

Kahanec, Martin; Tosun, Mehmet Serkan

Working Paper

Political economy of immigration in Germany: attitudes and citizenship aspirations

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3140

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Kahanec, Martin; Tosun, Mehmet Serkan (2007) : Political economy of immigration in Germany: attitudes and citizenship aspirations, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3140, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/34502>

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.

IZA DP No. 3140

Political Economy of Immigration in Germany: Attitudes and Citizenship Aspirations

Martin Kahanec
Mehmet Serkan Tosun

November 2007

Political Economy of Immigration in Germany: Attitudes and Citizenship Aspirations

Martin Kahanec

IZA

Mehmet Serkan Tosun

University of Nevada-Reno

Discussion Paper No. 3140
November 2007

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the institute. Research disseminated by IZA may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit company supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its research networks, research support, and visitors and doctoral programs. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Political Economy of Immigration in Germany: Attitudes and Citizenship Aspirations^{*}

This paper examines resident foreigners' interest in German citizenship. The study focuses on the roles played by attitudes towards foreigners, political interest of foreigners, intergenerational conflict between natives and foreigners and among foreigners themselves, and regional differences in public finances. To address our research questions, we use a unique dataset from a survey of foreign residents in the German States provided by the Central Archive for Empirical Social Science Research of the University of Cologne. We find that some of the significant negative factors that affect citizenship interest are negative attitudes towards foreigners and generational conflict within foreigner families. On the other hand, interest in political participation, German schooling, home ownership, being born in Germany and being a citizen of non-EU country are important positive factors. Negative experience of foreigners in terms of hostile attitudes, lack of voting rights, or uncertainty of the possibility to stay in Germany mainly discourage foreign residents who actively participate in the labor market, have more years of schooling, and are younger.

JEL Classification: F22, J15, J22

Keywords: immigration, attitudes, citizenship, voting

Corresponding author:

Martin Kahanec
IZA
P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany
E-mail: kahanec@iza.org

^{*} Martin Kahanec acknowledges financial support from the Volkswagen Foundation for the IZA project on "The Economics and Persistence of Migrant Ethnicity".

1. Introduction

There has been a large influx of foreign workers and their families into European countries since the 1960s. In 1955 the first immigrant treaty signed between the former West Germany and Italy marked the initiation of formation of immigrant communities in Germany. Other bilateral agreements with Greece, Spain, Turkey, Morocco, Portugal and Yugoslavia followed in the 1960s. The immigrant guest workers were by and large unskilled blue-collar workers who were expected to alleviate Germany's labour shortages in the times of economic upturn. After these immigration channels were discontinued following the 1973 oil shock, migration continued, but in general only through family reunification, increased fertility rates, and asylum seekers and refugees.

As of 2004 Germany's total foreign born population was 6.7 million, of which there were 2.1 million immigrants from other European Union members and 3.2 from the rest of Europe.¹ After German policy makers fully realized that Germany has turned into an immigration country, the new German naturalization law effective as of 2000 added the *jus soli* principle to the former "Reichs- und Staatsangehörigkeitsrecht" that until then only granted citizenship on the *ius sanguinis* basis to children born to a German parent. Since then ascension to citizenship has been an administratively complicated but possible venture for foreigners.

The migration trend in countries like Germany has raised interest in the overall macro effects of immigration in host countries. More recently, focus has shifted to more micro issues such as integration and assimilation of foreigners into host societies. Recent studies examined a number of issues including labor market integration, impact of

¹ Consisting of about 1.8 million Turks, 850 thousand former Yugoslavs, 277 thousand Africans and 827 thousand Asians.

foreigners on native worker wages, immigration policies, and natives' attitudes to immigration (Zimmermann, 1995; Gang, Rivera-Batiz and Yun, 2002; O'Rourke and Sinnott, 2004; Dustmann and Preston, 2005). There has not been as much attention to the foreigners' attitudes towards citizenship and how those attitudes are affected by the attitudes of natives.

This paper examines foreigners' interest in German citizenship. We focus on the roles played by attitudes towards foreigners, political interest of foreigners, generational conflict between natives and foreigners and among foreigners, and regional differences in public finances.

To address our research questions, we use a unique dataset from a survey of foreign residents in the German States provided by the Central Archive for Empirical Social Science Research of the University of Cologne.² This survey provides detailed information on the attitudes towards citizenship of five foreigner groups: Turks, Yugoslavs (former), Italians, Greeks and Spaniards. This dataset enables us to test whether the attitudes of natives, and other environmental and political factors play a significant role in the citizenship interest and assimilation of foreigners in Germany.

To preview the main results, we find that some of the significant negative factors that affect interest in citizenship are negative attitudes towards foreigners, and generational conflict within foreigner families. On the other hand, interest in political participation, German schooling, home ownership, being born in Germany and being a citizen of non-EU country are important positive factors. Negative experience of foreigners in terms of hostile attitudes, lack of voting rights, or uncertainty of the

² "Ausländer in Deutschland—Marplan Studies." (2002-Wave 2, ZA 4062) <http://www.gesis.org/en/ZA>.

possibility to stay in Germany mainly discourage foreign residents who actively participate in the labor market, have more years of schooling, and are younger.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section provides a brief review of the literature and outlines the theoretical framework used to guide our empirical analysis. In section 3, we present the data, our empirical methodology, and results. Section 4 concludes with policy recommendations.

2. The Theory and Empirics of Ascending to Citizenship

The migrant's decision to ascend to citizenship in the host country is driven by a number of social, economic, and demographic factors. Garcia (1981) maintains that the economics of naturalization is driven by the standard cost-benefit analysis on the side of the immigrant. Bratsberg et al. (2002) argue that the economic motivation to naturalize is driven by the greater occupational mobility and higher earnings it facilitates. The dynamics of the citizenship decision as a function of its costs and benefits has been studied by DeVoretz and Ma (2002). In the German context, given the individual's initial stock of human capital and social and economic aptitude, the benefits stemming from citizenship include (i) access to the German as well as all the EU labor markets, (ii) unrestricted access to the health and welfare system in Germany, (iii) any wage premium paid by discriminating employers to citizens, (iv) increased mobility worldwide, (v) the right to vote and be elected in Germany and the EU, (vi) exemption from requirements of the home country such as military conscription, and (vii) the right to own property in Germany and the EU. On the other hand, ascending to citizenship of the host country often involves mandatory giving up the citizenship of the home country (if dual

citizenship is illegal), implying no or restricted access to the home country welfare, labor market, and educational and health system as well as the loss of the right to own property.

These theoretical considerations lead to a number of empirical hypotheses about the relationships between ascending to citizenship and economic, social, and demographic variables. Since age, experience in the host country, economic aptitude and resources (including human capital), occupational specialization and actual and potential income determine the (potential) benefits from social and economic opportunities facilitated by citizenship, they also drive the propensity to ascend to citizenship. Yang (1994) argues that because men tend to seek jobs where citizenship is advantageous, they have higher propensity to ascend to citizenship. The presence of children or spouses (or plans to have some) increases the benefits of citizenship by extending the benefits of one's citizenship to his or her family at negligible additional costs.³ From another perspective, children are an integration device that imbeds parents into the host society through social relationships that they facilitate. Home ownership affects the economic consequences of the citizenship and migration decision, but may also reflect the immigrant's intentions to settle.

As measured by years since migration, the degree of cultural, social, and economic integration into the host society furthers immigrants' acquaintance with the host society and enhances their aptitude to meet the requirements of naturalization, thereby positively affecting the decision to naturalize according to a number of studies (e.g. Beijbom, 1971; Bernard, 1936; Garcia, 1981; Krassowski, 1963; Portes and Curtis, 1987).

³ Although Guest (1980) did not find any effects of marital status on naturalization, Beijbom (1971) finds significant effect of marital status for immigrants in Sweden.

The costs and benefits of naturalization are also importantly affected by home and host country institutional environments (Portes and Rumbaut, 1990). A large gap in the quality of living between the country of origin and the destination country (including economic development, democracy, and the quality of public goods and services) imply larger incentives to reap the benefits of naturalization in the more developed country.

The reversibility hypothesis predicts that recognition of dual citizenship in both home and host country diminishes the opportunity costs of ascending to a new citizenship and thus increases the propensity to naturalize. Geographical proximity of the country of origin to the host country decreases the opportunity costs of migration (increases its reversibility) and thus suppresses immigrants' incentives to naturalize (Portes and Curtis, 1987; Barken and Khokhlov, 1980).

Ethnic networks facilitate adjustment to the new environment by transmitting essential job market and social information (e.g. Anderson, 1974; MacDonald and MacDonald, 1974; Tilly, 1978). A high degree of urbanization facilitates the flow of information about the benefits of naturalization and lowers the costs of naturalization by providing local naturalization services.

Within the cost-benefit model of naturalization, the natives' attitudes importantly determine the likelihood of psychological, social, and economic costs associated with the decision to acquire citizenship. Natives' attitudes as perceived by the immigrant affect how the immigrant evaluates the subjective costs and benefits of staying in the host country and the other migration alternatives. In particular, negative attitudes decrease the subjective well being of an immigrant in the host country, thereby decreasing his or her propensity to naturalize. On the other hand, in an environment hostile to immigrants,

citizenship may mitigate the psychological distress and the likelihood of social and economic costs associated with the insecurity of expulsion from the host country. Therefore, the actual relationship between attitudes and citizenship aspirations is an empirical question.

Intergenerational conflict could also play an important role in attitudes towards citizenship. Razin, Sadka and Swagel (2002) argued and provided evidence that native elderly population doesn't support social government transfers to low-skill immigrants. Hence, interest in citizenship by foreigners could be hindered by unsupportive attitudes of the aging native population.⁴

From the empirical perspective, there is a large body of literature on assimilation of immigrants in the destination society, measuring assimilation by earnings (Chiswick, 1978; Borjas, 1985; Bratsberg et al., 2002; Meng and Gregory, 2005; Hatton and Leigh, 2007), occupational attainment (Chiswick, Lee and Miller, 2005; Bratsberg et al., 2002; Hatton and Leigh, 2007), and welfare dependency (Borjas and Hilton, 1996; Borjas, 1999; Hansen and Lofstrom, 2003). Citizenship as an assimilation correlate and device has been a central topic of several studies. While Kelley and McAllister (1982) and Portes and Mozo (1985) argue that economic variables, such as income and occupational and educational attainment, are the key factors driving the decision to naturalize, other, including Bernard (1936), Barkan and Khokhlov (1980) and Portes and Curtis (1987) put forward cultural and demographic rather than economic factors.

A number of empirical studies have studied the attitudes of natives towards immigrants as driven by immigration policies (Bauer, Lofstrom, and Zimmermann,

⁴ Tosun (2005) showed potentially negative economic and fiscal impact from failed citizenship through permanent restrictions on political participation of migrant workers in developed countries.

2000), racial prejudice and education (Gang, Rivera-Batiz, and Yun, 2002), welfare policies (Dustman and Preston, 2005), and native and immigrant skill and wealth distribution (O'Rourke and Sinnott, 2004). Facchini and Mayda (2006) investigate the effects of welfare policies on attitudes towards immigrants and their interaction with the skill distributions of natives and immigrants. In the German context, Krueger and Pischke (1997) find that the local relative concentration of foreigners does not affect crime against foreigners in the former West Germany, but it increases the incidence of such crime in the former East Germany, while economic factors play little role. Fertig and Schmidt (2001) compare the actual and perceived welfare dependence of immigrants and show, in contrast to the findings of Krueger and Pischke (1997), that respondents from the regions with a low share of immigrants are less likely to perceive immigrants as a burden to social security system. Fertig and Schmidt (2002) corroborate the assuaging role of educational attainment for attitudes towards immigrants.

In the light of this extensive literature, we examine foreigners' citizenship aspirations. We contribute to the literature by highlighting the roles played by attitudes towards foreigners, political interests of foreigners, generational conflict between natives and foreigners and among foreigners, and regional differences in public finances. Our findings thus further our understanding of the roles that these factors play for the characteristics of the foreigners that are more likely to aspire for and thus acquire German citizenship.

3. Empirical Analysis

Data Description

The second wave of the *Ausländer in Deutschland* (foreigners in Germany) database collected between September and October 2002 by Marplan in cooperation with the Central Archive for Empirical Social Research of the University of Cologne is the principal source of data for this study.⁵ This dataset covers five largest foreigner groups in Germany: Greek, Italian, Spanish, Turkish, and former Yugoslavian. The dataset contains information about circa 400 individuals without German citizenship from each of these national groups, resulting in 2019 observations altogether. Respondents were selected to be representative of their respective national group in terms of gender, age, employment status, and household size. Individual weights are provided in order to perform analysis representative of the total population of foreigners in Germany. To avoid any linguistic issues, the interviews were conducted in the language according to respondent's nationality.

The dataset contains all the necessary information for this study. Namely, it contains information on respondents' interest in German citizenship as well as a number of variables depicting respondents' ethnic and migration background: nationality, place of birth, years since migration, and contact with the country of origin. The data also depict natives' attitudes towards foreigners as well as respondents' political interests such as attitudes towards the right to vote and political parties. Furthermore, it contains a number of socio-economic and demographic variables such as gender, age, marital status, household size, number of children, education abroad and in Germany, employment

⁵ The data on public expenditures, population age structure, GDP per capita, unemployment, and number of municipalities by Federal State were obtained from the Genesis online database of the German Statistical Office.

status, income, and occupation. A number of variables in the dataset measure the cultural and social anxiety stemming from linguistic and religious differences, isolation, separation and uncertainty as perceived by the respondent. Finally, a number of variables provide controls for environmental and institutional effects. We give definitions of the variables used in our analysis by the categories mentioned above in Table 1.

Our key measure of citizenship attitudes of foreigners in Germany “Citizenship1” is based on the question on interest in ascending to German citizenship, with the options “not interested”, “somewhat interested”, and “very interested” that we code “0”, “1”, and “2”, respectively. A second measure that we use, “Citizenship2” takes the value of “0” if the respondent indicates no interest in citizenship and “1” if “somewhat interested” or “very interested” is indicated. To give a better idea about the citizenship variable by region and ethnic group, Table 3 presents data broken down by German Federal States (Bundesland) and Table 4 by nationality. Table 3 shows that foreigners are more interested in German citizenship in Schleswig-Holstein, Bayern, Hamburg and Nordrhein-Westfalen, and less interested in Bremen, Hessen, Baden-Württemberg and Niedersachsen. Respondents that are “very interested” in citizenship are from Hamburg, Niedersachsen, Baden-Württemberg and Bayern. On the other hand, none of the respondents from Bremen is “very interested” in citizenship. In Table 4, we see that respondents that are most interested in German citizenship are from Turkey and former Yugoslavian countries. It seems like foreigners from the European Union member countries do not value German citizenship as much and are also probably more likely to preserve their national identities compared to foreigners from countries that are not European Union members. We now examine the determinants of foreigners’ attitudes

towards citizenship more thoroughly in a regression analysis. The next section provides a discussion of our empirical methodology.

Empirical methodology

Given our key dependent variable measuring three degrees of interest in citizenship, which is thus inherently ordered, our baseline regression analysis is based on the probabilistic ordinal dependent variable regression model of the Logit type

$$P(Y = j|X) = \Lambda(\mu_j - \beta'X) - \Lambda(\mu_{j-1} - \beta'X),$$

where $P(Y = j|X)$ is the probability of observing $j \in \{0, \dots, J\}$ outcome of the dependent variable Y conditional on the vector X of individual characteristics and the socioeconomic context variables described in the previous section, Λ is the standard logistic distribution function, and β is the vector of regression coefficients to be estimated by the Maximum Likelihood method. Denoting Y^* the latent variable driving the observed outcomes of Y and μ_j the $J-1$ cutoff points such that $\mu_{j-1} < \mu_j$, the model assumes that $Y = 0$ if $Y^* < \mu_0$, $Y = j$ if $\mu_{j-1} < Y^* < \mu_j$, and $Y = J$ if $\mu_{J-1} < Y^*$.

The results from this baseline regression model are benchmarked vis-à-vis the binomial counterpart of the abovementioned Logit model using our binomial measure of interest in citizenship. Further check on these results is provided in the standard OLS model. To ensure the representativeness of our results for the entire populations of foreigners in Germany with respect to regional distribution, ethnicity, gender, age, household size, and employment status, we use weights provided by the Marplan institute.

Because rational immigrants understand the causal link from citizenship to economic success and returns to human capital, those with large potential benefits from citizenship exert more efforts to acquire human capital and to naturalize. As a result, the sample of immigrant non-citizens is potentially selected on economic aptitude. The dataset does not permit controlling for this possibility and the presented results are therefore conditional on the abovementioned selection, if any.

A typical intrinsic problem with estimation of citizenship models is the interpretation of the causal relationships from variables such as (household) income and home ownership to citizenship. Namely, the citizenship decision is affected by and at the same time affects the (expected) benefits it yields. In the literature where the typical sample contains both citizens and non-citizens it is problematic to disentangle the two channels. In contrast, our sample of non-citizens permits causal interpretation of the relationship from income and similar variables to citizenship, since our citizenship variable measures intentions rather than actual realization and thus the reverse channel is generally not present.

We acknowledge the difficulty of tackling the complicated relationship between party preferences and interest in citizenship. While political attitudes and beliefs affect the way of thinking about citizenship, individuals who are interested in citizenship may vote for pro-immigration parties regardless of their other characteristics. We have tried our regressions with and without this variable and found that the results for other variables are not significantly affected by its inclusion. Hence, we decided to include it in our regression analysis.

Empirical Results

Results from our regression analysis are reported in columns (1)-(6) of Table 5. Columns (1) and (2) are results from OLS regression with separate results for dependent variables Citizenship1 and Citizenship2, respectively. Columns (3) and (4) are ordered logit regressions, respectively, for the same set of dependent variables. Columns (5) and (6) are again ordered logit regressions with environmental and institution variables replaced by state dummies.

We start with results on the ethnicity and migration background variables. We find that having a non-EU country nationality has each positive association with interest in German citizenship.⁶ Length of stay in Germany and being born in Germany correlates with the interest in citizenship positively, but the results are not significant. Whether a respondent visited his or her country of origin or not has no significant effects on citizenship aspirations.

As for the attitudes and political interest variables, negative attitudes of natives towards foreigners are found to be negatively associated with interest in citizenship. Among the significant positive factors, anxiety about not being able to vote might be an indicator of strong interest in political participation and thus incentives to acquire citizenship. Similarly, voting preferences in favor of left-oriented pro-immigration political parties, social democrats (SPD) and the green party (Bündnis 90/Die Grünen) has a positive association with citizenship interest. These two results suggest that political participation is an important component of integration/assimilation process.

⁶ Auxiliary regressions show that nationality does not significantly affect the interest in citizenship beyond the EU/non-EU dichotomy.

Socio-economic and demographic variables are also found to be significant factors. Among these, age, being elderly (age 55 or older), being married, and household income have negative association, while self employment, German schooling and home ownership have positive association with interest in citizenship. The result on respondent being elderly is interesting as this might be pointing to a generational conflict among the foreigners. That gender does not play a role is also remarkable.

Concerning the cultural and social anxiety variables, it is especially religious anxiety, separation, and uncertainty that drive respondents' interest in citizenship. More specifically, we find that respondents are less interested in citizenship if they are having difficulties or are worrying about their religiosity in Germany. Similarly, those that indicate that separation from their home country makes them anxious are less interested in German citizenship. On the other hand, if it is the uncertainty about the possibility of his or her staying in Germany that worries the respondent, he or she is much more likely to be interested in German citizenship. Interestingly, those worried about their linguistic abilities and social contact are neither more nor less likely to report interest in citizenship.

Finally, of the environmental/institutional factors the age structure of the population turns out significant. In particular, it is the young-age dependency ratio of Germans that positively affects the citizenship intentions of foreigners. This result may stem from the perceived socio-economic future benefits that relatively young population will generate. It may also reflect a more favorable attitude towards immigrants of the relatively young German population. The young-age dependency ratio of foreigners has no significant effect. The negative sign of old-age dependency ratio of Germans may reflect either the more negative attitudes of elderly Germans or the fear of instability of

public finances in the future. The positive sign of the counterpart variable for foreigners possibly reflects the positive role of a history of immigration in the federal state. These results are insignificant, however.

We use the ratio of per capita government expenditure in Federal State to respondents' average income level to investigate whether state specific generosity in social expenditure plays a significant role in citizenship interest. We find that this variable is not significant. We also used an interaction with the non-EU dummy to tell us if such generosity might be a significant positive factor in citizenship interest by those foreigners that may feel unprotected, socially and politically, compared to their counterparts that are citizens of EU member countries. While we get a positive sign on the interaction term, it's not statistically significant. The number of municipal governments per state population is also found to be statistically insignificant. The GDP per capita in the federal state has positive but insignificant effect. On the other hand, unemployment rate has a positive and significant effect, possibly reflecting the desire to acquire citizenship and thus eligibility for social benefits especially in those regions where the risk of being dependent on such benefits is higher.

Acknowledging that these variables might not fully capture the factors specific to each Federal State, we replace them with separate dummy variables for each State and report the regression results in Columns (5) and (6). While these state dummies are found to be statistically significant (not reported), capturing the inter-state differences in, among others, social, economic, political, and demographic factors, all the key results reported above remain intact.

In order to investigate the magnitudes of the key effects of interest, we report the respective significant marginal effects at the means of the independent variables for the model specification as in Column (4). Being of non-EU nationality increases the interest in citizenship by 22.0 percentage points. Concerning attitudes and voting, on a four grade scale, every worsening of negative attitudes towards immigrants by one degree decreases the interest in citizenship by 9.4 percentage points. Being anxious about the right to vote increases the interest in citizenship by 21.5 percentage points, while preferring pro-immigrant political parties implies a further increase by 7.2 percentage points. As for age, every ten additional years of age decrease the interest in citizenship by 5.8 percentage points and being over 55 tallies additional 18.9 percentage points of decrease. Religious anxiety is one of the most important factors, decreasing the interest in citizenship by 24.0 percentage points. Home-sickness reduces the interest in citizenship by 10.4 percentage points, while being anxious of uncertainty of the possibility to stay in Germany increases this interest by 20.1 percentage points. Finally, for every 1 percentage point increase of the young age dependency ratio of Germans the probability of citizenship intentions increases by 9.4 percentage points.

An interesting question from the policy-maker's perspective is who among foreigners are discouraged from citizenship by negative attitudes of the host society towards immigrants. Besides the direct measure of negative public attitudes, we considered voting anxiety and uncertainty of the possibility to stay in Germany as measures of the (un-)friendliness of legal regulations governing foreigners' social integration and thus indirect measures of public attitudes towards foreigners. To investigate this question, we interacted these variables with respondent's age, educational

attainment, and labor market status. We find some evidence that negative experience of foreigners in terms of hostile attitudes, lack of voting rights, or legislature creating uncertainty of the possibility to stay in Germany mainly discourage foreign residents who actively participate in the labor market, have more years of schooling, and are younger. These results are reported in Table 6.⁷

4. Concluding Remarks

These results indicate that ethnicity, migration background, socio-economic and demographic characteristics, and political interest, negative attitudes, and cultural and social anxiety are significant factors in foreigners' interest in citizenship. We find it interesting that negative attitudes towards foreigners and foreigners' interest in political participation play important roles in citizenship interest. The previous literature addressed the impact of foreigners on natives' attitudes. Here we contribute to the literature by pointing out that negative attitudes of the natives in turn negatively affect citizenship interest. Hence, negative attitudes may pose a significant threat to the assimilation of foreigners into host country societies. Also the result on the interest in political participation might indicate that foreigners interested in citizenship are a potentially politically active group, which could contribute significantly to the representative democracy in the country.

An interesting finding of this paper from the policy maker's perspective is that negative experience of foreigners in terms of hostile attitudes, lack of voting rights, or legislature creating uncertainty of the possibility to stay in Germany mainly discourage

⁷ Table 6 regressions include the interaction terms as well as all the variables in columns 5 and 6 of Table 5. We show results for only the interaction terms to save space.

foreign residents who actively participate in the labor market, have more years of schooling, and are younger.

Finally, we do not find external environmental and institutional factors significant determinants of citizenship interest in this analysis. There may still be other factors that we missed as we are constrained by the type of data used in our analysis. We leave further examination of such factors for future research.

References

- Anderson, G. M. 1974. *Networks of Contact: The Portuguese and Toronto*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Barken, E. R. and N. Khokhlov. 1980. "Socioeconomic Data as Indices of Naturalization Patterns in the United States: A Theory Revisited," *Ethnicity*, 7:159-190.
- Bauer, T. K., M. Lofstrom, and K. F. Zimmermann. 2000. "Immigration Policy, Assimilation of Immigrants and Natives' Sentiments toward Immigrants: Evidence from 12 OECD-Countries," *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 7: 11-53.
- Beijbom, U. 1971 *Swedes in Chicago: A Demographic and Social Study of the 1846-1880 Immigration*. Chicago: Chicago Historical Society.
- Bernard, W. S. 1936. "Cultural Determinants of Naturalization," *American Sociological Review*, 1:943-953.
- Borjas, G. J. 1985. "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 3 (4): 463-489.
- Borjas, G. J., 1999. "The economic analysis of immigration," Handbook of Labor Economics, in: O. Ashenfelter & D. Card (ed.), Handbook of Labor Economics, edition 1, volume 3, chapter 28, pages 1697-1760, Elsevier.
- Borjas, G. J. and L. Hilton. 1996. "Immigration and the Welfare State: Immigrant Participation in Means-Tested Entitlement Programs," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111 (2): 575-604.
- Bratsberg B., J. F. Ragan and Z. M. Nasir. 2002. "The Effect of Naturalization on Wage Growth: A Panel Study of Young Male Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20 (3): 568-597.
- Chiswick, B. R. 1978. "The effect of Americanization on the earnings of foreign-born men," *Journal of Political Economy* 86 (5): 897-921.
- Chiswick, B. R., Y. L. Lee and Paul W. Miller. 2005. "Longitudinal Analysis of Immigrant Occupational Mobility: A Test of the Immigrant Assimilation Hypothesis," *International Migration Review*, 39(2): 332-353.
- DeVoretz, D. and Z. Ma. 2002. "Triangular Human Capital Flows between Sending, Entrepot, and Rest of the World Regions," *Special Issue on Migration and Globalization, Canadian Studies in Population* 29 (1): 53-69.
- Dustmann, C and I. Preston. 2005. "Is Immigration Good or Bad for the Economy? Analysis of Attitudinal Responses," mimeo.

- Facchini, G. and A. M. Mayda. 2006. "Individual Attitudes towards Immigrants: Welfare-State Determinants Across Countries," IZA Discussion Papers 2127, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Fertig, M. and C. M. Schmidt. 2001. "First- and Second-Generation Migrants in Germany - What Do We Know and What Do People Think," in R. Rotte and P. Stein (Eds.), *Migration Policy and the Economy: International Perspectives*, Munich.
- Fertig, M. and C. M. Schmidt. 2002. "Mobility within Europe - What do we (still not) know?," IZA Discussion Papers 447, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Gang, I., F. L. Rivera-Batiz and M. Yun. 2002. "Economic Strain, Ethnic Concentration and Attitudes Towards Foreigners in the European Union," IZA Discussion Paper No.578. September.
- Garcia, J. A. 1981. "Political Integration of Mexican Immigrants: Explorations into the Naturalization Process," *International Migration Review*, 15 (4): 608-625.
- Guest, A. M. 1980. "The old-new distinction and naturalization: 1900," *International Migration Review*. 14(4):492-510.
- Hansen, J. and M. Lofstrom. 2003. "Immigrant Assimilation and Welfare Participation: Do Immigrants Assimilate into or out of Welfare?" *The Journal of Human Resources*, 38 (1): 74-98.
- Hatton, T. J. and A. Leigh. 2007. "Immigrants Assimilate as Communities, Not Just as Individuals," IZA Discussion Papers 2538, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- Kelley, J. and I. Mcallister. 1982. "The Decision to Become an Australian Citizen," *Journal of Sociology*. 18: 428-439.
- Krassowski, W. 1963. *Naturalization and Assimilation-proneness of California Immigrant Populations: A Statistical Study*. Unpublished dissertation. Los Angeles: Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Krueger, A. B. and J.-S. Pischke. 1997. "A Statistical Analysis of Crime Against Foreigners in Unified Germany," *Journal of Human Resources*, 32 (1): 182-209.
- MacDonald, J. and L. MacDonald. 1974. "Chain Migration, Ethnic Neighborhood Formation, and Social Networks," In *An Urban World*. Ed. C. Tilly. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Meng, X. and R. G. Gregory. 2005. "Intermarriage and Economic Assimilation of Immigrants," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 23, pp. 135-176.
- O'Rourke, K. H. and R. Sinnott. 2004. "The Determinants of Individual Attitudes Towards Immigration," mimeo.

Portes, A. and J. Curtis. 1987. "Changing Flags: Naturalization and Its Determinants Among Mexican Immigrants," *International Migration Review*, 21:352-371.

Portes, A. and R. Mozo. 1985. "This Political Adaptation Process of Cubans and Other Ethnic Minorities in the United States: A Preliminary Analysis," *International Migration Review*, 19:35-63.

Portes, A. and R. G. Rumbaut. 1990. *Immigrant America*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Razin, A., E. Sadka and P. Swagel. 2002. "Tax Burden and Migration: A Political Economy Theory and Evidence," *Journal of Public Economics* 85 (2): 167-190.

Tilly, C. 1978 "Migration in Modern European History," in W. McNeill and R. Adams (Eds.), *Human Migration Patterns and Policies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tosun, M. S. 2005. "Global Aging and Fiscal Policy with International Labor Mobility: A Political Economy Perspective," *IMF Working Paper* 05/140, Washington, D.C.: IMF. <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/cat/longres.cfm?sk=18371.0>

Yang, P. Q. 1994. "Explaining immigrant naturalization," *International Migration Review* 28(3):449-477.

Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung (2002). "Ausländer in Deutschland—Marplan Studies," (2002-Wave 2, ZA 4062) (<http://www.gesis.org/ZA/>).

Zimmermann, K. F. 1995. "Tackling the European Migration Problem," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9 (2): 45-62.

Table 1. Variable Definitions

Variable	Definition
<u>Dependent Variables:</u>	
Citizenship1	= interest in German citizenship: 0= not interested, 1= somewhat interested, 2=very interested
Citizenship2	= 1 if interested in German citizenship; 0 otherwise
<u>Ethnicity and Migration Background:</u>	
NonEU	=1 if non-EU member country (Turkey or former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia); 0 otherwise
Cohort 10-20 years	= 1 if immigrated 10 to 20 years ago; 0 otherwise
Cohort >20 years	= 1 if immigrated more than 20 years ago; 0 otherwise
Born in Germany	= 1 if born in Germany; 0 otherwise
Visitedhome	= 1 if visited the country of origin; 0 otherwise
<u>Attitudes and Political Interest:</u>	
Negative Attitudes	= total number of checked responses to the following items that are listed as things that make them anxious or give them difficulty in Germany: "Argument with colleagues at work," "The way the kids are treated at school," "Being treated bad by Germans everyday," and "Hostility towards foreigners in Germany."
Voting	= 1 if respondent indicated "lacking voting rights" as one thing that makes him/her anxious and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise
Partylvote	= 1 if respondent would vote for SPD or Green Party in the next elections if they were a voter; 0 otherwise
<u>Socio-economic and Demographic:</u>	
Gender	= 1 if female; 0 otherwise
Age	Actual age
Elderly	= 1 if age ≥ 55; 0 otherwise
Married	= 1 if married; 0 otherwise
>0 children in the HH	= 1 if there is at least 1 child in the household; 0 otherwise
Family in Germany	= 1 if the respondent has some family in Germany (outside the household); 0 otherwise
Family abroad	= 1 if the respondent has some family in the home country; 0 otherwise
Participates in LM	= 1 if participates in the labor market; 0 otherwise
Unemployed	= 1 if unemployed; 0 otherwise
Semi skilled	= 1 if specialized or educated worker (Facharbeiter or Angelernte Arbeiter); 0 otherwise
Skilled	= 1 if white collar worker (Angestellte); 0 otherwise
Self employed	= 1 if self employed or free occupation; 0 otherwise
Years of Schooling	Years of schooling
German Schooling	= 1 if schooling in Germany; 0 otherwise
Household Income (different categories)	= total household monthly income after tax and social security deductions, categorical variable.
Homeown	= 1 if owner of a residence; 0 otherwise
<u>Cultural and Social Anxiety:</u>	
Religious Anxiety	= 1 if respondent indicated their religion as one thing that makes him/her anxious and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise
Linguistic Anxiety	= 1 if respondent indicated "speaking/understanding" as one thing that makes him/her anxious and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise
Isolation	= 1 if respondent indicated "contact/isolation" as one thing that makes him/her anxious and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise
Separation	= 1 if respondent indicated "separation from home country" as one thing that makes him/her anxious and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise
Uncertainty	= 1 if respondent indicated "uncertainty about staying in Germany" as one thing that makes him/her anxious

and gives him/her difficulty in Germany; 0 otherwise

Environmental and Institutional:

Old-age dep. G	= ratio of population 65 and older to 15-64 years old in the state respondent resides, Germans
Old-age dep. F	= ratio of population 65 and older to 15-64 years old in the state respondent resides, foreigners
Young-age dep. G	= ratio of population 14 and younger to 15-64 years old in the state respondent resides, Germans
Young-age dep. F	= ratio of population 14 and younger to 15-64 years old in the state respondent resides, foreigners
Public expenditures p.c.	= per capita state government spending on public administration, police and fire protection, and social insurance in the state respondent resides, relative to household income (imputed from the categorical variable)
Public expenditures p.c. X NonEU	= NonEU * Public expenditures p.c.
Municipality Density	= number of municipalities in the state divided by total state population
Municipality Density X NonEU	= Municipality Density * NonEU
GDP p.c. x 1000EUR	Federal state GDP per capita in thousands of EUR
Unemployment	Federal state unemployment rate
Stateid 1	= 1 if residing in Schleswig-Holstein; 0 otherwise
Stateid 2	= 1 if residing in Hamburg; 0 otherwise
Stateid 3	= 1 if residing in Niedersachsen; 0 otherwise
Stateid 4	= 1 if residing in Bremen; 0 otherwise
Stateid 5	= 1 if residing in Nordrhein-Westfalen
Stateid 6	= 1 if residing in Hessen; 0 otherwise
Stateid 7	= 1 if residing in Rheinland-Pfalz; 0 otherwise
Stateid 8	= 1 if residing in Baden-Württemberg; 0 otherwise
Stateid 9	= 1 if residing in Bayern; 0 otherwise
Stateid 10	= 1 if residing in Saarland; 0 otherwise
Stateid 11	= 1 if residing in West-Berlin; 0 otherwise

Source: Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung (2002). "Ausländer in Deutschland—Marplan Studies" Questionnaire.

Table 2. Summary Statistics

Variable	Observations	Mean	Std.Dev.	Min	Max
<u>Dependent Variables:</u>					
Citizenship1	2006	0.60	0.74	0	2
Citizenship2	2006	0.45	0.50	0	1
<u>Ethnicity and Migration Background:</u>					
NonEU	2019	0.40	0.49	0	1
Cohort 10 - 20	2014	0.21	0.40	0	1
Cohort >20	2014	0.34	0.47	0	1
Born	2019	0.30	0.46	0	1
Visitedhome	2017	0.92	0.27	0	1
<u>Attitudes and Political Interest:</u>					
Negative Attitudes	2019	0.19	0.48	0	4
Voting	2019	0.04	0.20	0	1
Partyvote	2019	0.43	0.50	0	1
<u>Socio-economic and Demographic:</u>					
Gender	2019	0.46	0.50	0	1
Age	2019	38.85	13.53	15	82
Elderly	2019	0.14	0.35	0	1
Married	2018	1.26	0.97	0	2
>0 children in HH	2019	0.38	0.49	0	1
Family D	2008	0.85	0.36	0	1
Family F	2019	0.96	0.19	0	1
Participates in LM	2019	0.70	0.46	0	1
Unemployed	2019	0.07	0.25	0	1
Skilled worker	2014	0.33	0.47	0	1
White collar	2014	0.22	0.42	0	1
Selfemployed	2014	0.06	0.23	0	1
Years of Schooling	2006	8.98	1.98	0	16
German Schooling	2018	0.41	0.49	0	1
Household income	1972	4150.57	2268.10	<650	>7500
Homeown	2017	0.11	0.32	0	1
<u>Cultural and Social Anxiety:</u>					
Religious Anxiety	2019	0.02	0.14	0	1
Linguistic Anxiety	2019	0.08	0.26	0	1
Isolation	2019	0.06	0.24	0	1
Separation	2019	0.13	0.34	0	1
Uncertainty	2019	0.06	0.23	0	1
<u>Environmental and Institutional:</u>					
Old age dep. G	2019	0.28	0.01	0.24	0.32
Old age dep. F	2019	0.08	0.01	0.06	0.09
Young age dep. G	2019	0.24	0.02	0.17	0.25
Young age dep F	2019	0.22	0.02	0.18	0.24
Public expenditures p.c.	1972	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.38
Municipality Density	2019	1.07E-04	1.25E-04	2.95E-07	5.68E-04
GDP PC x 1000 EUR	2019	28.27	4.23	22.76	44.87
Unemployment Rate	2019	0.080	0.02	0.058	0.18

Table 3. Citizenship Attitudes by German Federal States (Bundesland)

Questions on Attitudes to Citizenship or Length of Stay in Germany	National	State 1	State 2	State 3	State 4	State 5	State 6	State 7	State 8	State 9	State 10	State 11
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Not</u> <u>Interested</u> in German Citizenship	55.2%	26.5%	48.4%	57.3%	90.0%	53.4%	62.8%	54.5%	59.9%	47.8%	54.2%	53.8%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Interested</u> in German Citizenship	44.8%	73.5%	51.6%	42.7%	10.0%	46.6%	37.2%	45.5%	40.1%	52.2%	45.8%	46.2%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Somewhat Interested</u> in German Citizenship	29.6%	64.7%	32.8%	24.2%	10.0%	34.2%	20.6%	32.3%	22.7%	35.0%	37.5%	32.1%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Very Interested</u> in German Citizenship	15.2%	8.8%	18.8%	18.5%	0.0%	12.3%	16.6%	13.1%	17.3%	17.2%	8.3%	14.1%
Percent of Respondents That Plan to Apply for Citizenship in the Next 6 Months	10.4%	5.9%	14.1%	13.0%	0.0%	6.3%	13.0%	8.1%	14.8%	10.5%	8.3%	5.1%
Percent of Respondents That Would like to Stay in Germany As Long As Possible	51.1%	61.8%	56.3%	69.9%	55.0%	56.1%	46.7%	36.7%	54.5%	43.2%	17.4%	28.9%

Source: Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung (2002). "Ausländer in Deutschland—Marplan Studies."

State 1: Schleswig-Holstein
State 2: Hamburg
State 3: Niedersachsen
State 4: Bremen
State 5: Nordrhein-Westfalen
State 6: Hessen
State 7: Rheinland-Pfalz
State 8: Baden-Württemberg
State 9: Bayern
State 10: Saarland
State 11: West-Berlin

Table 4. Citizenship Attitudes by Nationality of Respondents

Questions on Attitudes to Citizenship or Length of Stay in Germany	National	Spanish	Italian	Turkish	Greek	Former Yugoslavian
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Not Interested</u> in German Citizenship	55.2%	66.7%	63.6%	41.9%	58.5%	45.7%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Interested</u> in German Citizenship	44.8%	33.3%	36.4%	58.1%	41.5%	54.3%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Somewhat Interested</u> in German Citizenship	29.6%	23.6%	26.6%	32.5%	31.4%	33.7%
Percent of Respondents That are <u>Very Interested</u> in German Citizenship	15.2%	9.8%	9.8%	25.6%	10.1%	20.6%
Percent of Respondents That Plan to Apply for Citizenship in the Next 6 Months	10.4%	4.8%	5.5%	21.4%	7.4%	12.6%
Percent of Respondents That Would like to Stay in Germany As Long As Possible	51.1%	45.7%	54.0%	54.1%	46.8%	54.7%

Source: Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung (2002). "Ausländer in Deutschland—Marplan S.

Table 5. Regression Results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NonEU	0.289*** (0.088)	0.173*** (0.057)	0.899*** (0.275)	0.899*** (0.303)	0.982*** (0.117)	0.972*** (0.129)
Cohort 10-20 years	-0.009 (0.080)	0.024 (0.052)	0.015 (0.239)	0.146 (0.254)	-0.030 (0.241)	0.106 (0.257)
Cohort >20 years	0.027 (0.087)	0.028 (0.055)	0.121 (0.267)	0.160 (0.275)	0.104 (0.270)	0.138 (0.278)
Born in Germany	0.049 (0.094)	0.065 (0.059)	0.162 (0.259)	0.331 (0.291)	0.114 (0.265)	0.257 (0.298)
Visitedhome	0.023 (0.081)	-0.010 (0.054)	0.107 (0.230)	-0.047 (0.283)	0.179 (0.233)	0.046 (0.286)
Negative attitudes	-0.073 (0.051)	-0.072** (0.029)	-0.248 (0.160)	-0.375** (0.149)	-0.248 (0.165)	-0.367** (0.152)
Voting	0.234* (0.122)	0.166** (0.080)	0.766** (0.350)	0.919* (0.474)	0.759** (0.347)	0.921** (0.468)
Partylvote	0.096** (0.044)	0.055** (0.027)	0.259** (0.130)	0.287** (0.142)	0.286** (0.131)	0.308** (0.142)
Gender	0.011 (0.048)	0.003 (0.030)	0.040 (0.147)	0.033 (0.158)	0.016 (0.147)	0.003 (0.158)
Age	-0.007** (0.003)	-0.005** (0.002)	-0.019* (0.010)	-0.023** (0.010)	-0.022** (0.010)	-0.027*** (0.010)
Elderly (>55)	-0.115 (0.083)	-0.127** (0.056)	-0.734** (0.322)	-0.774** (0.312)	-0.708** (0.321)	-0.777** (0.312)
Married	-0.124** (0.061)	-0.077** (0.036)	-0.372** (0.177)	-0.402** (0.193)	-0.348** (0.166)	-0.370** (0.179)
>0 Children in HH	0.035 (0.056)	-0.023 (0.035)	0.126 (0.164)	-0.136 (0.186)	0.236* (0.142)	0.009 (0.159)
Family in Germany	0.009 (0.055)	-0.017 (0.037)	-0.023 (0.168)	-0.110 (0.192)	-0.048 (0.172)	-0.121 (0.197)
Family abroad	0.004 (0.124)	0.055 (0.074)	0.077 (0.375)	0.343 (0.377)	0.057 (0.373)	0.322 (0.375)
Participates in LM	0.073 (0.083)	0.058 (0.053)	0.319 (0.248)	0.291 (0.262)	0.294 (0.248)	0.252 (0.264)
Unemployed	-0.002 (0.091)	-0.036 (0.056)	-0.064 (0.271)	-0.224 (0.280)	-0.088 (0.275)	-0.244 (0.283)
Semi-skilled	-0.069 (0.076)	-0.043 (0.050)	-0.250 (0.221)	-0.233 (0.236)	-0.287 (0.222)	-0.270 (0.237)
Skilled	0.048 (0.086)	-0.013 (0.055)	0.057 (0.249)	-0.068 (0.269)	0.044 (0.250)	-0.087 (0.271)
Self employed	0.331*** (0.125)	0.186** (0.078)	0.927** (0.368)	0.966** (0.399)	0.848** (0.366)	0.839** (0.401)
Years of schooling	0.020 (0.015)	0.011 (0.009)	0.061 (0.048)	0.053 (0.050)	0.042 (0.049)	0.024 (0.051)
German schooling	0.172** (0.078)	0.099** (0.049)	0.449** (0.226)	0.443* (0.235)	0.452** (0.230)	0.452* (0.237)
HH income 1000-2000	-0.313 (0.258)	-0.205* (0.114)	-0.666 (0.713)	-1.292 (0.950)	-1.098 (0.805)	-1.671 (1.031)
HH income 2000-3000	-0.342 (0.258)	-0.164 (0.115)	-0.737 (0.707)	-1.074 (0.956)	-1.228 (0.789)	-1.544 (1.023)
HH income 3000-4000	-0.199 (0.260)	-0.090 (0.116)	-0.379 (0.711)	-0.658 (0.964)	-0.900 (0.792)	-1.156 (1.026)
HH income 4000-5000	-0.259 (0.266)	-0.117 (0.119)	-0.549 (0.722)	-0.809 (0.974)	-1.132 (0.796)	-1.379 (1.029)
HH income 6000-7000	-0.415 (0.268)	-0.206* (0.122)	-1.067 (0.729)	-1.283 (0.983)	-1.629** (0.797)	-1.846* (1.030)
HH income >7000	-0.565** (0.279)	-0.304** (0.135)	-1.421* (0.784)	-1.752* (1.034)	-2.053** (0.842)	-2.387** (1.073)

Homeown	0.223*** (0.075)	0.109** (0.044)	0.652*** (0.225)	0.573** (0.261)	0.669*** (0.226)	0.606** (0.261)
Religious anxiety	-0.402*** (0.120)	-0.195** (0.082)	-1.260*** (0.422)	-1.027** (0.446)	-1.315*** (0.428)	-1.200*** (0.465)
Linguistic anxiety	0.087 (0.089)	-0.011 (0.053)	0.230 (0.288)	-0.044 (0.281)	0.250 (0.292)	-0.009 (0.285)
Isolation	-0.094 (0.077)	-0.006 (0.052)	-0.237 (0.251)	-0.012 (0.265)	-0.256 (0.254)	-0.048 (0.273)
Separation	-0.142** (0.059)	-0.070* (0.041)	-0.500** (0.216)	-0.419* (0.224)	-0.545** (0.218)	-0.495** (0.231)
Uncertainty	0.251*** (0.085)	0.155*** (0.053)	0.749*** (0.246)	0.846*** (0.282)	0.720*** (0.245)	0.773*** (0.284)
Old-age dep. G	-5.013 (3.356)	-1.770 (2.085)	-14.097 (10.530)	-8.318 (11.226)		
Old-age dep. F	9.234 (11.848)	3.665 (7.123)	13.681 (33.890)	13.555 (37.438)		
Young-age dep. G	9.075*** (3.334)	7.236*** (2.178)	31.697*** (10.967)	37.557*** (11.279)		
Young-age dep. F	0.760 (2.283)	-0.082 (1.401)	-0.053 (6.979)	-0.829 (7.226)		
Public expenditures p.c.	0.704 (0.954)	0.320 (0.599)	1.739 (2.935)	1.954 (3.194)		
Public expenditures p.c. X NonEU	0.152 (0.906)	0.228 (0.581)	0.473 (2.824)	0.924 (3.039)		
Municipality Density	195.976 (481.700)	178.781 (305.472)	403.010 (1,393.464)	732.674 (1,585.338)		
Municipality Density X NonEU	124.792 (259.521)	-58.518 (187.513)	130.808 (851.548)	-293.675 (979.029)		
GDP PC x 1000EUR	0.021 (0.015)	0.013 (0.010)	0.059 (0.047)	0.063 (0.050)		
Unemployment rate	4.485* (2.664)	4.323** (1.707)	15.288* (8.336)	21.472** (9.030)		
Regional dummies					Yes	Yes
Constant	-1.924 (1.457)	-1.709* (0.915)				
Observations	1925	1925	1925	1925	1925	1925
R-squared	0.24	0.24	0.14	0.20	0.14	0.21

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.

Table 6. Regression Results with Interaction Terms^a

	(1)	(2)
Age X Negative attitudes	-0.009 (0.016)	-0.004 (0.015)
Participates in LM X Negative attitudes	-1.235** (0.507)	-0.836* (0.481)
Unemployed X Negative attitudes	0.013 (0.588)	0.175 (0.619)
Semi-skilled X Negative attitudes	0.475 (0.401)	0.540 (0.417)
Skilled X Negative attitudes	0.575 (0.477)	0.581 (0.480)
Years of schooling X Negative attitudes	-0.086 (0.105)	-0.101 (0.102)
Age X Uncertainty	0.050*** (0.019)	0.032 (0.026)
Participates in LM X Uncertainty	0.170 (0.752)	-0.633 (0.852)
Unemployed X Uncertainty	-0.241 (1.089)	0.158 (1.071)
Semi-skilled X Uncertainty	-1.037 (0.770)	-1.081 (0.797)
Skilled X Uncertainty	-0.954 (1.047)	-1.481 (1.097)
Years of schooling X Uncertainty	0.074 (0.118)	0.188 (0.135)
Age X Voting	0.059** (0.026)	0.040 (0.036)
Participates in LM X Voting	-0.142 (0.914)	-0.947 (1.101)
Unemployed X Voting	-0.550 (1.255)	-1.312 (1.222)
Semi-skilled X Voting	-0.053 (0.888)	0.732 (1.158)
Skilled X Voting	-0.738 (0.976)	-0.201 (1.136)
Years of schooling X Voting	-0.109 (0.162)	-0.399** (0.184)
Regional dummies	Yes	Yes
Observations	1925	1925
R-squared	0.16	0.22

Notes: ^a These regressions include the same set of variables included in columns 5 and 6 of Table 5. Results for those variables are not shown here with the purpose of saving space. Robust standard errors in parentheses. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.