

**Transnationality and Social Inequalities of
Migrants in Germany**

**Margit Fauser
Sven Voigtländer
Hidayet Tuncer
Elisabeth Liebau
Thomas Faist
Oliver Razum**

**Margit Fauser, Sven Voigtländer, Hidayet Tuncer, Elisabeth Liebau, Thomas Faist,
Oliver Razum**

Transnationality and Social Inequalities of Migrants in Germany

SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 11
DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities
Research Project C1
Bielefeld, December 2012

SFB 882 Working Paper Series
General Editors: Martin Diewald and Thomas Faist
ISSN 2193-9624

This publication has been funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG).

SFB 882 Working Papers are refereed scholarly papers. Submissions are reviewed by peers in a two-stage SFB 882 internal and external refereeing process before a final decision on publication is made.

The Working Paper Series is a forum for presenting works in progress. Readers should communicate comments on the manuscript directly to the author(s).

The papers can be downloaded from the SFB 882 website <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

SFB 882 "From Heterogeneities to Inequalities"
University of Bielefeld
Faculty of Sociology
PO Box 100131
D-33501 Bielefeld
Germany
Phone: +49-(0)521-106-4942 or +49-(0)521-106-4613
Email: office.sfb882@uni-bielefeld.de
Web: <http://www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/>

DFG Research Center (SFB) “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities”

Whether fat or thin, male or female, young or old – people are different. Alongside their physical features, they also differ in terms of nationality and ethnicity; in their cultural preferences, lifestyles, attitudes, orientations, and philosophies; in their competencies, qualifications, and traits; and in their professions. But how do such heterogeneities lead to social inequalities? What are the social mechanisms that underlie this process? These are the questions pursued by the DFG Research Center (Sonderforschungsbereich (SFB)) “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities” at Bielefeld University, which was approved by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as “SFB 882” on May 25, 2011.

In the social sciences, research on inequality is dispersed across different research fields such as education, the labor market, equality, migration, health, or gender. One goal of the SFB is to integrate these fields, searching for common mechanisms in the emergence of inequality that can be compiled into a typology. More than fifty senior and junior researchers and the Bielefeld University Library are involved in the SFB. Along with sociologists, it brings together scholars from the Bielefeld University faculties of Business Administration and Economics, Educational Science, Health Science, and Law, as well as from the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) in Berlin and the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg. In addition to carrying out research, the SFB is concerned to nurture new academic talent, and therefore provides doctoral training in its own integrated Research Training Group. A data infrastructure project has also been launched to archive, prepare, and disseminate the data gathered.

Research Project C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: Pilot Project for the Panel Study”

The aim of this project is to develop a panel study to investigate social inequality within a transnational context. Although the issue is currently attracting increasing attention, there is still a lack of concepts and concrete research questions with which to understand it in more detail. This necessitates a research design that is capable of studying inequality in the transnational context.

In this framework, "transnationality" is regarded as a feature of heterogeneity that contributes to the genesis and reproduction of social inequalities. It is a feature defined by cross-border social and symbolic bonds and practices maintained by individuals and households. These give rise to processes of inequality at various locations within transnational social spaces which intersect states. The project seeks to identify the underlying mechanisms in order to understand how inequalities arise and change.

Innovative research design is a key requirement for an empirical study of this issue. The present approach employs a mixed-methods design and multisited research. It combines the analysis of existing panel data (SOEP) with the use of longitudinal, qualitative and quantitative transnational surveys. The first funding period will be used to prepare the panel study for implementation in the subsequent funding period, and is therefore devoted to developing research questions, methods and instruments. These will need to take account of the cross-border character of the phenomenon. The project begins this task by focusing on the German-Turkish reference area.

The Authors

Dr. Margit Fauser is a researcher and lecturer at the Department of Sociology at Bielefeld University. Her research interests focus on global migration, transnationalization, inequalities, citizenship and local development. She has recently published the monograph “Migrants and Cities. The accommodation of migrant organizations in Europe” (Ashgate 2012)

Contact: margit.fauser@uni-bielefeld.de

Dr. Sven Voigtländer works as Medical Officer in the Section “Quality of Health Care, Health Economics, Health System Analysis” at the Bavarian Health and Food Safety Authority. Until 2012 he worked for the Department of Epidemiology & International Public Health at the Bielefeld School of Public Health and was member of the SFB 882 research project C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: The Pilot Project for the Panel Study”. His research interests focus on social epidemiology, health services research, migration and quantitative methods.

Contact: sven.voigtlaender@lgl.bayern.de

Hidayet Tuncer is a researcher at the Department of Sociology at Bielefeld University. He is working on the SFB 882 research project C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: The Pilot Project for the Panel Study”. His research interests focus on transnationalization, social inequalities and education research.

Contact: hidayet.tuncer@uni-bielefeld.de

Dr. Elisabeth Liebau is an external research associate of the SFB 882 research project C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: The Pilot Project for the Panel Study” and survey manager of the Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) at DIW Berlin. Her research interests are migration and integration of immigrants, survey methodology, and quantitative methods.

Contact: eliebau@diw.de

Dr. Thomas Faist is Professor for the Sociology of Transnationalization, Development and Migration at the Department of Sociology, Bielefeld University, Germany. Furthermore, he is Deputy Spokesperson of the SFB 882 “From Heterogeneities to Inequalities” and Director of the SFB 882 research projects C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: The Pilot Project for the Panel Study” and C3 “Transnationality, the Distribution of Informal Social Security and Inequalities”. His research interests focus on transstate migration, transstate spaces, citizenship, social policy, sociology of development.

Contact: thomas.faist@uni-bielefeld.de

Dr. med Oliver Razum, MSc Epidemiology, is full professor and Dean of the School of Public Health, Bielefeld University, Germany; there, he also heads the Department of Epidemiology & International Public Health. Moreover, he is Co-Director of the SFB 882 research project C1 “Transnationality and Inequality: The Pilot Project for the Panel Study”. His main research field is social epidemiology with a particular focus on the health of migrants, and on the role of contextual factors in the production of health inequalities. Before moving into epidemiology, Oliver Razum has worked as district medical officer in Zimbabwe.

Contact: oliver.razum@uni-bielefeld.de

Transnationality and Social Inequalities of Migrants in Germany¹

Margit Fauser, Sven Voigtländer, Hidayet Tuncer, Elisabeth Liebau, Thomas Faist, Oliver Razum

Abstract

The relationship between people's transnational ties and practices and their social position is subject to a controversial debate that suggests a dualistic picture. While there seems to exist a group of highly educated people who benefit from transnational mobility and networks, for migrants the maintenance of transnational ties to their 'old homes' appears to lead to a social mobility trap, and thus to further marginalisation. Yet, the relationship between transnationality and social inequality has so far attracted little systematic exploration. This paper traces the association of transnationality with social inequalities among migrants in Germany.

The discussion is led by results from US studies while these, and the few available European studies, have investigated particular groups and used selected indicators in relation to both transnationality and social inequalities. In order to contribute to a better understanding of the relationship, this paper proposes a concept of transnationality as heterogeneity that distinguishes various dimensions of transnationality. In this respect, the analysis concentrates on financial, personal, identity-based and cultural practices. As a marker of heterogeneity, transnationality may be related to the production of social inequalities, understood as differential opportunities to participate in society. These, in turn, are based on the availability of economic, cultural and social capital.

Using these concepts, the association between transnationality and social inequalities will be analysed by employing data from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) which contains a relevant sub-sample of migrants as well as a number of transnational items. The analysis focuses on the question whether or not this association is marked by a dualistic pattern as suggested in the current debate. To this end, it investigates how the different dimensions of transnationality are related to the various forms of capital relevant for social inequalities. As it turns out, the analysis identifies no uniform pattern. To the contrary, different dimensions of transnationality are differently associated with the various forms of capital. More often than not, those persons who engage in transnational practices in the various dimensions are those who have higher levels of capital at their disposal. Frequently, however, the relationship is by no means clear-cut.

Keywords

Migrants, transnationality, inequality, Germany, SOEP

Introduction

The relationship between people's transnational ties and practices and their social position is subject to a controversial debate in both academia and the general public. The debate suggests a dualistic picture. From this picture it appears, on the one hand, that there exists a group of highly educated and professionally successful people who move across borders easily and who have relevant competencies for cross-border communication and exchange at their disposal. Their transnational education and career paths secure them a social position at the upper end of the social ladder. Thus, this group benefits from its transnationality (Kreutzer & Roth 2006; Weiß 2006; Mau & Mewes 2008). On the other hand, the picture projects the idea that, especially for migrants, the maintenance of transnational ties which attach them to their 'old homes' may allow them to allocate some resources through their networks and exchanges, help to confront daily needs, provide economic niches and jobs at the place of immigration, but will eventually lead into a social mobility trap. For this group, transnationality is likely to further contribute to a marginalised status in the immigration country (Esser 2003: 16, 2004: 48, 50; cf. Wiley 1970). Thus, for these migrants transnationality is considered to be 'bad' (Portes 1999: 468) for it hinders successful structural integration. It is at risk of worsening migrants' social inequality because it does not allow the accumulation of the relevant economic, social and cultural capital for key fields such as the labour market, education, health, or participation in the politics of the immigration country.

Surprisingly little effort has been devoted to exploring the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities systematically. Therefore, it remains an open question whether this seemingly dualistic picture still holds true in more systematic analyses. This duality emerges from various scholarly perspectives which focus either on highly skilled persons or on more marginalised migrants. Moreover, different studies often investigate very different kinds of transnational practices. In some cases, the rather unsustained claims about the negative effects of transnational involvement on migrants' social position are influential.

In addition to the predominance of US studies, there are three main shortcomings that characterise the existing literature. First, available studies generally use a broad and generic understanding of 'transnationalism', rather than considering transnationality a marker of heterogeneity and distinguishing its various dimensions. Parts of the literature investigate cross-border career paths or transnational economic entrepreneurialism; others are concerned with political involvement across borders; and still others look into personal ties and contacts.

Since people are involved in different transnational dimensions – economic, political, cultural, familial – to different degrees, the implications for social inequality are also likely to vary across the dimensions. Second, in most studies social inequalities are not specifically defined; this is so because they usually deal with social inequality only in an indirect way. And third, particularly the literature dealing with migrants' integration focuses on the determinants of transnationality rather than on its consequences and implications. Statements on the implications therefore often take the form of prognoses or speculations, but are hardly supported by data.

This paper attempts to make a methodological and empirical contribution to the important question of how transnationality is related to social inequalities. Therefore, the analysis concentrates on how different dimensions of transnationality are related to various aspects of social inequalities, in particular economic, cultural and social capital. This is a first step, currently being undertaken in the German-Turkish panel study², in the broader endeavour of investigating the role played by transnationality in the formation and reproduction of social inequalities and to identify the mechanisms underlying these processes.

The paper suggests a notion of transnationality defined by sustained cross-border ties and practices of individuals and groups. It is thus not limited to geographical mobility. Individuals and groups differ in the degrees and ways in which they are involved in transnationalisation, with some not being involved at all (Faist et al. 2011). This includes differential transnational involvement along various social dimensions. Transnationality is considered one of various heterogeneities characterising a person along with others such as age, gender, ethnicity or socio-economic status with which it interacts. As heterogeneity, transnationality may be involved in producing and reproducing social inequalities. Inequalities are understood here in terms of inequality of opportunities - rather than of outcome (Therborn 2006, Faist 2012). Such opportunities are reflected in various forms of capital – economic, cultural and social (Bourdieu 1983) – providing chances to gain access to key social fields. Both notions of transnationality and inequality will be elaborated in more detail below.

The data on which this paper draws stem from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) which contains relevant sub-samples of migrants as well as a number of transnational items. In the analysis presented in this paper, transnationality, as encountered in the SOEP data set, is reflected in more private or personal forms. These concern financial components such as sending remittances or goods; personal relations with family and friends abroad as

well as visits; identification with the country of origin; and cultural practices concerning use of language and media consumption. The few existing quantitative surveys of transnationality tend to be focused on its more public forms such as economic or political entrepreneurship or membership in hometown associations. Moreover, the personal forms are also less frequently considered in qualitative studies on transnational involvements of migrants in Germany (Fauser & Drebenstedt 2011) as compared to the economic entrepreneurship and political aspects on which more studies exist (Faist 2000a; Faist 2000b; Faist & Özveren 2004).

In the following, we first discuss existing insights into the transnationality-social inequality nexus, the mixed outcomes revealed by the existing empirical studies as well as their main shortcomings briefly mentioned above. Then the two key concepts of transnationality and social inequalities are defined in greater detail in order to provide a systematic framework for grasping their relationship. This is followed by a description of the data and the items used for the empirical analysis. In the empirical part of the paper, the results from our analysis are presented and discussed.

Perspectives and insights on transnationality and social inequalities

Research on the relationship between transnationalisation and social inequalities can be broadly distinguished into three strands. First, in the research on global talents and transnational elites, the comparatively small groups of well- and often internationally-educated and economically successful professionals - who are generally neither labelled nor considered to be migrants, but who rather display cosmopolitan identifications – are those who benefit from transnational living and working environments, and who turn their competencies into resources in international labour markets (Sklair 2001; Koehn & Rosenau 2002; Huntington 2004; Carroll 2010). In a similar vein, a study on German citizens also reveals that the involvement in transnational networks through contacts with persons abroad increases with the level of education (Mau 2010). These studies often have a global or at least international horizon.

Reflected in the second strand of research is the more frequent approach to social inequalities as conceptualised within one national context. This approach is used even when considering relatively mobile groups such as migrants, as can be seen in most research on the integration of migrants that is concerned with social inequalities. Although most of this literature neglects

transnational ties, some studies include resources related to countries of origin. In the case of Germany, this concerns the role of the language of the origin country (Esser 2006), for example, or the composition of co-ethnic friendship networks (Kalter & Frank 2006) for educational and labour market success. These studies, however, employ no concept of transnationality and do not account for cross-border exchanges and thus exclusively focus on the national container. Nevertheless, in the German case, as in other immigration cases, transnational ties and practices are seen as reinforcing ethnic resources and therefore leading into a social mobility trap (Esser 2003, 2004). Even though transnational ties and networks may provide some resources and allow migrants to find a job more easily, for example, it is assumed that this is of little and only short-term benefit and eventually contributes to further marginalisation. Yet, there exists no systematic evidence to support this assumption.

The third strand of interest is transnational migration research which has addressed the issue of inequalities in various ways. It has offered a more optimistic picture than classical integration research, frequently even an overtly positive assessment. Stemming from its world-system theory perspective on global asymmetries between world regions and populations, this kind of research has focused, especially at the outset, on the more marginalised migrant groups. Here, transnationalisation of migrants' transactions across borders of states was conceptualised as a grass-roots response to the negative effects of economic globalisation on various groups of people and, in particular, on migrants. According to this view, migrants were increasingly confronted by ever more limited possibilities for social mobility, specifically, but not only, in the US post-Fordist economy, and experienced racial and ethnic discrimination that made them rely on transnational ties for socio-cultural and economic reasons (Glick Schiller et al. 1992; Portes 1996; Smith & Guarnizo 1999). This research has been predominantly concerned with challenging mainstream views, both the optimistic perspective on globalisation to the benefit of all and the unilinear and exclusive versions of migrants' integration into one place only. Migrants' involvement with transnationalisation was seen as generating alternative routes to social mobility and a way towards political involvement for those facing the risk of downward mobility. From this perspective, transnational economic enterprises offer migrants opportunities that are otherwise not available; and through political and socio-cultural engagement, in the form of civic associations, for instance, the creation of more positive self-images and collective solidarity is considered to provide a 'protective layer against discrimination and contempt commonly found in the host society' (Portes 1999: 471). This positive image can also trigger the desire for formal electoral participation in the immigration country and thus the acquisition of

citizenship. Other transnational studies also place emphasis on status differences of migrants when comparing their marginal situation in the immigration country and their social position in their country of origin which has often improved due to transnational financial exchanges, investment and newly acquired political influence (Goldring 1999).

Whereas research on migrants' transnational practices is predominantly qualitative, a number of studies have started to quantitatively investigate the relationship between the socio-structural position of migrants, on the one hand, and the transnational engagements and practices, on the other. The first and until now most influential study is the Comparative Immigrant Entrepreneurship Project (CIEP) which collected data among selected Latin American immigrant groups in three US-American cities in the second half of the 1990s (Landolt 2001; Itzigsohn & Giorguli Saucedo 2002; Portes et al. 2002; Guarnizo et al. 2003). The findings highlighted the fact that transnational engagement is not a mere characteristic of the most marginalised and deprived. To the contrary, those who are well-established, better educated and who have lengthier periods of residence are in many ways among those most involved in cross-border exchanges of money, goods and ideas. In particular, these are represented among the transnational economic and political entrepreneurs and generally in the more public forms of transnationality such as membership in or support for hometown associations or business activities. The authors also pointed to the fact that the numbers of such individuals are relatively small, while many more migrants maintain looser forms of association and private activities across borders in their daily lives (Itzigsohn & Giorguli Saucedo 2002). In fact, when more private activities are concerned, transnationality emerges as a relatively widespread phenomenon, not only in the US but also in Europe (Snel et al. 2006; Schunck 2011).

These studies revealed that there exists a group of successful transnational economic and political entrepreneurs who can be considered well integrated and well positioned socio-economically, but it is very small. Against this background, a number of scholars have again suggested that, apart from the few successful individuals, transnational ties and loyalties may further reinforce the marginalisation of already marginalised migrants (Levitt 2003; Morawska 2003; Snel et al. 2006: 288). This may deepen social inequalities even more, since '[t]hose who have more income, education and language skills are more likely to be able to choose transnational activism, while those with less social and cultural capital are more likely to be forced into it' (Levitt 2003). This latter option has been termed 'reactive transnationalism', fostered by marginalisation and experiences of discrimination, while the

first, successful form is ‘resource-dependent’ since it relies on a certain level of economic, cultural and social capital which, in turn, allows for realising further upward mobility (Itzigsohn & Giorguli Saucedo 2002; Portes et al. 2002). Thus, again, the picture is relatively dualistic. Moreover, these two pathways focus attention on the determinants of transnationality rather than its implications for social inequalities.

Independent from the direction of relationship, two competing propositions on the transnationality-social inequalities linkage can be distinguished. One maintains that higher levels of capital go along with more transnationality. This proposition is based upon the assumption that higher income, better educational achievements, and a denser social network – capital which, in the case of migrants, supports settlement and upward mobility – is positively correlated with transnational involvement due to the availability of resources and security. At the same time, inversely, this transnationality is beneficial in a globalised world. The other proposition argues that lower levels of capital are characteristic to those with transnational ties and practices. It is assumed that the lower the income, especially when it reflects downward mobility, the lower the educational and occupational skills, and the more limited the network of a person, the greater her transnational involvement will be, since other alternatives for attaining status and prestige are not available and, therefore, transnationality is a welcomed option. Here, transnationality can lead to further marginalisation.

It is the purpose of this paper to investigate whether any of these two propositions can be supported through systematic analysis for the case of (foreign-born) migrants in Germany. Before moving on to the empirical analysis, however, it is necessary to briefly reflect on some of the methodological problems which have contributed to the so far ambivalent results, and to lay out the concepts employed in this paper to confront these problems.

Methodological and conceptual lacunae

Important limitations in the research on the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities result from the strategies of sampling employed in the available studies as well as the conceptual vagueness of both key notions, namely what is considered transnational and how social inequality is addressed. One main issue is that research has so far only investigated selective groups, making it unclear as to what degree the findings can be generalised. First of all, insights rest primarily on the US-American context. Here, quantitative data are available only on Latin American immigrants from a limited number of countries (Portes et al. 2002;

Waldinger 2008). The CIEP study has, moreover, been criticised for not being representative of the overall immigrant population from the chosen countries and even less of other migrant groups from the continent (Waldinger 2008: 6). The Pew Hispanic survey, which has also been used in this context (Waldinger 2008), is a representative telephone survey in the US but is not primarily concerned with transnationality and therefore includes only selected items on travel, remittances and attachments, as well as home-country voting. The probably only European study conducted specifically to quantify transnationality, in turn, is not representative. Its sample contains 50 respondents from each of the six immigrant groups chosen, based on snowball sampling (Snel et al. 2006). The SOEP data set on which this paper draws, in contrast, has the advantage of covering the broader migrant population of Germany, although not being entirely representative because of sampling strategies. It is specifically biased towards more established immigrant groups from the classical guest-worker countries (Italy, Greece, former Yugoslavia, Portugal and Spain) as well as towards migrants from Poland. Although potentially limiting generalisation for all foreign-born migrants, the sample allows for investigating migrants' transnationality along a wide spectrum of length of stay (see below).

In addition to limitations stemming from the definition of the sample, no systematic concept of the transnational is employed. Although studies have looked at selected aspects of transnational involvements of migrants, they generally use terms such as 'transnationalism' and 'transmigrants'. This not only applies to qualitative studies but also to the newer quantitative research where the transnational indicators used differ from one study to the other. However, a number of studies show that persons are involved in transnational practices to different degrees in various social fields (Itzigsohn et al. 1999) and that transnational engagements often do not cluster (Levitt 2003; Waldinger 2008; Schunck 2011), with certain migrants showing a higher propensity to send remittances while others are more likely to travel 'back home' for visits, for example. Quantitative studies have looked at economic, political and socio-cultural activism (Portes et al., 2003), travels, remittances and identification (Waldinger 2008), the duration of visits (Schunck 2011) or combined a view on activities and identifications (Snel et al. 2006), and are therefore comparable to a limited extent only. In order to capture the varieties of transnationality more comprehensively, the various dimensions of transnationality will be examined below.

The last main limitation is that most studies are interested in the relationship between structural indicators of integration and transnational involvements, resulting in a lack of a

concept of social inequality. This leads to the fact that studies use only some, often selective, variables for structural integration. Moreover, items available in the data sets which are particularly relevant for the study of social inequalities, such as income or level of education, are sometimes included in studies as independent variables but not always explored for the analysis (Waldinger 2008).

Other studies include consideration of resources related to the country of origin such as language and focus on their impact on integration processes, but do not investigate cross-border exchanges. Studies which are concerned with cross-border ties and exchanges, in turn, examine the question whether progressive integration, along with settlement, adaptation and upward mobility, leads to a decrease of transnationality among migrants. As a result, their focus lies on the determinants rather than on the consequences of transnationality. This leads to two additional challenges which constitute the primary goals of the broader endeavour in the investigation of the role of transnationality for social inequalities to which this paper relates. The first challenge concerns the need for a theoretical approach in order to explain how both aspects are connected. This will be done through an approach based on social mechanisms (Faist & Diewald 2011). The second challenge consists of the need for longitudinal studies (Levitt 2001; Portes et al. 2002). Most quantitative surveys use cross-sectional data, and therefore the causality and procedural dynamics in the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities are difficult to determine. Whether those with more cultural capital are more transnational, or whether the more transnational are (have become) those with higher educational credentials, cannot be determined on the basis of the data so far available.ⁱ This paper is a first step in offering a systematic analysis of the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities. Whereas available studies tend to focus on the determinants and generally offer no systematic exploration between the two dynamics, the aim here is to account for the complexity of this relationship. It is fair to say that in this research, the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities, often reflected in structural integration variables, has not been approached systematically.

Key concepts

Transnationality as a heterogeneity

In this paper, transnationality is one of the two key concepts used to operationalise more systematically what is going to be measured. Transnationality is considered a marker of

difference, that is a heterogeneity (Blau 1977). This is to say that, on the one hand, persons differ in the degree of transnational involvement along a continuum (akin to an ordinal scale). On the other hand, and more important in this paper, transnational practices exist in various social dimensions that need to be distinguished.

Considering the above mentioned findings from transnational migration research, which indicate that different dynamics operate in different domains of transnationality and that these generally do not seem to cluster for individuals and groups, it is important to analyse transnationality not only as a 'package' but to look into its various dimensions. Using the representative household survey of the SOEP, the focus of the analysis presented here is on the more private and personal forms of transnationality as compared to the economic and political entrepreneurs investigated in the CIEP-study. These private forms, in turn, exist in the economic, familial, political-identificational and cultural spheres. Accordingly, the items can be distinguished into financial exchanges (money and goods), personal relations, including family and friends abroad as well as visits, identification with the country of origin and cultural practices, namely the use of the language of the origin country and respective media consumption. For these different dimensions, several indicators are available in the data set and used for the analysis as will be explained in more detail below.

This perspective on transnationality includes the notion that it has to be carefully distinguished from its consideration as a resource *per se*. Rather, the question is to what kind of resources transnationality contributes (or does not contribute) and how. The literature has often hitherto neglected to systematically distinguish between transnational ties and practices and the resources that these generate (Faist et al. 2011). In newly emerging scholarship on inequality and cross-border mobility, notions such as transnational (cultural) capital have been employed, suggesting a positive role of transnational practices in the accumulation of cultural capital. Transnational capital refers to educational credentials or language proficiency acquired abroad or in an international context, and it is often implicitly or explicitly assumed that this constitutes valuable cultural capital. This paper, in contrast, is interested in the complex and multi-dimensional relationship between transnational ties and practices and the various forms of capital.

Social inequalities, participatory opportunities and forms of capital

The second key concept relevant here is that of social inequalities. Inequalities have to do with the possibilities to access generally existing and desirable social goods and positions which when limited negatively affect the life chances of the persons or groups concerned (Kreckel 2004). Inequalities are, thus, considered in their plurality and related to opportunities, rather than specific outcomes (Therborn 2006).

In order to provide a comprehensive framework for operationalisation, inequalities are approached here through the various forms of capital: cultural, social and economic (Bourdieu 1983). The forms of capital are understood as the basis for an individual's opportunities to partake in certain fields, e.g. labour market, education, health or politics. This understanding does not consider the outcome of inclusion in these fields but concerns the degree of opportunities for participation in them. Economic capital is the form most easily converted into money. Cultural capital can also be converted into economic capital under certain conditions. It exists in three different sub-forms and is either incorporated, objectified or institutionalised. Incorporated cultural capital refers to the time and efforts invested into acquiring education or culture. It is a personal attribute. Objectified cultural capital is visible in cultural goods, books, pictures and the like, as manifestations of cultural ideas and concepts. Institutionalised cultural capital exists through titles and credentials. Social capital here refers to social relations and networks emerging from an individual's membership in certain groups. These forms of capital can be converted into one another through different means and often only under certain conditions. It is crucial to understand that the different forms of capital are subject to procedural interactions through which individuals gain access to relevant social fields. The cultural capital of a young adult in the form of titles or certificates, for example, depends on the previous investment of cultural capital by the family. The opportunities to convert a professional or university title into relevant forms of economic and social capital, in turn, depend on the inherited social capital as well since this is a condition of the success of the inversion (Bourdieu 1983). This paper makes use of the three forms of capital in order to operationalise the dimension of social inequalities. In line with the broader interest of the research project on which this article draws, this is taken as a starting point focusing on the association of transnationality and capital.³ The operationalisation of both key concepts for the analysis will be explained in the next section, after a brief description of the data set and variables used.

Data, variables, and analysis

The analysis presented in this paper uses data from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP), a wide-ranging representative longitudinal study of private households in Germany. Annual face-to-face interviews are conducted in nearly 10,000 households with more than 20,000 persons. This includes a disproportionately large sub-sample of migrants who are followed over time through regular interviews and refreshment samples (B from 1984 and D from 1994/95; in addition, the immigrant population was oversampled in the newer sub-samples F from 2000 and I from 2009). The analysis population consists of SOEP sample members who migrated to Germany, thus foreign-born migrants with and without German citizenship. To be included, they must have taken part in the survey at least once between 2006 and 2010. Concerning some of the indicators the sample is further reduced due to the question filters. Specifically, some of the respondents from the group of so-called ethnic Germans stated that they had German citizenship since birth and therefore skipped some of the questions of interest (see Annex 3 for a more detailed description).

Variables for the measurement of transnationality

In the analysis presented here, transnationality is expressed through four distinct dimensions: a) financial exchanges, b) personal relations, c) identification and d) cultural practices. The SOEP offers the opportunity to measure these dimensions by one or more indicators which were coded as binary variables with the categories “yes” and “no”.

Table 1. Operationalisation of transnationality

Domain	SOEP-Indicators
Financial exchanges	Sends remittances or goods
Personal relations	Has spouse, children or parents abroad
	Has regular contact to friends abroad
	Has visited home-country in the last two years
Identification	Feels attached to origin country
	Has dual citizenship
Cultural practices	Speaks regularly in language of origin country
	Reads newspaper in language of origin country

The dimension ‘financial exchanges’ is covered by combining two items asking whether a respondent had provided financial resources or benefits in kind to relatives or other persons living outside Germany in the year preceding the interview. Cross-border personal relations are operationalised through the following variables: contact with friends abroad (yes if ‘having regular contact with friends abroad’); relatives abroad (yes if ‘having a spouse, children or parents abroad’); visits to country of origin (yes if ‘having visited the country of origin in the last two years’). The dimension ‘transnational identification’ reflects two variables, one on attachment to country of origin (yes if ‘feeling some or more attachment to country of origin’) and another one on dual citizenship (yes if ‘having dual citizenship’), based upon the assumption that holding dual citizenship indicates a conscious decision reflecting a strong sense of identity with the country of origin.⁵ The last dimension ‘cultural practices’ is assessed by two variables: language spoken (yes if ‘speaks mostly in language of country of origin’) and language of newspapers read (yes if ‘reads newspaper in language of origin’), assuming that respondents use the language of the origin country to receive or exchange information about affairs regarding their origin country.

Variables for the measurement of capital

As explained above, the analysis distinguished among the three forms of capital, economic, cultural and social. Using the available items in the SOEP data set, each form of capital is operationalised through two variables: economic capital by the net household income as well as net household assets, both weighted by the modified OECD equivalence scale (DIW 2011). Cultural capital is measured by educational achievement (with the categories ‘less than high school’, ‘high school’ and ‘more than high school’) and occupational status based on the International Standard Classification of Occupation from 1988 (ISCO-88) (Elias 1997) (with the categories ‘white collar’, ‘blue collar’ and ‘not applicable’). For social capital, the analysis uses the items ‘on the whole one can trust people’ (with the categories ‘agree’ and ‘disagree’) and ‘meeting with friends, relatives and neighbours’ (with the categories ‘at least once a week’ and ‘less often than once a week’).

Table 2. Operationalisation of capital

Domain	SOEP-Indicators
Economic capital	Household income
	Assets
Cultural capital	Education
	Occupation
Social capital	General trust
	Meets regularly with friends, relatives or neighbours

Control variables

In order to avoid bias in describing the association between transnationality and different forms of capital, the following control variables were included: migrant group (with the categories ‘Turkey’, ‘[ethnic German] Resettler’, ‘Ex-Yugoslavia’, ‘Italy’ and ‘all others’), years since migration, child migrant (dummy variable indicating that a respondent was 12 years old or younger at the time of immigration), German citizenship (dummy variable indicating German citizenship), age (with the categories ‘up to 39 years’, ‘40 to 64 years’ and ‘65 years and above’), gender (with the categories ‘female’ and ‘male’), marital status (dummy variable indicating that a respondent is married) and number of children in household (dummy variable indicating that one or more children live in the respondent’s household).

Statistical analyses

A series of (weighted) logistic regression models was run to describe the association between transnationality and different forms of capital (that is, one model for each transnational variable as dependent variable, including all capital variables as well as control variables). Logistic regression models measure the independent associations between a transnational variable and a number of capital variables while controlling for potential confounders which may bias these associations. In order to capture non-linear associations, net household income and net household assets were recoded into tertiles with an added variable ‘years since migration squared’ before performing the modelling. The number of complete cases for the various models is substantially lower than the number of observations made for the transnational variables each. This is because some of the capital variables (assets, trust and meeting friends) are not collected on an annual basis, i.e. they are collected in a different year

than the relevant transnational indicators (see Table 2). Thus, the complete cases resemble a balanced panel. Modelling was carried out in STATA/SE 12.1.

The association of transnationality and social inequalities in Germany

In the following, the results of the regression analysis on the association of the four chosen dimensions of transnationality and the three forms of capital (economic, cultural and social) are presented.

Financial exchanges

Respondents who engage in cross-border financial exchanges, measured by sending remittances or goods, are more often among those with higher levels of economic and cultural capital. They have on average higher incomes, higher levels of education and a better occupational position, that is they are either white- or blue-collar workers. For example, those sending remittances or goods have an almost fivefold higher chance of living in high-income households as opposed to low-income households. No significant association exists between sending remittances or goods and social capital, which is operationalised through the variables 'general trust' and 'social network'. In addition, financial exchanges are more often encountered among migrants who immigrated later than age 12. As far as nationality groups are concerned, those born in (Ex-)Yugoslavia are also more frequently among those sending remittances, although in this and the former case the association is not significant.

Personal relations

Having close family members (spouse, children or parents) abroad is not significantly associated with any form of capital. That is to say, that (foreign-born) migrants in Germany have transnational family relations across all social positions. This clearly indicates that, independent of their social position, migrants have not completely reunited with their close family in the country of immigration. However, there seems to be a tendency that familial cross-border relations are less frequent among blue collar workers and persons who are not active on the labour market.

With respect to the other types of personal relations measured, those persons who have friendships and those who undertake visits to the country of origin tend to have significantly higher levels of all three forms of capital. Social capital (measured by social networks) as well as economic capital (measured by income) are the two forms most consistently correlated with transnational friendships and visits. For example, those with friends abroad and those who visited their country of origin in the last two years are twice as likely to live in a high-income household compared to those who do not show these characteristics. The same applies to the relationship between having friends abroad and recent visits and its positive association with regularly meeting with friends in Germany.

In addition, those maintaining transnational personal relations were less likely to have arrived in Germany under the age of 12. In some respects (family abroad, contacts with friends, recent visit), respondents tend not to hold German citizenship. Moreover, transnational family relations can be observed to a lesser extent among ethnic German re-settlers and the same applies to visits in the country of origin. Those born in (Ex-)Yugoslavia are also less involved in visits.

Transnational identification

There is no significant association between transnational identification and the different forms of capital. However, different tendencies for the two variables employed to measure transnational identification were noticeable (albeit not significant). While attachment to the country of origin is positively associated with social capital, the prevalence of dual citizenship, in turn, increases with higher levels of cultural capital, especially with educational achievement.

It is noteworthy that those respondents who feel attached to their country of origin are more likely to having been born in Turkey and Italy and less often hold German citizenship. Those possessing dual citizenship, in turn, are much more often ethnic Germans.

Cultural practices

Cultural practices, again, do not show the same correlation with capital when the two indicator variables are considered. Reading newspapers has no particular relationship with

any form of capital. In contrast, the use of the language of the origin country is negatively associated with economic capital; it is particularly low for those with higher levels of assets. Cultural capital shows no correlation with the use of language while social capital does. Among those migrants who use the language of their origin country the chance that they have trust in society is one-and-a-half times higher and the other social capital indicator, 'meeting with others', is positively associated with using the language, albeit not significantly.

Transnational cultural practices are particularly present among persons born in Turkey and least so among resettlers. Having migrated as a child, being a German citizen or not being married is negatively associated with the chance to engage in transnational cultural practices. Moreover, the use of the language of their origin country is the only indicator of transnationality that is significantly related to years since migration, that is, use of the language of their origin country is lower with a longer duration of stay in Germany.

Summary and discussion

First of all, there is no uniform pattern of the transnationality-social inequality nexus. For the most part, transnationality and capital have a weak or no relationship at all. Where there is a significant association it is rather positive, meaning that transnationality goes hand in hand with higher levels of capital. Thus, transnationality is not a mere characteristic of those migrants with very low levels of capital, and it is also not systematically connected to higher levels in a uniform way. In contrast to the current debate on the issue, taken together, the results of this paper speak against both of the two prevailing propositions.

Assimilation theorists and also some transnationalists have suggested that transnationality is a characteristic mainly of the poor and deprived. From a more classical assimilation theory perspective, transnationality of those migrants with lower levels of capital is considered a further sign of their marginalisation and a path into a mobility trap (Esser 2003: 16, 2004: 48, 50). This position seems rather predominant in the German debate, but also has its followers in the US context (cf. Portes 1999: 468). From a transnational migration perspective, poorer migrants' transnational involvement has received a more favourable assessment as transnationality may constitute a 'protective layer against discrimination' (Portes 1999: 471) and carry the potential to enhance status and prestige. On the other hand, recent quantitative research has supported the idea that it is rather the better educated, well-off and established

who are in fact transnational. The investigation of transnational economic involvement in the US context has revealed that this is neither a sign of marginality nor related to poverty. “On the contrary, it is the better qualified, more experienced and more secure immigrants who are overrepresented in these economic activities” (Portes et al. 2002: 290).

Yet, the results of this paper underline that this debate suffers from its undifferentiated account of transnationality. Studies generally look into a small fraction of the various transnational dimensions, for instance cross-border business involvement. In addition, some of the items that are used in existent research, such as language of the country of origin or co-ethnic networks, although related to transnational practices, do not necessarily reflect real cross-border exchanges. More important, studies tend to overgeneralise ‘transnationalism’ as a generic characteristic but use selected items to account for it. In contrast, the analysis presented here has used a more specific concept of transnationality that distinguishes various dimensions. Against this background, the results show, for example, that financial exchanges are positively correlated with economic capital while transnational identification is not. Thus, the analysis clearly shows that the different dimensions of transnationality and the various forms of capital are differently associated with one another.

Most relationships analysed in this paper are not significant, and thus show little meaningful linkage. Some relationships are significant, however, and here there is generally a positive association between higher levels of capital and transnationality. Therefore, the case of foreign-born migrants in Germany provides some support for the findings of transnational involvement of the better educated and well-off mentioned above. In contrast to the more public forms of economic entrepreneurship and political and social-cultural involvement on which those findings rest, this paper has investigated the personal realm of remittance sending, cross-border family and friendship, identification and cultural practices. This again indicates that transnationality in the various dimensions, economic or familial for example, is related to the availability of capital in complex and different ways within and across dimensions.

Only one association is negative, namely the relation between the use of the language of the country of origin and economic capital, indicating that higher levels of assets go along with less intensive use of the origin language. The same does not apply, however, to income as the other variable used to capture economic capital, as there is no significant relation. This is one example where the variables employed to operationalise capital in its various forms reveal

different associations with transnationality. This variance is also true for the different aspects of transnationality within the same dimension.

Thus, additionally within the individual dimensions of transnationality the relationship with the forms of capital also varies. For instance in the cultural dimension ‘reading newspaper in the origin country language’ has no relationship with capital whereas the use of the origin country’s language in daily life does, being negative for economic capital, non-significant for cultural capital and positive for social capital.

Turning to the individual dimensions, the results show that financial exchanges go hand in hand with higher levels of economic and cultural capital. This, in turn, means that the majority of the financially transnational are on average neither the poorest nor the least educated or trained. This is an important finding since those in a better position to send money abroad do not necessarily do so, and the measurement here also does not concern the amount but rather the likeliness of the transfers. The fact that particularly migrants born in what is today ex-Yugoslavia are more frequently among those who send remittances or goods is likely to be related to the difficult situation following the fairly recent civil war. Similarly, personal cross-border relations are positively associated with higher levels of all three forms of capital. This does not apply, however, to ‘having close family members abroad’ where there is no particular association. Accordingly, many migrants from the first generation in Germany still have parts of their close family in the country of origin and have not completely reunited in the immigration country. This is independent from their position in the social hierarchy and transnational families exist across all social strata. The findings in the dimension of personal transnational relations also reveal that the elective forms of cross-border relations in particular correlate positively with all forms of capital. This is in line with findings from a survey on German citizens which found that ‘having friends abroad’ is positively associated with an increase in the level of education (Mau 2010). Thus, foreign-born migrants, with or without German citizenship, do not seem to differ from other citizens in this respect.

In contrast, identification in the form of attachment to the country of origin and dual citizenship is not significantly associated with capital. However, the relatively demanding form of having dual citizenship increases with higher levels of cultural capital. Since the regression analysis isolates variables with respect to their independent influence – thus excluding the fact that some groups, German re-settlers from Eastern Europe for instance,

have easier access to maintaining their citizenship – the higher levels of education and skills may indicate that knowledge and other cultural resources play a role. Maintaining the origin country's citizenship, in turn, does not seem to be a sign of (self-)marginalisation. A positive association also seems to exist between transnational attachment and social capital, potentially signalling a mutual reinforcement between the ties to the country of origin and the more locally organised social life.

Cultural practices, taken here as an indication of interest in the country of origin, show no relationship with the forms of capital as far as print media consumption is concerned. Everyday communication in the origin language, in turn, takes place across the various levels of income and educational capital, but can be observed more often among persons with higher social capital as well as among those with a lower quantity of financial assets. This might indicate that language proficiency in the origin language facilitates social networks. The results also show that using the origin country's language regularly has neither a negative nor a positive relationship with income and education.

In addition, the longer the stay in Germany, the less likely the person is to regularly speak the language of the country of origin. However, the duration of stay has no specific relationship with other dimensions of transnationality investigated here. A decline in the use of and proficiency in the original mother language has not infrequently been interpreted as a sign of weakening transnational relations of migrants (Alba & Nee 2003). Even though it is true that language is a necessary, maybe indispensable, basis for transnational relations, especially within families and among kin, it obviously does not imply its regular use – in contrast to the idea of rather enclosed ethnic, hence transnational communities. Holding German citizenship and having migrated as a child, in turn, are negatively associated with almost every dimension of transnationality, including single indicators. This supports classical assimilation theoretical assumptions concerning adaptation over time. It does not, however, allow any conclusion as to the implications for social inequalities.

In sum, persons who display transnational involvements can be found across the different levels of capital endowment. Yet, although some dimensions of transnationality are associated with higher levels of capital, in most dimensions, there is no particular relation with the resources of a person. In contrast to what is suggested by the current debate, the relationship between transnationality and social inequalities seems altogether weak, and neither for the more marginalised nor the better-off does it reflect a clear-cut pattern.

Notes

1 We are grateful to the participants of the Inaugural conference of the Collaborative Research Centre 882 for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. In particular, we wish to thank the two discussants Wolfgang Schröer and Janusz Mucha for their critical questions and important suggestions.

2 See www.sfb882.uni-bielefeld.de/projects/Teilprojekt_C1

3 In a next step, a procedural perspective based on longitudinal data will be applied.

4 It must be stressed that, in the case of Germany, dual nationality is not exclusively a matter of personal decision since nationality acquisition in principle does not allow for maintenance of previous nationalities. Yet there are various exceptions. It is generally allowed for ethnic Germans from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In the period from 2000 to 2006, 45 per cent of all naturalisations in Germany allowed for the maintenance of previous citizenship (Faist&Gerdes 2008)

References

- Alba, R. & Nee, V. (2003) *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Harvard University, Cambridge.
- Blau, P. M. (1977) *Inequality and Heterogeneity. A Primitive Theory of Social Structure*, New York: Free Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1983) Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital. In: Kreckel, R. (ed.) *Soziale Ungleichheiten*. Soziale Welt, Sonderband 2, pp. 183–198.
- DIW (2011) DIW Data Documentation 57, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Berlin
- Elias P. (1997) Occupational classification (ISCO-88): concepts, methods, reliability, validity and cross-national comparability. OECD Publishing, Report No. 20
- Esser, H. (2003) Ist das Konzept der Assimilation überholt? *Geographische Revue* 2 (5), 5–22.
- Esser, H. (2004) Welche Alternativen zur "Assimilation" gibt es eigentlich? *IMIS-Beiträge* 23, 41–59.
- Esser, H. (2006) Migration, Sprache und Integration. *AKI-Forschungsbilanz, Arbeitsstelle Interkulturelle Konflikte und gesellschaftliche Integration (AKI), Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung (WZB)* (4).
- Faist, T. & Gerdes, J. (2008) Dual Citizenship in an Age of Mobility. In: Bertelsmann Stiftung, Migration Policy Institute und European Policy Centre (eds.), *Delivering Citizenship*. Gütersloh: The Transatlantic Council on Migration & Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung, 73-98.
- Faist, T. & Özveren, E. (eds.) (2004) *Transnational Social Spaces*. Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Faist, T. (2000a) *The Volume and Dynamics of International Migration and Transnational Social Spaces*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Faist, T. (ed.) (2000b) *Transstaatliche Räume. Politik, Wirtschaft und Kultur in und zwischen Deutschland und der Türkei*. Transcript, Bielefeld.
- Faist, T., Fauser, M. & Reisenauer, E. (2011) Perspektiven der Migrationsforschung: vom Transnationalismus zur Transnationalität. *Soziale Welt* 62 (2), 203–220.
- Fauser, M. & Drebenstedt, E., 2011, Transnationalität zwischen Deutschland und der Türkei. Ein Überblick über den Forschungsstand (unpublished manuscript)
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch, L. & Blanc-Szanton, C. (1992) Transnationalism: A New Analytical Framework for Understanding Migration. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 645, 1–24.
- Goldring, L. (1999) The power of status in transnational social fields. In: Smith, M. & Guarnizo, L. E. (eds.) *Transnationalism from Below*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A. & Haller, W. (2003) Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (6), 1211–1248.
- Huntington, S. P. (2004) *Who are we? Die Krise der amerikanischen Identität*. Europa Verlag, Hamburg.

- Itzigsohn, J. & Giorguli Saucedo, S. (2002) Immigrant Incorporation and Sociocultural Transnationalism. *International Migration Review* **36** (3), 766–798.
- Itzigsohn, J., Cabral, C. D., Medina, E. H. & Vazquez, O. (1999) Mapping Dominican transnationalism: narrow and broad transnational practices. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **22** (2), 316–339.
- Kalter, F. (2006) Auf der Suche nach einer Erklärung für die spezifischen Arbeitsmarktnachteile von Jugendlichen türkischer Herkunft. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **35** (2), 144–160.
- Koehn, P. H. & Rosenau, J. N. (2002) Transnational competence in an emergent epoch. *International Studies Perspectives* (3), 105–127.
- Kreckel, R. (2004) *Politische Soziologie der sozialen Ungleichheit*, 3 rev. ed. Campus Verlag, Frankfurt a. M.
- Kreutzer, F. & Roth, S. (eds.) (2006) *Transnationale Karrieren*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.
- Landolt, P. (2001) Salvadoran economic transnationalism: embedded strategies for household maintenance, immigrant incorporation, and entrepreneurial expansion. *Global Networks* **1** (3), 217–241.
- Levitt, P. (2001) Transnational Migration: Taking Stock and Future Directions. *Global Networks* **1** (3), 195–216.
- Levitt, P. (2003) Keeping Feet in Both Worlds: Transnational Practices and Immigrant Incorporation in the United States. In: Joppke, C. & Morawska, E. (eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 177–194.
- Liebau, Elisabeth et al. (mimeo): Analysepotentiale des SOEP für die Migrations- und Integrationsforschung
- Mau, S. & Mewes, J. (2008) Ungleiche Transnationalisierung? Zur gruppenspezifischen Einbindung in transnationale Interaktionen. In: Berger, P. & Weiß, A. (eds.) *Transnationalisierung sozialer Ungleichheit*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, pp. 259–282.
- Mau, S. (2010) *Social Transnationalism: Lifeworlds beyond the nation-state*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Morawska, E. (2003) Immigrant Transnationalism and Assimilation: A Variety of Combinations and the Analytic Strategy it suggests. In: Joppke, C. & Morawska, E. (eds.) *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, pp. 133–176.
- Portes, A. (1996) Global Villagers: the Rise of Transnational Communities. *The American Prospect* **25**, 74–77.
- Portes, A. (1999) Conclusion: Towards a new world - the origins and effects of transnational activities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* **22** (2), 463–474.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. & Haller, W. J. (2002) Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation. *American Sociological Review* **67** (2), 278–298.

- Schunck, R. (2011) Immigrant Integration, Transnational Activities and the Life Course. In: Wingers, M., Windzio, M., Valk, H. & Aybek, C. (eds.) *A Life-Course Perspective on Migration and Integration*. Springer Science+Business Media, Heidelberg, pp. 259–282.
- Sklair, L. (2001) *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, Malden.
- Smith, M. & Guarnizo, L. E. (eds.) (1999) *Transnationalism from Below*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Snel, E., Engbergsen, G. & Leerkes, A. (2006) Transnational involvement and social integration. *Global Networks* 6 (3), 285–308.
- Therborn, G. (2006) Meaning, Mechanisms, Patterns and Forces: An Introduction. In: Therborn, G. (ed.) *Inequalities of the world*. Verso, London and New York, pp. 1–58.
- Waldinger, R. (2008) Between "Here" and "There": Immigrant cross-border activities and loyalties. *International Migration Review* 42 (1), 3–29.
- Weiß, A. (2006) Hoch qualifizierte MigrantInnen. Der Kern einer transnationalen Mittelklasse? In: Kreuzer, F. & Roth, S. (eds.) *Transnationale Karrieren*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden, pp. 283–300.
- Wiley, N. F. (1970) The Ethnic Mobility Trap and Stratification Theory. In: Rose, P. I. (ed.) *The Study of Society. An Integrated Anthology*, 2nd edition. Random House, New York, Toronto, pp. 397–408.

Annex 1

Table: Description of study sample, German Socio-Economic Panel Study 2006-2010^a

Variable	Year	Mean (SD)	Proportion (number of observation)
<i>Transnational items</i>			
Sends remittances or goods	2010		
yes			11.2 (194)
no			88.5 (1,535)
missing			0.3 (5)
Has regular contact to friends abroad	2009		
yes			77.4 (1,501)
no			22.2 (431)
missing			0.4 (7)
Has spouse, children or parents abroad	2006		
yes			31.8 (760)
no			68.2 (1,633)
Has visited home-country in the last two years ^b	2010		
yes			68.3 (999)
no			30.8 (451)
missing			0.8 (12)
Feels attached to country of origin	2010		
yes			77.4 (1,132)
no			22.1 (323)
missing			0.5 (7)
Has dual citizenship	2010		
yes			11.5 (200)
no			88.5 (1,534)
Speaks mostly in language of origin country	2010		
yes			37.9 (657)
no			61.9 (1,074)
missing			0.2 (3)
Reads newspaper in language of origin country ^{b,c}	2010		
yes			54.9 (803)
no			44.4 (649)
missing			0.7 (10)
<i>Economic capital</i>			
Household income (in €)	2010	17,737 (12,347)	
Assets (in €)	2007	80,600 (536,960)	
Missing			<0.1 (1)
<i>Cultural capital</i>			
Education	2010		
less than high school			32.9 (570)
high school			41.3 (717)
more than high school			21.5 (373)
missing			4.3 (74)
Occupation	2010		
white collar			28.0 (485)
blue collar			23.0 (399)
NA			44.8 (776)
missing			4.3 (74)
<i>Social capital</i>			
General trust	2008		
yes			56.1 (1,102)
no			43.1 (846)
missing			0.8 (15)
Meets regularly with friends, relatives or	2009		

neighbours			
yes			47.0 (911)
no			52.0 (1,009)
missing			1.0 (19)
<i>Controls</i>			
Migrant group	2010		
Turkey			15.8 (274)
Resettler			27.3 (474)
Ex-Yugoslavia			9.7 (168)
Italy			6.7 (116)
All others			40.5 (702)
Years since migration	2010	26.3 (12.5)	
Missing			4.6 (80)
Child migrant	2010		
yes			23.1 (400)
no			76.9 (1,334)
German citizenship	2010		
yes			54.8 (951)
no			45.2 (783)
Age	2010		
up to 39 years			29.3 (508)
40 to 64 years			51.4 (892)
65 years and above			19.3 (334)
Sex	2010		
female			54.7 (946)
male			45.4 (788)
Marital status	2010		
married			71.5 (1,240)
other			28.5 (494)
One or more children in household	2010		
yes			37.5 (650)
no			62.5 (1,084)

Notes: SD, standard deviation. ^a Description of annually collected variables refers to the most recent year of data collection. ^b Some of the ethnic Germans in the sample have had German citizenship since birth and therefore skipped this item. ^c Departing from the idea that this is not a matter of an ethnic press, but that migrant media greatly report on issues related to the country of origin.

Annex 2

Table : Logistic regression models with transnational items as dependent variables, German Socio-Economic Panel Study 2006-2010

	Financial exchanges	Personal relations			Identification		Culture	
	Sends remittances or goods (n=1,171)	Has regular contact to friends abroad (n=1,373)	Has spouse, children or parents abroad (n=1,467)	Has visited home-country in the last two years (n=962)	Feels attached to country of origin (n=965)	Has dual citizenship (n=1,176)	Speaks regularly in language of the origin country (n=1,174)	Reads newspaper in language of the origin country ^a (n=961)
	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR	OR
Economic capital								
Household income	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
first tertile	2.22*	0.96	1.14	1.76*	0.63	0.73	1.34	0.84
second tertile	4.71***	1.94**	1.28	2.36**	0.76	1.76	1.30	1.12
third tertile								
Assets								
first tertile	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
second tertile	1.65	0.92	1.19	1.20	0.89	1.02	0.76	1.00
third tertile	0.94	0.81	1.13	0.92	0.73	0.65	0.34***	0.76
Cultural capital								
Education								
less than high school	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
high school	1.39	1.15	0.96	2.03**	0.90	1.77	0.91	0.91
more than high school	3.12**	1.47	0.96	1.55	1.04	2.16	0.91	0.96
Occupation								
white collar	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
blue collar	0.75	0.68	0.71	0.80	0.56	0.66	1.58	0.86
NA	0.42**	0.51**	0.64*	0.75	0.77	0.65	1.05	1.14
Social capital								
General trust								
no	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
yes	0.81	1.28	0.95	1.11	1.49	0.82	1.53**	1.13
Meets regularly with friends, relatives or neighbours								
no	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
yes	1.50	1.91***	1.13	1.90***	1.48	0.77	1.35	0.99
Controls								
Migrant group								
Turkey	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
Resettler	0.68	0.69	0.29***	0.17***	0.25***	6.48***	0.08***	0.13***
Ex-Yugoslavia	2.14	1.61	0.85	0.37**	0.50	1.31	0.53*	0.73
Italy	0.08***	1.10	0.91	1.02	5.93*	1.27	0.61	0.72
All others	0.85	0.72	0.91	0.34***	0.47*	2.22	0.11***	0.24***
Years since migration	1.00	0.99	0.95	1.03	1.00	0.98	0.90**	0.96

Years since migration squared	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00*	1.00
Child migrant								
no	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
yes	0.61	0.36***	0.49**	0.47**	0.60	1.91	0.83	0.62
German citizenship								
no	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)		(ref.)	(ref.)
yes	0.75	0.15***	0.21***	0.36***	0.42***		0.40***	0.76
Age								
up to 39 years	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
40 to 64 years	1.63	0.80	1.26	1.16	1.68	1.80	1.45	1.23
65 years and above	2.55	0.65	0.69	1.29	1.93	1.98	2.56**	0.98
Sex								
female	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
male	0.81	0.91	0.75*	0.92	1.16	0.81	0.84	1.71**
Marital status								
other	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
married	1.07	1.55*	0.97	1.71**	1.94**	0.88	1.99***	1.75**
One or more children in household								
no	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)	(ref.)
yes	1.67	1.21	1.52**	0.99	1.31	1.18	1.07	0.80

Notes: OR, Odds Ratio. ^abased on the idea that this is not a matter of an ethnic press, but that migrant media greatly report on origin country affairs. Data are weighted.

*p < 0.1; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01

Annex 3

The German Socio-Economic Panel

SOEP

The German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP) is a wide-ranging representative longitudinal study of private households, located at the German Institute for Economic Research, DIW Berlin. Annual interviews of nearly 10,000 households and more than 20,000 persons have been conducted since 1984 by TNS InfratestSozialforschung. The central theme of SOEP is “subjective and economic well-being over the life course”. The data provide information on all household members, including household composition, occupational biographies, employment, earnings, health, and satisfaction indicators.

Sampling of migrants

The SOEP currently consists of nine sub-samples (A-I), with two sub-samples (B from 1984 and D from 1994/95) created specifically to study migrants and their descendants (Liebau et al., mimeo). Sample B was designed to capture the five largest migrant groups in pre-reunification West Germany (from Turkey, Italy, Greece, former Yugoslavia, and Spain), drawing on information from Germany’s local registration offices. For sample D, screening interviews were employed (extended by snowball method). Sample D was designed to reflect the main migrant groups in the years following reunification: primarily inner-German migrants from the former East to the former West, ethnic Germans from Eastern Europe, asylum-seekers from around the world, and families of migrant workers. Since migrants from East to West Germany and ethnic Germans acquired German citizenship upon emigration, it was not possible to use data from local registration offices to sample these two groups.

In response to the under-reporting of foreigners in the random samples of the overall population in subsample F from 2000 and I from 2009, the immigrant population was oversampled in the gross sample to ensure a representative cross-section in the net sample. In sample F, the random route walk was therefore extended to include screening interviews relating to the nationality of the household residents. Households with foreign citizenship that were identified in the extended random route walks were then added to the gross sample. In sub-sample I, the sample of immigrants in the gross sample was boosted with the help of

onomastic methods, whereby a person's name can be used to identify a possible migration background. Here, the names on the doorbells of buildings chosen randomly through the random route walk were noted in a list. The onomastic method was then run on this list to determine the proportion of individuals with a potential migration background per sample point. Individuals identified as migrants by the onomastic method were twice as likely to be included in the gross sample of sub-sample I.

The SOEP is thus unique, both in Germany and internationally, as a nationally representative longitudinal data set that also contains a disproportionately large sub-sample of migrants who are followed over time through regular interviews and refreshment samples.

Previously published SFB 882 Working Papers:

- Diewald, Martin / Faist, Thomas (2011): From Heterogeneities to Inequalities: Looking at Social Mechanisms as an Explanatory Approach to the Generation of Social Inequalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 1, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Bielefeld.
- Busch, Anne (2011): Determinants of Occupational Gender Segregation: Work Values and Gender (A) Typical Occupational Preferences of Adolescents, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 2, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A3, Bielefeld.
- Faist, Thomas (2011): Multiculturalism: From Heterogeneities to Social (In)Equalities, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 3, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.
- Amelina, Anna (2012): Jenseits des Homogenitätsmodells der Kultur: Zur Analyse von Transnationalität und kulturellen Interferenzen auf der Grundlage der hermeneutischen Wissenssoziologie, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 4, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.
- Osmanowski, Magdalena / Cardona, Andrés (2012): Resource Dilution or Resource Augmentation? Number of Siblings, Birth Order, Sex of the Child and Frequency of Mother's Activities with Preschool Children, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 5, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.
- Amelina, Anna / Bilecen, Başak / Barglowski, Karolina / Faist, Thomas (2012): Ties That Protect? The Significance of Transnationality for the Distribution of Informal Social Protection in Migrant Networks, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 6, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C3, Bielefeld.
- Alemann, Annette von / Beaufaÿs, Sandra / Reimer, Thordis (2012): Gaining Access to the Field of Work Organizations with the Issue of "Work-Family-Life Balance" for Fathers, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 7, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project B5, Bielefeld.
- Kaiser, Till (2012): Haben gebildete Mütter gewissenhaftere Kinder? Soziale Herkunft und Persönlichkeitsentwicklung im frühkindlichen Alter, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 8, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A1, Bielefeld.

Gusy, Christoph / Müller, Sebastian (2012): Social Construction of Heterogeneity Indicators and their Relationship to Law. The Example of Guiding Principles in Immigration Law, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 9, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project C4, Bielefeld.

Liebig, Stefan / May, Meike / Sauer, Carsten / Schneider, Simone / Valet, Peter (2012): Inequality Preferences in Interviewer- and Self-Administered Interviews, SFB 882 Working Paper Series, No. 10, DFG Research Center (SFB) 882 From Heterogeneities to Inequalities, Research Project A6, Bielefeld.