

Delaporte, Isaure

Working Paper

Ethnic identity and the employment outcomes of immigrants: evidence from France

CESifo Working Paper, No. 7651

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Delaporte, Isaure (2019) : Ethnic identity and the employment outcomes of immigrants: evidence from France, CESifo Working Paper, No. 7651, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/201877>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

**Ethnic identity and the
employment outcomes of
immigrants: evidence from
France**

Isaure Delaporte

Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de

Editor: Clemens Fuest

www.cesifo-group.org/wp

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
- from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
- from the CESifo website: www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Ethnic identity and the employment outcomes of immigrants: evidence from France

Abstract

The objective of this paper is twofold: first, to determine the immigrants' ethnic identity, i.e. the degree of identification to the culture and society of the country of origin and the host country and second, to investigate the impact of ethnic identity on the immigrants' employment outcomes. Using rich survey data from France and relying on a polychoric principal component analysis, this paper proposes two richer measures of ethnic identity than the ones used in the literature, namely: i) the degree of commitment to the origin country culture and ii) the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities. The paper investigates the impact of the ethnic identity measures on the employment outcomes of immigrants in France. The results show that having multiple identities improves the employment outcomes of the migrants and contribute to help design effective post-immigration policies.

JEL-Codes: J150, J210, J710, Z130.

Keywords: ethnic identity, immigration, employment, polychoric principal component analysis.

Isaure Delaporte
School of Economics
University of Kent
United Kingdom – Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NP
id72@kent.ac.uk
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0279-2032

I am grateful to Matloob Piracha and Bansri Malde for their helpful comments, suggestions and feedback. I also thank Irma Clots-Figueras, Amrit Amirapu and Sylvain Barde whose comments improved the paper. Finally, I thank for their useful comments and suggestions the seminar participants at the School of Economics of the University of Kent as well as the participants of the ifo CEMIR workshop in Munich, the participants of the SAEe 2018 in Madrid and the RES 2018 Postgraduate Meeting in London.

1 Introduction

Although ethnic identity is potentially an important determinant of the immigrants' labour market outcomes, the effect remains unclear. On one hand, immigrants who are not committed to the host country culture might suffer from a lack of host country specific human capital which in turn affect their employment outcomes. Second, immigrants who are attached to their origin country culture are likely to interact mostly with co-ethnics and this can reduce their access to or information about labour market opportunities ([Aizlewood, Bevelander, and Pendakur 2005](#); [Pendakur and Pendakur 2005](#)). Another channel is the labour market discrimination experienced by immigrants. Depending on the structure of the host labour market, employers may be more likely to hire/reward if they feel the person as an “insider” and not an “outsider” ([Knocke 2000](#)). Employers might also be reluctant to hire immigrants if they think they are likely to return eventually to their country of origin. Lastly, a strong attachment to the origin country culture is often associated with traditional gender norms that reduce the likelihood for immigrant women to work ([Fernández 2010](#); [Fernández and Fogli 2009](#)).

On the other hand, ethnic identity can be seen as an additional input that increases the “cultural capital” of the individual. Employers might also want to diversify the set of individual skills in the workplace to allow for complementarities in production ([Alesina and Ferrara 2005](#); [Alesina, Spolaore and Wacziarg 2000](#); [Fearon and Laitin 1996](#)). Furthermore, having contacts with both natives and co-ethnics can increase the social capital of the migrants allowing a better access to employment. In this sense, immigrants who are attached to both the culture of their country of origin and the culture of the host country can have better employment outcomes ([Constant 2014](#)).

The objective of this paper is twofold: first, to determine the immigrants' ethnic identity, i.e. the degree of identification to the culture and society of the country of origin and the host country and second, to investigate the impact of ethnic identity on the immigrants' employment outcomes. To answer these questions, this study uses a rich French survey named Trajectoires et Origines (TeO). The objective of this survey is to understand the differences in experiences with the process of integration of immigrants and immigrants' descendants. This survey provides information on different subgroups of the French population: immigrants, immigrants' descendants and natives. Besides, it contains extensive information on several dimensions of integration. For instance, questions were asked about the individual's attachments to the French culture as well as the individual's links with his country of origin. Information on the labour market integration of the migrants was also collected.

TeO, therefore, provides a unique opportunity to examine the impact of ethnic identity on the employment outcomes of immigrants.

To measure ethnic identity, existing studies have used either the self-identification measure (Battu and Zenou 2010; Manning and Roy 2010; Casey and Dustmann 2010) or an index known as the ethnosizer (Constant, Gataullina, and Zimmerman 2009; Constant and Zimmermann 2008, 2009, 2013). The first measure can be seen as subjective however, since the respondents are self-evaluating their ethnic identity (Constant 2014). Moreover, it dichotomizes the attachment to the host and the origin country culture that is inherently continuous. A breakthrough came with the second measure developed by Constant, Gataullina, and Zimmerman (2009). It is an index composed of five components: (1) language, (2) culture, (3) ethnic self-identification, (4) social interactions, and (5) history of migration. However, when constructing the ethnosizer, the researcher has to assume to know the factors that matter in order to classify migrants into identity categories as well as make the assumption that each factor has an equal importance in explaining ethnic identity.

The extensive information provided by the data allows the construction of two richer measures of ethnic identity than the ones used in the literature, namely: i) the degree of commitment to the origin country culture and ii) the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities. These measures are based on a polychoric principal component analysis (PCA). This approach has important advantages. First, it allows the inclusion of more dimensions of ethnic identity. Hence, the two measures constructed in this paper better capture the multidimensional nature of ethnic identity than the existing measures. Besides, this method allows to determine if and to what extent each dimension of ethnic identity influences the principal components.

The study uses linear probability models to investigate the impact of the ethnic identity measures on the immigrants' employment outcomes. However, one challenge in interpreting the results as causal is that ethnic identity is likely to be endogenous. Indeed, a lack of success in the French labour market may encourage immigrants to be less committed to the French culture. Besides, there might be some confounding factors that correlates with both ethnic identity and the employment outcomes. Previous studies acknowledge this issue but do not address it due to the difficulty of finding a good instrument (Casey and Dustmann 2010; Nekby and Rödin 2010; Pendakur and Pendakur 2005; Gorinas 2014; Schüller 2015).

The OLS results show that having multiple identities increases the probability of being employed for both the first- and the second-generation immigrants while having a minority identity does not affect the migrants' probability of being employed. Other employment outcomes are examined including the income level, the type of

employment (being salaried, being employed by the state, or being self-employed) and the quality of employment (being in elementary occupations or being a professional/manager).

To address the endogenous nature of ethnic identity, this study relies on an instrumental variable approach. The identification strategy exploits the heterogeneity in the influence of the French culture abroad. Five instruments are used: 1) the number of years the migrant's country of origin has been a French territory, 2) the number of years the country of origin has been in the CFA zone, 3) the number of years the country of origin has been in the European Union, 4) the number of years the country of origin has been part of the International Organisation of la Francophonie and 5) whether French is a language of the country of origin. The instruments are based from the year the individual migrated to France for the first generation (from the year of birth for the second generation) to the year of interview in order to have the degree of exposure that varies by individuals.

The longer the migrant has been exposed to the French culture, the less he is likely to feel exclusively close to his country of origin and the more he is likely to have multiple identities. Furthermore, being exposed to the French culture before arrival in France (or at birth for the second-generation immigrants) should not affect the immigrant's employment outcomes later on except through his identity. The results of the first-stage regressions confirm the relevance of the instruments. The results of the second-stage regressions show that having multiple identities increases the employment probability of the first-generation immigrant women and the second-generation immigrant men, even though it is not statistically significant. Besides, the IV estimates are larger than the OLS estimates. Due to the fact that the estimates are imprecise however, it is difficult to make any conclusive inference.

As a further robustness check, I conduct a sensitivity analysis following [Oster \(2017\)](#) to check for the stability of the coefficients to unobservables. I find that the results are not driven by selection on unobservables since the bias-adjusted coefficients are similar to the OLS estimates and the identified sets do not include zero. Besides, the more selection on unobservables is assumed to be important, the bigger the size of the coefficients. Considering the signs of the indexes, having multiple identities is in most cases positive. It becomes negative only when selection is assumed to be important. Hence, this analysis reinforces the idea that the ethnic identity effect is real. The results obtained contribute to help design effective post-immigration policies. They have important implications for improving the economic outcomes of the migrants and in turn enriching receiving countries.

The article contributes to a number of strands of literature. It relates to an

emerging literature based on Akerlof and Kranton’s identity framework ([Akerlof and Kranton 2000, 2010](#)) that shows that ethnic identity can have significant impact on individual economic outcomes ([Constant 2014](#); [Constant and Zimmermann 2008](#); [Battu, Mwale and Zenou 2007](#); [Bisin, Patacchini, Verdier and Zenou 2011, 2016](#); [Battu and Zenou 2010](#); [Constant and Zimmermann 2009](#); [Schüller 2015](#)). This study relies however on richer measures of ethnic identity and attempts to address the endogeneous nature of ethnic identity.

This study also relates to the literature that examines the role of culture in influencing economic outcomes ([Fernández 2010](#); [Fernández and Fogli 2009](#)). One improvement upon this literature is that rather than using a proxy for culture, the measures of ethnic identity include several cultural traits.

This study also contributes to a small literature that looks at the process of identity formation ([Manning and Roy 2010](#); [Casey and Dustmann 2010](#); [Constant, Gataullina, and Zimmerman 2009](#); [Constant and Zimmermann 2008, 2013](#); [Phinney et al. 2001](#); [Clots-Figueras and Masella 2013](#)). The existing studies highlight several determinants of ethnic identity. However, it is unclear what is the relative importance of each dimension in explaining ethnic identity.

Lastly, this study is closely related to the literature on the assimilation of migrants ([Algan, Bisin, Manning and Verdier 2013](#)) and more specifically to the segmented assimilation theory which explains how immigrants experience and adapt to the culture of the host country in different ways ([Portes and Zhou 1993](#); [Zhou 1997](#); [Gans 1992](#); [Portes, Fernández-Kelly and Haller 2005](#)).

The paper unfolds as follows. The next section sets the French background. Section 3 provides a discussion of the existing ethnic identity measures and reviews the literature on ethnic identity and the labour market outcomes of immigrants. Section 4 describes the data and the measures of ethnic identity; while Section 5 presents the empirical framework. Section 6 presents the empirical findings and discusses the robustness of the results. Finally, section 7 summarizes the results and concludes.

2 Background

2.1 The French Immigrant Population

Immigration to France has risen constantly over time since the Second World War. The composition of the French immigrant population has however changed considerably ([Migration Policy Institute 2004](#)). Figure 1 provides the composition of the

French immigrant population by region of origin.

European immigrants constituted the majority of immigrants after 1945. This proportion has fallen steadily since then. Significant numbers of migrants from French colonies came as well. Between 1945 and 1974, a wave of Vietnamese migrated to France after the Battle of Dien Bien Phu. Although many initially returned to the country after a few years, as the Vietnam War worsened, the majority decided to remain in France. During this period, there was also a significant wave of Algerian immigrants.¹ Additionally, the number of migrants from former French colonies in Sub-Saharan Africa as well as Asian immigrants increased during this period.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

In terms of migration status (Figure 2), since 1945, French immigration policy has had two aims: to attract migrant workers and to favor the permanent installation of foreign families. However, the late 1960s and early 1970s led to a period of social change. The maturing of the baby boom generation and the entrance of women into the labour force resulted in a decrease in the need for foreign workers. The 1973 oil price shock further hindered economic performance which led the French government to officially end its labour migration programs in 1974. Nonetheless, immigration continued and diversified over the following decades.

From 1995 to 1997, there was a continuous decline in permanent entries. In 1997, the Socialists won control of the National Assembly and began rethinking immigration policy. A new legislation was implemented to ease the admission procedures for graduates and highly skilled employees. Considering asylum applications, they increased at the end of the 1980s before falling between 1980 and 1995. They held steady until 1999 and, then, increased again from 1999 to 2003. Today, immigration is on the rise again, the main reason remaining family reunification.

[Insert Figure 2 here]

2.2 The French National Identity

The importance of the French national identity has been at the center of attention in recent years in France. Many think that being committed to a minority culture

¹The number of Algerian immigrants increased drastically after the independence of Algeria in 1962. Many of the immigrants known as the “harkis” were Algerians who supported the French during the war. Once the war was over, they were deeply resented by other Algerians and thus had to flee to France. The others known as the “pieds-noirs” were European settlers who moved to Algeria but migrated back to France since 1962 when Algeria declared independence.

necessarily decreases the quality of one’s commitment to the French culture ([Simon 2012](#)). This sentiment has been illustrated in a number of actions. For instance, in 2007, the government created the Ministry of Immigration, Integration, National Identity and Co-Development, which was tasked with “promoting national identity”. A “Great Debate on National Identity” was then launched in 2009 by the government with the objective of codifying “what it means to be French”.

In 2010, the radical right of the conservative party issued a parliamentary amendment to ban dual citizenship for French citizens. While the amendment was turned down, the debate resumed again in 2011 when high-level officials from the national soccer team criticized the choice of dual-national players for electing to play with their second-nationality national team instead of the French one ([The Guardian 2011](#)). In 2004, a bill was passed to ban religious symbols in public spaces, including Muslim headscarves. Considering access to citizenship, there are more requirements for migrants who wish to apply for French citizenship, such as linguistic and civic tests to fulfill. Therefore, from a policy perspective, it is important to investigate whether holding a minority identity has indeed a negative impact.

3 Related Literature

The existing empirical literature uses two ways to measure ethnic identity. A first method to measure the immigrant’s commitment to the culture and society of the country of origin and the host country is to ask the respondent about his/her identity with the majority group and the respondent’s ethnic group. More precisely, the importance of ethnic identification is captured by the answers to two statements: 1. I feel from the host country. 2. I feel [from respondent’s origin country or parent’s origin country].

Respondents are asked if they agree or disagree and if so, whether strongly or just a little. Based on their answers, individuals can be classified into four categories: (i) integrated if the person identifies with both the origin country and the host country; (ii) assimilated if the individual identifies only with the host country; (iii) separated if the individual exclusively identifies with his/her country of origin or (iv) marginalized if the individual reports a weak identification with both the country of origin and the host country.

A number of studies use this self-identification measure. [Battu and Zenou \(2010\)](#) find that individuals with extreme ethnic preferences experience a lower probability of being employed relative to those with less extreme views. [Manning and Roy \(2010\)](#) show that immigrants generally arrive in a new country with a strong sense

of their national origin and with varying degrees of willingness to adopt the identity of the host society whereas subsequent generations may face different identity issues. [Casey and Dustmann \(2010\)](#) also uses this measure in order to highlight the strong intergenerational transmission of identity from one generation to the next.

A couple of recent empirical studies advocate for a broader conceptualisation of identity ([Constant and Zimmermann 2008](#); [Zimmermann, Zimmermann, and Constant 2007](#)). Indeed, one can argue that the ethnic self-identification measure is highly subjective since the respondents are self-evaluating their ethnic identity ([Constant 2014](#)). Moreover, it dichotomizes the attachment to the host and the origin country culture that is inherently continuous. Another measure called the ethnosizer was developed by [Constant, Gataullina, and Zimmerman \(2009\)](#). To construct this measure, individual data is used on five indicators of ethnic identity: (1) language, (2) culture, (3) ethnic self-identification, (4) social interactions, and (5) history of migration.

For each indicator, individuals can be classified into the four states: integration, assimilation, separation or marginalization. For instance, with respect to language, individuals are: (i) linguistically integrated, if they speak both the language of the host country and their native language; (ii) linguistically assimilated, if they speak only the language of the host country; (iii) linguistically separated, if they are fluent in their mother tongue but have no skills in the host country language; or (iv) linguistically marginalized when their communication skills are limited due to a lack of fluency in both languages.

A similar classification is conducted for each of the remaining four elements. Then, four variables are generated for each state of ethnic identity. As people can, for example, be integrated in one dimension and separated in another, each state of ethnic identity ranges from 0 to 5 and measures how often a respondent is identified as integrated, assimilated, separated or marginalized. Unlike the self-identification measure of ethnic identity, the ethnosizer allows the comparison between more or less integrated respondents. Moreover, the ethnosizer is based on a number of dimensions and not just the self-report of the respondents. Therefore, a growing number of empirical studies rely on this approach.

[Constant, Gataullina, and Zimmerman \(2006\)](#) find that preserving an attachment to the country of origin does not affect the probability of being employed for immigrant men in Germany as long as they have a strong attachment to the host culture. The authors find, however, that immigrant women perform better when they are attached to both cultures. Using Swedish data, [Nekby and Rödén \(2007, 2010\)](#) find that what matters for the employment outcomes of immigrant men is

the strength of identification with the majority culture regardless of the minority identity. They find the same results for second and middle generation immigrants whereas [Gorinas \(2014\)](#) found no significant impact of ethnic identity on the employment outcomes of the second-generation immigrants. [Constant, Kahanec, Rinne and Zimmermann \(2011\)](#) show that migrants who are attached only to their ancestral culture have a relatively slow reintegration into the German labour market.

With respect to the income level of immigrants, [Drydakis \(2012\)](#) shows in Greece that being attached to the country of origin does not affect wages as long as immigrants strongly identify themselves as Greek. On the other hand, [Zimmermann \(2007\)](#) provides evidence that being committed to both the culture of the origin and the host countries significantly increases the immigrants' income. Other studies such as [Constant and Zimmermann \(2009\)](#) argue that there is no correlation between ethnic identity and various labour market outcomes including wages, participation, employment, and unemployment.

The ethnosizer takes care of the limitations of the self-identification measure. However, when constructing the ethnosizer, the researcher has to assume to know the factors that matter in order to classify migrants into identity categories as well as make the assumption that each dimension has an equal importance in characterising one's ethnic identity.

Alongside the ethnic identity literature, a number of empirical studies have examined the impact of several cultural proxies, highlighting the importance of different channels through which an individual's ethnic identity can influence his labour market outcomes. For instance, [Fernández \(2010\)](#) and [Fernández and Fogli \(2009\)](#) use past female labour force participation and total fertility rates from the country of ancestry as cultural proxies. The authors find that these characteristics of the ancestral country have positive and significant explanatory power for individual work and fertility outcomes. They argue that the effects are due to gender norms in the country of ancestry.

Other studies show that immigrants who have a strong attachment to religion and a strong attachment to ethnic traditions are less likely to be employed ([Bisin, Patacchini, Verdier and Zenou 2011](#); [Epstein and Heizler 2015](#)). On the opposite, those who share social norms with the majority group experience better employment outcomes ([Gorinas 2014](#)).

4 Data

This paper focuses on France and uses the Trajectoires et Origines²: Enquête sur la diversité des populations de France, a nationally representative study of immigrants in France conducted from September 2008 to March 2009 and collected jointly by the National Institute of Demographic Studies (INED) and the National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE). The objective of this survey is to understand the differences in experiences with the process of integration of the respondents. Several groups are interviewed: immigrants and people born in the French overseas territories (DOM), the descendants of immigrants and the descendants of people born in the overseas territories born in metropolitan France, and the French-born descendants of French-born nationals.

Individuals were interviewed with deliberate overweighting of particular migrant communities in order to achieve reliable analyses of statistically rare groups. As a result, almost 22,000 individuals were interviewed. However, for the purpose of this study, I exclude the following individuals: 1) the individuals born in France who were coded as first-generation immigrants, 2) the immigrants, children of returnees, children of French expats, returnees and the French born abroad who were coded as second-generation immigrants, and 3) the immigrants, children of returnees, children of French expats, returnees, and the French born abroad who were coded as natives. Therefore, the final sample is formed of 20,803 individuals including 8,971 first-generation, 8,812 second-generation immigrants and 3,020 native respondents.

The dataset is unique in that it covers detailed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of individuals from different subgroups of the French population. It also contains extensive information on an individual's commitment to the French culture and links with the country of ancestry. Finally, it provides information on labour force participation, employment and income of individuals.

Sociodemographic information is reported in Table 1. On average, there are slightly fewer men (47%) than women, and the average age of the respondents is 41 for first-generation immigrants, 30 for second-generation immigrants and 38 for natives. The majority of the respondents are in a relationship and most of them are married to someone who has French nationality. The first-generation immigrants are almost evenly split between two main religions: Islam and Catholicism while the second-generation immigrants have no religion, are Muslims or Catholics. Natives are either Catholics or have no religion.

The first-generation immigrants mostly come from Europe (26%), North Africa

²I thank ADISP-CMH for providing the data (Trajectoires et origines (TeO) - version complète - 2008, INSEE, INED [producers], ADISP-CMH [distributor]).

(22%) and Asia (21%) while the second-generation immigrants have parents that mostly come from Europe (34%) and North Africa (28%). 15% are children of an immigrant mother only and 24% of an immigrant father only. The rest of them are children of two immigrant parents and for the large majority, the two parents come from the same region. The most common household structure is a couple family with children.

[Insert Table 1 here]

4.1 Measures of Outcomes

Means and standard deviations for a range of variables are given in Table 2.³ The first-generation immigrants are less educated compared to the second-generation immigrants and the natives. First-generation women and men have similar levels of education whereas second-generation women are more educated than men. In terms of employment status, the vast majority in the sample is employed, with about 17% of first-generation immigrants (mostly married women) being inactive.

The employment gap between men and women decreases at the second generation. The employment rates differ by region of origin. In the first generation, North African immigrants have the lowest employment rate in the labour market (60%). On the opposite, people coming from the French overseas territories (DOM) are performing the best (81%). In the second generation, the lowest employment rate is recorded for the descendants of Central African immigrants (50%) whereas the descendants of European immigrants have the highest rate (80%).

The majority of the respondents are salaried. However, a larger proportion of natives are employed by the state compared to the first- and the second-generation immigrants. Most of the respondents are in full-time employment. In terms of occupations, it is mostly the first-generation immigrants who occupy elementary occupations or are machine operators and assemblers. The second-generation immigrants are more likely to be sales workers or technicians and associate professionals.

A larger proportion of natives are professionals or managers. With respect to the income level, both the first- and the second-generation immigrants, especially women, earn less than the natives. Among the first-generation immigrants, the Sahelian African and the Central African immigrants have the lowest hourly income. In the second generation, those who earn the least are the descendants of Sahelian

³In addition, the descriptive statistics by gender, marital status and country of origin are reported in the appendix.

African immigrants. Finally, a higher proportion of the first-generation immigrants, especially men, work with colleagues of similar origin.

[Insert Table 2 here]

4.2 Measuring Ethnic Identity with PCA

This paper proposes a new way of modelling ethnic identity based on a polychoric principal component analysis. This method is a statistical procedure which uses an orthogonal transformation to convert a set of observations of correlated variables into a set of values of linearly uncorrelated variables called principal components (Kolenikov and Angeles 2004). The first principal component that is generated has the largest possible variance and each succeeding component has the highest variance in the subspace orthogonal to the preceding components. The components are eigenvectors and have corresponding eigenvalues for each dimension of ethnic identity.

This method constitutes a viable alternative to model ethnic identity for a number of reasons. First, it is a technique that allows for dimensionality reduction in a context where a lot of variables could be used as proxies for ethnic identity. Second, no information about groups is needed when implementing the analysis. The PCA gives a visual representation of the dominant patterns in a data set. Therefore, this method is very informative about the determinants of identity: which dimensions matter as well as their relative importance given by the eigenvalues.

Step 1. Selection of the Variables

There are a number of practical choices that one has to make in order to implement the PCA. The first one is to select the variables to include in the analysis. Ethnic identity has several dimensions which can be proxied by a number of variables displayed in Table 3. First, nationality should influence the individual's ethnic identity, i.e. whether the individual identify himself with the society and the culture of his origin country or France. The large majority of the first-generation immigrants have a foreign nationality while in the second generation, a higher proportion of immigrants are French by birth.

With respect to language skills, the majority of the first-generation immigrants speak only a foreign language whereas most of the second-generation immigrants speak either French or several languages including French. A larger proportion of the second-generation immigrants, compared to the first-generation immigrants,

report French as the first language used by their parents to talk to them when they were a child.

Respondents were asked about their links with the country of origin. Unsurprisingly, the first-generation immigrants are closer to their country of origin compared to immigrants in the second generation. However, still a significant proportion of the second-generation immigrants visited their place of origin and use media (watch television, listen to the radio or read the newspapers) of the country of origin. Moreover, a larger proportion in the second generation feels at home in France and feels French compared to immigrants from the first generation. However, alongside the French identity, still a significant proportion of the second-generation immigrants report feeling from their parents' country of origin.

The place where the individual has received his education also forge his identity. Most first-generation immigrants have acquired their educational qualifications in a foreign country whereas the second-generation immigrants and the natives have received their education mostly in France. The importance of religion in the upbringing of the individual might illustrate a specific cultural commitment. Most of the first-generation immigrants report that religion was very important as opposed to natives who indicate that religion was not important at all. Ethnic density in the neighbourhood where the individual resides also influence cultural transmission and affects ethnic identity formation (Zimmermann, Constant, and Schüller 2014; Battu and Zenou 2010). A larger proportion of the first-generation immigrants live in segregated neighbourhoods compared to the second-generation immigrants and the natives.

Regarding social relationships, it is more common for the first generation of migrants to belong to associations whose members have the same ethnic background. A larger proportion of first-generation immigrants have provided financial aid to someone abroad compared to the second-generation immigrants. Finally, fewer second-generation immigrants and natives maintain contacts with family/friends that live abroad compared to the first-generation immigrants. Overall, these cultural traits shape the individual's ethnic identity and highlight a process of cultural integration across generations of migrants.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Step 2. The Polychoric Correlation Matrix

Since most of the data used for the PCA is discrete, the polychoric correlation matrix needs to be examined.⁴ The results show that these variables are highly

⁴The matrix is reported in the appendix.

correlated to each other, which justify including them in the PCA. Having a foreign nationality is highly positively correlated with speaking only a foreign language and negatively correlated with the mother and the father using French as the first language to speak with the respondent when he was a child. It is also positively correlated with having visited the country of origin, using the media of the country of origin, having given money to the country of origin, being an owner and having invested in the country of origin.

Having a foreign nationality is negatively associated with feeling at home in France and feeling French whereas it is positively correlated with feeling from the country of origin. People who have a foreign nationality are also more likely to have educational qualifications from a foreign country. The more religion was important in the upbringing of the individual, the more he is likely to be a foreigner. Besides, the higher the proportion of immigrants in the neighbourhood where the individual resides, the more likely the individual has a foreign nationality. Having a foreign nationality is positively associated with belonging to an association whose members are foreigners as well. Finally, it is also positively correlated with having provided financial aid to someone abroad and with maintaining contacts with family/friends living abroad.

Step 3. The Principal Components

The results for the polychoric PCA is given in Table 4. As illustrated in Figure 3, the first principal component has the greatest variance and extracts the largest share of information from the data; the second component is orthogonal to the first one, and has the greatest variance in the subspace orthogonal to the first component. Only the two first components are retained since the subsequent components explain less of the data.

[Insert Table 4 and Figure 3 here]

The eigenvectors of the two components are reported in Table 5. The first component can be interpreted as the degree of commitment to the origin country culture. Indeed, a higher score for the first component is associated with having a foreign nationality and speaking only a foreign language. If French was the first language used by the mother and the father to speak to the respondent when he was a child, the score decreases. Having visited the country of origin, using the media of the country of origin, having given money to the country of origin, being an owner and having invested in the country of origin are all associated with a higher score for the first component. Feeling from the country of origin and having educational

qualifications only from a foreign country also increases the first component. On the opposite, feeling at home in France and feeling French decrease the first component.

The importance of religion in the upbringing of the individual, a high ethnic density in the neighbourhood where the individual resides and belonging to associations whose members are foreigners increases the first component, even though to a lesser extent. The fact that high levels of ethnic concentration increases the residents' minority identity refers to the mechanism of cultural conformity where a high degree of ethnic clustering strengthen in-group loyalties encouraging immigrants to remain committed to their origin country culture (Zimmermann, Constant, and Schüller 2014). Finally, having provided financial aid to someone abroad and maintaining contacts with family/friends living abroad are associated with a higher score for the first component.

The second component can be interpreted as the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities. Indeed, having a foreign nationality and speaking only a foreign language are associated with a lower score for the second component. On the other hand, individuals whose parents used French as the first language to speak with them when they were a child have a higher score for the second component. Also, having visited the country of origin, using the media of the country of origin, having given money to the country of origin, being an owner and having invested in the country of origin are all associated with a higher score for the second component.

Feeling French but also belonging to associations whose members are foreigners, having provided aid to someone abroad and maintaining contacts with family/friends living abroad leads to higher scores for the second component. However, feeling at home in France, feeling from the country of origin, the importance of religion in the upbringing of the respondent as well as ethnic density in the neighbourhood where the individual resides in France do not seem to influence strongly the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities.

[Insert Table 5 here]

Figure 4 shows how the entire population is distributed along the two components (graph on the top) and then it shows separately i) the first-generation, ii) the second-generation immigrants and iii) the natives' distributions along the two components.⁵

[Insert Figure 4 here]

⁵The histogram plots and the density plots are available in the appendix for more detailed information about the distributions.

The first-generation immigrants (small graph on the left) are the furthest on the right with the highest values for the first component and lower values for the second component, meaning that they exhibit a higher level of commitment to their origin country culture but they are less likely to identify with both France and their origin country compared to the second-generation immigrants and the natives.

The second-generation immigrants (small graph in the middle) are spread in the middle with intermediate values for the first component as well as for the second component. Therefore, the second-generation immigrants remain committed to their parents' origin country culture but are more likely to hold multiple identities compared to the first generation.

Finally, the natives (small graph on the right) are mostly concentrated on the left with negative values for the first component illustrating no commitment to a foreign country culture. They are also less dispersed along the second component meaning that they differ less from one another and form an homogenous group compared to the first- and the second-generation immigrants.

Step 4. Different Samples for PCA

The previous components are generated when performing the polychoric PCA on the entire sample. However, there could be significant differences in terms of identity between men and women leading to different components for each group. Therefore, the cultural traits are examined separately for men and women.⁶ There are no differences in terms of nationality, language skills, the links with the country of origin and the ethnic density in the neighbourhood where the individual resides.

However, a lower proportion of women in both generations report feeling French compared to men. The first-generation immigrant women are more likely to have studied abroad compared to their men counterparts. Religion was significantly more important in the upbringing of women compared to men in both generations. Fewer women in both generations belong to associations whose members are of foreign origin or have provided financial aid to someone abroad. Lastly, a larger proportion of women in both generations maintain contact with family/friends living abroad compared to men.

The attachment to the host country and the origin country cultures might also differ depending on the marital status of the migrant.⁷ In fact, married migrants, especially in the first generation, seem to remain closer to their origin country compared to single immigrants. For instance, married immigrants are more likely to

⁶The summary statistics by gender of the ethnic identity variables are reported in the appendix.

⁷The summary statistics by marital status of the ethnic identity variables are reported in the appendix.

speak only their native language. They also appear to be more strongly linked with their country of origin. A higher proportion of married immigrants received their educational qualifications from a foreign country. Besides, religion was more important in the upbringing of married immigrants. Lastly, the first-generation immigrants who are married are more likely to maintain contact with family/friends living abroad.

Due to the differences in ethnic identity when looking at different groups, it might be necessary to perform the polychoric PCA separately on different samples. Therefore, in addition to the previous measures that were generated when performing the polychoric PCA on the entire sample, additional analyses are performed separately for the two following samples: i) the first-generation immigrants and ii) the second-generation immigrants and separately for the four following samples: i) the first-generation immigrant men, ii) the first-generation immigrant women, iii) the second-generation immigrant men and iv) the second-generation immigrant women. Since the measures obtained are similar from the previous ones, the analysis relies on the measures generated with the entire sample.⁸

4.3 Descriptive Statistics of the Components

The identity choice of the individual might differ depending on a number of factors. Table 6 displays the descriptive statistics of the two principal components by gender, age group, marital status, level of education, ethnicity, religion and family structure. First, the degree of commitment to the origin country culture is the same for both male and female first-generation immigrants. However, first-generation immigrant women are less likely to have multiple identities compared to men. In the second generation, men are less committed to the culture of their country of ancestry compared to women.

Among the first-generation immigrants, the youngest are the ones who are the least close to their origin country culture. There is no significant differences with respect to having multiple identities. On the contrary, among the second-generation immigrants, the oldest are the ones that are the least close to their parents' origin country culture. This is consistent with the fact that the more the individual spend time in the host country, the more he is likely to adopt the majority identity. However, all second-generation immigrants, especially the youngest, are likely to retain their origin country culture alongside adopting the French identity.

When we compare single with married individuals and with individuals who

⁸The measures obtained here are not reported but are available upon request.

married someone who is French, those who are the closest to their origin country culture in the first generation are those who are married to a foreigner. They are also the least likely to have multiple identities whereas single individuals are the least close to their origin country culture and the most likely to hold multiple identities. In the second generation, those who are married to a French are the least close to their parents' origin country culture. Conversely, those who are married to a foreigner are closer to their parents' origin country culture and are less likely to have multiple identities.

As expected, the level of education does not seem to affect the degree of identification with the country of origin for the first-generation immigrants. However, for the second generation and the natives, educated individuals are more likely to have multiple identities. Sahelian African and Asian first-generation immigrants are the ones that are the most committed to their origin country culture. On the opposite, people who were born in French overseas territories (DOM) are the ones that are the least committed to their origin country culture. Most ethnic groups among the first generation do not have multiple identities. Considering the second generation however, all ethnic groups have both identities except the descendants of Asian immigrants for whom the origin country culture is still very important.

Muslim immigrants are the most committed to their origin country culture in both generations. Finally, the children whose parents are both immigrants are more closed to their parents' origin country culture and are less likely to have multiple identities whereas those whose only the father is an immigrant are the closest to the French culture. This is in line with [Casey and Dustmann \(2010\)](#)'s finding that mothers transmit the home identity more strongly.

[Insert Table 6 here]

4.4 Comparison of the Ethnic Identity Measures

The two measures of ethnic identity based on the PCA are now examined in comparison with the existing measures used in previous studies. Both the self-identification measure and the ethnosizer are constructed.⁹ More specifically, four dummies are generated for the self-identification measure for each state of ethnic identity: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. For the ethnosizer, four variables are constructed for each state of ethnic identity ranging from 0 to 5.

Figure 5 provides the kernel densities of: 1) the two ethnic identity measures

⁹See Section 2 for a detail explanation on the construction of the self-identification measure and the ethnosizer.

generated from the polychoric PCA, 2) the four dummies of the self-identification measure and 3) the four categories of the ethnosizer.¹⁰ The two existing measures of ethnic identity are more restrictive than the ones generated from the PCA because the methods employed to construct the self-identification measure and the ethnosizer force the measures to be around specific values. In the case of the self-identification measure (graph in the middle), the value for each state of ethnic identity is either 0 or 1, categorizing the individual as fully integrated or not for instance. In the case of the ethnosizer (graph at the bottom), each category takes a value from 0 to 5. Therefore, the ethnosizer provides more flexibility than the self-identification measure but it might still lead to categorize individuals in states in which they are not. In contrast, the two measures generated by the polychoric PCA (graph at the top) are continuous.

[Insert Figure 5 here]

The correlation matrix provided in Table 7 shows the extent to which the measures are correlated with each other. The first part of the table reports the correlations using the entire sample while the two last parts of the table reports the correlations separately for the first- and the second-generation immigrants. As expected, the two components are correlated with both existing measures, even though more strongly with the ethnosizer.

[Insert Table 7 here]

5 Empirical Framework

5.1 Baseline Model Specification

To investigate the impact of an immigrant's ethnic identity on his labour market outcomes, the analysis relies on the following econometric framework:

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \beta_2 I_{ij} + \gamma_j + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{ij} is the employment outcome of individual i who resides in region j . A number of employment outcomes are examined subsequently: 1) the employment probability, 2) the hourly income, 3) the type of employment (being salaried, employed by the state or self-employed) and finally, 4) the quality of employment (being

¹⁰The kernel densities of the measures are reported separately for the first- and the second-generation immigrants in the appendix.

in elementary occupations or being a professional/manager). I_{ij} represents the ethnic identity measures: i) the degree of commitment to the origin country culture and ii) the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities.

To assess the relevance of the identity measures, the employment outcome is regressed on each identity measure separately and subsequently, a model including both measures is estimated. X_{ij} comprises individual characteristics which vary with the specification considered. γ_j is a full set of dummies for the region of residence in order to control for regional differences and ϵ_{ij} is the error term. Most of the regressions are estimated using linear probability models¹¹ except for the second outcome which is examined using ordinary least squares regressions. Finally, the effect of ethnic identity is examined separately for first- and second-generation immigrants as well as for men and women.

The sign of the coefficient of interest β_2 is uncertain. On the one hand, ethnic identity could have a negative effect on the immigrants' employment outcomes. Indeed, immigrants with a strong minority identity might suffer a lack of host country specific skills that reduces their employment probabilities. They are also more likely to rely on co-ethnics when looking for jobs, and this might affect their labour market opportunities. They are more likely to experience labour market discrimination. Lastly, being close to the origin country culture is often associated with traditional gender norms which would affect the migrant's employment outcomes. On the other hand, ethnic identity can potentially improve the employment outcomes of immigrants if having a minority identity allow the migrants to differentiate themselves with the natives giving them an advantage on the French labour market.

One concern is the endogenous nature of ethnic identity which would lead to biased OLS estimates. Indeed, a potential source of endogeneity is the reverse causality, i.e. the fact that a lack of success in the French labour market may encourage immigrants to be less committed to the French culture (Casey and Dustmann 2010; Nekby and Rödén 2010; Pendakur and Pendakur 2005; Gorinas 2014; Schüller 2015). Besides, there might be some confounding factors that correlates with both ethnic identity and the employment outcomes leading to an omitted variable bias. For instance, one may argue that certain parental characteristics such as ability or motivation to succeed in France are likely to be associated with both the ethnic identity and the labour market outcomes of immigrants.

¹¹The results are robust to probit estimations as well.

5.2 Identification Using Instrumental Variable Approach

In order to address the endogeneity issue, ethnic identity has to be instrumented for. However, finding a good instrument in this case is a difficult task. To identify ethnic identity, this study exploits the heterogeneity in France’s cultural influence (or “soft power”) over time and space. Indeed, the influence of the French culture in the country of origin of a migrant at the year of arrival in France is likely to significantly affect his ethnic identity later on in his life. The instrumental variable approach proceeds in two stages as follows:

$$I_{ijt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \beta_2 Z_{it} + \epsilon_{ij} \quad (2)$$

$$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{ij} + \beta_2 I_{ij} + \gamma_j + \epsilon_{ij}. \quad (3)$$

The first-stage least square (Equation 2) looks at the impact of several instrumental variables (Z_{it}) on the migrant’s ethnic identity (I_{ijt}). Then, the second-stage least square (Equation 3) examines the impact of the ethnic identity measures instrumented (I_{ij}) on the labour market outcomes of the migrants (Y_{ij}).

Five instrumental variables are included: 1) the number of years the migrant’s country of origin has been a French territory, 2) the number of years the country of origin has been in the CFA zone, 3) the number of years the country of origin has been in the European Union, 4) the number of years the country of origin has been part of the International Organisation of la Francophonie¹² and 5) a dummy equal to one if French is a language of the country of origin, zero otherwise.

The instruments which are continuous are based from the year the individual migrated to France for the first generation (from the year of birth for the second generation) to the year of interview in order to have the degree of exposure that varies by individuals. These instruments are likely to be strongly correlated with identity. In fact, the longer the migrant has been exposed to the French culture, the less he/she is likely to be exclusively close to the culture of his/her country of origin and the more he/she is likely to have multiple identities. Furthermore, these instruments are likely to impact the migrants’ employment outcomes only through identity. Indeed, the characteristics of the migrant’s country of origin should not influence directly the performance of the migrant in the French labour market.

¹²The OIF, created in 1970, represents one of the biggest linguistic zones in the world. The French language and its humanist values represent the two cornerstones on which the organisation is based. The OIF organises political activities and actions of multilateral cooperation that benefit French-speaking populations. Its actions serve to promote the French language, peace and sustainable development. More information can be found on the OIF’s website: <https://www.francophonie.org/Welcome-to-the-International.html>.

6 Results and Discussion

6.1 Main Results

OLS Results

The results of the linear probability models for the relationship between ethnic identity and employment probabilities are presented in Table 8. For the first-generation immigrant men, the results show that having multiple identities increases significantly their chances of being employed. The estimated effect suggests that one standard deviation from the “multiple identities” index is associated with a 3.2 pp increase in the probability of being employed.

First-generation immigrant women are also more likely to be employed if they have multiple identities: a one-standard-deviation increase in the “multiple identities” index is associated with a 3.4 pp increase in the employment probability. On the other hand, being only committed to the origin country culture does not have any significant effect. The results are robust when conditioning on both ethnic identity measures.

Similar results are found for the descendants of immigrants. Being committed to both the origin country culture and the French culture increases the chances of being employed for immigrant men in the second generation. The estimated marginal effect of having multiple identities amounts to 2.7 pp. This result holds even when introducing both measures at the same time. For the second-generation immigrant women, having multiple identities is beneficial, associated with a 1.9 pp increase in the likelihood of being employed. However, when conditioning on both ethnic identity measures, the “multiple identities” index becomes non significant.

[Insert Table 8 here]

Considering the income level of immigrants, the OLS estimates of the relationship between ethnic identity and the hourly income are presented in Table 9. Holding a minority identity or having multiple identities does not have any significant effect on the hourly income of the first-generation immigrants. Similarly, there is no impact of ethnic identity on the income level of the second-generation immigrant men. However, having multiple identities is associated with a higher hourly income for the second-generation immigrant women.

[Insert Table 9 here]

Table 10 displays the results for the type of employment: i) being salaried, ii) being employed by the state and iii) being self-employed. The first-generation immigrant men who are exclusively close to the culture of their country of origin are more likely to be self-employed. For the first-generation immigrant women, they are less likely to be employed by the state or self-employed and more likely to be salaried if they are exclusively committed to their origin country culture.

On the other hand, if they are committed to both the French culture and their origin country culture, it increases their probability to be employed by the state and decreases their probability to be salaried. For the second generation of immigrants, the men who are exclusively committed to the culture of their country of ancestry are less likely to be employed by the state and more likely to be salaried while for women, having multiple identities decreases the probability to be salaried and increases the probability to be self-employed.

[Insert Table 10 here]

Lastly, Table 11 reports the results for the quality of employment: i) being in elementary occupations or ii) being a professional/manager. The results show that being close to both cultures decreases the probability for both first-generation immigrant men and women to be in elementary occupations. Having a minority identity decreases the probability of first- and second-generation immigrant men to be professionals/managers.

For women in the second generation, having multiple identities increases the probability to be employed as professionals/managers. One potential explanation to the fact that having multiple identities is associated to a better performance in the host labour market for immigrants is that it allows the immigrants to differentiate themselves from natives. From the demand side, employers might be interested in diversifying their workforce while from the supply side, having a diverse cultural background and belonging to different social groups increases the migrant's cultural and social capital.

[Insert Table 11 here]

IV Results

Due to the endogenous nature of ethnic identity, the OLS estimates are likely to be biased. In order to address this concern, this study relies on an instrumental variable approach. The results are reported in Table 12. The estimates of the first-stage regressions are displayed in Panel C. More specifically, the first column of each

sub-group (Columns 1, 4, 7 and 10) reports the impact of the instrumental variables on the minority identity while the second column (Columns 2, 5, 8 and 11) reports the impact on the multiple identities index.

The results of the first-stage regressions reported in Panel C show that the five instruments strongly influence the identity choice of the migrants. The longer the first-generation immigrant spent in a French territory before migrating to France, the less he/she feels exclusively close to the country of origin and the more he/she has multiple identities. Besides, the longer the migrant's country of origin has been part of the European Union, the weaker the exclusive commitment to the country of origin and the more he/she holds multiple identities. This is unsurprising if one believes that the European Union has for objective to bring countries closer to each others.

Furthermore, the longer the migrant's country of origin has been part of the International Organisation of la Francophonie (OIF), the less likely the respondent has multiple identities. This might be due to the fact that the events organised by the OIF in the country of origin aim at promoting the culture of the origin country and thus at increasing the extent to which individuals feel proud of their own culture.¹³ Individuals also have the opportunity to meet co-ethnics. This would typically decrease the likelihood of having multiple identities. Finally, coming from a country that speaks French decreases the degree of exclusive commitment to the origin country culture and increases significantly the likelihood of having multiple identities.

The results of the second-stage regressions are presented in Table 12, Panel B. When ethnic identity is instrumented for, the results differ from the OLS estimates (Panel A). Ethnic identity is no longer significant in explaining the migrant's probability of being employed except for the second-generation immigrant men: having multiple identities increases their probability of being employed. Even if the coefficient is not significant though, having multiple identities remains positive for the first-generation immigrant women. Besides, the IV estimates are larger compared to the OLS estimates. However, due to the fact that the estimates are imprecise, it is difficult to make any conclusive inference.

[Insert Table 12 here]

¹³More information can be found on the organisation's website: <https://www.francophonie.org/Welcome-to-the-International.html>.

6.2 Robustness Check

One issue that need to be dealt with to be able to claim for causality is the omitted variable bias. Indeed, there might be some confounding factors that correlates with both ethnic identity and employment outcomes. For instance, one may argue that certain parental characteristics such as ability or motivation to succeed in France are likely to be associated with both the ethnic identity and the labour market outcomes of immigrants.

As a further robustness check, this study explores the sensitivity of the estimates to omitted variable bias following [Altonji, Elder and Taber \(2008\)](#) and [Oster \(2017\)](#). More specifically, the analysis investigates how robust estimates are to omitted variable bias by studying coefficient movements and movements in R-squared values after inclusion of additional controls. Table 13 reports the OLS estimates for the impact of ethnic identity on the immigrants' probability of being employed. Panel A displays the estimates when no controls are included while Panel B reports the estimates of the baseline specification and finally, Panel C presents the estimates when additional controls are included such as the parents' education as well as the parents' employment status and the health status of the individual.

The results displayed in Table 13 provide evidence that the ethnic identity effects are not due to unobserved differences in human capital or in the state of health of the individual since the results provided in Panel C do not differ significantly from those reported in Panel B. One exception is for the second-generation immigrant women: the positive impact of having multiple identities disappears when controlling for the employment status of the parents. However, for the other groups, the results are not sensitive to the inclusion of controls even though there is an increase in the R-squared. Therefore, there is no evidence of selection based on the observables.

One advantage of this framework is that it makes it possible to compute bounding values for the treatment effect. [Oster \(2017\)](#) derive the following bias-adjusted coefficient for the treatment effect:

$$\beta_1^{*'} = \tilde{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\delta} \frac{(\dot{\beta}_1 - \tilde{\beta}_1)(R_{max} - \tilde{R})}{(\tilde{R} - \dot{R})} \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\delta}$ captures the explanatory power of unobserved variables as a proportion of the explanatory power of observed variables. R_{max} denotes the R-squared from an hypothetical regression if one would observe all relevant factors for the outcome variable. The bias-adjusted coefficient depends on estimated parameters $(\dot{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_1, \dot{R}, \tilde{R})$ and chosen value for $\tilde{\delta}$ and R_{max} . The coefficient $\dot{\beta}_1$ and the R-squared \dot{R} are

estimated from the baseline specification (Table 13 Panel B) and the coefficient $\tilde{\beta}_1$ and the R-squared \tilde{R} come from the full specification (Table 13 Panel C).

With respect to $\tilde{\delta}$ and R_{max} , one needs to make some assumptions. [Oster \(2017\)](#) argues that $\tilde{\delta} \in [0, 1]$ is a useful bound. This is because it is unlikely that unobservables have a stronger impact on the outcome variable than observables. Therefore, the results are presented for $\tilde{\delta} = 1$ assuming equal selection as well as for $\tilde{\delta} = 0.5$ and $\tilde{\delta} = 1.5$ to further explore the sensitivity of the results. It is plausible to assume that $R_{max} < 1$ due to measurement error. Therefore, the results are presented for $R_{max} = 0.5$ and for $R_{max} = 0.8$. If the identified set excludes zero, the results from the controlled regressions can be considered as robust to omitted variable bias.

The results of coefficient stability to omitted variable bias are shown in Table 13 Panel D. The table reports the identified sets for both ethnic identity indices. The significant results are not driven by selection on unobservables since the bias-adjusted coefficients β_1^{*} do not change considerably relative to $\tilde{\beta}_1$ and the identified sets do not include zero. Furthermore, the identified sets indicate that having multiple identities has a positive impact on the probability of being employed for both the first- and the second-generation immigrants. It becomes negative only when selection on unobservables is assumed to be important. Hence, the results confirm that having multiple identities increases significantly the probability of being employed for immigrants.

[Insert Table 13 here]

6.3 Heterogenous Effects

The effect of ethnic identity on employment might differ depending on the migrant's ethnicity, religion, the marital status and also the ethnic density of the migrant's place of residence. The results are displayed in Table 14. The ethnic groups that are examined are the main ones: immigrants from Asia, Europe and North Africa. The first-generation Asian immigrants who are exclusively close to their origin country are less likely to be employed. However, there is no significant impact of ethnic identity for the descendants of Asian immigrants. Considering European immigrants (Panel C), there is no effect of ethnic identity in the first generation. On the other hand, the male descendants of European immigrants who are exclusively close to their parents' origin country are less likely to be employed. Finally, having multiple identities increases the probability of being employed for North African immigrant men in both generations.

Having multiple identities has a larger positive effect for first-generation immi-

grants who are Christian. On the other hand, for Muslim immigrants (Panel E), ethnic identity has no significant effect except for the first-generation immigrant women: being close to both the origin and the host country cultures increases the chances of being employed. For the first-generation immigrant men, having multiple identities increases significantly the chances of being employed irrespective of the individual's marital status, even though it increases it more for single individuals.

For the second-generation immigrants, being committed to both the origin and the French culture increases the likelihood to be employed only for single individuals whereas for married individuals, being close to the origin country culture leads to a lower probability of being employed. One potential explanation for this negative impact of the minority identity on the probability of being employed for married immigrant men in the second generation is that social norms concerning the role of women are less active for the second generation. Therefore, in couples where the husband is close to his origin country culture, the wife might be more likely to work.

For the first-generation immigrant women who are single (Panel G), having the minority identity as well as having multiple identities increase significantly their employment probability whereas for those who are married (Panel H), only having multiple identities increases the employment probability. On the opposite, being close to the origin country culture reduces their chances of being employed. This is consistent with the idea that the origin country culture is associated with more traditional gender norms, in turn decreasing the likelihood for women to work.¹⁴

In the second generation, having multiple identities increases significantly the employment probability of single women. However, this results does not hold when including the other ethnic identity measure. With respect to the second-generation immigrant women who are married, there is no significant impact of ethnic identity. This is not surprising since the second generation should have adopted more liberal gender norms compared to the first generation. Therefore, being committed to the origin country culture should not affect the women's probability of being employed.

Finally, the impact of an immigrant's ethnic identity on his employment outcomes might differ from one individual to another depending on whether the individual lives in a place where there is a high share of immigrants compared to places where the share of immigrants is low. Indeed, one may argue that in places where there is a low share of immigrants, the negative effect of having the minority identity might be amplified. Conversely, in places where there is a large share of immigrants,

¹⁴When examining the likelihood of being employed for women, the estimates of the baseline specification are similar to the ones obtained when controlling additionally for the husband's characteristics. The results are not reported with the additional controls but are available upon request.

being committed to the origin country culture should not penalise the immigrants as much. With respect to having multiple identities, it might be beneficial for immigrants living in places where there is a high ethnic density as it would allow them to differentiate themselves from the others.

Figure 6 shows the average percentage of immigrants by regions in the French population with the lightest regions being the ones with the lowest share of immigrants (between 4 and 5.5%) and the darkest regions being the ones with the highest share of immigrants (between 8.5 and 9%). Immigrants are mostly concentrated in Ile-de-France and Languedoc-Roussillon whereas Bretagne has the lowest share of immigrants. In order to avoid a simple comparison between individuals living in one region with another, a measure of the percentage of immigrants at a more disaggregated level is used in the regressions. Indeed, the percentage of immigrants was reported for the address of the respondent at the time of interview.

[Insert Figure 6 here]

Table 14 Panel I reports the results for the effect of ethnic identity on the employment probability of immigrants who live in places where ethnic density is low (less than 1.6%) while Panel J reports the results for immigrants who live in places where ethnic density is high (8.2% or more).

The results show for both generations that having multiple identities increases significantly the employment probability of the immigrant men who live in places where there is a high ethnic density. However, there is no significant impact of ethnic identity on the employment probability of the immigrant men who live in places where there is a low ethnic density for both generations. The same effect is found for the first-generation immigrant women, however not for the second-generation immigrant women. The positive effect of having multiple identities could be explained by the fact that it increases the individual's cultural and social capital, enabling him to differentiate himself from others in the labour market.

[Insert Table 14 here]

7 Conclusion

This paper investigated the impact of ethnic identity, i.e. the degree of identification with the culture and society of the host country and the country of origin, on first- and second-generation immigrants' employment outcomes in France. Relying on a polychoric principal component analysis, the paper proposed two richer measures of

ethnic identity than the ones used in the existing literature, namely: i) the degree of commitment to the origin country culture and ii) the extent to which the individual has multiple identities. Using linear probability models, the paper examined the impact of ethnic identity on a number of employment outcomes including the probability of being employed, the hourly income, the type of employment as well as the quality of employment.

The results show that preserving an attachment to the country of origin alongside adopting the French identity increases the probability of being employed for both the first- and the second-generation immigrants. There is no significant impact of ethnic identity on the hourly income of immigrants. Moreover, being exclusively committed to the origin country increases the probability of being salaried. On the opposite, it reduces the likelihood of being employed by the state. It increases the likelihood of being self-employed for the first-generation immigrant men whereas it reduces it for the first-generation immigrant women. With respect to the quality of employment, the first-generation immigrants who hold multiple identities are less likely to be employed in elementary occupations. First- and second-generation immigrant men who are exclusively close to their origin country culture are less likely to be employed as professionals/managers. Besides, the second-generation immigrant women who hold multiple identities are more likely to be employed as professionals/managers.

Due to the endogenous nature of ethnic identity, the OLS estimates are likely to be biased. To address this concern, this study relies on an instrumental variable strategy in which five instruments are included: 1) the number of years the migrant's country of origin has been a French territory, 2) the number of years the country of origin has been in the CFA zone, 3) the number of years the country of origin has been in the European Union, 4) the number of years the country of origin has been part of the International Organisation of la Francophonie and lastly, 5) whether French is a language of the country of origin. The results of the first-stage regressions show that the instruments are significantly related to the immigrant's ethnic identity. The results of the second-stage regressions show that having multiple identities increases the migrant's probability of being employed, even though it is no longer statistically significant.

A sensitivity analysis confirms that the results are not driven by selection on unobservables since the bias-adjusted coefficients are similar to the OLS estimates and the identified sets do not include zero. Besides, the more selection on unobservables is assumed to be important, the larger the coefficients. Considering the signs of the indices, having multiple identities becomes negative only when selection is assumed to be important. Lastly, the heterogeneous effect of ethnic identity is examined. The results show that the positive impact of having multiple identities is larger for single

migrants who live in places where there is a high share of immigrants.

This paper has important policy implications, especially since France has traditionally viewed the retention of a minority identity as an obstacle to the migrant's integration. On the opposite, this article provides evidence that immigrants who retain their origin country culture alongside adopting the French identity fare better than those who are assimilated which leads to question the position of France in favour of the assimilation strategy. Therefore, maintaining an open national identity that is more flexible should be the key objective for post-immigration policies.

References

- Aizlewood, Amanda, Pieter Bevelander, and Ravi Pendakur. 2005. "Research on Immigration and Integration in the Metropolis." *Vancouver Centre of Excellence Working Paper* (05-22).
- Akerlof, George A., and Rachel E. Kranton. 2000. "Economics and Identity." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 115 (3): 715-753.
- Akerlof, George A., and Rachel Kranton. 2010. "Identity Economics." *The Economists' Voice* 7 (2).
- Alesina, Alberto, and Eliana La Ferrara. 2005. "Ethnic Diversity and Economic Performance." *Journal of Economic Literature* 43 (3): 762-800.
- Alesina Alberto, Enrico Spolaore, and Romain Wacziarg. 2000. "Economic integration and political disintegration." *American Economic Review* 90(5):1276-96.
- Algan, Yann, Alberto Bisin, Alan Manning, and Thierry Verdier. 2013. *Cultural integration of immigrants in Europe*. Oxford University Press.
- Altonji, Joseph G., Todd E. Elder, and Christopher R. Taber. 2008. "Using Selection on Observed Variables to Assess Bias from Unobservables when Evaluating Swan-Ganz Catheterization." *American Economic Review* 98 (2): 345-50.
- Battu, Harminder, McDonald Mwale, and Yves Zenou. 2007. "Oppositional Identities and the Labor Market." *Journal of Population Economics* 20 (3): 643-667.
- Battu, Harminder, and Yves Zenou. 2010. "Oppositional Identities and Employment for Ethnic Minorities: Evidence from England." *The Economic Journal* 120 (542).
- Bisin, Alberto, Eleonora Patacchini, Thierry Verdier, and Yves Zenou. 2011. "Ethnic Identity and Labour Market Outcomes of Immigrants in Europe." *Economic Policy* 26 (65): 57-92.
- Bisin, Alberto, Eleonora Patacchini, Thierry Verdier, and Yves Zenou. 2016. "Bend it like Beckham: Ethnic Identity and Integration." *European Economic Review* 90, 146-164.
- Casey, Teresa, and Christian Dustmann. 2010. "Immigrants' Identity, Economic Outcomes and the Transmission of Identity Across Generations." *The Economic Journal* 120 (542).
- Clots-Figueras, Irma, and Paolo Masella. 2013. "Education, language and identity." *The Economic Journal* 123 (570): F332-F357.
- Constant, Amelie F. 2014. "Ethnic Identity and Work."
- Constant, Amelie F., Liliya Gataullina, and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2006. "Gender, Ethnic Identity and Work."
- Constant, Amelie F., Liliya Gataullina, and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2009. "Ethnosizing Immigrants." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 69 (3): 274-287.
- Constant, Amelie F., and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2008. "Measuring Ethnic Identity and its Impact on Economic Behavior." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 6 (2-3): 424-433.

- Constant, Amelie F., and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2009. "Work and Money: Payoffs by Ethnic Identity and Gender." *Ethnicity and Labor Market Outcomes*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 3-30.
- Constant, Amelie F., and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2013. "Immigrants, Ethnic Identities and the Nation-State." *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration*, 259.
- Constant, Amelie F., Martin Kahanec, Ulf Rinne, and Klaus F. Zimmermann. 2011. "Ethnicity, Job Search and Labor Market Reintegration of the Unemployed." *International Journal of Manpower* 32 (7): 753-776.
- Drydakis, Nick. 2012. "Ethnic Identity and Immigrants' Wages in Greece." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 36 (3): 389-402.
- Epstein, Gil S., and Odelia Heizler. 2015. "Ethnic Identity: A Theoretical Framework." *IZA Journal of Migration* 4 (1): 9.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 1996 "Explaining interethnic cooperation." *American political science review* 90 (4): 715-735.
- Fernández, Raquel. 2010. "Does Culture Matter?" No. w16277. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Fernández, Raquel, and Alessandra Fogli. 2009. "Culture: An Empirical Investigation of Beliefs, Work, and Fertility." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* 1 (1): 146-177.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1992. "Comment: Ethnic Invention and Acculturation, A Bumpy-line Approach." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 42-52.
- Gorinas, Cédric. 2014. "Ethnic Identity, Majority Norms, and the Native-immigrant Employment Gap." *Journal of Population Economics* 27 (1): 225-250.
- INSEE, XXI. 2012. "Immigrés et descendants d'immigrés en France." *Collection Insee References*, 232-233.
- Kolenikov, Stanislav, and Gustavo Angeles. 2004. "The Use of Discrete Data in PCA: Theory, Simulations, and Applications to Socioeconomic Indices." Chapel Hill: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina 1-59.
- Knocke, Wuokko. 2000. "Integration or Segregation? Immigrant Populations facing the Labour Market in Sweden." *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 21 (3): 361-380.
- Manning, Alan, and Sanchari Roy. 2010. "Culture Clash or Culture Club? National Identity in Britain." *The Economic Journal* 120 (542).
- Migration Policy Institute. November 2004. *The Challenge of French Diversity*. Retrieved from <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/challenge-french-diversity>
- Nekby, Lena, and Magnus Rödin. 2007. "Acculturation Identity and Labor Market Outcomes." *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 2826.
- Nekby, Lena, and Magnus Rödin. 2010. "Acculturation Identity and Employment among Second and Middle Generation Immigrants." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 31 (1): 35-50.

- Oster, Emily. 2017. "Unobservable Selection and Coefficient Stability: Theory and Evidence." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 1-18.
- Pendakur, Krishna, and Ravi Pendakur. 2005. *Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market*. Vancouver Centre of Excellence.
- Phinney, Jean S., Gabriel Horenczyk, Karmela Liebkind and Paul Vedder. 2001. "Ethnic Identity, Immigration, and Well-being: An Interactional Perspective." *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 493-510.
- Portes, Alejandro, Patricia Fernández-Kelly, and William Haller. 2005. "Segmented Assimilation On The Ground: The New Second Generation in Early Adulthood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 1000-1040.
- Portes, Alejandro and Zhou, Min. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530:74-98.
- Schüller, Simone. 2015. "Parental Ethnic Identity and Educational Attainment of Second-generation Immigrants." *Journal of Population Economics*, 28 (4), 965-1004.
- Simon, Patrick. 2012. "French National Identity and Integration: Who Belongs to the National Community." *Migration Policy Institute*.
- The Guardian. 2011. "Laurent Blanc in jeopardy as race row rattles French consciousness." Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/football/blog/2011/may/05/laurent-blanc-race-row-french>
- Zimmermann, Klaus F. 2007. "Migrant Ethnic Identity: Concept and Policy Implications."
- Zimmermann, Laura, Klaus F. Zimmermann, and Amelie Constant. 2007. "Ethnic Self-identification of First-generation Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 41 (3): 769-781.
- Zimmermann, Klaus F., Amelie Constant, and Simone Schüller. 2014. "Ethnic Spatial Dispersion and Immigrant Identity."
- Zhou, Min. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 975-1008.

Figures and Tables




Figure 1. *Immigration to France by Region of Origin*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: This figure shows the composition by region of origin of migrants that arrived in France from 1948 to 2008. Asia includes Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Turkey. Other refers to North America, Central America, South America, Middle East and Oceania. DOM refers to Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana and Reunion. North Africa includes Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia. Sahelian Africa includes Senegal, Mauritania, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad. Lastly, Central Africa refers to Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Republic of the Congo, DRC and Equatorial Guinea.




Figure 2. *Immigration to France by Residence Permits*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: This figure shows the composition by residence permits of migrants that arrived in France from 1948 to 2008. The different categories include refugees, students, workers, individuals married to a French citizen, individuals who have relatives living in France, and other permit. The two last categories include individuals who do not need a permit and individuals whose application is being processed.




Figure 3. *Scree Plot of Eigenvalues*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: This figure gives the scree plot. The eigenvectors are ordered from largest to smallest.




Figure 4. *Score Plots by Samples*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: The figure on the top gives the score plot for the entire sample with the first-generation immigrants (lighter shade) concentrated on the right, the second-generation immigrants spread in the middle and natives (darker shade) concentrated on the left. The graphs on the bottom show the score plots separately for the following samples: the first-generation immigrants are represented on the graph on the left, the second-generation immigrants are represented on the graph in the middle and the natives, on the graph on the right.




Figure 5. *Kernel Densities*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: The graph on the top shows the kernel densities for the two principal components generated from the polychoric PCA: the minority identity and the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities. The graph in the middle reports the kernel densities for the four regimes of the self-identification measure of ethnic identity: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. Finally, the graph at the bottom shows the kernel densities for the four states of the ethnosizer: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization.




Figure 6. *Composition of the Population in France 2008*
 Source: Trajectoires et Origines

Notes: The figure shows the composition of the French population in 2008 and more specifically, the average percentage of immigrants by regions with the lightest regions being the ones with the lowest share of immigrants (between 4 and 5.5%) and the darkest regions being the ones with the highest share of immigrants (between 8.5 and 9%).

Table 1.
Sociodemographic Characteristics

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Male	0.47	0.50	8,971	0.48	0.50	8,812	0.47	0.50	3,020
Female	0.53	0.50	8,971	0.52	0.50	8,812	0.53	0.50	3,020
Age at arrival in France	19.9	10.8	8,965	0	0	8,812	0	0	3,020
Age at interview	41.2	10.75	8,971	30.1	9.2	8,812	38	11.7	3,020
Living with parents	0.06	0.24	8,971	0.36	0.48	8,812	0.15	0.35	3,020
Living with partner	0.73	0.44	8,971	0.46	0.50	8,812	0.66	0.47	3,020
Married	0.66	0.47	8,971	0.30	0.46	8,812	0.47	0.50	3,020
Married french	0.58	0.49	5,770	0.80	0.40	2,574	0.98	0.14	1,382
Religion - Muslims	0.36	0.48	8,813	0.27	0.45	8,671	0.003	0.05	2,991
Religion - Catholics and other Christians ^a	0.39	0.49	8,813	0.35	0.48	8,671	0.53	0.50	2,991
Religion - Other ^b	0.07	0.25	8,813	0.04	0.20	8,671	0.007	0.08	2,991
No religion	0.18	0.39	8,813	0.34	0.47	8,671	0.47	0.50	2,991
Origin - Europe	0.26	0.44	8,971	0.39	0.49	8,435			
Origin - North Africa ^c	0.22	0.42	8,971	0.28	0.45	8,435			
Origin - Sahelian Africa ^d	0.07	0.26	8,971	0.05	0.22	8,435			
Origin - Central Africa ^e	0.08	0.27	8,971	0.04	0.19	8,435			
Origin - Other Africa	0.03	0.16	8,971	0.015	0.12	8,435			
Origin - Asia ^f	0.21	0.41	8,971	0.13	0.33	8,435			
Origin - DOM ^g	0.08	0.27	8,971	0.075	0.26	8,435			
Origin - Other ^h	0.05	0.21	8,971	0.016	0.13	8,435			
Only the mother is immigrant				0.15	0.36	8,812			
Only the father is immigrant				0.24	0.43	8,812			
Both parents are immigrants				0.61	0.49	8,812			
If both immigrants, parents have same origin				0.93	0.26	5,384			
Structure - single person	0.12	0.32	8,971	0.14	0.34	8,812	0.14	0.35	3,020
Structure - single parent family	0.09	0.28	8,971	0.13	0.34	8,812	0.09	0.28	3,020
Structure - couple family without children	0.15	0.36	8,971	0.11	0.31	8,812	0.20	0.40	3,020
Structure - couple family with children	0.58	0.49	8,971	0.57	0.50	8,812	0.55	0.50	3,020
Structure - other structure	0.07	0.25	8,971	0.06	0.23	8,812	0.03	0.17	3,020
Number of children living in dwelling	1.5	1.4	8,971	0.75	1.07	8,812	0.94	1.1	3,020
N = 20,803 individuals		8,971			8,812			3,020	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Catholics and other Christians refers to Catholics, Orthodoxes, Protestants and other christians.

^b Other refers to Jews, Buddhists, Hindus or those who have several religions.

^c North Africa refers to Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia.

^d Sahelian Africa refers to Senegal, Mauritania, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad.

^e Central Africa refers to Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Republic of the Congo, DRC and Equatorial Guinea.

^f Asia refers to Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Turkey.

^g DOM refers to Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana and Reunion.

^h Other refers to North America, Central America, South America, Middle East and Oceania.

Table 2.
Key Variables

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>									
No qualification	0.24	0.43	8,614	0.12	0.32	8,805	0.09	0.28	3,019
Primary education	0.07	0.26	8,614	0.008	0.09	8,805	0.03	0.17	3,019
Lower-secondary education	0.25	0.43	8,614	0.32	0.47	8,805	0.37	0.48	3,019
Higher-secondary education	0.16	0.36	8,614	0.26	0.44	8,805	0.21	0.41	3,019
Two-year higher education	0.08	0.27	8,614	0.13	0.33	8,805	0.14	0.34	3,019
More than two years in higher education	0.19	0.39	8,614	0.16	0.37	8,805	0.17	0.38	3,019
<i>Employment</i>									
Employed	0.68	0.47	8,971	0.67	0.47	8,812	0.76	0.42	3,020
Unemployed	0.12	0.33	8,971	0.12	0.33	8,812	0.08	0.27	3,020
Student	0.03	0.17	8,971	0.15	0.35	8,812	0.06	0.23	3,020
Inactive	0.17	0.38	8,971	0.06	0.24	8,812	0.10	0.30	3,020
<i>For those employed</i>									
Employed by the state ^a	0.15	0.36	6,106	0.22	0.41	5,901	0.25	0.43	2,307
Salaried ^b	0.76	0.43	6,106	0.73	0.44	5,901	0.66	0.47	2,307
Self-employed	0.08	0.28	6,106	0.05	0.22	5,901	0.09	0.28	2,307
<i>For salaried active workers only^c</i>									
Job - open-ended employment, full-time	0.71	0.45	5,442	0.68	0.47	5,521	0.73	0.44	2,072
Job - open-ended employment, part-time	0.11	0.32	5,442	0.10	0.30	5,521	0.13	0.34	2,072
Job - other fixed-term employment or contract	0.13	0.33	5,442	0.13	0.34	5,521	0.09	0.29	2,072
Job - other ^d	0.05	0.21	5,442	0.09	0.28	5,521	0.05	0.21	2,072
ISCO - elementary occupations ^e	0.13	0.34	5,442	0.07	0.25	5,521	0.05	0.23	2,072
ISCO - plant and machine operators and assemblers ^f	0.22	0.41	5,442	0.15	0.35	5,521	0.16	0.37	2,072
ISCO - service and sales workers ^g	0.35	0.48	5,442	0.38	0.49	5,521	0.33	0.47	2,072
ISCO - technicians, associate professionals ^h	0.13	0.34	5,442	0.19	0.39	5,521	0.18	0.38	2,072
ISCO - professionals ⁱ	0.12	0.33	5,442	0.16	0.36	5,521	0.19	0.39	2,072
ISCO - managers ^j	0.04	0.20	5,442	0.06	0.23	5,521	0.08	0.27	2,072
Number of hours per week	36.7	20	5,254	37.3	19	5,207	37.6	17.6	2,020
Work - full-time	0.83	0.38	5,352	0.85	0.36	5,273	0.82	0.39	2,045
Log net monthly salary	7.19	0.59	4,649	7.22	0.51	4,615	7.28	0.52	1,821
Log net hourly salary	3.65	0.49	4,586	3.65	0.44	4,574	3.70	0.45	1,800
Workplace - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.27	0.45	4,807	0.36	0.48	5,000	0.62	0.49	1,934
Workplace - less than half of immigrant origin	0.27	0.44	4,807	0.33	0.47	5,000	0.28	0.45	1,934
Workplace - half of immigrant origin	0.17	0.37	4,807	0.15	0.36	5,000	0.07	0.25	1,934
Workplace - over half of immigrant origin	0.14	0.35	4,807	0.10	0.30	5,000	0.03	0.17	1,934
Workplace - almost all are of immigrant origin	0.15	0.35	4,807	0.06	0.24	5,000	0.008	0.09	1,934
N = 20,803 individuals		8,971			8,812			3,020	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Individuals employed by the state include individuals employed by the state or employed by a local community.

^b Salaried individuals include individuals who are salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual or salaried company heads.

^c Salaried active workers are those who are either employed by the state, employed by a local community, salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual. Are excluded those who help a member of their family, salaried company head, or self-employed individuals.

^d “Other” includes apprenticeship or vocational training, temporary work through an agency, paid company internship and subsidized employment.

^e The category “elementary occupations” include unskilled manual workers.

^f The category “plant and machine operators and assemblers” include skilled or highly skilled worker, workshop technicians.

^g The category “service and sales workers” include first-line supervisors and office workers, sales workers, service personnel.

^h The category “technicians and associate professionals” include technicians and junior grade civil servants.

ⁱ The category “professionals” include engineers and middle grade civil servants.

^j The category “managers” include managing directors, direct deputies and senior grade civil servants.

Table 3.
Ethnic Identity

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Nationality</i>									
Nationality - French at birth	0.08	0.27	8,971	0.85	0.36	8,812	1	0	3,020
Nationality - French by acquisition	0.39	0.49	8,971	0.14	0.34	8,812	0	0	3,020
Nationality - Foreigner	0.53	0.50	8,971	0.01	0.12	8,812	0	0	3,020
<i>Languages</i>									
Speaks only French	0.05	0.22	8,951	0.39	0.49	8,811	0.86	0.34	3,020
Speaks several languages including French	0.26	0.44	8,951	0.49	0.50	8,811	0.13	0.33	3,020
Speaks several languages but not French	0.13	0.33	8,951	0.01	0.12	8,811	0	0.02	3,020
Speaks only foreign language	0.56	0.50	8,951	0.10	0.31	8,811	0.007	0.08	3,020
First language use by mother when was a child - French	0.12	0.33	8,971	0.66	0.47	8,812	0.97	0.17	3,020
First language use by father when was a child - French	0.13	0.34	8,971	0.66	0.47	8,812	0.96	0.20	3,020
<i>Links with country of origin</i>									
Visited place of origin	0.85	0.36	8,971	0.83	0.38	8,365	0	0	3,020
Use media of country of origin	0.67	0.47	8,971	0.43	0.49	8,435	0	0	3,020
Has given money to country of origin	0.11	0.32	8,971	0.08	0.27	8,812	0	0	3,020
Own land/house in country of origin	0.19	0.39	8,971	0.04	0.19	8,812	0	0	3,020
Owner or has invested in country of origin	0.01	0.11	8,971	0.002	0.05	8,812	0	0	3,020
<i>Self-image</i>									
Feel at home in France - totally disagree	0.05	0.21	8,795	0.02	0.13	8,728	0.01	0.11	2,998
Feel at home in France - disagree	0.07	0.26	8,795	0.04	0.19	8,728	0.03	0.18	2,998
Feel at home in France - agree	0.29	0.45	8,795	0.21	0.41	8,728	0.17	0.37	2,998
Feel at home in France - totally agree	0.59	0.49	8,795	0.74	0.44	8,728	0.79	0.41	2,998
Feel French - totally disagree	0.18	0.39	8,702	0.03	0.17	8,718	0.006	0.08	3,009
Feel French - disagree	0.14	0.35	8,702	0.04	0.20	8,718	0.01	0.11	3,009
Feel French - agree	0.27	0.44	8,702	0.21	0.41	8,718	0.09	0.29	3,009
Feel French - totally agree	0.40	0.49	8,702	0.72	0.45	8,718	0.89	0.31	3,009
Feel from country of origin - totally disagree	0.09	0.29	8,817	0.22	0.42	8,279	1	0	3,020
Feel from country of origin - disagree	0.09	0.29	8,817	0.14	0.35	8,279	0	0	3,020
Feel from country of origin - agree	0.25	0.43	8,817	0.31	0.46	8,279	0	0	3,020
Feel from country of origin - totally agree	0.57	0.50	8,817	0.33	0.47	8,279	0	0	3,020
<i>Education</i>									
Studied only in France	0.22	0.41	8,614	0.94	0.24	8,805	0.98	0.15	3,019
Studied in both foreign country and France	0.26	0.44	8,614	0.06	0.23	8,805	0.02	0.15	3,019
Studied only in foreign country	0.52	0.50	8,614	0.007	0.08	8,805	0	0.03	3,019
<i>Religion</i>									
Religion in upbringing - not important at all	0.15	0.35	8,843	0.24	0.43	8,726	0.39	0.49	3,005
Religion in upbringing - moderately important	0.21	0.41	8,843	0.28	0.45	8,726	0.34	0.48	3,005
Religion in upbringing - important	0.23	0.42	8,843	0.23	0.42	8,726	0.16	0.36	3,005
Religion in upbringing - very important	0.41	0.49	8,843	0.25	0.43	8,726	0.11	0.31	3,005
<i>Neighbourhood</i>									
Ethnic density - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.27	0.44	8,531	0.28	0.45	8,443	0.62	0.49	2,938
Ethnic density - less than half of immigrant origin	0.26	0.44	8,531	0.27	0.44	8,443	0.23	0.42	2,938
Ethnic density - half of immigrant origin	0.19	0.40	8,531	0.19	0.39	8,443	0.08	0.28	2,938
Ethnic density - over half of immigrant origin	0.18	0.39	8,531	0.18	0.39	8,443	0.05	0.22	2,938
Ethnic density - almost all of immigrant origin	0.10	0.30	8,531	0.08	0.27	8,443	0.02	0.12	2,938
<i>Social relationships</i>									
Belongs to associations whose members are of foreign origin	0.06	0.24	8,962	0.04	0.21	8,797	0	0	3,020
Has provided financial aid abroad in past 12 months	0.15	0.36	8,971	0.03	0.18	8,812	0.007	0.09	3,020
Contact with family/friends living abroad - never	0.13	0.33	8,971	0.38	0.48	8,812	0.71	0.45	3,020
Contact with family/friends living abroad - sometimes	0.28	0.45	8,971	0.31	0.46	8,812	0.17	0.38	3,020
Contact with family/friends living abroad - often	0.59	0.49	8,971	0.31	0.46	8,812	0.12	0.32	3,020
N = 20,803 individuals		8,971			8,812			3,020	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table 4.
Principal Components/Correlation

<i>Component</i>	<i>Eigenvalue</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Proportion</i>	<i>Cumulative</i>
Component 1	8.04581	6.39702	0.4470	0.4470
Component 2	1.64879	0.409071	0.0916	0.5386
Component 3	1.23972	0.0518343	0.0689	0.6075
Component 4	1.18789	0.235737	0.0660	0.6735
Component 5	0.952153	0.159588	0.0529	0.7264
Component 6	0.792565	0.0123473	0.0440	0.7704
Component 7	0.780218	0.0597858	0.0433	0.8137
Component 8	0.720432	0.166728	0.0400	0.8538
Component 9	0.553704	0.111439	0.0308	0.8845
Component 10	0.442265	0.0212021	0.0246	0.9091
Component 11	0.421063	0.0583418	0.0234	0.9325
Component 12	0.362721	0.0637296	0.0202	0.9526
Component 13	0.298992	0.0692291	0.0166	0.9692
Component 14	0.229762	0.0397422	0.0128	0.9820
Component 15	0.19002	0.0904919	0.0106	0.9926
Component 16	0.0995283	0.0665647	0.0055	0.9981
Component 17	0.0329635	0.031571	0.0018	0.9999
Component 18	0.00139258	.	0.0001	1.0000
N = 18,240 individuals				

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table 5.
Principal Components (Eigenvectors)

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Component 1</i>	<i>Component 2</i>
Nationality ^a	0.2934	-0.2613
Languages ^b	0.3018	-0.2650
Language mother ^c	-0.3172	0.2357
Language father ^d	-0.3096	0.2566
Visited cob ^e	0.2490	0.1128
Use media cob ^f	0.2680	0.1395
Transfer to cob ^g	0.1665	0.4667
Owner cob ^h	0.2321	0.1703
Invested in cob ⁱ	0.1658	0.3342
Home in France ^j	-0.1360	0.0193
Feel French ^k	-0.2344	0.1836
Feel cob ^l	0.2682	0.0502
Place of education ^m	0.2890	-0.1955
Religion ⁿ	0.1649	0.0985
Ethnic density ^o	0.1114	0.0206
Associations ^p	0.1297	0.4202
Aid ^q	0.1962	0.2472
Contact cob ^r	0.2443	0.1637

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a “Nationality” is equal to 1 if the individual is French at birth, 2 if the individual is French by acquisition and 3 if the individual is a foreigner.

^b “Languages” is equal to 1 if the individual speaks only French, 2 if speaks several languages including French, 3 if speaks several languages but not French, 4 if speaks only a foreign language.

^c “Language mother” is a dummy equal to 1 if French is the first language used by mother to speak to respondent when he was a child, 0 otherwise.

^d “Language father” is a dummy equal to 1 if French is the first language used by father to speak to respondent when he was a child, 0 otherwise.

^e “Visited cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent visited his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^f “Use media cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent uses the media of his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^g “Transfer to cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent has given money to his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^h “Owner cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent owns land/house in his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

ⁱ “Invested in cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent is a owner or has invested in a business in country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^j “Home in France” is a categorical variable for “I feel at home in France” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^k “Feel French” is a categorical variable for “I feel French” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^l “Feel cob” is a categorical variable for “I feel from country of origin” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^m “Place of education” is equal to 1 if the individual studied only in France, 2 if the individual studied in both France and a foreign country, 3 if the individual studied only in a foreign country.

ⁿ “Religion” is a categorical variable for “importance of religion in your upbringing” from 1 (not important at all) to 4 (very important).

^o “Ethnic density” is a categorical variable for the “proportion of immigrants who live in your neighbourhood” from 1 (none) to 5 (almost all).

^p “Associations” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent belongs to associations whose members are of same foreign origin, 0 otherwise.

^q “Aid” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent has provided financial aid to someone abroad in past 12 months, 0 otherwise.

^r “Contact cob” is a categorical variable for “Frequency at which you maintain contact with family/friends living abroad” from 1 (never) to 3 (often).

Table 6.
Descriptive Statistics of the Components

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>				<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>				<i>Natives</i>			
	<i>Minority identity</i>		<i>Multiple identities</i>		<i>Minority identity</i>		<i>Multiple identities</i>		<i>Minority identity</i>		<i>Multiple identities</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Overall sample</i>	1.18	1.15	-0.92	0.76	-0.99	1.2	0.07	0.63	-2.90	0.40	-0.02	0.27
<i>Gender</i>												
Male	1.18	1.15	-0.89	0.77	-1.03	1.22	0.07	0.63	-2.92	0.41	-0.04	0.27
Female	1.19	1.14	-0.95	0.75	-0.94	1.21	0.06	0.63	-2.89	0.39	0	0.26
<i>Age group</i>												
Age 17-30	1.06	1.22	-0.92	0.78	-0.81	1.2	0.09	0.63	-2.96	0.34	-0.03	0.21
Age 30-45	1.22	1.14	-0.92	0.77	-1.12	1.21	0.04	0.62	-2.91	0.39	-0.01	0.25
Age 45-60	1.2	1.11	-0.93	0.74	-1.54	1.05	0.04	0.60	-2.84	0.45	-0.02	0.32
<i>Marital status</i>												
Single ^a	0.80	1.17	-0.85	0.82	-1.02	1.17	0.08	0.62	-2.91	0.39	-0.03	0.26
Married	1.38	1.08	-0.96	0.72	-0.91	1.3	0.03	0.64	-2.9	0.41	-0.002	0.28
Married foreign	1.82	0.88	-1.09	0.68	0.14	1.15	-0.10	0.71	-2.65	0.43	0.20	0.24
Married french	1.10	1.11	-0.89	0.73	-1.17	1.18	0.07	0.61	-2.91	0.40	-0.005	0.27
<i>Education</i>												
No qualification	1.46	1.04	-1.12	0.65	-0.85	1.33	-0.15	0.59	-2.90	0.44	-0.11	0.30
Primary education	1.55	1.14	-1	0.70	-1.29	1.29	-0.04	0.65	-2.85	0.50	-0.12	0.36
Lower-secondary education	0.94	1.14	-0.86	0.75	-0.97	1.23	0.01	0.62	-2.94	0.41	-0.06	0.27
Higher-secondary education	1.10	1.20	-0.89	0.80	-0.96	1.16	0.11	0.61	-2.92	0.36	0.01	0.22
Two-year higher education	0.93	1.16	-0.71	0.83	-1.04	1.22	0.13	0.63	-2.89	0.40	0.007	0.27
More than two years	1.18	1.13	-0.84	0.82	-1.12	1.15	0.22	0.63	-2.82	0.37	0.07	0.24
<i>Ethnicity</i>												
Europe	1.23	1.10	-1.17	0.57	-1.32	1.11	0.07	0.58				
North Africa ^b	1.35	1.03	-0.96	0.60	-0.83	1.22	0.04	0.61				
Sahelian Africa ^c	1.64	1.05	-0.67	0.88	-0.28	1.24	0.19	0.74				
Central Africa ^d	0.99	1.11	-0.58	0.91	-1.19	1.05	0.33	0.61				
Other Africa	1.31	1.08	-0.95	0.68	-1.22	1	0.31	0.66				
Asia ^e	1.39	1.06	-1.17	0.62	-0.38	1.31	-0.26	0.68				
DOM ^f	-0.20	0.97	0.18	0.67	-1.18	0.88	0.41	0.45				
Other ^g	1.36	1.05	-0.97	0.72	-1.21	1.09	0.21	0.53				
<i>Religion</i>												
Muslims	1.65	0.90	-0.96	0.66	-0.08	1.05	0.002	0.69	-2.61	0.59	0.06	0.18
Catholics and other Christians ^h	1.04	1.18	-0.80	0.82	-1.17	1.1	0.15	0.60	-2.85	0.41	0.002	0.29
Other ⁱ	1.01	1.09	-1.08	0.72	-0.97	1.02	0.01	0.72	-2.83	0.36	0.009	0.20
No religion	0.72	1.19	-1.05	0.77	-1.6	1	0.05	0.58	-2.97	0.38	-0.04	0.24
<i>Family structure</i>												
Immigrant mother and native father					-1.77	0.83	0.28	0.43				
Immigrant father and native mother					-1.91	0.77	0.30	0.42				
Both parents are immigrants					-0.38	1.08	-0.09	0.70				
N = 18,240 Observations	7,659				7,690				2,891			

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a “Single” includes also widower and divorced.

^b North Africa refers to Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia.

^c Sahelian Africa refers to Senegal, Mauritania, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad.

^d Central Africa refers to Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Republic of the Congo, DRC and Equatorial Guinea.

^e Asia refers to Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Turkey.

^f DOM refers to Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana and Reunion.

^g Other refers to North America, Central America, South America, Middle East and Oceania.

^h Catholics and other Christians refers to Catholics, Orthodoxes, Protestants and other christians.

ⁱ Other refers to Jews, Buddhists, Hindus or those who have several religions.

Table 7.
Correlation Matrix - Ethnic Identity Measures

	<i>PCA</i>		<i>Self-identification</i>				<i>Ethnosizer</i>			
	<i>Minority identity</i>	<i>Multiple identities</i>	<i>Int.</i>	<i>Assim.</i>	<i>Marg.</i>	<i>Sep.</i>	<i>Int.</i>	<i>Assim.</i>	<i>Marg.</i>	<i>Sep.</i>
Minority identity	1.0000									
Multiple identities	-0.5414*	1.0000								
Self Integration	0.0454*	0.1568*	1.0000							
Self Assimilation	-0.4859*	0.1475*	-0.5628*	1.0000						
Self Marginalization	0.0456*	-0.0960*	-0.2694*	-0.1392*	1.0000					
Self Separation	0.4561*	-0.3155*	-0.5070*	-0.2618*	-0.1254*	1.0000				
Ethno Integration	0.1483*	0.1978*	0.6156*	-0.4070*	-0.1514*	-0.2446*	1.0000			
Ethno Assimilation	-0.7599*	0.4481*	-0.2437*	0.6174*	-0.0190	-0.3341*	-0.4258*	1.0000		
Ethno Marginalization	0.1853*	-0.1949*	-0.2186*	-0.1162*	0.6980*	-0.0286*	-0.0286*	-0.1495*	1.0000	
Ethno Separation	0.7038*	-0.5841*	-0.2561*	-0.2578*	-0.0563*	0.6372*	-0.3006*	-0.6317*	-0.0241*	1.0000
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>										
Minority identity	1.0000									
Multiple identities	-0.2422*	1.0000								
Self Integration	-0.1618*	0.2718*	1.0000							
Self Assimilation	-0.3542*	-0.0105	-0.4018*	1.0000						
Self Marginalization	-0.0160	-0.0919*	-0.2659*	-0.1002*	1.0000					
Self Separation	0.4588*	-0.2452*	-0.6604*	-0.2488*	-0.1647*	1.0000				
Ethno Integration	-0.0727*	0.3657*	0.5913*	-0.2382*	-0.1331*	-0.3897*	1.0000			
Ethno Assimilation	-0.6555*	0.2570*	-0.0588*	0.5404*	-0.0267	-0.3213*	-0.2216*	1.0000		
Ethno Marginalization	0.0574*	-0.0988*	-0.2126*	-0.0217	0.6124*	-0.0759*	-0.1359*	-0.0452*	1.0000	
Ethno Separation	0.6630*	-0.4498*	-0.4009*	-0.2337*	-0.0767*	0.6553*	-0.5011*	-0.6182*	-0.1695*	1.0000
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>										
Minority identity	1.0000									
Multiple identities	-0.2891*	1.0000								
Self Integration	0.3382*	0.0408*	1.0000							
Self Assimilation	-0.5345*	0.0385*	-0.7223*	1.0000						
Self Marginalization	0.0266	-0.0413*	-0.2730*	-0.1770*	1.0000					
Self Separation	0.3056*	-0.1189*	-0.3347*	-0.2170*	-0.0820*	1.0000				
Ethno Integration	0.5128*	0.0501*	0.6388*	-0.5605*	-0.1689*	-0.0478*	1.0000			
Ethno Assimilation	-0.6909*	0.2331*	-0.4762*	0.6392*	-0.0155	-0.1865*	-0.7538*	1.0000		
Ethno Marginalization	0.0921*	-0.0985*	-0.2438*	-0.1678*	0.8969*	-0.0608*	-0.1698*	-0.0400*	1.0000	
Ethno Separation	0.4076*	-0.2879*	-0.1443*	-0.1349*	-0.0657*	0.5200*	-0.1203*	-0.4107*	-0.0632*	1.0000

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: The first part of the table is for the entire sample, the middle part when including only the first-generation immigrants and the bottom part only for the second-generation immigrants. “Self” refers to the self-identification measure, “Ethno” refers to the ethnosizer, “Int” to integration, “Assim” to assimilation, “Marg” to marginalization and “Sep” to separation”.

Table 8.

Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Probability of Being Employed - Linear Probability Models

	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						
Minority identity	0.007 (0.91)		0.005 (0.74)	-0.004 (-0.45)		-0.002 (-0.24)
Multiple identities		0.032*** (3.35)	0.032*** (3.30)		0.034*** (2.91)	0.034*** (2.88)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,638	3,638	3,638	3,949	3,949	3,949
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						
Minority identity	-0.009 (-1.51)		-0.005 (-0.82)	-0.011 (-1.59)		-0.008 (-1.12)
Multiple identities		0.027*** (2.60)	0.025** (2.22)		0.019* (1.69)	0.015 (1.26)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,624	3,624	3,624	4,010	4,010	4,010

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for the first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. *t* statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 9.
Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Hourly Income - OLS Regressions

	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						
Minority identity	0.0003 (0.02)		-0.0003 (-0.02)	-0.009 (-0.78)		-0.009 (-0.76)
Multiple identities		0.022 (1.34)	0.022 (1.34)		0.004 (0.23)	0.003 (0.16)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,113	2,113	2,113	1,854	1,854	1,854
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						
Minority identity	-0.005 (-0.47)		-0.001 (-0.13)	0.0005 (0.07)		0.006 (0.75)
Multiple identities		0.019 (1.17)	0.019 (1.07)		0.028** (2.07)	0.031** (2.20)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,948	1,948	1,948	2,053	2,053	2,053

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for the first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”.

t statistics in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 10.

Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Type of Employment - Linear Probability Models

	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						
<i>Being salaried</i>						
Minority identity	-0.012 (-1.35)		-0.011 (-1.27)	0.034*** (3.23)		0.031*** (2.95)
Multiple identities		-0.015 (-1.27)	-0.014 (-1.19)		-0.050*** (-3.33)	-0.046*** (-3.09)
<i>Employed by the state</i>						
Minority identity	-0.0003 (-0.04)		-0.0006 (-0.08)	-0.018* (-1.85)		-0.015 (-1.58)
Multiple identities		0.006 (0.69)	0.006 (0.69)		0.042** (2.99)	0.040*** (2.88)
<i>Being self-employed</i>						
Minority identity	0.012* (1.82)		0.012* (1.77)	-0.016** (-2.58)		-0.016** (-2.52)
Multiple identities		0.009 (0.99)	0.008 (0.89)		0.008 (1.00)	0.006 (0.74)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,878	2,878	2,878	2,342	2,342	2,342
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						
<i>Being salaried</i>						
Minority identity	0.017** (2.22)		0.015* (1.94)	0.0007 (0.07)		-0.005 (-0.58)
Multiple identities		-0.016 (-1.19)	-0.009 (-0.63)		-0.030** (-1.99)	-0.033** (-2.07)
<i>Employed by the state</i>						
Minority identity	-0.014** (-2.09)		-0.013* (-1.92)	0.002 (0.23)		0.006 (0.63)
Multiple identities		0.009 (0.76)	0.003 (-1.92)		0.017 (1.15)	0.020 (1.29)
<i>Being self-employed</i>						
Minority identity	-0.003 (-0.67)		-0.002 (-0.42)	-0.003 (-0.75)		-0.0003 (-0.07)
Multiple identities		0.007 (0.88)	0.006 (0.73)		0.013** (2.28)	0.013** (2.13)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,567	2,567	2,567	2,550	2,550	2,550

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for the first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. *t* statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 11.

Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Quality of Employment - Linear Probability Models

	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						
<i>In elementary occupations</i>						
Minority identity	0.010 (1.34)		0.011 (1.44)	0.003 (0.43)		0.002 (0.24)
Multiple identities		-0.027*** (-2.74)	-0.027*** (-2.79)		-0.021** (-2.17)	-0.021** (-2.13)
<i>Professional/manager</i>						
Minority identity	-0.012* (-1.71)		-0.013* (-1.76)	-0.008 (-0.95)		-0.008 (-0.95)
Multiple identities		0.013 (1.36)	0.014 (1.42)		-0.0001 (-0.01)	-0.001 (-0.10)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,174	2,174	2,174
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						
<i>In elementary occupations</i>						
Minority identity	0.004 (0.80)		0.004 (0.80)	-0.004 (-1.07)		-0.006 (-1.48)
Multiple identities		-0.001 (-0.15)	0.0008 (0.08)		-0.007 (-1.09)	-0.010 (-1.55)
<i>Professional/manager</i>						
Minority identity	-0.017** (-2.58)		-0.015** (-2.19)	-0.0008 (-0.12)		0.006 (0.78)
Multiple identities		0.019* (1.79)	0.012 (1.05)		0.033*** (2.69)	0.036*** (2.74)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,339	2,339	2,339	2,445	2,445	2,445

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for the first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. *t* statistics in parentheses.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 12.
Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Probability of Being Employed - IV Strategy

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>					
	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
<i>Panel A: OLS results</i>												
Minority identity	0.007 (0.91)		0.005 (0.74)	-0.004 (-0.45)		-0.002 (-0.24)	-0.009 (-1.51)		-0.005 (-0.82)	-0.011 (-1.59)		-0.008 (-1.12)
Multiple identities		0.032*** (3.35)	0.032*** (3.30)		0.034*** (2.91)	0.034** (2.88)		0.027*** (2.60)	0.025** (2.22)		0.019* (1.69)	0.015 (1.26)
Observations	3,638	3,638	3,638	3,949	3,949	3,949	3,624	3,624	3,624	4,010	4,010	4,010
<i>Panel B: second-stage results</i>												
Minority identity	0.060 (1.45)		0.053 (0.65)	-0.028 (-0.73)		0.039 (0.43)	-0.043 (-0.65)		0.186 (1.24)	0.055 (1.30)		-0.147 (-0.40)
Multiple identities		-0.083 (-1.30)	-0.022 (-0.17)		0.058 (1.01)	0.115 (0.81)		0.112 (1.39)	0.328* (1.39)		-0.149 (-1.60)	-0.434 (-0.54)
<i>Panel C: first-stage results</i>												
Years French country	-0.0004 (-0.38)	0.003*** (3.30)		-0.001 (-1.59)	0.004*** (5.98)		0.002* (1.91)	0.0001 (0.13)		0.003*** (2.84)	-0.001** (-2.33)	
Years in CFA zone	0.002 (0.88)	-0.001 (-0.86)		-0.002 (-1.04)	0.004*** (3.19)		-0.0002 (-0.05)	0.002 (0.99)		-0.002 (-0.85)	0.003 (1.63)	
Years EU member	-0.0006 (-0.25)	0.005*** (2.83)		-0.008*** (-3.76)	0.002 (1.43)		-0.014*** (-4.31)	0.010*** (5.17)		-0.026*** (-8.37)	0.011*** (5.88)	
Years OIF member	-0.007*** (-3.08)	-0 (-0.00)		-0.003 (-1.19)	-0.003** (-1.97)		0.004 (0.82)	-0.010*** (-4.10)		0.012*** (3.02)	-0.008*** (-3.12)	
Country of origin speaks French	-0.806*** (-8.22)	0.470*** (6.40)		-0.904*** (-9.83)	0.626*** (9.46)		-0.274** (-2.28)	0.295*** (4.25)		-0.414*** (-3.57)	0.212*** (3.04)	
Observations	3,156	3,156	3,156	3,337	3,337	3,337	3,385	3,385	3,385	3,781	3,781	3,781
F (excluded IVs)	23.03	17.73		41.28	34.53		6.29	12.69		20.98	12.38	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. t statistics in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 13.

Impact of Ethnic Identity on the Probability of Being Employed - Sensitivity Analysis - Linear Probability Models

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>					
	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
<i>Panel A: no controls</i>												
Minority identity	-0.0008 (-0.14)		0.003 (0.45)	-0.070*** (-10.51)		-0.058*** (-8.11)	-0.026*** (-4.14)		-0.025*** (-3.95)	-0.045*** (-7.12)		-0.042*** (-6.40)
Multiple identities		0.033*** (3.97)	0.034*** (4.01)		0.087*** (8.98)	0.058*** (5.67)		0.015 (1.31)	0.002 (0.19)		0.041*** (3.40)	0.016 (1.26)
Individual characteristics	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Region Controls	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Observations	3,679	3,679	3,679	3,980	3,980	3,980	3,648	3,648	3,648	4,042	4,042	4,042
R-squared	0.0000	0.0040	0.0040	0.0269	0.0179	0.0341	0.0047	0.0004	0.0048	0.0124	0.0029	0.0128
<i>Panel B: baseline specification</i>												
Minority identity	0.007 (0.91)		0.005 (0.74)	-0.004 (-0.45)		-0.002 (-0.24)	-0.009 (-1.51)		-0.005 (-0.82)	-0.011 (-1.59)		-0.008 (-1.12)
Multiple identities		0.032*** (3.35)	0.032*** (3.30)		0.034*** (2.91)	0.034*** (2.88)		0.027*** (2.60)	0.025** (2.22)		0.019* (1.69)	0.015 (1.26)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,638	3,638	3,638	3,949	3,949	3,949	3,624	3,624	3,624	4,010	4,010	4,010
R-squared	0.1259	0.1283	0.1285	0.1662	0.1679	0.1679	0.3106	0.3114	0.3116	0.2391	0.2391	0.2394
<i>Panel C: full specification</i>												
Minority identity	0.007 (0.81)		0.005 (0.63)	-0.006 (-0.66)		-0.005 (-0.55)	-0.012* (-1.73)		-0.008 (-1.12)	-0.004 (-0.51)		-0.0007 (-0.08)
Multiple identities		0.030*** (2.83)	0.030*** (2.78)		0.023* (1.78)	0.023* (1.73)		0.032*** (2.73)	0.029** (2.36)		0.020 (1.53)	0.019 (1.46)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extra controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,906	2,906	2,906	3,138	3,138	3,138	2,974	2,974	2,974	3,263	3,263	3,263
R-squared	0.1789	0.1810	0.1811	0.2038	0.2045	0.2046	0.3481	0.3491	0.3494	0.2683	0.2687	0.2687
<i>Panel D: sensitivity tests</i>												
Identified sets:												
For $R_{max} = 0.5$ and $\delta = 0.5$	[-0.001;0.007]	[0.030;0.043]*		[-0.021;-0.006]	[0.023;0.039]*		[-0.032;-0.012]*	[0.032;0.056]*		[-0.004;0.077]	[0.020;0.106]*	
For $R_{max} = 0.5$ and $\delta = 1$	[-0.010;0.007]	[0.030;0.056]*		[-0.037;-0.006]	[0.023;0.057]*		[-0.094;-0.012]*	[0.032;0.114]*		[-0.004;1.22]	[0.020;1.49]*	
For $R_{max} = 0.5$ and $\delta = 1.5$	[-0.020;0.007]	[0.030;0.072]*		[-0.057;-0.006]	[0.023;0.080]*		[-0.109;-0.012]*	[-0.230;0.032]		[-0.040;-0.004]	[-0.049;0.020]	
For $R_{max} = 0.8$ and $\delta = 0.5$	[-0.009;0.007]	[0.030;0.055]*		[-0.037;-0.006]	[0.023;0.057]*		[-0.151;-0.012]*	[0.032;0.211]*		[-0.004;0.253]	[0.020;0.403]*	
For $R_{max} = 0.8$ and $\delta = 1$	[-0.031;0.007]	[0.030;0.088]*		[-0.079;-0.006]	[0.023;0.108]*		[-1.574;-0.012]*	[0.032;2.45]*		[-0.004;4.49]	[0.020;6.83]*	
For $R_{max} = 0.8$ and $\delta = 1.5$	[-0.065;0.007]	[0.030;0.133]*		[-0.142;-0.006]	[0.023;0.204]*		[-0.012;0.038]	[-0.053;0.032]		[-0.031;-0.004]	[-0.029;0.020]	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. t statistics in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Table 14.
Heterogenous Effects of Ethnic Identity - Linear Probability Models

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>					
	<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>			<i>Male</i>			<i>Female</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
<i>Panel A: all immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.007 (0.91)		0.005 (0.74)	-0.004 (-0.45)		-0.002 (-0.24)	-0.009 (-1.51)		-0.005 (-0.82)	-0.011 (-1.59)		-0.008 (-1.12)
Multiple identities		0.032*** (3.35)	0.032*** (3.30)		0.034*** (2.91)	0.034*** (2.88)		0.027*** (2.60)	0.025** (2.22)		0.019* (1.69)	0.015 (1.26)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,638	3,638	3,638	3,949	3,949	3,949	3,624	3,624	3,624	4,010	4,010	4,010
<i>Panel B: Asian immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	-0.036** (-2.03)		-0.045** (-2.41)	-0.047** (-2.11)		-0.052** (-2.24)	-0.013 (-0.67)		-0.010 (-0.48)	-0.020 (-0.90)		-0.015 (-0.62)
Multiple identities		0.020 (0.92)	0.037 (1.60)		0.010 (0.36)	0.028 (0.93)		0.032 (1.21)	0.029 (1.09)		0.031 (0.98)	0.025 (0.74)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	844	844	844	788	788	788	474	474	474	488	488	488
<i>Panel C: European immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.019 (1.35)		0.022 (1.48)	0.006 (0.40)		0.011 (0.71)	-0.013* (-1.65)		-0.015* (-1.75)	-0.015 (-1.52)		-0.011 (-1.05)
Multiple identities		0.019 (0.87)	0.024 (1.05)		0.035 (1.51)	0.039 (1.63)		0.002 (0.16)	-0.012 (-0.72)		0.026 (1.42)	0.016 (0.82)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	921	921	921	1,165	1,165	1,165	1,507	1,507	1,507	1,501	1,501	1,501
<i>Panel D: North African immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	-0.017 (-0.94)		-0.018 (-0.98)	-0.005 (-0.25)		-0.005 (-0.24)	-0.019 (-1.28)		-0.011 (-0.73)	-0.021 (-1.50)		-0.025* (-1.72)
Multiple identities		0.044* (1.83)	0.045* (1.84)		0.003 (0.09)	0.002 (0.06)		0.054** (2.45)	0.050** (2.20)		-0.008 (-0.36)	-0.020 (-0.88)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	840	840	840	821	821	821	942	942	942	1,220	1,220	1,220

Table 14.
Heterogenous Effects of Ethnic Identity - Linear Probability Models - Continued

<i>Panel E: Muslim immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.0004 (0.03)		-0.002 (-0.15)	-0.018 (-1.07)		-0.020 (-1.17)	-0.016 (-1.08)		-0.013 (-0.84)	0.003 (0.23)		0.004 (0.24)
Multiple identities		0.018 (1.02)	0.018 (1.04)		0.043* (1.87)	0.044* (1.93)		0.030 (1.47)	0.027 (1.29)		-0.0002 (-0.01)	0.001 (0.06)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,336	1,336	1,336	1,267	1,267	1,267	948	948	948	1,227	1,227	1,227
<i>Panel F: Christian immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.028** (2.37)		0.028** (2.37)	0.011 (0.95)		0.014 (1.19)	-0.006 (-0.64)		-0.002 (-0.22)	-0.005 (-0.47)		-0.004 (-0.35)
Multiple identities		0.031** (2.02)	0.031** (2.02)		0.034** (2.08)	0.036** (2.20)		0.021 (1.28)	0.020 (1.10)		0.008 (0.44)	0.006 (0.29)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,302	1,302	1,302	1,729	1,729	1,729	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,448	1,448	1,448
<i>Panel G: single immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.015 (1.12)		0.018 (1.35)	0.023* (1.68)		0.027** (1.98)	-0.007 (-0.84)		-0.001 (-0.17)	-0.012 (-1.34)		-0.008 (-0.86)
Multiple identities		0.036** (2.08)	0.039** (2.23)		0.036* (1.82)	0.041** (2.09)		0.035*** (2.63)	0.035** (2.45)		0.026* (1.85)	0.022 (1.53)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1,204	1,204	1,204	1,384	1,384	1,384	2,645	2,645	2,645	2,649	2,649	2,649
<i>Panel H: married immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	-0.002 (-0.19)		-0.005 (-0.55)	-0.021* (-1.95)		-0.021* (-1.90)	-0.016** (-2.01)		-0.017** (-2.03)	-0.006 (-0.51)		-0.003 (-0.23)
Multiple identities		0.028** (2.44)	0.029** (2.53)		0.035** (2.41)	0.035** (2.36)		0.002 (0.16)	-0.007 (-0.48)		0.015 (0.76)	0.013 (0.64)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,434	2,434	2,434	2,565	2,565	2,565	979	979	979	1,361	1,361	1,361

Table 14.
Heterogenous Effects of Ethnic Identity - Linear Probability Models - Continued

<i>Panel I: ethnic density place of residence</i>												
<i>Less than 1.6% immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	-0.020 (-0.74)		-0.022 (-0.63)	-0.034 (-1.22)		-0.038 (-1.04)	-0.026 (-0.99)		-0.028 (-0.81)	-0.024 (-0.89)		-0.021 (-0.60)
Multiple identities		0.012 (0.29)	-0.007 (-0.12)		0.022 (0.51)	-0.012 (-0.21)		0.018 (0.43)	-0.006 (-0.11)		0.027 (0.64)	0.009 (0.16)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	240	240	240	238	238	238	243	243	243	250	250	250
<i>Panel J: ethnic density place of residence</i>												
<i>8.2% or more immigrants</i>												
Minority identity	0.008 (0.87)		0.006 (0.68)	-0.013 (-1.26)		-0.011 (-1.07)	-0.013 (-1.54)		-0.009 (-1.06)	0.005 (0.58)		0.007 (0.81)
Multiple identities		0.022** (1.98)	0.021* (1.89)		0.043*** (3.15)	0.042*** (3.07)		0.028** (2.08)	0.024* (1.72)		0.007 (0.53)	0.011 (0.78)
Individual characteristics	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	2,593	2,593	2,593	2,848	2,848	2,848	2,279	2,279	2,279	2,684	2,684	2,684

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: Individual characteristics include age, age-squared, the age at arrival for first-generation immigrants only, whether the individual is married, religion dummies, education, region of origin. The base group for religion is “no religion”; the base group for education is “no education”; and the base group for region of origin is “Asia”. *t* statistics in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Appendix




Figure A.1. *Histogram Plots by Samples*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: The figures show the histogram plots separately for the following samples: the first-generation immigrants are represented on the left, the second-generation immigrants are represented in the middle and the natives, on the right.




Figure A.2. *Density Plots by Samples*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: The figures show the density plots separately for the following samples: the first-generation immigrants are represented on the left, the second-generation immigrants are represented in the middle and the natives, on the right.




Figure A.3. *Kernel Densities by Samples*

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Notes: The distributions of the measures are provided separately for the first- and the second-generation immigrants. The graphs for the first-generation immigrants are the ones on the left while the ones for the second-generation immigrants are on the right. The two graphs on the top show the kernel densities for the two principal components generated from the polychoric PCA: the minority identity and the extent to which the individual holds multiple identities. The two graphs in the middle report the kernel densities for the four regimes of the self-identification measure of ethnic identity: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization. Finally, the two graphs at the bottom shows the kernel densities for the four states of the ethnosizer: integration, assimilation, separation and marginalization.

Table A.1.
Key Variables for Men

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>									
No qualification	0.24	0.43	4,098	0.14	0.35	4,196	0.09	0.29	1,421
Primary education	0.07	0.26	4,098	0.008	0.09	4,196	0.03	0.17	1,421
Lower-secondary education	0.26	0.44	4,098	0.36	0.48	4,196	0.40	0.49	1,421
Higher-secondary education	0.16	0.37	4,098	0.24	0.43	4,196	0.19	0.39	1,421
Two-year higher education	0.08	0.27	4,098	0.11	0.32	4,196	0.12	0.32	1,421
More than two years in higher education	0.19	0.39	4,098	0.14	0.35	4,196	0.18	0.38	1,421
<i>Employment</i>									
Employed	0.79	0.41	4,188	0.71	0.46	4,197	0.80	0.41	1,421
Unemployed	0.11	0.31	4,188	0.13	0.33	4,197	0.07	0.25	1,421
Student	0.03	0.17	4,188	0.14	0.35	4,197	0.07	0.25	1,421
Inactive	0.07	0.26	4,188	0.02	0.16	4,197	0.07	0.25	1,421
<i>For those employed</i>									
Employed by the state ^a	0.11	0.31	3,304	0.16	0.37	2,962	0.19	0.39	1,133
Salaried ^b	0.79	0.41	3,304	0.77	0.42	2,962	0.71	0.45	1,133
Self-employed	0.11	0.31	3,304	0.07	0.26	2,962	0.11	0.31	1,133
<i>For salaried active workers only^c</i>									
Job - open-ended employment, full-time	0.78	0.41	2,851	0.74	0.44	2,706	0.84	0.36	988
Job - open-ended employment, part-time	0.05	0.23	2,851	0.05	0.21	2,706	0.04	0.20	988
Job - other fixed-term employment or contract	0.10	0.30	2,851	0.11	0.32	2,706	0.06	0.23	988
Job - other ^d	0.06	0.24	2,851	0.10	0.30	2,706	0.06	0.23	988
ISCO - elementary occupations ^e	0.15	0.36	2,851	0.09	0.29	2,706	0.06	0.24	988
ISCO - plant and machine operators and assemblers ^f	0.34	0.47	2,851	0.25	0.43	2,706	0.27	0.44	988
ISCO - service and sales workers ^g	0.22	0.41	2,851	0.25	0.43	2,706	0.20	0.40	988
ISCO - technicians, associate professionals ^h	0.12	0.33	2,851	0.20	0.40	2,706	0.19	0.39	988
ISCO - professionals ⁱ	0.13	0.34	2,851	0.17	0.38	2,706	0.21	0.41	988
ISCO - managers ^j	0.04	0.20	2,851	0.04	0.19	2,706	0.07	0.26	988
Number of hours per week	38.8	15.5	2,770	40.2	22.7	2,555	40.4	16.7	969
Work - full-time	0.95	0.23	2,813	0.94	0.24	2,594	0.97	0.18	981
Log net monthly salary	7.34	0.54	2,432	7.33	0.50	2,252	7.44	0.50	873
Log net hourly salary	3.71	0.50	2,406	3.68	0.48	2,231	3.77	0.47	862
Workplace - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.24	0.43	2,707	0.32	0.47	2,514	0.61	0.49	954
Workplace - less than half of immigrant origin	0.26	0.44	2,707	0.33	0.47	2,514	0.28	0.45	954
Workplace - half of immigrant origin	0.18	0.39	2,707	0.16	0.37	2,514	0.08	0.27	954
Workplace - over half of immigrant origin	0.15	0.36	2,707	0.12	0.32	2,514	0.03	0.16	954
Workplace - almost all are of immigrant origin	0.16	0.37	2,707	0.07	0.25	2,514	0.004	0.06	954
N = 9,806 individuals		4,188			4,197			1,421	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Individuals employed by the state include individuals employed by the state or employed by a local community.

^b Salaried individuals include individuals who are salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual or salaried company heads.

^c Salaried active workers are those who are either employed by the state, employed by a local community, salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual. Are excluded those who help a member of their family, salaried company head, or self-employed individuals.

^d “Other” includes apprenticeship or vocational training, temporary work through an agency, paid company internship and subsidized employment.

^e The category “elementary occupations” include unskilled manual workers.

^f The category “plant and machine operators and assemblers” include skilled or highly skilled worker, workshop technicians.

^g The category “service and sales workers” include first-line supervisors and office workers, sales workers, service personnel.

^h The category “technicians and associate professionals” include technicians and junior grade civil servants.

ⁱ The category “professionals” include engineers and middle grade civil servants.

^j The category “managers” include managing directors, direct deputies and senior grade civil servants.

Table A.2.
Key Variables for Women

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>									
No qualification	0.25	0.43	4,516	0.10	0.30	4,609	0.08	0.27	1,598
Primary education	0.08	0.27	4,516	0.008	0.09	4,609	0.03	0.18	1,598
Lower-secondary education	0.24	0.43	4,516	0.29	0.45	4,609	0.34	0.47	1,598
Higher-secondary education	0.15	0.36	4,516	0.28	0.45	4,609	0.22	0.42	1,598
Two-year higher education	0.08	0.27	4,516	0.14	0.35	4,609	0.15	0.36	1,598
More than two years in higher education	0.19	0.40	4,516	0.18	0.39	4,609	0.17	0.37	1,598
<i>Employment</i>									
Employed	0.58	0.49	4,783	0.64	0.48	4,615	0.73	0.44	1,599
Unemployed	0.13	0.34	4,783	0.12	0.32	4,615	0.09	0.28	1,599
Student	0.03	0.17	4,783	0.15	0.36	4,615	0.05	0.22	1,599
Inactive	0.25	0.44	4,783	0.09	0.29	4,615	0.13	0.34	1,599
<i>For those employed</i>									
Employed by the state ^a	0.20	0.40	2,780	0.27	0.44	2,935	0.31	0.46	1,165
Salaried ^b	0.74	0.44	2,780	0.70	0.46	2,935	0.62	0.49	1,165
Self-employed	0.06	0.24	2,780	0.03	0.18	2,935	0.07	0.25	1,165
<i>For salaried active workers only^c</i>									
Job - open-ended employment, full-time	0.63	0.48	2,591	0.63	0.48	2,815	0.63	0.48	1,084
Job - open-ended employment - part-time	0.18	0.38	2,591	0.15	0.36	2,815	0.21	0.41	1,084
Job - other fixed-term employment or contract	0.16	0.37	2,591	0.15	0.36	2,815	0.12	0.33	1,084
Job - other ^d	0.03	0.17	2,591	0.07	0.26	2,815	0.04	0.19	1,084
ISCO - elementary occupations ^e	0.11	0.32	2,591	0.04	0.20	2,815	0.05	0.21	1,084
ISCO - plant and machine operators and assemblers ^f	0.09	0.28	2,591	0.05	0.21	2,815	0.07	0.25	1,084
ISCO - service and sales workers ^g	0.50	0.50	2,591	0.51	0.50	2,815	0.45	0.50	1,084
ISCO - technicians, associate professionals ^h	0.14	0.35	2,591	0.18	0.39	2,815	0.18	0.38	1,084
ISCO - professionals ⁱ	0.12	0.32	2,591	0.14	0.35	2,815	0.18	0.38	1,084
ISCO - managers ^j	0.04	0.19	2,591	0.07	0.26	2,815	0.09	0.28	1,084
Number of hours per week	34.2	23.4	2,484	34.6	14	2,652	35	18	1,051
Work - full-time	0.69	0.46	2,539	0.76	0.43	2,679	0.68	0.47	1,064
Log net monthly salary	7.02	0.60	2,217	7.12	0.50	2,363	7.13	0.50	948
Log net hourly salary	3.58	0.47	2,180	3.62	0.41	2,343	3.63	0.42	938
Workplace - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.31	0.46	2,100	0.40	0.49	2,486	0.62	0.49	980
Workplace - less than half of immigrant origin	0.28	0.45	2,100	0.33	0.47	2,486	0.27	0.45	980
Workplace - half of immigrant origin	0.15	0.36	2,100	0.14	0.34	2,486	0.06	0.24	980
Workplace - over half of immigrant origin	0.13	0.34	2,100	0.09	0.28	2,486	0.03	0.18	980
Workplace - almost all are of immigrant origin	0.13	0.34	2,100	0.05	0.22	2,486	0.01	0.11	980
N = 10,997 individuals		4,783			4,615			1,599	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Individuals employed by the state include individuals employed by the state or employed by a local community.

^b Salaried individuals include individuals who are salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual or salaried company heads.

^c Salaried active workers are those who are either employed by the state, employed by a local community, salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual. Are excluded those who help a member of their family, salaried company head, or self-employed individuals.

^d “Other” includes apprenticeship or vocational training, temporary work through an agency, paid company internship and subsidized employment.

^e The category “elementary occupations” include unskilled manual workers.

^f The category “plant and machine operators and assemblers” include skilled or highly skilled worker, workshop technicians.

^g The category “service and sales workers” include first-line supervisors and office workers, sales workers, service personnel.

^h The category “technicians and associate professionals” include technicians and junior grade civil servants.

ⁱ The category “professionals” include engineers and middle grade civil servants.

^j The category “managers” include managing directors, direct deputies and senior grade civil servants.

Table A.3.
Key Variables for Men by Marital Status

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>																		
No qualification	0.20	0.40	1,360	0.26	0.44	2,738	0.14	0.34	3,085	0.15	0.36	1,111	0.09	0.29	761	0.09	0.29	660
Primary education	0.04	0.20	1,360	0.09	0.28	2,738	0.007	0.08	3,085	0.01	0.11	1,111	0.02	0.15	761	0.04	0.19	660
Lower-secondary education	0.29	0.45	1,360	0.25	0.43	2,738	0.35	0.48	3,085	0.38	0.49	1,111	0.37	0.48	761	0.44	0.50	660
Higher-secondary education	0.19	0.39	1,360	0.14	0.35	2,738	0.26	0.44	3,085	0.17	0.37	1,111	0.23	0.42	761	0.14	0.35	660
Two-year higher education	0.08	0.28	1,360	0.08	0.27	2,738	0.11	0.31	3,085	0.13	0.34	1,111	0.12	0.33	761	0.11	0.32	660
More than two years in higher education	0.20	0.40	1,360	0.19	0.39	2,738	0.14	0.34	3,085	0.17	0.37	1,111	0.17	0.37	761	0.18	0.39	660
<i>Employment</i>																		
Employed	0.71	0.45	1,374	0.83	0.38	2,814	0.63	0.48	3,085	0.92	0.26	1,112	0.73	0.45	761	0.88	0.32	660
Unemployed	0.13	0.34	1,374	0.09	0.29	2,814	0.15	0.36	3,085	0.06	0.23	1,112	0.10	0.31	761	0.03	0.16	660
Student	0.09	0.28	1,374	0.002	0.04	2,814	0.19	0.39	3,085	0.004	0.06	1,112	0.12	0.33	761	0.002	0.04	660
Inactive	0.07	0.25	1,374	0.08	0.27	2,814	0.03	0.17	3,085	0.02	0.12	1,112	0.05	0.22	761	0.09	0.29	660
<i>For those employed</i>																		
Employed by the state ^a	0.13	0.34	978	0.10	0.29	2,326	0.16	0.37	1,934	0.17	0.37	1,028	0.16	0.37	552	0.21	0.41	581
Salaried ^b	0.80	0.40	978	0.79	0.41	2,326	0.79	0.41	1,934	0.73	0.45	1,028	0.77	0.42	552	0.65	0.48	581
Self-employed	0.07	0.26	978	0.12	0.32	2,326	0.05	0.22	1,934	0.11	0.31	1,028	0.07	0.25	552	0.14	0.35	581
<i>For salaried active workers only^c</i>																		
Log net hourly salary	3.6	0.48	734	3.7	0.51	1,672	3.6	0.49	1,450	3.8	0.43	781	3.7	0.50	438	3.9	0.42	424
N = 9,806 individuals	1,374			2,814			3,085			1,112			761			660		

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Individuals employed by the state include individuals employed by the state or employed by a local community.

^b Salaried individuals include individuals who are salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual or salaried company heads.

^c Salaried active workers are those who are either employed by the state, employed by a local community, salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual. Are excluded those who help a member of their family, salaried company head, or self-employed individuals.

Table A.4.
Key Variables for Women by Marital Status

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>																		
No qualification	0.21	0.41	1,597	0.27	0.45	2,919	0.09	0.29	3,054	0.12	0.32	1,555	0.08	0.27	853	0.09	0.28	745
Primary education	0.05	0.22	1,597	0.09	0.29	2,919	0.005	0.07	3,054	0.01	0.12	1,555	0.02	0.12	853	0.05	0.23	745
Lower-secondary education	0.26	0.44	1,597	0.23	0.42	2,919	0.28	0.45	3,054	0.32	0.47	1,555	0.33	0.47	853	0.35	0.48	745
Higher-secondary education	0.18	0.39	1,597	0.14	0.35	2,919	0.32	0.47	3,054	0.21	0.40	1,555	0.25	0.43	853	0.20	0.40	745
Two-year higher education	0.08	0.28	1,597	0.08	0.27	2,919	0.14	0.34	3,054	0.15	0.36	1,555	0.15	0.36	853	0.15	0.36	745
More than two years in higher education	0.21	0.41	1,597	0.19	0.39	2,919	0.18	0.38	3,054	0.19	0.40	1,555	0.18	0.38	853	0.16	0.37	745
<i>Employment</i>																		
Employed	0.63	0.48	1,657	0.56	0.50	3,126	0.59	0.49	3,058	0.72	0.45	1,557	0.71	0.45	853	0.76	0.43	746
Unemployed	0.16	0.37	1,657	0.12	0.32	3,126	0.13	0.34	3,058	0.09	0.29	1,557	0.11	0.32	853	0.06	0.24	746
Student	0.07	0.26	1,657	0.005	0.07	3,126	0.22	0.42	3,058	0.014	0.12	1,557	0.09	0.29	853	0	0	746
Inactive	0.14	0.34	1,657	0.32	0.47	3,126	0.05	0.21	3,058	0.17	0.38	1,557	0.09	0.28	853	0.18	0.38	746
<i>For those employed</i>																		
Employed by the state ^a	0.22	0.41	1,044	0.20	0.40	1,736	0.26	0.44	1,816	0.29	0.45	1,119	0.29	0.46	603	0.33	0.47	562
Salaried ^b	0.73	0.44	1,044	0.74	0.44	1,736	0.71	0.45	1,816	0.67	0.47	1,119	0.65	0.48	603	0.59	0.49	562
Self-employed	0.05	0.22	1,044	0.07	0.25	1,736	0.03	0.16	1,816	0.04	0.20	1,119	0.05	0.23	603	0.08	0.27	562
<i>For salaried active workers only^c</i>																		
Log net hourly salary	3.6	0.42	815	3.57	0.50	1,365	3.6	0.43	1,425	3.67	0.37	918	3.6	0.43	491	3.67	0.40	447
N = 10,997 individuals	1,657			3,126			3,058			1,557			853			746		

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a Individuals employed by the state include individuals employed by the state or employed by a local community.

^b Salaried individuals include individuals who are salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual or salaried company heads.

^c Salaried active workers are those who are either employed by the state, employed by a local community, salaried by a company, artisan or association or salaried by a private individual. Are excluded those who help a member of their family, salaried company head, or self-employed individuals.

Table A.5.
Key Variables by Region of Origin

	<i>Europe</i>		<i>North Africa^a</i>		<i>Sahelian Africa^b</i>		<i>Central Africa^c</i>		<i>Other Africa</i>		<i>Asia^d</i>		<i>DOM^e</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>First-generation immigrants</i>														
<i>Education</i>														
No qualification	0.22	0.41	0.33	0.47	0.27	0.44	0.12	0.33	0.23	0.42	0.29	0.45	0.19	0.39
Primary education	0.11	0.31	0.05	0.22	0.06	0.25	0.05	0.23	0.03	0.17	0.08	0.27	0.08	0.27
Lower-secondary education	0.26	0.44	0.27	0.44	0.24	0.43	0.27	0.44	0.18	0.39	0.22	0.42	0.35	0.48
Higher-secondary education	0.15	0.36	0.12	0.32	0.13	0.33	0.22	0.41	0.24	0.43	0.17	0.38	0.15	0.36
Two-year higher education	0.06	0.25	0.08	0.28	0.08	0.27	0.12	0.33	0.07	0.26	0.08	0.27	0.10	0.30
More than two years	0.20	0.40	0.15	0.36	0.22	0.41	0.21	0.41	0.24	0.43	0.16	0.36	0.13	0.33
<i>Employment</i>														
Employed	0.74	0.44	0.60	0.49	0.67	0.47	0.68	0.46	0.73	0.44	0.64	0.48	0.81	0.40
Unemployed	0.07	0.26	0.15	0.36	0.16	0.37	0.18	0.39	0.12	0.32	0.13	0.34	0.07	0.25
Student	0.01	0.12	0.03	0.16	0.04	0.21	0.05	0.23	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.17	0.04	0.18
Inactive	0.17	0.38	0.22	0.42	0.13	0.34	0.08	0.27	0.12	0.32	0.20	0.40	0.09	0.29
<i>For salaried active workers only</i>														
Log net hourly salary	3.72	0.51	3.61	0.43	3.57	0.35	3.57	0.40	3.60	0.47	3.61	0.54	3.65	0.55
N = 8,971 individuals	2,349		2,000		637		711		236		1,912		712	
<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>														
<i>Education</i>														
No qualification	0.11	0.31	0.15	0.36	0.14	0.34	0.09	0.29	0.04	0.20	0.13	0.33	0.08	0.27
Primary education	0.01	0.12	0.006	0.08	0.004	0.07	0	0	0	0	0.005	0.07	0	0
Lower-secondary education	0.35	0.48	0.34	0.47	0.34	0.47	0.28	0.45	0.20	0.40	0.28	0.45	0.32	0.47
Higher-secondary education	0.21	0.41	0.26	0.44	0.31	0.46	0.31	0.46	0.43	0.50	0.29	0.45	0.29	0.45
Two-year higher education	0.14	0.35	0.11	0.32	0.11	0.31	0.10	0.31	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.32	0.16	0.37
More than two years	0.17	0.38	0.14	0.35	0.10	0.30	0.21	0.41	0.20	0.40	0.16	0.36	0.13	0.33
<i>Employment</i>														
Employed	0.80	0.40	0.60	0.49	0.52	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.56	0.50	0.54	0.50	0.69	0.46
Unemployed	0.07	0.26	0.18	0.38	0.19	0.40	0.14	0.34	0.09	0.29	0.14	0.35	0.12	0.33
Student	0.07	0.26	0.14	0.35	0.26	0.44	0.34	0.47	0.31	0.47	0.25	0.43	0.15	0.36
Inactive	0.06	0.23	0.08	0.27	0.03	0.17	0.03	0.16	0.03	0.18	0.07	0.25	0.04	0.19
<i>For salaried active workers only</i>														
Log net hourly salary	3.70	0.39	3.60	0.42	3.53	0.60	3.70	0.46	3.54	0.42	3.61	0.59	3.60	0.44
N = 8,435 individuals	3,325		2,376		451		307		127		1,077		633	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a North Africa refers to Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia.

^b Sahelian Africa refers to Senegal, Mauritania, the Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger and Chad.

^c Central Africa refers to Ivory Coast, Ghana, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Gabon, Republic of the Congo, DRC and Equatorial Guinea.

^d Asia refers to Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Turkey.

^e DOM refers to Guadeloupe, Martinique, French Guiana and Reunion.

Table A.6.
Ethnic Identity for Men

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Nationality</i>									
Nationality - French at birth	0.08	0.27	4,188	0.85	0.35	4,197	1	0	1,421
Nationality - French by acquisition	0.39	0.49	4,188	0.13	0.33	4,197	0	0	1,421
Nationality - Foreigner	0.53	0.50	4,188	0.02	0.14	4,197	0	0	1,421
<i>Languages</i>									
Speaks only French	0.05	0.22	4,181	0.39	0.49	4,197	0.86	0.34	1,421
Speaks several languages including French	0.26	0.44	4,181	0.49	0.50	4,197	0.13	0.33	1,421
Speaks several languages but not French	0.13	0.33	4,181	0.01	0.12	4,197	0	0.03	1,421
Speaks only foreign language	0.56	0.50	4,181	0.10	0.30	4,197	0.010	0.1	1,421
First language use by mother when was a child - French	0.12	0.32	4,188	0.67	0.47	4,197	0.97	0.18	1,421
First language use by father when was a child - French	0.12	0.33	4,188	0.67	0.47	4,197	0.95	0.21	1,421
<i>Links with country of origin</i>									
Visited place of origin	0.85	0.36	4,188	0.83	0.38	3,980	0	0	1,421
Use media of country of origin	0.68	0.47	4,188	0.42	0.49	4,017	0	0	1,421
Has given money to country of origin	0.13	0.33	4,188	0.08	0.27	4,197	0	0	1,421
Own land/house in country of origin	0.20	0.40	4,188	0.04	0.19	4,197	0	0	1,421
Owner or has invested in country of origin	0.01	0.12	4,188	0.003	0.05	4,197	0	0	1,421
<i>Self-image</i>									
Feel at home in France - totally disagree	0.05	0.21	4,098	0.02	0.14	4,148	0.01	0.11	1,412
Feel at home in France - disagree	0.07	0.26	4,098	0.04	0.19	4,148	0.03	0.17	1,412
Feel at home in France - agree	0.28	0.45	4,098	0.22	0.41	4,148	0.18	0.38	1,412
Feel at home in France - totally agree	0.61	0.49	4,098	0.72	0.45	4,148	0.78	0.42	1,412
Feel French - totally disagree	0.16	0.37	4,080	0.03	0.17	4,143	0.007	0.08	1,415
Feel French - disagree	0.13	0.33	4,080	0.04	0.19	4,143	0.01	0.11	1,415
Feel French - agree	0.28	0.45	4,080	0.20	0.40	4,143	0.09	0.29	1,415
Feel French - totally agree	0.43	0.50	4,080	0.73	0.44	4,143	0.89	0.32	1,415
Feel from country of origin - totally disagree	0.09	0.29	4,126	0.22	0.42	3,941	1	0	1,421
Feel from country of origin - disagree	0.09	0.28	4,126	0.15	0.36	3,941	0	0	1,421
Feel from country of origin - agree	0.25	0.44	4,126	0.30	0.46	3,941	0	0	1,421
Feel from country of origin - totally agree	0.56	0.50	4,126	0.32	0.47	3,941	0	0	1,421
<i>Education</i>									
Studied only in France	0.22	0.41	4,098	0.94	0.24	4,196	0.98	0.15	1,421
Studied in both foreign country and France	0.29	0.45	4,098	0.05	0.23	4,196	0.02	0.15	1,421
Studied only in foreign country	0.49	0.50	4,098	0.007	0.08	4,196	0	0	1,421
<i>Religion</i>									
Religion in upbringing - not important at all	0.16	0.37	4,126	0.26	0.44	4,152	0.43	0.50	1,414
Religion in upbringing - moderately important	0.22	0.41	4,126	0.28	0.45	4,152	0.35	0.48	1,414
Religion in upbringing - important	0.23	0.42	4,126	0.22	0.41	4,152	0.14	0.34	1,414
Religion in upbringing - very important	0.39	0.49	4,126	0.23	0.42	4,152	0.08	0.28	1,414
<i>Neighbourhood</i>									
Ethnic density - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.26	0.44	3,998	0.28	0.45	4,028	0.63	0.48	1,390
Ethnic density - less than half of immigrant origin	0.27	0.44	3,998	0.28	0.45	4,028	0.24	0.42	1,390
Ethnic density - half of immigrant origin	0.19	0.39	3,998	0.18	0.38	4,028	0.08	0.27	1,390
Ethnic density - over half of immigrant origin	0.18	0.38	3,998	0.18	0.39	4,028	0.04	0.20	1,390
Ethnic density - almost all of immigrant origin	0.09	0.29	3,998	0.07	0.26	4,028	0.01	0.10	1,390
<i>Social relationships</i>									
Belongs to associations whose members are of foreign origin	0.08	0.27	4,183	0.05	0.23	4,189	0	0	1,421
Has provided financial aid to someone abroad in past 12 months	0.17	0.38	4,188	0.03	0.16	4,197	0.006	0.08	1,421
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - never	0.14	0.35	4,188	0.41	0.49	4,197	0.73	0.44	1,421
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - sometimes	0.30	0.46	4,188	0.32	0.47	4,197	0.17	0.38	1,421
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - often	0.55	0.50	4,188	0.28	0.45	4,197	0.10	0.30	1,421
N = 9,806 individuals	4,188			4,197			1,421		

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table A.7.
Ethnic Identity for Women

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>			<i>Natives</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Nationality</i>									
Nationality - French at birth	0.08	0.27	4,783	0.84	0.36	4,615	1	0	1,599
Nationality - French by acquisition	0.39	0.49	4,783	0.15	0.35	4,615	0	0	1,599
Nationality - Foreigner	0.53	0.50	4,783	0.01	0.09	4,615	0	0	1,599
<i>Languages</i>									
Speaks only French	0.06	0.23	4,770	0.39	0.49	4,614	0.86	0.34	1,599
Speaks several languages including French	0.27	0.44	4,770	0.49	0.50	4,614	0.13	0.34	1,599
Speaks several languages but not French	0.12	0.33	4,770	0.01	0.12	4,614	0	0	1,599
Speaks only foreign language	0.55	0.50	4,770	0.11	0.31	4,614	0.004	0.06	1,599
First language use by mother when was a child - French	0.13	0.34	4,783	0.65	0.48	4,615	0.97	0.17	1,599
First language use by father when was a child - French	0.14	0.35	4,783	0.65	0.48	4,615	0.96	0.20	1,599
<i>Links with country of origin</i>									
Visited place of origin	0.85	0.35	4,783	0.83	0.38	4,385	0	0	1,599
Use media of country of origin	0.67	0.47	4,783	0.44	0.50	4,418	0	0	1,599
Has given money to country of origin	0.10	0.30	4,783	0.08	0.26	4,615	0	0	1,599
Own land/house in country of origin	0.18	0.38	4,783	0.04	0.19	4,615	0	0	3,020
Owner or has invested in country of origin	0.009	0.09	4,783	0.002	0.04	4,615	0	0	1,599
<i>Self-image</i>									
Feel at home in France - totally disagree	0.04	0.21	4,697	0.02	0.12	4,580	0.01	0.11	1,586
Feel at home in France - disagree	0.07	0.26	4,697	0.04	0.19	4,580	0.03	0.18	1,586
Feel at home in France - agree	0.30	0.46	4,697	0.20	0.40	4,580	0.15	0.36	1,586
Feel at home in France - totally agree	0.58	0.49	4,697	0.75	0.43	4,580	0.80	0.40	1,586
Feel French - totally disagree	0.21	0.40	4,622	0.03	0.18	4,575	0.005	0.07	1,594
Feel French - disagree	0.16	0.36	4,622	0.04	0.20	4,575	0.01	0.10	1,594
Feel French - agree	0.26	0.44	4,622	0.21	0.41	4,575	0.09	0.29	1,594
Feel French - totally agree	0.38	0.48	4,622	0.71	0.45	4,575	0.89	0.31	1,594
Feel from country of origin - totally disagree	0.09	0.29	4,691	0.22	0.41	4,338	1	0	1,599
Feel from country of origin - disagree	0.09	0.29	4,691	0.14	0.34	4,338	0	0	1,599
Feel from country of origin - agree	0.24	0.43	4,691	0.31	0.46	4,338	0	0	1,599
Feel from country of origin - totally agree	0.57	0.50	4,691	0.33	0.47	4,338	0	0	1,599
<i>Education</i>									
Studied only in France	0.22	0.42	4,516	0.94	0.25	4,609	0.98	0.15	1,598
Studied in both foreign country and France	0.23	0.42	4,516	0.06	0.23	4,609	0.02	0.14	1,598
Studied only in foreign country	0.55	0.50	4,516	0.007	0.08	4,609	0	0.04	1,598
<i>Religion</i>									
Religion in upbringing - not important at all	0.13	0.34	4,717	0.22	0.41	4,574	0.36	0.48	1,591
Religion in upbringing - moderately important	0.21	0.41	4,717	0.28	0.45	4,574	0.34	0.47	1,591
Religion in upbringing - important	0.23	0.42	4,717	0.24	0.42	4,574	0.18	0.38	1,591
Religion in upbringing - very important	0.43	0.49	4,717	0.27	0.44	4,574	0.12	0.33	1,591
<i>Neighbourhood</i>									
Ethnic density - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.27	0.44	4,533	0.28	0.45	4,415	0.61	0.49	1,548
Ethnic density - less than half of immigrant origin	0.25	0.43	4,533	0.26	0.44	4,415	0.23	0.42	1,548
Ethnic density - half of immigrant origin	0.20	0.40	4,533	0.20	0.40	4,415	0.09	0.28	1,548
Ethnic density - over half of immigrant origin	0.19	0.39	4,533	0.18	0.38	4,415	0.06	0.24	1,548
Ethnic density - almost all of immigrant origin	0.10	0.30	4,533	0.08	0.28	4,415	0.02	0.14	1,548
<i>Social relationships</i>									
Belongs to associations whose members are of foreign origin	0.05	0.21	4,779	0.04	0.19	4,608	0	0	1,599
Has provided financial aid to someone abroad in past 12 months	0.13	0.33	4,783	0.04	0.19	4,615	0.008	0.09	1,599
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - never	0.11	0.31	4,783	0.35	0.48	4,615	0.70	0.46	1,599
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - sometimes	0.26	0.44	4,783	0.31	0.46	4,615	0.17	0.38	1,599
Maintain contact with family/friends living abroad - often	0.63	0.48	4,783	0.34	0.47	4,615	0.13	0.34	1,599
N = 10,997 individuals		4,783			4,615			1,599	

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table A.8.
Ethnic Identity for Men by Marital Status

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Nationality</i>																		
Nationality - French at birth	0.13	0.34	1,374	0.05	0.22	2,814	0.87	0.33	3,085	0.80	0.40	1,112	1	0	761	1	0	660
Nationality - French by acquisition	0.32	0.47	1,374	0.42	0.49	2,814	0.11	0.32	3,085	0.17	0.37	1,112	0	0	761	0	0	660
Nationality - Foreigner	0.54	0.50	1,374	0.53	0.50	2,814	0.01	0.12	3,085	0.03	0.18	1,112	0	0	761	0	0	660
<i>Languages</i>																		
Speaks only French	0.09	0.28	1,370	0.03	0.17	2,811	0.39	0.49	3,085	0.39	0.49	1,112	0.87	0.34	761	0.86	0.35	660
Speaks several languages including French	0.34	0.47	1,370	0.21	0.41	2,811	0.50	0.50	3,085	0.47	0.50	1,112	0.12	0.33	761	0.13	0.33	660
Speaks several languages but not French	0.12	0.33	1,370	0.14	0.34	2,811	0.01	0.12	3,085	0.01	0.11	1,112	0	0	761	0.002	0.04	660
Speaks only foreign language	0.45	0.50	1,370	0.62	0.49	2,811	0.09	0.29	3,085	0.13	0.34	1,112	0.007	0.08	761	0.01	0.12	660
First language use by mother when was a child - French	0.19	0.39	1,374	0.08	0.27	2,814	0.68	0.47	3,085	0.64	0.48	1,112	0.97	0.17	761	0.96	0.19	660
First language use by father when was a child - French	0.20	0.40	1,374	0.08	0.28	2,814	0.68	0.47	3,085	0.64	0.48	1,112	0.96	0.19	761	0.95	0.22	660
<i>Links with country of origin</i>																		
Visited place of origin	0.77	0.42	1,374	0.89	0.32	2,814	0.81	0.40	2,917	0.88	0.32	1,063	0	0	761	0	0	660
Use media of country of origin	0.59	0.49	1,374	0.72	0.45	2,814	0.42	0.49	2,951	0.39	0.49	1,066	0	0	761	0	0	660
Has given money to country of origin	0.11	0.32	1,374	0.14	0.34	2,814	0.08	0.27	3,085	0.08	0.27	1,112	0	0	761	0	0	660
Own land/house in country of origin	0.11	0.31	1,374	0.24	0.43	2,814	0.04	0.19	3,085	0.04	0.21	1,112	0	0	761	0	0	660
Owner or has invested in country of origin	0.01	0.10	1,374	0.02	0.13	2,814	0.002	0.05	3,085	0.004	0.06	1,112	0	0	761	0	0	660
<i>Self-image</i>																		
Feel at home in France - totally disagree	0.05	0.23	1,345	0.04	0.20	2,753	0.02	0.15	3,043	0.01	0.12	1,105	0.01	0.11	753	0.01	0.11	659
Feel at home in France - disagree	0.08	0.27	1,345	0.07	0.25	2,753	0.04	0.20	3,043	0.04	0.19	1,105	0.04	0.19	753	0.02	0.15	659
Feel at home in France - agree	0.29	0.45	1,345	0.27	0.44	2,753	0.23	0.42	3,043	0.20	0.40	1,105	0.20	0.40	753	0.15	0.36	659
Feel at home in France - totally agree	0.57	0.49	1,345	0.62	0.48	2,753	0.71	0.45	3,043	0.75	0.43	1,105	0.75	0.43	753	0.81	0.39	659
Feel French - totally disagree	0.16	0.37	1,339	0.16	0.37	2,741	0.03	0.17	3,043	0.02	0.14	1,100	0.009	0.10	759	0.005	0.07	656
Feel French - disagree	0.12	0.32	1,339	0.13	0.34	2,741	0.04	0.20	3,043	0.03	0.18	1,100	0.02	0.13	759	0.008	0.09	656
Feel French - agree	0.28	0.45	1,339	0.28	0.45	2,741	0.21	0.41	3,043	0.18	0.38	1,100	0.12	0.32	759	0.06	0.24	656
Feel French - totally agree	0.44	0.50	1,339	0.43	0.50	2,741	0.72	0.45	3,043	0.77	0.42	1,100	0.86	0.35	759	0.93	0.26	656
Feel from country of origin - totally disagree	0.11	0.31	1,355	0.09	0.28	2,771	0.20	0.40	2,894	0.27	0.45	1,047	1	0	761	1	0	660
Feel from country of origin - disagree	0.10	0.29	1,355	0.08	0.28	2,771	0.15	0.36	2,894	0.16	0.37	1,047	0	0	761	0	0	660
Feel from country of origin - agree	0.26	0.44	1,355	0.25	0.43	2,771	0.31	0.46	2,894	0.28	0.45	1,047	0	0	761	0	0	660
Feel from country of origin - totally agree	0.53	0.50	1,355	0.58	0.49	2,771	0.34	0.47	2,894	0.29	0.45	1,047	0	0	761	0	0	660

Table A.8.
Ethnic Identity for Men by Marital Status - Continued

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>																		
Studied only in France	0.33	0.47	1,360	0.16	0.37	2,738	0.95	0.22	3,085	0.91	0.28	1,111	0.98	0.16	761	0.98	0.13	660
Studied in both foreign country and France	0.35	0.48	1,360	0.26	0.44	2,738	0.05	0.22	3,085	0.07	0.26	1,111	0.02	0.16	761	0.02	0.13	660
Studied only in foreign country	0.32	0.47	1,360	0.58	0.49	2,738	0.004	0.06	3,085	0.01	0.12	1,111	0	0	761	0	0	660
<i>Religion</i>																		
Religion in upbringing - not important at all	0.20	0.40	1,357	0.14	0.34	2,769	0.27	0.45	3,043	0.24	0.43	1,109	0.48	0.50	757	0.37	0.48	657
Religion in upbringing - moderately important	0.23	0.42	1,357	0.21	0.41	2,769	0.28	0.45	3,043	0.29	0.46	1,109	0.34	0.48	757	0.36	0.48	657
Religion in upbringing - important	0.21	0.41	1,357	0.24	0.43	2,769	0.21	0.41	3,043	0.25	0.43	1,109	0.11	0.32	757	0.16	0.37	657
Religion in upbringing - very important	0.36	0.48	1,357	0.41	0.49	2,769	0.24	0.43	3,043	0.22	0.42	1,109	0.06	0.24	757	0.11	0.31	657
<i>Neighbourhood</i>																		
Ethnic density - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.25	0.43	1,298	0.27	0.44	2,700	0.26	0.44	2,960	0.36	0.48	1,068	0.57	0.50	744	0.70	0.46	646
Ethnic density - less than half of immigrant origin	0.28	0.45	1,298	0.27	0.44	2,700	0.27	0.44	2,960	0.31	0.46	1,068	0.27	0.44	744	0.20	0.40	646
Ethnic density - half of immigrant origin	0.18	0.39	1,298	0.20	0.40	2,700	0.19	0.39	2,960	0.16	0.36	1,068	0.10	0.30	744	0.06	0.23	646
Ethnic density - over half of immigrant origin	0.20	0.40	1,298	0.17	0.37	2,700	0.20	0.40	2,960	0.14	0.34	1,068	0.05	0.22	744	0.04	0.19	646
Ethnic density - almost all of immigrant origin	0.08	0.28	1,298	0.10	0.30	2,700	0.09	0.29	2,960	0.03	0.18	1,068	0.01	0.12	744	0.008	0.09	646
<i>Social relationships</i>																		
Belongs to associations whose members are of foreign origin	0.07	0.25	1,372	0.08	0.28	2,811	0.05	0.22	3,081	0.06	0.24	1,108	0	0	761	0	0	660
Has provided financial aid abroad in past 12 months	0.13	0.33	1,374	0.20	0.40	2,814	0.02	0.15	3,085	0.04	0.20	1,112	0.003	0.05	761	0.01	0.10	660
Contact with family/friends living abroad - never	0.21	0.41	1,374	0.11	0.32	2,814	0.41	0.49	3,085	0.40	0.49	1,112	0.73	0.45	761	0.73	0.44	660
Contact with family/friends living abroad - sometimes	0.31	0.46	1,374	0.30	0.46	2,814	0.32	0.47	3,085	0.30	0.46	1,112	0.18	0.38	761	0.16	0.37	660
Contact with family/friends living abroad - often	0.49	0.50	1,374	0.58	0.49	2,814	0.27	0.44	3,085	0.29	0.46	1,112	0.09	0.29	761	0.10	0.31	660
N = 9,806 individuals	1,374			2,814			3,085			1,112			761			660		

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table A.9.
Ethnic Identity for Women by Marital Status

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Nationality</i>																		
Nationality - French at birth	0.14	0.35	1,657	0.05	0.21	3,126	0.87	0.34	3,058	0.80	0.40	1,557	1	0	853	1	0	746
Nationality - French by acquisition	0.36	0.48	1,657	0.40	0.49	3,126	0.13	0.33	3,058	0.19	0.39	1,557	0	0	853	0	0	746
Nationality - Foreigner	0.50	0.50	1,657	0.55	0.50	3,126	0.008	0.09	3,058	0.01	0.11	1,557	0	0	853	0	0	746
<i>Languages</i>																		
Speaks only French	0.09	0.28	1,655	0.04	0.20	3,115	0.40	0.49	3,058	0.37	0.48	1,556	0.87	0.33	853	0.85	0.35	746
Speaks several languages including French	0.38	0.49	1,655	0.21	0.41	3,115	0.50	0.50	3,058	0.47	0.50	1,556	0.12	0.33	853	0.14	0.35	746
Speaks several languages but not French	0.10	0.30	1,655	0.14	0.34	3,115	0.02	0.12	3,058	0.01	0.12	1,556	0	0	853	0	0	746
Speaks only foreign language	0.43	0.50	1,655	0.61	0.49	3,115	0.08	0.28	3,058	0.15	0.36	1,556	0.004	0.06	853	0.004	0.06	746
First language use by mother when was a child - French	0.20	0.40	1,657	0.09	0.29	3,126	0.68	0.47	3,058	0.59	0.49	1,557	0.97	0.16	853	0.97	0.17	746
First language use by father when was a child - French	0.22	0.41	1,657	0.10	0.30	3,126	0.68	0.47	3,058	0.60	0.49	1,557	0.96	0.20	853	0.96	0.19	746
<i>Links with country of origin</i>																		
Visited place of origin	0.81	0.40	1,657	0.88	0.32	3,126	0.80	0.40	2,888	0.87	0.33	1,497	0	0	853	0	0	746
Use media of country of origin	0.62	0.49	1,657	0.71	0.46	3,126	0.44	0.50	2,916	0.42	0.49	1,502	0	0	853	0	0	746
Has given money to country of origin	0.08	0.27	1,657	0.11	0.31	3,126	0.07	0.25	3,058	0.09	0.28	1,557	0	0	853	0	0	746
Own land/house in country of origin	0.11	0.31	1,657	0.21	0.41	3,126	0.04	0.18	3,058	0.04	0.20	1,557	0	0	853	0	0	746
Owner or has invested in country of origin	0.007	0.08	1,657	0.01	0.10	3,126	0.001	0.03	3,058	0.003	0.05	1,557	0	0	853	0	0	746
<i>Self-image</i>																		
Feel at home in France - totally disagree	0.05	0.22	1,623	0.04	0.20	3,074	0.02	0.13	3,035	0.01	0.12	1,545	0.008	0.09	845	0.01	0.12	741
Feel at home in France - disagree	0.07	0.26	1,623	0.08	0.27	3,074	0.04	0.20	3,035	0.04	0.19	1,545	0.03	0.18	845	0.04	0.19	741
Feel at home in France - agree	0.31	0.46	1,623	0.30	0.46	3,074	0.21	0.41	3,035	0.17	0.37	1,545	0.18	0.38	845	0.13	0.33	741
Feel at home in France - totally agree	0.57	0.50	1,623	0.59	0.49	3,074	0.73	0.44	3,035	0.79	0.41	1,545	0.78	0.41	845	0.82	0.38	741
Feel French - totally disagree	0.17	0.38	1,611	0.22	0.42	3,011	0.03	0.17	3,032	0.04	0.19	1,543	0.005	0.07	849	0.005	0.07	745
Feel French - disagree	0.14	0.35	1,611	0.16	0.37	3,011	0.04	0.21	3,032	0.04	0.20	1,543	0.01	0.11	849	0.007	0.08	745
Feel French - agree	0.26	0.44	1,611	0.26	0.44	3,011	0.23	0.42	3,032	0.18	0.39	1,543	0.11	0.31	849	0.07	0.25	745
Feel French - totally agree	0.43	0.50	1,611	0.35	0.48	3,011	0.70	0.46	3,032	0.74	0.44	1,543	0.87	0.33	849	0.92	0.27	745
Feel from country of origin - totally disagree	0.10	0.30	1,620	0.09	0.29	3,071	0.20	0.40	2,860	0.26	0.44	1,478	1	0	853	1	0	746
Feel from country of origin - disagree	0.10	0.30	1,620	0.09	0.28	3,071	0.14	0.35	2,860	0.13	0.34	1,478	0	0	853	0	0	746
Feel from country of origin - agree	0.26	0.44	1,620	0.24	0.43	3,071	0.32	0.47	2,860	0.30	0.46	1,478	0	0	853	0	0	746
Feel from country of origin - totally agree	0.54	0.50	1,620	0.59	0.49	3,071	0.34	0.47	2,860	0.31	0.46	1,478	0	0	853	0	0	746

Table A.9.
Ethnic Identity for Women by Marital Status - Continued

	<i>First-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Second-generation immigrants</i>						<i>Natives</i>					
	<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>			<i>Single</i>			<i>Married</i>		
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
<i>Education</i>																		
Studied only in France	0.31	0.46	1,597	0.17	0.38	2,919	0.95	0.23	3,054	0.91	0.28	1,555	0.97	0.17	853	0.99	0.12	745
Studied in both foreign country and France	0.29	0.45	1,597	0.19	0.39	2,919	0.05	0.22	3,054	0.07	0.26	1,555	0.03	0.17	853	0.01	0.12	745
Studied only in foreign country	0.39	0.49	1,597	0.64	0.48	2,919	0.003	0.05	3,054	0.02	0.12	1,555	0	0.001	853	0.001	0.04	745
<i>Religion</i>																		
Religion in upbringing - not important at all	0.16	0.36	1,621	0.12	0.33	3,096	0.23	0.42	3,027	0.20	0.40	1,547	0.43	0.50	847	0.28	0.45	744
Religion in upbringing - moderately important	0.22	0.41	1,621	0.21	0.40	3,096	0.28	0.45	3,027	0.27	0.44	1,547	0.32	0.47	847	0.36	0.48	744
Religion in upbringing - important	0.23	0.42	1,621	0.23	0.42	3,096	0.23	0.42	3,027	0.24	0.43	1,547	0.13	0.34	847	0.22	0.42	744
Religion in upbringing - very important	0.40	0.49	1,621	0.44	0.50	3,096	0.26	0.44	3,027	0.29	0.45	1,547	0.11	0.31	847	0.14	0.35	744
<i>Neighbourhood</i>																		
Ethnic density - none or almost none of immigrant origin	0.21	0.41	1,554	0.30	0.46	2,979	0.25	0.43	2,941	0.34	0.47	1,474	0.55	0.50	819	0.68	0.47	729
Ethnic density - less than half of immigrant origin	0.24	0.43	1,554	0.25	0.43	2,979	0.26	0.44	2,941	0.26	0.44	1,474	0.25	0.43	819	0.20	0.40	729
Ethnic density - half of immigrant origin	0.21	0.40	1,554	0.19	0.40	2,979	0.21	0.40	2,941	0.20	0.38	1,474	0.11	0.31	819	0.06	0.24	729
Ethnic density - over half of immigrant origin	0.22	0.41	1,554	0.17	0.37	2,979	0.19	0.39	2,941	0.16	0.36	1,474	0.07	0.26	819	0.05	0.21	729
Ethnic density - almost all of immigrant origin	0.12	0.32	1,554	0.09	0.29	2,979	0.10	0.29	2,941	0.06	0.24	1,474	0.03	0.17	819	0.01	0.10	729
<i>Social relationships</i>																		
Belongs to associations whose members are of foreign origin	0.04	0.21	1,655	0.05	0.22	3,124	0.04	0.19	3,052	0.03	0.17	1,556	0	0	853	0	0	746
Has provided financial aid abroad in past 12 months	0.12	0.33	1,657	0.13	0.34	3,126	0.02	0.15	3,058	0.06	0.24	1,557	0.004	0.06	853	0.01	0.12	746
Contact with family/friends abroad - never	0.15	0.36	1,657	0.09	0.29	3,126	0.35	0.48	3,058	0.34	0.48	1,557	0.70	0.46	853	0.70	0.46	746
Contact with family/friends abroad - sometimes	0.29	0.45	1,657	0.24	0.43	3,126	0.31	0.46	3,058	0.30	0.46	1,557	0.17	0.38	853	0.17	0.37	746
Contact with family/friends abroad - often	0.56	0.50	1,657	0.66	0.47	3,126	0.33	0.47	3,058	0.35	0.48	1,557	0.13	0.34	853	0.13	0.34	746
N = 10,997 individuals	1,657			3,126			3,058			1,557			853			746		

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

Table A.10.
Polychoric Correlation Matrix

<i>Variables</i>	Nationality ^a	Languages ^b	Language mother ^c	Language father ^d	Visited cob ^e	Use media cob ^f	Transfer to cob ^g	Owner cob ^h	Invested in cob ⁱ	Home in France ^j	Feel French ^k	Feel cob ^l	Place of education ^m	Religion ⁿ	Ethnic density ^o	Associations ^p	Aid ^q	Contact cob ^r
Nationality ^a	1.0000																	
Languages ^b	0.7650	1.0000																
language mother ^c	-0.8263	-0.9834	1.0000															
language father ^d	-0.8107	-0.9602	0.9800	1.0000														
Visited cob ^e	0.4682	0.5573	-0.5599	-0.5331	1.0000													
Use media cob ^f	0.5154	0.5600	-0.5679	-0.5536	0.6463	1.0000												
Transfer to cob ^g	0.2005	0.2889	-0.3237	-0.2990	0.3167	0.4215	1.0000											
Owner cob ^h	0.4920	0.4575	-0.5171	-0.5043	0.4801	0.4754	0.3516	1.0000										
Invested in cob ⁱ	0.3275	0.2123	-0.3009	-0.2690	0.3317	0.3006	0.3812	0.5138	1.0000									
Home in France ^j	-0.2482	-0.2331	0.2612	0.2523	-0.1421	-0.2899	-0.1713	-0.1391	-0.1851	1.0000								
Feel French ^k	-0.6260	-0.5276	0.5723	0.5529	-0.3419	-0.4656	-0.2158	-0.3037	-0.2399	0.6269	1.0000							
Feel cob ^l	0.5456	0.5919	-0.6193	-0.6047	0.7544	0.6888	0.3279	0.4352	0.2966	-0.2389	-0.4227	1.0000						
Place of education ^m	0.8774	0.7133	-0.7618	-0.7533	0.4048	0.5185	0.1982	0.5489	0.3714	-0.2535	-0.5801	0.5020	1.0000					
Religion ⁿ	0.2744	0.3525	-0.3931	-0.3732	0.3143	0.3600	0.2773	0.2786	0.1233	-0.1696	-0.2347	0.3687	0.2818	1.0000				
Ethnic density ^o	0.1630	0.2269	-0.2573	-0.2502	0.2467	0.2661	0.1374	0.1215	0.0906	-0.1805	-0.2080	0.3084	0.1511	0.1883	1.0000			
Associations ^p	0.1860	0.2159	-0.2263	-0.2054	0.2254	0.3170	0.4406	0.2323	0.2610	-0.1515	-0.1785	0.2410	0.1837	0.1831	0.0925	1.0000		
Aid ^q	0.4016	0.3460	-0.4234	-0.3952	0.2809	0.3480	0.4082	0.3999	0.2983	-0.1857	-0.2347	0.3190	0.4929	0.2733	0.1176	0.3238	1.0000	
Contact cob ^r	0.4927	0.4696	-0.4719	-0.4611	0.5378	0.5871	0.3177	0.4446	0.3774	-0.2512	-0.4204	0.5086	0.5658	0.2949	0.1842	0.2564	0.4969	1.0000

Source: Trajectoires et Origines, own calculations.

^a “Nationality” is equal to 1 if the individual is French at birth, 2 if the individual is French by aquisition and 3 if the individual is a foreigner.

^b “Languages” is equal to 1 if the individual speaks only French, 2 if the individual speaks several languages including French, 3 if the individual speaks several languages but not French, 4 if the individual speaks only a foreign language.

^c “Language mother” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if French is the first language used by mother to speak to respondent when he was a child, 0 otherwise.

^d “Language father” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if French is the first language used by father to speak to respondent when he was a child, 0 otherwise.

^e “Visited cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent visited his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^f “Use media cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent uses the media of his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^g “Transfer to cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent has given money to his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^h “Owner cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent owns land/house in his country of origin, 0 otherwise.

ⁱ “Invested in cob” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent is a owner or has invested in a business in country of origin, 0 otherwise.

^j “Home in France” is a categorical variable for “I feel at home in France” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^k “Feel French” is a categorical variable for “I feel French” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^l “Feel cob” is a categorical variable for “I feel from country of origin” from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

^m “Place of education” refers to the place of education: equal to 1 if the individual studied only in France, 2 if the individual studied in both France and a foreign country, 3 if the individual studied only in a foreign country.

ⁿ “Religion” is a categorical variable for “importance of religion in your upbringing” from 1 (not important at all) to 4 (very important).

^o “Ethnic density” is a categorical variable for the “proportion of immigrants who live in your neighbourhood” from 1 (none) to 5 (almost all).

^p “Associations” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent belongs to associations whose members are of same foreign origin, 0 otherwise.

^q “Aid” is a dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent has provided financial aid to someone abroad in past 12 months, 0 otherwise.

^r “Contact cob” is a categorical variable for “Frequency at which you maintain contact with family/friends living abroad” from 1 (never) to 3 (often).