



The Integration of the European Second Generation

TIES Policy Brief

The Second Generation in Europe Education and the Transition to the Labour Market

Maurice Crul & Jens Schneider

Funded by



CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Summary and policy recommendations | 2 |
| 1. Introduction | |
| <i>What is TIES?</i> | 4 |
| <i>The TIES survey in seven European countries</i> | 5 |
| 2. Background characteristics of the parents | 7 |
| 3. School careers and education of second generation Turks | |
| 3.1 Kindergarten and Primary School | |
| <i>Starting age schooling</i> | 8 |
| <i>Segregation in primary school</i> | 9 |
| <i>Age of selection</i> | 10 |
| 3.2 Secondary school | |
| <i>Access to pre-academic tracks</i> | 11 |
| <i>Drop-out</i> | 13 |
| <i>Early school leavers</i> | 14 |
| <i>Segregation in secondary school</i> | 15 |
| <i>School climate</i> | 16 |
| 3.3 Higher Education | |
| <i>Access to higher education</i> | 18 |
| <i>Retention and drop-out in higher education</i> | 20 |
| 3.4 Support: parents, siblings, and homework projects | |
| <i>Parents</i> | 21 |
| <i>Siblings</i> | 23 |
| <i>Homework projects</i> | 24 |
| 4. Transition to the Labour Market | |
| <i>Situation after finishing education</i> | 25 |
| <i>Current situation</i> | 26 |
| <i>Unfair treatment in job search</i> | 27 |
| Appendix 1: Sampling in the TIES survey | 29 |
| Appendix 2: Background characteristics of the Turkish parents | 30 |
| Appendix 3: Tables on city outcomes | 32 |
| List of Tables | 34 |
| Contact Details | 35 |

Summary and policy recommendations

The TIES survey is unique in the sense that it compares one group (second generation Turks) in 13 cities in seven European countries. Since the starting position of this group is very much comparable with regard to the predominantly rural origins and low levels of schooling of the parents, this approach brings the effects of systemic differences and integration policies into focus. This is particularly salient in the fields of education and labour. The comparison across countries (and cities) allows identifying what works (better) and what does not.

School system

There is a direct relationship between the attained levels of education of children of immigrants and the years they spent together with peers with native-born parents. Two parameters mainly have an influence here:

- § Starting school at an early age reduces the gap to the children of non-migrant background. Entering kindergarten at the age of two or three seems to be most effective.
- § Late selection provides the best conditions for doing justice to the talents among children of immigrants; in short: the more years between entering education and the selection into different tracks the better.
- § Segregated schools can have an additional negative effect.

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 streamed into higher secondary education or into vocational training/apprenticeships. Moreover, at this age the rates of pupils leaving school without any diploma increases strongly.

- § 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 streamed into apprenticeships or into preparatory tracks smoothing and facilitating the transition to the apprenticeship system.
- § Combining lower and middle vocational education in the same school also prevents early school leaving.
- § Especially in school systems with early selection longer or alternative routes to higher education are important for providing needed extra opportunities for children of immigrants.

Higher education

- § A quarter of the second generation Turks made it into higher education – a huge accomplishment of both the second generation and their supportive parents considering the low socio-economic background of the parents.
- § Drop-out in higher education is a serious problem across Europe – especially since this group showed the potential to succeed. The indirect routes to higher education frequently do not provide sufficient academic preparation to succeed in higher education.

- § 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; their starting point must be that those who entered higher education earned their presence there. They should implement measures for keeping students aboard (e.g. with 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, performing many of the tasks of parents in non-migrant families. Mentoring projects with higher education students (of migrant descent) as mentors provide effective support to children of immigrants in secondary schools.

Labour market and discrimination

- § As much in school as when looking for a job a clear majority of second generation Turkish respondents states to never have experienced hostility or unfair treatment.
- § Yet, a substantial minority in all countries *do* have had experiences with these kinds of treatment at least occasionally. The comparison with their non-Turkish peers at the same educational level indicates that the problem hits this group hard, especially the lower educated. Explicit anti-discrimination policies should be implemented to 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.

Workshops on the conference target these points and present good practice examples from all over Europe!

Corresponding workshops are indicated below for each chapter!

1. Introduction

What is TIES?

The TIES project is a collaborative and comparative survey on the descendants of immigrants from Turkey, 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 where their parents (or one of them) 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 labour migration experienced by all western and northern European countries since the 1960s.

The centrepiece of the project is a first systematic and rigorously common European dataset on these issues – relevant not only for a better general understanding of integration processes among children of immigrants, but also for the development of policies at all levels of government. The data collection for this dataset includes almost 10,000 face-to-face interviews and has been finished in 2008. 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.¹

One main interest of the TIES project is to address issues of *structural integration* by comparing the educational and labour 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 analyse 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.

Another important difference of TIES to previous international surveys is to not only record the final outcomes of education or labour market transition, but to look at full educational trajectories and professional career development. This makes it possible to reconstruct the most important selection- and transition-points in trajectories, and to relate them to the institutional arrangements in the different cities and countries. In the field of education, the following particular questions are addressed:

¹ The TIES survey was carried out by survey bureaus under 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 [CEIFOR], 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.

- § 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 or the way in which labour market transition is organised in the different national and local contexts?

The TIES project will also give insights in other important domains of life like social relations, identities or religion. While posing new and original research questions, the TIES project is also policy-oriented. Answers to the questions are therefore also addressing their policy implications and possible societal consequences.

The TIES survey in Sweden, Germany, Belgium, France, Austria and Switzerland

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 with one or both parents being born in Turkey, 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 neighbourhoods or city areas as the respondents from the three second generation groups.²

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 fifteen cities makes it possible to compare descendents from the same ethno-national background and starting posi-

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

tions. Interviews used the same questionnaire in all countries with cross-checked translations into national languages.

Country- and city-specific aspects were particularly included as refers to the different school systems. Differently from most international comparative surveys, the interviews recorded educational careers and steps in the country- or city-specific logic and terms. Only afterwards the different school types and levels were additionally coded into a newly developed international coding system for cross-country comparisons. This parallel of the educational codes allows 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) but without compromising our aim to select a representative population (see Appendix 1). For the first time both naturalised as well as non naturalised 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 generalising 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 is executed in fifteen large European cities. We have chosen for 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 effects or specific characteristics of the Turkish communities effected outcomes differently. Yet, in most countries differences between the cities are 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 the tables are mostly operating with the country names as labels 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 organised 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.

We will focus in this policy brief on second generation Turks. The main goal in the TIES project is to look at the importance of 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 favourable or less favourable school circumstances in each country. We do not want to disregard the characteristics of the parents but our design especially 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.³

The idea of the policy brief is to give policy makers, NGOs and practitioners an overview of the main TIES results in the main areas of education. This also serves as background information for the themes of the conference workshops.

2. Background characteristics of the parents of the Turkish respondents

An important departure point of the TIES project design is the hypothesis that the background situation of second generation Turks of a particular age group is actually comparable across different European countries. One of the most central elements to test this hypothesis are the background characteristics of the parents. We analysed these characteristics in three domains: reason for migration, rural versus urban origin and the level of education of both parents.

Two thirds of the fathers came as labour migrants. The second and third most mentioned reasons are family reunion and marriage. The exception is Sweden with much less labour migrants and being a refugee or asylum seeker as the second most important reason. 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 for more detailed information Appendix 2). Based on the background characteristics of the parents we would expect the second generation to fare a bit better in Austria, Switzerland and Sweden.

In general the Turkish parents are comparable in the two cities within each country. The exception is France: in Paris the Turkish parents are significantly higher educated than in Strasbourg. There is considerable group of professionals there (one in eight) whose children also do very well in school. The Turkish parents in the Strasbourg sample are more like the Turkish first generation in the other survey cities. As a consequence, we will especially indicate in the tables, if there are considerable differences between Paris and Strasbourg.

³ 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 labour 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 neighbourhoods as where the second generation is living. This makes the international comparison more diverse, because the social characteristics of these neighbourhoods are very different, sometimes featuring a highly educated native group and sometimes a predominantly low status group.

3. School careers and education of second generation Turks

In order to be able to compare the educational outcomes of second generation Turks across the different countries, but also to look for possible explanations for differences found, we look at the structural characteristics of the different systems, i.e. the institutional arrangements for organising access to and selection in education.

3.1 Kindergarten and Primary School

Starting age schooling

The systems in the German-speaking countries are characterised by a relatively late entrance into educational institutions. As the following table shows, the mean age was 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, while in the Netherlands they are in-between. Sweden is the country with the widest range in the entrance age: some children went to *Barne* at a very early age, but others stayed home until the beginning of compulsory schooling at the age of six. The mean age is three.⁴

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 the starting ages have strong effects on the further educational trajectories in the different countries. 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 or Austria they entered education two years later, being already fluent in Turkish, but with more difficulty to learn German as a second language.

Similarly to Sweden, there is a lot of variation in the starting age in the German speaking countries, which is mostly due to visiting kindergarten or not. Strikingly, visiting a kindergarten or not had a strong effect on the later educational careers of the respondents. Those who visited kindergarten in average make a better chance to go to *Gymnasium* afterwards. In Germany children were four times more likely to enter *Gymnasium* when they went to kindergarten as compared to those who did not. In

⁴ The reader should take into account that the starting age of schooling of our 18-35 year old sample reflects the situation in kindergarten and primary school in the 1980s.

Switzerland not one Turkish respondent in our survey made it to *Gymnasium* without being in kindergarten before.

The systemic differences in the starting ages are bigger between countries than between cities – despite different school systems within one country (e.g. Switzerland, Germany). Only in Austria there is a remarkable difference: second generation Turks in Linz went to kindergarten 1.5 times more often than their peers in Vienna.

See conference workshop 5 on pre-school and kindergarten and second language learning!

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 percentage of immigrant children versus majority group members in primary schools is an additional important factor.

The following table looks at the shares of pupils with an immigrant background when the respondents were in primary education. In all countries most respondents estimated the shares 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% 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% and 14.7% 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 in the Netherlands school segregation is so high on the political agenda.⁵ In general, primary schools tend to be more segregated in the biggest city compared to the smaller city within one country, where the overall smaller numbers of immigrant communities make concentrations more difficult.

⁵ 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 neighbourhoods). 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 organisations), which is without a parallel in the German-speaking countries.

It is in the cities of Rotterdam and Brussels where second generation Turks visited 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!⁶ In Paris a quarter of the second generation Turks went to such highly segregated schools while Strasbourg with only 4 percent 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 more favourable situation exists in the German speaking countries. This is for a large part the result of less segregation in the housing situation and the neighbourhoods in these countries.

The basic effect of segregation in primary school on the access to pre-academic tracks in secondary is the same in all countries: the more segregated a school the lower are the chances of entering *Gymnasium* and similar. In France the effect applies strongest to the group who does not continue after *Collège* 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 |

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

See the conference workshop 3 on school segregation and school results!

Age of selection

Another relevant aspect for the children of immigrants is how many years pass between entering education and the selection into different school tracks. 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. The following table shows the mean age our respondents entered school and the formal selection age in each country: the situation is most favourable in France, Sweden and Belgium with 11 to 12 years of common education before any selection is made.

⁶ In Antwerp this 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 at 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 ⁷ | 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 favourable in Austria, Germany and Switzerland with between five and seven years – a rather short period, moreover when considering that the majority of schools in the German speaking countries are still half-day schools, which further limits the amount of contact-hours between teachers or educators and the children. Finally, compulsory schooling in these countries only starts at age six, so that considerable numbers of children have even been in an educational institution for only four years, before the most important decision about their future school careers is taken.

3.2 Secondary school

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

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 into a pre-academic track in lower or upper secondary school:

⁷ In Berlin children are selected two years later than in Frankfurt. But second generation Turks in Berlin also start into education 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 shares in pre-academic tracks

| | Years of education before selection | Following a pre-academic track |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Sweden | 11.9 | 56.2 |
| France | 11.9 | 53.6 ⁸ |
| 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. ⁹ |

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

Differences between the countries with regard to the share of second generation Turkish pupils in pre-academic tracks are immense, 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 migratory background.

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

In consequence, although the actual value of pre-academic school and higher education diplomas is certainly varying from country to country (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 especially in Sweden, France and Belgium in a better overall position than in the German-speaking countries.

Summary:

- § **Starting school at an early age reduces the gap to the children of the majority population. Starting kindergarten at the age of two or three seems to be most effective.**
- § **Late selection provides the best conditions for doing justice to the talents among children of immigrants; in short: the more years between entering education and the selection into different tracks the better.**
- § **School segregation has an additional negative effect on the access probability to pre-academic tracks in secondary education. This is, however, not directly dependent on the overall degree of segregation in a city.**

See conference workshop 2 on late selection and the challenge to teach to a diverse student population!

⁸ The results for Strasburg and Paris are quite different here: in Strasburg 43.2% went 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.

⁹ 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.

Drop-out

Drop-out is defined in this report as someone who did not get any diploma from secondary school. So the highest obtained 'degree' is primary school.¹⁰ In most countries compulsory school only ends after lower secondary school. This results in only small percentages of actual drop-outs 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-outs (= primary school diploma at most)

| | 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) |

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 sixteen in the Netherlands, and since a lower vocational diploma can be obtained earliest at that age, many pupils in their exam year are not obliged to go to school anymore. This makes this a sensible point in time for drop-out (moreover considering that at this time also puberty is high). 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 visit 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'* shows the case in point.

By contrast, lower vocational education in the German speaking countries is very much mainstream and less *a priori* marginal as in the Netherlands. But more importantly, pupils in lower (vocational) education in the German speaking countries, in Belgium and in Sweden can receive their first qualifying diploma already at age fourteen or fifteen. This means that obtaining a first diploma is not coincident with the end of compulsory schooling. Also, fourteen and fifteen year old pupils are somewhat easier to be kept within the school system than sixteen or seventeen year olds. Sweden is an interesting case because primary school and lower secondary school are

¹⁰ 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 complete compulsory school with a diploma 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.

not separated in different schools. Pupils remain thus in a protected and familiar environment till they successfully finish *Grundskole*.

Early school leavers

The ranking of the countries is different when it comes to early school leavers.¹¹ Especially Germany and Austria are doing much worse on early school leaving than what could be expected based on the low drop-out rates.

Table 7: Second generation Turks: Early school leavers (= lower secondary diploma at most)

| | Share of early school leavers among those <i>not</i> in education (total N) | Share of ESL among all respondents (total N) |
|-------------|---|--|
| Austria | 33.5% (334) | 24.5% (458) |
| Belgium | 10.0% (468) | 7.8% (602) |
| France | 24.6% (284) ¹² | 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) |

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The pupils in *Hauptschule* form a particular vulnerable group in Germany. The majority of them would *not* find an apprenticeship position afterwards, which forces those still under 16 into preparatory classes for vocational training (*Berufsvorbereitungsjahr* or *BVJ*). But, if they repeated a class (or started school only at age 7), they are not in compulsory school age anymore when finishing *Hauptschule*. For these children *BVJ* is not attractive for actually mainly being an obligatory ‘waiting loop’. About half of the pupils (with or without diploma) do not continue to study after they finished *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 the second generation Turks go to *Hauptschule* (i.e. twice as many as in Germany). But most of them continue in regular vocational training with an apprenticeship (63%) or in the transition track of the *Polytechnicum* (21%). After *Polytechnicum* about half of the students stop their education, the other half moves on into regular vocational training. A much smaller share of the graduates from *Hauptschule* than in Germany end their education after this: only one in six students. But since the group at *Hauptschule* is twice as big as in Germany this is still a considerable number of respondents.

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 or-

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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.

ganizes the transition from lower vocational education into the dual system of apprenticeships. Apparently, this school type successfully prepares and coaches pupils to enter an apprenticeship position afterwards. Although being referred to as a 'waiting room' too, it seemed to work as being designed for. Most of the Turkish respondents managed to find and successfully finish an apprenticeship position after having been to the *Brückenangebot*.

See the conference workshop 11 on the role of the *Brückenangebot*!

In the Netherlands many second generation Turks also do not make the transition from lower into 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 without). The causes of drop-out are often related to the lack of proper preparation for an apprenticeship position among this most vulnerable group.

The Belgium case is interesting because – different from the Netherlands – it provides lower and middle vocational education in the *same* school type (BSO). The fact that pupils stay in the same school where teachers know them also seems to help preventing early school leaving.

Summary:

- § **Drop-out is a problem in those countries where the age in which compulsory school ends collides with the age of acquiring a lower secondary diploma. Raising compulsory school age would probably tighten the grip on 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 neighbourhoods prevents that problems are concentrated in some neighbourhoods and some schools.**
- § **The transition from lower to middle vocational education or to the dual system is particularly risky for the vulnerable age of 16 or 17. The Swiss system of *Brückenangebot* smoothens and facilitates the transition to the apprenticeship system.**
- § **Combining lower and middle vocational education in one school type also prevents early school leaving.**

Segregation in secondary school

Surprisingly, the picture of school segregation across the countries is the same in secondary as in primary school, while there was more segregation expected in countries with a higher degree of stratification in secondary education. Again Austria shows the lowest degree of segregation, while the Netherlands are highest with almost 40% of the respondents estimating the share of immigrant children in their secondary schools between three quarters and '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 visit mainly schools in their own highly segregated neighbourhoods. 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 neighbourhoods 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 in the Netherlands and Belgium to highly segregated secondary schools. 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.

School climate

School performances in secondary school are also influenced by the overall school climate. Did the second generation feel welcome in the secondary schools or rather 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. The efforts of teachers in this respect are recognized and appreciated by the respondents. But as the following table shows, two countries seem to stand out in a negative way: Germany and Austria. More than a quarter in Austria and almost 40% 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

The same trend appears when it comes to perceptions of hostility or unfair treatment in school because of the ethnic background. Again about half to three quarters of all respondents states that they 'never' or 'seldom' experienced hostility or unfair treatment in school. Secondary school for the majority of the second generation was perceived as a safe place to be.

But this does not mean, of course, the absence of cases of discrimination experienced by second generation youth. Experienced feelings of discrimination differ across countries. Again they are highest in Germany: more than one in seven second generation Turkish respondents reports 'regular' or even 'frequent' unfair treatment or hostility¹³:

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 | 6.0 | 1.6 | 500 |
| Germany | 26.1 | 35.0 | 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 quite some 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. The middle position of France is also the result of a quite diverse picture in the two cities, with Strasburg being closer to the situation in the German speaking countries than to Paris. Actually it is in Paris where the school environment was perceived as the fair-

¹³ According to research on reported discrimination higher educated people usually report more discrimination than lower educated people. This is not confirmed by our data. For the case of Austria, among those in higher education 17.6% state that they felt less or much less welcome in school, while this was the case for 29.8% of respondents who did not enter higher education. In relation to unfair treatment 3.5% of the higher educated reported regular or frequent unfair treatment while this was reported by 17.2% percent of the less educated.

est by second generation Turks, and in ‘feeling welcome’ it comes right after Amsterdam (see Appendix 3).

See the conference workshop 4 on teaching pupils to become world citizens at the Cosmicus School!

3.3 Higher Education

Access to higher education

Another important indicator for school success is the access to higher education.¹⁴ As mentioned above most second generation Turks have parents with little or no education. However, one quarter (i.e. 852) out of the 3,275 Turkish respondents we interviewed in the seven counties, made it into higher education!¹⁵ 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 group of second generation Turkish women in our study entered higher education while their mothers are frequently practically illiterate.

As mentioned earlier, there are huge disparities between the countries in the access to higher education. The rates range from 7.5% in Germany to over 50% in France – especially considering that in both countries the educational levels of the parents were low. In three countries – Sweden, Belgium and Austria – Turkish girls are more likely to enter higher education and in the Netherlands they are less likely.

Table 11: Turkish second generation: Students who entered higher education

| | Austria | Belgium | France ¹⁶ | Germany | Nether-lands | Sweden | Switzer-land |
|------------|---------|---------|----------------------|---------|--------------|--------|--------------|
| in % | 19.7 | 24.2 | 52.0 | 7.5 | 33.2 | 35.5 | 13.8 |
| in numbers | 90 | 145 | 260 | 38 | 166 | 89 | 64 |
| total N | 458 | 600 | 500 | 505 | 500 | 251 | 465 |

Source: TIES survey 2007/2008

The country differences are largely the result of the selection processes in secondary education as shown above. But the following table also shows that there are moreover 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.

¹⁴ This includes academias (and similar), higher vocational education and university.

¹⁵ This is *all* the students who entered Higher Education (also those who dropped out without a diploma).

¹⁶ Again, there are large differences between Paris and Strasburg. In Paris 63.3% of the total sample entered higher education, in Strasburg only 40.8%. These numbers are much closer to the figures for Sweden and the Netherlands but still higher than in these two countries.

Table 12: Turkish second generation: Presence in pre-academic track and actual transition to higher education

| | Austria | Belgium | France | Germany | Nether-lands | Sweden | Switzer-land |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|--------|---------|--------------|--------|--------------|
| pre-academic track | n.a. | 51.3% | 53.6% | 12.7% | 25.6% | 56.2% | 8.2% |
| in higher education | 19.7% | 24.2% | 52.0% | 7.5% | 33.2% | 35.5% | 13.8% |
| <i>Difference</i> | <i>n.a.</i> | -27.1 | -1.6 | -2.3 | +7.6 | -20.7 | +5.6 |
| total N | 458 | 600 | 500 | 505 | 500 | 251 | 465 |

Source: TIES survey 20072008

In Sweden and Belgium much less second generation Turks are entering higher education than what could be expected looking at the numbers in pre-academic tracks in secondary school. An important reason in Belgium is that many are streamed down from pre-academic into the vocational track in the second part of secondary school. In both countries high shares of students who obtained a diploma to access higher education also do actually not go to university or similar. This is different in the Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany, although at very different levels.¹⁷ 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 loose out on a large potential here.

Most remarkably, in the Netherlands, Switzerland and Austria we see *more* students in higher education than have been 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 years longer in education than the direct route. In Switzerland and Austria it is mostly only one year longer. This group of achievers through the 'long route' is particularly interesting for necessarily being 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 is repairing to a certain 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 have their main focus on bringing the young people into vocational or professional training and employment, rather than to stimulate further schooling. In contrast, middle vocational education in the Netherlands is an important springboard towards higher vocational education.

Summary:

§ **A quarter of the second generation Turks in Europe made it into higher education This is – considering the low socio-economic background characteristics of the parents – a huge accomplishment of both the second generation**

¹⁷ 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.

and their supportive parents. Also teachers and societies actually provided them with the corresponding opportunities.

- § Policy makers should be aware of the importance of longer or alternative routes to success for children of immigrants. Especially in school systems with early selection the long route is a way to provide extra opportunities for children of immigrants.
- § This sometimes means that they arrive in higher education at a later age when they already have to work to provide an income for themselves or their families. Often they also missed out on the academic preparation to succeed in higher education. Higher education institutions should be aware of this (see also the following chapter).

See the conference workshop 1 on the long route!

Retention and drop-out in higher education

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

Table 13: Turkish second generation: Current status in higher education

| | Austria | Belgium | France | Germany | Nether-lands | Sweden | Switzer-land |
|-----------------------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
| obtained diploma | 26.7 | 35.2 | 27.7 | 36.8 | 28.3 | 38.2 | 48.7 |
| still studying | 67.7 | 42.0 | 57.3 | 52.6 | 57.2 | 32.6 | 42.3 |
| left without diploma | 5.6 | 22.8 | 15.0 | 10.5 | 14.5 | 29.2 ¹⁸ | 9.3 |
| total % | 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 for each country the share of drop-out 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 (e.g. the socio-economic position of the 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 | Netherlands | 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

¹⁸ Of the students that have indicated in the survey that they were less than 3 years in Higher Education in Sweden we do not know if they have acquired a BA. We have put them in the drop-out category here but probably some of them have a higher education certificate.

Interestingly, drop-out rates are particularly high in countries with also high rates of entrance into higher education. Probably higher education institutions perform part of the selection which in other countries is primarily taking place in secondary education and especially targeting the children of immigrants.

Summary:

- § **Drop-out in higher education is a serious problem across Europe. This is all the more serious since this group showed the potential to succeed. From the perspective of both society and the emancipation of the Turkish community highly educated people play a pivotal role in advancing the situation of the Turkish group as a whole.**
- § **Starting point of higher education institutions should be that those who entered higher education earned their presence in the higher education institution. Retention should be the policy of higher education institutions, i.e. keeping students aboard (with extra guidance and mentoring) rather than selecting them out.**

See conference workshop 9 on higher education retention projects!

3.4 Support: parents, siblings, and homework projects

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

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 practically 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 have 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 group however is usually bigger than in the comparison group. Maybe this smaller group clouds the image among teachers?

Table 15: Turkish second generation: Importance of support by mothers

| | not important at all | not important | somewhat important | important | very im- portant | 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 important at all | not important | somewhat important | important | very im- portant | 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.

See conference workshops 7 on cultural mediators and 10 on parents and schooling!

The second cliché of teachers about practical help does seem to hold true. The majority of the Turkish parents was not able to practically 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

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 too: 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 important at all | 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

See conference workshop 6 on 'sibling-like' mentoring!

Homework projects

We asked the respondents, if they had visited a homework project outside school during secondary education. This could range from a project subsidized by the city to a community organization project with volunteers. As the following table shows, the outcomes differ a lot across the cities:

Table 20: Turkish second generation: Homework support in secondary education

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Paris | 16.9 | Strasbourg | 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

In principle this could mean three things: (a) that some cities are more active on this than others; (b) that migrant and other organizations are more active in some cities; and (c) that second generation Turks in one city more easily found access to these projects than in other cities.

The city of Linz by far shows the highest attendance (32%). The lowest is in Strasbourg with 7.5%. In some cities, like in 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 how schools can make use of their support.**
- § **Schools should also be aware of the important role of older siblings. In an institutionalized way, student mentor projects with 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 projects use this principle supporting a few thousand children of immigrants.**

See conference workshop 8 on homework support projects!

4. Transition to the Labour Market

This chapter takes a look at the transition to the labour 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 for a period worked in an apprenticeship while in school. For many respondents going on the job market after they finished full-time studies is therefore not their first labour market experience.

Situation after finishing education

The first table presents the situation right after finishing one's education. The table is split by cities, because the labour market situations differ a lot from city to city, also within one country.

Table 21: Turkish second generation: Situation immediately after finishing education (in % of those not in education)

| | Immediately found a job | Odd jobs | Family business | Unemployed, looking for job | Unemployed, <i>not</i> 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 |
| Strasbourg | 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 shares of those, who immediately found some sort of employment, ranges from 16% 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, Strasbourg, Frankfurt and Brussels (more than one third), followed by Berlin, Antwerp and Rotterdam (around one quarter).

Yet, the unemployment rates, i.e. of those respondents who are actually looking for a job, do not inversely match with the employed. Especially interesting are the inactivity rates here, and particularly those respondents dedicating themselves to the family and children – which almost exclusively refers to female respondents. Again the range of rates is immense: from below 3% in France, Belgium and Sweden to between 20 and 25% 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% 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 has 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 (Brussels: 15%) and lowest in Germany. To work in family business is a transition strategy, as the comparison between tables 21 and 22 shows, but to a very low degree. 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%):

Table 22: Turkish second generation: Current labour situation (Part I: on the job market)

| | One or more jobs | Own business | Family business | Work and study | Apprenticeship | Unemployed, looking for job |
|------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Paris | 53.4 | 3.4 | 0.6 | 16.2 | 6.1 | 10.8 |
| Strasbourg | 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 |

Table 22 continued: Current labour 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 |
| Strasbourg | 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, also the high shares of women in Austria and Germany looking after children or taking care of the family are a lot lower than right after education. This probably means that respondents either took care of family members, but not necessarily their own children or they returned to the labour market when children had become of 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 the group of native born parentage. This difference amounts to 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 those second generation Turks with only a diploma from *Hauptschule* is three times higher than among those who finished an apprenticeship (and almost twice as high as among 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 labour 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 probably no coincidence that especially this relatively low educated group complained most about unfair treatment when looking for 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' experienced discrimination on the basis of their ethnic background. It is obviously not always easy to clearly identify the actual reason behind unfair treatment. Therefore, these numbers might in part rather reflect the *interpretation* of certain experiences than to not have been exposed to unfair treatment *at all*.

The following table shows again 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 labour market are highest in Strasbourg and Frankfurt, while Amsterdam and Zurich come out as lowest:

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 |
| Strasbourg | 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 to have not suffered this kind of experience, it is not an uncommon phenomenon. Between one third and two thirds of the respondents think to have been exposed to situations, which they interpret as 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 affecting individual feelings of belonging and trust to the place, where the everyday life is centred.

Summary:

- § **Our second generation Turkish respondents in general do not report a lot of unfair treatment while looking for a job. Especially the lower educated group report it.**
- § **The comparison with their native peers with the same educational level however indicates that the problem of unfair treatment especially hits this group hard. Anti-discrimination policies should target jobs in these sectors.**

See conference workshops 11 and 12 on the project 'Anonymous CV' and positive discrimination!

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 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 (especially: birthplace of the parents). Non-response rates were quite high as it is quite common in 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 naturalised 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 age-group 18-35 year old, being born in Austria, Germany or Switzerland respectively. Then the onomastic analysis, executed by a specialised bureau in Germany, could identify people bearing a Turkish and a Yugoslavian name (96% hit ratio). From the resulting lists representative samples were drawn.

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 next step pre-screening by phone identified the ones 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 within street segments addresses were selected using name recognition and screening to identify target population.

Despite all differences, the end result is a unique data-set 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 naturalised. Therefore, there are also hardly any national data-sets with really comparable data. It is also important to stress that the TIES data-set 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 analyses the main reasons for migrating of the fathers and shows very similar results in six out of seven countries: a vast majority of around two thirds of the fathers came as labour migrants. The second and third most mentioned reasons are family reunion and marriage. The exception is Sweden with much less labour migrants and 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 labour immigrants mostly came from rural areas. But also the asylum seekers in Sweden 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 with the levels of education of fathers and mothers. The following table shows high shares 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 visited no higher school than elementary and corresponding low numbers for secondary and higher education. Especially 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 followed education of 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' level, 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 only followed 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 lowly educated mothers.

Table 28: Second generation Turks: Highest followed education of 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 school¹⁹

| | 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 |
| Strasbourg | 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

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 |
| Strasbourg | 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

¹⁹ For Belgium the deviant answer category “less than 25%” is added up to the category “approximately 25%” and the deviant answer category “more than 75%” is added up to the category “approximately 75%”.

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 |
| Strasbourg | 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

- Table 1: Number of interviews per city and group
- Table 2: Age of entrance into an educational institution
- Table 3a: Share of children of immigrants in primary school
- Table 3b: Percentage of children moving on to pre-academic tracks in relation to the share of children of immigrants in primary school
- Table 4: Years between the start of formal education and tracking
- Table 5: Years of education before selection and shares in pre-academic tracks
- Table 6: Drop-outs (= primary school diploma at most)
- Table 7: Early school leavers (= lower secondary diploma at most)
- Table 8: Share of children of immigrants in secondary school
- Table 9: Feeling welcome in secondary school
- Table 10: Hostility or unfair treatment in secondary school
- Table 11: Students who entered higher education
- Table 12: Presence in pre-academic track and actual transition to higher education
- Table 13: Current status in higher education
- Table 14: Share of drop-out among those who finished higher education
- Table 15: Importance of support by mothers
- Table 16: Importance of support by fathers
- Table 17: Parents' help with homework
- Table 18: Importance of support of siblings
- Table 19: Siblings' help with homework
- Table 20: Homework support in secondary education
- Table 21: Situation immediately after finishing education (in % of those *not* in education)
- Table 22: Current labour situation
- Table 23: Second generation Turks and Comparison Group: Percentage of unemployed among those with an apprenticeship diploma or similar
- Table 24: Experiences of unfair treatment on the job market
- Table 25: Most important reason for migration of the father
- Table 26: Residence of the father until his age 15
- Table 27: Highest followed education of the father
- Table 28: Highest followed education of the mother
- Table 29: Share of children of immigrants in primary school (by city)
- Table 30: Experienced hostility or unfair treatment in secondary school (by city)
- Table 31: Perceived degree of welcome of second generation Turks as compared to comparison group (by city)

Contact

Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies
Universiteit van Amsterdam
Oudezijds Achterburgwal 237
1012 DL Amsterdam

tel: +31 20 525 2080

fax: +31 20 525 3628

Email: M.R.J.Crul@uva.nl and J.Schneider@uva.nl

www.TIESproject.eu

See website for addresses of national partners!

Amsterdam, April 2009