



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The differences in attitudes about their society between 14 year old pupils with and without an immigration background; a cross-national comparison

Prokic, Tijana and Dronkers, Jaap
European University Institute, Maastricht University

March 2010

Online at <http://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/21637/>
MPRA Paper No. 21637, posted 25. March 2010 / 09:27



The differences in attitudes about their society between 14 year old pupils with and without an immigration background; a cross-national comparison

Tijana Prokic and Jaap Dronkers

Paper presented at the conference *Understanding the Dynamics of Migration: Family, Generations and Inequality*, held at the Robert Schumann centre for Advanced Studies of the European University Institute, San Domenico di Fiesole (Italy), 11-12 March 2010

The differences in attitudes about their society between 14 year old pupils with and without an immigration background; a cross-national comparison

Tijana Prokic and Jaap Dronkers¹

European University Institute, Italy

Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market ROA, Maastricht University, the Netherlands

Abstract

In this paper we analyze the attitudes of 14 year old children of first and second generation immigrants and their civic attitudes about (aspects of) the society of destination. We use data from the Civic Education Study conducted by International Educational Association (IAE) in 1999. This Civic Education Study tests civic knowledge, civic attitudes and civic participation of 14 year old students. We have five dependent variables in 11 countries: trust in government related institution positive attitudes towards immigrants, positive attitudes towards one's nation of residence positive attitudes towards women's rights and civic participation. 14-year pupils with an immigrant background had stronger positive attitudes towards immigrants, stronger negative attitudes towards women's political and economic rights, stronger negative attitudes towards the nation of residence and less outspoken lower trust in government related institutions. Second generation pupils do not deviate less than first generation, neither pupils in more inclusive societies differ less.

1. Introduction

The attitudes towards the society of destination by children with an immigrant background are one of the indicators of their degree of assimilation or integration into their society. The more their attitudes resemble those of children of native parents, the more we might consider those immigrants' children integrated in their society. This stronger resemblance should be especially true for second generation immigrant pupils², and/or pupils with an immigrant background who speak the national languages of the country of destination at home.

In order to examine the differences between native and immigrant children regarding their attitudes we need to look at those attitudes towards society which are actually comparable amongst them. For example, we cannot compare validly immigration experiences of pupils with and without an immigration background, because these experiences have quite different content meaning for them. In this paper we compare therefore general attitudes towards society which are relevant for both categories and which refer to the same context, like trust in government, attitudes towards immigrants, women's political and economic rights, attitudes towards one's nation of residence and the level of one's civic participation.

It is also important for the validity and comparability of the data to have data which are collected in the same context. The data we used here (Civic Education Study) fit this criterion. They are collected in schools where all children of 14 years old

participated. This is the right age for this comparison because at that age all children are still in school and there is not selective drop-out which might affect outcomes.

Another important characteristic of the Civic Education Study is that the data are collected in the same way in eleven countries in Europe and America. This allows us to compare the outcomes across various nations. That is important because these countries of test (which are also the countries of destination of the children with an immigrant background) might differ in their openness towards immigrants (for instance measured by MIPEX; Niessen, Huddleston & Citron, 2007)³ and thus children with immigrant background might have different attitudes towards society in different countries of destination.

Unfortunately, the Civic Education Study did not collect any detailed information about the country of birth of the pupils or the parents. As a consequence we only know whether the pupil or the parents are born outside the country of test. Previous research has shown that Characteristics of country of origin are important for the educational achievement of children with an immigrant background (Levels, Dronkers & Kraaykamp, 2008) and for the level of subjective discrimination experienced by immigrants (André, Dronkers & Fleischmann, 2009). Also it has been shown that immigrants are unequally distributed among the various destination countries which can lead to biased results. This omission of information on the country of origin is serious and certainly affects the quality of our analysis.⁴ Given that we analyze for the first time the attitudes towards society of children of immigrants cross-nationally, this paper should be seen as the first step of an more comprehensive analysis of the relation between immigrant background and the attitudes toward society.

2. Hypotheses

Given the preliminary nature of our cross-national analysis of the attitudes towards society of 14-year old children with an immigrant background, we do not want to formulate very elaborate or sophisticated hypotheses. Unfortunately the Civic Education Study has collected only information about speaking a foreign language at home⁵ and the age of arrival in the country of destination.⁶

We have three basic hypotheses:

1. Children with an immigrant background who are born in the test country deviate less in their attitudes from those of children of natives than children with an immigrant background who are not born in the test country.
2. Children with an immigrant background who speaks the destination country language at home deviate less in their attitudes from those of children of natives than children with an immigrant background who do not speak the destination country language at home.
3. Children with an immigrant background who have migrated into the test country before the age of 6 deviate less in their attitudes from those of children of natives than children with an immigrant background who have migrated into the test country after being 6 years old.

We have not many clear and testable hypotheses for the possible cross-national hypotheses. However, we will try to test two hypotheses:

4. Children with an immigrant background who are born in country of destination with higher percentages of children with an immigrant background deviate less in their attitudes from those of children of natives than children with an immigrant background in countries of destination with lower percentages.
5. Children with an immigrant background who are born in country of destination which are more inclusive towards immigrant (as measured with MIPEX) deviate less in their attitudes from those of children of natives (or have even more positive attitudes) than children with an immigrant background in countries of destination which less open towards immigrants.

3. Data and measurements

This article uses data from the Civic Education Study (CivEd) conducted by International Educational Association (IAE) in 1999. The aim of this study is to examine to which extent are young people ready to take their role as citizens in democracies (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001). In order to achieve this goal Civic Education Study tests civic knowledge, civic attitudes and civic participation of 14 year old students across 28 Countries. Regarding the civic attitudes there are three major domains of the study: *democracy and democratic institutions, national identity and social cohesion and diversity* (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001).

Civic Education Study focuses in particular on the role of schooling for the development of civic knowledge, attitudes and participation. However many background variables are available that give more insights into the student profile, such as family background. Therefore this study not only allows us to understand better how civic knowledge, attitudes and participation of young people are formed, but to examine this in comparative perspective.

For the purpose of this study we use measurements of civic attitudes and participation of the 14 year old pupils in the 11 Western countries⁷. The Western countries under consideration are United States, Germany, French Belgium, England, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Portugal and Italy. In total we analyze 34187 children in eleven different countries. Finally, given the nature of our dependent variables we have decided to exclude cases with missing values from our study in order to make the analysis more conservative.

3.1 Measurements of civic attitudes and participation

The three major domains of the study, democracy and democratic institutions, national identity, social cohesion and diversity, are reflected in the choice of our 5 dependent variables. The scaled items we base our dependent variables on are: trust in government related institutions, positive attitudes towards immigrants, positive attitudes towards one's nation of residence and positive attitudes towards women's political and economic rights. The fifth depended variable that we have found additionally interesting to look at and which is not a scaled variable, is amount of civic participation of students. The scaled items are designed using the Item Response Theory and are based on the questions that are listed below.

Trust in government related institutions is a scale designed by IEA that measures the extend to which pupils are having confidence in public institutions of their countries. It is

based on the level of agreement of student on the following questions: “How much of the time can you trust the national government/ courts/ local government/ the police/political parties and national parliament?”⁸.

The scale *positive attitudes towards immigrants* is also designed by IEA and measures to which extent pupils support certain rights and opportunities of immigrants. It is based on how the student feels about following statements⁹: “Immigrants should have the opportunity to keep their own language”; “Immigrants’ children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have”; “Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections”; “Immigrants should have the opportunity to keep their own customs and lifestyle”; “Immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in a country has”.

We use as the third dependent variable of this study the IEA scale of pupils’ *positive attitudes towards women’s rights*. This scale is an indicator of how much pupils actually endorse equal political and economic rights of men and women. Several questions are used to create it: “Women should run for public office and take part in government just as men do”; “Women should have the same rights as men in every way”; “Women should stay out of politics”; “When jobs are scarce men should have more right to a job than women”¹⁰.

The fourth dependent variable, *positive attitudes towards one’s nation of residence*, is also an IEA scale and measures pupils’ attachment to the country of residence and its political symbols and as well as their nationalistic feelings towards the country of destination. This scale is based on the reactions of students to another set of statements such as: “The flag of this country is very important to me”; “I have great love to this country”; “This country should be proud of what it has achieved”; “I would prefer to live permanently in another country”.

Our fifth dependent variable, *civic participation*, is not a IEA scale but an index that we generate our self. It measures to which extent pupils are involved in the civic activities. It is a sum of the positive answers to the questions on six different aspects of civic participation. The question asked here is if the pupil ever participated in the following six organizations: “a student council”, “youth organization affiliated with a political party or union”, “a group that prepares school newspaper”, “UNESCO club”, “human rights organization” and “a charity collecting money for a social cause”. One point is assigned to each confirming answer to these questions; therefore this variable can take values from 0 to 6, depending on the level of pupils’ civic participation.

3.2 Independent variables

The characteristics of the immigrants: In order to examine if the civic attitudes and participation of immigrant pupils are different to those of the native pupils, we have grouped all pupils in 6 different groups. These groups are our main independent variables. They are made according to three criteria; in the first place we looked if the children are born in the country of the test or not, if not we looked at how old they are

when they arrived to the country of the test. Finally, and most importantly we looked at which language both country born and foreign born students speak at home.

Taking this into account we created 6 different independent variables representing 5 groups of immigrant pupils¹¹ and native pupils. The first group of immigrant children contains those that speak a foreign language at home and arrived to the country of the test being older than 6 years. The second group of immigrant children contains those that speak foreign language at home and arrived to the country of the test being six years old or younger. The third group of are those children that are born in the country of the test, but yet speak a foreign language at home. Fourth group are those children that speak a language of the country of the test at home but arrived in this country when being older than 6 years. The fifth group consist of children that speak a language of the country where the test is hold and who arrived there being 6 years old or younger¹². Finally, the sixth group contains children that are born in the country of the test and speak its language at home.

Individual characteristics and family background: We control for the gender of a child by creating a dummy variable for gender where we coded female pupils with “1” and male ones “0”. There 8 different groups of independent variables that represent *educational level of father and mother*. We constructed dummy variables for the following educational levels; “elementary school”¹³, “high school” and “college”. We have also added additional category, where the respondent could not indicate the educational level of his or her parent. Next to parental education the variable *educational aspiration of pupils*, expresses by the expected amount of years of their further education. Additionally, we control for *family form*, by constructing a dummy variable where value “1” is assigned to mixed families, and “0” to single parent families. We were also interested in the *home literacy*. This variable expresses a number of books at pupils home. Finally, we control for *newspaper readership* of the pupils’ family, represented by the dummy that indicates if the families receive newspaper at home on the daily basis, where “1” means “yes” and “0” means “no”.

Civic participation: this last control variable is the one that represents the amount of *civic participation* of students. The reader has already encountered this variable on the “independent side of the model”. However we use it also as explanatory variables of the pupils’ civic attitudes¹⁴. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of all independent variables.

3.3 Analysis

The set-up of the Civic Education Survey requires techniques that take hierarchical data structure into account. Using individual’s level Ordinary Least Square analysis would overestimate the standard errors of the model and therefore we would run the risk of disregarding the significance of some variables. In order to avoid this we use a Weighted Least Square (WLS) technique where the survey’ weights and stratifications is taken into account. This technique is used to estimate the relationship between the levels of civic attitudes and the characteristics of individual pupil. This relationship is estimated for each 11 Western Countries under consideration.

As for the relationship between civic participation and the independent variables we use the Ordered Logistic Modeling (Ologit) as a technique that allows us to estimate the probability of having certain level of civic participation, conditioned on the characteristics of independent variables.

Each of the techniques is used to estimate two different models, the basic one (Model I) and the more extended one (Model II), where more control variables are added. Model I examines to which extend the level of civic values (WLS) and participation (Ologit) vary across immigrant pupils relative to the native ones. Model II examines the same relationships but in addition it controls for family background and civic participation.

4. Results

4.1. Trust in government related institutions

Table 2 shows the results for the scale trust in government related institutions. A negative figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background have a lower score on this trust scale compared with comparable native pupils of the same age, while a positive figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background have a higher score on this trust scale compared with comparable native pupils of the same age.

The first observation is that in the upper part of table 2 one finds no positive figure which is also significant, while there are a number of negative figures which are significant. This means that in all these countries pupils with an immigrant background trust as much as or less than their native counterparts the government related institutions, but never trust these institutions more.

The second observation is that controlling for expected years of further education, reading newspapers, the number of books at home and civic participation influences the results, but does not change the observation that in the lower part of table 2 seven figures are significant negative, while four are significant positive. This lead to the conclusion that a part of the observable lower trust of children with an immigrant background can be explained by their social-background, but that this background cannot explain in all cases the lower trust of children with an immigrant background. The socio-economic background is powerful in explaining lower trust among children with immigrant background who speaks the language of destination at home and who migrated before the age of 6.

The third observation is that the USA, Sweden and Finland are the only countries of destination with a significant positive figure after control for socio-economic background, while Germany and Switzerland are the only countries of destination without any significant difference in trust between pupils with an immigrant background and comparable native pupils. Germany and Switzerland have the highest percentages of pupils with an immigrant background in Europe, which would support out fourth hypothesis, while Sweden and Finland have relative high MIPEX scores (fifth hypothesis). The positive figures of the USA might be explained by the traditional immigrant character of that society.

The fourth observation is that there is no clear patterns of certain categories of pupils with negative or positive figures, especially after control for socio-economic background. This does not mean that our results are senseless. Seven significant figures in the lower part of table 2 is too high to be just an accidental result (in that case there

should 2 or 3 positive significant figures and the same number negative significant figures). It means that the language spoken at home, the age of immigration or being second generation cannot explain why pupils with an immigrant background trust government related institution less than comparable native pupils. Hypotheses 1 to 3 are thus not supported by the results of table 2.

4.2. Positive attitudes towards immigrants

Table 3 shows the results for the scale positive attitudes towards immigrants. A positive figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background score higher than comparable native pupils of the same age.

The first observation is that in the upper part of table 3 one finds only positive figures which are significant, while there is no negative figure which is significant. This means that in all these countries pupils with an immigrant background have far more positive attitudes towards immigrants than their native counterparts, and never have more negative attitudes.

The second observation is that controlling for expected years of further education, reading newspapers, the number of books at home and civic participation hardly influences the results, and the number of significant parameters (32) is equal both parts of table 3. This leads to the conclusion that the more positive attitudes towards immigrants of children with an immigrant background cannot be explained by their social-background.

The third observation is that positive and significant parameters exist in all destination countries, most in the USA, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, Denmark (at least four positive significant parameters), while in England, Portugal, and Italy native pupils and pupils with an immigrant background differ far less in their attitudes towards immigrants (only one positive and significant parameter). There seems to be no relation between the destination country level of immigrants or the destination country MIPLEX score. There is therefore no support for the fourth and fifth hypotheses.

The fourth observation is that there is no very clear pattern of certain categories of pupils with positive figures. Although most positive and significant parameters can be found among those pupils who speak a foreign language at home, also pupils with an immigrant background who speak the country language at home and migrated before they were 6 years old have a substantial number of significant parameters. There is therefore no support for the first three hypotheses.

4.3. Positive attitudes towards women's rights

Table 4 shows the results for the scale positive attitudes towards women's political and economic rights. A negative figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background have a lower score on this attitudes towards women's rights compared with comparable native pupils of the same age.

The first observation is that in the upper part of table 4 one finds 23 negative figures which are also significant, while there are two positive figures which are significant. This means that in all these countries pupils with an immigrant background have a more negative attitude towards women's economic and political rights than their native counterparts, and never have more positive attitudes.

The second observation is that controlling for expected years of further education, reading newspapers, the number of books at home and civic participation influences the

results, but does not change the observation that in the lower part of table 4 still seven figures are significantly negative, while three are significantly positive. This leads to the conclusion that a part of the observable negative attitude towards women's right of children with an immigrant background can be explained by their social-background, but that this background cannot explain in all cases the negative attitude of children with an immigrant background.

The third observation is that negative and significant parameters exist in all destination countries, if one do not control for socio-economic background. After control for the socio-economic background, only some categories of pupils with an immigrant background in Denmark, Norway, Finland and Italy have a more negative attitude towards women's economic and political rights. There seems to be no relation with the destination country level of immigrants or the destination country MIPEX score. There is therefore no support for the fourth and fifth hypotheses.

The fourth observation is that there is no clear pattern of certain categories of pupils with negative or positive figures, nor before neither after control for socio-economic background. There is therefore no support for the first three hypotheses

4.4. Positive attitudes towards one's nation of residence

Table 5 shows the results for the scale positive attitudes towards the nation of residence. A negative figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background have a more negative attitude towards the nation of residence compared with comparable native pupils of the same age.

The first observation is that in the upper part of table 5 one finds only negative figures (41) which are also significant, while there is no positive figure which is significant. This means that in all these countries pupils with an immigrant background have far more negative attitudes towards the nations of residence than their native counterparts, and never have more positive attitudes.

The second observation is that controlling for expected years of further education, reading newspapers, the number of books at home and civic participation hardly influences the results, and the number of significant negative parameters (37) is only a bit lower than in the first part of table 5 (32). This leads to the conclusion that the more negative attitudes towards the nation of residence of pupils with an immigrant background cannot be explained by their social-background.

The third observation that negative and significant parameters exist in all destination countries, irrespectively if one controls for socio-economic background. There seems to be no relation with the destination country level of immigrants or the destination country MIPEX score. There is therefore no support for the fourth and fifth hypotheses.

The fourth observation is that there is no very clear pattern of certain categories of pupils with negative figures. However one could maintain that there are fewer negative significant figures among those pupils who speak the language of the country of residence at home (9/22 versus 23/33). There is therefore some support for the second hypothesis.

4.5. Civic participation

Table 6 shows the results for the civic participation index. A negative figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background participate less compared with comparable native pupils of the same age, while a positive figure means that 14-year old pupils with an immigrant background participate more compared with comparable native pupils of the same age.

The only observation is that there are hardly significant differences in civic participation between 14-year old pupils with and without an immigrant background. The few significant positive and negative parameters (5 in upper part; 4 in the lower part) are within the boundaries of probability, given the 5% limit for significance.

5. Conclusion

We find clear differences in attitudes towards the society of residence between 14-year pupils with and without an immigration background. Those with an immigrant background had stronger positive attitudes towards immigrants, stronger negative attitudes towards women's political and economic rights, stronger negative attitudes towards the nation of residence and less outspoken lower trust in government related institutions.

These differences in attitudes between pupils with and without an immigration background could not or only partial be explained by expected years of further education, reading newspapers, the number of books at home and civic participation. The same holds for immigration related characteristics: speaking destination country language at home, age of immigration, second generation. These characteristics could not or only partial explain these differences in attitudes between pupils with and without an immigration background. Our first three hypotheses about the effects of these immigration characteristics were not supported by our results. That is an remarkable outcome because normally these three immigration characteristics have significant effects on the integration of immigrants in the society of destination. Also our two hypotheses about cross-national differences (openness of the society of residence; the percentage pupils with an immigration background) are not supported by our results.

The more general conclusion is that the attitudes of 14-year pupils with an immigrant background deviate from those of native pupils, especially in relation to positive attitudes towards immigrants, stronger negative attitudes towards women's political and economic rights, stronger negative attitudes towards the nation of residence and lower trust in government related institutions. We are not able to explain these results in a systematic way with the usually used socio-economic background variables, immigration characteristics or macro-variables. There is no sign that second generation of pupils deviates less than first generation, or that pupils in more inclusive societies differ less. These results do not support the idea that integration of immigrants, indicated by a convergence of attitudes towards society, is making head way in these societies. The stronger positive attitudes towards immigrants is neither a positive sign about the level of integration of immigrants in that society, but can indicate strong differences in the opinions between natives and immigrants about an important aspects of modern societies: immigration and their pro and cons.

As said already in the introduction, we miss important variables: the countries of birth of the pupil and the parents. Characteristics of their origin happen to be important

features for the explanation of behavior and attitudes of immigrants. The forced omission of these important origin-factors, which are unequally distributed among countries of destination, might explain the ineffectiveness of the usual socio-economic and immigration variables, but also the inconsistent cross-national differences.

Whatever the explanation might be for this outcome, our results do show that these differences are substantial and not easily changeable.

Notes

¹ Direct all correspondence to: Jaap Dronkers, Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market | ROA, Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht (The Netherlands). E-mail: j.dronkers@maastrichtuniversity.nl

² Children with an immigration background, who are born in the country of destination.

³ The MIPEX scores of the EU countries are given in table 2.

⁴ For instance, if all children with an immigrant background have in destination land I a Turkish origin while in destination land II they have a Swedish origin, and if Turkish parents socialize their children differently in their attitudes towards society than Swedish parents (for good reason; their origin society function quite differently), one might observe different outcome in attitudes of children with immigrant background in country I and II, but it would be wrong to ascribe these different outcomes to characteristics of the country of destination instead of to the country of origin. But it is even more complex, because this selectivity of immigration from certain countries of origin to certain countries of destination might also be the consequence of some historical action by the country of destination (colonial past; belong to the same larger Habsburg, German or Russian imperia).

⁵ But no information about that language other than that it was not the language of that country.

⁶ Be decided to make the distinction arrival before and after the age of 6, because that is in many countries of destination the average age to go to primary school.

⁷ Our initial idea was to include Eastern European countries as well in the analysis, but unfortunately the small percentage of immigrants in these countries did not allow us to make any statistical inference about this group.

⁸ The possible answers to all of these questions are: “never”, “only some of the time”, “most of the time”, “always” and “don’t know”.

⁹ Here, the possible answers are: “strongly agree”, “agree”, “disagree”, “strongly disagree” and “don’t know”.

¹⁰ We have calculated the Cronbach alpha values for all four scaled items. They are (respectively) 0.714, 0.828, 0.721 and 0.700. This means that all of the questions used to create scaled items do measure the same dimensions of civic attitudes of the stated item.

¹¹ We assume here that those children born abroad are indeed immigrant children. Of course it could also be the case that they are natives who were just born somewhere else. Unfortunately, we have no additional information on this and our data analysis does suffer from this limitation.

¹² This group is in fact most questionable one, regarding the above stated assumption, given that these children are the most 8 years in the country and yet speak the language of the country at home. This could be either very well integrated families or the natives that happen to be living abroad at the time of the child’s birth.

¹³ We did not distinguish between individuals with and without diploma, as this is not the main scope of the study.

¹⁴ Originally we had three constructed three different model, where the first basic model was containing only controls for immigrants, second was extended by family background control variables and this one comprised civic participation in addition to all other ones. As the difference between second and this model was not significant, for the practical reasons we decided to live it out of the main body of the paper. It can be found in the appendix.

References

André, S., J. Dronkers & F. Fleischmann, 2009. "Verschillen in groepsdiscriminatie, zoals waargenomen door immigranten uit verschillende herkomstlanden in veertien lidstaten van de Europese Unie." [Differences in in-group discrimination as perceived by immigrants from various countries of origin in fourteen member-states of the European Union] *Mens en Maatschappij* 84: 448-482

Levels, M., J. Dronkers & G. Kraaykamp, (2008). "Immigrant Children's Educational Achievement in Western Countries: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects on Mathematical Performance." *American Sociological Review* 73:835-853.

Niessen, J., Huddleston, T. & Citron, L. (2007) *Migrant Integration Policy Index*. [online]. Retrieved February 2008. (<http://www.britishcouncil.org/netherlands-networks-mipex-report.pdf>).

Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*. Delft: IEA

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Variable	Nr of observ.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>Dependant variables</i>					
Trust in government related inst.	33342	10.28676	1.898358	2.7702	17.24348
Positive attitudes towards nation	33381	9.62006	2.021544	3.187201	13.67964
Positive attitudes women' rights	33374	10.46882	2.089444	2.813033	13.51111
Positive attitude immigrants	33160	9.946575	2.186954	4.040047	14.1657
Civic participation	29521	.6578707	.9511171	0	6
<i>Independent variables</i>					
<i>Groups of immigrants</i>					
Foreign language > 6	29948	.022873	.149501	0	1
Foreign language < 6	29948	.0165286	.127499	0	1
Foreign language born	29948	.0627087	.2424423	0	1
Country language > 6	29948	.0216041	.1453894	0	1
Country language < 6	29948	.0380326	.1912782	0	1
<i>Individual characteristics & family background</i>					
Girl	33839	.50956	.499916	0	1
Educational aspirations	33445	3.016146	1.392344	1	7
Nr of books at home	33747	4.28695	1.32546	1	6
Mixed family	26238	.8716366	.3345004	0	1
Newspaper readership	33624	.687961	.4633326	0	1
<i>Parental education</i>					
Mother college	34187	.2158715	.4114316	0	1
Mother high school	34187	.4097171	.4917887	0	1
Mother elementary	34187	.1510808	.3581329	0	1
Mother don't know	34187	.1728142	.3780921	0	1
Father college	34187	.2013631	.4010246	0	1
Father high school	34187	.379501	.4852699	0	1
Father elementary	34187	.1541814	.3611278	0	1
Father don't know	34187	.1975605	.3981645	0	1

Source: IAE CivEd study, 1999

Table 2: Trust in Government related institutions (Weighted least square model)^{xv}

	USA	DEU	CHE	SWE	BFR	DNK	NOR	ENG	PRT	FIN	ITA
% of immigrants	10,96	19,10	16,63	12,39	9,58	7,10	6,35	5,76	5,42	3,00	2,10
MIPEX Total score	n.a.	53,00	50,00	88,00	69,00	44,00	64,00	63,00	79,00	67,00	65,00
MODEL I											
<i>Groups of immigrants</i>											
Foreign language > 6	-0.0900 (-0.22)	0.0281 (0.12)	-0.108 (-0.69)	-0.201 (-0.58)	-0.295 (-0.66)	-0.274 (-1.16)	-0.727* (-2.01)	-0.320 (-0.79)	-0.425 (-0.93)	0.206 (0.41)	-0.971 (-1.09)
Foreign language < 6	-0.659* (-2.46)	-0.574 (-1.93)	-0.205 (-1.10)	0.131 (0.38)	0.502 (0.74)	-1.372*** (-3.49)	-0.0716 (-0.30)	-0.679 (-1.48)	-0.387 (-0.60)	0.915 (1.66)	-0.170 (-0.38)
Foreign language born	-0.745** (-2.79)	-0.255 (-0.82)	-0.405** (-2.65)	-0.393 (-1.12)	-0.694* (-2.15)	-0.678* (-2.48)	-0.326 (-1.44)	-0.718* (-2.01)	-0.363 (-1.27)	0.389 (1.22)	-0.0312 (-0.45)
Country language > 6	0.524 (1.84)	-0.00751 (-0.03)	0.246 (1.69)	0.421 (1.90)	-0.851** (-3.19)	-0.0573 (-0.23)	-0.153 (-0.51)	-0.386 (-1.26)	0.133 (0.66)	-0.147 (-0.36)	-0.716* (-2.48)
Country language < 6	-0.0645 (-0.26)	-0.292* (-2.10)	0.0584 (0.37)	-0.507 (-1.56)	-0.664* (-2.32)	-0.132 (-0.56)	-0.492* (-2.19)	-0.228 (-0.91)	-0.179 (-0.99)	-0.447 (-1.85)	-0.396 (-1.14)
MODEL II											
Foreign language > 6	0.684* (2.45)	0.354 (1.42)	0.0638 (0.33)	-0.742 (-1.42)	0.439 (1.22)	-0.402 (-1.25)	-0.890** (-2.75)	-0.512 (-1.47)	-0.439 (-0.87)	0.425 (0.67)	-0.963 (-1.11)
Foreign language < 6	-0.517* (-2.06)	-0.495 (-1.38)	-0.0436 (-0.23)	0.00211 (0.01)	0.152 (0.39)	-1.436*** (-4.13)	-0.268 (-0.67)	-0.920 (-1.73)	-0.652 (-1.93)	0.985 (1.13)	-0.149 (-0.33)
Foreign language born	-0.504 (-1.84)	-0.275 (-0.68)	-0.263 (-1.52)	-0.0974 (-0.29)	-0.531 (-1.03)	-0.335 (-1.58)	-0.375 (-1.46)	-1.046*** (-3.62)	-0.772* (-2.08)	0.415 (0.93)	-0.00964 (-0.13)
Country language > 6	0.875** (2.92)	-0.0329 (-0.09)	0.326 (1.76)	0.731** (2.98)	-0.905* (-2.07)	0.351 (1.04)	-0.168 (-0.48)	-0.464 (-1.31)	-0.0243 (-0.10)	0.833* (2.20)	-0.768* (-2.37)
Country language < 6	0.184	-0.0845	0.111	-0.551	-0.355	-0.307	-0.511	-0.190	0.222	-0.499	-0.278

T-statistics in parentheses, * p<0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001, Source: IAE CIVED, Reference group: native country

Table 3: Positive attitudes towards immigrants (Weighted least square model)

MODEL I	USA	DEU	CHE	SWE	BFR	DNK	NOR	ENG	PRT	FIN	ITA
<i>Groups of immigrants*</i>											
Foreign language >6	0.393 (1.04)	1.463*** (5.99)	1.959*** (9.04)	1.799*** (4.88)	0.424 (1.10)	1.914*** (6.15)	0.978** (3.07)	0.375 (0.69)	1.175** (2.69)	1.541* (2.43)	0.194 (0.38)
Foreign language <6	1.596*** (4.19)	1.774*** (4.45)	2.195*** (9.00)	2.003*** (6.78)	1.028* (2.36)	2.694*** (4.89)	0.888 (1.68)	0.850 (1.13)	0.892 (1.71)	1.085 (1.01)	0.636 (1.07)
Foreign language born	0.373 (1.37)	2.609*** (9.98)	1.693*** (9.79)	0.623* (2.26)	0.435 (1.66)	0.682* (2.09)	0.120 (0.28)	1.486*** (3.82)	0.0460 (0.17)	0.00631 (0.02)	-0.286*** (-3.64)
Country language >6	0.127 (0.31)	0.582* (2.28)	0.945** (2.84)	0.494 (1.31)	0.422 (1.24)	0.569 (1.46)	1.914*** (5.55)	-0.0450 (-0.16)	0.577* (2.27)	1.344** (3.31)	0.960* (2.30)
Country language <6	0.867** (3.13)	0.471** (2.97)	1.464*** (7.88)	1.640*** (4.71)	-0.0850 (-0.20)	1.114*** (4.49)	0.604 (1.80)	0.651* (2.10)	0.484* (2.44)	0.0950 (0.22)	-0.234 (-0.51)
MODEL II											
Foreign language >6	1.077** (2.74)	1.431*** (4.33)	2.146*** (8.28)	2.145*** (6.46)	0.334 (0.67)	2.200*** (5.95)	0.841* (2.09)	0.765 (1.69)	1.187** (2.63)	1.764* (2.47)	0.335 (0.58)
Foreign language <6	1.537*** (3.86)	2.723*** (5.91)	2.111*** (6.42)	1.791*** (7.01)	1.573*** (3.56)	2.242** (3.14)	1.839*** (3.86)	0.723 (0.71)	0.452 (0.62)	1.971* (2.36)	0.692 (1.26)
Foreign language born	0.784** (2.64)	2.653*** (8.57)	1.620*** (8.68)	0.695* (2.06)	0.724* (2.19)	1.107** (3.02)	0.343 (0.64)	1.625*** (3.65)	0.286 (0.73)	0.137 (0.52)	-0.0992 (-1.31)
Country language >6	0.248 (0.55)	0.563 (1.48)	0.738* (2.06)	0.158 (0.42)	0.488 (0.96)	0.473 (0.91)	1.602*** (3.61)	-0.249 (-0.78)	0.527 (1.69)	1.493* (2.57)	0.994* (2.20)
Country language <6	0.775** (3.10)	0.372* (2.54)	1.411*** (6.34)	1.434*** (3.62)	0.567 (1.50)	0.964*** (3.83)	0.166 (0.42)	0.639 (1.91)	0.357 (1.69)	0.384 (0.94)	0.0780 (0.16)

T-statistics in parentheses, * p<0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001, Source: IAE CIVED, Reference group: native country

Table 4: Positive attitudes towards women's political and economic rights (Weighted least square model)

MODEL I	USA	DEU	CHE	SWE	BFR	DNK	NOR	ENG	PRT	FIN	ITA
% of immigrants	10.96	19.10	16.63	12.39	9.58	7.10	6.35	5.76	5.42	3.00	2.10
<i>Groups of immigrants</i>											
Foreign language >6	-1.103*** (-3.77)	-0.761*** (-3.48)	-0.573** (-2.79)	-0.744 (-1.79)	-0.813* (-2.51)	-0.523 (-1.71)	-0.739*** (-3.87)	-0.520 (-1.22)	0.815* (2.01)	-0.888 (-1.89)	-1.090** (-3.27)
Foreign language <6	-0.671 (-1.82)	-0.580 (-1.59)	-0.467* (-2.20)	-0.975** (-2.78)	-1.238* (-2.22)	-1.359** (-2.94)	-1.468*** (-3.80)	-0.781 (-1.48)	-0.865 (-1.74)	-1.597** (-2.88)	-0.684 (-1.43)
Foreign language born	-0.638* (-2.56)	-0.361 (-1.32)	-0.270 (-1.63)	-0.474* (-1.98)	-1.054*** (-4.40)	-0.443 (-1.12)	-0.895** (-2.62)	-0.658* (-2.03)	-0.643* (-2.60)	-0.928*** (-4.18)	-0.663*** (-7.29)
Country language >6	-0.269 (-0.72)	-0.455 (-1.66)	-0.403* (-1.98)	-0.335 (-0.78)	0.0475 (0.12)	-0.681* (-2.33)	1.242*** (4.10)	-0.487 (-1.62)	0.0376 (0.14)	0.0660 (0.13)	-0.0673 (-0.20)
Country language <6	-0.388 (-1.75)	-0.243 (-1.81)	0.0404 (0.17)	-0.707 (-1.90)	-0.116 (-0.39)	0.227 (0.96)	-0.639 (-1.93)	0.526 (1.93)	-0.0817 (-0.38)	0.402 (0.97)	-0.913*** (-3.39)
MODEL II											
Foreign language >6	-0.508 (-1.55)	-0.308 (-1.18)	-0.171 (-0.69)	-0.249 (-0.38)	-0.226 (-0.60)	-0.240 (-0.67)	-0.454 (-1.81)	-0.280 (-0.67)	1.050** (2.97)	-0.642 (-1.50)	-1.031* (-2.39)
Foreign language <6	-0.304 (-0.91)	0.0602 (0.15)	-0.139 (-0.55)	-0.642 (-1.38)	-1.095 (-1.64)	-1.598** (-3.18)	-0.955* (-2.00)	-0.382 (-0.65)	-0.291 (-0.40)	-1.455*** (-3.88)	-0.597 (-1.28)
Foreign language born	-0.217 (-0.91)	0.250 (0.67)	-0.255 (-1.55)	-0.197 (-0.62)	-0.228 (-0.84)	-0.0356 (-0.09)	-0.374 (-0.90)	-0.295 (-1.06)	-0.449 (-1.10)	-0.670** (-2.96)	-0.377*** (-5.32)
Country language >6	-0.0764 (-0.19)	0.0283 (0.09)	-0.269 (-1.63)	-0.356 (-0.66)	0.813* (2.40)	-0.510 (-1.64)	1.236** (3.29)	-0.180 (-0.67)	0.0243 (0.09)	0.733 (1.08)	0.0946 (0.27)
Country language <6	-0.275 (-1.26)	-0.109 (-0.80)	-0.0604 (-0.27)	-0.411 (-1.31)	0.462 (1.28)	0.146 (0.50)	-0.647* (-2.14)	0.507 (1.82)	-0.215 (-0.83)	0.359 (0.94)	-0.615** (-2.66)

T-statistics in parentheses, * p<0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001, Source: IAE CIVED, Reference group: native country

Table 5: Positive attitudes towards one's nation of residence (Weighted least square model)

MODEL I	USA	DEU	CHE	SWE	BFR	DNK	NOR	ENG	PRT	FIN	ITA
% of immigrants	10.96	19.10	16.63	12.39	9.58	7.10	6.35	5.76	5.42	3.00	2.10
<i>Groups of immigrants</i>											
Foreign language >6	-1.129*** (-3.61)	-0.207 (-0.84)	-0.614*** (-3.89)	-1.442*** (-3.95)	-1.214*** (-4.84)	-0.976*** (-4.32)	-1.298*** (-5.70)	-0.561 (-1.55)	-1.282** (-3.27)	-2.088*** (-7.85)	-0.720* (-2.27)
Foreign language <6	-1.460*** (-5.32)	-1.253*** (-5.22)	-1.398*** (-7.80)	-0.857*** (-3.52)	-1.510*** (-3.48)	-2.090*** (-5.50)	-1.481*** (-5.65)	-1.490*** (-4.11)	-0.941* (-2.46)	-0.0943 (-0.11)	-0.674 (-1.31)
Foreign language born	-1.241*** (-4.45)	-1.408*** (-5.63)	-1.291*** (-7.51)	-0.775* (-2.38)	-0.685** (-2.98)	-0.724** (-2.76)	-0.811*** (-3.70)	-1.191*** (-4.56)	-0.759** (-2.91)	-0.947*** (-3.48)	0.149 -1.85
Country language >6	-0.356 (-1.42)	-0.339 (-1.75)	-0.474* (-2.37)	-0.860*** (-3.44)	-0.55 (-1.30)	-0.695* (-2.14)	-0.552 (-1.48)	-0.730*** (-3.75)	-0.757** (-3.19)	-0.612 (-1.33)	-0.225 (-0.60)
Country language <6	-0.619** (-3.00)	-0.441** (-2.87)	-0.665*** (-3.82)	-1.227*** (-5.34)	-0.862*** (-3.58)	-0.564* (-2.13)	-0.604* (-2.38)	-0.932*** (-3.87)	-0.533* (-2.47)	-0.614 (-1.21)	-0.0313 (-0.11)
MODEL II											
Foreign language >6	-0.99*** (-3.61)	-0.335 (-1.23)	-0.555* (-2.28)	-2.157*** (-5.67)	-1.077** (-3.13)	-1.004*** (-3.85)	-1.394*** (-4.99)	-0.391 (-0.92)	-1.228* (-2.47)	-2.181*** (-6.81)	-0.862** (-3.06)
Foreign language <6	-1.560*** (-5.33)	-1.610*** (-4.84)	-1.445*** (-6.61)	-1.116*** (-3.45)	-1.902*** (-4.00)	-2.372*** (-4.51)	-1.516*** (-3.62)	-1.675*** (-3.43)	-1.353** (-2.98)	-1.149* (-2.19)	-0.582 (-1.12)
Foreign language born	-0.920*** (-3.62)	-1.739*** (-4.99)	-1.404*** (-5.27)	-1.131** (-3.28)	-0.762** (-2.91)	-0.521 (-1.86)	-0.809** (-2.72)	-1.590*** (-6.44)	-0.926** (-2.99)	-0.875* (-2.38)	0.105 (1.33)
Country language >6	-0.208 (-0.70)	-0.473 (-1.82)	-0.408 (-1.71)	-0.833*** (-3.37)	-0.351 (-0.55)	-0.952* (-2.16)	-0.335 (-0.67)	-0.693*** (-3.52)	-0.548 (-1.78)	-0.465 (-0.78)	-0.221 (-0.51)
Country language <6	-0.336 (-1.43)	-0.294* (-1.98)	-0.643** (-3.23)	-1.256*** (-3.38)	-0.788* (-2.07)	-0.473 (-1.77)	-0.472 (-1.45)	-1.058*** (-4.15)	-0.641* (-2.21)	-0.774 (-1.41)	-0.0109 (-0.03)

T-statistics in parentheses, * p<0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001, Source: IAE CIVED, Reference group: native country

Table 6: Civic participation (Weighted least square model)

MODEL I	USA	DEU	CHE	SWE	BFR	DNK	NOR	ENG	PRT	FIN	ITA
% of immigrants	10.96	19.10	16.63	12.39	9.58	7.10	6.35	5.76	5.42	3.00	2.10
<i>Groups of immigrants</i>											
Foreign language >6	-0.456 (-1.34)	-0.666* (-2.06)	-0.257 (-0.97)	-0.163 (-0.51)	0.302 (0.64)	-0.409 (-1.19)	-0.605 (-1.94)	0.188 (0.29)	-0.275 (-0.76)	-0.619 (-0.69)	0.349 (0.44)
Foreign language<6	-0.355 (-0.95)	-0.426 (-1.17)	0.192 (0.71)	0.353 (1.46)	0.498 (0.95)	-0.0214 (-0.04)	-0.257 (-0.79)	0.642 (0.88)	0.170 (0.22)	0.105 (0.12)	1.663 (1.79)
Foreign language born	-0.346 (-1.59)	0.622 (1.72)	0.0582 (0.35)	0.0285 (0.09)	0.419 (1.55)	0.0125 (0.06)	0.520 (1.84)	0.264 (1.24)	0.436 (1.16)	0.309 (0.89)	0.172 (1.59)
Country language>6	0.331 (1.19)	-0.868* (-2.39)	-0.569 (-1.61)	0.160 (0.47)	0.618* (2.10)	-0.863 (-1.97)	-0.897* (-2.01)	0.170 (0.66)	0.224 (0.75)	-0.174 (-0.34)	0.960* (2.00)
Country language<6	-0.319 (-1.37)	-0.0205 (-0.14)	0.353 (1.56)	-0.0283 (-0.07)	0.555 (1.49)	-0.265 (-1.19)	0.0336 (0.12)	0.197 (0.94)	0.377 (1.53)	-0.0763 (-0.15)	0.743 (1.55)
MODEL II											
Foreign language >6	-0.0827 (-0.20)	-0.431 (-1.39)	-0.353 (-1.01)	-0.0529 (-0.13)	0.581 (1.04)	-0.611 (-1.49)	-0.713* (-2.07)	-0.275 (-0.46)	-0.433 (-1.43)	-0.114 (-0.09)	0.463 (0.58)
Foreign language<6	0.0976 (0.24)	-0.165 (-0.36)	0.0753 (0.25)	0.390 (1.16)	0.784 (1.59)	-0.0286 (-0.05)	0.0384 (0.12)	1.442 (1.77)	0.622 (0.66)	-0.599 (-0.55)	1.638 (1.72)
Foreign language born	-0.0111 (-0.05)	1.077** (2.96)	-0.0112 (-0.05)	-0.00830 (-0.02)	0.547 (1.78)	-0.230 (-0.88)	0.464 (1.58)	0.144 (0.61)	0.835 (1.85)	0.308 (0.83)	0.270* (2.52)
Country language>6	0.469 (1.43)	-0.802 (-1.86)	-0.599 (-1.82)	0.0312 (0.09)	0.485 (1.50)	-0.838 (-1.73)	-0.974* (-2.31)	0.0456 (0.16)	0.363 (1.11)	0.348 (0.46)	0.917 (1.87)
Country language<6	-0.136 (-0.52)	-0.0985 (-0.56)	0.411 (1.77)	0.247 (0.71)	0.409 (1.25)	-0.0711 (-0.32)	-0.121 (-0.37)	0.0378 (0.17)	0.107 (0.37)	0.0532 (0.10)	0.765 (1.64)

T-statistics in parentheses, * p<0.05, ** p< 0.01, *** p< 0.001, Source: IAE CIVED, Reference group: native country

^{xv} Model I refers to basic model where controls are five different groups of immigrants and the ref. group are *natives who always speak the language of the country at home*
 Model II: Model I + additional control variables: years of further education, newspaper readership, # of books at home and the amount of civic participation