Host National Identification of Immigrants in the Netherlands

De Vroome, T., Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B.

De Vroome, T., Verkuyten, M., Martinovic, B. (2014).

Host National Identification of Immigrants in the Netherlands.

International Migration Review, 48(1), 76-102.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/imre.12063

Host National Identification of Immigrants in the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

This study examines immigrants' identification with the host country. We use survey data of more than 1700 Turkish and Moroccan immigrants and more than 2200 natives in the Netherlands. We answer four main questions in this study. First, do immigrants have lower national identification than natives? Second, does the level of national identification differ between immigrant groups? Third, do economic and social integration similarly affect national identification among immigrants and natives? And fourth, what are important additional determinants of national identification among immigrants? The results show that, compared to Dutch natives, Turkish but not Moroccan immigrants have lower national identification. Being employed and socially integrated is associated with higher national identification among immigrants as well as natives, but only among immigrants is higher occupational status associated with higher national identification. For immigrants, Dutch language proficiency, perceived discrimination, and contact with natives proved to be important conditions for national identification.

Key words: national identification, immigrants, natives, the Netherlands

INTRODUCTION

Immigration and cultural diversity put a strain on the social cohesion of societies. Diversity might lead to a lack of feelings of belonging together which is considered a prerequisite for national solidarity, a unified society and effective democracy (Barry, 2001; Putnam, 2007). Politicians and the media often claim that many immigrants have divided loyalties and a lack of attachment to the host society and therefore undermine a cohesive national identity. In West European countries, there is a renewed societal emphasis on traditional national values and immigrants are being scrutinized for their assimilation to a set of 'core values' and their loyalty to the host nation (see Kundnani, 2007; Vasta, 2007). Yet, proponents of multiculturalism also argue that a well-functioning society needs a sense of commitment and common belonging making it important to foster a spirit of shared national identity (Modood, 2007; Parekh, 2000).

Cross-national research shows that in most countries immigrants generally have lower host national identification than the majority group and a relatively weak sense of national belonging to the new country (e.g., Elkins and Sides, 2007; Staerklé et al., 2010). There is also some research evidence for a re-emphasis of ethnic distinctiveness (re-ethnicisation) and rejection of the host society (national dis-identification) among immigrants (e.g., Verkuyten and Yildiz, 2007). On the other hand, there are many immigrants who do develop a sense of belonging and commitment to the host society. This raises the question about the conditions that stimulate or hamper immigrants' national identification. Furthermore, there can be important differences among immigrant groups. Studies on national identity in Britain and the United States indicate that the strength of national identification may not be equal for immigrants from different origin countries and that therefore different immigrant groups should be examined (Heath and Roberts, 2006; Sidanius et al., 1997).

Integration and identification

Based on the work of T.H. Marshall, Bloemraad, Korteweg and Yurdakul (2008) argue that four dimensions of citizenship can be distinguished: legal status, equal rights, participation and a sense of belonging. Most immigrants in Western countries have legal status and equal citizen rights but participation and particularly a sense of belonging tend to be more problematic. Host national identification is considered to be one of the aspects of immigrant integration, alongside economic, social, and cultural integration (Fokkema and De Haas, 2011). These aspects of integration tend to be related; access to employment and education (economic integration) enables immigrants to interact more with natives and build social capital (social integration) (Martinovic, et al., 2009) and to learn the host country's language and customs (cultural integration) (Van Tubergen and Kalmijn, 2009).

According to the influential assimilation theory of Gordon (1964), and later Alba and Nee (1997) and Esser (2003), gaining access to employment and education is the first and most important step in the integration process, which in turn stimulates social integration in society. Immigrants' national identification is considered the 'final step' in the integration process, which only takes place after immigrants find that they can reach or have reached satisfactory socio-economic positions in the host society (Esser, 2003; Gordon, 1964). It can be argued, however, that economic and social integration also affect national identification among the native population. Research suggests that natives who are socio-economically marginalized have a relatively low sense of national belonging (Heath and Roberts, 2006). The notion that socio-economic marginalization reduces national identification among natives raises an interesting question, namely whether national identification of natives and immigrants is similarly affected by economic and social integration in society.

We want to disentangle economic and social integration as 'general' correlates of national identification, from factors that are specific to the experience of immigrants. The

specific factors generally relate to immigrants' familiarity with and knowledge of the host culture, while economic and social integration relate to a sense of purpose and inclusion in society. Previous research suggests several determinants of immigrants' national identification. These include indicators of social interaction with natives and cultural integration, as well as the time spent in the host country and perceived discrimination (Heath and Roberts, 2006; Maxwell, 2009; Nesdale, 2002). To a large degree the influences of these factors on immigrants' host national identification have been studied separately. However, these influences tend to be related and therefore should be considered simultaneously in order to determine their independent relationships with immigrants' host national identification.

Our study makes a contribution to the literature on immigrants' host national identification in several ways. First, we determine whether immigrants have lower host national identification than Dutch natives. Second, we examine whether the level of national identification differs between immigrants from different origin countries. Third, we investigate whether economic and social integration are equally important for natives' and immigrants' (host) national identification. Fourth, we examine specific determinants of national identification among immigrants. Regarding the third and fourth question, this means that we study two aspects of immigrants' social integration. The first is what we shall call social inclusion, which we argue is a general measure of social involvement that is also important for natives' sense of belonging to the nation and can be captured by social capital and feelings of loneliness; the second is contacts with natives in particular, which is of special relevance for immigrants.

We use representative samples (18-49 years of age) of more than 2200 Dutch natives and 1700 Moroccan and Turkish first and second generation immigrants. Moroccan and Turkish immigrants are studied because they are the two largest non-western minority groups in the Netherlands (De Graaf et al., 2010a). Moreover, they are interesting groups to study,

because research has shown that their economic integration lags behind natives, and because they are relatively often discriminated against (Dagevos and Bierings, 2005; Hagendoorn and Pepels, 2003). Moreover, Moroccan and Turkish immigrants are large minority groups in other West European countries such as Germany, Belgium, Sweden and Spain. This makes the Netherlands an interesting exemplary case and opens up the possibility for future comparisons.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

Level of national identification among immigrants and natives

When immigrants arrive in a country, their sense of identity is typically centered on membership in their ethnic community. There is a large body of acculturation research that focuses on the way immigrants re-evaluate their ethnic identity, and the extent to which they come to identify with the host country (Berry, 1997; Phinney, 1990; Zimmermann, et al., 2007). According to the acculturation framework, some immigrants will maintain an exclusive ethnic identity (separation), while others prioritize the new national identity (assimilation), or take on a dual identity that encompasses attachments to both the ethnic minority group and the host country (integration), and some turn away from both the ethnic and national identity (marginalization) (Berry, 1997; Verkuyten and Martinovic, 2012; Zimmermann, et al., 2007).

It is typically assumed that national identification is lower among immigrants than among natives. Because many nation states in Europe have historically developed around an indigenous group, the state institutions and national symbols (such as courts, schools, and the national anthem) reflect the majority group language and culture (Staerklé et al., 2010). These institutions and symbols tend to appeal more to ethnic majority than to immigrant groups. As a result, majority members typically feel closer to the nation than minority members (Staerklé

et al., 2010). Because large-scale immigration to the Netherlands did not start until the recruitment of labor migrants in the 1960's (Bevelander and Veenman, 2006), the Dutch state institutions and national symbols reflect the language and culture of the native majority group. It follows that minority group members will likely feel less close to the Netherlands than natives. Therefore, our first hypothesis states that (*host) national identification will be lower among immigrants than among natives* (H1).

Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands

In examining differences between immigrant groups, we propose two alternative hypotheses. First, the migration history of Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands is quite similar. Many people from Turkey and Morocco, mostly low-educated men, were recruited as labor migrants in the 1960s and early 1970s (Bevelander and Veenman, 2006). After the period of labor recruitment, family reunification and family formation resulted in a further increase of immigration from Morocco and Turkey to the Netherlands in the 1980s and 1990s (Bevelander and Veenman, 2006). Currently around 750,000 people of Turkish or Moroccan origin live in the Netherlands, which is around 4.5 per cent of the population (Nicolaas et al., 2010). Compared to natives, the education level, labor market participation and level of income of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants are much lower (Hagendoorn et al., 2003). Furthermore, both Turkish and Moroccan immigrants are at the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy, facing the highest levels of societal rejection and exclusion (Hagendoorn and Pepels, 2003; Schalk-Soekar and Van de Vijver, 2008).

However, despite these similarities, researchers have noted that the Moroccan and Turkish communities in the Netherlands differ in several respects. While both groups are low-status groups, Turkish immigrants do have somewhat higher employment rates and income levels than Moroccans (Gokdemir and Dumludag, 2011). Moreover, because general levels of

education and literacy are higher in Turkey than in Morocco, and because Turkey is a secular state like the Netherlands and unlike Morocco, the cultural distance between natives and Moroccan immigrants might be larger than between natives and Turkish immigrants (Stevens, et al., 2003). Therefore, it might be more difficult for Moroccan immigrants to develop an attachment to Dutch society than for Turkish immigrants. This leads to the hypothesis that *host national identification will be lower among Moroccan than among Turkish immigrants* (H2a).

However, it can also be argued that national identification will be lower among Turkish than among Moroccan immigrants. It has been found that Turkish immigrants' life satisfaction in the Netherlands tends to be lower than among other immigrant groups (Gokdemir and Dumludag, 2011). Also, Turkish immigrants have a relatively stronger orientation on their ethnic community. Compared to other minority groups in the Netherlands, researchers have noted relatively high residential segregation and ethnic community pressure among Turkish immigrants, an extensive and highly interconnected network of ethnic associations and transnational networks, and relatively high levels of Turkish nationalism (Fennema and Tillie, 1999; Koopmans and Statham, 2001; Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007; Van Heelsum, 2002). Because it is more difficult to identify with a society that one is not very satisfied with, and because the ethnic communities and organizations of Turkish immigrants provide an important source of identification and social control, it can be hypothesized that *host national identification will be lower among Turkish than among Moroccan immigrants* (H2b).

Economic integration and social inclusion

For natives as well as immigrants, economic integration and success are important determinants of feeling included in society. There is a long research tradition that relates

unemployment and poverty to reduced social inclusion and mental health among the general population (Bohnke, 2008; Strandh, 2000). Being economically unsuccessful makes people feel 'left out', and leads to disengagement from society (Heath and Roberts, 2006). In contrast, people who participate economically and are more successful on the labor market will have a feeling that they contribute to society, and will sooner feel that they belong and 'fit in'.

In the literature on immigrant integration, it is also suggested that economic integration plays a key role in stimulating other aspects of immigrants' integration, such as identification with the host country (Gordon, 1964). Similar to natives, economic integration can nurture a positive attitude toward society among immigrants because it confirms that they are valued members who make a useful contribution (Hagendoorn, et al., 2003). Moreover, by providing contact opportunities and financial resources to attend clubs and leisure activities, economic integration can provide opportunities for social inclusion in society, which can further stimulate immigrants' host national identification (Esser, 2003). We therefore hypothesize for immigrants as well as for natives, that *economic integration (being employed, and having a higher occupational level) will be positively related to national identification* (H3a), and so will *social inclusion (having more social capital, feeling less lonely)* (H3b).

Researchers have noted that unemployment levels and weak labor market positions set immigrants apart from mainstream society and undermine their motivation to adapt (Hagendoorn et al., 2003). Moreover, immigrants have generally left behind many of their close kin and friends in the country of origin, and start out with limited social resources in the host country. Because immigrants are more likely than natives to doubt whether they are accepted and seen as valued members of society, the effects of being economically successful and socially integrated on national identification can be expected to be stronger for immigrants than for natives. We therefore hypothesize that *the expected positive relation*

between economic integration and national identification (H4a) and *the expected positive relation between social inclusion and national identification* (H4b) *will both be stronger for immigrants than for natives*.

Immigrant-specific determinants of national identification

In addition to economic integration and social inclusion, the literature suggests that language proficiency (cultural integration), social interaction with natives, and the time spent in the host country are key determinants of immigrants' host national identification. In general, these factors can stimulate a sense of national belonging by increasing familiarity with the host country's culture and customs. Relatedly, perceived rejection by the host majority population (perceived discrimination) may negatively affect immigrants' national belonging, because it can convey a sense of being culturally different and can demotivate immigrants to interact with natives. We investigate these factors simultaneously for the first time in order to determine their independent associations with immigrants' host national identification.

First, researchers have suggested that national identification is closely related to proficiency in and use of the host country language (Remennick, 2004; Vervoort, 2011). Studies on immigrants' language proficiency and usage and their national identification have demonstrated that language can function as an important marker of identity (Vervoort, 2011). Proficiency in the host country language is also an important pathway to further integration in the host country (Espenshade and Fu, 1997; Remennick, 2004). By learning the language, immigrants become more familiar with the majority culture which makes it easier to identify with the host society (Esser, 2003). We therefore hypothesize that *Dutch language proficiency will be positively related to immigrants' host national identification* (H5).

Second, social interaction with natives can be an important explanation for immigrants' host national identification (Lubbers, et al., 2007; Nesdale, 2002). Because

individuals tend to adapt their norms, beliefs and commitments to those of their social network, the networks in which immigrants are involved will affect their national identification (Lubbers et al., 2007). Having many natives in one's personal network will make immigrants feel more accepted in the host society and will increase their orientation towards the host society (Nesdale, 2002). Therefore, we hypothesize that *more social contacts with natives will be positively related to immigrants' host national identification* (H6).

Third, an important factor relating to the national identification of immigrants' is perceived discrimination by the majority population (Jasinskaja-Lahti, et al., 2009; Maxwell, 2009; Ono, 2002; Verkuyten and Yildiz, 2007). Discrimination implies unfair treatment and such treatment tells people that they are not equal members of society and that society itself is less just. Therefore, perceived discrimination might increase the distancing from the host society. We expect that *perceived discrimination will be negatively related to immigrants' national identification* (H7).

Finally, it can be expected that immigrants adapt more to the host society over the course of years spent in this country, and from one migrant generation to the next (Maliepaard, Lubbers and Gijsberts, 2010; Van Ours and Veenman, 2003). Therefore, we hypothesize that *time spent in the Netherlands will be positively related to host national identification* (H8a)*,* and that *host national identification will be higher among second generation immigrants than among first generation immigrants* (H8b).

DATA AND METHODS

Data

We use the first wave of the NEtherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS 2009), which focuses on questions of social cohesion, inequality, and norms and values (De Graaf, et al., 2010b). The NELLS survey is a rich data source because it contains a large group of

natives and of Moroccan and Turkish immigrants. In collecting the data, a random sample of municipalities was selected, stratified by region and degree of urbanization. The four largest cities in the Netherlands were added to these municipalities, because of the large proportions of ethnic minorities in the largest cities. Second, respondents were randomly selected from the population registry based on their age (14-49), country of birth and parents' country of birth.

First and second generation immigrants were oversampled. According to the official definition of the Dutch Central Bureau of Statistics, first generation Moroccan and Turkish immigrants are those individuals who were born in Morocco or Turkey, and of whom one or both parents were born in Morocco or Turkey (Keij, 2000). Second generation Moroccan and Turkish immigrants are defined as those individuals who were themselves born in the Netherlands, and of whom one or both parents were born in Morocco or Turkey (Keij, 2000).

The survey was administered in the Dutch language, and each respondent took part in a face-to-face interview followed by a self-completion questionnaire. The overall response rate was 52 percent, which is about average for this type of surveys in the Netherlands (De Graaf, et al., 2010a). It should be noted however that response was somewhat lower for Moroccan and Turkish immigrants (46 percent and 50 percent) than for the native Dutch (56 percent). The reason is that immigrants were more difficult to reach and less willing to participate than natives, but some also could not participate because of the language barrier (De Graaf, et al., 2010a).

About one third of the immigrant respondents belong to the second generation (i.e. born in the Netherlands). We excluded the small minority of respondents in our sample (about 7.5 percent) that did not fill out the self-completion part of the survey, because this part contains key items for our analysis. Furthermore, because we are interested in the role of economic integration, we focus on the respondents who are 18 years or older (adults, of working age). Thus we excluded the respondents between 14 and 17 years of age (about eight

percent). Lastly, because only a few respondents had missing values on our variables of interest (i.e. less than three percent), they were also deleted from the sample in most cases. For two variables where the missing values were limited to only one item of a set of four or more scale items (i.e. language proficiency and perceived discrimination), we used the remaining scale items to impute that value. All in all, our study includes 4007 respondents, of which 2279 are native Dutch, 869 are Moroccan immigrants, and 859 are Turkish immigrants.

Measurement

Dependent variable

National identification was measured with the following three statements, to which respondents could answer on five-point scales: 'I identify strongly with the Netherlands', 'I really feel connected to the Netherlands', and 'My Dutch (national) identity is important to me'. Analysis showed that the items form a reliable scale (Cronbach's Alpha =.87). A higher score stands for stronger identification.

We tested the measurement invariance of the scale across the three groups (i.e. natives, Turkish and Moroccan immigrants) with Confirmatory Factor Analysis in MPLUS 6. First, based on the RMSEA and CFI fit measures, the model with invariant factor loadings (constrained to be equal across the three groups) fitted the data very well (RMSEA=.050, CFI=.998). The Chi^2 difference test did indicate however that the model with invariant loadings fitted the data significantly more poorly than the unconstrained model (Chi^2 difference=17.147, DF=4, p=.002). A model with invariant factor loadings for Moroccan and Turkish immigrants (constrained to be equal only for the Moroccan and Turkish groups) fitted the data equally well as the unconstrained model (Chi^2 difference=.000, DF=2, p=1.000). This means that, even though our three indicators form a reliable measure of national

identification, we do have to take into account that the items measuring national identification may not mean exactly the same to natives as they do to the immigrant groups.

We have further examined the reliability of our dependent variable by comparing the means and bivariate correlations for the three items between the ethnic groups (Table 1). The main difference between natives, on the one hand, and Moroccan and Turkish immigrants on the other, is that one item seems to define the latent construct best among natives (the second item), while this is not the case among the immigrant groups. Analyses using the three items as separate dependent variables are in line with the results presented here (available upon request). Among all groups, all bivariate correlations are above .60, which further suggests that the scale is reliable.

[Table 1 about here]

Independent variables

For economic integration, we used a variable that indicates respondents' *employment status*. We distinguished between those who were employed, those who were unemployed (but wanted to work), those who did not actively participate in the labor market (and did not plan to do so), and those who were students. For the measure of *occupational level*, respondents were asked to indicate what level of education was required for their current job position. Consequently, our variable for occupational level consists of 7 categories: (1) no education or primary education required, (2) lower secondary education, (3) higher secondary education, (4) lower vocational training, (5) higher vocational training, (6) higher vocational training or university degree, and (7) university degree required. Respondents who were not employed were given the mean score of their respective origin group.

Regarding social inclusion, we used a measure of social capital and of loneliness. The social capital scale included three items, such as 'there are enough people I can rely on in difficult times'. The loneliness scale also included three items, such as 'I often feel abandoned'. Factor analysis confirmed that the self-reported measures of social capital and loneliness constitute two distinct factors. Analysis shows that both the social capital scale (Cronbach's alpha= .81) and the loneliness scale (Cronbach's alpha= .80) are reliable.

Regarding immigrant-specific factors, we use a measure of *language proficiency* that consists of four items. Immigrant respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale how well they could speak and write in Dutch and understand spoken and written Dutch, ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (very well). The scores on the four items were summed and divided by four. Analysis showed that the items formed a reliable scale (Cronbach's Alpha =.96). For measuring *native contacts*, respondents were asked to indicate on a seven-point scale ranging from 'never' to 'daily', how often they had contact with natives in their neighbourhood.[1] *Perceived discrimination* was measured by asking respondents to indicate, on a three-point scale (i.e. never, sometimes, often), if they had been discriminated against in job applications, at work, at school, on the street, in associations/clubs they were members of, and while going out (nightlife). We took the average of these items that formed a reliable scale (Cronbach's Alpha =.81). *Years since migration* is based on respondents' answer to the question 'In what year did you come to live in the Netherlands?'. For second generation immigrants, years since migration was set equal to age. Finally, we used two control variables in our analysis: *gender* (female=1, male=0), and *age.* The descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables are presented in Table 2.

[Table 2 about here]

RESULTS

National identification among natives and Turkish and Moroccan immigrants

Our first hypothesis stating that national identification is lower among immigrants than among natives is partially confirmed. Regression analysis shows that, compared to natives, Turkish but not Moroccan immigrants have significantly lower national identification (Table 3, Model 1). As to the difference between the immigrant groups, a model in which Moroccans were used as a reference category confirmed that Turks identify less with the host nation than Moroccans (β=-.095, t=-4.82, p<.001), which is in line with hypothesis 2b. It should be noted, however, that Turkish participants score only a little lower than the other groups (the difference is less than .2 points on the scale from 1 to 5, see Table 2). Interestingly, in the second and third model of Table 3 that includes the variables for economic integration and social inclusion, the difference between natives and Turkish immigrants becomes smaller, while for Moroccan immigrants national identification becomes even significantly higher than that of natives.

[Table 3 about here]

Economic integration and social inclusion

We hypothesized that economic integration (being employed and having a higher occupational level) would be positively related to national identification (H3a). The results partially confirm this hypothesis. Compared to employed respondents, those who are unemployed and those who are inactive on the labor market have lower national identification (Table 3, Model 2). Employment is, in other words, positively related to national identification. The results in Model 2 of Table 3 also indicate, however, that occupational level is not significantly related to national identification.

We further hypothesized that social inclusion (social capital and low levels of loneliness) would be positively related to national identification (H3b), which is confirmed by the results in the third model of Table 3. It turns out that social capital is associated with higher national identification, while loneliness is associated with lower national identification Moreover, between the second and third model of Table 3, the contrast between employed respondents and those who are unemployed or inactive becomes smaller, suggesting that the relation between economic integration and national identification is partially mediated by social inclusion.

[Table 4 about here]

We hypothesized that the positive relations between economic integration and social inclusion, on the one hand, and national identification, on the other, would be stronger for immigrants than for natives (H4a/H4b). In Table 4, we compared the relations of economic integration and social inclusion with national identification for natives and immigrants (with Turkish and Moroccan immigrants combined), using interaction effects. The main effects of economic integration and social inclusion on national identification are practically the same whether or not we combine the Turkish and Moroccan immigrant groups in our analysis (see Model 3 in Table 3 and Model 1 in Table 4).

The interaction terms are included in the second model of Table 4. Our hypothesis (H4a) regarding occupational level is confirmed, but not for employment status. As expected, the significant interaction effect indicates that the relationship between occupational level and national identification is more positive among immigrants than among natives. We have calculated simple slopes as suggested by Aiken and West (1991). The simple slopes indicate that occupational level is positively related to national identification among immigrants

(b=.022, se=.014, p=.123), while the relation is negative among natives (b=-.020, se=.011, p=.078).

With regard to employment status, we did not find significant interaction effects (Table 4, Model 2). Among immigrants however, it is not the unemployed but rather the inactive ones who have significantly lower national identification than the employed, as becomes clear from Model 1 in Table 5 where we show the results for immigrants only. Findings from Table 4 and 5 combined thus suggest that being employed is positively associated with national identification among both natives and immigrants, but for immigrants mainly in contrast to the inactive.[2]

Regarding hypothesis 4b, the interactions between immigration status and social capital or loneliness are not significant. This means that the relations between social inclusion and national identification are the same for immigrants and natives, in contrast to our expectation of a stronger relationship among immigrants.

[Table 5 about here]

Immigrant-specific determinants of national identification

Table 5 shows the results of the analysis for the immigrant subsample. Models 1 and Model 2 respectively include the variables for economic integration and social inclusion, in addition to country of origin and the background characteristics age and gender. Regarding economic integration, the results in Table 5 (Model 1) show that being employed is associated with higher national identification, in contrast to being inactive. The first model also confirms that occupational level is positively related to national identification among immigrants. However, when we include the indicators of social inclusion in the second model, we again see that the relations between the economic integration variables and national identification become

smaller, indicating that the relation between economic integration and national identification is partially mediated by social inclusion.

Moreover, the results in the third model of Table 5 show that the effects of economic integration and social inclusion on immigrants' national identification are outweighed to some extent by the role of the immigrant-specific factors. When we take these factors into account in Model 3 (i.e. language proficiency, contact with natives, discrimination, years in the Netherlands and migrant generation), the effect of being inactive versus being employed is no longer significant, and also the relation between loneliness and national identification is no longer significant. The results in Table 5 thus suggest that employment and occupational level are not directly related to national identification but rather through social inclusion and through some factors specific for immigrants, such as host language proficiency, contacts with natives, and perceived discrimination. Regarding economic integration, only being a student (versus being employed) is directly related to national identification in the final model, while it was not significant in the first two models of Table 5, suggesting that this negative relation was 'suppressed' by students having relatively high language proficiency and more contact with natives.

Our immigrant-specific hypotheses are generally confirmed by the results. Model 3 in Table 5 shows that better Dutch language proficiency (H5) is indeed significantly associated with a higher host national identification. Importantly and as expected, having more contacts with natives (H6) is significantly associated with higher host national identification, even while taking into account the measures of social inclusion (social capital and loneliness). This shows that there are two distinct aspects to the relation between immigrants' social integration and their host national identification. First is the aspect of feeling included in society, which matters for immigrants and natives alike. Additionally, contacts and interactions with natives can further contribute to immigrants' host national identification.

Furthermore, the hypothesis that perceived discrimination will be negatively related to immigrants' host national identification (H7), is confirmed by the results. Finally, in line with our eighth hypothesis, we find that the number of years spent in the Netherlands is positively related to national identification. However, national identification is not significantly related to migrant generation (H8b).

Interactions with origin group and generation

In order to examine whether the relations found hold for both groups of immigrants, and for the first and second generation, we estimated two sets of additional models.[3] First, we estimated models as presented in Table 5 (Model 3), but additionally including interactions between all the predictor variables and ethnic group. Only the interaction between being a student (as opposed to employed) and being from Turkish (versus Moroccan) origin turned out to be significant. This means that the relations between occupational status and national identification, between social inclusion and national identification, and between the immigrant-specific factors and national identification do not differ between Turkish and Moroccan immigrants. Simple slopes indicate that being a student is associated with lower national identification among Moroccan immigrants (b=-.235, se=.082, p=.004) but not among Turkish immigrants (b=.011, se=.094, p=.907).

Second, we estimated a model with interactions between all predictors and migrant generation. Only the interaction between contact with natives and belonging to the second generation proved to be significant. The simple slopes for first and second generation immigrants show that the positive relationship between having native contacts and national identification only applies to the first generation (b=.060, se=.013, p<.001) and not to the second generation (b=.001, se=.020, p=.948). For interpreting this finding it is important to note that most second generation immigrants report relatively high levels of contact with

natives. Therefore, it is difficult to estimate whether contact with natives contributes to second generation immigrants' host national identification as it does among the first generation. However, the interaction between social capital and migrant generation is not significant, indicating that social inclusion also matters for second generation immigrants' national identification. Altogether, we can conclude that the correlates of national identification are very similar for immigrants from different origin countries and different generations.

DISCUSSION

We set out to answer four main questions in this study. First, do immigrants have lower national identification than natives? Second, does the level of national identification differ between immigrant groups? Third, do economic and social integration similarly affect national identification among natives and immigrants? And fourth, what are important additional determinants of national identification among immigrants?

Cross-national studies have found that national identification is lower among immigrants than natives (Elkins and Sides, 2007; Phinney, et al., 2006; Staerklé, et al., 2010). These studies, however, have neglected differences between minority groups (but see Sidanius et al., 1997; Heath and Roberts, 2006). Our findings indicate that it is important to consider differences in national identification between immigrants from different origin countries. We found that Turkish but not Moroccan immigrants had lower national identification than natives. For the Moroccan immigrants this result is surprising, because the common expectation is that immigrants' national identification lags behind the national identification of natives. Interestingly, other studies have also shown that some groups (e.g. African Americans, and Black Caribbeans in the UK) have lower national identification than the native majority, while other minority groups (e.g. Mexican Americans, and ethnic Indians in the UK) do not (Heath and Roberts, 2006; Sidanius et al., 1997). Thus, the often made

assumption that immigrants have a lower sense of national belonging compared to natives does not apply to all groups.

The literature offers some possible explanations why Turkish immigrants identify less with the host country than Moroccans. Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands have a rather strong orientation on their ethnic community (compared to other minority groups in the Netherlands), which could explain this result. It has for instance been noted in previous research that Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands have a relatively extensive and highly interconnected network of ethnic associations and transnational networks, and relatively high residential segregation and normative community pressure (Fennema and Tillie, 1999; Koopmans and Statham, 2001; Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, 2007; Van Heelsum, 2002). Even though we found a relatively small difference in substantive terms, future research could investigate these and other possible explanations of differences between minority groups. Moreover, studies with a cross-national design could attempt to disentangle 'origin effects' (characteristics of the minority group, related to the country and culture of origin) and 'community effects' (characteristics of minority communities in specific host countries).

The group differences in national identification can also indicate that national identification does not mean exactly the same to the groups studied, as is suggested by the results for the measurement equivalence of the items used. This puts studies that compare natives' and immigrants' national identification into perspective (e.g. Elkins and Sides, 2007; Staerklé, et al., 2010). Researchers have noted that there can be qualitative differences in national identification between ethnic groups (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005). Our findings confirm this notion and suggest that caution is required when studying national identification across majority and minority groups. Furthermore, it is important for future studies to examine different aspects and dimensions of national identification. We focused on the sense of

belonging but national identification can also relate to, for example, feelings of esteem and pride, and cultural beliefs and values (Ashmore, et al., 2004; Verkuyten, 2005).

Regarding the role of economic integration, we found that being employed is positively associated with national identification, both among natives and immigrants. However, among immigrants, it is mainly the inactive and not the unemployed who have significantly lower national identification than the employed. From a policy perspective, this indicates that there are two specific groups at risk of feeling excluded from society. Among natives, the economically marginalized (i.e. those who are unemployed and cannot find work, despite wanting to work) feel most 'left out', in line with the study by Heath and Roberts (2006). Among immigrants, the sizeable group of people who do not actively participate on the labor market (about 20 percent of our sample, compared to about 5 percent among natives) identified less with the host country than the employed. Furthermore, our study reveals that moving up on the occupational ladder matters for immigrants but not for natives. The results thus indicate that economic participation – in terms of being active on the labor market and attaining a higher status position – generally increases the national identification of immigrants, while among natives the unemployed form a specific group of concern.

A key aspect of our study is that we disentangled factors that are specific to the experience of immigrants as well as factors that apply to both natives and immigrants. We have argued that the classical integration theories such as formulated by Gordon (1964) and Esser (2003) actually suggest two sets of processes that drive national identification, one that applies to immigrants and natives alike which revolves around a sense of purpose and feeling included in society, and another one that is specific to immigrants and revolves around familiarity with and knowledge of the host culture. Regarding the role of social integration, our study clearly confirms this argument. The relation between social inclusion and national identification is the same among immigrants and natives, while among immigrants, contact

with natives is also related to national identification, in addition to social inclusion. Similarly, a marginal economic position is associated with lower national identification both among immigrants and natives, partially indirectly by reduced feelings of social inclusion. Additionally, among immigrants, occupational prestige is related to national identification.

Regarding the factors that apply only to immigrants, our findings indicate that perceived discrimination, Dutch language proficiency, and the time spent in the Netherlands are important determinants of host national identification. This confirms the notion from previous research that national identification is closely related to proficiency in and use of the host country language, and that the perceived acceptance or rejection by the majority strongly influences immigrants' sense of national belonging (Jasinskaja-Lahti, et al., 2009; Remennick, 2004; Vervoort, 2011).

Our findings thus suggest that increased familiarity with and knowledge of the host country and mainstream culture is important for immigrants' host national identification. In this respect, the distinction between migrant generations is also important. For first generation immigrants, a longer stay in the host country is associated with higher national identification. Moreover, the results suggest that contacts with natives are important for the national identification of first generation but not for second generation immigrants. It is thus likely that policies trying to stimulate interactions with natives will positively affect the host national identification of first generation immigrants. For second generation immigrants, contacts with natives are already quite extensive and therefore having more contacts has less influence on the development of a sense of national belonging. It should be noted though that our measure of social contacts with natives reflects the quantity rather than the quality of contacts. Moreover, our results show that also among the second generation, social capital is positively related to national identification. Our study therefore does not rule out that close interethnic friendships can positively affect the national identification of second generation immigrants.

We want to mention some limitations of our study. Although we did find that employment is positively related to host national identification among immigrants, this is particularly in contrast to being inactive. The lack of contrast between employed and unemployed immigrants may partly be due to a large portion of immigrants working in 'ethnic niches' of the labor market. It could be that employment in mainstream jobs is more positively associated with national identification among immigrants, as is suggested by the positive relation between occupational level and host national identification. This means that future studies should take into account the differences between employment in ethnic niches and employment in the economic mainstream.

Furthermore, we cannot make causal inferences because we used cross-sectional data. We argued that national identification can be the result of factors such as economic integration and social inclusion, but national identification, in turn, can also stimulate economic integration and social inclusion. However, this reversed causation is less likely (Nekby and Rödin, 2007). Our predictions were theoretically derived and there is longitudinal, causal evidence for some of the proposed relationships, such as between discrimination and host national identification (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009). We also note the possible sources of selectivity in the sample. Data collection was conducted in the Dutch language, and immigrants who were not proficient enough did not take part in the survey, meaning that the effect of language proficiency on national identification might be underestimated in our study. Moreover, data collection focused on a specific age range (15-45) and respondents from urban areas were likely oversampled. It remains to be investigated, therefore, whether the current findings can be generalized to the community of immigrants, including those who do not have much knowledge of the language of their host society. These issues of selectivity should be taken into account in future replications in other countries and in potential meta-analyses.

Despite these limitations, our study has several strengths. We used large samples (18-49 years) of two immigrant groups from different origin countries. We were able to make a comparison with natives, and we used a large set of reliable measures and adequate control variables to test our hypotheses, which were largely confirmed. Therefore, this study presents a valuable contribution to the literature on national attachment among immigrant and native populations. Future studies should examine generalizability to other national contexts and to different subgroups of immigrants, comparing, for instance, colonial migrants with guest workers and refugees. It could be that colonial migrants show higher attachment to the host country due to shared history and that for them economic inactivity and social exclusion represent less of an obstacle towards identification with the host country.

In conclusion, host national identification among immigrants does not appear to be much lower than the national identification of natives. This means that we found little evidence in the Netherlands for the claim that immigrants have divided loyalties and a lack of attachment to the host society and therefore undermine a cohesive national identity. Rather than assuming that minorities are less attached to the host country, migration scholars should examine which minorities in which countries show a lack of identification. This also means that policy makers should not assume that diversity is per definition detrimental to cohesion in society. Our findings also indicate that it is critical to examine the conditions that stimulate or hamper immigrant's national identification. For example, the findings indicate that the economic integration of immigrants is not only an important goal in itself but can also contribute to social inclusion and a sense of national belonging. In addition, policies aiming to further stimulate immigrants' host national identification should focus on factors that are closely connected to, or result from, familiarity with the host country's culture, such as high host language proficiency, low discrimination and frequent contacts with natives.

NOTES

[1] The questions on social contact in this survey asked how often respondents had contact with natives, in their neighborhood, at work and at social clubs. Because many respondents were not employed (about 40 per cent) and were not a member of any social club (about 60 per cent), we focus on the neighborhood contacts.

[2] Additional analyses (not shown here) indicate that when natives are analyzed separately, unemployed but not inactive respondents have significantly lower national identification than employed respondents. These results are available upon request from the authors.

[3] These additional models are not included in the tables, but are available upon request from the authors.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L.S. and West, S.G. (1991) *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Alba, R. and Nee, V. (1997) 'Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration', *International Migration Review,* 31(4): 826–74.

Ashmore, R.D., Deaux, K. and McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004) 'An organizing framework for collective identity: articulation and significance of multidimensionality', *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(1): 80-114.

Barry, B. (2001) *Culture and equality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Berry, J.W. (1997) 'Immigration, acculturation and adaptation', *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 46(1): 5-68.

Bevelander, P. and Veenman, J. (2006) 'Naturalization and employment integration of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands', *Journal of International Migration and Integration,* 7(3): 327-49.

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., and Yurdakul, G. (2008) 'Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation and challenges to the nation state', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34: 153-179.

Bohnke, P. (2008) 'Are the poor socially integrated? The link between poverty and social support in different welfare regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(2): 133-50.

Dagevos, J. and Bierings, H. (2005) 'Arbeid en inkomen (Work and income)', in SCP/WODC/CBS (eds) *Jaarrapport Integratie 2005.* The Hague: SCP/WODC/CBS, 81-106.

De Graaf, P.M., Kalmijn, M., Kraaykamp, G., Monden, C.W.S. (2010a) *Design and content of the NEtherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS).* Research report. Tilburg University and Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands.

De Graaf, P.M., Kalmijn, M., Kraaykamp, G., Monden, C.W.S. (2010b) *The NEtherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS Wave 1).* Dataset. Tilburg University and Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands.

Elkins, Z. and Sides, J. (2007) 'Can institutions build unity in multiethnic states?' *American Political Science Review,* 101(4): 693-708.

Espenshade, T.J. and Fu, H. (1997) 'An analysis of English-language proficiency among US immigrants', *American Sociological Review,* 62(2): 288-305.

Esser, H. (2003) 'What substance is there in the term 'Leitkultur'?', in Cuperus, R., Duffek, K.A. and Kandel, J. (eds) *The Challenge of Diversity.* Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 47-58.

Fennema, M and Tillie, J. (1999) 'Political participation and political trust in Amsterdam: civic communities and ethnic networks', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 25(4): 703-26.

Fokkema, T and De Haas, H. (2011) 'Pre- and post-migration determinants of socio-cultural integration of African immigrants in Italy and Spain', *International Migration,* DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2435.2011.00687.x (Published online: 3 May 2011).

Gokdemir, O. and Dumludag, D. (2011) 'Life satisfaction among Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands: the role of absolute and relative income', *Social Indicators Research,* DOI: 10.1007/s11205-011-9815-8 (Published online: 3 March 2011).

Gordon, M.M. (1964) *Assimilation in American Life.* London: Oxford University Press.

Hagendoorn, L., Veenman, J. and Vollebergh, W.A.M. (2003) (eds) *Integrating Immigrants in the Netherlands: Cultural versus Socio-Economic Integration*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Hagendoorn, L. and Pepels, J. (2003) 'Why the Dutch maintain more social distance from some ethnic minorities than others: A model explaining the ethnic hierarchy', in Hagendoorn, L., Veenman, J. and Vollebergh, W. (eds) *Integrating Immigrants in the Netherlands: Cultural versus Socio-Economic Integration.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 41-61.

Heath, A. and Roberts, J. (2006) *British Identity: Its Sources and Possible Implications for Civic Attitudes and Behaviour.* Oxford: University of Oxford.

Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K. and Solheim, E. (2009) 'To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination', *Applied Psychology – International Review,* 58(1): 105-28.

Keij, I. (2000) 'Standaarddefinitie allochtonen (Standard definition immigrants)', *INDEX,* 10: 24-25.

Koopmans, R. and Statham, P. (2001) 'How national citizenship shapes transnationalism: a comparative analysis of migrant claims-making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands', *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 17(2): 63-100.

Kundnani, A. (2007) 'Integrationism: The politics of anti-Muslim racism', *Race and Class,* 48(4): 24-44.

Lubbers, M.J., Molina, J.L. and McCarty, C. (2007) 'Personal networks and ethnic identifications – the case of migrants in Spain', *International Sociology,* 22(6): 721-41.

Maliepaard, M., Lubbers, M. and Gijsberts, M. (2010) 'Generational differences in ethnic and religious attachment and their interrelation. A study among Muslim minorities in the Netherlands', *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 33(3): 451-72.

Martinovic, B., Van Tubergen, F. and Maas, I. (2009) 'Dynamics of interethnic contact: a panel study of immigrants in the Netherlands', *European Sociological Review,* 25(3): 303-18.

Maxwell, R. (2009) 'Caribbean and South Asian identification with British society: the importance of perceived discrimination', *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 32(8): 1449-69.

Modood, T. (2007) *Multiculturalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Nekby, L., and Rödin, M. (2007) *Acculturation identity and labor market outcomes*. IZA Discussion paper No. 2826. Bonn: Institut zur Zukunft der Arbeit.

Nesdale, D. (2002) 'Acculturation attitudes and the ethnic and host-country identification of immigrants', *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 32(7): 1488-1507.

Nicolaas, H., Wobma, E., and Ooijevaar, J. (2010). Demografie van (niet-westerse) allochtonen in Nederland. (Demography of (non-Western) minorities in the Netherlands.) In R. Van der Vliet, J. Ooijevaar, and A. Boerdam (Eds.), *Jaarrapport Integratie 2010* (pp. 33-60). Den Haag, the Netherlands: CBS.

Parekh, B. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Macmillan.

Phinney, J.S. (1990) 'Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: review of research', *Psychological Bulletin,* 108(3): 499-514.

Phinney, J.S., Berry, J.W., Vedder, P. and Liebkind, K. (2006) 'The acculturation experience: attitudes, identities, and behaviours of immigrant youth', in: Berry, J.W., Phinney, J.S., Sam, D.L. and Vedder, P. (eds) *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity, and Adaptation across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 71-116.

Putnam, R. (2007) 'E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and community in the twenty-first century', *Scandinavian Political Studies,* 30(2): 137-74.

Remennick, L. (2004) 'Language acquisition, ethnicity and social integration among former Soviet immigrants of the 1990s in Israel', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(3): 431-54.

Sidanius, J., Feshbach, S., Levin, S. and Pratto, F. (1997) 'The interface between ethnic and national attachment', *Public Opinion Quarterly,* 61(1): 102-33.

Schalk-Soekar, S.R.G. and Van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2008) 'The concept of multiculturalism: a study among Dutch majority members', *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 38(8): 2152-78.

Staerklé, C., Sidanius, J., Green, E.G.T. and Molina, L.E. (2010) 'Ethnic minority-majority asymmetry in national attitudes around the world: A multilevel analysis', *Political Psychology,* 31(4): 491-519.

Stevens, G.W., Pels T, Bengi-Arslan, L., Verhulst, F.C., Vollebergh, W.A.M. and Crijnen, A.A. (2003) 'Parent, teacher and self-reported problem behavior in the Netherlands', *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(10): 576-85.

Strandh, M. (2000) 'Different exit routes from unemployment and their impact on mental well-being: The role of the economic situation and the predictability of the life course', *Work Employment and Society*, 14(3): 459-79.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J.C. (1986) 'The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour', in Wörchel, S. and Austin, W. (eds) *The social psychology of intergroup relations.* Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole, 33-48.

Van der Laan Bouma-Doff, W. (2007) 'Confined contact: residential segregation and ethnic bridges in the Netherlands', *Urban Studies,* 44(5): 997-1017.

Van Heelsum, A. (2002) 'The relationship between political participation and civic community of migrants in the Netherlands', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 3(2): 179-200.

Van Ours, J. and Veenman, J. (2003) 'The educational attainment of second-generation immigrants in The Netherlands', *Journal of Population Economics,* 16(4): 739-53.

Van Tubergen, F. and Kalmijn, M. (2009) 'Language proficiency and usage among immigrants in the Netherlands: incentives or opportunities?' *European Sociological Review,* 25(2): 169-82.

Vasta, E. (2007) 'From ethnic minorities to ethnic majority policy: multiculturalism and the shift to assimilationism in the Netherlands', *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30(5): 713-40.

Verkuyten, M. (2005) *The Social Psychology of Ethnic Identity.* Hove: Psychology Press.

Verkuyten, M. and Yildiz, A.A. (2007) 'National (dis)identification and ethnic and religious identity: a study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 33(10): 1448-62.

Verkuyten, M. and Martinovic, B. (2012) 'Immigrants' national identification: meanings, determinants and consequences', *Social Issues and Policy Review,* (in press).

Vervoort, M.H.M. (2011) *Living together apart? Ethnic concentration in the neighbourhood and ethnic minorities' social contacts and language practices.* Den Haag: Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP).

Yağmur, K. and Van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2011) 'Acculturation and language orientations of Turkish immigrants in Australia, France, Germany, and the Netherlands', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* DOI: 10.1177/0022022111420145 (Published online, 2 September 2011).

Zimmermann, L., Zimmermann, K.F. and Constant, A. (2007) 'Ethnic self-identification of first-generation immigrants', *International Migration Review,* 41(3): 769-81.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and correlations for items measuring national identification

	Descriptive statistics			Correlations		
	Range	M	SD	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3
Natives						
Item 1	1-5	3.73	.79	1	.78**	.67**
Item 2	1-5	3.73	.81	.78**	1	.72**
Item 3	1-5	3.69	.84	.67**	.72**	1
Moroccans						
Item 1	1-5	3.75	.88	1	.71**	.71**
Item 2	1-5	3.77	.91	.71**	1	.67**
Item 3	1-5	3.71	.94	.71**	.67**	1
Turks						
Item 1	1-5	3.60	.88	1	.63**	.63**
Item 2	1-5	3.59	.88	.63**	1	.62**
Item 3	1-5	3.53	.91	.63**	.62**	1

Source: Own calculations (NELLS 2009).

Note: Item 1 - 'I identify strongly with the Netherlands'
Item 2 - 'I really feel connected to the Netherlands'
Item 3 - 'My Dutch identity is important to me'.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of national identification and independent variables

		Natives N=2279		Moroccans N=869		Turks N=859	
	Range	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Dependent variable							
National Identification	1-5	3.72	.74	3.74	.81	3.57	.77
Economic integration							
Employment status							
Employed	0/1	.78		.54		.61	
Unemployed	0/1	.03		.07		.10	
Inactive	0/1	.05		.23		.18	
Student	0/1	.14		.16		.11	
Occupational level	1-7	3.90	1.42	3.01	1.23	3.01	1.37
Social inclusion							
Social capital	0-3	2.20	.53	2.07	.61	1.98	.59
Loneliness	0-3	.76	.60	1.01	.66	1.09	.62
Immigrant-specific factors							
Language proficiency	0-4			3.28	.94	3.07	1.00
Native contacts	0-6			4.59	1.74	4.62	1.69
Discrimination	1-3			1.36	.41	1.33	.41
Second generation	0/1			.31		.32	
Years in the Netherlands[1]	0-44			19.90	9.37	21.09	10.11
Control variables							
Female	0/1	.54		.55		.51	
Age	18-49	32.90	8.28	31.60	7.81	33.29	7.94

Source: Own calculations (NELLS 2009).
[1]: Years in the Netherlands among first generation respondents.

Table 3: Regression analysis of national identification among natives and immigrants

	M1		M2		M3	
	β	t	β	t	β	t
Origin group						
(Natives = ref.)	-		-		-	
Moroccan immigrants	.015	.94	.039	2.22 *	.051	2.96 *
Turkish immigrants	-.080	-4.87 **	-.061	-3.52 **	-.038	-2.20 *
Economic integration						
Employment status						
(Employed = ref.)			-		-	
Unemployed			-.032	-1.99 *	-.019	-1.20
Inactive			-.083	-4.90 **	-.065	-3.88 **
Student			-.039	-2.05 *	-.039	-2.04 *
Occupational level			.008	.46	-.007	-.40
Social inclusion						
Social capital					.103	6.09 **
Loneliness					-.068	-3.99 **
Control variables						
Female	.010	.63	.024	1.52	.015	.96
Age	.023	1.43	.010	.54	.017	.92
N		4007		4007		4007
R^2		.008		.015		.033

Source: Own calculations (NELLS 2009).
The relation is statistically significant at * (p<.05), ** (p<.001).
Note: one-tailed test for hypothesized effects.

Table 4: Interaction effects between immigrant background and economic integration/social inclusion

		M1		M2	
		β	t	β	t
Origin group					
(Natives = ref.)		-		-	
Immigrants (M + T)		.008	.47	.019	.91
Economic integration					
Employment status					
(Employed = ref.)		-		-	
Unemployed		-.021	-1.30	-.058	-2.03 *
Inactive		-.061	-3.62 **	-.024	-.77
Student		-.037	-1.97 *	-.030	-1.28
Occupational level		-.007	-.42	-.037	-1.76
Social inclusion					
Social capital		.106	6.24 **	.105	4.32 **
Loneliness		-.071	-4.12 **	-.074	-3.12 **
Interaction effects					
Unemployed	x Immigrant			.043	1.48
Inactive	x Immigrant			-.045	-1.42
Student	x Immigrant			-.012	.57
Occupational level	x Immigrant			.048	2.30 *
Social capital	x Immigrant			.000	.00
Loneliness	x Immigrant			.004	.18
Control variables					
Female		.016	1.01	.015	.94
Age		.013	.69	.014	.72
N			4007		4007
R^2			.028		.031

Source: Own calculations (NELLS 2009).
The relation is statistically significant at * (p<.05), ** (p<.001).
Note: one-tailed test for hypothesized relationships.

Table 5: Regression analysis of national identification among immigrants

	M1		M2		M3	
	β	t	β	t	β	t
Origin group						
(Moroccan immigrants = ref.)	-		-		-	
Turkish immigrants	-.120	-5.00 **	-.109	-4.56 **	-.114	-4.85 **
Economic integration						
Employment status						
(Employed = ref.)						
Unemployed	-.019	-.78	-.007	-.27	.016	.67
Inactive	-.119	-4.61 **	-.101	-3.89 **	-.041	-1.55
Student	-.041	-1.41	-.041	-1.41	-.056	-1.98 *
Occupational level	.052	2.16 *	.037	1.57	-.017	-.72
Social inclusion						
Social capital			.099	3.96 **	.075	3.07 *
Loneliness			-.061	-2.45 *	-.017	-.70
Immigrant-specific factors						
Language proficiency					.127	3.86 **
Native contacts					.092	3.93 **
Discrimination					-.128	-5.27 **
Second generation					-.011	-.33
Years in the Netherlands					.151	4.32 **
Control variables						
Female	.025	1.01	.018	.71	-.025	-1.00
Age[1]	.029	.99	.036	1.26	-.001	-.02
N		1728		1728		1728
R^2		.028		.044		.106

Source: Own calculations (NELLS 2009).
The relation is statistically significant at * (p<.05), ** (p<.001).
[1] When years in the Netherlands is included in the (second) model, age can effectively be interpreted as age at migration.
Note: one-tailed test for hypothesized effects.