The Integration of the European Second Generation

OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE

The Second Generation in Europe:
Education and the Transition to the Labor Market

Maurice Crul and Jens Schneider

TIES: The Integration of the European Second Generation
University of Amsterdam

June 2009

The Migration Policy Institute is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit think tank dedicated to the study of the movement of people worldwide.

Executive Summary

The Integration of the European Second Generation (TIES) survey compares data for one group — second-generation Turks — across 13 different cities in seven European countries. Since the parents of this group have comparable backgrounds (due to their predominantly rural origins and low levels of schooling), we can isolate the effect of contextual factors and *policy* on the second-generation youth. The comparison across countries (and cities) allows us to identify what works (better) and what does not, particularly in the fields of education and labor.

We have identified some broad conclusions in the following five areas:

School system

There is a direct relationship between the educational attainment of children of immigrants and the years they are able to spend with peers who have native-born parents. Three main parameters are influential here:

- Starting school at an early age reduces the gap between children with migrant backgrounds and children of natives. Entering kindergarten at the age of two or three seems to be most effective.
- Children of immigrants do better when they are allowed to specialize *later*; in short: the more years between starting school and "selection" (choosing a specialized track) the better.
- Segregated schools can have an additional negative effect, as they limit the probability that a child of immigrants will continue to secondary education.

The risks of age 16

In most countries, compulsory schooling ends at age 16. This is the crucial point in time when students are either steered into higher secondary education or into vocational training or apprenticeships. At this age, the rate of pupils leaving school without a diploma increases significantly.

- Drop-out is more effectively prevented in countries where pupils acquire their first lower secondary diploma before the end of compulsory education.
- This works especially well if they are effectively steered into apprenticeships or into preparatory tracks that smooth and facilitate the transition to the apprenticeship system.
- Combining lower and middle vocational education in the same school also prevents early school leaving.
- Longer or alternative routes to higher education are important for providing needed extra opportunities for children of immigrants, especially in school systems with early selection.

Higher education

- A quarter of second-generation Turks surveyed made it into higher education — a huge accomplishment for both the students and their supportive parents, considering the low socioeconomic background of the first generation.

- Drop-out in higher education is a serious problem across Europe, especially since this group shows potential to succeed. The indirect routes to higher education frequently do not provide sufficient academic preparation to ensure success.
- Because of the frequently longer and indirect routes to higher education, many second-generation students begin to study at an age when they already have to work to provide an income for themselves or their families.
- Higher education institutions should be aware of this; they should operate on the assumption that those who enter higher education deserve to be there, and thus focus on retention (implementing measures to keep students aboard, such as extra guidance and mentoring), rather than selecting them out.

Parental support and siblings

- The support of parents is mostly socio-emotional and not practical. Teachers should focus more on this aspect rather than on what parents are *not* able to do. Schools need to develop more effective ways to reach out to parents and to find their support.
- Schools should also be aware of the important role of older siblings, who perform many of the tasks of parents in migrant families. Mentoring projects with higher education students (of migrant descent) as mentors provide effective support to children of immigrants in secondary schools.

Labor market and discrimination

- A clear majority of second-generation Turkish respondents stated that they have never experienced hostility or unfair treatment either in school or when looking for a job.
- Yet, a substantial minority in all countries surveyed has had at least occasional experiences with discrimination. A comparison with their non-Turkish peers at the same educational levels indicates that the problem hits this group hard, especially the less educated. Explicit anti-discrimination policies should be implemented that target schools and companies.
- From the perspective of both society and the emancipation of the Turkish community, highly educated persons of Turkish background can play a pivotal role in advancing the situation of the Turkish group as a whole. But this requires good professional perspectives and social recognition in the wider society.

What Is TIES?

The TIES project is a collaborative and comparative survey on the descendants of immigrants from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, and Morocco in eight European countries: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. All respondents belong to the "second generation," defined as persons who were actually born in the country at least one of their parents migrated to. Their age ranges from 18 to 35.

TIES studies the topic of integration in a broad scope, from economic, social, and educational integration to identity, religion, and transnational ties. The project focuses on the long-term consequences of the large-scale labor migration all western and northern European countries have experienced since the 1960s.

The centerpiece of the project is the creation of the first systematic and rigorously standardized European dataset on these issues. This is relevant not only for a better general understanding of integration processes among children of immigrants, but also for policy development at all levels of government. The data collection for this dataset, which was completed in 2008, included almost 10,000 face-to-face interviews. The fifteen participating cities are: Paris and Strasburg in France, Berlin and Frankfurt in Germany, Madrid and Barcelona in Spain, Vienna and Linz in Austria, Amsterdam and Rotterdam in the Netherlands, Brussels and Antwerp in Belgium, Zurich and Basle in Switzerland, and Stockholm in Sweden.*

One main interest of the TIES project is to address issues of structural integration by comparing the educational and labor market positions of the same second-generation groups (Turkish, Moroccan and ex-Yugoslavian) across countries and cities. The fact that each of these group shares very similar starting positions in the different countries offers the unique opportunity to look at the effects of specific local and national contexts. TIES allows to analyze in which regards and to which degree the educational and professional situations of second generation descendants of migrants are resulting from the specific social, institutional and political conditions on local and national levels.

* The TIES survey was carried out by survey bureaus under the supervision of the seven national TIES partner institutes: The Institute for Social and Political Opinion Research [ISPO], University of Leuven in Belgium; the National Institute for Demographic Studies [INED] in France; the Swiss Forum for Migration and Population Studies [SFM], University of Neuchâtel in Switzerland; the Centre for Research in International Migration and Ethnic Relations [CEIFO], University of Stockholm in Sweden; the Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies [IMIS], University of Osnabrück in Germany, the Institute for the Study of Migration [IEM], Pontifical Comillas University of Madrid in Spain, and the Institute for European Integration Research [EIF], Austrian Academy of Sciences in Austria.

Introduction

The TIES project is distinct from previous international surveys because it looks at the full educational trajectories and professional career development of second-generation immigrants, not just the final outcomes of their education or labor market transitions. This makes it possible to reconstruct the most important selection and transition points in immigrants' educational and professional trajectories, and to relate them to the institutional arrangements in different cities and countries. In the field of education, the following specific questions are addressed:

- Why is it that school outcomes are so different from one country to another, even when looking at the same groups (e.g. the Turkish second generation)?
- What is the relationship between school outcomes and the institutional characteristics of school systems? How are outcomes affected by the way the labor market transition is organized in the different national and local contexts?

The TIES project will also give insights into other important domains of life, such as social relations, identities, and religion. While posing new and original research questions, the TIES project is also policy-oriented. Answers to the questions therefore also address the policy implications and possible societal consequences.

We will focus in this policy brief on second-generation Turks, with an emphasis on the integration context. Second-generation Turks are present in seven out of the eight countries we have studied. This makes them the perfect group for comparison. Based on the results for second-generation Turks, we can describe favorable or less favorable school circumstances in each country. We do not want to disregard the characteristics of the parents, but our survey design makes it possible to look at contextual factors. The emphasis in this policy brief is therefore on differences in school system characteristics and their effects on outcomes, rather than on the characteristics of the immigrant parents.[1]

Methodology: The TIES Survey

The following table shows the final numbers of interviewees per city and 'ethnic' category. Please note that all the groups were sampled according to a technical demographic criterion: all respondents were born in the country where the survey was executed, but one or both parents were born in Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, or Morocco. For the Comparison Group, two criteria were relevant: (a) both parents were born in the survey country; and (b) respondents live in the same neighborhoods or city areas as the respondents from the three second-generation groups.[2]

[1] We also do not focus in this policy brief on the comparison with the respondents with native-born parents. First of all because the school and labor market outcomes for second Turks in the seven countries already show a complex and interesting comparison in itself. Moreover, the background characteristics of the native born parents are rather different in the various countries. This is due to the sampling of the comparison group in the same neighborhoods as where the second generation is living. This makes the international comparison more diverse, because the social characteristics of
these neighborhoods are very different, sometimes featuring a highly educated native group and sometimes a predominantly low status group.

[2] An exception to the second criterion is Stockholm; here the Comparison Group is a representative sample of the age group in general.

Table 1: Number of interviews per city and group

		Turkish	"Former Yugoslavian"	Moroccan	Comparison Group	Total
Austria:	Wien	252	253	-	250	**755**
	Linz	206	242	-	234	**682**
Belgium:	Brussels	250	-	257	271	**778**
	Antwerp	358	-	312	303	**973**
France:	Paris	248	-	-	174	**422**
	Strasbourg	252	-	-	177	**429**
Germany:	Berlin	255	202	-	250	**707**
	Frankfurt	250	204	-	253	**707**
Netherlands:	Amsterdam	237	-	242	259	**738**
	Rotterdam	263	-	251	253	**767**
Sweden:	Stockholm	250	-	-	250	**500**
Switzerland:	Zürich	206	235	-	202	**643**
	Basel	248	191	-	266	**705**
Spain:	Madrid	-	-	250	250	**500**
	Barcelona	-	-	250	250	**500**
TOTAL		**3.275**	**1.327**	**1.562**	**3.642**	**9.806**

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Using the same definition of "second generation" in all 15 cities makes it possible to compare descendents from the same ethno-national background and starting positions. Interviews used the same questionnaire in all countries with cross-checked translations into national languages.

The survey included country- and city-specific terminology to describe the different school systems. Unlike most international comparative surveys, the interviews recorded educational careers and steps in the country- or city-specific logic and terms. Only afterward were the different school types and levels additionally coded using a newly developed international coding system for cross-country comparisons. The uniform educational codes allow fine grain national analyses of school trajectories, but also international comparisons with corresponding higher levels of abstraction.

The international TIES project team interviewed second-generation youth according to the same selection criteria. Sampling strategies however had to be (slightly) different (according to the available information in the register data in the countries), without compromising our aim to select a representative population (see Appendix 1). For the first time, both naturalized as well as non-naturalized second-generation young adults were interviewed in a European survey. Since in most countries no comparable survey is available, the representativity of our samples is hard to check. Therefore some caution in generalizing our findings is necessary. Our analyses in this policy brief will mostly focus on school trajectories. In this type of analysis, the degree of representativity of each city sample is also important, but not the only relevant criterion. We also want to unravel the underlying mechanisms of selection and exclusion practices in schools.

The TIES survey was executed in fifteen large European cities. We have chosen the city level rather than the country level because it is in the big cities where the second generation largely resides.

Therefore our study does not claim any national representativity. We started out by looking at the educational results at the city level. By comparing the two cities in each country, we can see to which degree city-specific characteristics or specific characteristics of the Turkish communities affected outcomes differently. In most countries, differences between the two cities was not significant, neither in educational outcomes nor with regard to the general circumstances of schooling (for instance in the level of segregation in schools). In some countries we found differences in some aspects, but not in others.

For these reasons, we will mostly present differences between countries in the tables below. If there are differences between cities within one country, these will be shown in a separate table or in the text. For matters of convenience, we use the country names as labels in the tables, which is, strictly speaking, not correct because – as mentioned above – it is only a sample of two cities and not a national survey.

The fact that, in general, outcomes for the two cities within one country are more similar than outcomes of cities across countries suggests that educational systems are largely organized in national ways (e.g. the starting age, the way they select, etc.), and it is these structural aspects which affect school outcomes of the second generation more than local differences.

Background Characteristics of the Parents of the Turkish Respondents

The TIES project is premised on a critical hypothesis: that the backgrounds of second-generation Turks of a particular age group are comparable across different European countries. One of the most central elements to test this hypothesis is the background characteristics of the parents. We analyzed these characteristics in three domains: reason for migration, rural versus urban origin, and the level of education of both parents.

Our analysis reveals that two thirds of the fathers in our sample group came as labor migrants. The second and third most mentioned reasons are family reunion and marriage. The exception is Sweden, which had far fewer labor migrants and listed being a refugee or asylum seeker as the second most important reason for migrating. Sweden has a higher share of Kurdish and Assyrian refugees than the other countries. The parents of our second-generation respondents also mostly originate from small villages or towns in the countryside, and they came with quite low levels of education. In Austria, Sweden, and Switzerland they are somewhat better educated than in Germany and France (see Appendix 2 for more detailed information). Based on the background characteristics of the parents, we would expect the second generation to fare a bit better in Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden.

The background of the Turkish parents is generally similar in the two cities we examined within each country. The exception is France: in Paris, the Turkish parents are significantly better educated than in Strasburg. The population there includes a sizeable group of professionals (one in eight) whose children also do very well in school. The Turkish parents in the Strasburg sample are more similar to the Turkish first generation in the other survey cities. As a consequence, we will make a special note in the tables if there are considerable differences between Paris and Strasburg.

School Trajectories and Education of Second-Generation Turks

In order to compare the educational outcomes of second-generation Turks across the different countries, we will first need to look at the structural characteristics of the different systems, namely, the institutional arrangements for organizing access to and selection in education.

Kindergarten and Primary School

A. Starting age of schooling

School systems in German-speaking countries are characterized by a relatively late entrance into educational institutions. As the following table shows, the mean age is highest in Austria and Switzerland, followed by Germany. Our second-generation respondents in France and Belgium were the youngest: almost 90% went to kindergarten at the age of three. The starting age for children in the Netherlands was midway between the two. Sweden is the country with the widest range in the entrance age: while the mean age is three, some children went to Barne at a very early age, whereas others stayed home until the beginning of compulsory schooling at the age of six.[3]

Table 2: Second-Generation Turks: Age of Entrance into an Educational Institution

	< 3	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Austria	3.5	13.1	24.2	14.8	34.3	8.7	0.4	458
Belgium	19.3	68.0	5.8	4.1	1.9	0.7	0.0	582
France	3.4	86.4	6.4	2.8	0.8	0.2	0.0	500
Germany	0.0	39.0	28.1	10.1	8.3	11.5	0.0	490
Netherlands	3.8	9.6	76.4	7.4	2.4	0.4	0.0	499
Sweden	39.7	12.9	14.2	13.4	9.1	0.0	0.0	232
Switzerland	0.0	0.6	11.4	64.7	15.5	6.3	1.5	464

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

These differences in starting ages had strong effects on the educational trajectories of the second-generation youth in the different countries analyzed. In France, the respondents started to learn French in an educational environment at the age of two or three, i.e. in a development phase where they were most open to learning a new language. In Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, they entered education two years later. Already fluent in Turkish, they had more difficulty learning German as a second language.

As with the Swedish case, the German-speaking countries show a lot of variation in the starting age, which is mostly due to whether children attended kindergarten or not. Strikingly, kindergarten enrollment had a strong effect on the later educational careers of the respondents. On average, those who attend kindergarten have a better chance of going to *Gymnasium* (upper secondary school that

[3] The reader should take into account that the starting age of schooling of our 18 to 35-year-old sample reflects the situation in kindergarten and primary school in the 1980s.

prepares pupils to enter a university for advanced academic study). In Germany, children who completed kindergarten were four times more likely to enter Gymnasium than those who did not. In Switzerland, not one Turkish respondent in our survey made it to Gymnasium without having attended kindergarten before.

The systemic differences in the starting ages are bigger between countries than between cities – despite the existence of different school systems within a single country (for instance in Switzerland and Germany). Only in Austria is there a remarkable inter-city difference: second-generation Turks in Linz went to kindergarten 1.5 times more often than their peers in Vienna.

B. Segregation in primary school

As mentioned above, being exposed to the majority language and to social networks involving majority members at a young age has a potential influence on educational careers. Therefore, the ratio of immigrant children to native children in primary schools is an additional important factor.

The following table compares the percentages of pupils with an immigrant background in primary schools across the different countries, as estimated by respondents. In all countries, most respondents estimated the shares to be between a quarter and half of the student body. Differences between the countries can be seen more at the extremes: almost one quarter of the Turkish respondents in Austria went to a primary school with "hardly any" other children of immigrants, while this was the case for only 5 percent of the German respondents. At the other end, particularly in the Netherlands and Sweden, a substantial group states that "almost all" pupils were of immigrant origin in their primary schools (17.4 percent and 14.7 percent respectively).

Table 3a: Second-Generation Turks: Share of Children of Immigrants in Primary School

	Hardly any	ca. 25%	ca. 50%	ca. 75%	Almost all	No answer	Total
Austria	22.9	45.5	19.2	5.0	2.4	5.0	458
Belgium	7.0	33.2	27.0	24.6	8.2	n.a.	582
France	13.8	34.0	30.6	15.2	3.0	3.4	500
Germany	4.8	38.0	40.0	7.7	1.6	7.9	505
Netherlands	11.8	19.8	26.8	21.6	17.4	2.6	500
Sweden	15.1	21.1	29.5	19.1	14.7	0.4	250
Switzerland	21.9	37.8	25.8	8.8	3.2	2.4	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The figures show why school segregation is so high on the political agenda in the Netherlands.[4] In general, primary schools tend to be more segregated in the bigger of the two cities within one country (smaller cities have smaller immigrant communities, making high concentrations of immigrants more rare).

[4] There is certainly a tendency to overestimate the share of one's own ethnic group in school, particularly in countries or cities where this group is a focus point of debates around integration and 'school-flight' by non-migrant parents (parallel to the generally overestimated shares in certain neighborhoods). Yet, the Netherlands know the phenomenon of 'black schools', referring to schools with very high shares of children of immigrants, and 'Muslim schools' (based on the 'pillar-system' of educational institutions run by churches and religious organizations), which is without a parallel in the German-speaking countries.

Rotterdam and Brussels had the most segregated primary schools. Almost half of the second-generation Turks in those two cities went to schools in which immigrant children represented *three quarters or more* of all pupils.[5] In Paris, a quarter of second-generation Turks went to similarly highly segregated schools, while Strasburg is more similar to the cities in the German-speaking countries (see Appendix 3 for the numbers for each city). With regard to segregation in primary schools, the most favorable situation exists in the German-speaking countries. This is for a large part the result of less segregation in housing and neighborhoods in these countries.

The basic effect of segregation in primary school is the same in all countries: the more segregated a school, the lower a child's chances of progressing to a pre-academic track (gymnasium or its equivalent) in secondary school. In France, the effect is strongest for groups who do not continue after *Collège* (the first level of secondary education in the French educational system), because this is the track before the first selection.

Table 3b: Second-Generation Turks: Percentage of Children Moving on to Pre-Academic Tracks in Relation to the Share of Children of Immigrants in Primary School

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden
almost none/approx. 25%	30.4	76.3	55.9	17.6	32.2	78.4
almost all/approx. 75%	14.7	45.3	51.5	10.6	19.5	36.1

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The table shows that the strength of the effect is seemingly not dependent on the overall *degree* of segregation in a country. It is especially low in Germany and France, but quite high in Austria and the Netherlands. The strongest difference is observed in Sweden.

C. Age of selection

Another relevant aspect for the children of immigrants is how many years elapse between the age they start school and "selection," the age they must choose different school tracks. This is relevant because the years before selection offer exposure to the majority language, a mixed social environment, and better chances to acquire the necessary skills and level of schooling to enter higher qualifying strands of education. The longer a child of immigrants has had the chance to be in school before a decision is made about the most suitable track, the higher his/her chances to access pre-academic paths. The following table shows the mean age our respondents entered school and the formal selection age in each country. The situation is most favorable in France, Sweden, and Belgium, where there are 11 to 12 years of common education before any selection is made.

[5] In Antwerp, this is only true for a quarter of second-generation Turks; in Amsterdam: one third.

Table 4: Second-Generation Turks: Years between the Start of Formal Education and Tracking

	Mean age of entering school	Age at track selection	Years of education before selection
Austria	4.9	10	5.1
Belgium	3.0	14	11.0
France	3.1	15	11.9
Germany[6]	4.2	10/12	5.8/7.8
Netherlands	4.0	12	8.0
Sweden	3.1	15	11.9
Switzerland	5.2	12	6.8

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

At the other end, the situation is least favorable in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, which have between five and seven years of common education. This is a rather short period considering that the majority of schools in the German-speaking countries are still half-day schools, which further limits the amount of contact between teachers/educators and children. Finally, compulsory schooling in these countries only starts at age six, meaning that a considerable number of children have been in an educational institution for only four years before having to make the most important decision about their future school careers.

Secondary School

In most countries, the first selection occurs at the end of primary school. The exceptions are France and Belgium, which only select after lower secondary school. In Sweden, selection takes place at the end of *Grundskole* (primary school). The Swedish Grundskole, however, includes the lower part of secondary school.

A. Access to pre-academic tracks

As the following table shows, there is a direct connection between the number of years of education before selection and the shares of second-generation Turks that enter a pre-academic track in lower or upper secondary school.

[6] In Berlin, children are selected two years later than in Frankfurt. But second-generation Turks in Berlin also start school at a slightly later age (4.3 compared to 4.1, on average). The later tracking in Berlin results in only slightly higher numbers (+ 2.1%) of those going to Gymnasium as compared to Frankfurt.

Table 5: Second-Generation Turks: Years of Education before Selection and Percentage in Pre-Academic Tracks

	Years of education before selection	Percentage enrolled in a pre-academic track
Sweden	11.9	56.2
France	11.9	53.6[7]
Belgium	11.0	51.3
Netherlands	8.0	25.6
Germany	5.8/7.8	12.7
Switzerland	6.8	8.2
Austria	5.1	n.a.[8]

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Differences among countries are immense when we look at the share of second-generation Turkish pupils in pre-academic tracks, even though this is partly due to the generally more prominent role of pre-vocational tracks in the German-speaking countries (also for pupils without a migrant background).

The problem is that being steered into separate tracks in lower qualifying schools frequently limits the choices for professional careers afterwards. While in Germany, for example, it is quite common for pupils with an academic access diploma (i.e. Abitur or Fachabitur) to obtain an apprenticeship after finishing school, in practice, a lower vocational diploma is not sufficient even for many apprenticeship positions, and it also closes the door to higher education.

Although the actual value of pre-academic school and higher education diplomas certainly varies across countries (e.g. for entering the job market), in all countries the range of possibilities is higher with a pre-academic diploma than with a lower pre-vocational diploma. This puts the respondents in Sweden, France, and Belgium in a better overall position than their peers in the German-speaking countries.

Summary:

- Starting school at an early age reduces the gap between children with migrant backgrounds and children of natives. Entering kindergarten at the age of two or three seems to be most effective.
- Children of immigrants do better when they are allowed to specialize *later*; in short: the more years between starting school and "selection" (choosing a specialized track) the better.
- Segregated schools can have an additional negative effect, as they limit the probability that a child of immigrants will continue to secondary education. This is, however, not directly dependent on the overall *degree* of segregation in a city.

[7] The results for Strasburg and Paris are quite different here: in Strasburg, 43.2% continued to a pre-academic track, while this was the case for 70.5% of the second-generation Turks in the Paris sample. For Paris, this is in line with the high level of education of the parents (as mentioned above), but even the numbers for Strasburg are well above those in other countries in our survey.

[8] In Austria, 26.6% of the second-generation Turks went to the *Allgemeinbildende Höhere Schule* (AHS), which gives access to both the middle and higher level. For this reason we did not put this number in the table.

B. Drop-out

"Drop-out" is defined in this report as a student who did not receive a secondary-school diploma; so the highest obtained "degree" is from primary school.[9] In most countries, compulsory schooling ends after lower secondary school, which means the percentage of actual drop-outs is small in most countries: around two to three percent of the total survey population. As the following table shows, the only exceptions are France and the Netherlands, where drop-out rates are two to three times as large.

Table 6: Second-Generation Turks: Drop-out* Rates

	Drop-outs as % of the population that left school	Drop-outs as % of total population (incl. still in school)
Austria	5.1% (334)	3.7% (458)
Belgium	1.7% (468)	1.3% (602)
France	9.2% (284)	5.2% (500)
Germany	2.5% (438)	2.5% (438)
Netherlands	11.5% (304)	7.0% (500)
Sweden	3.5% (201)	2.8% (251)
Switzerland	3.2% (277)	1.9% (465)

* Defined as obtaining, at most, a primary-school diploma

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

In the Netherlands, many pupils drop out from the lower vocational track (VMBO) in secondary school. Full compulsory schooling ends at age 16 in the Netherlands, and since a lower vocational diploma can be obtained as early as 16, many pupils in their exam year are not obliged to go to school anymore. This makes age 16 a vulnerable moment for drop-out (one must also consider that puberty is also a factor at this age). Those who fail their exams often do not return to school after the summer holidays. Drop-out from secondary school is more frequent in Rotterdam than in Amsterdam.

In France, the main problem is that many finish Collège without acquiring a diploma. This means that they do not obtain any degree if they do not continue their studies. Both in France and the Netherlands, second-generation Turks frequently attend lower secondary schools that are highly segregated (see below). The educational climate in these schools is frequently not very conducive to school success. The recent French Oscar-award winning film "Entre les Murs" illustrates this point.

By contrast, lower vocational education in the German-speaking countries is very much mainstream and considered less marginal than in the Netherlands. But more importantly, pupils in lower (vocational) education in the German speaking-countries, Belgium, and Sweden can receive their first qualifying diploma as early as age 14 or 15. This means that obtaining a first diploma does not coincide with the end of compulsory schooling. Also, 14 and 15-year-old pupils are somewhat easier

[9] In the Netherlands, Germany, Austria, and Belgium, drop-outs are pupils with primary school as the highest completed level. In Sweden, the definition involves those who did not complete Grundskole and also did not continue into Gymnasium; similarly, in Switzerland it refers to those who did not attain a diploma before completng compulsory education and did not continue with school afterwards. In France, those who did not complete Collège with a diploma and also did not continue to study were counted as drop-outs.

to be kept within the school system than 16 or 17-year-olds. Sweden is an interesting case because primary school and lower secondary school are not separated in different schools. Pupils thus remain in a protected and familiar environment until they successfully finish Grundskole.

C. Early school leavers

The ranking of the countries is different when it comes to early school leavers.[10] Germany and Austria in particular do much worse with early school leaving than what would be expected based on their low drop-out rates.

Table 7: Second-Generation Turks: Early School Leavers*

	Share of early school leavers among those *not* in education (total N)	Share of early school leavers among all respondents (total N)
Austria	33.5% (334)	24.5% (458)
Belgium	10.0% (468)	7.8% (602)
France	24.6% (284)[11]	14.2% (500)
Germany	34.2% (438)	29.7% (505)
Netherlands	48,4% (304)	29.4% (500)
Sweden	11.4% (201)	9.2% (251)
Switzerland	17.3% (277)	10.3% (468)

* Defined as having obtained a lower secondary diploma at most.

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The pupils in *Hauptschule* (lower secondary school) form a particularly vulnerable group in Germany. The majority of them are unable to find an apprenticeship position after completing school, which forces those still under 16 into preparatory classes for vocational training (Berufsvorbereitungsjahr or BVJ). But, if they repeat a class (or start school later, at age seven), they are no longer in compulsory school age when they finish Hauptschule. For these children, BVJ is not attractive, as it is mainly an obligatory "waiting area." About half of the pupils (with or without a diploma) do not continue to study after they finish Hauptschule. Only a small group enters BVJ, or the slightly more prestigious BGJ (Berufsgrundbildungsjahr), as a sort of transition into vocational training in the dual track.

In Austria, *two-thirds* of second-generation Turks go to Hauptschule (twice as many as in Germany). But most of them (63 percent) continue to regular vocational training with an apprenticeship, or pursue the transition track of the Polytechnicum (21 percent). After Polytechnicum, about half of the students stop their education, while the other half move on to regular vocational training. Only one in six students from the Austrian Hauptschule ends their education after this, which is a much smaller share than in Germany. However, since the Austrian group at Hauptschule is twice as big as in Germany, this is still a considerable number of respondents.

[10] Netherlands: max. VMBO diploma; Germany: max. diploma from Hauptschule or Realschule/Mittelstufe Gymnasium/Gesamtschule; Austria: max. AHS Unterstufe; Switzerland: max. compulsory diploma; France: max. diploma of Collège; Sweden: max. Grundskole; Belgium: max. diploma of the first cycle.

[11] In France we again see more early school leavers in Strasburg compared to Paris. The overrepresentation of girls among the early school leavers is also exceptional.

Switzerland also has a majority of second-generation Turks in the vocational column of secondary education, but shows much better results in the transition to vocational training. This is mainly due to a so-called Brückenangebot ("bridging offer"), which organizes the transition from lower vocational education into the dual system of apprenticeships. Although it is also referred to as a "waiting room," it succeeds in its goal of preparing and coaching pupils to enter an apprenticeship position afterwards. Most of the Turkish respondents managed to find and successfully finish an apprenticeship position after having been to the Brückenangebot.

In the Netherlands, many second-generation Turks also fail to make the transition from lower to middle vocational education. The reason here is not the lack of apprenticeship positions, but the weak connection between the two school types: lower vocational education is part of secondary school, while middle vocational education is part of adult education. Also, in the Netherlands early school leaving is a big phenomenon because of drop-out in middle vocational education (either from an apprenticeship position or separate). The causes of drop-out are often related to the lack of adequate preparation for an apprenticeship position among this most vulnerable group.

The Belgian case is interesting because it provides lower and middle vocational education in the same school (BSO), in contrast to the Netherlands. The fact that pupils stay in the same school where teachers know them also seems to help prevent early school leaving.

Summary:

- Drop-out is a more serious problem in countries that end compulsory schooling at the same age that students can acquire a lower secondary diploma. Raising the compulsory school age would probably tighten control over an age group that is difficult to keep in school.
- Segregation in secondary school can result in what is often referred to by the students themselves as 'ghetto schools,' where pupils from poverty-stricken households are grouped together. Desegregation of schools and neighborhoods prevents problems from being concentrated in only some neighborhoods and some schools.
- The transition from lower to middle vocational education or to the dual system is particularly risky for the vulnerable age group of 16 or 17-year-olds. The Swiss "bridging" system of Brückenangebot smoothens and facilitates the transition to the apprenticeship system.
- Combining lower and middle vocational education in one school system also prevents early school leaving.

D. Segregation in secondary school

Surprisingly, the picture of school segregation across the countries is the same in secondary as in primary school, despite the fact that one would expect more segregation in countries with a higher degree of stratification in secondary education. Again, Austria shows the lowest degree of segregation, while the Netherlands show the highest with almost 40 percent of the respondents estimating the share of immigrant children in their secondary schools to be either three quarters or "almost all." France and Sweden also come out as highly segregated. Although all pupils in Paris and Strasburg go to Collèges with the same uniform curriculum, they still mainly attend schools in their own highly segregated neighborhoods. This is also true for the Gymnasium in Sweden.

Table 8: Second-Generation Turks: Share of Children of Immigrants in Secondary School

	Hardly any	ca. 25%	ca. 50%	ca. 75%	almost all	No answer	total
Austria	23.8	41.0	19.9	7.2	3.9	4.1	458
Belgium	5.0	38.9	28.5	21.9	5.5	n.a.	582
France	7.4	28.8	34.2	25.4	2.8	1.4	500
Germany	5.1	38.8	40.4	9.3	1.2	5.1	505
Netherlands	8.2	16.6	31.8	26.0	13.8	3.6	500
Sweden	10.5	26.1	38.2	20.2	4.6	0.4	250
Switzerland	21.2	30.6	28.9	12.5	6.8	n.a.	582

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Generally, segregation in secondary school is most prevalent in the vocational tracks. Yet, interestingly, this too varies across countries: it is most evident in the Netherlands, where half of the second-generation Turks in lower vocational education went to schools with three quarters or more of the pupils being of immigrant descent. By contrast, in the German Hauptschule this is only true for a quarter of the Turkish respondents. In the vocational track BSO in Belgium it applies to a third of the second-generation Turks. The high concentration in neighborhoods in the Netherlands, together with rigorous tracking in secondary school, results in the highest level of segregation in vocational tracks.

The combination of tracking and segregation leads to highly segregated secondary schools in the Netherlands and Belgium. Pupils refer to these schools as "ghetto schools." Comprehensive schools like in France and Sweden, however, do not seem to be the answer to segregation either.

E. School climate

Student performance in secondary school is also influenced by the overall school climate. Does the second generation feel welcome in secondary school or are descendants of immigrants treated as outsiders? In general, the outcomes are positive: two thirds to three quarters of the Turkish respondents answered that they felt just as welcome as any other group. They acknowledge and appreciate the efforts of their teachers to help them fit in. But as the following table shows, two countries seem to stand out in a negative way: Germany and Austria. More than a quarter of respondents in Austria and almost 40 percent in Germany felt "less" or even "much less welcome" than others.

Table 9: Second-Generation Turks: Feeling Welcome in Secondary School

	Much less welcome	Less welcome	Just as welcome	More welcome	Much more welcome	Total
Austria	5.9	21.4	63.1	7.0	2.2	455
Belgium	3.1	17.3	69.4	8.0	2.2	578
France	2.0	20.0	72.9	3.6	1.4	494
Germany	5.9	33.5	58.0	2.2	0.4	505
Netherlands	2.2	13.0	75.6	7.2	2.0	500
Sweden	question not asked					
Switzerland	2.6	19.8	72.5	4.3	0.9	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

We observed the same trend when measuring perceptions of hostility or unfair treatment in school due to ethnic background. Again, about half to three quarters of all respondents state that they "never" or "seldom" experienced hostility or unfair treatment in school. Secondary school is perceived as a safe place to be for the majority of the second generation.

But this does not mean, of course, that second-generation youth have not experienced cases of discrimination. These experiences differ across countries. Again, they are highest in Germany, where more than one in seven second-generation Turkish respondents reports "regular" or even "frequent" unfair treatment or hostility.[12]

Table 10: Second-Generation Turks: Hostility or Unfair Treatment in Secondary School

	Never	Seldom	Occasionally	Regularly	Frequently	Total
Austria	40.4	23.1	21.6	8.3	6.3	458
Belgium	47.8	25.6	19.9	5.2	1.6	579
France	51.2	26.4	14.4	6	1.6	500
Germany	26.1	35	22.8	13.5	2.6	505
Netherlands	58.4	15.8	18.8	4.8	2.2	500
Sweden	question not asked					
Switzerland	49.7	24.9	18.9	3.2	3.2	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

On this topic there is also substantial variation between cities within one country. Most remarkably, in Austria the relatively high percentages mostly result from the negative reports from Linz. In the two German cities the numbers are much closer, but there is a somewhat higher perception of unfair treatment in Frankfurt. France's position in the middle of the list is also the result of the diversity between its two cities, with Strasburg being closer to the situation in the German-speaking countries

[12] According to research on reported discrimination, more highly educated people usually report more discrimination than the low educated. This is not confirmed by our data. For the case of Austria, among those in higher education 17.6 percent state that they felt "less" or "much less" welcome in school, while this was the case for 29.8 percent of respondents who did not enter higher education. In relation to unfair treatment, 3.5 percent of the more highly educated reported regular or frequent unfair treatment, while this was reported by 17.2 percent of the less educated.

than to Paris. Actually, second-generation Turks perceived the school environment in Paris to be the fairest, and in terms of where they "feel welcome," it ranks just after Amsterdam (see Appendix 3).

Higher Education

A. Access to higher education

Another important indicator for school success is the access to higher education.[13] As mentioned above, most second-generation Turks have parents with little or no education. However, one quarter (i.e. 852) of the 3,275 Turkish respondents we interviewed in the seven counties made it into higher education.[14] To enter higher education for the second generation means an enormous step of intergenerational mobility. This is especially true if we compare daughters in higher education with their mothers. A considerable number of second-generation Turkish women in our study who entered higher education came from families with practically illiterate mothers.
As mentioned earlier, there are huge disparities among countries when we look at access to higher education. The rates range from 7.5 percent in Germany to over 50 percent in France – which is an especially stark difference considering that the educational levels of the parents were low in both countries. In three countries – Sweden, Belgium, and Austria – Turkish girls are more likely to enter higher education, while in the Netherlands they are less likely.

Table 11: Turkish Second Generation: Students Who Entered Higher Education

	Austria	Belgium	France[15]	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Percent	19.7	24.2	52	7.5	33.2	35.5	13.8
Numbers	90	145	260	38	166	89	64
total N	458	600	500	505	500	251	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The differences among countries are largely the result of the selection processes in secondary education, as shown above. But the following table shows that there are also some important differences in the numbers of those being in a school track granting the access to higher education and those actually entering higher education institutions later on.

Table 12: Turkish Second Generation: Presence in Pre-Academic Track and Actual Transition to Higher Education

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Pre-Academic track	n.a.	51.30%	53.60%	12.70%	25.60%	56.20%	8.20%
Higher education	19.70%	24.20%	52.00%	7.50%	33.20%	35.50%	13.80%
Difference	n.a.	-27.1	-1.6	-2.3	7.6	-20.7	5.6
Total N	458	600	500	505	500	251	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

[13] This includes academies and (similar) higher vocational education and university.
[14] This is all the students who entered Higher Education (also those who dropped out without a diploma).
[15] Again, there are large differences between Paris and Strasburg. In Paris 63.3 percent of the total sample entered higher education, in Strasburg only 40.8 percent. These numbers are much closer to the figures for Sweden and the Netherlands but still higher than in these two countries.

In Sweden and Belgium, far fewer second-generation Turks enter higher education than what one might expect from the numbers in pre-academic tracks in secondary school. An important reason in Belgium is that many are streamed down from pre-academic into vocational tracks in the second part of secondary school. In both countries, high shares of students who obtained a diploma to access higher education actually do not go to university (or its equivalent). This is different in the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Germany, although at very different levels.[16] In these countries, almost all students with a diploma granting access to higher education also move on to such an institution. Sweden and Belgium seem to lose out on a large potential here.

Most remarkably, in the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Austria we see *more* students in higher education than there were in the pre-academic track. This means that a considerable group of students entered higher education through the vocational column. They often started in the lowest level of vocational education and moved up step by step into higher vocational education (part of tertiary education). In the Netherlands, that path often implies three more years of education than the direct route. In Switzerland and Austria, it is mostly only one year longer. The group that takes the "long route" is particularly interesting, as it is by definition very motivated and determined. It shows that there is an enormous educational drive among many second-generation Turkish students and their parents. The long route mitigates — to some extent — the effects of (too) early selection in these three countries.

In Germany, the "long route" also exists, but hardly anyone in our survey made use of it. This is probably due to the fact that almost all post-secondary steps available to graduates from vocational education primarily focus on bringing the young people into vocational or professional training and employment, rather than stimulating further schooling. In contrast, middle vocational education in the Netherlands is an important springboard towards higher vocational education.

Summary:

- A quarter of second-generation Turks surveyed made it into higher education — a huge accomplishment for both the students and their supportive parents, considering the low socioeconomic background of the first generation. Teachers and the wider society also deserve credit for providing these students with opportunities.
- Policymakers should be aware of the importance of longer or alternative routes to higher education for children of immigrants. Especially in school systems with early selection, the "long route" is a way to provide extra opportunities for the second generation.
- Many second-generation students begin to study at an age when they already have to work to provide an income for themselves or their families. Also, they often lack the academic preparation necessary to succeed in higher education. Higher education institutions should be aware of this (see also the following chapter).

[16] In France, a considerable group enters higher education through the professional Lyceum. At the same time a considerable group does not continue on to higher education from the academic and technical colleges. This results in almost the same percentages going to higher education as were in the pre-academic track.

B. Retention and drop-out in higher education

The TIES data not only provide information about access to higher education, but also about retention. We can distinguish between those still studying, those who have already acquired a diploma, and those who ended their studies without a diploma (dropout from higher education).

Table 13: Turkish Second Generation: Current Status in Higher Education

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Obtained diploma	26.7	35.2	27.7	36.8	28.3	38.2	48.7
Still studying	67.7	42	57.3	52.6	57.2	32.6	42.3
Left w/o diploma	5.6	22.8	15	10.5	14.5	29.2[17]	9.3
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total N	90	145	260	38	166	89	64

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

It is interesting to single out the share of drop-out in each country among the students who already finished higher education. Considering the special efforts necessary for second-generation youth to make it into higher education against all odds (due to the low socioeconomic position of their parents), the overall rate of one third who stumble at the last hindrance is indeed preoccupying.

Table 14: Turkish Second Generation: Share of Drop-Out among Those Who Finished Higher Education

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Nether-lands	Sweden	Switzerland
Drop-out in %	17.2	39.3	35.1	22.2	33.8	43.3*	16.2%
Drop-out in N	5	33	39	4	24	26	6
Total N of ex-students	29	84	111	18	71	60	37

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Interestingly, drop-out rates are particularly high in countries that have high *entrance* rates into higher education. Higher education institutions probably act as a step in the "selection" process, which in other countries primarily takes place in secondary education. This especially affects the children of immigrants.

Summary:

- Drop-out in higher education is a serious problem across Europe. This is all the more serious for second-generation Turks because this group showed the potential to succeed. From the perspective of both society and the emancipation of the Turkish community,

[17] Of the surveyed students who indicated that they were in Higher Education in Sweden for less than three years, we do not know if they acquired a BA. We have put them in the drop-out category here, but it is likely that some of them have a higher education certificate.

highly educated people play a pivotal role in advancing the situation of the Turkish group as a whole.

- Higher education institutions should operate on the assumption that those who enter higher education deserve to be there, and thus focus their policies on retention (implementing measures to keep students aboard, such as extra guidance and mentoring), rather than selecting them out.

Support: Parents, Siblings, and Homework Projects

In line with what we stated earlier, this section is not so much about the background characteristics of the Turkish parents, but about what schools can expect from them and the immigrant families.

A. Parents

There are two widespread clichés about Turkish parents among teachers: that most Turkish parents are not supportive or not engaged in the school success of their children, and that they cannot help their children with homework. As the following table shows, the first cliché is not supported by the survey. The majority states that their parents' support has been important or very important for them. Mothers and fathers are considered almost equally important. Only a minority expresses that their parents were not supportive. This minority, however, is usually larger than in the comparison group. Maybe this smaller group disproportionately influences teachers' images of Turkish immigrant families?

Table 15: Turkish Second Generation: Importance of Support by Mothers

	Not at all important	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Missing	Total N
Austria	14.6	18.6	21.2	27.3	11.4	7.0	458
Belgium	question not asked						
France	24.2	16.0	13.8	23.4	21.2	1.4	500
Germany	14.1	17.8	14.7	22.8	28.9	1.8	505
Netherlands	6.4	7.4	14.2	30.2	39.8	2.0	500
Sweden	8.8	3.8	10.9	32.4	43.3	0.8	238
Switzerland	21.9	23.7	12.5	18.9	13.5	9.5	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Table 16: Turkish Second Generation: Importance of Support by Fathers

	Not at all important	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Missing	Total N
Austria	13.3	17.2	18.6	29.9	11.6	9.4	458
Belgium	question not asked						
France	24.4	16.8	18.6	19.8	18.2	2.2	500
Germany	6.9	14.3	17.2	24.8	35.0	1.8	505
Netherlands	7.6	11.0	16.4	29.2	30.2	5.6	500
Sweden	11.8	3.8	12.2	29.4	39.1	3.8	238
Switzerland	20.9	25.6	14.0	17.6	11.2	10.8	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

If we look at the effect of support on school outcomes, it is basically the same in all countries: respondents performing well in school also stated that their parents were more supportive. Students in the Netherlands who took the long route to higher education especially stated that their parents were important.

The second cliché (about practical help with homework) *does* seem to hold true. The majority of Turkish parents were unable to help their children with homework. Between half to three quarters "never" or "rarely" helped their children with homework; this is something which most first-generation parents simply could not provide.

Table 17: Turkish Second Generation: Parents' Help with Homework

	Frequently	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Missing	Total N
Austria	8.5	16.6	26.0	27.7	20.7	5.4	458
Belgium	question not asked						
France	4.6	5.8	15.6	20.0	53.0	1.0	500
Germany	1.4	11.3	27.1	30.1	29.5	0.6	505
Netherlands	2.6	9.5	19.5	19.3	49.1	0.0	493
Sweden	1.7	7.1	19.7	21.8	49.6	0.0	236
Switzerland	5.2	7.7	22.4	22.4	34.4	8.0	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

B. Siblings

In the discussion about family resources, usually only the support of parents is considered. In immigrant families, however, older siblings often play a pivotal role: they already had to find their way in school and they had the same subjects to learn. Sometimes older siblings practically take over the guiding role from the parents in school matters – especially if they reached a high level of

education themselves. This support by elder sisters or brothers was "important" or "very important" for around half of the respondents in all countries (except Austria).

Table 18: Turkish Second Generation: Importance of Support of Siblings

	Not at all important	Not important	Somewhat important	Important	Very important	Missing	Total N
Austria	34.1	25.1	21.4	11.6	7.9	0.2	268
Belgium	question not asked						
France	14.9	15.6	23.7	24.0	21.8	0.0	308
Germany	5.6	15.8	33.4	32.0	13.2	0.0	341
Netherlands	6.7	11.9	21.0	32.2	23.2	4.9	328
Sweden	25.0	12.7	18.2	27.1	15.7	1.3	236
Switzerland	11.8	15.9	18.0	29.4	24.9	0.0	245

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Table 19: Turkish Second Generation: Siblings' Help with Homework

	Frequently	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Missing	Total N
Austria	17.3	27.3	25.8	14.4	15.1	0.4	273
Belgium	8.2	16.7	21.5	16.2	37.5	0.0	587
France	14.2	12.9	26.8	14.9	24.2	6.9	302
Germany	10.6	24.6	41.9	17.6	5.3	0.0	341
Netherlands	5.9	17.1	30.8	15.5	30.8	0.0	328
Sweden	question not asked						
Switzerland	14.3	14.7	35.2	15.6	20.1	0.0	244

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

C. Homework projects

We asked the respondents if they had sought outside help with their homework during secondary education from a "homework project," a service organized either by the city or by community volunteers to help children with their homework. As Table 20 shows, the outcomes differ a lot across cities. In principle this could mean three things: (a) some cities are more active on this than others; (b) migrant and other organizations are more active in some cities; or (c) second-generation Turks in one city more easily found access to these projects than in other cities.

Table 20: Turkish Second Generation: Homework Support in Secondary Education (in percent)

Paris	16.9	**Strasburg**	7.5
Amsterdam	15.2	**Rotterdam**	17.9
Vienna	12.3	**Linz**	32.0
Zurich	11.3	**Basel**	23.8
Berlin	21.2	**Frankfurt**	14.0
Brussels	question not asked	**Antwerp**	question not asked
Stockholm	16.0		

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The city of Linz shows by far the highest attendance (32 percent). The lowest is in Strasburg, with 7.5 percent. In some cities, like Amsterdam, we know that Turkish and Moroccan community organizations have set up a network of projects across the city to help children with their homework. The organizations SKC and De Witte Tulp alone already gave guidance to over two thousand pupils in Amsterdam.

Summary:

- The support of parents is mostly social-emotional and not practical. Teachers should focus more on this aspect rather than on what parents are not able to do. They need to reach out to parents more effectively and find ways for schools to make use of their support.
- Schools should also be aware of the important role of older siblings. Institutionalized mentoring projects (where mentors are higher education students of migrant descent) provide a similar sort of support to children of immigrants in secondary school. In the Netherlands, about a hundred similarly structured projects support a few thousand children of immigrants.

Transition to the Labor Market

This section takes a look at the transition to the labor market of those respondents who are not in full-time education anymore. This is a somewhat artificial dividing line. Many full-time students already have a part-time job, and many full-time students worked part-time in an apprenticeship while in school. For many respondents, going on the job market after finishing full-time studies is therefore not their first labor market experience.

Situation after Finishing Education

Table 21 presents the situation of second-generation immigrants right after they complete their education. The table is split by cities, as the labor market situations differ substantially from city to city within the same country.

Table 21: Turkish Second Generation: Situation Immediately after Finishing Education (in percent of those not in education)

	Immediately found a job	Odd jobs	Family business	Unemployed, looking for job	Unemployed, *not* looking for job	Family/ children	Community/ Military service	Total N
Paris	27.7	15.4	4.6	36.9	6.2	2.3	6.9	130
Strasburg	29.0	16.4	3.3	31.1	9.8	0.0	10.4	183
Amsterdam	41.5	12.9	2.1	19.1	14.4	9.0	1.1	188
Rotterdam	51.8	9.9	2.1	23.6	5.8	6.3	0.5	191
Vienna	30.4	5.8	1.0	19.9	11.0	19.9	12.0	191
Linz	16.2	14.6	3.8	23.8	6.5	27.6	7.6	185
Zurich	66.0	6.3	1.6	11.0	7.9	5.2	2.1	191
Basel	56.4	5.6	3.0	18.8	6.4	9.0	0.9	234
Berlin	19.7	5.5	5.1	23.6	15.7	26.8	3.5	254
Frankfurt	20.0	3.8	10.8	37.5	5.0	20.0	2.9	240
Antwerp	68.9	not asked	0.4	25.6	2.4	2.8	not asked	254
Brussels	57.4	not asked	1.4	35.1	3.4	2.7	not asked	148
Stockholm	67.8	0.5	2.5	15.3	6.4	2.0	5.4	202

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The percentage of second-generation immigrants who immediately found some sort of employment ranges from 16 percent in Linz (as compared to almost one third in Vienna), to two thirds in Antwerp, Stockholm, and Zurich. On the other side, unemployment is particularly high in Paris, Strasburg, Frankfurt, and Brussels (more than one third), followed by Berlin, Antwerp, and Rotterdam (around one quarter).

Yet, the unemployment rates of respondents who are actually looking for a job do not inversely match with the employed. Especially interesting are the inactivity rates here, particularly those respondents who dedicate themselves to family and children – which almost exclusively refers to female respondents. Again, the percentage range is immense: from below 3 percent in France, Belgium, and Sweden to between 20 and 25 percent in Germany and Austria. Considering that these numbers include both sexes, this means that around a third of the Turkish second-generation young women in these two countries did not look for a job after finishing education.

Current Situation

The table above refers to the first couple of months on the job market. For those who were looking for a job, we actually find surprisingly short periods of transition: in most cities, close to 90 percent found their first job within six months. Therefore, a couple of years later, when looking at the current situation at the time of the interview, the picture changed: unemployment rates went down significantly, especially in the French cities and in Frankfurt. Self-employment or running one's own business is highest in Belgium (15 percent in Brussels) and lowest in Germany. One transition strategy is to work in a family business, as the comparison between tables 21 and 22 shows, but this is not very relevant in our sample. Contrary to widespread ideas about the relevance of Turkish business creating job opportunities for youth of Turkish descent, for the second generation in our researched cities this aspect is no more than marginal (below 2 percent).

Table 22a: Turkish Second Generation: Current Labor Situation (Part I: on the job market)

	One or more jobs	Own business	Family business	Work and study	Apprentice-ship	Unemployed, looking for job
Paris	53.4	3.4	0.6	16.2	6.1	10.8
Strasburg	57.5	4.1	0.5	8.8	1.0	14.5
Amsterdam	43.3	5.3	1.9	16.3	7.7	10.6
Rotterdam	49.3	3.5	0.9	15.0	4.4	11.5
Vienna	44.9	3.3	0.9	6.1	4.2	13.1
Linz	58.2	5.3	0.6	13.5	5.3	8.8
Zurich	58.9	3.6	0.0	7.1	17.8	8.6
Basel	54.6	4.4	1.3	7.5	21.6	3.5
Berlin	59.1	1.7	0.0	1.3	0.8	15.6
Frankfurt	57.5	1.3	3.9	0.4	8.2	8.6
Antwerp	55.2	10.3	0.0	1.4	1.7	15.2
Brussels	45.1	14.5	0.5	2.6	3.6	25.9
Stockholm	71.0	8.1	0.0	7.1	0.0	8.6

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Table 22b: Current Labor Situation (Part II: not on the job market)

	Unemployed, *not* looking for job	Family/ children	Sick/ disabled	Community/ Military service	Total N
Paris	1.4	7.4	0.7	n.a	148
Strasburg	3.1	9.3	1.0	n.a	193
Amsterdam	1.0	11.1	2.9	n.a.	208
Rotterdam	2.6	10.1	2.6	n.a.	227
Vienna	6.5	17.8	0.9	2.3	214
Linz	1.8	5.9	0.6	0.0	170
Zurich	1.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	197
Basel	1.3	4.0	1.8	0.4	227
Berlin	7.2	13.5	0.4	0.4	237
Frankfurt	3.4	16.7	0.0	0.0	233
Antwerp	4.8	6.9	4.5	0.0	290
Brussels	2.1	4.7	1.0	0.0	193
Stockholm	1.0	3.3	0.5	0.5	210

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Interestingly, the percentage of women looking after children or taking care of the family in Austria and Germany is a lot lower than it was immediately after finishing education. This probably means that respondents either took care of family members (but not necessarily their own children) or they returned to the labor market when children had reached kindergarten age.

Second-generation Turks are concentrated in most countries in apprenticeships and vocationally oriented school tracks. At the same time, for this level of education the risks of unemployment are higher than for the better educated. The following table compares the unemployment figures of second-generation Turks and the Comparison Group with native-born parents, both at the educational level of an apprenticeship diploma or similar. We only looked at those who are actively looking for a job.

Table 23: Second-Generation Turks and Comparison Group: Percentage of Unemployed among Those with an Apprenticeship Diploma or Similar

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Second-generation Turks	11,6	28.9	19.6	8.3	9.6	6.3	16.2
Comparison group	4.3	26.4	12.0	10.1	3.3	2.3	14.3

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

In all countries except for Germany, the level of unemployment is higher among the Turkish second generation than among the group of native-born parentage. The difference is between one and a half and three times as high. In Germany, as discussed earlier, the main problem for second-generation Turks is to get into the apprenticeship system. But once they have found and successfully finished an apprenticeship, their job chances seem to be the same. The unemployment level for second-generation Turks with only a Hauptschul-diploma is three times higher than for those who finished an apprenticeship (and almost twice as high as Comparison Group members with only a Hauptschul-diploma).

Unfair Treatment in Job Search

The numbers above indicate that second-generation Turks do not get offered the same chances for labor market integration as their peers of non-migrant background – even if they have the same level of qualification. This is particularly the case for those with vocational diplomas and training, and it is most likely not a coincidence that this relatively low-educated group complained the most about unfair treatment when seeking employment.

Our last topic is about the experiences of unfair treatment because of one's ethnic background while looking for a job. About half of the second generation Turkish respondents state that they "never" experienced hostility or unfair treatment while looking for a job, and only a small minority reports "regular" or "frequent" experiences of discrimination on the basis of their ethnic background. Obviously, the motivation behind unfair treatment is not always clear-cut or easy to identify. Therefore, these numbers may in part reflect the *interpretation* of certain experiences.

The following table shows a lot of variation across cities, but the overall trends are similar to those described above in the domain of education. Reports of unfair treatment on the labor market are highest in Strasburg and Frankfurt, while Amsterdam and Zurich come out with the lowest numbers.

Table 24: Turkish Second Generation: Experiences of Unfair Treatment on the Job Market

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly	Frequently	Total N
Paris	59.6	21.3	10.6	5.7	2.8	141
Strasburg	45.6	17.6	17.6	13.7	5.5	182
Amsterdam	62.4	15.4	13.1	5.4	3.6	221
Rotterdam	50.9	18.0	20.6	7.5	3.1	228
Vienna	48.4	21.0	21.5	6.7	2.2	223
Linz	32.0	33.5	23.2	7.7	3.6	194
Zurich	62.0	21.6	10.3	2.3	3.8	213
Basel	61.9	20.2	12.7	2.8	2.4	252
Berlin	42.0	30.2	18.0	8.2	1.6	255
Frankfurt	37.2	29.6	21.6	9.2	2.4	250
Antwerp	50.7	16.8	19.9	9.4	3.1	286
Brussels	42.3	26.4	19.4	9.9	2.0	201

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Although the respondents in all cities overwhelmingly state they have not suffered this kind of experience, it is not an uncommon phenomenon. Between one third and two thirds of the respondents believe they have been in situations in which they have received unfair treatment because of being Turkish or "foreign." Even if it happened only once or twice in their lives, the psychological effects might be long-lasting and affect individual feelings of belonging and trust to the place around which their everyday life is centered.

Summary:

- In general, our second-generation Turkish respondents do not report a lot of unfair treatment while looking for a job (though the lower-educated respondents report more incidents).
- However, when we compare this group to their native peers with the same educational levels, we find that unfair treatment affects this group especially hard. Antidiscrimination policies should target jobs in these sectors.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Sampling in the TIES Survey

Sampling procedures for the TIES survey had to be done differently from country to country due to large differences in the availability of – or access to – reliable register data. Also, the researched second-generation groups are of quite different size in the different cities, therefore, specific efforts were necessary to meet the targeted minimum numbers as shown in the table above.

Sampling in the Netherlands was based on the data of the population register GBA. A representative selection of possible respondents could be drawn directly from the register, because it contains all relevant information (in particular, the birthplace of the parents). Non-response rates were quite high, as is quite common for this type of research in the Netherlands.

Stockholm (Sweden) and Antwerp (Belgium) were the only other cities where the sampling could also be done directly from the registers. In other countries either the registers do not contain all of the necessary information (especially place of birth of the parents), or there simply are no registers (almost) completely covering the population of a city. In Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, the only recorded reference to Turkish or Yugoslavian backgrounds in city registers is nationality, which would, of course, have added a serious bias to the sample because of excluding all naturalized persons. Therefore, the additional selection method of onomastic analysis (name recognition) had to be applied. The registers of the cities provided all the names of the 18 to 35-year-old age-group born in Austria, Germany, or Switzerland, respectively. Then the onomastic analysis, executed by a specialized bureau in Germany, could identify people bearing a Turkish and a Yugoslavian name (96% hit ratio). Representative samples were drawn from the resulting lists.

The onomastic analysis was also applied in the two French cities and in Brussels (Belgium). In France there were no reliable registers available. The sampling here was based on telephone directories, from which Turkish names could be identified. In a subsequent step, pre-screening by telephone identified those belonging to the target group by age and generational status. Due to the costs of this more complex procedure, no second group of descendants from immigrants was sampled. In Brussels, street segments according to the proportion of target-group members living there were sampled (on the basis of the Census), then addresses were selected within street segments using name recognition and screening to identify the target population.

Despite the differences, the end result is a unique dataset for second-generation Turks, Moroccans, and ex-Yugoslavs. In Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and France, the second generation has never earlier been identified in such a way, especially including the naturalized. Therefore, there are hardly any national datasets with really comparable data. It is also important to stress that the TIES dataset covers an important part of the target-group population in the sampled cities, while in national surveys the actual numbers for the selection criteria "born in the country" and age-group 18-35 are generally very small. In smaller cities, such as Linz, Basle, and Strasbourg, the TIES survey even reached comparatively large shares of the total target population.

Appendix 2: Background Characteristics of the Turkish Parents

The first table analyzes the fathers' main reasons for migrating and shows very similar results in six out of seven countries: a vast majority (around two thirds) of the fathers came as labor migrants. The second and third most mentioned reasons are family reunion and marriage. The exception is Sweden, which has far fewer labor migrants and cited being a refugee or asylum seeker as the second most important reason.

Table 25: Second-Generation Turks: Most Important Reason for Migration of the Father

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Marriage	2.2	6.3	0.4	1.6	5.8	14.2	6.9
Family reunion	10.9	18.1	2.0	10.9	17.4	15.8	11.8
Family formation	1.1	2.3	0.2	1.2	3.0	3.6	1.3
Work	57.4	63.5	33.2	54.1	62.2	34.0	43.7
Study	3.1	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.8	2.0	2.2
Asylum seeker	2.2	1.0	0.6	5.7	1.8	16.6	3.9
Other	2.0	4.5	0.8	5.3	5.4	9.5	3.9
Missing/not known	21.2	2.3	61.2	20.4	3.6	4.3	26.5
Total (N)	458	602	500	505	500	253	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The following table confirms the idea that Turkish labor immigrants mostly came from rural areas. Asylum seekers in Sweden also mostly come from the countryside. This is mainly due to high numbers of Kurdish refugees from villages in Eastern Turkey.

Table 26: Second-Generation Turks: Residence of the Father until His Age 15

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Village	35.8	43.5	46.6	39.6	49.6	53.4	43.2
Town	46.5	24.8	26.8	38.4	24.4	24.5	34.6
City	17.0	22.1	26.0	18.4	25.2	20.2	21.1
Missing	0.7	9.6	0.6	3.6	0.8	2.0	1.1
Total (N)	458	602	500	505	500	253	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

This overall picture is confirmed by the levels of education of the fathers and mothers. The following table shows high percentages of fathers with only elementary or Koran school education in all countries. Yet, there are remarkable differences too: in Germany, the level of education is particularly low, with between half and two thirds of the respondents' fathers having attended no higher school than elementary and corresponding low numbers for secondary and higher education. In Austria, by contrast, almost two thirds of the father had gone to secondary or even higher education. This is also true for Switzerland, but to a smaller degree.

Table 27: Second-Generation Turks: Highest Level of Education Attained by the Father

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Elementary school	29.1	43.5	47.0	60.2	46.2	47.8	34.0
Secondary education	50.2	40.6	39.5	20.2	35.0	30.6	46.7
Postsec. + Tertiary	15.9	7.1	9.2	1.0	6.2	13.6	10.1
Missing	4.8	8.8	4.4	18.6	12.6	8.0	9.2
Total (N)	458	602	500	505	500	251	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

As would be expected, the level of education of the mothers is generally lower than the fathers', as the following table shows. But in Sweden this is not the case: almost half of the fathers, but only one third of the mothers, has attended only primary education or Koran lessons. In Austria and the Netherlands, the differences between mothers and fathers are particularly high, while in Germany these differences are rather small. Nonetheless, Germany has the highest shares of very low-educated mothers.

Table 28: Second-Generation Turks: Highest Level of Education Attained by the Mother

	Austria	Belgium	France	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden	Switzerland
Elementary school	50.0	54.1	57.0	64.3	61.2	34.2	48.4
Secondary education	38.0	36.8	33.6	22.0	24.2	53.0	43.7
Postsec. + Tertiary	6.1	2.5	5.8	0.4	3.6	8.4	4.7
Missing	5.9	6.5	3.6	13.3	11.2	4.4	3.2
Total (N)	458	602	500	505	500	251	465

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Appendix 3: Tables on City Outcomes

Table 29: Second-Generation Turks: Share of Children of Immigrants in Primary School[18]

	hardly any	ca. 25%	ca. 50%	ca. 75%	almost all	don't know	total
Paris	7,3	29.0	35.9	19.0	2.0	4.4	100
Strasburg	20.2	38.9	25.4	11.5	1.6	2.4	100
Amsterdam	11.8	19.8	29.5	21.1	13.1	4.6	100
Rotterdam	11.8	19.8	24.3	22.1	21.3	0.8	100
Vienna	18.7	45.6	23.4	5.6	2.8	4.0	100
Linz	28.2	45.1	14.1	4.4	1.9	6.3	100
Zurich	16.9	40.8	27.7	8.0	2.3	4.2	100
Basel	26.2	35.3	24.2	9.5	4.0	0.8	100
Berlin	3.1	38.8	40.4	9.0	2.0	6.7	100
Frankfurt	6.4	37.2	39.6	6.4	1.2	9.2	100
Antwerp	10.2	39.7	25.2	16.7	8.2	n.a.	100
Brussels	2.2	23.1	29.7	36.6	8.3	n.a.	100

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

[18] For Belgium, the deviant answer category "less than 25%" is added to the category "approximately 25%" and the deviant answer category " more than 75%" is added to the category "approximately 75%."

Table 30: Second-Generation Turks: Experienced Hostility or Unfair Treatment in Secondary School

	frequently	regularly	occasionally	seldom	never	missing	total
Paris	0.4	2.0	11.3	25.0	60.5	0.8	100
Strasburg	2.8	9.9	17.5	27.8	42.1	0.0	100
Amsterdam	2.5	4.6	17.7	19.0	56.1	0.0	100
Rotterdam	1.9	4.9	19.8	12.9	60.5	0.0	100
Vienna	5.6	6.0	17.5	18.3	52.8	0.0	100
Linz	7.3	11.2	26.7	29.1	25.2	0.5	100
Zurich	2.8	2.8	15.0	23.5	55.9	0.0	100
Basel	3.6	3.6	22.2	26.2	44.4	0.0	100
Berlin	2.7	12.9	19.6	34.9	29.8	0.0	100
Frankfurt	2.4	14.0	26.0	35.2	22.4	0.0	100
Antwerp	1.7	5.5	17.8	22.7	52.3	0.0	100
Brussels	1.3	4.8	22.9	29.9	41.1	0.0	100

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Table 31: Second-Generation Turks: Perceived Degree of Welcome of Second Generation Compared to Comparison Group

	much less welcome	less welcome	just as welcome	more welcome	much more welcome	missing	total
Paris	0.8	12.5	80.2	3.2	1.2	2.0	100
Strasburg	3.2	27.0	63.9	4.0	1.6	0.4	100
Amsterdam	1.7	9.7	78.9	7.2	2.5	0.0	100
Rotterdam	2.7	16.0	72.6	7.2	1.5	0.0	100
Vienna	4.4	17.5	74.6	2.0	1.2	0.4	100
Linz	7.8	26.7	48.1	13.1	3.4	1.0	100
Zurich	2.3	15.0	77.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	100
Basel	2.8	23.8	68.7	3.2	1.6	0.0	100
Berlin	5.5	32.2	58.8	3.1	0.4	0.0	100
Frankfurt	6.4	34.8	57.2	1.2	0.4	0.0	100
Antwerp	2.3	13.0	74.1	8.6	2.0	0.0	100
Brussels	4.3	23.8	62.3	6.9	2.6	0.0	100

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

List of Tables