

**THE SITUATION AMONG
CHILDREN OF MIGRANT ORIGIN
IN GERMANY**

Susanne Clauss and Bernhard Nauck

**Special Series on Children in Immigrant
Families in Affluent Societies**

IWP-2009-14

October 2009

Innocenti Working Papers
Special Series on Children in Immigrant Families in Affluent Societies

UNICEF Innocenti Working Papers are intended to disseminate initial research contributions within the Centre's programme of work, addressing social, economic and institutional aspects of the realization of the human rights of children.

The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF.

Extracts from this publication may be freely reproduced with due acknowledgement.

© 2009 United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
ISSN: 1014-7837

For readers wishing to cite this document, we suggest the following form:

Clauss, Susanne and Bernhard Nauck (2009), 'The Situation among Children of Migrant Origin in Germany', *Innocenti Working Paper*, no. 2009-14, Florence, UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.

The UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre

The UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, in Florence, was established in 1988 to strengthen the research capability of the United Nations Children's Fund and to support its advocacy for children worldwide. The Centre – formally known as the International Child Development Centre – generates knowledge and analysis to support policy formulation and advocacy in favour of children, acts as a convener and catalyst for knowledge exchange and strategic reflections on children's concerns and supports programme development and capacity-building.

Innocenti studies present new knowledge and perspectives on critical issues affecting children, informing current and future areas of UNICEF's work. The Centre's publications represent contributions to a global debate on child rights issues and include a range of opinions. For this reason, the Centre may produce publications that do not necessarily reflect UNICEF policies or approaches on some topics.

The Centre collaborates with its host institution in Florence, the Istituto degli Innocenti, in selected areas of work. Core funding for the Centre is provided by the Government of Italy and UNICEF. Additional financial support for specific projects is provided by governments, international institutions and private sources, including UNICEF National Committees, as well as UNICEF offices involved in collaborative studies.

For further information and to download or order this and other publications, please visit the IRC website at <<http://www.unicef.org/irc>>.

Correspondence should be addressed to:

UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre
Piazza SS. Annunziata, 12
50122 Florence, Italy
Tel: (+39) 055 20 330
Fax: (+39) 055 2033 220
Email: florence@unicef.org

Special Series on the Situation of Children in Immigrant Families in Affluent Societies

The series supports and complements the UNICEF Innocenti Insight on ‘Children in Immigrant Families in Eight Affluent Countries: Their Family, National and International Context’ and includes the following papers:

<i>Review of the Circumstances among Children in Immigrant Families in Australia</i> by Ilan Katz and Gerry Redmond
<i>The Children of Immigrants in France: The Emergence of a Second Generation</i> by Thomas Kirszbaum, Yaël Brinbaum and Patrick Simon, with Esin Gezer
<i>The Situation among Children of Migrant Origin in Germany</i> by Susanne Clauss and Bernhard Nauck
<i>The Situation of Children in Immigrant Families in Italy: Changes and Challenges</i> by Letizia Mencarini, Emiliana Baldoni and Gianpiero Dalla Zuanna
<i>Children in Immigrant Families in the Netherlands: A Statistical Portrait and a Review of the Literature</i> by Helga A. G. de Valk, Kris R. Noam, Alinda M. Bosch and Gijs C. N. Beets
<i>Children in Immigrant Families in Switzerland: On a Path between Discrimination and Integration</i> by Rosita Fibbi and Philippe Wanner
<i>The Situation of Children in Immigrant Families in the United Kingdom</i> by Heaven Crawley

The findings presented in this series are based on data derived from sources of the countries' respective national statistical offices. In several cases, the basic estimates reported have been calculated directly by the national statistical offices on behalf of the country study teams. In other cases, microdata have been provided by the national statistical offices, and specific estimates have been calculated by the country experts.

The results reported represent the best estimates possible on the immigrant population as derived from official statistical sources. Given the fluid nature of the migration phenomenon, it is not possible to know precisely the extent to which the coverage is representative of the whole population of interest or is fully comparable across the countries studied. In general, the number of undocumented arrivals and undocumented residents is more difficult to measure through routine data collection processes, and the country researchers did not specifically address this segment of the immigrant population. Undocumented immigrants and their families may or may not be covered in some of the country analyses.

The country studies have been reviewed as individually indicated by national experts, by members of the international research team, including UNICEF IRC, and by the series editor.

The project has been supported by contributions to the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre by the Government of Sweden and the Swiss Committee for UNICEF and by a contribution by the Government of Spain to UNICEF for policy advocacy and partnerships for children's rights.

THE SITUATION AMONG CHILDREN OF MIGRANT ORIGIN IN GERMANY

Susanne Clauss^a and Bernhard Nauck^a

^a Department of Sociology, Chemnitz University of Technology.

Summary: Germany may be described as a country of immigrants. Resident foreign citizens alone number around 6.7 million. The share of children who are living with parents who are recent immigrants is quite large. More than 1 million children 0–17 years of age are foreign citizens. Counting German citizens, there are nearly 6 million children of migrant origin under the age of 25. Of all persons of migrant origin, nearly 30 per cent are in the 0–20 age group..

The following are key findings of the study.

- Relative to the population without a migrant origin, the age structure among people of migrant origin is shifted considerably towards younger ages.
- Large shares of children of migrant origin grow up in households in which at least one parent is working full time.
- Immigrant groups have differing views on the value to them of their children. In some cases, these views are linked to expectations derived from experiences in the countries of origin rather than the country of settlement.
- Young children of migrant origin face disadvantages in preschool. Many are held back because of a lack of German language proficiency. Children and youth in foreign-born families tend to start school later and repeat classes more often. Children of migrant origin are often guided towards less demanding and less promising educational tracks because of their perceived deficiencies. This is apparent especially during the first important educational transition in German schools, from primary to lower secondary education.
- Children of migrant origin benefit from less health care. Important among the reasons is the more restrained participation of these children in early diagnosis and preventive care. There may also be a greater incidence of obesity and poor dental care among children in some immigrant groups.
- Youth of migrant origin are involved in violent crimes at a higher rate. Certain migrant groups are at especially high risk of involvement in committing crimes. Among the factors responsible for the prevalence of deviant behaviour among youth of migrant origin are disadvantages in education, greater parental tolerance of violent behaviour, acceptance of concepts of masculinity that legitimize violence, and more frequent association with young people prone to delinquency and crime. Crimes committed by offenders of migrant origin are also more likely to be reported to police. Germans are the least frequent victims of youth crime. Other migrant groups are among the more frequent victims.

Keywords: immigrant child, immigrant family, demography, education, labour market, discrimination, citizenship, health, poverty, deviant behaviour.

Acknowledgments: An earlier version of this paper was discussed at the project review meeting held at the UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence, on 6 June 2008. Daja Wenke and Peter Whiteford offered assessments. The authors have relied greatly on Nauck et al. (2008). Eva Jespersen (formerly of UNICEF IRC) and Donald Hernandez (formerly of University at Albany, State University of New York) have provided additional comments. The study was edited by Robert Zimmermann.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

EEA	European Economic Area: Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, plus the EU
EU	European Union
EU-15	Member states of the EU before 2004: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom
EU-25	Member states of the EU before January 2007: the EU-15, plus Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. RECENT PATTERNS IN IMMIGRATION	1
3. SIZE AND ORIGIN OF THE POPULATION OF CHILDREN IN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES	2
4. CURRENT NATURALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP POLICY	5
5. DATA ANALYSIS AND LITERATURE REVIEW: INCLUSION AND OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES	7
5.1 Definitions and methodological clarifications	7
5.2 Family environment	12
5.3 Educational attainment among children	21
5.4 Youth and the labour market	25
5.5 Children and health	26
5.7 Children and poverty	27
5.8 Youth and deviant behaviour	28
6. CONCLUSIONS	31
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION

Immigration is an undeniable part of the recent history of Germany, which has become a major country of immigrant settlement. In this paper, we present a statistical and analytical portrait of living conditions among children in immigrant families in Germany.

As in many countries, there is a shortage of data suitable for the study of immigration issues. Unfortunately, the data problems are acute in Germany. By highlighting these problems, this paper represents an advocacy tool for the collection of better data so that important research questions about immigration may be addressed and the difficulties facing immigrant groups might be more readily resolved.

We first supply a brief historical perspective on immigration in Germany. We describe the major demographic characteristics of immigrant groups, especially children and families, based on the most recent data available nationwide. We sketch out the legal and conceptual framework governing the process of naturalization for immigrants and children in immigrant families. In the literature review, we combine analysis of data and the recent literature on immigration in Germany to examine the social and economic well-being of children in immigrant families and the social environment in which these children develop and grow, including the education system, health care and the labour market.

2. RECENT PATTERNS IN IMMIGRATION

Already more than 2,000 years ago, Celts, Romans and Slavs were settling among the Germans. Germany's status as a country of settlement is also apparent today. Since the end of World War II, immigration has been a decisive component in the development of the population of the country.

In 1950, there were only about 500,000 foreigners living in the Federal Republic of Germany. This represented about 1 per cent of the total population of the country. Later immigrants came in several waves. From 1955 to 1973, the number of resident foreigners rose to about 4 million following the recruitment of foreign workers, who were known as guest workers (*Gastarbeiter*). The largest immigrant group, persons of Turkish origin have been arriving steadily since this period. Smaller, but still important immigrant groups recruited initially as guest workers include persons of Italian origin, who represent the oldest immigration flow into the country, as well as persons of Greek, Moroccan, Portuguese, Spanish and Tunisian origin and people from the former Republic of Yugoslavia.

After 1973 and up to about 1985, most immigration occurred through family reunification (*Familiennachzug*) as spouses and foreign-born children joined foreigners already living in Germany. In 1985, 4.4 million foreigners were living in the Federal Republic.

When the Cold War ended in the late 1980s, two new waves of immigration began: asylum seekers and ethnic German repatriates. There were 57,000 asylum applications in 1987. The next year, the number jumped, and, by 1992, it had reached 438,000. In 1998, after the asylum law was amended, the number subsided to well below 100,000 applications.

Meanwhile, between 1945 and 1990, 15 million refugees – German expellees from other countries and ethnic Germans whose forebears had migrated elsewhere, sometimes centuries earlier – arrived in Germany seeking resettlement (Heckmann 1995). An average 36,000 repatriates of German ancestry were resettled in the Federal Republic from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union each year from 1950 to 1984. In 1987–1988, this new wave of immigration began to swell. In 1988, the number of ethnic Germans moving to Germany rose to 203,000, and, in 1990, it was nearly 400,000. From 1987 to 1999, Germany took in a total of 2.7 million ethnic German repatriates from the territory of the former Soviet Union. In 2000, the annual figures began sinking below 100,000; they have now returned to the levels of the early 1980s.

The immigration of ethnic Germans from the former Soviet Union demonstrates that statistics on foreigners living in Germany do not provide a full picture of the phenomenon of immigration in the country. This is why the term ‘persons of migrant origin’ is gaining currency. It may refer to foreign nationals, but it may also refer to German citizens who are immigrants (repatriates or naturalized foreigners) and to their children born in Germany.

The number of persons of migrant origin is still increasing because of family unification and marriage. It is safe to assume that, including German repatriates, nearly one person in five living in Germany today is a person of migrant origin.

3. SIZE AND ORIGIN OF THE POPULATION OF CHILDREN IN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES

In Germany, immigration clearly accounts for a significant share of the population. In 2005, there were around 15.3 million people of migrant origin (Table 1). This represented 18.6 per cent of the total population (82.4 million).

Table 1: Structure of the Population according to Immigration Status and Location, Germany, 2005

millions and per cent

<i>Status</i>	<i>Total</i>		<i>Western old Länder^a (%)</i>	<i>Eastern new Länder and Berlin-east^b (%)</i>
	<i>Millions</i>	<i>%</i>		
Of migrant origin	15.3	18.6	21.5	5.2
Foreign residents	7.3	8.9	10.2	2.7
German citizens	8.0	9.7	11.3	2.5
Not of migrant origin	67.1	81.4	78.5	94.8
Total	82.4	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Microcensus 2005.

a. The Federal Republic of Germany before October 1990: Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Bremen, Hamburg, Hesse, Lower Saxony, North Rhine–Westphalia, Rhineland-Palatinate, Saarland and Schleswig-Holstein, plus, in practice, Berlin-West.

b. Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt and Thuringia, plus Berlin-Ost (the eastern part of Berlin). Since reunification, reunited Berlin has had the status of a Land.

Most people of migrant origin are living in the western part of the country, which corresponds to the 10 old *Länder* (states) of the Federal Republic of Germany before reunification, on 3 October 1990 (Table 1). Only a small share is living in the eastern *Länder*. In Saxony in eastern Germany, for example, the share of foreign residents is only about 2 per cent, and, in Thuringia, foreign residents represent only 1 per cent of the population.

Meanwhile, in western Germany, the shares are 12 per cent in Baden-Württemberg, 13 per cent in North Rhine–Westphalia, 14 per cent in Hesse, 15 per cent in Bremen, 16 per cent in Berlin and 17 per cent in Hamburg.

The shares of men and women and of foreign and German citizens in the population are indicated in Table 2. Among the foreigners in 2005, 48.3 per cent were women and 51.7 per cent were men. This is almost the reverse of the shares of women and men in the population of German citizens and the entire population.

Table 2: Population according to Citizenship and Gender, Germany, 2004–2007

thousands

<i>Population segment</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2007</i>
German citizens	75,212.9	75,148.8	75,059.0	74,960.8
Men	36,567.1	36,576.5	36,563.8	36,547.3
Women	38,645.7	38,575.4	38,495.2	38,413.5
Foreign citizens	7,288.0	7,289.1	7,255.9	7,257.0
Men	3,786.5	3,766.5	3,737.4	3,727.0
Women	3,501.5	3,522.6	3,518.5	3,530.1
Total	82,500.8	82,438.0	82,314.9	82,217.8
Men	40,353.6	40,340.0	40,301.2	40,274.3
Women	42,147.2	42,098.0	42,013.7	41,943.5

Source: Federal Statistical Office.

Around 10.4 million individuals now living in the country arrived in Germany through a personal immigration experience (Table 3). Among these are 5.6 million foreigners, 3.1 million naturalized Germans, and 1.7 million individuals who, through immigration, acquired German citizenship without following the discretionary naturalization procedure (shown as ethnic German repatriates in the table). This last group includes, for example, many ethnic German repatriates who arrived from Poland or the countries of the former Soviet Union and who acquired naturalization on demand by entitlement.

Table 3: Persons of Migrant Origin, by Place of Birth, Germany, 2007

millions

<i>Population segment</i>	<i>Foreign birth</i>	<i>German birth</i>
Foreign residents	5.6	1.7
Naturalized Germans	3.1	0.4
Ethnic German repatriates	1.7	—
German nationals with at least one parent who immigrated to Germany or who was born as a foreigner in Germany	—	2.6
Total	10.4	4.7

Source: Federal Statistical Office.

Another 4.7 million individuals have been born in the country, but have nonetheless been affected directly by immigration because of their citizenship or because of the migrant origin of at least one of their parents. These include 2.6 million German nationals with at least one parent who is an ethnic German repatriate, a naturalized German, or a foreign resident, 0.4 million naturalized Germans and 1.7 million foreign residents (shown as foreign residents under the German birth column in the table).

At the end of 2006, there were 6.7 million foreigners living in Germany who were registered in the central register of foreigners (*Ausländerzentralregister*) (Table 4). Although this source gives data that are slightly different from the population estimates of the Federal Statistical Office shown in Tables 1–3, the data indicate that about a third of the foreigners are citizens of member countries in the European Union (EU), and around two thirds are citizens of other countries.

Table 4: Foreign Population according to Citizenship, Germany, 2006

number and per cent

<i>Country of origin</i>	<i>EU</i>		<i>Non-EU</i>		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Country of origin</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Italy	534,657	7.9	Turkey	1,738,831	25.8
Poland	361,696	5.4	Republic of Yugoslavia ^a	481,929	7.1
Greece	303,761	4.5	Croatia	227,510	3.4
Austria	175,653	2.6	Russian Federation	187,514	2.8
Netherlands	123,466	1.8	Bosnia and Herzegovina	157,094	2.3
Other	681,341	10.1	Other	1,777,550	26.3
Total	2,180,574	32.3	Total	4,570,428	67.7

Source: Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, Federal Ministry of the Interior.

a. Includes individuals carried in the central register of foreigners as citizens of (former) Serbia and Montenegro or the (former) Republic of Yugoslavia.

Because recent immigration to Germany began in earnest in the 1960s, many families in immigrant groups, especially the groups involved in earlier immigration flows, have become well settled in Germany. For this reason, within these groups, the number of children 0 to 17 years of age born in Germany is much larger than the number of such children born outside Germany. In terms of the sociological taxonomy of immigrant generations, the second generation (85 per cent of the age group within the population of migrant origin), that is, the generation of children born in Germany to at least one parent born abroad, is larger than the first and third generations, that is, respectively, the generation of children born abroad to immigrant families and the generation of children born in Germany to parents of migrant origin born in Germany. Today, relatively few children 0 to 17 are first-generation immigrants. The largest group among first-generation children of migrant origin is the group from the Russian Federation. Among certain immigrant groups, such as persons of Italian or Turkish origin, a significant third generation of children 0 to 17 has been socialized and reached adulthood entirely in Germany.

Like most other societies in Europe, German society is ageing because of advances in health care and nutrition and the pronounced reduction in the birth rate associated with economic well-being. Marriage rates have declined along with the birth rate, and growing shares of women are remaining childless. For several years, the fertility rate has stood at around 1.4 children per woman.

Among the foreign population, there are around 1 million children 0–17 years of age, 3.1 million people between 18 and 40, 1.8 million between 41 and 60 and 0.8 million older than 60. There are nearly 6 million people of migrant origin under the age of 25. Relative to the rest of the population, the age structure among people of migrant origin is shifted considerably towards younger age groups. Of all persons of migrant origin, 29.3 per cent are

in the 0–20 age group. The corresponding share among the rest of the population, 17 per cent, is plainly lower. The microcensus data indicate that nearly 60 per cent of all children 0 to 17 of migrant origin are in the 0–9 age group; 26 per cent are 10 to 14 years of age, and 14 per cent are 15 to 17 years old. Meanwhile, the corresponding shares among persons without a migrant origin are more balanced, at 49.8 per cent for the 0–9 age group and 50.2 per cent for the 10–17 age group.

According to the data, 58 per cent of all children 0–17 years of age in immigrant families have German citizenship. Only 8 per cent are naturalized German citizens. The share of children in Germany who are living with parents who are recent immigrants is quite large. Among the parents of children of migrant origin, 26 per cent are mixed, that is, one parent is a German citizen, and one is not.

4. CURRENT NATURALIZATION AND CITIZENSHIP POLICY

From 1995 to 2004, 1,278,524 foreigners obtained German citizenship by naturalization (Table 5). This means that about 1.5 per cent of the German population was naturalized during this period.

Table 5: Naturalization among Foreign Citizens of Selected Countries, Germany, 1995–2004

number

<i>Country</i>	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Turkey	31,578	46,294	42,240	59,664	103,900	82,861	76,573	64,631	56,244	44,465
Poland	10,174	7,872	5,763	4,968	2,787	1,604	1,774	2,646	2,990	7,499
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	874	649	1,171	1,529	1,863	14,410	12,020	13,026	9,440	6,362
Russian Federation	—	—	—	—	—	4,583	4,972	3,734	2,764	4,381
Afghanistan	1,666	1,819	1,475	1,200	1,355	4,773	5,111	4,750	4,948	4,077
Ukraine	—	—	—	—	—	2,978	3,295	3,656	3,889	3,844
Morocco	3,288	2,918	4,010	4,981	4,312	5,008	4,425	3,800	4,118	3,820
Iraq	364	363	290	319	483	984	1,264	1,721	2,999	3,564
Serbia and Montenegro ^a	3,623	2,967	2,244	2,721	3,444	9,776	12,000	8,375	5,504	3,539
Israel	1,025	0	584	0	802	1,101	1,364	1,739	2,844	3,164
Lebanon	595	784	1,159	1,782	2,491	5,673	4,486	3,300	2,651	2,265
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2,010	1,926	995	3,469	4,238	4,002	3,791	2,357	1,770	2,103
Croatia	2,479	2,268	1,789	2,198	1,536	3,316	3,931	2,974	2,048	1,689
Viet Nam	3,357	3,464	3,129	3,452	2,270	4,489	3,014	1,482	1,423	1,371
Total ^b	71,981	86,356	82,913	106,790	143,267	186,688	178,098	154,547	140,731	127,153

Source: BAMF (2005).

a. Indicated this way in the data.

b. Including countries not shown.

The amended Nationality Act (*Staatsangehörigkeitsgesetz*) of 1 January 2000 and the Immigration Act (*Zuwanderungsgesetz*) of 1 January 2005 revised German law on naturalization and citizenship. Originally based on *ius sanguinis*, the right (*ius*) to citizenship conferred by a blood relationship (*sanguinis*) to a citizen, the law now also includes provision for the application of *ius soli*, the right of citizenship based on birth within the national territory (*soli*). Thus, an individual may acquire German citizenship if one of the parents is a German citizen, irrespective of the individual's place of birth, but also, under certain circumstances, if the individual has been born in Germany to parents who are both foreign citizens. Though it would have been undertaken in any case, the reform well reflects the reality that more than 7 million foreigners are now living in Germany, half for at least 20

years, and one third for more than 30 years. The revised law makes it somewhat easier for foreigners resident in Germany on a long-term basis to acquire German citizenship, but especially their children born in Germany. Mandatory waiting periods before an individual may apply for naturalization have also been reduced.

An individual born to a mixed couple is usually a German citizen on that basis (*ius sanguinis*) even if the individual is born outside Germany and the parent who is a German citizen has been naturalized. However, in future, individuals born outside Germany to a German parent who was born outside Germany will need to be registered as a German citizen within 12 months of birth.

Birth in Germany generally does not automatically confer German citizenship if neither parent is German. However, children born to non-German parents on or after 1 January 2000 acquire German citizenship at birth if at least one parent has been entitled to residence or possessed a permanent residence permit for at least three years and has been lawfully residing in Germany for at least eight years. Because Germany allows dual citizenship only in certain cases (though there is flexibility on this issue), such children who may have also acquired the foreign citizenship of parents are obliged formally to apply successfully for German citizenship after they reach the age of 18 and before they reach the age of 23. They will normally also be required to prove at the time of application that they have already submitted an application for denaturalization with respect to any other citizenship they may possess.

German citizenship may be acquired through naturalization by an individual with a permanent residence permit who has lived in the country for eight years. The individual must have mastered German and demonstrated the means to a livelihood without resorting to the welfare system. Applicants are normally expected to show they have renounced or become ineligible for any other citizenship they may have possessed. Some discretion is allowed on this issue. For instance, an applicant who is a refugee may not be able to give up the other nationality, and thus the rule might be waived in this case. There is also an exception for citizens of EU member states that do not require Germans to renounce their citizenship upon naturalization. The residence requirements may also be otherwise reduced or waived. Thus, the spouse of a German citizen may be naturalized after three years of residence if the couple has been married for at least two years.

The right of people in selected groups to German citizenship has been recognized in the German constitution, the Basic Law (*Grundgesetz*). Thus, German repatriates who have returned to Germany since 1993 from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union may claim automatic German citizenship if these ethnic Germans are expellees from other countries or had forebears who emigrated from Germany. Likewise, persons who lost their German citizenship between 30 January 1933 and 8 May 1945 by individual decree or through the application of directives under the Reich Citizenship Law (*Reichsbürgergesetz*) that deprived Germans of Jewish faith living outside Germany of their nationality are entitled to renaturalization. Descendants of these persons are also entitled to renaturalization if they would have acquired German nationality by birth had their parents or grandparents (or more remote ancestors) not been deprived of German citizenship. In these cases, the residence requirements and obligation to renounce a foreign citizenship are waived.

The rules governing naturalization and citizenship are complicated, and there are many other exceptions and conditions. Nonetheless, because of the reforms, a substantial share of the foreign population in Germany now has the opportunity to participate in and help shape social and political issues by exercising their inherent rights and obligations as German citizens.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND LITERATURE REVIEW: INCLUSION AND OTHER SOCIAL ISSUES

5.1 Definitions and methodological clarifications

5.1.1 Data issues

According to a sociological taxonomy of immigrants by generation, children may be classified according to their generation with respect to their arrival or the arrival of their parents or grandparents in a country of settlement. Thus, immigrants who have arrived in Germany as adults would be classified as the 1.0 generation. Those who have arrived at a young age would be classified as the 1.5 generation. Children born in Germany of two immigrant parents would be children of the 2.0 generation, while the children born in Germany of mixed native and immigrant parents would be the 2.5 generation. The 3.0 generation would represent the children born in Germany of parents of migrant origin born in Germany.

However, there are few statistical resources that provide relevant data on the situation of children in immigrant families in Germany, and fewer still that are amenable to the distinctions drawn in the taxonomy based on generations. Other terms are more common in the German data, as follows:

- One may differentiate between German citizens and foreigners (*ausländische Bevölkerung*). Foreigners are people residing in Germany who do not possess German citizenship.
- The term immigrant (*Zuwanderer*) is reserved for foreign-born people who have immigrated to Germany. This corresponds to the first generation in the immigrant taxonomy. Occasionally, in the German literature, the term 1.5 generation is used to refer to foreign-born children who have come to Germany before the age of compulsory education.
- Persons of migrant origin (*Personen mit Migrationshintergrund*) include all persons who, since 1949, have migrated into the territory that, today, constitutes the Federal Republic of Germany. It also includes all foreigners born in Germany, as well as all German nationals born in Germany who have at least one parent who immigrated into Germany or who was born as a foreigner in Germany. Persons of migrant origin therefore correspond mainly to first- and second-generation immigrants in the immigrant taxonomy. A small share – people in immigrant families who have been born in Germany to parents of migrant origin born in Germany – would be third-generation immigrants.
- Ethnicity (*Ethnizität*) indicates membership in a group that has a common cultural heritage as expressed in a common history, language and cultural traditions, a shared

religion, a feeling of mutual solidarity and so on. Immigrants of Greek or Turkish ethnicity, for example, may be so distinguished independently of citizenship.

- A special group in Germany is ethnic German repatriates (*Spätaussiedler*). These are members of German minorities who had been living, mainly in Eastern Europe, including the former Soviet Union, for generations before immigrating to Germany. They are Germans within the meaning of the Constitutional Law of the Federal Republic of Germany, article 116. They therefore have the right of admission into the country, where they are recognized as German nationals on demand by entitlement rather than through the discretionary naturalization process. For this reason, they are known as German citizens of migrant origin (*Deutsche mit Migrationshintergrund*).

Studies on issues involving children in immigrant families in Germany, including estimates on the numbers of children of migrant origin according to various variables and indicators of well-being and quality of life, usually rely on the following data resources:

- official government statistics such as the central register of foreigners and other population registers;
- data produced through the educational system and through international school achievement studies such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study coordinated by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement;
- representative surveys of the population such as the microcensus of the Federal Statistical Office (see below), the German Socio-Economic Panel Study that is carried out by the German Institute for Economic Research, an independent, non-profit academic institution, and the German general social survey, a national data generation programme of the GESIS–Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften that collects statistical data on attitudes, behaviour and social structure;¹
- data published in surveys on specific research topics.

A large share of the studies available on people of immigrant origin is based on official statistics. This data source has a major disadvantage: the statistics typically cover migrant origin insufficiently because they differentiate only by foreign or German citizenship. Thus, ethnic Germans and naturalized immigrants, for example, usually appear in statistics as Germans although they have a migrant origin and may have been socialized entirely outside Germany. For this reason, the number of people of migrant origin may be calculated only approximately and, indeed, is probably regularly underestimated.

Currently, only a few studies provide data (on a limited basis) that may help us more accurately identify children in immigrant families according to the country of origin of the parents (see Stanat 2006). Such is the case, for example, of the IGLU (Internationale-Grundschul-Lese-Untersuchung), part of the International Reading Literacy Study, an international assessment of reading comprehension in primary schools that is aimed at improving reading education. In 2006, 35 countries participated in the study.

¹ The latest German Socio-Economic Panel Study covers data from more than 20,000 respondents between 1984 and 2006, while the German general social survey currently includes data collected from a total of 44,526 respondents between 1980 and 2006.

Another example is the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), an international assessment of scholastic performance among 15-year-olds that has been jointly developed by countries within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development to standardize and improve teaching methods. Beginning with the first PISA assessment, in 2000, personal citizenship information has been collected, as in other surveys and assessments in Germany, but information on the year of migration, the year of naturalization and the migration history of the parents of the children has also been collected. However, birthplace is indicated only as ‘Germany’ or ‘not Germany’.

5.1.2 The sample

In 2005, the regular microcensus survey conducted by the Federal Statistical Office and the statistical offices of the Länder to collect structural data on the population and the labour market began to include specific countries of origin and is therefore helping us to clarify individual immigration experiences. In the case of the children of ethnic German repatriates, in particular, this represents a new chance to attempt to distinguish them as Germans of migrant origin, which has not been possible with previous data sets.

The following analysis of living conditions and well-being among children in immigrant families in Germany draws on the stock of statistical material produced through the 2005 version of the microcensus, Microcensus 2005. The general focus of Microcensus 2005 was economic and social conditions, gainful employment, the labour market and education. Microcensus 2005 included information from 477,239 respondents.

The regular microcensus covers a representative sample of 1 per cent of all households in Germany. It is an ongoing household sample. Households are chosen on a principle of contingency, and each household remains in the sample for four years. Because participation is obligatory, the non-response rate is low (about 3 per cent).

Although there have been improvements in the data set, there are still significant gaps. Important variables are missing. One example is kindergarten and primary school enrolments, which were surveyed in Microcensus 2004, but not again in 2005. Such gaps force us to seek to match diverse sources of information or leave concepts out. Nonetheless, the numbers are the most recent available within this representative survey, and they may be the best current source for our information.

Because of the particularities of the German data explained here and elsewhere above, we have been obliged to include Germany in our tables as a country of origin. We note that the Germany category is part of the German data. It may indicate children in the majority population of German-born citizens of German origin, but it may also include children who are naturalized Germans, children whose parents or grandparents are naturalized Germans, children of ethnic German repatriates and other children in immigrant families. Information on the previous countries of residence or citizenship among the families of these children may not be available in the data. (Note, for example, the missing second generation in Table 6 below.)

The problems represented for us by the Germany category are aggravated by the other singularities of the data. Thus, as the reader may see in our tables, we have been able to separate out fairly well the children of the first generation in immigrant families. This is because the focus of the German data on the distinction between foreign and German is typically much more relevant in this generation. However, because of the idiosyncrasies of the data, the third generation of children in immigrant families – the children born in Germany of parents of migrant origin born in Germany – has also tended to disappear without much of a trace in the data because many of them are already German citizens. Thus, we are unable to identify clearly many third-generation children in immigrant families in the sense in which the terms are used in this UNICEF series.

Moreover, because of the differences in the terms in the German practice and the taxonomy of immigrant generations, we have been constrained to use a rather misleading category for the children who, in the data, are not included among foreign-born families. These are the children in ‘native-born’ families. The latter actually includes the majority population of children, plus many third-generation children in immigrant families and even some second-generation children (of naturalized Germans, for example) and first-generation children, particularly children in the 1.5 generation who have arrived in Germany as members of ethnic German repatriate families and are therefore actually foreign born. The microcensus has allowed us to separate out some of these children in the tables, but, in general, we cannot be entirely confident that we have captured them all, and we have kept the numbers among the native born.

This means that our analysis of the situation among children in immigrant families in Germany is actually an analysis of the situation among (most) first- and second-generation children in comparison with the situation among the majority population, plus the (relatively small) third generation of children in immigrant families and a small share of second- and first-generation children, none of whom, in the data, appear clearly among the group of children that is the focus of our interest.

In what follows, children are defined as individuals 0 to 17 years of age as of their last birthday who are living with at least one parent in one common household. All the national groups used in the calculations have been taken from the original data set. Totals for countries of origin accounting for low numbers of children in immigrant families have been aggregated.

Based on our calculations, the number of children in foreign-born families in Germany is 3,673,300. The number of children in native-born families is 10,740,700. Because the data set is based on a sample, the respective totals reflected in our tables are 18,256 and 62,944. Tables 6–8 indicate a basic profile of the sample in the data set.

Table 6: Children in the Sample according to Generation, Germany, 2005*number of children*

Family origin	In native-born families ^a			In foreign-born families ^b			a + b
	a. Total	Second	First	b. Total	Second	First	
All children	62,944	0	1,022	18,256	15,523	2,592	81,200
Germany ^c	62,210	0	962	15,842	15,523	265	78,052
Foreign origin ^c	734	0	60	2,414	0	2,327	3,148
Africa	6	—	—	76	0	75	82
Asia	192	0	8	654	0	643	846
Afghanistan	—	—	—	22	0	21	22
Viet Nam	2	—	—	32	0	32	34
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	30	0	30	30
Turkey	179	0	8	301	0	299	480
Other Western Asia, Middle East	11	—	—	269	0	261	280
Europe	509	0	49	1,424	0	1,401	1,933
Austria	16	—	—	20	0	20	36
France	12	—	—	41	0	37	53
Greece	36	—	—	39	0	37	75
Italy	79	—	—	74	0	70	153
Netherlands	17	—	—	35	0	31	52
Portugal	11	—	—	33	0	32	44
Spain	24	—	—	11	0	11	35
United Kingdom	2	—	—	19	0	19	21
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	48	0	4	147	0	145	195
Poland	10	0	1	139	0	139	149
Other EU-12 ^e	31	0	2	80	0	79	111
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7	—	—	74	0	73	81
Croatia	24	—	—	48	0	48	72
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	9	0	3	123	0	123	132
Russian Federation	21	0	18	492	0	489	513
Other western CIS ^g	40	0	21	—	—	—	40
Other Europe	122	—	—	49	0	48	171
North America	5	—	—	105	0	57	110
Other countries	22	0	3	155	0	151	177

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: First and second refer to the taxonomy of immigrant generations. First generation = not born in Germany. Second generation = born in Germany of at least one foreign-born parent. For the data issues involved in this table and our other tables, see the text.

a. Children born in Germany of parents born in Germany. The significance of the total cannot be broken down clearly into the taxonomy of immigrant generations.

b. Children who have not been born in Germany or children with at least one parent who has not been born in Germany.

c. The Germany category is a peculiarity of the data. It may indicate children who are naturalized Germans, children whose parents or grandparents are naturalized Germans, children of ethnic German repatriates and other children in immigrant families. Information on the previous countries of residence or citizenship among the families of these children may not be available in the data.

d. Other EU-15 = Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg and Sweden. EEA = European Economic Area; refers here to Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway.

e. Other EU-12 = Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

f. Albania, Montenegro, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

g. Belarus, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine. CIS = Commonwealth of Independent States.

— = data are not available.

Table 7: Children in the Sample by Age and Gender, Germany, 2005*number of children*

Family origin	Children in native-born families ^a					Children in foreign-born families ^b				
	Age at last birthday				Boys per 100 girls	Age at last birthday				Boys per 100 girls
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-17		0-4	5-9	10-14	15-17	
All children	14,243	17,056	18,291	13,287	—	5,309	5,341	4,794	2,812	—
Germany ^c	13,976	16,849	18,157	13,228	106	5,039	4,737	3,954	2,112	102
Foreign origin ^c	267	207	134	59	—	270	604	840	700	—
Africa	2	3	1	0	500	11	17	29	19	105
Asia	96	56	27	13	—	61	172	234	187	—
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	6	5	8	3	69
Viet Nam	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	11	10	52
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—	0	3	18	9	200
Turkey	90	50	26	13	95	17	71	101	112	121
Other Western Asia, Middle East	4	6	1	0	120	36	84	96	53	117
Europe	166	146	104	45	—	144	359	488	433	—
Austria	11	4	0	1	220	1	10	4	5	67
France	8	2	2	0	140	14	11	11	5	105
Greece	15	12	8	1	100	3	10	12	14	86
Italy	26	28	22	3	114	11	18	26	19	76
Netherlands	7	6	4	0	113	11	10	11	3	106
Portugal	7	3	0	1	57	2	8	13	10	74
Spain	11	9	3	1	118	0	6	2	3	120
United Kingdom	1	1	0	0	100	1	8	6	4	90
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	16	20	10	2	140	9	38	63	37	96
Poland	5	1	3	1	43	16	30	41	52	111
Other EU-12 ^e	0	0	0	2	0	11	19	19	31	100
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	2	2	0	40	3	11	32	28	81
Croatia	13	9	2	0	118	2	10	22	14	92
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	1	4	2	2	80	6	15	42	60	132
Russian Federation	1	2	8	10	91	47	143	167	135	102
Other western CIS ^g	0	0	9	12	62	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	41	43	29	9	103	7	12	17	13	133
North America	3	2	0	0	67	31	22	29	23	94
Other countries	0	0	2	1	200	23	34	60	38	118

Source: Microcensus 2005.*Note:* For the notes, see Table 6.

5.2 Family environment

The family, the household and the community influence the way the child develops and grows. Indicators on these features of society therefore help us understand living and housing conditions among children in immigrant families in Germany.

5.2.1 Size and structure of the family

Two-parent households are quite common in Germany. Nonetheless, children in second-generation immigrant families are more likely than any other children to live in two-parent households. The share of children in native-born families living in mother-only or father-only households, 22 per cent, is significantly higher than the corresponding share among children in foreign-born families, 13 per cent (Table 9). In both cases, around 90 per cent of the single-parent households are mother-only households. Altogether, only 12 per cent of the children in foreign-born families are living only with their mothers. The share of father-only households is similar among native-born and foreign-born families.

Table 8: Immigrant and Citizenship Profile of Children in the Sample, Germany, 2005

a. Children in native-born families^a

number of children

<i>Family origin</i>	<i>German citizens</i>	<i>Naturalized citizens</i>	<i>Only one parent is a German citizen</i>	<i>At least one parent in Germany for under five years (since 2000)</i>	<i>Parents are from different countries of origin</i>
All children	62,333	698	474	13,943	527
Germany ^c	61,881	635	254	13,780	318
Foreign origin ^c	452	63	220	163	209
Africa	5	—	—	6	—
Asia	122	22	41	45	48
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—
Viet Nam	1	—	—	1	—
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	110	22	41	39	48
Other Western Asia, Middle East	11	—	—	5	—
Europe	317	38	121	105	158
Austria	15	—	4	1	5
France	8	—	2	3	6
Greece	10	—	12	9	12
Italy	38	—	35	23	43
Netherlands	17	—	3	—	3
Portugal	9	—	3	1	5
Spain	14	—	15	6	15
United Kingdom	2	—	1	—	1
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	4	4	2	11	9
Poland	10	1	—	2	—
Other EU-12 ^e	25	2	1	10	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3	—	—	6	—
Croatia	15	—	17	3	17
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	8	3	1	4	1
Russian Federation	21	13	—	2	—
Other western CIS ^g	21	15	3	7	4
Other Europe	97	—	22	17	35
North America	5	—	—	1	—
Other countries	3	3	58	6	3

b. Children in foreign-born families^b

number of children

<i>Family origin</i>	<i>German citizens</i>	<i>Naturalized citizens</i>	<i>Only one parent is a German citizen</i>	<i>At least one parent in Germany for under five years (since 2000)</i>	<i>Parents are from different countries of origin</i>
All children	10,771	1,442	4,814	4,744	5,228
Germany ^c	10,417	1,093	4,164	3,422	4,600
Foreign origin ^c	354	349	650	1,322	628
Africa	15	6	23	49	26
Asia	42	47	123	322	125
Afghanistan	—	1	1	13	1
Viet Nam	2	3	5	17	7
Other South East Asia	1	3	1	9	1
Turkey	9	12	33	104	29
Other Western Asia, Middle East	30	28	83	179	87
Europe	269	276	419	780	384
Austria	2	—	12	9	13
France	5	—	15	27	21
Greece	1	—	—	10	1
Italy	1	—	11	42	12
Netherlands	—	—	—	24	2
Portugal	1	—	2	14	2
Spain	2	1	6	5	7
United Kingdom	2	—	7	7	9
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	24	22	41	80	46
Poland	38	35	59	88	50
Other EU-12 ^e	10	17	17	50	18
Bosnia and Herzegovina	6	2	9	33	8
Croatia	—	2	4	19	5
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	1	5	5	31	7
Russian Federation	165	179	213	316	162
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	11	13	18	25	21
North America	3	1	27	68	33
Other countries	25	19	58	103	60

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

Table 9: Children according to Family Structure, Germany, 2005

a. Children in native-born families^a

number of children

<i>Family origin</i>	<i>Two-parent family</i>	<i>Mother-only family</i>	<i>Father-only family</i>	<i>No sibling 0-17 at home</i>	<i>One sibling 0-17 at home</i>	<i>Two or three siblings 0-17 at home</i>	<i>Four or more siblings 0-17 at home</i>	<i>One or more grandparents at home</i>
All children	49,198	12,334	1,345	21,356	29,187	9,525	2,062	747
Germany ^c	48,658	12,212	1,340	21,128	28,905	9,405	2,038	734
Foreign origin ^c	540	122	5	228	282	120	24	13
Africa	0	5	1	1	4	0	0	1
Asia	147	44	1	67	74	28	18	5
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Viet Nam	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	140	38	1	64	64	28	18	5
Other Western Asia, Middle East	6	5	0	1	10	0	0	0
Europe	386	72	3	155	201	92	6	7
Austria	15	1	0	7	6	3	0	0
France	10	2	0	4	8	0	0	0
Greece	29	7	0	9	18	9	0	0
Italy	58	21	0	25	39	15	0	0
Netherlands	17	0	0	2	6	9	0	0
Portugal	10	1	0	7	4	0	0	0
Spain	21	3	0	13	2	9	0	0
United Kingdom	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	40	7	1	17	22	9	0	0
Poland	9	1	0	3	4	3	0	0
Other EU-12 ^e	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	5	1	3	0	0	4	0
Croatia	21	2	1	13	8	3	0	0
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	5	4	0	4	2	3	0	0
Russian Federation	20	1	0	6	12	3	0	0
Other western CIS ^g	21	0	0	3	11	3	2	2
Other Europe	105	17	0	37	57	23	0	5
North America	4	1	0	3	2	0	0	0
Other countries	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0

b. Children in foreign-born families^b

number of children

<i>Family origin</i>	<i>Two-parent family</i>	<i>Mother-only family</i>	<i>Father-only family</i>	<i>No sibling 0-17 at home</i>	<i>One sibling 0-17 at home</i>	<i>Two or three siblings 0-17 at home</i>	<i>Four or more siblings 0-17 at home</i>	<i>One or more grandparents at home</i>
All children	15,873	2,120	263	4,905	7,587	3,770	1,250	744
Germany ^c	13,924	1,711	207	4,229	6,637	3,301	1,050	625
Foreign origin ^c	1,949	409	56	676	950	469	200	119
Africa	54	16	6	18	22	23	4	9
Asia	550	89	15	109	230	162	95	58
Afghanistan	16	6	0	5	15	2	0	0
Viet Nam	27	5	0	11	13	8	0	0
Other South East Asia	28	2	0	3	7	14	6	0
Turkey	257	33	11	39	100	82	46	34
Other Western Asia, Middle East	222	43	4	51	95	56	43	24
Europe	1,150	243	31	477	577	242	85	43
Austria	15	3	2	8	7	1	4	0
France	25	15	1	11	18	12	0	0
Greece	33	4	2	6	20	12	1	0
Italy	57	15	2	23	31	12	7	1
Netherlands	29	6	0	5	7	18	0	5
Portugal	26	6	1	9	15	5	1	3
Spain	10	1	0	7	3	1	0	0
United Kingdom	19	0	0	3	6	6	0	4
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	117	26	4	58	56	21	11	1
Poland	101	36	2	62	55	17	5	0
Other EU-12 ^e	64	14	2	35	31	11	0	3
Bosnia and Herzegovina	53	19	2	20	29	11	9	5
Croatia	41	5	2	16	19	3	5	5
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	116	4	3	11	40	41	21	10
Russian Federation	405	80	7	180	220	65	21	6
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	39	9	1	23	20	6	0	0
North America	66	35	4	30	55	15	3	2
Other countries	129	26	0	42	66	27	13	7

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

A grandparent in the home may imply additional childcare opportunities and additional attention to children and their needs. Children in foreign-born families are more likely than children in native-born families to live with grandparents in the home (3.6 versus 2.5 per cent, respectively), though grandparents in the homes of grandchildren are not especially common in any case.

That foreign-born families tend to be larger than native-born families becomes clearer if one examines the number of siblings in a household. Children in native-born families are more likely to have fewer siblings. In the sample, 80.3 per cent of the children in native-born families have fewer than two siblings each; only 4.5 per cent have three siblings or more. The respective shares among children in foreign-born families are 68.4 and 10.9 per cent.

5.2.2 Educational attainment among parents

Children in foreign-born families are less likely to have fathers and mothers who have completed at least a university degree (Table 10). First- and second-generation children are more likely than third-generation children to have parents with low educational attainment. The educational attainment of mothers is more often lower than the educational attainment of fathers in both native-born and foreign-born families.

Table 10: Children according to the Level of Education of the Parents, Germany, 2005

a. Children in native-born families^a

number of children

Family origin	Father completed						Mother completed					
	Secondary			Post-	Tertiary		Secondary			Post-	Tertiary	
	Primary	Lower	Upper	secondary, non-tertiary	First stage	Second stage	Primary	Lower	Upper	secondary, non-tertiary	First stage	Second stage
All children	378	3,364	25,475	2,863	17,265	1,173	884	7,944	34,106	5,318	12,782	495
Germany ^c	360	3,282	25,223	2,841	17,125	1,166	832	7,780	33,823	5,259	12,682	491
Foreign origin ^c	18	82	252	22	140	7	52	164	283	59	100	4
Africa	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	3	0	2	0	0
Asia	17	40	65	2	16	2	32	70	61	12	16	0
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Viet Nam	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	17	40	65	2	15	2	30	70	57	8	13	0
Other Western Asia, Middle East	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0	4	4	1	0
Europe	1	41	186	20	119	5	20	90	220	44	80	4
Austria	0	0	7	1	7	0	2	3	7	1	3	0
France	0	0	0	1	7	2	0	0	3	1	6	2
Greece	1	2	13	3	9	1	7	8	13	2	6	0
Italy	0	12	33	2	11	0	3	18	47	6	5	0
Netherlands	—	—	—	—	—	—	0	0	9	2	6	0
Portugal	0	1	5	0	4	0	0	1	4	3	3	0
Spain	0	1	10	0	10	0	1	2	8	7	6	0
United Kingdom	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	0	1	20	7	11	2	0	11	20	3	11	2
Poland	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	3	6	0	1	0
Other EU-12 ^e	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	1	0	0	0
Croatia	0	0	15	1	6	0	0	4	16	2	1	0
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	3	2	1	3	0
Russian Federation	0	3	14	1	2	0	0	5	8	2	6	0
Other western CIS ^g	0	8	5	3	5	0	2	6	7	1	5	0
Other Europe	0	13	51	1	40	0	1	24	67	13	17	0
North America	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	0
Other countries	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0

b. Children in foreign-born families^b

number of children

Family origin	Father completed						Mother completed					
	Secondary			Post-secondary, non-tertiary	Tertiary		Secondary			Post-secondary, non-tertiary	Tertiary	
	Primary	Lower	Upper		First stage	Second stage	Primary	Lower	Upper		First stage	Second stage
All children	1,968	3,911	6,274	760	2,958	265	3,170	5,534	5,736	1,080	2,372	90
Germany ^c	1,663	3,431	5,628	671	2,521	217	2,648	4,852	5,117	971	1,972	75
Foreign origin ^c	305	480	646	89	437	48	522	682	619	109	400	15
Africa	15	13	16	2	14	0	29	21	12	3	5	0
Asia	164	150	140	23	83	5	275	178	105	25	56	0
Afghanistan	2	4	5	2	3	0	6	6	8	2	0	0
Viet Nam	0	6	6	9	5	1	6	3	12	4	7	0
Other South East Asia	13	2	1	4	8	0	19	3	2	3	3	0
Turkey	105	95	52	3	13	0	166	93	21	5	5	0
Other Western Asia, Middle East	44	43	76	5	54	4	78	73	62	11	41	0
Europe	103	284	443	57	266	28	166	433	448	67	262	7
Austria	0	1	10	2	3	1	0	9	4	1	4	0
France	1	4	0	2	18	1	4	10	6	2	18	0
Greece	3	23	8	1	0	0	5	18	10	1	3	0
Italy	4	22	17	0	14	2	8	32	20	4	8	0
Netherlands	1	1	13	1	13	0	3	7	21	1	3	0
Portugal	14	9	3	0	1	0	14	16	1	0	1	0
Spain	1	2	2	1	4	0	1	1	4	0	5	0
United Kingdom	0	1	1	0	14	3	0	0	9	1	9	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	7	10	44	4	49	7	13	38	26	8	48	0
Poland	5	17	52	10	19	0	12	27	65	18	15	0
Other EU-12 ^e	3	14	20	3	18	8	7	10	32	6	21	2
Bosnia and Herzegovina	8	16	20	5	6	0	19	24	19	3	7	0
Croatia	5	10	22	1	3	2	7	22	13	1	3	0
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	25	31	39	9	15	0	38	55	19	3	5	0
Russian Federation	23	118	176	15	78	2	31	156	181	18	97	2
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	3	5	16	3	11	2	4	8	18	0	15	3
North America	0	8	11	1	38	12	0	12	37	4	40	8
Other countries	23	25	36	6	36	3	52	38	17	10	37	0

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

5.2.3 Parental employment

Large shares of children grow up in households in which at least one parent is working full time. Among children in native-born families, the share is 73.6 per cent (Table 11). The corresponding share is 63.7 per cent among children in foreign-born families.

Fathers are typically employed full time in Germany (Table 12). (A full-time work week is calculated at 35–42 hours.) The fathers of 66.7 per cent of the children in native-born families are working full time. Among the children in native-born families who have at least one parent working full time, this is the father in 90.4 per cent of the cases. The corresponding shares among children in foreign-born families are 58.4 and 91.7 per cent, respectively. Among fathers who are working full time, most are working 36 to 40 hours a week.

Labour participation is less typical among mothers. Additionally, employment among mothers is more frequent in eastern Germany even among mothers of under-3-year-olds, whereas mothers in western Germany tend to join the labour force, mostly part time, after their children begin kindergarten. In 47.5 and 31.7 per cent of the cases in native-born and foreign-born families, respectively, mothers are working part time (Table 13). The respective shares of children whose mothers are not employed are 31.9 and 54.6 per cent.

Table 11: Children according to Employment among the Parents, Germany, 2005*number of children*

Family origin	In native-born families ^a			In foreign-born families ^b		
	At least one parent works full time (36+ hours/week)	In two-parent families		At least one parent works full time (36+ hours/week)	In two-parent families	
		One parent works full time	Two parents work full time		One parent works full time	Two parents work full time
All children	46,380	35,483	7,134	11,635	9,840	1,272
Germany ^c	45,883	35,110	7,058	10,390	8,832	1,138
Foreign origin ^c	497	373	66	1,245	1,008	134
Africa	1	0	0	26	19	1
Asia	113	93	12	292	259	15
Afghanistan	—	—	—	9	6	2
Viet Nam	2	1	0	10	9	0
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	13	13	0
Turkey	102	86	12	141	123	7
Other Western Asia, Middle East	9	6	0	119	108	6
Europe	368	276	52	776	609	103
Austria	15	11	4	17	13	2
France	12	8	2	28	19	6
Greece	20	11	7	28	19	6
Italy	49	42	4	47	40	5
Netherlands	17	15	2	26	26	0
Portugal	10	8	2	25	20	3
Spain	21	17	3	6	4	2
United Kingdom	2	1	1	19	12	7
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	32	26	5	77	57	9
Poland	8	5	3	74	52	16
Other EU-12 ^e	15	2	0	57	44	6
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	40	33	3
Croatia	20	17	2	32	24	5
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	7	5	0	51	44	3
Russian Federation	18	15	3	223	183	25
Other western CIS ^g	29	18	1	—	—	—
Other Europe	93	75	13	26	19	5
North America	3	3	0	70	51	7
Other countries	12	1	2	81	70	8

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

5.2.4 Family socioeconomic status

According to government statistics, the economic situation among families of migrant origin differs notably from that of the total population. In 2005, 46.8 per cent of all households of migrant origin were included in the income group earning €1,500 or less per month, whereas 39.6 per cent of households of non-migrant origin were in this low-income group.

Housing conditions are generally worse among families of migrant origin. Although conditions have improved, these families face additional difficulties in renting or purchasing housing and finding affordable housing with adequate space and in moderately good condition. The average residential floor area per person is less among families of migrant origin. Although, in most cases, these families tend to be larger, this measure is still indicative. In 2002, the residential floor area among Germans was over 90 square metres (about 968 square feet) for an average household of 2.1 individuals, whereas the average foreign-born family had to share 74 square metres (840 square feet) among 2.7 individuals (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2005). Foreign-born families also pay a higher average rent (without heating) for this smaller living space of poorer quality, €422. Among Germans, the average is €407 per month.

Table 12: Employment Status of Fathers, Germany, 2005

a. Children in native-born families^a

number of children

Family origin	Not employed	Part time (1–35 hours/week)	Full time (36+ hours/week)			
			Total	36–40 hours	41–48 hours	49+hours
All children	4,105	4,495	41,934	28,473	4,561	8,900
Germany ^c	4,047	4,432	41,519	28,165	4,521	8,833
Foreign origin ^c	58	63	415	308	40	67
Africa	0	0	1	1	0	0
Asia	31	18	99	86	6	7
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—
Viet Nam	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	31	18	92	84	4	4
Other Western Asia, Middle East	0	0	6	2	2	2
Europe	27	44	309	216	34	59
Austria	0	1	14	6	6	2
France	0	0	10	2	1	7
Greece	7	4	18	13	1	4
Italy	0	12	46	35	4	7
Netherlands	0	0	8	8	0	0
Portugal	0	1	9	8	1	0
Spain	4	0	17	11	2	4
United Kingdom	0	0	2	2	0	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	3	9	29	21	3	5
Poland	0	1	8	8	0	0
Other EU-12 ^e	0	0	2	1	0	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	1	0	0	0	0
Croatia	1	1	20	15	2	3
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	0	0	5	5	0	0
Russian Federation	3	1	16	14	0	2
Other western CIS ^g	0	2	19	11	5	3
Other Europe	8	11	86	56	9	21
North America	0	1	3	3	0	0
Other countries	0	0	3	2	0	1

b. Children in foreign-born families^b

number of children

Family origin	Not employed	Part time (1–35 hours/week)	Full time (36+ hours/week)			
			Total	36–40 hours	41–48 hours	49+hours
All children	3,302	2,167	10,262	7,793	747	1,722
Germany ^c	2,641	1,939	9,551	7,292	678	1,581
Foreign origin ^c	661	228	711	501	69	141
Africa	23	14	23	18	3	2
Asia	226	65	274	211	18	45
Afghanistan	5	4	7	6	0	1
Viet Nam	18	1	8	6	0	2
Other South East Asia	10	5	13	9	3	1
Turkey	104	30	134	111	1	22
Other Western Asia, Middle East	89	25	112	79	14	19
Europe	372	122	408	267	48	93
Austria	0	0	17	11	1	5
France	2	1	23	12	3	8
Greece	5	4	26	21	1	4
Italy	10	3	46	29	4	13
Netherlands	3	0	26	11	8	7
Portugal	2	1	24	19	3	2
Spain	1	3	6	3	1	2
United Kingdom	0	0	19	9	0	10
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	37	19	65	42	11	12
Poland	22	17	8	8	0	0
Other EU-12 ^e	13	4	2	1	0	1
Bosnia and Herzegovina	14	5	0	0	0	0
Croatia	11	2	20	15	2	3
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	58	17	5	5	0	0
Russian Federation	181	43	16	14	0	2
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	19	11	5	3
Other Europe	13	3	86	56	9	21
North America	6	7	3	3	0	0
Other countries	34	20	3	2	0	1

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

Table 13: Employment Status of Mothers, Germany, 2005**a. Children in native-born families^a***number of children*

Family origin	Not employed	Part time (1–35 hours/week)	Full time (36+ hours/week)			
			Total	36–40 hours	41–48 hours	49+hours
All children	20,084	29,919	11,529	9,625	757	1,147
Germany ^c	19,792	29,656	11,422	9,536	751	1,135
Foreign origin ^c	292	263	107	89	6	12
Africa	3	2	0	0	0	0
Asia	115	50	26	21	2	3
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—
Viet Nam	1	0	1	1	0	0
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	—	—	—
Turkey	110	46	22	19	2	1
Other Western Asia, Middle East	4	4	3	1	0	2
Europe	173	206	79	66	4	9
Austria	7	4	5	5	0	0
France	5	3	4	2	0	2
Greece	14	13	9	6	0	3
Italy	34	38	7	7	0	0
Netherlands	7	8	2	2	0	0
Portugal	1	7	3	3	0	0
Spain	10	7	7	7	0	0
United Kingdom	0	1	1	1	0	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	16	23	8	7	1	0
Poland	3	4	3	3	0	0
Other EU-12 ^e	0	2	0	0	0	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	5	0	0	0	0
Croatia	5	16	2	2	0	0
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	1	6	2	2	0	0
Russian Federation	6	10	5	5	0	0
Other western CIS ^g	4	16	1	1	0	0
Other Europe	59	43	20	13	3	4
North America	0	5	0	0	0	0
Other countries	1	0	2	2	0	0

b. Children in foreign-born families^b*number of children*

Family origin	Not employed	Part time (1–35 hours/week)	Full time (36+ hours/week)			
			Total	36–40 hours	41–48 hours	49+hours
All children	9,961	5,792	2,250	1,882	155	213
Germany ^c	8,444	5,214	1,977	1,657	133	187
Foreign origin ^c	1,517	578	273	225	22	26
Africa	47	19	4	3	1	—
Asia	500	106	33	28	3	2
Afghanistan	12	6	4	4	0	0
Viet Nam	22	8	2	2	0	0
Other South East Asia	18	12	0	0	0	0
Turkey	233	43	14	9	3	2
Other Western Asia, Middle East	215	37	13	13	0	0
Europe	820	381	202	170	13	19
Austria	8	8	2	1	1	0
France	19	10	11	9	0	2
Greece	17	12	8	7	0	1
Italy	49	17	6	4	2	0
Netherlands	17	18	0	0	0	0
Portugal	12	16	4	4	0	0
Spain	4	5	2	0	0	2
United Kingdom	11	1	7	5	0	2
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	83	39	31	24	2	5
Poland	69	42	26	21	3	2
Other EU-12 ^e	38	26	14	11	3	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	36	29	7	7	0	0
Croatia	29	10	7	6	0	1
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	89	21	10	10	0	0
Russian Federation	315	110	60	56	2	2
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	24	17	7	5	0	2
North America	45	36	20	13	4	3
Other countries	105	36	14	11	1	2

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

5.2.5 Family dynamics, intergenerational relationships and friends

The interplay of values and parent-child relationships across generations and cultures has increasingly become a focus of research in Germany and elsewhere in recent years because of demographic change. One approach adopted in this research, the value-of-children approach, involves examining intercultural differences in generative behaviour and in the structure and nature of parent-child relationships and the related intrafamily arrangements (see Nauck 2000, 2005). As a means of linking family dynamics and intergenerational behaviour, the approach systematically explores the value and worth of children to their parents across cultures, including across various immigrant groups within individual countries. Several indicators are used to measure this value and worth, which may be described as follows:

- the economic and utilitarian value of children: the need for help around the home and with work, income support, insurance against the uncertainties of old age;
- the psychological and emotional value of children: emotional satisfactions of parenting, stimulation through interaction with children and younger people;
- the cost of children: the financial, material, physical, social and psychological burdens and the time burden involved in parenthood.

Through a comparison of the value of children to parents of German, ethnic German, Greek, Italian, Turkish and Vietnamese origin, Nauck et al. (1998) find that the psychological and emotional value of children is generally more highly esteemed than the economic and utilitarian value (Table 14). Across all groups, the share of fathers or mothers who esteem these values is usually well over 50 per cent. Families of Turkish origin appreciate these values the most.

Table 14: The Value of Children to Parents across Groups of Migrant Origin, 1998

per cent

Value	Germans ^a		Greeks		Italians		Turks		Vietnamese		Ethnic Germans	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
<i>Psychological and emotional value</i>												
Enrich one's life	73.6	79.2	51.5	58.4	57.3	61.5	92.2	84.0	66.5	75.6	61.9	72.6
Make one feel needed	55.1	62.8	53.5	54.3	51.9	59.5	77.1	85.5	57.6	61.4	63.7	69.3
Are fun to have around	82.8	86.9	60.0	53.8	51.9	59.5	99.5	96.0	74.4	84.3	60.5	73.9
<i>Economic and utilitarian value</i>												
Are a help in old age	9.4	10.6	29.5	28.9	21.4	35.0	73.7	68.5	45.8	59.4	32.9	36.9
Help out in emergencies	15.2	20.1	36.5	34.0	30.1	34.5	69.8	79.5	55.2	61.4	40.5	40.6
Keep parents together	31.9	30.4	40.0	35.5	33.5	32.5	92.7	81.0	66.0	69.5	49.3	47.6

Sources: Nauck et al. (1998).

a. Refers to the population of non-migrant origin.

The greatest intercultural differences occur in the appreciation of the economic and utilitarian value of children by fathers and mothers. Thus, among Germans of non-migrant origin, relatively few fathers and mothers expect children to be a help in old age. This contrasts with the opinions of Turkish and Vietnamese fathers and mothers. Nauck (2000, 2005) considers these particular differences to correlate to the expectations created because of differences in the provision of old age support in Germany, where the state provides old age benefits, and Turkey and Viet Nam, where parents generally rely on transfers between generations. We

note, moreover, that ethnic Germans are not equivalent or even nearly equivalent to Germans of non-migrant origin according to any of these measures.

Friendships also play an important role among children and youth of migrant origin. Haug (2003) has studied interethnic networks and friendships among young people aged 18 to 30 using the integration survey conducted by the Federal Institute for Population Research in 2000. Her analysis reveals that youth of Italian origin have significantly more contact with German youth than with youth of Turkish origin. She shows that more Italians are thereby receiving society-specific social capital that leads to effective social inclusion. She also shows that, among men and women of migrant origin, men have more contact with Germans.

5.3 Educational attainment among children

Education policymakers are convinced of the urgency of supporting education in the German language among children of migrant origin. Researchers find that fluency in the language of the country of settlement is decisive in the social inclusion of children of migrant origin (for example, see Esser 2001, Beisenherz 2006). However, the progress in this area has not been particularly promising (Diefenbach 2007).

In preschool, in the school system and during leisure activities among peers, the importance of a common language for communication, social interaction and cooperation has begun to be emphasized. The PISA 2000 assessment found that students of migrant origin are, on average, less fluent in the shared language in school and that this has long-term negative effects on their school careers. Kristen (2002, 2003) likewise points to the key role of language competence during the transition that occurs in the education system after the four years of primary school and revolves around entry in lower secondary school (see elsewhere below). Boos-Nünning and Karakasoglu (2005) have studied the importance of language within an immigration context among 950 girls and young women of ethnic German, Greek, Italian, Turkish and (former) Yugoslav migrant origin.

Using data from school entrance examinations in the city of Osnabrück in 2000–2005, Becker (2006) shows that fluency in German is closely linked to the length of time children stay in kindergarten. The longer children of migrant origin attend kindergarten, the more likely they are to overcome their difficulties with German. However, especially among children of Turkish origin, the presence in schools of a large number of children from families from the same country of origin is leading to linguistic separation in these institutions and among these children.

Systematic studies of school performance among children of migrant origin have been undertaken only recently. Thus, Diefenbach (2007) describes the nature and extent of the disadvantages faced by children of migrant origin in schools. She focuses on culture, immigration and education in light of human capital theory, discrimination and language use.

In their investigation based on data from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study conducted by the German Institute for Economic Research, Becker and Schubert (2006) have demonstrated empirically the significance of parental resources, parental educational decisions, differences in learning environments and the institutional regulations in the school

system, but also the social differentiation and selectivity involved in the transitions in the system, such as the transition from primary to secondary school, in determining the development of reading competence among pupils under the age of 15.

Besides general research on children of migrant origin in the educational system, several studies have concentrated on the school performance of these children in particular stages of education and thereafter.

5.3.1 Preschool and kindergarten attendance (ages 3 to 5 and 6)

The amount of research on preschool and children of migrant origin is limited. Kunze and Gisbert (2005) show that attendance at a childcare facility outside the home has positive impacts on the development of the cognitive, social, emotional, physical and linguistic abilities of children. The first six years of life are the most decisive educational years because of the significant educability and knowledge retention among children in this age group (see also *Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2005*).

Through an analysis of data on preschool enrolments collected through the German Socio-Economic Panel Study, Becker and Tremel (2006) find that preschool attendance enables children of migrant origin to improve their school performance and contributes to the educational opportunities available to them. Nonetheless, children of migrant origin who attend preschool thereby reach the average level of school performance of the children of blue-collar workers, who are considered somewhat disadvantaged in the educational opportunities open to them.

Becker and Biedinger (2006) have confirmed the existence of differences in educational outcomes after preschool among various groups, including children of migrant origin, using the Osnabrück data from 2000–2005 (see above). Controlling for family origin, they find that educational disadvantages persist among children in foreign-born families. They also find that, if preschool attendance is prolonged, the effect of family origin on school readiness is reduced. This effect begins to disappear completely only through additional gains in cognitive and language ability.

According to Diefenbach (2004a, 2004b) and Becker and Tremel (2006), preschool enrolment rates are lower among children in foreign-born families. Government statistics indicate that attendance rates at preschool facilities outside the home are lower among children who are not German citizens than among children who are German citizens (78 and 84 per cent, respectively) (*Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung 2006*). Preschool attendance rates among foreign children born in Germany (80.7 per cent) are nearly the same as the rates among German citizens, while the rates among foreign-born children are lower, at 71.7 per cent (*Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung 2006*). Analyses based on *Microcensus 2005* show that 90 per cent of all children aged 5 and above attend a preschool or kindergarten (the age of primary school enrolment is approaching for these children) and that the differences in attendance rates between foreign and German children have become smaller (86.2 and 89.6 per cent, respectively) (*Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2005, Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung 2006*).

Few comparable data exist on primary school enrolment and attendance rates among foreign children because this information is gathered differently or not at all in the individual Länder. Despite these constraints, Gomolla and Radtke (2000) find that children in foreign-born families begin school significantly later than German children. The example of school entry in North Rhine–Westphalia during the 1995/96 and 2003/04 school years shows that the share of children in foreign-born families who begin school later is twice as high as the corresponding share among German children, while the share of children in foreign-born families who begin school earlier is lower by one third than the corresponding share among German children. We must point out, however, that the role of earlier or later school entry in school performance is still controversial.

5.3.2 Children of migrant origin in secondary school (ages 10 to 18)

In the 2005/06 school year, 12.3 million students were attending general education and vocational schools. Of the approximately 1.1 million students who were not German citizens (9.1 per cent), 83 per cent were attending a general education school, while 17 per cent were attending vocational school. More than 70 per cent of these foreign students were living in one of only four Länder, namely, Baden-Württemberg, Bavaria, Hesse and North Rhine–Westphalia. In 2003, citizens of countries that had once been the main sources of migrant labour in Germany represented the largest share of foreign students: 43.4 per cent were citizens of Turkey, 11.8 per cent were citizens of one of the successor states of the former Yugoslavia and 15.5 per cent were citizens of Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, or another EU member country.

The education system has a hierarchical structure. The transition from primary to lower secondary school is the first significant transition in the system. After primary school (*Grundschule*), children may attend one of three types of secondary schools, a *Hauptschule*, a *Realschule*, or a *Gymnasium*.² The choice determines the subsequent path in a child's education. The decision to attend one type of school or another therefore has considerable consequences in access to the labour market and professional careers.

Although foreign pupils are treated equally given that, since the 1960s, foreign families have been required to meet the obligations imposed by compulsory education, nearly all available studies agree that, in practice, the opportunities in the educational system are not equally available. This is one of the reasons for the relatively poor school performance of foreign children and youth.

Children in foreign-born families obtain grades that are generally lower than the grades of children in native-born families beginning in primary school, and the improvement among children in native-born families is greater as well during the subsequent grades. In her study

² *Hauptschule* is a five-year school offering lower secondary education, including the sciences and English, finishing at age 15–16 and preparing for entry-level positions in the labour market or public sector, practical vocational training, including basic apprenticeships, or admission to career vocational schools. *Realschule* is a six-year school from ages 10–11 to 16–17 and preparing for apprenticeships, vocational training programmes, higher level trade or technical schools, and, for the best students, the opportunity to attend university after they have successfully completed the *Abitur* (the school-leaving examination after 13 years of education). *Gymnasium* is a nine-year secondary school ending at age 18–19, emphasizing the humanities and sciences and representing the academic track to university for students completing the *Abitur*.

of 3,000 pupils in the fourth grade in six primary schools in Mannheim, Kristen (2002, 2003) concludes that differences in the participation in education are evident already during the transition from primary to secondary schooling. Children in foreign-born families appear to be more frequently guided towards the least intensive school track, the Hauptschule, and less frequently towards the Realschule or Gymnasium. Kristen finds that performance in two primary school subjects, mathematics and German, is most often the deciding factor in this outcome (Table 15). Although her sample is small, highly selective and unrepresentative, her results nonetheless illustrate the differences also found by other researchers on performance at the end of primary school.

Table 15: Achievement in Mathematics and German among Foreign-Born and Native-Born Children, Germany, 2003

per cent of children in the respective group

<i>Grades^a</i>	<i>Children in foreign-born families (total = 1,228)</i>	<i>Children in native-born families (total = 1,900)</i>
<i>German</i>		
1.0–2.4	14.2	33.5
2.5–3.0	21.3	26.2
3.1–6.0	64.5	40.3
<i>Mathematics</i>		
1.0–2.4	23.7	36.9
2.5–3.0	23.1	24.7
3.1–6.0	53.2	38.4

Source: Based on Kristen (2003).

a. The highest grade is 1.0; the lowest is 6.0.

Children and youth in foreign-born families tend to start school later and repeat classes more often. Analysis of the data gathered during the PISA 2000 assessment show that the risk of repeating grades 1, 2, or 3 is four times greater among children of migrant origin. We assume that this outcome is mainly generated because of problems with German. In any case, the actual repetition rates are probably much higher given that children and youth attending schools for children with special needs (*Sonderschule*) have not been included in comparative studies. Using the results of the PISA 2000 assessment, Stanat (2006) has examined the effects on academic performance of the composition of classes among adolescents. She finds that class composition has unexpected positive effects on educational aspirations among adolescents. Adolescents in schools with large shares of children of migrant origin tend to have higher expectations and to be more motivated in school. They are striving towards better educational results.

5.3.3 Vocational education (ages 16 to 18)

There was a surge in the number of youth of migrant origin enrolling in vocational education during the 1980s and into the mid-1990s. The peak – 34 per cent of youth of migrant origin participating in education in the relevant age group – was reached in 1994. There has been a strong downward trend since then, and the share was 24 per cent in 2005.

After leaving the regular school system, youth of migrant origin are less likely to undertake formal vocational training and are therefore underrepresented among trainees generally. The overall decline in the number of available apprenticeships in Germany, where the apprenticeship system by trades is particularly well organized, has been especially difficult for youth of migrant origin. This was the finding of a 2004 study carried out by the Federal

Institute for Vocational Education and Training and the Bundesagentur für Arbeit among applicants for apprentice and trainee positions (see Eberhard et al. 2005). The study found that only 29 per cent of youth of migrant origin had taken up an apprentice or trainee position, whereas 40 per cent of youth in the rest of the population had done so.

5.4 Youth and the labour market

Analysis of Microcensus 2005 data reveals that all youth aged 15 to 17, including youth in foreign-born families, attend school (Table 16). Some of these youth may also be working, but no youth in this age group who are working are not also in education. The microcensus found no cases of youth who were not attending school and who also were not working.

Table 16: Young People Aged 15–17 in School and Work, Germany, 2005

number of children

Family origin	In native-born families ^a				In foreign-born families ^b			
	Total	Academic track	Vocational track	Not in school	Total	Academic track	Vocational track	Not in school
All children	13,211	10,781	2,427	0	2,724	2,326	398	0
Germany ^c	13,150	10,733	2,417	0	2,101	1,804	297	0
Foreign origin ^c	58	48	10	0	623	522	101	0
Africa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Asia	13	8	5	0	182	157	25	0
Afghanistan	—	—	—	0	3	3	0	0
Viet Nam	—	—	—	0	10	10	0	0
Other South East Asia	—	—	—	0	9	8	1	0
Turkey	13	8	5	0	108	89	19	0
Other Western Asia, Middle East	—	—	—	0	52	47	5	0
Europe	42	37	5	0	380	310	70	0
Austria	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	0
France	—	—	—	0	5	4	1	0
Greece	1	1	0	0	14	10	4	0
Italy	3	2	1	0	19	16	3	0
Netherlands	—	—	—	0	3	2	1	0
Portugal	1	1	0	0	10	8	2	0
Spain	1	1	0	0	3	2	1	0
United Kingdom	—	—	—	0	4	4	0	0
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	2	2	0	0	37	33	4	0
Poland	1	1	0	0	—	—	—	0
Other EU-12 ^e	5	4	1	0	31	24	7	0
Bosnia and Herzegovina	—	—	—	0	28	26	2	0
Croatia	—	—	—	0	14	13	1	0
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	2	2	0	0	60	46	14	0
Russian Federation	10	9	1	0	134	108	26	0
Other western CIS ^g	12	11	1	0	—	—	—	0
Other Europe	3	2	1	0	13	11	2	0
North America	—	—	—	0	23	20	3	0
Other countries	3	3	0	0	38	35	3	0

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

Among youth and adults aged 18 to 24 in native-born families, young men and women are similar in school attendance – in most cases, vocational school or training programmes – and in participation in the labour force (Table 17). In this age group, men are only slightly more likely to be working and slightly less likely to be attending school relative to women. The shares of men and women who are not in school and who are not participating in the labour market are nearly identical.

Table 17: Young Men and Women Aged 18–24 in School and Work, Germany, 2005

number of children

Family origin	Men					Women				
	In school			Not in school		In school			Not in school	
	Total	Academic track	Vocational track	Working	Not working	Total	Academic track	Vocational track	Working	Not working
<i>In native-born families^a</i>										
Germany ^c	7,185	1,790	5,395	4,666	2,569	6,819	2,077	4,742	4,159	2,556
<i>In foreign-born families^b</i>										
Foreign origin ^c	321	95	224	238	228	352	127	225	258	528
Africa	17	4	13	10	22	5	4	1	13	20
Asia	83	31	52	80	78	82	30	52	56	214
Afghanistan	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	7
Viet Nam	8	3	5	2	2	12	8	4	1	3
Other South East Asia	7	2	5	10	5	5	2	3	2	9
Turkey	35	11	24	48	44	42	12	30	40	158
Other Western Asia, Middle East	29	12	17	20	26	23	8	15	11	37
Europe	192	52	138	132	107	238	82	156	170	252
Austria	5	3	2	5	1	4	0	4	6	1
France	1	1	0	0	2	3	1	2	3	3
Greece	13	3	9	10	3	10	0	10	10	13
Italy	12	5	7	13	2	13	5	8	16	6
Netherlands	2	0	2	3	0	2	0	2	2	6
Portugal	4	1	3	6	2	5	3	2	2	4
Spain	3	0	2	1	1	5	2	3	2	0
United Kingdom	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	2	2
Other EU-15, EEA and Switzerland ^d	23	5	18	10	18	26	8	18	18	29
Poland	—	—	—	—	—	42	13	29	27	44
Other EU-12 ^e	10	3	7	10	5	17	4	13	10	20
Bosnia and Herzegovina	21	4	17	16	8	12	3	9	18	11
Croatia	9	3	6	7	0	6	2	4	9	11
Other South Eastern Europe ^f	19	3	16	17	24	19	8	11	17	25
Russian Federation	61	18	43	28	33	67	29	38	25	68
Other western CIS ^g	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other Europe	7	3	4	5	6	6	3	3	3	9
North America	9	2	7	4	4	8	4	4	5	4
Other countries	20	6	14	12	17	19	7	12	14	38

Source: Microcensus 2005.

Note: For the notes, see Table 6.

Among young adults in foreign-born families, the results are only marginally different between men and women relative to the corresponding group among native-born families. The share of men participating in the labour market is nearly the same as the corresponding share of women (Table 17). A small difference persists only among young adults who are not attending school and who are also not working. There are more than two times more women than men in this category. Some researchers have proposed that greater shares of pregnancy among women in this group at these ages may explain the difference.

5.5 Children and health

The German health interview and examination survey for children and adolescents was conducted between 2003 and 2006 by the Federal Ministry of Health and the Robert Koch Institute among a nationally representative sample of 17,641 participants 0 to 17 years of age in nearly 170 communities. The comprehensive study gathered data through objective measures of physical and mental health, as well as through parent- or self-reported subjective health status evaluations covering health behaviour, health care utilization, social and migrant status, living conditions and environmental determinants of health. Because of the questions about migrant status, the study was able to collect data on the share of children and youth of migrant origin in the population and determine that these children and youth use the health care system less frequently relative to the rest of the population (see Schenk et al. 2007).

The study also found that children of migrant origin participate less often in individual early diagnostic tests. Altogether, only 56 per cent of children of migrant origin take part in these medical checkups regularly. This compares with 85 per cent of children of non-migrant origin. The share of children of migrant origin who have never taken part in such an early general diagnostic test is seven times the corresponding share of children of non-migrant origin, 14 versus 2 per cent, respectively (Kamtsiuris et al. 2007).

The study similarly found that there are differences in oral hygiene practices among children and youth of migrant origin and other children and youth. Schenk and Knopf (2007) find that the differences remain after they control for social class. Another possible explanation for this outcome may be a more curative than prophylactic attitude towards dentistry among families of migrant origin. In 2003, a study was undertaken in Rems-Murr, a district in Baden-Württemberg, to examine the dental health of preschool children of Turkish origin and the dental health of other preschool children (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2005). The study found that a large majority of parents in families of Turkish migrant origin agree with the statement, 'it is sufficient to visit a dentist only if one has a toothache'.

Monitoring in Berlin schools reveals that the share of school beginners of foreign nationality and, especially, school beginners of Turkish migrant origin who are overweight is larger than the corresponding share among school beginners in the rest of the population (Delekat 2003, Kurth and Schaffrath Rosario 2007). The German health interview and examination survey for children and adolescents found similar results. Additional research should clarify whether there are any linkages between these differences and socioeconomic factors or factors related to immigration status.

The German health interview and examination survey for children and adolescents found that relatively more children and youth of migrant origin experience problems in social and emotional adjustment compared with the rest of the population (9.8 versus 6.7 per cent, respectively) (Hölling et al. 2007). Thus, 11 per cent of all children of migrant origin and 8.8 per cent of all children of non-migrant origin have emotional problems (such as excessive anxiety or depression).

5.6 Children and poverty

The likelihood of poverty among children of migrant origin rose from 5 to 15 per cent in 1989–2001, while the corresponding rise among other children was from 6.4 to 11.2 per cent (Boos-Nünning 2005). The share of children and youth in foreign-born families receiving social benefits was more than twice as high as the corresponding share among children and youth in native-born families, 13.9 and 5.9 per cent, respectively (Boos-Nünning 2005).

Studies on children and youth of migrant origin cover various dimensions of poverty such as: (1) financial restrictions, including pocket money and money for clothing, recreation and entertainment and so on, that are directly tied to low household incomes; (2) less opportunity to obtain an appropriate education that matches needs and to acquire positive German language skills and social and cultural advantages; (3) deficient health care (see Boos-Nünning 2005, Butterwegge et al. 2005, Hradil 2005).

In 1999, a study supported by the Arbeiterwohlfahrt Bundesverband and the Institut für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpädagogik found that 42.7 per cent of foreign preschool children were poor (Hock et al. 2000). Butterwegge et al. (2005) found that 46.5 per cent of all children of migrant origin in a sample in Cologne were among low-income population segments.

Kinderbarometer Hessen 2006, a study by the Land of Hesse, found that children of migrant origin, on average, have less pocket money than other children, €15.56 versus €23.72 per month (Hessenstiftung 2007). Children of migrant origin must also generally pay more out of their own pockets for items that the families of other children more often tend to provide. Thus, 12 per cent of children of migrant origin must bear the cost of school materials, and 9 per cent must pay for their own clothes, whereas the respective shares are only 5 and 4 per cent among other children. The study found that children of migrant origin often mention snacks or clothes in answering the question, ‘What do you buy with your pocket money?’. They mention toys, magazines, or leisure activities much less often than other children.

According to a study supported by the Land of North Rhine–Westphalia, children of migrant origin more often live in poor housing (LBS–Initiative Junge Familie 2006). Relatively more children of migrant origin are living in blocks of flats (25 versus 3 per cent among other children), and fewer are living in detached homes (41 versus 73 per cent). The study also found that fewer children of migrant origin have their own room and do not have to share a room with siblings or other family members (62 versus 82 per cent). Children living in blocks of flats or in large families rarely have a room of their own. Given that children of migrant origin are more likely to belong to one or both of these two groups, these are factors in the housing conditions among these children. According to the study, the families of children of migrant origin tend to allow children fewer opportunities to participate in decisions about housing and the home and tend to be more strict on the use of the home by children to meet with and entertain their friends. Nonetheless, the study found that children of migrant origin and other children differed only slightly in their self-reported evaluations of their housing conditions, 6.1 versus 6.5, respectively, on a 7-point scale, with 7.0 the highest score.

The need for more research is clear. The few studies available on poverty among families of migrant origin are generally tentative. They rely on small numbers of cases or only refer to particular areas or Länder. They cannot be considered representative. There have been no serious attempts to separate out ethnic factors, the effects of immigration status, or socioeconomic factors in determining the causes of these and other outcomes.

5.7 Youth and deviant behaviour

The chief source of reliable nationwide information on deviant or criminal behaviour among children and youth is police statistics, the *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik* (BKA 2007). According to this source, the share of suspects under 14 years of age among all suspects rose from 4.3 per cent in 1993 to 6.7 per cent in 1999, but then declined back to 4.4 per cent in 2006 (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration 2005, BKA 2007). Delinquency and crime rates among foreign children showed a significant decline. In 1993, 24.7 per cent of all delinquent children were foreign citizens; the share was only 17.5 per cent in 2006. Nonetheless, younger foreign children are clearly in conflict with the law relatively more often (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge

und Integration 2005). This is also the case among adolescents and young people 14 to 21 years of age (Pfeiffer and Wetzels 1999). The most frequent offences are not much different within this age group among foreign and German children, but there are differences in the proportional frequency distributions (BKA 2007). The most common offences are shoplifting (44.1 per cent among German children and 41.4 per cent among foreign children), damage to property (18.8 and 12.5 per cent) and serious theft (6.2 and 6.6 per cent). Slightly more children in foreign-born families (17 per cent) are involved in episodes of petty delinquency (fighting, stealing and so on) compared with other children (14.4 per cent).

However, these crime statistics do not differentiate on the basis of migrant or non-migrant origin, but citizenship. Comparisons are thus possible only between Germans and foreigners, but such comparisons are problematic for the following reasons:

- Not all offences are reported to the police. Offenders who are unknown to their victims tend to appear more often in reports to police. If offender and victim know each other, situations tend relatively more often to be resolved without resort to a call to the police. The closer the relationship between offender and victim, the less likely an offence will be reported. Moreover, offenders who are unknown to their victims and who also appear foreign or speak with an accent or in another language, are more likely, in relative terms, to be reported to the police (Pfeiffer et al. 2004).
- Age and gender influence crime rates significantly. Boys and young men aged 14 to 24 show an especially high propensity for criminal behaviour. There are proportionally more foreigners than Germans in this high-risk group (13.1 versus 11.8 per cent, respectively).
- Crime rates in high-population urban areas and among people in low-income groups are proportionally greater. As a group, foreigners tend to live in large towns and cities and to have relatively fewer financial resources.
- Some crimes, offences against immigration or asylum laws, for example, can only be committed by people who are not German citizens (Naplava 2005, Pfeiffer et al. 2004).

To counter some of these problems, Pfeiffer et al. (1998) surveyed adolescents about crimes they might have committed. The authors focused on four types of crimes: robbery, extortion, assault, and assault and battery. They were able to show that youth of migrant origin are involved in violent crimes at a higher rate. Turkish youth are at especially high risk.

Several other studies have also found variations in the incidence of violence among groups, though they are based on small sample sizes and less differentiated results among certain migrant groups. In three waves (1994, 1999 and 2004) over 10 years, Fuchs et al. (2005) investigated 4,523 students in a representative study in Bavaria. They found that foreign children and youth are significantly more violent than other children and youth. Babka von Gostomski (2003) and Goldberg (2006) find that Turkish and ethnic German youth are involved in fighting much more often relative to Germans of non-migrant origin.

Goldberg (2006) has examined the links between leisure activities such as computer games, sports, television and other media to explain differences in delinquent behaviour among youth of migrant origin and other youth. Schmitt-Rodermund and Silbereisen (2004), in their study among ethnic German youth of migrant origin, find a strong correlation between delinquency and the frequency of contact with other delinquent youth. Babka von Gostomski

(2003) finds that the higher crime rates, especially among Turkish youth, are the result of socioeconomic disadvantage and lack of opportunities. Pfeiffer et al. (1999) investigated parental-partner violence and found that Turkish youth reported three times more frequently that they had witnessed violent behaviour by their parents at home.

Baier and Pfeiffer (2007) analyse the results of a 2005 survey among school students (Table 18). They find that three main factors explain the greater relative violence and crime rates among youth of migrant origin: (1) disadvantages in education, (2) parental tolerance of violent behaviour and (3) a greater incidence of concepts of masculinity that favour aggressivity and promote excessive violence. This culture of violence is relatively more characteristic among youth in low-income groups.

Table 18: Factors in Violent Behaviour according to Migrant Origin, 2005

mean values, per cent

<i>Variable</i>	<i>1. German^a</i>	<i>2. Turkish</i>	<i>3. Russian</i>	<i>4. Yugoslav^b</i>	<i>5. Polish</i>	<i>6. Italian</i>	<i>7. Other</i>	<i>Cramer's V/F, explained variance^c</i>	<i>No differences^d</i>
<i>General</i>									
Average age	15.0	15.4	15.5	15.3	15.2	15.2	15.2	.111.715**/.045	—
Realschule	14.3	42.9	27.7	46.4	17.6	40.5	24.2	.260**/.092	—
Gymnasium	44.2	45.3	49.1	33.0	52.2	39.3	40.1	.066**/.006	1/2,6
<i>Family</i>									
Poverty	8.1	23.0	29.1	15.7	11.6	13.6	16.6	.190**/.060	—
Experienced parental separation or divorce	30.4	15.0	24.4	19.4	25.9	30.5	32.8	.113**/.020	1/6,7
Less severe punishments (during childhood)	23.8	16.6	16.4	18.0	20.0	21.5	22.1	.064**/.007	1/5,6,7
More severe punishments (childhood)	17.0	29.8	25.4	27.9	27.6	30.7	26.1	.128**/.025	—
Little supervision (childhood)	31.7	38.1	40.7	36.9	36.5	39.9	35.2	.062**/.005	—
<i>Personality</i>									
Concepts of masculinity	1.85	2.32	2.17	2.20	2.05	2.09	1.99	211.783**/.082	—
Self-discipline: risk-seeking behaviour	2.83	2.74	2.98	2.78	3.12	2.82	2.82	7.803**/.003	1/4,6,7
Self-control: temper	2.94	3.22	3.00	3.21	3.12	3.17	2.98	19.195**/.008	1/3,7
<i>Media</i>									
Combat games, first-person shooter games	2.66	2.99	2.82	2.80	3.07	2.77	2.77	13.556**/.006	1/6
<i>Social environment</i>									
Highly tolerant of violence (parents)	10.9	12.2	16.0	16.1	15.1	14.9	13.9	0.55**/.006	1/2
Moderately tolerant of violence (parents)	46.2	39.7	41.3	40.4	46.1	41.4	39.8	.057**/.004	1/5,6
1–4 delinquent friends	43.1	41.9	46.6	48.0	43.2	42.6	44.3	.026/.001	1/2,3,5,6,7
>4 delinquent friends	12.5	24.1	18.7	23.3	24.7	20.2	18.4	.123**/.024	—
Member of a club	64.7	41.4	39.2	39.5	53.6	46.7	54.0	.195**/.050	—
<i>Various</i>									
Has been a victim of violence	17.9	20.3	19.9	18.8	26.8	23.1	20.3	.049**/.004	1/3,4
Cuts school 1–4 days a month	34.5	34.5	37.8	38.3	38.3	36.5	38.6	.035**/.002	1/2,3,4,5,6
Cuts school more than 4 days a month	8.5	16.0	14.7	18.5	17.2	16.7	13.5	.112**/.023	—
Infrequent alcohol consumption	49.1	37.5	44.0	49.8	47.1	50.5	42.1	.075**/.008	1/4,5,6
Regular alcohol consumption	40.6	17.2	44.5	29.9	41.8	35.2	32.8	.151**/.033	1/5,6

Source: Baier and Pfeiffer (2007).

Note: The data are weighted.

a. Refers to the population of non-migrant origin.

b. Includes individuals from (former) Serbia and Montenegro or the (former) Republic of Yugoslavia.

c. Illustration of Nagelkerke R^2/R^2 through a logistic/linear regression test.

d. Illustration of paired comparisons between German and non-German adolescents: not significant in a test of 'German' as a reference category using a logistic/linear regression ($p < .05$). — = differences between German and non-German adolescents are significant; italics indicate the lowest and the highest values ($*p < .05$ $**p < .01$).

Baier and Pfeiffer (2007) note, however, that offences such as shoplifting, crimes involving property and various kinds of substance abuse are not especially common among Turkish youth, who, however, are involved in crimes of violence relatively more often.

Findings that youth of migrant origin are involved relatively more frequently in violence are politically charged. Studies have pointed out that children of migrant origin are also victims of crime. Pfeiffer and Wetzels (1999) lament the lack of periodic, standardized, representative victim surveys. For their study, Baier and Pfeiffer (2007) have surveyed German and foreign youth victims of robbery, blackmail, sexual violence, and bodily injuries

caused by armed or unarmed offenders. They find that Germans are the least frequent victims of these crimes (17.9 per cent had this experience at least once in the last year), whereas Italian (23.1 per cent), Polish (26.8 per cent) and Turkish (20.3 per cent) youth showed the highest rates of victimization. However, the differences among the Turkish group and the remaining migrant groups are not sharp.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Children of migrant origin face disadvantages in preschool. Many are held back because of a lack of German language proficiency. For numerous reasons, including obvious practical reasons, proficiency in German is decisive for the inclusion of children of migrant origin in the school system and for their subsequent academic success.

The German school system is highly selective, and children in foreign-born families are often guided towards less demanding and less promising educational tracks because of their perceived or actual deficiencies. This is apparent especially during the first important educational transition in German schools, from primary to lower secondary schools.

Empirical results from health surveys indicate that children of migrant origin benefit from less health care. Important among the reasons for this outcome is the more restrained participation of these children in early diagnosis and preventive care. Research suggests that there may also be a greater incidence of obesity and poor dental care among children in some immigrant groups.

Deviant and criminal behaviour, including crimes of violence, appear to be more prevalent among children and youth of migrant origin. Among the most important factors responsible for this outcome are the disadvantages in education faced by immigrant groups, greater parental tolerance of violent behaviour, acceptance of concepts of masculinity that tend to legitimize aggressivity and violence, and more frequent association with young people prone to delinquency and crime.

Many researchers appear to believe that the disadvantages confronting immigrant groups are tied to the status of people in these groups as immigrants. However, the generally poorer socioeconomic conditions among foreign-born families may be at least as important. Lower average incomes mean that families of immigrant origin face many of the same disadvantages as poor native-born families. Thus, similar to poorer people in the rest of the population, the selective placement of children of migrant origin in less demanding and less promising educational tracks may also be conditioned by the shortage in social and cultural resources among the parents of these children. Because of these and similar structural effects, many people of migrant origin experience disadvantage even after they become German citizens.

The data resources and the collection of statistics on living conditions among children of migrant origin have improved. Nonetheless, it is still impossible even to determine the number of these children with any precision. The efforts associated with the microcensus, the German health interview and examination survey for children and adolescents and other initiatives offer an inspiring example for child-oriented research on immigrant families. However, this must only be the beginning.

References

- Alba, Richard D., Johann Handl and Walter Müller (1994), 'Ethnische Ungleichheiten im deutschen Bildungssystem', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 209–237.
- Babka von Gostomski, Christian (2003), 'Gewalt als Reaktion auf Anerkennungsdefizite? Eine Analyse bei männlichen deutschen, türkischen und Aussiedler-Jugendlichen mit dem IKG-Jugendpanel 2001', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 253–277.
- Baier, Dirk and Christian Pfeiffer (2007), 'Gewalttätigkeit bei deutschen und nichtdeutschen Jugendlichen: Befunde der Schülerbefragung 2005 und Folgerungen für die Prävention', Forschungsbericht, no. 100, Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen, Hanover.
- BAMF (Federal Office for Migration and Refugees) (2005), *Migrationsbericht des Bundesamtes für Migration und Flüchtlinge im Auftrag der Bundesregierung: Migrationsbericht 2005*, Berlin: BAMF.
- Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration (2005), 'Bericht der Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration über die Lage der Ausländerinnen und Ausländer in Deutschland', Federal Government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration, Berlin.
- Becker, Birgit (2006), 'Der Einfluss des Kindergartens als Kontext zum Erwerb der deutschen Sprache bei Migranten', *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 449–464.
- Becker, Birgit and Nicole Biedinger (2006), 'Ethnische Bildungsungleichheiten zu Schulbeginn', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 58, no. 4, 660–684.
- Becker, Rolf and Wolfgang Lauterbach (eds) (2004), *Bildung als Privileg? Erklärungen und Befunde zu den Ursachen der Bildungsungleichheit*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Becker, Rolf and Frank Schubert (2006), 'Soziale Ungleichheit von Lesekompetenzen: Eine Matching-Analyse im Längsschnitt mit Querschnittsdaten von PIRLS 2001 und PISA 2000', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 253–284.
- Becker, Rolf and Patricia Tremel (2006), 'Auswirkungen vorschulischer Kinderbetreuung auf die Bildungschancen von Migrantenkindern', *Soziale Welt*, no. 57, no. 4, 397–418.
- Beisenherz, Gerhard (2006), 'Sprache und Integration', pp. 39–70 in Christian Alt (ed.), *Bedingungen des Aufwachsens von türkischen, russlanddeutschen und deutschen Kindern*, vol. 4 of *Kinderleben: Integration durch Sprache?*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- BKA (Bundeskriminalamt) (2007), *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik 2006, Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, Wiesbaden, Germany: Kriminalistisches Institut, Bundeskriminalamt.
- Boos-Nünning, Ursula (2005), 'Kinder und Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund: Armut und soziale Deprivation', pp. 161–180 in Margherita Zander (ed.), *Kinderarmut: Einführendes Handbuch für Forschung und soziale Praxis*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

- Boos-Nünning, Ursula and Yasemin Karakasoglu (2005), *Viele Welten leben: Zur Lebenssituation von Mädchen und jungen Frauen mit Migrationshintergrund*, Münster: Waxmann.
- Butterwegge, Christoph, Michael Klundt and Matthias Zeng (2005), *Kinderarmut in Ost- und Westdeutschland*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Delekat, Dietrich (2003), 'Zur gesundheitlichen Lage von Kindern in Berlin: Ergebnisse und Handlungsempfehlungen auf Basis der Einschulungsuntersuchungen 2001', 'Spezialbericht', no. 2003-2, Gesundheitsberichterstattung Berlin, Senatsverwaltung für Gesundheit, Soziales und Verbraucherschutz, Berlin.
- Diefenbach, Heike (2004a), 'Bildungschancen und Bildungs(miss)erfolge von ausländischen Schülern oder Schülern mit Migrationshintergrund im System schulischer Bildung', in Rolf Becker and Wolfgang Lauterbach (eds), *Bildung als Privileg? Erklärungen und Befunde zu den Ursachen der Bildungsungleichheit*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Diefenbach, Heike (2004b), 'Ethnische Segmentation im deutschen Schulsystem: Eine Zustandsbeschreibung und einige Erklärungen für den Zustand', pp. 225-256 in Franz-Josef Jelic, Ulrich Brinkmann, Bernd Faulenbach and Klaus Kraemer, *FIAB-Forschung Schwerpunkt: Bildung als Bürgerrecht oder Bildung als Ware*, 'Jahrbuch Arbeit, Bildung, Kultur', vol. 21/22, 2003/04, Bochum, Germany: Forschungsinstitut Arbeit, Bildung, Partizipation, Institut an der Ruhr-Universität Bochum.
- Diefenbach, Heike (2007), *Kinder und Jugendliche aus Migrantenfamilien im deutschen Bildungssystem: Erklärungen und empirische Befunde*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Eberhard, Verena, Andreas Krewerth and Joachim Gerd Ulrich (2005), "'Man muss geradezu perfekt sein, um eine Ausbildungsstelle zu bekommen": Die Situation aus Sicht der Lehrstellenbewerber', *Berufsbildung in Wissenschaft und Praxis*, no. 3 (special issue), pp. 10-13.
- Esser, Hartmut (2001), 'Integration und ethnische Schichtung', Working Paper, no. 40, Mannheimer Zentrums für Europäische Sozialforschung, Mannheim, Germany.
- Fuchs, M., S. Lamnek, J. Luedtke and N. Baur (2005), *Gewalt an Schulen, 1994-1999-2004*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Goldberg, B. (2006), 'Freizeit und Kriminalität bei Achtklässlern mit und ohne Migrationshintergrund', pp. 861-892 in T. Feltes, C. Pfeiffer and G. Steinhilper (eds), *Kriminalpolitik und ihre wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen: Festschrift für Professor Dr. Hans-Dieter Schwind zum 70. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg: Müller.
- Gomolla, Mechtild and Frank-Olaf Radtke (2000), 'Mechanismen institutioneller Diskriminierung in der Schule', pp. 321-341 in Ingrid Gogolin und Bernhard Nauck (eds), *Migration, gesellschaftliche Differenzierung und Bildung: Resultate des Forschungsschwerpunktprogramms FABER*, Opladen, Germany: Leske und Budrich.
- Haug, Sonja (2003), 'Interethnische Freundschaftsbeziehungen und soziale Integration: Unterschiede in der Ausstattung mit sozialem Kapital bei jungen Deutschen und Immigranten', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 716-736.

- Heckmann, Friedrich (1995), 'Is There a Migration Policy in Germany?', in Friedrich Heckmann and Wolfgang Bosswick (eds), *Migration Policies: A Comparative Perspective*, Stuttgart: Enke.
- Hessenstiftung (2007), *Kinderbarometer Hessen 2006: Stimmungen, Meinungen, Trends von Kindern in Hessen*, Bensheim, Germany: Hessenstiftung–Familie hat Zukunft.
- Hock, Beate, Gerda Holz and Werner Wüstendörfer (2000), *Frühe Folgen: langfristige Konsequenzen? Armut und Benachteiligung im Vorschulalter*, vol. 4, ISS-Pontifex, no. 2/2000, Frankfurt: Institut für Sozialarbeit und Sozialpädagogik.
- Hölling, H., M. Erhart, U. Ravens-Sieberer and R. Schlack (2007), 'Verhaltensauffälligkeiten bei Kindern und Jugendlichen: Erste Ergebnisse aus dem Kinder- und Jugendgesundheitsurvey (KiGGS)', *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, vol. 50, no. 5–6, pp. 784–793.
- Hopf, Dieter (1981), 'Schulprobleme der Ausländerkinder', *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 839–861.
- Hradil, Stefan (2005), *Soziale Ungleichheit in Deutschland*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Kamtsiuris, Panagiotis, Eckardt Bergmann, P. Rattay and Martin Schlaud (2007), 'Inanspruchnahme medizinischer Leistungen', *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, vol. 50, 5–6, pp. 836–850.
- Konsortium Bildungsberichterstattung (2006), *Bildung in Deutschland: Ein indikatorengestützter Bericht mit einer Analyse zu Bildung und Migration*, Bielefeld, Germany: W. Bertelsmann Verlag.
- Kristen, Cornelia (2002), 'Hauptschule, Realschule oder Gymnasium? Ethnische Unterschiede am ersten Bildungsübergang', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 534–552.
- Kristen, Cornelia (2003), 'Ethnische Unterschiede im deutschen Schulsystem', pp. 126–132 in 'Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte', B21–22/2003, Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, Bonn.
- Kunze, Hans-Rainer and Kristin Gisbert (2005), 'Förderung lernmethodischer Kompetenzen Kindertageseinrichtungen', pp. 15–117 in Wassilios E. Fthenakis, Kristin Gisbert, Wilfried Griebel, Hans-Rainer Kunze, Renate Niesel and Corina Wustmann, *Auf den Anfang kommt es an! Perspektiven für eine Neuorientierung frühkindlicher Bildung*, Berlin and Bonn: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.
- Kurth, Bärbel-Maria and Angelika Schaffrath Rosario (2007), 'Die Verbreitung von Übergewicht und Adipositas bei Kindern und Jugendlichen in Deutschland', *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, vol. 50, no. 5–6, pp. 736–743.
- LBS–Initiative Junge Familie (2006), *LBS-Kinderbarometer Wohnen in NRW: Stimmungen, Meinungen, Trends von Kindern*, Münster: LBS–Initiative Junge Familie.
- Naplava, Thomas (2002), 'Delinquenz bei einheimischen und immigrierten Jugendlichen im Vergleich: Sekundäranalyse von Schülerbefragungen der Jahre 1995–2000', Arbeitspapiere, no. 5, Max-Planck-Institut für ausländisches und internationales Strafrecht, Freiburg, Germany.
- Naplava, Thomas (2005), 'Jugenddelinquenz im interethnischen Vergleich: Erklärungsmöglichkeiten delinquenten Verhaltens einheimischer und immigrierter Jugendlicher', Ph.D thesis, Faculty of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany.

- Nauck, Bernhard (1994), 'Bildungsverhalten in Migrantenfamilien', pp. 9–39 in Peter Büchner, Matthias Grundmann, Johannes Huinink, Lothar Krappmann, Bernhard Nauck, Dagmar Meyer and Sabine Rothe, *Kindliche Lebenswelten, Bildung und innerfamiliäre Beziehungen*, vol. 4 of *Materialien zum 5. Familienbericht*, Munich: Verlag Deutsches Jugendinstitut.
- Nauck, Bernhard (2000), 'Eltern-Kind-Beziehungen in Migrantenfamilien: Ein Vergleich zwischen griechischen, italienischen, türkischen und vietnamesischen Familien in Deutschland', pp. 347–392 in Sachverständigenkommission 6. Familienbericht, Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend, *Familien ausländischer Herkunft in Deutschland: Empirische Beiträge zur Familienentwicklung und Akkulturation*, vol. 1 of *Materialien zum 6. Familienbericht*, Opladen, Germany: Leske und Budrich.
- Nauck, Bernhard (2001), 'Intercultural Contact and Intergenerational Transmission in Immigrant Families', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 159–173.
- Nauck, Bernhard (2005), 'Changing Value of Children: An Action Theory of Fertility Behaviour and Intergenerational Relationships in Cross-Cultural Comparison', pp. 183–202 in Wolfgang Friedlmeier, Pradeep Chakkarath and Beate Schwarz (eds), *Culture and Human Development: The Importance of Cross-Cultural Research for the Social Sciences*, Hove, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Nauck, Bernhard, Susanne Clauss and Elisabeth Richter (2008), 'Zur Lebenssituation von Kindern mit Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland', pp. 127–151 in Hans Bertram (ed.), *Mittelmaß für Kinder: Der UNICEF-Bericht zur Lage der Kinder in Deutschland*, Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Nauck, Bernhard, Heike Diefenbach and Kornelia Petri (1998), 'Intergenerationale Transmission von kulturellem Kapital unter Migrationsbedingungen: Zum Bildungserfolg von Kindern und Jugendlichen aus Migrantenfamilien in Deutschland', *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik*, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 701–722.
- Pfeiffer, Christian, Ingo Delzer, Dirk Enzmann and Peter Wetzels (1998), 'Ausgrenzung, Gewalt und Kriminalität im Leben junger Menschen', paper presented at the Deutsche Vereinigung für Jugendgerichte und Jugendgerichtshilfen, Deutschen Jugendgerichtstag, 'Kinder und Jugendliche als Opfer und Täter: Prävention und Reaktion', Hamburg, 18–22 September.
- Pfeiffer, Christian, Matthias Kleimann, Sven Petersen and Tilmann Schott (2004), 'Probleme mit Kriminalität bei Migranten und integrationspolitische Konsequenzen: Expertise für den Sachverständigenrat für Zuwanderung und Integration (Zuwanderungsrat) der Bundesregierung', Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen, Hanover.
- Pfeiffer, Christian and Peter Wetzels (1999), 'The Structure and Development of Juvenile Violence in Germany: A Proposition Paper Based on Current Research Findings', *Forschungsbericht*, no. 76, Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen, Hanover.
- Pfeiffer, Christian, Peter Wetzels and Dirk Enzmann (1999), 'Innerfamiliäre Gewalt gegen Kinder und Jugendliche und ihre Auswirkungen', *Forschungsbericht*, no. 80, Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen, Hanover.

- PISA 2000 International Database, Programme for International Student Assessment, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, <<http://pisa2000.acer.edu.au/index.php>>
- Reinders, Heinz (2002), 'Entwicklungsaufgaben: Theoretische Positionen zu einem Klassiker', pp. 13–37 in Hans Merkens and Jürgen Zinnecker (eds), *Jahrbuch Jugendforschung*, no. 02/2002, Opladen, Germany: Leske und Budrich.
- Reinders, Heinz (2003), 'Freundschaften im Jugendalter', in Wassilios E. Fthenakis and Martin R. Textor (eds), 'Das Online-Familienhandbuch des Staatsinstituts für Frühpädagogik' <<http://www.familienhandbuch.de/cms/Jugendforschung-Freundschaften.pdf>>
- Reiser, Helga, R. (1981), *Sonderschulen: Schulen für Ausländerkinder?* Berlin: Marhold.
- Rohling, Inge (2002), *Gesundheit und Entwicklungsstand der Osnabrücker Schulanfänger: Multifaktorielle Analyse der Ergebnisse der Schuleingangsuntersuchungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Jahrgangs 2001*, Osnabrück, Germany: Gesundheitsamt, Osnabrück Stadt.
- Schenk, Liane, Ute Ellert and Hannelore Neuhauser (2007), 'Kinder und Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland', *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, vol. 50, no. 5–6, pp. 590–599.
- Schenk, Liane and H. Knopf (2007), 'Mundgesundheitsverhalten von Kindern und Jugendlichen in Deutschland', *Bundesgesundheitsblatt-Gesundheitsforschung-Gesundheitsschutz*, vol. 50, no. 5–6, pp. 653–658.
- Schmitt-Rodermund, Eva and Rainer K. Silbereisen (2004), "'Ich war gezwungen, alles mit der Faust zu regeln": Delinquenz unter jugendlichen Aussiedlern aus der Perspektive der Entwicklungspsychologie', in D. Oberwittler and S. Karstedt (eds), *Soziologie der Kriminalität*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Stanat, Petra (2006), 'Schulleistungen von Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund: Die Rolle der Zusammensetzung der Schülerschaft', pp. 189–219 in Jürgen Baumert, Petra Stanat and Rainer Watermann (eds), *Herkunftsbedingte Disparitäten im Bildungswesen: Differenzielle Bildungsprozesse und Probleme der Verteilungsgerechtigkeit; vertiefende Analysen im Rahmen von PISA 2000*, Wiesbaden, Germany: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.