



2011

European Integration: A Plan to Make the Grade

Megan Weinstein

Illinois Wesleyan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/respublica>

Recommended Citation

Weinstein, Megan (2011) "European Integration: A Plan to Make the Grade," *Res Publica - Journal of Undergraduate Research*: Vol. 16

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/respublica/vol16/iss1/10>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Commons @ IWU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this material in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This material has been accepted for inclusion by editorial board of Res Publica and the Political Science Department at Illinois Wesleyan University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@iwu.edu.

©Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

European Integration: A Plan to Make the Grade

Abstract

Since World War II, millions of immigrants have settled into European societies. While many of these ethnic minorities are entering their second and third generation within their host countries there is still a deep sense of disunity and alienation. Some researchers suggest that the best way to acculturate these migrants into society is through structural integration where migrants are exposed to and involved in institutions such as the educational system. To examine the importance of education's impact on socio-cultural integration, this article examines the effect of educational structures on the socio-cultural integration of Europe's ethnic minority populations, including foreign-born migrants. More specifically, this report examines the relationship between socio-cultural integration and starting age and duration of compulsory education.

EUROPEAN INTEGRATION: A PLAN TO MAKE THE GRADE

Megan Weinstein

***Abstract:** Since World War II, millions of immigrants have settled into European societies. While many of these ethnic minorities are entering their second and third generation within their host countries there is still a deep sense of disunity and alienation. Some researchers suggest that the best way to acculturate these migrants into society is through structural integration where migrants are exposed to and involved in institutions such as the educational system. To examine the importance of education's impact on socio-cultural integration, this article examines the effect of educational structures on the socio-cultural integration of Europe's ethnic minority populations, including foreign-born migrants. More specifically, this report examines the relationship between socio-cultural integration and starting age and duration of compulsory education.*

INTRODUCTION

In almost any immigration country, the integration of minorities into the host society is vital to the cohesion and harmony within that society. Since World War II, Europe has witnessed a large influx of immigrant populations, mainly due to temporary and guest worker programs followed by permanent settlement. Many of these migrants, even two or three generations after settling, encounter economic and social disadvantages, discrimination, xenophobia, and exclusion from civic and political participation. Of the many vehicles through which integration can be improved, structural integration, and more specifically education, has gained recent esteem within studies conducted by the European Union. These studies have recognized that education is able to set the ground work for further integration in both the cultural and structural realms because it reaches the population at a young age.

Policymakers throughout Europe are aware of the dangers of social exclusion and have been experiencing greater pressure to adopt effective approaches for increasing the integration of these new members into their respective host societies. The European Commission has called for leadership committed to overcoming social division and adopting policies that will promote equality. This is a problem that is not likely to go away on its own. In an increasingly globalized world, migratory movements will continue to bring an influx of minority populations, and as long as there continue to be cultural differences, there will be a distinct need to increase levels of social tolerance and inclusion.

This research inquires how institutions, particularly compulsory education, play a role in advancing the integration of migrant cultures in Europe. The role of education has been generally neglected by policymakers in the past, but holds value because of the state's ability to make structural changes which may further affect socio-cultural aspects of integration.

LITERATURE REVIEW*Defining Integration*

This research examines the inclusion process of migrant populations within the social and institutional realms of the host society. Within social science research, several terms have been used to describe this phenomenon including but not limited to: absorption, adaptation, race relations cycle, assimilation, acculturation, inclusion, incorporation, and integration. For the purpose of this research, the focus is on social integration, referring to "the process by which people who are relatively new to a country become part of a society."¹ This consists of "the inclusion and acceptance of immigrants into the core institutions, relationships, and positions of a host society."² According to the Council of the European Union, it acts as a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of the member state.³

Integration vs. Assimilation

The most common terms used to describe this process are integration and assimilation. The notion of integration differs from assimilation mostly in historical conception. Historically, assimilation has been viewed as a unidirectional process where migrants are forced to abandon their own culture in order to adapt to the host society. This often arouses negative connotations of suppression, ethnocentrism, and violence. This reaction stems from the rise of abusive nationalism throughout Europe in the late 19th and 20th centuries. Some of these extreme forms of nationalism motivated attempts to create culturally homogenous nations; in the process, 'assimilation' became a form of cultural suppression. The most obvious cases of such occurrences include Germany throughout WWII and the "brutally homogenizing" aspirations of Jacobian Republicanism in France.⁴

However, Rogers Brubaker argues that, in reality, there are two distinct forms of assimilation: the general and abstract term and the specific and organic term. The specific and organic term depicts assimilation as "convert into a substance of its own nature, as the bodily organs convert food into blood, and thence into animal tissue... to absorb into the system, incorporate."⁵ In this sense, this form implies a sense of total absorption and is the form of 'assimilation' most associated with negative historical connotations.⁶ Meanwhile, the general and abstract form of 'assimilation' is rooted in the idea of increasing similarity or likeness. Here, assimilation regards only the notion of becoming similar, to make similar, or to treat as similar. This version of the word is being used more widely in the past decade. Authors are challenging the taboo by incorporating the term in their research instead of integration.⁷ Heckmann and

¹ Rudinger and Spencer 2003.

² Bosswick and Heckmann 2006.

³ Joppke 2007.

⁴ Brubaker 2003.

⁵ Oxford English Dictionary.

⁶ Brubaker 2003.

⁷ Brubaker 2003; Bosswick and Heckmann 2006; Joppke 2007.

Schnapper state that it does not need to just be a one-sided process but can instead be used to shrink the differences and social distance between two or more groups or parts of them. Regardless, “assimilation” does have negative and distorted connotations that require continual clarification.⁸ Because of this, for pragmatic and communicative purposes, ‘integration’ serves as a more appropriate word than ‘assimilation’ within the realm of migrant integration. It better serves as a concept that is adequate for scientific purposes as well as for communication with policy makers and the wider public.

Modes of Integration: Integration of a Nation

Methods of migrant regulation vary from country to country. However, they have often been generalized into four main approaches for the incorporation and integration of migrants into society: assimilation, differential exclusion, multiculturalism, and two-way integration. These approaches to integration are strongly connected with the past immigration trends unique to each country, as well as the historical concepts of nationalism and citizenship. Each approach demonstrates a cultural view of integration and places integration responsibility on the migrant population, the host society, neither, or both.

The first main category focuses on the complete assimilation of migrants in terms of learning the national language and adopting the social and cultural practices of the host society. As previously discussed, the concept of assimilation usually includes migrants giving up old practices in order to fully adopt the new national identity. Therefore, the responsibility of integration falls entirely on the shoulders of the migrants. This approach is appropriately titled an “assimilationist approach” by both Castles and Crul.⁹ Meanwhile, the differential exclusion method focuses more on the separation of migrants and the host society. Typically, this form is found in countries with temporary migration schemes like guest-worker or labor programs. Migrants are considered strictly temporary and are therefore not given the right to family reunification or permanent residence. This leaves migrants only temporarily integrated in the labor market and excludes them from integrating into other levels of society such as political participation and national culture.¹⁰ The next category is referred to as the “multiculturalism” approach. Unlike the assimilationist and civic integration approaches, multiculturalism does not assume the existence or necessity of homogenous and monocultural nation-states. It instead works through the concept of pluralism in accepting cultural diversity and community formation and emphasizes the promotion of equality.¹¹ This is often times carried out through anti-discrimination legislation and equal opportunities policies. The responsibility of integration falls more on the host society as it is expected to accept newcomers along with the cultural practices they carry.

While the previously described approaches to integration have been prevalent in the past, the European Union is now encouraging member states to adopt an approach that focuses

⁸ Heckmann and Schnapper 2003.

⁹ Castles 2002; Crul and Schneider 2009.

¹⁰ Castles 2002; Crul 2009.

¹¹ Castles 2002; Crul and Schneider 2009, “Children of Turkish Immigrants”.

more on the fusion of the migrant and host societies. In this “two-way integration” both the migrants and the receiving societies must change in the process of integration. In reality this supposes two separate one-way processes in which the burden of change falls on both actors.¹² Christian Joppke states that this occurs in the dual presence of civic integration and the antidiscrimination measures found in the multiculturalist approach.¹³ This method is supported by the European Union because it acknowledges that integration is not a one-sided process.¹⁴ Both the migrants and host communities are active participants in the integration process, each with their own characteristics, reactions, and levels of adaptation.¹⁵ There is an inherent interaction between these parties, and successful integration incorporates a change in the perspectives of both the migrant population and the host community.¹⁶

This push towards two-way integration is relatively recent, only gaining serious attention in the past five years. Methods of assimilation, differential exclusion, and multiculturalism still exist in many European countries. Those countries that have adopted the two-way integration method have done so quite recently. Therefore, past ideologies of each nation still have a large effect on the attitudes towards immigration and integration today. The level of socio-cultural integration, social tensions, and discrimination can still be largely influenced by this history.

Process of Integration: Integration of Individuals

While the national ideologies regarding immigration and integration are extremely influential in determining the nation’s capacity for integration, the actual process takes place at the individual level. Opportunities and incentives for integration manifest themselves in multiple spheres of active life, whether going to the office, participating in local sports clubs, or even just eating at a local restaurant. Integration acts as a multi-dimensional phenomenon which manifests itself through 3 key systems: Legal/political, cultural, and structural integration.

Legal/political integration refers strictly to the process of immigrants’ inclusion as members of the political community. The fundamental aspect of this process regards the naturalization of immigrants and national policies directed at citizenship requirements. These policies determine the difficulty with which migrants are able to claim national citizenship and therefore gain full access to the political system. This access serves as a precondition for exerting influence on the political system and provides a way for immigrants to partake in the host society.¹⁷ Often, the level of difficulty of naturalization relates back to the national ideals of integration. For example, Germany, until roughly five years ago, did not consider itself an immigration country (‘Deutschland ist kein Einwanderungsland’) and thus employed a strict

¹² Christian 2007.

¹³ Joppke 2007, “Transformation,” 247-248.

¹⁴ Entzinger and Biezeveld 2003.

¹⁵ Penninx 2005.

¹⁶ Rudinger 2003, 5.

¹⁷ Bosswick and Heckmann 2006.

system of differential exclusion, which made gaining citizenship relatively difficult compared to other European states.¹⁸ Even today with its new acceptance of two-way integration, the citizenship requirements are still extensive. Meanwhile, the French assimilationist model allows for full-fledged citizenship to those who subscribe completely to the principles of the country's political system and accept its national ideals. However, while naturalization is quite simple, upon subscribing to this culture one forfeits any state recognition of individual cultural or religious heritage and receives no safeguards against discrimination. In general, the legal/political aspect of integration has a large impact on an immigrant's ability to partake in society as the stepping stone to gaining legal and political rights. However, this one-way form of integration focuses solely on the burden on the immigrant and has little effect on the host culture. Such legal/political inclusions are a necessity but not sufficient for full integration.

While legal/political integration is necessary for access to legal rights and the political system, it is through cultural and structural integration that two-way integration takes place and migrants are able to fully acculturate with the host society. Cultural integration refers to the cognitive, behavioral, and attitudinal changes experienced as migrants acquire the core competencies of the host culture and society. It places the individual's personal identification within the social system and determines whether they continue to identify with their national culture or, rather, see themselves as a part of the host society.¹⁹ This does not necessarily mean that immigrants must completely forego the culture and ideologies of their respective countries of origin; cultural integration promotes an interactive, mutual process in which the host society also experiences change as it adapts and learns to relate to the newcomers. Typically, cultural integration includes knowledge of the host country language and cultural standards; it involves adapting to a new way of life and social participation in the host culture. Such adaptation associates higher rates of immigrants in social networks of the host society, including but not limited to friendships, partnerships, marriages, and membership in voluntary organizations.²⁰

Structural integration is closely linked to cultural integration but includes migrants' participation in the "core" institutions of the host culture. Bosswick and Heckmann title this 'placement' and define it as the process of an individual gaining a position in society, which enables them to partake in socioeconomic institutions and gain cultural, social, and economic capital.²¹ It includes the attainment of access to position and status within the economy and labor market, the educational institutions, the housing system, etc. Bosswick and Heckmann argue that structural integration is the most essential aspect of integration, for it enables migrants to partake in socioeconomic institutions and gain capital, which, he believes, leads to cultural integration over time.

While these different forms of integration have been discussed separately, it is important to note that they are extremely interconnected.²² Heckmann argues that structural integration

¹⁸ "Migration Citizenship Education - Germany."

¹⁹ Bosswick and Heckmann 2006.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Entzinger 2003, 30-31.

has the greatest effect because it introduces immigrants to the society and the host culture through co-workers, classmates, neighbors, etc. Furthermore, failing to integrate migrants into the institutions of a nation can severely impair their ability to culturally integrate because they have no way of gaining capital and prominence within society. However, the same can be said for the effect of cultural integration. Becoming acculturated in society and understanding the basic social skills relevant to the host culture can positively impact migrants' abilities to succeed in the labor market. Because integration is such a cyclical concept, it is imperative that policies address both the structural and cultural aspects of integration as key to a better acculturated society.

IMPACT OF EDUCATION

One strategy for integrating ethnic migrants begins with the reform of procedures, practices, and policies that address the foundational systems through which integration takes place. A key example of this is the education system. The education system serves as a major vehicle for integration because of its direct impact upon both structural and cultural integration. The beauty of education is that it targets youth while they are still at impressionable ages and has the ability to help set the foundation for their future success. However, education can also be indirectly discriminatory or exclusionary if it fails to narrow the gap between the achievements of migrants and host nationals.

Within the European Union, it is widely recognized that education serves as an excellent medium through which a state can increase equal opportunities and foster the recognition of diversity. It is because of this that the education sector is the main field of targeted integration policies among European Union member states. Even those states averse to minority-specific anti-discrimination and equal-opportunity policies have adopted education measures to aid in the integration battle.²³

In terms of cultural integration, entrance into the school system usually marks immigrants' earliest and most intensive contact with the host society, and education has been found to play an important role in shaping immigrants' cultural identities and relations with host nationals. Policymakers suggest that education can bridge cultural gaps in times of high social tension and negativity towards migrants. The exposure of both migrant youth to the host culture and the host culture to the migrant youth encourages the recognition of diversity.²⁴ Education serves as a form of two-way integration where migrant students are exposed to the culture of the host society and adapt to social mores, while, simultaneously, students of the host culture are exposed to ethnic diversity and can expand social understanding. Furthermore, participation in education encourages social contacts and relationships across cultural and ethnic boundaries. According to the European Commission and Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), it is through social contacts and the climate created by the

²³ OECD, 3.

²⁴ Ibid., 8.

possibility of such contacts that people develop a sense of belonging in a particular social space.²⁵

Structurally, education encompasses the fundamental building blocks of opportunity that allow individuals to get ahead in society. Upon leaving the school system, students are supplied with the necessary know-how and intellectual skills needed to partake in socioeconomic institutions and to gain a position in the labor market.²⁶ The level to which students are able to integrate within the school system determines the opportunities and resources available to them later on in life. One of the most recognized aspects of education's structural effect on integration focuses on migrants' perceived lack of skills, particularly language. It is through the acquisition and full competency of language that migrants are able to gain comparable social and economic capital within the host society. Without such skills, migrants compete at an inherently unequal level with host-country nationals and are often left much more vulnerable to social exclusion and further disintegration. It is not uncommon for migrant youth to be raised speaking a language that is foreign to the host society. In such circumstances many students actually begin learning integral language skills only upon entering the school system.

The realm of education encompasses multiple facets that may influence success levels for migrants both within school and later on in the labor market and which may therefore have an impact on cultural and structural integration. These include systematic structure, curriculum, level of segregation, special programming, bilingual opportunities, and allocation of funds.

INDICATORS

Education

While multiple aspects of education are relevant to migrant achievement, this study focuses on the technical and social benefits of education through a specific focus on educational structure, comprised of the age requirements and specific tracking of education. Educational structures vary across countries, especially in the extent to which they constrain and maximize choice and in how easy they are to navigate.²⁷ Variations in structure may shape the pathways that migrant children take into the labor market, higher education, and their lives as citizens.

According to The Integration of the European Second Generation (TIES) surveys, which address issues of structural integration by comparing education and labor market positions, there is a direct relationship between educational structure and attained levels of education of migrants (in this specific case they look at second generation migrants).²⁸ These surveys demonstrate the impact of compulsory educational structure on second generation migrants' ability to adapt and keep up with host-country nationals in terms of educational competencies.

²⁵ OECD, 6.

²⁶ Entzinger 2003, 33.

²⁷ Holdaway, Crul, and Roberts 2009.

²⁸ Crul and Schneider 2009.

For this project, the first indicator of educational structure is starting age. The starting age of migrant children can have a large effect on their capacity for integration because the beginning of formal education often times marks the beginning of many students' full exposure to the host culture. This means that students who enter formal education earlier are more likely to be exposed to social culture and language education during a critical period of emotional and cognitive development.²⁹ Furthermore, it is not unusual for migrant students to be raised where the home language is other than that of the host culture. Therefore, their exposure to this language does not begin until the beginning of formal education.³⁰

In this study, only the starting age for compulsory education is included because it is completely inclusive of the migrant society. While pre-primary education, often termed kindergarten, has been shown to have positive effects on the educational attainments of migrants, there is a significantly smaller proportion of the migrant population attending pre-primary education in comparison to children of the host society. Including those ages in the measurement may exclude a large portion of the migrant population.

The second indicator of educational structure is the length of time between starting age and the age of first selection track. This indicator shows the greatest amount of variance. For example, in Germany the selection of first track begins at age ten when students are placed in three rather strictly separate school levels (Hauptschule, Realschule, and Gymnasim). Coupled with the later starting age, migrant students in Germany thus have comparatively little time to pull themselves out of their disadvantaged starting position. This early selection often leaves more migrants students in the lower qualifying streams, especially Hauptschule, which is the lowest track of secondary schooling.³¹ This is relevant for the exposure to the majority language and a mixed social environment, but also for the chances of acquiring the necessary skills and level of schooling for being tracked into higher qualifying strands of education. The longer a child of immigrants has had the chance to be in education before a decision is made about the most suitable track, the higher are her/his chances to access pre-academic paths.³² The problem is that being tracked in lower qualifying school types frequently limits the choices for professional careers afterwards.

Integration

The dependent variable in this study is the level of socio-cultural integration of the migrant population. This pertains to the level at which migrants are integrated into the host society, in terms of proficiency and use of the host-country language, mutual stereotypical attitudes, and interethnic social contacts. It is recognized that integration outcomes are affected by the interplay of a range of factors and that comprehensive measurement of this would include language proficiency, amount of societal organizations migrants were regularly involved in, mutual stereotypical attitudes, and the relationships they formed with members of

²⁹ Eurydice, 130.

³⁰ Eurydice, 11.

³¹ TIES, 6.

³² TIES, 10.

the host society. Unfortunately, due to resource constraints, the amount of involvement in social organizations and interethnic relationships are not available for this study. However, measures of discrimination and ethnic tension are readily available. The indicators that will be used to measure the dependent variable are the feelings of discrimination based on ethnic origin and the extent to which there exists discrimination in each host country, as measured in the Eurobarometer 71.2 (2009), and the amount of tension felt between people of different races and ethnic groups, as measured in the Eurobarometer 72.1 (2009). Specifically, the questions being analyzed are:

Eurobarometer 72.1:

QA15_1: In all countries there sometimes exists tension between social groups. In your opinion, how much tension is there between each of the following groups in (OUR COUNTRY)?

Different racial and ethnic groups:

- (1) A lot of tension
- (2) Some tension
- (3) No tension
- (4) DK

Eurobarometer 71.2:

QE1_1: For each of the following types of discrimination, could you please tell me whether, in your opinion, it is very widespread, fairly widespread, fairly rare, or very rare in (OUR COUNTRY)?

On the basis of ethnic origin:

- (1) Very widespread
- (2) Fairly widespread
- (3) Fairly rare
- (4) Very rare
- (5) Nonexistent

QE3_1: In the past 12 months have you personally felt discriminated against or harassed on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply.

Ethnic origin mentioned

- (0) Not mentioned
- (1) Mentioned

QE4_1: In the past 12 months have you witnessed someone being discriminated against or harassed on the basis of one or more of the following grounds? Please tell me all that apply.

Ethnic origin mentioned

- (0) Not Mentioned
- (1) Mentioned

QE16_1: Do you have friends or acquaintances who are of an ethnic origin different than yours?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No
- (3) Don't Know

DESIGN AND STRATEGY

My formal hypotheses for this research are as follows:

H 1: Nations in which compulsory education begins at an earlier age will have higher rates of socio-cultural integration.

H2: Nations in which compulsory education allows for more time between the starting age and the age of first specific track selection will have higher rates of socio-cultural integration.

The methods used to test these hypotheses are based on a quasi-experimental design that focuses on population surveys from seven countries: Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, France, and the United Kingdom. This case selection allows for a variety of dissimilar educational structures. Scandinavian countries, on the one hand, have a single structure for all students until age sixteen and generally have automatic progression of students through the years. On the other hand, Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands have differentiation in students' routes through school beginning at age twelve or earlier. Comparatively, this study includes France because of its intensive use of options and channeling within the general structure and the United Kingdom for its coexistence of several parallel structures.

The unit of analysis is the individual respondent from these selected countries and the revised survey sample size contains an N of 7,248 total respondents. Findings first analyze the effect of educational structure measures on individual discrimination and social tension responses through cross-tabular descriptive statistics accompanied by Pearson's Chi Square levels of significance and the Gamma measure of association. Then, to control for country, crosstab analyses will be run and measured with Pearson's Chi Square and Gamma measures as well. Finally, the study will examine the foreign population proportion, GDP per capita, and unemployment rates within each country to examine their separate effects on integration. The dependent variables as taken from the Eurobarometer surveys have been re-coded on a 0-1 scale with 0 representing the highest level of discrimination or social tension within each question and 1 being the lowest level of discrimination or social tension within each question. This means that higher responses (those closer to 1) represent higher levels of integration and vice versa. Furthermore, an index has been created to represent the summation of all dependent variables regarding measures of discrimination. This will measure the cumulative effects in order to demonstrate the feelings of discrimination and tension across the board. The scale ranges from 0 to 1 in .25 unit increments where 1 again represents the lowest level of discrimination/highest level of integration and vice versa.

One recognized potential problem within this design is the fact that the population being measured for the dependent variable may not have necessarily gone through the national school system in which they reside. Therefore, there is the potential that the sample will not be representative of the population parameter.

The independent variable measures are outlined as follows:

Table 1: Independent Variable Measures by Country

	Start Age	Track Age	Duration	% Foreign Population	GDP Per capita	Percent Unemployment
Denmark	7	16	9	5.8%	36,000	4.3%
Sweden	7	16	9	5.9%	36,600	8.3%
Germany	6	10	4	8.8%	34,100	7.5%
Austria	6	10	4	10.3%	39,200	4.8%
The Netherlands	5	12	7	3.9%	39,500	4.9%
France	6	11	5	5.8%	32,600	9.1%
United Kingdom	5	16	11	6.6%	34,800	7.6%

The general spread of the dependent variables is as follows:

Table 2: Model Dependent Variable General Statistics

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Discrimination Spread	28504	0.6441	0.25001
Personal Discrimination	29768	0.9736	0.16044
Other Discrimination	29768	0.8951	0.30640
Friends of Ethnic Origin	29458	0.5700	0.49509
Social Tension	25659	0.6481	0.32850

Index measures

Discrimination spread overall is concentrated in the middle-high range with 70.1% of respondents claiming it to be fairly widespread (26.9%) or very widespread (43.2%). Personal discrimination was only mentioned by 2.6% of the respondents. However, the proportion of respondents reporting witnessing discrimination of others was much higher at 10.5% of respondents. Meanwhile, 43.0% of respondents reported having friends of a different ethnic origin.

The index measure, which ranged from 0 to 4 in .25 increments, had a mean of 3.09 and a standard deviation of .606. The distribution shows two major spikes around 2.75 and 3.75. To achieve a 2.75 score, respondent's responses would include a "fairly widespread" measure of discrimination along with the recognition of 2 of the 3 other discrimination variables (personal discrimination, other discrimination, or reporting no friends of a different ethnic origin). To achieve a score of 3.75, respondent's responses would include a "fairly widespread" measure of discrimination along with the recognition of all 3 other discrimination variables. This shows that, in general, much of the sample reports relatively high levels of discrimination.

CONCEPTUAL FINDINGS

Table 3: Bivariate Correlations for Migrant Integration (All Countries)
Independent Variable: Starting Age in Country's Educational System

	Chi-Square	Degrees of Freedom	Significance	Gamma
Discrimination spread	155.915	8	.000	-.011
Personal Discrimination	7.684	2	(at the .05 level)	0.127
Other Discrimination	5.8	2	Not significant	0.019
Friends of Ethnic Origin	6.385	2	0.041	0.015
Social Tension	77.932	4	.000	.045

Table 4: Bivariate Correlations for Migrant Integration
Independent Variable: Duration (in years) Between Starting Age and Track Age

	Chi-Square	Degrees of Freedom	Significance	Gamma
Discrimination spread	228.391	16	.000	0.179
Personal Discrimination	25.980	4	.000	0.192
Other Discrimination	40.293	4	.000	-.018
Friends of Ethnic Origin	106.451	4	.000	.107
Social Tension	162.218	8	.000	.076

Hypothesis 1

The cross-tabulations examining the relationship between the starting age of compulsory education and the dependent variables are significant at the 0.05 level, with the exception of those measured against the witnessed discrimination of others. The results demonstrate a positive correlation between starting age and levels of social tension with the highest peaks at ages five and seven. This finding supports the research hypothesis. However, the results demonstrate that there is actually a negative correlation between starting age and levels of discrimination; as the starting age increases, the level of discrimination decreases. This means that as the age at which students begin compulsory schooling increases, levels of integration also increase. These findings do not support the research hypothesis.

Furthermore, for all cross-tabulations, the Gamma measure of association is quite low, ranging from -0.111 to 0.127. Therefore, while the correlation between starting age and the dependent variables is significant, the change in starting age only accounts for a very small, if any, proportion of the change in the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 2

The cross-tabulations examining the relationship between the duration of time between the starting age and first track age of compulsory education are significant at the .001 level. The results demonstrate a negative correlation between duration and levels of discrimination; as duration increased, the level of discrimination decreased. This means that as duration increases, levels of integration also increase. This finding supports the research hypothesis. However, the results also demonstrate a positive correlation between duration and the levels of

social tension; as duration increased the level of social tension increased. This means that as duration increases the levels of integration decrease. This finding does not support the research hypothesis.

However, for all cross-tabulations, the Gamma measure of association is again very low, ranging from -0.018 to 0.192. These results demonstrate that the change in the amount of time between starting compulsory education and the age of first track selection only accounts for a very small, if any, proportion of the change in the dependent variables.

Ethnic Minority Control

In preparation for the country control, the responses of those identifying as an ethnic minority in comparison to those not claiming ethnic minority status were examined. Respondents identifying as an ethnic minority show significantly different results than those not claiming ethnic minority status. The discrimination indicator's spread remains consistent on all levels. However, there is a much higher percentage responding "Very Widespread" among respondents identifying as an ethnic minority than those not claiming ethnic minority status. Meanwhile, the personal discrimination measures, other discrimination measures, and those reporting friends of different ethnic origin varied greatly with those claiming ethnic minority status showed higher rates of discrimination than those not claiming ethnic minority status. Within personal discrimination, 23.1% mentioned being personally discriminated against compared to the 1.7% of non-ethnic respondents. Within other discrimination, 29.7% of ethnic minorities responded that they had witnessed somebody else being discriminated against due to ethnic origin compared to the 9.6% of non-ethnic respondents. Finally, 81.9% of respondents identifying as an ethnic minority reported having friends of a different ethnic origin while only 55.8% of non-ethnic respondents reported having friends of a different ethnic origin.

Country Comparisons

In an attempt to control for the effect of individual countries upon the dependent variable, a linear regression was run with the United Kingdom as a dummy variable. However, the results could not be properly calculated because of the multicollinearity of the independent variables. To further investigate the effect of educational structures within each country, several cross-tabulations were run. The results were not significant, but may still be of interest.

To compare the variables controlling for country, the countries with the same starting ages for compulsory education and the countries with the same duration of schooling before the first tracking were matched up and compared. If countries with the same dependent variables differ greatly, it is more likely that other country-specific variables are throwing off the data. If they are similar, it may mean one of two things. The hypothesis would appear stronger because a) there would be a continuation of effects across country borders, or b) countries with similar

educational structures may also be quite similar in other structural and policy-oriented ways, and the measures could be a result of these common variables.³³

To compare within starting age, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are paired up, both starting schooling at age five; Germany, Austria, and France are paired up, all starting school at age six, and Denmark and Sweden are paired up, both starting schooling at age seven. The Netherlands and the United Kingdom have very similar responses for the discrimination spread, personal discrimination, and other discrimination. Meanwhile, friends of ethnic origin varied with 16.9% more respondents claiming friends of a different ethnic origin in the United Kingdom than in the Netherlands. However, this could be a result of higher levels of ethnic minority responses within the United Kingdom. For social tension, the United Kingdom reported much lower levels than the Netherlands.

Germany, Austria, and France showed varying results. For discrimination spread, Germany and Austria demonstrated similar findings, with Austria reporting a higher spread of discrimination. However, France reported a much higher spread of discrimination than both Austria and Germany. The responses for personal discrimination and other discrimination were relatively comparable for all three countries. The number of respondents reporting having a friend of different ethnic origin was much lower in France. Social tension variables for Austria and France were very similar but Germany reported much less social tension.

Finally, Denmark and Sweden reported very similar results for all measures except for the perception of other discrimination. Here, Denmark reported much higher numbers of respondents witnessing discrimination of others at 20.2% compared to the 6.2% of Sweden. To compare within duration, Austria and Germany are paired up, both with four years of duration between starting compulsory education and the age of first track. Denmark and Sweden are paired up, both with nine years of duration between starting compulsory education and the age of first track.

Austria and Germany reported similar findings across all measures. Within discrimination spread, Austria reported with slightly higher discrimination measures, but the difference was mild. Affirmative responses for personal discrimination, other discrimination, and having friends of a different ethnic origin were also very closely matched. The most variation occurred within the social tension variable. Here, Austria reported more social tension with 47.7% of respondents reporting "A Lot of Tension" compared to the 36.9% within Germany, 46.8% reporting "Some Tension" compared to the 54.9% within Germany, and only 5.5% reporting "No Tension" compared to the 8.3% within Germany. This difference may be influenced by the fact that Austria had more respondents of ethnic minority than Germany. Denmark and Sweden were again compared for duration and therefore demonstrate the same results as stated before when compared for starting age.

³³ For percentage spreads of different dependent variables, see Tables 5-7 in the appendix.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, while the effects on integration of both the starting age of compulsory education and the duration between this age and the age of first track selection were significant, they were not of sufficient magnitude for the hypotheses to be supported. The effect of the independent variables on integration accounts for very little of the change in the dependent variable. Therefore, it can be concluded that there are other factors that have a greater effect on integration than educational structure.

In an attempt to account for such other factors, a multiple regression was run to examine the effects of the percent foreign population, GDP per capita, and unemployment rates. Again, there was a high level of significance, but with a very low Pearson's R-squared measure of association. It appears that the data may be picking up nuances because of the large number of cases being utilized. With such a large number, any variation in the data will impact the results, even if the independent variable is only accounting for a very small proportion of the dependent, as seen with the Gamma measures of association. Even upon controlling for country, foreign population percentage, GDP per capita, and unemployment rates, the data shows very little variation. Therefore, it is possible that the measurement for integration is incomplete or inaccurate. It could also be the case that the sample is not representative because it includes those who may have not gone through the education system of the country in which they reside. The most likely error is that of internal validity. The measures of socio-cultural integration do not appear to be accurately evaluating the theoretical concept.

Upon examining the results of the first hypothesis, the direction of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables must be addressed. In order to support the research hypothesis, the effect of starting age on discrimination and social tension should show a positive relationship. While this was the case for the effect of starting age on social tension, the effect of starting age on discrimination demonstrates a negative relationship overall.

Upon examining the results of the second hypothesis, again the direction of the relationships between the independent and dependent variables must be addressed. In order to support the research hypothesis, the effect of duration of compulsory education on discrimination and social tension should show a negative relationship. While this is the case for the effect of duration of compulsory education on discrimination, the effect of duration of compulsory education on social tension demonstrates a positive relationship overall.

While the discrimination and social tension indicators were meant to cumulatively measure the level of two-way integration, it appears that they may be measuring two different things. After examining the results of the first hypothesis, several potential explanations for this peculiarity surfaced. Upon further inspection, it seemed as though the measures of discrimination may address the manifest discriminatory acts which occur in society, while social tension addresses the more passive feelings of insecurity among those of different ethnic backgrounds. In general, acts of discrimination have a high occurrence within structural and institutional aspects of society. It may be the case that starting school at an earlier age allows for more potential for discrimination to occur or for the perception of discrimination to occur. If a

student has more time in school exposed to the hierarchy of the host culture, they may feel more discrimination than if they were still at home. Furthermore, migrant parents with children in school are going to be more conscious of discriminatory acts that their child may undergo within the institution, which may further hamper the results. Social tension, on the other hand, may still decrease for the reasons hypothesized. While early entrance does allow more potential for acts of discrimination, the overall exposure to the student population may still reduce social tensions through the forming of friendships and relationships and the general cultural exposure of the host culture to the migrant culture and vice versa.

Unfortunately, the results of this research do not support the second hypothesis, thereby negating expected conclusions. In fact, they are completely reversed. The main explanation for this phenomenon simply points out the potential insufficiency of the dependent variable. As previously mentioned, there is a multiplicity of influences on integration. Perhaps the inclusion of a greater number or greater variety of these influences would hold more significant and similar results. When controlling for the country variables, there appeared no real pattern in the results. Apart from the differentiation explained by the number of respondents claiming ethnic minority status, most of the results were not cohesive. Furthermore, some of the results, such as the very low discrimination and social tension scores of Germany, appeared out of place considering the high political and media attention that such issues have received in recent years. This again may allude to the measurement problems of the dependent variable.

Overall, the inconsistencies within the data create real challenges. While the project demonstrated some provocative results, they are extremely difficult to interpret because they fail to paint a clear picture. One aspect of this is simply the limitation of the methodology. Due to time constraints and the impracticality of extended cross-tabular analyses, few opportunities to test various controls existed. A suggestion for future research would include indicators for both the independent and dependent variables with more variance. This would eliminate the problem of multicollinearity, allowing the researcher to run logistic regressions. These improvements in methodology would expand the scope of the data and provide for clearer interpretation. Furthermore, as previously suggested, further research should include a greater variety of indicators to measure socio-cultural integration. Future research may be able to build upon the foundation laid by this project, in order to further our understanding of the link between European integration and education.

APPENDIX

Table 5: Discrimination Spread (by percent) for Model as Controlled by Country

Level of Discrimination	Denmark	Sweden	France	Austria	Germany	Netherlands	UK
Non-existent	0.4	0	0.2	3.1	1.8	1.4	1.1
Very Rare	3.4	1.7	1.3	6.6	9.2	5.4	5.8
Fairly Rare	19.7	19.2	15.9	24.2	34.2	20.9	31.2
Fairly Widespread	51.3	60.4	55.8	50.2	44.3	54.9	45.0
Very Widespread	25.1	18.7	26.8	15.8	10.5	17.5	16.9

Table 6: Dichotomous Variables: Affirmative Responses for Experiences of Discrimination (in percent)

	Denmark	Sweden	France	Austria	Germany	Netherlands	UK
Personal	2.4	1.2	2.1	5	2	4.1	3.9
Other	20.2	6.2	17.7	15.3	13.6	9.8	10.6
Have Friends of Different Ethnicities	41.1	42.0	34.1	43.8	45.0	48.6	31.7

Table 7: Respondents' Perceived Level of Social Tension (in percent)

	Denmark	Sweden	France	Austria	Germany	Netherlands	UK
None	2.7	2.0	4.9	5.5	8.3	1.9	4.8
Some	40.5	50.6	43.0	46.8	54.9	42.0	54.1
A Lot	56.8	47.4	52.1	47.7	36.9	56.0	41.2

WORKS CITED

- Bosswick, Wolfgang, and Friedrich Heckmann. 2006. *Integration of Migrants: Contribution of Local and Regional Authorities*. Publication no. Ef0622. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 2003. "The Return of Assimilation? Changing Perspectives on Immigration and Its Sequels in France, Germany, and The United States." In *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*, eds. Joppke, Christian, Morawska, Ewa. Palgrave Macmillan: 39-59.
- Castles, Stephen. 2002. "Migration and Community Formation under Conditions of Globalization." *International Migration Review* 36(4): 1143-168.
- "CIA – The World Factbook." Central Intelligence Agency.
- Crul, Maurice. 2007. "Pathways to Success for the Children of Immigrants." *Migration Policy Institute*.
- Crul, Maurice, and Jens Schneider. 2009. "Children of Turkish Immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands: The Impact of Differences in Vocational and Academic Tracking Systems." *Teachers College Record* 111(6): 1508-1527.
- Crul, Maurice, and Jens Schneider. 2010. "Comparative integration context theory: participation and belonging in new diverse European cities." *Ethnic & Racial Studies* 33(7): 1249-1268.
- Crul, Maurice, and Jens Schneider. 2009. "The Second Generation in Europe: Education and the Transition to the Labor Market." *TIES Policy Brief*.
- Dupriez, Vincent; Dumay, Xavier. 2006. "Inequalities in school systems: effect of school structure or of society structure?" *Comparative Education* 42(2).
- Early Childhood Education and Care in Europa: Tackling Social and Cultural Inequalities*. 2009. Eurydice. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Entzinger, Han, and Renske Biezeveld. 2003. *Benchmarking in Immigrant Integration*. Rep. European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations.
- Ersanilli, Evelyn, and Ruud Koopmans. 2010. "Rewarding Integration? Citizenship Regulations and the Socio-Cultural Integration of Immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany." *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies* 36(5): 773-791.
- Eurydice: Information on Education Systems and Policies in Europe. 2010. *Executive Agency of Education, Audiovisual & Culture* (October 2010).
- Favell, Adrian. 2001. "Integration Policy and Integration Research in Europe." *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices*. (November 17, 2010).

- Guest, Avery M., and Keith R. Stamm. 1993. "Paths of Community Integration." *Sociological Quarterly* 34(4): 581-95.
- Heckmann, Friedrich, and Dominique Schnapper. 2003. *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies National Differences and Trends of Convergence*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Holdaway, Jennifer, Maurice Crul, and Catrin Roberts. 2009. "Cross-National Comparison of Provision and Outcomes for the Education of the Second Generation." *Teachers College Record* 111(6): 1381-1403.
- Joppke, Christian. 2007. "Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe." *West European Politics* 30(1): 1-22.
- Joppke, Christian. 2007. "Transformation of Immigrant Integration: Civic Integration and Antidiscrimination in the Netherlands, France, and Germany." *World Politics* 59(2): 243-273.
- Luciak, Mikael. 2004. *Migrants, Minorities and Education: Documenting Discrimination and Integration in 15 Member States of the European Union; [equality and Diversity for an Inclusive Europe; EUMC Comparative Study]*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publ. of the European Communities.
- "Migration Citizenship Education - Germany." *Migration Citizenship Education - Home* (October 2010).
- Penninx, Rinus. 2005. "Integration of Migrants: Economic, Social, Cultural and Political Dimensions." *The New Demographic Regime: Population Challenges and Policy Responses*. New York: Geneva. 137-51.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1998. "Reactions Toward The New Minorities Of Western Europe." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24(1): 77-103.
- Rudinger, Anja, and Sarah Spencer. 2003. *Social Integration of Migrants and Ethnic Minorities: Policies to Combat Discrimination*. Proc. of The Economic and Social Aspects of Migration, Brussels. European Commission and the OECD, 21-22.
- Wagner, Ulrich, and Andreas Zick. 1995. "The Relation of Formal Education to Ethnic Prejudice: Its Reliability, Validity and Explanation." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 25(1): 41-56.