**DISSERTATION PROPOSAL**

1. **SCIENTIFIC BACKGROUND**

Fertility behavior of immigrants is perceived to be an important indicator to the degree of social integration in the country of destination (De Valk & Milewski, 2011). In the Western European context, the focus is often on immigrants from high-fertility to European low fertility countries. While the fertility patterns of immigrants in Europe has been studied for many years, focusing on the effect of the migration process itself and the degree of adaptation to the new environment, research on the descendants of immigrants is still on its early years. It is only now that there is enough cohorts of second generation women who are getting closer to the end of their reproductive years, allowing thorough investigation on their family and complete fertility behavior (Andersson et.al., 2017). The majority of the existing studies show that the descendants of immigrants have, on the one hand, higher levels of fertility than native population, but lower than their immigrant parents, on the other hand (Dubuc, 2012; Milewski, 2007). Consequently, these observed fertility patterns indicate on some degree of intergenerational convergence and adaptation to the norms of the receiving country.

The massive immigration flows from less developed countries to Western Europe have led to a greater attention on its’ social, economic and political impact, among both politicians and native Europeans. The immigration issue has reached the top of the list of concerns among European citizens (at the EU level: Eurobarometer, 2019), with evidence supporting the claim that society heterogeneity negatively affect public support for welfare state redistribution and the inclusion of immigrants (Mau & Burkhardt, 2019). Welfare dependency of immigrants compared to natives, and the amount of welfare services and other social benefits that immigrants consume are in the center of this debate. More specifically, the extant that immigrants access to non-contributory social protection schemes, which directly draw their resources from the general fiscal budget, compared to natives. Studies have shown that the higher relative probability of immigrants’ dependency on non-contributory schemes is diminish when controlled for age, gender, education and family size (Conte & Mazza, 2019). If so, the higher the degree of immigrants’ integration, in terms of fertility and family behavior and socioeconomic status, the less they will depend on public funds.

The welfare state, originated in Europe, created in order to design a cohesive economic, social, political and cultural system, and to address related challenges in the new industrial environment (Van Kersbergen, 2016). European welfare regimes, although share the same origin and primary goal, have substantial differences. Esping-Andersen in his typology (1990) describes three welfare states models, the conservative, the social democratic and the liberal. The models differ mainly in the quality of social rights and the perception of the relationships between the state, market and family in social provision. The distinction of welfare characteristics is important here in order to analyze each receiving country. First, with regard to its relevant policies which directly and indirectly affect family and fertility decision making and behavior. And second, respecting the degree of immigrants inclusion to the general social rights, in addition to specific immigrant integration schemes.

The integration process of Turkish immigrants in European countries have been the study case of many researches. Not only the fact that it is the largest immigrant population in Western Europe, Turkey’s culture and traditions of family norms constitute fertile ground for comparative analysis. While many studies in the European context have focused on the comparison of immigrants’ descendants to their native counterparts, their parents or other immigrant groups in the same receiving country, the proposed study is designed to reveal how the immigrants’ descendants from Turkey differ in their complete fertility patterns in distinct countries of destination and welfare-states. Using the 2020 Generations and Gender Survey, this project could examine complete fertility histories of cohorts of the Turkish second generation in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. More specifically, I will assess the effect of both cultural intergenerational transmission of fertility and family norms and the framework in which migrant descendants grew up. This cross country comparative study could shed light not only on fertility patterns of immigrants of same origin in different environments, but also on the effect of welfare regime and policies on the integration of immigrants and their descendants. In the next sections I describe the contextual and theoretical background of this proposed study.

* 1. **Turkish Immigrants and their Descendants in Europe**

Turkish-born migrants residing Western Europe stand at about 2.5 million, as they constitute the largest modern immigrant group in the area. With the inclusion of second and third generations to Turkish parents who were born outside Turkey, the estimations are of 4.6 million people with Turkish ancestry living in Western European countries (De Bel-Air, 2016). Post World-War II Turkish immigration was formally initiated with the sign of the labor bilateral agreement between West Germany and Turkey in 1961. According to the agreement, the Turkish *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers) were granted with a two-year working visa in order to prevent them from staying permanently in Germany. The Turkish government encouraged low-skilled workers to emigrate in order to ease the economic pressure in the country, alongside the expectation that they will return to Turkey with new skills and qualifications that will fill the void of skilled workers (Aydin, 2016). Throughout the 1960’s other European countries have embraced the German-Turkish scheme, with Austria, Belgium, and the Netherlands signing an agreement with Turkey in 1964, France in 1965 and Sweden in 1967.

Many of the Turkish guest workers have managed to stay and settle in the country of destination, and with the European economic and oil-crisis in 1973 which brought to the end of the recruitment of immigrants, the second immigration wave of Turkish family reunification throughout Europe has begun. The Turkish low skilled immigrant population that came from mainly rural areas in Turkey, have settled in industrial cities. The observed socioeconomic differences between native population and the Turkish immigrants were due to compositional characteristics of the immigrant group, country level development gap, and the negative effect of the migration process. Although the educational gap has decreased with generations, research has shown that second generation of Turkish immigrants are still highly underrepresent in higher education compared to natives and other immigrant groups, in several European countries (Crul & Vermeulen, 2003).

In addition to socioeconomic differences, the demographic background of the immigrant population was distinct to the country of destination’s levels. While in most Western countries TFR was well below 3 during the 1960’s and below replacement level during the 1970s’-80s’, Turkey has only started the fertility decline stage of its’ demographic transition, recording TFR higher than 6 in 1960 with a steady decline since, recording 2.05 in 2019 (Le Goff & Forney, 2006 ; World Bank 2018). Although in recent decades Turkey has progressed significantly (in terms of the demographic transition) and even reduced demographic gaps with Western Europe, Turkish women, compared to their Western-European counterparts, still marry at younger ages and out-of-wedlock births and childlessness are a rare phenomenon (Balbo et al., 2013 ; Yavuz 2008).

* 1. **Fertility of Immigrants and their Descendants**

Modern international migration has become, in recent years, a topic of great interest to both demographers and policy makers. In the European context, most cases under investigation are of mass immigration flows from countries with higher rates of fertility to Western-European countries who have recorded lower fertility rates for decades. Consequently, with the natural increase of immigrant populations and their descendants in the discussed destination countries, migration has become one of the main driving forces behind both demographic change (Coleman, 2006) and broader social changes within each country. Accordingly, the demographic and social impact of immigrants in the country of destination have found to be even more dramatic when their fertility rates are relatively higher, alongside other childbearing patterns that differ from those of receiving society (Sobotka, 2008).

Until recent years, research on fertility patterns of immigrants have mainly focused on the first generation of international migrants in the European context (Milewski, 2011). Recently, as some female cohorts of second generation of immigrants in European countries are at, or even getting closer to the end of, its’ reproductive ages, investigating the childbearing patterns of the descendants of immigrants is becoming of great interest to researchers.

There are some theoretical differences that need to be taken under consideration when examining first generation of immigrants on the one hand, and when investigating second generation on the other. While first generation immigrants’ fertility patterns and related decision making are also affected by the migration process itself, their descendants who were born in the country of destination are mainly influenced by the environment they grew up in. Thus, the fertility behavior of second generation is influenced by growing up under the influence of mainstream society or alternately, under a dominant sub-culture ethnic group (Kulu et al., 2017).

Traditionally, research on immigrants’ process of integration into receiving society was described threw the classical assimilation theory, mainly in the North-American context and other “old” mass migration receiving countries. Under the assimilation hypothesis it is expected that immigrants will gradually become part of mainstream society as ethnical and cultural distinctions decline. This process is viewed as inevitable and which will be accelerated over generations (Alba & Nee, 1997). According to more recent approach, the assimilation process is perceived as more diverse and which is influenced by the immigrants group unique characteristics (Milewski, 2011).

If so, a more sensitive theory was offered in order to investigate the integration process of immigrants. The *adaptation hypothesis* can offer us explanations for the observed convergence of immigrants fertility levels to those of receiving society (Krapf & Wolf, 2015). On the one hand, the adaptation to fertility norms by immigrants is influenced by micro-economic decisions of the real costs of childbearing and raising children in the new economic environment (Becker, 1991), which derived from the receiving country’s welfare policies, job perspectives and other national-economic factors (Sobotka, 2008). On the other hand, the adoption of new family ideals and norms ﻿can facilitate an adjustment of migrants’ fertility to receiving society fertility patterns. (ibid, 2008). For second generation, the absorption of mainstream society ideals is an ongoing process, which begins in early childhood, with exposure to majority population and by the formation of social contacts and meaningful interactions.

A complementary theory, the *socialization hypothesis*, has offered in order to explain the mechanisms behind observed differences of fertility behavior between immigrants, their descendants and native population. Driven from the classical socialization theory (Parsons, 1955), it is assumed that social values and norms are transmitted from one generation to the other, mainly by meaningful others in one’s childhood. Parents are perceived to be responsible for the early development of their children’s attitudes and values, before they engage in any other significant social contact. Gender-role and family values are transmitted from parents to children by providing a live example (Barber, 2001) and by expressing their own attitudes (Cunningham, 2001). Accordingly, immigrants’ fertility patterns are designed mainly by the influence of meaningful family members and the community they grew up in, at the country of origin. The theory posits that if the descendants of immigrants, who were born in the country of destination, show significant differences in family and fertility behavior compared to native population, it is due to the influence of dominant immigrant group and parents who preserve their cultural background.

Socioeconomic status is influential in one’s fertility decision making and patterns. Alongside demographic characteristics, it has been found that education constitute influential determinant in fertility outcomes, while the influence of employment status differ between education groups (Lappegard & Ronsen, 2005 ; Kreyenfeld & Andersson, 2014). In large, immigrant groups are often perceived to have different demographic and socioeconomic composition than native society, mainly shaped by the process and reason of immigration and the effect of the country of origin. The *composition hypothesis* is offered to us as an addition explanation to observed differences between second generation immigrants and their counterparts. If fertility differences disappear after controlling for all relevant socioeconomic and demographic variables, the cultural socialization hypothesis is ruled out and an alternative explanation is offered. In addition, compositional characteristics have been proven to be important factor even when comparing the same origin migrant descendants group in different receiving countries, with regard of transition to motherhood and family formation (Milewski, 2011).

* 1. **Fertility and Family-Labour Market Policies: The Role of Country of Destination**

The type of welfare regime and its policies regarding fertility and family-labour market relationship are acknowledged for their influence on fertility behavior of both natives (Andersson et al., 2014; Luci-Greulich & Thevenon, 2013) and immigrants (Amuedo-Dorantes et.al., 2016) in a developed economy context. Different realms of policies, regarding parental leave, maternal employment, child-care and birth-grants, have found to be influential on fertility patterns and decision making of couples.

The impact of family cash related policies on fertility have been widely investigated. In general, studies have concluded that there is a significant positive correlation between these types of policies and fertility. Both, cash benefits of births and childcare allowances positively influence the probability of having a first child in a specific country-case (Laroque & Salanie, 2004; ﻿D’Addio & Mira d’Ercole, 2005; Vikat, 2004). Other related financial aid policies, such as maternal and parental leave have found to be with strong connection to fertility outcomes. Arguably, the duration of parental leave entitlement for women and for both parents, which support family income during childbirth, has positive effect on fertility (Luci-Greulich & Thevenon, 2013). In the Scandinavian context, where gender equality­–with regard to parental leave–is desired (although different schemes applied for each country), fathers’ use of parental leave has ﻿positive association with continued childbearing (Duvander et. Al., 2010).

The increase of women’s participation in labour market has implications on the country’s fertility levels. Studies have shown that women earnings and level of participation in labour market are associated with their fertility patterns, and that policy and social context determine whether the effect is positive or negative (Andersson et al., 2014). Childcare related policies is another fertility associated schemes that have great influence on couples’ fertility decision making. Both childcare availability and cost are found to be positively associated with the probability of having a child (Del Boca et.al., 2003) and parity progression for all birth orders (Diprete et.al., 2003) across European countries.

National and welfare context are proven to be crucial when determining fertility patterns and family decision making. Accordingly immigrants and their descendants are influenced by the extent of their inclusion or exclusion from social schemes, and by the norms that are embraced as consequence of these policies. If so, it is important to take under consideration the degree of entitlement to social policies and the environment that immigrants’ descendants grew up in, when investigating integration process by fertility behavior.

* 1. **Descendants of Immigrants’ Fertility in Europe**

Studies investigating the fertility patterns of the descendant of migrants from high to low fertility countries have mainly compared them to their native counterparts or to both their immigrant parents and native population. The comparison was made in order to examine the discussed competing theories, alongside the socioeconomic and demographic compositional effect.

The majority of studies have focused on the analysis of a single-country case, examining fertility by birth order. There is a large evidence that when examining first birth behavior and entering parenthood the story is somewhat uniform. In most cases, the descendants of immigrant have recorded same, or even lower, first birth risks compared to their native counterparts (Andersson & Persson, 2015; Kulu & Hannemann, 2016; Gonzalez-Ferrer & Castro-Martin, 2015; Guarin & Bernardi, 2015; Andersson et.al., 2017). If convergence degree was varied between immigrant groups, the differences disappeared after controlling for compositional socioeconomic variables (Pailhé, 2015). While first birth risk findings provide support to the adaptation hypothesis, higher birth risks results varied between cases. For second birth risk, some second generation immigrant groups have shown further depressed rates (Andersson & Persson, 2015; Pailhé, 2015), while in some cases the descendants of immigrants had higher likelihood of having a second child compared to native population (Kulu & Hannemann, 2016; Gonzalez-Ferrer & Castro-Martin, 2015). Although until recent years the number of events for third birth risk of immigrants’ descendants in Europe was still low, studies have recorded higher likelihood of having a third child among immigrant groups (Kulu & Hannemann, 2016; Kulu et al., 2017; Andersson & Persson, 2015), thus providing some support to the socialization hypothesis.

If so, most researches have concluded that there is a dynamic interrelationship between the two competing theories. On the one hand, immigrants’ descendants ,with regard to the postponement of childbearing and even proceeding to second child, adapt to fertility and family norms of the receiving country. On the other hand, the observed fertility behavior of the second generation also provide support to the socialization hypothesis. Compared to native population, the higher probability of forming a bigger family is part of the intergenerational transmission of fertility norms. These conclusions strongly support the claim that any comparison of fertility patterns between immigrant groups and native population should also be examined by birth order. In addition, although composition effect may not always explain differences in fertility behavior between migrant descendants and natives (e.g Kulu & Hannemann, 2016 for high birth order), the inclusion of such socioeconomic and demographic indicators is of great importance when explaining fertility differences between groups (Milewski, 2007, 2011 ; Scott & Stanfors, 2011).

Ultimately, the fertility differences between natives and Turkish population may have converged over generations to a certain extent (e.g. Kulu et al., 2017), but the degree of difference was mainly examined in a single-country context. While the differences between Turkish descendants in different environments were discussed before only by means of transition to motherhood (Milewski, 2011) and not in terms of higher birth orders and complete fertility histories. Thus, the key questions here are whether the fertility patterns of Turkish descendant women differ across countries for all birth orders, and if so, whether fertility convergence degree is similar among the same origin group in different countries, each compared to its relevant counterparts.

1. **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED SIGNIFICANCE**

The review suggests that while the integration of Turkish immigrant and their descendants, by their relative fertility patterns, has been examined in various ways, it is yet to be discussed under the context of different destination welfare-states and in terms of complete fertility. This proposed study is now available due to new data that will contain cohorts of second generation of Turkish women immigrants that are reaching the end of their reproductive years.

The proposed project will assess whether second generation of Turkish immigrants should be addressed as one ethnic group with the same family and fertility patterns across countries, and if not, whether they integrate at the same degree under different regimes. Put differently, the overarching objective of this project is to examine the role of welfare systems in shaping the integration process and fertility patterns of immigrants.

**Objective I: Assess the nature of fertility patterns of immigrants’ descendants from the same origin in different receiving societies**

1. Origin-culture socialization or adaptation to receiving country: What is the effect of the country of residence compared to origin-cultural socialization on the fertility patterns (measured by relative risk of childbearing for all births order) of the descendants of immigrants?
2. Composition differences: Do demographic and socioeconomic composition differences also explain fertility differences between descendants of immigrants of the same origin in different countries of destination?

**Objective II: Assess whether the degree of integration, in terms of fertility behavior, differ between countries of destination for the same immigrant origin group**

Different country and welfare policies: To what extant the second generation to immigrants of the same origin resemble to their native counterparts, in terms of fertility patterns, in each investigated country of destination.

The proposed study provides a platform for immigrants integration theory building and public policy design. Studying the completed fertility patterns of migrant descendants can tell us a more accurate story of their social integration process. The results will demonstrate the power of socialization process and adaptation on shaping one’s decision making. Moreover, the results have potential to shed light on the effectiveness of the inclusion of immigrants in each investigated society, under welfare states that are in a constant pursuit of finding the balance between providing social protection, encouraging economic growth and addressing new demographic challenges. Such an understanding of background forces at play will provide important information for policy makers across western Europe, who are wish to reduce social inequalities.

1. **DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED RESEARCH**
   1. **Working Hypothesis**
2. Both adaptation to country of destination patterns and origin-culture socialization determine immigrants’ descendants fertility and family behavior. Yet, I assume that the adaptation to host society patterns and norm are more important in determining fertility outcomes. If so, we are to observe significant differences between the Turkish-descendants groups, even after controlling for socioeconomic and demographic variables.
3. Socioeconomic and demographic composition explain some of the fertility differences between the second-generation groups, on the grounds that immigration process vary in each destination. Consequently, fertility differences, if exists, should converge to some extent after controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the women.
4. Country of destination determine the degree of fertility adaptation and convergence. Type of welfare regime, social policies, and immigrants’ degree of inclusion in these scheme are of great importance to the degree of integration and fertility adaptation.
   1. **Research Design and Methods**
      1. **Data and Variables**

The main data source to be used is the 2020 Generations and Gender Programme (GGP). The new 2020 GGP survey is a comprehensive source of demographic data on European countries, which allows cross national comparability using advanced micro-level data. It will have an average of 10,000 respondents aged 18-79 per country, making the study of Turkish descendants possible, as they constitute the largest minority group in the investigated countries.

In the proposed study I will focus on Women. The analysis will include all women of Turkish descendants who were born in the country of destination with one or two Turkish-born parents. I will also include the same amount of non-migrant women in each country to serve as the comparison group of the study. Accordingly, because Turkish immigrants were mainly settled in urban cities, I will make sure that the comparison groups are also of urban background. Relying on previous GGP surveys, the countries under investigation will be: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. These countries are known to be the main Turkish immigrants receiving countries during the 1960’s, thus having the largest amount of Turkish immigrant descendants, hence, enough cohorts of women who reach the end of their reproductive years will be available for the study.

The data contains information regarding the socioeconomic status and demographic background of each subject. This relevant information will serve as the control variables in the proposed study, as described in the theoretical background. The Socioeconomic covariates are: *level of* *education* (ISCED categories); *employment status* coded as activity status. Respectively, The demographic covariates are : *age of respondent; birth cohort; marital status; number of siblings; religiosity* (scale of 1-10 from “not religious” to “very religious”). The data provides detailed complete fertility histories for all women, number of biological children and their age, year and month of birth.

* + 1. **Methods**

Using the detailed provided data I will analyze the transition from childless to motherhood (first birth), from first birth to second, from second to third, and if the data allows I will also analyze higher birth orders. In order to apprise the research objective, first I will conduct a non-parametric analysis using the Kaplan-Meier estimator. Then, I will apply an event-history analysis using the Cox proportional hazard model, while adding the relevant covariates to the regression models. In order to assess the first objective, I will fit a model of relative risks of childbirth by country of destination. One model for the descendants of Turkish immigrants and another for the natives comparison groups. For all birth orders, I will control for socioeconomic and demographic sets of covariates, adding them one by one in order to assess the compositional differences. To assess the second objective, I will apply the same discussed process within each country of destination, comparing relative risks of childbirth between each Turkish descendants group and their native counterparts, measuring the differences of risks for all birth orders.

**Potential Supervisors:**
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