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1 Introduction to the Research Programme

Immigration, Diversity and the Nation–State: Institutional Effects and Structural Transformations

One of the most visible consequences of globalization for advanced democracies is that they have virtually all become immigration societies, in which an increasing part of the population has roots in other places of the world. Compared to earlier waves of immigration, many of these immigrants originate in regions that are culturally and religiously strongly different from the countries of immigration. The global politicization of Islam since the Iranian revolution of 1979 and its escalation since September 11, 2001 have made the integration of Muslim immigrants a particularly salient issue of controversy. These developments are having important political repercussions. Immigration and cultural diversity are the main driving forces behind the rise of populist parties across the advanced democracies. More generally, along with supranational political integration and economic neo-liberalism, immigration and diversity have been identified as driving forces behind the emergence of a new cleavage between cosmopolitan elites and less privileged sections of the population who seek economic and cultural protection from the nation-state.

The reason why immigration and diversity have become so salient and controversial is not just their intrinsic scope and importance. Much more still, it is the fact that immigration and diversity pose several key challenges to the institutions, self-understanding, social cohesion, and autonomy of nation-states. They have become a major source of societal conflict that increasingly links domestic conflicts to ethnoreligious conflicts in immigrants’ countries of origin around the globe.

To begin with, immigration and diversity challenge traditional institutions and idioms of citizenship and the notions of national identity on which they are founded. As newcomers, immigrants reinvigorate questions that played a crucial role in the formative stages of nations but had since in most countries lain dormant: who can under which conditions become a member of the national community and which duties and entitlements does this entail? Immigration moreover adds a new dimension to these citizenship controversies by raising the question to what extent citizenship can and should be based on a shared dominant culture, as communitarians would argue; common adherence to universal norms of individual liberty and equality, the republican position; or the public recognition of cultural pluralism, as multiculturalists advocate.

Immigration also re-politicizes and transforms church–state regimes. These too were fiercely contesterd in the formative stages of many nations, and were after a phase of relative pacification re-politicized – within the context of a global revival of
religiosity – by the arrival of immigrants and the new religions, most conspicuously Islam, which they brought along. This raises questions such as whether Islam can be granted an institutional position equal to that of established religions, and which new claims to public recognition of special religious practices and symbols can or cannot be met. The issue is not just whether Islam and other new religions can be made to fit Western notions of church-state relations, but also whether these church-state arrangements themselves can adapt to new realities.

The control of immigration, access of immigrants to rights, and the regulation of diversity also challenge nation-state's autonomous capacity to act. The rights of immigrant workers, asylum seekers, and their families are subject to a variety of international treaties and jurisprudence by supranational courts of law, as are the rights of cultural minorities more generally. The emergence of such supranational regulation raises the question to what extent nation-states are still capable of effectively implementing independent policies of immigration and integration that are rooted in national institutional frameworks and self-understandings. Increasingly, immigrant minority claims, often referring to supranational human and minority rights regimes, clash with majorities’ efforts to retain and defend native cultural traditions (e.g., the Dutch controversy over “Black Pete”), liberal-democratic values (e.g., freedom of expression vs respect for religious symbols in the various Mohammed cartoon conflicts), or a combination of these (e.g., burqa and headscarf debates).

These conflicts are just a few examples of how immigration and associated cultural diversity have become major sources of ethnic and religious conflicts. As studies by Dieter Rucht and Hanspeter Kriesi, among others, have shown, immigration and cultural diversity have become the single largest field of protest politics in Western Europe, including primarily peaceful pro-immigrant mobilization, as well as, often violent, mobilization by anti-immigrant groups and Islamic radicals. The latter type of mobilization is one salient example of the fact that immigration establishes a direct link between social conflicts in immigration countries and ethnoreligious strife in the regions of origin of immigrants, intensifying conflicts both “here” (e.g., clashes between Kurds and Salafists in Germany during the battle over the Syrian city of Kobane) and “there” (e.g., thousands of young European Muslims joining the ranks of the so-called Islamic State in Syria and Iraq). Conflicts “here” over immigration and diversity increasingly also have global repercussions: Geert Wilders, the Mohammed cartoons, Charlie Hebdo – these have long ceased to be just Dutch, Danish, French or even European controversies. Because of the social conduits and global ethnoreligious networks of solidarity and identification created by immigration, conflicts around the world increasingly have faraway consequences.

Even when it does not escalate into overt ethnic and religious conflict, cultural diversity poses challenges to social cohesion. In the wake of Robert Putnam’s pioneering work, mounting evidence has shown that increased diversity is associated with erosions of trust, solidarity and the ensuing capacity of (local and national) communities to cooperate. While the correlation among these phenomena is meanwhile well-established, our research on this topic has focused on the open questions of causality and the mechanisms behind the linkage between diversity and social cohesion.
By focusing on how immigration and diversity shape and are shaped by key institutional features of the nation-state, and how they are linked to ethnoreligious conflicts and social cohesion, the research in our department is clearly distinct from immigrant integration research programmes elsewhere. While we of course also pay attention to the key dimensions of immigrant integration – socio-cultural and socio-economic – that are central to much other research in this area, our research programme is not just about immigration and diversity as such – intrinsically important as these topics may be. Rather, it takes them as lenses through which we observe and analyse key challenges that confront nation-states in the age of globalisation: the question of membership, the place of religion in liberal democracies, how to maintain cohesion in diversifying societies, the shifting relationship between nation-states and supranational institutions, and increased exposure to global ethnoreligious conflicts. This leads to an approach that puts institutions and processes of political mobilisation at the centre of attention, both as shapers of immigration and immigrant integration, and as being transformed by them.

Figure 1 visualises the structure of the research programme. The block on the left stands for immigration and cultural diversity in their "unprocessed" forms, as a set of potential problems and challenges for institutions.

**Figure 1:** Structure of the research programme

Our first set of research questions – identified by arrow A – asks how immigration and cultural diversity are politically processed and lead to different patterns of institutional change and adaptation. We claim that such processes are shaped by institutional factors such as notions of citizenship and national identity, church-state regimes, insertion of countries into systems of multi-level governance, and electoral politics. In the parlance of independent and dependent variables, immigration and
diversity are here the independent variables and institutional adaptation is the dependent variable.

Our second set of research questions – identified by arrow B – asks how different institutional responses affect the outcomes of the process of immigrant integration along the two traditionally distinguished dimensions of socio-cultural and socio-economic integration (or cultural and structural assimilation as they are denoted in the classical US-American literature on the topic). Particular attention is also paid to the linkages between socio-cultural and socio-economic integration. In this second part of our research programme, institutional responses are the independent variables, and the various components of the immigrant integration process are the dependent variables. We do not claim that institutional regulation is the only or even necessarily the most important factor affecting integration outcomes, but our focus on meso-level and macro-level causal antecedents and consequences of immigrant integration makes that we are particularly interested in such institutional effects. To an important extent immigrant integration outcomes are also shaped by the composition of the immigrant influx, both in terms of its human capital prior to migration, and in terms of its ethnic and religious origins (arrow C).

Immigrant integration outcomes in turn affect the degree to which immigration gives rise to ethnoreligious conflicts and poses challenges to social cohesion (arrow D). To the extent that immigrants are socio-culturally distant from the “native” population and socio-economically marginalized, conflict and cohesion problems can be expected to be more intense. As we noted above, ethnoreligious conflicts increasingly have global origins and repercussions. Therefore, they, too, depend on an important part on the composition of the immigrant population, and the particular conduits between regions of origin and countries of immigration that are thus established (arrow E). Institutional regulations may also have direct effects on the intensity of social conflicts and cleavages, for instance by providing opportunities and constraints for minorities’ expression of ethnic and religious difference or by limiting or facilitating immigrants’ participation in electoral politics by way of access to citizenship (arrow F).

In a dynamic perspective, these integration outcomes alter the constellation of problems and challenges surrounding immigration and cultural diversity and thus feed back into institutions, as indicated by the final arrow G in the figure. To the extent that integration outcomes are characterised by deep cultural differences and strong socio-economic marginalization of immigrants, with ensuring conflicts and lacking solidarity and trust across ethnic and religious boundaries, pressures on institutions and the political salience of immigration and diversity will increase. The social and political relevance of our research programme lies in the answers that it seeks to provide to the question, which patterns of institutional responses to immigration and diversity are best suited to avoid such negative outcomes, and have the greatest potential to make immigration a positive-sum game that benefits both immigrants and receiving societies.

Based on the above considerations, our research is organised into five thematic clusters, as indicated in Figure 1. The first deals with institutional responses to immigration and diversity, the next two with socio-cultural and socio-economic integration, and the final two with the consequences for ethnoreligious conflicts and social cohesion:
• Cluster 1: The regulation of citizenship, immigration and diversity
• Cluster 2: Socio-cultural integration and interethnic contacts
• Cluster 3: The socio-economic integration of immigrants
• Cluster 4: Ethnic and religious conflicts
• Cluster 5: Solidarity, trust, and cooperation in diverse communities

In terms of theory and research questions, we seek to define our place in the research landscape by delineating our approach from four other strands of research in the immigration and diversity fields. First, in contrast to the many normative studies that are available (e.g., Kymlicka, Barry), our approach is empirical. This does not mean that we ignore normative theories, which often contain assumptions, of which the validity can be empirically investigated. For instance, most normative theories assume that easy access of immigrants to rights will be beneficial for their integration and social mobility. Results of several of our studies show that this is not always true, and that sometimes even the opposite is the case. Such results are, of course, also food for thought for normative theorists. In our empirical work we seek to connect macro questions of institutional responses to concrete empirical mechanisms on the meso (e.g., neighbourhoods, ethnic communities, social movements, public institutions) and micro (individual) levels of analysis. Thereby we seek to distinguish ourselves, second, from institutional analyses that remain entirely on the macro level, and, third, from studies that put individual-level determinants of immigrant integration, such as the possession of various forms of human capital, at the centre of attention. Fourth and finally, in investigating contextual effects we seek to follow the path between fundamental and applied research that defines the WZB’s profile of “problem-oriented fundamental research.” This implies that our focus is on institutional arrangements of a broader scope and theoretical relevance, such as citizenship, church-state regimes, labour market structures and supranational regulation, rather than – as in the many useful applied policy studies that are conducted elsewhere – primarily on concrete policy solutions for particular integration problems.

Because of our ambition to connect various levels of analysis and to uncover the social mechanisms by which macro-contextual conditions affect and are affected by immigration and diversity, we draw inspiration (and research personnel) from various disciplines, most importantly sociology, political science and social psychology. In terms of research design, the nature of our interests privileges comparative designs, across countries, but also across time, ethnic groups, and local communities. Data that span such comparative dimensions are scarce within the migration and diversity field. Most cross-national surveys, for instance, include too few immigrants for meaningful analyses and do not contain crucial migrant-specific variables such as language proficiency and interethnic contacts. Moreover, because they aim at the general population and make no special efforts to sample the immigrant subgroup, the immigrants within such studies tend to be heavily biased towards highly-educated and better-integrated individuals (e.g., the European Social Survey). Because of the scarcity of existing data that are suitable to answer our research questions, many of our projects make great efforts to gather their own primary data. For instance, we have conducted two of only three existing surveys of immigrants and their children across several European countries (see projects 2.1 and 2.2; brief outlines of the
projects are presented in section 4 below; more information can be found on the Department’s web pages) and we have recently embarked on the first-ever cross-national field experiment on labour-market discrimination (projects 3.4 and 3.5) and the first cross-national survey of religious radicalism and fundamentalism (project 4.1). As Table 1.1 shows, 19 of the 30 projects that we have conducted during the last five years (since 2011) or are currently conducting rely on primary data. Some of these of course require third-party funding, but to an important extent the investments that we have been able to make into extensive and innovative primary data gathering would not have been possible without the opportunities that the WZB offers as an extra-university research institute, where scholars can spend a larger share of their time on research, and internal funding is available for small to medium-sized data gathering.

Table 1.1: Types of data used in MIT projects 2011–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects with primary data gathering</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Of which:
| Surveys                             | 5  |
| Field experiments                   | 7  |
| Survey experiments                  | 3  |
| Laboratory experiments              | 2  |
| Content analyses                    | 5  |
| Qualitative interviews              | 3  |
| Quantitative field data             | 2  |
| Policy data                         | 2  |
| Projects with only secondary analysis of existing data | 9  |
| Of which: surveys                   | 9  |
| Other projects                      | 2  |

The need to connect data on various levels of analysis, as well as our interest in social mechanisms, imply that our research projects use – and often combine – a wide range of data sources and methods. This, too, is shown in Table 1.1. Quantitative surveys are the most-often used type of data (14 of 30 projects), and the only type of data where we can rely in part on existing data. Experiments are the second-most frequently used data type. Seven projects use field experiments, e.g. a letter drop experiment on

---

1 The third cross-national survey of European immigrants is the TIES project on the immigrant generation in cities in eight European countries. Regarding labour market discrimination a study was conducted by the ILO in the mid-1990s in four European countries, but it was not really comparative because the design varied across countries. A few questions on religious radicalism and fundamentalism have been included in surveys by the US-American Pew research institute, but these do not go into much depth and are not available for multivariate analyses.

2 This may include more than one type of primary data gathering per project.

3 This includes one normative project (1.5) and one project at a very early stage, where no definitive choices on data gathering have been made (4.5).
prosocial behaviour across Berlin neighbourhoods (project 5.2), and a randomized intergroup contact trial between Jews and Arabs in Israel (project 4.6). Three studies use survey experiments, e.g., an experiment priming various types of diversity (project 5.2), and other projects use classical laboratory experiments (project 5.1), and lab-in-the-field experimental games (project 5.4). Content analyses are used in five projects to study for instance public debates on Islam (project 2.2), the incidence and spread of xenophobic violence (project 4.4), and the content of citizenship tests (project 1.2). The palette of data types is completed by qualitative interviews (e.g., on how the military deals with religious diversity; project 1.4), quantitative field data (e.g., 311 calls in New York City to study neighbourhood conflicts; project 5.3), and comparative policy data (e.g., the ICRI dataset of immigrant rights policies across 29 countries worldwide; project 1.1).

The department was established in 2007. In the first phase of our research programme (see the previous research report for the WZB Advisory Board of November 2010), our geographical focus was mainly on comparisons across long-standing European immigration countries such as Germany, France, and the Netherlands. With its combination of a wide range of national institutional traditions and unique exposure to political supranationalization in the context of the European Union, Europe is a vast laboratory for investigating the kind of questions that we are interested in. While this makes a research focus on Europe analytically attractive, immigration has become a global phenomenon that affects not only Europe and the classical Anglo-Saxon immigration countries but countries around the world. Moreover, as we have emphasized above, ethnoreligious conflicts, too, have increasingly become global in scope, to an important extent because of immigration. In the last few years, we have therefore begun to extend the geographical scope of our research to include non-Western immigration countries such as Singapore, Israel, and Kuwait.

We also increasingly felt that it was necessary to transcend the boundary between immigration-related and “autochthonous” ethnic, racial, and religious diversity. The literatures on immigrant minorities and conflicts around immigration, on the one hand, and on national minorities and related ethnoreligious conflicts, on the other, are largely separated. Of course, there are some ways in which the two are different (e.g., the normative basis of rights claims of immigrant and national minorities; see project 1.5), but to an important extent this boundary is artificial and obscures that many of the same processes and mechanisms are at work (e.g., ethnic competition), many of the same problems arise (e.g., lacking trust and interethnic cooperation), and similar theoretical perspectives can be applied (e.g., intergroup contact theory). Moreover, in the context of globalized ethnoreligious conflicts, the boundary also becomes empirically blurred, because what appears as an immigration-related conflict “here” appears as an autochthonous ethnoreligious cleavage elsewhere (Islamic radicalism is the prime case in point). We therefore believe that there is much to be gained from a stronger integration of these as yet largely disparate research fields. Several of our newer research projects therefore include a focus on diversity issues that are not directly tied to immigration, including racial discrimination in post-Apartheid South Africa and the United States, religious fundamentalism in Cyprus and Kenya, and intergroup relations in Israel and Singapore.
The need to take the increasingly global nature of immigration and ethnoreligious conflicts into account has led to a considerable geographical expansion of the scope of our research. Figure 2 shows in which countries across the world we have gathered or are in the process of gathering primary data. Altogether our primary research covers 34 countries on all continents, 18 of which are studied in more than one project. For obvious reasons, most projects include a German component (14 out of 19 projects), and many include long-standing European and Anglo-Saxon immigration countries. However, compared to the first phase of our research programme we now have developed considerable research activities outside the OECD and Western worlds.

Figure 2: Countries where primary data have been gathered

Topically, our research programme has also seen some recent shifts of emphasis. Regarding immigrant integration, our initial emphasis was more strongly on socio-cultural integration, while more recently most of the projects on immigrant integration focus on the socio-economic side, especially the labour market. Socio-cultural aspects of integration such as language proficiency and interethnic contacts continue to play an important role, however, since they are important factors explaining successful socio-economic integration. A second shift of emphasis is that for the reasons alluded to above we more strongly engage with ethnoreligious conflicts. Next to the research on anti-immigrant mobilization that has from early on been part of our research programme, new projects focus on Arab-Jewish relations in Israel, as well as on religious fundamentalism and radicalization, comparing both across countries (Germany, Canada, Cyprus, Kenya) and religious groups (Muslims and Christians).

While we have thus broadened the scope of our research in various directions, it also needs to be emphasized that with the limited resources at our disposition (structurally 5.5 full time positions including the Director), we cannot cover the whole field of migration and diversity. In particular, we do not conduct research into immigration flows, e.g., questions such as what determines immigrants’ decision to leave home and move to one country and not another, which policies are best-suited to attract high-
skilled immigrants or how can refugee flows best be managed? We also do not study the repercussions of immigration on the countries of origin, e.g. questions of brain drain and remittances. These are important issues in their own right that would merit attention. However, this would not only require more personnel resources but also a further widening of the disciplinary scope to demography and economics. Since with our limited staff we already cover three disciplines (political science, sociology, and social psychology), further disciplinary broadening would amount to overstretching. Nevertheless, within the Research Area Migration and Diversity to which the Department belongs, we cover issues of migration flows at least where policy analysis is concerned. In the Junior Research Group Immigration Policies in Comparison (IPC), led by former MIT member Marc Helbling, immigration policies and their impacts are studied on the basis of a large dataset covering all OECD countries. This dataset has just been finished and will be a very useful source for research in the coming years, not least because it can be fruitfully combined with the similarly structured ICRI dataset on immigrant integration policies compiled by Ruud Koopmans and Ines Michalowski (project 1.1). A research fellowship for Marc Helbling after the conclusion of his Junior Research Group in 2016 will assure that we can profit from collaborative analyses of these rich data sets in the coming years. In a more long-term perspective, arrangements such as these seem to be the only feasible way to include perspectives on immigration beyond the research questions covered by the Department. A new junior research group or research professorship focusing on immigration flows and their causes and consequences, possibly with a more demographic or economic disciplinary perspective, would be a good way to assure that the WZB has a stronger voice in debates on these aspects of immigration.
2 Research Team and Organization

Director

Prof. Dr. Ruud Koopmans
Director since April 2007.

- Since November 2013 Professor of Sociology and Migration Research at the Humboldt University of Berlin.
- Since September 2010 Visiting Professor at the Department of Political Science of the Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- From 2003-2010 Professor of Sociology, Chair in Social Conflict and Change, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Researcher at the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR), at the Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau in Den Haag and at the WZB.
- Doctor in Political and Social-Cultural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam (1992).
- M.A. in political science, University of Amsterdam (1987).

Research interests: immigration and integration politics; Islamic religious fundamentalism, radicalization and political violence; right-wing radicalism; social movements; European integration; evolutionary sociology.

Current research staff members

Ruth Katharina Ditlmann, Ph.D.
Senior research fellow since October 2012.

- From 09/2014-06/2015 Postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Psychology and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.
- Ph.D. in Social Psychology at Yale University (2012).

Research interests: Conflict Resolution & Reconciliation, Immigration and National Identity, Intergroup Contact, Political Psychology
Eylem Kanol, M. A.

Junior research fellow since May 2015.

- M.A. in Racism and Ethnicity Studies, University of Leeds (2010).

*Research interests*: religious fundamentalism, radicalisation, migration, integration, and intercultural conflicts.

Dr. Ines Michalowski

Senior research fellow since March 2008.

- Visiting Fellow at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies at Harvard (02 – 04/2015).
- Guest Professor for Migration and Integration, University of Vienna (10-11/2014).
- Ph.D. in Political Science and Sociology, University of Münster & Centre de Sociologie des Organisations (Sciences Po) (2007).

*Research interests*: organizations and diversity, military and religious diversity, integration and citizenship policies.

Anselm Frieder Rink, M.Phil

Junior research fellow since May 2015

- Ph.D. candidate in Comparative Politics at Columbia University, New York, NY.
- 2015 M.Phil from Columbia University
- 2013 M.A. from Columbia University
- B.Sc. in Government and Economics (distinguished), London School of Economics (2011).

*Research interests*: Migration, Integration, and Intercultural Conflicts.
Dr. Susanne Veit
Senior research fellow since January 2015.

- Ph.D. in Psychology, Free University of Berlin (2014),
- From 01/2009-12/20014 junior research fellow of the research unit "Migration, Integration, Transnationalization”.
- Diploma in Psychology, University of Potsdam (2007).


Ruta Yemane, M.A.

Junior research fellow since May 2014.

- From 2012-2014 junior researcher at the German Expert Council on Integration and Migration (SVR), Berlin.
- M.A. International Politics (Global Justice and Ethics), Newcastle University (2011).
- B.Sc. in Psychology, University of Hildesheim (2010).

Research interests: Ethnic discrimination in the labour market, integration and migration policies Prejudice, and Intergroup Conflicts.

Assistants

Dr. Maike Burda
Research assistant to the Director (since 01.01.2015)

Susanne Grasow
Assistant to the Department (since 01.04.2008)
Student assistants

- Jeyhun Alisade (since 01.10.2015)
- Emma Ekdahl (since 01.07.2015)
- Benjamin Gerloff (since 01.10.2015)
- Hanno Hilbig (since 15.04.2013)
- Jelena Jovovic (since 01.10.2015)
- Sandra Leumann (since 01.03.2015)
- Lars Mojem (since 01.01.2015)
- Sophie Wilske (since 01.12.2014)
### Former research staff members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Employment period at MIT</th>
<th>Position(s) at MIT</th>
<th>Current position(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Carol</td>
<td>01.04.2009 – 30.06.2014</td>
<td>Junior researcher, postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2013)</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Demography and Social Inequality, Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology (ISS), University of Cologne, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Dunkel</td>
<td>01.10.2011 – 31.12.2012</td>
<td>Junior researcher</td>
<td>Deputy Head of the Kommunales Integrations-zentrum, Wesel, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ersanilli</td>
<td>01.09.2009 – 29.02.2010</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2010)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenella Fleischmann</td>
<td>01.09.2010 – 31.12.2011</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2011)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor at the Department of Diversity and Youth, Faculty of Social Science, Utrecht University, The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim Hajji</td>
<td>01.04.2008 – 30.03.2009</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2008)</td>
<td>Professor of Health and Social Science Research Methods at the Hochschule Magdeburg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Hebling</td>
<td>01.02.2009 – 30.04.2011</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2007)</td>
<td>Full Professor of Political Sociology at the University of Bamberg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jutta Höhne</td>
<td>01.04.2007 – 31.05.2014</td>
<td>Administrative assistant, research assistant</td>
<td>Researcher and Head of online communication unit at Institute of Economic and Social Research (WSI), Hans-Böckler-Stiftung Düsseldorf, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuhal Kavacik</td>
<td>01.04.2009 – 31.01.2012</td>
<td>Junior researcher</td>
<td>PhD student at the Faculty of Economics and Social Science, Universität Hamburg, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bram Lancee</td>
<td>01.09.2011 – 31.01.2014</td>
<td>Humboldt fellow; postdoctoral research fellow</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Sociology at Utrecht University, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Employment period at MIT</td>
<td>Position(s) at MIT</td>
<td>Current position(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlin Schaeffer</td>
<td>01.01.2009 – 31.08.2015</td>
<td>Junior researcher, postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2012)</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Demography and Social Inequality, Institute of Sociology and Social Psychology (ISS), University of Cologne, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Schönwälder</td>
<td>01.04.2007 – 31.05.2008</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 1990)</td>
<td>Research Group Leader at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity and extracurricular full professor at the Georg August University Göttingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmar Schlüter</td>
<td>15.04.2008 – 28.02.2011</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2007)</td>
<td>Full Professor of Sociology and Director of the Department of Sociology at the Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Strijbis</td>
<td>01.01.2014–31.08.2015</td>
<td>Postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2012)</td>
<td>Assistant professor of sociology at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céline Teney</td>
<td>01.06.2010 – 14.03.2014</td>
<td>Humboldt fellow; postdoctoral research fellow (PhD 2009)</td>
<td>Junior Professor and Junior Research Group head, Zentrum für Sozialpolitik, Universität Bremen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Former student assistants**

- Christine Barwick (15.06.2009–30.03.2011)
- Mareike Bünning (01.10.2009–30.09.2011)
- Valeska Cordier (01.08.2012–28.02.2013)
- Felix Hübner (01.03.2912–28.02.2013)
- Adrian Iselin (15.11.2012–30.09.2014)
- Rafael Lira Carrillo (01.05.2015–30.06.2015)
Organization

Apart from the Director, the Department structurally has four full-time equivalent researcher positions at its disposition, plus one PhD-track junior researcher position (0.5 fte in the first year; 0.65 fte thereafter) financed from the central WZB budget. For secretarial and research assistance 1.5 fte are available. Structural research funding amounts to about 80 000 € per annum, from which student research assistants, travel costs for conferences and research training, as well as copying and a contribution to library subscription costs must be paid.

Communication within the Department is assured by the weekly colloquium of the Research Area Migration and Diversity, which offers a stage for both internal presentations of work in progress, as well as external speakers. On a rotational basis, research fellows are in charge of the colloquium programme, and have a large degree of freedom to invite speakers of their and their colleagues’ choice. The Department has a “culture of presence”, implying that, while working from home, e.g., to finish writing a paper, is possible, as a rule researchers are expected to work from their office at the WZB. This leads to a relatively high degree of mutual exchange, learning, and collaboration, as is testified by the high number of papers co-authored with Department colleagues.

In 2013 the WZB reformed its research area structure, and the Department, together with Marc Helbling’s Junior Research Group “Immigration Policies in Comparison”, became its own Research Area “Migration and Diversity”. This made an additional 10 000 € yearly available for activities on the level of the Research Area. This money has been used to initiate a conference series, the “Annual WZB Conference on Migration and Diversity”. Three such conferences have been held so far, on “Ethnic Diversity and Social Capital” (2013; organizers: Ruud Koopmans, Bram Lancee & Merlin Schaeffer), “Causes and Consequences of Immigration and Citizenship Policies” (2014; organizers: Marc Helbling, Ruud Koopmans & Ines Michalowski), and “National Identity in Motion” (2015; organizers: Ruth Ditlmann & Ines Michalowski). The 2016 Fourth Annual Conference will be on “Institutional and Policy Experiments on Migration, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations” and is organized by Ruth Ditlmann and Marc Helbling. Recruitment for the conferences is partly on invitation and partly by way of open calls for papers, which have drawn strong resonance. For instance, for the 2015 conference more than 100 paper proposals were submitted, less than 20 of which were selected. The conferences have also resulted in publications. A selection of papers from the 2013 conference was published as an edited volume with Routledge (Koopmans, Lancee & Schaeffer 2014). From the 2014 and 2015 conferences special issues are in preparation for Comparative Political Studies and Political Psychology. The annual conferences have thus become an important tool for promoting the WZB’s and the Research Area’s name recognition and reputation within the field.
3 Personnel and Career Development Strategy

As part of the Department’s philosophy to grant researchers a relatively large degree of independence, each postdoctoral research fellow has an annual sum of 3,000 €, and each junior researcher 1,500 € at his or her free disposition for research costs or travel. Funding beyond this amount is available on request. All researchers also have equal access to support by the Department’s research assistants. Participation in external training programmes, in particular in research methods, is encouraged and financed by the Department. Leave for research stays abroad and temporary teaching positions outside Berlin is generously granted if it serves the development of a researcher’s profile on the academic job market.

Considerable personnel fluctuation has occurred since November 2010, when the last evaluation by the WZB Advisory Board took place (see the overview of current and former members of the Department in the previous section). Of the researchers employed at the time of the last evaluation, only Ines Michalowski and Susanne Veit (at the time junior researcher, since 2014 postdoctoral research fellow) are still at the Department. Elmar Schlüter took up a call to a junior professorship at the University of Cologne in February 2011 and subsequently moved to a full professorship at the University of Gießen. Marc Helbling left in May 2011 after he had obtained an Emmy-Noether grant from the DFG to set up his own Junior Research Group Immigration Policies in Comparison within the WZB’s Migration & Diversity Research Area. In early 2015 he took up a call to a full professorship at the University of Bamberg. Fenella Fleichmann obtained a tenure-track assistant professorship at the University of Utrecht as of January 2012. Two junior researchers, Anna Dunkel and Zuhal Kavacik, left in 2012. Anna Dunkel is now working on immigrant integration issues for the City of Wesel; Zuhal Kavacik has started a PhD trajectory at the University of Hamburg.

In 2012, Ruth Ditlmann joined the Department as a postdoctoral research fellow from Yale University, where she had obtained her Master’s degree. After finishing his PhD in 2012, Merlin Schaeffer switched from a junior to a postdoctoral research fellow position. He stayed in that position until September 2015, when he took up an associate professorship at the University of Cologne. Meanwhile, the Bridging Project (project 4.7) had started, and our Humboldt research fellow Céline Teney was hired as a postdoctoral research fellow on this project from mid-2012 onwards. In early 2014, she moved to the University of Bremen, where she was offered the position of Head of the Junior Research Group Gender Politics in the Welfare State. She was succeeded in the Bridging Project by Oliver Strijbis (previously postdoctoral teaching and research fellow at the University of Bremen), who stayed until September 2015, when he moved to Madrid, where he had obtained an assistant professorship at the Universidad Carlos III. Junior researcher Sarah Carol obtained her PhD in 2013, and was subsequently hired as a postdoctoral researcher by the Mannheimer Zentrum für europäische Sozialforschung (MZES), where she stayed only briefly after having, like Merlin Schaeffer, obtained an associate professorship at the University of Cologne as of September 2015.

Bram Lancee, who had been at the Department for two years as a Humboldt fellow, was hired as a postdoctoral research fellow in the Summer of 2014. However, in early
2015, he obtained a tenure-track assistant professorship with a strongly reduced teaching load at the University of Utrecht. He was enabled to get such good conditions because he had obtained an attractive VENI grant from the Dutch Science Foundation, which offers talented young researchers funding to set up their own line of research. Unfortunately, it is a precondition of these grants to move to a Dutch host institution, if one is not already at one. In his place, Susanne Veit, who had meanwhile obtained her PhD, was hired as a postdoctoral research fellow from 2014 onwards. Ruta Yemane, previously a researcher at the Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, joined in the same year as a junior researcher in the project on ethnic labour market discrimination (project 3.4). In 2015, two more junior researchers were hired in the new project on religious fundamentalism and radicalization (project 4.1): Eylem Kanol (just graduated from the Freie Universität Berlin), and Anselm Rink (previously a PhD student at Columbia University, New York). As a result, the Department currently has three postdoctoral research fellows (Ruth Ditlmann, Ines Michalowski, Susanne Veit) and three junior researchers (Eylem Kanol, Anselm Rink, Ruta Yemane).

The high degree of personnel fluctuation is due to a number of factors. First among these is, paradoxically, the Department’s attractiveness for highly talented young researchers, not only from Germany, but also from the Netherlands (Fleischmann, Lancee), Belgium (Teney), and Switzerland (Helbling, Strijbis), as well as young German scholars trained in the United States (Ditlmann, Rink). Attracting such talent is of course first and foremost an asset, because it raises both the quantity and the quality of output, contributes to the international visibility and reputation of the Department, creates a strong learning environment for junior researchers, and is self-reinforcing because talent attracts more talent. However, as will have become clear from the above, there is also a downside: highly talented and productive young scholars easily obtain good offers from elsewhere. The Department and the WZB more generally have limited options to counter such external offers, because these ambitious postdoctoral research fellows know that the WZB is not a career end station for them. Not only does the WZB offer tenure only in few cases (as a rule not more than maximum one tenured position per Department) but even tenured positions are only attractive to a limited extent because there is no possibility to move further up the career ladder within the WZB. Because these are all people who have the qualities to become full professors, moving to a university position is the natural move for them. Given the limited number of university professorships available in Germany, and a possible further tightening of the market in the near future, they are tempted to take the first good opportunity, especially if these outside opportunities entail the perspective of tenure or match the WZB in offering research funding and reduced teaching (as in the case of Junior Research Groups in Germany or the VENI programme in the Netherlands).

Moreover, in many cases, dual career reasons played a decisive role. Elmar Schlüter’s wife was professionally tied to Frankfurt and he took the opportunity to get a job closer to her, allowing them to move together. In Fleischmann’s case, her partner is from the Netherlands so for her, too, moving back to the Netherlands solved a private problem. Bram Lancee could get a position in Utrecht at the same time as his (Austrian) wife had received an offer from the University of Amsterdam. And Sarah Carol and her partner Merlin Schaeffer were simultaneously offered an associate professorship in Cologne. Such offers that allow people to better align their
professional and private lives are impossible to beat for a small and topically circumscribed Department.

One response to this problem has been to alter the basic personnel model (excluding third-party funded positions) from a 4+1 (four postdoctoral research fellows plus one junior researcher on a PhD trajectory) to a 3+3 model (three postdoctoral plus 3 junior researchers). With junior researchers there is a better perspective of binding them to the Department for a longer period, as the examples of Sarah Carol (who was an MIT member for more than five years), Merlin Schaeffer (who stayed almost seven years), and Susanne Veit (who has been at MIT now for almost seven years) illustrate. The average retention time of postdoctoral research fellows has by contrast been much shorter (about 2.5 years).

Still, regardless of the problems that it to some extent causes for the continuity of the Department’s research, the fact that MIT members are so successful on the academic market is obviously great from the perspective of these young scholars and a reason to be proud as a Department. Three former postdoctoral fellows are now full university professors (Schönwälder, Schlueter, Helbling), one is professor at a Hochschule (Hajji), two have become associate university professors (Carol, Schaeffer), and five have become junior or assistant professors (Ersanilli, Fleischmann, Lancee, Strijbis, Teney). Three of these (Carol, Ersanilli, Schaeffer) are former MIT PhD students.

A final noteworthy case of career development is Jutta Höhne, who started as an administrative assistant within the Department, followed a series of social science statistics and methods courses in Berlin that were financed by the Department, and was then promoted to the position of research assistant. In 2013, this career reorientation enabled her to get a position as a researcher at the WSI research institute of the Hans Böckler Foundation. During and after her stay at MIT, she was a co-author of several academic publications together with other Department members – a remarkable achievement for someone without a formal social science degree whose original career had been side-tracked as a result of German reunification (she used to be a Romanian-German translator in East Germany, a profession for which demand collapsed after the fall of communism). She was succeeded as a research assistant in early 2015 by Maike Burda, who holds a PhD in economics.

### 3.1 Dissertation Projects

Dissertation projects at the research unit


---

4 Calculated over the period 2007–2015; three of the contracts included in the calculation are ongoing and continue beyond 2015 (Ditlmann, Michalowski, Veit).


• **Ruta Yemane**, *Ethnic Discrimination in the US Labour Market in Comparative Perspective*. Supervisor: Ruud Koopmans.

• **Anselm Rink**, *Evangelical Missions and Democratic Values*. Columbia University, New York. Supervisors: Macartan Humphreys & Donald Green.


**Dissertation projects in affiliation to the research unit**

• **Doutje Lettinga**, *Framing the Hijab. The Governance of Intersecting Religious, Ethnic, and Gender Differences in France, the Netherlands, and Germany*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Completed 2011. 1st supervisor: Sawitri Saharso (VUA); 2nd supervisor: Ruud Koopmans.


• **Liv Bjerre**, *Steering Irregular Migration*. Humboldt Universität Berlin: 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans; 2nd supervisor: Steffen Mau.
3.2 External training


Ines Michalowski. 09.09.2015: How to Apply Successfully for External Funds (Drittmittel erfolgreich einwerben), Dahlem Research School, Freie Universität zu Berlin, Germany.

Ruta Yemane. 13.07.2015-24.07.2015: Introduction to Data Analysis with Stata, Essex Summer School for Social Sciences Data Collection and Analysis, University of Essex, United Kingdom.

3.3 Research stays abroad

Sarah Carol. 01.01.2012-29.02.2012: Visiting Scholar, Center for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship, University of Bristol, United Kingdom.

Ruth Katharina Ditlmann, 01.09.2014 – 30.06.2015: Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Psychology and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ.

Ines Michalowski. 01.02.2015 – 30.04.2015: Guest Researcher at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.

Ines Michalowski. 01.10.2014 – 30.11.2014: Guest Professor for Migration and Integration Research, University of Vienna, Austria.


Anselm Rink. 16.07.2015-06.08.2015: Field Research and Gathering of Data, dissertation project, Kenya and South Sudan, Africa.

4 Research Clusters and Projects

We will now explicate the leading questions within each of the five research clusters and how they are interconnected, briefly discussing the research projects by which we address them. Because the research questions of many projects link phenomena that cross boundaries between clusters, the categorisation of projects into a particular cluster is not always clear-cut. Projects have been classified according to their main focus, but often refer to phenomena situated in other clusters. Only those projects that were concluded during the period 2011-2015 or are still ongoing have been included in this overview. For projects that were concluded prior to 2011, see the previous research report of November 2010 or the Department’s website.

Cluster 1: The regulation of citizenship, immigration and diversity

In this research cluster, we focus on policies on immigrant rights and cultural and religious difference, and the idioms of national identity attached to them. We ask to what extent there is evidence of cross-national convergence due to supranational regulation and transnational interdependence, or whether path dependence driven by national policy traditions and institutional differences continues to be decisive. We analyse to what extent such structural trends are modified by electoral factors. We critically examine the idea of unified national "grand narratives" of citizenship and national identity by investigating variation across institutions within countries, and asking to what extent such elite-driven notions correspond to how ordinary citizens see their nation. Finally, we highlight the tensions between the strong normative basis of minority rights in national constitutions and supranational conventions, and the weakened legitimacy of claims by cultural majorities, and how this relates to the rise of nationalist populism.

1.1 Indicators of citizenship rights for immigrants - ICRI

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski
Project status: Ongoing

This project forms the foundation of the cluster. In the first phase of the project, data were gathered on policies along two dimensions of citizenship, individual equality and cultural difference, for ten Northwest European countries for the period 1980-2008 – the first cross-national and longitudinal dataset on such a wide range of immigrant rights policies. In a first, already much-cited publication (Koopmans, Michalowski & Waibel 2012) we used these data to test a range of theories about immigrant rights. Against theories of postnational citizenship and transnationalism, we found no evidence of cross-national convergence or of EU membership. Instead, we found strong path dependence with a relatively stable rank order of countries across the three decades of the study. Changes that occurred could be explained by two electoral factors: the strength of the populist right, and the size of the immigrant electorate. Interestingly, we could identify these dynamic electoral variables as main mechanisms through which path dependence is reproduced. Countries with ethnic
notions of citizenship tended to see strong populist parties later on, which kept these countries on a restrictive course regarding immigrant rights. By contrast, countries with initially open citizenship regimes enabled immigrants to become voters and thereby produced a mechanism of electoral pressure that kept them on an inclusive course. In the second phase of the project, we extended the data to the four classical immigration countries – the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand – for the same 1980–2008 period, as well as cross-sectionally for the year 2008 to 15 further important immigration countries in Southern and Eastern Europe, Africa, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America. Almost all theorizing and empirical work on immigrant rights is based on Western, industrial countries and we therefore know little about the scope conditions of our current knowledge. Our results show that most of the non-Western countries investigated (e.g., Argentina, South Africa, Japan, Russia, Turkey) have immigrant rights policies that fall within the same range of variation as the Western immigration countries studied so far. However, three of the countries in our sample – Kuwait, Israel, and Singapore – are strong outliers and grant immigrants very little rights and protection. We use this wide range of variation to test various hypotheses. We confirm that also beyond the European context of our earlier study, countries’ implication in political globalization by way of membership in international organizations and being a signatory of treaties has no discernible impact. Perhaps surprisingly, liberal democracy only exerts a threshold effect: autocracies grant immigrants fewer rights, but beyond a minimum level, there is no significant difference between less (e.g., Turkey, Venezuela) or more (e.g., Switzerland, Austria) democratic countries. Historical heritages have the greatest impact: former colonial powers, historical settler countries, and countries with a history of pluralist religious accommodation have been most likely to grant rights to immigrants.

1.2 Integration requirements and citizenship tests

MIT researchers: Ines Michalowski
Project status: Concluded

While the previous project shows us the broad picture, three further projects zoom in on specific policies and institutions. The first of these investigated the content of citizenship tests and other integration requirements for immigration, access to permanent residence and naturalisation in five European countries – Germany, France, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Austria – and the USA. A first important conclusion is that there is only a weak linkage between broad distinctions such as the one between ethnic and civic notions of national citizenship, and the concrete knowledge that is required of immigrants in citizenship and integration tests (Michalowski 2014). Second, although these tests have been widely criticized as being illiberal and assimilationist, the “assimilation” that they require of immigrants does not go beyond knowledge and acceptance of the procedural rules of liberal democracy (Michalowski 2011).
1.3 Naturalization of immigrants: Obstacles and Opportunities in German municipalities

MIT researchers: Ruth Ditlmann
Collaboration: Rafaela Dancygier (Princeton University)
Project status: Ongoing

Naturalization can be a deeply personal moment for many migrants, fostering national identification and attachment. There is also evidence that naturalization improves integration outcomes in the political realm. Though non-citizens have access to many of the same rights as do citizens, citizenship continues to signify full membership in a political community. Yet, even though more and more immigrants in Europe are eligible for citizenship, they might not apply because the bureaucratic hurdles can appear daunting, and state authorities may seem inaccessible. This project examines the barriers to – and facilitators of – citizenship in German municipalities. Administrative and political hurdles as well as psychological factors are examined by using a combination of experimental, survey and qualitative methods. Examples of psychological factors are how immigrants are perceived by citizens or how decisions are made in the realm of local politics that have consequences for immigrants seeking naturalization.

1.4 The organization of religious diversity in the military

MIT researchers: Ines Michalowski
Project status: Ongoing

This project focuses on institution-specific opportunity structures and exigencies, taking the case of religious accommodation in the military as a case in point. It investigates whether general national institutional traditions (e.g., church-state regimes, citizenship regimes) or specific institutional and organizational opportunity structures are decisive for the way in which public institutions deal with religion and religious diversity. The project compares five European countries (Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Austria, France) and the USA on the basis of in-depth qualitative interviews with responsible military officials and other qualitative data. Results show that cross-national institutional differences in particular with regard to the state-religion relationship influence the accommodation of Muslims: countries with a strong focus on religious pluralism are for instance more advanced in setting up Muslim chaplaincies, whereas countries whose state-religion relationship explicitly allows for the differential treatment of religious groups lag behind, in particular if Muslims are among the groups for whom official cooperation with the state is impossible since they have not acquired the requested legal status. At the same time, the study shows that organization-specific factors lead to a convergence of practices. Chief among these is the military’s nature as a “total institution”, which cannot easily relegate religion to the private sphere. Therefore, the military is generally accommodative of religious difference compared to other national institutions, leading to a particularly sharp contrast in France, where elsewhere a strict exclusion of religious expression from public institutions prevails in the context of laicité
A concluding monograph on the project is currently being prepared.

1.5 Cultural rights of native majorities between universalism and minority rights

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans
Project status: Ongoing

In all the above projects, and in the wider empirical and normative literatures, minority rights are the central focus of attention. However, minorities’ claims for rights increasingly clash with important sections of majority populations who wish to retain and defend “national” cultural and religious traditions. Debates around minarets in Switzerland, burqas in France, Saint Nicolas’ companion “Black Pete” in the Netherlands, and about freedom of speech versus respect for minorities in several countries are cases in point. Such issues are highly salient and offer a major mobilization potential for populist parties. However, while libraries can be filled with publications about minority rights, the normative literature is remarkably silent on the rights of autochthonous cultural majorities and the conditions under which they may legitimately prevail. A new project (1.5; Koopmans) is unique among the studies conducted in the Department by picking up this normative question. It argues that the proliferation of minority protection provisions in supranational treaties as well as national legislation after the Second World War, while understandable given the historical context of widespread minority persecution in the Interbellum, has left majority rights in a normative void. Of course, majorities can, by definition, impose their will by electoral force. But this does not solve the normative problem and leads to a whole range of situations in which claims of minorities, legitimated by national and supranational minority protection norms and sometimes enforced by courts against the will of majorities, stand against majorities backed by the power of numbers but lacking normative legitimacy. A first, Dutch-language paper argues that it is this dynamic of “right” versus “might” that stands behind the rise of nationalist populism across Western countries (Koopmans 2015). It also argues that the distinction between the legitimacy of rights claims of immigrants and national minorities (advanced for instance by Kymlicka) may point towards a normative solution to the problem of cultural majority rights.

1.6 The meaning of being German, American, Singaporean: An inductive approach to national identity

MIT researchers: Ruth Ditlmann
Collaboration: Johannes Kopf-Beck (Max-Planck Institut für Psychiatrie, Munich), Valerie Purdie-Vaughns (Columbia University, New York), Shirlena Huang (Nanying Technological University, Singapore) and Eric Thompson (National University of Singapore)
Project status: Ongoing

The final project in this cluster moves beyond rights and institutional policies and asks to what extent the notions of national citizenship and identity that are embodied
in official norms and regulations correspond to the subjective meanings that ordinary citizens attach to their national identity. Whereas previous studies have addressed this question with fixed-format questions that channel responses into predefined categories, this study (project 1.6; Ditlmann) is unique in eliciting 1000 free responses from German citizens to the question what it means for them to be German. The resulting narratives were content-coded and analysed with latent class analysis. In line with expectations on the basis of historical ethnic notions of German-ness, a first paper that is currently under review shows that heritage-based definitions of German identity referring to language and history are the largest class of responses, including both negative and positive evaluations. Next to these, three further types emerged. Of these, ideology-based notions of national identity, such as those referring to democracy and the welfare state, are closely tied to civic ideas of nationhood. The other two, however, are detached from prevailing institutional and theoretical categories of nationhood. Personality-based notions refer to character traits such as punctuality and narrow-mindedness, and the second-most frequent type of answers described being German as a coincidental or superficial identity, e.g., merely “having a German passport” or “I happen to have been born here”. The latter type of responses was especially frequent among left-wing respondents, suggesting that it is a kind of refusal of national identity altogether, which, like the frequent negative references to heritage-based aspects of national identity, may be typical for Germany. Data collection for comparative studies that should throw further light on such questions has meanwhile been completed in the United States and will soon start in Singapore.

Cluster 2: Socio-cultural integration and interethnic contacts

The projects in this cluster ask under which conditions immigrants will develop cultural orientations on the host society, e.g., in the form of identification, language acquisition, and high rates of interethnic contact, or will retain attitudes and customs of the country of origin and segregated lifestyles, and how orientation on the host culture and ethnic retention are related. The cluster contains two large cross-national surveys (SCIICS and EURISLAM), which have also been used for some publications in projects belonging to other clusters, which are discussed there.

2.1 Six-country immigrant integration comparative survey – SCIICS

MIT researchers: Sarah Carol, Jutta Höhne, Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski Bram Lancee, Verena Seibel

Collaboration: Johannes Kopf-Beck (Max-Planck Institut für Psychiatrie, Munich), Valerie Purdie-Vaughns (Columbia University, New York), Shirlena Huang (Nanying Technological University, Singapore) and Eric Thompson (National University of Singapore)

Project status: Data gathering concluded, analyses ongoing

The SCIICS survey is a fully WZB-funded study of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants and their second-generation offspring, as well as a native comparison group in six countries (Germany, France, Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, and Sweden; total n ~ 9000
respondents). Respondents had the choice to answer the interview questions in either the host country or their origin country language. The design of the study allows investigation of three types of contextual effects on immigrant integration: those related to the regions of origin of immigrants in Turkey and Morocco (e.g., urbanity and socio-economic prosperity), those related to the localities in which they have settled within the country of immigration (e.g., levels of immigrant concentration and local unemployment), and those related to the national contexts of the countries of immigration (e.g., citizenship regimes). The study has a quasi-experimental nature insofar as the immigrant sample includes only immigrants from the guest-worker period and their offspring, and half of the immigrant sample comes from a selected number of provinces in the countries of origin. This design thus minimizes the role of migration period and ensures that there is sufficient overlap between the samples in the different countries in terms of regions of origin. Topics of the survey range from labour market position and education to identification, segregation, interethnic social contacts, religiosity and attitudes towards cultural preservation. The native sample moreover includes questions about attitudes towards immigrants. The dataset, as well as a detailed technical report (Ersanilli & Koopmans 2013) that includes the full questionnaire, are publicly accessible on the Department’s website. Publications on the basis of the survey by MIT members within the domain of socio-cultural integration have focused on the impact of rural origins within Turkey or Morocco on interethnic contacts in the countries of immigration (Lancee & Seibel 2014); the effect of cross-national and inter-individual variation in participation in language course programmes on subsequent language proficiency and interethnic contacts (Höhne 2013; Höhne & Michalowski 2015); and on the relationship between religiosity, rural origin, and family reunification policies on the choice of a transnational spouse from the country of origin (Carol, Ersanilli & Wagner 2014). The latter two studies are among the few in the field that have investigated and documented policy effects on integration outcomes.

2.2 Cultural interactions between Muslim immigrants and receiving societies

MIT researchers: Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski

Collaboration: Jean Tillie (University of Amsterdam), Paul Statham (University of Sussex), Dirk Jacobs (Université Libre de Bruxelles), Matteo Gianni & Marco Giugni (Université de Genève) and Manlio Cinalli (CEVIPOF, Paris)

Project status: Data gathering and funding period concluded, analyses ongoing

A second large project was funded by the EU’s 7th Framework Programme and focuses on the integration of Muslims in six countries (Germany, France, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland). The project asks to what extent cross-national differences in religiosity, interethnic contacts, and identification vary with how Islam is institutionally incorporated and politically mobilised. It combines several types of data: indicators of Muslim rights drawn from ICRI (project 1.1 above), content analyses of public claim-making on Islam and Muslims for the period 1999-2008, and a large survey among four groups of Muslims (Turks, Moroccans, Pakistani and ex-Yugoslav
Muslims) and a comparison group of native non-Muslims. Two publications dealt with public debates and public opinion on religious rights for Muslims. Based on the content-analytical data drawn from 30 newspapers across the six countries, the first study (Carol & Koopmans 2013) reveals striking cross-national differences. Whereas in France and Germany debates revolve around religious claims of mainstream Muslim groups for rights such as mosque construction and allowance of the headscarf, these topics are much less salient in the United Kingdom in the Netherlands, where instead conflicts focus on demands by orthodox Muslim groups for rights such as the allowance of burqas, gender segregation or recognition of Sharia rules. Distinguishing three dimensions of claims – mainstream versus orthodox; private versus public; parity versus special rights – the paper shows that there is a close correspondence between the kind of claims that are central in public controversies and the inclusiveness of religious rights regulations as measured by the ICRI data (project 1.1 above). Paradoxically, the more accommodating religious rights policies are, the more this offers mobilization opportunities for orthodox Muslim groups to demand more far-reaching rights, which in turn provokes opposition from other groups. A second paper (Carol, Helbling & Michalowski 2015) investigates public opinion on rights for Muslims and Christians, using items from the EURISLAM survey on religious education in public schools and the right to wear a headscarf or a Christian cross in public institutions as cases in point. The results show that Muslims and Christians are more supportive of each other’s rights than secular individuals are. The authors suggest that the reason is that in the strongly secularized societies of Western Europe, the existence of Christian precedents helps Muslims to legitimize their own claims to rights, and Christians find in Muslims a new ally to prevent a further erosion of the place of religion in society. In cross-national comparison, France stands out with low levels of support among all groups for religious rights for both Christians and Muslims, which is in line with the country’s institutional regulations regarding religious rights (see project 1.1 above). Finally, the dissertation project of Sarah Carol (Carol 2013a) drew to an important extent on the EURISLAM data. The dissertation focuses on spousal choice and intermarriage attitudes, distinguishing two main dimensions of choice, between a partner from the native ethnic group of the country of immigration or a member of the own ethnic group (inter-ethnic versus intra-ethnic marriage), and, in the latter case, between a marriage with a partner also living in the country of immigration, or a partner from the country of origin (transnational marriages). It shows that religiosity has a strong impact on perceived social distance and reduces the rate of interethnic marriage, whereas transnational marriages are affected by ethnic group size in the country of immigration. Both intra-ethnic and transnational marriages are more likely to occur where parents intervene in the decision-making process (arranged and semi-arranged marriages) or among children who have been socialized by parents with intermarriage attitudes that emphasize the value of endogamy (see Carol 2013b, 2015; Carol, Ersanilli & Wagner 2014). The latter linkage could be shown by using a unique design feature of an earlier research project of the Department, which contained 129 parent-child dyads among Turks in Germany, France, and the Netherlands (Carol 2014).
2.3 The effect of aggregated intergroup contact on ethnic minorities

MIT researchers: Ruth Ditlmann, Susanne Veit
Collaboration: Miles Hewstone (University of Oxford)
Project status: Ongoing

The final project in this cluster is still in the planning phase. Traditionally, the social-psychological literature on intergroup contact focuses on individual-level contact, i.e. how much contact an individual has with members of the out-group. Recently, scholars have expanded the notion of contact to consider aggregated intergroup contact, i.e. how much contact in-group members have with members of the out-group. This work has shown that the main insight about contact from the individual-level, that it reduces bias in majority group members, holds true also for the aggregate level. However, another insight from the literature on individual intergroup contact, namely that it reduces in-group solidarity and perceptions of discrimination in members of minority groups, has not been investigated at the aggregate level so far. This will be the research focus of the new project.

Cluster 3: The socio–economic integration of immigrants

This cluster focuses on the socio-economic integration of immigrants in the domains of the labour market and education, but several projects refer to socio-cultural integration (cluster 2) and institutional regulations (cluster 1) as explanatory variables.

3.1 Socio-cultural determinants of labour market integration of immigrants

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans
Collaboration: Jutta Höhne (Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, Düsseldorf)
Project status: Ongoing

The first project closely relates to cluster 2 and investigates to what extent cultural variables (e.g., language proficiency, media use, religiosity) and interethnic contacts affect immigrants’ labour market integration. A forthcoming paper (Koopmans 2015) uses the cross-national EURISLAM survey (project 2.2 above) to compare rates of labour market participation and unemployment across four Muslim ethnic groups and between three immigrant generations – first, 1.5th and second – and native ethnics. Numerous studies have shown that even after controlling for relevant socio-economic background variables, minorities lag considerably behind natives. The label “ethnic penalties” is often used to denote these gaps and reflects the idea that differences that cannot be explained by demographic and human capital variables must be due to discrimination by employers. As a result of the scarcity of datasets that include the appropriate variables, few studies have investigated to what extent socio-cultural variables can explain these gaps. The results of this study show that once sociocultural variables are taken into account, differences between native ethnics and the Muslim groups, as well as between the immigrant generations are strongly reduced and in many cases become statistically insignificant. Mediation analyses demonstrate that
the findings do not fit a scenario that assumes that the causality primarily flows from labour market participation to sociocultural assimilation rather than the other way around. Future work in this project (Koopmans) will use the SCIICS dataset to replicate the analyses and to extend them to occupational status. In a second new study (Koopmans), the large Turkish sample in the SCIICS data will be used to compare Alevites and Sunnites, two groups that had similar socio-economic profiles in Turkey before immigration, but different cultural values, especially where gender roles and religiosity are concerned. A third study (Höhne, Koopmans) will continue earlier work on the German Socio-Economic Panel. Earlier, we demonstrated the role of sociocultural variables for four immigrant groups using duration analyses of labour market transitions. The study will be updated for more recent GSOEP waves, extended with a native comparison group, as well as with an analysis of levels of labour market participation next to transitions.

3.2 Immigrant performance in the labour market: The role of bonding and bridging social capital

MIT researchers: Bram Lancee
Project status: Concluded

The next project addressed closely related questions, zooming in on the role of intra-ethnic (bonding) and inter-ethnic (bridging) social capital. Using the SOEP for Germany and the SPVA panel for the Netherlands, the effect of these different forms of social capital on employment levels and transitions, as well as occupational status of first and second generation immigrants were investigated. Strong inter-ethnic ties turn out to be beneficial for both employment and occupational status, but there is no effect of co-ethnic ties and family-based social capital (see Lancee 2012a, 2012b, 2012c, 2013). Thus, bridging social capital contributes to a better economic position whereas bonding social capital does not – a conclusion that is striking in the light of the positive view on intra-ethnic ties and strong ethnic communities that prevails in the immigration literature in the United States. It is an interesting question for future work to find out why co-ethnic ties apparently have such different value for labour market integration in Europe compared to the USA.

3.3 Gender and migration on the labour market: additive or interacting disadvantages in Germany?

MIT researchers: Jutta Höhne and Fenella Fleichmann
Project status: Concluded

Gender gaps in labour market participation across immigrants from 16 origin groups and a native comparison group were the topic of this project. Gender and ethnic differences in labour market participation are most often studied separately. In contrast, this study analyses interactions between gender, ethnic background and immigrant generation with regard to labour market participation, part-time work, and occupational status. Although unlike the two previous projects this study based on the German Mikrozensus does not include direct measurements of cultural differences, it uses patterns of labour market participation in the countries of origin as a proxy. The
data reveal considerable variation in gender gaps across ethnic groups, which can to a large extent be explained by the cultural patterns of the countries of origin (see Fleischmann & Höhne 2013). Intergenerational comparisons show that most ethnic minorities assimilate towards German patterns of gendered labour market attainment. Interestingly, for some ethnic groups whose countries of origin are characterized by higher rates of female labour force participation than Germany (e.g., East Europeans), assimilation means that gender gaps will increase rather than decrease.

3.4 Ethnic discrimination on the labour market in comparative perspective

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane

Collaboration: Devah Pager (Harvard University), Justine Burns (University of Capetown, South Africa):

Project status: Ongoing

Survey data are one way to study labour market disadvantages of immigrants but they have the disadvantage that to the extent that not all differences with natives can be explained away with the available variables there is no way to determine with certainty whether the residual gaps are due to discrimination or to other unobserved variables. Audit and correspondence studies have become popular responses to this problem and have demonstrated for a wide range of ethnic groups and countries that discrimination occurs. So far studies have almost exclusively used a paired application design, in which two applications, one native and one from a selected minority group, are sent, which apart from cosmetic details differ only in the ethnicity of the applicant. Widespread as it may be, this design has the major disadvantage that it is diagnostic rather than analytic. It can demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that discrimination occurs – at least for a selected ethnic group – but not whether taste or statistical mechanisms are behind discrimination, nor which characteristics of applicants – their race, religion, cultural or linguistic distance, or specific ethnicity – provoke discrimination. In this project that was started in late 2014 we want to move beyond these limitations by using an unpaired multiple-group, multiple-treatment design in which we vary racial phenotype, religion, as well as ethnicity. Native ethnics are compared to second generation applicants from 34 immigrant ethnic groups. The study is meanwhile underway in Germany, where we aim at a total number of 8000 applications. For her dissertation, Ruta Yemane will implement a similar design in the USA in cooperation with Harvard University, and a South African study is planned in cooperation with the University of Capetown. The German and South African studies allow a direct measurement of racial discrimination because in these countries photographs are allowed or required in the application process. In the USA race will be indirectly signaled by names and ethnic language. The multiple-group design allows regression analyses testing for taste or statistical discrimination, for instance by relating callback rates to cultural distance to the countries of origin (using World Values Survey data) or to group educational and labour market status averages (e.g., using the German Mikrozensus).
3.5 Growth, equal opportunities, migration, and markets – GEMM

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane

Collaboration: Neli Demirova (University of Essex), Bram Lancee (Utrecht University), Anthony Heath (Oxford University), Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund (University of Oslo), Javier Polavieja (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid), Emilio Reyneri (Università degli studi di Milano-Bicocca), Octav Marcovici (Centrul de sociologie urbana si regionala, Bukarest, Romania), and Siyka Kovacheva (New Europe Center for Regional Studies, Plovdiv, Bulgaria)

Project status: Ongoing

Funding by an EU Horizon 2020 grant allows us to build on the previous project by further extending the scope of comparison to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Spain, and Norway. This project will also extend the scope of analysis to first-generation immigrants as well as to high-skilled prospective migrants from Eastern and Southern Europe who apply from their country of origin. Next to the correspondence study the project also includes an analysis of contextual variables that can explain cross-national variation (e.g., antidiscrimination policies, labour market structures), and qualitative interviews with prospective and recent high-skilled migrants. Together, this and the previous project will allow the first cross-national and multiple-group analyses of rates of discrimination that have ever been conducted. This requires a major investment of time and resources because the method is very labour-intensive and implementing it consistently across countries requires careful attention.

3.6 Discrimination of social welfare applicants in the German bureaucracy

MIT researchers: Anselm Rink

Collaboration: Johannes Hemker (Columbia University)

Project status: Ongoing

In this smaller project we use a similar correspondence method to study discrimination of welfare bureaucrats in Germany against minority individuals who apply for social welfare benefits. Letters requesting information about the welfare application procedure were sent to all 408 German regional employment agencies. Unlike similar previous studies, which only looked at callback rates (whether or not a letter got a response) this study also looks at the content of replies. First results show that whereas applicants with Turkish and Romanian names were as likely to receive a response as German applicants, these responses were qualitatively inferior in the sense that they more often gave incorrect responses that signal distrust in the sincerity of the applicant.
3.7 Income advantages of poorly-qualified immigrant minorities

MIT researchers: Merlin Schaeffer

Collaboration: Céline Teney (Universität Bremen), Jutta Höhne (Wirtschafts- und sozialwissenschaftliches Institut, Düsseldorf)

Project status: Concluded

This project tested an often overlooked implication of the signaling model of statistical discrimination. If immigrant minorities’ educational qualifications carry less signaling power, formally lower-qualified minority members should experience positive statistical discrimination. This lower signaling power stems from disadvantages associated with insufficient language skills and lack of supportive parental resources, which prevent minority students from achieving those educational qualifications that would reflect their high motivation and ambition. If this is true, we should find immigrant minorities in jobs for which they are formally under-qualified. Using data from the German Mikrozensus, incomes of 1.5th and 2nd generation ethnic German (“Spätaussiedler”) and Turkish migrants were compared to those of native Germans. The findings (Schaeffer, Höhne & Teney 2015) show that poorly qualified persons of Turkish origin indeed experience income advantages: they frequently work in better-paying jobs for which they are formally under-qualified. This surprising finding shows that statistical discrimination can be a two-edged sword. While it hurts minority individuals with above-average qualification levels, it may also benefit those among them with lower formal qualifications.

3.8 Over-education of immigrants in Germany

MIT researchers: Verena Seibel

Project status: Concluded

The reverse problem of immigrant over-education – working in a job below one’s formal qualification level – was studied in this dissertation project. Many studies have already shown that over-education is particularly widespread among immigrants, but surprisingly little is known about its causes and consequences. The findings show (Seibel 2015, Griesshaber & Seibel 2015) that pre-migration labour market experience, educational expenditure in the country of origin as an indicator of the quality of foreign credentials, over-education prior to migration, and host-country language knowledge are human capital factors that all affect the risk of over-education specifically for migrants. With the exception of language, these factors have received little to no attention in previous research. The same is true for skill-underutilization variables that are investigated in this project: legal status (distinguishing EU migrants, ethnic German migrants, and third-country nationals), statistical discrimination, and regulation of access to professions. Social capital also affects the risk of over-education: immigrants who are active in associations, especially when these are connected to other associations, are less likely to be over-educated, and the same holds for those with native friends or a native partner.
3.9 Ethnic educational inequality: the role of neighbourhood contexts

MIT researchers: Fenella Fleischmann
Collaboration: Karen Phalet (University of Leuven, Belgium)
Project status: Concluded

A smaller project (3.9; Fleischmann) focused on educational inequality in secondary schools. Based on census and contextual data from Belgium – a country with comparatively severe gaps between children of immigrants and natives in education – this project investigates contextual explanations on the neighbourhood level for educational disadvantages among second-generation Turkish, Moroccan and Italian immigrants. It shows (Fleischmann et al. 2011) that the local density of ethnic communities has a positive effect on educational outcomes, although the effect is moderated by the stability and quality of neighbourhoods.

3.10 Second Federal Integration Indicators Report

MIT researchers: Jutta Höhne, Ruud Koopmans
Collaboration: Dietrich Engels (Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik, Cologne, Germany)
Project status: Concluded

The final project in this cluster is of a different nature than the others because it consisted of contract research for the German Federal Ministry of the Interior. After already having participated in producing the first Federal Integration Indicators Report, we also won the call for the second report (Engels, Koopmans, Köller & Höhne 2012). The reports are intended to monitor the progress of immigrant integration and they mainly draw on data from the German Mikrozensus, supplemented with the German Socio-Economic Panel, the Labour Force Survey, and other sources. It compares first to second generation immigrants, first-generation immigrants from EU and non-EU countries, and all of these groups to persons without a migration background. Our contribution consisted of multivariate analyses in the areas of Kindergarten attendance, secondary educational outcomes, vocational training, labour market status, income, and civic engagement. The aim of these analyses was to investigate to what extent univariate differences can really be ascribed to migration background, or whether they can be explained by other socio-economic status variables.

Cluster 4: Ethnic and religious conflicts

Projects in this cluster look at ethnic and religious conflicts from various angles, including both the familiar topic of xenophobia among natives towards immigrants (projects 2-5), pro-immigrant solidarity (projects 4 and 5), as well as more rarely studied phenomena of outgroup hostility and violence among immigrants (project 1). Not only ethnoreligious conflicts in immigration countries are studied, but also those related to native diversity (Cyprus and Kenya in project 1; Israel in project 6). While projects 1-5 study the causes and dynamics of conflicts, project 6 focuses on conflict
resolution strategies. Project 7, finally, asks the question to what extent immigration contributes to the formation of a new and wider socio-political cleavage in Western immigration countries and perhaps beyond. The latter project will be separately evaluated by the WZB Advisory Board in the Spring of 2016.

4.1 Religious fundamentalism and radicalization in comparative perspective

MIT researchers: Eylem Kanol, Ruud Koopmans, Anselm Rink

Collaboration: Dietlind Stolle, McGill University, Montreal)

Project status: Ongoing

In the context of the combination of escalated sectarian conflicts in Iraq and Syria, and home-grown conflicts around real and perceived attacks on Islam and its symbols in the West (from Rushdie to Charlie Hebdo), increased numbers of Muslim youth in Western countries have embraced radical forms of Islam, and have sometimes become actively involved in violence, both at home and abroad. Beyond impressionistic evidence on a few active radicals, extremely little is known about the incidence among countries’ Muslim populations of adherence to radical versions of Islam and support for religiously-motivated violence. To answer these questions, cross-national surveys across Muslim populations in different countries are necessary, but apart from the very descriptive surveys by the US American Pew Research Institute, which are moreover not publicly accessible for secondary analysis, no such information is available. Existing research also leaves another major question unanswered, namely to what extent religious radicalism is specific to current Islam or whether it is comparable to what we find in other contemporary religions, particularly within Christianity. This project wants to fill these voids. A first step was an analysis based on the SCIICS survey (project 2.1 above). This was the first representative survey study to compare religious fundamentalism and outgroup hostility between Muslims and Christians (Koopmans 2015), and as such it attracted worldwide media attention. While the study revealed large differences between the two religious groups even when controlled for a range of socio-economic and demographic variables, the limitation of the study to two Muslim ethnic groups as well as the fact that it compared Muslims of immigrant origin to autochthonous Christians limits the generalizability of its findings. Moreover, the SCIICS survey did not include questions about support for religiously-motivated violence and extremist religious organizations. We are therefore now in the process of designing the questionnaire for a survey of Muslims, Christians, and non-believers in four countries; Germany, Canada, Cyprus, and Kenya. In terms of cross-national comparisons, it not only includes two Western immigration countries with strongly divergent immigrant integration policies (Germany and Canada), but also two countries with autochthonous Muslim and Christian populations (Kenya and Cyprus), allowing, for instance, a comparative analysis of the role of the immigration experience in radicalization processes. The inclusion of Kenya and Cyprus extends the range of comparison beyond the context of Western Christianity, including both Greek orthodox Christians, and the generally more conservative Christianity of Subsaharan Africa. In Germany and Canada the survey will include not only Muslims and autochthonous Christians, but also Christians of immigrant origin. This too, extends the range of comparison to a variety of Christianities, and augments possibilities to
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isolate the role of immigration and integration experiences in religious radicalism. In Germany and Canada, the Muslims surveyed will not be limited to specific ethnicities or religious currents within Islam. In addition to the inclusion of Kenyan and (Turkish) Cypriote Muslims, this gives us increased leverage to investigate variations across Muslim groups. Apart from the usual socio-economic and demographic control variables, the surveys include questions on religiosity, religious knowledge, fundamentalism, out-group hostility, intergroup contacts, discrimination, adherence to conspiracy theories, violence legitimation, and support for extremist groups. We will employ survey-experimental techniques, including vignette and endorsement experiments, to assess the causal nature of key explanatory variables, uncovering causal mechanisms giving rise to radicalization. The survey will go into the field before the end of 2015. The project will also include a dissertation project by Eylem Kanol (yet to be specified).

4.2 The group threat hypothesis revisited: A spatial analysis of NPD electoral support

MIT researchers: Céline Teney
Project status: Concluded

The group threat hypothesis states that the perception by members of the majority group that an outside group threatens their group's prerogative is positively associated with prejudice against the out-group. The population share of the immigrant population is the most-often used indicator to compare group threat across spatial units. However, the application of multilevel techniques for the analysis of spatial data relies on the arbitrary fragmentation of a spatial context into discrete units disconnected from one another at a higher hierarchical level. Moreover, the effects of space are continuous so that people might be affected by the macro-social conditions not only of their area of residence but also of the context beyond these administrative boundaries, such as the surrounding areas. In order to overcome these shortcomings, this project applied spatially weighted regression to the analysis of the electoral success of the NPD, an extreme right-wing political party, during the 2009 German federal election. The results (Teney 2012) do not support the group threat hypothesis: the immigrant rate remains insignificant in large areas of West Germany while it shows a negative and significant relationship with NPD electoral success in most localities in East Germany as well as in Northern Bavaria. The latter finding fits the contact hypothesis: a higher percentage of immigrants within an electoral district implies larger interethnic contact opportunities and this in turn leads to a lower proportion of votes for the NPD. Methodologically, the findings illustrate the importance of spatial variability and make the case for a broader research agenda dedicated to exploring the mechanisms underlying spatial non-stationarity.
4.3 The diffusion of anti-immigrant violence in Germany, 1990-1999

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans
Collaboration: Robert Braun (Cornell University)
Project status: Concluded

This project continues a long line of research on the causal dynamics behind anti-immigrant violence in Germany during the 1990s. With a total of about one hundred deaths and many thousands of acts of violence over an extended period of time, this constitutes by far the most important outbreak of ethnic violence in post-war Germany. The project is based on a unique dataset of newspaper reports of public debates on immigration, anti-immigrant violence, as well as repression, counter-mobilization, and reactions of bystander publics, altogether containing more than 12,000 events. Earlier research in the project showed that violence was spurred by political opportunities in the form of highly mediatised controversies between government and opposition over immigration control, and that its geographical diffusion followed a pattern of social, political, and economic homophily across localities. In the reporting period, the project was concluded with an analysis of the role of bystander publics (Braun & Koopmans 2014). On several occasions (e.g., Hoyerswerda, Rostock, but also less well-known instances) local bystander crowds were present when groups of right-wing youths attacked immigrant hostels. Sometimes these crowds "just" watched, at other times they signaled support by applauding or cheering, or signaled opposition by verbally or physically intervening in defense of immigrants. We show that bystander reactions that supported anti-immigrant activists had a strongly positive impact on the subsequent rate of violence. Bystander reactions that disapproved of the violence did not have a significant effect, probably because they inadvertently generated more media attention for the violence and its perpetrators. Importantly, once bystander public reactions are taken into account, effect sizes for the political opportunity variables become weaker and in some cases insignificant, suggesting that bystander public reactions were indeed important in signaling to activists the opening or closure of opportunities for successful mobilization. The bystander reactions themselves were in turn explained by the public debate among elite actors. Willingly or unwillingly, this debate created the opinion climate in which local audiences felt encouraged to applaud attacks on asylum seekers, and the perpetrators of violence felt in turn legitimized by these reactions of local publics. Awareness of the dynamics behind these dramatic events in the 1990s is very important at a time when events like these are repeating themselves – fortunately so far on a much smaller scale – in the context of the current refugee crisis.
4.4 German public opinion and the refugee crisis: Mechanisms of support and opposition

MIT researchers: Ruth Ditlmann, Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski, Anselm Rink, Susanne Veit

Collaboration: Jutta Allmendinger (WZB), infas Research (Bonn)

Project status: Ongoing

The refugee crisis is the topic of our most recent project, which investigates what drives the partially rapid changes of the German public’s attitudes towards refugees and the right to asylum. Since the late Summer of 2015 Germany has experienced what is now already one of the largest immigration waves in its history, which moreover is occurring suddenly and within an unprecedentedly short span of time. Dynamics of public opinion on the topic have likewise been volatile, from initial hostile outbursts of anti-refugee collective action, to a massive wave of solidarity and support for refugees, and what seems to be a strong bifurcation of opinions later on. This project aims to investigate these dynamics while they are happening by fielding a survey on attitudes towards and social contacts with refugees, as well as on participation in pro-refugee or anti-refugee collective action. To get a handle on the mechanisms that drive opinions towards refugees, the survey includes several experiments. In a vignette experiment we measure how support for the granting of refugee status to an applicant depends on his or her profile, randomly varying reasons for seeking refuge in Germany (political persecution or economic hardship), religion (Muslim or Christian), level of education, and gender. By way of an authority support experiment we will be able to investigate to what extent support for pro- and anti-refugee statements depends on their endorsement by politicians of different political affiliations. Finally, an inclusive identity and victimhood experiment measures how feelings towards refugees vary depending on whether they are framed in a context that refers to Germany’s three main earlier historical experiences with mass immigration: the ethnic Germans that came to Germany in the early 1950s after having been expelled from Eastern Europe, the guestworkers and their offspring who came from Mediterranean countries from the 1950s onwards, and the 1990s wave of refugees from Eastern Europe and the former Yugoslavia after the collapse of East European communism. Respondents’ place of residence will be geo-coded, which allows linkage to very detailed data on local context variables, e.g. the ethnic composition of immediate neighbours. We will also gather data on the precise location, time of establishment, and population of refugee hostels and reception centers, allowing us to investigate if and how opinion formation is driven by actual exposure to refugees. The survey is planned to go into the field in early November. Depending on the available funding, the survey may be turned into a panel with a second wave later in the year or in early 2016. This would allow linking opinion changes to changes in the political debate on refugee and asylum rights in the media.
4.5 Xenophobia in East Germany

MIT researchers: Susanne Veit
Collaboration: Dietlind Stolle (McGill University, Montreal)
Project status: Ongoing

Another project in its very initial stages investigates the strikingly divergent responses to the refugee crisis and to immigration and diversity more generally, in the former East and West Germany. The emergence of the PEGIDA movement in 2014, the right-wing terror of the National Socialist Underground, as well as the violent protests against refugees in 2015 demonstrate how easily anti-immigrant attitudes become politically mobilized. However, the recent wave of refugees from Syria and other countries has also sparked a high level of solidarity and civic engagement among many Germans who have welcomed refugees with open arms and gifts. Apparently, the very same social reality triggers feelings of fear or dislike in some and feelings of sympathy in others. Hostility is more widespread in the East, whereas acts of solidarity are more common in the West. This project tries to understand why this is the case. Drawing on well-established theories on social identity, life events and contact, threat, and deprivation, the project will apply a mixed-method design in order to disentangle the dynamics that make some Germans and particularly East Germans vulnerable to xenophobia—while simultaneously asking about the characteristics at the individual and contextual levels that make some people resilient against it. We plan to use existing surveys, focus groups, new surveys, experiments as well as statistical regional analyses to answer these questions.

4.6 Ambassadors of peace? Intergroup contact and conflict resolution in Israel

MIT researchers: Ruth Ditlmann
Collaboration: Cyrus Samii (New York University, USA)
Project status: Ongoing

While the projects thus far investigated the emergence and dynamics of ethnoreligious conflicts, a key question is also how conflicts can be de-escalated and resolved. Every year governments, non-governmental organizations and companies spend millions of dollars on "people-to-people" peace-building programmes or intergroup contact interventions in conflict-ridden societies. The assumption behind these programmes is that they will help transform conflict-ridden into peaceful societies. Yet, little is known as to whether effects of these programs ever go beyond improving the out-group attitudes held by immediate programme beneficiaries and whether they contribute to mitigating hostility in their wider in-group communities. The "ambassadors of peace" project tries to address this latter question. It examines if and how a peace and contact programme in Israel affects the way participants relate to their in-group peers. Can peace-building programmes cause individuals to dissent from their in-group and take positions vis-à-vis their peers that promote harmony and non-violence towards the out-group? We focus on a range of outcomes, including in-group mobilization and in-group censuring, as well as individual willingness to mitigate inter-group hostility by censuring aggressive actions of in-group peers.
toward out-group individuals. In-group focused strategies include standing up to extremist's violent provocation. Methodologically, the project combines three strategies: a difference-in-differences pilot study, an innovative randomized controlled trial (to be completed Spring 2016), and a survey including current and former participants in the program (data collection ongoing, to be completed November 2015).

4.7 The political sociology of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism

MIT researchers: Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans, Oliver Strijbis, Céline Teney
Pieter De Wilde, Onawa Lacewell, Wolfgang Merkel, Bernhard Wessels, and Michael Zürn (WZB Bridging Project)

Project status: Ongoing

Across many advanced democracies an elite-mass divide has crystallized around issues related to globalization and denationalization, in their political, socio-cultural, and economic forms. Politically, the shift of authority from national to supranational decision-making forums, most visibly in the context of the European Union, has been pushed and endorsed strongly by elites, but has in recent years been confronted with increasing popular resistance, exemplified by the failed referenda on the European Constitution and the emergence of populist parties in a number of member states. The most salient socio-cultural consequence of globalization and denationalization, increased immigration along with its resulting cultural diversity, has also mostly enjoyed strong support of elites, but faces increased opposition from majorities of electorates, who demand entry restrictions and cultural assimilation of immigrants. Finally, economic denationalization in the form of the deregulation of international markets has enjoyed widespread support among elites – including those on the left, e.g., "New Labour" – but has run into increased opposition of movements against neoliberal globalization as well as parts of the traditional labour movement, who defend national welfare state arrangements and sometimes economic protectionism.

Against this background, the project asks whether these different conflicts follow a similar logic and can be described as a "new political cleavage" and whether the positions of the two sides of such a cleavage are already embedded in encompassing normative foundations which we may label as cosmopolitanism and communitarianism. Empirically, the project covers five countries – Germany, Poland, Turkey, the United States, and Mexico – that are differently involved in processes of globalization – e.g., they are involved to varying degrees in supranational political integration, they include immigration-sending and immigration-receiving countries, and they belong to the capitalist core and semi-periphery. Empirically, the project includes four major components that involve a large amount of primary data gathering: a content analysis of claim making in news media on five globalized issues – migration, international trade, human rights, climate change, and regional integration; a content analysis of party programmes, a secondary analysis of population surveys, and a large new elite survey in each of the countries. Data gathering has recently been completed. Except for the party programme analysis, the MIT department is involved in all of parts of the project, which has already resulted in
first publications (De Wilde, Koopmans & Zürn 2014; Teney & Helbling 2014; Teney, Lacewell & De Wilde 2014). Currently, a common monograph on the main results of the project is being prepared.

**Cluster 5: Solidarity, trust, and cooperation in diverse communities**

Mutual feelings of threat and hostility, communication problems because of linguistic and cultural barriers, and unwillingness to interact because of religious behavioural rules, may lead different ethnic and religious groups to live in separate worlds, even if they live in physical proximity. To the extent that this is the case, solidarity, trust and the capacity of diverse communities to produce public goods through common civic engagement are at stake. This is a very direct example of a feedback from integration outcomes into institutional challenges (see Figure 1 above). Indeed, there is now a large amount of evidence that reveals a negative relationship between ethnic heterogeneity, various measures of social capital (trust, collective efficacy, prosocial behaviour etc.), and levels of public goods provision. At the same time, there are also studies that do not find such a negative relationship, which raises the question under which conditions the erosion of social capital in diverse communities occurs. This thematic field has been a major focus of attention of our research over the last years. We have addressed the topic by a variety of methods, including surveys as well as laboratory, survey, and field experiments.

5.1 **The role of group competition and cultural group composition in the provision of public goods: an evolutionary approach**

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans

Collaboration: Susanne Rebers (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam); Jeroen van den Bergh (Universidad de Barcelona), and Julian Garcia (University of Amsterdam)

Project status: Concluded

This project investigated the relationship between cultural diversity and cooperation from the perspective of what biologists refer to as ultimate, i.e. evolutionary explanations. Current evolutionary theories of cultural group selection predict a behavioural pattern of "parochialism," which combines ingroup favouritism with outgroup hostility and that leads people to cooperate more in homogeneous ingroups, especially when these groups are in competition with cultural outgroups. In this project, we tested implications of this theoretical perspective in a series of public goods laboratory experiments in which we systematically contrast ingroup and outgroup conditions (using political affiliation, religion, and nationality as cultural traits); homogeneous and heterogeneous groups; settings with and without competition between groups; and with and without the option of costly punishment of free-riders. The question of the evolutionary basis of human collective action is relevant for the study of immigration and integration because if correct, the theory of cultural group selection has several important implications for interethnic relations, for instance that cooperation will be more difficult in culturally heterogeneous communities (see project 6.2) or that intergroup conflict is more likely to occur when
cultural differences between groups are stark (see projects in cluster 4). Findings revealed significant ingroup favouritism, but we found no evidence of outgroup hostility. Contrary to the parochialism thesis, but in line with recent work in sociology and experimental economics on the effects of diversity on cooperation (see project 6.2), we found that group homogeneity raises contribution levels, even among individuals who culturally deviate from other group members. A further experiment showed that in line with group selection theories, intergroup competition raises within-group cooperation levels. In the reporting period, the project was concluded with a final experiment (Koopmans & Rebers 2012), which confirmed the expectation that individuals are more likely to punish free riders in intergroup competition settings. Taken together, the results provide strong evidence that group cooperation increases with group homogeneity and intergroup competition. Translated to interethnic relations in the context of immigration, the findings support the idea that cultural diversity may undermine communities’ capacity for collective action and raise the potential for intergroup conflict. However, the fact that effects of shared fate (i.e. membership of the same payoff group) are much stronger than those of shared cultural group membership suggests that the extent to which such negative outcomes will occur depends importantly on how ethnicity interacts with socio-economic status and material interests.

5.2 Ethnic diversity, social trust and civic engagement

MIT researchers: Ruud Koopmans, Merlin Schaeffer, Susanne Veit
Project status: Concluded

Many studies have demonstrated a negative correlation between cultural diversity and trust and cooperation, but they have left the question of the causal nature of this relationship largely open, and the mechanisms behind it unexplored. This large project was intended to fill some of these gaps by conducting a comparative analysis across three countries, across cities, and in the context of schools, using both survey and experimental data. The ‘Ethnic Diversity and Collective Action Survey’ (EDCAS; see Schaeffer et al. 2011 for the technical report) was conducted across local populations in 67 cities and towns in Germany, France, and the Netherlands with a total sample size of 9100 respondents. The survey especially focused on neighbourhood trust and other measures of social cohesion, as well as interethnic networks and civic engagement. We also conducted a survey of parents of children in Berlin primary schools. In both surveys, experiments were integrated – priming experiments in both the German EDCAS and the school survey, and a cooperation game in the school survey. In Berlin, we also conducted a field experiment on cooperative behavior in which we investigated the return rates of letters that were apparently lost on the pavement. Two dissertations were completed on the basis of the project, both graded with highest honors (Schaeffer 2014; Veit 2014). The various experiments make a key contribution by providing consistent and strong evidence that ethnic diversity challenges cooperation. The two priming experiments (Koopmans & Veit 2014; Veit 2015) demonstrate that raising the salience of ethnic diversity leads to more negative judgments of cooperation, both with regard to peoples’ trust in their fellow neighbors to return a lost wallet, and with regard to parents’ judgments of parental cooperation at school. Raising the salience of diversity in age or income, by contrast, has no such
effect. The cooperation experiment (see Veit 2014a) reveals less successful coordination of efforts to produce a public good among parents in more diverse schools and classrooms. The lost-letter field experiment (Koopmans & Veit 2014b), finally, demonstrated that return rates of letters are lower in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods, controlling for other neighbourhood characteristics. This experiment also tests the most-often proposed mechanism behind reduced cooperation in diverse contexts: in-group favouritism. We find no evidence for this mechanism because letters are returned more often from homogenous neighbourhoods dominated by native ethnics regardless of whether the addressee is German, Christian, Muslim, or Turkish. By contrast, all letters are returned less often from more diverse neighbourhoods where many Turks and Muslims live. Results of the EDCAS survey confirm the negative relationship between diversity and trust, as well as collective efficacy, and experienced neighbourhood social problems. They also provide further insight into the mechanisms behind this relationship. In one study (Koopmans & Schaeffer 2015a) we focus on perceptions of the quantity and various aspects of the qualitative nature of diversity and test three explanations that have been proposed in the literature for negative diversity effects: out-group biases, asymmetric preferences and coordination problems. We show that all three mechanisms matter. Another study shows that children and interethnic partnerships act as brokers of interethnic contacts that mitigate negative diversity effects (Schaeffer 2013a). Finally, the project made significant contributions to the theoretically adequate measurement of diversity (Schaeffer 2013b; Koopmans & Schaeffer 2015b). In the context of the project a large international conference on “Ethnic diversity and social capital: Mechanisms, conditions, and causality” was organized in 2013. A selection of papers was recently published as an edited volume (Koopmans, Lancee & Schaeffer 2015).

5.3 Contested boundaries: Explaining where ethno-racial diversity provokes neighbourhood conflict

MIT researchers: Merlin Schaeffer

Collaboration: Joscha Legewie (New York University)

Project status: Concluded

This project further refines our knowledge about negative diversity effects by taking a spatial approach, which asks where diversity provokes conflicts. As such, its research question lies at the intersection of the topics of clusters 4 and 5. The project develops the “contested boundary hypothesis”, which states that neighbourhood conflicts occur along fuzzy boundaries between ethnically homogenous neighbourhoods. These transitional areas are contested and conflict-prone because they are subject to competing ethnic territorial claims. Clear-cut boundaries between groups, by contrast, are less conflictual, because they tend to be generally accepted. This implies the need for a methodological approach that does not treat neighbourhoods as independent spatial islands, but focuses instead on where they are located in the urban structure (see similarly project 4.2 above). To this end the project draws on publicly available data on 4.7 million phone calls to the New York City central service number (311), which are then linked to geo-coded data from the US Census and the American Community Survey. We explain variation in the rate of phone calls that concerned
complaints about neighbours across 30,000 census blocks as a function of so-called “edge intensity”, which we code with the help of „edge detection” algorithms, which have been developed in the field of image processing. The results clearly confirm that the rate of neighbourhood conflicts is higher where boundaries between local ethnic communities are fuzzy.

5.4 Evangelical missions and democratic values

MIT researchers: Anselm Rink
Project status: Ongoing

This dissertation project investigates how the introduction of a new brand of religion – Evangelical Protestantism – affects prosocial behaviour, trust and engagement for public goods across localities in developing countries that are differentially exposed to Evangelical missionary activities. Against the questionable consensus in the literature on religion and politics that Protestantism facilitates democracy, this project departs from the assumption that it can go either way. Two positive mechanisms—the introduction of egalitarian beliefs and the focus on peaceful conflict mediation—are counterbalanced by three negative mechanisms, namely, the creation of individualist preferences, the propagation of uncritical obedience, and the weakening of social ties. Paying close attention to a causally identified design, the salience of the mechanisms is tested in two places: Peru and South Sudan. This allows variation in the degree of exposure to socio-economic development and a focus on cases where villages and individuals exposed to Evangelical missions can be compared to a meaningful control group by exploiting a natural experiment (Peru) and by actually randomizing the assignment of mission posts (South Sudan). Five pivotal democratic values are studied as dependent variables—equality, freedom, peace, criticality, and public spirit. The main evidence that will be collected consists, first, of behavioral measurements of democratic values by way of various types of experiments: an equality experiment, a vignette experiment with different conflict scenarios, dictator, trust, and public goods provision games, as well as obedience, conformity, and compliance experiments. Second, community-level outcomes will be assessed by way of in-depth interviews with key decision-makers, including chiefs/presidents, police officers, and church leaders. Where available, these will be complemented by administrative data, e.g., on violence, election turnout rates, frequency of community gatherings, and applications to build schools or provide education campaigns.
5 External Funding: Strategy and Projects

The mobilization of external funding is not an aim in itself, but fulfils two purposes. First, the limited research resources at the unit's disposition are not sufficient to finance larger data gathering efforts. Second, given the limited personnel resources that the unit has structurally at its disposal, external funding is used to create additional positions for PhD researchers. Three large grants (see the overview below\(^5\)), from the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, and two from the European Commission in the context of the 7th Framework and Horizon 2020 funding programmes have allowed us to finance four PhD positions (for Sarah Carol, Merlin Schaeffer, Susanne Veit, and Ruta Yemane). Former postdoctoral research fellow Marc Helbling obtained a grant to establish a junior research group in the context of the Emmy Noether-programme of the German Science Foundation. This project also employs three PhD researchers. However, the Emmy Noether-programme requirement that the junior research groups it funds are formally independent implied that Marc Helbling had to formally leave MIT with his group and became an independent research group within the Research Area Migration & Diversity as of May 2011.

5.1 External funding received


**Ruth Ditlmann**, (project management, 120 000 US$): *Contact, Sports, and Peacebuilding: A randomized field experiment with Peace Players International*, United States Institute for Peace (USIP) research grant, 01.07.2013–30.06.2015 (with Dr. Cyrus Samii, New York University, USA).


**Ruud Koopmans** (project management, 18 000 Euro): *Immigration Policies, Immigrant Rights and Social Inclusion – Western Experiences and Asian Challenges* (workshop in

---

\(^5\) The resources for the Koopmans project funded by NWO, and for the Ditlmann projects funded by USIP and USAID were/are administered at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and New York University, respectively.


### 5.2 Submissions for external funding currently under review


6 Participation in Research Networks

The following table gives an overview of the external research partners that we have substantial cooperation relationships with in Germany, in various European countries, and in other parts of the world. Altogether, such cooperation includes 34 universities and research institutes in 16 different countries. The list only contains partners with whom we concretely cooperate in the context of study design, data gathering, and co-authorships in the context of MIT projects. Not included are occasional cooperation and co-authorships by MIT members in the context of projects or papers that are not part of the MIT research programme (see the list of publications), collaboration in the context of teaching, or the manifold other types of contact and exchange that we have with researchers around the world.

Table 6.1 External project cooperation partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Cooperation partners</th>
<th>MIT partners</th>
<th>Project number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Max–Planck Institut für Psychiatrie</td>
<td>Johannes Kopf-Beck</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max–Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen</td>
<td>Marian Burchardt</td>
<td>Ines Michalowski</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wirtschafts- und sozialwissenschaftliches Institut, Hans-Böckler-Stiftung, Düsseldorf</td>
<td>Jutta Höhne</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Merlin Schaeffer</td>
<td>3.1, 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universität Bremen</td>
<td>Céline Teney</td>
<td>Merlin Schaeffer, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>3.7, 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences</td>
<td>Nicolas Griesshaber</td>
<td>Verena Seibel</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik</td>
<td>Dietrich Engels</td>
<td>Jutta Höhne, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infas research, Bonn</td>
<td>Doris Hess, Menno Smid</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>Jean Tillie</td>
<td>Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation partners</td>
<td>MIT partners</td>
<td>Project number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julian Garcia</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam</td>
<td>Susanne Rebers</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht University</td>
<td>Bram Lancee, Marcel Coenders</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Université Libre de Bruxelles</td>
<td>Dirk Jacobs</td>
<td>Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Leuven</td>
<td>Karen Phalet</td>
<td>Fenella Fleischmann</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>University of Luxembourg</td>
<td>Anne Hartung</td>
<td>Bram Lancee</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>CEVIPOF, Science Po Paris</td>
<td>Manlio Cinall</td>
<td>Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Sussex</td>
<td>Paul Statham</td>
<td>Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Essex</td>
<td>Neli Demirova, Yasemin Soysal</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td>Anthony Heath</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles Hewstone</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann, Susanne Veit</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evelyn Ersanilli</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Sarah Carol</td>
<td>2.1, 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Universidad Carlos III de</td>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Ruud</td>
<td>3.5, 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation partners</td>
<td>MIT partners</td>
<td>Project number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Polavieja, Jonas Radl</td>
<td>Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane, Bram Lancee</td>
<td>Oliver Strijbis</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complutense University, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Barcelona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Universita degli studi di Milano–Bicocca</td>
<td>Emilio Reyneri</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>Gunn Elisabeth Burkelund</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Université de Genève</td>
<td>Matteo Gianni Marco Giugni</td>
<td>Sarah Carol, Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Centrul de sociologie urbana si regionala, Bukarest</td>
<td>Octav Marcovici</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>New Regional Center for Regional Studies</td>
<td>Siyka Kovacheva</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Columbia University, New York</td>
<td>Valerie Purdie-Vaughns</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes Hemker, Macartan Humphreys</td>
<td>Anselm Rink</td>
<td>3.6, 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cooperation partners</td>
<td>MIT partners</td>
<td>Project number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Rafaela Dancygier</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Devah Pager</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit, Ruta Yemane</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>Cyrus Samii</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joscha Legewie</td>
<td>Merlin Schaeffer</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Robert Braun</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>McGill University, Montréal</td>
<td>Dietlind Stolle</td>
<td>Eylem Kanol, Ruud Koopmans, Anselm Rink, Susanne Veit</td>
<td>4.1, 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>Eric Thompson</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanying Technological University, Singapore</td>
<td>Shirlena Huang</td>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>University of Capetown</td>
<td>Justine Burns</td>
<td>Ruud Koopmans, Susanne Veit</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Collaboration and Academic Service within the WZB

An important research collaboration within the WZB takes place in the context of the Bridging Project "The political sociology of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism" (project 4.7), in which Ruud Koopmans and former MIT members Oliver Strijbis, Sarah Carol, and Céline Teney collaborate with the Departments Democracy and Democratization (Director: Wolfgang Merkel) and Global Governance (Director: Michael Zürn). Further, intensive cooperation continued with former MIT member Marc Helbling, who since May 2011 leads the Junior Research Group Immigration Policies in Comparison. This led to common publications with Céline Teney (Helbling & Teney 2014) and with Sarah Carol and Ines Michalowski (Carol, Helbling & Michalowski 2015), as well as two international conferences organized at the WZB by Marc Helbling with Ruud Koopmans and Ines Michalowski on Causes and Consequences of Immigration and Citizenship Policies (2014) and an upcoming conference with Ruth Ditlmann on Institutional and Policy Experiments in Research on Migration, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations in March 2016. Merlin Schaeffer's collaboration with Joscha Legewie (New York University) started at the WZB when the latter was a member of the Department Inequality and Social Policy (Director: David Brady). The recruitment of Anselm Rink (formerly Columbia University) was facilitated by the link established through one of his PhD supervisors, Macartan Humphreys, who is a WZB-fellow and former guest of the Department Market Behavior (Director: Dorothea Kübler).

MIT researchers play an active role in organizing institution-wide methodological training colloquia. Together with Martin Ehler (Skill Formation and Labor Markets) and Christian Rauh (Position Formation in the EU Commission), Merlin Schaeffer initiated and organized the monthly "CO:STA"-seminar series, where invited external speakers and WZB researchers with expertise on specific quantitative methods share their knowledge with interested participants from all departments. Ruth Ditlmann co-organized with Lena Hipp (Junior Research Group Work and Care) a similar series of workshop meetings on experimental methods in the social sciences that ran from 2012 to 2014. Sarah Carol organized a workshop on agent-based modelling in 2013.

MIT members also participate actively in WZB politics. Marc Helbling (2010-2012), Merlin Schaeffer (2012-2014) and currently Susanne Veit (since 2015) have been elected representatives of the WZB's postdoctoral fellows. Ruta Yemane is (since 2015) one of the representatives of the predoctoral researchers. Ines Michalowski, Ruta Yemane, and Susanne Veit (currently) have been the Department's representatives in the Academic Council of the WZB.
8 Organized Workshops and Conferences

2015


2014


2013


Ruud Koopmans. 11.11.2013 – 12.11.2013: Immigration Policies, Immigrant Rights and Social Inclusion – Western Experiences and Asian Challenges, workshop in cooperation with Nanyang Technological University, National University of Singapore, Singapore.


2012

Ruth Ditlmann. 31.08. – 03.09.2012: Reconciliation in Intergroup Context, EASP workshop in cooperation with Sabina Cehajic–Clancy, Sarajevo.


2011

9 Board Memberships and Administrative Positions

Editorial Boards

Sarah Carol, since 2011: Member of the Editorial Board of the *BGSS Working Paper Series*.

Ruud Koopmans, since 2015: Editorial Advisory Board of the *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*.

Ruud Koopmans, since 2012: Editorial Advisory Board of the *International Journal of Comparative Migration Studies*.

Ruud Koopmans, since 2000: Editorial Advisory Board of the journal *Mobilization*.

Ines Michalowski, since 2012: Member of the Editorial Board of the journal *Comparative Migration Studies*.

Ines Michalowski, from 2007 to 2013: Member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*.

Advisory Boards and Scientific Councils

Marc Helbling, since 2010: Member of the Young Academy at the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the German Academy of Sciences Leopoldina, Halle.

Ruud Koopmans, since 2011: Member of the Academic Advisory Board of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Nuremberg, Germany.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2012 to 2013: Member of the Academic Advisory Council for the Exposition “Demographic Change” by the Leibnitz Association, Berlin, Germany.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2010 to 2014: Member of the Advisory Board of the research project *Solidarity in the 21st century* of the Institute for Labour Studies, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2009 to 2011: Member of the Advisory Board of the DFG Post-Graduate Program *Negotiating Processes of the Civil Society from the 19th Century to the Present – Germany and the Netherlands Compared*, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Germany.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2009 to 2010: Member of the Advisory Board of the research project *Salafism in the Netherlands*, University of Amsterdam and Commission on Combating Terrorism of the Ministry of the Interior, the Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2008 to 2010: Member of the Scientific Council of the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
Ruud Koopmans, from 2006 to 2012: Member of the Scientific Council of the Duitsland Instituut, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans, from 2006 to 2010: Member of the Advisory Board of the chair of Emancipation in International Comparative Perspective of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands
10 Publication Output and Citation Impact

The Department’s publication strategy privileges high-quality, international publications. This entails an emphasis on English-language publications, and in particular a preference for monographs and articles in high-quality journals. The reason is that other publication types generally have limited visibility and impact. However, these other types of publications are not entirely discouraged because they may be important in other respects, e.g. to reach non-academic or specialised academic audiences or to attain national visibility. Rather, the optimal publication output is seen as comprising a variety of types, however with an emphasis on publications of the types mentioned. Compared to the publication strategy that was long prevalent in German academia, this means a shift away from a predominance of (often German-language) book chapters. To stimulate a shift in the preferred direction while retaining a pluriform output, a publication scoring system is applied that is shown in Table 10.1.

Table 10.1: Publication output scores (points per publication of a particular type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Other language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edited volumes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal articles</td>
<td>6 (WoS impact factor &gt; 1)</td>
<td>6 (WoS impact factor &gt; 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (WoS impact factor &lt; 1)</td>
<td>4 (WoS impact factor &lt; 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (not WoS-listed)</td>
<td>1 (not WoS-listed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book chapters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZB discussion papers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles in WZB-Mitteilungen</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every postdoctoral research fellow is expected to obtain at least five points per year, i.e. the equivalent of one publication in an average Web of Science (WoS)-listed journal. To take into account fluctuations in output levels that are beyond the control of the researcher (e.g., long publication delays) this is assessed on the basis of moving averages across three year-periods. The minimum expectation for PhD researchers is that they obtain five points across three years, and that by the end of this period at least one article is under review with a WoS-listed journal.

Beyond these minimum output criteria, it is not necessarily a question of “the more the better” as the production of work of outstanding quality (e.g., a monograph with a renowned press or an article in one of the top journals) may sometimes require much effort and time. Even while working on such a manuscript, however, it should be possible to meet the minimum criteria. In the end, what matters is not so much the quantity of publications, or even the impact factor of the outlets they are published in, but the impact that such publications have in terms of citations and substantive
impact on the academic debate. For this reason, next to numbers of publications, we also monitor citation impact.

Table 10.2: Overview of publication output 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of publication</th>
<th>English language</th>
<th>Other language</th>
<th>Total 2011-2015</th>
<th>Per postdoc fte-year 2011-2015*</th>
<th>Previous per fte-year 2007-2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographs and dissertations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edited volumes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles (refereed, WoS-listed)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles (refereed, not WoS-listed)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in edited volumes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working papers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in WZB Mitteilungen/Briefe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in newspapers and magazines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2011-2015: 21.12 fte-years; 2007-2010 11.3 fte-years

As Table 10.2 shows, the minimum publication norms have been easily surpassed. Compared to the previous reporting period, total publication output per postdoctoral fte-year has somewhat declined from 9.03 to 8.0. However, this slight decline has been the result of our publication strategy that promoted publication of monographs and high-ranking, Web of Science listed journals. Indeed, the number of monographs and dissertations per capita has gone up significantly, from 0.27 to 0.47. The total number of journal publications went up only slightly – from 3.09 to 3.32 per fte-year – but the share of Web of Science listed journal publications increased dramatically, from 1.59 to 2.94. To some extent this increase is artificial because the Web of Science has expanded the number of journals – especially European ones – in its database. However, to an important extent the trend is real. Moreover, within the category of Web of Science listed journals, there has been a shift – in line with our publication strategy – towards journals with a stronger reputation and higher impact. These include top US and European sociology journals such as the *Annual Review of Sociology* (1x; 5-year journal impact factor 7.374), *American Journal of Sociology* (2x; impact factor 5.326), *European Sociological Review* (4x; impact factor 2.941), and *Social Forces* (1x; impact factor 2.326). In social psychology, too, our research appeared in some of the top journals, such as *Political Psychology* (2x; impact factor 2.679), *British Journal of
Social Psychology (1x; impact factor 2.675), and Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology (1x; impact factor 2.312). In political science journals, our visibility somewhat declined compared to the previous reporting period, which is related to the fact that, after the departure of Marc Helbling, all new recruitments were in sociology or social psychology. Still, our output includes articles in high-ranking political science outlets such as Comparative Political Studies (1x; impact factor 2.808) and Political Behavior (1x; impact factor 2.868). While these publications testify to the relevance of our research for general audiences in the social sciences, we of course also publish in journals that are dedicated to migration and integration issues. Our research is extremely well-represented in the top three journals in this field: Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies (10x; impact factor 1.593), International Migration Review (4x; impact factor 1.691), and Ethnic and Racial Studies (3x; impact factor 1.285). Against this increased output in high-ranking journals stands a strong decline in the category of chapters in edited volumes, from 2.83 to 1.52 per fte-year, and also a decline in the number of volumes that our researchers edited (from 0.44 to 0.28). Our output of working papers also declined (from 1.24 to 0.76). This is however not something we deplore because it was our declared intention to steer publication output from such publications that are subject to less strong peer review and that generally have lower visibility and impact towards monographs and high-quality journal articles. This went along with a relative decline in the share of publications in other languages than English. This is something one can deplore, because it threatens to decouple academic discourse more strongly from media and political debates. However, this is to some extent counteracted by the fact that our non-academic publications in WZB media and in newspapers and magazines are predominantly in other languages than English, namely German and Dutch (see section 16 below on dissemination outside academia).

Table 10.3 shows citation impact over the period 2010–2015 of both current and former MIT members who were employed during (part of) this period. For current MIT researchers, the table gives both Web of Science and Google Scholar citation data. Gathering Web of Science cited reference data is extremely cumbersome and virtually impossible for anyone else than the researcher herself or himself. However, a comparison of Web of Science and Google Scholar citation scores conducted by Hanno Hilbig and Ruud Koopmans in 2014 for 110 current and former postdoctoral WZB researchers showed that results from the two databases are very highly correlated (.90 for citation counts and .88 for H-indices) with no significant biases across the three main WZB disciplines (sociology, political science, and economics). The only significant difference found between the two databases was that scholars who publish more often in English perform comparatively better in Web of Science, due to the latter’s overrepresentation of English-language journals. We therefore conclude that Google Scholar is the more representative of the two. Added to Google Scholar’s much higher transparency – Web of Science citation scores are virtually impossible to verify for anyone else than the author – this leads us to clearly prefer Google Scholar as a source.
Table 10.3: Impact scores of current and former MIT postdoctoral researchers employed between 2010 and 2015 (WoS citations for current researchers only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>WoS-citations career total</th>
<th>WoS-citations in the years 2010-2015</th>
<th>Google Scholar citations career total (h-factor in parentheses)</th>
<th>Total Google Scholar citations since 2010 (h-factor in parentheses)</th>
<th>Google Scholar citations to publications published since 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruud Koopmans (PhD 1992)</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>11801 (49)</td>
<td>6269 (38)</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ines Michalowski (PhD 2007)**</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>524 (13)</td>
<td>411 (10)</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmar Schlüter (PhD 2007)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>553 (14)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Hebling (PhD 2007)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>849 (14)</td>
<td>748 (14)</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céline Teney (PhD 2009)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149 (8)</td>
<td>140 (8)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ersanilli (PhD 2010)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>216 (8)</td>
<td>210 (8)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bram Lancee (PhD 2010)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>473 (10)</td>
<td>451 (10)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenella Fleischmann (PhD 2011)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>432 (10)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Ditlmann (PhD 2012)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>357 (4)</td>
<td>331 (4)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Strijbis (PhD 2012)**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33 (4)</td>
<td>33 (4)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merlin Schaeffer (PhD 2013)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84 (6)</td>
<td>83 (6)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Veit (PhD 2014)**</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64 (5)</td>
<td>62 (5)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Retrieved October 19, 2015

** For these persons account should be taken of the fact that they have not been working over the full period because of parental and pregnancy leave: Ines Michalowski (two children, on leave 14 months); Susanne Veit (one child; on leave 9 months); Oliver Strijbis (one child; on leave 2 months).

For Sarah Carol, no citation scores are available because she has no Google Scholar page and her relatively common name makes it impossible to trace her citations. For Elmar Schlüter and Fenella Fleischmann no figure for total citations since 2010 could be given, because they do not have a Google Scholar page and Publish or Perish does not deliver this statistic.
For both Web of Science and Google Scholar, the table shows both the cumulative career total number of citations, and the number of citations since 2010. The latter measure is a better indicator of the current impact of a scholar’s work. Even that current impact may however be due to a scholar’s work in the more distant past. Therefore, a final indicator – only available from Google Scholar – refers to citations to a scholar’s recently – here: since 2010 – published work.

Based on these measures, most current and former MIT members have a strong impact profile. Taking the last column – citations to recent work – as the best measure of current impact and the one least biased towards more senior researchers, Ruud Koopmans is currently the most-cited WZB scholar. Marc Helbling is the most-cited WZB scholar who is not a department director or research professor (and the 7th most-cited WZB scholar overall), and Ines Michalowski is just outside the WZB top 10 among postdoctoral research fellows. If they would have still been at the WZB, Bram Lancee and Fenella Fleischmann would both have been in the top 5 of WZB researchers excluding directors and research professors, and Elmar Schlüter would have been in the top 10. For researchers who have completed their PhD’s very recently, citation scores are not yet very telling, because publications take a few years to gather significant numbers of citations.
11 Academic Publications

Monographs

2015


2014


2013


2012


---

7 For non-academic publications in newspapers and magazines, see section 16 „Dissemination outside academia“.


Edited volumes and special issues

2015


2013


2012


Articles in journals

2015

Carol, Sarah/Helbling, Marc/Michalowski, Ines (2015): A Struggle over Religious Rights? How Muslim Immigrants and Christian Natives View the Accommodation of


**2014**


2013


De Vries, Catherine E./Hakhverdian, Armen/Lancee, Bram (2013): The Dynamics of Voters’ Left/Right Identification. The Role of Economic and Cultural Attitudes. In: *Political Science Research and Methods, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 223-238, online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2013.4*.


2012


2011


**Articles in edited volumes**

2015


2013


2012


2011


Working papers

2014


2013


2012


2011


Articles in WZB Mitteilungen, Briefe and Reports

2015


2014


2013


2012


2011

12 Academic Conference and Workshop Presentations

2015

Ruth Ditlmann. 23.05.2015: "Can Intergroup Contact Contribute to Conflict Resolution Behaviors?". Conference: Annual Meeting of the Association for Psychological Science, New York, NYC, USA.


Ruud Koopmans. 09.06.2015: "Why Do States Extend Rights to Immigrants? Historical Legacies and Institutional Paths across 29 Countries Worldwide". External Colloquium: Department of Sociology and Human Geography University of Oslo, Berlin, Germany.

Ruud Koopmans. 13.05.2015: "Religious Fundamentalism and Out–Group Hostility among Muslims and Christians in Western Europe". Colloquium: Post Graduate Colloquium, German Studies Institute, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans. 11.05.2015: "Does Assimilation Work? Cultural Determinants of Labour Market Participation of European Muslims". Meeting: EU Framework 7 Project Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe (MIME), Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans. 11.05.2015: "The Majority’s Justification Problem: Cultural Rights between Universalism and Minority Rights". Colloquium: Department of Political Science, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Ruud Koopmans (in collaboration with Hanno Hilbig), 29.04.2015: "Reliability and Validity of Citation Scores: An Empirical Comparison of Google Scholar and Web of Science among Scholars at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin Universities and other Berlin Research Institutes", WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.

Ines Michalowski. 24.08.2015: "Levels of Analysis in Research on Religion in Public Institutions". Conference: Annual Meeting Doing Study of Religions in Public Institutions, International Association for the History of Religions, Erfurt, Germany.


Ines Michalowski. 10.07.2015: "Citizenship Rights for Immigrants in the West and Beyond". Conference: Annual Conference of the Council for European Studies, Paris, France.

Ines Michalowski. 25.05.2015: "Comments on the Final Report Integration of Islam". Conference: ReligioWest (Preparatory Conference towards the Final Report), European University Institute, Florence, Italy.

Ines Michalowski. 16.04.2015: "Citizenship Rights for Immigrants in France and Germany". Colloquium: Lunch Talk Series, Center for German and European Studies, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, USA.


2014


Sarah Carol. 10.10.2014: "Religiöse Rechte für Muslime und Nicht-Muslime in Deutschland und im westeuropäischen Vergleich". Conference: 37. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Trier University, Trier, Germany.

Sarah Carol. 29.07.2014: "Micro-Level Influences on Immigrant Integration". Workshop: Citizenship, Migration and Diversity, Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences, Berlin, Germany.

Ruth Ditlmann. 10.10.2014: "Can Intergroup Contact Contribute to Conflict Resolution?". Workshop: 3 Labs meet, Columbia University, New York, NYC, USA.


Ruth Ditlmann. 03.10.2014: "Fight The Power vs. I Have a Dream: Implicit Power Moderates how African Americans Promote Intergroup Understanding about
Injustice and Oppression”. Conference: *50th Annual Meeting of the Society for Experimental Social Psychology*, Columbus, Ohio, USA.


**Ruud Koopmans.** 12.11.2014: “Citizenship Rights for Immigrants in the West and Beyond”. Colloquium: *SOC LIFE Research Seminar*, Universität Köln, Cologne, Germany.

**Ruud Koopmans.** 05.11.2014: "Religiöser Fundamentalismus und Fremdgruppenfeindlichkeit unter Muslimen und Christen in Westeuropa*. Colloquium: *WZB Lunch Talk*, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.


**Ruud Koopmans.** 14.03.2014: "Comparing Turkish Alevi and Sunni Immigrants in Western Europe – A Natural Experiment on the Relationship between Cultural and Structural Integration*. Conference: *21st International Conference of Europeanists*, Council for European Studies (CES), Washington, D.C., USA.


**Ines Michalowski.** 03.11.2014: "Der Leistungsgedanke in der Integrationspolitik Europäischer Nachbarländer*. Workshop: *Leistung – Gestaltungsprinzip gesellschaftlicher und politischer Inklusion?*, Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria.


**Ines Michalowski.** 01.07.2014: "Institution-Specific Opportunity Structures. The Accommodation of Immigrant Religious Minorities in Hospitals and the Military*. 

**Ines Michalowski.** 26.06.2014: "Citizenship Rights for Immigrants in the West and Beyond". Conference: *Causes and Consequences of Immigration and Citizenship Policies*, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.


**Merlin Schaeffer.** 06.11.2014: "Contested Boundaries: Explaining Where Ethno-Racial Diversity Provokes Neighborhood Conflict". Lecture Series: *Universität ohne Vorurteile*, Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany.


**Merlin Schaeffer.** 30.05.2014: "Ethnic Diversity and Social Cohesion: How to Test and Advance Competing Theories". Workshop: *Explanatory Theories in Migration Research*, Universität Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland.


**Oliver Strijbis.** 06.10.2014: "Vorhersage und Analyse von Wahl- und Abstimmungsverhalten mit Prognosemärkten". Colloquium: Institute of Political Science, Universität Bern, Bern, Switzerland.

**Oliver Strijbis.** 03.10.2014: "Komplementär oder substituierend? Prognosemärkte und quantitative Modelle zur Vorhersage von Abstimmungsergebnissen". Colloquium: *Abstimmungsprognosen in der Schweiz*, Institute of Political Science, Universität Bern, Bern, Switzerland.


Susanne Veit. 06.07.2014: "Ethnic Labor Market Discrimination: Racial Appearance, Cultural Distance, and Regional Variation". Conference: 37th Annual Scientific Meeting of ISPP, International Society of Political Psychology, Rome, Italy.

Susanne Veit. 05.07.2014: "Ethnic Diversity and Collective Action: An Experiment on Parental Coordination in Ethnically Diverse Schools". Conference: 37th Annual Scientific Meeting of ISPP, International Society of Political Psychology, Rome, Italy.

Ruta Yemane. 03.10.2014: 'Measuring Ethnic Discrimination: Correspondence Studies in the German Labour Market'. Conference: Measuring Ethnic Discrimination – Lessons Learned in Germany and Sweden, The Danish Institute For Human Rights and The Danish Anti-Discrimination Unit, Copenhagen, Denmark.

2013


Ruud Koopmans. 09.05.2013: "Europe's Struggle with Immigration and Islam". Lecture: The State of the Union Lecture, European University Institute (EUI), Florence, Italy.

Ruud Koopmans. 02.05.2013: "Multiculturalism: A Contested Field in Cross-National Comparison". Colloquium: New York Immigration Seminar Series, Immigration Research Initiative, The Graduate Center, City University of New York, New York, USA.

Ruud Koopmans. 25.04.2013: "Ethnic Diversity and Local Social Capital: Survey and Experimental Evidence". Colloquium: Stanford University, Stanford, USA.

Ruud Koopmans. 22.04.2013: "Watch the Crowd: Bystander Responses, Trickle-Down Politics, and Xenophobic Mobilization". Colloquium: Stanford University, Stanford, USA.


Ruud Koopmans. 08.04.2013: "Immigrant Citizenship Rights in the West and Beyond". Colloquium: Migration, Citizenship and Transnational Politics: Comparative Perspectives of Western Europe and North America, Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences, Berlin, Germany.


Bram Lancee. 05.09.2013: "Educational Attainment and Attitudes towards Immigrants of Young Adults". Conference: ECPR Conference, European Consortium for Political Research, Bordeaux, France.


Bram Lancee. 18.05.2013: "Job Referrals and Immigrants' Occupational Status. The Role of Bridging Social Capital". Conference: RC28 Conference, University of Trento, Trento, Italy.


**Merlin Schaeffer.** 30.10.2013: "Moving to Diversity: Residential Mobility, Changes in Ethnic Diversity and Concerns about Immigration". Colloquium: *SOEP Brownbag Seminar*, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Berlin, Germany.


**Merlin Schaeffer.** 23.01.2013: "Immigration, Ethnicity and Neighbourhood Relations". Lecture: Faculty of Architecture, Darmstadt, Germany.

**Susanne Veit.** 08.07.2013: 'Not All Neighbours are Friends: Diversity, Interethnic Contact & Social Trust among Natives and Immigrants'. Conference: *Political Psychology of Global Conflict, Protest and Reconciliation*, Annual Meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Herzliya, Israel.


**2012**


Ruud Koopmans, 09.05.2012: "Discourse of Opportunities and the Breakthrough of Pim Fortuyn". Colloquium: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.


Bram Lancee, 17.10.2012: "Job Referrals and Immigrants’ Occupational Status. The Role of Bridging Social Capital". Colloquium: German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Berlin, Germany.


Bram Lancee, 28.06.2012: "Volunteering over the Life Course". Conference: GSOEP User Conference, German Institute for Economic Research (DIW), Berlin, Germany.


Bram Lancee, 14.03.2012: "Inequality, Participation and Trust". Colloquium: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.


Ines Michalowski. 03.05.2012: "Die Organisation der Militärseelsorge. Zugewanderte religiöse Minderheiten in Frankreich, Österreich und den Niederlanden". Conference: Journée d'études "Les immigrés et leurs descendants au sein des institutions françaises et allemandes", Centre Marc Bloch, Berlin, Germany.


Ines Michalowski. 22.03.2012: "Military Chaplain Positions. Cross-National Differences in the Accommodation of Religious Minorities in France, the Netherlands and Austria". Conference: Council for European Studies Conference, Boston, USA.


Merlin Schaeffer. 03.03.2012: "Inter-Ethnic Neighbourhood Acquaintanceships between Natives and Migrants. On the Brokering Roles of Inter-Ethnic Partners and Children in Germany". Conference: Migration, Ethnicity, and Urban Inequality, UCLA Center for European and Eurasian Studies, University of California, Los Angeles, USA.


Céline Teney. 29.03.2012: "Multiple Correspondence Analysis: A Multidimensional and Relational Technique". Colloquium: [CO:STA] Colloquium for Statistical Analyses, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.


2011

Sarah Carol (with Evelyn Ersanilli and Mareike Wagner). 17.11.2011: "Partner Choice Among Turkish and Moroccan Migrants in Six European Countries: Transnational
Spouse or Co-Ethnic Migrant?, Workshop: IMISCOE Workshop Spatial Mobility, Family Lives and Living Arrangements, University of Bremen, Germany.

Sarah Carol, 06.09.2011: "Family and Gender Values and their Impact on Intermarriage Attitudes". Summer Course: Mechanisms of Inclusion and Exclusion in Divided Societies, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.


Fenella Fleischmann (with Céline Teney, Evelyn Ersanilli and Laurent Lessard-Phillips), 04.11.2011: "Surveying Muslim Identity and Religiosity: Experiences from three Recent Cross-National Surveys". Workshop: Quantifying the Muslim: The Methodological Challenges of Polling Specific Populations, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.


Fenella Fleischmann (with Céline Teney, Evelyn Ersanilli and Laurent Lessard-Phillips), 11.03.2011: "Surveying First and Second-Generation Immigrants across European Countries: Experiences from Two Comparative Surveys". Conference: Researching Ethnicity: What, Why and How?, Methods@Manchester, University of Manchester, United Kingdom.


Ruud Koopmans. 12.01.2011: "Evolution - ein sozialwissenschaftlich relevantes Paradigma?". Debate with Michael Hutter, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.


Ines Michalowski. 20.06.2011: "Explaining Differences in Family Reunification Policies in Europe". Conference: 18th International Conference of Europeanists, Barcelona, Spain.

Ines Michalowski. 20.06.2011: "Rethinking migration-integration linkages in Europe". Conference: 18th International Conference of Europeanists, Barcelona, Spain.

Merlin Schaeffer. 22.07.2011: "The EDCA-Survey: How Important are Sampling Technique, Survey Language and Interviewer Background in Surveying (Turkish) Migrants?". Conference: 4th Conference of the European Survey Research Association (ESRA), Lausanne, Switzerland.


Merlin Schaeffer. 08.04.2011: "Which Groups are Mostly Responsible for Problems in Your Neighborhood? The Varying Effects of Economic Decline and Ethnic Diversity on Making Ethnic Distinctions". Conference: Annual Conference of the British Sociological Association (BSA), London School of Economics (LSE), United Kingdom.
Céline Teney, 22.07.2011: "Surveying First and Second Generation Immigrants across European Countries: Experiences from two Comparative Surveys". Conference: *European Survey Research Association Conference*, Lausanne, Switzerland.


Céline Teney, 11.03.2011: "Surveying First and Second Generation Immigrants across European Countries". Conference: *Researching Ethnicity: What, Why and How?, Methods@Manchester*, University of Manchester, United Kingdom.


### 13 Awards, Grants and Scholarships

**Sarah Carol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>WZB Flexible Funds, WZB Berlin Social Science Center</td>
<td>Purpose: Completion of book manuscript.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Teaching Scholarship, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Grant, European Science Foundation</td>
<td>Purpose: Participation in the QMSS Summer School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Travel grant, German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research and Development</td>
<td>Purpose: Participation in a Summer Course of the Tel Aviv University, Israel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ruth Ditlmann**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Fellowship for Psychology and Public Policy</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson School for Public and International Policy, Princeton University, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Marc Helbling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Research Award from the Mayor of Berlin for Young Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Project Grant Emmy Noether Programme, German Research Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Harvard Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bram Lancee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Research Grant, VENI Programme of the Dutch Research Organization NWO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ines Michalowski**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>WZB Harvard Merit Fellowship, WZB und Harvard University</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>International Visitor Leadership Program 'Diversity and Inclusion Management', United States Department of State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Merlin Schaeffer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Scholarship, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Susanne Veit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Best Dissertation Honorable Mention, International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Flexible funds for career development, WZB Berlin Social Science Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Travel grant, German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Teaching

In the period 2011–2015, MIT members taught not only at the Humboldt Universität Berlin, where Ruud Koopmans has his Chair in Sociology and Migration Research, but also at twelve other universities in Germany and in five other countries (The Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Austria, and the United States).

**Sarah Carol**

Winter Term 2014/2015  
Migration und Integration in vergleichender Perspektive  
(Seminar, Universität Mannheim, Germany)

Summer Term 2014  
Forschungsdesigns, Daten und Methoden: Herausforderungen in der Familienforschung  
(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

Winter Term 2012/2013  
Grundkurs Familie, Sozialisation, Bevölkerungsentwicklung  
(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

Summer Term 2012  
Migration und Integration in vergleichender Perspektive  
(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

**Ruth Ditlmann**

Summer Term 2015  
Psychology for Policy Analysis  
(Lecture, Princeton University, USA)

**Eylem Kanol**

Winter Term 2015/2016  
Islamic Religious Fundamentalism, Radicalization and Political Violence  
(Seminar with Ruud Koopmans and Anselm Rink, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

**Ruud Koopmans**

Winter Term 2015/2016  
Ethnic Discrimination in the Labour Market  
(Seminar with Susanne Veit and Ruta Yemane, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

Winter Term 2015/2016  
Islamic Religious Fundamentalism, Radicalization and Political Violence  
(Seminar with Eylem Kanol and Anselm Rink, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

Winter Term 2014/2015  
Key Theoretical Debates in the Social Sciences  
(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)

Summer Term 2014  
Literature Workshop  
(Seminar, Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

Winter Term 2013/2014  
Key Theoretical Debates in the Social Sciences  
(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)
### Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2012</td>
<td>Key Theoretical Debates in the Social Sciences</td>
<td>(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2011</td>
<td>Key Theoretical Debates in the Social Sciences</td>
<td>(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bram Lancee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2013/2014</td>
<td>Migration and Integration in a Comparative Perspective</td>
<td>(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ines Michalowski</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2015/2016</td>
<td>Proseminar Einführung in die Organisationssoziologie</td>
<td>(Seminar, Universität Potsdam, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2014/2015</td>
<td>Migration Research – Theories and Methods</td>
<td>(Block Seminar, Universität Wien, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2014/2015</td>
<td>Einbürgerungs- und Integrationspolitik im internationalen Vergleich</td>
<td>(Block seminar, Universität Wien, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2014</td>
<td>Einbürgerungs- und Integrationspolitik im internationalen Vergleich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2012/2013</td>
<td>Migration und Integration in vergleichender Perspektive</td>
<td>(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2012</td>
<td>The Administration of International Migration: Organizational Theory Applied to Selected Case Studies</td>
<td>(Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anselm Rink</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2015/2016</td>
<td>Islamic Religious Fundamentalism, Radicalization and Political Violence</td>
<td>(Seminar with Ruud Koopmans and Eylem Kanol, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merlin Schaeffer</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2014/2015</td>
<td>Immigration, Integration, Akzeptanz</td>
<td>(Seminar, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2014/2015</td>
<td>Einführung in die Soziologie</td>
<td>(Tutorial, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2014/2015</td>
<td>Einführung in die Soziologie</td>
<td>(Lecture, Karlsruher Institut für Technologie, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2014</td>
<td>Quantitative Migration and Integration Research</td>
<td>(Block seminar, Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao, Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Term 2013/2014</td>
<td>Introduction to Statistical Inference</td>
<td>(Block seminar, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Term 2014</td>
<td>Quantitative Migration and Integration Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Political Decision Making Based on Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Migration und Integration in vergleichender Perspektive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/2013</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Quantitative Migration and Integration Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elmar Schlüter**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungsdesigns</td>
<td>Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Céline Teney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism</td>
<td>Seminar, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>The Political Sociology of Cosmopolitanism and Communitarianism</td>
<td>Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Multivariate Analysis</td>
<td>Seminar, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Belgium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Susanne Veit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Soziale Wahrnehmung und Intergruppeneinstellungen</td>
<td>Block seminar, Universität Potsdam, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Ethnic Discrimination in the Labor Market</td>
<td>Seminar with Ruud Koopmans and Ruta Yemane, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Ethnic Discrimination in the Labor Market</td>
<td>Seminar, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Ethnische Vielfalt in der Schule aus sozialpsychologischer Sicht: Kontakte, Intergruppeneinstellungen und Zusammenhalt</td>
<td>Seminar, Universität Potsdam, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ruta Yemane**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Institution and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/2016</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Ethnic Discrimination in the Labor Market</td>
<td>Seminar with Ruud Koopmans and Susanne Veit, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 Guest Researchers and Guest Lectures

15.1 Guest researchers

2015

Paul Bauer, Universität Bern, Switzerland: 04.05.2015–22.08.2015
Sarah Carol, University of Cologne, Germany: 01.01.2015-30.06.2015
Tina Goldschmidt, Stockholm University, Sweden: 01.09.2015–31.08.2016
Jutta Höhne, Institute of Economic and Social Research (WSI), Hans-Böckler-Foundation Düsseldorf, Germany: 01.01.2015–31.12.2015
Lea Klarenbeek, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands: 08.09.2015–30.11.2015
Giuseppe Pietrantuono, University of Mannheim, Germany: 01.01.2015–31.10.2015
Verena Seibel, Berlin Graduate School of Social Science Stipend, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany: 01.01.2015-30.04.2015
Dietlind Stolle, McGill University, Canada: 01.01.2015-31.07.2015
Céline Teney, University of Bremen, Germany: 01.01.2015-31.01.2015
Sabina Toruńczyk-Ruiz, University of Warsaw, Poland: 08.04.2015–24.07.2015

2014

Ayca Arklic, University of Texas, USA: 01.01.2014–15.01.2014
Jutta Höhne, Institute of Economic and Social Research (WSI), Hans-Böckler-Foundation Düsseldorf, Germany: 01.06.2014–31.12.2014
Carolyn Morgan, Ohio State University, USA: 14.05.2014-25.06.2014
Erika van Elsas, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands: 03.03.2014–31.05.2014
Dietlind Stolle, McGill University, Canada: 04.08.2014–31.12.2014
Céline Teney, University of Bremen, Germany: 15.03.2014-31.12.2014

2013

Rolle Alho, University of Turku, Finland: 03.06.2013-31.12.2013


Francisco Beltrán, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain: 04.03.2013-30.06.2013

Julia Berczyk, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands: 01.01.2013-31.07.2013

Bram Lancee, Humboldt Research Fellow, Berlin, Germany: 01.01.2013-31.08.2013

Jonathan Laurence, Boston College, USA: 01.01.2013-30.05.2013

Giuseppe Pietrantuono, University of Mannheim, Germany: 05.08.2013-31.12.2013

Oriane Sarrasin, Swiss National Foundation for Science Stipend, University of Lausanne, Switzerland: 01.01.2013-30.06.2013


2012

Fiona Barker, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand: 01.08.2012-30.09.2012


Fenella Fleischmann, European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations (ERCOMER), University of Utrecht, The Netherlands: 01.01.2012-01.09.2012


Juan Diez Medrano, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain: 01.08.2012-31.08.2012

Derya Ozkul, University of Sidney, Australia: 23.01.2012-05.04.2012

Sybille Regout, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium: 01.05.2012-31.07.2012


2011


**Juan Diez Medano**, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain: 04.08.2011–31.08.2011

**Jasper Muis**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands: 02.05.2011–30.06.2011

**Akasemi Newsome**, University of California, USA: 01.07.2010–30.04.2011


**Hillary Silver**, Brown University Providence, USA: 06.06.2011–31.07.2011


**Céline Teney**, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium: 01.06.2010–30.06.2011

**Andreas Wimmer**, University of California, USA: 16.06.2011–15.07.2011

15.2 Guest Lectures

2015

**Paul Bauer** (Universität Bern, Switzerland), 20.05.2015: *Vague Concepts In Survey Questions: A General Problem Illustrated with the Left–Right Scale*, MaD-Colloquium., WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

**Julia Berczyk** (Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands), 10.06.2015: *The Work of Hayat Germany – A Counseling and De–Radicalization Network*, MaD-Colloquium., WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

**Claire de Galembert** (Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France), 21.01.2015: *Negotiating Lâcité – A Cross–Organizational Comparison of the Penitentiary and the Military*, MaD-Colloquium., WZB Berlin Social Science Center.


**Max Haller** (Universität Graz, Austria), 18.03.2015: *Income Inequality within Nations around the World: The Role of Ethnic Stratification*, MaD–Colloquium., WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

**Karolina Hansen** (University of Warsaw, Poland), 08.06.2015: *Interplay of Accent and Appearance in Society’s Reactions to Immigrants*, MaD–Colloquium., WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

**Maria Kranendonk** (Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands), 25.03.2015: *The Complex Nature of Political Participation among Muslim Immigrants: A Comprehensive Test of Six Models of Participation by Turkish and Maroccan Immigrants in the*
Netherlands (with Floris Ferneulen, Tom van der Meer and Jean Tillie), MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Orlando Patterson (Harvard University, USA), 09.10.2015: Culture, Poverty and Disadvantaged Urban Youth: What Have We Learned?, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Dietlind Stolle (McGill University, Canada), 14.01.2015: Consequences of Ethnic Diversity – Can We Revive the Research Agenda?, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Sabina Toruńczyk-Ruiz (University of Warsaw, Poland), 06.05.2015: Neighbourhood Diversity and Place Attachment: The Role of Social Ties and Perceptions of Diversity, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Michael Minkenberg (Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt, Germany), 07.05.2015: Politics or Culture? Path Dependency and Religious Diversity in Democratic Development, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Martin Weinmann (The Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration, Germany), 16.09.2015: A twofold lack of legitimacy in democratic states through international migration?, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Tom van der Meer (Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands)/Tim Reeskens (Tilburg University, The Netherlands), 25.02.2015: The Color of Benefits: A Large-Scale Survey Experiment on the Importance of Ethnicity as Deservingness Heuristic, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Roos van der Zwan (Radboud University Nijmegen, The Netherlands), 08.04.2015: Perceived Migrant Threat Among Migrants in Europe, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

2014

Nihad El-Kayed (BGSS, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 09.07.2014: The Meaning of Space for Political Participation of Turkish 1st and 2nd Generation Immigrants in Berlin, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Charlotte Fiala (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 18.06.2014: Regularisation programmes in Europe, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Michael Hannan (Stanford University, USA), 29.09.2014: What Does it Mean to Cross Cultural Boundaries, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Shanto Iyengar (Stanford University, USA), 04.6.2014: Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Frank Kalter (Mannheimer Zentrum für europäische Sozialforschung (MZES), Germany), 16.12.2014: Between Mechanism Talk and Mechanism Cult: New Emphases in Explanatory Sociology and Empirical Research (with Clemens Kronenberg), MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.
Thomas Kessler (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Germany), 21.05.2014: Authoritarianism: From Vices to Virtues to Vices, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Annabel Krause (Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA), Germany), 22.01.2014: Anonymous Job Applications of Fresh Ph.D. Economists, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Clemens Kronenberg (Mannheimer Zentrum für europäische Sozialforschung (MZES), Germany), 14.05.2014: Big structures, large processes: Methodological challenges in applying formal models in historical sociology, [CO:STA] Colloquium for Statistical Analyses, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Guy Laforest (Université Laval, Canada), 05.11.2014: Canadian Multiculturalism, Québec Interculturalism and Issues of Integration, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Lars Leszczensky (Mannheimer Zentrum für europäische Sozialforschung (MZES), Germany), 10.12.2014: Social Networks and Host Country Identification of Young Immigrants, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Rahsaan Maxwell (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA), 25.06.2014: The Symbolic Importance of Occupations for the Acceptance of Immigrant-Origin Minorities in the National Community, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.


Susan Olzak (Stanford University, USA), 23.09.2014: The Impact of Category Spanning on the Lethality of Terrorist Organizations, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Robert J. Sampson (Harvard University, USA), 27.10.2014: Durable Inequality and Life-Course Change: Trajectories of Contextual Mobility in a 17-Year Study of Chicago Children, WZB Distinguished Lecture in Social Sciences, Berlin.

David Schiefer (Universität Bremen, Germany), 03.12.2014: Cultural Values and Intergroup Attitudes: A Comparison of Individuals with and without Migration Background across 24 Countries, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Verena Seibel (BGSS, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 15.10.2014: Over-Education and Job Satisfaction: A Comparison between Immigrants and Natives in Germany, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Kristin Surak (University of London, United Kingdom), 29.01.2014: The Political Sociology of Regional Variations: Family Immigration in North America, Europe, and East Asia, Lecture in cooperation with the Centre Marc Bloch, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Barbara Thériault (Université de Montréal, Canada), 10.07.2014: Investigating Diversity in German Police Forces, Lecture in cooperation with the Centre Marc Bloch, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.
Michael Windzio (Universität Bremen, Germany), 30.09.2014: Structural Equation Models, Lecture in cooperation with the Centre Marc Bloch, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

2013

Francisco Béltran (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain), John Mollenkopf (CUNY, France), 19.06.2013: Cultural Conflict and Integration: A Normative Analysis of Concepts, Policies and Institutions, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Valeska Cordier (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 26.06.2013: Diskussion um das Bleiberecht. Die Rahmung und Darstellung der Bleiberechtsdebatte 2006 in TAZ, FAZ und SZ, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Luicy Pedrosa Espinoza (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany), 06.11.2013: Stepwise or Failed? Framing in Processes of Enfranchisement of Resident Migrants in Portugal and Germany, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Annekatrin Hoppe (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 30.1.2013: Cultural Diversity, Labor Migration, and Well-Being: A Resources-Oriented Perspective, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Joscha Legewie (Columbia University, USA), 11.12.2013: At the Edge: Explaining Where Ethno-Racial Diversity Provokes Neighborhood Conflict (with Merlin Schaeffer), MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Liav Orgad (Interdisciplinary Center Herzeglia, Israel), 27.11.2013: Cultural Defense of Nations: A Liberal Theory of Majority Rights, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Guiseppe Pietrantuono (Universität Mannheim), 29.05.2013: The Causal Effects of Citizenship: Evidence from Naturalization Decisions in Swiss Municipalities, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Oriane Sarrasin (University of Sussex, United Kingdom), 08.05.2013: Ivan, rapist and soon to be citizen: When immigration is framed as threat for women, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.


Rens Vliegenthart (University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands), 10.04.2013: The Rise (and Decline) of a Politicized Issue: Media and Political Attention for Immigration in the Netherlands, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Jonas Wiedner (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin), 05.06.2013: The Social Position of Immigrants in Germany 1970 – 2010, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.
2012


Erik Bleich (Middlebury College, USA), 12.06.2012: *The Freedom to Be Racist? How the United States and Europe Struggle to Preserve Freedom and Combat Racism*, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Zsófia Ignácz (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany), 22.05.2012: *Confirmatory factor analysis and the necessity of measurement invariance in group comparisons*, [CO:STA] Colloquium for Statistical Analyses, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

Michael Windzio (Universität Bremen, Germany), 11.04.2012: *Immigrant children and Their Parents: Is There an Intergenerational Embeddedness of Social Integration into Social Networks?*, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

2011

Jaap Dronkers (Maastricht University, The Netherlands), 05.07.2011: *Why Are Immigrant Students Better Off in Certain Types of Educational Systems or Schools Than in Others*, MaD-Colloquium, WZB Berlin Social Science Center.

16 Dissemination outside Academia

Members of the Department were engaged in various ways to disseminate our research results to non-academic audiences. Migration and integration are hotly debated social issues in public debates and it would not be difficult to be more present in debates on current affairs than we currently are. However, as a general rule, we only respond positively to requests to give presentations or media interviews if they relate to topics that we conduct empirical research on. The same holds for those occasions on which we ourselves take the initiative to go public through press statements. We thus decline many requests on topics outside our core realm of research.

Still, members of the Department have been engaged in a range of dissemination activities to policy and media audiences. We gave presentations on our research to German policy audiences for the Berlin House of Representatives (Teney), the Berlin Senator for Labour, Integration and Women (Yemane), the Federal Ministry of the Interior (Koopmans), the Federal Ministry for Families, Senior Citizens, Women, and Youth (Schaeffer), and the Bundestag (Koopmans). Foreign policy audiences were addressed in presentations for the Dutch and Canadian embassies (Koopmans) and the US Department of Defense (Michalowski). In this context we should also mention Ruud Koopmans' membership since 2011 in the Scientific Advisory Council of the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (BAMF) in Nuremberg; an executive organization of the Federal Ministry of the Interior, which coordinates and executes a large part of the Federal government’s policies in the domains of migration and integration. He was also a member of the Advisory Board of a research project of the Dutch Interior Ministry’s Commission for Combating Terrorism (see above under section 9 “Board Memberships and Administrative Positions”).

Media audiences were addressed by eighteen authored op-ed articles and article-length interviews (seventeen by Koopmans and one by Michalowski) for a range of newspapers in the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, and Austria, as well as thirteen TV appearances (twelve by Koopmans and one by Veit) for German, Dutch, and Danish public broadcasters. Added to this were dozens of radio interviews and a multitude of citations in news media (both not listed here). Topics that drew a lot of media attention included Susanne Veit on the lost-letter experiment in Berlin (see project 5.2), Merlin Schaeffer’s finding on the importance of children and mixed marriages for neighborhood cohesion (also project 5.2), and especially Ruud Koopmans’ findings on religious fundamentalism and out-group hostility (project 4.1), which led to hundreds of citations and commentaries in news media around Europe, as well as in countries around the world such as Israel, Pakistan, Indonesia, and the United States.
16.1 Lectures and panel discussions

2015


**Ines Michalowski.** 08.05.2015: 'Integrationspolitik und Integration. Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich'. Workshop: *Akademie Soziale Demokratie*, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Duisburg, Germany.


**Susanne Veit.** 19.06.2015: „Das Experiment der verlorenen Briefe: Solidarität in Neukölln“. Workshop: *Fokus Neukölln*, WZB Berlin Social Science Center and Bürgerstiftung Neukölln, Berlin, Germany.


**2014**


**Ruud Koopmans.** 02.07.2014: "Vertrauen, Kooperation und kulturelle Diversität". Symposium „Vertrauenserosion: Krisenrhetorik oder mehr?": *Alfred Herrhausen Gesellschaft*, WZB Berlin Social Science Center, Berlin, Germany.

**2013**


2012


2011

Ruud Koopmans. 17.05.2011: "Kultur und Integration". Panel discussion: Kultur und Integration, Embassy of the Netherlands, Berlin, Germany.


16.2 Articles in newspapers and magazines

2015


Koopmans, Ruud (2015): "Forscher: Euphorie zu Flüchtlingen ließ sich nicht erhalten". Interview: dpa (German Press Agency’s news channel), printed in several German daily newspapers, October 19, 2015.


2014


2013


2011

Koopmans, Ruud (2011): "Die Gesellschaft insgesamt muss sich Fragen stellen”. Interview on the Neo-Nazi Terrorist National Socialist Underground and a Possible
Ban on the NPD Party. In: Der Tagesspiegel (German daily newspaper), December 5, 2011


16.3 Television appearances

2015


2014

2012


2011
