

Chapter 12

Does Citizenship Promote Integration? An Austrian Case Study of Immigrants from Former Yugoslavia and Turkey

Raimund Haindorfer, Department of Sociology, University of Salzburg
Max Haller, Professor Emeritus, Department of Sociology, University of Graz/
Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna

Abstract

This paper addresses the question of whether or not naturalisation promotes the integration of immigrants. The empirical basis for the study is a standardised survey comprising 600 immigrants from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia living in Austria. We investigate the differences in four aspects of (social) integration: structural integration (access to the labour market), social integration (the building-up of social relations with members of the host society), cultural integration (acquiring German-language skills and support for modern gender-role attitudes) and identificative integration (strengthening the feeling of belonging to Austria). Our hypothesis is that the attainment of citizenship supports all of these. Immigrants who became Austrian citizens are compared with those who did not – across indicators of all four aspects of integration. In multivariate regression analyses, we also include migration experience (migration background and generation as well as the length of stay in Austria) as explanatory and socio-demographic characteristics (gender, age, educational level) as control variables. The findings show the expected effects in most regards. In addition, a significant interaction effect emerges between migration background and gender, whereby Turkish women have fewer chances of finding employment than ex-Yugoslavian women in comparison with men of the same nationalities as the women. In the conclusion, we point out the methodological limitations of the study and indicate avenues for further research, both in theoretical terms and concerning empirical research designs.

1. Introduction

Citizenship is a basic resource of a person in modern societies. It provides the unlimited right to residence in a country, full access to political participation and access to all welfare-state benefits, including for persons who are not active economically. Therefore, the naturalisation of immigrants is connected with several important advantages (see Blatter, Sochin D'Elia and Buess 2018). The state grants the unconditional right to residence and provides diplomatic support in foreign countries, guaranteeing that the person will be

able to return to the country of origin whenever he or she wishes. In addition, citizenship helps decisively in many socio-economic aspects. This also applies, albeit to a lesser degree, to citizens of other EU states who already have a right to settle down and work anywhere in the European Union. What is also very important is that, through naturalisation, the immigrants acquire full political rights to participate, so they can feed their attitudes and interests into the political process. This also applies to immigrants from other EU member countries who, as “denizens”,¹ have the most social and economic rights but not full political rights and – as non-citizens – also experience several forms of open and hidden discrimination. In the EU, however, such discrimination applies particularly to third-country nationals (citizens of non-EU member states) from non-Western countries (see OECD 2015; for discrimination against immigrants in general, see Shadow Report 2017). If large numbers of immigrants are not enfranchised, this affects the legitimacy of elections and the political system in general because the electorate does not reflect the whole social structure and areas which are exempt from democratic politics emerge (Stadlmair 2018a; Valchars 2018).

The situation of immigrants without citizenship is particularly relevant in the case of Austria for two reasons. First, because Austria has become an “immigration country” since the mid-1960s (Fassmann and Münz 1995). In 1961, just 1.4 per cent of the resident population were foreigners (non-Austrian citizens); by 2017, the proportion had risen to 15.3 per cent or 1.3 million people. This is one of the highest proportions in the European Union; in Vienna alone, 30 per cent of the resident population are foreigners. The total number of residents with a migration background in Austria was around 1.9 million in 2017 – again, nearly 30 per cent of the population (Haller 2019; Statistik Austria 2018). The second reason why the situation of immigrants without national citizenship is particularly important in the case of Austria is that naturalisation has been made more difficult in recent times. In a comparison between eight European countries in the mid-1990s, Austria had the highest threshold concerning residence permits, access to the labour market, family reunification and the legal rights of second-generation immigrants (Çınar, Hofinger and Waldrauch 1995; MIPEX 2015; Valchars 2018). The legal hurdles for naturalisation have been strengthened (as in many other countries) – in addition to the restrictions (quotas) on immigration from the 1990s on; today, Austrian citizenship law is one of the most restrictive in Europe (Karasz and Perchinig 2013; Stadlmair 2018b; Valchars 2018). Two scholars wrote on this topic in 2013: “... it appears that [Austrian] citizenship law has been and is still being instrumentalized to uphold the idea of a citizenship that ought to be a ‘precious’ good and ‘needs to be earned’” (Stern and Valchars 2013,

¹ In biology, the term “denizen” refers to an animal or plant living in a specific place; historically, the concept referred to a privileged status of foreigners granted by the English monarchy; in the social sciences, it means a foreigner with a right to permanent settlement and, maybe, some other socio-economic rights.

46). From the perspective of the Austrian government, an integration policy requiring many preconditions (such as long-term residence, good knowledge of German and a steady and considerable income) has the advantage that those who attain citizenship are already better integrated (Koopmans 2015).

2. Literature review and hypotheses

Naturalisation – the acquisition of citizenship after birth based on an individual application – can have several positive effects on integration. As mentioned above, it provides full access to welfare-state benefits and state services, it supports access to the labour and housing markets by reducing open and hidden discrimination and it bestows the right of access to all jobs in public administration. For employers, it indicates that a person is already well integrated and committed to remaining in the country and it reduces their administrative costs. The main reason why the effect of naturalisation could be weak or even absent is a selection effect: naturalisation might only be a final step of integration for those immigrants who already made previous successful efforts to integrate. For Sweden, Scott (2008) and Engdahl (2011) came to this conclusion.

Several studies have been carried out about the relevance of naturalisation for the process of integration (see Peters and Vink 2016 for an overview). For several North American and European countries, Bratsberg, Ragan and Nasir (2002) and Helgertz, Bevelander and Tegunimataka (2014) found a positive association between citizenship acquisition and labour-market integration. For the Netherlands, a country with a very high number of naturalisations, Bevelander and Veenman (2006a) found a positive effect on labour-market integration and income, except for Mediterranean immigrants. For immigrants from Morocco and Turkey, no positive effect of naturalisation on employment and cultural integration was found (Bevelander and Veenman 2006b). For Germany, Steinhardt (2012) re-analysed a large, representative employment survey (including 60,000 persons, a 2 per cent sample of the employed population) in both a cross-sectional and a panel (longitudinal) design. Steinhardt (2012) also found a significant positive effect of naturalisation on wages, which occurred in two ways: as an immediate effect of naturalisation and as an accelerated wage growth in the years after naturalisation. The OECD held a comprehensive seminar on this topic with participants from many countries; in 2008, in the whole OECD area, the number of naturalisations exceeded 2 million people (OECD 2011). The result of the presentations of data from many European and North American countries at this seminar was that naturalisation enhances labour-market integration, particularly access to higher-skilled occupations and the public sector. Hainmüller, Hangartner and Pietrantuono (2017) detected that naturalisation fosters political participation in Switzerland; Just and Anderson (2012) found the same for many European countries. However, Bartram (2019), in a panel study, concluded that, in Britain, the effect of naturalisation was absent or even negative –

people who became British citizens later reported less interest in politics and were less likely to participate in organisations. He explains this divergent finding by the fact that both the strict requirements for naturalisation and the mandatory citizenship ceremony alienate those new citizens who do not already feel genuinely British before naturalisation. In our study, we compare two groups of immigrants to Austria from the former Yugoslavia and Turkey – one group who had attained Austrian citizenship and another who had not. The study is methodically limited regarding the identification of a true causal relationship between citizenship and integration because we did not conduct a panel study investigating immigrants both before and after naturalisation. However, in comparison with prior research, this study has two strengths. First, we not only investigate the effects of naturalisation on economic outcomes such as labour-market access and income but, instead, include three additional aspects of integration (social, cultural and identificative integration). Second, we can compare two well-defined, different groups of immigrants – those from the former Yugoslavia and those from Turkey. Here, we can rely on a special survey in Austria which has been carried out and analysed intensively regarding other aspects by a group of sociologists (Aschauer, Beham-Rabanser, Bodi-Fernandez, Haller and Muckenhuber 2019). Based on general considerations about the relevance of citizenship for integration outcomes and the relevant research evidence presented, we propose the following two sets of hypotheses on the effect of naturalisation and the migration experience on integration (1 and 2) and include socio-demographic characteristics (3) as controls.

2.1 The naturalisation effect

The first and basic hypothesis is that naturalisation will have a positive effect on integration outcomes in the host society in all its four aspects – i.e. structural, social, cultural and identificative integration. These four dimensions can be conceived as crucial dimensions of integration (Esser 2009; Heckmann 2015). More precisely, immigrants with Austrian citizenship in comparison to those without it will have a greater likelihood of being employed (structural integration); they will have more contacts with Austrians and will agree more frequently to interethnic marriages (social integration); they will have better German-language skills and will more frequently reject traditional gender roles (cultural integration); they will have a more pronounced sense of national belonging to Austria and will be more interested in events in the host society (identificative integration).

2.2 The migration experience

The integration achievements of immigrants may also depend on their specific migration background, generation and length of stay in the host society.

- a. *Migration background*: prior analysis of the SSÖ Migration Survey 2016 showed that immigrants from the former Yugoslavia are generally better integrated and identify

more frequently with Austria than immigrants from Turkey; however, in both samples there was a trend towards an increase in integration in line with the duration of residence in Austria (Aschauer et al. 2019). One main reason for these findings is certainly that people from ex-Yugoslavia are more similar to autochthonous Austrians in religious (most of them are Christians) and linguistic terms, while nearly all immigrants from Turkey are Muslims and the Turkish language is also quite different from Indo-European languages. Yugoslavia has also had a higher GDP per capita and was under the influence of communism for several decades so that traditional social attitudes will be less prevalent there than in Turkey. Additional reasons for diverging integration outcomes among the two groups of immigrants in Austria are related to the recent socio-economic and political situation in the two countries of origin. First, the economic and political situation after the downfall of Yugoslavia was (and in some ways still is) somewhat worse than in Turkey; around 100,000 people fled from the wars in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo to Austria in the 1990s. They might have been comparatively happy to find shelter in Austria and therefore quite ready to integrate. Second, immigrants from Turkey are politically and emotionally more connected to their country of origin (Müller-Kmet and Bodi-Fernandez 2019). They are also highly exposed to political influence and pressure from the Turkish government and the media as well as from compatriots living in Austria (Aschauer et al. 2019; Riegler 2000). Based on these considerations and empirical findings, we expect a significant difference in integration outcomes between immigrants from the former Yugoslavia and those from Turkey; the first will be better integrated than the latter.

- b. *Migration generation and length of stay in Austria:* as mentioned above, a prior study found a trend towards an increase of integration according to the duration of residence in Austria (Aschauer et al. 2019). This empirical finding is also reflected in many other studies on the integration of immigrants (Heckmann 2015; Koopmans 2015) and in the theoretical literature that argues that integration can take time (Castles, Korac, Vasta and Vertovec 2002; Esser 2009). Against this background, we suggest that the second generation of immigrants (in comparison with the first generation) as well as immigrants with a longer length of stay in Austria do show better integration outcomes. It is important to point out that, by including the variables of migration generation and length of stay in Austria in our analyses, we also control for the temporal differences between the immigrants in the survey that probably influence both their integration achievements and their probability of gaining Austrian citizenship.

2.3 Socio-demographic characteristics

We expect that several of these characteristics are relevant for the degree of integration and possibly also for the effect of naturalisation on integration. As these are probably con-

founder variables (Frank 2000) in the relationship between citizenship and integration, it is important to adjust for them in the multivariate analyses; we include respondents' gender, age and educational level.

3. Data and methods of analysis

3.1 *The SSÖ Migration Survey 2016*

The empirical basis for our analysis is the SSÖ Migration Survey 2016² – an additional survey on migrants in the course of the data collection for the fourth Social Survey Austria (SSÖ) in 2016. The focus was on the two biggest non-German-speaking immigration groups – i.e. those from the former Yugoslavia (ex-Yugoslavia) and Turkey. The SSÖ Migration Survey 2016 was carried out by the Institute for Empirical Social Research (IFES) in Vienna. The IFES used an onomastic (name-based) sampling procedure based on the official telephone directories as there are no complete directories for persons with a migration background in Austria and those of the second and third generations who belong to the defined target group. Sampling based on country-specific names from the official telephone directory (the onomastic method) is deemed to be a feasible way of attaining a good sample of ethnic minorities. The survey was conducted by Computer Assisted Telephone Interviews (CATI) in German or in the language of the immigrants.³ In total, 600 interviews with persons with a migration background from Turkey (n = 300) and ex-Yugoslavia (n = 300) resident in Austria was able to be realised (cf. Bodi-Fernandez, Hadler and Meyer 2019, 313–318). However, the SSÖ Migration Survey 2016 cannot be considered as representative, as several biases can be seen in comparison to the Austrian micro census – for instance, its interviewees are clearly better qualified and more often employed. As there exist no official weighting data for the target groups of the SSÖ survey, no weighting could be carried out (therefore, all analyses in the present article are based on unweighted data). However, representativity is no precondition for the testing of hypotheses on relationships between variables within the survey. Therefore, although we cannot draw inferences on the statistical distribution of our variables in the total migrant population, the sample can be considered as a valid basis for investigating group differences and relationships between variables regarding the attitudes and characteristics of immigrants (cf. Bodi-Fernandez et al. 2019, 325–326).

² For data access we would like to thank Lorenz Makula and Otto Bodi-Fernandez from AUSSDA – The Austrian Social Science Data Archive (<https://aussda.at/en/>).

³ The respondents could choose between the German, Turkish or Croatian/Serbian/Bosnian languages.

3.2 *Dependent variables: structural, social, cultural and identificative integration*

In Table 12.1 the descriptive statistics for the variables of the regression analyses are presented, both for the total sample and separately for the groups with a migration background from ex-Yugoslavia (YUG) and Turkey (TUR) who hold (CIT) and do not hold (N-CIT) Austrian citizenship. The following variables were used for the operationalisation of the main indicators:

- *Structural integration*: a dichotomous variable measuring whether or not the respondents are *currently employed*;⁴
- *Social integration* is measured through two variables – first, by a variable on the *share of Austrians in social contact* (1 = nobody, 2 = a few, 3 = about half, 4 = most, 5 = all);⁵ secondly, by a question on the *agreement on potential interethnic marriages* (1 = no way, 4 = yes, definitely). The latter variable is a mean score of two items that were, on the one hand, asking if it would be okay if the person's son (or if he or she had a son) married an Austrian woman and, on the other, asking if it would be okay if the person's daughter (or if he or she had a daughter) married an Austrian man (1 = in no way, 2 = rather not, 3 = perhaps, 4 = yes, definitely). The reliability of the scale was sufficiently high (Cronbachs Alpha = 0.9).
- *Cultural integration*: immigrants' *German-language skills* (1 = very bad/not at all, 5 = very good) which also is a mean score of two items comprising language skills in terms of the ability to (a) understand Austrians when they are talking German and (b) to read and fill out forms in German (1 = very bad/not at all, 2 = quite bad, 3 = moderate, 4 = good, 5 = very good) (Cronbachs Alpha was again sufficiently high: 0.9).⁶
- *Agreement on traditional gender roles*: we used the item "It is the duty of the man to earn money, it is the duty of the woman to look after the household and the children" (1 = agree, 2 = partly, 3 = disagree).
- *Identificative integration*, understood as emotional orientation towards a group (cf. Esser 2009), is operationalised by two variables. First, by the variable *sense of national belonging* (1 = as Turk, Kurd, Croat..., 2 = rather as Turk, Kurd, Croat..., 3 = both as Austrian and as Turk, Kurd, Croat..., 4 = rather as Austrian, 5 = as Austrian) and, second, by the question *interest in events in Austria* (1 = never, 2 = rarer, 3 = a couple of times a year, 4 = a couple of times a month, 5 = several times a week, 6 = daily), measuring the frequency of informing oneself.

⁴ It should be said that this variable only includes such persons who have previously been employed in Austria.

⁵ The respondents' social contacts include relatives, friends or acquaintances outside of the respondents' households in the previous two weeks.

⁶ It should be mentioned that this variable includes only those persons whose first language is not German.

Table 12.1. Descriptive statistics for the variables of the regression analyses

			Total (n=578)	YUG- CIT (n=174)	YUG- N-CIT (n=110)	TUR- CIT (n=168)	TURN- CIT (n=126)
	Min	Max	% / Mean (SD)				
Independent variables							
Citizenship							
<i>Austrian</i> (n=578)							
No	0	1	40.8	0	100	0	100
Yes	0	1	59.2	100	0	100	0
Migration experience							
<i>Background</i> (country of birth of both parents) (n=578)							
Turkey	0	1	50.9	0	0	100	100
Ex-Yugoslavia	0	1	49.1	100	100	0	0
<i>Migration generation</i> (i.e. respondent is not born [1 st G.] vs born in Austria [2 nd G.]) (n=578)							
1st generation	0	1	76.5	74.7	87.3	66.1	83.3
2nd generation	0	1	23.5	25.3	12.7	33.9	16.7
<i>Length of stay in Austria</i> (i.e. age minus age at arrival in Austria or age if born in Austria; in years) (n=577)							
	2	72	27.84 (11.68)	32.47 (13.00)	24.30 (10.75)	29.40 (9.53)	22.48 (10.06)
Socio-demographic characteristics							
<i>Gender</i> (n=578)							
Female	0	1	50.0	63.2	45.5	45.2	42.1
Male	0	1	50.0	36.8	54.5	54.8	57.9
<i>Age</i> (in years) (n=578)							
	16	91	42.58 (14.60)	46.59 (16.39)	44.89 (14.93)	39.55 (12.89)	39.04 (12.03)
<i>Educational level</i> (i.e. highest school-leaving qualification) (n=578)							
Compulsory school	0	1	24.4	16.1	20.0	22.0	42.9
Apprenticeship/ vocational mid-level school	0	1	40.7	46.6	47.3	35.7	33.3
High-School certificate (i.e. Matura, Abitur)	0	1	23.0	23.0	19.1	29.2	18.3
University, FH	0	1	11.9	14.4	13.6	13.1	5.6

			Total (n=578)	YUG- CIT (n=174)	YUG- N-CIT (n=110)	TUR- CIT (n=168)	TURN- CIT (n=126)
	Min	Max	% / Mean (SD)				
Dependent variables							
<i>Structural integration</i>							
Currently employed (n=536)							
No	0	1	31.0	31.0	33.3	27.2	34.3
Yes (dependently or independently)	0	1	69.0	69.0	66.7	72.8	65.7
<i>Social integration</i>							
Share of Austrians in social contacts (1=none, 5=all) (n=550)	1	5	2.48 (1.13)	3.01 (1.20)	2.50 (0.99)	2.34 (1.01)	1.91 (0.95)
Agreement on potential interethnic marriages (i.e. mean score of two items) (1=in no way, 4=yes, definitely) (n=547)	1	4	3.48 (0.91)	3.89 (0.36)	3.90 (0.39)	3.24 (0.98)	2.85 (1.17)
<i>Cultural integration</i>							
German language skills (i.e. mean score of two items; includes only those persons whose first language is not German) (1=very bad/not at all, 5=very good) (n=529)	1	5	4.29 (0.92)	4.77 (0.46)	4.30 (0.87)	4.33 (0.84)	3.62 (1.05)
Agreement on traditional gender roles (1=agree, 3=disagree) (n=574)	1	3	2.44 (0.75)	2.64 (0.61)	2.41 (0.78)	2.32 (0.79)	2.37 (0.78)
<i>Identificative integration</i>							
Sense of national belonging (1=as Turk, Kurd, Croat..., 5=as Austrian) (n=557)	1	5	3.06 (1.13)	3.66 (1.05)	2.92 (1.10)	3.01 (1.06)	2.46 (0.95)
Interest in events in Austria (i.e. frequency of informing oneself) (1=never, 6=daily) (n=573)	1	6	5.29 (1.28)	5.57 (0.91)	5.53 (1.00)	5.30 (1.16)	4.66 (1.78)

Source: SSÖ Migration Survey 2016; own calculations.

3.3 Independent variables: the role of citizenship and migration experience (explanatory variables) and socio-demographic characteristics (control variables)

To prove the hypotheses, we use a number of independent variables that can be summarised under the headings of citizenship, migration experience and socio-demographic characteristics. Regarding citizenship, we differentiate between those immigrants who do not have and those who have *Austrian citizenship* (0 = no, 1 = yes). To comprehensively capture the effects of the migration experience on the integration outcomes, three variables are used: (a) the *migration background* – measured as the country of birth of both parents (0 = Turkey, 1 = ex-Yugoslavia),⁷ (b) the *migration generation* (i.e. respondent was not born in Austria [first generation] vs was born in Austria [second generation]) (0 = first generation, 1 = second generation) and (c) *length of stay in Austria* (i.e. age in years minus age at arrival in Austria or age if born in Austria). In terms of socio-demographic characteristics, we include in our analysis respondents' *gender* (0 = female, 1 = male), *age* (in years) and *educational level* (i.e. highest school-leaving qualification) (0 = apprenticeship/vocational mid-level school, 1 = for various categories; see Table 12.1). In the regression analysis on explaining employment, we additionally include the interaction term *migration background*gender*.

3.4 Methods of data analysis

In our data analysis we use descriptive tables as well as multivariate analyses. For this latter we chose methods of multiple regression analysis. According to the scale level of the various dependent variables, we apply linear regression if it is quasi-metric, ordinal logistic regression in the case of one ordinal variable (agreement on traditional gender roles) and binary logistic regression in the case of one dichotomous variable (currently employed). Multiple regression analysis allows us to explicitly control for several other factors that simultaneously have effects on the dependent variable alongside the central "causal" factor. Therefore, it is more amenable to *ceteris paribus* analysis than bivariate regression (cf. Wooldridge 2013, 68). We are aware, however, that we cannot establish a true causal relationship and conclude definitely from our findings whether naturalisation *per se* has an effect or not; a more successful integration of naturalised persons could also be the consequence of a selection effect, since well-integrated people may apply more frequently for citizenship.

⁷ This definition of a migration background excludes persons with mixed-origin parents (admittedly, those were non-existent in the survey) as well as persons with at least one parent born in Austria (21 persons in the survey) (Bodi-Fernandez et al. 2019, 319ff). We use this narrow definition of a migration background, since we want to have a clear comparison of groups with a Turkish and those with an ex-Yugoslavian migration background.

4. Empirical findings

Firstly, we take a close look at the results of the multivariate regression analyses and discuss the contribution of the various independent variables in explaining the integration outcomes of the immigrants under study. Secondly, we provide additional descriptive findings on the integration differences that exist with regards to the migration background, citizenship status and length of stay in Austria among the studied groups.

4.1 Findings of the multivariate regression analyses: the effects of citizenship, migration experience and socio-demographic characteristics on integration outcomes

- a. *Naturalisation effect*: in nearly all the integration outcomes under investigation (see Tables 12.2 and 12.3), naturalisation shows a significant positive effect. More precisely, immigrants holding Austrian citizenship show a higher probability of being currently employed (structural integration), of having a higher share of Austrians among their social contacts, more agreement on potential interethnic marriages (social integration), better German-language skills (cultural integration) and a more pronounced feeling of belonging to Austria (identificative integration) than those who do not have Austrian citizenship. These correlations are significant after controlling for many other variables that account for differences in migration experience and socio-demographic characteristics. However, in terms of gender-role attitudes and interest in events in the host society (further indicators of cultural as well as identificative integration) there is no significant correlation with citizenship status. In other words, better or worse integration outcomes in these matters seem to be independent of whether the immigrant is naturalised or not. Concerning gender-role attitudes, which are primarily framed by migration background, gender and educational level, this finding is plausible to some extent. However, with respect to a person's interest in events in Austria, it is surely surprising that his or her citizenship status should not be relevant. It might be expected that someone's interest in events in the host society would grow significantly when being a citizen of that country. Still, our findings regarding the naturalisation effect support, by and large, our first and most important hypothesis – that naturalisation has a positive effect on integration outcomes in the host society in its four aspects of structural, social, cultural and identificative integration. Let us now discuss the role of the other variables used for explaining integration outcomes in the presence of the citizenship-status variable. Firstly, we take a look at the independent variables that are used to measure the respondents' migration experience.
- b. *Migration experience*: we can see that those with an ex-Yugoslavian background are significantly better integrated in every respect than immigrants with a Turkish background. This is in line with our theoretical considerations and hence corroborates our hypothesis. The results regarding the differences in the integration outcomes be-

tween the different migration generations can be summarised as follows: in contrast to being an immigrant from the first generation, belonging to the second generation significantly lowers the chances of being currently employed (structural integration) and lowers the share of Austrians among a person's social contacts (social integration) as well as his or her interest in events in Austria (identificative integration). In all the other integration indicators, no significant difference between the first and the second generation emerges.

The length of stay in Austria, a further variable used for operationalising the migration experience, is significantly positively related to the share of Austrians among a person's social contacts (social integration), German-language skills (cultural integration), sense of national belonging and interest in events in Austria (identificative integration). There are no significant relationships with the other three integration aspects (employment, attitudes towards gender roles and interethnic marriages). However, our hypothesis that integration increases with the duration of residence in the host society is mostly supported. Nevertheless, in terms of the generational differences in the integration outcomes, a somewhat opposite trend was observed, insofar as the second generation is less-well integrated than the first generation in some ways. It is important to add that, in the full regression models presented in this article, average integration differences between the first and the second generations are calculated after adjusting for their potential differences in the other characteristics included. Thus far, the average integration differences between immigrants of the first and the second generation are estimated *ceteris paribus* (i.e. all else being equal or, in other words, when they are of the same age and gender and when they exhibit the same length of stay in Austria etc.). Moreover, after controlling for the length of stay in Austria and age, it is questionable what effect remains of the migration-generation variable. Nevertheless, we decided to use all of these time-related variables (length of stay in Austria, migration generation and age) in our models in order to estimate their isolated effects on the integration outcomes. However, as they are isolated effects, they should also not be over-interpreted.

- c. *Socio-demographic characteristics*: the various regression analyses show that respondents' socio-demographic characteristics are important as well in explaining integration outcomes. Male immigrants show significantly better integration results than female immigrants in most of the aspects of integration investigated here. For instance, male immigrants are more often in agreement with potential interethnic marriages (social integration) and are more interested in events in the Austrian host society (identificative integration) than their female counterparts. Only one exception to this pattern of significant gender differences in integration exists in the agreement on traditional gender roles (cultural integration); males do agree more strongly with these than females, who are the ones suffering from these traditional gender roles. On the contrary, no significant gender differences exist in German-language skills

Table 12.2. Logistic regressions: effects of citizenship on being employed and on gender role attitudes

	Binary logistic regression		Ordinal logistic regression
	Currently employed (0=No, 1=Yes)		Agreement on traditional gender roles (1=agree, 3=disagree)
	M I	M II (incl. interaction)	
	Exp(B)	Exp(B)	Estimate
Citizenship			
<i>Austrian citizenship</i> (Ref. No)			
Yes	1.544 ⁺	1.525 ⁺	0.076
Migration experience			
<i>Migration background</i> (Ref. Turkey)			
Ex-Yugoslavia	1.562 ⁺	2.272 ^{**}	0.644 ^{***}
<i>Migration generation</i> (Ref. 1 st gen)			
2 nd generation	0.287 ^{**}	0.309 ^{**}	0.018
<i>Length of stay in Austria</i> (in years)	1.018	1.015	0.001
Socio-demographic characteristics			
<i>Gender</i> (Ref. female)			
Male	1.860 ^{**}	2.701 ^{**}	-0.591 ^{**}
<i>Age</i> (in years)	0.916 ^{***}	0.916 ^{***}	-0.025 [*]
<i>Educational level</i> (Ref. apprenticeship/ vocational mid-level school)			
Compulsory school	0.738	0.723	-0.199
High-school certificate (Matura, Abitur)	0.784	0.755	0.405 ⁺
University, FH	1.584	1.484	0.796 [*]
Migration background*Sex	-	0.460 ⁺	-
Constant	45.424 ^{***}	39.652 ^{***}	
N	535	535	573
Nagelkerkes R² (binary regression)			
Pseudo R² (Nagelkerke) (ordinal regression)	0.223	0.231	0.111

Source: SSÖ Migration Survey 2016; own calculations.

Notes: Significance levels: ⁺p < 0.1, ^{*}p < 0.05, ^{**}p < 0.01, ^{***}p < 0.001.

(cultural integration) and the sense of national belonging (identificative integration). With regards to differences between the gender groups in the likelihood of being currently employed (structural integration), we additionally calculated an interaction term between migration background and gender. The significant interaction

Table 12.3. Linear regressions: the effects of citizenship on social contacts with Austrians, attitudes toward interethnic marriages, German-language skills, the sense of national belonging and interest in events in Austria

	Share of Austrians among social contacts (1=no-body, 5=all)	Agreement on potential interethnic marriage (1=in no way, 4=yes, definitely)	German-language skills (1=very bad/not at all, 5=very good)	Sense of national belonging (1=as Turk/Kurd/Croat..., 5=as Austrian)	Interest in events in Austria (i.e. frequency of self-informing) (1=never, 6=daily)
	Beta				
Citizenship					
<i>Austrian citizenship</i> (Ref. No)					
Yes	0.139**	0.077 ⁺	0.172***	0.201***	0.051
Migration experience					
<i>Migration background</i> (Ref.: Turkey)					
Ex-Yugoslavia	0.280***	0.421***	0.366***	0.226***	0.168***
<i>Migration generation</i> (Ref. First generation)					
Second generation	-0.123*	0.039	-0.043	-0.013	-0.118*
<i>Length of stay in Austria</i> (in years)	0.269***	0.043	0.477***	0.263***	0.274***
Socio-demographic characteristics					
<i>Gender</i> (Ref. Female)					
Male	0.102*	0.069 ⁺	0.006	-0.030	0.081*
<i>Age</i> (in years)	-0.159*	0.092	-0.623***	-0.042	-0.100
<i>Educational level</i> (Ref. Apprenticeship/vocational mid-level school)					
Most compulsory school	-0.083 ⁺	-0.103 ⁺	-0.191***	-0.053	-0.142**
Higher School Certificate (i.e. Matura, Arbitur)	0.068	0.020	0.039	-0.043	0.085 ⁺
University, FH	0.028	-0.031	0.109**	-0.065	0.047
Constant¹	1.741***	2.644***	4.512***	2.107***	4.537***
N	549	546	528	556	572
Corrected R²	0.164	0.232	0.454	0.198	0.120

Source: SSÖ Migration Survey 2016; own calculations.

Notes: Significance levels: ⁺p < 0.1, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001. ¹ For the constant the unstandardised regression coefficients B are shown.

Table 12.4. Average integration differences according to immigrants' migration background, citizenship status and length of stay in Austria (means)

	Currently employed¹ (0=No, 1=Yes)	Agreement on traditional gender roles (1=agree, 3=disagree)	Share of Austrians among social contacts (1=nobody, 5=all)	Agreement on potential interethnic marriages (1=in no way, 4=yes, definitely)	German-language skills (1=very bad/not at all, 5=very good)	Sense of national belonging (1=as Turk/Kurd/Croat..., 5=as Austrian)	Interest in events in Austria (i.e. frequency of self-informing) (1=never, 6=daily)
YUG-CIT							
(≤ 25 years) (n = 81)	0.82*	2.70	2.81	3.86	4.79	3.34**	5.41**
YUG-CIT							
(> 25 years) (n = 92) (ref.)	0.58	2.58	3.18	3.92	4.76	3.95	5.71
YUG-N-CIT							
(≤ 25 years) (n = 65)	0.74	2.47	2.48**	3.93	4.31*	2.80***	5.45***
YUG-N-CIT							
(> 25 years) (n = 45)	0.57	2.33	2.52*	3.85	4.27**	3.07***	5.65**
TUR-CIT							
(≤ 25 years) (n = 69)	0.63	2.45	2.43**	3.16***	4.49	2.86***	4.96***
TUR-CIT							
(> 25 years) (n = 99)	0.79*	2.22*	2.27***	3.30***	4.22***	3.11***	5.55***
TUR-N-CIT							
(≤ 25 years) (n = 87)	0.73	2.45	1.83***	2.73***	3.59***	2.32***	4.55***
TUR-N-CIT							
(> 25 years) (n = 39)	0.51	2.18	2.08***	3.10**	3.68***	2.74***	4.92***
Total (n) (n = 577)	535	573	549	546	528	556	572

Source: SSÖ Migration Survey 2016; own calculations.

Notes: Significance levels: *p < 0.1, **p < 0.05, ***p < 0.01, ****p < 0.001. Statistical differences of means to the reference group "YUG-CIT (> 25 years)" were tested by using Tukey-HSD (for the dependent variable "Sense of national belonging") and Games-Howell (for the other dependent variables). ¹ For the sake of consistency, means are also calculated for the dichotomous variable of being employed, which could also be presented in the form of percentages.

term (see Table 12.2 MII) means that the difference between ex-Yugoslavian men's and women's probability of being currently employed is significantly lower than the difference between those of Turkish men and women; in other words, the difference between the gender groups varies according to the migration background, whereby Turkish women have fewer chances of employment than ex-Yugoslavian women in comparison to their male counterparts.

Our analysis also reveals some significant age differences in integration achievements, all of which were negative; this means that younger immigrants are – after controlling for a number of variables – on average better integrated than older ones. For instance, we see, not unexpectedly, that the agreement on traditional gender roles (cultural integration) is more pronounced among our elderly respondents. It is remarkable, however, that no significant age effect exists in any of the indicators for identificative integration as well as in the agreement on potential interethnic marriages (social integration). Finally, there are no significant differences, according to educational level, in the probability of being currently employed (supposedly because the question is whether one is employed or not, regardless of the quality of the job) and in regard to a person's sense of national belonging (which is more unexpected). However, the integration of immigrants is, in general, more advanced when they possess a higher educational level. For instance, higher-educated immigrants do have better German-language skills (cultural integration) and agree more on potential interethnic marriages (social integration) than immigrants with a lower educational level. Our results therefore support prior findings that immigrants' integration outcomes do correlate positively with educational level.

4.2 Additional descriptive findings: average integration differences according to immigrants' migration background, citizenship status and length of stay in Austria

Here we present some additional descriptive findings on the integration differences that exist concerning the migration background, citizenship status and length of stay in Austria of the immigrants in our study. In order to compare the average differences in integration between immigrants having and not having Austrian citizenship, we also include their length of stay in Austria (up to 25 years vs more than 25 years) to account for their duration of residence in Austria.⁸ This leads us to a typology of eight different groups that are compared in terms of their average integration outcomes (means) (see Table 12.4). For the comparison of the average integration outcomes between the different groups, those with a migration background from ex-Yugoslavia who have lived in Austria for more than 25 years were chosen as the reference group. According to the

⁸ The categories for the length of stay in Austria were chosen widely (up to 25 years vs more than 25 years) in order to have a sufficient number of cases in each of the comparison groups.

regression analyses above, this group of immigrants is supposed to be the most integrated. Except for the average integration outcomes of being employed, this immigrant group indeed shows the best integration results in all respects, thereby confirming the multivariate findings.

5. Concluding remarks

Austria is a country with an exceptionally large number of immigrants in recent years. Official statistics as well as several studies have shown that the overall integration of immigrants is relatively good (Aschauer et al. 2019; Haller 2019; Statistik Austria 2018). At the same time, however, the legal situation makes it quite difficult for immigrants to attain Austrian citizenship (see [Chapter 10](#) by Bauböck and Valchars in this volume). Our question was whether or not having host-country citizenship supports the integration of immigrants in Austria. Several but not all studies in different European countries have found such an effect. We used a survey of persons with a migration background who had immigrated to Austria from the former Yugoslavia and Turkey. By comparing those who are Austrian citizens with those who are not, we were able to test our central question. We looked at four different aspects of integration: structural integration (employment), social integration (social contacts with Austrians and agreement on interethnic marriages), cultural integration (knowledge of German and disagreement on traditional gender roles) and identificative integration (sense of national belonging and interest in events in Austria). Using multivariate analysis in order to control for other variables (such as age and migration generation), we found that naturalisation had a positive effect on integration in five out of seven indicators. No effect of naturalisation was found for gender-role attitudes (cultural integration) or interest in Austrian affairs (identificative integration). Thus, our central hypothesis has been affirmed by the empirical findings. This is in accordance with several other studies carried out in different European countries. Bratsberg et al. (2002) and Helgertz et al. (2014) found a positive effect of naturalisation on later income; Bevelander and Veenman (2006a) and Blatter et al. (2018) found positive effects on labour-market integration; a summary of additional studies is given in Prokic-Breuer, Dronkers and Vink (2013).

However, we should also point out some methodological limitations of our study that we have already mentioned above. A first concerns the problem of the representativity of the sample. It is obvious that, in the sample used, better-educated people were over-represented (Bodi-Fernandez et al. 2019). It is hard to say, however, what the findings might have been had we had a fully representative sample; there exists no obvious reason why they should be different. The second limitation is that the absolute numbers in the sample are quite low, which is often the case in surveys on or embracing immigrants. The third limitation is that our study is only a cross-sectional, one-time snapshot. Thus, we cannot establish a true causal relationship and conclude definitely, from our findings, whether

naturalisation *per se* has a positive effect on integration. A more successful integration of naturalised persons could also be the consequence of a selection effect, since well-integrated people may apply more frequently for citizenship. Moreover, the relationship between citizenship and integration is probably reciprocal: naturalisation may enhance integration and integration may enhance a person's readiness to apply for naturalisation. The fourth limitation is closely linked to the fifth. Unfortunately, the survey did not ask whether a respondent had obtained Austrian citizenship by birth or by naturalisation. Since we also include immigrants of the second generation in our analysis, there may be a significant number in our sample who are Austrian citizens by birth (if either one of their parents obtained Austrian citizenship by naturalisation or is an Austrian citizen by birth) or who were naturalised upon application by their parents while they were minors. For these categories, the expected effects of citizenship should be different from those who naturalised as adults, as their life and integration process already started once they were awarded Austrian citizenship. Consequently, the self-selection of better-integrated immigrants into naturalisation should be a minor issue among these categories as this would be the only way for them to do so. Future research could address any differences between the various categories of immigrants.

Finally, we would like to highlight questions and possibilities for future research on this topic. First, additional theoretical considerations are necessary concerning the relationship between naturalisation and integration. Some authors have argued – also with supporting empirical evidence – that high hurdles to naturalisation support integration because they induce immigrants to make personal efforts – for instance, to improve their knowledge of the national language. Besides, a very fast and easy process of naturalisation could also dispose some immigrants to rely on welfare-state support (Heckmann 2015; Koopmans 2015; Prokic-Breuer et al. 2013). A study by Peters, Vink and Schmeets (2018) indicates that naturalisation has a positive impact on the economic integration of immigrants in the Netherlands even before naturalisation occurs, as

the employment probability of naturalising migrants already develops faster during the years leading up to citizenship acquisition, even when controlling for the endogeneity of naturalisation. We conclude that it is not just the positive signal of citizenship that improves employment opportunities, but also migrants' human capital investment in anticipation of naturalisation (Peters et al. 2018, 1051).

In a nutshell, whether high hurdles for naturalisation support integration or whether naturalisation fosters integration instead – or even both of these processes – can be beneficial in terms of the integration outcomes of immigrants and probably also depends to a great extent on their regional, social and cultural origin and their personal resources.

In terms of empirical research, two challenges should be addressed in future studies. One is to invent research designs which enable us to capture the real effect of naturalisation. Panel studies, looking at the same people over a number of years, would be one

possibility. Another fruitful research design would be a comparative approach. Here we should look at countries with different rules for naturalisation but comparable groups of immigrants and investigate, in each of them, how the process of integration actually works.

References

- Aschauer, W., Beham-Rabanser, M., Bodi-Fernandez, O., Haller, M. and Muckenhuber, J. (eds) 2019. *Die Lebenssituation von Migrantinnen und Migranten in Österreich. Ergebnisse einer Umfrage unter Zugewanderten*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Bartram, D. 2019. The UK citizenship process: political integration or marginalization? *Sociology*, 53(4): 671–688.
- Bevelander, P. and Veenman, J. 2006a. *Naturalization and Socioeconomic Integration. The Case of the Netherlands*. Bonn: Institute of Labor Economics, IZA Discussion Paper No. 2153. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=908239 (accessed 03 December 2020).
- Bevelander, P. and Veenman, J. 2006b. Naturalization and employment integration of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants in the Netherlands, *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 7: 327–349.
- Blatter, J., Sochin D'Elia, M. and Buess, M. 2018. *Bürgerschaft und Demokratie in Zeiten transnationaler Migration. Hintergründe, Chancen und Risiken der Doppelbürgerschaft*. Bern-Wabern: Eidgenössische Migrationskommission EKM, Research report. Available at: <https://www.ekm.admin.ch/dam/data/ekm/dokumentation/materialien/ekm-studie-doppelbuenger-d.pdf> (accessed 04 December 2020).
- Bodi-Fernandez, O., Hadler, M. and Mayer, C. 2019. Die Methodik der Zusatzerhebung unter Migrantinnen und Migranten im Rahmen des Sozialen Survey Österreich 2016, in Aschauer, W., Beham-Rabanser, M., Bodi-Fernandez, O., Haller, M. and Muckenhuber, J. (eds) *Die Lebenssituation von Migrantinnen und Migranten in Österreich*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 313–327.
- Bratsberg, B., Ragan, J.F. Jr and Nasir, Z.M. 2002. The effect of naturalization on wage growth: a panel study of young male immigrants, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20(3): 568–597.
- Castles, S., Korac, M., Vasta, E. and Vertovec, S. 2002. *Integration: Mapping the Field*. London: Home Office, Online Report 28/03.
- Çinar, D., Hofinger, C. and Waldrauch, H. 1995. *Integrationsindex. Zur rechtlichen Integration von Ausländern in ausgewählten europäischen Ländern*. Vienna: Institut für Höhere Studien.
- Engdahl, M. 2011. The impact of naturalization on labour market outcomes in Sweden, in OECD (ed.) *Naturalization. A Passport for the Better Integration of Immigrants?* Paris: OECD, 99–130.

- Esser, H. 2009. Pluralisierung oder Assimilation? Effekte der multiplen Inklusion auf die Integration von Migranten, *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 38(5): 358–378.
- Fassmann, H. and Münz, R. 1995. *Einwanderungsland Österreich*. Vienna: Jugend & Volk.
- Frank, K.A. 2000. Impact of a confounding variable on a regression coefficient, *Sociological Methods and Research*, 29(2): 147–194.
- Hainmüller, J., Hangartner, D. and Pietrantuono, G. 2017. Catalyst or crown? Does naturalization promote the long-term social integration of immigrants? *American Political Science Review*, 111(2): 256–276.
- Haller, M. 2019. *Migration und Integration – Fakten oder Mythen? Siebzehn Schlagwörter auf dem Prüfstand*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Heckmann, F. 2015. *Integration von Migranten. Einwanderung und neue Nationenbildung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Helgertz, J., Bevelander, P. and Tegunimataka, A. 2014. Naturalization and earning: a Denmark–Sweden comparison, *European Journal of Population*, 20(3): 337–359.
- Just, A. and Anderson, C.J. 2012. Immigrants, citizenship and political action in Europe, *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(3): 481–509.
- Karasz, L. and Perchinig, B. 2013. *Studie Staatsbürgerschaft. Konzepte, aktuelle Situation, Reformoptionen*. Vienna: Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte.
- Koopmans, R. 2015. *Social Cohesion and Immigration in Europe and North America: Mechanisms, Conditions, and Causality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- MIPEX 2015. *How Countries are Promoting the Integration of Immigrants: Migrant Integration Policy Index*. Barcelona: CIDOB Barcelona Center for International Affairs (www.mipex.eu).
- Müller-Kmet, B. and Bodi-Fernandez, O. 2019. Emotionale Integration, nationale oder duale Identitäten? In Aschauer, W., Beham-Rabanser, M., Bodi-Fernandez, O., Haller, M. and Muckenhuber, J. (eds) *Die Lebenssituation von Migrantinnen und Migranten in Österreich. Ergebnisse einer Umfrage unter Zugewanderten*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 241–269.
- OECD 2011. *Naturalization: A Passport for the Better Integration of Immigrants?* Paris: OECD. Available at: https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/naturalization-a-passport-for-the-better-integration-of-immigrants_9789264099104-en (accessed 04 December 2020).
- OECD 2015. *Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015*. Brussels and Paris: EU/OECD. Available at: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/docserver/9789264234024-17-en.pdf?expires=1584295170&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=3940794F4E3BB97749EFBAC-14CFB274D> (accessed 04 December 2020).
- Peters, F. and Vink, M. 2016. Naturalization and the socio-economic integration of immigrants: a life-course perspective, in Freeman, G. and Mirilovic, N. (eds) *Handbook on Migration and Social Policy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 362–376.

- Peters, F., Vink, M. and Schmeets, H. 2018. Anticipating the citizenship premium: before and after effects of immigrant naturalisation on employment, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 44(7): 1051–1080. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1367650>.
- Prokic-Breuer, T., Dronkers, J. and Vink, M. 2013. *The Faster, the Better? Speed of Naturalization and Socio-Economic Integration of Immigrants in Europe*. The Hague: Ministerie van Veiligheid & Justitie.
- Riegler, H. 2000. Zwischen Rechtserwerb und Identitätsbedrohung. Einbürgerung aus der Sicht der Migranten, in Pilgram, A. and Steinert, H. (eds) *Sozialer Ausschluss- Begriffe, Praktiken und Gegenwehr*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag, 183–201.
- Scott, K. 2008. Investment in human capital, *The American Economic Review*, 37(19): 379–397.
- Shadow Report 2017. *Racism and Discrimination in Employment in Europe 2013–2017*. Brussels: European Network Against Racism, ENAR Shadow Report.
- Stadlmair, J. 2018a. Demokratische Mitbestimmung von Fremden aus politikwissenschaftlicher Perspektive, in Landtag, S. and Weiser, K. (eds) *Demokratische Zukunft der (Salzburger) Landesgesetzgebung*. Vienna: Jan Sramek Verlag, 121–155.
- Stadlmair, J. 2018b. Earning citizenship: economic criteria for naturalization in nine EU countries, *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 26(1): 42–63 (Open access: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14782804.2018.1437025>).
- Statistik Austria 2018. *Migration & Integration. Zahlen. Daten. Indikatoren*. Vienna: Statistik Austria/Bundesministerium für Europa, Integration und Äußeres.
- Steinhardt, M.F. 2012. Does citizenship matter? The economic impact of naturalizations in Germany, *Labour Economics*, 19(6): 813–823.
- Stern, J. and Valchars, G. 2013. *Naturalisation Procedures for Immigrants*. Florence: European University Institute, Robert Schumann Centre for Advanced Studies.
- Valchars, G. 2018. Staatsbürgerschaft: Recht und Praxis in Österreich, in Mosler, R., Pfeil, W.J. and Schratlbauer, B. (eds) *Migration, Arbeitsmarkt und Sozialpolitik*. Vienna: Manz, 163–190.
- Wooldridge, J.M. 2013. *Introductory Econometrics. A Modern Approach*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning (5th edition).

