

Perceptions of In-group Discrimination by First and Second Generation Immigrants from Different Countries of Origin in EU Member-States

S. André, J. Dronkers & F. Fleischmann¹

Last updated: October 21, 2008

Abstract

Drawing on 71593 respondents of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey, we analyse the perceptions of in-group discrimination of 7034 immigrants from 177 different countries of origin in 14 EU countries. In addition to testing the effects of individual factors, such as education, religion, and migration history, we estimate the effects of macro-characteristics of both origin and destination countries and community variables such as community size. Perceived in-group discrimination is far more common among immigrants than among natives. The influence of adherence to Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Islamic, and other non-Christian religions on perceived in-group discrimination can be explained by European history. The migration history of these groups is also relevant for the perceived discrimination: immigrants who are citizens of the country of their destination, who speak the majority language at home and who are married to a native perceive in-group discrimination less often. The community level characteristics do not add much to the explanation of perceived in-group discrimination, with social-economic distance between community and destination as the only significant negative effect. There are only two significant effects of macro-characteristics of the country of destination: easy access to long term residence and non prevalent religion lowers the perceived in-group discrimination. There are more significant effects of the macro-characteristics of the country of origin. Immigrants from weaker socio-economic origin countries perceive in-group discrimination less often. Immigrants originating from former colonies perceive in-group discrimination more often, just as do immigrants coming from countries with a higher income inequality.

Key words: immigration, perceived in-group discrimination, European Union, immigration policies, country of origin, religion

1. Introduction

The countries of the European Union are facing the challenge of immigration. Immigration politics are now a major issue in most European countries. Issues about freedom of non-Christian religions and tolerance of cultural diversity are important elements of current political debates. One of the questions of these political debates is which social and immigration policies contribute to integration of immigrants in their society of destination? Discrimination against minority groups and immigrants is often seen as an important explanation for their slow pace of integration and their weak socio-economic, cultural and political position in the societies of the European Union. Numerous projects both at the European Union level and at the level of the member-states aim to counter this discrimination of minorities and immigrants. In-group discrimination can have a significant influence on the different levels of integration of immigrants into their destination societies. Tubergen (2004), Kogan (2007), and Fleischmann & Dronkers (2007), have investigated the participation of male and female immigrants on the European labour markets as one of the forms of socio-economic integration. They found significant differences between the socio-economic integration of various groups of immigrants, next to differences between countries of destination, which might, in part, be interpreted as consequences of in-group discrimination. Although there has been a lot of research in the field of social psychology on perceptions of in-group discrimination, until now perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants has not

been analysed cross-nationally at a European level. We therefore try in this analysis to answer the question: “*which macro and policy factors of the destination-, origin- and community-level influence the perception of in-group discrimination by immigrants in the European Union, taking individual characteristics of these immigrants into account?*”

The topic of this paper is perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants. Verkuyten (2002) analysed perceptions of discrimination among early adolescents (10 to 12 years) of diverse minority groups and the majority in the Netherlands. He finds, firstly, that minority children perceive more discrimination than majority children and, secondly, that experienced in-group discrimination is larger than personal discrimination. Perceived discrimination tends to be higher if the members of the ethnic group have support by their group members (Ruggiero, Taylor & Lyndon, 1997), in-group status is higher (Taylor, Wright & Porter, 1994) and in-group identification is higher (Operario & Fiske, 2001). Although Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) predicts the opposite, these studies suggest that a stronger ethnic identity would make individuals more aware of ethnic-relevant information such as discrimination (Verkuyten, 2002).

A well-known phenomenon in social psychology research with regard to perceived discrimination is the discrepancy between personally experienced discrimination and perceived discrimination against one's in-group. Individual members of all groups, minorities as well as the majority, report more in-group discrimination than personal discrimination (see Verkuyten, 2002; Moghaddam, Stalkin & Hutcheson, 1997; Taylor, Wright & Porter, 1994). In our study, we analyse the perception of discrimination against one's ethnic, racial, national, religious or linguistic group, but not personally experienced discrimination. The level of perceived discrimination need not be the same as the experienced discrimination. Social psychologists (Verkuyten, 2002; Moghaddam, Stalkin & Hutcheson, 1997; Taylor, Wright & Porter, 1994) assume that reporting personal discrimination is more threatening for respondents' self-worth and psychological well-being than reporting in-group discrimination. Therefore, personally experienced discrimination is often minimized and under-reported in general surveys, relative to perceived in-group discrimination.

On the other hand, perceived in-group discrimination might not reflect the personal experience of discrimination. For instance, during the 20th century Jews have experienced strong in-group discrimination in many European countries. Thus Jewish respondents will with a high probability report in-group discrimination, especially if they were born before 1945 in the Nazi-occupied countries and have to answer the question of whether or not the respondent “belongs to a group which is discriminated against in society.”² The phrasing of the question is general and not restricted to the month or year of the survey. Thus a positive answer does not necessarily mean that Jewish respondents have personally and currently experienced this discrimination in their society. The 20th century history of Europe (changing frontiers after both world-wars and the collapse of the communist regimes, forced migrations and ethnic cleansings, changing relations with (former) colonies, influx of “guest-workers” and asylum-seekers, growing numbers of immigrants from within the European Union) will be reflected in the answers by early 21st century respondents on perceived in-group discrimination. But this reported in-group discrimination does not necessarily reflect the personal experience of discrimination.

2. Theories and hypotheses

Most research about discrimination is based on the attitudes of the majority-group to the minority group and mostly about one country or a small group of countries (Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004; Hagendoorn & Sniderman, 2001; Verkuyten, 2005; Devine, 1989). Some studies have compared the attitudes of the majority group across several countries (Semyonov, Raijman & Gorodzeisky, 2008). Few studies have analysed the attitudes of the minority group towards the majority or other minority groups, but these

studies are generally situated in one or a small number of countries (Bobo & Hutchins, 1996; Verkuyten, 2002; Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004; Snellman & Ekehammer, 2005; Berry & Kalin, 1979; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). There have been no studies about the perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in a comparative European perspective, using a comparable dataset for all EU member-states.

Social psychologists like Verkuyten (2005) have signalled an increasing demand for studies that also take the historical and ideological contexts of immigration into account outside the experimental setting of the laboratory. The data of the European Social Survey are more representative from this cross-national perspective; they allow the analysis of a sample of established immigrants for fourteen EU member-states. We also hope to make a contribution here to the analysis of the historical and political context of in-group discrimination studies.

There is hardly any literature on cross-national differences in (perceived) in-group discrimination which is useful for the formulation of our hypotheses. Most available theories and empirical evidence on discrimination come from the field of social-psychology, and they are less useful for formulating hypotheses that can be tested in cross-national survey studies. We have tried to use these theories and evidence as much as possible to formulate hypotheses about the possible effects of individual, community and macro characteristics on the likelihood of perceiving in-group discrimination. In a number of cases (for instance migrant generation, educational level, occupational status) we have formulated hypotheses based on the current literature or on current policy assumptions, although one might also argue for a causal relation in the opposite direction than the hypothesized one. In other cases (for instance gender, parental educational level) we could not formulate a clear hypothesis because the existing literature contains too few indications of its possible direction. However, we have included these characteristics in the analysis, both as controls for spurious relations, and to explore new, not yet theorized relations.

As a consequence our hypotheses do not fit neatly together in a coherent pattern based on one theory or a common set of assumptions. They should be seen more as descriptive tools to find our way around this unexplored area of cross-national differences in perceived in-group discrimination.

We analyse here only the perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in Europe, not the discrimination of other minorities in European societies. These religious, cultural and ethnic minorities do still exist in Europe: Swedish speakers in Finland; German speakers in Belgium, Denmark and Italy; Danish speakers in Germany; Basques and Catalonians in Spain. However, their level of perceived discrimination cannot be studied with the European Social Survey.

2.1. Hypotheses at the individual level

The contact theory is one of the oldest and the most influential theories about intergroup relations, such as the discrimination of minorities by majorities. It originates from Allport (1954) and was later extended by Pettigrew (1998). The contact hypothesis states that interpersonal contact between members of different groups is beneficial for positive intergroup relations when five conditions are met: equal status between groups, common goals to be reached, intergroup cooperation, support of laws and customs and the potential for friendship. The theory predicts discrimination to be minimal when intergroup contact is maximal. Many investigations also empirically supported these assumptions (see Pettigrew, 1998).

Second generation immigrants are born in their parents' destination country and have therefore relatively more chances for contact with the native population and to fulfil at least some of the five conditions of the contact theory (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). We hypothesize therefore that *second generation immigrants perceive in-group*

discrimination less often. But one can also argue for the opposite effect: second generation immigrants who are born and raised in their country of destination might be more aware of discrimination as they expect to be treated like the natives with whom they grew up. As a consequence of this other frame of reference *second generation immigrants might report more perceived in-group discrimination than first generation immigrants.*

Studies show that immigrants are often perceived as threats to the social, political and economic hierarchy and the national identity of the country by natives with lower socio-economic status (Coenders, 2001; Scheepers et al., 2002, Sniderman et al., 2004). One of the explanations is that natives with a lower socio-economic status are more discriminating against immigrants because of their competition with immigrants for the limited number of available jobs in the lower regions of the labour market. We expect that this discrimination is mostly felt by the unemployed immigrants, because they have to compete with these natives. Unemployed immigrants therefore experience more personal discrimination and thus perceive and report more often in-group discrimination. Moreover immigrants are more often unemployed than natives (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007) and therefore can feel more discriminated as a group. *Immigrants, who do not participate at the labour market, perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Highly educated persons tend to discriminate less. Because they have more contact with highly educated natives, highly educated immigrants will perceive less in-group discrimination, as found in previous research (Jasinskaja-Lathi, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). An additional argument is that highly educated immigrants have more opportunities to be successful in their new country and are probably better integrated, having adopted the habits of the destination country more than lowly educated immigrants. That is why *we expect immigrants who are highly educated to perceive in-group discrimination less.* But one can also argue the opposite relation: *more highly educated immigrants are more aware of social exclusion as they face more in-group discrimination in the labour market where they compete with highly-educated natives for the more attractive jobs* (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007).

A comparable argument can be made for immigrants who have jobs with high occupational status. These immigrants have been successful in their new country and are probably better integrated, again having adopted the habits of the destination country. That is why *we expect immigrants with higher occupational status to perceive in-group discrimination less often.* But one can also argue the opposite: immigrants with high status jobs might have faced more discrimination in the labour market where they compete with natives for the more attractive jobs (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007).

We also assume that if an immigrant is a citizen of the destination country he/she will be better integrated into the country of destination. The same holds for speaking a minority language at home. *We expect that immigrants, who are not a citizen of the destination country or speak a minority language at home, perceive in-group discrimination more often.* But one can also argue for the opposite effect: better integrated immigrants with citizenship and who do not speak a minority language at home might be more aware more aware of discrimination as they expect to be treated as natives. As a consequence of this higher awareness, immigrants who have become citizens and who speak the majority language might report more perceived in-group discrimination in comparison with less integrated immigrants.

Religion seems to be becoming less important in the Western world; secularization has taken place in most European countries in the post-Second World War period (Need & De Graaf, 1996). This seems to be less the case for immigrant groups coming from outside Europe. For Muslims, the honour of the prophet and the religion is very important, especially when this honour seems to be violated and less protected by laws than the native Christian religion (Modood, 1993). Comparable mechanisms might be true for other non-Christian religions, because their adherents might be treated by native (ex-)Christians with more suspicion. Moreover, most adherents of Judaism (the most numerous non-Christian religion in

Europe at the start of the 20th century) were mass-murdered by Nazi-Germany with the help of the citizens of occupied European states. Finally the civil wars in the former Republic of Yugoslavia of the '90s could also be described as wars between Christian groups and non-Christian religious groups (Bosnian Muslims) or between western and eastern Christianity (Orthodox Serbs versus Catholic Croats). *We expect that immigrants who are adherents of a non-Christian religion perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

2.2 Hypotheses at the community level

Alongside the individual characteristics of immigrants, their community features can also matter. In-group discrimination might be based on the specific economic, social and cultural situation of a particular immigrant group in a particular country of destination instead of the individual characteristics of the immigrants. That is why we also include the community level. We define a community of immigrants as a group from a specific country of origin in a specific country of destination (for instance Turks in Germany). We focus on the socio-economic, cultural and religious distance between the country of origin and thus the community to the native population.

The socio-economic distance of the immigrant community to the natives of the destination country was found in earlier research to be the most significant characteristic in predicting education and labour-market outcomes of immigrants (Levels, Dronkers & Kraaykamp, 2008; Tubergen, 2004). One of the indicators of that socio-economic distance is the difference in the educational level between the community and the natives. *We expect that immigrants with a greater socio-economic distance to the destination country perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Cultural distance can also be important as more distance between two cultures probably goes together with less mutual understanding (Jasinskja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). Hofstede (1984) identifies five cultural scales on which countries can be distinguished: power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation. We used only Hofstede's individualism or collectivism scale for a measurement of cultural distance. The extent to which the cultures of countries are individualistic or collectivistic differs greatly in the world, and this is seen as a major cultural distinction. *We expect that immigrants with a greater cultural distance to the destination country perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Another aspect is the religiosity or secularisation distance, which can also influence perceived in-group discrimination. More distance in religiosity to the native population might give rise to more discrimination. *We expect that immigrants with a greater religiosity distance to the destination country perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Next to cultural, socio-economic and religious differences, immigrants' group size can be responsible for rejection of minorities by the majority group. The larger the minority, the less benevolent it appears, as first proposed by Williams (1947) and later tested by various authors (Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004; Hagendoorn, 2007; Semyonov, Raijman and Gorodzeisky, 2008). Larger groups are more visible in the country of destination, for example because of groups of immigrants (communities) who live together. Allport (1954) predicted that there is a greater chance for ethnic conflict when the density of a minority group is greater. Schlueter & Wagner (2008) show that the regional size of the immigrant population within EU member-states increases the levels of perceived group threat by natives and that of intergroup contact between natives and immigrants. For this reason we expect that *the larger the size of the immigrant community in the destination country, the more this group perceives in-group discrimination.*

2.4 Hypotheses of the effect of the macro-characteristics of the country of destination

The national context of destination countries affects perceptions of natives and immigrants as shown in the case of prejudice (Semyonov, Raijman & Gorodzeisky, 2008), and thus these national contexts can also influence immigrants' likelihood to perceive in-group discrimination. We will estimate the influence of several macro-characteristics of the country of destination, which might account for a higher or lower amount of perceived in-group discrimination among immigrants. We start with hypotheses on the legal and economic openness of these societies, continue with socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the country of destination and conclude with religion and attitudes of the natives of the country of destination.

First, the laws of destination countries can vary in their levels of openness or inclusiveness towards immigrants. In countries with higher level of openness and inclusiveness, it is possible that migrants feel more welcome and less discriminated. The conflicts between the immigrant group and the natives will be less present and the perceived in-group discrimination lower. *We therefore expect that immigrants who live in a country with more inclusive policies perceive less in-group discrimination.*

Secondly, the labour markets of destination countries can vary in the level of openness for outsiders. We expect that in countries with better employment protection (at least in legislation) the jobs of the insiders (mostly natives) are better protected against outsiders (like immigrants; see Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007; Kogan, 2007), and thus the conflict of interests between insiders and outsiders is stronger. Such conflicts have given rise to group discrimination during the working life, as has been shown by research (Duckitt, 1992). That is why we expect that *immigrants who live in a country with higher employment protection legislation perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Thirdly, parties on the political left claim to defend the socially deprived (like immigrants), and their histories give evidence of that claim. Left-wing governments are expected to have a different policy approach towards minorities than centre- or right-wing governments. They are more in favour of for example minority rights and less restrictive asylum policies (Tubergen, 2004; Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007). This might influence the attitudes of the immigrants as well as the natives in the country, making them more accepting each other. That is why we expect *immigrants in countries with more left-wing parties governing in the past thirty years to perceive less in-group discrimination.*

Fourth, the economic development of destination societies has been found to have negative effects on the attitudes towards foreigners in Europe (Semyonov, Raijman and Gorodzeisky, 2008; Coenders et al., 2004). Natives in destination countries with higher economic development may feel more threatened by the influx of foreigners, because they fear for their economic prosperity. If a higher GDP goes together with more negative attitudes towards immigrants, this might also influence the perceived in-group discrimination by immigrant groups. *Immigrants in destination countries with a higher GDP will perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Fifth, destination countries with higher positive migration rates may feel more threatened in their historical existence or cultural or religious identity. On the other hand, it is also possible that countries with higher migration rates are more inclusive of immigrants, because they are experienced in canalizing the influx of immigrants. *The net migration rate will have an effect on the perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants.*

Sixth, another distinguishing feature of European countries is their type of welfare state regime (Esping-Andersen, 1990; Kogan, 2007; Fahey, 2007). We focus on the liberal welfare regime (United Kingdom and Ireland) which is a market-based social insurance system with low benefits. Kogan (2007) found a positive influence of a liberal welfare regime on the socio-economic integration of immigrants, due to its less strict distinction between insiders and outsiders (like immigrants). This less strict distinction of the liberal welfare state

between possible recipients of social welfare and the lower level of welfare benefits in the liberal welfare state will dampen conflicts between outsiders and insiders and thus decrease the possibility of in-group discrimination of outsiders. Immigrants might perceive less discrimination in the social-democratic welfare state regime because their access to social rights and benefits is assumed to be universal, thus including legal immigrants. Perceived discrimination could be highest in conservative welfare state regimes, as they are built to maintain the status quo of the society and social strata, i.e. uphold differences between immigrants and natives. *That is why we expect that in-group discrimination in liberal and social-democratic welfare states is perceived less often by immigrants than in the conservative and Mediterranean welfare states.*

Seventh, European destination countries can differ in their religious composition and thus in their openness to adherents of other religions. We expect that immigrants originating from non-Christian countries of origin living in countries of destination with *prevalent Christian religion perceive more in-group discrimination.*

Finally, the attitudes of the natives towards the immigrants are also an important factor in the way the natives perceive immigrants. Studies show that immigrants are often perceived as threats to the social, political and economic hierarchy and the national identity of the country by the natives with lower social-economic status (Coenders, 2001; Scheepers et al., 2002, Sniderman et al., 2004). Immigrants might perceive less in-group discrimination if the natives of their country of destination have more positive attitudes about immigration. We expect that *immigrants perceive less in-group discrimination in countries of destination where natives have on average a more positive view about immigration.*

2.5 Hypotheses of the effect of the macro-characteristics of countries of origin

In addition to the differences at the individual, community and destination level, we also analyse the effects of macro-characteristics of the country of origin. Several studies have shown that differences in countries of origin result in differential integration in terms of educational achievement and labour market success (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007; Levels & Dronkers, 2008; Levels, Dronkers & Kraaykamp, 2008). These origin macro-characteristics might influence the behaviour and the attitudes of immigrants, and thus affect immigrants' likelihood of perceiving in-group discrimination. But these origin characteristics might also arouse different reactions from the natives of the countries of destination, which in their turn might affect the amount of in-group discrimination immigrants perceive. We distinguish between economic, religious and political characteristics of the countries of origins.

The first category of indicators at the level of the origin country are economic characteristics. On the one hand, if the origin countries have poor economies, the emigration from these origin countries might be more economically motivated. Economic immigrants who come primarily to make money (and send remittances home) might care less about how they are treated as long as they earn more money than in their countries of origin. As a consequence, they might perceive in-group discrimination less often. *Immigrants who originate in countries with poor economies perceive less in-group discrimination.* On the other hand, origin countries with rich economies have a smaller socio-economic distance from the European Union countries and thus immigrants from these countries have less difficulty in adjusting to the new situation and thus perceive less in-group discrimination. *Immigrants who originate from wealthy countries perceive less in-group discrimination.*

The second category of indicators at the level of the origin country are religious characteristics, which might influence the behaviour and attitudes of immigrants coming from these origins, but which might also influence the reactions of the natives towards these immigrants with this specific religious background. Tubergen (2004) and Fleischmann & Dronkers (2007) found that immigrants who come from non-Christian origin countries had worse labour market outcomes than comparable immigrants from prevalently Christian

societies. We expect that *immigrants who come from non-Christian origin countries perceive more in-group discrimination.*

The third category of indicators at the level of the origin country is political characteristics. Politically motivated immigrants might remain more oriented towards their country of origin than towards their country of destination. As a consequence, they are less sensitive to discrimination in their countries of destination and thus report less perceived in-group discrimination, also after a prolonged stay in the country of destination. We expect that *immigrants who come from less political stable countries will perceive in-group discrimination less often.*

3. Data and Measurements

We use the second and third wave of the European Social Survey for our analysis.³ The data are assembled in the years 2004-2005 for the second and 2006-2007 for the third wave (Jowell and the Central Co-ordinating Team, 2005; Jowell and the Central Co-ordinating Team, 2007). The data-set contains information on very diverse topics, among which are perceptions of in-group discrimination for over 82000 respondents in 28 European countries. We selected only EU member-states from the European Social Survey, because we are especially interested in the effects of immigration and social policies on the degree of integration of immigrants (in this case perceived in-group discrimination), and reliable and comparable indicators of these policies (like type of welfare state or the Migrant Integration Policy Index) are only available for EU member-states (see also section 3.4). Therefore, only 23 European Union countries where the ESS was conducted were selected. Regrettably Italy, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania were not available in the ESS data-sets.

We classified respondents as immigrants if at least one of the parents of the respondent was born outside the country in which the interview took place. The respondents who were born outside the country of interview but whose parents were born in the country of interview were classified as natives. We do not expect them to be different from natives in the destination country. All other respondents were classified as natives as well and are only used for aggregate variables for the destination countries and are excluded from all analyses. If both parents were born in the same country, this country is used as the country of origin. If the parents were born in different countries we used the country that matched the language spoken at home. In all other cases the country of birth of the mother was used.⁴ For first generation immigrants (i.e. those respondents who are themselves born outside the country of interview), their country of birth is used as country of origin. Because not all identifiable countries of origin are represented by substantial numbers of surveyed immigrants in the ESS, we merged countries into regions if the number of immigrants from these countries in our sample was smaller than 10. The nineteen regions of origin we use are derived from the United Nations classification of geographical regions (United Nations Statistical Office). The pooled ESS data-set of the remaining 23 EU member-states contains 10.038 non-native respondents.

The question of the definition of immigrant status is contested in the social sciences (see Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007, for an extensive discussion). Some prefer to define immigrants as not (yet) naturalized persons. This legal definition of immigrants would exclude many naturalized immigrants from our analysis and, as a consequence, differences in the level of perceived in-group discrimination could be biased by the naturalization policies of the different destination countries. That is why we chose for the division into natives and non-natives based on the country of birth of the respondent and his or her parents. Citizenship status of these non-natives will be included in our analysis as an independent variable.

A problem with the use of country of birth or having immigrant parents for the measurement of immigrant status are the changing national boundaries in Europe during the

full 20th century and the start of the 21st century. Due to changes in political frontiers after 1918 (the restructuring of middle and eastern Europe) and 1945 (the annexation by Poland of some formerly German territory; the extension of Russia at the expense of Polish territory) and due to the subsequent displacement of large populations, an unknown number of ‘indigenous’ persons are measured as being born outside their country, e.g. a German respondent or his/her parents born in Königsberg (East Prussia) and now living in Germany or a Polish respondent or his/her parents born in Lvov (Ukraine) and now living in Poland. We can add more examples of this border-changing in recent time for Yugoslavia and the USSR. One can argue that by failing to make the distinction between genuine migrants and border changes, we overestimate the number of better-integrated immigrants. At the same time, this possible failure highlights a conceptual problem in defining an immigrant: for how many generations must a Polish family live in Germany before he/she is no longer considered Polish? This issue also extends to the large number of ‘visible minority’ natives, whose grandparents migrated from former colonies to Europe. The grandchildren of these immigrants are not included in this analysis, because their parents are born in the European country of destination where the respondent is also born.

Another problem of using the ESS for comparative analyses of immigrants is the selectivity of the migrants in the ESS sample. As the ESS is not specifically designed to include immigrants, and because participation requires language proficiency, the immigrants that are in the sample need to speak the language of the destination country⁵ and be willing to participate in a survey, so they most probably have a legal status in the country of destination. This selectivity of established immigrants in the ESS might be undesirable, but at this moment the ESS data are the best available for a comparative analysis. We should keep in mind, however, that if significant and substantial effects are found for these legal, more well-established immigrants, the effects are probably even larger with the illegal immigrants that are not included in the survey. Illegal immigrants have a higher probability for being discriminated against, because they have hardly any legal protection and have a very vulnerable position in the destination society.

Because of the small number of immigrants in some of the destination countries we excluded Cyprus, Bulgaria, Hungary, Finland and Poland from our analysis. Secondly, the Cronbach’s alpha of the scale developed to measure perceived in-group discrimination, based on race, ethnicity, nationality, religion or language, was too low for Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal and Slovakia (see section 3.1). This means that these countries will also be excluded from the analysis. In the end we had 7.034 immigrants from 14 countries of destination left. They are distributed across 67 countries of origin and 19 regions of origin, with different numbers of immigrants varying from 1197 coming from the Former Soviet-Union and 2 immigrants originating from the region Southern Africa.

Table 1 gives the numbers of natives and immigrants per destination country, while table 2 gives the number of immigrants per country or region of origin.⁶

[Tables 1 & 2 about here]

3.1 Dependent variable: perceived in-group discrimination

Our measurement of perceived discrimination is based on two questions of the ESS. The first question was whether or not the respondent “belongs to a group which is discriminated against in society.” If respondents answered this question positively, they were asked for what reasons this group is discriminated against—seven explicit reasons were given in the questionnaire. Five different reasons for in-group discrimination form one acceptable scale, which is also separated for countries of origin or destination: language, race, nationality, ethnicity and religion. The other two reasons of perceived in-group discrimination (gender and age) are fitted badly together with these five other reasons into one scale. The overall

Cronbach's alpha of the scale of these five grounds of in-group discrimination is 0.55. Although this is not a high alpha, it indicates that a combined use of these five reasons is acceptable in order to measure perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants, based on either their language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion. These five reasons for discrimination jointly indicate perceived in-group discrimination based on ethnic minority or immigrant status, and therefore fit badly with the two other reasons for discrimination (age, gender), which can also apply to the majority population.

We estimated per destination country the Cronbach's alpha for natives and immigrants separately. For immigrants in some destination countries, the Cronbach's alpha would improve if we deleted race or ethnicity.⁷ But the improvements for those countries were small when we delete race from the scale, while the alphas of other destination countries flew down. Deleting race as well as ethnicity also did not positively affect most alphas. That is why we decided to keep both reasons in the scale. An explanation of these problems with race and ethnicity is that ethnicity is mostly used in continental European destination countries, while race is used more frequently in the Anglo-Saxon countries, while in some other European countries both words are taboo. Moreover these problems with low Cronbach's alphas might be explained by the special mix of immigrants from some (ex-colonial) countries (for instance Cuba, the Czech Republic, Ireland, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, USA, Dutch speaking Caribbean and South America)

The Cronbach's alphas of this scale of five reasons of perceived in-group discrimination were so low for the immigrants in Greece, Luxembourg, Portugal and Slovakia that a combined use of these five reasons was not defensible. This might be explained by the special mix of immigrants in these four destination countries (for instance many EU employees in Luxembourg) for whom the combination of these five reasons for in-group discrimination is not applicable. Therefore we deleted these four countries from further analysis. The Cronbach's alphas of five reasons of perceived in-group discrimination are high enough for the immigrants in other countries.⁸ We conclude from these analyses that a combined use of these five reasons of in-group discrimination is acceptable, and given the different uses of reasons in the (history of) EU countries (race or ethnicity for instance; religion or language) is to be preferred in a comparative analysis of perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants. However, it should be remembered that the turbulent European history of the 20th century has a strong impact on perceived in-group discrimination. Next to the above-mentioned example of the deadly discrimination of Jews in this century, another example is the forced settlement of Russians in the Baltic states after 1945 and their changed position due to the independence of these states after 1989, which might explain the high level of perceived in-group discrimination by Russian immigrants in Estonia.

However, we do not use this scale of the five reasons as an indicator of in-group discrimination, because such a scale would measure the number of reasons given by the respondent for perceived in-group discrimination.⁹ Instead, our dependent variable is dichotomous and measures whether or not a respondent in the selected fourteen destination countries reports his/her in-group to be discriminated for one or more of these five reasons. The reported characteristics of the scale of five reasons justify our transformation of these reasons into a dichotomous variable that indicates belonging or not belonging to a group which is discriminated against.

Table 1 shows how many natives and immigrants per destination country say that they belong to a group which experiences in-group discrimination for one or more of these five reasons. The mean percentage of perceived in-group discrimination among immigrants in these European Union countries is 12.5 %, while only 3.9% of the natives in these societies perceive such in-group discrimination. This large difference in perceived discrimination between natives and immigrants supports our assumption that the combination of these five reasons is a valid indicator of immigrants' minority status in Europe. The highest percentage

of perceived in-group discrimination among immigrants is found in Estonia (22.4 %) and the lowest percentage in Slovenia (3.0 %). The high score for Estonia can be explained by its large Russian-speaking minority, immigrated during the Soviet occupation of Estonia, and perceiving more discrimination after the downfall of the Soviet-Union and the break-away of Estonia from Russia. The highest number of natives perceiving in-group discrimination lives in the UK (8.0%) and the lowest number (0%) in Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Netherlands and Norway. The high score of natives feeling discriminated against in the UK might be accounted for by the ‘visible third generation minorities’ in that society, which we can not distinguish in our sample.

Table 2 gives the percentages of immigrants per origin country or region who say that they belong to a group which experiences in-group discrimination in their society of destination. The countries or region of origin are ordered by these percentages. The resulting rank order is not very surprising: immigrants from outside Europe perceive far more in-group discrimination than immigrants coming from inside Europe.

3.2 Independent variables: individual characteristics

Table 3 shows descriptive information about the independent individual and macro variables which we use in this analysis.¹⁰ All these individual variables and their coding are self-evident and directly derived from the European Social Survey. However, the educational level of the immigrants was originally measured on the seven point scale of ISCED-97, but unfortunately the measurement of education in the United Kingdom forces us to reduce this to a five point scale, by collapsing the categories of upper secondary and post-secondary non-tertiary to one category and by joining first stage of tertiary education and second stage of tertiary education to just tertiary education. The scale now starts with not completed primary education (0) and ends with tertiary education (4).¹¹

[About here table 3]

3.3 Independent variables: community variables

We define a community of immigrants as a group from a specific country of origin in another specific country of destination (for instance Turks in Germany). We have 578 different immigrant communities in our data-set, running from the largest (N=986) to the smallest (N=1).

Socio-economic distance is measured by the educational level of the natives of a country of destination and the specific groups of immigrants in that country. Hence, we have subtracted the mean level of education of the specific immigrant group in a specific country of destination from the mean level of education of the natives of that destination country.

We use only Hofstede’s (1984) individualism or collectivism scale for a measurement of cultural distance. For most countries in our dataset Hofstede (1984) estimated an individualism score. We subtracted the level of individualism of the country of origin from the level of individualism in the country of destination as an indicator of the cultural distance. As a consequence, immigrants with a positive score on the cultural distance scale come from a less individualistic culture compared to their country of destination. Negative scores mean that the origin culture is more individualistic than the destination culture.

We measure religiosity or secularisation distance by firstly computing the mean religious practice (attendance and prayer) of an immigrant group in the destination country, and secondly subtracting the mean level of religious practice of the natives in the country.

3.4 Independent variables: macro-characteristics of destination¹²

We have collected the policy indicators of the level of legal and economic openness of these societies (MIPEX; EPL), socio-economic demographic characteristics of the country of

destination (GDP, net migration rate; type of welfare state) and religious and attitudes of the natives of the country of destination (prevalent religion, attitudes towards immigration).

The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a measurement of the different policies towards the integration of migrants for 28 states among which 25 EU-member states. It uses over a hundred policy indicators in six areas of shaping citizenship for immigrants (Niessen, Huddleston and Citron, 2007). Higher scores represent better migrant integration policies on a scale from 0 to 100. The highest score in our sample is reached in Sweden with 88 points on the total scale. We also used the six subscales for long-term residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination policy, family reunion, political participation and labour market access.

The index of Employment Protection Legislation (EPL) measures the openness of labour markets of destination countries to outsiders. The EPL measures all kinds of protection in employment in the different countries. An example of such protection is the ease with which a job contract can be terminated by an employer. A higher score indicates better employment protection for those in the destination country who already have jobs. We derived data about Employment Protection Legislation from the OECD (2007), using the average of the available data of 1990, 1998 and 2003. The indicator ranges from 0.65 in the United Kingdom to 3.33 in Greece, indicating higher labour market regulation in the latter country.

The presence of left-wing parties in the government during the past thirty years is based on data provided by Beck et al. (2001). We computed a total score for every country of destination. Countries could score a point (1) for every year the government was fully made-up of left-wing parties and 0.5 points for every year a left-wing party has been part of a coalition government with centre and or right-wing parties.

The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita is an indicator of the economic wealth of a country (Data are from 2005; OECD, 2007).

The net-migration rate of a destination country is the difference between the immigration and emigration in a country per 1000 persons in the population per year. The mean net migration rate of 2007 is used if present (CIA World Fact Book, 2007).

For the different types of welfare-regime we use the classic typology of Esping-Andersen (1990) in addition to the more recent work of Kogan (2007) and Fahey (2007). The first regime is the liberal welfare regime (United Kingdom and Ireland) which is a market-based social insurance system with low benefits. The second regime is the social-democratic welfare regime of Sweden, Denmark and Norway. The third is the conservative welfare regime; countries like Austria, Belgium, France, Germany and the Netherlands fall into this category. The fourth welfare regime is the Mediterranean welfare regime which we find in Portugal and Spain. This type is comparable with the conservative welfare regime but has far lower welfare benefits. The former communist European countries are all building up welfare regimes and are still in a transitional state. Fahey (2007) investigated measurements of poverty in the European Union, and based on the amount of poverty he distinguish three categories for former communist societies. Of the middle category only Estonia is included in our sample. The third group consists of Slovenia and the Czech Republic, in which the poverty level is more or less the same as in the Mediterranean countries. Therefore we code the Czech Republic and Slovenia as 'high' ex-communistic welfare-regimes and Estonia as a 'low' ex-communistic welfare regime.

We made dummy variables to indicate the prevalent religion in the country of destination. If at least fifty percent of the population belonged to the same religious group, this religion was classified as prevailing. If no religious group reached this fifty percent, the country was classified as having no prevalent religion. If necessary, the different Christian denominations were aggregated, and if the Christian denominations were more than fifty percent the country is classified as prevalently Christian. If the Eastern Orthodox Church was

prevailing, the country was classified as Eastern Orthodox. Data are taken from the CIA World Factbook (2008).

We computed the means per country of two scales which measure the extent to which natives are in favour of more immigration and the extent to which natives see positive consequences of immigration for their country.

3.5 Independent variables: macro-characteristics of origin

The first category of indicators at the level of the origin country is economic characteristics, which might influence the economic motives for immigration. The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite measure for the development level of a country. Its three components are a long and healthy life, knowledge and a decent standard of living. Data of the Human Development report 2007/2008 are used. In addition, we take into account the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita. This indicates the total amount of final goods and services that are produced by a country in a year relative to the size of the population (CIA World Factbook, 2008). The third economic variable is the net migration rate. A negative score indicates more emigration from the country of origin. The fourth economic variable is the GINI coefficient. The GINI-coefficient is an internationally comparable measure of income inequality. If there would not be any inequality the index would be zero, if there is total inequality the index reaches 100. Data are retrieved from the CIA World Factbook, collected between 1987 (Mauritius) and 2007 (among others Russia and the United States) (CIA, 2008).

The second category of indicators at the level of the origin country is religious macro-characteristics. We use dummy variables for the prevalent religion in the country of origin, which are defined in the same way as for destination countries. We distinguish prevalently Catholic, Protestant, Eastern-Orthodox, (other) Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Eastern Religious or other non-Christian religion (CIA World Factbook, 2008).

The third category of indicators at the level of the origin country is political macro-characteristics. We firstly use Kaufmann's indicator of political stability, which assesses the probability that the government in function will be overthrown in the near future by unconstitutional or violent means (Kaufmann et al., 2006). Data from 2006 are used. Using seven to eleven components, the indicator ranges from -2.5 to + 2.5 due to a standardization procedure. Higher scores indicate more political stability. We also used the index of political freedom and civil rights developed and published for over thirty-five years by Freedom House (2007). After recoding, a higher score on the six-point scale is an indication of more political freedom or civil rights. We also included the status of political freedom indicator of Freedom House, which tells us if a country is free (2), partly free (1) or not free (0).

4. Results

In order to take into account the nested structure of our data (respondents are nested in communities and communities are nested in countries of destination as well as countries of origin) we need to use multilevel analysis. As the two levels of country of origin and country of destination are not hierarchically nested, we will use a cross-classified model. This model makes it possible for respondents to be as well nested into countries of origin as into countries of destination. Given the dichotomous nature of our dependent variables (whether or not belonging to a group which is discriminated against in society) we apply logistic multilevel analysis.

4.1 Building the multilevel models

We start with an empty model ('null-model') as displayed in Table 4. The (not shown) null-model shows that there is some variance in perceived in-group discrimination at the country of origin level: 0.730 (st. dev. 0.114). The destination and community level do not show

significant variance: 0.072 (0.049); resp. 0.000 (0.000). The variance at the lowest individual level is fixed on 1.0 in logistic multilevel analysis.

[Table 4 about here]

Our first step is to build an individual-level model by adding significant individual characteristics of the respondents.¹³ Being a citizen of the destination country, speaking a minority language at home, age, educational level, educational level of the mother, unemployment, retirement and religious affiliation (Protestant, Jewish, Islam, non-Christian religions) and religious practice all have significant effects on perceived in-group discrimination and are included in model 1.

In model 2 the community variables are included. Socio-economic, religious and cultural distance and community size are added to this model. The latter three have significant coefficients.

In the next step we have tested the effect of all macro-characteristics of the country of destination as well as the country of origin. We added one by one separately the macro-characteristics of the countries of origin and destination to the second model. Table 5 shows all coefficients of this separate inclusion. We can see that only a few characteristics of the country of destination have significant effects: the subscales family reunion, access to long term residence, political participation and access to nationality of the Migrant Integration Policy Index and no prevalent religion in the country of destination. High scores on these macro-characteristics of the destination countries lower the chances that immigrants in these countries perceive in-group discrimination, compared to immigrants in destination countries with low scores on these macro-characteristics. More characteristics of the country of origin have significant effects. High scores on Human Development Index, GDP per capita, Net Migration Rate, Political freedom and Civil rights lower the chances that immigrants from these countries perceive in-group discrimination, compared to immigrants from origin countries with low scores on these macro-characteristics. The high score on the GINI coefficient, an Islamic origin country, and origin country as former colony of destination country, increase the chances that immigrants from these countries perceive in-group discrimination, compared to comparable immigrants from origin countries with low scores on these macro-characteristics.

[Table 5 about here]

As the next step we selected the most influential variable (based on -2loglikelihood and significance) and added thereafter the next most influential characteristic. If the latter also remained significant a third variable was added and so forth until adding variables did not account for any more variance.

The third model contains the combination of all significant macro-characteristics of the country of destination added to the second model. If one of these macro-variable becomes insignificant it is deleted from the equation of model 3. In this case only the subscale access to long term residence of the Migrant Integration Policy Index and no prevalent religion in the country of destination maintain their significant effects and are therefore added.

The fourth model contains the combination of all significant macro-characteristics of the country of origin added to the second model. If one of these macro-variable becomes insignificant it is deleted from the equation of model 4. Four macro-characteristics of the country of origin maintain their significant effects and are added in the fourth model to model 2: the Human Development Index, GINI coefficient, former colony of destination country and GDP per capita. The inclusion of the origin variables makes the three community

characteristics (religious and cultural distance, community size) insignificant, but rather the socio-economic distance significant instead.

The fifth model shows the combination of models 3 and 4 with all the significant macro-characteristics of both countries of origin and of destination. The combination of origin and destination macro-characteristics hardly affect the parameters, but makes all community characteristics insignificant.

In the sixth model all insignificant effects are deleted. This makes the community variable socio-economic distance again significant, but contrary to our hypothesis, it has a negative effect.

4.2 The significant results for the individual characteristics

As noted above, the individual characteristics explain more of the variance of perceived in-group discrimination than characteristics of the context (community; destination; origin).

Aspects of the migration history have substantial effects: being a citizen of the destination country, being married to a native and not speaking a minority language at home decreases the chances of perceiving in-group discrimination. But general sociological characteristics are also important: higher education or being unemployed increase the chances of perceiving in-group discrimination, while being retired or older and having a highly educated mother decrease the chances of perceiving in-group discrimination. The latter seems an odd result, but can be explained by the argument that the mother's education level is the best indicator of the parental class.

Another important result is the insignificance of the variable second generation: this means that second generation immigrants do not perceive less in-group discrimination than the first generation.

4.3 The significant results for the macro-characteristics of destination

The characteristics of the destination countries seemed hardly at all to explain the variance in immigrants' perception of in-group discrimination. Moreover, there are only two significant macro-characteristic of the countries of destination and four significant macro-characteristics of the countries of origin. The addition of these macro variables to the equation explains all significant variance at the destination and origin levels.

In the final model only the subscale *access to long term residence* of the Migrant Integration Policy Index and no prevalent religion in the country of destination maintain their significant effects. This means that immigrants in EU countries with easy access to long term residence perceive less in-group discrimination than comparable immigrants in EU countries with a more difficult access to long term residence. It also means that immigrants in EU countries with no prevalent religion perceive less in-group discrimination than comparable immigrants in EU countries with a dominant Christian religion.

The low number of significant parameters means that nearly all our hypotheses about the effects of macro-characteristics of countries of destination are refuted. Differences in perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants within the EU can hardly be explained by anti-discrimination, immigration or welfare policies of these destination countries. Moreover, average natives' attitudes in destination countries towards immigration do not have the expected significant effect on perceived in-group discrimination. This is a serious problem as many of our hypotheses are formulated such that the underlying mechanisms refer to these attitudes towards immigrants.

4.4 The significant results for the macro-characteristics of origin

There are four macro-characteristics of the countries of origin that remain significant in the final model: the Human Development Index, GDP per capita, GINI coefficient, and former colony of destination country.

Immigrants originating from countries with higher levels of human development or a higher income per capita perceive less in-group discrimination than comparable immigrants originating from countries with a lower level of human development or a lower income per capita.

Immigrants originating from countries with higher levels of income inequality perceive more in-group discrimination than comparable immigrants originating from countries with lower levels of income inequality.

Immigrants originating from former colonies of the destination countries perceive more in-group discrimination than comparable immigrants originating from countries which were not a colony of that destination country. Note that this effect occurs after controlling for citizenship, which has a significant negative effect on perceived in-group discrimination. A possible explanation of this unexpected result is that immigrants from former colonies might be more aware of discrimination as they expect to be treated as persons who have at least partly a common history and culture with the natives. As a consequence of this higher awareness, immigrants from former colonies might report more perceived in-group discrimination in comparison with migrants from countries without historical political, economical or cultural ties to the country of destination.

The parameters of the other origin macro-characteristics were not significant or could be explained by other macro characteristics (Islamic origin country, net migration rate, political freedom and civil rights by Human Development Index, GINI coefficient, Former colony of destination country or GDP per capita). This means that many of our hypotheses about the effects of macro-characteristics of countries of origin are refuted. Differences in perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants within the EU can only partly be explained by the characteristics of their origin countries.

4.5 The significant results for the community characteristics

We formulated four hypotheses about community characteristics referring to community size, religious distance, socio-economic distance and cultural distance. Community size does not affect perceived in-group discrimination, if one takes macro-characteristics of the countries of origin into account. If these macro-characteristics of the countries of origin of immigrants are not taken into account, immigrants in larger immigrant communities perceive more in-group discrimination.

Only immigrants in communities with smaller socio-economic distance toward the destination society perceived in-group discrimination more often, but only if one takes the macro-characteristics of their origin countries into account. Without controlling for these origin characteristics, this socio-economic distance is insignificant for the perceived in-group discrimination. Religious distance and cultural distance between immigrant community and destination society are significant, but only if one does not take the origin macro-characteristics of these immigrants into account. These results illustrate the importance of the variation of origins of immigrants to explain their attitudes and behaviour and the flaws that result from not taking these origins into account.

4.6 Equal parameters for countries of destination and origin?

In the foregoing multilevel models all individual and community effects (except of course the constant) were fixed. We have tested in model 5, whether making the effects random at the country of origin level or at country of destination level yields significantly different results. As can be seen in table 6, it makes a difference: some effects are not equal for all countries of origin or destination. The effect of respondents' education varies both at the level of the country of destination and the country of origin. However, a substantial number of random effect models did not converge, which is an indication that the distribution of the effect-parameters between countries of destination or origin is far from normally distributed and

therefore the iteration can not converge into one optimal solution. The provisional conclusion of these analyses of random coefficients is that many individual and communities variables have the same effect, irrespective of the destination or the origin of the immigrants, but that this might not be true for important variables, like education, citizenship, second generation, Islamic religion, etc.

[Table 6 about here]

5. Conclusion and discussion

In this study we analyzed the perceived levels of in-group discrimination of 7034 immigrants in fourteen European Union countries. We used a logistic cross-classified multi-level model to answer our main question: *which macro-factors on destination-, origin- and community-level influence the perception of in-group discrimination by immigrants, taking individual characteristics of the immigrants into account?*

The first conclusion is that immigrants indicate far more often than natives that they belong to a group which is discriminated against in their society, either for their language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion. This higher occurrence of perceived in-group discrimination is not self-evident, because most immigrants who participated in the *European Social Survey* will be well-established (because they could answer the survey in the national language and they were willing to participate). This perceived in-group discrimination is not the same as personally experienced discrimination. The precise relation between the former and the latter needs further study, but it is probable that this relation is positive, although not very strong. If this positive relation exists, our study suggests that discrimination of immigrants in the EU exists, and it varies mostly as a function of origin country and the individual characteristics of the immigrant, and only partly as a function of the country of destination.

The second conclusion is that perceived in-group discrimination is not a recent phenomenon, only related to the current immigration, but that it is strongly related to the violent European history of the 20th century. The high levels of perceived in-group discrimination by Russian immigrants in Estonia, by Jewish immigrants in the EU,¹⁴ and by immigrants originating from former colonies, are testimonies of the importance of European history for perceived in-group discrimination.

The third conclusion is that the largest variance in perceived in-group discrimination is at the individual level. Here several indicators have explanatory power for perceived in-group discrimination.

Particularly notable is the effect of educational attainment; the higher the educational level, the higher the perceived in-group discrimination. This result suggests that more highly educated immigrants are more aware of social exclusion, as they face more discrimination in the labour market where they compete with highly-educated natives for more attractive jobs and other resources. Previous research (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007) has shown that immigrants have much lower returns on their education in terms of access to the most prestigious jobs, which shows that the gap between immigrants and natives in labour market attainment is especially large among the most highly educated.

Moreover, immigrants who are unemployed and have a mother with a lower educational level perceive more in-group discrimination. The latter perhaps unexpected result can be explained by the argument that mothers' education is a good indicator of parental class and that descents of higher classes perceive themselves less as victims of in-group discrimination.

A remarkable finding is that there is no difference in perceived in-group discrimination between the first and second generation of immigrants. Partly this can be explained by the factors that influence the level of perceived in-group discrimination and that do differ between these two generations (notably age and retirement). Although our data are cross-sectional and do not allow the drawing of conclusions over time, the non-significance of the variable second generation at least suggests that there is no automatic decline in perceived in-group discrimination over immigrant generations. One possible interpretation of our result is that the positive effect of increased contact with the native population is neutralized by the greater awareness of discrimination as the second generation expects to be treated like other natives.

The strong influence of adherence to Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Islamic and other non-Christian religions on perceived in-group discrimination is also a remarkable finding, because the discrimination-line does not run between Christian and non-Christian religions but follows the Schism between the western and eastern Christian churches of 1054. Thus, it is important to underline that Muslims are not the only religious group that perceives more often in-group discrimination: Jews perceive the highest level, followed by adherents of non-Christian religions and the Eastern Orthodox Church. Muslims perceive relatively less in-group discrimination than Eastern Orthodox. It should be noted that adherents of Eastern religions (Hinduism; Buddhism; Confucianism) do not perceive more often in-group discrimination than the non-religious immigrant. Because it is implausible that these adherents are not discriminated against in the EU (in most cases they are a visible minority and experience no less discrimination: Modood, 2004: 94), the adherents of Eastern religions might ignore the occurrence of in-group discrimination and focus on their individual success.

Migration history is also relevant for the perceived discrimination: immigrants who are citizens of the country of their destination are speaking the majority language at home and are married with a native perceive in-group discrimination less often than other immigrants with the same characteristics, originating from the same countries and living in the same countries. These effects of migration history can probably (partly) be explained by selectivity: those who really want to live in the country of destination, will probably get the citizenship faster, might marry a native, speak the national language more often and ignore or not encounter in-group discrimination. But it might also be possible that these choices made in the migration history have their own dynamic, for instance natives might treat immigrants with citizenship, a native spouse, etc, less discriminatorily than immigrants who still live in the culture of their country of origin.

The fourth conclusion is that there are very few significant effects of macro-characteristics of the country of destination, and the variance in perceived in-group discrimination at the destination level is not significant. The ease of access to long term residence and the absence of a prevalent religion were the only significant ones. This suggests that perceived in-group discrimination is not driven by specific characteristics and histories of particular European nation-states. We can conclude that the differences in perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in the European destination countries are due to differences in immigrants' origin countries and their own individual characteristics, whereas differences in the destination countries themselves hardly contribute to the explanation of perceived in-group discrimination.

The fifth conclusion is that there are more significant effects of macro-characteristics of the country of origin, and the variance in perceived in-group discrimination at the origin level is can be fully explained by the macro-characteristics of the origin countries. The features of the countries of origin of immigrants in the EU are of course less homogeneous than the features of the EU countries of destinations, and this might explain why more origin characteristics

have significant effects on perceived in-group discrimination. But this larger homogeneity of the EU member states compared to the countries of origin of the EU immigrants is not a statistical artefact but a basic characteristic of migration processes.

There is an indication that immigrants from poorer countries perceive less in-group discrimination. The economic nature of emigration from the less advanced countries to the EU might increase the willingness of these economic immigrants to be successful and to ignore in-group discrimination.

The history of the dependence relations between the countries of origin and destination also affects the occurrence of perceived in-group discrimination. Immigrants originating from former colonies perceive in-group discrimination more often than do comparable immigrants coming from countries who had no such colonial relation with the country of destination. The behaviour and attitudes of the natives to immigrants from their former colonies might be more negative or immigrants from former colonies might be more sensitive for and aware of in-group discrimination due to the more painful aspects of this common history. We can not test these possible explanations, but the results show how strongly history can influence perceived in-group discrimination.

The sixth conclusion is that the community level does not add much to the explanation of perceived in-group discrimination. As long as the macro-characteristics of the countries of origin are not included, community size and the cultural and religious distances between the specific immigrant-community and the specific country of destination seem to be related to perceived in-group discrimination. However, these are spurious effects which disappear after the inclusion of the origin macro-characteristics. Only after this the socio-economic distance between the specific immigrant community and the natives of a specific country of destination has a significant negative effect. A smaller socio-economic distance between community and the destination society results in more perceived in-group discrimination, contrary to our hypothesis. Thus the opposite of our hypothesis might be more correct: immigrants belonging to a group with a small socio-economic distance also face more discrimination in the labour market where they compete with natives for the more attractive jobs and are thus more aware of that discrimination.

Our analysis shows that a cross-national analysis of discrimination of immigrants can be very fruitful and that such an analysis will be flawed if the country of origin of the immigrants is not incorporated. The religious dimension should also not be ignored. In the short run our results might be less self-congratulating for the European societies and their openness towards immigrants, but unpleasant social facts ignored will become dangerous in the long run.

Notes

¹ Stéfanie André is a masters student of social cultural science and political science at the Radboud University of Nijmegen (the Netherlands). Jaap Dronkers holds a chair in the study of social stratification and inequality in the Department of Social and Political Sciences at the European University Institute near Florence (Italy). Fenella Fleischmann is a PhD student at the Universities of Utrecht (the Netherlands) and Leuven (Belgium). This paper is a product forthcoming from a traineeship of Stéfanie André at the European University Institute supervised by Professor Jaap Dronkers. An older version of this paper has been presented at the RC28 Spring Meeting 2008, Florence, Italy, 15-18 May 2008, the Dutch-Fleming Meeting of Sociology 2008, Leuven, Belgium, 29 May 2008 and the International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Contexts (3MC), Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, June 25-28, 2008. All correspondence, including requests for the appendix, to Jaap Dronkers, SPS Department, EUI, Via dei Roccettini 9, I-50014 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy. E-mail: jaap.dronkers@eui.eu

² This was the first part of the used question in the European Social Survey.

³ The first wave of the European Social Survey is not usable for our purposes, because we do not know the countries of origin of the second generation immigrants.

⁴ We follow the same approach as Fleischmann & Dronkers (2007).

⁵ The survey was only conducted in the official languages of the countries of destination.

⁶ The appendix gives the precise combination of natives and immigrants per country of origin and destination.

⁷ The Cronbach's alpha of language, nationality and religion were not problematic in any country.

⁸ More information about the reliability of the in-group discrimination scale is given in appendix B.

⁹ We used this number of reasons as dependent variable in an older version of this paper. The results are roughly the same, but a fitting models required more higher order interaction to take account for the number of reasons for perceived in-group discrimination.

¹⁰ Instead of using the complete-case analysis in which respondents with any missing values are completely removed from the analysis (Jones, 1999), we decided to rely on the missing dummy variable method as proposed by Cohen and Cohen (1983). If for a respondent one of the individual characteristics was not available, we imputed the mean of the people from the same immigrant status, country of origin, educational level and immigrant generation. For educational level the country of origin mean is used. If there was no available reference category, the mean of the immigrants in the country of destination was imputed. For all imputations a missing dummy was created who was also used in the analyses of perceived discrimination. If this dummy is significant, this means the imputation should better not have occurred. Because of the average small number of imputations we do not think this to be a problem.

¹¹ We have used the same procedure as Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007.

¹² Not all macro characteristics were available for the selection of countries we used. First we calculated the mean score of the available data for all regions. When a country had a missing the score of the region was imputed. For former Yugoslavia, the mean of the former Yugoslavian countries was used. For Czechoslovakia the mean of the Czech Republic en Slovakia was used. The category which contains the countries that were members of the former Soviet Union is calculated in the same way.

¹³ The building of this individual model is shown in Table IV of the appendix , in which we include each group of individual characteristics separately (migration; demographic and social; religious).

¹⁴ Note that we analyse immigrants with the Jewish religion. That means that the strong effect of Jewish religion in this analysis can not be explained by Jews who continued to live in the countries which have been occupied by the Nazis. These not-immigrated Jews are not included in this analysis.

References

- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Berry, J. & Kalin, R. (1979). Reciprocity of Inter-ethnic Attitudes in a Multicultural Society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3: 99-112;
- Bobo, L. & Hutchings, V.L. (1996). Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context. *American Sociological Review* 61 (6). P. 951-72.
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2008). *The 2008 World Factbook*. [online]. Retrieved February 2008.
- Coenders, M. (2001). Nationalistic Attitudes and Ethnic Exclusionism in a Comparative Perspective: an Empirical Study of Attitudes Toward the Country and Ethnic Immigrants in 22 countries. PHD dissertation, ICS, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Coenders, M., Lubbers, M. and Scheepers, P. (2004). 'Majorities' Attitudes Towards Minorities in Western and Eastern European Societies. *Results from European Social Survey 2002-2003, Report 4 for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia*.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis in behavioral sciences*, Erlbaum, Hillsdale.
- Devine, P. 1989. Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56: 5-18.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York: Praeger.
- Esping-Anderson, G. (1990). *Three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Fleischmann, F. and J. Dronkers (2007). *The Effects of Social and Labour Market Policies of EU-countries on the Socio-Economic Integration of First and Second Generation Immigrants from Different Countries of Origin*. EURSCAS Working paper 2007/19 (European Forum Series) (<http://hdl.handle.net/1814/6849>)
- Geddes, A. et al. (2004), *European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index 2004*. British Council Brussels. [online]. Retrieved February 2007. (<http://www.britishcouncil.org/brussels-europe-inclusion-index.htm>).
- Fahey, T. (2007). The Case for an EU-wide Measure of Poverty. *European Sociological Review* 23 (1). P. 35-47.
- Freedom House. (2007). *Freedom in the world country ratings 1972-2007*. [online]. Retrieved March 2008. (<http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=276>).
- Hagendoorn, L. (1993) Ethnic categorization and outgroup exclusion: the role of cultural values and social stereotypes in the construction of ethnic hierarchies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16 (1), pp. 26-51.
- Hagendoorn, L. & Sniderman, P. (2001). Experimenting with a National Sample: a Dutch Survey of Prejudice. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 35: 19-31.
- Human Development Index (2007/8). [online]. Retrieved April 2008.
- Hofstede (1984) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Perhoniemi, R. (2006). Perceived Discrimination and Well-being: A Victim Study of Different Immigrant Groups. *Journal of community & applied social psychology*, 16 (4): 267-284.
- Jowell, R. and the Central Co-ordinating Team. (2005). *European Social Survey 2004/2005: Technical Report*. London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University.
- Jowell, R. and the Central Co-ordinating Team. (2007). *European Social Survey 2006/2007: Technical Report*. London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University.

- Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A. and Mastruzzi, M. (2006). "Governance Matters V: Aggregate and Individual Governance Indicators for 1996-2005." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 4012*.
- Kogan, I. (2007). *Working through barriers: Host Countries Institutions and Immigrant Labour Market Performance in Europe*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Levels, M. and J. Dronkers (2008). Educational Performance of Native and Immigrant children from Various Countries of Origin. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. (in press)
<http://www.eui.eu/Personal/Dronkers/articles/ethnicRacialStudies2008.pdf>
- Levels, M., J. Dronkers and G. Kraaykamp (2008). Educational achievement of immigrants in Western countries: origin, destination, and community effects on mathematical performance. *American Sociological Review*. 73:835-853.
- Modood, T. (1993). Muslims, Incitement to Hatred and the Law. In *Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration*. Ed. John Horton. Houndmills: Macmillan Press.
- Modood, T. (2004). Capitals, ethnic identity and educational qualifications. *Cultural Trends* 13: 87-105.
- Moghaddam, F.M., Stalkin, A.J., & Hutcheson, L.S. (1997). A generalized personal/group discrepancy: Testing the domain Specificity of a Perceived Higher Effect of Events on One's Group Than on Oneself. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 23: 743-750.
- Need, A. & Graaf, N.D., de. (1996). Losing my religion. A dynamic analysis of leaving the church in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review* 12: 87-96.
- Niessen, J., Huddleston, T. & Citron, L. (2007) *Migrant Integration Policy Index*. [online]. Retrieved February 2008. (<http://www.britishcouncil.org/netherlands-networks-mipex-report.pdf>)
- OECD (2007). *OECD Factbook 2007*. [online]. Retrieved February 2008. (http://stats.oecd.org/wbos/default.aspx?DatasetCode=EPL_1)
- Operario, D., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice: Judgements of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27, 550-561.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*.
- Ruggiero, K.M., Taylor, D.M. & Lydon, J.E. (1997). How disadvantaged Group Members Cope With Discrimination When They perceive That Social Support is Available. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27; 1581-1600.
- Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M. and Coenders, M. (2002). Ethnic Exclusionism in European Countries: Public Oppositions to Civil Rights for legal Migrants as a Response to Perceived threat. *European Sociological Review* 18: 17-34.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., and Gorodzeisky, A. (2008). Foreigners Impact on European Societies: Public Views and Perceptions in a Cross-National Comparative Perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 49 (1): 5-29.
- Schlueter, E. & Wagner, U. (2008). Regional Differences Matter. Examining the Dual Influence of the Regional Size of the Immigrant Population on Derogation of Immigrants in Europe. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 49, pp. 153-173
- Snellman, A. & Ekehammer, B. (2005). Ethnic hierarchies, ethnic prejudice and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15: 83-94.
- Sniderman, P. M., Hagendoorn, L., and Prior, M. (2004). Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities. *American Political Science Review* 98: 35-49.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behaviour. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., & Porter, L.E. (1994). Dimensions Of Perceived Discrimination: The Personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M.P. Zanna & J.M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario Symposium, vol 7*: 233-256. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Tubergen, F. van (2004). *The Integration of Immigrants in Cross-National Perspective: Origin, Destination and Community Effects*. PhD thesis Utrecht University.

Verkuyten, M. (2002) Perceptions of ethnic discrimination by minority and majority early adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, pp. 321-332.

Verkuyten, M. (2005) Ethnic group identification, and group evaluations among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, pp. 121-138.

Verkuyten, M. & Brug, P. (2004) Multiculturalism and ethnic group status: The role of ethnic identification, group essentialism and protestant ethic. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34, pp. 647-661.

Williams, R.M. (1947). *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Table 1: Number of natives and immigrants and percentages natives and immigrants who perceive in-group discrimination on one of the five grounds (language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion) per destination.

Country	Number of natives and % perceiving discrimination		Number of immigrants and % perceiving discrimination	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Austria	1888	0.0	350	15.1
Belgium	2966	2.3	590	8.6
Czech Republic	2687	0.0	243	7.4
Germany	4945	7.1	758	10.2
Denmark	2662	0.0	296	8.4
Estonia	2115	5.0	1278	22.4
Spain	3228	2.9	290	18.3
France	3066	3.1	691	12.3
Ireland	2101	4.8	152	6.6
Netherlands	1602	0.0	274	11.7
Norway	3110	0.0	310	8.4
Sweden	3158	6.7	704	7.8
Slovenia	2392	1.8	496	3.0
United Kingdom	3593	8.0	602	15.9
Total	10.038	3.9	7034	12.5

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

Table 2: total number of immigrants and percentage of those immigrants who perceive in-group discrimination on one of the five grounds (language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion) per origin country or region.

Country of origin	Total N	% perceiving discrimination
Africa, Western	82	41.5
Africa, Middle	54	33.3
Caribbean, French Speaking	12	33.3
Turkey	222	32.0
Pakistan	66	30.3
Albania	10	30.0
Morocco	192	27.6
Caribbean, English speaking	44	25.0
Africa, Eastern	75	24.0
Asia, Remaining Southern	254	23.6
Russian Federation	1273	21.8
Africa, Southern	23	21.7
Caribbean and South America, Dutch Speaking	35	20.0
Africa, Remaining Northern	189	19.6
Ukraine	171	18.7
Algeria	125	18.4
Asia, Remaining Western	127	18.1
India	84	16.7
Caribbean and South America, Spanish Speaking	172	14.5
Europe, Remaining Eastern	451	11.5
Ireland	126	10.3
Romania	80	8.8
Asia, South-East	139	8.6
Portugal	84	8.3
Brazil	13	7.7
Asia, Eastern	41	7.3
Yugoslavia	604	7.3
Poland	308	6.8
America, Remaining Northern	150	6.0
Europe, Remaining Western	272	5.9
Hungary	75	5.3
United States	122	4.9
Czech Republic	89	4.5
Indonesia	47	4.3
Italy	327	3.7
Finland	249	3.6
Germany	396	3.5
France	177	2.8
United Kingdom	207	2.4
Switzerland	44	2.3
Europe, Remaining Northern	316	2.2
Belgium	55	1.8
Spain	111	1.8
Netherlands	116	1.7
Australia & New Zealand	28	0.0
Europe, Remaining Southern	52	0.0
Norway	77	0.0

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

Table 3: Descriptive information about the individual and macro-characteristics for immigrants only.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceived in-group discrimination	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.33
Individual characteristics of respondent				
Citizen destination country	0.00	1.00	0.73	0.44
Minority language	0.00	1.00	0.28	0.45
Mixed marriage	0.00	1.00	0.47	0.50
Second generation	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50
Age respondent	15.00	97.00	44.03	17.46
Female	0.00	1.00	0.53	0.50
Educational level	0.00	4.00	2.76	1.04
Education mother	0.00	6.00	2.15	1.51
Occupational status	16.00	88.00	41.39	17.00
Unemployed	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.25
retired	0.00	1.00	0.17	0.38
housework	0.00	1.00	0.07	0.26
student	0.00	1.00	0.10	0.30
Roman catholic	0.00	1.00	0.23	0.42
protestant	0.00	1.00	0.11	0.32
Eastern orthodox	0.00	1.00	0.10	0.30
Other Christian religion	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.18
Jewish	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.06
Islam	0.00	1.00	0.09	0.29
Eastern religions	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.12
Other non-Christian religions	0.00	1.00	0.01	0.07
Religious practicing	1.00	7.00	2.79	1.75
Community characteristics				
Socio-economic distance	-2.65	2.02	0.07	0.41
Religious distance	-3.92	4.78	0.35	0.77
Cultural Distance in Individualism	-40.00	75.00	17.05	19.76
Relative Community Size	0.02	28.97	5.99	9.71
Origin macro-characteristics				
Origin neighbouring country	0.00	1.00	0.41	0.49
Origin former colony	0.00	1.00	0.21	0.41
Origin country non Christian religion	0.00	1.00	0.14	0.35
Human Development Index origin	0.47	0.97	0.83	0.11
GDP origin	1.00	55.60	20.28	13.06
Kaufmann index political stability origin	-2.91	1265.00	2.76	58.36
GINI origin	23.00	60.00	35.23	7.28
Net migration rate origin	-8.38	9.65	0.7238	1.81
Political freedoms origin	0.00	6.00	3.86	2.34
Civil rights origin	0.00	7.00	4.11	2.04
Origin country with no prevalent religion	0.00	1.00	0.06	0.25
No religious affiliation origin	0.00	1.00	0.02	0.13
Catholic origin	0.00	1.00	0.35	0.48
Protestant origin	0.00	1.00	0.14	0.35
Eastern orthodox origin	0.00	1.00	0.22	0.41

Other Christian origin	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.04
Islam origin	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.36
Eastern religions origin	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.17
Status political freedom origin	0.00	2.00	1.23	0.89
Destination macro-characteristics				
Bottom labour market	16.10	34.30	23.36	5.22
MIPEX Labour market access destination	40	100	65.84	16.89
MIPEX Family reunion destination	34	92	60.85	14.01
MIPEX Long term residence destination	39	76	62.71	9.18
MIPEX Political participation destination	15	93	52.42	22.00
MIPEX Access to nationality destination	22	71	46.33	16.45
MIPEX Anti discrimination destination	23	94	58.99	24.64
MIPEX total destination	4	88	55.27	16.98
GDP destination	21800	55600	33325.50	7749.68
Gini destination	23.00	34.00	28.85	3.86
Net migration rate destination	-3.22	4.82	0.73	2.02
Left wing politics destination	3	56	15.62	13.65
Employment protection index destination	0.65	3.26	1.97	0.83
Bottom labour market destination	16.10	34.30	23.36	5.22
No religious affiliation destination	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.18
Christian religion destination	0.00	1.00	0.78	0.41
No prevalent religion destination	0.00	1.00	0.08	0.28
Liberal welfare destination	0.00	1.00	0.11	0.31
Conservative welfare destination	0.00	1.00	0.38	0.49
Social democratic welfare destination	0.00	1.00	0.19	0.39
Mediterranean welfare state destination	0.00	1.00	0.04	0.20
Low communistic welfare state destination	0.00	1.00	0.18	0.39
High communistic welfare state destination	0.00	1.00	0.11	0.31
Individualism scale of natives in destination	51	89	67.40	10.20
Favour more or less immigration of natives in destination	1.00	4.00	2.26	0.77
Positive consequence immigration of natives in destination	0.00	10.00	5.52	2.13
% in-group discrimination natives in destination	0.00	8.00	3.88	2.72

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

Table 4: Unstandardized coefficients and (standard errors) of logistic multilevel analyses of perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in different European Union member-states. $N_{\text{immigrants}}=7034$; $N_{\text{communities}}=587$; $N_{\text{origin}}=177$; $N_{\text{destination}}=14$.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Individual characteristics						
Citizen	-0.261 (0.090)*	-0.348 (0.095)*	-0.343 (0.094)*	-0.386 (0.096)*	-0.377 (0.095)*	-0.365 (0.091)*
Minority language	0.627 (0.107)*	0.593 (0.101)*	0.616 (0.101)*	0.623 (0.102)*	0.638 (0.102)*	0.646 (0.100)*
Mixed marriage	-0.643 (0.107)*	-0.548 (0.195)*	-0.559 (0.105)*	-0.539 (0.107)*	-0.547 (0.106)*	-0.519 (0.100)*
Second generation	0.034 (0.109)	0.084 (0.109)	0.075 (0.109)	0.163 (0.110)	0.151 (0.109)	
Age	-0.014 (0.004)*	-0.011 (0.003)*	-0.011 (0.003)*	-0.008 (0.004)*	-0.008 (0.004)*	-0.009 (0.003)*
Female	-0.124 (0.084)	-0.113 (0.084)	-0.126 (0.084)	-0.101 (0.084)	-0.106 (0.083)	
Education	0.089 (0.043)*	0.161 (0.046)*	0.105 (0.046)*	0.119 (0.045)*	0.114 (0.045)*	0.118 (0.045)*
Education mother	-0.085 (0.032)*	-0.072 (0.028)*	-0.073 (0.032)*	-0.061 (0.032)*	-0.059 (0.031)	-0.060 (0.032)*
Unemployed	0.442 (0.134)*	0.398 (0.134)*	0.407 (0.134)*	0.362 (0.134)*	0.364 (0.134)*	0.363 (0.134)*
Retired	-0.541 (0.176)*	-0.561 (0.172)*	-0.571 (0.172)*	-0.548 (0.173)*	-0.556 (0.171)*	-0.532 (0.172)*
Roman Catholic	-0.206 (0.131)	-0.137 (0.137)	-0.139 (0.137)	-0.173 (0.139)	-0.174 (0.138)	
Protestant	-0.451 (0.189)*	-0.361 (0.192)	-0.347 (0.193)	-0.377 (0.198)	-0.372 (0.197)	
Eastern orthodox	0.544 (0.144)*	0.523 (0.136)*	0.552 (0.135)*	0.574 (0.137)*	0.592 (0.136)*	0.681 (0.129)*
Other Christian	0.125 (0.229)	0.073 (0.227)	0.112 (0.229)	0.004 (0.230)	0.040 (0.230)	
Jewish	1.871 (0.454)*	1.924 (0.456)*	1.932 (0.463)*	1.693 (0.462)*	1.686 (0.466)*	1.795 (0.485)*
Islam	0.672 (0.149)*	0.495 (0.151)*	0.502 (0.151)*	0.413 (0.152)*	0.396 (0.152)*	0.532 (0.132)*
Eastern religion	0.005 (0.332)	-0.113 (0.319)	-0.134 (0.324)	-0.250 (0.322)	-0.245 (0.321)	
Other non Christian religion	1.234 (0.396)*	1.356 (0.411)*	1.370 (0.412)*	1.308 (0.422)*	1.304 (0.422)*	1.380 (0.418)*
Religious practice	0.092 (0.027)*	0.057 (0.027)*	0.060 (0.028)*	0.060 (0.028)*	0.058 (0.028)*	
Community characteristics						
Social-economic distance		-0.165 (0.115)	-0.132 (0.113)	-0.216 (0.132)*	-0.185 (0.111)	-0.218 (0.109)*
Cultural distance		0.019 (0.003)*	0.019 (0.003)*	0.000 (0.004)	0.001 (0.004)	
Religious distance		0.161 (0.068)*	0.154 (0.068)*	0.030 (0.070)	0.013 (0.070)	
Community size		0.016 (0.008)*	0.015 (0.007)*	0.007 (0.007)	0.008 (0.006)	
Country of destination characteristics						
MIPEX access to long term residence destination			-0.024 (0.008)*		-0.014 (0.007)*	-0.017 (0.008)*
No prevalent religion in destination			-0.557 (0.238)*		-0.638 (0.232)*	-0.634 (0.226)*
Country of origin characteristics						

Human Development Index origin				-1.345 (0.661)*	-1.419 (0.656)*	-1.469 (0.603)*
Income Gini origin				0.033 (0.008)*	0.029 (0.008)*	0.032 (0.007)*
Origin former colony				0.414 (0.132)*	0.372 (0.128)*	0.350 (0.127)*
GDP per capita origin				-0.019 (0.007)*	-0.021 (0.007)*	-0.021 (0.007)*
Constant	-1.638 (0.243)*	-2.295 (0.261)*	-0.725 (0.552)	-1.855 (0.678)*	-0.677 (0.786)	-0.438 (0.791)
Destination variance	0.082 (0.047)	0.095 (0.051)	0.036 (0.027)	0.039 (0.028)	0.018 (0.018)	0.040 (0.027)
Origin variance	0.174 (0.059)*	0.114 (0.049)*	0.105 (0.046)*	0.068 (0.040)	0.055 (0.037)	0.040 (0.035)
Community variance	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
-2loglikelihood	1105	497	269	178	40	167

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey
* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table 5: Unstandardized coefficients of the macro-characteristics in the multilevel analysis on perceived in-group discrimination, their standard error and significance at their single addition to model 2 of table 4. $N_{\text{immigrants}}=7034$; $N_{\text{communities}} = 587$; $N_{\text{origin}} = 177$; $N_{\text{destination}}= 14$.

		Coefficient	Standard error	Sign.	
Destination	MIPEX Total	-0.004	0.005		
	MIPEX labour market access	-0.008	0.005		
	MIPEX family reunion	-0.014	0.005	*	
	MIPEX access to long term residence	-0.024	0.008	*	
	MIPEX political participation	-0.008	0.004	*	
	MIPEX access to nationality	-0.010	0.005	*	
	MIPEX anti-discrimination	-0.006	0.004		
	Employment Protection Legislation	-0.044	0.129		
	Left Wing Government	0.001	0.008		
	GDP per capita	0.000	0.000		
	Net Migration Rate	0.030	0.069		
	Liberal Welfare System	0.184	0.313		
	Social Democratic Welfare System	-0.390	0.216		
	Conservative Welfare System	0.167	0.195		
	Mediterranean Welfare System	0.084	0.378		
	Low Communistic Welfare System	0.167	0.407		
	High Communistic Welfare System	-0.129	0.353		
	No prevalent religion	-0.559	0.239	*	
	Christian prevalent religion	-0.227	0.322		
	Eastern Orthodox religion	0.000	0.000		
	No religious affiliation	0.247	0.481		
	Mean in favour of more immigration	0.487	0.447		
	Mean positive influence of immigration	-0.166	0.187		
	Bottom of the labour market	0.001	0.018		
	Mean natives on in-group discrimination scale	-0.024	0.033		
	Gini coefficient	0.023	0.029		
	Individualism	-0.013	0.009		
	Origin	Human Development Index	-3.104	0.559	*
		Gini coefficient	0.042	0.007	*
		GDP per capita	-0.035	0.007	*
		No religious affiliation	0.154	0.390	
		Catholic	-0.170	0.128	
		Protestant	-0.268	0.226	
Eastern orthodox		0.215	0.181		
Jewish		0.000	0.000		
Islam		0.370	0.147	*	
Eastern Religions		0.045	0.204		
Other non-Christian religions		0.000	0.000		
Kaufmann indicator of political stability		0.000	0.001		
Net Migration Rate		-0.070	0.027	*	
Political Freedom		-0.079	0.030	*	
Civil Rights		-0.085	0.035	*	
Status Political Freedom		0.043	0.077		
Neighbouring countries		-0.195	0.168		
Former colony of destination country	0.446	0.136	*		

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

* Significance at the 0.05 level

Table 6: Beta (standard error) with either random variance on destination (standard error), or beta (standard error) with random variance on origin (standard error). $N_{\text{immigrants}}=7034$; $N_{\text{communities}} = 587$; $N_{\text{origin}} = 177$; $N_{\text{destination}}= 14$.

Variable	Destination		Origin	
	Beta (SE)	Random (SE)	Beta (SE)	Random (SE)
Citizen	-0.149 (0.175)	0.218 (0.137)	-0.377 (0.095)*	No convergence
Minority language	0.638 (0.102)*	No convergence	0.638 (0.102)*	No convergence
Mixed marriage	-0.600 (0.107)*	0.168 (0.109)	-0.510 (0.107)*	0.311 (0.188)
Second generation	0.172 (0.174)	0.211 (0.130)	0.151 (0.109)	No convergence
Age	-0.008 (0.004)*	0.000 (0.000)	-0.008 (0.004)*	No convergence
Female	-0.106 (0.083)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.106 (0.083)	0.000 (0.000)
Education	0.009 (0.225)	0.656 (0.261)*	0.147 (0.058)*	0.161 (0.053)*
Education mother	-0.057 (0.044)	0.010 (0.006)	-0.055 (0.034)	0.020 (0.015)
Unemployed	0.364 (0.134)*	0.080 (0.115)	0.364 (0.134)*	0.000 (0.000)
Retired	-0.556 (0.171)*	No convergence	-0.556 (0.171)*	0.000 (0.000)
Roman Catholic	-0.228 (0.162)	0.084 (0.098)	-0.158 (0.145)	0.261 (0.257)
Protestant	-0.372 (0.197)	No convergence	-0.353 (0.202)	0.264 (0.533)
Eastern orthodox	0.592 (0.136)*	0.000 (0.000)	0.634 (0.140)*	0.120 (0.140)
Other Christian	0.040 (0.230)	0.000 (0.000)	0.188 (0.281)	2.234 (0.982)*
Jewish	1.686 (0.466)*	0.000 (0.000)	1.753 (0.502)*	0.501 (1.388)
Islam	0.362 (0.228)	0.323 (0.198)	0.396 (0.152)*	No convergence
Eastern religion	-0.245 (0.321)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.245 (0.321)	No convergence
Other non Christian religion	1.450 (0.501)*	0.836 (1.141)	1.304 (0.422)*	No convergence
Religious practice	0.058 (0.028)*	No convergence	0.060 (0.033)	0.039 (0.015)*
Social-economic distance	-0.214 (0.124)	0.038 (0.057)	-0.186 (0.111)	0.000 (0.000)
Cultural distance	0.001 (0.004)	No convergence	0.001 (0.004)	0.000 (0.000)
Religious distance	0.013 (0.070)	0.000 (0.000)	0.021 (0.073)	0.054 (0.066)
Community size	0.008 (0.006)	0.000 (0.000)	0.008 (0.006)	0.000 (0.000)

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey.

* significance at the 0.05 level

Appendix

Table I: the number of cases of immigrants from various origin and destination countries

	AU	BE	CZ	GE	DK	EE	SP	FR	UK	IR	NL	NO	SW	SL	Total
Albania	1	3		2				1			1	2			10
Algeria		7					6	109		1	1	1			125
Argentina							18	1					1		20
Australia				1	1			1	12	3	1		2		21
Austria		2	12	38	3			2			3	2	7	25	94
Bangladesh				1			1		15	1			1		19
Belarus				2		78	1						1		82
Belgium	1			2	1		1	23	7		17	2		1	55
Bosnia & Herzegovia	22	1		6	6						4	9	16	8	72
Brazil	1	1		2			5				1	2	1		13
Canada		5			1				6	2	1	3			18
Chile					2		3	1				4	13		23
China		2		1			3	2	5		5	1	2		21
Colombia							21					1			22
Congo		24		3				6	1		1	2	1		38
Croatia	17			5				3	2		1	1	7	20	56
Cuba							10						1		11
Czech Republik	34	2		46				2	1		2		2		89
Czechoslovakia			1	12	1							1	3	1	19
Denmark	2	1		2					1	1		41	29		77
Ecuador							28						1		29
Egypt	2			1	2			3	2		1		1		12
Estonia				2	1				1			1	10		15
Finland					9	14	1	1	2			12	211		250
France	4	115	1	13	3		13		6	1	2	6	4	9	177
Germany	71	23	9	2	64	2	2	25	31	6	57	18	68	18	396
Greece	2	9		9				4	1		1	2	3	1	32
Hungary	28	7	10	17	2	1		1			3	1	4	1	75
India	2	2		3			1	1	68		1	2	4		84
Indonesia		1			3						43				47
Iran	1	1		7	5		1		1		1	5	22		44
Iraq	2	2		2	11			1	2		3	11	22		56
Ireland	1			1	2		2		119			2	1		126
Italy	29	96		37	4		5	111	10	1	8	1	3	20	327
Jamaica					1				35						36
Latvia				2	1	26						1	1		31
Lebanon	1	3			2		1	2					9		18
Lithuania	1			2		14	2		1		2		2		24
Macedonia	2	2		3	1			6				2	2	1	19
Mauritius		5		1				1	6						13
Morocco		68		8	2		38	65		1	9		1		192
Netherlands	4	76		8	2	1	2	2	5	2		7	6	1	116
Nigeria	1						4	1	20	2					28
Norway		2			23								52		77
Pakistan		4		2	4		3		47			6			66
Peru	1	1			1	1	10	2			2	1	3		22
Philippines	2			3	5		3		7	2	3	7	1		33
Poland	11	9	22	140	12	10	2	31	19	1	6	12	32	1	308
Portugal		1		5	1		19	51	4		1		2		84
Romania	17	3	4	26			22	3	1		3		2		81
Former USSR **	1	5	15	137	4	992	8	8	2	2	5	8	5	5	1197
Serbia & Montenegro	14			4	2			4				1	7	2	34
Slovakia	5		157	4			1	3			1			1	172
South Africa		2			1				18		1				22
Spain	2	16		7				62	10	3	3	1	7		111
Sri Lanka				1	5			1	15	2	1		3		28
Suriname											20				20
Sweden	2	2			23	1			2		1	43		1	75
Switzerland	8			6	3			11	6		1	3	6		44
Syria		2		1			2	1	3		1		6		16
Thailand	1	2		3	3		1		1			1	3		15
Tunisia		6			2			37			1	1			47
Turkey	29	25		108	12			6			17	7	18		222
Ukraine	2	1	5	20		134	6	3				2		1	174
United Kingdom	51	11		8	9		4	8		110	5	28	20		208
United States	1	4		15	12		2	6	27	7	2	30	9	7	122
Viet Nam		3		2	2			8	1		1	4	5		26

Yugoslavia	7	2	7	9	4		1				1		22	370	423
Spanish Speaking Caribbean & South America		1		1			21	2	2		1	1	9		38
Remaining Northern Europe					12				1			2	3		18
Remaining Western Asia		1		2	5	11	3	1	3		1	1	4		32
Eastern Africa		5		1	4			8	23	1		8	11		61
Remaining South-East Asia		1			2			5	7		2		3		20
Western Africa		8		3			6	29	7	1	1	1	2		58
Remaining Southern Europe	8			1				1	8	1		1	1		21
Remaining Southern Asia		2		1	3		1				5	1	1		14
Dutch Speaking Caribbean								1			14				15
Eastern Asia	3	1		2			2	1	7	1	1		2		21
Middle Africa		7					1	6							14
Remaining Eastern Europe	2			2	2	3	3		2						14
English Speaking Caribbean & South America								1	7						8
Remaining Northern Africa				1				2	1		1				6
Remaining Northern America					10										10
Australia and New Zealand									7			1			8
Southern Africa				2							3				5
French Speaking Caribbean		1						11							12
Remaining Western Europe	1	4						3	4				1		13
Total	350	590	243	758	296	1278	290	691	602	152	274	310	704	496	7034

* significant at alpha = 0.05

**Former USSR Excluding Belarus, Ukraine and the Baltic states

Table II: Cronbach's Alpha of in-group discrimination scale for immigrants per country of destination (5 items)

Country of destination	Cronbach's Alpha
Austria	0.694
Belgium	0.690
Czech Republic	0.658
Germany	0.651
Denmark	0.666
Estonia	0.454
Spain	0.696
France	0.501
United Kingdom	0.579
Greece	0.296*
Ireland	0.614
Luxembourg	0.126*
Netherlands	0.605
Norway	0.566
Portugal	0.054*
Sweden	0.574
Slovenia	0.730
Slovakia	0.357*

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

* Cronbach's alpha is so low that the country is excluded from further research.

Table III: Cronbach's Alpha of in-group discrimination scale per country of origin (5 items)

Country of origin	Cronbach's alpha
Albania	0.682
Algeria	0.482
Argentina	0.833
Austria	0.493
Bangladesh	0.751
Belarus	0.209
Belgium	0.625
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.576
Brazil	0.000
Canada	0.625
Central African Republic	0.434
Chile	0.559
China	0.000
Colombia	0.232
Congo	0.000
Croatia	0.414
Cuba	-0.139
Czech Republic	-0.022
Denmark	0.000
Ecuador	0.411
Egypt	0.441
Finland	0.314
France	0.861
Germany	0.238
Hungary	0.330
India	0.442
Indonesia	0.618
Iran, Islamic Republic of	0.751
Iraq	0.434

Ireland	0.080
Italy	0.256
Jamaica	0.369
Latvia	0.625
Lebanon	0.881
Lithuania	0.337
Macedonia	0.496
Malta	0.880
Morocco	0.745
Netherlands	0.495
Nigeria	0.773
Pakistan	0.672
Peru	-0.206
Philippines	-0.040
Poland	0.138
Portugal	0.473
Russian Federation	0.448
Serbia and Montenegro	0.565
Slovakia	0.683
South Africa	-0.176
Spain	0.499
Sri Lanka	0.824
Suriname	0.488
Syria	0.732
Tunisia	0.249
Turkey	0.623
Ukraine	0.434
United Kingdom	0.759
United States	-0.032
Viet Nam	0.697
Czechoslovakia	0.833
Yugoslavia	0.505
Spanish Speaking Caribbean and South America	0.601
Western Asia	0.644
Eastern Africa	0.735
South-East Asia	0.679
Western Africa	0.596
Remaining Southern Asia	0.764
Dutch Speaking Caribbean and South America	-0.139
Eastern Asia	0.747
Middle Africa	0.333
Remaining Eastern Europe	0.831
Remaining Northern Africa	0.476
Remaining Northern America	0.488
Southern Africa	0.000
French Speaking Caribbean	0.000
EU natives	0.417

Table IV: coefficients and (standard errors) of logistic multilevel analysis of the individual characteristics on perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in different European Union States. Making an ideal model. $N_{\text{immigrants}}=7034$; $N_{\text{communities}} = 587$; $N_{\text{origin}} = 177$; $N_{\text{destination}}= 14$.

	Zero Model	Model A	Model B	Model C	Preferred Model
Citizen		0.368 (0.093)*			-0.261 (0.090)*
Minority language		0.822 (0.096)*			0.627 (0.107)*
Second generation		0.249 (0.104)*			0.034 (0.109)
Mixed marriage		-0.741 (0.102)*			-0.643 (0.107)*
Age			-0.014 (0.004)*		-0.014 (0.004)*
Female			-0.142 (0.082)*		-0.124 (0.084)
Education			0.100 (0.048)*		0.089 (0.043)*
Education mother			-0.119 (0.037)*		-0.085 (0.032)*
Education father			-0.021 (0.033)		
Occupation (work = ref)					
Unemployed			0.376 (0.135)*		0.442 (0.134)*
Retired			-0.517 (0.171)*		-0.541 (0.176)*
Student			-0.004 (0.140)		
Housework			-0.012 (0.158)		
Other Occupation			0.196 (0.190)		
Occupational status			-0.006 (.003)		
Religion (none = ref)					
Roman catholic				-0.301 (0.128)*	-0.206 (0.134)
Protestant				-0.687 (0.179)*	-0.451 (0.189)*
Eastern orthodox				0.768 (0.144)*	0.544 (0.144)*
Other Christian				0.219 (0.221)	0.125 (0.229)
Jewish				1.734 (0.438)*	1.871 (0.454)*
Islam				1.203 (0.144)*	0.672 (0.149)*
Eastern religions				0.229 (0.328)	0.005 (0.332)
Non Christian religion				1.260 (0.376)*	1.234 (0.396)*
Religious practice				0.093 (0.023)*	0.092 (0.027)*
Constant	-1.930 (0.092)*	-1.832 (0.045)*	-1.051 (0.234)*	-2.454 (0.122)*	-1.638 (0.243)*
Destination variance	0.072 (0.049)	0.048 (0.036)	0.132 (0.072)	0.078 (0.047)	0.082 (0.047)
Origin variance	0.730 (0.114)*	0.416 (0.085)*	0,634 (0.110)*	0.325 (0.076)*	0.174 (0.059)*
Community variance	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
-2loglikelihood	4055	2650	3462	2787	1105

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey

* significance at the 0.05 level

In Table IV, we test the effects of different categories of individual indicators to finally arrive at an ideal model. For all variables who have had imputations we also let the missing value dummy variable (Cohen & Cohen, 1983) go with the rest. These missing value dummies were not significant, this means that the respondents who did not answer the question significantly

did not differ from the rest of the respondents with regard to perceived discrimination. In model A, the variables with regard to immigration are taken. The significant variables from the first four models are used to compute model D, called the preferred individual model, with two deviances. Second generation becomes insignificant in model D, but we keep it in the equation because the difference between first and second generation immigrants is seen by many policy makes. The same holds for the gender variable. The preferred model is used in model one of table four in the main text.