

Appendices

Appendix A. Indicators of conceptions of citizenship

Individual equality: nationality acquisition
Number of years residence before naturalisation can be requested
Welfare and social security dependence as obstacle to naturalisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is dependence on welfare or social security (e.g. unemployment benefits) a reason to refuse naturalisation? - Are there exceptions to this rule (not personally responsible)?
Automatic attribution or facilitated naturalisation for 2 nd generation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the nationality of the host country automatically attributed at birth? If so, on which conditions (e.g. connected to years of legal residence of parents)? - Is naturalisation attributed automatically at majority? - Is there an option or declaration to naturalisation for host country born children of immigrants? - Are there other forms of facilitated naturalisation: double ius soli (3rd generation) or socialisation (1.5 generation)?
Allowance of dual nationality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does naturalisation require giving up the former nationality? - Are there exemptions from the renunciation requirement? If so, are they generous or limited?
Actual naturalisation rates
Individual equality: citizenship rights for foreign nationals
What is the minimum age for family formation of spouses coming to the host country?
What is the income requirement for family reunification for foreign nationals?
What are the eligibility criteria for sponsors (kind of residence permit or minimum duration of stay) for family reunification for foreign nationals?
Voting rights for foreign nationals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there voting rights at local level? - Are there voting rights at other levels (regional or national)? - Are voting rights active and/or passive? - Do voting rights include all foreigners or are they selective (reciprocity or certain groups (e.g. Commonwealth)?
How many years of criminal conviction lead to expulsion for short term residents?
How many years of criminal conviction lead to expulsion for long term residents?
Is expulsion impossible or extremely difficult for immigrants socialized in the country?
Welfare dependence a reason for expulsion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is welfare dependence a reason for expulsion? - Are there special rules for long term residents?
The right for foreign nationals to work in the police force

The right for foreign nationals to work as teachers
The right for foreign nationals to work in public administration
Individual equality: anti-discrimination rights
Implementation of ICERD provisions against racial hatred implemented in national criminal law
Inclusion of discrimination (next to explicit racism) in criminal law
Existence of specific anti-discrimination legislation in civil law <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there an anti-discrimination article in the civil law? - Are important grounds (ethnicity/race, religion, nationality) of discrimination covered by the law? - Are important spheres (employment, housing, education, goods and services) covered by the law?
Establishment by state of anti-discrimination bodies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there any state sponsored special anti-discrimination bodies? - Can the special body take legal action on behalf of victims? - Does the body have the power to instigate independent investigations? - Can it decide on discrimination complaints?

Cultural difference: cultural requirements for naturalisation
Cultural requirements for residence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there language requirements? - Are there civic knowledge requirements?
Cultural requirements for naturalisation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there language requirements? - Are there civic knowledge requirements? - Is there an oath or declaration of loyalty? - Are there assimilation requirements?
Cultural requirements for family reunification
Cultural difference: allowances for Islamic religious practices outside of public institutions
Allowance ritual slaughtering animals according to the Islamic rite <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it allowed to slaughter animals according to Islamic rite: meaning without stunning the animal before slitting its throat - If yes, are the conditions strict (e.g. a doctor has to present, consumption only in community, no export) or liberal?
Allowance of Islamic call to prayer in public <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a national provision to allow the call to prayer? If it is left to the local level, what is the common policy? Is it practiced widely?
Presence of mosques with minarets relative to the size of the Muslim community
Presence of separate sections and burial regulations for Muslims
Provisions for burial without a coffin
Cultural difference: cultural rights and provisions in public institutions
Number of (partly) state-financed Islamic schools, relative to the size of the Muslim population
Amount of state funding for Islamic schools
Islamic religious classes in state schools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there Islamic classes as direct alternative to Religion?
Right of female teachers to wear a headscarf in public schools
Right of female students to wear a headscarf in public schools
Programmes in immigrant languages in public broadcasting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there any public TV- or Radio-Broadcasting directed towards immigrants? - What is the language? - How much time is devoted to such programmes?
Islamic religious programmes in public broadcasting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there Islamic religious programmes on public radio or television? - How much time is devoted to such programmes?

<p>Mother tongue teaching in schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there mother-tongue teaching during regular school hours? - Is mother tongue teaching state-funded?
<p>Availability of state-paid imams in the army</p>
<p>Availability of state-paid imams in prisons</p>
<p>Cultural difference: political representation rights</p>
<p>Immigrant consultative bodies at the local level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does a consultative body with interest in immigrant affairs exist? - Does the state have influence in the appointment of its members? - Are the members individuals or representatives of immigrant organisations? - What is their share of immigrants?
<p>Immigrant consultative bodies at the national level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does a consultative body with interest in immigrant affairs exist? - Does the state have influence in the appointment of its members? - Are the members individuals or representatives of immigrant organisations? - What is their share of immigrants?
<p>Muslim consultative bodies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does a consultative body with interest in Muslim affairs exist? - Do Muslims represent 50% or more? - Are the members individuals or representatives of immigrant organisations? - Does the state have influence in the appointment of its members?
<p>Cultural difference: affirmative action in the labour market</p>
<p>Affirmative action in public sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there quotas, target of preferential hiring programmes for minority groups? - Are there other programmes to stimulate the presence of minority groups in public sector jobs?

Source: "Comparative indicators of citizenship rights for immigrant minorities" 1980-2008, WZB, MIT department. Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski, and Stine Waibel, with the assistance of Francisca Gromme and Madelene Narbrink. Valuable input was also provided by the members of the EURISLAM research project.

Appendix B. Scores for France, Germany and the Netherlands on conceptions of citizenship indicators in 1980, 1990, 2002 and 2008

	France			Germany			Netherlands					
	1980	1990	2002	2008	1980	1990	2002	2008	1980	1990	2002	2008
Individual equality dimension												
Nationality acquisition												
Number of years of residence	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
Welfare and social security dependence obstacle to naturalisation	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Automatic attribution/facilitated naturalisation for second generation	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	-1	-1	0.5	0.5	-0.5	0	0	0
Allowance of dual nationality	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	0
Naturalisation rates ¹	0	0	0.5	1	-1	-1	0	-0.5	0.5	0	1	1
<i>Average</i>	<i>0.60</i>	<i>0.60</i>	<i>0.50</i>	<i>0.60</i>	<i>-0.70</i>	<i>-0.70</i>	<i>0.10</i>	<i>0.00</i>	<i>0.10</i>	<i>0.10</i>	<i>0.50</i>	<i>0.50</i>
Citizenship rights for foreign nationals												
Conditions for family reunification: age	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	-0.5	-0.5
Conditions for family reunification: income	0	0	0	-1	0	0	0	-1	1	-	0	-1
Conditions for family reunification: residence status	0	0	0	-1	-	1	1	1	0	-	1	1
Voting rights for foreign nationals	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0.5	0.5	0.5
Criminal conviction as grounds for expulsion short term residents	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	-1
Criminal conviction as grounds for expulsion long term residents	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	-0.5	0	0	-0.5	0	0	0
Expulsion extremely difficult for persons socialised in country	0	0	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-0.5	1	1	1

Welfare dependence as grounds for expulsion	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-	0	1
Rights for foreign nationals to work for the police force	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-1
Rights for foreign nationals to work as teachers	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1
Rights for foreign nationals to work in the public administration	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	1	1	1
<i>Average</i>	-0.23	-0.23	-0.23	-0.50	-0.55	-0.41	-0.18	-0.36	-0.25	0.50	0.32	0.18
Anti-discrimination rights												
ICERD racial hatred provisions in criminal law	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Discrimination in criminal Law	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1
Discrimination in civil law	-1	-0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0.5	-1	-1	1	1
State established anti-discrimination bodies and legal mandate	-1	-1	-0.5	1	-1	-1	-1	-0.5	-1	-1	1	1
<i>Average</i>	0.00	0.13	0.38	0.88	-0.25	-0.25	-0.25	0	0	0	1	1

160 Comparing integration

	France			Germany			Netherlands					
	1980	1990	2002	2008	1980	1990	2002	2008	1980	1990	2002	2008
Accommodation of diversity dimension												
Cultural requirement for access to rights												
Cultural requirements for residence	1	1	1	0	-1	-1	0	-1	1	1	1	-1
Cultural requirements for naturalisation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	-0.5	-1	0.5	0.5	-0.5
Cultural requirements for family reunification	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
<i>Average</i>	0.33	0.33	0.33	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3	0.33	-0.5	0.33	0.83	0.83	-0.5
Allowance of Islamic religious practices outside of public institutions												
Allowance of Islamic ritual slaughtering	1	0	0	0	-1	-1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Allowance of Islamic call to prayer	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	-1	1	1	1
Presence of mosques with minarets ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
Separate sections and burial regulations for Muslims	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	1
Allowance of burial without a coffin	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	-1	1	1
<i>Average</i>	-0.2	-0.4	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	-0.4	0.2	0.2	-0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8
Cultural rights in public institutions												
Number of Islamic schools (partly) financed by the state ¹	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-0.5	-0.5	-1	-	1	1
Amount of state funding for Islamic schools	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-0.5	-0.5	-1	1	1	1
Islamic religious classes in state schools	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-1	0	0	0
Right of female teachers to wear headscarf	-	-	-1	-1	-	-	0	0	-	-	1	1

Appendix C Sampling and survey procedures

Sampling

The main sampling frame was surname sampling from online phonebooks.⁴⁹ A list of 30 stems of common Turkish surnames was used. Surname-based sampling from phonebooks has proven to be an efficient and representative method for the study of immigrant populations in general, and Turks in particular (see, Galonska *et al.* 2003; Granato 1999; Humpert and Schneiderheinze 2000; Salentin 1999). Since not all Turkish immigrant households are listed in the phonebook, this method might have a bias. It might be that people who are not listed in the phonebook differ on certain vital characteristics from people who are listed. Therefore we combined this technique with two other techniques.

In the summer of 2005 I went to Turkey together with an interpreter. We went to the provinces of Karaman (South-Central Anatolia) and Sivas (East-Central Anatolia). In the towns and villages of these provinces we looked for migrants from France, Germany and the Netherlands who were spending their holidays in their hometowns. We told them about our research project and asked them to give their phone number so that they could later be contacted for the telephone survey.⁵⁰ This sampling technique can also have a bias, since it only includes immigrants who have maintained a connection to their region of origin. These migrants might show higher levels of ethnic retention.

Thirdly, a snowball technique was used. Snowballing was used in three different ways. Firstly, people (both immigrant holiday makers and locals) in Karaman and Sivas were asked if they knew any people living in either of the three target countries. Secondly, respondents of the survey were asked for the phone numbers of their parents or adult children. Lastly, survey respondents were asked for the phone numbers of family members or people from their origin village in the other two countries. The snowball technique is often criticized for violating the random sample assumption. The risk is that the snowball only rolls towards people who are relatively similar to the original respondents and excludes people who are not. However, using a cross-national snowball fits with the quasi-experimental nature of the research. It allows tracing people with similar backgrounds (i.e. people from the same family or village) to different destination countries.

Survey

The telephone survey was executed in two waves, each beginning in the Netherlands and ending in France. The survey was timed so as not to overlap with the holy month of Ramadan, a period of heightened religious awareness that might bias the results. The first wave was from November 2005 until the end of January 2006, the second from April 2006

⁴⁹ In Germany we used www.telefonbuch.de, in the Netherlands www.nationaletelefoongids.nl and for France www.infobel.com/france. In Germany and the Netherlands, cell phone numbers were included in the sample. The French online telephone directories unfortunately did not include cell-phone numbers.

⁵⁰ Massey *et al.* (1994) also used a home-country sample for their study on Mexican migrants to the United States.

until June 2006. In the first wave only people from Karaman and Sivas were interviewed. Because this did not lead to sufficiently high response rates the target regions for the second wave were extended to the whole of East-Central and South-Central Anatolia.

Because immigrants are notoriously hard to reach (CBS 2005), all numbers were called up to six times, unless a definitive response or non-response was attained before then. Nevertheless, as Appendix D shows, 12 -16 % of the sample has not been reached. Less than a third of all people reached belonged to the target group. Possibly, the actual percentage is even lower because some people refused to participate before we could establish whether or not they belonged to the target group.

The holiday and snowball sample had lower refusal rates than the phonebook sample. This is in part because some non-response occurred before inclusion in the sample. Not all holiday makers we approached were willing to give their phone numbers.

The response rate of the phonebook sample varies between countries. It is highest in France and lowest in Germany. One of the reasons is that the Turkish community in Germany is often targeted by telemarketers, also in the Turkish language. In Germany the refusal rate for the second survey wave was higher than for the first. We suspect this was an effect of the debate on an integration questionnaire (*Einbürgerungsfragebogen*) that started at the time of the second wave. Some of the potential respondents were afraid that our study was in fact this integration questionnaire and refused to participate.

Appendix D. Response rates per sample type per country

	Netherlands			Germany			France					
	Phone book	Holiday	Snow ball	Phone book	Holiday	Snow ball	Phone book	Holiday	Snow ball			
Sample	1640	93	137	1870	2935	58	220	3213	2660	57	274	2991
Wrong numbers	134	13	14	161	198	7	31	236	192	12	15	219
Not reached	265	13	29	307	364	8	30	402	326	12	40	378
Reached	1241	67	94	1402	2373	43	159	2575	2142	33	219	2394
% of sample	75.67%	72.04%	68.61%	75.00%	80.85%	74.14%	72.27%	80.14%	80.53%	57.89%	79.93%	80.04%
Other region	788	0	1	789	1624	2	9	1635	1463	0	5	1468
Migration after												
1975	116	9	17	142	89	5	18	112	266	10	37	313
Target	337	58	76	471	660	36	132	828	413	23	177	613
% of all reached	27.16%	86.57%	80.85%	33.59%	27.81%	83.72%	83.02%	32.16%	19.28%	69.70%	80.82%	25.61%
Refusals	181	6	11	198	484	4	45	533	139	5	37	181
Interviews	156	52	65	273	176	32	87	295	274	18	140	432
Nett response rate	46.29%	89.66%	85.53%	57.96%	26.67%	88.89%	65.91%	35.63%	66.34%	78.26%	79.10%	70.47%

Table D.1 Response rates per sample type and country

Appendix E. Descriptives of telephone survey sample and discussion of comparability and representativeness

	Netherlands		Germany		France	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
East-Central Anatolia	0.29	0.45	0.56	0.50	0.28	0.45
Alevi	0.06	0.23	0.17	0.38	0.05	0.22
Age	36.91	13.69	38.07	13.46	37.20	14.11
First generation	0.18	0.38	0.18	0.38	0.25	0.43
In-between generation	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.45	0.50
Second generation	0.30	0.46	0.29	0.45	0.30	0.46
Female	0.51	0.50	0.42	0.49	0.45	0.50
Married	0.77	0.42	0.78	0.42	0.82	0.39
Children	0.72	0.45	0.74	0.44	0.76	0.43
No / primary education	0.24	0.43	0.20	0.40	0.31	0.46
Secondary education	0.59	0.49	0.68	0.47	0.58	0.49
Post-secondary education	0.17	0.38	0.12	0.33	0.11	0.31
Working	0.46	0.50	0.53	0.50	0.50	0.50
Phone book sample	0.57	0.50	0.60	0.49	0.63	0.48
Holiday sample	0.19	0.39	0.11	0.31	0.04	0.20
Snowball sample	0.24	0.43	0.29	0.46	0.32	0.47
Relative size of imm. population	17.91	8.70	13.72	4.63	13.37	6.30
Relative size of Turkish imm. pop.	2.63	1.24	2.89	1.51	1.31	1.20
Only host country citizenship	0.07	0.25	0.34	0.47	0.06	0.25
Only Turkish citizenship	0.13	0.34	0.58	0.50	0.46	0.50
Dual citizenship	0.80	0.40	0.09	0.28	0.48	0.50
Dependent variables						
Turkish identification	4.47	0.70	4.37	0.77	4.52	0.64
Turkish language proficiency	4.06	1.01	4.01	1.04	3.94	1.10
Muslim identification	4.59	0.70	4.32	0.86	4.49	0.74
Religious observance	0.15	0.70	-0.27	0.93	0.09	0.70
Host country identification	2.80	0.97	2.31	0.89	2.69	1.08
Host country language proficiency	3.79	1.16	3.90	1.05	3.84	1.25
Host country language use	0.32	0.30	0.35	0.30	0.41	0.35
Social contacts	1.59	0.54	1.57	0.53	1.69	0.60
Perceived as host country member	2.36	1.22	2.00	1.12	2.52	1.32
Perceived discrimination	2.16	1.18	2.27	1.22	2.17	1.22

Table E.1 Descriptives of telephone survey sample by country

Discussion of cross-national comparability

Overall, the background characteristics of the respondents are comparable across countries. There are somewhat less female respondents in France and in Germany. The French respondents have the lowest levels of education. As the generation-specific tables in Appendix F show, this difference is present in both the first and the in-between generation.

A noticeable difference is the higher share of respondents from East-Central Anatolia and of Alevi denomination in Germany. Likely, this reflects a difference in the composition of the Turkish immigrant population in Germany compared to the other two countries. Narrowing down the target group has allowed us to minimise but not to entirely avoid cross-national differences in composition. Therefore, all multivariate analyses presented in this dissertation are controlled for regions of origin and religious denomination next to individual level factors such as gender, generation and level of education.

The relative size of Turkish community and citizenship possession also differ between the three samples, but these differences fit the general differences between the countries and are unlikely to be caused by sampling bias.

Representativeness of the samples

To investigate possible sampling biases it is preferable to compare the samples from this research project to census-like databases. There are however no representative studies on the target group of this project (i.e. Turkish immigrants from East-Central and South-Central Anatolia, who migrated before 1975 and their children). To nevertheless get an impression of possible sampling biases I will compare the sample of this study with studies on the general Turkish immigrant population.

Tables E.2 tot E.4 provide a comparison of the regional spread of the respondents of our study to the spread of the Turkish immigrant population according to the population statistics in each country. The overall spread is comparable but there are large divergences for some regions. This can mainly be explained by the regional nature of our sample. Because migration destination is related to region of origin it is to be expected that a regional sample shows a different dispersal than the Turkish immigrant population at large. In France the difference between population statistics and our sample are particularly pronounced for Ile-de-France. This is in part related to the exclusion of Istanbul and post-1975 immigrants from our sample. Many Turkish immigrants come to the Parisian region to study and often stay after finishing their degree. These people are included in the population statistics but do not form part of our target group. The Dutch province of Overijssel has a significant share of orthodox-Christian Turkish immigrants who come from regions such as Mardin that are not included in our sample.

	Population		
	statistics	This study	Difference
Brabant	12.86%	8.79%	-4.07%
Drente	0.47%	0.00%	-0.47%
Flevoland	1.41%	1.47%	0.06%
Friesland	0.49%	0.00%	-0.49%
Gelderland	10.27%	8.06%	-2.21%
Groningen	1.23%	1.10%	-0.13%
Limburg	3.37%	1.83%	-1.54%
Noord-Holland	20.58%	24.54%	3.96%
Overijssel	9.10%	4.03%	-5.07%
Utrecht	6.71%	10.26%	3.55%
Zeeland	0.82%	0.37%	-0.45%
Zuid-Holland	32.69%	39.56%	6.87%

Table E.2 Comparison of regional spread of Turkish immigrant population and sample population in the Netherlands. Source population statistics: CBS Statline, data for the year 2005

	Population		
	statistics	This study	Difference
Baden-Württemberg	17.22%	27.46%	10.24%
Bayern	12.68%	9.83%	-2.85%
Berlin	6.84%	4.07%	-2.77%
Bremen	1.62%	0.34%	-1.28%
Hamburg	3.49%	1.02%	-2.47%
Hessen	8.75%	12.20%	3.45%
Niedersachsen	7.49%	7.46%	-0.03%
NRW	33.92%	33.56%	-0.36%
Rheinland-Pfalz	3.97%	2.03%	-1.94%
Saarland	0.95%	0.34%	-0.61%
Schleswig-Holstein	1.96%	1.69%	-0.27%
The six new <i>Bundesländer</i>	1.11%	0.00%	-1.11%

Table E.3 Comparison of regional spread of Turkish immigrant population and sample population in Germany. Source population statistics: Mikrozensus 2005

	Population		
	statistics	This study	Difference
Alsace	12.44%	13.46%	1.02%
Aquitaine	1.62%	0.93%	-0.69%
Auvergne	1.88%	5.80%	3.92%
Basse-Normandie	1.39%	1.39%	0.00%
Bourgogne	2.30%	1.39%	-0.91%
Bretagne	1.52%	1.86%	0.34%
Centre	4.71%	6.50%	1.79%
Champagne-Ardenne	1.83%	1.86%	0.03%
Franche-Comté	3.91%	5.10%	1.19%
Haute-Normandie	1.69%	1.16%	-0.53%
Ile-de-France	28.89%	13.69%	-15.20%
Languedoc	1.51%	0.23%	-1.28%
Limousin	1.12%	0.93%	-0.19%
Lorraine	7.42%	11.60%	4.18%
Midi-Pyrénées	0.95%	0.23%	-0.72%
Nord-Pas-de-Calais	1.34%	1.16%	-0.18%
Pays de la Loire	1.80%	2.09%	0.29%
Picardie	1.86%	3.02%	1.16%
Poitou-Charentes	0.46%	0.23%	-0.23%
Provence	4.15%	0.70%	-3.45%
Rhône-Alpes	17.20%	26.68%	9.48%

Table E.4 Comparison of regional spread of Turkish immigrant population and sample population in France. Source population statistics: INSEE, recensement 1999

The Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP) and the Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis (CPB) undertook a study on Turkish immigrants and their offspring in the Netherlands and Germany (Dagevos *et al.* 2006). The data used in the SCP/CPB study provide a basis for a general comparison of the level of education. The Dutch data include people born in Turkey or with at least one parent born in Turkey. The German dataset only includes the foreign-born, and German-born descendants of Turkish immigrants who have Turkish nationality (Dagevos *et al.* 2006). An important difference with the sample of our study is that the sample used by Dagevos *et al.* includes people who migrated as adults after 1975. This group consists mainly of marriage migrants.

The SCP/CPB study presents information on the level of education of Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands and Germany. I recalculated the results from the sample of our study to match the definitions used by the SCP/CPB:

- The SCP/CPB data measures the level of education attained, whereas the survey for this study measures the level of education attended. The results were recoded so that people who did not receive a degree (either because they are still attending, or because they dropped out), are scored as having attained the level of education that precedes the attended level. For example, people who dropped out of high school are scored as having no more than primary education.
- The definition of generation used in the SCP/CPB study only distinguishes between the first generation (born in Turkey, migrated after the age of 5) and second generation (born in the host country, or born in Turkey and migrated before the age of 6). Generation was recoded in line with this definition.
- The share of in-between and first generation respondents was weighed in accordance with the distribution of the SCP/CBS data.

The results are presented in Tables E.5 and E.6. In our study, the level of education of the first generation in both countries is lower than in the SCP/CBS study. This is probably because the marriage migrants, who form a significant part of the first generation in the SCP/CBS study but are excluded from our study, are better educated than the guest-workers. For the second generation there is a modest educational bias. In our study, the Dutch respondents are better educated than in the SCP/CPB study and in Germany less. This rough comparison of regional spread and level of education indicate that our sampling techniques have not led to large sampling biases.

	The Netherlands		Germany	
	This study	SCP/CPB	This study	SCP/CPB
No more than primary education	71%	56%	58%	40%
Secondary education	25%	38%	38%	49%
Tertiary education	5%	6%	5%	11%

Table E.5 Level of education of first generation (migration after the age 5)

	The Netherlands		Germany	
	This study	SCP/CPB	This study	SCP/CPB
No more than primary education	18%	24%	16%	13%
Secondary education	74%	71%	76%	80%
Tertiary education	8%	4%	8%	7%

Table E.6 Level of education of second generation (incl. migration under age 6)

Appendix F. Details on procedure and representativeness of the in-depth interviews

Recruitment of respondents

In each country two regions were selected that have a high share of Turkish immigrants. For France the regions Rhône-Alpes and Alsace were selected. After Ile-de-France these regions have the largest Turkish communities. Alsace occupies a special position within France because of its history. When in 1905 the law on the separation of church and state came into force, Alsace was part of Germany. When it later became part of France again, the concordatarian system was nevertheless upheld. This means that in Alsace the ministers of the recognised religions - i.e. Christian denominations and Judaism but not Islam – are paid by the state. At primary school and the first tier of secondary school (*collège*) there is compulsory religious education. However pupils can be excused from these classes if their parents put in a written request. What is also a particular feature of Alsace is that Turks form the largest immigrant group.

The Netherlands are divided into twelve provinces, but these are all relatively small. The main difference in the Netherlands is that between the *Randstad*, the metropolitan area that spans three provinces encompassing the cities of Utrecht, Rotterdam, The Hague and Amsterdam, and the provinces to the north, south and east of the *Randstad*. Almost half the Dutch population and more than half of the immigrant population lives in the *Randstad*. Turks are particularly concentrated in the *Rijnmond* area around Rotterdam, but significant numbers also live in The Hague, Amsterdam and Utrecht. I conducted interviews in both the *Randstad* and the eastern provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel. Several cities in these provinces such as Enschede, Deventer and Almelo have a large Turkish population

In Germany North Rhine–Westphalia and Baden–Württemberg were selected. About one-fifth of Germany's population and one-third of the Turkish-origin population lives in North Rhine–Westphalia. Major cities in this *Land* are Cologne and Bonn, and the *Ruhrgebiet* cities of Duisburg and Dortmund. North Rhine–Westphalia is one of the more progressive *Bundesländer*, Baden–Württemberg one of the more conservative ones. This state has the second-largest Turkish-origin community in Germany.

During my stay in each region I tried to contact all people in that region who had expressed their willingness to participate in an in-depth interview. Because especially for the first generation this did not always lead to a satisfactory number of respondents, additional respondents were recruited with help of the interpreters. These respondents meet the same year of migration and origin region criteria as the respondents from the survey. Table F1 shows the way in which respondents were recruited and their region of residence.

In France 28 interviews were carried out. Three of the first generation respondents had not participated in the telephone survey but were recruited through the interpreters. In the Netherlands I did 29 interviews of which also one respondent of the in-between generation was contacted through snowball sampling. Among the first generation in

Germany, suspicion of people in general and researchers in particular made it harder to find respondents. Here four respondents were recruited through snowballs by the translators. An additional non-survey respondent was added because she was present at her aunt's when I came to do the interview. In total 29 interviews were conducted in Germany.

	The Netherlands		Germany		France	
	Randstad	Eastern NL	NRW	Baden-W	Rhône-Alpes	Alsace
Survey	24	4	14	10	13	12
Snowball	1	0	3	2	0	3
<i>Total</i>	<i>25</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>15</i>

Table F.1 Interview respondent recruitment

Representativeness of the in-depth interviews

To investigate to what extent the respondents of the in-depth interviews are representative of their respective national sample, Tables F2 through F7 compare the descriptives of the survey respondents and the in-depth interview respondents for each generation. Since the interview respondents that were recruited through snowballing were not interviewed in the survey, their characteristics cannot be given for all survey items. The third column for each country presents the descriptives of the interview-sample including the snowball respondents, for those variables that were asked again in the interviews. The table reflects the situation of the respondents at the time of the survey. Changes that occurred between the time of the survey and the interview (divorce, child-birth, naturalisation) are not taken into account, because this distorts the comparison with the survey sample.

Differences between the interview and survey respondents that exceed 10% of the scale of the variable are printed in bold type. Because of the low number of respondents per generation per country, one person that is 'extraordinary' can already lead to large divergences. Overall the in-depth interview respondents are representative of the survey sample. When using the results of the in-depth interviews to interpret the results from the survey, the sample biases that do exist have been taken into account.

	Netherlands		Germany		France	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Independent variables						
East-Central Anatolia	0.33	0.48	0.60	0.50	0.32	0.47
Alevi	0.09	0.29	0.24	0.43	0.06	0.24
Age	60.42	5.62	61.21	4.98	58.11	4.91
Age at arrival	26.31	4.27	26.92	4.18	25.93	4.77
Year of arrival	1971	2.96	1971	2.58	1973	1.21
Female	0.16	0.37	0.26	0.44	0.23	0.42
Married	0.98	0.15	0.94	0.25	0.99	0.10
Parent	0.98	0.15	1.00	0.00	0.96	0.20
No / primary education	0.75	0.44	0.73	0.45	0.84	0.37
Secondary education	0.21	0.41	0.24	0.43	0.15	0.36
Post-secondary education	0.04	0.20	0.04	0.20	0.01	0.10
Working	0.10	0.31	0.25	0.44	0.32	0.47
Phone book sample	0.50	0.51	0.60	0.50	0.71	0.45
Holiday sample	0.17	0.38	0.08	0.27	0.00	0.00
Snowball sample	0.33	0.48	0.33	0.47	0.29	0.45
Relative size of immigrant population	17.78	9.17	12.60	4.46	13.63	6.36
Relative size of Turkish immigrant pop.	2.49	1.17	2.75	1.74	1.20	1.20
Only host country citizenship	0.02	0.15	0.11	0.32	0.01	0.10
Only Turkish citizenship	0.36	0.49	0.80	0.40	0.78	0.42
Dual citizenship	0.61	0.49	0.09	0.29	0.21	0.41
Dependent variables						
Turkish identification	4.54	0.76	4.55	0.62	4.79	0.36
Turkish language proficiency	4.64	0.68	4.66	0.79	4.67	0.81
Muslim identification	4.68	0.70	4.50	0.78	4.76	0.47
Religious observance	0.41	0.84	-0.19	1.03	0.40	0.61
Host country identification	2.91	1.09	2.00	0.83	2.24	0.85
Host country language proficiency	2.62	1.03	2.89	1.01	2.46	1.04
Host country language use	0.10	0.20	0.12	0.18	0.06	0.13
Social contacts	1.51	0.51	1.30	0.51	1.40	0.56
Perceived as host country member	2.14	1.16	1.77	1.08	1.88	1.12
Frequency of perceived discrimination	1.56	1.03	1.73	1.18	1.49	0.98

Table F.2 Descriptives of first generation survey respondents by country

	Netherlands		Germany		France			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	
					<i>incl</i>		<i>incl</i>	
				<i>SB</i>		<i>SB</i>	<i>SB</i>	
Independent variables								
East-Central Anatolia	0.43	0.53	0.50	0.58	0.43	0.14	0.38	0.20
Alevi	0.29	0.49	0.75	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00
Age	60.71	4.72	58.50	5.26	0.61	57.14	4.45	0.57
Age at arrival	24.57	1.62	25.50	4.43	26.57	25.00	3.61	24.60
Year of arrival	1969	3.98	1972	2.00	1970	1973	1.21	1973
Female	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.50	0.30	0.14	0.38	0.10
Married	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
Parent	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.86	0.38	0.90
No / primary education	0.71	0.49	0.75	0.50	0.86	0.71	0.49	0.60
Secondary education	0.14	0.38	0.25	0.50	0.14	0.29	0.49	0.40
Post-secondary education	0.14	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Working	0.14	0.38	0.25	0.50	0.29	0.43	0.53	0.30
Relative size of imm pop	15.77	8.11	14.92	4.19		14.80	4.70	
Rel. size of Turkish imm pop.	2.36	1.38	3.35	2.25		1.38	0.54	
Only host country citizenship	0.14	0.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Only Turkish citizenship	0.29	0.49	0.75	0.50	0.86	1.00	0.00	1.00
Dual citizenship	0.57	0.53	0.25	0.50	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00
Dependent variables								
Turkish identification	4.14	1.07	4.58	0.17		5.00	0.00	
Turkish language proficiency	4.14	0.90	5.00	0.00		4.43	0.79	
Muslim identification	4.33	0.84	4.00	1.56		4.90	0.25	
Religious observance	0.17	1.20	-0.75	0.74		0.68	0.32	
Host country identification	3.10	1.03	1.75	0.57		1.86	0.38	
Host country language prof.	3.43	0.53	2.50	0.58		2.43	1.13	
Host country language use	0.24	0.33	0.00	0.00		0.05	0.08	
Social contacts	1.71	0.49	1.25	0.50		1.50	0.84	
Perceived as host cntr member	2.43	1.27	2.00	1.00		3.86	1.57	
Frequency of perceived discr.	1.71	0.95	1.00	0.00		1.14	0.38	
<i>N</i>		7		4		7		7
								10

Table F.3 Descriptives of first generation in-depth interview respondents by country

	Netherlands		Germany		France	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Independent variables						
East-Central Anatolia	0.32	0.47	0.53	0.50	0.29	0.46
Alevi	0.07	0.26	0.17	0.37	0.05	0.21
Age	36.44	7.26	37.10	6.84	34.65	6.99
Age at arrival	10.13	5.55	10.63	5.05	8.81	5.66
Year of arrival	1979	5.86	1979	5.65	1979	5.91
Female	0.54	0.50	0.41	0.49	0.49	0.50
Married	0.89	0.31	0.89	0.32	0.91	0.28
Parent	0.89	0.31	0.87	0.34	0.92	0.28
No / primary education	0.20	0.40	0.12	0.32	0.21	0.41
Secondary education	0.64	0.48	0.76	0.43	0.71	0.46
Post-secondary education	0.16	0.37	0.12	0.33	0.08	0.27
Working	0.55	0.50	0.65	0.48	0.62	0.49
Phone book sample	0.67	0.47	0.63	0.48	0.68	0.47
Holiday sample	0.15	0.36	0.12	0.32	0.05	0.21
Snowball sample	0.18	0.38	0.25	0.43	0.27	0.45
Relative size of immigrant pop.	17.72	8.66	14.14	4.75	13.00	6.36
Relative size of Turkish imm pop.	2.64	1.24	2.95	1.46	1.29	1.12
Only host country citizenship	0.09	0.28	0.36	0.48	0.05	0.21
Only Turkish citizenship	0.11	0.32	0.55	0.50	0.58	0.49
Dual citizenship	0.80	0.40	0.10	0.30	0.37	0.48
Dependent variables						
Turkish identification	4.46	0.72	4.31	0.80	4.43	0.68
Turkish language proficiency	4.04	1.03	4.02	0.96	3.81	1.08
Muslim identification	4.55	0.75	4.22	0.94	4.36	0.81
Religious observance	0.13	0.68	-0.24	0.92	0.04	0.70
Host country identification	2.76	0.96	2.28	0.79	2.81	1.12
Host country language proficiency	3.88	1.11	3.95	0.94	4.05	1.05
Host country language use	0.30	0.26	0.33	0.29	0.44	0.30
Social contacts	1.66	0.56	1.60	0.52	1.78	0.61
Perceived as host country member	2.40	1.31	1.92	1.08	2.53	1.27
Frequency of perceived discr	2.35	1.22	2.26	1.19	2.37	1.26

Table F.4 Descriptives of in-between generation survey respondents by country

	Netherlands			Germany			France	
	Mean	SD	<i>Mean</i>	Mean	SD	<i>Mean</i>	Mean	SD
			<i>incl</i>			<i>incl</i>		
			<i>SB</i>			<i>SB</i>		
Independent variables								
East-Central Anatolia	0.46	0.52	<i>0.50</i>	0.85	0.38	0.86	0.25	0.46
Alevi	0.08	0.28	<i>0.07</i>	0.46	0.52	0.50	0.13	0.35
Age	37.46	6.95	<i>37.57</i>	38.31	5.68	<i>38.93</i>	35.13	8.77
Age at arrival	9.15	5.41	<i>9.21</i>	10.08	5.48	<i>10.29</i>	7.63	5.58
Year of arrival	1977	3.04	<i>1977</i>	1977	4.76	<i>1976</i>	1978	5.83
Female	0.62	0.51	<i>0.64</i>	0.69	0.48	<i>0.64</i>	0.63	0.52
Married	0.92	0.28	<i>0.93</i>	0.92	0.28	<i>0.93</i>	0.88	0.35
Parent	0.92	0.28	<i>0.93</i>	0.85	0.38	<i>0.86</i>	0.88	0.35
No / primary education	0.15	0.28	<i>0.14</i>	0.15	0.38	<i>0.14</i>	0.13	0.35
Secondary education	0.69	0.44	<i>0.64</i>	0.69	0.48	<i>0.71</i>	0.75	0.46
Post-secondary education	0.15	0.38	<i>0.22</i>	0.15	0.38	<i>0.14</i>	0.13	0.35
Working	0.69	0.48	0.71	0.46	0.52	<i>0.50</i>	0.38	0.52
Relative size of imm pop	17.69	8.66		15.41	4.45		14.81	2.09
Rel. size of Turkish imm pop.	2.70	1.27		3.56	1.46		1.63	1.11
Only host country citizenship	0.08	0.28	<i>0.00</i>	0.54	0.52	0.57	0.00	0.00
Only Turkish citizenship	0.08	0.28	<i>0.07</i>	0.31	0.48	0.29	0.38	0.52
Dual citizenship	0.85	0.38	<i>0.93</i>	0.15	0.38	<i>0.14</i>	0.63	0.52
Dependent variables								
Turkish identification	4.54	0.46		3.64	1.00		4.08	0.81
Turkish language proficiency	3.46	0.88		3.46	0.97		4.00	1.20
Muslim identification	4.64	0.60		3.42	1.23		3.81	1.09
Religious observance	0.02	0.68		-0.77	1.07		-0.49	0.81
Host country identification	3.08	0.80		2.59	0.81		3.15	1.25
Host country language prof	4.08	1.04		4.15	0.99		4.63	0.74
Host country language use	0.30	0.26		0.51	0.41		0.59	0.29
Social contacts	1.85	0.55		1.77	0.60		2.00	0.76
Perceived as host cntry memb	2.67	1.44		2.54	1.13		2.86	1.07
Frequency of perceived discr	2.54	1.20		2.69	1.32		2.00	1.20
<i>N</i>		<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>13</i>		<i>14</i>	<i>8</i>	

Table F.5 Descriptives of in-between generation in-depth interview respondents by country

	Netherlands		Germany		France	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Independent variables						
East-Central Anatolia	0.20	0.40	0.61	0.49	0.24	0.43
Alevi	0.01	0.12	0.13	0.34	0.04	0.20
Age	23.83	4.57	25.45	5.57	23.74	4.28
Female	0.65	0.48	0.54	0.50	0.56	0.50
Married	0.44	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.54	0.50
Parent	0.23	0.43	0.37	0.49	0.36	0.48
No / primary education	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.15	0.02	0.12
Secondary education	0.73	0.45	0.81	0.39	0.75	0.43
Post-secondary education	0.27	0.45	0.16	0.37	0.23	0.42
Working	0.53	0.50	0.49	0.50	0.47	0.50
Phone book sample	0.43	0.50	0.54	0.50	0.50	0.50
Holiday sample	0.28	0.45	0.12	0.32	0.07	0.26
Snowball sample	0.29	0.46	0.34	0.48	0.43	0.50
Relative size of immigrant population	18.21	8.58	13.48	4.36	13.71	6.18
Relative size of Turkish immigrant pop.	2.67	1.29	2.87	1.46	1.42	1.31
Only host country citizenship	0.07	0.25	0.44	0.50	0.13	0.34
Only Turkish citizenship	0.03	0.16	0.50	0.50	0.04	0.20
Dual citizenship	0.91	0.29	0.06	0.24	0.83	0.38
Dependent variables						
Turkish identification	4.45	0.63	4.38	0.78	4.44	0.68
Turkish language proficiency	3.77	1.01	3.61	1.13	3.55	1.07
Muslim identification	4.61	0.62	4.41	0.71	4.47	0.73
Religious observance	0.03	0.60	-0.37	0.91	-0.08	0.67
Host country identification	2.81	0.91	2.52	1.04	2.87	1.11
Host country language proficiency	4.31	0.83	4.38	0.86	4.61	0.74
Host country language use	0.47	0.32	0.50	0.31	0.65	0.33
Social contacts	1.51	0.50	1.65	0.53	1.76	0.56
Perceived as host country member	2.43	1.08	2.27	1.17	3.02	1.32
Frequency of perceived discrimination	2.14	1.08	2.59	1.23	2.41	1.14

Table F.6 Descriptives of second generation survey respondents by country

	Netherlands		Germany		<i>Mean incl SB</i>	France	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		Mean	SD
Independent variables							
East-Central Anatolia	0.25	0.46	0.57	0.49	0.50	0.20	0.42
Alevi	0.13	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.32
Age	24.25	2.71	27.57	5.06	26.88	26.40	2.46
Female	0.63	0.52	0.57	0.53	0.63	0.60	0.52
Married	0.50	0.53	0.57	0.53	0.75	0.70	0.48
Child	0.25	0.46	0.43	0.53	0.38	0.60	0.52
No / primary education	0.00	0.00	0.14	0.38	0.13	0.00	0.00
Secondary education	0.38	0.52	0.86	0.38	0.88	0.70	0.48
Post-secondary education	0.63	0.52	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.48
Working	0.50	0.53	0.57	0.53	0.63	0.50	0.53
Relative size of immigrant pop.	21.19	7.31	13.36	3.35		13.84	4.38
Relative size of Turkish imm pop.	3.46	1.29	2.69	1.68		2.06	1.26
Only host country citizenship	0.13	0.35	0.57	0.53	0.50	0.00	0.00
Only Turkish citizenship	0.00	0.00	0.43	0.53	0.50	0.20	0.42
Dual citizenship	0.88	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.42
Dependent variables							
Turkish identification	4.40	0.95	4.33	0.75		4.43	0.63
Turkish language proficiency	3.75	1.49	2.86	0.69		3.60	1.07
Muslim identification	4.02	0.70	4.52	0.47		4.37	0.60
Religious observance	-0.20	0.86	0.04	0.64		-0.29	0.98
Host country identification	2.90	0.73	2.74	1.06		3.23	1.09
Host country language proficiency	4.75	0.71	4.14	1.07		4.80	0.63
Host country language use	0.44	0.40	0.45	0.35		0.63	0.33
Social contacts	1.50	0.53	1.43	0.53		1.80	0.63
Perceived as host country member	1.88	0.99	1.71	0.76		2.90	1.37
Frequency of perceived discr.	2.38	0.92	2.86	1.35		2.70	1.57
<i>N</i>	8		7		8	10	

Table F.7 Descriptives of second generation in-depth interview respondents by country

Appendix G. Additional table Chapter 4

	Perceived as host country member		Perceived discrimination	
Germany (Ref cat)	-		-	
France	.56***	(.12)	.09	(.12)
Netherlands	.37**	(.12)	-.08	(.12)
East-Central Anatolia	.00	(.10)	-.05	(.10)
Alevi	.33	(.18)	-.20	(.18)
Second generation	.21	(.11)	.06	(.11)
Female	.36***	(.10)	-.28**	(.10)
Married	.05	(.12)	.01	(.12)
Education, none primary	-		-	
Secondary education	.44**	(.15)	.31*	(.14)
Post-secondary education	.68***	(.18)	.29	(.18)
Working	.11	(.10)	.01	(.10)
Phone book sample	-		-	
Holiday sample	.12	(.15)	.09	(.15)
Snowball sample	.23	(.10)	-.06	(.10)
Share of Turkish immigrants	-.08*	(.03)	.05	(.03)
Constant	1.37***	(.23)	2.11***	(.22)
<i>Adj. R2</i>	.727		.746	
<i>N</i>	.10		.01	

Two-tailed t-tests, * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Unstandardized coefficients of OLS regression of identification with Turks and with the host country (Standard errors in parentheses)

Appendix H. Table Chapter 5 with other reference categories

	Host-country identification		Freq. of using host country language		Host-country language proficiency		Social contacts	
<i>Netherlands, non-naturalised</i>	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Germany, naturalised	-.54*	(.21)	.09	(.05)	.38	(.21)	-.03	(.13)
Netherlands, naturalised	-.15	(.19)	.03	(.05)	.17	(.19)	.02	(.12)
France, naturalised	.19	(.20)	.16**	(.05)	.43*	(.20)	.12	(.13)
France, non-naturalised	-.38*	(.19)	.09	(.05)	.12	(.19)	.04	(.12)
Germany non-naturalised	-.88***	(.19)	.00	(.05)	.04	(.19)	-.11	(.12)

Table H.1 Netherlands non-naturalised as reference category

	Host-country identification		Freq. of using host country language		Host-country language proficiency		Social contacts	
<i>France, non-naturalised</i>	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Germany, naturalised	-.16	(.14)	.00	(.04)	.26	(.14)	-.07	(.09)
Netherlands, naturalised	.23*	(.11)	-.05	(.03)	.04	(.38)	-.02	(.07)
France, naturalised	.57***	(.12)	.08**	(.03)	.31*	(.12)	.08	(.07)
Netherlands, non-naturalised	.38*	(.19)	-.09	(.05)	-.12	(.19)	-.04	(.12)
Germany non-naturalised	-.50***	(.12)	-.09**	(.03)	-.09	(.12)	-.15*	(.07)

Table H.2 France non-naturalised as reference category

	Host-country identification		Freq. of using host country language		Host-country language proficiency		Social contacts	
<i>Netherlands, naturalised</i>	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Germany, naturalised	-.39**	(.14)	.06	(.03)	.21	(.14)	-.05	(.08)
France, naturalised	.33*	(.13)	.13***	(.03)	.27*	(.13)	.10	(.08)
Netherlands, non-naturalised	.15	(.19)	-.03	(.05)	-.17	(.19)	-.02	(.12)
France, non-naturalised	-.23*	(.11)	.05	(.03)	-.04	(.11)	.02	(.07)
Germany non-naturalised	-.73***	(.12)	-.03	(.03)	-.13	(.12)	-.13	(.07)

Table H.3 Netherlands naturalised as reference category

	Host-country identification	Freq. of using host country language	Host-country language proficiency	Social contacts
<i>Germany, naturalised</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>	<i>Ref.</i>
Netherlands, naturalised	.39** (.14)	-.06 (.03)	-.21 (.14)	.05 (.08)
France, naturalised	.72*** (.15)	.07 (.04)	.05 (.33)	.15 (.09)
Netherlands, non-naturalised	.54* (.21)	-.09 (.05)	-.38 (.21)	.03 (.13)
France, non-naturalised	.16 (.14)	.00 (.04)	-.26 (.14)	.07 (.09)
Germany non-naturalised	-.34* (.14)	-.09* (.04)	-.35* (.14)	-.08 (.09)

Table H.3 Germany naturalised as reference category

Appendix I. List of codes of naturalisation motives per type of motive

Instrumental motives

- Easier dealing with bureaucracy
- Easier to get a residence permit for spouse
- Practical
- More possibilities
- More rights
- Visa-free travel
- Voting rights
- No more bureaucracy and fees for residence permit
- Protection against expulsion
- School
- Work
- No military service in Turkey
- No more dealings with Turkish bureaucracy (the consulate)

Emotional motives

- Connection with host country
- Identify with host country
- Self-evident
- Born in host country
- Grown up in host country
- Lives in host country
- Has long lived in host country
- No connection with Turkish nationality
- No plan to return to Turkey