

PREFERENCES OF IMMIGRANTS ON IMMIGRATION: CONVERGENCE OR PERSISTENCE? EVIDENCE FROM THE EUROPEAN SOCIAL SURVEY

Fausto GALLI¹, Giuseppe RUSSO²

DOI: 10.2478/tjeb-2023-0003

This article studies the immigrants' attitude towards immigration with special emphasis on the transition from the first to the second and the 1.5 generations. We use European Social Survey (ESS) data for the 2002-2020 period, which include many questions that allowed us to estimate the preferences of immigrants on economic, social and cultural consequences of immigration. As general evidence, we find that immigrants of all the considered generations show more favor to immigration than natives. Besides, our results reveal that the gap with the natives shows a remarkable degree of persistence through generations for many of the indicators we analyzed. We also observe that the opinions of individuals who immigrated during childhood (generation 1.5) look not different from second-generation immigrants. For what concerns the main determinants of the support of immigrants for immigration, our results suggest that citizenship and age have a negative impact, whereas religiosity, education level and the feeling of being discriminated have a positive one. These results are generally consistent with the previous literature. Finally, ESS data allowed us to investigate an effect of intergenerational ongoing migration. We considered migrants born to fathers who were first generation migrants. These individuals are second generation in the origin country, and first generation in the destination country. Their favor for further inflows of migrants is still higher compared to the natives of destination countries, but lower compared to migrants of the same origin who were not born to immigrant fathers.

Keywords: Immigrants, Immigrant integration, Attitudes/View towards immigration, IntraEU migration

JEL Classification: J11, J61, Z13

¹ University of Salerno and CELPE

² University of Salerno, CSEF and GLO

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

1. Introduction

A vast literature deals with the attitudes of natives toward immigration (see, for instance, Mayda, 2006; Hainmueller & Hangartner 2013; Hainmueller & Hiscox, 2007, Hainmueller & Hopkins, 2014). However, we still know relatively little about the immigrants' own view about immigration. The expanding share of immigrants in the population (about 12% in the US, and 6.5% in the EU) (Trevelyan et al., (2016); Eurostat, (2014), has made this issue relevant not only in traditional destination countries, but also in a growing number of new destinations. Thus, knowing the immigrants' attitudes about immigration is interesting not only because eventually they will be enfranchised with voting rights, but also because their opinion is an outcome of their interaction with the receiving society.

The literature has identified different channels through which immigrants' preferences over immigration are shaped (see, for instance, Braakmann, Waqas and Wildman, 2017). Economic concerns can have ambiguous effects. On the one hand, increased economic activity due to immigration may lead to generalized benefits. On the other hand, inflows of workers may increase the competition in the labor market.

Similarly, socio-cultural concerns offer reasons both to support and to oppose further immigration (respectively, the widening of the network in the culture of origin and the fear of being discriminated against by the natives). The net effect is in principle undetermined, and identifying the final result is an empirical matter. In addition, preferences may change over time and generations. Though there exists evidence about immigrants' preferences over immigration, little is known about the persistence and the intergenerational transmission of this peculiar behavioral trait. Here, we contribute to fill the gap in the literature.

Most of the research concerning the attitudes of immigrants towards immigration covers the US (see, for example, Binder, Polinard & Wrinkle, 1997; Hood, Morris & Shirkey, 1997; Polinard, Wrinkle & de la Garza, 1984). The literature concerning Europe is less developed, albeit some contributions have been recently proposed. For instance, Just and Anderson (2015) analyze data on the first 5 waves of the European Social Survey (2002-2011) in 18 West European democracies, finding that immigrants support immigration more than natives, but the acquisition of the host country citizenship can be associated with a reduction in the support for immigration.

As for the UK, Braakmann, Waqas and Wildman (2017) use the 2007-2010 Citizenship Survey to investigate the thoughts of immigrants regarding immigration and compare them with those of natives. Results show as well that immigrants tend to favor immigration more than natives, but those who have been in the UK for longer (5 years or more) have opinions

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

closer to natives.¹ Mustafa & Richards (2019), use ESS data (Round 7) on eight European countries to explore attitudes towards immigration from the perspective of Muslim Europeans. Results show that Muslims tend to hold more favorable attitudes towards migrants from poorer countries and that their attitudes towards Muslim immigrants are contingent upon religiosity.

We add to the literature dealing with the immigrants' preferences over immigration by studying the intergenerational transmission of these preferences. In fact, while immigrants' attitudes towards immigration are quite less studied than natives' ones, even less attention has been paid to the possible transmission of these preferences to the second generation. We attempt to fill this gap using data from the European Social Survey (ESS). This database enables us to analyze not only views about the expected costs and benefits from immigration, but also about socio-cultural issues that are quite relevant in the public debate, like the potential immigrants' impact on the receiving country's culture. In particular, we can explore how these attitudes change through three generations of immigrants. This issue is important to understand whether immigrant minorities will become more and more similar to the natives, or whether some differences are going to be permanent. In the first case, we will observe a traditional melting pot; alternatively, immigration is going to make the receiving societies more heterogeneous. In this scenario, the authorities should avert the risk that the increased heterogeneity grows into increased social polarization and inequality (Bisin and Verdier, 2011).

Actually, only a few authors explore the intergenerational transmission of the immigrants' attitudes towards immigration. The paper closest to our approach is undoubtedly Meeusen, Abts and Meuleman (2019). These authors focus on Belgians of Turkish and Moroccan descent, using data from the Belgian Ethnic Minorities Election Study (BEMES). They compare attitudes to immigration of first- and second-generation immigrants. Interestingly, they find that the latter do not display more negative attitudes towards immigration than more recent immigrants, proving some intergenerational transmission of preferences regarding immigration.

Our contribution improves on Meeusen, Abts and Meuleman (2019) not only because we can use quite a larger database, but especially because we study three generations of immigrants; namely, the first generation, the second generation, and the so-called 1.5 generation.² The latter is important since it enables us to assess the importance of an early

¹ Notably, these authors do not find any robust evidence that anti-immigration views of natives, earlier and recent immigrants alike, can be attributed to labor market outcomes

² The 1.5 generation is formed by immigrants who enter the host country in the childhood. For our purposes, we use a rather restrictive definition, and we consider as 1.5 generation immigrants those who entered the host country no older than 6. Using alternative definitions (for instance by including in the 1.5 generation entrants no older than 10) does not substantially alter our results. Our estimates are available upon request.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

exposure to the culture of the receiving country. In fact, these individuals started the process of identity formation in their origin country but were soon familiarized with the destination country. Consequently, it is particularly interesting to compare them to the second generation, in order to verify the possible differences between an early exposure to the destination country and being born in the destination country. According to our results, there is indeed no statistically significant difference between the second and the 1.5 generation, suggesting that, at least for what concerns our purposes, these situations are equivalent.

Finally, we contribute to the literature on the European immigration by carrying out an empirical analysis that extends to all the countries included in the ESS over the whole chronological coverage of the survey to date (namely, 10 waves from 2002 to 2020).

The paper is organized as follows: after this introduction, section 2 describes our data, section 3 reports our empirical analysis, and section 4 contains our conclusions.

2. Data and variables

We used waves 1-10 (2002 to 2020) of the European Social Survey (ESS). The survey is a repeated cross-section conducted in a large number of European countries including a wide range of standardized questions addressed to first- and second-generation immigrants concerning various aspects of their interaction with the host country society. We consider 39 European countries available in the survey. Table 1 reports the sample numerosity of the ten biennial rounds of the survey, while table 2 presents the sample size for each country. It is worth remarking that not all countries participate to the ESS in every round, as reported in columns 4 and 9 of table 2. In the statistical analysis below, the different ratio of samples to population were used to reweight the estimates.

Table 1. Country- and time-fixed effects estimations

ESS round	Year	Observations	Percent
1	2002	39,041	8.73
2	2004	43,975	9.83
3	2006	39,724	8.88
4	2008	52,824	11.81
5	2010	48,745	10.9
6	2012	50,667	11.33
7	2014	37,006	8.27

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

ESS round	Year	Observations	Percent
8	2016	41,080	9.18
9	2018	45,795	10.24
10	2020	48,403	10.82
Total		447,260	100

*Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data***Table 2. Countries in the sample**

Code	Country	Observations	Rounds	Code	Country	Observations	Rounds
AL	Albania	1,183	1	IT	Italy	9,841	5
AT	Austria	13,837	7	LT	Lithuania	10,757	6
BE	Belgium	14,756	9	LU	Luxembourg	2,717	2
BG	Bulgaria	13,009	6	LV	Latvia	2,433	2
CH	Switzerland	15,052	10	ME	Montenegro	2,260	2
CY	Cyprus	4,954	5	MK	Macedonia	1,346	1
CZ	Czech Republic	18,538	9	NL	Netherlands	17,081	10
DE	Germany	31,657	10	NO	Norway	15,095	10
DK	Denmark	11,616	8	PL	Poland	17,009	10
EE	Estonia	14,424	9	PT	Portugal	16,992	10
ES	Spain	18,836	10	RO	Romania	2,050	1
FI	Finland	18,930	10	RS	Serbia	3,137	2
FR	France	17,135	10	RU	Russia	11,311	5
GB	United Kingdom	18,307	9	SE	Sweden	16,830	10
GR	Greece	11,983	5	SI	Slovenia	12,101	10
HR	Croatia	5,894	4	SK	Slovakia	10,612	7
HU	Hungary	15,983	10	TR	Turkey	4,206	2
IE	Ireland	18,776	9	UA	Ukraine	8,541	5
IL	Israel	13,133	6	XK	Kosovo	1,232	1
IS	Iceland	3,706	5		Total	447,260	100

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

2.1. Individuals and immigrant status

For our purposes, we classify the individuals as follows:

- Natives: individuals born in the country, with both parents born in the country.
- First-generation immigrants (*gen1*): foreign-born individuals with both parents born abroad, who entered the country *after* the age of 6.
- One-point-five-generation immigrants (*gen15*): foreign-born individuals with both parents born abroad, who entered the country *before* the age of 7.
- Second-generation immigrants (*gen2*): Individuals born in the country, with both parents born abroad.

Individuals with only one foreign-born parent and individuals born abroad with parents born in the host country were discarded, as they do not fit in our distinction between natives and immigrants. Table 4 reports the number of interviewed immigrants and natives by country.

It is worth remarking that, due to different formulation of the corresponding questions in the survey, the precise age at which immigrants first entered the host country can only be computed in rounds 5-10. For rounds 1-4 we compute an approximate age considering the midpoint of time intervals that ranged from 1 to 10 years.

Table 3. Natives and immigrants of different generations

Country	gen1	gen15	gen2	natives	Total	Country	gen1	gen15	gen2	natives	Total
AL	3	2	13	1,165	1,183	IT	509	67	41	9,224	9,841
AT	1,074	105	361	12,297	13,837	LT	192	40	127	10,398	10,757
BE	1,388	145	616	12,607	14,756	LU	801	58	230	1,628	2,717
BG	58	13	91	12,847	13,009	LV	278	17	151	1,987	2,433
CH	3,265	253	844	10,690	15,052	ME	69	7	18	2,166	2,260
CY	261	3	15	4,675	4,954	MK	33	1	29	1,283	1,346
CZ	323	30	186	17,999	18,538	NL	1,120	144	384	15,433	17,081
DE	2,416	376	1,013	27,852	31,657	NO	1,046	51	105	13,893	15,095
DK	552	40	130	10,894	11,616	PL	76	11	145	16,777	17,009
EE	2,102	302	1,339	10,681	14,424	PT	678	44	121	16,149	16,992
ES	1,475	48	74	17,239	18,836	RO	7	0	6	2,037	2,050
FI	430	35	35	18,430	18,930	RS	214	33	141	2,749	3,137
FR	1,353	192	832	14,758	17,135	RU	295	21	117	10,878	11,311
GB	1,722	86	550	15,949	18,307	SE	1,720	228	450	14,432	16,830
GR	664	39	392	10,888	11,983	SI	726	62	359	10,954	12,101

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

Country	gen1	gen15	gen2	natives	Total	Country	gen1	gen15	gen2	natives	Total
HR	418	55	168	5,253	5,894	SK	117	9	80	10,406	10,612
HU	168	19	90	15,706	15,983	TR	34	1	44	4,127	4,206
IE	1,847	37	97	16,795	18,776	UA	684	41	284	7,532	8,541
IL	3,855	687	3,794	4,797	13,133	XK	38	6	10	1,178	1,232
IS	148	10	12	3,536	3,706	Total	32159	3318	13494	398289	447260
						Percent	7.19%	0.74%	3.02%	89.05%	100%

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

2.2. Control variables

Our control variables are defined as follows:

- "female": dummy for the gender of the respondent (1 if female).
- "age": age of the respondent.
- "citizen": dummy for citizenship of the host country (1 if citizen).
- "minority": dummy for positive answer to the question "Do you belong to an ethnic minority group in the country?".
- "discriminated": dummy for positive answer to the question "Would you describe yourself as a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?".
- "religious": answer to the question "How religious are you", from 0 ("Not at all") to 10 ("Very").
- "rel_": series of dummies indicating the religion ("christian", "jewish", "muslim", "other").³
- "educ_": series of dummies indicating the level of education from I (less than lower secondary) to V2 ("higher tertiary").⁴
- "employed": dummy for positive answer to the question: "Have you done any paid work in the last 7 days?"
- "income": self-reported decile of family income.
- "retired": dummy for positive answer to the question: "Are you retired?".
- "essround": series of dummies for the ESS round.
- "country": series of dummies for the countries where data were collected.

³ The "nonreligious" dummy was left out to avoid collinearity.

⁴ The original ESS variable responds to the question: "What is the maximum level of education you have reached?", which indicates the level of education, as defined by the UNESCO ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education).

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

Table 4 reports a brief description and summary statistics for the control variables.

Table 4. Control variables

Variable	Type	Mean	Std dev
<i>female</i>	binary	0.54	
<i>age</i>	continuous	48.74	18.64
<i>citizen</i>	binary	0.96	
<i>minority</i>	binary	0.05	
<i>discriminated</i>	binary	0.07	
<i>religious</i>	discrete 1 to 10	4.71	3.04
<i>rel_christian</i>	binary	0.54	
<i>rel_jewish</i>	binary	0.02	
<i>rel_islam</i>	binary	0.04	
<i>rel_other</i>	binary	0.01	
<i>educ_I</i>	binary	0.08	
<i>educ_II</i>	binary	0.15	
<i>educ_IIIb</i>	binary	0.15	
<i>educ_IIIa</i>	binary	0.18	
<i>educ_IV</i>	binary	0.10	
<i>educ_V1</i>	binary	0.08	
<i>educ_V2</i>	binary	0.10	
<i>employed</i>	binary	0.51	
<i>income</i>	discrete 1 to 12	5.46	2.76
<i>retired</i>	binary	0.26	

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

2.3. Dependent variables

All dependent variables used in our analysis are ordinal. We recoded and renamed three ESS variables⁵ so that, in accordance with the other variables, the support for immigration increases as their values increase. Individuals who refused to answer or answered “don't know” were considered missing values. The variables considered are the following:

- **"sameethnic"**: answers to the question "To what extent do you think the country should allow people of the same race or ethnic group to come and live here?" The answers are assigned values from 1 (“allow none”) to 4 “allow many to come and live here”.
- **"diffethnic"**: answers to the question "How about people of a different race or ethnic group from most people in the country? To what extent should they be allowed to come". The answers are ordered as the “diffethnic” variable.
- **"poorer"**: answers to the question "What do you think about immigrants from the poorer countries outside Europe? To what extent should they be allowed to come". The answers are ordered as the “diffethnic” variable.
- **"economy"**: answers to the question "Do you think it is good or bad for the economy that foreign people come and live in the country?" The answers are assigned values from 0 (extremely negative assessment) to 10 (extremely positive assessment).
- **"culture"**: answers to the question "would you say that the cultural life of the country is undermined or enriched by people from outside?" The answers are assigned values from 0 (extremely negative assessment) to 10 (extremely positive assessment).
- **"betterplace"**: answers to the question "is the country made a better or worse place by people coming to live here from outside?" The answers are assigned values from 0 (extremely negative assessment) to 10 (extremely positive assessment).

Table 5 displays a summary.

Table 5. Dependent variables

Variable	Mean	Std dev	min	max
<i>sameethnic</i>	2.83	0.89	1	4
<i>diffethnic</i>	2.50	0.91	1	4
<i>poorer</i>	2.42	0.93	1	4
<i>economy</i>	4.92	2.51	0	10
<i>culture</i>	5.44	2.60	0	10
<i>betterplace</i>	4.86	2.37	0	10

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

⁵ These variables are *imdfetn*, *imsmetn* and *impcntr*, renamed, respectively, *diffethnic*, *poorer*, *economy*.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

Table 6 shows the Spearman rank correlation matrix for the six measures proposed. Correlations are all positive but relatively far from 1, suggesting that using multiple variables can convey some informational content about different aspects of the support for immigration.

Table 6. Spearman rank correlation of dependent variables

	sameethnic	diffethnic	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
sameethnic	1.00					
diffethnic	0.69	1.00				
poorer	0.60	0.79	1.00			
economy	0.44	0.51	0.49	1.00		
culture	0.41	0.51	0.49	0.63	1.00	
betterplace	0.43	0.52	0.50	0.65	0.69	1.00

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

3. Empirical analysis

3.1. Full sample results

The estimates in Table 7 show the effect of the immigrant status (as described in section 2.1) on the preference for immigration. Given the ordinal nature of the dependent variable, we estimated the following ordered probit model with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors:

$$y_i^* = \beta_{gen1}gen1_i + \beta_{gen15}gen15_i + \beta_{gen2}gen2_i + controls_i + u_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_i^* \leq cut_1 \\ 2 & \text{if } cut_1 < y_i^* < cut_2 \\ \dots & \\ k & \text{if } cut_{\{k-1\}} < y_i^*, \end{cases}$$

where y is the observed dependent variable, y^* the latent dependent one and $gen1$, $gen15$, and $gen2$, the dummies for the generation of immigrants. Observations were weighted with the suitable country and post-stratification design values provided by the ESS. Apart from the controls described above, the regressions include dummies for country and ESS rounds. Their estimated coefficients and cuts values are available upon request. At the end of the regressions we also present the results of a series of joint significance tests. In particular, the results show the p-values of the LR tests of:

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

- joint significance of the variables of interest (*gen1*, *gen15*, *gen2*);
- joint significance of controls;
- joint significance of the dummies for the interview country and for the ESS round;
- zero slopes (Wald test) for all regressors of the model.

In all cases the tests rejected the null hypothesis of no significance.

The first evidence provided by the estimation output is that immigrants of every generation are more open to immigration than natives.⁶ Actually, the dependent variables capture different aspects of the attitudes towards immigration, and all the coefficients of *gen1*, *gen15* and *gen2* are positive and highly significant across the board. Thus, the immigrant status increases the preference for immigration with respect to the natives. Since the magnitude of the coefficients declines over generations, we can investigate if there exists a kind of “convergence trend” towards the natives. The existence of this trend appears to be present, after formally testing for its significance, only for some variables (*economy*, *betterplace* and, with less clarity, *sameethnic*). Table 8 presents the p-values of a series of Wald test of the following restrictions:

- all generations have the same coefficients ($H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$);
- gen1* has the same coefficient as *gen15* ($H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15}$);
- gen15* has the same coefficient as *gen2*. ($H_0: \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$);
- gen1* has the same coefficient as *gen2*. ($H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen2}$);

In the case of *diffethnic*, *poorer* and *culture*, the hypothesis of equality of coefficients cannot be rejected, suggesting either that all immigrant generations share the same views on immigration or that the sample size is not large enough to correctly evaluate the difference among generations. This result is in line with the findings by Meeusen, Abts and Meuleman (2019). The equality of the coefficients is instead clearly rejected (p-value smaller than 1%) for *economy* and *betterplace*, while for *sameethnic* the rejection is only at the 10% level. Remarkably, in all these cases the evidence of a convergence to the natives’ preferences appears to be driven by the difference between the opinions of first-generation immigrants and the subsequent ones. In none of the estimation considered we could detect a statistically significant difference between the opinion of generations one point five and two.

Table 7. Ordered probit regressions

	sameethnic	diffethnic	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
gen1	0.208*** [0.0191]	0.164*** [0.0193]	0.138*** [0.0199]	0.339*** [0.0195]	0.263*** [0.0189]	0.365*** [0.0191]

⁶ The dummy for natives is excluded to avoid perfect collinearity, therefore the estimated coefficients for generation dummies must be interpreted as the difference with respect to the natives.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

	sameethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
gen15	0.170*** [0.0388]	0.147*** [0.0386]	0.164*** [0.0396]	0.186*** [0.0389]	0.209*** [0.0413]	0.199*** [0.0407]
gen2	0.159*** [0.0219]	0.140*** [0.0214]	0.147*** [0.0227]	0.191*** [0.0219]	0.226*** [0.0226]	0.214*** [0.0223]
female	-0.0180** [0.00733]	-0.00662 [0.00710]	0.00765 [0.00714]	-0.123*** [0.00664]	0.0153** [0.00663]	-0.0317*** [0.00666]
age	- 0.00397*** [0.000295]	-0.00609*** [0.000288]	-0.00710*** [0.000289]	-0.00160*** [0.000266]	-0.00312*** [0.000267]	-0.00411*** [0.000270]
citizen	-0.101*** [0.0229]	-0.100*** [0.0234]	-0.105*** [0.0232]	-0.180*** [0.0232]	-0.136*** [0.0231]	-0.183*** [0.0230]
minority	0.000821 [0.0219]	0.113*** [0.0207]	0.0872*** [0.0218]	0.0668*** [0.0185]	0.117*** [0.0191]	0.110*** [0.0199]
discriminated	0.0524*** [0.0149]	0.0465*** [0.0143]	0.0497*** [0.0149]	-0.0370*** [0.0138]	-0.00685 [0.0145]	-0.0879*** [0.0140]
religious	0.00663*** [0.00153]	0.00651*** [0.00148]	0.0151*** [0.00149]	0.0128*** [0.00145]	0.00925*** [0.00146]	0.0230*** [0.00144]
rel_christian	-0.0363*** [0.00976]	-0.0991*** [0.00920]	-0.117*** [0.00928]	-0.0673*** [0.00860]	-0.120*** [0.00857]	-0.123*** [0.00859]
rel_jewish	0.857*** [0.0711]	0.138** [0.0553]	0.137** [0.0581]	0.247*** [0.0580]	0.222*** [0.0587]	0.391*** [0.0648]
rel_islam	-0.0369 [0.0310]	0.119*** [0.0310]	0.0798** [0.0313]	0.141*** [0.0281]	0.202*** [0.0277]	0.178*** [0.0278]
rel_other	0.0360 [0.0432]	0.141*** [0.0423]	0.101** [0.0443]	0.0226 [0.0412]	0.118*** [0.0425]	0.0329 [0.0429]
educ_I	-0.279*** [0.0181]	-0.286*** [0.0184]	-0.245*** [0.0183]	-0.272*** [0.0175]	-0.193*** [0.0174]	-0.196*** [0.0177]
educ_II	-0.130*** [0.0166]	-0.140*** [0.0167]	-0.107*** [0.0166]	-0.125*** [0.0161]	-0.0439*** [0.0161]	-0.0629*** [0.0162]
educ_IIIb	-0.0979*** [0.0160]	-0.129*** [0.0161]	-0.130*** [0.0158]	-0.121*** [0.0155]	-0.0286* [0.0155]	-0.0755*** [0.0156]
educ_IIIa	0.0816*** [0.0161]	0.0945*** [0.0162]	0.0485*** [0.0160]	0.0801*** [0.0153]	0.166*** [0.0155]	0.107*** [0.0155]
educ_IV	0.127*** [0.0180]	0.120*** [0.0176]	0.0720*** [0.0175]	0.144*** [0.0166]	0.234*** [0.0167]	0.165*** [0.0167]
educ_V1	0.298*** [0.0173]	0.322*** [0.0171]	0.255*** [0.0171]	0.322*** [0.0163]	0.427*** [0.0168]	0.351*** [0.0166]
educ_V2	0.346*** [0.0187]	0.364*** [0.0181]	0.312*** [0.0180]	0.405*** [0.0168]	0.484*** [0.0170]	0.378*** [0.0171]
employed	-0.0180* [0.00999]	-0.00994 [0.00958]	-0.0215** [0.00968]	-0.0295*** [0.00898]	-0.0151* [0.00891]	-0.00611 [0.00895]
income	0.0209*** [0.00156]	0.0195*** [0.00150]	0.0152*** [0.00152]	0.0311*** [0.00140]	0.0203*** [0.00142]	0.0211*** [0.00142]
retired	0.0644*** [0.0140]	0.0274** [0.0135]	0.0234* [0.0136]	0.0377*** [0.0127]	0.0110 [0.0127]	0.0249* [0.0128]
ESS round dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	326255	325756	325676	323965	324375	323549
Log-likelihood	-386980.22	-394813.18	-401343.36	-703480.46	-711742.21	-677068.46

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

	sameethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
LR test for country and ESS round dummies significance. P-value	0	0	0	0	0	0
LR test for all controls significance. P-value	0	0	0	0	0	0
LR test for interest variables significance. P-value	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wald test for zero slopes. P-value	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

Table 8. P-values for Wald tests for equality of interest parameters

	sameethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
Hypothesis	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value	p-value
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.1353	0.6226	0.8017	0***	0.2225	0***
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15}$	0.3396	0.6546	0.522	0.0002***	0.203	0.0001***
$H_0: \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.7927	0.882	0.6844	0.9099	0.7126	0.7399
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.0542*	0.3448	0.7506	0***	0.1567	0***

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

It might also be interesting to have a look at the effect of the control variables. It is worth remarking that, except for the citizenship status, these variables apply to all individuals in the sample, so they inform us on the preferences of natives and immigrants alike. Therefore, the results are likely to be driven by the natives, who are the large majority in the sample (89%, as in table 4). A general result is that effect tend to have the same sign, and often significance, for all the dependent variables considered in the study.

- Age has significant negative effect on attitudes to immigration. This outcome confirms well-known findings in the literature (see, for instance, Mayda 2006)
- Citizenship, the only variable that applies only to immigrants, has a significant negative impact on support to immigration. This result is in line with the findings of Just and Anderson (2015).
- Except for a few cases where the effects are insignificant, being part of a minority or feeling discriminated against increase the support for immigration.
- While feeling religious has a positive and significant effect on the views about immigration, different religious affiliations have different impacts. Christians tend to favor immigration less

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

than non-religious respondents, while Muslims and followers of other cults –especially Jews– tend to support immigration.

- Income and education have a positive and significant effect on attitudes toward immigration. Unemployment has a positive effect as well, but its significance is limited.

Tables 9 and 10 present some robustness checks of the results presented so far.

In Table 9 we show the estimation results with different approaches on different configurations of control variables. In the first specification the variables of interest are included in the model without controls. In the second, the controls are added excluding the dummies for the interview country and the ESS round. Finally, in the third specification, all controls used in Table 7 are considered. The models are estimated with an ordered probit (as in equation 1) with classic standard errors, with an ordered probit with standard errors clustered on the country of interview and with a linear regression with heteroskedasticity consistent standard errors. The results reported in table 9 relate only to the first of the dependent variables considered, *sameethnic*, and are available upon request for the others. The results do not appear to show substantial qualitative changes in the effects of the variables of interest: their estimated coefficients remain significant in all estimates and their sign does not change.

Table 10 presents a more general summary of the results of the estimates in table 9, extended to all the dependent variables present in the study. The estimation approaches are the same (ordered probit with classic and clustered standard errors, and linear regression) and the estimates were conducted with the full set of control variables. Results tend to confirm the findings described in the original regression presented in table 7. The coefficients of the generational variables remain stable in sign and significance, showing the general tendency of immigrants to display a sizable higher degree of preference for immigration compared to natives. We also carried out tests of equality of the effects of generational variables. As in the case of the model estimated with the ordered probit with robust standard errors (table 8), the null hypothesis of equality of the coefficients is rejected for *economy* and *betterplace*, and not rejected for *diffethnic* and *poorer*. The evidence for a generational convergence is instead somewhat stronger than in the previous regressions for *sameethnic* and *culture*. Remarkably, also in these estimates the significant differences are between first-generation immigrants and the ones of the subsequent generations. The null hypothesis of difference between the coefficients of generation one point five and generation two is never rejected.

In order to assess the robustness of the definition of generation 1.5 do different ages, we repeated the ordered probit estimation of equation (1) with a different cutoff year of age for the definition of generation 1.5. While the results of the regression of table 7 are presented with a cutoff of 6 years of age (corresponding with the start of primary school in many

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

countries), the results computed by defining immigrants of generation 1.5 as those that immigrated before the age of 10. This age is somewhat arbitrary but it can represent the beginning of the (lower) secondary instruction cycle and the end of the critical period for second language acquisition. Results are displayed in table 11 and show a similar picture the results are presented in table 11 and show a similar picture to the case of the 6-year cutoff: positive and highly significant difference from natives in the preferences for immigration and evidence of some generational convergence but limited in magnitude and not extended to all the dependent variable considered. It could be relevant to note that even by broadening the definition of generation 1.5, statistically significant differences can not be detected compared to the opinions of the second generation.

As a final robustness check, we estimated the ordered probits in (1) with the inclusion of two dummies for the immigrational background of generation one and one point five immigrants. As an anonymous referee suggested, the family members, cultural traditions and lifestyle might be very different between people who come from families of the country's nationality and people who were only born in the respective country and come from other nationality. We therefore estimated the models displayed in table 7 with the inclusion of the dummy *immfamily1* and *immfamily15* which activate if immigrants have a father born in a country which is different from the one they were born (that is, if first and 1.5 generation immigrants were in turn second generation immigrants before transferring to the destination country registered in the ESS). Results for the variables of interest are displayed in table 12. First generation immigrants who in turn are second generation immigrants in the origin country seem to have a reduced preference for further inflow of migrants, though the significance of this difference appears to be present only in three out of the six considered cases (and in one is only weakly significant). Moreover, even if they display a less favorable attitude, these migrants still show a difference from the natives of the destination countries. No significant effect appears to be present for generation 1.5 immigrants instead.

Finally, to summarize the main findings of our analysis, we can highlight three key results.

Result 1. Attitudes to immigration are significantly different between immigrants and natives. More precisely, immigrants are more open and well-disposed towards immigration.

Result 2. This difference shows intergenerational persistence, especially for some variables. Even when there exists some convergence towards the opinions of the natives, the gap is far from disappearing.

Result 3. In our estimates, the generation 1.5 is not significantly different from the second generation.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey***Table 9.** Different specifications of ordered probit and linear regressions with classic, robust and HC standard errors. Dependent variable: sameethnic.

	Ordered probit			Ordered probit			Linear regression		
	Classic SE			SE clustered on country			Heteroskedasticity robust SE		
	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameethnl c	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameethnl c	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc
gen1	0.353*** [0.00655]	0.280*** [0.0100]	0.208*** [0.0102]	0.353*** [0.0443]	0.280*** [0.0380]	0.208*** [0.0521]	0.287*** [0.00875]	0.226*** [0.0139]	0.163*** [0.0139]
gen15	0.419*** [0.0197]	0.291*** [0.0231]	0.170*** [0.0233]	0.419*** [0.0609]	0.291*** [0.0477]	0.170*** [0.0477]	0.339*** [0.0237]	0.231*** [0.0276]	0.129*** [0.0275]
gen2	0.328*** [0.0104]	0.227*** [0.0125]	0.159*** [0.0127]	0.328*** [0.0593]	0.227*** [0.0426]	0.159*** [0.0322]	0.266*** [0.0134]	0.185*** [0.0162]	0.122*** [0.0160]
female		-0.0169*** [0.00389]	0.0180*** [0.00391]		-0.0169* [0.00898]	-0.0180** [0.00897]		-0.0128** [0.00566]	-0.0132** [0.00562]
age		0.00316** * [0.000154]	0.00397** * [0.000157]		0.00316** * [0.00108]	0.00397** * [0.000935]		0.00252** * [0.000226]	0.00314** * [0.000227]
citizen		-0.133*** [0.0128]	-0.101*** [0.0129]		-0.133*** [0.0333]	-0.101*** [0.0320]		-0.102*** [0.0167]	-0.0721*** [0.0165]
minority		0.0118 [0.00866]	0.000821 [0.00903]		0.0118 [0.0412]	0.000821 [0.0272]		0.00526 [0.0164]	-0.000741 [0.0165]
discriminate		0.0443*** [0.00727]	0.0524*** [0.00734]		0.0443 [0.0392]	0.0524 [0.0320]		0.0300*** [0.0113]	0.0323*** [0.0113]
religions		0.00271** * [0.000790]	0.00663** * [0.000808]		0.00271 [0.00485]	0.00663 [0.00624]		0.00262** * [0.00115]	0.00539** * [0.00117]
rel_christian		-0.00461 [0.00484]	0.0363*** [0.00507]		-0.00461 [0.0357]	-0.0363 [0.0338]		-0.00301 [0.00712]	-0.0243*** [0.00749]
rel_jewish		0.598*** [0.0280]	0.857*** [0.0417]		0.598*** [0.127]	0.857** [0.373]		0.379*** [0.0214]	0.621*** [0.0471]
rel_islam		-0.220*** [0.00986]	0.0369*** [0.0129]		-0.220* [0.128]	-0.0369 [0.0541]		-0.186*** [0.0174]	-0.0234 [0.0233]
rel_other		-0.00393 [0.0225]	0.0360 [0.0227]		-0.00393 [0.126]	0.0360 [0.0949]		0.00156 [0.0326]	0.0323 [0.0318]
educ_l		-0.0392*** [0.00862]	-0.279*** [0.0108]		-0.0392 [0.0653]	-0.279** [0.111]		-0.0374*** [0.0124]	-0.221*** [0.0144]
educ_l1		0.188*** [0.00731]	-0.130*** [0.0100]		0.188** [0.0741]	-0.130 [0.117]		0.151*** [0.0104]	-0.0920*** [0.0131]
educ_l1lb		0.288*** [0.00727]	0.0979*** [0.0101]		0.288*** [0.102]	-0.0979 [0.114]		0.236*** [0.00919]	-0.0600*** [0.0125]
educ_l1la		0.345*** [0.00731]	0.0816*** [0.0101]		0.345*** [0.0728]	0.0816 [0.0815]		0.272*** [0.0116]	0.0717*** [0.0126]
educ_lv		0.477*** [0.00796]	0.127*** [0.0105]		0.477*** [0.102]	0.127 [0.0894]		0.375*** [0.0109]	0.107*** [0.0139]
educ_v1		0.598*** [0.00966]	0.298*** [0.0117]		0.598*** [0.0926]	0.298*** [0.0809]		0.468*** [0.0105]	0.230*** [0.0131]

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

	Ordered probit			Ordered probit			Linear regression		
	Classic SE			SE clustered on country			Heteroskedasticity robust SE		
	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameethnl c	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc	sameethnl c	sameeth nlc	sameeth nlc
educ_v2		0.654*** [0.00807]	0.346*** [0.0106]		0.654*** [0.114]	0.346*** [0.0697]		0.500*** [0.0111]	0.262*** [0.0142]
employed		-0.0250*** [0.00500]	0.0180*** [0.00504]		-0.0250** [0.0118]	-0.0180 [0.0131]		-0.0157** [0.00765]	-0.0106 [0.00766]
income		0.0256*** [0.000764]	0.0209*** [0.000790]		0.0256*** [0.00602]	0.0209*** [0.00551]		0.0216*** [0.00117]	0.0167*** [0.00119]
retired		0.0629*** [0.00727]	0.0644*** [0.00740]		0.0629*** [0.0203]	0.0644*** [0.0174]		0.0512*** [0.0108]	0.0524*** [0.0109]
ESS round dummies	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
country dummies	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
_cons							2.816*** [0.00267]	2.709*** [0.0221]	3.142*** [0.0506]
cut1	-1.347*** [0.00278]	-1.280*** [0.0164]	-1.912*** [0.0797]	-1.347*** [0.0781]	-1.280*** [0.120]	-1.912*** [0.159]			
cut2	-0.453*** [0.00206]	-0.360*** [0.0163]	-0.972*** [0.0796]	-0.453*** [0.0680]	-0.360*** [0.0868]	-0.972*** [0.128]			
cut3	0.736*** [0.00218]	0.898*** [0.0163]	0.316*** [0.0796]	0.736*** [0.0815]	0.898*** [0.0834]	0.316*** [0.119]			
N	430470	326255	326255	430470	326255	326255	430470	326255	326255
Log-likelihood	-536400.81	-393146.45	-386980.22	-536400.81	-393146.45	-386980.22			
Zero slopes p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

Ordered probit and linear regression with standard errors in brackets. Significance shortcuts: *
 $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 10. Ordered probit and linear regressions with classic, robust and HC standard errors. Specification with controls and dummies for ESS rounds and countries. P-values for Wald and F tests for equality of interest parameters

	Ordered probit	Ordered probit	Linear regressio n	Ordered probit	Ordered probit	Linear regressio n	Ordered probit	Ordered probit	Linear regressio n
	classic SE	clustered SE	het. robust SE	classic SE	clustered SE	het. robust SE	classic SE	clustered SE	het. robust SE
	sameeth nlc	sameethnl c	sameethnl c	diffethnlc	diffethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	poorer	poorer
gen1	0.208*** [0.0102]	0.208*** [0.0521]	0.163*** [0.0139]	0.164*** [0.0100]	0.164** [0.0785]	0.131*** [0.0150]	0.138*** [0.00999]	0.138 [0.0951]	0.113*** [0.0160]

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

	Ordered probit classic SE	Ordered probit clustered SE	Linear regressio n het. robust SE	Ordered probit classic SE	Ordered probit clustered SE	Linear regressio n het. robust SE	Ordered probit classic SE	Ordered probit clustered SE	Linear regressio n het. robust SE
gen15	0.170*** [0.0233]	0.170*** [0.0477]	0.129*** [0.0275]	0.147*** [0.0229]	0.147** [0.0592]	0.115*** [0.0292]	0.164*** [0.0228]	0.164*** [0.0527]	0.132*** [0.0312]
gen2	0.159*** [0.0127]	0.159*** [0.0322]	0.122*** [0.0160]	0.140*** [0.0125]	0.140*** [0.0253]	0.112*** [0.0165]	0.147*** [0.0125]	0.147*** [0.0245]	0.118*** [0.0181]
controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ESS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
round	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	326255	326255	326255	325756	325756	325756	325676	325676	325676
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.0026** *	0.1791	0.067*	0.2373	0.9052	0.5836	0.5073	0.8073	0.8308
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15}$	0.1133	0.1046	0.2294	0.4532	0.6842	0.5979	0.2692	0.6681	0.5464
$H_0: \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.6647	0.8088	0.8189	0.8057	0.8923	0.9108	0.4843	0.6676	0.6661
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.0005** *	0.2481	0.0223**	0.0805*	0.6739	0.3012	0.5455	0.9122	0.8014
	economy	economy	economy	culture	culture	culture	betterpla ce	betterplac e	betterpla ce
gen1	0.339*** [0.00950]	0.339*** [0.0791]	0.769*** [0.0445]	0.263*** [0.00949]	0.263*** [0.0773]	0.616*** [0.0445]	0.365*** [0.00952]	0.365*** [0.0733]	0.789*** [0.0414]
gen15	0.186*** [0.0216]	0.186*** [0.0613]	0.424*** [0.0877]	0.209*** [0.0215]	0.209*** [0.0767]	0.485*** [0.0953]	0.199*** [0.0216]	0.199*** [0.0839]	0.424*** [0.0876]
gen2	0.191*** [0.0118]	0.191*** [0.0559]	0.436*** [0.0502]	0.226*** [0.0118]	0.226*** [0.0355]	0.519*** [0.0526]	0.214*** [0.0118]	0.214*** [0.0425]	0.458*** [0.0482]
controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ESS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
round	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	323965	323965	323965	324375	324375	324375	323549	323549	323549
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0***	0.0018***	0***	0.0039***	0.0752*	0.172	0***	0***	0***
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15}$	0***	0.0008***	0.0002***	0.015**	0.0245**	0.1825	0***	0***	0.0001***
$H_0: \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.8393	0.8869	0.9041	0.4841	0.7292	0.7427	0.5342	0.7999	0.7263
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen2}$	0***	0.0018***	0***	0.0092***	0.5300	0.1278	0***	0.0113**	0***

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

Table 11. Ordered probit with robust standard errors with cutoff for generation 1.5 at 10 years of age

	sameethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
gen1	0.216*** [0.0195]	0.175*** [0.0199]	0.143*** [0.0206]	0.351*** [0.0198]	0.270*** [0.0194]	0.383*** [0.0195]
gen15	0.154*** [0.0326]	0.109*** [0.0312]	0.134*** [0.0320]	0.194*** [0.0336]	0.199*** [0.0335]	0.190*** [0.0335]
gen2	0.159*** [0.0219]	0.141*** [0.0214]	0.147*** [0.0227]	0.191*** [0.0219]	0.226*** [0.0226]	0.214*** [0.0223]
controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ESS round dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	326255	325756	325676	323965	324375	323549
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.0411**	0.1023	0.9413	0***	0.0634	0***
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen15}$	0.0693*	0.0466**	0.7868	0***	0.0423**	0***
$H_0: \beta_{gen15} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.8902	0.3786	0.7294	0.9429	0.4881	0.5283
$H_0: \beta_{gen1} = \beta_{gen2}$	0.0291**	0.1813	0.8965	0***	0.0958*	0***

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

Ordered probit regression with robust standard errors in brackets. Significance shortcuts: * $p < 0.10$,
 ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Table 12. Ordered probit with robust standard errors with dummies for family background of first and 1.5 generation immigrants

	sameethnlc	diffethnlc	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
gen1	0.215*** [0.0206]	0.184*** [0.0209]	0.154*** [0.0216]	0.336*** [0.0210]	0.265*** [0.0204]	0.375*** [0.0205]
immfamily1	-0.0141 [0.0454]	-0.0820* [0.0440]	-0.119*** [0.0434]	-0.0582 [0.0467]	-0.0655 [0.0445]	-0.151*** [0.0456]
gen15	0.167*** [0.0420]	0.175*** [0.0423]	0.173*** [0.0427]	0.206*** [0.0424]	0.207*** [0.0438]	0.196*** [0.0429]
immfamily15	0.0382 [0.113]	-0.110 [0.108]	0.0179 [0.119]	-0.129 [0.111]	0.0560 [0.134]	-0.0123 [0.133]
gen2	0.162*** [0.0228]	0.141*** [0.0222]	0.144*** [0.0236]	0.199*** [0.0228]	0.229*** [0.0235]	0.226*** [0.0231]
controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ESS round dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	300580	300108	300072	298595	298860	297974

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

3.2. Results considering only immigrants

So far, we have explored the variation in attitudes to immigration between natives and immigrants of different generations. It can be interesting to explore how the controls used in

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

our regressions are related to the immigrants' own support for immigration. To this aim, we repeat our estimation in (1) restricting our sample to immigrants and removing the *gen1*, *gen15* and *gen2* regressors.

Results of the ordered probit regressions on these limited samples (roughly one tenth of the original) are presented in table 13. Some coefficients change their sign compared to those of the whole population, where natives are expected to drive the results. This suggests that some determinants of attitudes to immigration can have very different effects, depending on the native-immigrant status. In particular:

- Age always has a negative effect on the taste for immigration, as it happens for the whole population. This result is often found in the literature. Education has a positive effect, which is also in line with the literature (see, among others, Mayda, 2006; Hainmueller & Hiscox, 2007 and 2014).
- The coefficients of *minority* and *discriminated* keep the same sign but increase in magnitude, suggesting that these conditions might be more sensitive for immigrants than for natives.
- While being religious still has a positive effect on attitudes to immigration (albeit smaller and not always significant) the religious affiliation has different impacts for natives and immigrants. In particular, Jewish and "other religion" immigrants have a lower preference for immigration, contrary to the whole population. Christian immigrants show a slightly higher distaste for immigration than Christians in general.
- While income in the whole population is positively correlated to support for immigration, when we restrict our analysis to immigrants the coefficients are mostly insignificant. This suggests that immigrants are not concerned by labor market competition from other immigrants.
- In the whole population, being employed has a negative effect on the attitude to immigration. This effect is reversed when only immigrants are considered, indicating that employed immigrants seem to have more favorable views about immigration and, apparently, confirms that they are not concerned about labor market competition.

Table 13. Ordered probit regressions, immigrants only

	sameethnic	diffethnic	poorer	economy	culture	betterplace
female	-0.0290 [0.0224]	-0.0357 [0.0218]	-0.0329 [0.0215]	-0.147*** [0.0206]	-0.0251 [0.0208]	-0.0678*** [0.0206]
age	-0.00687*** [0.000940]	0.00937*** [0.000923]	-0.0102*** [0.000916]	0.00329*** [0.000868]	0.00319*** [0.000872]	-0.00459*** [0.000881]
citizen	-0.117*** [0.0254]	-0.108*** [0.0248]	-0.0981*** [0.0235]	-0.189*** [0.0229]	-0.118*** [0.0232]	-0.187*** [0.0230]
minority	0.0422 [0.0299]	0.0729** [0.0283]	0.0789*** [0.0280]	0.122*** [0.0269]	0.153*** [0.0271]	0.134*** [0.0273]
discriminated	0.0911*** [0.0309]	0.142*** [0.0306]	0.128*** [0.0300]	0.0823*** [0.0295]	0.121*** [0.0297]	0.0311 [0.0295]
religious	0.00583	0.00355	0.0114***	0.00437	0.0120***	0.0227***

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

	[0.00431]	[0.00412]	[0.00425]	[0.00401]	[0.00414]	[0.00414]
rel_christian	-0.0746**	-0.110***	-0.135***	-0.0397	-0.130***	-0.102***
	[0.0308]	[0.0291]	[0.0290]	[0.0270]	[0.0274]	[0.0267]
rel_jewish	0.124	-0.183**	-0.198**	-0.129*	-0.287***	-0.152**
	[0.0963]	[0.0776]	[0.0876]	[0.0779]	[0.0768]	[0.0753]
rel_islam	-0.0522	0.114***	0.0765**	0.101***	0.195***	0.194***
	[0.0389]	[0.0388]	[0.0388]	[0.0358]	[0.0366]	[0.0362]
rel_other	-0.237***	-0.0627	-0.132**	-0.0994*	-0.0657	-0.0530
	[0.0618]	[0.0590]	[0.0598]	[0.0561]	[0.0576]	[0.0597]
educ_I	-0.134**	-0.175***	-0.0578	-0.0597	-0.0879*	0.00736
	[0.0581]	[0.0578]	[0.0548]	[0.0530]	[0.0517]	[0.0538]
educ_II	-0.0853	-0.116**	-0.0708	-0.0155	-0.0221	-0.0272
	[0.0521]	[0.0507]	[0.0504]	[0.0496]	[0.0492]	[0.0493]
educ_IIIb	-0.189***	-0.258***	-0.208***	-0.0828*	-0.0899*	-0.0962**
	[0.0515]	[0.0501]	[0.0487]	[0.0470]	[0.0479]	[0.0481]
educ_IIIa	0.00318	0.0259	0.00586	0.126***	0.0981**	0.0891*
	[0.0523]	[0.0506]	[0.0496]	[0.0463]	[0.0480]	[0.0468]
educ_IV	-0.00222	-0.0239	-0.0411	0.139***	0.130***	0.103**
	[0.0568]	[0.0539]	[0.0523]	[0.0493]	[0.0494]	[0.0509]
educ_V1	0.130**	0.150***	0.103*	0.303***	0.260***	0.288***
	[0.0549]	[0.0520]	[0.0535]	[0.0498]	[0.0542]	[0.0499]
educ_V2	0.183***	0.156***	0.145***	0.373***	0.348***	0.319***
	[0.0560]	[0.0539]	[0.0525]	[0.0486]	[0.0486]	[0.0493]
employed	0.0549**	0.0476*	0.0251	0.0612**	0.0510**	0.0862***
	[0.0269]	[0.0265]	[0.0262]	[0.0249]	[0.0252]	[0.0256]
income	0.00543	0.00456	0.00126	0.00701*	0.00615	-0.00135
	[0.00464]	[0.00454]	[0.00449]	[0.00419]	[0.00440]	[0.00422]
retired	0.129***	0.0771	0.0419	0.0186	-0.0487	-0.0150
	[0.0474]	[0.0471]	[0.0472]	[0.0437]	[0.0432]	[0.0446]
ESS round dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
country dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	35699	35566	35461	35436	35518	35242
Log-likelihood	-38517.389	-41043.061	-42575.575	-76564.223	-76716.873	-74812.722
Wald zero slopes p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Source: Authors' elaboration on ESS data

*Ordered probit regression with robust standard errors in brackets. Significance shortcuts: * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.*

4. Conclusion

In Europe, many countries known for being once a source of emigration are rapidly turning into destination countries (see, for example, Přívarová, Rievajová, Galstyan & Gavurová, 2022). This crucial social transformation involves the settlement of new minorities and the birth of a large second generation. Actually, in many aging countries, only immigrant

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

communities contribute positively to the demographic balance (Naumann & Hess, 2021). Consequently, it is inevitable that their opinions are going to shape the policy decisions of the host countries. Knowing these opinions can shed some light on the future of the destination societies: are they going to be isolated and protectionist, or more open and inclusive? Are they going to be a melting pot or, on the contrary, an aggregation of stratified and segregated communities? It is well-known that first-generation immigrants are relatively more open to immigration. However, less is known on the second generation, which is even more important since it is going to exercise voting rights.

We tried to assess the evolution of different immigrants' generations over immigration using the ESS, which gathers information about a wide range of European countries over a large time period. Our results shed new light on the intergenerational dynamics of these preferences and, consequently, on the future dynamics of the attitudes towards immigration in Europe. First, immigrants of all the considered generations (first, 1.5, and second) show more favor to immigration than natives. Then, we remark that the gap with the natives does persist through generations, though it is reduced in some responses. Finally, we observe that individuals who immigrated during childhood (generation 1.5) look indistinguishable from second-generation immigrants.

Overall, our results suggest that, as the new generations gain voting rights, it is possible that destination countries are going to become less averse to immigration, and that anti-immigration parties become less relevant in the policymaking. On the other hand, the presence of large second-generation minorities could foster social polarization. We cannot know the ultimate outcome of such a long term process. Apparently, both scenarios are possible, and, as a result of current immigration, the societies of the destination countries could become either more open to immigration or more polarized. The success in the socio-economic integration of the immigrant minorities will be crucial in tilting the balance.

The results emerging from this work could be further developed by overcoming some limitations of our analysis. First, the absence of a richer data structure prevents tracking the evolution of preferences along generations of individual households over time, limiting the analysis to generational averages. Second, the correlations we estimated between the measures of immigration preference and the variables of interest are not necessarily causal; in fact, though our model controls for many variables, we cannot exclude the existence of confounders that can bias our estimates. It is our intention to pursue further lines of research along these directions.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).*Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey*

Acknowledgments

We thank Sabrina Natale for her help in drafting this article.

References

- Binder, N. E., Polinard, J. L., & Wrinkle, R. D. (1997). Mexican American and Anglo attitudes toward immigration reform: A view from the border. *Social Science Quarterly*, 324-337.
- Bisin, A., & Verdier, T. (2011). The economics of cultural transmission and socialization. In *Handbook of social economics* (Vol. 1, pp. 339-416). North-Holland
- Blinder, S., & Richards, L. (2016). UK public opinion toward immigration: Overall attitudes and level of concern. *Migration Observatory briefing, COMPAS, University of Oxford*.
- Borjas, G. J. (1994). The economics of immigration. *Journal of economic literature*, 32(4), 1667-1717.
- Braakmann, N., Waqas, M., & Wildman, J. (2017). Are immigrants in favour of immigration? Evidence from England and Wales. *The BE Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy*, 17(1).
- EUROSTAT (2014). "First and second-generation immigrants - a statistical overview". EUROSTAT Online Publications.
- Hainmueller, J., & Hangartner, D. (2013). Who gets a Swiss passport? A natural experiment in immigrant discrimination. *American political science review*, 107(1), 159-187.
- Hainmueller, J., & Hiscox, M. J. (2007). Educated preferences. Explaining attitudes toward immigration in Europe. *International Organization*, 61(2), 399-442.
- Hainmueller, J., & Hopkins, D. J. (2014). Public attitudes toward immigration. *Annual review of political science*, 17, 225-249.
- Hood III, M. V., Morris, I. L., & Shirkey, K. A. (1997). "¡ Quedate o Vente!": Uncovering the Determinants of Hispanic Public Opinion Toward Immigration. *Political Research Quarterly*, 50(3), 627-647.
- Just, A., & Anderson, C. J. (2015). Dual allegiances? Immigrants' attitudes toward immigration. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(1), 188-201.
- Mayda, A. M. (2006). Who is against immigration? A cross-country investigation of individual attitudes toward immigrants. *The review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(3), 510-530.
- Meeusen, C., Abts, K., & Meuleman, B. (2019). Between solidarity and competitive threat?: The ambivalence of anti-immigrant attitudes among ethnic minorities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 71, 1-13.
- Mustafa, A., & Richards, L. (2019). Immigration attitudes amongst European Muslims: Social identity, economic threat and familiar experiences. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(7), 1050-1069.
- Naumann, E., & Hess, M. (2021). Population ageing, immigration and the welfare state: the political demography in Western Europe. In *Global Political Demography: The Politics of Population Change* (pp. 351-371). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

GALLI, F. & RUSSO, G. (2023).

Preferences of immigrants on immigration: convergence or persistence? Evidence from the European Social Survey

- Polinard, J. L., Wrinkle, R. D., & De La Garza, R. (1984). Attitudes of Mexican Americans toward irregular Mexican immigration. *International Migration Review*, 18(3), 782-799.
- Přívarová, M., Rievajová, E., Galstyan, A., Gavurová, B. (2022). Migration processes and determinants: the case of the Slovak Republic. *Social Policy Issues*, 59(4), 305-322.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2013). The complicated constituency: a study of immigrant opinions about political representation. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1(1), 26-47.
- Trevelyan, Edward, Christine Gambino, Thomas Gryn, Luke Larsen, Yesenia Acosta, Elizabeth Grieco, Darryl Harris, and Nathan Walters (2016). "Characteristics of the U.S. Population by Generational Status: 2013". U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Survey Reports.
- Vasey, H. (2017). The emergence of a low-skill migrant labour market: structural constraints, discourses of difference and blocked mobility. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 18(3), 863-879.
-