MPRA

The socio-cultural integration of immigrants in Germany: changes across generations

Giovanis, Eleftherios and Akdede, Sacit Hadi

Izmir Bakircay University, Izmir, Turkey

14 December 2022

The socio-cultural integration of immigrants in Germany: Changes across generations

Eleftherios Giovanis[1]
Izmir Bakircay University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of International Trade and Business, Menemen, İzmir, Turkey
giovanis95@gmail.com and eleftherios.giovanis@bakircay.edu.tr

Sacit Hadi Akdede
Izmir Bakircay University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences
Department of Economics, Menemen, İzmir, Turkey
sacithadi.akdede@bakircay.edu.tr

Abstract

Previous studies have used language proficiency, citizenship, labour indicators, educational outcomes, and political rights as measures of migrants' socio-cultural integration. However, little is known about the migrants' participation in volunteering activities, music concerts, theatrical plays, and artistic activities, among others, and how this is compared to the participation of natives, defined as people of German descent and born in Germany. The study aims to investigate and compare the cultural and social involvement between migrants and natives. The analysis relies on information from the German Socio-Economic Panel Survey (GSOEP). Panel data models, in particular, the random-effects ordered Logit model, are utilised because the investigated outcomes are recorded in frequency and are ordered variables. We compare the participation in socio-cultural activities among immigrants of the first, second, and 2.5 generations. Our findings indicate that first-generation immigrants are less likely to engage in various socio-cultural activities. However, the 2.5 generation immigrants are more active than the native population, as this generation of immigrants participates more frequently. The findings highlight the importance of fostering interaction between natives and immigrants in the workplace and the social and cultural realms. Participation in social and cultural activities may increase intercultural awareness and contribute to the eradication of bias and prejudice.

Keywords: International Migration; First and Second-Generation Immigrants; Panel Data; Socio-Cultural Participation

1. Introduction

The main logic and argument of the contemporary international migration movements, especially towards the Western developed countries, is the economic advantages associated with them and the migrants' expectations of social promotion in the destination country. Therefore, since the motivation for migration is an improvement in living standards in terms of monetary value, the cultural prospects tend to be secondary to the immigrants (Okólski, 2006; Aksoy and Poutvaara, 2019). In other words, the migration movements are determined by the economic motivation that will bring economic power and privilege in the future, even though numerous migrants have been escaping violent conflicts over the last years, and there is little room for cultural autonomy and enhancement in these movements. Hence, international migration should be interpreted in both contexts of economic aspirations and current cultural features, as the decision to migrate to any place can be culturally very different from the origin country.

This study is motivated by the fact that researchers have paid less attention to an essential and significant aspect of human socialisation and integration: the extent to which migrants participate in various social and cultural activities in host societies. With the inclusion of the commitment to "leave no one behind" in the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, migrant integration has assumed a central position on the global agenda. Increased interest in immigrant integration highlights the need for additional research.

The International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines *integration* as a two-way adaptation process by migrants and host communities. This definition includes the rights and responsibilities of both parties, access to the labour market and forms of services, and the identification and respect of a core set of values that bind native and migrant communities to a common goal. For example, social inclusion refers to migrants' full socio-cultural, economic, and political participation in host communities. Indicators of successful integration of migrants

include, among others, a decrease in the wage gap, and an improvement in living standards, education, employment, health, and social inclusion. Consequently, while integration in the civic, political, and socio-economic spheres are important outcomes, the cultural participation of migrants is worthy of study because it may improve well-being and promote social inclusion (Birman, 2011; Algan et al., 2012; Docquier et al., 2014; Giovanis et al., 2021; Giovanis, 2021, 2022).

Few studies have looked into the role of various cultural and social activities in the integration process and well-being (Stodolska and Alexandris, 2004; Bertacchini et al., 2022; Berasategi Sancho et al., 2022). Furthermore, the empirical analysis in numerous studies relies on cross-sectional data, while we employ panel data to follow individuals across time. The sample size used in previous studies is small compared to the empirical work of this paper. Therefore, panel data contain more information and variability, improving the modelling. Furthermore, including area and time-fixed effects, regressions may eliminate unobserved area and time-constant heterogeneity that could otherwise cause a measurement error and confounding bias (Vidal and Lersch, 2021). Nevertheless, still, panel data cannot account for time-varying unobserved heterogeneity.

Another advantage of the panel data is that, as mentioned earlier, the regressions may control for unobserved area characteristics, such as migration diaspora. In particular, North-Western European countries have witnessed large migration flows since World War II from Southern and Eastern European countries and, until recently, from non-European countries. Nevertheless, the patterns of migration flows and dynamics of diaspora vary by area within the host countries. A typical example is Germany, where most newcomers migrate to South Germany and Bavaria (Tanis, 2018). The spatial differentiation of population migration may highlight regional differences in the patterns of settlements of migrants, economic levels and related employment opportunities. Thus, these migration patterns in certain ethnic settlements may affect the labour market opportunities and socio-cultural participation outcomes (Beine et al., 2011; Prinz, 2019;

Smith et al., 2019). Moreover, the survey employed in the analysis follows individuals over a long period, including those who have abandoned the original households or have created new household samples. Also, it allows us to account for a diverse set of dynamics at the individual and household level, including educational attainment, employment status, and changes in family arrangements that may be associated with social and cultural participation.

This study aims to contribute to the existing body of knowledge by identifying and investigating 2.5 and second-generation immigrants. Specifically, 2.5-generation immigrants are individuals born in the host country and have one immigrant parent. Second-generation migrants are those who were born to immigrants in the host country.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Participation in socio-cultural activities

Because of the increasing numbers of immigrants, the weight of research on migrant integration is growing (Heath et al., 2008; Giovanis et al., 2021). Given the substantial socio-cultural and political disparities in European societies, bringing the national environment as a significant factor in integration was an essential contribution to the international theoretical debate on migrants' integration. These findings have shown substantive differences in social, economic and cultural integration in various European countries of similar migrant groups due in part to differences in integration policies, labour market opportunities and educational attainment (Doomernik, 1998; Thomson and Crul, 2007; Farashah and Blomquist, 2021; Hsieh, 2021).

As the younger generations reach adulthood and the economic, institutional and social contexts change, studies exploring more thoroughly relevant background factors (Dustmann et al., 2012; Li and Heath, 2016) provide a better understanding of how minority groups grow. According to Berry (1997, 2001), acculturation is the socio-cultural transition process where immigrants may decide

how important it is to preserve their cultural identity and to build and maintain ties with natives and members from other ethnic groups. Acculturation, in particular, is the dual process of psychological, social, and cultural change involving various forms of reciprocal accommodation among cultural groups and their members. Thus, one of the primary goals of this research is to delve more into the socio-cultural participation of the second and 2.5 generations of immigrants in Germany.

The length of years staying in the host society may influence perceived differences in socio-cultural integration between different generations of immigrants (Rick and Forward, 1992). From birth, childhood, through school, neighbourhood and the workplace during adulthood, the 2.5 and second-generation immigrants are exposed to the host countries' social norms and cultural values (Milewski, 2007; Washbrook et al., 2019). However, first-generation immigrants are exposed to those norms and attitudes at a later stage of their life. Nevertheless, the host country's residence length can be linked to the socio-cultural integration of first-generation immigrants.

Previous studies examined the determinants of socio-cultural participation, suggesting that income and individual and parental education are key factors. Nonetheless, these studies do not compare the attendance between natives and immigrants, and most of them explore institutional and economic outcomes as integration measures, including language, religion, fertility choices and employment (Ateca-Amestoy, 2008; Dustmann et al., 2012; Fleischmann and Phalet, 2012; Martinovic et al., 2015; Falk and Katz-Gerro, 2016; Wrobel, 2021).

2.2 Hypotheses

A research question is how the migrants' integration into the new society affects their cultural consumption patterns. Participation in socio-cultural activities, like other sorts of migrants' behaviour and choices, can be viewed as the result of cultural integration processes. International migration, in particular, can be linked to a radical shift in the socio-cultural environment, where

variations in consumption patterns cause changes in social behaviours. Consequently, integration into the new society depends on the migrants' level of exposure to the new environment, as well as on the new social structure. We expect that more excellent social and economic integration results in improved educational attainment and income, employment opportunities, and enhanced living standards, positively impacting social and cultural participation.

The regressions control for various individual and household demographic and socio-economic characteristics. In his groundbreaking work, Bourdieu (1984, 1987) contends that social class and cultural consumption are inextricably linked. Different social classes utilise cultural preferences and practices to differentiate themselves, recognise peers, and reproduce their economic, political and cultural privileges. Therefore, members of the social elite, such as the well-educated, and the wealthy, participate more in highbrow cultural activities, such as attending live performances of opera and classical music, theatrical plays, and practising arts, than members of other social groups. According to previous research studies, we expect that first-generation immigrants engage less in social and cultural activities (Van Tubergen and Sindradottir, 2011; Martinovic et al., 2015; Bertacchini et al., 2022). The main reason is that pre-migration determinants such as language, feelings of belonging, social and cultural values and habits differ between migrants and natives. Moreover, previous studies show that the intention to stay, length of residence, and demographic and socio-economic factors, including income, educational attainment and employment tend to narrow the inequalities of participation in social and cultural activities. Therefore, based on the discussion so far, we test hypothesis I.

Hypothesis I: First-generation immigrants participate in socio-cultural activities less frequently than natives.

In migration research, there is a common expectation that the second and 2.5 generations of immigrants in Europe will be better adapted and integrated into the different domains of the host countries than the first generation. It is also assumed that these generations are in the process of

achieving equality with the native population, a process that would lead to the complete integration of future generations. Dennis et al. (2016) argue that compared to the first and second generations, migrants from the 2.5 generation report higher levels of integration, cultural orientation to the native's values, and identity to their ethnic origins.

Due to socialisation at school, second and 2.5-generation migrants learn the host society's language and social attitudes. Socially and emotionally, friends and peers take on more significance during this period, romantic interests start to take shape, and adolescents have to make crucial decisions about how to navigate different social circles and build their networks of connections. They begin to think about their future careers and develop aspirations. However, this may vary across different generations of migrants, especially for the second generation whose parents are both foreign-born. More specifically, migrants of this generation may not experience the integration process as natural, which is considerably more complicated since they absorb their heritage culture at home and family while being socialised in the host country's schools. Moreover, according to the acculturation theory (Berry, 1997, 2001), distinct ethnic groups may experience different intergenerational trajectories, and integration rates may vary along several dimensions as well, such as integration in occupational and residential spheres, social behaviour and cultural attitudes. Hence, the other two hypotheses tested are:

Hypothesis II: Second-generation immigrants' participation in socio-cultural activities depends on the degree of their exposure to the socio-economics and socio-cultural norms of the host country.

Hypothesis III: Migrants from the 2.5 generation are more likely to participate in socio-cultural activities at a similar frequency to natives.

2.5-generation immigrants are more likely to integrate into the host country's social and cultural values within the family than first and second-generation immigrants (İnal, 2014; Martinovic et al., 2015; Giovanis and Akdede, 2021). Sociologists assert that intermarriage occurs after

7

structural acculturation, indicating a high level of integration of a minority group into the culture of the majority group (Berry, 1997; Lee and Bean, 2010; Huschek et al., 2012). Therefore, 2.5-generation immigrants are more likely to adopt the cultural norms of their host country.

3. Data and Methodology

3.1 Data

The empirical research relies on the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP). This survey began in West Germany in 1984 and is a large longitudinal dataset that is nationally representative. In 1990, the GSOEP was expanded to include the entirety of Germany. The survey provides an abundance of information regarding household and individual characteristics, such as demographics, earnings, education, marital status, and labour market factors (for a more detailed description, see Wagner et al., 2007; Goebel et al., 2019).

The analysis focuses on 1984-2017 based on the available data. Almost 68 per cent of the sample in the GSOEP are natives, 15 per cent are first-generation immigrants, 11 per cent are second-generation immigrants, and around 6 per cent are 2.5-generation immigrants. Based on the data available, the period covered for the outcomes explored includes 1990, 1995, 1998, 2003, 2008, 2013 and 2017. About the variables of *attending Theatre or Opera*; *attending Cinema*, *Classical Music, Jazz or Pop Concert*, *Voluntary Work* and being a *Member of a political party and/or Local community organisation*, the period of the analysis is every two years from 1984 to 2017, for instance in 1984, 1986 and so on. The last variable, which is *making arts*, is available in 2001, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2011, 2015 and 2017. Therefore, questions related to socio-cultural participation are not available every year in the GSOEP. Furthermore, this variable is very general and refers to various activities, such as performing in a theatrical play, painting and playing music.

The social and cultural activities distinguished by active and passive participation are briefly described in Table 1. As stated previously, direct participation is related to active participation. Examples include composing music, writing a novel, acting in a play, playing an instrument, drawing and painting, and creating artwork on a computer. Passive participation, on the other hand, entails only attendance, such as attending a concert or play or visiting cultural sites and museums.

Notably, volunteer work refers to participation in associations and social services, whereas another measure of socio-cultural integration employed in this study is membership in a political party or a local community organisation. Both indicators can be viewed as indicators of inclusion. These individuals must adhere to their host society's social norms and cultural values (Hanifi, 2013; Ndukwe, 2017). Therefore, many European nations have recognised the significance of volunteerism, participation in political parties, and membership in local community organisations as integration tools for migrants and have sought to promote these activities (Hanifi, 2013; Baert and Vujic, 2016; Ndukwe, 2017; Four elements, 2019).

(Insert Table 1)

3.2 *Measures and Methods of Analysis*

The regression model to be estimated is:

$$IN_{i,r,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 M_{i,r,t} + \beta' M \cdot \mathbf{Z}_{i,r,t} + \alpha_r + \theta_t + \varepsilon_{i,r,t} \tag{1}$$

In eq. (1), $IN_{i,r,t}$ is the dependent variable indicating the integration process for individual *i,* in location-area *r,* and time *t,* and it measures the frequency of attendance in social and cultural activities. *M* is a dummy variable taking a value of 1 for migrants and 0 for natives. As mentioned before in Table 1, the outcomes are measured on a scale from high to low participation Hence, a negative coefficient implies a higher degree of participation. Vector **Z** includes the individual and household characteristics mentioned in the previous section.

9

Furthermore, we include interaction terms between the dummy *M* and the control variables **Z** to compare the socio-cultural integration by demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Set α_r denotes the respondents' location-area fixed effects, which are 16 Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) 1 Level. Time-fixed effects are expressed by the set θ_t and $\varepsilon_{i,r,t}$ is the error term. As we discussed earlier, it is important to perform the analysis on different generations of migrants, as, for instance, second-generation migrants may experience liberal values from the media and their peers, but at the same time, they may also be exposed to conservative values by their ethnic communities and families (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Wimmer and Soehl, 2014).

Since the frequency of participation in social and cultural activities is measured on a scale ranging from daily to never, the Random-Effects Ordinal Logit Model is used (Avanath and Kleinbaum, 1997). Using random effects rather than fixed effects is justified because the variable of interest, migrant status, is time-invariant. Therefore, the coefficient in the fixed effects will drop, making it difficult to compare the frequency with which natives and migrants participate in social and cultural activities. While we provide detailed information about socio-cultural participation in Table 1, the variables are always ordered and expressed as the frequency of attendance, ranging from *every day/often and never*. Consequently, a negative estimated coefficient of the dummy variable M will indicate an increase in participation in the activities we investigate.

4. Results

4.1 First-generation migrants

In Table 2, we present estimates of the random effects of the Ordered Logit Model for first-generation immigrants, and in Table 3, we provide estimates for the second and 2.5-generation immigrants. Overall, we find that the participation rate of first-generation immigrants is lower than that of natives. Since the study aims to compare the participation of immigrants and natives in

10

social and cultural activities, we report the estimates for the control variables only for first-generation immigrants. This is because the final remarks for the 2.5 and second generation are identical. We report the demographic estimates for gender, age, and household size in panel B. We present the household income in panel C, whereas panel D provides the estimated coefficients for educational attainment. We show the estimates for marital status in panel E, and in panel F, the estimates for employment status.

We conclude that household income and higher education are two major factors that increase the participation of migrants, confirming the works of Bourdieu (1984, 1987), who argued that wealthier and more educated people participate more frequently. This finding is further supported by the employment status, as the employed participate more often in social and cultural activities than those who do not work. These results confirm the findings of the studies by Giovanis and Akdede (2021) and Bertacchini et al. (2022). Furthermore, students are more likely to participate, while the unemployed participate less frequently since this implies a lower household income. The definition of non-working here is those who are homemakers or family caregivers.

The results indicate that female migrants participate less frequently in most social and cultural activities, except for attending theatrical performances, classical music concerts, opera performances, and art-making. According to previous research, women are more likely to engage in "highbrow" activities such as attending theatrical performances (Christin, 2012; Bennett et al., 2013). The relationship between age and the frequency of participation in sociocultural activities is positive.

The household size is associated with a lower frequency of participation in socio-cultural activities, except classical music, theatre, and opera attendance. Singles and the divorced participate more frequently in cultural activities, such as attending music concerts and creating art, confirming earlier research (Davies, 2005). Overall, the results confirm the hypothesis I, which states that first-generation migrants engage in social and cultural activities less frequently than

natives. However, household income, educational attainment, and employment status are significant social and cultural engagement determinants.

When we consider the interaction effects as well, then we can consider the migrants and compare their participation among them. In particular, the main effects show the participation of natives. For instance, in the regression for the attendance at a classical musical concert, a theatrical play or an opera and panel B, we find that native females participate more than native males, and the estimated coefficient is -0.3946. As a reminder, a negative sign implies a lower participation frequency based on Table 1 and the description of the socio-cultural variables in the data section. We consider only this coefficient and not the interaction term *migrant × gender* since the dummy migrant *M* takes a value of 0 for native respondents, and thus, the interaction becomes 0. Considering the interaction effects, we can investigate the differences in the frequency of participation in socio-cultural activities among migrants and identify whether socio-economic factors play a significant role in their integration. Returning to the same regression of the attendance to a music concert, theatre or opera, we find the estimated coefficient of the interaction term *migrant × gender* equal at -0.3160, indicating that migrant females participate more frequently in the specific activity than male migrants do. We derive similar concluding remarks for the remaining demographic and socio-economic factors, and we find that wealthier, more educated, employed, and single migrants participate more frequently in social and cultural activities.

(Insert Table 2)

4.2 2.5 and second-generation migrants

12

Regarding the estimates for the 2.5-generation migrants, we find an insignificant coefficient in the dummy variable *M* (immigrants), implying that 2.5-generation immigrants integrate more into the host country. In panel B of Table 3, we report the estimated coefficients of second-generation immigrants. In this case, we observe similar patterns with first-generation immigrants, who are less likely to participate in cultural events.

The concluding remark from Table 3 is that 2.5 immigrants participate more frequently than second-generation immigrants. One explanation for the higher frequency of participation of 2.5-generation immigrants is that- like the second generation- does not directly encounter the challenges of migration, language barriers and difficulties of adjusting to new environments. Furthermore, 2.5-generation immigrants may outperform natives in education and economic outcomes (Smith et al., 2019), improving their social class and status, which in turn increases their participation in "highbrow" activities (Bourdieu, 1984, 1987). Studies show that second-generation groups in the USA outperform native-born students (Chiswick and DebBurman, 2004), while those of Indian ancestry outperform native students in Norway, England and Wales (Heath and Brinbaum, 2007).

According to previous research, the bicultural path proposes that migrants' children can achieve upward mobility by identifying with the cultural and social values of the host societies while retaining their minority identification and utilising the resources given by their ethnic community. As a result, the 2.5 and second generations can integrate into society while keeping their ethnic identity (Portes and Zhou, 1993; Gouveia et al., 2005). Our results suggest that 2.5-generation immigrants may integrate with the native Germans, but this is not the case for the second generation. We report only the estimated coefficient of the dummy variable M in regression (1) as the concluding remarks derived from the control variables remain similar to those found in Table 2 for first-generation immigrants. Thus, household income, employment and education are significant factors and are positively correlated with a higher frequency of participation.

(Insert Table 3)

4.3 Comparison between first, second and 2.5-generation migrants

In Germany, 2.5 and second-generation immigrants tend to participate in a broader range of socio-cultural activities than first-generation immigrants, indicating that these generations navigate two identities, the one of their home country and the one of their host country. In light of this dual sense of identity, second and 2.5-generation immigrants may be more inclined to engage in socio-cultural activities than their first-generation counterparts (Fernández-Kelly, 2010; Kasinitz, 2014). According to Berry's acculturation model, second and 2.5-generation immigrants born in the host country are more likely to assimilate with the host society's values. Specifically, first-generation migrants, who immigrated as adolescents or adults, may encounter language barriers and difficulties adopting the values and customs of the receiving communities.

We also depict this in Table 4 and panels A and B among first, second, and 2.5-generation immigrants. Specifically, in panel A, the variable first-generation migrant is the dummy variable M, as in regression (1), with a value of 1 if the respondent is a first-generation migrant and 0 otherwise. In panel B, we assign the dummy variable with the value of 1 for the initial generation and 0 for the 2.5-generation. The estimates confirm the findings of Tables 2 and 3, which indicate that first-generation migrants participate in fewer socio-cultural activities than German natives and consequently less frequently than second and third-generation migrants. This is also demonstrated by the fact that there are no differences between 2.5, second-generation migrants, and natives in Table 3. Second-generation migrants are less active than natives in all socio-cultural activities except participating in classical music, opera concerts, and theatrical performances. However, in that case, the size of the estimated coefficient is significantly smaller than in Table 2. Therefore,

this explains the findings in Table 4, where first-generation migrants are less active than the younger generations, which is consistent with the literature review discussed in the previous sections.

Concerning the 2.5 generation and the second generation, the results in panel C reveal an intriguing lack of difference in the frequency of socio-cultural participation, except for making art and voluntary work, in which the second-generation migrants are less active. Specifically, in the regressions, the dummy variable is assigned the value 1 for second-generation migrants and 0 for 2.5-generation migrants. In panel A of Table 3, we found no difference between natives and 2.5-generation migrants regarding the frequency of art production and volunteer work. In panel B of Table 3, second-generation migrants participate in these activities less frequently than natives. This result supports the findings in Table 4 panel C.

(Insert Table 4)

5. Discussion

Numerous factors contribute to social and political exclusion and economic deprivation. Legislation, democratic decision-making, social inclusion policies, and policies that increase participation in civil society are required for policymakers who want to promote integration. As mentioned earlier, most studies have focused on the economic and political integration of migrants. However, in this study, we attempted to extend the analysis to include the socio-cultural sphere and participation across various generations of migrants.

The study's findings have implications for scholars, governments and policymakers because social and economic factors, such as educational attainment and income, encourage migrants' integration. Therefore, policymakers should be aware that employment opportunities and

15

economic growth can attract immigrants and facilitate a more rapid and practical integration. Thus, the quality of life may encourage immigrants to remain in the country, enabling them to integrate into the economic, social, and cultural spheres and possibly experience greater levels of well-being (Giovanis et al., 2021).

The investigation of different generations of immigrants is critical since any debate related to the policy implementation aiming at successful and positive integration of the immigrants into the host country must focus on the impact of those policies on both natives' and migrants' well-being. Hence, analysing and comparing the socio-cultural participation between natives and immigrants and among migrant generations may provide insights to policymakers and ways to improve and promote effective integration programmes. Therefore, the findings may provide insights to policymakers about the dynamics of the intergenerational integration of migrants and help them design policies for multicultural integration, facilitating the bridging of cultural borders. Policies that may foster the ongoing development of cultures and identities can help overcome segregation by enabling the participation of all migrant generations in social, economic, cultural and political spheres.

Earlier studies have shown that apart from migration policies, other factors have played a substantial role in the integration and participation of the migrants in the host country, such as economic, ethnic and religious factors (Martiniello, 2006). Nevertheless, this does not necessarily imply that migration integration policies should be neglected. On the contrary, these should be promoted and emphasise the potential differentiated impacts these policies may have on diverse migrant groups. Hence, even though the study's aim was not the investigation of migration policies' effect on migrants' integration, future studies may explore and compare different policies in various countries. Moreover, successful policies that promote the migrants' participation in social and cultural activities may further affect their living standards and well-being (Schiele,

2020; Giovanis et al., 2021). Hence, this analysis may offer insights into whether migration policies in some countries are more successful or not compared to other countries.

6. Conclusion

The findings of this study suggest that first-generation immigrants participate less frequently in the socio-cultural activities explored, but no differences are identified when we consider the 2.5-generation immigrants. Acculturation is the social-cultural transition process where immigrants may decide how important it is to preserve their cultural identity and to build and maintain ties with natives and members from other ethnic groups. Thus, the analysis has distinguished first, second, and 2.5-generation immigrants to investigate whether there are differences between natives and immigrants but also to explore whether there are intergenerational gaps among immigrants in terms of their participation in socio-cultural activities.

However, this study is not without drawbacks and limitations. While our purpose was to fill gaps in the literature, more needs to be done to understand the ethnic and cultural differences among various migrant groups and generations across different countries. Thus, further investigation by migrant groups in a large sample of countries will provide valuable insights into the adaptation and integration of immigrants by different generations. Furthermore, the study has not explored the potential discrimination in the host countries that may make it difficult for the immigrants to integrate into various domains of integration, including education, economic, political, cultural and social norms of the host society. Proper socio-cultural integration initiatives, such as language courses, educational programmes, and socio-cultural events to promote interactions between migrants and natives may have great potential to promote further the

migrants' integration and improve the well-being of both natives and immigrants (Giovanis, 2021; Giovanis and Akdede, 2021).

Another major limitation of this study is that it has not explored the country of origin for the second and the 2.5-generation immigrants. This is especially important for the 2.5 generation, where the non-native parents could potentially share similar values with the native-born parents. For instance, an Austrian parent could be married to a German native. Therefore, a more in-depth investigation is required and explore whether intermarriages take place with people sharing very similar cultural values. Greek, Italian and Spanish immigrants in Germany rarely choose a wife from their country of origin, while in most cases, Spanish and Italian men are married to German wives (Kalter and Schroedter, 2010). However, due to space limitations, those topics are suggested for further investigation in future studies.

References

Aksoy, C.G. and Poutvaara, P. (2019), "Refugees and irregular migrants in Europe: Self-selection and sorting", Available at https://voxeu.org/article/self-selection-and-sorting-among-refugees-and-irregular-migrants-europe (Accessed on 12 June, 2020).

Algan, Y., Bisin, A., Manning, A. and Verdier, T. (2012), *Cultural integration of immigrants in Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK

Ateca-Amestoy, V. (2008), "Determining heterogeneous behavior for theater attendance", *Journal of Cultural Economic*s, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 127-151.

Avanath, C. V. and Kleinbaum, D. G. (1997), "Regression models for ordinal responses: A review of methods and applications", *International Journal of Epidemiology*, Vol. 26 No. 6, pp. 1323-1333.

Baert, S. and Vujic, S. (2016), "Immigrant volunteering: A way out of labour market discrimination?", *Economics Letters*, Vol. 146 No. 9, pp. 95-98.

Beine, M., Docquier, F. and Özden, Ç. (2011), "Diasporas", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 95 No. 1, pp. 30-41.

Bennett, T., Bustamante, M. and Frow, J. (2013), "The Australian space of lifestyles in comparative perspective", *Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 49 No. 2-3, pp. 224-255.

Berasategi Sancho, N., Roman Etxebarrieta, G., Alonso Saez, I. and Idoiaga Mondragon, N. (2022), "Leisure as a Space for Inclusion and the Improvement of Life Satisfaction of Immigrants", *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-021-00917-y.

Berry, J.W. (1997), "Immigration, Acculturation and Adaptation", *Applied Psychology International Review*, Vol. 46, No. 1, pp. 5- 34.

Berry, J. W. (2001), "A psychology of immigration", *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 57 No. 3, pp. 615-631.

Bertacchini, E., Venturini, A. and Zotti, R. (2022), "Drivers of cultural participation of immigrants: evidence from an Italian survey", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 57-100.

Birman, D. (2011), "Migration and well-being: Beyond the macrosystem", *Psychosocial Intervention*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 339-342.

Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1987), "What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups", *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 32, pp. 1-18.

Chiswick, B. R. and DebBurman, N. (2004), "Educational attainment: analysis by immigrant generation", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 361-379.

Christin, A. (2012), "Gender and highbrow cultural participation in the United States", *Poetics*, Vol. 40 No. 5, pp. 423-443.

Davies, S. (2005), "Still popular: Museums and their visitors 1994-2004", *Cultural Trends*, Vol. 14 No. 1, pp. 67-105.

Dennis, J. M., Fonseca, A. L., Gutierrez, G., Shen, J. and Salazar, S. (2016), "Bicultural competence and the Latino 2.5 generation: The acculturative advantages and challenges of having one foreign-born and one US-born parent", *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 341-359.

Docquier, F., Peri, G. and Ruyssen, I. (2014), "The Cross-Country Determinants of Potential and Actual Migration", *International Migration Review*, Vol. 48 No. s1, pp. S37-S99.

Doomernik, J. (1998), "The effectiveness of integration policies towards immigrants and their descendants in France, Germany and the Netherlands", International Migration Papers No. 27. Geneva: International Labour Organisation. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_protect/---protrav/---migrant/documents/publication/wcms_201974.pdf.

Dustmann, C., Frattini, T. and Lanzara, G. (2012), "Educational achievement of second-generation immigrants: an international comparison", *Economic Policy*, Vol. 27 No. 69, pp. 143-185.

Falk, M. and Katz-Gerro, T. (2016), "Cultural participation in Europe: Can we identify common determinants?" *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 127-162.

Farashah, A. D. and Blomquist, T. (2021), "Work experiences of qualified immigrants: a review of theoretical progress", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2016-0094.

Fernández-Kelly, P. (2010), "A Howl to the Heavens: Art in the Life of First- and Second-Generation Cuban Americans", In *Art in the Lives of Immigrant Communities in the United States* P. DiMaggio and P. Fernandez-Kelly (Eds.), (pp. 52-71). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Fleischmann, F. and Phalet, K. (2012), "Integration and religiosity among the Turkish second generation in Europe: a comparative analysis across four capital cities", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 320-341.

Four elements. (2019), "Guide for Migrant Volunteers: Introduction to Volunteerism and how to find a suitable volunteering opportunity". Four elements, Thessaloniki, Greece https://www.vai-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Guide_english-1.pdf

Giovanis, E. (2021), "Participation in socio-cultural activities and subjective well-being of natives and migrants: Evidence from Germany and the UK", *International Review of Economics*, Vol. 68 No. 4, pp. 423-463.

Giovanis, E. and Akdede, S. H. (2021), "Cultural participation in later life among older-aged immigrants in the Czech Republic", *Politická Ekonomie*, Vol. 2021 No. 2, pp. 193-226.

Giovanis, E., Akdede, S. H. and Ozdamar, O. (2021), "Impact of the EU Blue Card programme on cultural participation and subjective well-being of migrants in Germany", *PLOS One*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. e0253952.

Giovanis, E. (2022), "Impact of migration policies on socio-cultural participation and well-being: evidence from the Migration Act of 2000 in Germany", *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print, https://doi.org/10.1108/JEAS-01-2022-0014.

Goebel, J., Grabka, M. M., Liebig, S., Kroh, M., Richter, D., Schröder, C. and Schupp, J. (2019), "The German socio-economic panel (SOEP)", *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, Vol. 239 No. 2, pp. 345-360.

Gouveia, L., Carranza, M.A. and Cogua, J. (2005), "The Great Plains Migration: Mexicanos and Latinos in Nebraska", In *New Destinations: Mexican Immigration in the United States*. V. Zúñiga and R. Hernández-León, (Eds.), pp. 23-49. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Hanifi, R. (2013), "Voluntary work, informal help and trust: Changes in Finland", *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp. 32-46.

Heath A. and Brinbaum Y. (2007), "Explaining ethnic inequalities in educational attainment", *Ethnicities*. Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 291-305.

Heath, A. F., Rothon, C. and Kilpi, E. (2008), "The second generation in Western Europe: Education, unemployment, and occupational attainment", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 211-235.

Hsieh, Y. J. T. (2021), "Learning language and gaining employment: problems for refugee migrants in Australia", *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. Vol. 40 No. 8, pp. 1013-1031.

Huschek, D., de Valk, H. A. G. and Liefbroer, A. C. (2012), "Partner choice patterns among the descendants of Turkish immigrants in Europe", *European Journal of Population*, Vol. 28 No. 3, pp. 241-268.

İnal, K. (2014), "Cultural Integration of Turkish Immigrant Workers' Children into the Host Society: An Intergenerational Comparison in the Context of France and Germany", *Akdeniz Iletisim*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 75-94.

IOM (2017), "Integration and Social Cohesion: KeyElements for Reaping the Benefits of Migration. Global Compact Thematic Paper: Integration and Social Cohesion", International Organization for Migration. Available at https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ODG/GCM/IOM-Thematic-Paper-Integration-and-Social-Cohesion.pdf.

Kalter, F. and Schroedter, J. H. (2010), "Transnational marriage among former labour migrants in Germany", *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 11-36.

Kasinitz, P. (2014), Immigrants, the Arts, and the "Second-Generation Advantage" in New York. In *New York and Amsterdam: Immigration and the New Urban Landscape,* N. Foner, J. Rath, J. W. Duyvendak and R. Reekum (Eds.), (pp. 263-286). New York: New York University Press.

Laurentsyeva, N. and Venturini, A. (2017), "The social integration of immigrants and the role of policy–A literature review", *Intereconomics*, Vol. 52 No. 5, pp. 285-292.

Lee, J. and Bean, F. D. (2010), *The diversity paradox: Immigration and the color lines in 21st century America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Li, Y. and Heath, A. (2016), "Class matters: A study of minority and majority social mobility in Britain, 1982-2011", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 122 No. 1, pp. 162-200.

Martiniello, M. (2006), "Towards a coherent approach to immigrant integration policy(ies) in the European Union. Intensive Programme: Theories of International Migration", https://www.oecd.org/dev/38295165.pdf. OECD, Paris, France.

Martinovic, B., van Tubergen, F. and Maas, I. (2015), "A longitudinal study of interethnic contacts in Germany: Estimates from a multilevel growth curve model", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 41 No. 1, pp. 83-100.

Milewski, N. (2007), "First child of immigrant workers and their descendants in West Germany: Interrelation of events, disruption, or adaptation?" *Demographic Research*, Vol. 17 No. 29, pp. 859-896.

Ndukwe, T. C. (2017), "African immigrants in Finland in onward translocal and transnational mobility and migration, and the political implications", *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 115-142.

Okólski, M. (2006), "Costs and benefits of migration for Central European countries", Centre of Migration Research Working Paper. Warsaw: Warsaw University, Poland http://www.migracje.uw.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/007_65-1.pdf.

Portes, A., Zhou, M. (1993), "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants", *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 530 No. 1, pp. 74-96.

Prinz, A. (2019), "Migration, cultural identity and diasporas an identity economics approach", *IZA Journal of Development and Migration*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 1-20.

Rick, K. and Forward, J. (1992), "Acculturation and perceived intergenerational differences among Hmong youth", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 85-94.

Schiele, M. (2020), "Life satisfaction and return migration: analysing the role of life satisfaction for migrant return intentions in Germany", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 110-129.

Smith, R., Spaaij, R. and McDonald, B. (2019), "Migrant integration and cultural capital in the context of sport and physical activity: A systematic review", *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 851-868.

Stodolska, M., and Alexandris, K. (2004), "The role of recreational sport in the adaptation of first generation immigrants in the United States", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 379-413.

Tanis, K. (2018), "Regional distribution and location choices of immigrants in Germany", *Regional Studies*, Vol. 54 No. 4, pp. 483-494.

Thomson, M. and Crul, M. (2007), "The second generation in Europe and the United States: How is the transatlantic debate relevant for further research on the European second generation?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 33 No. 7, pp. 1025-1041.

Van Tubergen, F. and Sindradottir, J. I. (2011), "The religiosity of immigrants in Europe: A cross-national study", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 272-288.

Vidal, S. and Lersch, P. M. (2021), "Panel Data in Research on Mobility and Migration: A Review of Recent Advances", *Comparative Population Studies*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 187-214.

Wagner, G. G., Frick, J. R. and Schupp, J. (2007), "The German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP): Scope, Evolution and Enhancements", SOEP papers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research No. 1. DIW Berlin, The German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). *Berlin, Germany.*

Washbrook, E., Waldfogel, J., Bradbury, B., Corak, M. and Ghanghro, A. A. (2012), "The development of young children of immigrants in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States", *Child Development*, Vol. 83 No. 5, pp. 1591-1607.

Wimmer, A. and Soehl, T. (2014), "Blocked acculturation: Cultural heterodoxy among Europe's immigrants", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 120 No. 1, pp. 146-186.

Wrobel, M. (2021), "Determinants of successful labour market integration as exemplified by the German Green Card programme", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vo. 47 No. 17, pp. 4135-4154.

Table 1. Socio-Cultural activities

Variables-Outcomes	Description-Scale of Measure
Attending (Passive participation): Attending Classical Music Performance, Theatre or Opera; Attending Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	These questions include frequency of attendance asking on "How often they participate in those activities and the possible answers are: Every day; At least once a week; At least once a Month; Rare and Never. The variables related to attendance to **classical music performance, theatre or opera**; attendance **to Cinema**, **Jazz or Pop concert** answer to the following: Every Week; Every Month; Rare and Never
Doing (Active participation): Making art; Member of a political party and/or Local community organization	These questions include frequency of doing and practicing and not on passive attendance. The answer as before in the following: Every day; At least once a week; At least once a Month; Rare and Never. The variables **Making Arts**; **Voluntary Work**; **Member of a political party** and answer to: Every Week; Every Month; Rare and Never

Table 2. Estimates for First Generation Immigrants in Germany

	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
Panel A: Migrant Status					
Immigrant	0.8855***	0.8430***	0.7708***	1.4857***	0.7938***
	(0.0286)	(0.0269)	(0.0362)	(0.0363)	(0.0492)
Panel B: Demographics					
Gender (Female)	-0.3946***	0.2012***	-0.5951***	0.2851***	0.5261***
	(0.0206)	(0.0202)	(0.0245)	(0.0235)	(0.0322)
Migrant *x* Gender (Female)	-0.3160***	0.2243***	-0.4016***	0.1213**	0.3463***
	(0.0433)	(0.0426)	(0.0547)	(0.0551)	(0.0806)
Age	-0.0644***	-0.0602**	-0.0615***	-0.0743***	-0.0748***
	(0.0072)	(0.0032)	(0.0045)	(0.0041)	(0.0062)
Migrant *x* Age	-0.0377***	0.0334***	-0.0490***	-0.0307***	0.0382**
	(0.0087)	(0.0092)	(0.0129)	(0.0113)	(0.0177)
Household Size	-0.0612***	0.0403***	0.0707***	0.0594***	0.0782***
	(0.0142)	(0.0142)	(0.0217)	(0.0175)	(0.0276)
Panel C: Income					
Logarithm of Household Income	-0.7283***	-0.6323***	-0.4525***	-0.1766***	-0.0359**
	(0.0170)	(0.0166)	(0.0207)	(0.0190)	(0.0166)
Migrant *x* Logarithm of Household Income	-0.0757*	-0.0934**	-0.1939***	0.0289	-0.2029***
	(0.0409)	(0.0407)	(0.0554)	(0.0512)	(0.0283)
Panel D: Education (Reference category- In school)					
Incomplete	1.1355***	0.6935***	1.7380***	1.1915***	1.2245***
	(0.0927)	(0.0873)	(0.1367)	(0.1177)	(0.2088)
Elementary School	0.6076***	0.1555***	1.1239***	0.5120***	0.3897***
	(0.0495)	(0.0470)	(0.0629)	(0.0562)	(0.0947)
Middle Vocational	0.0378	-0.1131**	0.5866***	0.2761***	0.0991
	(0.0464)	(0.0439)	(0.0562)	(0.0521)	(0.0882)
High School	-0.5540***	-0.3822***	-0.0298	-0.0457	-0.0608
	(0.0574)	(0.0548)	(0.0694)	(0.0642)	(0.1051)
Higher vocational school	-0.4453***	-0.3067***	-0.7134***	-0.2086***	-0.3755***
	(0.0568)	(0.0545)	(0.0718)	(0.0632)	(0.1007)
University and Higher	-1.2037***	-0.4749***	-0.9077***	-0.3388***	-0.6990***
	(0.0514)	(0.0491)	(0.0617)	(0.0572)	(0.0933)
Incomplete	0.8122***	0.9616***	1.3631***	0.2761	0.1614
	(0.1398)	(0.1370)	(0.2028)	(0.1870)	(0.3068)
Migrant *x* Elementary School	0.5704***	0.5175***	0.7799***	0.2191	0.0497
	(0.1315)	(0.1269)	(0.1712)	(0.1764)	(0.2914)
Migrant *x* Middle Vocational	-0.0639	0.0424	0.1252	0.0423	-0.1058
	(0.1297)	(0.1251)	(0.1654)	(0.1739)	(0.2872)
Migrant *x* High School	-0.3040**	-0.0592	-0.1758	0.0664	-0.2292
	(0.1398)	(0.1354)	(0.1803)	(0.1870)	(0.3063)
Migrant *x* Higher vocational school	-0.8456***	-0.6171***	-0.9782***	-0.7297***	-0.7029**
	(0.1624)	(0.1588)	(0.2157)	(0.2090)	(0.3339)
Migrant *x* University and Higher	-1.592***	-0.6034***	-1.1690***	-0.6375***	-0.8828***
	(0.1368)	(0.1324)	(0.1734)	(0.1817)	(0.2970)

Table 2 (Cont.) Estimates for First Generation Immigrants in Germany

	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
Panel E: Marital Status (Reference category-Married)					
Single	-0.7180*** (0.0275)	-1.0256*** (0.0268)	-0.1884*** (0.0361)	-0.0660** (0.0313)	-0.2411*** (0.0973)
Divorced	-0.1658*** (0.0322)	-0.5281*** (0.0315)	-0.0671** (0.0328)	0.2695*** (0.0381)	0.1394** (0.0568)
Widowed	0.0250 (0.0416)	0.1996*** (0.0456)	0.3771*** (0.0577)	0.0144 (0.0500)	0.2511*** (0.0745)
Migrant x Single	-0.9449*** (0.0592)	-1.6605*** (0.0575)	-0.5222*** (0.0797)	-0.2825*** (0.0766)	-0.2526** (0.1207)
Migrant x Divorced	-0.2077*** (0.0799)	-0.6219*** (0.0787)	-0.2824*** (0.1010)	0.2306** (0.1081)	-0.0199 (0.1648)
Migrant x Widowed	-0.1076 (0.1091)	-0.0201 (0.1232)	0.2980* (0.1613)	-0.0104 (0.1489)	0.1919 (0.2276)
Panel F: Job Status (Reference Category-Non-Working)					
Unemployed	0.3945*** (0.0384)	0.1164*** (0.0378)	0.2948*** (0.0533)	0.2608*** (0.0463)	0.1221* (0.0735)
Student	-0.8659*** (0.0454)	-0.6074*** (0.0441)	-0.5825*** (0.0593)	-0.2531*** (0.0515)	-0.4851*** (0.0836)
Retired	-0.1539*** (0.0358)	0.1670*** (0.0387)	0.1367*** (0.0482)	-0.0764* (0.0422)	0.0157 (0.0623)
Employed	-0.0704*** (0.0254)	-0.4042*** (0.0261)	0.2021*** (0.0359)	-0.0243 (0.0292)	-0.1162** (0.0449)
Migrant x Unemployed	0.1699** (0.0655)	-0.1474** (0.0668)	-0.1087 (0.0975)	0.1260 (0.0904)	0.1306 (0.1475)
Migrant x Student	-0.7343*** (0.1060)	-0.6920*** (0.1038)	-0.7315*** (0.1647)	-0.3109** (0.1410)	-0.4883** (0.2209)
Migrant x Retired	-0.2396*** (0.0853)	-0.1358 (0.0984)	0.2069 (0.1301)	-0.0236 (0.1171)	-0.0023 (0.1814)
Migrant x Employed	-0.2331*** (0.0481)	-0.6100*** (0.0503)	-0.0437 (0.0643)	-0.1850*** (0.0648)	-0.0086 (0.1038)
No. Observations	188,301	183,969	126,338	187,846	187,645
Wald Chi-Square	32,453.23 [0.000]	30,678.81 [0.000]	6,043.06 [0.000]	16,732.84 [0.000]	15,410.74 [0.000]

Robust standard errors within brackets. P-values within square brackets. ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1%, 5% and 10% level. All regressions are estimated with the Random Effects Ordered Logit Model as the dependent variables are frequency-ordered described in Table 1.

Table 3. Estimates for Natives, 2.5 and Second-Generation Immigrants in Germany

Panel A: 2.5-Generation Immigrants	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making Art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
Immigrant	0.0396 (0.0417)	0.1113 (0.0887)	-0.0609 (0.0506)	0.8916 (0.6882)	1.0582 (0.9947)
No. Observations	165,705	162,234	112,979	165,334	165,126
Wald Chi-Square	24,825.48 [0.000]	27,296.96 [0.000]	4,902.70 [0.000]	14,822.16 [0.000]	13,878.11 [0.000]
Panel B: Second-Generation Immigrants	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making Art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
Immigrant	-0.0239 (0.0331)	0.1005*** (0.0306)	0.1161*** O(0.0397)	0.3557*** (0.0393)	0.1839*** (0.0511)
No. Observations	178,975	175,443	123,914	178,574	178,338
Wald Chi-Square	25,643.55 [0.000]	29,119.05 [0.000]	5,065.96 [0.000]	13,033.91 [0.000]	14,206.34 [0.000]

Robust standard errors within brackets. P-values within square brackets. *** indicates significance at 1% level.

Table 4. Estimates for First, Second and 2.5-Generation Immigrants in Germany

Panel A: First versus Second-Generation Immigrants	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making Art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
First Generation Immigrant	0.8388*** (0.0409)	0.6225*** (0.0393)	0.5460*** (0.0502)	0.9407*** (0.0513)	0.6133*** (0.0707)
No. Observations	60,234	58,780	41,190	60,034	59,985
Wald Chi-Square	11,885.26 [0.000]	8,600.58 [0.000]	2,013.63 [0.000]	5,525.17 [0.000]	4,288.04 [0.000]
Panel B: First versus 2.5-Generation Immigrants	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making Art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
First Generation Immigrant	0.7115*** (0.0462)	0.5338*** (0.0449)	0.7040*** (0.0586)	1.1100*** (0.0582)	0.6827*** (0.0791)
No. Observations	46,964	45,571	30,255	46,794	46,773
Wald Chi-Square	9,926.63 [0.000]	7,080.78 [0.000]	1,898.78 [0.000]	4,950.22 [0.000]	3,477.44 [0.000]
Panel C: Second versus 2.5-Generation Immigrants	DV: Classical Music/Theatre/ Opera	DV: Cinema, Jazz or Pop Concert	DV: Making Art	DV: Voluntary Work	DV: Member of a political party
Second generation Immigrant	-0.0055 (0.0498)	-0.0193 (0.0479)	0.1960*** (0.0617)	0.2482*** (0.0624)	0.1032 (0.0781)
No. Observations	37,638	37,045	27,831	37,522	37,466
Wald Chi-Square	4,397.41 [0.000]	6,070.58 [0.000]	1,056.85 [0.000]	2,447.75 [0.000]	2,566.91 [0.000]

Robust standard errors within brackets. P-values within square brackets. *** indicates significance at 1% level.