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Appendix I: Quantitative Analysis

1. The TIES Survey

The TIES Survey was initiated within the framework of an international project called TIES Research. The aim of the TIES survey was to gather statistically representative information on various topics, including the parental background, education, labour market attainment, marriage patterns, identity, religious affiliation and neighbourhood attachment of native-born descendants of immigrants from Turkey, Morocco and former-Yugoslavia in fifteen cities (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Brussels, Antwerp, Paris, Strasbourg, Barcelona, Madrid, Basel, Zurich, Linz, Vienna, Berlin, Frankfurt and Stockholm) across eight countries (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012). As a result, the same survey questionnaire, with slight country-specific differences, was conducted in distinct settings to enable the collection of robust comparative data on the descendants of immigrants in Europe. The current study utilized a subset of the TIES data for Amsterdam and Strasbourg focusing on the descendants of immigrants from Turkey and a comparison group.

2. Sampling Frames

In order to collect representative data from the descendants of immigrants in the given cities, the TIES survey developed an adequate sampling strategy (Schnell, 2012). In fact, the sampling strategy faced issues of accessing readily available sampling frames from population registers, the high concentration of immigrants and their descendants in certain regions and neighbourhoods of the cities, and the problem of focusing on a minority group within the wider population (Groenewold, 2008, Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012). Furthermore, due to the comparative nature of the survey, all three issues were faced to different extents in different cities. As a result Amsterdam and Strasbourg had slightly varied sampling frames.

*Amsterdam Sampling Frame*

The ideal way to sample was envisaged to access up-to-date population registers which would provide information on the age, sex, date of birth and birth place of respondents, as well as their parents’ place of birth. In the Netherlands, this information was readily available in the municipal population register (GBA), which provided the most accurate information available parents (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012). In Amsterdam, both the descendants of immigrants from Turkey and the comparison group were sampled from the same neighbourhoods. The target group was aged 18-35, and a total of 237 native born descendants of Turkish immigrants, 242 native born descendants of Moroccan immigrants and 259 respondents from the comparison group were interviewed. The response rate for
the descendants of Turkish immigrants was 29.9% and for the comparison group was 40.1%. Groenewold and his colleagues in NIDI (Nederlands Interdisciplinair Demografisch Instituut) examined selection bias using the personal records of municipal registry and concluded that the non-response bias was slight with regards to the characteristics compared (Groenewold, 2008).

**Strasbourg Sampling Frame**

In France, the sampling process proved more difficult as the information to identify the respondents was missing from the population register since the municipalities did not register the country of birth of the parents (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012). The French team at INED (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques) developed an alternative strategy to construct a frame of names and addresses of descendants of immigrants using phone books in Paris and Strasbourg (Milewski and Hamel, 2010). Applying onomastic identification procedures, they identified 2,745 names as Turkish in Strasbourg, and these names were then organized according to postcodes. Next, the postal code areas were selected with probabilities proportional to the residents registered with Turkish names. A screening was then conducted using questionnaires to recruit eligible respondents from the initial sample. The questionnaire included basic information such as age, sex, individual and parents’ country of birth to control whether the respondents met the criteria of the survey targets. If they did not, they were asked whether they had a family member living in the household who would fit the criteria as a native-born descendant of Turkish immigrant. The comparison group was randomly selected using a similar technique. After this lengthy period of sampling, a total of 252 interviews with descendants of immigrants from Turkey and 177 interviews with the comparison group were conducted. In the first stage, the response rate was 25% for the descendants of Turkish immigrants and 37% for the comparison group. However, this number of respondents was too low so the data collection entered a second stage.

One issue with regard to the sampling frame in France was the potential bias in selecting “Turkish sounding names”. It was argued that this strategy would miss young women who might have married a French partner or who had French fathers. However, considering the low rate of mixed marriage among Turkish immigrants and their descendants in France (Milewski and Hamel, 2010), this was not considered to present a high risk to sampling integrity. Nevertheless, in the first stage of screening, the French team inquired whether the respondents had any female family members who had married a non-Turkish person and left the household, and, if there were, this person was included in the sample (Milewski and Hamel, 2010).

In both settings, the interviews were conducted face-to-a-face with the respondents. The potential language barrier was dealt with using bilingual interviewers (Groenewold and Lessard-Phillips, 2012). In the Netherlands, the
fieldwork began in 2006 and lasted nearly 14 months (Groenewold, 2008). In France, the first round of fieldwork was conducted in 2007, and, when both rounds are considered, in total the fieldwork took five-and-a-half months (Schnell, 2012). This short review shows that the TIES survey has accomplished the collection of an invaluable body of data despite the various difficulties in sampling and data collection. Recent publications using the TIES Survey also provide further detailed information on the methodology (Crul and Heering, 2008, Crul et al., 2012, Huschek, 2011, Schnell, 2012).