

# **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. Fleischmann<sup>1</sup>

**Last updated: July 20<sup>th</sup> , 2010**

## **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 destination country, 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 lower 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 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. Van Tubergen (2004), Kogan (2007), and Fleischmann & Dronkers (2007; 2010), 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, besides 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. In this analysis we therefore pose the following 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 this 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), the in-group status is higher (Taylor, Wright & Porter, 1994) and if in-group identification is higher (Operario & Fiske, 2001).

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. A similar distinction is made by Vanneman and Pettigrew (1972) based on egoistic and fraternalistic deprivation. Vanneman and Pettigrew (1972) and other researchers (an overview can be found in: Dion, 1986) found that fraternalistic deprivation based on the comparison of the own group with other groups is more important than egoistic deprivation (comparing with other individuals) for structural outcomes and group action. This is in line with the finding that individual members of all groups, minorities as well as the majority, report more in-group discrimination than personal discrimination, since group-based discrimination is more salient than individual discrimination. (see Moghaddam, Stalkin & Hutcheson, 1997; Taylor, Wright & Porter, 1994; Verkuyten, 2002). Therefore, in our study, we analyse the perception of discrimination against one's ethnic, racial, national, religious or linguistic group, but not personally experienced discrimination. It should be noticed that, the level of perceived discrimination against one's group need not be the same as personally experienced discrimination. We identify in this article as immigrants all adult respondents in the *European Social Survey* who have at least one parent born outside the current country of residence of the respondent. As a consequence of this definition of immigrant the full 20<sup>th</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup> century respondents on perceived in-group discrimination.

## **2. Theories and hypotheses**

Most research on discrimination is based on the attitudes of the majority-group to the minority group and focuses mostly on one country or a small group of countries (Devine, 1989; Hagendoorn & Sniderman, 2001; Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004; Verkuyten, 2005). Some studies have compared the attitudes of the majority group across several countries (Kunovich, 2004; Schneider, 2008; Semyonov, Glikman & Krysan, 2007; Semyonov, Raijman & Gorodzeisky, 2006; 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 (Berry & Kalin, 1979; Bobo & Hutchins, 1996; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006; Snellman & Ekehammer, 2005; Verkuyten, 2002; Verkuyten, 2005; Verkuyten & Brug, 2004). As far as our knowledge reaches, 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* which covers all member-states of the European Union allows for such an analysis. 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, therefore this research and the theory and hypotheses used should be seen as

an exploration and a descriptive tool to find our way around this unexplored area of cross-national differences in perceived in-group discrimination. The hypotheses we derive are based on the intergroup contact theory, which is an often used theory in research into discrimination and interethnic relations, and we will only develop hypotheses from this theory for reasons of parsimony<sup>2</sup>.

### **2.1. Intergroup contact theory**

Intergroup contact theory is one of the oldest and 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). Intergroup contact theory states that interpersonal contact between members of different groups is beneficial for positive intergroup relations (and thus diminishes negative attitudes) 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 this (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

We will use two assumptions derived from intergroup contact theory to base our hypotheses on: 1. if the chances on more and more equal contact between immigrants and natives is larger, than this induces less experienced discrimination of the immigrants; 2. less experienced discrimination of immigrants will induce less reported perceived in-group discrimination. The logic behind this is that if there is more contact between immigrants and natives, both might develop more positive attitudes towards the other group. When the majority has a more positive attitude towards immigrants, we expect them to discriminate less and therefore we expect immigrants to perceive less discrimination.

Rejection of our hypotheses can mean two things. First, it is possible that one or both of these two assumptions are incorrect. It might be that contact does not have positive

consequences, but negative consequences as expected by the competition theory<sup>3</sup>, or to more awareness of discrimination. Second, it is possible that contact with natives leads to discriminatory practices, for example ‘subtle’ racial remarks by natives.

In the next sections we distinguish four dimensions in which we categorized our hypotheses: immigration, religion, economy and politics & policy. Within each of these dimensions we will formulate hypotheses on four levels: individual, community, country of destination and country of origin. A community of immigrants is a group from a specific country of origin in a specific country of destination (for instance Turks in Germany). The national context of destination countries affects perceptions of natives and immigrants as showed in the case of prejudice (Semyonov, Raijman & Gorodzeisky, 2008), and thus these national contexts can also influence immigrants’ likelihood to perceive in-group discrimination. Several studies also showed that differences in countries of origin result in differential integration (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007; Levels & Dronkers, 2008; Levels, Dronkers & Kraaykamp, 2008; Van Tubergen, 2004). These origin macro-characteristics might influence the behaviour and the attitudes of immigrants, and thus affect immigrants’ likelihood of perceiving in-group discrimination. However, 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. For all these reasons, we think that it is important to take these four levels into account.

## **2.2 Immigration hypotheses**

Different characteristics of immigration and integration can influence the nature of and chances on contact with natives. First, we expect that those immigrants who have lived longer in the country of destination have had more chances for contact with natives. Second-generation immigrants are born in their parents’ destination country and have therefore relatively more chances for contact with the native population and to have equal contact

(Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). These immigrants have been raised in the country of destination and this countries educational system which also enhances the chances on equal contact. We therefore expect that *second generation immigrants perceive in-group discrimination less often.*

We expect that the chances on equal contact increase when immigrants are more integrated into the country of destination, because, the more integrated an immigrant is, the less the immigrant differs from natives. If the immigrant is a citizen of the destination country he/she is assumed to be better integrated. Citizenship in most countries in the European Union has to be earned by means of an examination of the values and language of a country. Learning these increases the possibility of contact with natives and we expect that it will also make the contact more equal in nature. If the immigrant speaks a minority language at home, we think that this might reduce the possibility of contacts with natives. Speaking the minority language can indicate less integration into the destination society. Also if this minority language is spoken outside the home, this can reduce the chances of having contact with natives. A third possibility that increases contact chances is if one's parents have a mixed marriage e.g. if one parent is native-born and the other is foreign-born. We therefore expect that *immigrants, who are not a citizen of the destination country, who speak a minority language or who do not have one native parent, perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

The integration of immigrants and the chances on contact are not only individually determined. Different groups of immigrants integrate at different levels as is found in earlier research (Fleischman & Dronkers, 2007; Van Tubergen, 2004). Cultural distance can be important as more distance between two cultures probably goes together with less mutual understanding (Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind & Perhoniemi, 2006). Hofstede (1984) identifies five distinguishing cultural characteristics: power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation. 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. A larger cultural distance induces less contact. We therefore expect that *members of a specific immigrant community with a greater cultural distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Group size can also affect contact with natives. The larger the minority, the less benevolent it appears, as first proposed by Williams (1947) and later tested by various authors (Hagendoorn, 1993; Semyonov, Raijman & Gorodzeisky, 2008; Sniderman, Hagendoorn & Prior, 2004). Larger groups are more visible in the country of destination, for example because of groups of immigrants who live together and this can induce less mutual understanding and thus less contact with natives. Schlueter and Wagner (2008) show that the regional size of the immigrant population within EU member-states decreases the contact with natives. This indicates that when the group size is larger natives in general will feel less prone to have contacts with immigrants. For this reason we expect that *the larger the size of a specific immigrant community in their destination country, the more often members of this community perceive in-group discrimination.*

### **2.3 Religion hypotheses**

The second dimension we distinguish is religion. Religion seems to become less important in the Western world; secularization has taken place in most European countries after World War II (Need & De Graaf, 1996). This seems to be less the case for immigrants from outside (Western) Europe. For Muslims, the honour of the prophet and their religion is very important, especially when this honour seems to be violated (Modood, 1993). Comparable mechanisms might be true for other non-Christian religions, because their adherents might be treated by native (former) Christians with more suspicion. Moreover, most adherents of Judaism 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 and non-Christian groups (Bosnian Muslims) or

between Western and Eastern Christianity (Orthodox Serbs versus Catholic Croats). Religions can clash with each other and religious people clash with non-religious people. Since immigrants are more often religious and more often adherent of a non-Christian religion, we expect this to reduce contact with natives. Thus we expect that *immigrants who are adherents of a non-Christian religion perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Religious adherence can also be important. Immigrants that are adherents of a religion but do not go to a church, mosque or synagogue very often may be seen as less 'deviant' to natives than adherents of a religion that go to these places very often. Therefore we expect that *immigrants who are more integrated into their religious community, will perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Another aspect is the religious distance at the community level. More distance in religiosity to natives can reduce contact with natives and thus induce discrimination. When the distance between natives and immigrants with respect to religiosity is larger, we expect that this reduces contact for every immigrant, regardless of the individual religion or religious integration of the immigrant. Since natives might judge all immigrants of that community to be religiously distant. Therefore we expect that *immigrants who belong to a specific community with a greater religious distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

The religion of the origin country might influence immigrants from these origins, but might also influence the reactions of the natives towards these immigrants. Van Tubergen (2004) and Fleischmann and Dronkers (2007) found that immigrants who come from non-Christian origin countries had worse labour market outcomes than comparable immigrants from prevalently Christian societies. The same mechanism is expected for perceived discrimination. For example, a Christian Iraqi immigrant may have less contact with natives, because natives think that he is a Muslim. This results in the expectation that *immigrants who come from non-Christian origin countries perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

## 2.4 Economy hypotheses

The economic dimension of integration is important for our research, since at the work floor contacts between natives and immigrants are more easily and more often made. There are at least three possibilities of economic integration: education, employment and occupational status. 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, which induces equal contact. Also employed immigrants have more possibilities on contact with natives, since they can meet natives at work. The occupational status can influence the equality of the relationship between natives and immigrants. If the immigrant has a higher occupational status, this can imply more equal contact with natives who have on average a higher occupational status than immigrants. That is why we expect *immigrants who are more successfully integrated economically to perceive in-group discrimination less often.*

The socio-economic distance of the immigrant community to the natives of the destination country was found to be the most significant characteristic in predicting education and labour-market outcomes of immigrants (Levels, Dronkers & Kraaykamp, 2008; Van Tubergen, 2004). As with religious distance, we therefore expect *that immigrants of a specific community with a greater socio-economic distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Immigrants from poorer countries differ more from European natives and thus immigrants from these countries have more difficulty in meeting natives and contact with natives might be less equal. Therefore we expect that *immigrants who originate from countries with poorer economies, perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

## **2.5 Politics & Policy hypotheses**

The last category in our research is politics & policy, many characteristics of the country of destination can influence the integration of immigrants and the contact immigrants and natives have.<sup>4</sup> We focus on two aspects: laws and labour-markets. First, the laws of destination countries, in countries with higher level of openness and inclusiveness, immigrants might feel more welcome and less discriminated. The conflicts between the immigrant group and the natives is less present, contact is stimulated more and on a more equal basis and the perceived in-group discrimination might lower. We therefore expect that *immigrants who live in a destination country with more inclusive policies perceive in-group discrimination less often.*

Second, 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 (Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007; Kogan, 2007). This indicates that contact between natives and immigrants can arise less often and equal, it can even induce conflicts. Such conflicts have given rise to group discrimination during the working life, as showed by Duckitt (1992). That is why we expect that *immigrants who live in a destination country with higher employment protection legislation perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

## **2.6 Control variables**

We will control for age and gender in our analysis. Age can be seen as an estimate of the time that the immigrant has possibly spent in the country of destination and thus how much contact the immigrant might have had with natives. Gender can reveal differences between men and women.

### **3. Data and Measurements**

We use the second and third wave of the *European Social Survey* (ESS) for our analysis<sup>5</sup>. The data are assembled in the years 2004-2005 for the second and 2006-2007 for the third wave (Jowell et al., 2005; Jowell et al., 2007). The data-set contains information on very diverse topics, among which are perceptions of in-group discrimination for over 82000 respondents in European countries. We selected only EU member-states from the ESS, because we are especially interested in the effects of immigration and social policies on the degree of integration of immigrants, and reliable and comparable indicators of these policies are only available for EU member-states (see also section 3.6). Therefore, only 23 European Union countries were included in this pooled dataset of the ESS. Regrettably Italy, Latvia, Lithuania and Romania were not available in the ESS data-sets at the moment of the analysis.

#### **3.1. Measurement of immigrants**

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 excluded from analysis. 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.<sup>6</sup> For first generation immigrants (i.e. those respondents who are themselves born outside the country of residence), 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. Because of the small number of immigrants in nine of these 23 EU member-states we excluded these countries from our analysis<sup>7</sup>. 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. The question of the definition of immigrant status is contested in the social sciences (see for an extensive discussion, Fleischmann & Dronkers, 2007). 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 this measurement strategy of immigrant status lies in the changing national boundaries in Europe during the full 20<sup>th</sup> century and the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> 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 immigrants 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 country<sup>8</sup> 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 undocumented immigrants that are not included in the survey. Undocumented 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<sup>9</sup>.

### **3.2 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. Ten explicit reasons were given in the questionnaire: colour or race, nationality, religion, language, ethnic group, age, gender,

sexuality, disability and other. We selected on a theoretical basis the five reasons that jointly indicate perceived in-group discrimination based on ethnic minority or immigrant status, these are: language, race, nationality, ethnicity and religion.

If a respondent indicated that the experienced in-group discrimination was based on either language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion, this respondent scored a (1) on the dependent variable perceived in-group discrimination. If the respondent did not indicate to perceive in-group discrimination at all, or not for these five immigrant-related reasons, he or she receives a (0) on the dependent variable.

Given the different uses of reasons in the (histories of) EU countries to discriminate or distinguish natives from immigrants (race or ethnicity; religion or language) it is to be preferred to use multiple reasons in a comparative analysis of perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants. It should be remembered that the turbulent European history of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has a strong impact on perceived in-group discrimination. This is shown by the above-mentioned examples of the deadly discrimination of Jews in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the below-mentioned forced settlement of Russians in the Baltic states.

How do we know if this measure is comparable across countries? This can not be established with certainty. The order of the countries of origin and destination (see Tables 1 & 2), when ordered on percentage perceived discriminated is in the expected direction and this gives face validity for our measure. The five reasons for our measurement of perceived in-group discrimination are so called formative items and formative items can not be tested on their comparability with Structural Equation Modelling (Saris & Stronkhorts, 1984).

[Tables 1 & 2 about here]

Table 1 shows how many natives and immigrants per destination country say that they belong to a group which experiences in-group discrimination for any of these five reasons. The table

shows that this percentage is always higher for immigrants than for natives. 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 by force 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 cannot 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. The highest in-group discrimination is found in the region Western-Africa and the lowest in Norway, remaining Southern Europe and Australia and New-Zealand.<sup>10</sup>

### **3.3 Independent immigration variables:**

Table 3 shows descriptive information about the independent individual, community and macro variables which we use in this analysis.<sup>11</sup>

[Table 3 about here]

The first generation is born abroad, the second generation is born in the country of destination, but one or both of the parents have been born abroad. If the immigrant is a citizen of the country of destination is asked in the survey. It is also asked which two main languages the respondent speaks at home, if one or both of these languages are not an official language of the country of destination, the respondent scores a (1) at speaking a minority language at home. A respondent is born from a mixed marriage if one of the parents is native-born and the other parent is not a native of the country of destination.

The other two immigration variables are at the community level: We use Hofstede's (1984) individualism 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 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). Group size is the number of immigrants in the community (number of immigrants of origin A in destination country B). We have 587 different immigrant communities in our data-set, running from 1 to 986 members.

### **3.4 Independent religion variables**

Religion is measured with eight dummy variables indicating if a respondent was not religious (reference), or an adherent of the Roman-Catholic, Protestant, Eastern-Orthodox, Other Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Eastern or other non-Christian religion(s) or church. Religious practice was measured as the mean of religious attendance and praying.

At the community level we measure religious 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. Immigrant groups with a positive score are thus more religious than natives and immigrant groups with a negative score are less religious on average than natives.

The last variable within the domain of religion is the prevalent religion of the country of origin. We created dummy variables to indicate this prevalent religion. 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 no Christian religion reached a majority in the country of origin, but different Christian denominations did reach at least 50 percent, than the country is classified as prevalently Christian. We distinguish prevalently Catholic, Protestant, Eastern-Orthodox, (other) Christian, Islamic, Eastern Religious or other non-Christian religion. Data are from the CIA World Factbook (2008). Because of small numbers we only take two dummies into account in the analysis: prevalently Islamic and prevalently Eastern religions; the reference category becomes Christian religions.

### **3.5 Independent economy variables**

The educational level 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 tertiary education. The scale now starts with not completed primary education (0) and ends with tertiary education (4). A dummy variable was made indicating if someone is employed, e.g. has a paid job, students, housewives and the unemployment do not have a paid job.

At the community level we measure socio-economic distance. 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<sup>12</sup>.

The state of the economy of a country of origin is measured with two variables. First 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). Second, we use the Human Development Index. 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. We code the HDI in such a way that the country with the best living conditions has the highest score.

### **3.6 Independent politics & policy variables<sup>13</sup>**

The last domain is politics & policy. First, 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 EPL 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.

### **3.7 Control variables**

Age is computed from the birth year and women score a (1) on the variable gender, men a (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 nested as well 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'). The (not shown) null-model shows that there is variance in perceived in-group discrimination at the country of origin level: 0.730 (s.d. 0.114). The destination and community level do not show significant variance: 0.072 (0.049); resp.

0.000 (0.000), contrary to earlier research into the social-economic integration of immigrants (Van Tubergen, 2004). The variance at the lowest individual level is fixed to 1.0 in logistic multilevel analysis.

We have built five more models. In the first model of Table 4 the immigration explanations are tested. In the second model the religion variables are tested, followed by the third model consisting of economy variables and in the fourth model the last domain: policy & politics is tested. In the last model (5) we test all explanations together. In all models except for the null-model we control for age and gender.

[Table 4 about here]

#### **4.2 The results for immigration expectations**

The first model of Table 4 shows the immigration characteristics that can influence the perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in Europe. We see that there is no significant effect of second generation, indicating that there is no difference in the perceived in-group discrimination of the first and second generation immigrants in Europe. Being a citizen of the destination country and having a native parent do reduce the perceived in-group discrimination. This means that more opportunities for contact with natives does have an influence, though being a second generation immigrant does not have the expected effect.

At the community level we tested the cultural distance and the group size hypotheses. In model 1 both variables are significant. This means that immigrants from cultural more distant countries (less individualistic than natives of the destination country) perceive in-group discrimination more often than immigrants from cultural less distant countries. Also if immigrants are from a group that has a larger size in the destination country this increases the perceived in-group discrimination. However, both variables are not significant in the complete model 5 when controlled for variables from the other domains.

The fit of the model increases considerably with 2745 points (6 df) in the immigration model. The variance at the origin level decreases from 0.730 to 0.210 with 70 percent and remains significant.

### **4.3 Results for religion expectations**

The religion dimension contains variables at three levels: individual, community, and country of origin. Model 2 shows us that Jewish, Islamic, Orthodox and other non-Christian respondents perceive in-group discrimination more often than non-religious immigrants. It also shows that Protestant immigrants perceive in-group discrimination less often than non-religious immigrants. This indicates that more 'deviant' religions that differ more from the Latin-Christian majority in Europe, perceive in-group discrimination more often, as was expected. In the final model 5 the effect of Protestant and Islamic individual religion are not significant anymore. The finding that adherents of Eastern religions do not perceive in-group discrimination more often than non-religious respondents can be explained in another way. Adherents of Eastern religions as Hinduism and Buddhism can perceive or reject on perceived in-group discrimination differently (Sue & Okazaki, 1990). We also found in model 2 that more religious immigrants perceive in-group discrimination more often, but this effect is not significant anymore in the final model 5.

At the community level we measured religious distance. Immigrants from specific origins that are religious more distant from the natives in their destination country perceive more often in-group discrimination in model 2. But this religious distance has no significant effect anymore in the final model.

We also tested the effects of the dominant religion of the country of origin and expected that non-Christian dominant religions (that differ more strongly from the religion in the EU destination country) increase the perceived in-group discrimination. This is not the case for immigrants from origin countries that have prevalent Eastern religion (in line with the absence of an individual eastern religion). However, immigrants from countries with a prevalent Islamic religion do report more perceived in-group discrimination controlled for the individual Islamic religion. But this effect is not significant anymore in the final model.

The religion variables decrease the fit with 1974 points compared to the null model and the variance at the origin level decreases with 65 percent.

#### **4.4 Results for economy expectations**

The economic dimension consists of three individual, one community and two origin variables. Model 3 shows that respondents with more educational attainment feel in-group discrimination more often. This is contrary to our expectation, a possible explanation is that higher educated immigrants perceive more in-group discrimination, because they interact more with natives and thus may better see the underprivileged situation of their own group. The other two variables do have the expected direction at least in model 3. Employed respondents perceive less often in-group discrimination in model 3 and the final model, respondents with a higher occupation status also perceive less in-group discrimination in model 3, but not in the final model.

The social-economic distance of a specific immigrant community is significant in model 3. Immigrants from an immigrant group with a larger distance to the native population perceive less often in-group discrimination than immigrants from an immigrant group with less distance to the native population. However this variable is not significant anymore in the final model 5.

The two macro variables at the country of origin gross domestic product and the human development index are significant and negative in model 3 and in the final model. This means that immigrants from wealthier economies (higher GDP and HDI) perceive in-group discrimination less often than immigrants from 'poorer' countries of origin. This is in line with our hypothesis that immigrants with a large economic gap to the country of destination perceive more often in-group discrimination.

The fit decreased with 2016 points (6 df) compared to the null model. The variance at the country of origin level increased slightly.

#### **4.5 Results for politics & policy expectations**

The dimension of integration policy contains only country of destination variables. Their policies based on the access to nationality, anti-discrimination and political participation do not have an effect on perceived in-group discrimination. However, integration policy based on the possibilities of long-term residence and family reunion have the expected negative effect. Immigrants in countries of destination with policies that are more inclusive in these three policy areas perceive less often in-group discrimination. However, immigrants in countries of destination with more inclusive labour market access policy perceive more often in-group discrimination. This might indicate that these immigrants enter the labour market more easily and thus might experience more employment-related discrimination as a group. These two indicators are both significant in the final model.

The last policy indicator is the Employment Protection Legislation (EPL), in countries in which the EPL is better (insiders are better protected from outsiders) immigrants perceive more in-group discrimination. This is in line with our explanation of the MIPEX effect for labour market access.

Our politics & policy domain explains the least of the variation in perceived in-group discrimination from all four domains. The fit increases with 769 points (7 df) and the variance at the origin level increased considerably.

#### **4.6 Results of the final model**

The final model in which we included the variables of all four domains explain a lot of the variance in perceived in-group discrimination, the fit decreased with 92 percent compared to the null model and the variance at the origin level decreased with 57 percent to 0.091. Having citizenship or a native parent, being employed, originating from a country with a high GDP or life standard or living in a destination country with easy access to long term residence or family reunion or with a high employment protection lowers the chances of the perception of in-group discrimination. Adherence of Orthodox, Jewish or other non-Christian religions, a higher educational level or living in a destination country with an easy labour market access for immigrants increases the chances of the perception of in-group discrimination.

The control variables tell us that older immigrants on average perceive less in-group discrimination than younger immigrants. It also tells us that there is no significant difference between men and women in perceived in-group discrimination.

#### **4.7 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 whether making the effects random at the country of origin level or at the country of destination level yields significantly different results. As can be seen in Table 5, 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 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 process 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 some important variables, like education, citizenship, second generation, .

[Table 5 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* are well-established (because they could answer the survey in the national language and 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, though 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. This means that the differences between European countries are fairly small. However, the differences between immigrants from different countries of origin are the largest.

In analyzing perceived in-group discrimination as with other immigrant related subjects the double comparison in which the country of origin as well as the country of destination are included are important. Model 4 of Table 4 indicates that effects of policy and politics might be less influential when we take characteristics of the individual, community and origin country into account. Without controlling for these other variables wrong conclusions might be reached on the effects of policy.

We explained the perceived in-group discrimination with four domains of variables (immigration; economy, religion; politics & policies) based on the contact theory: immigrants who have more contact chances with natives were expected to perceive less in-group discrimination. We found that immigration characteristics as citizenship, speaking a minority language at home and having a native parent were the most powerful explanations, which all relates with the immigration background of the respondent. We also found that immigrants from wealthier economies perceive less often in-group discrimination than immigrants from 'poorer'

countries of origin, and this was the second best explanation. Adherence to the Orthodox, Jewish or 'other non-Christian' religion also explained variance in perceived in-group discrimination, but less than the immigration or economy domains. That immigration policies are a less powerful explanation does not mean that this explanation does not matter: immigrants in destination country with easy access to long term residence or family reunion or with a high employment protection perceive less often in-group discrimination. Our research shows that it is important to include policy indicators besides other explanations in the economy and religious domains.

We should notice that not all of our findings are in line with intergroup contact theory. Especially the finding that second generation immigrants who could have more contact with natives do not perceive less in-group discrimination shows this. This can indicate two things. First, it might be that our two assumptions on the relationship between characteristics, contact and perceived in-group discrimination are not correct. It is possible that more equal contact leads to more perceived in-group discrimination, since immigrants become more aware of (subtle) discrimination. Second, it might be possible that intergroup contact theory is not the only or the best theory to explain perceived in-group discrimination. Other societal processes like the increasing ethnic identification of immigrants, more competition between immigrants and natives and more awareness of discrimination in general can influence perceived in-group discrimination. This would be in line with the finding of Verkuyten (2005) that immigrants with a stronger ethnic identity report more 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 to 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.

A remarkable finding is that there is no difference in perceived in-group discrimination between first and second generation 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 drawing 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 natives.

The strong influence of adherence to Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, and other non-Christian religions on perceived in-group discrimination is also a remarkable finding, because the fault 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 perceive in-group discrimination more often: 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 adherents. This means that it is not a simple contradiction between Islam and Christian religions that induces perceived in-group discrimination. It should be noted that adherents of Eastern religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism) do not perceive in-group discrimination more often 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, p.94), the adherents of Eastern religions might ignore the occurrence of in-group discrimination and focus on their individual success (Sue & Okazaki, 1990).

Migration history is also relevant for the perceived discrimination: immigrants who are citizens of the country of destination, are speaking the majority language at home, and whose parent is 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 parent, etc, less discriminatorily than immigrants who still live more in the culture of their country of origin.

The policy indicators did not all have a significant effect. Access to long-term residence, family reunion and access to the labour market were significant. This also means that the policy that has influence is the policy that focuses on concrete measures instead of symbols as anti-discrimination legislation. We can conclude that the differences in perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in the European destination countries are mainly 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.

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, but unpleasant social facts ignored will become dangerous in the long run. European countries should for example focus on including their immigrants in the labour market to reduce perceived in-group discrimination.

## References

- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading (Mass): Addison-Wesley.
- Berry, J. and Kalin, R. (1979). Reciprocity of Inter-ethnic Attitudes in a Multicultural Society. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 3, p. 99-112;
- Bobo, L. and 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. 951-972.
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2008). *The 2008 World Factbook*. [online]. Retrieved February 2008.
- Cohen, J. and 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, p. 5-18.
- Dion, K.L. (1986). Responses to perceived discrimination and relative deprivation. In: Olson, J.M., Peter Herman, C., and Zanna, M.P. *Relative Deprivation and Social Comparison. The Ontario Symposium*, p. 159-180.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. New York: Praeger.
- 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*. EUIRSCAS Working paper 2007/19 (European Forum Series) (<http://hdl.handle.net/1814/6849>)
- Fleischmann, F. and J. Dronkers. (2010). Unemployment among immigrants in European labour markets: an analysis of origin and destination effects. *Work, Employment and Society* 24, p. 337-354.
- 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), p. 26-51.
- Hagendoorn, L. and Sniderman, P. (2001). Experimenting with a National Sample: a Dutch Survey of Prejudice. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 35, p. 19-31.
- Human Development Index (2007/8). [online]. Retrieved April 2008.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work Related Values*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., and Perhoniemi, R. (2006). Perceived Discrimination and Well-being: A Victim Study of Different Immigrant Groups. *Journal of community and applied social psychology*, 16 (4), p. 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.

Kogan, I. (2007). *Working through barriers: Host Countries Institutions and Immigrant Labour Market Performance in Europe*. Dordrecht (The Netherlands): Springer.

Kunovich, R.M. (2004). Social Structural Position and Prejudice: An Exploration of Cross-national Differences in Regression Slopes. *Social Science Research* 33(1), p. 20-44.

Levels, M. and J. Dronkers (2008). Educational Performance of Native and Immigrant children from Various Countries of Origin. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(8), p. 1404-1425

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, p. 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, p. 87-105.

Moghaddam, F.M., Stalkin, A.J., and 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, p. 743-750.

Need, A. and Graaf, N.D., de. (1996). Losing my religion. A dynamic analysis of leaving the church in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review* 12, p. 87-96.

Niessen, J., Huddleston, T. and 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](http://stats.oecd.org/wbos/default.aspx?DatasetCode=EPL_1))

Operario, D., and 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, p. 550-561.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*.

Pettigrew, T.F. and Tropp, L. R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90 (5), p. 751-783.

Ruggiero, K.M., Taylor, D.M. and 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, p. 1581-1600.

Saris, W.E., and Stronkhorst, H. (1984). *Causal Modelling in Nonexperimental Research*. Amsterdam (NL): Sociometric Research Foundation.

Schlueter, E. and 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, p. 153-173

Schneider, S. L. (2008). Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: Outgroup Size and Perceived Ethnic Threat. *European Sociological Review* 24(1), p. 53-67.

Semyonov, M., Glikman, A., and Krysan, M. (2007). Europeans' Preferences for Ethnic Residential Homogeneity: Cross-National Analysis of Responses to Neighborhood Ethnic Composition. *Social Problems* 54(4), p. 434-453.

Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., and Gorodzeisky, A. (2006). The Rise of Anti-Foreigner Sentiment in European Societies, 1988-2000. *American Sociological Review* 71(3), p. 426, 449.

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), p. 5-29.

Snellman, A. and Ekehammer, B. (2005). Ethnic hierarchies, ethnic prejudice and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, p. 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, p. 35-49.

Sue, S. and Okazaki, S., (1990). Asian American Educational Achievements: A Phenomenon in Search of an Explanation. *American Psychologist* 45, p. 913-920

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

Vanneman, R.D. and Pettigrew, T.F. (1972). Race and relative deprivation in the urban United States. *Race and Class, 13* (4), p. 461-486.

Verkuyten, M. (2002). Perceptions of ethnic discrimination by minority and majority early adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology, 37*, p. 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*, p. 121-138.

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

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

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

Country	Number of natives and % perceiving discrimination		Number of immigrants and % perceiving discrimination	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
<b>Austria</b>	1888	0.0	350	15.1
<b>Belgium</b>	2966	2.3	590	8.6
<b>Czech Republic</b>	2687	0.0	243	7.4
<b>Germany</b>	4945	7.1	758	10.2
<b>Denmark</b>	2662	0.0	296	8.4
<b>Estonia</b>	2115	5.0	1278	22.4
<b>Spain</b>	3228	2.9	290	18.3
<b>France</b>	3066	3.1	691	12.3
<b>Ireland</b>	2101	4.8	152	6.6
<b>Netherlands</b>	1602	0.0	274	11.7
<b>Norway</b>	3110	0.0	310	8.4
<b>Sweden</b>	3158	6.7	704	7.8
<b>Slovenia</b>	2392	1.8	496	3.0
<b>United Kingdom</b>	3593	8.0	602	15.9
<b>Total</b>	39,513	3.9	7,034	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.

<b>Country of origin</b>	<b>Total N</b>	<b>% Perceiving discrimination</b>
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.

	<b>Minimum</b>	<b>Maximum</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
Perceived in-group discrimination	0.00	1.00	0.13	0.33
<b>Immigration</b>				
Second generation	0.00	1.00	0.50	0.50
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
Cultural Distance in Individualism	-40.00	75.00	17.05	19.76
Relative Community Size	0.02	28.97	5.99	9.71
<b>Religion</b>				
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 practice	1.00	7.00	2.79	1.75
Religious distance	-3.92	4.78	0.35	0.77
Eastern religions origin	0.00	1.00	0.03	0.17
Islam origin	0.00	1.00	0.16	0.36
<b>Economy</b>				
Educational level	0.00	4.00	2.76	1.04
Employment	0.00	1.00	0.93	0.25
Occupational status	16.00	88.00	41.39	17.00
Socio-economic distance	-2.65	2.02	0.07	0.41
GDP origin	1.00	55.60	20.28	13.06
HDI origin	0.47	0.97	0.83	0.11
<b>Politics &amp; Policy</b>				
MIPEX Labour market access destination	40.00	100.00	65.84	16.89
MIPEX Family reunion destination	34.00	92.00	60.85	14.01
MIPEX Long term residence destination	39.00	76.00	62.71	9.18
MIPEX Political participation destination	15.00	93.00	52.42	22.00
MIPEX Access to nationality destination	22.00	71.00	46.33	16.45
MIPEX Anti discrimination destination	23.00	94.00	58.99	24.64
MIPEX total destination	4.00	88.00	55.27	16.98
Employment Protection Legislation	0.65	3.26	1.97	0.83
<b>Control</b>				
Age	15.00	97.00	44.03	17.46
Female	0.00	1.00	0.53	0.50

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 European Union member-states.  $N_{\text{immigrants}}=7034$ ;  $N_{\text{communities}}=587$ ;  $N_{\text{origin}}=177$ ;  $N_{\text{destination}}=14$ .

	Level	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
<b>Immigration</b>						
Second generation	1	.068 (.110)				.116 (.111)
Citizen	1	-.383* (.095)				-.364* (.096)
Minority language	1	.708* (.098)				.526* (.102)
Mixed marriage	1	-.692* (.104)				-.607* (.107)
Cultural distance	2	.025* (.003)				-.001 (.004)
Group size	2	.020* (.009)				.009 (.008)
<b>Religion</b>						
No religion (ref.)	1					
Roman Catholic	1		-.175 (.134)			-.079 (.138)
Protestants	1		-.512* (.187)			-.279 (.202)
Orthodox	1		.792* (.152)			.493* (.134)
Other Christian	1		.157 (.226)			.115 (.229)
Jewish	1		1.655* (.447)			1.750* (.469)
Islam	1		.635* (.164)			.312 (.167)
Eastern religions	1		.060 (.336)			-.146 (.343)
Other non Christian	1		1.304* (.392)			1.336* (.425)
Religiosity	1		.080* (.028)			.053 (.028)
Religious distance	2		.295* (.068)			.083 (.069)
Christian origin (ref.)	30					
Eastern religions origin	30		.345 (.287)			-.081 (.276)
Islamic origin	30		.653* (.155)			.082 (.162)
<b>Economy</b>						
Educational attainment	1			.133* (.049)		.143* (.049)
Employed	1			-.364* (.133)		-.408* (.136)
Occupational status	1			-.007* (.003)		-.004 (.003)
Social-economic distance	2			-.348* (.118)		-.222 (.117)
GDP origin	30			-.037* (.007)		-.024* (.008)
HDI origin	30			-2.675* (.642)		-1.866* (.693)
<b>Policy &amp; politics</b>						
MIPEX Long term residence	3D				-.030* (.010)	-.021* (.009)
MIPEX Access to nationality	3D				-.010 (.008)	-.007 (.007)
MIPEX Anti discrimination	3D				.005 (.006)	.007 (.005)
MIPEX Family reunion	3D				-.036* (.010)	-.023* (.009)
MIPEX Political participation	3D				.007 (.005)	.004 (.005)
MIPEX Labour market access	3D				.038* (.008)	.018* (.008)
EPL	3D				-.312* (.102)	-.307* (.100)
<b>Control</b>						
Age	1	-.017* (.003)	-.015* (.003)	-.012* (.003)	-.017* (.002)	-.013* (.003)
Women	1	-.121 (.083)	-.155 (.083)	-.131 (.084)	-.154 (.080)	-.110 (.085)
Constant	1	-1.677* (.198)	-2.043* (.176)	-.366 (.629)	0.824 (.492)	.125 (.855)
Destination variance	30	.093 (.052)	.134 (.069)	.130 (.067)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)
Origin variance	3D	.210* (.062)	.255* (.070)	.242* (.070)	.617* (.103)	.091* (.042)
Community variance	2	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)	.000 (.000)

-2loglikelihood		1320	2081	2039	3286	338
-----------------	--	------	------	------	------	-----

Source: unweighted data of the second and third wave of the European Social Survey \* Significant at 0.05 level;  
1=individual, 2=community, 3O = origin country 3D=destination country.

Table 5: 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)
<b>Immigration</b>				
Second generation	0.172 (0.174)	0.211 (0.130)	0.151 (0.109)	No convergence
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)
Cultural distance	0.001 (0.004)	No convergence	0.001 (0.004)	0.000 (0.000)
Community size	0.008 (0.006)	0.000 (0.000)	0.008 (0.006)	0.000 (0.000)
<b>Religion</b>				
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)*
Religious distance	0.013 (0.070)	0.000 (0.000)	0.021 (0.073)	0.054 (0.066)
<b>Economy</b>				
Education	0.009 (0.225)	0.656 (0.261)*	0.147 (0.058)*	0.161 (0.053)*
Employed	-0.364 (0.134)*	0.080 (0.115)	-0.364 (0.134)*	0.000 (0.000)
Social-economic distance	-0.214 (0.124)	0.038 (0.057)	-0.186 (0.111)	0.000 (0.000)
<b>Control</b>				
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)

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			7	2	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

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Stéfanie André is a masters student of social cultural science and political science at the Radboud University of Nijmegen (the Netherlands). Jaap Dronkers holds the chair Chair International comparative research on educational performance and social inequality, Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market, Maastricht University. 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. All correspondence, including requests for the appendix, to Jaap Dronkers, Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market | ROA, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht (The Netherlands). E-mail: [j.dronkers@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:j.dronkers@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The competition theory is often used together with the intergroup contact theory to explain interethnic relations. We chose to focus on one of the two theories (contact) as to develop a parsimonious set of hypotheses. If the competition theory was also used, contradictory hypotheses for almost all of our hypotheses could be developed.

<sup>4</sup> For more variables at the country of destination level, request the appendix from the corresponding author.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> In classifying immigrants into countries of origin, we follow the same approach as Fleischmann & Dronkers (2007).

<sup>7</sup> The countries that are not in this analysis are: Cyprus, Bulgaria, Greece, Finland, Hungary, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal and Slovakia

<sup>8</sup> The survey was only conducted in the official languages of the countries of destination.

<sup>9</sup> However of course we do not know if these immigrants perceive more or less in-group discrimination than the (more established) interviewed respondents.

<sup>10</sup> The appendix gives the precise combination of natives and immigrants per country of origin and destination.

<sup>11</sup> 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 (always less than 3 %) of imputations we do not think this to be a problem.

<sup>12</sup> We use education instead of occupational status or income because of the substantial lower number of missing cases of the education variable.

<sup>13</sup> 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 and Slovakia was used. The category which contains the countries that were members of the former Soviet Union is calculated in the same way.