history of migration
CATI 1 to CATI 6: Histories of school-to-work-transition (completion of Hauptschule, further education, participation in internships, vocational preparation and training, apprenticeships, employment, unemployment)

Data collection: perceived ethnic discrimination, and (re)ethnicisation **

Cross sectional and longitudinal analyses of the interaction of stages of school-to-work-transition and social integration vs. (re)-ethnicisation **

Option of continuation

CATI 1
N = 2,414

CATI 2
N = 2,362

CATI 3
N = 2,192

CATI 4
N = 1,994

CATI 5
N = 1,819

CATI 6
N = 1,000

CATI 5
N = 1,819

CATI 4
N = 1,994

CATI 3
N = 2,192

CATI 2
N = 2,362

CATI 1
N = 2,414

Baseline
N = 4,000

* funded by the German Federal Ministries of Education and Youth
** funding requested from the Jacobs Foundation
2. Research Focus

Recently, the media in Europe have reported increasing public concern about the emergence of parallel societies formed by immigrant populations in the banlieues of large cities. These parallel societies are characterised by poor educational achievement among children, lack of training opportunities for young people, a high rate of unemployment among young adults, a high crime rate, frequent vandalism and – last but not least – a trend towards (re)ethnicisation among teenagers and young adults (Wacquant 1999).

Indeed, research in most countries of the European Union has shown that ethnic minorities obtain lower positions on the job market and that for them access to employment and social networks related to employment is difficult to achieve. (Bevelander 1999; Fassmann u. a. 1999; Gras/Bovenkerk 1999; Heath/McMahon 2000; Neels/Stoof 2000; Reynier 2001; Vourc'h u. a. 1999).

Both, integration opportunities for young immigrants and risks of (re)ethnicisation, are particularly evident in the transition from school to work in nearly all European countries. This is true in Germany as well. On the one hand, the percentage of young people from immigrant families who attend higher-ranking secondary schools with a view to acquiring high-quality vocational training and well-paid jobs is steadily increasing. On the other hand, the percentage of young immigrants who attend Hauptschulen and special education schools is notably high; such schools prove to be difficult starting points for a successful transition to vocational training. Young immigrants also account for a disproportionately large percentage of school dropouts. In addition, they form the majority among young people who enter working life without having completed formal vocational training.

Children from immigrant families perceive their failure to find access to vocational training and employment as a cultural, social and economic debacle, as ethnically motivated discrimination or exclusion. Multiple discrimination – especially in the labour market – results in young people from ethnic minorities becoming dependant on their own social group of origin (with all the social-cultural and economic consequences) and being only able to relate to that group. They feel like second-class citizens, not accepted in the country in which they live.

Burnley, Bradford and Oldham 2001 in Great Britain or Paris and other cities 2005 in France show how dissatisfaction turns into aggression, powerlessness turns into revolt. In response to the question as to 'why' this revolt, the youth speak of being excluded from society, of being
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unable to obtain work or credit and of not being accepted as full members of society because they are of a different colour, culture or from a different social environment than 'the others'. The young people affected by this situation are not for the most part 'immigrants' – as they are usually labelled – but young citizens from second or third generation immigrant families.

Discussions about the opportunities for the integration of youth with an ethnic minority background into society in Germany have, until now, been focused on two aspects: a) integration or exclusion caused by discrimination based on human capital (Diefenbach/Nauck 1997; Esser 2001; Esser 1990; Granato/Kalter 2001; Nauck u. a. 1998) and b) integration or exclusion caused by ethnically motivated, personal and institutional discrimination (Gomolla/Radtke 2002; Solga 2005; Youdell 2003). The issue of whether ethnic minority youth themselves pursue collective strategies which reinforce exclusion, rather than lead to integration, has remained largely ignored. Will similar developments like in Great Britain or France take place in Germany and other Central European countries? Have they already started? Is there a tendency towards (re)ethnicisation due to subjectively perceived discrimination, in addition to the restrictions imposed on young people by discrimination, particularly in employment? Is it true that the response to negative experiences of personal and collective integration is dependent on the values, norms and interpretation schema of the group of origin? If so, what consequences does an ethnic (re)definition have for the future integration of young people in society?

Demographic statistics suggest that the demand for skilled labour will grow over the next decade. Well-trained young immigrants will thus encounter comparatively favourable conditions for occupational and social integration into German society. A second forecast indicates that the number of unskilled jobs will continue to decline. This means that those who receive inadequate training or none at all will face a high risk of exclusion from the job market (Solga 2005). Unless steps are taken to ensure effective educational and occupational integration, young people from immigrant families are likely to see their hopes of training and integration unfulfilled. Ethnic withdrawal and (re)ethnicisation may be the consequences.

This research project addresses these issue by asking of the following questions: Under which circumstances do young immigrants complete vocational training, enter employment and become fully integrated? What are the causes of failure in vocational training and employment within this group? How does such failure relate to processes of (re)ethnicisation? Which institutional factors support integration and which exclusion? Under which circumstances can exclusion be reversed?
3. State of the art

Members of ethnic minorities do complain about discrimination in their day-to-day lives. The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (2006) reports cases of discriminatory behaviour towards ethnic minorities in nearly all of the European Union Member States. Complaints about discrimination in Germany concern employment, both for trainee positions and for full time jobs, and overall discrimination in society. Insofar institutional discrimination as well as discriminatory behaviour are part of daily life for members of ethnic minority groups (Asbrock u. a. 2006; Klink/Wagner 1999).

In spite of this situation, the search for the causes and consequences of perceived discrimination and (re)ethnicisation is still marginal. However, recently there has been increasing research activity and attention has been paid to these problems. Foremost among these activities is socio-psychological research to investigate the determinants and health-related effects of personal and group-related discrimination (Clark u. a. 1999; Gary 1995; Klonoff u. a. 1999; Williams u. a. 1997) (Clark u. a. 1999; Klonoff u. a. 1999; Williams u. a. 1997; Gary 1995).

Two general perspectives have arisen from this research. The first concentrates on the identification and description of the phenomenon of perceived discrimination (Dion/Kawakami 1996; Gary 1995; Hagan/Albonetti 1982; Sigelman/Welch 1991) (Sigelman/Welch 1991). The second perspective focuses on the question of the causes of perceived discrimination and the effects of personal and group-related perception of discrimination (Liebkind/Jasinskaja-Lahti 2000; Phinney u. a. 1998; Shorey u. a. 2002; Wakenhut u. a. 1998).

In sociological research – which has dealt less exhaustively with this issue at present – research on the lack of positive recognition and the results on the mobilisation of members of social groups is of interest with regard to perceived discrimination and (re)ethnicisation (Anhut/Heitmeyer 2000; Asbrock u. a. 2006; Heitmeyer u. a. 1997; Schröder u. a. 2000). The assumption is that a lack of positive recognition, arising from difficulties in accessing socially recognised material and immaterial goods, promotes a reactivation of ethnic categories and hence forms of (re)ethnicisation. This in turn results in positive social identity and reassurance of identity, but also in a differentiation from the societal majority. However, due to material powerlessness, the range of such a strategy remains narrowly confined. It is thus unlikely that broader mobilisations of the minorities against the majority will take place, as long as no resourceful elites capable of mobilisation are present or eventually emerge.
To sum up, over the last years, a number of empirical studies have been completed to learn more about the relationships between perceived discrimination, group identity and (re)ethincisation among young persons from immigrant families. What has been insufficient was theory building that may help to better understand the processes involved and research designs – especially longitudinal ones – that are appropriate to uncover determinants of such processes. It is the intention of this research project to contribute to theory building and apply a (longitudinal) design to learn more about such processes.
4. Theoretical framework and hypotheses

In analysing processes of (re)ethnicisation we use the conceptual framework provided by Social Identity Theory (SIT). Social Identity Theory (Tajfel/Turner 1986) argues that individuals strive to maintain and enhance their self-esteem. For an individual whose self-esteem is at risk because of his/her affiliation to a low status social group – for instance an underprivileged ethnic minority – according to Social Identity Theory there are at least three options available to rebuild his/her positive social identity:

- The first option is social mobility that promises integration into a higher status group or – in our example – into more privileged segments of the society. This requires a sufficient degree of education and training.

- A second option is referred to as ‘social creativity’: Positive distinctness of the group the individual belongs to is strived for by redefining or altering elements of the comparative situation. The hope for equal rights and opportunities is given up for an emphasis on distinctness or the claim of superiority in culture or values: In our example social creativity can be described as a coping strategy of returning to patterns and orientations associated with a supposed social identity and may become the starting point of a process of (re)ethnicisation that may interfere with, or even prevent, productive interaction between minorities and majority.

- The third option is labelled ‘social competition’. In this option, withdrawal and (re)ethnicisation may be a chance of establishing a forum for negotiating equal rights and opportunities within the host society. Yet, social competition, particularly when faced with an unequal distribution of power, may result in deviant behaviour (Merton 1938; Merton 1995) generate conflict and antagonism between subordinate and dominant groups and thus severely threaten social cohesion (Esser 1999; Mummendey u. a. 1999; Skrobanek 2004).

Through social comparison, individuals obtain information pertaining to their own position as well as that of the group of reference; the result of this social comparison can be positive or negative (Merton 1995: 65). A positive social comparison leads to a stable and satisfactory identity. Should the group not come off so well however, this may lead to a negative social identity. This is where the problem of discrimination comes into the game. Basically, the actors seek to achieve certain goals through their actions (Esser 1999; Lindenberg 1989).
In order to fulfil these goals however, they need access to the according capital. Capital and goals are not independent from societal context, as Merton outlined with 'designs of group living'. Should access to the capital necessary in order to achieve one’s goals be difficult or impossible, these goals cannot be achieved. Compared to other groups, who do have access to the necessary capital, the group with more limited access to capital will hence not do as well as the other group, especially with regards to the centrally defined capital and the scope of realisation of the goals.

In this context we define perceived discrimination (personal and group related) as perceived threat of access to favoured goods/capital when compared to other individuals or groups (Banton 1994). The fundamental problem lies in the fact that a group discriminated against will share the same goals as groups who do not suffer discrimination, but because of its respective situation, it will have 'less' or 'less efficient' means at its disposal in order to achieve these goals. A threat to social recognition thus arises from the precariousness of access to those goods (Anhut/Heitmeyer 2000), which particularly motivates persons who feel discriminated against to create a positive social identity or, as the case may be, to secure their own threatened personal or social identity (Tajfel/Turner 1986).

At this point, (re)ethnicisation constitutes a way to maintain a positive social identity. A specific feature of (re)ethnicisation is the attempt to mobilise an entire group within a conflict about limited resources, coupled to positional competition within the social structure. The struggle for the recognition of specific assets is as such not in foreground, but rather the activation of 'models' of exclusion and justification of the group affected by the social comparison. (Re)ethnicisation represents as such a resource in the conflict in order to manage both identity and resources. It is the result of conscious efforts and as such also of the frustrations associated with the restricted access to social, cultural, political and material resources (Groenemeyer 2003). Insofar, one should understand (re)ethnicisation as the process of ethnic framing of a conflict about access to material and cultural capital as a result of perceived discrimination, both personal and group-related. The objective of (re)ethnicisation is the valorisation and defence of group-specific capital as opposed to the capital of a dominant group, in order to attain a positive social identity and to maintain it in the long term.

Migration research suggests that (re)ethnicisation is a phenomenon particularly likely to occur among second- and third-generation immigrants. For first-generation immigrants, the prime objective is to improve their standard of living. Second- and third-generation immigrants know
that they are here to stay. Therefore, they aspire to rights and opportunities equal to those enjoyed by the host population. Failure to achieve these may result in withdrawal and (re)ethnicisation (Gestring u. a. 2006).

In the course of their transition from school to adulthood young immigrants come into contact with a large number of institutions (schools, companies, training institutions) and individuals (teachers, counsellors, training personnel, employers) that/who claim to treat them in an ethnically neutral manner. The institutions and individuals involved in this school-to-work transition are in fact transmitting a wide range of cultural messages, ranging from openness and sympathy, via ignorance, to prejudice and overt discrimination. Young immigrants receive these messages, interpret them and draw their own conclusions in terms of career decisions and options taken with regard to the definition of their own ethnicity and its relationship to other social groups or the host society.

Based on the concepts and assumptions described above, our analysis is guided by three key hypotheses:

(1) Our first hypothesis is that withdrawal and (re)ethnicisation are responses to a perceived denial of equal rights and opportunities, particularly when that denial occurs with reference to the ethnic characteristics of young people from immigrant families.

(2) Our second hypothesis is that processes of educational and occupational integration in the school-to-work-transition and of social integration or (re)ethnicisation have a knock-on effect. Successful educational and occupational integration will promote social integration, and this in turn will foster progress in education, training and employment. Experiencing ethnic discrimination in education, training or employment on the other hand can cause a vicious circle of (re)ethnicisation resulting in further discrimination and finally exclusion from employment and participation in the society.

(3) Our third hypothesis is that intercultural competence and sensitivity among institutions and individuals involved in the school-to-work transition promotes occupational and social integration, whereas cultural blindness and discrimination provoke withdrawal and (re)ethnicisation and thus constitute a high-level risk to successful occupational and social integration.
5. Data and methods

The study

The study reported on here is part of a larger longitudinal study of the school-to-work transition processes experienced by 4000 young people who in 2004 completed compulsory education either in a lower secondary school (Hauptschule) or in the Hauptschule stream of a comprehensive school. It was conducted at 126 secondary and comprehensive schools throughout Germany. The baseline was established four months before the end of compulsory schooling, using a classroom questionnaire covering socio-demographic information (e.g., immigration histories of the young persons’ families, professional status of the parents, gender, age), aspects of their personality (e.g. self-confidence, health problems), information’s on their previous educational careers, and on their plans for further schooling and vocational education.

In order to test our assumptions about the relationship between structural, socio-cultural or personal restrictions and perceived discrimination, social identity and (re)ethnicisation, the interviews (from the beginning of the fifth wave of interviewing) were supplemented by an additional module on perceived discrimination and (re)ethnicisation. To generate a sub-sample for this research project, in a first step only young people with a Turkish background and young Aussiedler were selected from the main file. In a second step, the status of the young people was checked again at the beginning of the interview. If the information given matched with the definition of 'Turkish background' and 'Aussiedler' the interview was completed.

Sample

In the first interview 635 boys and girls participated. 289 youngsters had a Turkish background and 346 were Aussiedler. Among the young Turks more than half of those who have participated in the module were boys (N=158/55 per cent). Eighty per cent of the young people had been born in Germany. Those who had not been born in Germany had lived there for an average of 10.5 years, ranging between 1 year and 15 years. On average, they were 15.7 years old. A language other than German is spoken, or is spoken in addition to German, in more than 95 per cent of the young people’s households. Nearly 70 per cent of the interviewees were citizenz of Turkey and about 30 per cent were German citizens or both German and Turkish citizens. 16 per cent of the young people had no school diploma at all, 68 per cent a school diploma of the lower secondary school (Hauptschule) and 16 per cent of a secondary school (Realschule).
Aussiedler are a different from the young Turks because of their special migration status. Again more than half of those who participated in the module were boys (N=199/58 per cent). But only 9 per cent of the Aussiedler had been born in Germany. Those who not had been born in Germany had lived there for an average of 8.9 years, ranging between 1 and 17 years. On the average, they were 16 years old. A language other than German is spoken, or is spoken in addition to German, in 90 per cent of the young people’s households. Ten per cent speak only German. More than 80 per cent of the Aussiedler interviewees are German citizens, 12 per cent were citizens of Germany and another country and about 7 per cent were citizens of exclusively another country. Twenty four per cent of the youngsters had no school diploma at all, 56 per cent a school degree of the lower secondary school (Hauptschule) and 20 per cent of a secondary school (Realschule).

Indicators
For the chart pertaining to (re)ethnicisation (reEth), four indicators were developed focusing on the group-related dimensions of language, marriage, cohesion in case of conflict and employment. Items are rated on a 4-point Likert-typ scale ranging from I disagree completely to I completely agree. According to Table 1 results of SEM (Structural Equation Modelling) analysis with LISREL 8.3 only showed minimal differences of the simultaneous group comparisons. As a result of the analysis the indicators were compiled to one scale.

Social identity (sozId) was measured by means of three indicators: group identification, salience of identification for the concept of the self, and pride in belonging to the group (Skrobanek 2004). As expected, the indicators reveal a high correlation (r > .70). A scale labelled 'social identity' was created from the three indicators.

In order to measure perceived personal discrimination (eigDis), four variables were taken into account, investigating young peoples’ personal experiences of discrimination in school, leisure and institutions. The four indicators were compiled to one scale of 'perceived personal discrimination'. The construct of perceived group-related discrimination (grupDis) was measured with the help of three questions pertaining to the discrimination of Turks or Aussiedler as a group in school, in the labour market and to 'second class feelings'. These indicators were also compiled to one scale.
Two indicators were used in order to measure the non-permeability of group boundaries (permeability) as perceived by those concerned. The young people had to state whether it is difficult for a Turk/Aussiedler to be perceived as being German and whether Turks/Aussiedler will ever be recognised as being German (Tajfel 1981; Tajfel/turner 1986). Again, a 4-point Likert-type scale was used ranging from not true at all to always true. These indicators were also compiled to one scale.

Table 1: Sample specific standardized factor loadings, explained variance and reliabilities for Turks and Aussiedler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Re)ethnicisation</th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>Aussiedler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion in the case of group-conflict</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square/df – group comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.67/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained variance</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's alpha</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Social identity                               |       |            |
| Group identification                          | .64   | .47        |
| Salience of identification                    | .80   | .61        |
| Pride to be member of the social group        | .79   | .71        |
| Chi-Square/df – group comparison              |       | 5.44/3     |
| Explained variance                            | 70.2% | 56.9%      |
| Cronbach's alpha                              | .79   | .62        |

| Perceived personal discrimination             |       |            |
| School                                        | .74   | .86        |
| Youth clubs                                   | .95   | .99        |
| Disko                                         | .83   | .90        |
| Charges/Authorities                           | .76   | .76        |
| Chi-Square/df – group comparison              |       | 20.00/8    |
| Explained variance                            | 75.7% | 73.1%      |
| Cronbach's alpha                              | .89   | .88        |

| Perceived group-related discrimination        |       |            |
| School                                        | .65   | .70        |
| Work                                          | .59   | .56        |
| Second class feelings                         | .60   | .53        |
| Chi-Square/df – group comparison              |       | 3.58/6     |
| Explained variance                            | 58.4% | 56.9%      |
| Cronbach's alpha                              | .64   | .62        |

Finally, the following socio-demographic variables were taken into consideration: level of educational qualifications achieved, type of school attended, language spoken at home, gender and born in Germany. An overview of the variables used can be found in Table 2 of the appendix.
6. First Results

**Distribution of model variables**

Based on the first wave of interviewing, we can provide a first insight into the situation of young people of Turkish origin and young Aussiedler in Germany. We will examine whether and to what extent they have experienced discrimination, how strongly they identify themselves with their group of origin and whether (re)ethnicisation can be identified as a reaction to experienced discrimination. If (re)ethnicisation can be identified, the question arises as to which factors can explain this. Therefore, the role of perceived discrimination, group identification and perceived permeability of group borders will be investigated.

An examination of the measures relating to perceived personal and group related discrimination shows that over one third of the young Turks maintain that as individuals or as Turks they have been discriminated against and been disadvantaged compared to ethnic Germans in school, when looking for work, when visiting recreational facilities or when dealing with government offices. Perceived personal discrimination returns a mean value of 2.06, while group related discrimination has a mean value of 2.24. It is interesting to note the higher perception of group discrimination. This could be seen as supporting the hypothesis that it is not necessary to have personally experienced discrimination in order to perceive group discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>eigDis</th>
<th>grupDis</th>
<th>sozId</th>
<th>reEth</th>
<th>n-Permea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>TUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 non-existent</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 strong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.55*</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: if * p < 0.01; TUR = Turkish ethnic background; AUS = Aussiedler

Furthermore, a marked social identity or group identification can be identified among the Turks. Nearly 90 per cent of the youth feel strongly or very strongly connected to their group of origin. About a quarter of those interviewed show a tendency towards (re)ethnicisation.
Questions as to the permeability of the group boundaries suggest young people with a Turkish background perceive their chances of one day being accepted as German as being very remote.

What about the young Aussiedler? In nearly every case the young Aussiedler have significantly lower values on the indices than the young Turks. They feel less discriminated against personally (Mean = 1.55), identify themselves to a lesser degree with their group of origin (Mean = 2.22), get not as much attracted by (re) ethnicisation than Turks (Mean = 1.86) and perceive group borders as more permeable (Mean = 2.91).

**Relations between socio-demographic and model variables**

What about the relation between the socio-demographic variables and the ethnic variables? Table 3 shows the results of a regression analysis. Only between a minority of socio-demographic and the dependent variables effects can be identified. Let us first examine experience of discrimination by the young people themselves. As a rule, the higher the degree of education of the interviewees, the lower the chance perceiving (personal and group-related) discrimination compared to Germans. This contradicts other studies that suggest the higher the social and economic status of a person, the more likely this person will feel discriminated against, when subjective goals cannot be achieved. This could be because young people with a lower level of education perceive access to desirable societal goods as more problematic and thus consider the more easily accessible goods from their own social group to be more attractive. Additionally, research on social groups suggests that the available group-specific goods are valorised and guarded from being accessed by other groups. An interpretation based on the theory of social identity could go even further. Young people with limited educational capital may know that their educational assets receive little positive recognition, resulting in an endangered or negative social identity. A way of stabilising this identity and of diminishing or even reversing the negative effects of a lack of positive recognition would be to adopt, or at least encourage, a stronger preference for the positively assessed ethnic assets available within the group. This in turn may lead to a stronger recognition within the group of origin and may have a stabilising effect on identity.

In the case of perceived personal discrimination a second effect can be identified for language: Interviewees are less likely to perceive discrimination if they mainly speak German at home. But if they only speak their language of origin they are more likely to feel discriminated against.
There is a third interesting effect in the model: Young people with an immigrant background born in Germany are more likely to feel discriminated against than those who were born elsewhere. The remaining variables play no substantial role.

In the case of identification with the group of origin an effect of the language spoken at home and of being born in Germany can be identified. Using the language of origin – for example Turkish – and belonging to the second or third generation of migrants makes identification with one’s group of origin more likely. This of course raises the question why identification with one’s group of origin is more attractive and important for those born and brought up in Germany.

Table 4: Effects of socio-demographic features on eigDis, grupDis, sozId, reEth and n-Permea (standardized regression coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model variables</th>
<th>eigDis</th>
<th>grupDis</th>
<th>sozId</th>
<th>reEth</th>
<th>n-Permea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native country Germany</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
<td>.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: if † coefficients significant at the 0.07 level; if * coefficients significant at the 0.05 level; if ** coefficients significant at the 0.01 level

In addition, there is a significant effect of the level of education achieved and being born in Germany on (re)ethnicisation. Young people who mainly speak their language of origin tend to show a stronger tendency towards (re)ethnicisation than those who mainly speak German at home.

Last but not least let us observe the permeability of group boundaries. It is interesting to note that the only effect in the model regards the generation variable. Youngsters with an immigrant background belonging to the second or third generation tend to view group boundaries as being more permeable than youngsters from the first generation of immigrants.

Interrelations of the ethnic variables

According to the theoretical aspects discussed in section 4 it can be assumed that all measured ethnic dimensions are interrelated. Therefore we tested how strongly ethnically loaded dimensions are correlated with each other. Table 5 confirms our hypothesis that the examined dimensions are interrelated. The coefficients range between .14 and .44.
Table 5: Correlations between the ethnic variables (Spearman’s rho)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>eigDis</th>
<th>grupDis</th>
<th>sozId</th>
<th>reEth</th>
<th>n-Permea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eigDis</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grupDis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sozId</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reEth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-Permea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * coefficients significant on the 0.05 level; ** coefficients significant on the 0.01 level

The strongest correlation appears between grupDis and n-Permea, the lowest between grupDis and sozId. It is worth to mention that the correlations are not as high as one may expect. For example all of the measures used might be part of a general factor. In so far a factor analysis should bring about a single factor solution. In contrast if one uses all of the single indicators a factor analysis produces 5 single factors according to the eigDis till n-Permea dimensions we have used.

(Re)ethnicisation influenced by perceived discrimination, permeability and social identity

At this state of the project we also tested if the perceived personal and group related discrimination – in a causal way – effects (re)ethicisation. Thus we tested a model where perceived discrimination directly and indirectly – mediated by the social identity of the youngsters and the perceived permeability of the group boundaries – influences the dependent variable.

The theoretically postulated initial model with $\chi^2 = 114.16$, $df = 5$, $p = 0.000$, an RMSEA of .186, an RMR of .114 and an AGFI of .790 yielded a slightly problematic model adaptation. In this respect the model did not conform with the data. Therefore, to apply a model-generating approach (Jöreskog/Sörbom 1993) three paths were added.

Generally these modifications had only small effects on the size of the remaining path coefficients. The modified model thus proves to be robust and became better adapted to the data with $\chi^2 = .50$, $df = 2$, $p = .778$ and an RMSEA of .000, an RMR of .004 and an AGFI of .998 (Figure 1). The standard path coefficients meet expectations in extent and direction.
The more they perceive themselves and their group as a whole as being discriminated against the more will the young Turks and Aussiedler interviewed perceive the permeability of group boundaries between their own group and Germans as being low and the stronger will they identify with their group of origin. The perception of group boundaries as being almost or completely impermeable reinforces social identity, too. Identification with their own group will strengthen, the less they believe that they may one day be a part of the German majority group. A reinforced identification with their own group renders (re)ethnicisation processes more probable. Perceived discrimination, perception of the impermeability of group boundaries and reinforced identification with the groups of origin all tend towards (re)ethnicisation.
7. Summary

Although public awareness of processes of (re)ethnicisation has increased over the last few years, there has been little research in the emergence of (re)ethnicisation. This project is an attempt to fill this gap. Our main hypothesis is that processes of school-to-work-transition and social integration or self-exclusion of young immigrants are closely interrelated. This hypothesis and the objectives of this study are based on assumptions about dynamic interactions of educational and occupational histories, discrimination vs. non-discrimination and integration vs. (re)ethnicisation. A number of hypotheses have been developed and they are now being tested.

To study the assumed processes and their outcomes both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses are required. This is the reason why we are using a longitudinal design: We have interviewed young immigrants who graduated from the lower secondary school (Hauptschule) repeatedly on their way from school to vocational training and employment.

Using the data from the first wave of interviewing in a first step of the analysis particular attention has been paid to the influence of perceived discrimination and other secondary variables, such as perceived permeability of group boundaries and social identity, on (re)ethnicisation.

The starting points for the theoretical discussion were social identity, perceived discrimination and (re)ethnicisation. The discussion led to assumptions concerning the interrelation between personal, biographical and structural aspects and the above mentioned variables.

Some of the hypotheses have already been confirmed. Young people with an immigrant background – in our case young Turks and Aussiedler – tend to (re)ethnicisation when they perceive themselves and their group as being discriminated against. Perceived discrimination has direct and indirect effects on (re)ethnicisation, on perceived permeability of group boundaries and on the social identity of the young people. Hence, when a young person with an immigrant background feels discriminated against, he or she will then perceive the permeability of the group boundaries as being low. This perception of impermeability of group boundaries in turn strengthens his or her social identity or identification with his or her group of origin. He or she will identify more closely with his or her own group, the less he or she believes in the possibility of one day becoming part of the German majority group. This reinforced group-identification finally causes a process of (re)ethnicisation or renders such a process more probable.
Perceived discrimination leads to a retreat into the own group and to a mobilisation of the own group vis-à-vis other groups. Whether the young people really did experience discrimination or whether these experiences are 'adequate to reality' cannot be determined from our data.

Further, the data suggests that the tendency towards (re)ethnicisation should not be interpreted as merely a lack of willingness to integrate. The results show, that the (re)ethnicisation becomes an attractive alternative when young people with an immigrant background encounter problems in their day-to-day lives, in their attempts to realise their life wishes and to achieve their goals. This situation can arise in many different areas of life, from going to the disco to contact with government offices and authorities. In relationship to successful integration policy, questions arise as to why these effects are more likely to occur among those born and brought up in Germany than among those who have themselves migrated to Germany. Thus the critical question is from which perspective the young people define the situation? Do they define it through non-adaptation to the demands of the German 'outside world' or do they try to adapt, but then fail to be accepted by the dominant group?

In light of ongoing discussions about integration or alienation of young people with an ethnic background, discrimination – regardless of whether actual or perceived – makes alienation more probable. This is particularly problematic because it also exerts influence on other fields of perception, such as permeability of group boundaries, social identity of the young people and the overall social identity.
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Notes

[1] We have defined as “young Turks” or young persons with a “Turkish background” adolescents who themselves or whose families migrated from Turkey to Germany

[2] Aussiedler are young immigrants with a German ethnic background from East Europe and from the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)

[3] Research into groups who are not of foreign ethnicity is more developed with regards to ‘group-related xenophobia’. For a more comprehensive overview of the state of research in this domain, see Heitmeyer, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005.

[4] 'Less' or 'efficient' are socially open categories, whose cultural meaning first appears within the course of exchanges between groups.

[5] In addition to this strategy, a considerable body of research can be found in the literature. They recommend the further intergroup strategies of social creativity, social competition, realistic competition, recategorisation at a higher level and preferences for temporal comparison (Tajfel/Turner 1986). However, it often remains unclear in such investigations which marginal requirements must be fulfilled in order to choose one strategy or the other.


[7] A Turkish ethnic background is in case when the young person, the father or the mother was born in Turkey and also when the young person, the father or the mother possesses Turkish citizenship. A Aussiedler background is in case when the young person, the father or the mother or the grandfather or the grandmother got the German Volkszugehörigkeit, have an Aufnahmebescheid at one’s disposal and on that basis moved to Germany.
### Appendix

#### Table 2: Module variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the variable</th>
<th>Meaning of the variable and possible range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Re)Ethnicisation</td>
<td>Measured according to agreement with the following indicators: a) Turks in Germany should only speak Turkish when it is absolutely necessary; b) A Turk man should marry Turk woman rather than a German woman and vice-versa; c) In case of problems with Germans, Turks should stick together; and d) Turks should only hire other Turks. Possible answers ranged from ‘I disagree completely’ (1) to ‘I completely agree’ (4). The indicators were added together and divided by the number of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>Measured as follows: a) To what extent to you consider yourself Turkish. Possible answers ranged from ‘not at all’ (1) to ‘very much’ (4); b) How important is it for you to be Turkish: ‘not important at all’ (1) to ‘very important’ (4) and c) How proud are of being Turkish? Possible answers from ‘not proud at all’ (1) to ‘very proud’ (4). The indicators were added together and divided by the number of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived personal discrimination</td>
<td>The question was asked as to what extent youth with Turkish ethnic minority background feel disadvantaged in comparison to their German counterparts in school, youth centres, discos or clubs as well as when dealing with public authorities and governmental offices. Possible answers ranged from ‘not at all’ (1) to ‘very much’ (4). The indicators were added together and divided by the number of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived group-related discrimination</td>
<td>The young people were asked to what extent Turks in Germany are treated as second-class citizens, Turkish students were penalised in school and Turks were disadvantaged when looking for work. Possible answers ranged from ‘not true at all’ (1) to ‘always true’ (4). The indicators were added together and divided by the number of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permeability of group boundaries</td>
<td>The permeability was measured according to the participants’ agreement or otherwise with the statements that it is difficult for Turks to be perceived as being German and that Turks will never be treated like Germans. Possible answers ranged from ‘not at all true’ (1) to ‘completely true’ (4). The indicators were added together and divided by the number of items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-demographic variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of educational qualification</td>
<td>‘No school diploma’ (1), ‘simple secondary school diploma’ (2) ‘(qualified) secondary school diploma’ (3) ‘secondary modern school diploma’ (4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td>‘Secondary school’ (1), ‘Comprehensive school’ (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Languages spoken at home: ‘German only’ (1), ‘German and one or more languages’ (2), ‘one or more other languages’ (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>‘Male’ (1) ‘Female’ (2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native country Germany</td>
<td>‘Yes’ (1), ‘No’ (2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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