

---

 Contents/Inhalt

<i>Notes for Contributors</i>	4
<i>Louise van 't Hof/Jaap Dronkers</i> Differences in Educational Attainment of Children from Various Groups of Recent Immigrants in the Netherlands: Class, Family or Migrant Culture?	5
<i>Ahmet Icduygu</i> Changing Settlement Intention of the Turkish Immigrants in Australia and Sweden: Some Recent Parallels	49
<i>Kathleen Valtonen</i> Refugee Adaptation as an Experience of Stress and Coping Among the Vietnamese in Finland	75
<i>Reports of the European Migration Centre</i>	
<i>Norbert Cyrus</i> Flexible Work for Fragmented Labour Markets. The Significance of the New Labour Migration Regime in the Federal Republic of Germany	97
Reviews	125
Journals on Migration and Ethnicity	135
Literature Received	145
Call for Papers	155
Editorial Cooperation: Migration Specials/Yearbooks	156
<i>Editorial Board</i>	157

---

 Louise van 't Hof/Jaap Dronkers

 Differences in Educational  
 Attainment of Children  
 from Various Groups of Recent  
 Immigrants in the Netherlands:  
 Class, Family or Migrant Culture?

*Differences in Educational Attainment of Children  
from Various Groups of Recent Immigrants in the  
Netherlands: Class, Family or Migrant Culture?*

*Like most West European countries, Holland has experienced a relatively large immigration wave since the '60s. This growing immigration mostly streamed from former Dutch colonies, from some Southern European and Mediterranean societies and from the surrounding European societies. This immigration wave has generated the possibility for the rise of an underclass in Dutch society, formed by the offspring of these immigrants. Equal educational opportunities for immigrant children and their Dutch*

peers is regarded as crucial in preventing this phenomenon. A major controversy regarding the lower educational attainment of migrant children focuses on the relative importance of the reasons for these arrears: 1) lower-class position (occupation, education) of immigrant parents which hampers the educational success of their children in the same way as it affects children from Dutch families with the same position in the social stratification; 2) less appropriate pedagogical attitudes and behavior displayed by migrant parents (cultural activities, contact with children regarding school activities, and so on) hampering the educational success of their children just as that of children from Dutch families showing the same attitudes and behaviors is hampered; 3) ethnic culture (of the immigrant groups) that does not fit into the Dutch culture and increases the distance between family and school.

In this paper we estimate the relative importance of these possible causes of arrears in order to explain differences in educational attainment at the point where children finish primary education and enter secondary education. We will make this estimation with ANOVA, using a national sample of primary school leavers from 1989, made available by the Netherlands Central Bureau of Statistics. Besides Dutch pupils we distinguish 17 groups of immigrants' children, according to their own and their parents' immigration history. The lower-class position occupied by immigrant parents is the most important explanation for the lower educational attainment of their children. After controlling for parental class and pedagogical attitudes and behavior, we have found children belonging to some of the immigrant groups to have a higher level of educational attainment than comparable Dutch children.

### *Unterschiede im schulischen Bildungsniveau bei Kindern verschiedener Gruppen neuerer Einwanderer in den Niederlanden: Klassen-, Familien- oder Migrantenkultur?*

Wie die meisten westeuropäischen Länder sind die Niederlande seit den sechziger Jahren Ziel eines relativ umfangreichen Einwandererstromes, der vorwiegend aus den ehemaligen niederländischen Kolonien, aus einigen Kulturkreisen Südeuropas und des Mittelmeerraumes sowie aus den umliegenden europäischen Gesellschaften gespeist wird. Diese zuneh-

mende Einwanderungswelle führte potentiell zur Entstehung einer sozialen Unterschicht in der niederländischen Gesellschaft, die sich aus den Nachfahren dieser Einwanderer rekrutiert. Gleiche Bildungsmöglichkeiten für die Kinder von Einwanderern und ihre niederländischen Altersgefährten werden als entscheidende Voraussetzung angesehen, um eine solche Entwicklung zu vermeiden. Ein großer Meinungsstreit in bezug auf das niedrigere Bildungsniveau von Einwandererkindern konzentriert sich auf die relative Bedeutung der Ursachen für diesen Rückstand: 1) Zugehörigkeit der eingewanderten Eltern zu einer sozialen Unterschicht (Beschäftigung, Bildung), wodurch der schulische Erfolg ihrer Kinder in der gleichen Weise beeinträchtigt wird wie bei Kindern aus niederländischen Familien mit der gleichen Stellung innerhalb der sozialen Schichtung; 2) weniger geeignete pädagogische Einstellungen und Verhaltensweisen seitens der Migranteneltern (kulturelle Aktivitäten, Kontakt zu den Kindern hinsichtlich der schulischen Aktivitäten usw.), wodurch der schulische Erfolg ihrer Kinder ebenso beeinträchtigt wird wie bei Kindern aus niederländischen Familien mit den gleichen Einstellungen und Verhaltensweisen; 3) ethnische Kultur (der Einwanderergruppen), die sich nicht in die niederländische Kultur einfügt und die Kluft zwischen Familie und Schule verbreitert.

Im vorliegenden Beitrag bewerten wir die relative Bedeutung dieser potentiellen Ursachen für den Bildungsrückstand, um Unterschiede im schulischen Bildungsniveau an jenem Zeitpunkt zu erklären, da die Kinder die Grundschulbildung beenden und die Oberschulbildung beginnen. Wir treffen diese Bewertung mit Hilfe einer Varianzanalyse (ANOVA), gestützt auf ein landesweites Sample von Grundschulabgängern des Jahres 1989, das vom niederländischen Zentralbüro für Statistik zur Verfügung gestellt wurde. Außer niederländischen Schülern unterscheiden wir 17 Gruppen von Einwandererkindern nach ihrer eigenen und ihrer Eltern Einwanderungsgeschichte. Die soziale Unterschichtsstellung eingewandelter Eltern liefert die wichtigste Erklärung für den niedrigeren Bildungsstand ihrer Kinder. Nach Untersuchung der elterlichen Klassenzugehörigkeit sowie der pädagogischen Einstellungen und Verhaltensweisen stellten wir fest, daß Kinder, die einigen der Einwanderergruppen angehören, einen höheren Bildungsstand aufweisen als vergleichbare niederländische Kinder.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Migrants from Mediterranean societies and former Dutch colonies often occupy a low socio-economic position in the Dutch society due to their immigration history and to developmental differences existing between their country of origin and the adoptive country (*Massey*: 1981). The school careers of these immigrants' children are generally less successful than those of native children. It is often assumed that this difference in school success, mostly observable at the point where children finish primary education and move up to secondary education, is caused by cultural differences existing between these migrant groups and the average culture of the adoptive country. The educational arrears observed among migrant children could be generated by a clash between native and foreign cultures at school. Depending on political preferences, one argues either in favor of the integration of migrant children into the Dutch culture or for the recognition of cultural multiformity in Dutch society. The question is, however, whether the arrears in school career observed among migrant children could be generated by differences between the cultures of the immigrants and the standard culture of the immigration country. Less successful school careers observed among immigrant children could be entirely explained by the social position occupied by their parents (particularly their lower occupational and educational levels) and by less favorable family characteristics (family size, for instance). In other words: the low socio-economic position of immigrants, mostly resulting from their immigration history, could explain the arrears in educational attainment observed among their children. The migrant effect on school career is then a spurious effect resulting from the relationship between the socio-economic position and the fact of belonging to certain immigrant groups.

The assumption that the migrant effect upon school career is a spurious effect has been tested in various Dutch studies. *Van Langen* and *Jungbluth* (1990) analyzed the differences in educational positions of pupils in the third grade of secondary education. They concluded that, for migrant children, the socio-economic position is the best predictor. "Ethnicity" subsequently explains a rather small indeed, but relevant part of these differences. In the research conducted by *De Jong*

(1987), children of Rotterdam were observed from elementary group seven to the second grade of secondary education. After controlling for socio-economic characteristics, he found - for the whole group of native and migrant children - no direct migrant effect on teacher's recommendation and educational position at the end of the transition year. Still, he did find a direct migrant effect on "school intelligence". *Tesser et al.* (1990), on the other hand, found no direct migrant effect in elementary group eight: when fathers had equal educational levels, there was no question of special migrant effects on teacher's recommendation. *Driessen* (1990) studied pupils in elementary group eight. Taking into account the original social class, he found no migrant effect with regard to arithmetic and transfer to secondary education. With regard to language, he found a small, in his opinion, not relevant effect. *Kerkhoff* (1988) analyzed the relation between language proficiency and school success, using a detailed operationalization of language proficiency in the Netherlands. This study also showed that language differences between native and migrant pupils are mainly related to socio-economic characteristics. However, it appeared that noticeable differences with regard to school success existed between native and migrant pupils from lower socio-economic classes. According to *Kerkhoff*, these differences were caused by an inadequate operationalization of the "socio-economic class" variable. By using the same data and a better indicated socio-economic class, *Dronkers* and *Kerkhoff* (1990) showed in their analysis that not really all differences can be attributed to the lower average educational and occupational level attained by immigrants. It is true that this explained 80 per cent of the differences in the school careers of immigrant children and comparable Standard Educated Dutch speaking pupils but, nevertheless, 20 per cent remained unexplained.

None of the above-mentioned studies made a distinction between migrant children belonging to the in-between generation (still born in their homeland) and those belonging to the second generation (born in the Netherlands). Also, there is no separate analysis of the particular category of children of which only one parent belongs to a migrant minority. Analyzing these groups separately opens the possibility to verify whether a longer stay in the Netherlands, and growing up in a heterogeneous family, could have a positive effect on children's educational chances.

Finally, it is possible that the occupational and educational level of the parents or other family and pupil characteristics of certain migrant groups might influence in a deviant way the school careers of the children. The immigration history as well as the land of origin are quite different for the various migrant groups living in Holland. The educational level of the parents or their pedagogical attitudes might have different meanings in different migrant groups regarding the school careers of their children: the effect of some characteristics can be stronger or weaker than for native Dutch pupils or even act according to completely deviant patterns. With regard to this possible interaction effect also, none of the above-mentioned studies attempted a systematical approach.

The present study endeavors to supply these wants. By verifying the following four, partly contradictory, hypotheses we will be able to establish whether, and if so to what extent, the educational chances of various groups of immigrant pupils (divided into different groups according to their country of origin, but also in-between and second-generation groups, also not omitting to consider whether they were or were not brought up in homogeneous migrant families) are determined by their socio-economic class, family characteristics or the degree in which their own migrant culture differs from the native culture. These hypotheses are as follows:

- 1) Differences in school career between the various groups of immigrant and native children have their origins exclusively in the occupational and educational level of their parents.
- 2) Differences in school career between the various groups of immigrant and native children cannot fully be traced back to the occupational and educational level of their parents. The remaining effect can be fully explained by differences in family and pupil characteristics such as pedagogical attitudes, the degree in which the Dutch language is used at home and the reading behavior of the parents.
- 3) Differences in school career cannot be fully explained by occupational and educational level and by family and pupil characteristics.
- 4) The greater the differences between the culture of the migrant groups and the average culture of native Dutch, the greater will

be the educational arrears which cannot be explained by socio-economic and other family and pupil characteristics.

The four hypotheses ensue from the introduction. The fourth hypothesis has several consequences which will be verified in this study. The first consequence is that, after controlling for class, family and pupil characteristics, none of the groups of immigrant children can achieve higher school performances than comparable native pupils. Per definition, the difference between the culture of this last group of immigrant pupils and the Dutch school culture is the smallest. A second consequence is that the less West European elements the culture of an immigrant group contains, the lower will be the school performances of their children. The difference between migrant culture and the culture in Dutch schools is indeed smaller for immigrant groups whose cultures contain more West European elements. A third consequence is that children from homogeneous migrant families will achieve lower school performances than children from "mixed migrant" families. The latter are considered to be closer to the average native culture because one of the parents could be native Dutch, this increasing the chance for better integration in the Dutch culture. A last consequence is that children belonging to the in-between generation (born in the country of origin) score lower than those belonging to the second generation (born in the Netherlands). Due to longer contact with the Dutch culture, the latter should be closer to this culture and therefore also closer to the school culture. These four consequences are based on a culturalistic explanation (*Vermeulen: 1992*) where the matter of importance is the difference between the cultures in the countries of origin and the dominant culture of the adoptive country. Of course, for the fourth hypothesis it is possible to formulate alternative hypotheses where not the difference between the homeland culture and the dominant culture of the immigration country is the most important matter, but the extent and usefulness of the immigrants' own culture in their life in the immigration country (*Nee/Wong: 1985*). According to international literature concerning successful immigrant groups (*Massey: 1981*) this should go without saying. However, because in the Netherlands (and generally in West Europe) the discussion concentrates on the harmful consequences generated by cultural differences, in our study we will confine ourselves to the fourth hypothesis.

The causal model which will be used in our analysis assumes direct effects upon school success generated by belonging to a particular migrant group, on the one hand, and by characteristics of parental class, family and pupil on the other hand. This causal model will not further analyze the connections between belonging to a migrant group and class, family and pupil characteristics. These connections will be used in the analysis only to control the possibly resulting spurious effect. So, our analysis will only deal with direct effects of belonging to a certain migrant group, controlled for the class, family and pupil characteristics. Possible indirect effects of belonging to a certain migrant group via these class, family, and pupil characteristics will not be discussed in this article.

This verification is not only scientifically but also socially important. In pursuing a policy aimed at reducing educational arrears of immigrants it is necessary to find out the causes of these arrears and, particularly, the relative importance of the various causes.

If the first or second hypothesis is confirmed, policies aimed at improving social position and family stimulation will be successful. In that case, there will be almost no need for special policies for immigrants; a general policy aimed at improving the social position of all underprivileged groups will be sufficient.

If the third and fourth hypotheses can explain a large part of the educational arrears, it goes without saying that the remedy should be sought either in the cultural integration of immigrants or in the recognition of a multiform Dutch society.

## Data and method

### *Data*

In this article, we used the data of the VOCL'89 cohort (secondary-education pupils' cohort 1989). This is a stratified sample of pupils who attended the first grade of secondary education in September

1989 (CBS: 1991). The file contains 19,524 pupils. These pupils were subjected to a national test, consisting of a language test (which tested pupils' knowledge and receptive skills concerning the Dutch language), an arithmetic test and an information-processing test. Apart from this, the primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education was made available. The secondary schools involved also provided a characterization of the first secondary-school year which pupils attended. The parents or guardians had to fill in a questionnaire. This questionnaire contained items concerning the pupils (including native country and nationality), the family composition and also the parents themselves (including country of origin, nationality, education received, profession and socio-cultural activities). Although the CBS took great trouble to obtain the participation of immigrant parents in this questionnaire, it may be assumed that immigrant parents who are less settled in Dutch society filled in the questionnaire comparatively less often. Although this might have led to a reduced effect of belonging to a migrant group, this selective response, mainly from "settled" immigrant parents, has not been really harmful in finding a reliable answer for our hypotheses, since a selective response enables unintentional control for the degree of "settlement" reached by the various migrant groups. Without this control, a biased picture could be formed with regard to the causes of educational arrears observed among children of recently "settled" immigrants, because, in fact, these groups have only recently arrived in the Netherlands, this not meaning that there are greater cultural differences between these groups and the average Dutch culture. Also, pupils in special secondary education have not been included in the sample. However, a biased effect is not likely.

For this study, only pupils who entered secondary education in 1989 have been selected. Out of the whole group of Dutch children, we took a random sample of 1,000 pupils, so that our analyses could not be biased by a disproportionately large number of Dutch pupils.

Subsequently, we have confined ourselves to pupils coming from two-parent families. Including single-parent families, a comparatively frequent phenomenon in certain immigrant groups, could cause an over-estimation of the significance of the migrant culture. Because children brought up in single-parent families have poorer school careers than

those brought up in two-parent families (Dronkers: 1992) children coming from migrant groups where there is a greater incidence of single-parent families will have, on the average, greater educational arrears. However, these arrears are the result of the frequent incidence of single-parent families and not that of the culture of that group. Apart from this, Dronkers (1992) found no interaction effect between belonging to a migrant group and single-parent family. Children from immigrant families are not more or less negatively influenced by growing up in single-parent families than children from comparable native Dutch families. Deleting all pupils from single-parent families from our analysis means, therefore, a conservative estimation of the effect of the migrant culture upon school career because the possible relation between the culture of a particular group of migrants and the incidence of single-parent families in that group has been excluded by this selection.

#### *Migrant groups*

First of all, ten groups of immigrant pupils have been distinguished, respectively, pupils from Turkey, Morocco, Surinam, Dutch Antilles, Molucca Islands (Indonesia), Southern Europe, China, the rest of Asia, the other countries in the First World (Western and Northern Europe, USA and Canada, Australia and New Zealand) and the other countries in the Third World (South America and Africa).

For the first five groups, the classification criterion was that at least one of the parents had to be born in the countries concerned. For the rest of the groups, neither for the parents nor for the children was the country of origin known. All we knew was that they were not born in the Netherlands. For these groups, our point of departure was the nationality of the parents recorded in the data file. The criterion established was that at least one of the parents had the corresponding nationality and that he/she was not born in the Netherlands.

Where the numbers allowed, we subdivided pupils into a group born in the Netherlands and a group not born in the Netherlands and also into a group where only one parent and one where both parents came from the countries concerned. This means that, as far as possible, we

also distinguished between immigrant pupils from the in-between generation (not born in the Netherlands) and pupils from the second generation (born in the Netherlands), as well as between children brought up in families where the parents share the same migrant backgrounds (both from the same country; however, a family where one parent is Kurdish-Turkish and the other one is not Kurdish-Turkish could be considered as mixed migrants but in this study, it has been considered as homogeneous), and children whose parents have different migrant backgrounds.

Unfortunately, within the group of immigrant pupils, we could not further distinguish between those who spoke standard Dutch at home and those who spoke a dialect, as Kerkhoff (1988) did in his study.

In combination with the classification regarding the countries of origin we tried to do justice to the differences existing between and within the migrant groups, as shown in Figure 1.

Of course, this classification is not an ideal one because there are only indirect indicators of belonging to a certain migrant group or culture. Dutch data about considering oneself to belong to a migrant group or culture are not available in large-scale school-career research and small-scale data files do not offer enough possibilities of controlling for spurious relations. Given the situation in Dutch school-career research, the subdivision made by the present study is the most feasible. The distinction we made here is more precise than anything done till now in the field of educational-arrears research, although our classification might still obscure certain differences within and between the migrant groups. These subgroups are the 18 categories of one independent variable "migrant group". Therefore, in this analysis, for instance, Moroccans belonging to the in-between generation are considered to be a different migrant group than Moroccans belonging to the second generation. By this classification we try to dynamize and differentiate the analysis of educational arrears observed among immigrant pupils. The price that has to be paid for that purpose is that some groups are really very small but, in our opinion, this drawback still compensates for the much rougher, a-dynamic classification used in the above-mentioned studies.

*Variables<sup>2</sup>*

With regard to these migrant groups, we will verify whether they differ in educational success. To that purpose, we will compare their scores on three national performance tests (language, arithmetic and information-processing), their teachers' recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education and their educational position in the first grade of secondary education. For a correct comparison, the groups will be controlled for class, family and pupil characteristics. These characteristics are considered to have an influence upon school success and are mostly unequally divided among the various migrant groups. The five dependent school-success variables are: 1) score on the language test; 2) score on the arithmetic test; 3) score on the information-processing test; 4) primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; 5) educational position in the first grade of secondary education.

The class control variables are: 6) occupational level of the father; 7) father has or does not have a paid job; 8) educational level of the father; 9) occupational level of the mother; 10) mother has or does not have a paid job; 11) educational level of the mother.

The family and pupil control variables are: 12) number of children in the family; 13) pupil has or has not a younger brother and/or sister; 14) pupil has or has not an elder brother or/and sister; 15) parents' reading behavior; 16) parents' passive participation in cultural activities (concert, theatre and museum); 17) extent to which parents talk with their children about school; 18) extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; 19) gender of the pupil; 20) degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; 21) pupil was or was not a direct Dutch primary school entrant.

*Method*

For the verification of our hypotheses we used ANOVA (option with simultaneous estimation of factors and covariates). This analysis technique enables comparing with each other the average scores of the 18 migrant groups on the five dependent school-success variables (tables

Figure 1:  
The eighteen subgroups of pupils used in the analyses

Origin	Pupil	Parents	Number	Code
1. Turkey	not born in Netherlands	both from Turkey	117	Tur-2
2. Turkey	born in Netherlands	both from Turkey	130	Tur+2
3. Morocco	born in Netherlands	one from Morocco	17	Mar+1
4. Morocco	not born in Netherlands	both from Morocco	159	Mar-2
5. Morocco	born in Netherlands	both from Morocco	74	Mar+2
6. Suriname	born in Netherlands	one from Suriname	41	Sur+1
7. Suriname	not born in Netherlands	both from Suriname	26	Sur-2
8. Suriname	born in Netherlands	both from Suriname	39	Sur+2
9. Dutch Antilles	born in Netherlands	one from Dutch Antilles	41	Ant+1
10. Molucca Islands	born in Netherlands	one from Molucca Islands	17	Mol+1
11. South Europe	born in Netherlands	one from South Europe	37	SE+1
12. South Europe	born in Netherlands	one from South Europe	23	SE+2
13. China	born in Netherlands	both from South Europe	23	SE+2
14. other Asia	all		17	Chin
15. other 1st World	not born in Netherlands	one from other 1st World	21	Asia
16. other 1st World	born in Netherlands	one from other 1st World	34	1thW-1
17. other 3rd World	all		91	1thW+1
18. Dutch	born in Netherlands	both from Netherlands	14	3rdW
			1.000	Dut

1-5). It has been determined whether the migrant group variable and the various control variables can explain a significant part of the mean differences. In the first equation A, the effect ( $\beta$ ) of the "migrant group" on each of the five school-career characteristics has been measured. At this point, the effects of other class, family and pupil characteristics have not been taken into consideration. The educational and occupational level of the parents and other family and pupil characteristics have been added to the equation step by step (in the order in which they ensue from the hypotheses). Each addition can cause a change in the earlier measured "migrant group" effect on school success. It has also been established which part of the differences ( $R^2$ ) is explained by the control variable introduced. If, in this last equation, the effect of the "migrant group" ( $\beta$ ) is significant, we will ascertain separately, for each migrant group, whether it differs significantly from the native Dutch group. Subsequently, we will ascertain whether within certain migrant groups the effect of certain characteristics deviates from that within other groups, mainly the native group. This deviant effect will be analyzed by determining whether there is a significant interaction between the independent variable "migrant group" and a control variable. For that purpose, all the control variables from the last equation will be introduced in that equation in separate analyses, one by one, as factors and we will determine whether the interaction between this factors and the variable "migrant group" is significant, after having introduced the factors and covariates.

## Research results

First of all, we will describe the uncontrolled effect of the "migrant group" upon the five dependent variables: language score, arithmetic score, information score, teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education and educational position in the first grade of secondary education (table 1-5). Subsequently we will discuss the results obtained by introducing the control variables step by step: first, for the variables which refer to the socio-economic position of the family, then for the other family and pupil characteristics and finally, for the teacher's recommendation and educational position for

the three performance scores (language, arithmetic and information) and by educational position also for teacher's recommendation. Finally, the interactions found will be brought into discussion.

### *The uncontrolled effect of the "migrant group"*

The uncontrolled effect of "migrant group" on the five dependent variables language score, arithmetic score, information score, teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education, and educational position can be read in the first row (equation A, tables 1-5) of the five tables. For each of the five dependent variables the effect of the "migrant group" ( $\beta$ ) is significant<sup>3</sup>. The standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) of the "migrant group" variable and the explained variance ( $R^2$ ) vary from .30 and 9 per cent for educational position to .40 and 16 per cent for the information score. These figures show that the differences in school success between the 18 groups are quite great.

Only one group scores higher than native Dutch pupils: children born in the Netherlands of which one parent belongs to the migrant group from the First World. On all five school-career characteristics they score significantly better than native Dutch pupils. Surinamese children from the second generation growing up in homogeneous families, Antillians, Moroccans, children from Asia and the other Third World countries score on none of the five variables significantly different than native Dutch pupils. Surinamese children from "mixed families", Chinese and both groups of South Europeans score significantly lower on two to three of the performance variables, yet not on teacher's recommendation and educational position. All the groups of Turks and Moroccans score on all five school-career variables significantly lower than native Dutch children. Furthermore, the results obtained by Turkish and Moroccan children belonging to the in-between generation are the lowest. On the three performance variables they are followed by Surinamese pupils. Regarding this last group, bad results are clearly observable on the three national performance scores; not so obviously bad are the results on teacher's recommendation and hardly so on educational position.

Table 1:

Differences between groups averages and the total average on *language test*, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and the significance ( $+p < .05$ ) of the variable *migrant group*, explained variance ( $R^2$ ) of the equation, interaction between *migrant group* and the variables of equation Q

Total average on language test: 10,8 (n=1898)

EQUATION	1 TUR-2	2 TUR+2	3 MAR+ I	4 MAR-2	5 MAR+2	6 SUR+1	7 SUR-2	8 SUR+2	9 ANTI+1	10 MOL+1
A. ethn. group	-2,7*	-1,8*	-1,0*	-3,0*	-1,7*	-,2*	-1,9	,5	,7	-,2
B. A + var6	-2,4	-1,4	-,6	-2,6	-1,4	-,2	-1,6	,6	,4	-,2
C. B + var7	-2,1	-1,2	-,5	-2,3	-1,1	-,2	-1,5	,6	,3	-,3
D. C + var8										
-var7@	-1,7	-,8	-,3	-1,7	-,6	-,3	-1,2	,4	-,1	-,3
E. D + var9	-1,7	-,7	-,3	-1,7	-,5	-,2	-1,1	,6	-,2	-,2
G. E + var11	-1,2	-,2	-,3	-1,1	-,0	-,3	-1,2	,7	-,7	-,6
I. G + var13	-1,2	-,3	-,3	-1,2	-,2	-,4	-1,2	,7	-,6	-,6
K. I + var15	-1,2	-,3	-,3	-1,2	-,2	-,4	-1,3	,7	-,6	-,5
L. K + var16										
-var15	-1,3	-,3	-,3	-1,2	-,2	-,4	-1,2	,8	-,6	-,5
M. L + var17	-1,1	-,3	-,3	-1,1	-,1	-,4	-1,1	,7	-,6	-,6
N. M + var18	-,8	-,1	-,1	-,9	,1	-,2	-,9	1,0	-,5	-,7
O. N + var19	-,8	-,0	-,2	-,9	,2	-,2	-,8	1,0	-,6	-,8
Q. O + var21	-,4	-,1	-,3	-,5	-,2	-,2	-,7	,9	-,7	-,8

(Table 1 cont.)

EQUATION	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASIA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$	$p$	$R^2$
A. ethn. group	-,6*	-,2	-1,6*	-,1	-,5*	2,0*	-,1	1,1	37	+	14
B. A + var6	-,1	,5	-1,4	,1	-,5	1,7	,4	,9	31	+	17
C. B + var7	-,2	,6	-1,3	,2	-,5	1,6	,4	,8	28	+	17
D. C + var8											
-var7@	-,2	,5	-,5	,2	-,6	1,3	-,2	,6	21	+	19
E. D + var9	-,1	,7	-,6	,2	-,4	1,3	-,4	,5	20	+	20
G. E + var11	-,4	-,8	,0	,2	-,8	,9	-,3	,3	14	+	23
I. G + var13	-,3	,8	-,1	,2	-,7	1,0	-,4	,4	15	+	23
K. I + var15	-,4	,7	-,0	,2	-,8	1,0	-,4	,4	15	+	23
L. K + var16											
-var15	-,3	,7	-,0	,2	-,7	,9	-,4	,4	15	+	23
M. L + var17	-,4	,7	,3	,2	-,7	,9	-,5	,3	14	+	23
N. M + var18	-,4	1,0	,4	,3	-,6	1,0	-,6	,2	12	+	25
O. N + var19	-,4	1,0	,5	,3	-,6	1,0	-,7	,2	12	+	26
Q. O + var21	-,6	,9	1,6	,6	-,2	,9	-,2	,1	10	-	27

Significant interactions between var11 and migrant group and between var17 and migrant group.

\* and †: difference between the migrant group and DUT (group 18) is significant (\*:  $p < .05$ ; †:  $p < .10$ ) as estimated in equations A and T.

@: variable is deleted from the equation if  $p > .10$ .

var1 language test; var2 arithmetic test; var3 information-processing test; var4 primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; var5 educational position in the first grade of secondary education; var6 occupational level of the father; var7 father has or does not have a paid job; var8 educational level of the mother; var9 occupational level of the father; var10 mother has or does not have a paid job; var11 educational level of the mother; var12 number of children in the family; var13 pupil has or has not a younger brother/sister; var14 pupil has or has not an elder brother/sister; var15 parents' reading behavior; var16 parents' passive participation in cultural activities; var17 extent to which parents talk with their children about school; var18 extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; var19 gender of the pupil; var20 degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; var21 pupil was or was not a direct entrant in Dutch primary school.

Table 2:

Differences between groups averages and the total average on *arithmetic test*, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and the significance ( $+p < .05$ ) of the variable *migrant group*, explained variance ( $R^2$ ) of the equation, interaction between *migrant group* and the variables of equation Q

Total average on arithmetic test: 10,3 (n=1898)

EQUATION	1 TUR-2	2 TUR+2	3 MAR+ I	4 MAR-2	5 MAR+2	6 SUR+1	7 SUR-2	8 SUR+2	9 ANT+1	10 MOL+1
A. ethn. group	-2,4*	-2,0*	-1,5*	-3,0*	-1,5*	-,3	-2,4*	-,2	,9	,5
B. A + var6	-2,0	-1,6	-1,1	-2,6	-1,1	-,3	-2,0	-,2	,6	,5
C. B + var7	-1,4	-1,1	-,9	-2,0	-,7	-,3	-1,8	-,1	,4	,3
D. C + var8	-,8	-,6	-,7	-1,1	-,1	-,4	-1,4	-,4	-,2	,3
E. D + var9	-,8	-,5	-,7	-1,1	-,2	-,3	-1,3	-,1	-,3	,4
F. E + var10	-,7	-,5	-,7	-1,1	-,2	-,3	-1,3	-,2	-,3	,3
G. F + var11										
-var10@	-,3	-,1	-,6	-,5	,6	-,5	-1,4	-,1	-,7	,1
K. G + var15	-,3	-,0	-,6	-,5	,7	-,4	-1,4	-,1	-,7	,1
L. K + var16										
-var15	-,3	-,1	-,6	-,5	,6	-,4	-1,4	-,0	-,7	,1
M. L + var17	-,2	-,1	-,6	-,4	,7	-,4	-1,3	-,0	-,7	,1
N. L + var18	,1	,2	-,4	-,2	1,0	-,2	-1,1	-,4	-,6	+,1
O. N + var19	,1	,1	-,3	-,3	,9	-,4	-1,3	,5	-,6	-,1
Q. O + var21	,4	,0	-,4	-,0	,9	-,4	-1,2	,5	-,7	-,2

(Table 2 cont.)

EQUATION	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASLA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$	p	$R^2$
A. ethn. group	-,8*	-,9 <sup>1</sup>	,8	-,1	1,0	2,1*	-,7	1,0	31 + 10		
B. A + var6	-,3	-,2	1,1	,2	1,0	1,8	-,2	,8	26 + 13		
C. B + var7	-,5	-,1	1,2	,3	,9	1,5	-,2	,6	20 + 14		
D. C + var8	-,5	-,1	2,3	,3	,8	1,1	-,9	,3	13 + 16		
E. D + var9	-,4	,2	2,1	,3	1,0	1,1	-1,1	,2	12 - 17		
F. E + var10	-,4	,1	2,1	,3	1,1	1,1	-1,1	,2	12 - 17		
G. F + var11											
-var10@	-,7	,2	2,7	,3	,7	,8	-1,1	,1	09 - 19		
K. G + var15	-,7	,1	2,7	,3	,6	,7	-1,1	,1	09 - 19		
L. K + var16											
-var15	-,6	,1	2,8	,3	,6	,7	-1,1	,1	09 - 19		
M. L + var17	-,7	,1	3,1	,3	,6	,7	-1,2	,0	09 - 19		
N. L + var18	-,7	,5	3,2	,5	,8	,8	-1,3	-,2	10 - 21		
O. N + var19	-,8	,6	3,1	,6	,9	,8	-1,1	-,1	10 - 23		
Q. O + var21	-,9	,6	3,8	,8	1,1	,7	-,5	-,2	11 - 23		

Significant interaction between var11 and migrant group.

\* and <sup>1</sup>: difference between the migrant group and DUT (group 18) is significant (\*: p < .05; <sup>1</sup>: p < .10) as estimated in equations A and T.

@: variable is deleted from the equation if p > .10.

var1 language test; var2 arithmetic test; var3 information-processing test; var4 primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; var5 educational position in the first grade of secondary education; var6 occupational level of the father; var7 father has or does not have a paid job; var8 educational level of the father; var9 occupational level of the mother; var10 mother has or does not have a paid job; var11 educational level of the mother; var12 number of children in the family; var13 pupil has or has not a younger brother/sister; var14 pupil has or has not an elder brother/sister; var15 parents' reading behavior; var16 parents' passive participation in cultural activities; var17 extent to which parents talk with their children about school; var18 extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; var19 gender of the pupil; var20 degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; var21 pupil was or was not a direct entrant in Dutch primary school.

Table 3:

Differences between groups averages and the total average on *information-processing test*, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and the significance ( $+p < .05$ ) of the variable *migrant group*, explained variance ( $R^2$ ) of the equation, interaction between *migrant group* and the variables of equation Q

Total average on information-processing test: 11,1 (n=1898)

EQUATION	1 TUR-2	2 TUR+2	3 MAR+ 1	4 MAR-2	5 MAR+2	6 SUR+1	7 SUR-2	8 SUR+2	9 ANT+1	10 MOL+1
A. ethn. group	-2,9*	-2,1*	-.6 <sup>1</sup>	-2,9*	-1,7*	,6*	-2,3*	,1	,7	,1
B. A + var6	-2,6	-1,8	-.2	-2,5	-1,5	-.6	-2,1	,1	,4	,1
C. B + var7	-2,3	-1,5	-.1	-2,2	-1,2	-.6	-2,0	,2	,3	-.1
D. C + var8 -var7@	-1,9	-1,2	,0	-1,7	-.8	-.7	-1,7	-.1	-.2	-.0
E. D + var9	-1,8	-1,0	,1	-1,6	-.6	-.5	-1,6	-.3	-.2	,1
G. E + var11	-1,4	-.7	,1	-1,1	-.2	-.7	-1,6	-.3	-.6	-.2
K. G + var15	-1,4	-.7	,1	-1,1	-.2	-.6	-1,7	-.3	-.6	-.2
L. K + var16 -var6	-1,4	-.7	,1	-1,1	-.2	-.7	-1,7	-.3	-.5	-.2
N. L + var18	-1,2	-.5	,3	-1,0	,1	-.5	-1,5	,7	-.5	-.3
O. N + var19	-1,2*	-.5	,3	-1,0	,0	-.5	-1,6	,8	-.5	-.3
Q. O + var21	-.9	-.6	,2	-.7	,1	-.6	-1,4 <sup>1</sup>	,7	-.5	-.4

(Table 3 cont.)

EQUATION	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASIA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$ p R <sup>2</sup>
A. ethn. group	-.0 <sup>1</sup>	-1,9*	-1,4*	-.2	,8	2,2 <sup>1</sup>	,2	1,1	40 + 16
B. A + var6	,4	-1,3	-1,2	-.0	,8	2,0	,6	,9	35 + 19
C. B + var7	,3	-1,3	-1,1	,0	,8	1,9	,7	,8	31 + 19
D. C + var8 -var7@	,3	-1,3	-.3	,0	,7	1,6	,0	,6	25 + 21
E. D + var9	,5	-1,1	-.4	,1	1,0	1,6	-.1	,6	23 + 23
G. E + var11	,2	-1,0	,1	-.1	,6	1,3	-.1	,4	18 + 25
K. G + var15	,2	-1,1	,1	,0	,6	1,2	-.1	,4	17 + 25
L. K + var16 -var6	,1	-1,3	-.2	-.0	,5	1,2	-.3	,4	17 + 25
N. L + var18	,1	-.9	,2	,1	,7	1,2	-.5	,3	15 + 27
O. N + var19	,1	-.9	-.1	,2	,7	1,2	-.4	,3	15 + 28
Q. O + var21	-.1	-.9	,8	,4	1,0	1,1 <sup>1</sup>	,2	,2	13 + 29

No significant interactions.

\* and <sup>1</sup>: difference between the migrant group and DUT (group 18) is significant (\*: p, .05; <sup>1</sup>: p < .10) as estimated in equations A and T.

@: variable is deleted from the equation if p > .10.

var1 language test; var2 arithmetic test; var3 information-processing test; var4 primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; var5 educational position in the first grade of secondary education; var6 occupational level of the father; var7 father has or does not have a paid job; var8 educational level of the father; var9 occupational level of the mother; var10 mother has or does not have a paid job; var11 educational level of the mother; var12 number of children in the family; var13 pupil has or has not a younger brother/sister; var14 pupil has or has not an elder brother/sister; var15 parents' reading behavior; var16 parents' passive participation in cultural activities; var17 extent to which parents talk with their children about school; var18 extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; var19 gender of the pupil; var20 degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; var21 pupil was or was not a direct entrant in Dutch primary school.

Table 4:

Differences between groups averages and the total average on *teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education*, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and the significance ( $+p < .05$ ) of the variable *migrant group*, explained variance ( $R^2$ ) of the equation, interaction between *migrant group* and the variables of equation T

Table 4a: Control variables: SES, family- and pupil characteristics and scholastic ability  
Total average teacher's recommendation: 4,8 (n = 1898)

EQUATION	1 TUR-2	2 TUR+2	3 MAR+ I	4 MAR-2	5 MAR+2	6 SUR+1	7 SUR-2	8 SUR+2	9 ANT+1	10 MOL+1
A. ethn. group	-1,1*	-,7*	-,7*	-1,3*	-,5*	,4	-,6*	,3	,8	,2
B. A + var6	-,8	-,4	-,4	-1,0	-,3	,4	-,4	,4	,6	,2
C. B + var7	-,6	-,2	-,4	-,8	-,1	,4	-,3	,4	,5	,1
D. C + var8	-,3	-,1	-,2	-,3	,3	,3	-,1	,3	,2	,1
E. D + var9	-,3	,1	-,2	-,3	,3	,4	-,1	,4	,1	,2
G. E + var11	-,1	,3	-,2	-,0	,6	,3	-,1	,4	-,1	-,0
K. G + var15	-,1	,3	-,2	,0	,6	,3	-,1	,4	-,1	-,0
L. K + var16										
-var7@	-,1	,3	-,2	-,0	,5	,3	-,1	,4	-,1	,0
M. L + var17	-,0	,3	-,2	,1	,6	,3	-,1	,4	-,1	,0
N. M + var18	,1	,4	-,1	,1	,7	,4	,0	,6	-,0	-,1
Q. N + var21	,2	,4	-,1	,2	,7	,4	,1	,6	-,1	-,1
R. Q + var1										
S. R + var2	,3	,4	-,1	,3	,6	,5	,3	,3	,1	,1
T. S + var3	,3	,4	-,0	,3	,5	,5	,3	,4	,1	,1
-var9	,3*	,4*	-,0	,4*	,5*	,5*	,4*	,3*	,2 <sup>1</sup>	,1

(Table 4a cont.)

EQUATION	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASIA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$ p R <sup>2</sup>
A. ethn. group	-,1	,0	,3	-,2	,4	,9*	-,6	,3	31 + 09
B. A + var6	,3	,5	,5	-,1	,4	,7	-,3	,2	22 + 17
C. B + var7	,2	,6	,5	-,0	,4	,6	-,3	,1	17 + 18
D. C + var8	,2	,6	1,1	,0	,3	,4	-,7	-,0	11 + 22
E. D + var9	,3	,7	1,0	,0	,5	,4	-,7	-,1	12 + 23
G. E + var11	,2	,7	1,3	,0	,3	,2	-,7	-,2	13 + 26
K. G + var15	,1	,7	1,3	,0	,2	,2	-,7	-,2	12 + 26
L. K + var16/-var7@	,2	,6	1,4	-,0	,2	,1	-,8	-,1	12 + 26
M. L + var17	,2	,6	1,6	-,0	,2	,1	-,8	-,2	13 + 27
N. M + var18	,1	,8	1,6	-,1	,3	,2	-,9	-,2	16 + 29
Q. N + var21	,1	,8	1,9	,2	,4	,1	-,6	-,3	18 + 29
R. Q + var1/-var21	,2	,5	1,5	-,0	,5	-,1	-,7	-,3	17 + 53
S. R + var2	,3*	,6	1,1*	-,1	,3*	-,1	-,6	-,3	15 + 59
T. S + var3/-var9	,2	,6	1,2	-,1	,2	-,2	-,6	-,3	16 + 59

Significant interaction between var11 and migrant group.

\* and <sup>1</sup>: difference between the migrant group and DUT (group 18) is significant (\*: p < .05; <sup>1</sup>: p < .10) as estimated in equations A and T.  
@: variable is deleted from the equation if p > .10.

var1 language test; var2 arithmetic test; var3 information-processing test; var4 primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; var5 educational position in the first grade of secondary education; var6 occupational level of the father; var7 father has or does not have a paid job; var8 educational level of the father; var9 occupational level of the mother; var10 mother has or does not have a paid job; var11 educational level of the mother; var12 number of children in the family; var13 pupil has or has not a younger brother/sister; var14 pupil has or has not an elder brother/sister; var15 parents' reading behavior; var16 parents' passive participation in cultural activities; var17 extent to which parents talk with their children about school; var18 extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; var19 gender of the pupil; var20 degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; var21 pupil was or was not a direct entrant in Dutch primary school.

Table 4b:  
Control variables: scores on three performance tests

Total average teacher's recommendation: 4,8 (n=1989)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	TUR-2	TUR+2	MAR+ <sub>1</sub>	MAR-2	MAR+2	SUR+1	SUR-2	SUR+2	ANT+1	MOL+1
EQUATION										
A. ethn. group	-1,1*	-.7*	-.7*	-1,3*	-.5*	,4	-.6*	,3	,8	,2
B. A + var1	-.2	-.1	-.4	-.3	,0	,5	-.0	,2	,5	,3
C. B + var2	-.2	-.0	-.3	-.2	,1	,5*	,1	,3	,5*	,2
D. C + var3	-.1	,0	-.3	-.1	,1	,5	,2	,3	,5	,2

(Table 4b cont.)

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	$\beta$	p	R <sup>2</sup>
	SE+1	SE+2	CHIN	ASIA	1stW-1	1stW+1	3rdW	DUT			
EQUATION											
A. ethn. group	-.1	,0	,3	-.2	,4	,9*	-.6	,3	31 + 09		
B. A + var1	,1	,1	,8	-.2	,6	,2	-.6	-.0	10 + 47		
C. B + var2	,2	,2	,5*	-.2	,4	,2	-.5	-.0	08 - 55		
D. C + var3	,2	,3	,6	-.2	,3	,1	-.6	-.1	08 - 56		

Table 5:

Differences between groups averages and the total average on *educational position at the start of secondary education*, standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) and the significance (+:p<.05) of the variable *migrant group*, explained variance (R<sup>2</sup>) of the equation, interaction between *migrant group* and the variables of equation U

Table 5a: Control variables: SES, family- and pupil characteristics and scholastic ability

Total average educational position at the start of secondary education: 4,2 (n=1898)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	TUR-2	TUR+2	MAR+1	MAR-2	MAR+2	SUR+1	SUR-2	SUR+2	ANT+1	MOL+1
EQUATION										
A. ethn. group	-1,3*	-.5*	-.8*	-1,3*	-.2*	,3	-.1	,6	,5	,3
B. A + var6	-1,0	-.2	-.4	-1,0	,0	,3	,1	,7	,3	,3
C. B + var7	-.7	-.0	-.4	-.7	,2	,3	,2	,7	,2	,2
D. C + var8	-.5	,3	-.3	-.3	,6	,2	,4	,6	-.1	,2
E. D + var9	-.4	,3	-.2	-.3	,6	,3	,5	,7	-.1	,3
G. E + var11	-.2	,5	-.2	-.0	,9	,2	,4	,7	-.4	,1
K. G + var15	-.2	,5	-.2	,0	,9	,2	,4	,7	-.3	,1
L. K + var16	-.2	,5	-.2	,0	,9	,2	,4	,7	-.3	,1
M. L + var17	-.1	,6	-.2	,1	,9	,2	,4	,7	-.3	,1
N. M + var18	-.0	,6	-.2	,1	1,0	,3	,5	,8	-.3	,0
O. N + var19	-.0	,6	-.2	,1	1,0	,3	,5	,8	-.3	,0
Q. N + var21	,1	,6	-.2	,3	1,0	,3	,6	,8	-.4	-.0
R. Q + var1										
-var17,19@	,2	,6	-.2	,3	,9	,3	,7	,6	-.2	,2
S. R + var2										
-var7,9,18	,1	,6	-.2	,3	,8	,3	,8	,6	-.1	,2
T. S + var3	,1	,6	-.2	,3	,8	,3	,8	,6	-.1	,2
U. T + var4										
-var3,8,16	-.1	,3*	-.1	,1*	,4*	-.0	,6*	,4*	-.2	,1

(Table 5a cont.)

	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASIA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$ p R <sup>2</sup>
EQUATION									
A. ethn. group	-.2	.6	.2	.0	.5	.8*	-.7	.3	30 + 09
B. A + var6	.2	1.1	.4	.2	.5	.6	-.3	.1	23 + 17
C. B + var7	.1	1.1	.5	.2	.5	.5	-.3	.0	18 + 18
D. C + var8	.1	1.1	1.0	.2	.4	.3	-.7	-.1	15 + 22
E. D + var9	.2	1.2	.9	.3	.5	.3	-.8	-.1	16 + 23
G. E + var11	.0	1.3	1.2	.2	.3	.1	-.7	-.2	18 + 26
K. G + var15	-.0	1.2	1.3	.2	.3	.1	-.8	-.2	18 + 26
L. K + var16	.0	1.2	1.3	.2	.3	.1	-.8	-.2	18 + 27
M. L + var17	-.0	1.2	1.4	.2	.3	.1	-.8	-.2	19 + 27
N. M + var18	-.0	1.3	1.5	.3	.3	.1	-.8	-.3	21 + 28
O. N + var19	-.0	1.3	1.5	.3	.3	.1	-.9	-.3	21 + 28
Q. N + var21	-.1	1.2	1.9	.4	.5	.0	-.5	-.3	23 + 29
R. Q + var1/-var17,19@	.1	1.0	1.4	.2	.5	-.2	-.6	-.3	21 + 48
S. R + var2/-var7,9,18	.1	1.1	1.2	.2	.3	-.2	-.5	-.3	19 + 53
T. S + var3	.1	1.1*	1.2	.2	.3	-.2	-.5	-.3	19 + 53
U. T + var4/-var3,8,16	-.1	.7	.4	.3	.2 <sup>1</sup>	-.1	-.0	-.1	09 + 78

Significant interactions between var2 and migrant group and between var4 and migrant group.

\* and <sup>1</sup>: difference between the migrant group and DUT (group 18) is significant (\*: p,.05; <sup>1</sup>: p<.10) as estimated in equations A and T.  
@: variable is deleted from the equation if p > .10.

var1 language test; var2 arithmetic test; var3 information-processing test; var4 primary-school teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education; var5 educational position in the first grade of secondary education; var6 occupational level of the father; var7 father has or does not have a paid job; var8 educational level of the father; var9 occupational level of the mother; var10 mother has or does not have a paid job; var11 educational level of the mother; var12 number of children in the family; var13 pupil has or has not a younger brother/sister; var14 pupil has or has not an elder brother/sister; var15 parents' reading behavior; var16 parents' passive participation in cultural activities; var17 extent to which parents talk with their children about school; var18 extent to which they prompt their children to work harder; var19 gender of the pupil; var20 degree to which parents speak Dutch at home; var21 pupil was or was not a direct entrant in Dutch primary school.

Table 5b:  
Control variable: teacher's recommendation

Total average educational position in the first grade of secondary education: 4,2 (n=1989)

	1 TUR-2	2 TUR+2	3 MAR+	4 MAR-2	5 MAR+2	6 SUR+1	7 SUR-2	8 SUR+2	9 ANT+1	10 MOL+1
EQUATION										
A. ethn. group	-1,3*	-.5*	-.8*	-1,3*	-.2*	.3	-.1,	.6*	.5	.3
B. A + var4	-.3	.1	-.2	-.2	.2	-.0	.4	.4	-.1	.1

(Table 5b cont.)

	11 SE+1	12 SE+2	13 CHIN	14 ASIA	15 1stW-1	16 1stW+1	17 3rdW	18 DUT	$\beta$ p R <sup>2</sup>
EQUATION									
A. ethn. group	-.2	.6	.2	.0	.5	.8*	-.7	.3	30 + 09
B. A + var4	-.1	.6*	-.0	.2	.1	.1	-.1	-.0	08 + 77

#### In-between and second generations<sup>4</sup>

The second generation of Turks, Moroccans and Surinamese (born in the Netherlands) appeared to score better on all five school-career variables than comparable children from the in-between generation (born in the country of origin), however, the difference is not always significant. Differences are indeed, each time significant with regard to language and information-processing scores, twice for arithmetic scores and educational position and three times for teacher's recommendation.

#### Mixed and homogeneous migrant families<sup>5</sup>

Children from "mixed families" (only one parent belongs to the group concerned) present a variable picture compared to those from homogeneous migrant families. Children from mixed families sometimes score better than those from homogeneous families but more often they score lower. The greatest differences can be observed with regard to information processing and educational position but they are only once significant: South European children from mixed families score higher on information processing.

#### *Educational arrears and socio-economic positions*

In the next steps (equation B to G, tables 1-5), the six variables which refer to the socio-economic status of the parents are added successively. The established sequence is: the occupational level of the father, whether he is employed or not, the educational level of the father, the occupational level of the mother, whether she is employed or not, and the educational level of the mother.

After controlling for the three variables related to the father, the effect of the "migrant group" variable remains significant for all dependent variables. In individual migrant groups we observe that the great differences in mean scores on the dependent variables have strongly diminished after this control. This can be explained by the fact that, in most migrant groups, fathers have a lower socio-economic

position. It fits into this picture also that the advantage in school success of First-World immigrant children belonging to the in-between generation has also strongly diminished: fathers belonging to this group quite often have a comparatively higher socio-economic status.

For the three variables which refer to the socio-economic status of the mother, it appears that the question whether the mother has a paid job or not is totally irrelevant. After controlling for the remaining two variables, the effect of the migrant group is no longer significant regarding the arithmetic score. For the arithmetic test, therefore, the migrant factor is not significant, despite the necessity for an adequate language proficiency concerning more advanced, amply contextual arithmetic methods.

To work out which of these six class characteristics explains the largest part of the differences between the migrant groups, we have added each variable separately to equation A<sup>6</sup>. So, it appears that the educational level of the parents explains more of the differences existing between the various migrant groups than their occupational level and, furthermore, that the educational level of the mother is the most important factor. Regarding this difference between education and profession of the parents, it might be important to observe that for the educational level an underneath more refined scale has been used while the somewhat rougher occupational classification has for result that a very large number of employed immigrant fathers fall into the same occupational category.

After adding the six socio-economic variables, we notice that the effect ( $\beta$ ) of the "migrant group" variable has diminished. It also appears that the effect of the "migrant group" by the three performance variables has diminished to the same degree. Regarding teacher's recommendation and particularly educational position the reduction is smaller. The standardized regression coefficient ( $\beta$ ) varies from .09 for arithmetic to .18 for information processing and educational position.

By changing the order in introducing the variables we can obtain a picture regarding the added effect (expressed in a percentage of explained variance) of the "migrant group" variable *after* having introduced the socio-economic variables. This is an indicator for the ques-

tion to what extent it is justified to base educational-priority policies exclusively on socio-economic factors, leaving the migrant factors aside. According to the study carried out by *Van Langen and Jungbluth* (1990) the migrant factor appeared to play a small part. For language score, the total explained variance was 23 per cent whereas by introducing only the socio-economic variables an explained variance of 21 per cent has been obtained. Thus, the "migrant group" can be held accountable for only approximately 2 per cent. For the information-processing score we come to 3 per cent whereas for the arithmetic score the migrant factor has already vanished. For teacher's recommendation and educational position we find, respectively, 1 and 3 per cent.

To summarize, we may state that the first hypothesis (differences in migrant school-careers can be totally traced back to the socio-economic factors) has not been proved, except for the arithmetic score. Regarding the other school-career variables, it is true that socio-economic characteristics explain a large part of the differences, still, the effect of the "migrant group" variable remains perceptible.

#### *Educational arrears, family and pupil characteristics*

After class characteristics, the following family and pupil characteristics are added step by step (equation K to Q, tables 1-5): the number of children in each family, whether there is a younger brother or sister, whether there is an elder brother or sister, the reading behavior of the parents, the passive cultural participation of the parents, whether they talk about school with their children (about events, performances, whether they compliment their children on their results), whether the child is being urged by its parents to work (hard) at school, the gender of the pupil, the extent to which Dutch is spoken at home and whether the child is a direct entrant in Dutch primary education. The last two variables are rather unequally divided among the various migrant groups. Regarding the variable indicating the extent to which the Dutch language is spoken at home there is hardly any variance within the native Dutch group, contrary to the migrant group. And, of course, direct entrants (pupils who start their school education in the Netherlands) and late-joiners (pupils who

started their school education in their country of origin and only later have entered Dutch schools) are very unequally divided among immigrant groups belonging to the in-between and the second generation. At this point in our analysis, the family characteristic described as "speak Dutch at home" explains nothing of the differences on the dependent variables. The pupil characteristic described as "direct entrant" is, on the other hand, significant on all five variables.

The most remarkable conclusion is that, by introducing these ten family and pupil characteristics, only an additional 3 to 4 per cent of the differences between the various migrant groups can be explained. Furthermore, we notice that the migrant group effect upon the language and the information scores has diminished ( $\beta$  is now respectively .09 and .13) and, what is more, it is no longer significant for the language score. Regarding the arithmetic score where, after controlling for socio-economic factors, the migrant group effect was already no longer significant,  $\beta$  has somewhat increased (to .11) but has not become significant. Concerning teacher's recommendation and educational position, the migrant group effect has increased to .18 and .23 respectively.

For school-career variables where the migrant effect has remained significant we have, subsequently, changed the order in introducing the variables (just as we did before with the socio-economic variables): first, the socio-economic and other family and pupil characteristics and, next, the "migrant group" variable. In this way, here too, we can work out which part of the explained variance can be exclusively attributed to the migrant factor. For information-processing and teacher's recommendation, the "migrant group" can only be held accountable for 2 per cent of the explained variance and 3 per cent for educational position.

For that matter, it is quite remarkable that even after introducing the control variables, still, only 23 to 29 per cent of the variance can be explained. As it has been established that the migrant factor is only to a limited extent accountable for school success, it is now also obvious that, besides the migrant factor, socio-economic characteristics

and other family and pupil characteristics, there is a large number of other unknown factors which have an influence on school success.

In conclusion, we may state that the second hypothesis (migrant school-career differences can be fully explained by socio-economic factors and other family characteristics) only holds true when we restrict ourselves to the arithmetic and language tests. For the information-processing test, teacher's recommendation and educational position in the first grade of secondary education, the effect of the migrant factor remains present, although it is very small. This seems to indicate that – if we depart from an equal importance of the three performance scores – the migrant factor is missing in two thirds of the performances. The migrant factor is mainly present in derived matters such as teacher's recommendation and educational position where not only results alone but also people's choices (teachers and parents) play a role. Thus, differences in school career could be more a result of the differences existing in adults' attitudes regarding native and immigrant children respectively.

*Direct effect of the migrant group on language, arithmetic and information-processing scores*

For all three performance scores, the various migrant groups have varying results (equation Q, tables 1-3) which partly contradict the fourth hypothesis.

First of all, it is remarkable that, for each performance test, five to ten groups score higher than native Dutch pupils; thus, the latter take up a middle position. However, only very seldom does an immigrant group differ significantly from the native Dutch group. Because a significant migrant effect was observed only for the information-processing test, it is only there that each migrant group has been examined separately to determine whether it significantly differs from the native Dutch pupils. Only twice does a group score significantly lower than the native Dutch pupils: Turkish and Surinamese pupils belonging to the in-between generation. Only once did we find a result which was significantly better than the result obtained by native pupils: second-generation children from the First World. The fact that a migrant

group scores better than native Dutch pupils conflicts with the fourth hypothesis. Regarding immigrants from the First World we may remark that, possibly, the Dutch culture, insofar as it has an influence on education, is not exclusively Dutch but rather a First-World culture. This explains why immigrant pupils from the First World do not show lower performances than their Dutch peers, but it does not offer a conclusive explanation for the better performances observed within this group.

The results obtained on arithmetic and language, insofar as the matters tested in these two subjects are concerned, do not support the assumption that in education, cultural biases are quite frequent in teaching and assessing. The postulate affirming that all the pupils who do not fit into the Dutch school culture are "therefore" lower assessed has not been proved here. Anyway, the language score has been determined by means of a test which pays special attention to the linguistic aspects. The cultural biases seem indeed to be present in the contents of the information test. This fits in with the fourth hypothesis assuming that groups which score significantly lower belong to the in-between generation. Possibly, one could blame this on lesser skills in the Dutch language. Indeed, verbal aspects, of course, are also quite strongly represented in the information test but, in this case, they have a different character than in the language test, being more oriented towards text comprehension. The assumption that a small part of the poorer results obtained by immigrant children has to be attributed to culturally established contents in our education has not been denied by this result.

*In-between and second generations<sup>4</sup>*

For groups where this distinction has been made (Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese, and immigrant children from the First World), the performance scores of the in-between and second generations have once again been compared with each other, after controlling for class, family and pupil characteristics. The second generation appears to do better than the in-between generation, although the progress is smaller than it seemed to be before the control. The fact that the progress appears to be less after controlling for class, family and pupil charac-

teristics is a result of second-generation children growing up in families that have a comparatively better socio-economic position and more favorable family characteristics than children belonging to the in-between generation. Second-generation children score five times significantly higher: Moroccans, on arithmetic and information-processing, Surinamese, on language and information-processing and immigrants from the First World, only on language. The second generation never performs significantly lower than the in-between generation. The assumption that for a successful school career in Dutch education it is better when the pupil has come to live in Holland at a very young age appears to be confirmed by this finding although this is not valid for all migrant groups and also not on all dependent variables. Because second-generation pupils do not, on any point, significantly differ from native Dutch pupils, one should not expect great improvements in the school performances of children growing up in families that have lived in the Netherlands for a longer period of time, neither through forced integration nor through drastic adaptation of the education system to the recognized migrant multiformity in Dutch society. Only a relative improvement of parental occupational and educational levels might lead to great improvements in children's school performances.

#### Mixed and homogeneous migrant families<sup>5</sup>

After control, children from homogeneous migrant families appear to perform somewhat better than those from mixed families (Moroccans, Surinamese and South-Europeans). The difference proved to be somewhat greater than before control but it is significant only in two of the nine cases: Surinamese pupils from homogeneous migrant families score higher on language and information-processing. Not even once do children from mixed families score significantly higher than children from homogeneous migrant families.

Although it is difficult to give unequivocal explanations, it is, nevertheless, obvious that, here, no confirmation can be found for the assumption that mixed families are more receptive and more integrated in the Dutch society and that this leads to greater school success. More likely, the opposite seems to be true: it is possible that enforc-

ing the cultural identity of the pupil might have a positive effect upon school success. A possible explanation could be that cultural identity is more problematic for children brought up in mixed families than for children growing up in homogeneous migrant families (*De Jong*: 1987). The feeling of insecurity ensuing from this problematic identity could then explain the poorer results obtained by these children. Another explanation for this unexpected negative effect of "mixed" families could be that children brought up in these families face a greater risk of taking up negative aspects from both parental cultures.

#### *Direct effect of the migrant group on teacher's recommendation and educational position*

The two variables "teacher's recommendation" and "educational position" have been finally controlled for the other dependent variables: language, arithmetic and information-processing scores; subsequently, "educational position" has been also controlled for teacher's recommendation (equation R to Q, table 4 and 5). The three performance variables explain as usual a significant part of the variance both for teacher's recommendation (30 per cent added) and for educational position (24 per cent added). "Teacher's recommendation" obviously also provides a substantial contribution (25 per cent added) to the explanation of variance for educational position. In this case, both for "teacher's recommendation" and for "educational position", there is still a significant migrant effect:  $\beta$  is respectively .16 and .09. From the last equation in table 4 and 5 it appears that native Dutch pupils score both on teacher's recommendation and educational position below the mean and, what's more, almost the lowest. Twelve migrant groups have significantly higher teacher's recommendation than native Dutch pupils. The "other Third-World" group is the only group which has (not significantly) lower teacher's recommendation than native Dutch pupils. Chinese have very positive teacher's recommendations. Possibly, this group, which scores particularly high on arithmetic, takes advantage of the fact that the teacher "raises" the recommendations in accordance with this high score. Seven groups have a higher educational position than native Dutch pupils. This corresponds to the results obtained by *Mulder* (1991). She found that many immigrant pu-

pils get comparatively high teacher's recommendations and, subsequently, that for equal teacher's recommendations they have a comparatively high educational position.

The fourth hypothesis, assuming that the difference between migrant cultures and Dutch culture influences in a negative way immigrant pupils' transition from primary to secondary education, has certainly not been confirmed here. More likely, cultural differences appear to act in their favor. However, in this respect, one should take into consideration that teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education and educational position in the first grade of secondary education are not so much indicators of school success, but rather indicators of assessment with regard to school success. It is true that other studies have proved that, for native Dutch pupils, assessment (teacher's recommendation) is to a large extent a predictor for further success in school career. The question whether this also applies to immigrant children still awaits an answer (for empirically founded pessimism see *Schouten: 1990; Veenman: 1990*). For the moment, the pupils in the analyzed cohort are still in the first grade of secondary education, so that the first decision (concerning promotion, referral to another school or type of transition class) has generally not been taken yet.

#### In-between and second generations

An equation of school success (controlled for performances, socio-economic and other family and pupil characteristics) between the second and in-between generations of Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and immigrants from the First World provides a variable picture: the second generation shows a significantly higher score three times and the in-between generation scores higher once.

Where Turks are concerned, the second generation has a better educational position. Second-generation Moroccans have both higher teacher's recommendations and a better educational position. For Surinamese the differences are not significant. Immigrants from the First World show higher scores for the in-between generation than for the second generation, but only regarding educational position. A possible

explanation for the difference between Turks and Moroccans, on the one hand, and Surinamese and First-World immigrants, on the other hand, might be found in the limited command of the language observed by the teacher within the in-between generation. Teachers who wish to discriminate positively and who assume that the pupil will be able to get over his/her arrears probably do not venture to do so when pupils have considerable arrears. An apparently unbridgeable gap in this respect leads to "cautious" recommendation. In a number of cases, such an unbridgeable gap can be observed among Turks and Moroccans belonging to the in-between generation. In the second generation, the differences do not seem to be unbridgeable, this resulting in higher teacher's recommendations. It is conceivable that, regarding Surinamese children from the in-between generation, the teacher considers this gap as being bridgeable, with the result that we cannot see any difference between the second and the in-between generations. The small cultural differences between immigrants from the First World and native Dutch pupils has the effect that, regarding this group, the teacher will experience the gap with the in-between generation as bridgeable. The fact that we have even observed a decline from the in-between to the second generation might be attributed to the teacher's wish not to let the pupil become a victim of "accidental" circumstances, in other words, the wish for positive discrimination. The unbridgeable gap observed among Turks and Moroccans from the in-between generation undoes completely the tendency towards positive discrimination, while for the small gap observed among immigrant pupils from the First World this tendency towards positive discrimination becomes quite dominant. The comparatively lower educational position of the in-between generation of Turks and Moroccans could also be explained by the fact that their parents are not really familiar with Dutch secondary education.

#### Mixed and homogeneous migrant families

From an equation made between children from homogeneous migrant families and children from "mixed" families (Moroccans, Surinamese and South Europeans) it appeared that in five of the six cases pupils from homogeneous migrant families obtained a higher teacher's recommendation and/or a better educational position. These differences

are three times significant, every time for educational position. Just as for performance scores, the assumption that pupils from "mixed" families have better school careers than those from homogeneous migrant families has not been confirmed here; here as well the opposite appears to be true. Because these pupils are all born here, lower performances will not be regarded as unbridgeable. If we add this to the wish expressed by primary-school teachers for a positive discrimination concerning those pupils who "have a hard time" at school, children coming from homogeneous migrant families will probably "profit more" from this positive discrimination than those from mixed families.

#### *Interactions between migrant groups and other independent variables*

The effect of socio-economic or any other family characteristics is not necessarily equal for every migrant group. In the ANOVA analyses it has been determined whether, between the migrant groups, the effect of occupational and educational characteristics and that of pupil and family characteristics differ significantly. The objection to the procedure employed in establishing significant interaction effects is that the chance for such significant effects can be artificially increased. We were obliged to use this procedure because the literature does not provide any clear theories regarding differences in significance for class, family and pupil characteristics between various migrant groups. Therefore, in our discussion referring to the interaction effects found we will confine ourselves to the significant interaction effects which have been found in several equations.

In all, there is six times a significant interaction effect of a control variable with the independent variable "migrant group". On three of the school-career variables (language, arithmetic and teacher's recommendation) we observe a significant interaction between the variables "migrant group" and "educational level of the mother". On language there is also an interaction with the variable "extent to which parents talk with their children about school". On educational position there are two variables which interact with the "migrant group", namely, arithmetic and teacher's recommendation.

The interaction effect between the independent variables "migrant group" and "educational level of the mother" appears only in connection with the dependent variables arithmetic score, language score and teacher's recommendation and, therefore, we will limit our discussion to these three interaction effects. In the Moroccan group (second generation, mixed families) pupils whose mothers have not finished primary school score remarkably high, both on the arithmetic test and on the language test. They appear to score even better than children whose mothers have finished this type of school. Possibly the explanation for this can partly be found in the fact that, particularly among Moroccan mothers without any education, a great deal of latent talent might be present. Turkish pupils show a pattern that corresponds to that observed among native Dutch pupils, meaning that exactly those second-generation Turkish pupils whose mothers have not finished primary education score extra low on language and arithmetic. The presumption regarding possible latent talent obviously does not apply to Turkish mothers. In the immigrant group from the First World belonging to the in-between generation we observe that children whose mothers have only followed elementary education score comparatively high on language and arithmetic. Immigrants from the First World belonging to the second generation and Asians show a reverse picture: if the mothers followed only primary education, their children score comparatively low (significant only for arithmetic). In the case of the interaction of the "educational level of the mother" with "teacher's recommendation" we find the following deviations from the native Dutch pattern. In the Surinamese group from the in-between generation, pupils whose mothers have not finished primary education obtain relatively high teacher's recommendations. In the Surinamese group belonging to the second generation, pupils whose mothers have followed primary education obtain comparatively higher teacher's recommendations. Immigrant children from the First World (in-between generation) whose mothers have followed the first stage of secondary education obtain comparatively low teacher's recommendations.

Still, we must observe that there are only a few interactions. Particularly for the profession and education of the father (two for the socio-economic position rather determining variables) there are no interactions. This means that, in general, the mechanisms that influ-

ence the school success of the various migrant groups do not drastically deviate from those influencing the school success of native Dutch children.

## Conclusion

Differences in the socio-economic status of the parents explain totally the differences observed in the arithmetic scores between the various groups of immigrant and native Dutch pupils (hypothesis 1). However, they do not totally explain differences in language and information-processing scores and those in teacher's recommendation on the most suited type of secondary education and educational position in the first year of secondary education. The combination of the socio-economic status of the parents and other family and pupil characteristics explains the differences in language scores between the various migrant groups (hypothesis 2). The disappearance of the migrant effect on language scores does not really mean that there is no migrant factor in language command. The language test has a strong linguistic character whereas the information-processing test requires a great deal of language proficiency (particularly reading comprehension). In the information-processing score, teacher's recommendation and educational position the migrant factor remains present even after controlling for parental class and family and pupil characteristics. This applies also after controlling teacher's recommendation for the three performance scores and educational position also for teacher's recommendation and the performance scores. The effect of the migrant group on these variables is small ( $\beta$  between .09 and .16) but not negligible (hypothesis 3).

The assumption that this significant migrant effect is related to the difference between culture of the immigrant groups and the standard native Dutch culture and that this difference influences school performances in a negative way (hypothesis 4) has been only incidentally confirmed, however, and in most cases it has been denied. If there is a negative effect of the migrant factor, then we might indeed speak of great cultural differences (Turks and Surinamese belonging to the

in-between generation) but great cultural differences between the cultures of the migrant groups and the Dutch culture by no means always lead to low school performances (Chinese, Moroccans from the in-between generation). Regarding teacher's recommendation and educational position we can speak of a migrant factor which does not act negatively but, on the contrary, in favor of migrant pupils. In line with our expectations, the trend is that from the in-between to the second generation, school careers become more successful. Contrary to our expectations, pupils brought up in "mixed" families which we expected to be closer to the Dutch culture do not have better school careers than children brought up in comparable homogeneous migrant families.

We have not always found lower school performances within the migrant group compared with the native Dutch group. If there are differences these cannot always be attributed to differences in social class and family characteristics. The fact that the pupil belongs to a migrant group still has a predicting value with respect to his/her school career. However, in this respect, migrant groups are quite different. Lower scores have indeed been found for the immigrant pupils belonging to the in-between generation, but by no means do all migrant groups from the in-between generation score lower. Therefore, particularly if we confine ourselves to pupils who have lived in Holland for a longer period of time, the migrant effect is so marginal that it is really not to be expected that any policy aimed at cultural integration could have a noticeable effect on the school performances of migrant pupils. Based on the same facts, we could reject any policy specifically oriented towards migrant groups. However, in this respect, we should not forget that, in the first place, the migrant factor is still present and, in the second place, belonging to a migrant group, unlike belonging to a group with a specific socio-economic position, is directly observable for the class, this increasing the risk of stigmatization.

The presumption sometimes expressed that migrant groups in the Netherlands have fallen into a downward spiral has been refuted by the present study. In this stage of educational career there is no question of deepening marginalization. Regarding the important role played by education in bringing about inequality in our society, this

conclusion is a rejection of the too quickly expressed, but not sufficiently demonstrated presumption that there is a deepening marginalization of the migrant groups living in the Netherlands. Of course, our conclusion is not final; it is possible that during secondary education there still appear differences between pupils from the various migrant groups because it is then that the serious race for higher qualifications begins.

A more pessimistic conclusion that one could draw from our results is that, indeed, migrant pupils do not have less chances than native Dutch pupils in a comparable socio-economic position but the large numbers of migrant pupils coming from weaker socio-economic classes are not given much chance to struggle out of this weak socio-economic position via education (in fact, this is also the situation of native Dutch pupils coming from comparable socio-economic classes).

#### Notes

- 1) This article is an English version of one of the products of the project entitled "The special position occupied by children of migrants, unemployed, incapacitated, single-parent families, and working families at the point of transition from primary to secondary education" carried out at the SCO-Kohnstamm Institute of the University of Amsterdam, under the authority of the Institute for Educational Research (SVO) in the Hague (project 0509). The study was carried out by Louise van 't Hof as a thesis subject for her study of Language and Literature at the Brabant Catholic University in Tilburg, under the supervision of J. Dronkers. The Dutch version was published in *Migrantenstudies* (1993, 9, pp. 2-25). The English version was presented at the meeting of the ISA research committee "Social Stratification and Mobility", Duke University in Durham (North Carolina), August 9-11, 1993.
- 2) Information regarding codes and classification of native Dutch and immigrant pupils respectively in categories, as well as a more detailed description of the variables, are to be found in the appendix of the complete paper, which can be obtained from the authors. The variables employed and their codes are common for school-career research and correspond to the ones

used in the above-mentioned studies. All the employable variables from the VOCL'89 Cohort have been used in the analysis, this, of course, not meaning that these are all the conceivable relevant variables (for instance, teacher characteristics have been left out). The above-mentioned studies have generally used even less control variables in the analysis of educational arrears of immigrant pupils.

- 3) In this study, differences such as  $p \leq .10$  are significant with the exception of the interactions found; there, the limit is set to .05.
- 4) This data is derived from a part of our research that has not been published in this article. There, ANOVA analyses have been carried out separately for each migrant group in which the in-between and second generations (of homogeneous and mixed migrant families) have been compared with each other.
- 5) See note 3.
- 6) The degree in which  $\beta$  of the independent variable "migrant group" decreases after adding the concerned control variable is an indication of the relative importance of the various control variables in explaining the differences between migrant groups.

#### References

- Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek: 1991, *Schoolloopbaan en achtergrond van leerlingen*; deel 1; cohort 1989, instroom. Den Haag (SDU).
- Driessen, G. W. J. M.: 1990, *De onderwijspositie van allochtone leerlingen. De rol van sociaal-economische en etnisch-culturele factoren, met speciale aandacht voor het Onderwijs in Eigen Taal en Cultuur*. Nijmegen (Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociale Wetenschappen).
- Dronkers, J.: 1992, *Zullen wij voor de kinderen bij elkaar blijven? De veranderende effecten van eenoudergezinnen op de schoolloopbanen van de kinderen*, in: *Mens en Maatschappij* 67, pp. 23-44.
- Dronkers, J./Kerkhoff, A.: 1990, *Sociaal milieu, taalvaardigheid en schoolsucces bij allochtonen, dialect- en standaardtaalsprekers*, in: *Sociologische Gids* 37, pp. 304-319.
- Jong, M. J. de: 1987, *Herkomst, kennis en kansen. Allochtone en autochtone leerlingen tijdens de overgang van basis- naar voortgezet onderwijs*. Lisse (Swets en Zeitlinger).
- Kerkhoff, A.: 1988, *Taalvaardigheid en schoolsucces*. Amsterdam/Lisse (Swets & Zeitlinger).

- Langen, A. van/Jungbluth, P.: 1990, *Onderwijskansen van migranten. De rol van sociaal-economische en culturele factoren*. Amsterdam/Lisse (Swets & Zeitlinger).
- Massey, D. S.: 1981, *Dimensions of the new immigration to the United States and the prospects for assimilation*, in: *Annual Review of Sociology* 7, pp. 57-85.
- Mulder, L.: 1991, *De overgang van basis- naar voortgezet onderwijs van de OVB-doelgroepen; advies, schoolkeuze en rapportcijfers in het eerste leerjaar*. Nijmegen/Groningen (ITS/RION).
- Nee, V./Wong, H. Y.: 1985, *Asian-American socio-economic achievement. The strength of the family bond*, in: *Sociological Perspectives* 28, pp. 281-306.
- Schouten, S. P.: 1990, *Schoolloopbanen van Turken en Marokkanen in het voortgezet onderwijs*, in: Du Bois-Reymond, M./Eldering, L. (eds.), *Nieuwe oriëntaties op school en beroep. De rol van sexe en etniciteit*. Amsterdam/Lisse (Swets & Zeitlinger), pp. 163-176.
- Tesser, P./Werf, G. van der/Mulder, L.: 1990, *Het onderwijsvoor-rangsbeleid en de onderwijskansen van leerlingen uit etnische minderheidsgroepen*, in: Bois-Reymond, M. du/Eldering, L. (eds.), *Nieuwe oriëntaties op school en beroep; de rol van sexe en etniciteit*. Amsterdam/Lisse (Swets & Zeitlinger), pp. 151-162.
- Veenman, J.: 1990, *De positie van allochtonen in Nederland*, in: Veenman, J. (ed.), *Ver van huis; achterstanden en achterstelling bij allochtonen*. Groningen (Wolters-Noordhoff).
- Vermeulen, H.: 1992, *De cultura. Een verhandeling over het cultuur-begrip in de studie van allochtone etnische groepen*, in: *Migrantenstudies* 8, pp. 14-30.

Jaap Dronkers  
 SCO-Kohnstamm Institute  
 University of Amsterdam  
 Grote Bickersstraat 72,  
 NL-1013 KS Amsterdam  
 Netherlands

Ahmet Icduygu

## Changing Settlement Intention of the Turkish Immigrants in Australia and Sweden: Some Recent Parallels

### *Changing Settlement Intention of the Turkish Immigrants in Australia and Sweden: Some Recent Parallels*

*One of the most telling social consequences of the five decades of post-war immigration to advanced industrial countries has been the process by which a significant proportion of temporary labour migrants have become permanent settlers. This paper has grown out of a belief that a comparison of the settlement experience of Turkish immigrants in Australia with that in Sweden furnishes us with an unusual model for the study of the changes in the settlement intention of immigrants over time.*