



Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

Union formation and partner choice of the second generation of Turkish origin in Europe: the influence of third parties and institutional context

Huschek, D.

2011

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Huschek, D. (2011). *Union formation and partner choice of the second generation of Turkish origin in Europe: the influence of third parties and institutional context*. [, VU University Amsterdam]. Wöhrmann Print Service.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

pure@knaw.nl

Chapter 6

Conclusion and discussion

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis was to gain more insight into union formation and partner choice among Turkish second-generation young adults in Europe. The study addressed two sets of overarching research questions:

A) What union formation patterns are observed among the Turkish second generation? How do these patterns differ from those of other ethnic groups? How do these patterns differ between second-generation Turks in different European countries?

B) How can we explain the union formation patterns of the Turkish second generation? In particular, what is the role of third parties and the institutional context?

Specifically, this thesis studied how various aspects of union formation among second-generation Turks in seven European countries are affected by characteristics of the individual, the family of origin, the embeddedness into non-coethnic networks and the existence of macro-level factors such as group size and policies connected to welfare state and integration regimes. These factors were linked to the framework of individual preferences, third parties and opportunity structure as developed by Kalmijn (1998). Among the choices studied were timing of first union and first marriage, the ethnic origin of the partner, the choice between direct marriage vs. cohabitation (before marriage), and choices regarding the division of labor within a union. The overarching research questions were translated into more specific questions which were dealt with in each of the four empirical chapters. These more specific research questions referred to one particular aspect of union formation of the second generation in a European comparative perspective. In one case different union formation choices were studied in one survey country (Chapter 2).

While union formation decisions have been extensively studied among European majority populations, we know relatively little about different union formation choices (with the exception of intermarriage) among migrants and their descendants in particular. A broader understanding of factors influencing union formation choices among the second generation is important as, particularly among the younger age groups, large parts of the populations are children of migrants and many important societal questions and future population trends relate to their behavior in the family domain. One of the reasons for the limited knowledge in this domain is, of course, the limited availability of data on the second generation in general and even more so in a European comparative perspective. Using data from “The Integration of the European Second Generation” (TIES 2007-08) survey allowed for a three-way comparative approach (inter- and intragroup and across countries). The special features of the TIES survey are that a similar design and questionnaire was used in all the participating countries and that the survey concentrated on second-generation migrants aged 18-35 years living in large European cities. Chapter 2, the first empirical chapter of this thesis, used only the Dutch TIES data, but the subsequent empirical chapters also included the Turkish second-generation respondents in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Sweden and Switzerland.

This thesis aimed to contribute to the literature in several ways. First, we concentrated on children of migrants, the second generation, and their union formation behavior. Compared

with their parents, who arrived in Europe as migrants, the second generation was born and grew up in Europe. For this second generation we were able to study how behavioral patterns are transmitted in and/or adjusted to new circumstances. Few studies have explored different aspects of union formation patterns among the second generation and the potential mechanisms influencing these decisions. Second, most previous studies focused mainly on intermarriage when studying union formation among migrant groups (in the US: Kalmijn, 1993; Lieberson and Waters, 1988; Pagnini and Morgan, 1990; Qian and Lichter, 2007 and in Europe: Coleman, 1994; Dribe and Lundh, 2008; Kalmijn and Van Tubergen, 2006; Klein, 2001a; Lievens, 1998; Lucassen and Laarman, 2009; Muttarak and Heath, 2010; Safi and Rogers, 2008). However, intermarriage is only one aspect of union formation. This thesis therefore expanded the scope and included other aspects of union formation as well. The result is a more thorough picture of how migration, settlement processes and interactions with the migrant community, natives and other migrant groups within a new country influence the union formation behavior of the descendants of migrants in Europe. Third, another limitation of previous studies is that they often focused on attitudes regarding union formation among migrant groups, particularly in relation to the preferred type of union and gender roles (Bernhardt and Goldscheider, 2007b; De Valk, 2008; Diehl et al., 2009; Röhr-Sendlmeier and Yun, 2006), whereas in this thesis we focused on actual behavior. This offered new insights as factors influencing behavior may be different from those influencing attitudes. We contributed further to the literature by taking into account the special situation of the second generation who grew up in different cultural spheres. This brought the second generation into contact with a variety of views and possibilities on union formation behavior. We studied how members of their two main spheres of contact influence the second generation: their parents and (non-coethnic) peers. The inclusion of the latter group is the most innovative contribution as generally very little is known about the role of peers in union formation decisions, despite the fact that adolescents spend a large part of their time with age peers. A final contribution to the literature was the study of the union formation choices of the second generation in different institutional contexts throughout Europe. This allows us to assess the role of context in explaining differences in union formation choices among the Turkish second generation. This European comparative perspective has not often been applied in this domain in previous studies.

The following section, 6.2, summarizes the findings related to our specific research questions. In section 6.3 we discuss the conclusions that can be drawn from these findings for the overarching research questions and the specific factors influencing union formation among the second generation, namely parents, peers and context. Lastly, in section 6.4, we suggest possible directions for future research based on the findings and limitations of this thesis.

6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

6.2.1 Union formation decisions among second-generation migrants in the Netherlands

The first research question addressed in Chapter 2 referred to the potential importance of non-family networks for various aspects of union formation. We questioned whether the level of social embeddedness in non-coethnic networks influences the union formation decisions of second-generation Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands.

The relationship between parental influence and parental background characteristics and the union formation choices of their children is well established (Axinn and Thornton, 1992; Starrels and Holm, 2000; Thornton, 1991). Similarly, the importance of parents in general and for union formation in particular was also found for migrants coming from more collectivistic groups (De Valk, 2006; Haug, 2005; Idema and Phalet, 2007; Kagitçibasi, 1996; Phalet and Schönplflug, 2001a). By contrast, we know very little about the role of peers in this respect. This is true for young adults in general and even more so for the children of migrants. Turkish second-generation young adults interact with individuals outside their home environment. They are exposed to behaviors and attitudes on union formation that potentially differ from those in their families of origin through friendships and more casual acquaintances at school, particularly if these contacts occur with non-coethnics. This exposure may lead to changes in the union formation behavior of the second generation. Research in other behavioral domains has shown how peers influence various behaviors via social learning and social influence (Biddle, Bank, and Marlin, 1980; Kohler, 2000). This chapter examined a variety of union formation aspects and the role of non-coethnic peers in these decisions. This approach helps us understand whether non-family networks have any effect at all on union formation and whether their role may differ depending on the aspect of union formation.

We assumed that a higher level of social embeddedness in non-coethnic networks would result in a higher likelihood of postponement of first union and first marriage, of opting for cohabitation (before marriage) and of exogamous partner choice compared with young adults who have a low level of embeddedness in non-coethnic networks. These expectations are in line with current behavior among native young adults in Europe (Billari and Liefbroer, 2010; Corijn and Klijzing, 2001) and may well become more likely among Turkish second-generation young adults who associate with people outside their own ethnic group. We distinguished between strong ties (close non-coethnic friends) and weak ties (ethnic composition of secondary school), as different types of contact may affect union formation choices in different ways. Previous studies showed that whereas strong ties exert a more normative influence, weak ties offer access to alternative or new information and ideas (Granovetter, 1973; Kohler, 2000).

We compared the union formation choices of Turkish second-generation young adults with those among Moroccan second-generation and native Dutch young adults living in Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Moroccan second generation shares many similarities in terms of cultural and migration history with the Turkish second generation. At the same time,

the Moroccan group is reported to have a less cohesive community structure and generally more contact with the Dutch majority group (Lievens, 2000; Pels, 2003).

Our findings were in line with other studies (Bernhardt, et al., 2007; De Graaf and Distelbrink, 2005; Lievens, 1999; Nauck, 2002a; Reniers, 2001; Tribalat, 1996) and showed that second-generation Turks entered into a first union at an early age, usually by direct marriage, and that the majority had a partner who had migrated from Turkey for the marriage. The union formation patterns of second-generation Turks were more traditional than those of the other two groups. Native Dutch young adults were characterized more by individualization and diversification in their union formation choices: the majority of these young adults who were in a relationship had lived in unmarried cohabitation and only 20 percent were married by age 30, compared with 70 percent of the Turkish second generation. The Moroccan second generation occupied an intermediate position compared with the other two groups. They entered into a first union and first marriage later than the Turkish second generation, but earlier than native Dutch. Like the Turkish second generation, the majority of the Moroccan second generation had a partner from their parents' country of origin, but at a lower level than the Turkish group. Cohabitation rates among both second-generation groups were equally low. The smallest differences among the three groups were found for the timing of the first union, larger differences were found for the timing of first marriage and for cohabitation rates.

Looking at the role of non-family networks among the two second-generation groups, we found that contact with non-coethnics indeed influences union formation choices in the expected direction. Turkish and Moroccan young adults who were strongly embedded in non-coethnic peer networks resembled native Dutch young adults much more strongly than second-generation young adults who were mainly embedded in coethnic peer networks. The findings did not differ for the Moroccan and Turkish second generations. Our findings suggest that strong ties with non-coethnics are particularly relevant for all four union formation choices. Superficial embeddedness does not seem to be enough: significant effects were found only if all three best friends at secondary school were non-coethnics. Weak ties in terms of ethnic composition at secondary school affected only the timing of entry into a first union and first marriage. The effect of ethnic composition displayed a U-shape. We found a postponement of first union formation and marriage at schools with neither many nor few majority group students. Weak ties were not found to have a significant effect on more normative aspects of union formation in Turkish and Moroccan families, such as choosing a partner from outside one's own ethnic group or opting to cohabit before marriage.

6.2.2 Timing of first union among the Turkish second generation across Europe

In the second empirical chapter of this thesis (Chapter 3) we focused on the role of parents and peers in union formation in different institutional contexts. Our main research questions were: To what extent do parents and peers influence the timing of a first co-residential union among the Turkish second generation in seven European countries? Does the influence of

parents and peers differ by the institutional context in which the Turkish second generation live?

The main aim of this chapter was thus to assess whether the importance of parents and peers for the timing of a first union differs by integration regime. Multicultural integration regimes, such as those in Sweden, the Netherlands and Belgium, offer migrants and their descendants more scope to live according to their own cultural traditions and more freedom of cultural expression than the more assimilative and restrictive integration policies in countries such as France, Germany, Austria and Switzerland, where there is less room for diversity of cultural expression (Brubaker, 1992; Castles and Miller, 2003). In countries promoting multicultural policies, parents should thus encounter fewer hurdles to socialize their children according to their own cultural preferences. As a result, we expected parental influence in these countries to be stronger and the relevance of peers to be smaller. The opposite was expected to be the case in more restrictive integration regimes.

Our findings showed that while the timing of first union among the Turkish second generation occurred relatively early, it still varied significantly between the seven countries in this study. Among second-generation Turks, the median age of entry into a first union was between 21.9 and 25.0 years for women and 23.8 and 25.9 years for men. Entry into a first union was earlier in countries with multicultural integration policies, namely Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden, as well as Austria, while it occurred later in France, Germany and Switzerland.

Analyses showed that both parents and peers were relevant to the timing of first union among second-generation Turks. More modern family values (higher human capital, smaller family size and no parent originating from Anatolia) as well as higher levels of contact with non-coethnic peers resulted in postponement of entry into a union. However, parental effects became less important when individual levels of education were taken into account. We again found a U-shaped effect of ethnic composition at secondary school: postponement of entering a first union is more common among Turkish second-generation young adults who had attended a secondary school where the majority group was neither particularly small nor large. Despite the variety of integration policies in the countries studied, peer influence was found to be similar in all seven countries. Most surprisingly, the effect of parental influence was opposite to our expectation. They were stronger in countries with assimilative or restrictive integration countries policies than in countries that favored multicultural integration.

6.2.3 Partner choice of the Turkish second generation across Europe

Chapter 4 addressed the partner choice of the Turkish second generation in different countries. The research question was: What is the ethnic origin of partners chosen by the Turkish second generation in seven European countries? Which roles do parents, peers and the institutional context play in this partner choice?

Previous research has shown that a large part of the Turkish second generation continued to choose a partner originating from Turkey and that the majority of these partners migrated to Europe for the purpose of this relationship (Hooghiemstra, 2001; Lievens, 1999; Milewski and Hamel, 2010; Reniers, 2001; Strassburger, 2003). Yet, due to the changing composition of European populations, the Turkish second generation now have an increased chance of finding a partner among their own migrant community as well as among other migrant groups. As the number of young adults of migrant and second-generation origin is growing, this should increase the likelihood of them meeting and choosing such a partner. We investigated which factors influenced the choice between four partner types (first-generation partner from Turkey, Turkish second-generation partner, native partner and partner of another migrant origin). We additionally studied whether the partner choices varied by institutional context. Previous studies in the US have shown that contact with non-coethnic peers during adolescence may be a good indicator of later intermarriage with the majority population or other migrant groups (Clark-Ibanez and Felmler, 2004; King and Harris, 2007) as friendships can develop into romantic relationships and can open new networks for young adults. However, parents may be particularly influential in the partner choice of their children as they are shown to attach a lot of importance to the Turkish origin of their children's partners. Surveys found that the potential acceptance of having a partner from another ethnic group is still low (but increasing) among parents of second-generation Turks compared with other migrant groups (Mehrländer, Ascheberg, and Ueltzhöffer, 1996; Roehr-Sendlmeier and Yun, 2006). This attitude is found in particular among parents with more traditional family values and a stronger preference for the family-initiated marriage system. These parents often share characteristics such as a low level of human capital, large family size, rural origins and a strongly religious background (Hortaçsu and Oral, 1994; Kagitçibasi, 1996; Kagitçibasi and Ataca, 2005; Koc, 2008). Thus, in Chapter 4, non-coethnic peer contact and parental characteristics were included in order to examine their role in the partner choice decisions of the second generation. Furthermore, we looked at the relevance of contextual factors. We did so by including indicators of the marriage market and the availability of potential partners of the same ethnic origin (size of the local young Turkish second-generation group) and the type of integration regime (multicultural versus stricter integration regimes). The size of the local marriage market is a well-known structural factor influencing the opportunity to meet suitable partners (Blau, 1994). Similarly, the integration regime determines how easy it is to bring a spouse from Turkey, as regulations differ by country.

Finally, we took the potential differences in partner choice by gender into account. It is often suggested that Turkish families control the behavior of their daughters more than that of their sons in order to protect the honor of the family (De Vries, 1987). In addition, having a partner from another religion has different consequences depending on gender as the children of women who marry a non-Muslim partner are not considered to be Muslims (Todd, 1985). As a result, the factors influencing partner choice may differ for men and women. We therefore conducted separate analyses by gender.

We found that Turkish second-generation young adults were most likely to have a first-generation partner from Turkey (similar to earlier studies: Hooghiemstra, 2001; Lievens, 1999; Reniers, 2001). However, in Germany the most common partner was someone from their own Turkish second-generation group. In the other six countries, this partner choice among their own second-generation group represented only the second or third preferred partner choice. A partner from another migrant group was a more common partner choice than the choice of a native partner. Both of these partner choices were more prevalent among Turkish second-generation men. While a first-generation partner from Turkey continued to be the predominant choice, in some countries the combined percentages of the other partner choices exceed this choice. This underlines that the other partner choices should not be ignored. Part of the preference for a first-generation partner seemed to be associated with the small number of second-generation Turks at the local level and policies promoting freer cultural expression and easier family reunion. This situation resulted in them opting for a first-generation partner from Turkey.

The individual-level findings were generally in line with our expectations and indicated that Turkish second-generation young adults whose parents showed characteristics of the traditional family model and those with few non-coethnic contacts at secondary school were more likely to have a first-generation partner from Turkey. The opposite was found for second-generation Turks with a native or other migrant partner. By contrast, characteristics of Turkish second-generation young adults with a propensity for a second-generation partner seem to be located between the characteristics of those with a first-generation, native or other migrant partner. Finally, the analysis showed that although the effects of parents, peers and context were similar by gender, they were more pronounced among men.

6.2.4 Gender-role behavior of the Turkish second generation across Europe

The final specific research questions, addressed in Chapter 5, discussed gender-role behavior in varying contexts of gender egalitarianism throughout Europe: What gender-role behaviors are observed among second-generation Turks in Europe? What roles do the ethnic origin of the partner and welfare state policies play in the division of tasks between partners?

In the literature, actual gender-role behavior among migrants has received little attention and we are not aware of European comparisons for this group. This study aimed to fill this gap in knowledge by comparing gender-role behavior among children of Turkish labor migrants across several European countries: Austria, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland. Four aspects of gender-role behavior (childcare, routine household tasks, taking care of finances, and income contribution) were examined. This study highlighted the importance of macro-level factors by examining whether the division of labor among second-generation Turks differed by the extent to which the welfare state in which they lived supported different family models (Korpi, 2000). Studies among majority groups showed that the welfare state context was crucial in explaining differences in gender-role

behavior and preferences across countries (Batalova and Cohen, 2002; Fuwa, 2004; Geist, 2005; Hook, 2006; Knudsen and Wærness, 2008).

Existing studies on Turkish gender roles are attitudinal (Bernhardt and Goldscheider, 2007b; De Valk and Liefbroer, 2007; Idema and Phalet, 2007; Röhr-Sendlmeier and Yun, 2006). It is not clear whether the same characteristics influence attitudes and behavior among the Turkish second generation and whether attitudes are related to actual behavior. Our study aimed to examine the influence of gender ideology and (transnational) partner choice on actual gender-role behavior.

Our findings indicated a strong interrelationship between gender ideology and behavior and showed that men choosing a partner from Turkey were more likely to adhere to the most traditional division of labor with their partner. Conversely, second-generation Turks with a native partner had the most egalitarian division of labor. However, the difference between a second-generation Turk with a native partner and those with a second-generation partner disappeared when other characteristics such as education and religiosity were taken into account. Women with a partner from Turkey maintained the traditional, gender-specific division of labor with regard to childcare and routine housework, but combined this with changes in other domains, such as finances and income.

We found that country differences with regard to the gender-role behavior of second-generation Turks followed a typology based on gender relations and predominant family models among the majority population (Korpi, 2000). This was the case in particular for the traditionally female domains of childcare and routine household tasks. Thus, in more conservative and general family-supporting countries, such as Germany, Austria and France, we found the lowest levels of gender equality in childcare and household tasks. Higher levels of equality were apparent in Sweden (dual earner family support) and Switzerland (liberal family model). Taking care of financial matters followed no clear country pattern. Whereas contributing to the household income was clearly shared in Sweden, this was less the case in the other countries.

6.3 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In the introduction, we mentioned that the children of Turkish migrants are in a special situation because they balance the influences of their various networks. Their parents come from a more collectivistic and patriarchal society than the individualistic countries they grew up in. We therefore questioned whether the same or different processes underlie union formation choices among the children of migrants of Turkish origin compared with what is known for the majority populations. The summary of the findings supported the assumption that the union formation and partner choice of Turkish second-generation young adults involves various spheres, which each exert influence on these choices. In the following section, the findings from the specific research questions of the empirical chapters are considered in terms of our general questions. We discuss the conclusions and implications for the role of parents, peers and the institutional context with respect to differences within the

Turkish second generation, across countries and compared with the Moroccan second generation and native Dutch young adults.

6.3.1 The role of third parties in understanding differences in union formation within the Turkish second generation and compared with the Moroccan second generation

The discussion focuses mainly on the roles of parental and peer effects, which is one of the main interests of this thesis. The findings of the empirical chapters underscored that parental characteristics were very important for understanding union formation decisions among second-generation Turks. This is in line with findings from previous studies (Bernhardt, et al., 2007; De Valk, 2006; Haug, 2005). However, the findings also indicated that family values and attitudes differed among the Turkish group and that these differences were essential in predicting timing differences in union formation and differences in partner choice. For instance, Turkish second-generation young adults were more likely to postpone union formation (Chapter 3) and to have a native or other migrant partner (Chapter 4) when their parents had a higher educational level, the language proficiency of their parents was better, their mothers worked during the child's adolescence, they had fewer siblings, and their parents did not originate from a rural and/or rural Anatolian region. These parental characteristics can all be perceived to be indicators of more modern family values and of the family model of psychological interdependence. In this family model, the emotional connection between family members remains important but children are given more independence in their own life choices (Kagitçibasi and Ataca, 2005; Koc, 2008). If parents had the opposite characteristics, they were more likely to endorse more traditional family values, which are linked to the family-initiated marriage system and the traditional family model of interdependence. More traditional family values increased the likelihood of earlier union formation and the choice of a marriage partner from Turkey. Generally, the findings showed that parental background characteristics remained important in predicting partner choice and union formation, also among the second generation. This indicates that parents still socialize their children with the values with which they grew up themselves. For some, particularly those with a low social status (Hagendoorn, Veenman, and Vollebergh, 2003), these values may even become more pronounced through the migration experience. However, for the timing of union formation (Chapter 3) we found that the educational level of the children became more important than the parents' human capital. Thus, while transmission from parents to children remains strong, it seems to be weakening for union formation aspects that are less linked to the core family values of the parental generation.

One of the main contributions of this study was to take a closer look at the relevance of non-family networks for the union formation choices of the Turkish second generation. The importance of social actors outside the family was clear throughout our empirical chapters. The effect of non-coethnic peers was strong and persistent. We found significant effects for all aspects studied: timing of first union and marriage (Chapters 2 and 3), partner type

(Chapter 4) and union type (Chapter 2). A higher level of embeddedness in non-coethnic networks or more contact with outside group members resulted in a higher likelihood of postponement of union formation, of having a native or other migrant partner and of opting for cohabitation. However, the effects were not equally strong for every aspect of union formation. Peers overall were important, but their influence seemed to be stronger for aspects of union formation that were linked to practical aspects and weaker for aspects that were central to the own ethnic group identity. Thus, while there were clear effects of both close friends and acquaintances for timing aspects, the role of more distant acquaintances was limited or non-existent for partner choice and type of union. Nevertheless, these findings still emphasize the importance of peers. Considering that parental value transmission among the Turkish second generation is strong, these peer effect findings remained important even when controlling for parental characteristics.

The results also supported previous findings on the different roles of friends and more distant acquaintances (Granovetter, 1973; Kohler, 2000; Moody and White, 2003). Close friends are clearly most important for union formation and partner choice. They offer both support and pressure, for example through processes of social learning and social influence, and their influence is quite similar to the one exercised by parents and also extends to different aspects of union formation. By contrast, the effects of more distant peer networks is more strongly related to the diffusion of new ideas and their influence on union formation decisions is weaker. In our case, we found that the ethnic composition of the secondary school, a proxy for more distant networks, had a U-shape effect on the timing of first marriage and union formation and on first-generation and native partner choice. Postponement of union formation was more likely and the above-mentioned partner choices were less likely in cases where the native population was neither a clear majority nor minority group at school. We discussed that this could be an effect of different majority-minority situations (Hallinan and Smith, 1985). At schools with few minority or migrant students, these students build close coethnic networks and strongly influence each other; where these minorities represent the majority group at school they are dominant and thus unlikely to be influenced by the native group. In the intermediate situation, where the groups are equally sized, the peer effects are maximized. This finding implies that social integration and the adoption of new behaviors might be largest in a mixed school context.

We concentrated mainly on the importance of having non-coethnic peers and union formation behavior. However, as shown in Chapter 4, coethnic peers also play a role in partner choice. On the one hand, having few non-coethnic friends is an indicator of a low level of contact with the majority group and a higher likelihood of importing a partner from Turkey. On the other hand, having many coethnic friends offers a greater chance of finding a partner from one's own migrant group. Second-generation young adults who indicated that they had many coethnic friends at secondary school were not only more likely to have a first-generation partner, they were also more likely to have a second-generation partner from their own group. The descriptive analysis of how they met their partners showed that in contrast to those with a first-generation partner, whose partnership was more likely to be arranged, those

with a second-generation partner had met their partners mainly through friends, i.e. according to the couple-initiated marriage system. With an increasing number of young adults of their own origin in their local environment, the Turkish second generation and following generations will be more likely to meet suitable partners in their peer networks. Consequently, it seems likely that in the future the arranged marriage system will lose importance among this group.

As mentioned in Chapters 4 and 5, we performed separate analyses for men and women because we expected partner choice effects to differ by gender. We found indeed that, in line with previous studies (Bernhardt, et al., 2007; Lievens, 1998; Nauck 2002a), men are more likely to out-marry both with natives and with other migrant groups. However, our main factors of interest, parental and peer effects, were similar for both sexes. The main difference in relevant influencing factors between men and women was that educational attainment had stronger effects for women. For example, education had no effect on the likelihood of marrying a native partner for men but did have an effect for women. This seems to indicate that a higher level of education opens new behavioral choices for women, while for men choices do not seem to be linked to education. With rising levels of educational attainment, which was found to be somewhat stronger for second-generation women (Heath, et al., 2008), these women may become more likely to out-marry, marry later and cohabit, as was found among second-generation Turkish men. Gender differences in union formation choices may thus become smaller.

While the main focus has been on studying union formation processes within the Turkish second generation, we included a comparison with other ethnic groups, namely the Moroccan second generation and native Dutch (Chapter 2 focusing on the Netherlands). This comparison allows for initial exploration and conclusions on differences in the influence of third parties on union formation choices between two second-generation groups. Studying various aspects of union formation (timing of first union and first marriage, partner choice and union type), we found that the Turkish second generation differed most from the native comparison group, with the Moroccan second generation showing more intermediate patterns. For example, cohabitation and intermarriage were more likely among second-generation Moroccans than among second-generation Turks, although the differences were not large. These findings were in line with previous studies highlighting that Turks have one of the most distinctive union formation behaviors compared with the majority group and other prominent migrant groups in various European countries. This is probably related to the cohesiveness of their ethnic community (De Valk, 2006). In previous studies the Turkish group was reported to be less oriented toward Dutch lifestyles and have less contact with Dutch natives than the Moroccan group (Dagevos et al., 2003; Pels, 2003). Although Moroccans generally have more contact with Dutch society, non-coethnic peers seem to make their union formation choices in a similar way to the Turkish second generation. In the case of close personal non-coethnic contact at school, individuals of both second-generation groups were more likely to make union formation choices that resemble those of the majority group. These effects were most pronounced for close friends and less so for acquaintances.

What are the further implications of these findings for the future union formation patterns of (second-generation) migrant groups and the majority population? As the Turkish second generation and next generations develop more contacts outside their own ethnic group, their union formation choices are likely to show more convergence towards those of the majority population. However, the level and speed of changes are likely to differ for different aspects of union formation. As stated in the introduction, union formation is not a static process and changes are ongoing among both the second generation and the majority population. The more practical aspects of union formation are likely to change faster than aspects connected to core values. Not all members of migrant populations will adopt similar union formation behavior to the majority group. Based on the findings of this thesis, it seems that part of the group may remain distinct (at least for a longer period of time). This seems to be likely for men with a low social status. Similarly, the gender-role behavior of women with a first-generation partner from Turkey shows that even bringing a partner from Turkey can lead to changes in behavior because of special circumstances in their relationship, e.g. the wife being more knowledgeable about country-specific rules, and thus taking on more roles in the traditionally male domains of work and finances. It also shows, however, that behaviors persist as these women were also found to be primarily responsible for taking care of routine household tasks and childcare; no changes occurred in these domains even though these women took on more responsibilities outside their household.

6.3.2 The role of the institutional and policy context for cross-national differences among the Turkish second generation

The cross-national design of this study allowed us to assess commonalities and differences in the union formation choices among the Turkish second generation across countries. Overall, we found that the union formation choices of the Turkish second generation remain distinct, e.g. more traditional compared with the majority groups, who show high levels of cohabitation and postponement of marriage. The Turkish second generation in all 7 countries – Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and Switzerland – and 13 cities analyzed in this study showed similar patterns: cohabitation remained relatively uncommon and direct marriage was most common. Young adults tended to form a union in their early twenties and a large part of the second generation still married a partner from Turkey. This suggests that the transmission of cultural values related to union formation choices remains strong among the European Turkish second generation.

Nevertheless, there are variations at the country and city level. The study of these differences represented one of the main contributions of this thesis. Although we could not directly test actual policy effects, the results do suggest the importance of structural factors. We discussed various aspects: the group size of the Turkish second generation and the influence of migration and integration policies on the partner's ethnic origin (Chapter 4); the effect of migration and integration policies versus general welfare state policies directed at

young adults on the timing of union formation (Chapter 3), and the role of welfare regimes promoting specific gender-role behavior (Chapter 5).

Immigration and integration policies are likely to be relevant for the second generation as they themselves may have only Turkish citizenship and are not necessarily citizens of the country they were born in. Equally, a large part of the Turkish second generation opt for a partner from Turkey. Another important element is that multicultural integration policies are expected to enable migrant groups to live more according to their own cultural values and traditions than more restrictive policies. Therefore, we examined possible connections between migration and integration policies and the union formation choices of the Turkish second generation in Chapters 3 and 4. In Chapter 3, we argued that the parents of the Turkish second generation would exert a stronger influence on their children's union formation timing in countries promoting multicultural policies and peers would have a weaker influence than in more restrictive integration countries. The descriptive results partially supported this expectation. We found that the Turkish second generation in Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden, all countries with different levels of multicultural policies, but also in Austria, a country with more restrictive integration policies, entered into a union at an earlier age than those in France, Switzerland and Germany – countries with more restrictive integration regimes. However, our hypothesis that parents and peers would be of varying importance in different integration regimes was not supported. Parents had a stronger influence in countries promoting integration or assimilation and the influence of peers did not differ by integration regime. In Chapter 4 we also examined the role of integration policies by arguing that partner choice is linked to different integration regimes because they allow family reunification to varying degrees. In this case, the expected effect was observed. In countries with less strict laws on integration and family reunification, Turkish second-generation men and women were more likely to have a first-generation partner from Turkey and less likely to have a second-generation partner from their own community than in countries where family reunification policies were stricter.

General welfare policies are also potentially relevant to the second generation as they are affected by these institutional arrangements. We examined their possible relevance in Chapters 3 and 5. In Chapter 3, as discussed in the previous paragraph, residing in a country with predominantly multicultural integration policies could not explain country differences in union timing. Consequently, we looked for other possible connections. The pattern of early union formation in the Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden and Austria was expected to be related to welfare policies providing young adults with more opportunities to establish their own household. In Chapter 5, we studied whether welfare state policies promoting certain family support models (Korpi, 2000) would lead to the same country-specific patterns of gender-role behavior among the Turkish second generation as reported for the majority populations living in different European countries. We found support for this argument, in particular for gender-role behavior related to childcare and routine household chores. In Sweden, which has a dual-earner model, we found the most egalitarian behavior. In Switzerland, with its liberal family model, less gender egalitarian behavior was found, and the most gendered behavior was

observed in the Netherlands, Austria, Germany and France. These latter countries all have a general family support model. However, the findings for the Turkish second generation in the Netherlands were less consistent as, for example, sharing of household chores more closely resembled those of young adults in Sweden. This may be due to the Dutch intermediate position in the defined family support models. Tax changes in the first decade of this century placed more emphasis on individual earnings rather than on couples' earnings (Fokkema et al. 2008), moving the Netherlands further away from the general family support model. By contrast, in terms of their contribution to the general household income, we found that only the Turkish second generation in Sweden was clearly more gender egalitarian than the second generation in any of the other countries. Sweden is a unique case in terms of union formation (Bernhardt, et al., 2007). It is either seen as a forerunner in behavioral change (Lesthaeghe, 2010) or as the most individualistic country, with specific behaviors that even differ from those in other northern countries (Liefbroer and Goldscheider, 2007; Sobotka and Toulemon, 2008). This societal and institutional context is also likely to affect the Turkish second generation living in Sweden.

These findings raise the question as to which type of policy has a more important influence on union formation among the Turkish second generation: policies targeting migrants in particular, or policies directed at the general population. Based on our findings, we cannot give a definite answer to this question. General welfare policies seem to explain union formation behavior of second-generation Turks by influencing the ability of young people to become independent and to form a union, and they influence the opportunities for women to focus on paid labor. The results are less clear for the immigration and integration policies that are directed at migrants. The immigration policies seem to affect the union formation of second-generation Turks, in particular policies relating to family reunification and thus affecting (transnational) partner choice. However, the effect of integration policies seems to be less obvious. This may be explained by the fact that in countries like Sweden the emphasis on multicultural policies is counterbalanced by an emphasis on individual-decision making, which is prominent in their general welfare policies. Lastly, integration policies can have an indirect effect by reflecting public opinion and the general climate with regard to migrant group acceptance. This may affect the union formation behavior of second-generation Turks. If Turkish migrants have a low social standing and acceptance in society this may make them less likely, for instance, to intermarry with natives. The overall conclusion is therefore that the exact mechanisms of the policies remain unclear, and while some of these policies seem to have yielded clear results, the effect of other policies may be counterbalanced by other factors.

Our study covered 13 cities in 7 European countries. Most differences between cities in the same country were small with the exception of those in France (Paris and Strasbourg) and Switzerland (Zurich and Basel). In Paris, for example, men were more likely to have a partner from another migrant group than men in Strasbourg, and in Paris and Zurich men and women entered into a union later than those in Strasbourg and Basel. These city differences are believed to be caused by differences in the composition of the Turkish group. For instance, in

Zurich many Turks originate from the Marmara and other urban regions in Turkey, whereas in Paris more Turks are university students. Additionally, higher rents in Paris may result in the postponement of union formation. Equally, the larger number of foreigners in Paris compared with Strasbourg may lead to migrants meeting and choosing more partners from other migrant groups. As the composition of the Turkish group may differ in terms of region of origin, language and educational attainment, we tried controlling for some of these compositional effects. Even after controlling for intra-group differences, many country-level differences remain. This leads to the conclusion that important factors at the country level play a role in the union formation choices of the Turkish second generation and that these factors are independent of the compositional differences.

Lastly, how are future population developments and the role of union formation among an ethnically diverse population linked? In research on the majority population in Europe and their union formation there is an ongoing discussion as to whether there is a possible convergence towards similar patterns of union formation within and across countries once current changes of individualization and secularization may be finalized (Billari and Liefbroer, 2010). From the point of view of this thesis, a convergence towards diversity within countries should increasingly occur as migrants come from more diverse parts of the world. Their growing weight within populations will drive dynamics within these populations. While there may be convergence of parts of the migrant groups and their children to the behavior among the majority population, this effect may be driven largely by the given policies and institutional arrangements, such as required years in education, vocational training, the transition into the labor market, support for certain life course paths and living arrangements, and government support to combine parenthood and the labor force participation of women. A part of the migrant groups are likely to continue to follow their group-specific union formation behavior, particularly in an increasingly mobile and transnational world.

6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Our focus on non-family networks and institutional context highlighted their relevance in the union formation process among second-generation Turks. Despite clear effects on all studied aspects of union formation, the importance of peers and context varies. This shows a need to widen the analysis of union formation choices from mainly partner choice to include other aspects of union formation. Despite these new insights, some issues remain unresolved or were raised in the process.

Generalization of findings. The TIES survey represents one of the few comparative surveys with a focus on the second generation. However, three limitations should be discussed here. First, it is an urban sample and thus not a representative dataset at the country level. Additionally, for the majority of countries no sampling frames exist for migrant groups or the second generation in particular. Consequently, in some countries sampling was based on a surname recognition technique also used in other surveys, but this technique may

underestimate people with uncommon names or women who intermarried. This sampling may thus underestimate part of the second generation although we are confident that it is relatively limited as intermarriage among the parental generation was marginal. Nevertheless, can these results be generalized and are they of added value? An argument in favor of this is that the majority of the second generation live in cities. The findings therefore represent a context that is common for the Turkish second generation in Europe. Another point that underlines the relevance of the data is that they cover many countries, allowing for a European comparable approach. A second issue related to the data is that, because of the cross-sectional nature of the dataset, we analyzed a second-generation group which, on average, is still too young to have completed their entire union and family formation history, particularly with respect to childbearing and possible divorce and subsequent remarriage or cohabitation strategies. These possible further developments may become apparent once the majority reach age 40 and over, but cannot be studied yet. A third limitation, also related to the generalization of findings, is that this study focused on the Turkish second generation. Expanding the study of the effects of non-family networks and institutional context to include other migrant groups may lead to more general conclusions about these effects. The Turkish migrant group is strongly cohesive (Crul and Vermeulen, 2003; Lesthaeghe, 2000a; Phalet and Heath, 2011). The effect of peers and context may therefore be particularly strong, which may be less the case for other second-generation groups. However, our comparison with the Moroccan second generation, a group that shares many similarities with the Turkish second generation, showed that at least for this group similar effects of peer roles were observed.

Causality. Our conclusions are based on a retrospective dataset. The suitability of retrospective data for the drawing of causal conclusions about the factors influencing union formation is limited. For this reason, many of the factors studied are stable background characteristics of the individual and the family of origin or variables related to childhood and adolescence, e.g. peer and education variables. By choosing this strategy, we only linked variables relating to childhood and adolescence to the later union formation choices. However, this approach could not solve the issue of the causal direction of the peer effect, e.g. are non-coethnic friends chosen because an individual has alternative values and few ties with the ethnic community, or does having these non-coethnic friends result in these changed values and behaviors? Therefore, to better understand the causal relationships, a next step would be to turn to longitudinal data. Panel data would allow for a more dynamic approach, such as the inclusion of time varying variables as contact with peers may vary over time. The study could be further expanded to include several transitions in the life course, for instance both union formation and educational transitions, and how these events are interlinked among the Turkish second generation.

Peer effect measurement. In this thesis, new questions were raised with respect to the role of peers. We studied the embeddedness into non-coethnic peer networks, both for close friends and wider networks of friends during adolescence. In order to do so information was used on the ethnic composition of the three best friends, the wider friendship network, and the ethnic composition of the secondary school. More detailed information on the peer networks

would help towards improving our understanding of the selection process of peers, which mechanisms lead to changes in behavior and which characteristics of peers play a role in union formation choices.

We also know little about the peer effect among majority groups on union formation decisions. At what stages in life are peers important? Is the peer effect on behaviors and values more important in childhood, adolescence or in the actual age of union formation? How do peers actually influence union formation? We pointed out that these mechanisms are believed to work through processes of social learning and social influence, as was found for peer studies dealing with other behaviors, but the exact mechanisms remain to be further explored. Furthermore, the role of male and female friends could be looked upon separately as their roles might differ. Boys usually have larger networks of friends and they emphasize the sharing of activities while girls have fewer friendships that are more intimate (Aukett, Ritchie, and Mill, 1988; Vaquera and Kao, 2008). Because of these different networks, transmissions and influences may differ.

A special kind of friendship is those with non-coethnic peers, as it allows access to other information, values and behaviors. More insights into their importance could be gained by analyzing the frequency and quality of contact, and whether coethnic and non-coethnic friendships differ, for example by shared activities and the length and depth of the friendship. Network analysis may be a suitable method to explore these issues in more detail (Van Tubergen, 2010).

Measuring context effects. This study analyzed union formation behavior among the Turkish second generation in European countries with diverse integration regimes and general welfare state policies. It showed that the context in which the second generation lives leads to variations in their behavior. Of course, it would be an asset if the effects of specific policies could be measured more directly than we were able to do in this study and a larger set of countries would be helpful in this respect. In this thesis, we could not study the actual effects of welfare state regimes or specific policies, but rather had to assume and discuss possible connections between union formation and macro level effects. While even this approach yielded important findings, it could clearly be improved upon.

Turkish and majority group perspective. Lastly, a potential future research area could be a comparison of union formation patterns among Turkish second-generation young adults in Europe with the behavior of young adults in Turkey. This would be interesting as the second generation still have many transnational ties. Furthermore, the continued trend of bringing spouses from Turkey among large segments of the second generation brings them into contact with the social context in Turkey as well. This may, in turn, influence union formation among future generations. We also paid little attention to the majority population perspective. Segregation, discrimination and social hierarchy of ethnic groups are examples of factors that can limit the contact between the second generation and the majority group and may thus equally help in explaining union formation choices among the Turkish second generation.

