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1. Research Programme

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

One of the most visible consequences of globalisation for advanced democracies is that they have virtually all become immigration societies, in which a sizeable and 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. Moreover, they also come from a much greater variety of places of origin – giving rise to what Vertovec has called “super-diversity.” The global politicisation 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 force 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 by scholars such as Kriesi 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 due to 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. 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-politicises and transforms church-state regimes. These too were fiercely contested in the formative stages of many nations, and were after a phase of relative pacification re-politicised – within a context of a global revival of religiosity – by the arrival of immigrants and the new religions, most conspicuously Islam, which they brought along. Questions such as whether Islam can be granted an institutional position equal to that of established religions, which new claims to public recognition of special religious practices and symbols can or cannot be met, and under which conditions this may happen, are only beginning to be addressed. This is not just a question of 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 the subject of a variety of international treaties and jurisprudence by supranational courts of law, as are the rights of cultural minorities more generally. Within the context of the European Union, such supranational regulation is particularly advanced. In addition, in the context of the free movement of labour within the EU, immigration and integration policies have become increasingly interdependent across countries, as the acquisition of residence or citizenship rights by an immigrant in one member country has immediate repercussions for access to other member states. 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. In our research programme we therefore investigate to what extent national institutions and traditions are still decisive in shaping immigration and integration policies and their outcomes, or whether we observe increasing convergence due to supranational regulation and transnational interdependence.

Further, there is mounting evidence, highlighted by the controversy over Putnam’s recent work, that increased diversity may pose problem for levels of trust and solidarity and the ensuing capacity of (local and national) communities to cooperate. However, we still have limited knowledge about the mechanisms behind this relationship, which may include ethnic bias and prejudice, uncertainty and coordination problems, and less efficient social control. Moreover, there is some evidence that suggests that the relationship between diversity, trust and cooperation can be neutralised in some contexts or may even be turned into a positive synergy. But there is as yet little theorising or empirical evidence regarding the mechanisms by which local and national contexts may affect the relationship between diversity and various measures of social cohesion. These effects of diversity on solidarity and cooperativeness also pose a challenge to national welfare states. A variety of authors have argued that immigration poses a “liberal dilemma” (Goodhart, Barry) because it undermines support for welfare state spending. Especially in the American context, evidence has been gathered, for instance by Alesina and his colleagues, that supports this thesis. In particular, support for welfare state arrangements seems to be undermined where ethno-cultural and socio-economic cleavages overlap, i.e. when the division between those whose contributions finance the welfare state and those who are dependent on welfare benefits coincides with ethnic boundaries. Less is known about the extent to which these findings transfer to the European context. In addition to the issue of popular support for the welfare state, immigration also puts welfare state arrangements into question because there are indications that strong welfare states with their equal income distributions lead to so-called “negative selection” (Borjas) of immigrants, and disproportionately high rates of immigrant dependence on social benefits.

Our research programme is not just about immigration and diversity as such – intrinsically important as these topics may be – but takes them as lenses through which we observe and analyse these key challenges that confront advanced democratic nation-states in the age of globalisation: the question of membership, the role of religion, how to maintain cohesion in diversifying societies, the future of the welfare state, and the shifting relationship between nation-states and supranational institutions. 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, and as potential fuel for political mobilisation. Our first set of research questions – identified by arrow A – asks how immigration and cultural diversity are processed and therefore lead to different patterns of institutional change and political mobilisation. We claim that such processes are shaped by pre-existing differences regarding
citizenship and national identity, church-state regimes, the welfare state, and insertion of countries into systems of multi-level governance. In the parlance of independent and dependent variables, immigration and diversity are here the independent variables and institutional adaptation and political mobilisation are the dependent variables.

**Figure 1:** Structure of the research programme
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Our second set of research questions — identified by arrow B — asks how different institutional responses and varying patterns of political mobilisation affect the outcomes of the process of immigrant integration. These outcomes include four components: how immigrants are perceived and received by members of the majority group; patterns of cultural assimilation, religiosity, and interethnic contact among immigrants; immigrants’ placement in socio-economic status hierarchies; and finally levels of solidarity, trust, and cooperation in culturally diverse communities that are affected by each of the three previous outcomes. In this second part of our research programme, institutional responses and political mobilisation are the independent variables, and the various components of the immigrant integration process are the dependent variables. We do not claim that institutional regulation and political mobilisation effects are the only or even necessarily the most important factors affecting these outcomes of the integration process. These are however the effects that we are particularly interested in and we treat their actual importance for integration processes as an empirical question, which is still largely open given the limited empirical (in contrast to normative) attention that such effects have received in the immigration and integration literature so far.

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 and political mobilisation, as indicated by arrow C in the figure: To the extent that integration outcomes are characterised by widespread hostility to immigrants among members of the majority group, little cultural assimilation and strong socio-economic marginalisation of immigrants, and lacking solidarity and trust across ethnic boundaries, pressures on institutions and the salience of immigration and diversity in political mobilisation 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 and political 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 six thematic clusters, as indicated in Figure 1. The first two deal with institutional and political responses to immigration and diversity, the others with the four components of the integration process that were distinguished above:

- Cluster 1: The regulation of citizenship, immigration and diversity
- Cluster 2: The political mobilisation of immigration and diversity
- Cluster 3: Prejudice and anti-immigrant sentiments
- Cluster 4: Cultural assimilation, religiosity and interethnic contacts
- Cluster 5: The socio-economic integration of immigrants
- Cluster 6: Solidarity, trust, and cooperation in diverse communities

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 – and often excellent – normative studies that are available (e.g., Kymlicka, Barry), our approach is steadfastly empirical. This does not mean that we ignore these 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 and patterns of political mobilisation to concrete empirical mechanisms on the meso (e.g., neighbourhoods, ethnic communities) 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, the welfare state 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 in specific fields of immigrant integration (e.g., whether early enrolment in day care promotes immigrant children’s educational attainment in primary school).

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 research interests privileges comparative designs, across countries, but also across time, ethnic groups, and local communities. 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, including policy analyses, media content analyses, quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews, as well as laboratory, field and survey experiments.

In the first phase of our research programme, we focus on a set of countries that provide significant variation along the institutional dimensions that we are interested in (notions of citizenship, church-state regimes, welfare state regimes, varying dependence on supranational regulation) but that are at the same time similar in being long-standing liberal democracies and economically prosperous. Moreover, we focus on countries that have been confronted with mass immigration for at least four to five decades (i.e., since the 1960s or early 1970s), implying that a
second generation of descendants of immigrant parents has already come of age and that immigration has definitely turned into permanent settlement. It is only in this phase of the immigration process that many of the issues that we are interested in pose themselves with full force: when restrictive citizenship laws and socio-economic marginalisation affect young people grown up or born in the country of immigration who claim that "this land is also their land;" when the upward mobility of the second generation makes them enter professions in the field of education, the police or the military where some of them raise new claims of religious accommodation; or when accommodating Islam is no longer just a question of tolerating improvised and invisible backyard mosques of a first generation still dreaming about return. This implies that for the moment our research focus is on North-Western Europe and the classical immigration countries. We believe that studying how these countries have confronted immigration and the new diversities that it introduces will deliver important conclusions that are also relevant for countries that have more recently turned into immigration societies, such as has been the case in Southern Europe since the early 1990s, and, on a still much smaller scale, in some East European countries since the turn of the century. In a later phase, when we can build on the research findings we have obtained from our current programme, and when these countries have progressed to a somewhat more advanced stage in the settlement process, it will certainly be interesting to broaden our geographical scope to include these newer immigration destinations, or perhaps even immigration countries that are radically different in terms of economic prosperity or political regime type, such as the Arabian Gulf states and some African countries.

We will now explicate the leading questions within each of the six research clusters and how they are interconnected, indicating also the research projects by which we address them. More detailed information on the individual research projects and their findings can be found in the appendix to this report. Because the research questions of most 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 dependent variable, but often use phenomena situated in other clusters as explanatory variables. As will become clear, research within the department encompasses a relatively large number of projects of different size and scope. This is the result of deliberate choices (see also section 3 below), related to a recruiting strategy that focused on finding the best candidates within a relatively broad field rather than using more circumscribed profiles to fill in particular cogs in the wheel of a predetermined master project, to a choice for a large degree of autonomy for senior researchers to set their own research agendas, and to a belief that in science only a combination of roads leads to Rome.

Cluster 1: The regulation of citizenship, immigration and diversity

In this research cluster, we focus on three institutional contexts: citizenship regulations and the idioms of national identity attached to them; church-state regimes; and regimes of immigration control. For a fourth institutional context that is relevant for our research programme – welfare state regimes – there is no need to conduct our own primary research as we can rely on the extensive available comparative literature. For all three institutional contexts that we study we ask to what extent there is evidence of cross-national convergence due to supranational regulation and transnational interdependence, and to what extent national policy traditions and institutional differences continue to be decisive. In addition, we ask to what extent structural trends of convergence and national path dependence are modified by more conjunctural processes of political mobilisation.

The first three projects in this cluster address the institution of citizenship. In a cross-national and longitudinal study (project 1.1; Koopmans, Michalowski, Waibel) covering ten European immigration countries as well as the three largest classical immigration countries (the USA, Canada and Australia), we investigate convergence, divergence and path dependence of policies
of access for immigrants to equal citizenship rights as well as state accommodation of cultural and religious diversity across three decades (1980–2008). The project is based on an extensive new dataset that is unique in its kind and allows us to systematically investigate temporal trends and cross-national differences in immigrant rights and the impact of variables such as EU membership, left vs. right government incumbency, the role of the judiciary, and the strength of populist parties. In a second project (1.2; Michalowski) that takes the form of a research network of young, mostly post-doctoral researchers, it is debated whether classical national models of citizenship that were developed particularly in the 1990s such as French assimilation, Dutch multiculturalism or a German ethno-cultural model are still useful for international comparisons today. Based on the original comparative empirical data of the network members, a special issue in preparation for publication discusses what the heuristic limits of these national models are and how they could be refined to better seize and explain cross-national differences in discourse, institutions and social integration processes. The next project (1.3; Michalowski) zooms in on citizenship tests and other integration requirements for immigration, access to permanent residence and naturalisation. By comparing the content of these tests and requirements in five European countries (Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Austria, France) and the USA the project seeks to investigate to what extent they deviate from liberal-democratic principles, whether the diffusion of these policies contributes to cross-national convergence, and whether cross-national differences reflect national traditions of citizenship and identity.

A further project (1.4; Michalowski) discusses whether national particularities (e.g., church-state regimes, citizenship regimes) or specific institutional and organizational opportunity structures are decisive for the way public institutions deal with religion and religious diversity. The project seeks to compare the accommodation of Islam and other religious minorities in five European countries (Germany, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Austria, France) and the USA as well as in two institutions: the military and schools. Both institutions play an important symbolic role for the nation-state, but the military is also a ‘total institution’ (Goffman), which cannot simply relegate religious issues to the private sphere. The project is based on qualitative interviews carried out in all countries of comparison and a broad collection of grey and scientific literature. The fifth project in this cluster (1.5; Helbling), which covers all 27 OECD countries, follows a similar approach to the project 1.1, but applies it to immigration policies, i.e. the regulation of entry and exit, for four categories of immigrants: labour migrants, asylum seekers, family migrants, and so-called “co-ethnic migrants.” Next to questions of convergence and path dependence, the effectiveness of immigration policies in actually shaping migration patterns will be analysed, thereby addressing the question of liberal nation-states’ autonomous capacity to act under conditions of supranational regulation and transnational interdependence. The final project (1.6; Helbling) in this cluster, taking the form of an international conference and follow-up publications, focuses on the case of Switzerland. While some consider Switzerland as a civic nation or a “nation of will” (because of its internal cultural pluralism), others see it as a case of ethnic nationalism (because of its restrictive policies regarding immigrant rights). The project investigates to what extent the Swiss case brings out the limitations of such typologies, and provides opportunities to revisit existing theories of nationalism.

Cluster 2: The political mobilisation of immigration and diversity

The first three projects in this cluster place immigration and diversity in the wider context of a transformation of the structural bases of political cleavages, both between and within national contexts, as a result of globalisation and Europeanisation. The first two projects were initiated before the establishment of the research unit, but both see immigration as one of the central issue fields in which these new patterns of political mobilisation are expressed. The first project (2.1; Helbling) assumes that increasing economic, cultural and political competition linked to globalisation has created latent structural potentials of globalisation ‘winners’ and ‘losers’. The
study addresses this new 'integration-demarcation' cleavage by analysing political conflict structures in party systems between 1970 and 2005 in six European countries: Austria, Germany, France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Empirically, the project studies election campaigns, as well as protest events and public debates regarding three issues: immigration, economic liberalisation and European integration. In a subproject, public debates regarding Islam and Muslim immigration in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland are analysed. The second project (2.2; Koopmans) focuses on how the process of European integration has affected patterns of political mobilisation, with a special focus on public debates in the mass media. The study covers the time period 1990-2003 and seven European countries (Germany, France, United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and Switzerland) and focuses on selected issues, including immigration. It assumes that shifts of political authority to the European level will differentially affect the opportunities of various categories of actors to successfully intervene in public debates. The study uses extensive content-analytic data from 28 European newspapers, analyses of search engine results and hyperlink networks, and structured interviews with media professionals and political actors. A third planned project (2.3; Helbling, Koopmans), for which recruitment is now ongoing, builds on this earlier work, in the context of a so-called "WZB bridging project," in which the research unit collaborates with the departments of Wolfgang Merkel (DSL) and Michael Zürn (TKI). This project, too, departs from the observation of a growing distance between political elites and mass publics, particularly on issues related to the denationalisation of markets, the supranationalisation of governance structures, and immigration and cultural diversity. Although a more precise demarcation of the three research units' role in the project will have to await the outcome of the recruitment process, our department is likely to be most strongly involved in the module that studies the forms and social bases of elite cosmopolitanism, relying on content analyses of the elite and tabloid press, and an online survey among elites measuring items that are also available in existing representative population surveys, allowing a comparison between elite and mass opinions.

Further projects in this cluster zoom in on a key consequence of the transformations just described, namely the rise of right-wing populist parties and protest movements, which is everywhere strongly related to dissatisfaction regarding immigration and cultural diversity. One of the most striking developments in this domain has been the rise of right-wing populism in the Netherlands, a country that used to be known for its adherence to multicultural policies and its seeming immunity to right-wing populism. Based on extensive day-to-day media content analyses for the years 2001-2002, we (project 2.4; Koopmans) investigate the rise of right-wing leader Pim Fortuyn from political marginality to the greatest landslide election victory in Dutch parliamentary history. Fortuyn’s rise marks the beginning of a new era in European right-wing politics, which fuses liberal elements (defence of gay and women’s rights, freedom of speech, opposition to anti-Semitism) with a critique of what is seen as the cultural threat to these liberal values of particular groups of immigrants, particularly Muslims. Two planned projects on Switzerland aim to shed further light on the causes behind the rise of right-wing populism. The first of these (2.5; Helbling) will study the interplay between the mobilisation of immigration issues by right-wing populists, attitudes towards immigrants, and voting choices on the basis of the Swiss election study 2011, in which a special question module will be included. The other project (2.6; Helbling) focuses on political behaviour in the context of a scheduled referendum on immigration. It investigates the effects of frames and partisan cues on how citizens vote in a referendum over immigration policy by way of a field experiment that provides information about key arguments and partisan cues to citizens immediately prior to the referendum. Municipalities will be randomly assigned to different informational and framing treatments (mailings) prior to the referendum. The final project (2.7; Koopmans) in this research cluster focuses on extra-institutional forms of anti-immigrant mobilisation. It studies the most important outbreak of ethnic violence in post-war Western European history, namely the wave of anti-immigrant attacks in Germany during the 1990s. Two social mechanisms behind the spread of violence are investigated: spatial diffusion processes and the role of bystander publics. We
investigate whether local opportunity structures affected variation in rates of violence and whether diffusion was more likely to occur between socially homophilous localities. Further, we analyse whether bystander public reactions to anti-immigrant violence contributed to the diffusion or containment of violence and acted as an intermediate mechanism between national political opportunities and local activism.

**Cluster 3: Prejudice and anti-immigrant sentiments**

Anti-immigrant parties and movements thrive not only on structural transformations and favourable political opportunities, but also on the availability of a pool of anti-immigrant sentiments. Projects in this cluster analyse the social correlates of such sentiments on the individual level and the contextual factors that explain cross-national and cross-local variations in their intensity. A first project (3.1; Schlüter) draws on insights from group threat and inter-group contact theory and tests competing propositions on the effects of immigrant population size. Does a larger immigrant population increase perceived group threat and immigrant derogation? Or does it increase intergroup contact and thereby ameliorate immigrant derogation? These questions are addressed both across countries and larger regions within countries using data from the European Social Survey, and across municipalities using Dutch survey data. A second project (3.2; Teney) addresses a weakness of existing multilevel studies in general, and of studies of local variations in anti-immigrant sentiments in particular, namely that they are based on arbitrary fragmentation of the spatial context into discrete units. However, 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. This problem will be addressed using geographically weighted regression, analysing existing data from Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland and the UK. The project seeks to explain spatial variation in anti-immigrant attitudes, as well as electoral success of anti-immigrant parties.

The next three projects investigate how anti-immigrant sentiments are affected by policies and political mobilisation. A first project (3.3; Schlüter) in this set simultaneously examines the impact of immigrant group size, negative immigration-related news reports and their interaction on perceived group threat. It analyses the impact of mass media coverage of diversity-related issues on individual anti-immigrant attitudes, and explores whether media effects interact with immigrant group size, following the hypothesis that media framing has stronger effects where people have less direct experience with immigrants. Claims regarding such media effects are frequently made, but they are rarely investigated because they require a combination of survey and media content data. In this project, such data are brought together for two countries, Spain and Germany. In a recently started project (3.4; Helbling, Schlüter) we further explore effects of political mobilisation by analysing to what extent and under which conditions the rhetoric of political parties enhances or mitigates hostile stances towards immigrants. The study combines data from the European Value Study 2000 with information on the role of ethnic diversity in the rhetoric of political parties derived from the Comparative Manifestos Project. In this same line of inquiry, a project to start in 2011 (3.5; Schlüter) will investigate whether integration policies influence citizens’ attitudes towards immigrants, combining data from the 2009 Eurobarometer with policy indicators from the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX). Surprisingly, to date no evidence-based answer is available to the question whether, to what extent and how national-level integration policies affect citizens’ perceptions of immigrants as ethnic threat.

Two final projects in this cluster go beyond general measures of anti-immigrant sentiments to investigate prejudices and biases against particular groups. In recent years, Muslims and Islam have come to occupy a central place in anti-immigrant mobilisation, and to an important extent recent forms of right-wing populism are better characterised as anti-Islam parties than as parties that turn against immigrants in general. Still, we know surprisingly little about the attitudes of ordinary citizens towards Islam and Muslim migrants. We inquire (project 3.6; Helbling) to what
extent Islamophobia differs from other forms of xenophobia by analysing survey data from Switzerland and Canada. The project will be concluded with an edited volume that invites leading researchers from various countries in Western Europe and North America to investigate what characterises Islamophobia, how it can be explained, and why it differs across countries. A second form of group-specific xenophobia is studied (project 3.7; Helbling) primarily for its theoretical relevance, namely the current phenomenon of Germanophobia in Switzerland. The project critically examines two common assumptions in the literature, namely that xenophobia is found mostly among the poorly educated, and that it mainly concerns immigrants from lower social strata and from geographically and culturally disparate nations.

Cluster 4: Cultural assimilation, religiosity, and interethnic contacts

From the reaction of members of the majority group to immigrants in the previous cluster, the projects in this cluster shift attention to immigrants’ attitudes and behaviours. They 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. Special attention is paid to religiosity, particularly of Muslims. Under which conditions do we observe secularisation or a shift towards less traditional forms of religiosity, and when do we find religious retention or even a reinvigoration of orthodox religious practices and attitudes?

The first project (4.1; Ersanilli, Koopmans) compares identification, language proficiency and use, interethnic contacts, and religiosity of Turkish immigrants in Germany, France, and the Netherlands based on original survey data and in-depth interviews. The project investigates to what extent the host country context, and differences in policies of citizenship in particular, affect cultural assimilation and retention. The project scrutinises several theories of immigrant assimilation in a cross-national perspective, which emphasise respectively costs and benefits, acculturative stress, and reactive ethnicity. In order to isolate the effects of the context of the receiving country, a quasi-experimental design is used that compares a group of immigrants that was very similar prior to migration (pre-1975 guest workers who came from two circumscribed regions in Anatolia, as well as their offspring) but who ended up in three different countries of immigration. A second project (4.2; Fleischmann) also studies religiosity among Muslims (Turks and Moroccans) in a comparative context (Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden), but focuses exclusively on the second generation. The project investigates the association between educational and labour market integration and religiosity, and investigates whether this relationship differs across countries with historically different church-state relations. In addition, the project asks whether Muslim and Turkish or Moroccan ethnic identities are compatible or conflicting with national (e.g. German, Dutch) and city identities. The project also relates religious identification and perceived discrimination to support for political Islam and political action. The study is based on survey data drawn from the TIES-project (‘The Integration of the European Second generation’).

A third, large project (4.3; Carol, Kavacik, Koopmans), funded by the EU’s 7th Framework Programme, focuses on the integration of Muslims in six countries (Germany, France, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland). Because religiosity is at the centre of the project’s interests, we have placed it in cluster 4, but in fact it spans clusters 1-4, linking information on religious rights, public debates on Islam in the mass media, and attitudes, behaviour, and interethnic contacts of both Muslim immigrants and native populations. 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, content analyses for the period 1999-2008, a new survey among four groups of Muslims (Turks, Moroccans, Pakistani and ex-Yugoslav
Muslims) and a comparison group of native non-Muslims, and finally focus groups with members of "transnational families," of which members have migrated to different countries. This part of the project is again quasi-experimental in nature, comparing groups with a very similar background before migration who have ended up in different immigration countries. The project comprises two dissertation projects. The first (4.3.1; Carol) investigates honour-related family values among Pakistanis and Turks in Germany and the United Kingdom as barriers to interethnic contacts. Current theories offer contradictory expectations on the effects of host country policies on the persistence of such traditional values. Restrictive immigration and integration policies might provoke a reactive endorsement of traditional values, but multicultural policies may also stimulate value retention, and liberal immigration laws can facilitate import marriages in which the culture of the home country is retained. The dissertation project uses survey data, focus groups, and a content-analysis on the topic of honour killings. The second dissertation project (4.3.2; Kavacik) has a twofold aim. First, to investigate how cross-national differences in church-state regimes affect Muslim religiosity, and second to investigate to what extent variations in religiosity can explain the prevalence of interethnic marriages across countries and ethnic groups. To this end, it compares Turks and ex-Yugoslavs in Germany, the United Kingdom, and France. The analysis will be based on indicators of religious rights, the survey, and focus groups.

Interethic contacts are also central to two further projects. A project to be started in 2011 (4.4; Schlüter) turns the question of the previous projects around and asks how interethnic contacts affect the cultural beliefs (e.g. gender role attitudes, religious orientations) and values of immigrants. It will use multi-wave panel data from the German Socio-Economic Panel, individual and contextual data from the Dutch SPVA 2002 study, as well as cross-national data from the SCIICS survey (see project 5.3 below). A further project (4.5; Schlüter) focuses on residential segregation. It investigates whether effects of segregation on interethnic contacts differ according to immigrants' socio-economic status and to what extent segregation results from immigrants’ choices to live among co-ethnics, or from homophily preferences on the side of members of the majority population. The project comprises a neighbourhood-level analysis of the impacts of residential segregation on interethic contacts in the city of Duisburg. In addition, two factorial survey experiments using varying descriptive vignettes of neighbourhood characteristics will be conducted, one to investigate immigrants' and another to investigate majority group members' residential preferences.

A final, small project in this cluster (4.6; Hajji), investigated an individually salient experience that frequently accompanies the migration process, but has received very little attention in the literature, namely childhood experiences of separation from one or both parents, when the child was left behind in, or temporarily sent back to the country of origin, either with a remaining parent or with other family members. Using survey and biographical interview data, the study compares the frequency of such experiences across immigrant groups in Germany and investigates how such experiences have had enduring effects on attachment behaviour later in life, in particular marriage patterns.

**Cluster 5: The socio-economic integration of immigrants**

The next cluster turns to the socio-economic integration of immigrants in the domains of the labour market and education. Research in this cluster is closely related to that in cluster 4 because most of the projects investigate to what extent cultural variables (e.g., language proficiency, religiosity) and interethic contacts affect immigrants' structural integration. A first project (5.1; Koopmans) investigates the interaction between welfare state regimes and citizenship and cultural diversity policies. It argues that a combination of a strong welfare state with immigrant integration policies that grant easy access to citizenship rights and that make few assimilation demands on immigrants, may have the unintended consequence of a high rate of dependence of immigrants on welfare state arrangements and attendant socio-economic
marginalisation in other domains. The analysis includes eight countries (Germany, France, United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Belgium, Austria, Switzerland, and Sweden), and relies on indicators of immigrant rights and welfare state regimes, data from the European Labour Force Survey, International Prison Statistics, as well as results from previous studies on immigrants' labour market participation and residential segregation. In a second study (5.2; Höhne, Koopmans) the relationship between cultural and labour market integration is further explored, but this time from a longitudinal perspective, based on a duration analysis of labour market transitions using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel. In Germany as well as in other countries there are large differences across ethnic groups regarding (gross) labour market participation and unemployment. The reasons behind such group differences are the subject of much speculation and heated public debate. Comparing Turkish, ex-Yugoslav, Italian, Spanish, and Greek immigrants, the project asks to what extent cultural assimilation (German language proficiency, interethnic contacts, German media consumption) and religiosity affect transitions into the labour market and transitions from and to unemployment. Further, we ask, if this is the case, whether this can explain differences across immigrant groups. The third project in this cluster (5.3; Fleischmann) shifts attention to the other main domain of structural integration: education. Based on census and contextual data from Belgium – a country with relatively severe ethnic penalties in education – this project investigates contextual explanations on the neighbourhood level for educational disadvantages among second-generation Turkish, Moroccan and Italian immigrants. In particular, it looks at how segregation, the density of ethnic communities, and the quality and socio-economic status of the neighbourhood affect educational outcomes.

Many of the research questions of the previous three projects in this cluster, as well as from the projects in cluster 4 are brought together in a large, department-wide project (5.4; Ersanilli, Koopmans (project coordinators), Carol, Fleischmann, Helbling, Höhne, Kavacik, Michalowski, Schaeffer, Schlüter, Veit) that is based on an original survey that was conducted in 2008 in six European countries (Germany, France, the Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, and Sweden) among Turkish and Moroccan immigrants and a native comparison group (total sample size more than 9,000). The individual-level data are complemented with extensive context information on the level of regions and municipalities within the countries of immigration, as well as the origin regions in Turkey and Morocco. The project aims to investigate three types of contextual effects on immigrant integration: those related to the regions of origin of immigrants (e.g., levels of religiosity 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 and welfare state regimes). The survey, which was administrated bilingually, includes a wide range of items on cultural assimilation and retention, religiosity, interethnic contacts in a range of contexts (neighbourhood, school, workplace), as well as detailed information on employment, professional status, and education. The data will form the basis for a common departmental book.

The final project in this cluster (5.5; Hajji, Koopmans) is of a somewhat different nature than the others because it consisted of contract research (in collaboration with the Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik in Cologne) for the Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration. The aim was to produce a first federal report on the state of immigrant integration in Germany, on the basis of a pre-defined set of 100 indicators in 14 areas (among others, legal status, education, employment, income, social participation), which should form the basis for a continuous monitoring system. The report mainly draws on data from the German Mikrozensus (2005-2007), supplemented with the German Socio-Economic Panel, the Labour Force Survey, and other sources. It compares first to second generation immigrants, and both to persons without a migration background, and where possible examines trends over time. The research unit’s contribution consisted of recommendations regarding the type and number of indicators to be used in future reports, as well as multivariate analyses in the areas of educa-
tional outcomes, labour market integration, social participation, and income. The aim was to investigate to what extent univariate differences are really related to migration background, or whether they can be explained by other socio-economic status variables.

**Cluster 6: Solidarity, trust, and cooperation in diverse communities**

Ultimately, the integration process is about more than just immigrants and the attitudes and behaviours of the majority group towards them. Mutual feelings of threat and hostility between immigrants and natives, communication problems because of linguistic and cultural barriers, and unwillingness to interact because of religious behavioural rules, may lead immigrants and natives 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, voluntarism, associational membership 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 can be prevented or mitigated.

In a first project (6.1; Koopmans) we investigate 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 test the implications of this theoretical perspective in a series of public goods experiments in which we systematically contrast ingroup and outgroup conditions (using political affiliation, religion, and nationality); homogeneous and heterogeneous groups; settings with and without competition between groups; and with and without the option of costly punishment of free-riders. The results allow us to determine the relative impact on levels of cooperativeness of ingroup favouritism, outgroup hostility, group homogeneity, intergroup competition, and shared fate.

Whereas this first project provides insight into general mechanisms that enable or undermine group cooperation in contexts of cultural diversity, it does not clarify the reasons behind variations in the strength of the negative relationship between diversity and cooperation across communities. A second, large project (6.2; Dunkel, Koopmans, Schaeffer, Veit), funded by the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, addresses this question. By way of a comparison across cities and towns in Germany, France, and the Netherlands, and across schools and amateur football clubs in Berlin and Lyon, the project aims to find out which contextual factors affect the relationship between diversity and solidarity, trust and cooperation. In addition, the project seeks to decompose diversity and to move beyond the purely statistical treatment (in the form of Herfindahl indices based on racial or ethnic statistics), that it has received in studies so far. To this we add measures of actual life style differences (e.g., languages spoken, visible signs of religiosity, value differences) as well as measures of perceived diversity. Further, the project is unique in combining three methodological approaches: a survey across 67 cities and towns with a total sample size of 9 100, which is connected to contextual data on these localities; qualitative comparative case studies of schools and sport associations in Berlin and Lyon that will provide insight into the micro-level processes behind ethnic diversity effects; and a series of survey, online, and field experiments. Along the lines of these three methodological angles, the project comprises three dissertation projects. The first (6.2.1; Schaeffer) uses the survey data to investigate variations in diversity effects and the mechanisms that are responsible for producing them. In addition to the decomposition of diversity alluded to
above, the project will focus on the role of networks in different social spheres such as associations, the workplace and the neighbourhood, and their ethnic segregation, by comparing the effects of strong and weak ties on interethnic trust, civic engagement and wider identification. Theories on opportunity and relational mechanisms will be central for these investigations. The second dissertation project (6.2.2; Dunkel) focuses on cooperation in organisational contexts, taking parental engagement in schools and voluntarism in sports clubs as examples. By way of interviews and observational data gathered in schools and sports clubs in Berlin and Lyon, and a wider survey of parents across schools in Berlin, the project seeks to examine mechanisms enabling or constraining cooperation and engagement, including the role of how organisations frame and manage diversity. The third dissertation project (6.2.3; Veit) complements the previous two with an experimental approach. These experiments are unique because they are integrated either into the cross-national survey or into the local comparisons across schools and sports clubs. Thus, they allow us to investigate the impact of contextual differences on behaviour. Examples that were already implemented include a dyadic Prisoners’ Dilemma game with treatments that varied players’ anonymity, co-players’ anonymity and co-players’ ethnicity (allowing tests of in-group favouritism, ethnic stereotypes and social control), and an experiment in which the effects of different priming treatments on trust in neighbours was investigated.

The final project in this cluster (6.3; Helbling) investigates how national integration policies and political party mobilisation affects levels of trust and engagement, as well as differences in these levels between immigrants and natives. Integration policies and party platforms are seen as communicating symbolic messages about the inclusiveness and cohesiveness of society, which may help to increase generalised trust and other aspects of social cohesion. Unlike the previous project, which studies variation across cities and organisations in three countries, this project takes a large-N cross-national perspective, using data from the four waves of the European Social Survey (2002-2008) combined with measures of party mobilisation drawn from the Comparative Manifesto Project, and MIPEX data on immigrant integration policies.
2. Research team

Director

- **Prof. Dr. Ruud Koopmans**, M.A. in political science, University of Amsterdam (1987), Dr. in Political and Social-Cultural Sciences at the University of Amsterdam (1992). Dissertation on "Democracy from Below. New Social Movements and the Political System in West Germany"; researcher at the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research (ASSR), at the Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau in Den Haag and at the WZB. Since 2003 Professor of Sociology, Chair in Social Conflict and Change, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and since September 2010 visiting professor at the Department of Political Science of the Universiteit van Amsterdam. Since April 2007 Director of the research unit "Migration, Integration, Transnationalization" at the WZB. **Research interests:** immigration and integration politics; right-wing radicalism; social movements; European integration; evolutionary sociology.

Research staff

- **Sarah Carol**, Diploma in Social Sciences, University of Duisburg-Essen (2006). Diploma thesis on "The importance of social networks and social support for social integration: An empirical analysis on South Asians in Germany and Canada"; since April 2009 junior researcher in the project "Finding a Place for Islam in Europe (EURISLAM)"; associate PhD candidate at the Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences. **Research interests:** social integration of immigrants, interethnic friendships, South-Asian diaspora, sociology of media.

- **Anna Ute Dunkel**, Diploma in Sociology, Political Science and English Philology, Free University Berlin (2007). Diploma thesis on "Exploring meanings of perceived and ascribed ethno-cultural difference in friendship relations of 2nd generation Turkish migrants"; since October 2009 junior researcher in the project "Ethnic Diversity, Social Trust and Civic Engagement"; PhD candidate at the Humboldt University Berlin. **Research interests:** migration trajectories, interethnic relations, urban development and neighbourhood renewal, volunteering and civic participation.

- **Fenella Fleischmann**, M.Sc. in Migration, Ethnic Relations and Multiculturalism, Utrecht University (2007). PhD researcher, University of Leuven, and European Research Centre on Migration and Ethnic Relations, Utrecht University (2007–2010). Dissertation on "Structural integration and religiosity: A comparative analysis of the Turkish and Moroccan second generation across European cities" (submitted September 2010); since September 2010 senior researcher at the WZB. **Research interests:** ethnic inequalities in education and labour market integration; religion and intergroup relations between ethnic minorities and the host society.
• **Dr. Marc Helbling**, M.A. in Political Science, University of Lausanne (2002), Dr. in Political Science, University of Zurich (2007). Dissertation on "Practicing citizenship and heterogeneous nationhood. Naturalisations in Swiss municipalities"; 2003–2008 researcher at the University of Zurich; 2005–2006 visiting scholar at the Center for European Studies (New York University); since February 2009 senior researcher at the WZB. **Research interests**: immigration and citizenship policies, nationalism, xenophobia and Islamophobia, Islam in Europe and public policy analysis.

• **Zuhal Kavacik**, M.A. in international migration and intercultural relations, University of Osnabrück (2009). M.A. thesis "School experiences of female immigrants with a successful educational career"; since April 2009 junior researcher in the project "Finding a Place for Islam in Europe (EURISLAM)"; PhD candidate at the Humboldt University Berlin. **Research interests**: international migration and social differentiation.

• **Dr. Ines Michalowski**, M.A. in sociology of organisations, IEP de Paris (2001). Dr. in Political Science and Sociology, University of Münster and Centre de Sociologie des Organisations (Sciences Po) (2007). Dissertation on "Integration als Staatsprogramm. Deutschland, Frankreich und die Niederlande im Vergleich"; researcher at the University of Münster, the University of Osnabrück and at the WZB; since March 2008 senior researcher at the WZB; 2008–2009 Fellow of the Transatlantic Academy in Washington, D.C. **Research interests**: comparative migration studies; political and legal incorporation of Islam in different EU member countries; integration policies.

• **Merlin Schaeffer**, M.A. in Social Sciences, Humboldt University Berlin (2008). M.A. thesis on "The social meaning of inherited property. Moral ambivalences of intergenerational transfers"; since January 2009 junior researcher in the project "Ethnic Diversity, Social Trust, and Civic Engagement" at the WZB; PhD candidate at the University of Amsterdam. **Research interests**: immigration, inheritances, intergenerational relations, social stratification and inequality.

• **Dr. Elmar Schlueter**, Diploma in Sociology, University of Marburg (2002); Research fellow at the Center for Conflict Studies, University of Marburg (2003–2004); Dr. in Social Sciences, DFG-Research Training School "Group-focused enmity" Universities of Bielefeld, Marburg and Giessen (2007); PostDoc at the University of Marburg; research fellow at the University of Mannheim (Chair "Methods of Empirical Social Research and Applied Sociology"); since April 2008 senior researcher at the WZB. **Research interests**: methods of comparative empirical social research, social integration of migrants, interethnic conflicts and discrimination.
• **Dr. Céline Teney**, M.A. in Sociology and Ethnology, Albert Ludwigs Universität Freiburg (2004), M.A. in Quantitative Analysis in the Social Sciences, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven and Katholieke Universiteit Bruxelles (2008). Dr. in Social and Political Sciences, Université Libre de Bruxelles (2009). Dissertation on "Acculturation and prejudice against sociological minorities among Brussels youth: A multilevel regression approach"; researcher at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, since June 2010 at the WZB with a Postdoctoral Fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (Germany) and of the FRS-FNRS (Belgium). *Research Interests*: minority issues, prejudice, quantitative methodology.

• **Susanne Veit**, Diploma in Psychology, University of Potsdam (2007). Diploma thesis on "Dual identity – Way out or wrong track? A comparison of models on the example of the ethnic group of Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina"; since January 2009 junior researcher in the project "Ethnic Diversity, Social Trust, and Civic Engagement" at the WZB, PhD candidate at the Free University Berlin. *Research interests*: comparative migration studies, social identity approach, conflict and cooperation, social cognition.

**Student assistants**

- Lisa Anders (01.06.2008–30.09.2009)
- Christine Barwick (15.06.2009–30.03.2011)

**Secretaries**

- Susanne Grasow
- Jutta Höhne

**Former research staff members**

- **Dr. Evelyn Ersanilli**, 01.09.2009–29.02.2010, left to become a senior researcher at the International Migration Institute, University of Oxford
- **Dr. Rahim Hajji**, 01.04.2008–30.03.2009, left to become a senior researcher at the Expert Council of German Foundations on Integration and Migration
- **Prof. Dr. Karen Schönwälder**, 01.04.2007–31.05.2008, left to become Professor at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen
- **Stine Waibel**, 01.05.2010–31.08.2010, left to work as a trainee at the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) in Tanzania
3. Personnel and career development strategy

The research unit was founded in April 2007, with the arrival of Ruud Koopmans as a director. However, because of existing obligations in Amsterdam and the wish to maximise the chances to recruit high-quality researchers the four researcher positions that had been allocated to the unit have been filled gradually. Ines Michalowski and Elmar Schütte joined in April 2008, followed a year later, in February 2009, by Marc Helbling. The fourth researcher position was filled in September 2010, with the appointment of Fenella Fleischmann. During this period, the unit also employed Rahim Hajji, Evelyn Ersanili and Stine Waibel on short-term contracts. Senior researchers were recruited with a relatively wide thematic search frame rather than for specific topics or projects. The idea has been to try to gain some of the best young researchers working in the field of migration, integration and citizenship and to give them the opportunity to work on topics largely of their own choosing, provided they fit in the research programme of the unit, with its focus on institutions, contextual effects, and comparative approaches.

As a result of successful bids for third-party funding, four PhD researchers (Sarah Carol, Zuhal Kavacik, Merlin Schaeffer and Susanne Veit) joined the unit in early 2009. In October 2009 an additional PhD researcher (Anna Dunkel) could be recruited because of the WZB’s decision to grant each department an extra 0.5 researcher position. Thanks to the new WZB initiative to stimulate so-called “bridging projects” that link several departments (see section 6 on WZB collaboration), another full-time postdoc researcher position will become available in early 2011. Further, two Humboldt Fellowship applications of young researchers in which the department has collaborated as a host institution have been successful. Currently, Céline Teney (Université Libre de Bruxelles) is a visiting Humboldt Fellow; Bram Lancee (Universiteit van Amsterdam) will join us in September 2011 for a period of two years.

Relationships within the research unit are relatively non-hierarchical. Of course, final authority and responsibility remain with the director, but it is felt that researchers and other personnel will develop their motivations and skills optimally in an atmosphere that fosters autonomy, and that this will ultimately also benefit the research unit as a whole. Examples of how this is concretely translated are the personal budgets that each senior and junior researcher has, and the inclusive granting of funding for external training (see below). At the same time, the research unit adheres to a “policy of physical presence,” implying that all researchers are required to spend most of their working time at the WZB (of course, exemptions from this rule can be granted for special reasons). Unlike some academic departments where colleagues hardly see each other, this policy ensures regular exchange, mutual support and cooperation with colleagues, and fosters a collegial atmosphere.

Formalised internal communication takes place in departmental meetings that are held weekly on Wednesdays. During these meetings, members of the unit present drafts of papers or research proposals. External speakers are also frequently invited (see list of guest speakers in section 13). Senior and junior researchers have an important role in selecting and inviting these guest speakers. The first week of every month an additional departmental meeting takes the form of a brown bag lunch, which is not dedicated as the other meetings to a presentation but to the exchange of news regarding WZB internal politics, project progress, conference visits, publications, training opportunities, etc., as well as for directing practical questions at the other members of the team. Informally, there are further opportunities for exchange during the daily common lunches.

Once a year, in January, the director has an individual assessment meeting with each of the members of the research unit. During the meeting, progress in various domains, plans for the coming year, problems and barriers, as well as opportunities for improvement are discussed. The most important expectations from researchers have been formally specified in advance. Apart
from publication criteria, which are discussed below, these include for postdoc researchers output in most – though dependent on individual preferences and skills not necessarily all – of the following areas: teaching; acquisition of funding; organisation of workshops and conferences; and extra-scientific resonance and dissemination (e.g., invited non-scientific lectures, media resonance, policy advice). For PhD researchers the most important criterion is obviously sufficient progress with the dissertation work. In addition, activities towards publication of results and a modest degree of realised publication output are expected (see below). Participation in external training, attendance at national and international conferences, and a limited amount of teaching that is preferably closely related to the dissertation topic are encouraged, but not mandatory.

The age structure of the department is relatively young (average: 32 including the director, senior researchers, and PhD researchers), as all senior researchers were recruited soon after or just before completing their dissertations. Senior researchers are responsible for independently developing their own research (which of course does not exclude cooperation with others inside and outside the department) and have access to research assistants and the secretariat to support them in their work. In addition, they have a personal budget of 3 000 Euro yearly, which they can use autonomously for conference travel (provided they do present a paper or equivalent), hiring additional research assistance, etc. Given the unit’s limited resources (about 65 000 Euro yearly, from which conferences, research travel, research assistant salaries, but also library and copying costs must be covered), funds above this sum can be requested from the director, but must be balanced with other interests. Postdocs hired for one of the four regular positions are initially offered a three-year contract, which is however extended to six years (or the maximum according to German legal regulations for temporary academic positions if this is less than six years in a particular case) if after one year the functioning and output of the researcher are judged to be satisfactory. All three senior researchers who have been in the unit for longer than a year have obtained this extension to six years. Such a relatively long period offers a sufficient planning horizon for the development of research projects with a longer time-frame and for their qualification for further academic careers by way of funding acquisition, teaching, administrative tasks, research stays abroad, etc. Moreover, offering a perspective for a longer contract duration has proved to be an important motivational element to convince preferred candidates who have to move to Berlin from abroad (as has been the case for two of the senior researchers) or from elsewhere in Germany (as has been the case for the other two). Currently, the unit does not strive to create permanent positions as this would limit the flexibility to respond to new research themes and to keep recruiting and developing new talent. Because the Habilitation is no longer seen by everybody as necessary for a successful academic career, none of the senior researchers currently has explicit plans for a Habilitation.

PhD researchers are employed for the duration of three years in half-time positions, as is the usual practice in Germany (although in the case of third-party funded projects, initial contracts may be somewhat shorter due to restrictions of the funding institutions; in such cases internal resources are used to extend the contracts to three years). In all cases, the project work is directly related to the PhD project, and the data from the projects also forms the empirical basis for the dissertations. This ensures that the completion of the dissertation within three years is indeed feasible. All five PhD researchers work in projects supervised by and in close collaboration with the director. Although momentarily not the case, successful mobilisation of project funding by senior researchers could imply that they also acquire a role in future PhD supervision. The senior researchers do however already regularly support and counsel PhD researchers on an informal basis. All PhD researchers write at least one – usually the first – article together with the supervisor. This offers the opportunity to transfer important skills of presentation, composition, writing, how to deal with reviews, choice of publication outlets etc., which are acquired best through "learning by doing" under the guidance of a more experienced researcher. The PhD researchers, too, have a personal budget, in their case of 1 500 Euro, which they can use auto-
nomously. Their budget is lower than that of the senior researchers because the funding of the projects in which they work already includes research travel and research assistance. Again, additional funding can be requested.

In addition to the five internal PhD researchers, four PhD researchers in Amsterdam (Evelyn Ersanilli, Susanne Rebers, Jasper Muis and Doutje Lettinga) were or are associated to the unit and have stayed as guests at the WZB for shorter or longer periods of time over the last few years. In addition, two external PhD students (Anne Koch and Oliver Strijbis) are supervised by the director. The PhD projects currently conducted at or in affiliation to the research unit are:

### 3.1 Dissertation projects

**Dissertation projects at the research unit**

- **Sarah Carol**, *Is blood thicker than water? Family and gender values and their impact on interethnic contacts among Pakistanis and Turks in Germany and the United Kingdom*. Dissertation, Humboldt University Berlin, since March 2010, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans.
- **Anna Dunkel**, *Collective parental involvement in the face of ethnic diversity – comparative case studies at schools and sport clubs*. Dissertation, Humboldt University Berlin, since March 2010, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans.
- **Zuhal Kavacik**, *The impact of state-religion regulation on interethnic contacts of first and second-generation Turkish and ex-Yugoslav Muslim Immigrants in Germany, France and the United Kingdom*. Dissertation, Humboldt University Berlin, since March 2010, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans.

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

- **Maria Berger**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *Politiek burgerschap van migranten in Berlijn*, completed 09.02.2010, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Evelyn Ersanilli**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *Incorporation trajectories and migration histories of Turkish immigrants to Western Europe in a cross-national perspective*, completed 03.03.2010, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Diana van Bergen**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *Suicidal behavior of young migrant women in the Netherlands. A comparative study of minority and majority women*, completed 01.06.2009, 2nd supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Doutje N. Lettinga**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *VEIL- Values, equality and differences in liberal democracies; debates over female Muslim headscarves in Europe*, since 01.01.2006, 2nd supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Susanne Rebers**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *The evolution of collective action: The role of co-evolving groups*, since 01.01.2006, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Jasper Muis**, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: *Pim Fortuyn: The evolution of a media phenomenon*, since 01.01.2006, 1st supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Anne Koch**, BGSS, Humboldt University Berlin: *The politics and discourse of return. Investigating the formulation of migrant return policies in the UK, France, and Germany*, since 01.09.2008, 2nd supervisor: Ruud Koopmans
- **Oliver Strijbis**, University of St. Gallen: *The political mobilisation of ethnic minorities*, since 01.01.2009, 2nd supervisor: Ruud Koopmans

### 3.2 External training

All personnel categories are stimulated to develop their skills and career potential by way of courses and training, and funding is made available to this end. This applies not only to senior and PhD researchers but also to student assistants and the secretariat. For instance, four of the PhD researchers, as well as two student assistants (Stine Waibel and Mareike Wagner) and one member of the secretariat (Jutta Höhne) have followed courses at the Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis. The active involvement of all echelons of the department is further shown by the fact that two research assistants (Christine Barwick and Stine Waibel), as well as a member of the secretariat (Jutta Höhne) are (co-)authors of publications (see list of publications). The following list gives an overview of the various external training activities in which members of the research unit have participated:

- **Jutta Höhne**, 09.08.2010–20.08.2010: *Advanced Programming with Stata*, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, University of Essex, England
- **Sarah Carol**, 26.07.2010–06.08.2010: *Logit and Probit Models*, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, University of Essex, England
- **Mareike Wagner**, 26.07.2010–06.08.2010: *Introduction to Duration Analysis*, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, University of Essex, England
- **Sarah Carol**, 22.02.2010–24.02.2010: *Einführung in Mehrebenenanalysen mit MPlus*, University Osnabrück
- **Sarah Carol**, 14.10.2009–18.02.2010: *New Methods in Comparative Analysis*, Humboldt University Berlin

• **Susanne Veit**, 03.04.2009–09.04.2009: *6th IGC Summer School “Conflict and Cooperation in Intergroup Relations,”* International Graduate College Schloss Hasenwinkel

• **Merlin Schaeffer**, 02.04.2009: *Aktuelle Ansätze zur Erfassung von Einstellung und Verhalten*, GESIS Mannheim

• **Merlin Schaeffer**, 05.02.2009: *Introduction to Multilevel Linear Models*, Humboldt Graduate School, Berlin

• **Jutta Höhne**, 21.07.2008–01.08.2008: *Introduction to Duration Analysis*, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, University of Essex, England


3.3 Research stays abroad

Career development policies also entail stimulating research stays abroad. Thus far, two senior researchers and one PhD researcher have taken this opportunity, which in two cases is supported by extra funding that has been made available for this purpose by the central WZB.

• **Marc Helbling**, 01.03.2011–31.05.2011: Centre for European Studies, Harvard University (USA)

• **Merlin Schaeffer**, 01.10.2010–31.11.2010: Harvard Kennedy School of Government (USA)

• **Ines Michalowski** 01.10.2008–30.06.2009: Fellowship at the Transatlantic Academy (German Marshall Fund, Zeit Stiftung, Bosch Stiftung, Bradley Foundation), Washington DC (USA)
4. **External funding: strategy and projects**

The mobilisation of external funding is not an aim in itself, but fulfils two purposes. First, given the limited personnel resources that the unit has structurally at its disposal, external funding is used to create positions for PhD researchers. This has the additional advantage that PhD researchers are embedded within larger project contexts. Two large grants, from the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth and from the European Commission have allowed us to appoint four PhD researchers. Second, the limited research resources at the unit's disposal are not sufficient to finance large-scale data gathering. Within the context of the two large externally funded projects, two cross-national surveys, a series of comparative experiments in Germany and France, and a cross-national content analysis are conducted, which would not have been possible in the absence of such funding. An application for a long-term project that entails the collection of longitudinal indicators on immigration policies across the OECD countries is currently under review (see project 1.5 in the appendix). Further applications for large-scale projects are not envisaged for the moment, because more external funding would stretch the management and supervision capacities of the department too far. The following list gives an overview of the externally funded projects of the research unit.

4.1 **Research projects: external funding**

- *Finding a Place for Islam in Europe: Cultural Interactions between Muslim Immigrants and Receiving Societies (EURISLAM)*, 01.02.2009–31.01.2012: European Union (7th Framework Programme), 287 040 Euro (project management: **Ruud Koopmans**)
- *Erster Integrationsbericht: Erprobung des Indikatorenssets und Bericht zum bundesweiten Integrationsmonitoring (First Integration Indicator Report „Integration in Germany“)*, 01.01.2008–31.03.2009: Federal Government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration, 15 958 Euro (project management: **Ruud Koopmans**)
- *The Group Threat Hypothesis Revisited with Geographically Weighted Regressions: A Comparison of Germany and Great Britain (research grant for Dr. Celine Teney)*, 01.06.2010–30.11.2010: Alexander v. Humboldt-Stiftung, 3 000 Euro (project management: **Ruud Koopmans**)

4.2 **Project submission for external funding**

5. Participation in research networks

All senior researchers actively participate in several formal and informal national and international research networks. The cooperation within the EU-funded project "Finding a place for Islam in Europe" (see project 4.3 in the appendix) is of key importance. Ruud Koopmans and the PhD students Sarah Carol and Zuhal Kavacik work together with researchers from five countries (Prof. Dr. Jean Tillie, Universiteit van Amsterdam; Dr. Dirk Jacobs, Université Libre de Bruxelles; Prof. Dr. Paul Statham, University of Bristol; Dr. Marco Giugni, Université de Genève; Dr. Manlio Cinalli, Sciences Po Paris). Ruud Koopmans was also the coordinator of another large EU-project titled "The transformation of political mobilisation and communication in European public spheres," involving teams from seven countries (see project 2.2 in the appendix), which was completed this year. In the next years, he will continue, among others, his joint research with Prof. Dr. Paul Statham (University of Bristol), Robert Braun (Cornell University), Dr. Evelyn Ersanilli (University of Oxford), Dr. Rens Vliegenthart (University of Amsterdam), and Jaser Muis and Susanne Rebers (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam). As of Autumn 2010 he has been appointed as a regular visiting professor at the University of Amsterdam, a connection which in addition to a role in graduate teaching also aims at strengthening research cooperation with researchers there, including those affiliated to the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (IMES).

Fenella Fleischmann has been a member of two large international networks since 2007: TIES ("The Integration of the Second Generation") and EQUALSOC-EDUC ("Ethnic educational inequality"). In the coming years, she will continue her cooperation with her dissertation supervisor, Prof. Karen Phalet (University of Leuven), within the research framework "Re-emergence of religion as a social force in Europe."

Marc Helbling maintains intense research cooperations with researchers in Switzerland (among others, Prof. Dr. Hanspeter Kriesi, University of Zurich, and Dr. Eva Green, University of Lausanne), Austria (Dr. Martin Dolezal, University of Vienna), Germany (Swen Hutter, University of Munich) and many other European countries, but has also strong working ties to political scientists working in US and Canadian universities (e.g. with Dr. Matthew Wright, Harvard University, Jens Hainmüller, MIT, and Prof. Dietlind Stolle, McGill University). Since June 2010 he has been a member of the "Young Academy at the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina," an interdisciplinary network of young scholars with background ranging from biology and medicine to social sciences.

Ines Michalowski currently elaborates a common research project together with Christophe Bertossi (IFRI/Sciences Po, Paris) and also maintains a steady cooperation with the Center for Migration Law (Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen), the Transatlantic Academy (Washington, D.C.) and its former fellow Rahsaan Maxwell (University of Massachusetts Amherst) as well as with John Bowen (Washington University St. Louis). In addition she coordinates, together with Dr. Claudia Finotelli (Complutense University Madrid), a network of 15 young mostly post-doctoral researchers from Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Romania, Spain, and Norway about the heuristic potential of models of immigrant integration for international comparisons.

Elmar Schlüter has been working together with Prof. Dr. Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen) and Dr. Johannes Ullrich (Goethe University) for a long time, but he also pursues joint research projects with partners in the Netherlands (Bart Meuleman, Tilburg University, and Prof. Dr. Peer Scheepers, University of Utrecht) and Switzerland (Prof. Dr. Eldad Davidov, University of Zurich). Thanks to his outstanding expertise in quantitative analysis, he is actively working in several European methodological research associations, with a special focus on structural equation modelling.
6. Collaboration within the WZB

Because the research unit was during the review period still "under construction," formal collaboration with other research units has thus far not been a priority. With the finalisation of the personnel build-up of the unit and the introduction of additional funding for "bridging projects" at the WZB, this has changed. In 2010, two proposals for a bridging project were developed, of which one was successful. In this project, entitled "The political sociology of cosmopolitanism and communitarianism" (see project 2.3 in the appendix) MIT will collaborate with the research units Democracy: Structures, Performance, Challenges (Wolfgang Merkel) and Transnational Conflicts and International Institutions (Michael Zürn).

To explore future opportunities for cooperation, the department organised three joint meetings with the research units Inequality and Social Integration (Jens Alber), Skill Formation and Labour Markets (Heike Solga) and Cultural Sources of Newness (Michael Hutter) where the involved groups laid out the theoretical framework of their research and introduced selected projects. Moreover, research from other departments was presented during the regular MIT-colloquia: Benny Geys (The Future of Fiscal Federalism), and Lora Anne Viola, together with Thomas Rixen (Transnational Conflicts and International Institutions) held guest lectures in Summer 2009. Susanne Veit and Susanne Rebers discussed their work during colloquia of the Market Behaviour research unit, as both groups use innovative experiments in their research.

Junior MIT-researchers play an active role in organising institution-wide methodological training colloquia. Together with Martin Ehlert (Inequality and Social Integration) and Christian Rauh (Position Formation in the EU Commission), Merlin Schaeffer initiated the monthly "CO:STA"- seminar series, where WZB researchers with special expertise on certain quantitative methods share their knowledge with interested participants from all departments. Anna Dunkel and Zuhal Kavacik contributed to a similar WZB-forum for qualitative methods by organising a workshop on focus group interviews, together with Dagmar Simon und Alexander Wentland (Science Policy Studies).

The research unit also participates in WZB boards, committees and interest groups: Ines Michalowski has been a member of the Scientific Council of the WZB since early 2010, and Marc Helbling was elected vice-speaker for the WZB-PostDoc-group in June 2010. All PhD-students participated in the WZB weekend-seminars organised for doctoral students in 2009 and 2010.
7. Board memberships and administrative positions

- **Marc Helbling**, since 01.06.2010: Member of the Junge Akademie der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina, Halle

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2010: Member of the Advisory Board of the research project “Solidarity in the 21st century” (Solidariteit in de 21e eeuw), Instituut voor Arbeidsstudies, Amsterdam (Netherlands)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2009: Member of the Scientific Council "Graduiertenkolleg Zivilgesellschaftliche Verständigungsprozesse," University of Münster

- **Ruud Koopmans**, 2009-2010: Member of the Advisory Board of the research project “Salafism in the Netherlands,” University of Amsterdam and Dutch Commission on Combating Terrorism, Amsterdam (Netherlands)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.11.2008: Member of the Scientific Council of the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Amsterdam (Netherlands)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2006: Member of the Scientific Council of the Duitsland Instituut Amsterdam (Netherlands)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2006: Member of the Advisory Board of the research project “Multicultural Democracy and Immigrants Social Capital in Europe” Universidad Murcia (Spain)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2001: Research Associate of the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, University of California, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies, San Diego (USA)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, since 01.01.2000: Editorial Advisory Board of the journal "Mobilization," San Diego State University (USA)

- **Evelyn Ersanilli**, since 01.04.2005: Member of the Editorial Board of the journal "Migranten-studies," (Netherlands)

- **Ines Michalowski**, since 01.07.2003: Member of the Editorial Board of the “Journal of Immigration and Refugee Studies” (USA)

- **Karen Schönwälder**, since 01.01.2007: Member of the Scientific Council for the Evaluation of Integration, Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Berlin
8. Overview of output

8.1 Publication strategy, publications and impact

The research unit’s publication strategy privileges high-quality, international publications. This entails an emphasis on English-language publications, and in particular a preference for books (monographs and edited volumes) 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 in Germany. 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 1.

Table 1: Publication scores MIT (points per publication of a particular type)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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; 0.5)</td>
<td>6 (WoS impact factor &gt; 0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (WoS impact factor &lt; 0.5)</td>
<td>4 (WoS impact factor &lt; 0.5)</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 postdoc researcher 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. This is a minimum requirement, which thus far all researchers have been able to meet. Beyond this minimum, 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 criterion. 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 an WoS-listed journal.

Table 2 gives an overview of the total number of publications during the review period 2007–2010, including each researcher’s publications from the year in which they joined the research unit. As the table makes clear, the publication strategy has achieved its aim in terms of publications in WoS-listed journals, which numbered 18 during the review period, amounting to 1.59 per senior researcher fte-year. In other words, considering international refereed journal publications alone, the minimum standard that we have set is already easily met. Of course, this is an average across the director and the senior researchers, but as the list of publications makes clear (see section 9 below) most researchers have individually achieved an average of more than
one international refereed journal publication per year, and where this is not the case, it is compensated by larger numbers of publications in other categories. Such inter-individual variation is not seen as a problem as this contributes to the aim of a pluriform publication output. As the table makes clear, the privileging of WoS-listed journal and English-language book publications has not meant that other publication types have disappeared from the menu. To the contrary, book chapters are even under these conditions the most frequent publication type in absolute numbers, and almost 40 percent of the publications remain in other languages than English, primarily German and Dutch. Thus, contrary to what is sometimes feared, we conclude that a publication strategy such as ours, which more strongly rewards selective publication types that are more difficult to produce, increases the diversity of publication output rather than leading to a publication monoculture.

Table 2: Overview of publication output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>type of publication</th>
<th>English language</th>
<th>other language</th>
<th>total 2007-2010</th>
<th>per postdoc fte-year*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monographs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edited volumes and special issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal articles (refereed, WoS-listed)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal articles (refereed, not WoS-listed)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book chapters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working papers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles in WZB Mitteilungen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>newspaper articles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2007-2010: 11.3 fte-years

Apart from numbers and types of publications, and the visibility of outlets (reputation of presses, impact factor of journals) it is also important to consider the impact that individual publications and researchers have in terms of citations. Needless to say, many citations are not necessarily a sign of quality, but they are a sign of relevance for the academic community, as even critical citations judge a publication or author as worthy to bother with. Conversely, very few citations must not imply low quality in every respect, but they do signal that a publication or author has had limited impact in the academic community, which at the very least testifies to an unfortunate choice of publication outlets. We do not apply formal benchmarks for judging citation impact, but we do consider it useful to monitor it, at least for those researchers who have completed their dissertations and for whom a certain minimum of visibility and impact will be a necessary prerequisite for their further academic careers. It should however be noted that while we give the figures, the WoS citations in particular say very little about the impact of the three researchers who have completed their dissertations only a few years ago and of whom most other publications are of an even younger date. Given the increasingly long process between first submission and publication of journal articles, their publications have had little chance yet to be cited in the journals included in the WoS. To the extent that they are partly also based on refereed journal citations, Google Scholar citations share this problem, but because they also include citations in other types of outlets, they give a more immediate reflection of impact that disadvantages young researchers somewhat less. With these important caveats in mind, Table 3 gives an overview of the impact scores of MIT senior researchers in the Web of Science (WoS)
and in Google Scholar (using the Publish or Perish programme). The results show that the director’s publications have a high resonance within the academic community. Moreover, they testify that even at the early stage of their careers, the three senior researchers have achieved a degree of visibility in the academic community, which is for the reasons outlined above still very limited where WoS citations are concerned, but reaches already respectable levels in Google Scholar.

Table 3: Impact scores of MIT senior researchers (as of 9 September 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total WoS-citations in the years 2007-2010 (excl. self-citations)</th>
<th>Total Google Scholar citations according to P&amp;P (H-factor in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruud Koopmans</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4838 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Helbling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>132 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ines Michalowski</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>117 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmar Schlüter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2 Generation of data sets

- **Evelyn Ersanilli, Ruud Koopmans**, 01.01.2008–30.06.2008: Six Country Immigrant Integration Comparative Study (SCIICS) (Germany, France, Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, and Sweden)

  The survey created a data basis for the investigation of the effects of different integration policy approaches on Turkish immigrants in six (Germany, France, Netherlands, Austria, Belgium, and Sweden) and Moroccan immigrants in four countries (Germany, France, Netherlands, Austria). Data were collected in a bilingual phone survey during the first half of 2008. In each country a minimum of 500 respondents for each group was surveyed. The study has a quasi experimental nature 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 country of origin.

- **Ruud Koopmans, Ines Michalowski, Stine Waibel**, since 01.04.2008

  Citizenship rights for immigrants, 1980-2008
  (Germany, France, UK, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, Netherlands, Austria, Switzerland, Norway, USA, Canada, Australia)

  The project collected data for 42 policy indicators in the fields of naturalization, family reunion, protection from expulsion, access to public service employment, anti-discrimination legislation, political rights, educational rights, and other cultural and religious rights for the years 1980, 1990, 2002, and 2008. For every indicator and every year, each country received a specific score to assure comparability. Information on these indicators was gathered from a variety of sources: formal legislation, relevant secondary literature, jurisprudence, administrative decrees, information directly requested from ministries, immigrant organisations, and national experts, as well as from websites and newspaper archives.

- **Marc Helbling**, 01.07.2010–30.06.2012

  Indicators on Immigration Policies in the Western World (27 OECD countries)

  This project proposes to create a set of quantitative indicators to measure immigration policies in 27 OECD countries. Data will be gathered from the analysis of documents/regula-
tions and expert questionnaires. At a second stage, existing datasets need to be compiled to operationalise the independent indicators for multivariate analyses. In the third step, the implementation processes will be studied by means of detailed case studies and semi-structured interviews with bureaucrats. 15 to 20 persons will be selected per policy issue and country – resulting in 60 to 80 interviews per country.

- **Marc Helbling**, in cooperation with Hanspeter Kriesi (University of Zurich) and Edgar Grande (University of Munich), 01.01.2006–31.12.2010
  Restructuring Political Conflict in the Age of Globalisation
  (Austria, Germany, France, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom)

  The project analyses political conflict structures and public debates on the national and European level between 1970 and 2000s. Data have been gathered for each country from one quality newspaper and the most widely read tabloid. The research team applied the core sentence approach in content analysis. The sampling period for national elections was the two-month period up to the day a national election was held. For the debates, they chronologically took a random sample of 1,200 articles per country over the period of three years from a list of sub-issues. The study of protest politics was done at the level of events, coding one national quality newspaper per country. The research design resulted in a dataset of 19,182 protest events in the six countries.

- **Marc Helbling**, in cooperation with Eva T. Green (University of Lausanne), October 2011
  Attitudes towards Immigrants and Party Choice in Switzerland
  (Switzerland)

  For the 2011 Swiss Electoral Study, a set of indicators has been developed to study the interplay between the mobilisation of immigration issues by right-wing populists, attitudes towards immigrants and voting choices. 3200 Swiss voters and non-voters and all election candidates will be interviewed. The resulting data will allow to uncover the complexity and multidimensionality of positioning towards "immigration issues."

- **Ruud Koopmans**, in cooperation with the Europub research team, 2001–2010
  The Transformation of Political Mobilisation and Communication in European Public Spheres

  In the context of this project, several large-scale data sets were gathered. All data cover seven European countries: Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

  The data set on public claim-making covers the years 1990, 1995, 2000, 2001, and 2002. 28 newspapers have been coded (in each country, two quality newspapers, a regional newspaper and a tabloid newspaper). The final data file includes more than 20,000 cases. For the years 2000-2002, 1,400 editorial and commentary articles were coded. Several search engines have been used to collect a sample of 2,640 web sites with relevant information on at least one of seven selected issue fields, and the researchers also collected data on hyperlink networks among the websites of the most important actors on the national and supranational level, arriving at a total sample of 17,951 hyperlinks on 1,078 web sites for the year 2002. In 2003 and 2004, semi-structured interviews were conducted with over 110 journalists and 345 key political actors from governance institutions, political parties, interest groups and social movements. The data are available for public download at the research unit’s website.

- **Ruud Koopmans, Merlin Schaeffer, Susanne Veit**, 01.10.2009–15.06.2010:
  Ethnic Diversity and Collective Action Survey (EDCAS) (Germany, Netherlands and France)

  The EDCA Survey is a computer assisted telephone survey with a focus on neighbourhood heterogeneity, social capital, civic engagement and political engagement. The survey was
conducted in Germany (n = 7 500), France (n = 1 400), and the Netherlands (n = 1 300). Additionally to sampling the general population (n = 6 172), the survey has an oversample of persons with migration background (n = 2 600), as well as an oversample of persons with a Turkish migration background (n = 1 428). It is stratified by 74 subnational regions with at least 100 respondents each. Respondents were sampled via random digit dialling. However, respondents who were oversampled for their Turkish migration background, were sampled from telephone books via their last names.

EURISLAM Media-Content-Analysis and Survey (Germany)

The database for the project will be generated from newspapers and a large computer assisted telephone survey. The articles for the content analyses have been sampled from five newspapers from different political viewpoints, ranging from tabloid, centre-right/left to the left, covering the period from 1999 to 2008. The data set includes about 5 000 claims and covers a wide range of issues relevant to Muslims and Islam, including immigration issues, terrorism and responses to it, discrimination, and integration of Muslims in various sectors of society.

The computer assisted telephone survey aims to trace effects of policy contexts across immigration countries with a focus on Muslim immigrants. The Muslim immigrant sample in Germany includes migrants from the former Yugoslavia, Morocco, Turkey (n = 250 each) and Pakistan (n = 150). Migrants will be sampled by their surnames from phone directories while respondents from the receiving society (n = 385) will be recruited by random-digit-dialling.

The surveys in Belgium, France, Switzerland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom will be conducted by partner institutes.

### 8.3 Dissemination outside academia

Migration and integration, and issues of Muslim integration in particular are central policy issues and hot topics of public debate. The research unit wants to contribute to these debates, but holds that such interventions should be grounded in its research findings. Because most of our research projects are still ongoing, this has implied that we have been relatively restrained in seeking media attention. However, on several occasions, members of the department have undertaken extra-academic dissemination activities, of which we highlight a few here.

In 2008-2009, Ruud Koopmans and Rahim Hajji won, in collaboration with the Institut für Sozialforschung und Gesellschaftspolitik in Cologne, the bid for the elaboration of a first national report on integration indicators for the Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugee and Integration. The report covered about 100 indicators in fourteen areas of integration (e.g., labour market, education, health) and was based on analyses of federal statistics and data sets such as the Mikrozensus and the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). The report was presented at a press conference together with the Federal Commissioner on 10 June 2009 and drew a lot of media attention. Further, it was discussed in the Bundestag on 18 June 2009. Ruud Koopmans also gave two keynote talks on the topic at the yearly integration conference of the state of Brandenburg in Potsdam in November 2009 and at the yearly conference of the Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge in Nuremberg in June 2010. The discussion on how to measure integration has since continued, focusing especially on how to deal with differences across ethnic groups. Given its actuality, we have chosen this as the topic for a symposium on the occasion of the WZB Beirat visit on 11 November 2010. Participants will be Han Entzinger (Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam), Andreas Kapphan (Bureau of the Federal Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration), Kenan Kolat (Türkische Gemeinde Deutschland), and Ruud Koopmans (MIT/WZB).
All in all, researchers from the unit – in particular Marc Helbling, Zuhal Kavacik, Ruud Koopmans, and Ines Michalowski – have during the review period given 17 talks for non-academic audiences at various workshops and conferences, organised by institutions such as the Friedrich Ebert and Heinrich Böll Foundations, the Haus der Kulturen der Welt, the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, and the European Academy Berlin (for an overview see the list of presentations at non-academic workshops and conferences in section 14 of this report).

Members of the department were also present in various media. During the review period, we contributed seven articles to the *WZB Mitteilungen*. In 2007 and 2008, Ruud Koopmans wrote two full-page, widely-discussed op-ed articles on respectively dual nationality and Dutch multiculturalism for the Dutch leading quality newspaper *NRC Handelsblad*. In 2009, he wrote an article for the *Tagesspiegel* comparing integration in Germany, France, and the Netherlands. Marc Helbling is the author of an article on Germanophobia in Switzerland, published in the Swiss *Tages-Anzeiger* in February 2010. Apart from self-authored contributions, members of the department were also cited and interviewed by various print and audiovisual media, including interviews with Ruud Koopmans in the main Norwegian television news bulletin (as well as several Scandinavian newspapers) on immigration and the welfare state and on the Thilo Sarrazin controversy in the Italian daily *La Stampa*; articles in several Dutch newspapers reporting on Evelyn Ersanilli’s dissertation on the integration of Turks; and several items in German newspapers and radio stations with Marc Helbling on Germanophobia in Switzerland. On three occasions, respectively related to the Swiss minaret referendum and to controversies around statements of Thilo Sarrazin, Marc Helbling and Ines Michalowski were responsible for the so-called "Faktencheck" of the ARD television programme "Hart, aber fair." Some examples of print media attention for MIT researchers can be found at the end of this report (section 15).
9. Publications

Monographs


Edited volumes and special issues


Journal articles (refereed)

- **Ersanilli, Evelyn/Koopmans, Ruud** (2011): "Ethnic Retention and Host Culture Adoption among Turkish Immigrants in Germany, France and the Netherlands. A Controlled Comparison." In: *West European Politics* (accepted for publication).


Book chapters


• Helbling, Marc (2010): "Naturalisation Politics in Switzerland. Explaining Rejection Rates at the Local Level." In: Tiziana Caponio/Maren Borkert (Eds.): The Local Dimension of Migration Policymaking. IMISCOE Reports. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 33-56.


### Working papers


**Articles in WZB Mitteilungen**


Publications


Newspaper articles


10. Conference and workshop presentations

- **Ruud Koopmans**, 08.11.2010: “Vertical and horizontal dimensions of Europeanised political communication” (Reflections on the Europeanisation of the Public Sphere: The Turkish Case, Yaşar University, Izmir, Turkey)

- **Ines Michalowski**, 29.10.2010: "Social effects of integration requirements – reflections from a sociological point of view" (Integration and Naturalisation Tests. The New Way to European Citizenship, Brussels, Belgium)


- **Marc Helbling**, 06.10.2010: "Migration musulmane et Islamophobie en Suisse et en Europe" (Observatory of Religions in Switzerland, University of Lausanne, Switzerland)

- **Marc Helbling**, 05.10.2010: "Les débats publics sur l’Islam en Allemagne, Autriche et Suisse. Une comparaison quantitative, 1998–2004" (Observatory of Religions in Switzerland, University of Lausanne, Switzerland)

- **Ines Michalowski**, 04.10.2010: "A transatlantic comparison of civic integration/citizenship policies" (workshop organised by the Dutch Directorate-general for Housing, Communities and Integration, Metropolis Conference, Den Haag, Netherlands)

- **Ines Michalowski**, 13.09.2010: "Required to assimilate? The content of citizenship tests in five countries" (Colloquium, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Netherlands)


- **Ruud Koopmans**, 06.09.2010: "The Europeanisation of public spheres: Comparisons across issues, time and countries" (Exchanging Ideas on Europe: Europe at a Crossroads, UACES Annual Conference, College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium)

- **Marc Hebling**, with Dietlind Stolle (McGill University), Cameron Stark (McGill University) and Tim Reeskens (Tilburg University), 05.09.2010: “Social cohesion and integration regimes: Redirecting our attention to immigrant-native-born gaps” (Annual Conference of the American Political Science Association, Washington DC, USA)

- **Sarah Carol**, with Zuhal Kavacik and **Ruud Koopmans**, 01.09.2010: "Pushing the limits, drawing the line: Dynamics of contestation over Islamic religious rights in Western Europe, 1999-2008" (ECPR Graduate Conference, University of Dublin, Ireland)

- **Zuhal Kavacik**, 01.09.2010: "ECPR panel: Political representation of migrants and minorities" (ECPR Graduate Conference, University of Dublin, Ireland)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, with Robert Braun (Cornell University), 17.08.2010: "Bystander responses, trickle-down politics and xenophobic mobilisation" (Annual Conference of the American Sociological Association, Washington DC, USA)


- **Merlin Schaeffer**, 15.07.2010: "Friend or foe: How are prejudices and resentment overcome to establish interethnic contact" (XVII World Congress of Sociology, Gothenburg, Sweden)

- **Susanne Veit**, 13.07.2010: “Effects of ethnic diversity on trust in neighbours – evidence from a large-scale survey experiment” (XVII World Congress of Sociology, Gothenburg, Sweden)
- **Susanne Veit**, 08.07.2010: "Cooperation within and across ethnic boundaries" (TU/WZB Colloquium, Berlin)

- **Sarah Carol**, with **Evelyn Ersanilli**, 02.07.2010: "Intergenerational transmission of interethnic social contacts. The impact of attitudes and contacts of Turkish immigrant parents on the interethnic social contacts of their adult children" (New Migrations, New Challenges: Trinity Immigration Initiative International Conference, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, with **Evelyn Ersanilli**, 02.07.2010: "A cross-national investigation of secularisation among the children of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants" (New Migrations, New Challenges: Trinity Immigration Initiative International Conference, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland)

- **Jutta Höhne**, with **Ruud Koopmans**, 01.07.2010: "Host-country cultural capital and labour market trajectories of migrants in Germany" (New Migrations, New Challenges: Trinity Immigration Initiative International Conference, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland)

- **Ines Michalowski**, 24.06.2010: "Obligatory integration measures for immigrants. New support for cultural assimilation?" (Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain)

- **Susanne Veit**, 16.06.2010: "Dual identity – way out or wrong track? A comparison of two theoretical models on the basis of Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina" (23rd Annual Conference of the German Peace Psychology Association, Bielefeld)

- **Marc Helbling**, 30.04.2010: "Islamophobia in Europe: A new phenomenon or a new name for xenophobia?" (Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, USA)

- **Marc Helbling**, 22.04.2010: "Public debates on citizenship and immigration in six West European nationstates. Between citizenship regimes and transnationalism" (Annual Conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, USA)


- **Marc Helbling**, with Tim Reeskens (Tilburg University) and Dietlind Stolle (McGill University), 15.04.2010: "Bringing political parties back in – cultural diversity, social cohesion and political mobilisation" (The Revenge of the European Model? 17th International Conference of the Council for European Studies, Montreal, Canada)

- **Ines Michalowski**, 15.04.2010: "Citizenship tests in five countries – An expression of political liberalism?" (The Revenge of the European Model? 17th International Conference of the Council for European Studies, Montreal, Canada)

- **Susanne Veit**, 14.04.2010: "Priming of ethnic diversity and trust in neighbors. Does intergroup contact moderate priming effects?" (Inaugural CReSP Conference on Tearing Down the Walls, Queens University Belfast, Northern Ireland)


- **Ines Michalowski**, 26.03.2010: "How are Muslim migrants integrating into German society?" (Immigration and Integration in Germany, European Academy, Berlin)

- **Ruud Koopmans**, 19.03.2010: "Trade-offs between equality and difference: Immigrant integration, multiculturalism and the welfare state" (Institute for Social Research, Oslo, Norway)

- **Merlin Schaeffer**, 19.03.2010: "Explaining perceptions of conflictual diversity" (Political and Social Challenges in Europe, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain)
• Ruud Koopmans, 15.02.2010: "Trade-offs between equality and difference: Immigrant integration, multiculturalism and the welfare state in Europe" (Luce Project Speaker Series, Princeton University, Princeton NJ, USA)

• Ines Michalowski, 08.02.2010: "Testing norms and values" (INTEC Seminar, Radboud Universiteit, Nijmegen, Netherlands)

• Ruud Koopmans, 28.01.2010: "Managing integration: Ethnic relations and xenophobia" (Centro de Información y Documentación Internacionales en Barcelona, Spain)

• Marc Helbling, 08.01.2010: "Why Swiss-Germans dislike Germans. On negative attitudes towards a culturally and socially similar group" (Swiss Political Science Association, Geneva, Switzerland)


• Merlin Schaeffer, 03.12.2009: "Immigration, neighbourhood diversity and interethnic cohesion" (German-Turkish Future Workshop II on Neighborhood, Middle Eastern Technical University and Goethe Institut, Ankara, Turkey)

• Ines Michalowski, 28.11.2009: "Religiöse Minderheiten im Militär: Die USA und Deutschland im Vergleich" (Minderheiten im Militär, Arbeitskreis Militärsoziologie, Berlin)

• Ines Michalowski, 21.10.2009: "Migration, integration and education in Germany" (Fulbright Commission, Berlin)

• Marc Helbling, with Martin Dolezal (University of Munich) and Swen Hutter (University of Munich), 15.10.2009: "Conflicts over Islam in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland: Between ethnic citizenship, state-church relations and right-wing populism" (Europäische Tagung für junge Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler. Religion und Integration in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft, DVPW AK Migration, Münster)

• Ines Michalowski, 20.09.2009: "Framing Citizenship for Muslims. A comparative analysis of civic education courses and tests" (Framing Muslims across Western Europe, George Washington University, St. Louis, USA)

• Marc Helbling, 12.09.2009: "Driving and framing immigration politics in West European public spheres" (Annual Conference, ECPR, Potsdam)

• Ines Michalowski, 12.09.2009: "How integration measures transformed into integration requirements" (Annual Conference, ECPR, Potsdam)

• Marc Helbling, 11.09.2009: "Islamophobia: A new phenomenon or a new name for xenophobia?" (Annual Conference, ECPR, Potsdam)

• Evelyn Ersanilli, 10.09.2009: "Having a German passport doesn’t make me more German. Immigrants perceptions of citizenship legislation and the value of citizenship" (Annual Conference, ECPR, Potsdam)

• Marc Helbling, 10.09.2009: "Multiculturalism vs. conflict" (Annual Conference, ECPR, Potsdam)

• Marc Helbling, with Anke Tresch (University of Zurich), 05.09.2009: "Measuring party positions and issue salience from media coverage: Introducing and crossvalidating new indicators" (Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Toronto, Canada)

• Elmar Schlüter, with Johannes Ulrich (Goethe University), 16.07.2009: "Intergroup contact reduces but does not eliminate ingroup bias in residential choice" (32nd Annual Scientific Meeting, International Society of Political Psychology, Dublin, Ireland)
• Elmar Schlüter, with Eldad Davidov (University of Mannheim), 14.07.2009: "Negative media portrayals of immigrants give rise to majority members perceived group threat: A longitudinal analysis" (32nd Annual Scientific Meeting, International Society of Political Psychology, Dublin, Ireland)

• Merlin Schaeffer, 02.07.2009: "Immigration, diversity and regional potentials for civic collective action" (Harvard-Manchester Summer Workshop on Inequality and Social Change (SCHMi), Harvard University and University of Manchester, England)

• Ruud Koopmans, 30.06.2009: "Immigrant integration: Is model-thinking convincing in international comparisons?" (Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset, Madrid, Spain)

• Elmar Schlüter, with Hermann Duelmer (University of Cologne), Eldad Davidov (University of Cologne) and Peter Schmidt (University of Giessen), 30.06.2009: "Explaining noninvariance in the universalism value across 25 countries using multilevel analysis" (European Survey Research Association, Warsaw, Poland)

• Elmar Schlüter, with Bart Meuleman (Tilburg University), 30.06.2009: "Measurement inequivalence as a source of useful information. Using multi-level SEM to explain why measurements are inequivalent" (European Survey Research Association, Warsaw, Poland)

• Ruud Koopmans, 26.06.2009: "Water to the Sea? Comments on the relationship between social movements and elections" (Hot Models and Hard Conflicts: The Agenda of Comparative Political Science in the 21st Century, University of Zurich, Switzerland)

• Ines Michalowski, 23.06.2009: "Immigration and integration in Germany and the US" (Fulbright Diversity Initiative, Fulbright Commission, Berlin)

• Ruud Koopmans, 22.06.2009: "Winners and losers of Europeanisation – How European integration strengthens the influence of national governments in public debates" (Free University Berlin)

• Elmar Schlüter, 05.06.2009: "Die Analyse komplexer Messkonzepte für hierarchisch strukturierte Daten: Eine Demonstration der Anwendungspotenziale von Mehrebenen-Faktorenanalysen" (Spring conference, DVPW, AK Empirische Methoden der Politikwissenschaft, Friedrichshafen)

• Ruud Koopmans, 07.05.2009: "Ethnic retention and host culture adoption among Turkish immigrants in Germany, France and the Netherlands: A controlled comparison" (Diversity and Democratic Politics, Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada)

• Marc Helbling, 05.05.2009: "Why Swiss-Germans dislike Germans. On negative attitudes towards a culturally and socially similar group" (Center for Comparative and International Studies, Technical University Zurich and University of Zurich, Switzerland)

• Ines Michalowski, 04.05.2009: "Citizenship tests compared. Does Europe become more like the US?" (Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA)

• Ines Michalowski, 01.05.2009: "Comments on a presentation by Christophe Bertossi on integration and diversity in the French police and armed forces" (Brookings Institution, Washington DC, USA)

• Marc Helbling, with Martin Dolezal (University of Munich) and Swen Hutter (University of Munich), 24.04.2009: "Conflicts over Islam in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland: Between ethnic citizenship, state-church relations and right-wing populism" (Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Nationalities, New York, USA)

• Elmar Schlüter, with Bart Meuleman (Tilburg University), 05.04.2009: "Using multi-level structural equation models to explain why survey measurements are cross-culturally inequivalent" (7th International Amsterdam Multilevel Conference, Netherlands)
Marc Helbling, with Martin Dolezal (University of Munich) and Swen Hutter (University of Munich), 03.04.2009: "Conflicts over Islam in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland: Between ethnic citizenship, state-church relations and right-wing populism" (Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, USA)

Ruud Koopmans, 12.02.2009: "Winners and losers of Europeanisation – How European integration strengthens the influence of national governments in public debates" (Europa auf dem Prüfstand: Demokratie, Öffentlichkeits- und Identitätsdefizit der EU, University of Zurich, Switzerland)

Ruud Koopmans, 10.12.2008: "Migrantenselbstorganisationen zwischen Herkunftsländerorientierung und Interessenvertretung: Ein internationaler Vergleich" (Zivilgesellschaft und Integration, University of Münster)

Ruud Koopmans, 01.12.2008: "The two faces of best practices: Integration policies and integration outcomes" (Citizenship and Integration Policies in EU Member States, University of Maastricht, Netherlands)

Ruud Koopmans, 06.11.2008: "Tradeoffs between equality and difference – Immigrant integration, multiculturalism, and the welfare state in cross-national perspective" (University of Bremen)

Ruud Koopmans, 29.10.2008: "Integration the German, Dutch, and French Way: Comparative evidence on integration policies and outcomes“ (WZB, Berlin)

Ruud Koopmans, with Susanne Rebers, 07.06.2008: "Cultural group selection and the evolution of collective action" (20th Annual Conference of the Human Behaviour and Evolution Society, Kyoto University, Japan)

Elmar Schlüter, 15.04.2008: "Do regional differences matter? Examining the dual influence of the regional size of the immigrant population on derogation of immigrants in Europe" (Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung, Mannheim)
11. Teaching

When Ruud Koopmans moved to the WZB in April 2007, he kept his Chair in Social Conflict and Change at the Department of Sociology of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, albeit with a reduced teaching load. Because of increasing ties to Berlin colleagues, and the growing number of PhD students under his supervision in Berlin, this is no longer an optimal situation. Negotiations are now in a very advanced stage for Koopmans to take up an S-Professur at the Humboldt University Berlin, where he will start teaching during the academic year 2010-2011 in the context of the Berlin Graduate School of Social Sciences. Once this has been formally confirmed, the chair at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam will be discontinued. Koopmans will however keep a connection to the Netherlands through the other Amsterdam-based university, the Universiteit van Amsterdam. From the academic year 2010-2011 on, he will become a visiting professor at the Department of Political Science, which is also affiliated to the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies. This connection entails a limited amount of graduate teaching and supervision during short stays in Amsterdam, as well as an institutionalisation of existing research cooperation ties.

- **Marc Helbling**, Winter 10/11, University of Lucerne, Hauptstudium: "Democracy in Danger? Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe"

- **Elmar Schlüter**, Summer 10, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, PhD students: "Advanced Structural Equation Modelling"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 09/10, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Logic of Social Science Explanations"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 09/10, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Sociology of Globalisation"

- **Ines Michalowski**, Winter 09/10, Free University Berlin, Master students: "Diversität in staatlichen Institutionen"

- **Merlin Schaeffer**, Winter 09/10, Humboldt University Berlin, Bachelor students: "Soziologische Theorie"

- **Elmar Schlüter**, Winter 09/10, Humboldt University Berlin, Graduate students: "Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungsdesigns"

- **Elmar Schlüter**, Summer 09, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, PhD students: "Advanced Structural Equation Modelling"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 08/09, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Logic of Social Science Explanations"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 08/09, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Sociology of Globalisation"

- **Elmar Schlüter**, Winter 08/09, Humboldt University Berlin, Graduate students: "Introduction to Multilevel Modelling using MlwiN"

- **Elmar Schlüter**, Summer 08, Essex Summer School in Social Science Data Collection and Analysis, PhD students: "Advanced Structural Equation Modelling"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 07/08, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Logic of Social science explanations"

- **Ruud Koopmans**, Winter 07/08, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Master students: "Sociology of Globalisation"
12. Workshops and conferences organised

- **Sarah Carol**, 18.11.2009-19.11.2009: *Family and Migration*, Berlin (workshop)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 10.05.2010–12.05.2010: *The Heuristic Value of Integration Models for International Comparisons*, Berlin (workshop 4, DFG-network)
- **Marc Helbling**, 07.05.2010–08.05.2010: *Switzerland. A Nation-State or a Multi-National State?*, Aarau (workshop, in cooperation with the Center for Democracy Aarau)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 26.06.2009: *Hot Models and Hard Conflicts: The Agenda of Comparative Political Science in the 21st Century* (discussion meeting, organised with the Center for Comparative and International Studies, University of Zurich, Switzerland)
13. Guest researchers and guest lectures

Guest researchers

- Oliver Strijbis, University of St. Gallen, 01.10.2010–30.09.2011
- Akasemi Newsome, University of California, Berkeley, 05.07.2010–30.06.2011
- Prof. Dr. Damir Skenderovic, University of Fribourg, 02.07.2010–31.08.2010
- Prof. Jonathan Laurence Ph.D., Boston College, 01.06.2010–01.07.2010 (funded by the central WZB)
- Drs. Jasper C. Muis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 08.03.2010–31.05.2010
- Ali Hedayat, Institute for Advanced Studies, Lucca, 04.01.2010–30.06.2010
- Robert Braun, Cornell University, Department of Government, 04.01.2010–20.01.2010
- Laura Block, European University Institute, Florence, 01.09.2009–30.04.2010
- Prof. Paul Statham, Ph.D., University of Bristol, 01.05.2009–30.06.2009 (funded by the central WZB)
- Albrecht Metzger (journalist in residence), 01.05.2009–31.07.2009
- Nina Eggert, University of Geneva and University of Trento, 15.09.2008–31.05.2009
- Prof. Dr. Anton Steen, University of Oslo, 01.04.2008–31.05.2008
- Catarina Laranjeiro, University of Lisbon, 17.03.2008–29.07.2008
- Martin F. Meyer, University of Cambridge, 08.08.2007–26.11.2007
- Prof. Dr. Juan Diez Medrano, University of Barcelona, 01.08.2007–31.08.2007

Guest lectures

- Oded Stark (University of Klagenfurt), 01.12.2010: A theory of non-assimilation, Berlin (lecture and discussion)
- Gökçe Yurdakul (Humboldt University Berlin), 03.11.2010: Religion, culture and the politicisation of honour-related violence: A critical analysis of media and policy debate in Western Europe and North America (lecture and discussion)
- Naika Foroutan (Humboldt University Berlin), 22.09.2010: Hybride europäisch-muslimische Identitätsmodelle (lecture and discussion).
- Daniel Faas (Trinity College Dublin), 13.09.2010: Negotiating political identities: Multiethnic Schools and youth in Europe, Berlin (lecture and discussion)
- Phillip O’Connor (Princeton University), 02.09.2010: Immigrant religious adaptation: Evidence from Western Europe, the United States, and Canada (lecture and discussion)
- Jonathan Laurence (Boston College), 22.06.2010: The partial emancipation of Muslim minorities in Western Europe (lecture and discussion)
- Rahsaan Maxwell (University of Massachusetts Amherst) 16.06.2010: Incorporation tradeoffs: Ethnic minority migrants in Britain and France (lecture)
- Steffen Mau (University of Bremen), 17.03.2010: Mobility citizenship, inequality and the liberal state. A conceptual and empirical exploration (lecture and discussion)
- Steven Lukes, 10.03.2010: Multiple moralities and the diversity of morals (lecture)
- Jochem Tolsma (University of Nijmegen), 25.11.2009: Ethnic diversity and social capital. How to test Putnam’s thesis in European countries? (lecture and discussion)
- Yasemin Soysal (University of Essex), 06.11.2009: Citizenship, work, and immigration: European dilemmas (lecture)
- Marc Howard (Georgetown University), 01.07.2009: The politics of citizenship in Europe (lecture and discussion meeting)
- Lora Anne Viola and Thomas Rixen (WZB), 01.07.2009: Institutionalism and the concept of path dependency (lecture and discussion)
- Paul Statham (University of Bristol), 17.06.2009: Political Party Contestation over Europe in the Mass Media. Who Criticises Europe, How, and Why?
- Benny Geys (WZB), 10.06.2009: Bridging and bonding social capital: Methodologies for measurement and applications to Belgium, UK and US (lecture and discussion)
- Linda Tropp (University of Massachusetts Amherst), 05.05.2009: Social capital and ethnic diversity (lecture and discussion)
- Jaap Dronkers (European University Institute), 02.09.2009: Educational systems as a resource or hindrance for immigrants? The effects of educational system characteristics of both countries of origin and destination on the scientific literacy of immigrant children in Western countries (lecture and discussion)
14. Dissemination outside academia

Lectures and discussions

- **Zuhal Kavacik**, 15.11.2010: "Bildungssituation der zweiten Migrantengeneration" (Wochen des interkulturellen Miteinanders, Berlin)
- **Marc Helbling**, 04.10.2010: "Grenzenlos Arbeiten?" (Roundtable, IG BAU Bildungsstätte Steinbach/Frankfurt)
- **Ruud Koopmans**, 18.06.2010: "Benchmarking im Integrationsbereich" (Nürnberger Tage für Integration, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Nuremberg)
- **Ruud Koopmans**, 09.06.2010: "Podiumsdiskussion zu den Wahlen in den Niederlanden" (Dutch Embassy, Berlin)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 20.05.2010: "Dutch perspectives on dual citizenship" (Dual Citizenship – Help or Hindrance?, Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 29.03.2010: "Intégration et égalité des chances. Deutschland und Frankreich im Vergleich" (Office Franco-Allemand de la Jeunesse, Paris, France)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 22.01.2010: "Integrationsanforderungen. Über Leitkultur und den Umgang mit Verschiedenheit" (Deutsch-türkische Lebenswelten, Evangelische Akademie, Hofgeismar)
- **Ruud Koopmans**, 19.01.2010: "Tradeoffs between equality and difference. Immigrant integration, multiculturalism, and the welfare state in cross-national perspective" (Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes, Berlin)
- **Zuhal Kavacik**, 08.12.2009: "Berlin’s integration policy on Turkish migrants" (Goethe Institut e.V.)
- **Zuhal Kavacik**, 24.11.2009: "Die Situation von Frauen auf dem deutschen Arbeitsmarkt" (Frauen auf dem deutschen Arbeitsmarkt, Friedrich Ebert-Stiftung, Berlin)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 13.11.2009: "Einbürgerungstests in Europa" (Zeit Stiftung, Hamburg)
- **Marc Helbling**, 24.06.2009: "Reactions of European societies to migration from a comparative perspective" (Seminar on Cultural Diplomacy in Europe, Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin)
- **Ruud Koopmans**, 22.06.2009: "The nine lives of Dutch multiculturalism: Path-dependent policies and their consequences" (Democracy, Diversity and Civic Inequality: Culture and Religion in the Netherlands, Germany and Beyond, Heinrich Böll Stiftung, Berlin)
- **Zuhal Kavacik**, 06.06.2009: "Education and integration" (Interactive Workshop of Europe)
- **Ruud Koopmans**, 05.06.2009: "Conceptual logic of the critique of multiculturalism" (Podiumsdiskussion: Modelle und Erfahrungen von Einwanderungsgesellschaften im internationalen Vergleich, Haus der Kulturen der Welt, Berlin)
- **Ines Michalowski**, 25.09.2008: "Integrationskonzepte in europäischen Nachbarländern" (Annual conference of Caritas, Berlin)
Television/Radio

- Michalowski, Ines (2010): "German expellee groups reassert their history as charter turns 60." In: Deutsche Welle, 05.09.2010.
15. Examples of press resonance

"I vero: i musulmani si adattano a meno" - Il sociologo Bogomo: "Ma sono anche i più discriminati".

This is an example of press resonance from the press release.

"Das Debakel der Integration in Deutschland" - A discussion sparked by Yeha Stoeckel.

Mehalov asks if it is true that the way children are integrated into German society is more problematic for those from refugee backgrounds."

"Allgemeine Angst vor Überfremdung" - A common worry of society.

"In der Schule gibt es wie überall negativen Erfolg der Schüler. In der Schule ist es immer ein doppelter Erfolg, der einen Schüler in einer anderen Umgebung. In der Schule ist es immer ein doppelter Erfolg, der einen Schüler in einer anderen Umgebung."

"Ingen enkle løsninger" - No simple solutions.

A lack of specific solutions to the problem of integration is highlighted in the article.

"Politikere fordern Ausländerarbeit" - Politicians demand more non-EU workers.

The document contains examples of press resonance from various sources.