

BACHELOR THESIS EUROPEAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

*Integration of the second-generation immigrants in the
Netherlands*

Written by: Didem Kirtas

Supervisor: dr. Ann Morissens

Co-reader: dr. Jörgen Svensson

University of Twente, August 2015

In this paper use is made of data of the LISS (Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social sciences) panel administered by CentERdata (Tilburg University, The Netherlands).

Abstract

In recent years a lot of research has already been done on the level of integration of the second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands. An example of this is the LISS Immigrant Panel. These types of research present different outcomes but they agree that integration has several dimensions (social, economic, cultural integration). It is also agreed upon that when comparing the immigrants with the natives, the immigrants lack behind in several aspects of integration. Concerning this topic, this thesis will be answering the research question: *“To what extent is the second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands integrated?”*

The way to find this answer will be done by using three sub-questions guiding this research. The sub-questions will help in finding the degree of integration in the social and economic dimension of integration and explain the role of education in this. Furthermore, a quantitative cross-sectional study has been conducted and illustrated with cross tables containing data from the LISS Immigrant panel of February 2011. Results show that while immigrants have equal scores on social participation, they show to have a lower level of economic integration. The role of education can be explained by stating that the higher the level of education, the lower the level of social participation. And concerning the economic integration; the higher the level of education, the higher the economic integration.

Foreword

This bachelor thesis is the result of completing three years of my bachelor European Public Administration at the University of Twente in Enschede. My own second nationality (Turkish) brought me to the idea of writing about this subject. In this way I hope to, even if it is just a little bit, contribute to the society I am living in. Nowadays it is not very easy to be part of a society if you are not a 'native'. There are a lot of ups and downs one faces and this thesis added a positive and based on reality view on my own ideas.

Just like no journey is easy, mine has not been easy either. But I always kept in my mind that if you have goals and if you are determined to achieve it, you should give everything you have, and this kept me going. Lots of days that you do not have the motivation to study, lots of days that you have struggles, but lucky me, lots of people who were always by my side and supported me every day again and again. First of all I want to thank my parents and little sister for always being with me. Also my family and best friends helped me through this journey and achieve one of my goals. Without their love, their trust and patience I could not have done all of this. Last but not least, I also want to thank my supervisor dr. Ann Morissens, for being very helpful during this whole process.

I hope that you enjoy reading my work and that this research and results will be of additional value.

Didem Kirtas

Almelo, 08 August 2015

Table of contents

1. Introduction	5
1.1. Research question.....	7
1.2. Social relevance.....	8
1.3. Outline of the thesis.....	9
2. Theoretical framework.....	10
2.1. Background information.....	10
2.1.1. Integration.....	11
2.1.2. Second-generation immigrants	13
2.1.3. Hypotheses	13
3. Research Methodology.....	14
3.1. Research design.....	14
3.2. Data collection	15
3.3. Variables and operationalization	15
3.4. Potential threats and limitations	17
3.4.1. Internal and external validity.....	17
3.4.2. Reliability.....	18
4. Results	18
4.1. Results.....	19
4.1.1. Social participation	19
4.1.2. Economic participation.....	23
4.1.3. Level of education.....	25
4.2. Main findings.....	30
5. Conclusion	31
5.1. Limitations.....	34
References	35

1. Introduction

In recent decades, Member States of the EU experienced increasing migration. Europe's economic prosperity, relatively high level of political stability and democratic principles make the region an attractive destination for both asylum seekers and regular migrants. The arrival of these migrants brings challenges and changes; the structure of the society changes and societies become more diverse. Those immigrants often will find themselves in an unfavorable position within society (Dagevos, 2001). Usually they have a different mother tongue, religion, culture and their participation and successes within important social areas such as labor and education, will lack behind as a result of all this.

Integration has always been an important issue ever since that other cultures arrived in the Netherlands and it is closely linked with migration for different reasons. As a consequence of migration, people are different in significant ways from one another and these differences create both opportunities and challenges. It is important to reduce or remove particular differences so that everyone feels that they receive the same chances.

While immigrants and their families share much of the burden of integrating into new societies, the longer-term members of those societies are also implicated in this process. Without their deliberate and thoughtful engagement, which may consist of adapting their own behaviors and expectations and examining their stereotypes about new arrivals, successful integration is not possible. Here, social contact is extremely important because it is one of the most powerful ways to break down barriers among people, challenge misconceptions, and develop meaningful partnerships, relationships, and cooperation. The importance of having social contacts with the native population is very crucial to receive a higher level of social and economic integration (WRR, 2001).

Regardless of the definition or concept of integration applied, scholars agree that integration of migrants has for sure three basic dimensions, namely the social, economic and cultural dimension (Council of Europe, 1997; Jiménez, 2011). The social dimension is about relationships/interactions between individuals and their involvement and participation in different associations and organizations. The economic dimension focuses on the economic situation of the immigrant, so the level of income, the working situation and the level of education. The cultural dimension mainly looks at the beliefs, practices and rituals of a group (Heckmann et. al, 2001). This thesis looks at the social and economic dimension of

integration and hereby at the participation, the educational level and the income of the individuals.

Most of the Dutch individuals think that it is the case for the Netherlands that integration has not been very successful. The media and some politicians seem to be confirming this again and again. This idea is contradicting the findings of Verhagen (2010) who concludes that the second-generation immigrants, born and grown up in the Netherlands, perform much better than one expects. They speak the language; they achieve huge successes in education and think and act more like the Dutch average. *“The relative inflow of non-Western ethnic minorities in higher education in 2008 was around 55%, which was similar to the average of the natives. Before, in 1995, the percentage of the same group used to be just 27% for entering higher education”* (Verhagen, 2010). Also in speaking the language the immigrants show progress; while in 1998 just 10% of the parents spoke Dutch with their children, this percentage became 30% in 2006. Thanks to the typical Dutch welfare state and the broad, accessible facilities for everyone, the integration process in the Netherlands is much more faster than in many traditional immigration countries (Verhagen, 2010).

To see whether these findings about the Netherlands are still valid, the research done within this thesis has been centered on the question to what extent the second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands are socially and economically integrated. A better understanding of this both in terms of success and failure makes it easier to look for solutions and possibilities of how to solve issues with integration if needed.

Since integration relates to different areas, it is not possible to restrict the evaluation of a progress in integration to one single unit of measurement. Thus, if one wants to measure integration, indicators from the different dimensions mentioned should be analyzed. This thesis will be looking at indicators of participation and income (so the social and economic dimension). The group will be considered as integrated of highly if their scores are very close to, or similar to the comparison group (respondents with a Dutch background). While most of the research done uses a longitudinal study in order to monitor the integration, this study just looks at the situation at one point in time. So instead of comparing integration outcomes over a longer period of time, integration outcomes of immigrants will be compared with outcomes for Dutch natives at a single point in time. Within the research that is done over a longer period of time, the results are often not compared with natives, but it is just the scores of the immigrant that is being monitored. Instead of doing it that way, within this thesis the comparison with the natives has been preferred. In this way one is able to find any gaps

between the groups, if this is the case. After having made this comparison one can make statements and see for example in how far the immigrants lack behind the natives and take action if needed. Making this comparison will show us the degree of integration. We first need to know how the migrants perform on the different integration dimensions to conclude what their level of integration is. In order to do so, the following chapter will provide information about the questions raised to find out this degree.

1.1. Research question

As mentioned in the introduction already, this thesis will be looking at the integration of the second-generation immigrants. In order to do research about this, a research question has been set up to guide this thesis. This question is as the following: *“To what extent is the second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands integrated?”* With this research I want to find out what the situation of this generation is. In order to be able to answer this question, the following three sub-questions below are formulated.

1. “What are the outcomes of the second generation immigrants in terms of social integration?”
2. “What are the outcomes of the second generation immigrants in terms of economic integration?”
3. “What is the role of education for social and economic integration of the second generation immigrants?”

All the questions have different goals. This means that the first sub-question will just look at the social integration of the immigrants. As already explained in the introduction, integration has a few dimensions and one of them is the social dimension. So, this question is formulated in order to describe the social integration of second-generation migrants. This will be done by looking at the following indicators; (1) participation in activities of a sports club and hobby club, (2) the frequency of contact with someone from the respondents’ neighborhood and (3) the satisfaction with their social contacts. These indicators show the participation of the immigrants within society, so actually, how ‘socially’ active they are.

The second sub-question deals with the economic integration of the second-generation. To be able to answer this question, the indicators (1) educational level and (2) the income of the respondent are used. For each of the dimensions, the outcomes of the scores of the second-

generation immigrants will be compared to the outcomes of the natives. This is in order to find out to what extent this generation differs from the native population.

These dimensions are especially chosen because the social and the economic dimension of integration are seen as the two dimensions where the non-Western immigrants differ a lot compared with the native population (WRR, 2001).

Then last but not least, the third sub-question has been formulated in order to see what kind of role education has on the integration of both dimensions mentioned above. This will be done by looking at the level of education and the (1) participation in activities, (2) frequency of contact with others and (3) the level of income.

1.2. Social relevance

This bachelor thesis focuses on the level of integration of the second-generation migrants in the Netherlands because it is an important issue to look at. Integration of the immigrants is a political and social theme that has been and definitely will be discussed about often. A very good example of this is given by Witteman (2015); he namely states that the degree of unemployment of the non-Western immigrants is much higher compared to the natives. According to him it is shocking that also high-educated immigrants are more often unemployed compared to the native population with the same degree of education. This unemployment then can be explained according to Witteman by the situation that immigrants are more likely to have flexible working contracts and with an economic crisis, these are the first ones who get fired. Another explanation is that the first generation lacks behind in language and a low level of education (Witteman, 2015).

It is very important to have useful data because it might also provide an answer to any other integration questions such as the knowledge of the language of the new country. This makes it more interesting because if the answer for the main question of this research will be given, one will be able to create possible solutions on the national level to affect integration.

Integration in a community is sometimes not as easy as it might look. The second-generation finds their selves in an overwhelming pressure to quickly integrate into a new culture but the support they need is not always available (Urquhart, 2010). They have to learn a new language and some of the immigrants face a different school system than they were used to. They have to integrate into the labor market, be educated and have enough economic resources to take care of inter alia the integration of their children who also belong to the second-generation.

The integration of those immigrants is very important for different reasons and for both groups (natives and immigrants). First of all, integrating into a society means participating in a variety of fields. This will result in groups knowing each other and removing barriers between them. Different cultures will come together and a variety of norms and values will come out. Research shows that a higher level of social participation even has a positive affect on the health of an individual (RIVM, 2015).

It is also important for the immigrants to participate in economic fields. Here it starts with the level of education and it continues with the level of their income.

Both types of participation are in favor of the immigrants and the natives. The immigrants will benefit from this because when they have a higher level of participation they will feel safe, they will not be discriminated because of a 'lower' position and they will be able to find their place in society. The natives on the other hand, will benefit from the high level of participation of those immigrants because the knowledge and the differences in perspectives will be added on theirs.

So it is important that they are part of the society, because in this way they will feel more connected to the natives and the country and they will participate more and more. To conclude, individual performances equal the collective benefits; the integration of one individual has additional value for the whole society and that is why it is very important.

1.3. Outline of the thesis

After having explained in the introduction the topic of this thesis, and having stated the main question with the sub-questions, the importance of this research has been dealt with. From now on, this thesis will have the following structure.

The next chapter will briefly offer an overview of the current challenges of integration. This is followed by a description of the integration theory and discourse based on previous research. Based on this, a number of hypotheses will be formulated. A third chapter discusses the method chosen for this research, the data collection and the operationalization. A fourth chapter then presents the results of this research and a concluding chapter will give a short summary and a short discussion of the results. Also some recommendations for further research can be found there.

2. Theoretical framework

This chapter presents firstly the background of the integration of the second-generation migrants in the Netherlands, and secondly the theoretical framework. The background information where the challenges of integration will be explained starts this chapter. This will be followed by the part that the definition of ‘integration’ and the ‘second-generation immigrants’ will be explained.

2.1. Background information

The integration process of immigrants brings together challenges and opportunities.

Challenges associated with the integration of immigrants often extend beyond first generation. If the children of immigrants, the second-generation this research is looking at, experience similar impediments to social and economic integration as their parents did, then low socioeconomic status may persist (Palameta, 2007).

First of all, as stated before, migration results in a more diverse society. A more diverse society means the existence of different groups, which on its turn might result in different group approaches in daily life. Currently there are more than 150 nationalities in the Netherlands and the chance of having a so-called ‘doelgroepenbeleid’¹ is very small. Hence the problem is that in policies and in practice different approaches towards different migrant groups exists. This creates the chance that less important differences are highlighted and “we-they-differences” unnecessarily keep maintained. This might be a reason for the immigrant to keep the contacts with its home country, and be less involved to the Dutch culture. Also the fact that the connection with the home country stays strong makes them having more identities that result in the maintenance of the diversity in society.

Next to this, integrating into a new society deals with more than one generation. A problem of this might be that norms and values of the parents are not the same as their children’s who are born in the Netherlands. Because the youth grows up between two cultures, they take norms and values of both of the cultures. This situation might than have consequences for other fields, such as education (WRR, 2001).

¹ This has not been translated from Dutch. Doelgroepenbeleid is policy that focuses on combating the lacking behind of a specific group. In this way, this group receives extra attention and support. The goal of this policy is to achieve equal chances.

All in all, it can be said that there are diverse factors influencing integration. These will be explained in more detail in the following paragraph.

2.1.1. Integration

There is a very extensive body of literature (Bijl & Verweij 2012; Scholten, 2011) on the question of what could or should be understood by the term ‘integration’. Does it refer to assimilation, based around the requirement that migrants abandon their cultural identity and assume the identity of the host country in its place? Or does integration mean multiculturalism, in which both migrant and host society retain their own identities and only limited adaptation is required? There exist different opinions and definitions used when it comes to defining integration. Robinson (1998) suggests that ‘integration’ is a chaotic concept: a word used by many but understood differently by most. According to Robinson (1998) the concept is individualized, contested and contextual and there is little prospect for a unifying definition. This idea is confirmed by Castles et al. (2001) when they state that ‘there is no single, generally accepted definition, theory or model of immigrant integration’. However, the European Union comes with a different approach and defines integration as a ‘two-way process in which neither group need to give up their cultural identity but in which both add a shared dimension to that identity’.

It is agreed that finding a common definition of ‘integration’ is very difficult, but there is some consensus that integration means the incorporation of an individual into the host country and its society (CoE, 1996). The different concepts applied for interpreting integration, cover a broad spectrum ranging from ideas close to assimilation on the one end and multiculturalism on the other. Having said this, it can be concluded that all forms of cultural or social behavior ranging from completely giving up one’s background to preserving unaltered patterns of behavior are covered by the term integration.

Yet, a study on integration cannot do without a definition. Integration as a concept is used in many academic disciplines, of which sociology is most relevant for the purpose of this thesis. Seen from a macro perspective, integration refers to a characteristic of a social system, e.g. a society. The more a society is integrated, the more closely and the more intensely its constituent parts (groups or individuals) relate to one another (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003). This will be the base used in this research too. So, when referring to the term integration, the participation of immigrants in society is meant.

But as already stated in the introduction chapter, whatever concept or definition of integration is applied, integration involves at least three basic dimensions. These are the social, economic and cultural dimension (Council of Europe, 1997). These dimensions can be measured by using different indicators that create these dimensions. Even though there are a wide variety of indicators, to stay within the framework of this research, a few of them have been selected. Since this research just looks at the social and economic dimension, that are seen as the most important dimensions of being successfully integrated, the indicators are also chosen from these dimensions (Ersanilli, 2010).

Integration is very important for different reasons and for both groups (natives and immigrants). First of all, integrating into a society means participating in a variety of fields. For example, the social participation of immigrants will result in groups getting to know each other and so removing barriers between them. Next to this, it is also important for the immigrants to participate in economic fields. This will make them having an income and that will create other opportunities on its turn. Both types of participation are in favor of and the immigrants and the natives. The immigrants will benefit from this because when they have a higher level of participation they will feel safe, they will not be discriminated because of a 'lower' position and they will be able to find their place in society. The natives on the other hand, will benefit from the high level of participation of those immigrants because the knowledge and the differences in perspectives will be added on theirs.

Another factor having an important role within integration is the level of education. Education is widely perceived as the main channel through which immigrant families could economically and socially catch up with the native population over generations. Not only is the educational achievement of the second generation crucially important for immigrant families' long-term economic advancement, it is also a key indicator for the success of the economic, social and cultural integration of the parental generation in its own right (Schüller, 2013). For example education is a very important determinant of the level of economic integration. As Martinovic (2009) claims in her research, 'the level of education of the immigrants plays an important role. The higher the level of education, the higher the level of economic integration is expected to be'. Whether this is also the case in this thesis, will be presented later on.

To conclude, as mentioned above, integration involves three dimensions that can be measured by analyzing certain factors. For the social dimension, factors such as relationships/interactions and organizations in which the immigrant is involved are taken into

consideration. The economic factors that focus on the economic situation of the immigrant are the level of income and the level of education. Within this research, for the social dimension, the indicators (1) participation in activities of a sports club and hobby club, (2) the frequency of contact with someone from the respondents' neighborhood and (3) satisfaction with their social contacts will be analyzed. For the economic dimension, I will be looking at (1) the educational level and (2) the income of the respondent.

2.1.2. Second-generation immigrants

If one looks at the previous research, one can state that there are different ideas about the definition of the second-generation immigrants. Some state that second-generation consists from individuals "*who are native-born children of foreign parents or foreign-born children who were brought to the country before adolescence*" (Portes & Rumbaut, 2005; Glitz & Manning, 2009). While other studies suggest that one of the parents of the (native-born) individual has to be born abroad to be included in this generation (Portes & Schauffler, 1994; Ramakrishnan, 2004). This thesis and also the LISS panel data use the definition set up by Statistics Netherlands. The SN has defined the migrants as: "*a person with at least one parent born abroad*" (Statistics Netherlands, 2015). Then they distinguish between two types of migrants; the first-generation and second-generation migrants. This research just looks at the second-generation migrants, who are defined as '*a native born person, with at least one parent born abroad*' (Statistics Netherlands, 2015). So this means that the individual has to be born in the Netherlands, and he/she at least needs to have one parent who is born abroad.

2.1.3. Hypotheses

Considering all the information dealt with until now, there are a few important things to note. To measure the integration level of the second-generation immigrants, the indicators mentioned in the part above will be used. These indicators then will be compared with the respondents with a Dutch background. Based on this, the following hypotheses are formulated:

Hypothesis 1: The second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands has equal social outcomes compared to natives

Hypothesis 2: The second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands has worse economic outcomes compared to natives

Hypothesis 3: The higher the level of education, the higher the level of integration.

The focus of this paper will be on the second-generation immigrants. The first hypothesis is based on the research done by Huijnk, Gijsberts & Dagevos (2010). This research concludes that the second-generation immigrants have more often social contacts with natives and that they are socially integrated. The economic integration of the immigrant is expected to be worse because Statistics Netherlands (2015) showed that second-generation migrants are two till three times more often unemployed as the natives. At the same time second generation migrants are taking disadvantaged positions in terms of education and work in relation to the natives (Heath et al. 2008). Which is the basic for the third hypothesis.

Considering these results of research done before, it is expected that the social integration of the immigrants is much better than their economic integration. Which is also the starting point for the following chapters of this paper. But first one will get to know more about the research methodology of the research done for this paper.

3. Research Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to explain and clarify the research design that is used to achieve the results given in this paper. Furthermore, the data collection method and the way this data is analyzed within the framework of this paper will be dealt with in detail too. In the last part, the limitations of this research design are explained.

3.1. Research design

This quantitative cross-sectional research bases its analyzes on the data collected in the project by the Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social sciences (LISS immigrant panel). Within this panel, panel members complete online questionnaires and they are paid for every completed questionnaire. It deals with the attitudes and situations of the individuals regarding participation and integration in the Netherlands. The aim of this paper is to describe the situation of the immigrants and to compare this with the situation of Dutch individuals. This thesis will be a study based on observations representing a single point in time, February 2011. There will be no comparison in time.

3.2. Data collection

The LISS panel (Longitudinal Internet Studies for the Social sciences) is based on a true probability sample of households drawn from the population register by Statistics Netherlands. The Immigrant panel that has been used for this thesis is in addition to the LISS panel. Around 1600 households (2400 individuals) participated of which 1100 households (1700 individuals) were of non-Dutch origin. These include first and second-generation immigrants, and is divided in Western and non-Western immigrants. An important factor in choosing for this dataset is that this panel fits the best within the framework of this paper.

Panel members have to complete these questionnaires online every month, taking about 15 to 30 minutes. If they do not have Internet connection and/or a PC at home, LISS supplies these for the households. For each completed questionnaire they get paid 15€ per hour. *“When we differentiate between households where LISS has provided the Internet connection and/or the PC, and the other households we find that households with Internet or PC provided by LISS are clearly less likely to become sleepers (6.2%) than the other households (13.8%)”* (Vos, 2009). There is one member in the household providing the household data and updating this information at regular time intervals. While the LISS panel started in 2007, the Immigrant panel just has data from October 2010 up until December 2014.

Switching back to the thesis, the target group will be limited to just the second-generation non-Western migrants. The dataset from February 2011 with the background variables and the core study ‘Social Integration and Leisure’ and ‘Work and Schooling’ will be looked at. The descriptive results achieved will determine the level of integration of the second-generation immigrants by comparing it to the situation of individuals with a Dutch background. With these one will be able to see how ‘far’ this generation is and possibilities to develop new strategies in order to increase the level will arise.

3.3. Variables and operationalization

To be able to answer the main research question with the sub-questions, a few variables need to be looked at of the LISS Immigrant panel. As stated earlier, the dataset of the core study ‘Social Integration and Leisure’ has been merged with the dataset of the background variables and this is analyzed to answer the first sub-question about the level of social integration. Secondly, the core study ‘Work and Schooling’ dataset has been merged with the

background variables to answer the second research question concerning the economic integration of the immigrants. Since the research question is about the second-generation migrants, this is also the group that will be looked at in the study and compared with the individuals of Dutch origin.

In order for this thesis the data will be analyzed in the following way. As stated at the beginning of this part, there will be two datasets; one for the first and one for the second sub-question. From these datasets, two groups have been selected; the migrants and the natives. This variable can be found within the background variables. The respondents are categorized within five categories namely; (1) first generation foreign, Western background, (2) first generation foreign, non-Western background, (3) second-generation foreign, Western background, (4) second-generation foreign, non-Western background and (5) Dutch background. For this thesis, the last two groups have been selected within the datasets.

Regarding the dataset of 'Social Integration and Leisure', the indicators (1) participation in activities of a sports club, (2) the frequency of contact with someone from the respondents' neighborhood and (3) satisfaction with their social contacts will be analyzed in the analysis parts.

The first indicator about participation in activities refers to the last 12 months before the respondent fills in the questionnaire. The answer possibilities are yes and no. The second indicator, the frequency of contact is divided into seven categories. These are; almost every day, 1-2 times a week, few times per month, once a month, a number of times per year, once a year and never. Also these categories are re-coded for this research where almost every day and 1-2 times a week are called 'weekly', few times per month and once a month is called 'monthly', a number of times per year and once a year are called 'annually' and the last category 'never'. Then the last indicator of this sub-question about satisfaction has a scale from 1 to 10 to answer the question. For this research, the respondents giving a 6 or higher are considered as 'satisfied' with their social contacts, while the group giving a 5 or lower, are considered as not satisfied. This is divided this way because within the Netherlands, the grading system says that a '1' is the lowest, and a '10' is the highest number you can give. Whereas giving a '5' is lower than the satisfactory level (5,5).

The second sub-question about the level of economic integration will be measured by looking at indicators such as (1) the level of education and (2) the income of the respondent. The respondents had the possibility to choose for their level of education from the following categories; primary school, VMBO (intermediate secondary education), HAVO/VWO (higher secondary education), MBO (intermediate vocational education), HBO (higher vocational

education) and WO (university). The income of the respondents is questioned in the background variables and is very broadly categorized. The respondent was able to choose between 13 categories that started with 'no income', then 500€ or less, followed by 501€ < 1000€, 1001€ < 1500, and so on till 7500€ and more. These categories are also re-coded and got the following categories: 'none', '0 < 1500€', '1501€ < 3000€' and '3000€ >'.

These two indicators are taken into account because as already mentioned to a certain extent in paragraph 2.1.1.; the level of education is an important determinant of the level of economic integration. Which is the reason why the third sub-question has been formulated. The second-generation immigrants have had a school career in the new country, which should result in better language skills and so in having more chance at the labor market. Next to this, if one has a high level of education, and so a well-paid job, the income will be higher too. And this on its turn might create more possibilities to be socially active.

All the variables mentioned are presented in cross tables. The tables will provide the information about for example the percentage of the participation in a sports activity for both groups separately. The percentage of the immigrants will be compared to the one of the respondents with a Dutch background to see in what degree they are integrated. After this, these tables where two groups are compared will be tested for the significance with the independent t-test. This test is used to see whether there is a significant difference between two independent groups.

3.4. Potential threats and limitations

Within this part some short explanations of the threats in validity and the reliability in cross- sectional studies and existing statistics will be discussed. As for the former kind of threat, the internal and external validity will be dealt with separately. Furthermore, it will be stated how researchers would solve each threat and this will be linked to the research of this paper.

3.4.1. Internal and external validity

When doing a research, special attention to two technical considerations has to be paid; validity and reliability. 'Validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. Whenever we base research on an analysis of data that already exist, we're obviously limited to what exists'

(Babbie, 2010). There are two important factors affecting the validity of experimental research according to Babbie.

The first one is the internal validity. This one ‘refers to the possibility that the conclusions drawn from experimental results may not accurately reflect what went on in the experiment itself’ (Babbie, 2010).

One can try to deal with this by making similar groups and test more than one variable or independent variables which cannot be manipulated (for instance age or gender) to find causality, as suggested by de Vaus (2001). Within the data used for this thesis, more ethnicities are looked at. So there is made a division between several groups. This thesis mainly looks at the non-Western second generation. To measure their level of integration, the results are compared with individuals with a Dutch background.

3.4.2. Reliability

As stated before, the second technical consideration is the reliability of a research. “Reliability is a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, yields the same result each time” (Babbie, 2010). In this paper existing statistics will be analyzed so one has to take into consideration that the quality of the existing dataset is very crucial. This means that if the quality of the dataset is relatively low, the reliability of the research will be affected negatively. The researcher should be aware of this threat and in order to try to minimize it, the data has to be analyzed by the researcher itself to see the potential threats of it. If the research done in this paper would be repeated for the same object, the results would not differ. This means that the reliability of the research done is very high.

The following chapter will tell in detail how the data has been analyzed and dealt with.

4. Results

After having explained what this research will measure and how it will be measured we arrive to the results chapter. Within this chapter the cross tables with the relevant data will be given and the results will be explained. Firstly, just the results will be provided and then in the following part, the sub-questions will be answered one by one according to the data measured. The results of the social participation will be explained first, followed by the results of the economic participation. Then the role of education for the social and economic integration will be explained. Last but not least, the answer of the main research question and limitations of this research will be explained in the chapter ‘Conclusion’.

4.1. Results

As already mentioned above, this paragraph will discuss the results. The results are presented in cross tables will be shown in order to answer the different sub-questions.

These tables include two groups, namely; respondents with a Dutch background and respondents of the non-Western second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands. For each of the groups is given what the percentage they score is for a specific variable. The significance of the variables will be discussed too. In order to have a significant difference, the significance has to be smaller than 0.05 (5% chance for mistakes).

4.1.1. Social participation

To be able to answer the first sub-question: *“What are the outcomes of the second-generation in terms of social integration?”* four tables are presented and discussed (4.1 until 4.4).

The first table gives us information about whether the respondent participated in a sports club and/or outdoors activities club within the last 12 months. In Table 1 we can see that the second-generation immigrants score relatively higher on not participating (83,5%) than participating in such activities (16,5%). But what we also see is that when we look at the respondents with a Dutch background, the bigger part (79,7%), just like the immigrants, does not participate in these kind of activities. If we compare the two groups, it is clear that both are not really active in sports clubs. Although the percentages are very close to each other, the immigrants score even a bit higher in not participating. The difference between both groups for their participation in a sports club is considered as not significant, because the t-test results in a significance of 0,381 which is bigger than 0,05.

4.1 Participation in a sports club / outdoors activities club by origin

		Origin		Total
		Dutch background	Second generation, immigrants	
Participated	no	224 79,7%	101 83,5%	325 80,8%
	yes	57	20	77

	20,3%	16,5%	19,2%
Total	281	121	402
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Concerning the second aspect, whether they have participated in a cultural association or hobby club in the last 12 months (Table 4.2) kind of shows similar results as table 4.1. For both the individuals with a Dutch background and the individuals with a non-western background, it is clearly shown that within their own origin group, the biggest part again does not participate in such an activity. When we compare the two groups with each other it is again the individuals with a Dutch background relatively participating more in cultural associations or hobby clubs than the immigrants do. Just like the scores of table 4.1, also this question shows that there is no significance in difference between the natives and the immigrants since the t-test gives a significance level of 0,690.

4.2 Participation in a cultural association or hobby club

		Origin		Total
		Dutch background	Second generation immigrants	
Participated	no	242 86,1%	106 87,6%	348 86,6%
	yes	39 13,9%	15 12,4%	54 13,4%
Total		281 100,0%	121 100,0%	402 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Having explained the results above, we arrive at the question of how satisfied the respondents with their social contacts are (Table 4.3). This question will show us how the respondents feel about their own social contacts. If the satisfaction level will be higher, we could say that this person might be happier than when the satisfaction level will be lower. The respondents had the possibility within this question to give an answer on the scale of 0 to 10. The higher the satisfaction, the higher the number on the scale. The respondents giving a 6 or higher are considered as 'satisfied' with their social contacts, while the group giving a 5 or lower, are considered as not satisfied, as explained in the 'data analysis' chapter of the Research Methodology. Interestingly if we look at the table, we can see that the percentages

are extremely close to each other. We can say that while 3,4% of the immigrants is not satisfied at all, there is not any Dutch respondent saying that he/she is not satisfied with its social contacts. When looking further though, the immigrants score higher in being completely satisfied (7,8%) compared to the Dutch respondents who almost have the same score (6,6%), but a bit lower. The biggest part of the immigrants gave their satisfaction an 8, namely 30.2%. For the Dutch respondents the biggest part gave a 7 (25,3%). All in all we can say that analyzing the table shows us that the biggest part of both groups (+- 77%) is satisfied with their social contacts. There is no significant difference between both groups for this aspect because the significance resulting from the t-test is 0,988.

Table 4.3 Satisfaction social contacts according to origin

	Origin		Total
	Dutch background	Second generation immigrants	
Satisfaction 1 < 5	61 22,3%	26 22,4%	87 22,4%
6 < 10	212 77,7%	90 77,6%	302 77,6%
Total	273 100,0%	116 100,0%	389 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Going on with the neighborhood of the respondent and its ‘connection’, which is shown in Table 4.4; the last one for this sub-question. The LISS Immigrant Panel asked the respondents the frequency of spending an evening with someone from the neighborhood. Since the neighborhood is a very important determinant within the integration process, as mention in the introduction part, the question included in the survey about this subject has been taken into account too. Migration may have impacts on cohesion. This refers to how migration affects neighborhoods, and is defined by people’s perceptions of how people get along with each other in their local area or neighborhood (Saggar et. all, 2012). The neighborhood can affect the social participation of a respondent positively and negatively. There are important factors here that determine the level of participation. For example, if the respondent from the immigrant group lives in a neighborhood with a lot of individuals from his/her own ethnicity, the social participation might be high. But since the respondent just

stays within his/her own group, the integration level into the native society will not be high because of this participation.

Considering this table (4.4) we can see that while 23,5% of the immigrants say ‘never’ to spend an evening with someone from the neighborhood, 36,1% says to at least do this once a year. For the respondents with a Dutch background, we can see that these percentages differ for ‘never’ spending an evening (20,9%) and 29,5% for spending an evening at least once a year. Using the independent t-test in SPSS it is stated that the significance is 0,931 and so the differences between the groups are not significant.

Table 4.4 Frequency of contact by origin

		Origin		Total
		Dutch background	Second generation immigrants	
Frequency of contact	Never	56 20,9%	28 23,5%	84 21,7%
	Weekly	60 22,4%	27 22,7%	87 22,5%
	Monthly	73 27,2%	21 17,6%	94 24,3%
	Annually	79 29,5%	43 36,1%	122 31,5%
Total		268 100,0%	119 100,0%	387 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Considering these tables and the results explained, for the social aspect of life we can say that the second-generation has less or more the same results as the comparison group, respondents with a Dutch background. This means that the social participation of the immigrants is satisfactory within the framework of this research. Hence, it should be kept in mind that the research did not look at what kind of organizations the individuals participate and with whom they have contact. If for example the organization or sports club where the immigrant participates in activities has the same cultural roots as the immigrant, this has consequences for the level of integration of this individual. In that case the immigrant might be very active and social within its own group, but not within the Dutch culture. This will then lead to a lower level of integration.

4.1.2. Economic participation

In order to answer the second sub-question: *“What are the outcomes of the second-generation immigrants in terms of economic integration?”* two tables are presented and discussed (4.5 and 4.6).

Challenges associated with the integration of immigrants often extend beyond first generation. If the children of immigrants, the second-generation this research is looking at, experience similar impediments to social and economic integration as their parents did, then low socioeconomic status may persist (Palameta, 2007). For example, low education attainment and low socioeconomic status in the parental generation is linked to relatively low educational attainment among immigrants’ children, leading to less successful labor market outcomes (Osterberg, 2000; Smith and Husted, 2001). So then, let’s take a look at the results of the economic integration.

Analyzing the tables received from the research done gives us the following results. While the expectation is that the level of education determines the level of income and so the integration, the results explained below will show if this is true or not.

The biggest part of the immigrants, which exists of 26,3% of the total, says not to have any income and lives from social benefits. This percentage is just 11,3% for the respondents with a Dutch background, so here there is a relatively big difference of 15,3%. The second-generation immigrants have relatively a lower income compared to the natives.

An important factor in measuring the level of economic integration is education. If we just analyze the data received for both origins (Table 4.5) we can state that with 24,1%, most of the Dutch respondents study ‘MBO’ and this is also the biggest group for the immigrants (30,1%). The immigrants just score higher at studying ‘primary school’. For higher education such as ‘HBO’ and ‘University’ the Dutch respondents score relatively higher with for ‘HBO’ a difference of 8,2% and for ‘WO’ a difference of 5,4%. From this it can be concluded that the immigrants relatively have a lower level of education.

Table 4.5 Level of education by origin

	Origin	Total
--	--------	-------

		Dutch background	Second generation immigrants	
Level	Primary school	62 8,9%	42 12,0%	104 9,9%
	VMBO	138 19,7%	63 18,1%	201 19,2%
	HAVO/VWO	81 11,6%	62 17,8%	143 13,6%
	MBO	169 24,1%	105 30,1%	274 26,1%
	HBO	166 23,7%	54 15,5%	220 21,0%
	WO/University	84 12,0%	23 6,6%	107 10,2%
Total		700 100,0%	349 100,0%	1049 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

So now we know the numbers for the education level received of both groups, but what about their incomes? Research done (table 4.6) shows that 22,1% of the immigrants and 11,2% of the natives says not to have any income. The biggest part of the migrants (51%) and also the natives (41%) has an income between 0 and 1500€. If we look at a level higher, having an income between 1500€ and 3000€, for the natives it is a group of 40,4% and for the immigrants this percentage is just 25,2%. The highest income group (> 3000€) has 7,3% of the natives and 1,7% of the immigrants. Considering this, we can conclude that relatively the natives have a higher level of income compared to the immigrants.

Table 4.6 Level of income by origin

		Origin		Total
		Dutch background	Second-generation immigrant	
Income in €	None	74 11,2%	65 22,1%	139 14,6%
	0 < 1500	270 41,0%	150 51,0%	420 44,1%
	1500 < 3000	266 40,4%	74 25,2%	340 35,7%
	3000 >	48	5	53

	7,3%	1,7%	5,6%
Total	658	294	952
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

To summarize this part, after having compared and the level of education and the income of both groups, we can say that there are indeed differences. The level of education is relatively higher for the natives (HBO) compared to the immigrants (MBO). When comparing the net income per month of the respondents, both groups have the most respondents in the category of earnings between 0€ and 1500€. But while studying these results it is important to note that the total of natives (658) is much higher than the total of the second-generation immigrants (294). After all it can be said that the level of income of the individuals with a Dutch background is relatively higher.

4.1.3. Level of education

In order to answer the third sub-question: *“What is the role of education for social and economic integration of the second generation immigrants?”* five tables (4.7 till 4.11) are presented and discussed. The first three tables (4.7 till 4.9) present the results of the role of education for social integration. Then the last two tables (4.10 and 4.11) present the role of education for economic integration.

Education is widely perceived as the main channel through which immigrant families could economically and socially catch up with the native population over generations. Not only is the educational achievement of the second generation crucially important for immigrant families’ long-term economic advancement, it is also a key indicator for the success of the economic, social and cultural integration of the parental generation in its own right (Schüller, 2013).

To start with the effects of education on social integration, the first table (4.7) deals with the relationship between the level of education and the participation in a sports club or outdoors activity. To start with the individuals not participating in such activities, we can see that 28,5% has finished primary school and 10,8% has finished WO. The biggest group of the ones not participating is also the group having finished primary school, while the smallest group has finished HAVO/VWO (9,5%). In contradiction the group who is participating in activities, we can see that the higher the level of education, the lower the level of

participation, with an exception for individuals studying HAVO/VWO. Also here the biggest group has finished primary school (30,1%) and the smallest group has finished HAVO/VWO (8,9%).

Table 4.7 Participation in a sports club / outdoors activities club by level of education

		Participated		Total
		No	Yes	
Level of education	Primary school	394 28,5%	88 30,1%	482 28,8%
	VMBO	228 16,5%	57 19,5%	285 17,0%
	HAVO/VWO	131 9,5%	26 8,9%	157 9,4%
	MBO	253 18,3%	55 18,8%	308 18,4%
	HBO	226 16,4%	37 12,7%	263 15,7%
	WO	149 10,8%	29 9,9%	178 10,6%
	Total	1381 100,0%	292 100,0%	1673 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Then the next table (4.8) deals with the level of education again but now we are looking at the participation in a cultural association or hobby club. Comparable with the results of table discussed above we can see that also here the biggest group in not participating and participating is the ones finishing primary school. The smallest group is again the ones having finished the level of education of HAVO/VWO. Individuals who have finished MBO and who participate in activities is 19,8% and of the ones finishing WO, 12,4% participates in activities. Also this table brings us to the conclusion that the higher the level of education, the lower the rate of participation, with an exception for HAVO/VWO.

Table 4.8 Participation in a cultural association or hobby club by level of education

		Participated		Total
		No	Yes	
Level of education	Primary school	433 28,9%	49 27,7%	482 28,8%
	VMBO	251	34	285

		16,8%	19,2%	17,0%
	HAVO/VWO	142	15	157
		9,5%	8,5%	9,4%
	MBO	273	35	308
		18,2%	19,8%	18,4%
	HBO	241	22	263
		16,1%	12,4%	15,7%
	WO	156	22	178
		10,4%	12,4%	10,6%
Total		1496	177	1673
		100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Then the last table (4.9) showing the relationship between the level of education and social integration, looks at the frequency of contact with others. Within the group that never has contact with other individuals, the group having finished MBO (19,7%) is bigger than the individuals having finished HBO and never having contact (15,7%). When we look at having weekly contact we can say that this is just 9,6% of the ones finishing University, and 18,8% of the ones finishing MBO. If we leave out primary school, VMBO and HAVO/VWO, we can see a clearly declining line in the percentages if we look at a higher level of education. From this one can conclude that the higher the level of education, the lower the frequency of contacts.

Table 4.9 Frequency of contact by level of education

		Frequency of contact				Total
		Never	Weekly	Monthly	Annually	
Level of education	Primary school	118 31,9%	97 30,9%	113 25,7%	133 29,1%	461 29,2%
	VMBO	60 16,2%	55 17,5%	80 18,2%	74 16,2%	269 17,0%
	HAVO/VWO	34 9,2%	24 7,6%	43 9,8%	46 10,1%	147 9,3%
	MBO	73 19,7%	59 18,8%	80 18,2%	81 17,7%	293 18,5%
	HBO	58 15,7%	49 15,6%	74 16,8%	68 14,9%	249 15,7%
	WO	27 7,3%	30 9,6%	50 11,4%	55 12,0%	162 10,2%
	Total	370	314	440	457	1581

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

After having presented the results of the role of education for social integration, the following part will deal with the results of it for economic integration.

Table 4.10 shows us the level of income by the education level received for the immigrants. If we analyze these numbers closely we see that 27,1% just finished primary education and does not have any income. This percentage is just 4,2% for the ones having finished University; so the higher the level of education, the lower the chance of not having any income. Then, the biggest group having an income between 1500€ and 3000€ exists from the ones who have finished MBO. The highest level of income (< 3000€) exists from HBO and WO. From these numbers it can be concluded that the higher the level of education, the higher the level of income will be. But the fact that the number of respondents is also very low in these columns should be taken into account while stating this conclusion.

Table 4.10 Income by education of the second-generation immigrants

		Income in €				Total
		None	0 < 1500	1500 < 3000	3000>	
Level of education	Primary school	13 27,1%	11 7,9%	0 0,0%	0 0,0%	24 9,3%
	VMBO	12 25,0%	32 22,9%	5 7,8%	0 0,0%	49 19,0%
	HAVO/VWO	10 20,8%	26 18,6%	6 9,4%	2 33,3%	44 17,1%
	MBO	10 20,8%	47 33,6%	24 37,5%	0 0,0%	81 31,4%
	HBO	1 2,1%	19 13,6%	18 28,1%	2 33,3%	40 15,5%
	WO	2 4,2%	5 3,6%	11 17,2%	2 33,3%	20 7,8%
	Total	48 100,0%	140 100,0%	64 100,0%	6 100,0%	258 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

If we look at the same numbers for the natives at Table 4.11 we see that 17,4% finished primary school and does not have any income. While for the individuals having finished WO, so a higher level of education, this percentages is just 2,9%. It is again remarkable that the chance of not having any income is lower for the group of natives with a higher level of

education. The biggest group of the natives studying MBO has a net monthly income between 0 and 1500€. And for the ones finishing University, clearly the biggest group (42%) earns more than 3000€ a month. The table shows that there is a relationship between income and the level of education. Relatively the individuals who have finished a higher education, are more likely to have a higher income too.

Table 4.11 Income by education of the natives

		Income in €				Total
		None	0 < 1500	1500 < 3000	3000>	
Level of education	Primary school	12 17,4%	30 10,2%	11 4,0%	2 4,0%	55 8,0%
	VMBO	27 39,1%	74 25,3%	38 13,8%	1 2,0%	140 20,4%
	HAVO/VWO	14 20,3%	45 15,4%	20 7,3%	2 4,0%	81 11,8%
	MBO	7 10,1%	89 30,4%	70 25,5%	2 4,0%	168 24,5%
	HBO	7 10,1%	40 13,7%	95 34,5%	22 44,0%	164 23,9%
	WO	2 2,9%	15 5,1%	41 14,9%	21 42,0%	79 11,5%
	Total	69 100,0%	293 100,0%	275 100,0%	50 100,0%	687 100,0%

Source: LISS Immigrant panel, own dataset, June 2015

Interestingly within both groups the ones having a higher income than 3000€ have either studied HBO or WO as it is shown in Table 4.10 and 4.11. For the immigrants this percentage is 33,3% for both levels of education (Table 4.10), whereas for the natives it is 44% (HBO) and 42% (WO), which is shown in Table 4.11. The groups in between, so the ones having an income between 1500€ and 3000€ have finished MBO (37,5% for the immigrants) and HBO (34,5% for the natives). Then lastly, of the ones saying not to have any income 27,1% of the immigrants have finished primary school, which is 17,4% of the natives.

Not having any income but having a higher level of education (WO) is then 4,2% for the immigrants and 2,9% for the natives. Also from here it can be concluded that relatively the individuals who have finished a higher education, are more likely to have a higher income too.

In the following paragraph a short summary with the sub-questions and hypotheses raised in the beginning of the thesis will be provided.

4.2. Main findings

Overall, the results shown and explained above show that the situation of the immigrants is more or less the same as the Dutch natives concerning social participation in society; the scores were almost the same for all the indicators discussed. When it comes to the economic situation, the information given confirms that the natives relatively have a higher level of education and income than the immigrants. Furthermore, for the role of education on social and economic integration, it can be said that it has different effects. So while it has a negative effect on social integration, the effect on the economic integration is positive.

Now we will look whether the hypotheses are confirmed and the sub-questions can be answered. The following table will give an overview of this.

Question & Hypothesis	Answer
<p>1) “What are the outcomes of the second-generation in terms of social integration?”</p> <p>Hypothesis 1: The second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands has equal social outcomes compared to natives</p>	<p>The tables (4.1 until 4.4) clearly showed that the results of the second-generation immigrants are less or more the same as the results of the natives. So here we can conclude that the immigrants are integrated well concerning the social integration.</p> <p>This means that the hypothesis stated is confirmed, and that the outcomes of social integration indeed are equal to the natives.</p>
<p>2) “What are the outcomes of the second-generation immigrants in terms of economic integration?”</p>	<p>The information given in the chapter for this question (Table 4.5 and 4.6) explained us that the level of education for the natives is higher (HBO), than the level of the immigrants (MBO). Comparable to this, the natives also relatively have a</p>

<p><i>Hypothesis 2: The second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands has worse economic outcomes compared to natives</i></p>	<p>higher level of income compared to the immigrants. The majority of both groups has a net income between 0€ and 1500€.</p> <p>This means that the second hypothesis is confirmed too. Thus, the income of the immigrants is relatively lower compared to the natives, just like the level of education.</p>
<p>3) “What is the role of education for social and economic integration of the second generation immigrants?”</p> <p><i>Hypothesis 3: The higher the level of education, the higher the level of integration.</i></p>	<p>The tables (4.7 till 4.11) showed us on the one hand that the higher the level of education, the lower the social integration. On the other hand, it can be stated that the higher the level of education, the higher the level of income.</p> <p>This means that the third hypothesis is partly confirmed. It is indeed true that education has a positive effect on economic integration, but for social integration this is not the case.</p>

5. Conclusion

This bachelor thesis started with the main research question: “*To what extent is the second-generation immigrants in the Netherlands integrated?*” To be able to answer this research question, three sub-questions were formulated. Short information about ideas coming from other researchers about the subject ‘integration’ and the level of this for the immigrants has also been dealt with. An existing dataset of the LISS Immigrant Panel has been used in order to conduct a descriptive analysis within the framework of this thesis. However this panel was focusing on the whole group of immigrants and not just the second-generation. Although, since the second-generation is the ‘future’ of the Netherlands and since they constitute a growing share of metropolitan youth of the immigrants, for this thesis,

particularly this group has been chosen to work with, and so has been selected from the dataset.

This research dealt with the social and the economic part of life for the second-generation immigrants. To start with, the social part has been measured by looking at indicators such as participation, frequency of contact and the satisfaction with their social contacts. On these indicators the immigrants had similar outcomes as the native population with a Dutch background. The scores of both groups were quite similar so their level of participation did not differ very much from each other. This also counts for the frequency of contacts and the level of satisfaction. Interestingly comparing these outcomes with the annual report of Statistics Netherlands (2012), it contradicts. While Statistics Netherlands also state that participating in activities is a way to be socially active, they conclude that natives are more active than non-Western immigrants. Hence the difference is that the first generation also is included within the conclusion that immigrants lack behind and this may explain the different results compared to my research. In line with the conclusion of this thesis, Huijnk et. al. (2010) makes a difference between the two generations and shares the view that the social participation of the second generation is close to the natives.

As mentioned before, this thesis also looked at the economic dimension of immigrants' life and took into account the level of education and the income of both groups. The expectation of the immigrants having relatively lower incomes and a low level of education compared to the natives came true. The low level of education when comparing both groups is shared with the findings of Martinovic (2009) who states that the level of education of the immigrants is relatively lower than the one of the natives in the Netherlands. Just like expected, this thesis showed that this is indeed the case. The level of income of the immigrants, is just like the level of education, relatively lower compared to the results of the natives. This statement can be explained explained by Andriessen et. al. (2007) by saying that immigrants and natives with comparable, relevant characteristics for the labor market such as education, knowledge of the language, have also comparable incomes and job positions. But in this case it has been proven that the level of education is relatively lower, which means that the characteristics of both groups are not equal. No equal characteristics means that the outcome for the income will not be equal either.

When we look further in detail and specify it to the categories of the level of education, the immigrants and natives are part of the same category for income. So the ones who have

finished HBO, have the same income per month for both groups, and also for the other levels of education this is the case.

This makes us arrive to the third sub-question raised within this thesis that looked at the role of education within the social and economic part of life. Education is one of the most important predictors—usually, in fact, the most important predictor—of many forms of social engagement, as Helliwell (2007) states.

Results from this thesis showed that the role of education differs for both dimensions. For example, it is presented that the higher the level of education, the lower the social participation of the individuals. This can be explained by looking at the statement of Helliwell (2007), who says that participation is affected primarily by relative educational levels, and thus has not been (and should not have been expected to be) rising with aggregate educational levels. And indeed, it did not necessarily mean that the higher the level of education, the higher the participation.

Furthermore, this thesis presented that when it comes to the economic participation, it is indeed that the higher the level of education, the higher the economic integration. And this view is clearly shared by Martinovic (2009) as mentioned before. She said that the higher the level of education, the higher the level of economic integration is expected to be’.

Education is, however, not the only factor contributing to these socio-economic patterns. What is more, language proficiency constitutes a constant and relevant factor in the understanding of economic performances among the non-western minorities. Both with regard to patterns of labor market participation and unemployment, evidence proves that the capability of speaking the native language must be considered as a significant underlying factor (OECD, 2006).

To conclude and to give an answer to the main research question we can say the following. By now it is clear that the immigrants score higher on some aspects compared to others. While they score relatively well on the social dimension of integration, still the educational skills and the level of income of the immigrants lacks behind the natives. This means that they are partially integrated into society but this is not enough. In order to be integrated very well, the results for the educational aspect and the income should be higher too. The expectation that the educational level is closely linked with the income came indeed true.

For further research it is important to take into consideration the different immigrant groups; so not just the whole second-generation but also the separate groups within this generation. This is an important detail because differences between groups might exist in terms of for example the social participation. Some immigrant groups might be social more active and have more social contacts with natives than others because their norms and values might be more close to the Dutch individuals than the other groups. This then on its turn bring us to the questions whether there are any cultural factors such as religion, tradition and/or norms and values playing an important role in determining the level of integration? Are there any differences between the different immigrant groups? These factors are important to analyze because the chance of generalizing the scores of the second-generation to all the immigrants will be lower. And what about the attitudes of these groups towards education? These things are crucial because within research that already has been done it is assumed that for example Turkish immigrants consider their own tradition as being more important than a relatively high school education compared to for example the Moroccans (Crul and Vermeulen, 2003). This subject still needs future research in order to create the possibilities for the immigrants to develop their level of integration.

5.1. Limitations

Just like as it is the case with a lot of research, with the research done for this paper there are limitations too. It has been explained already that this research uses an existing dataset of the LISS Immigrant Panel. While most of the data is close to what is needed for this research, some data that would be useful too, could not be found within the datasets. For example, keeping in the back of the mind Table 4.4, where the frequency of contact with someone from the neighborhood has been asked, it would be interesting to have the answer of what the origin of this person would be. So, assuming that the respondent says that he/she meets someone almost every day, if we would have known the origin of this person, we could conclude whether the respondent is being social within its own origin group, or that he/she also has contact with individuals from other origins. The same counts for the participation in sports clubs. It is not asked whether these clubs are from their own culture or whether they are Dutch organizations.

Secondly, another limitation that this research brings is the number of respondents. Even though the panel consists of 1600 households; which are 2400 individuals, a lot of respondents are missing in the datasets. Since this online questionnaire has to be filled in

every month, the sample size is very low. This makes it on its turn difficult to generalize and say that the results achieved counts for the whole group of immigrants. To limit this limitation as much as possible and in order to be able to generalize the results, looking at a longer period of time could be the solution. One will then monitor the different variables of integration over time and be able to see the development.

Another important aspect here is that of these 2400 individuals, 1700 individuals were of non-Dutch origin. So the immigrants are a bigger group according to these numbers. Hence, when we just select the second-generation, non-Western immigrants, and compare these with respondents with a Dutch background, the amount of the second group is much higher than the immigrants itself.

All these aspects created different limitations within the research project. Although there has been tried to be aware of these limitations and to 'limit' these as much as possible, it is important to keep these in the back of the mind while analyzing the data.

References

Andriessen, I., N. V., Jaco Dagevos, . N. V., Eline Nievers, . N. V., & Igor Boog, . N. V. (2007). *Discriminatiemonitor niet-westerse allochtonen op de arbeidsmarkt 2007*. s.n.

Babbie, E. (2010). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Bijl, R., & Verweij, A. (2012). Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. *Integration*.

Borooah, V., & Mangan, J. (2009). Multiculturalism versus assimilation: Attitudes towards immigrants in western countries. *International Journal of Economic Sciences and Applied Research*, 2(2), 33-50.

Castles, S. (1986). The guest-worker in Western Europe-An obituary. *International Migration Review*, 761-778.

Council of Europe, 2005, Concerted development of social cohesion indicators. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Crul, M., & Vermeulen, H. (2003). The second generation in Europe. *International migration review*, 37(4), 965-986.

Dagevos, J. (2001). Perspectief op integratie: over de sociaal-culturele en structurele integratie van etnische minderheden in Nederland. The Hague: Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid.

Dagevos, J. (2007). Jaarrapport integratie 2007. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Entzinger, H., & Biezeveld, R. L. (2003). Benchmarking in immigrant integration.

Ersanilli, E., & Koopmans, R. (2010). Rewarding integration? Citizenship regulations and the socio-cultural integration of immigrants in the Netherlands, France and Germany. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(5), 773-791.

European Commission (2003). Migration and social integration of migrants. D-G. of Research. Brussels.

Euwals, R., Dagevos, J., Gijsberts, M., & Roodenburg, H. (2007). Immigration, integration and the labour market: Turkish immigrants in Germany and the Netherlands.

Ewijk, A.C. van, (2011). Sociaaleconomische integratie van niet-westerse allochtonen

Fenger, M. (2012). Deconstructing social cohesion: towards an analytical framework for assessing social cohesion policies. *Corvinus Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, (2), 39-54.

Gijsberts, M., van der Meer, T., & Dagevos, J. (2012). 'Hunkering down' in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods? The effects of ethnic diversity on dimensions of social cohesion. *European Sociological Review*, 28(4), 527-537.

Giugni, M., Michel, N., & Gianni, M. (2014). Associational Involvement, Social Capital and the Political Participation of Ethno-Religious Minorities: The Case of Muslims in Switzerland. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(10), 1593-1613.

Hansen, R. (2003). Migration to Europe since 1945: its history and its lessons. *The Political Quarterly*, 74(s 1), 25-38.

Heath, A.F., R. Rethon en E. Kilpi (2008). The second generation in Western Europe. Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment. In: *Annual Review of Sociology*, jg. 34, p. 211-235.

Heckmann, Friedrich et al. (2001). *Effectiveness of National Integration Strategies towards Second Generation Migrant Youth in a Comparative European Perspective (EFFNATIS)*. Final report.
[http://improvingser.sti.jrc.it/default/page.gx?_app.page=entity.html&_app.action=entity&_entity.object=TS ER---000000000000000051&_entity.name=Report.pdf](http://improvingser.sti.jrc.it/default/page.gx?_app.page=entity.html&_app.action=entity&_entity.object=TS+ER+---+000000000000000051&_entity.name=Report.pdf).

Heerden, S. van, de Lange, S. L., van der Brug, W., & Fennema, M. (2014). The immigration and integration debate in the Netherlands: Discursive and programmatic reactions to the rise of anti-immigration parties. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(1), 119-136.

Helliwell, J. F. (2007). Well-being and social capital: Does suicide pose a puzzle?. *Social indicators research*, 81(3), 455-496.

Huijnk, W. J. J., Gijsberts, M. I. L., Dagevos, J.J., Broek, A., Bronneman, R. (2010). Toenemende integratie bij de tweede generatie? *Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2010*.

Jiménez, T. R. (2011). How Well Are They Integrating into Society? Retrieved from: <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/integration-Jimenez.pdf>

Karthick Ramakrishnan, S. (2004). Second-Generation Immigrants? The “2.5 Generation” in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(2), 380-399.

Koopmans, R. (2010). Trade-offs between equality and difference: Immigrant integration, multiculturalism and the welfare state in cross-national perspective. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 36(1), 1-26.

Lambert, W. E., & Taylor, D. M. (1988, December). Assimilation versus multiculturalism: The views of urban Americans. In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 72-88). Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lange, T. D. (2007). Staat, markt en migrant: De regulering van arbeidsmigratie naar Nederland 1945-2006. Den Haag: Boom juridische Uitgevers.

Latten, J., & De Jong, A. (2005). Nieuwe Bevolkingsprognose cbs: Veel verandering, weinig groei. *Demos*, 21(1), 5-8.

Luthra, R. R. (2011). The Position of the Turkish and Moroccan Second Generation in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(3), 523-524.

Martinovic, B., Tubergen, F. A. V., & Maas, I. (2009). Changes in immigrants' social integration during the stay in the host country: the case of non-western immigrants in the Netherlands. *Social Science Research*, 38, 870-882. [10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2009.06.001)

Peeters, A. L., & d'Haenens, L. (2005). Bridging or bonding? Relationships between integration and media use among ethnic minorities in the Netherlands. *Communications*, 30(2), 201-231.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (2005). Introduction: The second generation and the children of immigrants longitudinal study. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 983-999.

Portes, A., & Schauffler, R. (1994). Language and the second generation: Bilingualism yesterday and today. *International migration review*, 640-661.

Saggar, S., Somerville, W., Ford, R., & Sobolewska, M. (2012). The impacts of migration on social cohesion and integration. *Final report to the Migration Advisory Committee, home Office, London*.

Sanderse, C., Verweij, A. & Beer, de, J. (2011). Migratie: Wat waren de belangrijkste ontwikkelingen in het verleden? In: Volksgezondheid Toekomst Verkenning, Nationaal Kompas Volksgezondheid. Bilthoven: RIVM.

Schaeffer, M. (2011). Ethnic diversity and social cohesion in the Netherlands. *Migration Education*. Retrieved from: http://www.migrationeducation.org/fileadmin/uploads/SCHAEFFER_01.pdf

Scholten, P. (2011). Framing immigrant integration: Dutch research-policy dialogues in comparative perspective. Amsterdam University Press.

Schüller, S. (2013). *Education and immigrant integration* (Doctoral dissertation, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany).

Schmeets, H., & te Riele, S. (2010, January). A decline of social cohesion in the Netherlands? Participation and trust, 1997-2010. In *International Conference on Social Cohesion and Development* (Vol. 20).

Smits, F., & Spierings, N. (2012). Sociale integratie en het kijken naar nieuwsprogramma's als determinanten voor het wisselen van politieke partijkeuze in de periode 1994-2006. *Mens en maatschappij*, 87(2), 150-173.

Staring, R., Geelhoed, F., Aslanoglu, G., Hiah, J., Kox, M. (2014). The social position of Turkish Dutch citizens. *Erasmus University, Rotterdam*.

Statistics Netherlands, 2012. Jaarrapport Integratie 2012. Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek

Urquhart, D. (2010). Immigrant Children, Youth and Families: A Qualitative Analysis of the Challenges of Integration.

Vaus, D. A. de, & de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research design in social research*. Sage.

Veenman, J. (1994). Participatie in perspectief. Ontwikkelingen in de sociaal-economische positie van zes allochtone groepen in Nederland, Houten/Zaventem: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.

Verhagen, F. C. (2010). Hoezo mislukt?: de nuchtere feiten over de integratie in Nederland. Nieuw Amsterdam.

Vos, K. de, (2009). Sleepers in LISS. Arbeitspapier, CentERdata, Tilburg University, Niederlande.

Wilson, W.J. (1987). The Truly Disadvantaged. The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

WRR (2001). Nederland als Immigratiesamenleving. Den Haag, Sdu Uitgevers.

Witteman, J. (2015, Maart 21). Allochtoon erg slecht af op Nederlandse arbeidsmarkt. Volkskrant.