

Multicultural Policies and Civic Solidarity between Natives and Immigrants in European Countries

著者	Igarashi Akira
学位授与機関	Tohoku University
学位授与番号	11301甲第18388号
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10097/00125694

This study aims to reveal the association between multicultural policies and civic solidarity between natives and immigrants. Since after WWII, European countries have experienced large growth and acceptance of immigrants. In reacting to the larger population of immigrants, the countries are required to incorporate immigrants' life, and also, their culture. Unlike assimilation (Gordon, 1964), some European countries took multiculturalism, although there are variations in its level of tolerance, as a general policy for immigrants' culture. However, multicultural policies are not free from critics, and there have been harsh debates over the side-effects of multicultural policies for the entire host society. The fields of debates are in the politics (Koopmans, 2013), as well as the studies of (anti-) multicultural theorists. Politicians in Western Europe criticised multicultural policies for undermining intergroup relations. In his Prime Minister's speech, David Cameron (2011) stated "(Muslim people) also find it hard to identify with Britain too, because we have allowed the weakening of our collective identity. Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream". However, his arguments are not necessarily based on firm empirical evidence, because theoretical debates and empirical studies over the consequences of multicultural policies are not conclusive.

In Chapter 2, I summarised the theoretical debates over multiculturalism. Theoretical debates between multiculturalists and anti-multiculturalists have mainly focused upon the association between multicultural policies and civic solidarity between natives and immigrants, in which intergroup mutual tolerance, acceptance of ethnic out-groups, and sense of belonging to a larger group. In this study, I focus on immigrants' national identification and natives' attitudes towards immigrants' culture. In general, multiculturalists support multicultural policies that result in immigrants' higher national identification and natives' more positive attitudes, while anti-multiculturalists oppose these views.

On one hand, multiculturalists have contended that as multicultural policies are more tolerant, immigrants are more likely to identify with the host society. One of the mechanisms between multicultural policies and immigrants' national identification is group permeability, which refers to a perceived strictness of intergroup socioeconomic and cultural boundaries (Ellemers, Wilke, & van Knippenberg, 1993; Jackson, Sullivan, Harnish, & Hodge, 1996; Verkuyten & Reijerse, 2008). Under lower permeability situations, immigrants are exposed to low affective and socioeconomic cost for integration and participation into the host society, and thus are more likely to identify to the host society. On the other hand, when intergroup boundaries are perceived to be difficult to negotiate, immigrants perceive that they highly cost to participate and integrate into the host society, and thus are less likely to identify to the host society. Multicultural policies are relevant to permeability as multicultural policies remove cultural barriers (Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000). In a multicultural society, immigrants can participate in the host society while retaining their own cultures; in other words, the cost for immigrants to participate in the society is relatively low. As a result, immigrants perceive less strict boundaries, and the perceived ease of group transition strengthens immigrants' sense of belonging (Banting & Kymlicka, 2017; Kymlicka, 1995; Modood, 2007).

In addition, multiculturalists argued that because multicultural policies develop cultural norms among natives, the policies decrease natives' prejudice against immigrants. Scholars in political science have argued that policies are influential on social norms and public opinion (Campbell, 2012; Mettler & Soss, 2004; Pierson, 1993) through conveying messages regarding desirable state of affairs and normative expectations (Svallfors, 2006). Especially, visible and relevant policies for residents institutionalise social norms (Soss & Schram, 2007). As multicultural issues caught high attentions from the public debate and relevant for their cultural life (e.g., Moran, 2011; Ng Tseung-Wong & Verkuyten, 2015), multicultural policies may potentially influence social norms.

Anti-multiculturalists argued that multicultural policies decrease immigrants' national identification and deteriorate natives' attitudes towards immigrants and their culture. Their primary claim is that multicultural policies force immigrants to retreat to their own groups rather than engage in the host society. Accordingly, multicultural policies facilitate the essential categorisation of immigrants, forcing them to focus on group boundaries and differences, and thus marginalising them outside of the host society. Due to the emphasis on group boundaries, immigrants are aware of their ethnic identification, that eventually leads to lower national identification (Barry, 2001; Bissoondath, 1994; Goodhart, 2004; Hage, 2012; Miller, 1995).

In addition, anti-multiculturalists have suspected that as the policies protect immigrants' culture, natives perceive their values and cultures are threatened and deteriorate their attitudes towards immigrants (Barry, 2001; Freeman, 2002; Huntington, 2004). This notion is based on the group threat theory (Blumer, 1958), in which in-group's perception that out-groups threaten in-group's scarce and valuable resources result in negative attitudes towards the out-groups. Policies that render resources and ways of protection for one's life may be perceived as threatening for other groups that do not receive these benefits, because of limitation of resources which is allocated and redistributed, and also the presence of empowered group by policies. If there are a considerable difference between groups, the member of group that is not a recipient of policies may feel threatened by the empowered group. Empirical findings showed that natives perceive cultural threats when minority group tend to maintain their own culture (Tip, Zagefka, González, Brown, Cinnirella, & Na, 2012). On top of the group threat theory, anti-multiculturalists argue that multicultural policies create intergroup division between immigrants and natives. Because of division of recipients and non-recipients of multicultural policies, multicultural policies create clear division of groups. Potentially, multicultural policies may bind the native group more tightly and the grouping may eventually lead them to be more prejudicial against immigrants. This argument is based on the social identity perspective (Hornsey, 2008; Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Accordingly, when intergroup categories are salient, people perceptually enhance similarity within their own group and seek difference between groups as they are motivated to hold positive self-concept. These tendencies lead groups to hold in-group preference and out-group derogation, which in turn, result in negative attitudes towards out-groups (although the initial idea of Tajfel (1978) does not necessarily indicate prejudice enhancement). Because multicultural policies are, according to anti-multiculturalists, create division between groups along the line of recipients (immigrants) and non-recipients (natives), natives may hold more negative attitudes towards immigrants as a reaction to this clear grouping. and this division deteriorate natives' attitudes towards immigrants.

However, despite of their contradicting arguments and opposing expectations of multicultural policies' consequences, there are few studies that investigate the association between multicultural policies, immigrants' national identification, and natives' attitudes. As for national identification, Koopmans (2013) describes this situation by stating, "a few studies have related the strength of identification [of immigrants] with the country of settlement to multicultural policies" (p. 161). In addition, these few existing studies are not well-implemented. Ersanilli and Koopmans (2011) conducted a comparative analysis across France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the U.K. They found that comparing to Germany, in France and the Netherlands, wherein high degree of legal equality in institutions are ensured, Turkish immigrants more strongly identify to the residential country. Given the high level of national identity in France, a non-multicultural society, the authors claimed that civic integration (i.e., policies providing such as language and cultural courses in the host society, citizenship ceremony, and loyalty oath) is more important than multiculturalism (Koopmans, 2013). Bloemraad and Wright (2014) compared the U.S. and Canada, showing that national identity among the second-generation immigrants is the same level between the countries, while that

among the first-generation immigrants is higher in Canada. This result indicates that the multicultural countries strengthen national identity of ethnic minorities immigrants (also see Wright & Bloermaad 2012). However, because these studies relied on a few number of countries and did not control for confounding factors at the country level, these results are not conclusive.

As for studies on natives' attitudes towards immigrants and multiculturalism, most of the cross-country comparative studies use immigrant integration policies in general (e.g., Callens & Meuleman, 2017; Callens, 2015; Guimond et al., 2013, 2014; Kauff, Asbrock, Thörner, & Wagner, 2013), or one of the policies (e.g., citizenship, anti-discrimination, labour market) (Ariely, 2012; Weldon, 2006; Ziller, 2014). However, although these studies provide insightful results, these studies are not consistent, and also rely on policies that are not necessarily categorised as multicultural policy. Studies using multicultural and non-multicultural regions are also not free from disadvantages for their design. Wright and colleagues compare the U.S., Quebec, and non-Quebec Canada, showing that people in Quebec, a state of restrictive political culture, are more likely to be negative against immigrants, while there are small differences in the level attitudes between the U.S. and non-Quebec Canada (Wright, Johnston, Citrin, & Soroka, 2016). The authors argued that the determinants of attitudes are not intercountry differences in multicultural policies but rather regional political culture. However, not only multicultural policies and political cultures but also other aspects of societies differ between these three regions/countries, and thus the studies are not very conclusive.

I summarised the data and methods in Chapter 3. One of the reasons for these lack of studies is lack of data availability for policy index, respondents and variables. The few existing studies also did not directly test the association between multicultural policies and civic solidarity, or empirically not adequate (e.g., Bloemraad & Wright, 2014; Fleischmann & Phalet, 2016). Thus, in this study, using existing indices of integration policies and multicultural policies, I construct a new index to measure multicultural policies and combine it to the newly released social survey conducted in European countries, European Social Survey Round 7 conducted in 2014. With these datasets, I examine how multicultural policies are related with immigrants' national identification and natives' cultural concerns and also endorsement of multiculturalism.

In Chapter 4 and 5, immigrants' national identification under multicultural policies has been analysed. Multiculturalists argued that multicultural policies facilitate immigrants' participations in the host society because immigrants feel less cultural barriers to participate in the society as they are not required to assimilate the national culture and are tolerated to retain their culture. On the other hand, anti-multiculturalists argued that because immigrants keep their culture of origin intact, they are more likely to retreat to their own culture and less participate in the host society, resulting in lower level of national identification. I attempt to settle these disputes with analysis of the association between multicultural policies and the gap of natives' and immigrants' national identification. The results are supportive for multiculturalists' arguments that multicultural policies diminish the gap in national identification between natives and immigrants. However, this effect is evident only for immigrants from non-European countries, and not for immigrants from European countries. The effects are equal for generations: first and second non-European immigrants are influenced by the policy, while first and second European immigrants are not. This effect can be interpreted that immigrants from non-European countries need cultural protection and thus they are more reactive to the policies.

For national identification, multiculturalists arguments seem to be supported. However, Chapter 4 left a new question: why anti-multiculturalists' arguments are not supported? In Chapter 5, I argued that the assumption of anti-multiculturalists, incompatibility of ethnic and

national identification, is not met under multicultural policies. Literatures in psychology are generally supportive for this incompatibility. However, multicultural policies may change the images of a country into more inclusive and more positive for ethnic out-groups, and diversity becomes a part of components of national identification. As a result, ethnic identification becomes not incompatible against national identification; instead, they are part of national identification and become compatible. To test these possibilities, I conducted a role of modification of multicultural policies between ethnic and national identification. The results show that under tolerant multicultural policies, immigrants' ethnic and national identification are not incompatible. Thus, from these results, the reason why anti-multiculturalists' arguments are not supported is partially revealed: their assumption, in which ethnic and national identifications are not compatible, are not met under multicultural policies. I should emphasise that from psychological literature, their assumption is generally correct, but it is not met under multicultural policies, that anti-multiculturalists criticised.

In Chapter 6 and 7, I dealt with the natives' side. On association between multicultural policies and natives' attitudes towards immigrants and their culture, multiculturalists and anti-multiculturalists have been debated. Multiculturalists argued that natives internalise cultural norms through policies and thus have more positive attitudes, while anti-multiculturalists argued that multicultural policies are perceived to threaten natives' cultural and other types of resources, and also emphasise group boundaries between natives and immigrants, and thus natives have more negative attitudes towards immigrants and their culture. I conducted an analysis to test the association between multicultural policies and endorsement of multiculturalism among natives, resulting in support for multiculturalists' idea.

The results of the previous chapter again raise new question: if multicultural policies improve natives' attitudes towards multiculturalism, why there are large supports for far-right parties in multicultural societies? One of the answer to this question may be that multicultural policies make the cultural issue more salient, leading natives to connect their pre-existing threats against immigrants and attitudes towards multiculturalism. Because under tolerant multicultural policies, cultural issues become more visible, proximate, and close for natives. These environments make natives more accessible to their pre-existing sentiments to form their attitudes towards multiculturalism. As a result, those with higher level of threats living in multicultural environment are more likely to oppose against multiculturalism comparing with those with the same level of threats but living in non-multicultural environment. The results are supportive for these arguments, although these are not the only one reason for the raise of far-right parties and also anti-immigrants and culture. Still, however, this argument may pave one interpretation for what is happening in multicultural society.

Through a series of empirical analyses, I have shown that multicultural policies strengthen civic solidarity between natives and immigrants. Immigrants' national identification are, although the effects are only evident for non-European immigrants, strengthened, and natives have more positive attitudes towards their culture. These associations are along with expectations of multiculturalists, and thus this study are generally supportive for multiculturalists' arguments. These two tendencies, higher national identification and more positive attitudes towards immigrants and their culture, may result in higher positivity in the society. Immigrants are more likely to identify with the host society, which may result in further participation in the host society, higher economic and social integration to the host society, and might also bring cultural integration as a form of language learning and cultural acquisition (De Vroome, et al., 2014; Verkuyten & Martinovic, 2012). These may seem to be one form of assimilation, but immigrants are not under pressure to change their culture, and thus their wellbeing is not damaged from acculturative stress. They can choose to culturally integrate into the host society through participation that is facilitated by multicultural policies. Furthermore, natives become more positive against immigrants' culture and also immigrants themselves,

which in turn reduce discrimination against immigrants (Blommaert, et al., 2012; Carlsson & Eriksson, 2017; Habtegiorgis, et al., 2014) and social communication with immigrants (Jugert, et al., 2011; Rosenthal & Levy, 2016; Wu, et al., 2015). Natives positive sentiments towards immigrants induce further incorporation of immigrants in the host society.

The future decision whether to introduce multicultural policies may be a trade-off. On one hand, natives have more positive attitudes in general and immigrants are more identified with the host society. However, introduction of multicultural policies may induce these extreme oppositions among some natives. Introduction of multicultural policies may be determined whether the former is more beneficial than the latter. This discussion is out of scope of this study. Although the number of natives who has extreme level of threats and thus highly opposing against multiculturalism may not be large, these extremists may commit devastating violent acts (e.g., Braun & Koopmans, 2009; Jäckle & König, 2017; Koopmans & Olzak, 2004). Thus, even though multiculturalists' arguments are generally supported in this study, it is not easy task to determine whether multicultural policies are positive or not for the host society.

Further studies are required for multicultural policies and its association with natives' and immigrants' perceptions, sentiments, and integration. I propose future direction of these studies. First, it is needed to study how multicultural policies are associated with immigrants' participation in the host society. These are expectations proposed by Kymlicka and other multiculturalists (Banting & Kymlicka, 2017; Kymlicka, 1995; Modood, 2007). These theorists expect that under multicultural policies, immigrants are not exposed to acculturative pressure and less cultural barriers, and thus they are more likely to participate in the society. However, as long as I know, these expectations have not been tested yet. The results I provided in Chapter 4 is also relying on this mechanism. To support the results in this study, and also test multiculturalists' theory, multicultural policies and immigrants' participation in the society is to be tested in future. Second, this study and previous literatures have limitations in geographical choices. I used European countries for analysis for two reasons. First, European countries are, if not all, accommodating a large number of immigrants as a new country of destination, and as thus developing policies to incorporate immigrants. Second, European countries are very suitable for cross-country comparison for its large size of countries, datasets, and also policy index. In other words, empirically European countries are suitable for analysis. However, because of its availability, this study and most of the previous studies are limited to investigate European countries, and this fact prevents us from applying the results of this study to other areas and regions. The direct effects and interactions are not theoretically changeable across different regions and countries, but I should test generalisability of the results. I do not propose to compare two or few countries (e.g., Bloemraad & Wright, 2014), but in future, studies are required to include not only European countries but other countries for cross-country comparison to examine effects of policies. Third, future studies are required to incorporate longitudinal development of multicultural policies and track attitudinal and behavioural shifts along with the policy changes. Specifically, some studies utilised within-country variations (Breugelmans, van de Vijver, & Schalk-Soekar, 2009; Flores, 2017; van de Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar, 2008). However, only within-country variations do not capture the effects of policy: because policy has a long-term effect, within-country variations may not represent this aspect. Instead, cross-country variations incorporating within-country variations may settle both paths, short-term and long-term influences (Fairbrother, 2014).

References

- Ariely, G. (2012). Globalisation and the decline of national identity? An exploration across sixty-three countries. *Nations and Nationalism*, 18(3): 461-482.
- Banting, K., & Kymlicka, W. (2017). Introduction: The political sources of solidarity in diverse societies. In *The Strains of Commitment: The Political Sources of Solidarity in Diverse Societies* by Banting, K. & Kymlicka, W. (Eds.), 1-58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barry, B. (2001). *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bissoondath, N. (1994). *Selling Illusions: The Cult of Multiculturalism in Canada*. Chicago: Penguin.
- Bloemraad, I., & Wright, M. (2014). "Utter failure" or unity out of diversity? Debating and evaluating policies of multiculturalism. *International Migration Review*, 48: S292-S334.
- Blommaert, L., van Tubergen, F., & Coenders, M. (2012). Implicit and explicit interethnic attitudes and ethnic discrimination in hiring. *Social science research*, 41(1): 61-73.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1(1): 3-7.
- Braun, R., & Koopmans, R. (2009). The diffusion of ethnic violence in Germany: The role of social similarity. *European Sociological Review*, 26(1), 111-123.
- Breugelmans, S. M., van de Vijver, F. J., & Schalk-Soekar, S. G. (2009). Stability of majority attitudes toward multiculturalism in the Netherlands between 1999 and 2007. *Applied Psychology*, 58(4): 653-671.
- Campbell, A. L. (2012). Policy makes mass politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1): 333-351.
- Caney, S. (2002). Equal treatment, exceptions and cultural diversity. In *Multiculturalism Reconsidered* by Kelly, P. (Eds.), 81-101. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Carlsson, M., & Eriksson, S. (2017). Do attitudes expressed in surveys predict ethnic discrimination?. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(10): 1739-1757.
- De Vroome, T., Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2014). Host national identification of immigrants in the Netherlands. *International Migration Review*, 48(1): 76-102.
- Ellemers, N., Wilke, H., & van Knippenberg, A. (1993). Effects of the legitimacy of low group or individual status on individual and collective status-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(5): 766-778.
- Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2011). Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants. *West European Politics*, 34(2): 208-234.
- Fairbrother, M. (2014). Two multilevel modeling techniques for analyzing comparative longitudinal survey datasets. *Political Science Research and Methods*, 2(1): 119-140.
- Fleischmann, F., & Phalet, K. (2016). Identity conflict or compatibility: A comparison of Muslim minorities in five European cities. *Political Psychology*, 37(4): 447-463.
- Flores, R. D. (2017). Do anti-immigrant laws shape public sentiment? A study of Arizona's SB 1070 using Twitter data. *American Journal of Sociology*, 123(2): 333-384.
- Freeman, S. (2002). Liberalism and the accommodation of group claims. In *Multiculturalism Reconsidered* by Kelly, P. (Eds.), 18-30. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goodhart, D. (2004). Too Diverse? *Prospect*, 95(February): 30-37.
- Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. Oxford University Press.
- Guimond, S., Crisp, R. J., De Oliveira, P., Kamiejski, R., Kteily, N., Kuepper, B., ... & Sidanius, J. (2013). Diversity policy, social dominance, and intergroup relations: Predicting prejudice in changing social and political contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(6): 941-958.

- Guimond, S., de la Sablonnière, R., & Nugier, A. (2014). Living in a multicultural world: Intergroup ideologies and the societal context of intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 25(1): 142-188.
- Habtegiorgis, A. E., Paradies, Y. C., & Dunn, K. M. (2014). Are racist attitudes related to experiences of racial discrimination? Within sample testing utilising nationally representative survey data. *Social Science Research*, 47: 178-191.
- Hage, G. (2012). *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. London: Routledge.
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(1): 204-222.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004). *Who Are We?: The Challenges to America's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Jäckle, S., & König, P. D. (2017). The dark side of the German 'welcome culture': Investigating the causes behind attacks on refugees in 2015. *West European Politics*, 40(2): 223-251.
- Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. N. (1996). Achieving positive social identity: Social mobility, social creativity, and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(2): 241-254.
- Jugert, P., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2011). Friendship preferences among German and Turkish preadolescents. *Child Development*, 82(3): 812-829.
- Kauff, M., Asbrock, F., Thörner, S., & Wagner, U. (2013). Side effects of multiculturalism: The interaction effect of a multicultural ideology and authoritarianism on prejudice and diversity beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(3): 305-320.
- Koopmans, R. (2013). Multiculturalism and immigration: A contested field in cross-national comparison. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 39: 147-169.
- Koopmans, R., & Olzak, S. (2004). Discursive opportunities and the evolution of right-wing violence in Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(1): 198-230.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mettler, S., & Soss, J. (2004). The consequences of public policy for democratic citizenship: Bridging policy studies and mass politics. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(1): 55-73.
- Miller, D. (1995). *On Nationality*. Gloucestershire: Clarendon Press.
- Modood, T. 2007. *Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Moran, A. (2011). Multiculturalism as nation-building in Australia: Inclusive national identity and the embrace of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(12): 2153-2172.
- Ng Tseung-Wong, C., and Verkuyten, M. (2015). Multiculturalism, Mauritian style: Cultural diversity, belonging, and a secular state. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(6): 679-701.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2016). Endorsement of polyculturalism predicts increased positive intergroup contact and friendship across the beginning of college. *Journal of Social Issues*, 72(3): 472-488.
- Soss, J., & Schram, S. F. (2007). A public transformed? Welfare reform as policy feedback. *American Political Science Review*, 101(1): 111-127.
- Svallfors, S. (2006). *The Moral Economy of Class: Class and Attitudes in Comparative Perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation Between Social Groups*. London: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* by Austin, W. G. & Worchel, S. (Eds.), 33-47. Monterey: Brooks-Cole.

- Tip, L. K., Zagefka, H., González, R., Brown, R., Cinnirella, M., & Na, X. (2012). Is support for multiculturalism threatened by...threat itself? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(1): 22–30.
- van de Vijver, F. J., Breugelmans, S. M., & Schalk-Soekar, S. R. (2008). Multiculturalism: Construct validity and stability. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32(2): 93-104.
- Verkuyten, M., & Martinovic, B. (2012). Immigrants' national identification: Meanings, determinants, and consequences. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 6(1): 82–112.
- Verkuyten, M., & Reijerse, A. (2008). Intergroup structure and identity management among ethnic minority and majority groups: The interactive effects of perceived stability, legitimacy, and permeability. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(1): 106-127.
- Weldon, S. A. (2006). The institutional context of tolerance for ethnic minorities: A comparative, multilevel analysis of Western Europe. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(2): 331-349.
- Wright, M., & Bloemraad, I. (2012). Is there a trade-off between multiculturalism and socio-political integration? Policy regimes and immigrant incorporation in comparative perspective. *Perspectives on Politics*, 10(1): 77-95.
- Wright, M., Citrin, J., & Wand, J. (2012). Alternative measures of American national identity: Implications for the civic-ethnic distinction. *Political Psychology*, 33(4): 469-482.
- Wu, Z., Schimmele, C. M., & Hou, F. (2015). Group differences in intermarriage with Whites between Asians, Blacks, and Hispanics: The effects of assimilation and structural constraints. *Journal of Social Issues*, 71(4): 733-754.
- Ziller, C. (2014). Societal implications of antidiscrimination policy in Europe. *Research &*