C R E M
UMR CNRS 6211

Centre de Recherche en Économie et Management
Center for Research in Economics and Management

Working Paper

National Identity and Immigrants' Assimilation in France

Gabin Langevin
Université de Rennes 1, CREM CNRS UMR 6211, France

Pascaline Vincent
Université de Rennes 1, CREM CNRS UMR 6211, France

December 2013 - WP 2013-41

université de Caen
Basse-Normandie

cnrs
dépasser les frontières

UNIVERSITÉ DE
RENNES 1

National Identity and Immigrants' Assimilation in France[1].

Gabin Langevin[2] and Pascaline Vincent[3]

December 2013

Abstract

Determination and changes of immigrants' identity resulting from intercultural contacts impact their socio-economic integration. To precisely assess individuals' identity, we propose a continuous index which aims to overcome interpretation troubles faced by usual measures of ethnic identity. Then, we investigate the determinants of immigrants' ethnic identity in France. We compare our composite and continuous index exhibiting individuals' assimilation with a usual measure of ethnic identity – the national identity ("I feel French" dummy). We underline the importance of some sociodemographic characteristics in ethnic identity formation and detail immigrants' assimilation in France. We are thus able to show that cultural assimilation and national identity do not always coincide. It seems that the further the origin (in cultural terms), the higher the national identity, but the lower the assimilation. We also present evidence of second generations' identity convergence to natives' one, either in terms of national identity (almost total commitment) or assimilation.

Keywords: ethnicity, ethnic identity, first and second generation immigrants, integration, assimilation.

JEL classification: J15, D63, Z13

---

[2] CREM, Université de Rennes 1, email: gabin.langevin@univ-rennes1.fr.

[3] CREM, Université de Rennes 1, email: pascaline.vincent@univ-rennes1.fr.

1 Introduction

Under the impact of immigration, modern societies become *culturally plural* (Berry, 1997). People of many cultural backgrounds have to live together and immigrants' assimilation is thus a crucial issue. Two models of integration can be pointed out. The multiculturalism model adopted by Anglo-Saxon countries is based on the coexistence of various cultures. On the other hand, the assimilation model adopted in France compels that immigrants perfectly and uniquely integrate the culture of the host country (see Bloemraad, 2007).

Ethnic identity of immigrants is an expression of their integration. This issue has been traditionally addressed by sociologists (Berry, 1997) and political scientists (Abdelal et al, 2009). Economists have recently paid attention to immigrants' identity since it is likely to impact individuals' behaviors and decisions (Akerlof and Kranton, 2000) and therefore to induce consequences on their socioeconomic integration (see for empirical studies, Pendakur and Pendakur, 2005, Constant et al., 2006, Nekby and Rödin, 2007, Manning and Roy, 2010, Battu and Zenou, 2010, Casey and Dustmann, 2010). In most of these works, the empirical measure of ethnic identity is based on the answer to the question *"Do you think of yourself as* [natives' citizenship]*?"* Moreover, although estimation of the impact of ethnic identity on the socioeconomic integration of immigrants raises econometric issues, the literature stresses a significant and negative influence of ethnic identity (Nekby and Rödin, 2007, Constant and Zimmermann, 2009, Casey and Dustmann, 2010, Battu and Zenou, 2010, Bisin et al., 2011).

Nevertheless, this measurement of ethnic identity suffers from a number of drawbacks. The first one is that the surveyed individual has to place herself regarding the native's identity – for instance, through questions like *"do you feel French* (or *"British",* or *"German"*, etc.)*"* that can only be answered by a simple yes or no. This discrete measure of identity loses the fact that the immigrants' identity may be more or less close to the natives' one. For instance, valuable information would similarly be lost by assessing individuals' incomes as *"rich"* or *"poor"* rather than a continuous distribution.

A second drawback raised by Lee (2009) underlines the subjective interpretation that each respondent may give to the reference category (*"as French"*, *"as British"*, *"as German"*, etc.). Indeed, this latter may not be equally salient and valid across individuals and contexts. Similarly, Citrin and Sears (2009) point out that while answering to a *"Do you feel French?"* question like, it is not clear whether the respondent considers the *"civic"* or *"ethnic"* (say, *"cultural"*) conception of a nation? In other words, some may consider themselves as civically French (i.e. in a legal point of view) with, however, multiple ethnic identities (in a cultural point of view). National identity questions cannot report these.

A third one is given by Abdelal et al (2009). It emphasizes the fact that it may be stigmatizing to answer that you do not feel like the natives, particularly when the pollster is a native.

This article makes four contributions.

First, we provide a new measure of ethnic identity that circumvents drawbacks of existing measures. Its key feature is that it is based on characteristics that individuals choose to define themselves. Precisely, we use the *TeO* survey conducted by INED and INSEE in 2008 which is aimed to inform about the life conditions of immigrants and their descendants in France. To assess ethnic identity, we use the following question *"Which of the following features define yourself the most?"* Individuals can choose at most 4 features among the following 14 items : *"my age/generation"*, *"my gender"*, *"my job occupation"*, *"my educational attainment"*, *"my neighborhood or my town"*, *"my*

health", *"my citizenship"*, *"my origins"*, *"my skin color"*, *"my religion"*, *"my hobbies"*, *"my political opinion"*, *"my region of origin"* and *"my family situation"*. We conduct a Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA) on these 14 items and we interestingly observe that the first dimension discriminates characteristics chosen by immigrants from those chosen by native respondents. This crucial dimension represents the ethnic or cultural part of respondents' identity. Note that we do not ask for this immigrants-versus-natives opposition. No information regarding immigration position is included in the MCA. We ex-post observe such an opposition and conclude that the ethnic dimension of identity is the most important.

Following this result, we are thus able to build a weighted composite index of these 14 items where the weights are the correlation coefficients between each item and the first dimension. By construction, this index has to capture respondents' ethnic identity. The higher the index, the closer the self-definition from the *"typical"* native one. The construction of the composite index follows the methodology provided by Filmer and Pritchett (2001) in a rather different context.

Our index therefore circumvents the difficulties faced by the standard measure of ethnic identity. It is continuous and allows obtaining a measure of the cultural distance between immigrants and natives. Furthermore, it overcomes the salience and validity troubles since respondents do not situate themselves regarding a given category but choose characteristics that ex-post locate them on an ethnic identity axis, thanks to the MCA procedure. By doing so, it also follows Sen's (2006) call for multiple identities consideration, rather than a one-dimensional position. Finally, in a face-to-face interview, respondents are likely to feel less under pressure by defining themselves through multiple characteristics than regarding the dominant group belonging (natives).

Second, considering that the presence and importance of identity questions largely differ among surveys and countries, the assimilation index is not a ready-made tool for further studies. However, its methodology is exportable and interesting results are extracted from MCA. In particular, we find on the one hand that immigrants and, to a lesser extent, descendants of immigrants are likely to define themselves with attributes related to their ethnic group (origins, nationality, religion, skin color). On the other hand, natives choose more individualistic items (job, level of education, hobbies). At the risk of paraphrasing Durkheim (1893), the ethnic part of immigrants' identity could be seen as a mechanical identity, because self-definition is made by homogeneity with other ethnic group members. On the contrary, natives' one would be an organic identity, since it highlights individuals' socio-economic interdependence with others members (for more details about mechanical versus organic integration in France see in Schnapper, 2007).

Third, we try to clarify the interpretations that can be done thanks to ethnic identity in terms of socioeconomic integration. Among the existing measures in the empirical literature, national identity is by far the most used. We discuss and qualify conclusions implied by this use by running regressions on national identity and on the assimilation index in parallel. The comparison of the results for both measures enables us to deepen the understanding of national identity and, in particular, to explore its meaning and performance regarding assimilation. This leads us to challenge some conclusions of the economic literature. In particular, Manning and Roy (2010) investigate national identity determinants in Great-Britain and find that *"the process of assimilation is faster for those from poorer and less democratic countries"*. With our data we have a similar conclusion with national identity. However, this conclusion is completely reversed when we use our assimilation index. Then, our contribution is simple, national identity quite imperfectly assesses the convergence of immigrants' ethnic identity

toward natives' one. Furthermore, it seems that when assimilation of an immigrant is high, the claim for national identity remains less necessary.

Finally, we give a detailed description of the determinants of ethnic identity. Notably, as found in the literature (Manning and Roy, 2010, Battu and Zenou, 2010, Casey and Dustmann, 2010), time since arrival is crucial. Thus we show that, compared with first generations, second generations claim more often national identity (93.12%, against 63.33%) and assimilate better. Nevertheless, the assimilation index of second generations is much lower than natives' and some determinants as discrimination or religiosity that do no impact first generations are activated for second's.

The following section presents the literature. Section 3 describes more precisely the identity features and assimilation index achievement after a brief presentation of the survey. We also present the potential measures of identity. In Section 4, we introduce the exogenous variables and corresponding descriptive statistics. Ethnic identity's determinants for the whole French population (thanks to representative weights) are presented in Section 5. Section 6 focuses on a comparison of first and second generations of migrants and presents related determinants. Section 7 concludes.

2 Literature review

This paper focuses on the measurement of ethnic identity with the aim of improving the understanding of immigrants' integration. It thus belongs to two strands of literature, economics of immigration and economics of identity.

The literature in economics about identity is recent. Akerlof and Kranton (2000), Austen-Smith and Fryer (2005) propose theoretical frameworks – not specifically in immigration contexts – to explain individuals' socio-economic outcomes through identity. Identity refers to the sense of belonging to a given group. More particularly, ethnic identity is activated when ethnic groups have to cohabit together which is an obvious consequence of immigration. While migrating, an individual might face a trade-off between conforming to the host culture or preserve her own cultural heritage such that it could even lead to adopt oppositional identities (Battu and Zenou, 2010). Consequently, ethnic identity may have direct implications on economic outcomes (Pendakur and Pendakur, 2005, Constant et al., 2006, Nekby and Rödin, 2007, Battu and Zenou, 2010, Casey and Dustmann, 2010, Bisin et al., 2011). Empirically, immigrant's assimilation is often approached by the national identity (Manning and Roy, 2010, Casey and Dustmann, 2010, Bisin and al., 2010). None of these studies investigate the case of France which is interesting in two ways. First, France has a specific model of integration which promotes cultural conformity of people (natives and immigrants) toward the "French Republican ideal". Second, for two centuries, France has experienced a relatively high rate of immigration[4]. Furthermore, the issue of identity measurement is crucial but poorly documented by the literature. This concern is at the core of this article.

Besides national identity, a few other empirical works have focused on the measurement of ethnic identity (Constant et al., 2006, Nekby, 2007) using Berry's typology. Constant et al. (2006) have introduced the ethnosizer for commitment with home or host identity measurement. It allows a ranking of individuals regarding this commitment among four states of acculturation: integration (commitment with both host and home culture), assimilation (commitment with host culture only), separation

---

[4] See Noiriel (2002).

(commitment with host culture), or marginalization (no commitment with either host or home culture). To compute the index they defined *a priori* identity features such as spoken language, religion, societal interaction... They are then able to emphasize different pre-migration – religious cults, origins – and post-migration determinants – age, education, and hours worked. Our methodology is different and less subjective since we do not have postulate which characteristic should be regarded as typically native or typically immigrant.

In 2011, Bisin et al. focus on ethnic identities of immigrants in Europe. Thanks to factor analysis, they construct a composite index with three variables that are attachment to religion, attachment to traditions and customs, language spoken at home. They present determinants of identity as origins, age, educational level, gender and years since arrival. Then, they analyze the influence of ethnic identity on educational and economic outcomes. However, their index is based on only three variables. The quality and amount of information given by the *TeO* survey as well as the use of Multiple Correspondence Analysis are assets of our index.

Our work provides new information about immigrant's identity in France. Furthermore, we confront usual measures to a new one which exhibits immigrants' assimilation based on individuals' self image. Thus, compared with previous studies, we can show that national identity and assimilation of immigrants, although tied, are not equivalent.

3 Data, sample and measures of ethnic identity

3.1 Data and sample

Our work is based on the French *Trajectoires et Orignes* (*TeO*, thereafter) cross-sectional survey developed in 2008 which focuses on integration and discrimination issues. It offers a very large set of variables about today's first and second generation of immigrants in France. It has been conducted by two main French statistical institutes, INSEE and INED.

The scope of the survey is the set of people from 18 to 60 years old residing in metropolitan France according to the 2007 French national census. Survey areas have been chosen – countryside and cities – to be representative of the structure of the whole country. It voluntarily over-samples immigrants and descendants of immigrants but representative weights have been calculated to improve analysis. The major difficulty was the construction of the second generation sample due to their statistical invisibility in French censuses. This has been fixed by assembling information about parents' birth country, nationality, and information about respondents' current situation. Only one person in the household has been interviewed but information about other members in the housing is available. Finally, 21761 respondents have been kept in the overall sample, including 8456 immigrants, 8161 descendants, 712 DOM[5] natives, 651 descendants of DOM natives and 3781 respondents whom both parents are born French and called French natives. After our own selection (some necessary answers about respondents' self image were missing), our final sample is composed of 6964 descendants of immigrants, 6868 immigrants and 3545 natives.

---

[5] "Départements d'Outre-Mer", that is French Overseas Departments.

The survey can be divided into 3 main themes: domestic and social environment (classical but numerous socio-demographics), access to social life resources (employment, educational, housing outcomes), different dimensions of origins, and cultural belongings (parents' origin, senses of belonging, discriminations, etc.). One of its main appeals is that it includes an entire part about *"person's self image"*.

3.2 The assimilation index

Each one of the existing measures has its limits: interpretation dilemmas with national identity, endogeneity issues in identity formation explanation with the ethnosizer, lack of information and improper statistical method with the composite index of Bisin et al. (2011). Here, we propose a methodology aiming to circumvent drawbacks of these measures.

Construction

Tajfel (1974) explains that individuals identify themselves by features that both translate their belonging to a specific group and distinguish them from other groups. The *TeO* survey offers a large set of variables regarding respondents' identity. One question is particularly interesting in the questionnaire, *"Which of the following features would you choose to define yourself? Please choose at most 4 of them"*. Then, 14 features are proposed: *"my age/generation"*, *"my gender"*, *"my job occupation"*, *"my education"*, *"my neighborhood or town"*, *"my health"*, *"my nationality"*, *"my origins"*, *"my skin color[6]"*, *"my religion"*, *"my hobbies"*, *"my political opinion"*, *"my region of origin"* and *"my family situation"*. We call these previous features identity attributes in the sense that they are chosen by respondents to define themselves. In other words, these attributes are 14 endogenous variables corresponding to 14 specific dimensions of a person's identity. The challenge is to find a proper way to summarize this heterogeneous information about individuals' identity in a unique measure.

In a totally different context, Filmer and Pritchett (2001) create a weighted index of Indian individuals' material possessions (washing machine, clock, etc.) in order to approach long-run wealth. They run a Principal Component Analysis with all individuals possessions as exogenous and assume that the first dimension exhibit respondents' wealth, i.e. their long-run wealth index. Therefore, weights equal correlation coefficients between each possession variable and the first dimension. Bisin et al. (2011) follow this approach with a limited amount of information.

However, PCA in Filmer and Pritchett (2001) and factor analysis in Bisin et al. (2011) are not suitable procedures when exogenous attributes are discrete. That is why we prefer another multivariate procedure, the Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA).

MCA helps us to uncover and summarize the ethnic part of individuals' identity that is common to the 14 identity attributes. Indeed, this statistical procedure aims to classify different variables (here the identity attributes) among several axes, the dimensions, such that the first dimension accounts for as much of the variability in the data as possible and, in turn, each succeeding dimension has to get the highest variance as possible under the constraint that it is uncorrelated with the preceding one.

---

[6] One might think that skin-color is particularly discriminating since it would target particular population. Around 36% of sub-Saharan migrants choose this feature against nearly 10% of French. As regard to the relatively limited gap between the previous proportions we do not think that this feature is biased by restrictiveness.

Therefore, each dimension is a weighted linear combination of all the variables entering in the statistical procedure where weights are the corresponding MCA's correlation coefficients.

Obviously, MCA is a blind procedure and interpretation of each dimension that it produces is left to researchers. Here is an important assumption stipulating that the first dimension (i.e. the one that captures the highest possible part of the common information) exhibits ethnic identity. Running the MCA – without postulating on what should be immigrants' or natives' characteristics (these information about individuals' origins are not used neither needed to run the MCA) – we obtain the satisfaction of this assumption since immigrants are retrospectively located on negative and natives on positive values of the first dimension. This dimension can be extracted as an indicator thanks to correlation coefficients, this indicator being henceforth our assimilation index.

The index will then have the following form for respondent j:

$$I_{1j} = w_{11}.X_{1j} + w_{12}.X_{2j} + \cdots + w_{1Z}.X_{Zj}$$

with I_{1j} being the index (equal to the first dimension) for individual j, w_{1Z} the correlation coefficient between the zth identity attribute and the first component (that is weights) and X_{Zj} the value for the zth attribute. Its minimum is -12.25 and its maximum 7.89 with a mode around 0.41 and a standard deviation equal to 3.47. The higher it is, the closer (resp. the farther) the respondent self-image or identity from the natives' typical one (resp. immigrant's). We interpret moves of the index as improvement or worsening of individual's assimilation since it corresponds to Berry's typology and is positively correlated with the assimilation state of the ethnosizer[7].

Table 1

Weights for assimilation index

Identity attributes	Weights based on MCA
Religion	-4.019
Skin color	-3.852
Nationality	-2.547
Origins	-1.831
Region	-0.394
Gender	0.039
Family	0.498
Health state	0.648
Education	0.831
Town/Neighborhood	0.843
Generation	1.580
Political view	1.725
Job occupation	2.207
Hobbies	2.378

Results for MCA-based weighting procedure are presented in Table 1. There are 9 identity attributes which increase the assimilation index when chosen: hobbies, job occupation, political view

---

[7] Thanks to our data, we were able to build the ethnosizer developed by Constant et al. We then observed that assimilation was the state of acculturation which was the most correlated with our index. In the interest of clarity of the paper, we do not develop the construction of our ethnosizer hereafter. However, further details and results about our *"TeO-based"* ethnosizer and its relations with our index are available upon request.

and generation being the four most representative. Conversely, there are 5 attributes that decrease the index with particularly high coefficients for religion, skin color, nationality and origins. By construction, the assimilation index does not represent the entire individual identity but only the ethnic dimension of it.

We insist on the fact that these attributes are not dummies which would indicate whether the respondent is a male or a female, is graduated or not, has a religion or not and so forth, but dummies which take 1 if she believes that these attributes actually define herself, 0 otherwise. To say it even simpler, every respondent has a family position but everyone does not select it to define herself.

Index performances

Reader used to multivariate analysis knows that the percentage of inertia is crucial to determine the importance of each dimension. Here, the percentage of total inertia explained by the first dimension may seem too low (10.53%). However, M. Greenacre (2005) points out that, with MCA, it would be *"futile to expect a good approximation of a matrix of zero and ones in a two dimensional map of points"*. He advises to find other ways to assess the quality of the dimensions and notably to look at the correctness of predictions. To do so, we run 14 probit regressions with each of the fourteen identity items as endogenous and the assimilation index as the unique regressor. We then check whether or not predicted values of these simple models match actual answers of respondents. Table 2 gives the percentages of correct predictions for each identity attributes. The assimilation index alone predicts almost 70% of no (zero) and 62% of yes (ones). These relatively high percentages suggest that the first dimension (the index) succeed in summarizing the information that is common to all identity attributes.

Table 2

Predictions of each attribute by the index only			
Good predictions	**Not selected**	**Selected**	**Total**
Religion	77.18	91.14	84.16
Skin color	73.16	89.90	81.53
Hobby	71.54	80.51	76.03
Job occupation	78.00	69.85	73.93
Nationality	75.44	68.48	71.96
Generation	70.25	66.14	68.20
Origins	49.38	80.19	64.79
Political view	85.98	42.72	64.35
Quartier	58.27	63.27	60.77
Education	58.20	62.45	60.32
Health	82.66	28.38	55.52
Family	56.50	52.32	54.41
Region	68.93	36.54	52.73
Gender	66.14	35.37	50.75
Total	69.40	61.95	65.67

As main works in this literature, we use national identity (*"I feel French"* dummy). Nevertheless, most papers directly regard national identity as an expression of ethnic identity and even more abusively of immigrants' assimilation.

Our assimilation index, with its combination of multiple attributes, has the advantage to not directly ask people about which group they belong (which is more or less implicitly what national identity and the ethnosizer[8] do) but about which personal characteristics they identify and then to locate them on an endogenous ethnic identity dimension. By doing so, it deepens individuals' identity investigation and enlightens national identity.

4 Treatment and descriptive evidence

4.1 Treatment

In this section and the following, we only focus on national identity and the assimilation index. We look at their determinants thanks to probit – for national identity – and OLS regressions – for the index. Endogeneity is obviously a main concern, insofar as we do not clearly distinguish how far identity explains individual behaviors from how far individual positions influence identity. That is the reason why we focus, as far as possible, on impact of exogenous demographic characteristics as:

For each group,
- Age ;
- Gender ;
- Education, 1 if higher than certificate of general education ("brevet des colleges"), 0 otherwise;
- Language spoken by parents during childhood ;
- Parents' origins ;
- Discrimination feeling, 2 types (due to skin color and due to origin) ;
- Proportion of immigrants in living area, 1 when respondent says that at least half of her neighborhood inhabitants are immigrants ;
- Mother education, 1 if higher than certificate of general education, 0 otherwise ;
- Parents' religion ;
- Home country sense of belonging ;
- Framing effect control ;

For first generations only,
- Years since arrival in France ;
- French citizenship ;

For second generations only,
- Mixed origin, 1 if respondent has exactly one of her parents who is a French native and 0 otherwise ;

---

[8] The appendix provides a comparison of the assimilation index and our TeO-based calculation of the ethnosizer.

We are aware of the risk of endogeneity of some of the previous variables (education, discrimination, for instance) and we try to minimize it as far as possible. However, we cannot completely avoid it and interpretations must be cautious.

The survey provides representative weights that will be used in every treatment of our study. It also proposes a huge amount of other possible variables and we chose the most relevant ones after trying a lot of them. Context variables (as unemployment rate in the neighborhood, average level of education, etc.) could be used but, surprisingly, none of them has a significant impact on either national identity or assimilation index and, more importantly, they would increase endogeneity issues.

Framing effect issue

A well-known issue raised by this type of question is the framing effect. Indeed, while answering a multiple answers question, respondents are likely to choose the first ones. Anticipating this, the fourteen items were written in two different orders (A or B). They were then randomly proposed to respondents. 50.08% of respondents answered a A-order questionnaire, 49.98% answered a B-order questionnaire. Not surprisingly, the comparison of answers among the two series shows that a framing effect occurs. However, in this work, our first interest is not to find the characteristics that people choose to define themselves but if there are differences in these choices between groups. The two series being randomly determined, the difference between each group choice (native, immigrants, and descendants of immigrants) is not impacted. However, the framing effect also influences MCA coefficients. In order, to address this issue, a dummy corresponding to the items' order proposed to each respondent is integrated in the following regressions.

4.2 Descriptive statistics

TeO survey allows differentiation of respondents as regard to their personal migratory history (that is their parents' or their own origin). In particular, it is possible to know whether an individual belongs to the French natives group (that we define as respondents with no migratory history for less than two generations), the first generation group (immigrants) or the second generation group (descendants of immigrants). Here we present some descriptive statistics for each of these groups and for the whole sample.

Table 3
Means of ethnic identity measures

	Overall	Natives	1st Generations	2nd Generations
National Identity (*"I feel French"*)	93.75	97.87	63.33	93.12
Assimilation Index	1.596	2.004	-0.671	0.810
N	17377	3545	6868	6964

Deeper descriptive analysis of national identity thanks to French *TeO* survey can be found in Simon (2012) and Simon and Tiberj (2012).

Table 3 gives weighted means of our both endogenous measures of ethnic identity. Obviously, weights have important impacts on statistics for the whole sample because of over-representation of immigrants in the survey. The proportion of respondents which agrees with the sentence *"I feel French"* largely corresponds to majority (93.75%, 97.87% for natives and 93.12% for descendants). One could consider the proportion of first generations which agrees as low (63.33%) but it is quite

similar with the value found by Manning and Roy (2010) or Battu and Zenou (2010) for British national identity and much higher than what Casey and Dustmann (2010) obtain for German national identity among immigrants with very similar questions in both cases.

Interpretations for the assimilation index are more difficult and regressions results will be much more interesting. Concerning relations between national identity and the assimilation index, we observe a positive correlation between both measures[9]. By construction of the sample, second generations are much younger than natives and even more than first generations (see the appendix for detailed figures). Such a gap in age is likely to induce differences of identity. This will be controlled as far as possible and notably by using representative weights and performing distinct regressions for first and second generations.

Table 4 allows for analyzing the changes of the structure of the French immigration. Indeed, here are presented origins of parents. If we compare second and first generations origins, we then roughly consider two different, although wide, waves of immigration (in average, around the late 60's for second generations' parents, and in the late 80's for first generations). Maghreb immigration has slightly decreased in proportion of overall immigration while the proportion of western European immigration is almost divided by two. Eastern Europe immigration stays at a relative low level when Sub-Saharan's, Asian's and Turkish's have significantly increased. Finally, 41% of second generations' mothers or fathers are French.

<div align="center">Table 4</div>

Origin	Whole sample	1st Generation	2nd Generation
Weighted shares of origins			
Other Africa	6.66	10.10	3.30
Northern America	0.70	0.81	0.58
South America	1.98	3.11	0.70
Asia	4.98	7.81	2.26
Eastern Europe	7.11	6.27	7.95
Western Europe	40.14	27.72	52.26
North Africa	29.57	31.36	27.91
Middle East	1.82	2.52	1.14
Sahel	3.04	4.00	2.10
Turkey	4.01	6.30	1.80
	100.00	100.00	100.00

Complementary tables of descriptive statistics are available in the Appendix. We notably observe that average time since arrival of first generations is quite high (almost 21 years). The highest differences can be observed in religions. While almost none of the natives' parents are Muslims (less than 1%), this religion was followed by parents of 43% of immigrants and more than 25% of descendants. On the contrary, Christian and atheistic represents almost the totality of natives' parents, against less than a half of immigrants' parents and around two thirds of descendants' parents.

European and Arabic languages are the most spoken foreign languages in France (see appendix A3). We distinguish Sahelian languages from other African languages following the work of some French researchers (notably H. Lagrange, 2010) who pointed out a more difficult integration of

---

[9] In order to observe the relation between both measures, we run a simple OLS regression with the assimilation index as endogenous and national identity as regressor, estimate = 1.744***.

Sahelian natives due to cultural gaps. 41.28% of first generations immigrants already acquired French citizenship at the time of the survey. The literature regularly points out the importance of the citizenship's acquisition on national identity of immigrants. Furthermore, we observed that 83.4% of immigrants with French citizenship claim national identity against 49.2% for those without. This is going to be verified by further econometric analysis.

5 Determinants of ethnic identity: whole sample

Our aim is to investigate the importance of each determinant and wonder to what extent national identity is an informative measure of ethnic identity thanks to its comparison with the assimilation index. Table 5 presents the results of a weighted probit on national identity and a weighted OLS regressions on the assimilation index on socioeconomic regressors for the French representative population.

The first remark is that, for this sample, determinants' impacts are quite similar (in terms of signs and significance) for both measures. Though, the assimilation index seems to depend on more numerous determinants than national identity. This is particularly visible for languages[10]. Generally speaking, French taken as control, the use of a foreign language by parents leads to increase respondents' distance from native identity (either assessed by national identity or by the assimilation index). However, one can remark some specificity. European languages only affect national identity. Arab only affects assimilation. We are going to focus deeper on languages in the next section since they can be seen as an assimilation effort of parents for second generations and an asset in terms of human capital for both second and first generations.

Not surprisingly, French origin taken as the reference, respondents' origins have globally negative effects on commitment toward natives' identity. However, situations differ among ethnic groups regarding the selected measure of ethnic identity. While some origins only affect national identity (Northern America, Northern Europe), others exclusively impact the assimilation index (South America, Asia, Sahelian and other Africa). This is an important result of our study, immigrants from culturally close origins (roughly speaking, developed countries) less commit toward national identity but have higher score in the assimilation index. The reverse conclusion holds for culturally far origins.

As expected mixed origin (exactly one parent who is born French) increases both national identity claim and assimilation. Furthermore, it leads to the highest variation among all regressors for national identity and the second highest one for the assimilation index.

Age has significant effects on both measures of ethnic identity but these are surprisingly negative. This can be explained by the fact that first generations, who are the farthest from natives' identity, are elder than other groups (natives and second generations). There is no impact of gender.

---

[10] We consider the first language used by both parents to speak with the respondent during her childhood. When the language spoken by mother and father was different (and different from French) we picked the language spoken by the father. Though subjective, this choice does not affect the analyses since this situation represents only 1.6% of our immigrants' sample (first and second generations).

Table 5

National identity and assimilation index for the whole population

	National Identity	Index
Origin (ref. French)		
Northern America	-0.105*	-0.487
	(-2.55)	(-1.28)
South America	-0.0201	-1.458***
	(-1.26)	(-4.44)
Asia	-0.0109	-1.522***
	(-0.86)	(-5.03)
Africa	-0.00761	-1.909***
	(-0.83)	(-5.44)
Eastern Europe	-0.0285*	-0.658*
	(-2.12)	(-2.21)
Northern Europe	-0.0772***	-0.0345
	(-3.98)	(-0.14)
Southern Europe	-0.0250*	-0.511*
	(-1.99)	(-2.41)
North Africa	-0.0195*	-0.587***
	(-2.23)	(-3.42)
Middle-East	-0.0150	0.00901
	(-1.09)	(0.03)
Sahel	-0.0197	-1.814***
	(-1.56)	(-5.52)
Turkey	-0.0168	-0.418
	(-1.01)	(-1.31)
Mixed	0.0193***	0.423*
	(5.15)	(2.40)
Age	-0.000609**	-0.0166*
	(-3.11)	(-2.31)
Gender	0.00223	-0.0314
	(0.47)	(-0.35)
Diploma	0.0125	0.799***
	(1.74)	(7.35)
Discrimination origin	-0.0172**	-0.467*
	(-3.04)	(-2.31)
Discrimination skin color	-0.00724	-0.637**
	(-1.32)	(-2.62)
Immigrants share in neighborhood	-0.00390*	-0.102*
	(-2.49)	(-2.52)
Mother diploma	0.000508	0.636***
	(0.09)	(5.70)
Citzenship (ref. foreigner)		
French by reintegration	0.0252***	0.0225
	(7.37)	(0.06)
French by acquisition	0.0272***	0.132
	(9.38)	(1.12)
French	0.0735***	0.0675
	(4.70)	(0.38)
Home country national identity	-0.0255***	-0.975***
	(-5.62)	(-9.74)
Years since arrival	0.00156***	0.00714
	(7.85)	(1.07)
Framing effect control	-0.00625	0.455***
	(-1.31)	(5.14)

Table 5 (continued)

National identity and assimilation index for the whole population

	National Identity	Index
Mother religion (ref. atheist)		
Christian	-0.00961	-0.00770
	(-1.06)	(-0.05)
Muslim	0.00312	-0.597*
	(0.32)	(-2.11)
Buddhist	-0.0145	0.640
	(-0.70)	(1.47)
Other	0.0135	0.289
	(1.29)	(0.87)
Father religion (ref. atheist)		
Christian	0.000844	0.222
	(0.08)	(1.46)
Muslim	-0.0183	-0.126
	(-1.27)	(-0.50)
Buddhist	-0.0192	-0.291
	(-0.88)	(-0.73)
Other	-0.0422	-0.320
	(-1.45)	(-1.06)
Importance of religion in received education	0.00228	-0.261***
	(0.79)	(-5.02)
Parents' language (ref. French)		
European	-0.0393**	-0.223
	(-2.92)	(-1.28)
Arab	-0.0157	-0.658***
	(-1.85)	(-3.96)
Berber	-0.0228	-0.451
	(-1.81)	(-1.87)
Sahel	-0.0337*	-0.906*
	(-2.02)	(-2.55)
African	-0.0279*	-0.988**
	(-2.25)	(-3.00)
Asian	-0.0309*	-0.704**
	(-2.23)	(-2.69)
Turkish	-0.0807*	-0.649*
	(-2.50)	(-2.03)
Other	-0.0343	-1.213
	(-1.12)	(-1.89)
N	17377	17377
adj. R-sq	0.316	0.167

*Notes: *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 5, 1 and 0.1 percent level, respectively*

Education may be a source of endogeneity since the causality way with ethnic identity is unclear. Many previous researches use the time of education which does not solve this issue. Thus, we created a dummy with the certificate of general education (CGE) – *Brevet des colleges* – which is the first national diploma that all French pupils have to pass (around 14 or 15 years old, compulsory). Respondents who have a higher diploma are assigned 1 and 0 otherwise. We thus minimize time before diploma and then the potential reverse impact of identity on educational choice. Interestingly, national identity does not depend on diploma whereas the impact of this latter on assimilation index is the highest.

Discrimination feeling is obviously subjective and may imply endogeneity troubles. One must thus be cautious. Yet, it seems that skin color[11] based discrimination does not impact national identity, contrary to origin discrimination. Regarding assimilation index, the coefficient associated with origin discrimination is lower (and less significant) than the skin color's one. In any case, the sign is negative and discrimination increases the distance from natives' identity[12].

During the survey, respondents had to give their own estimation about the proportion of immigrants in their living area. Although there is no way to control for over- or underestimation, this variable is of first interest and could be seen as a perceived segregation indicator. Estimates are significant and suggest the likelier conservation of ethnic identity in segregated areas.

A strong identification with home national identity implies a lower commitment toward identity of natives. This was expectable for the assimilation index since assimilation is a process that does not theoretically accept the conservation of ethnic identities. In a sense, this goes against the hypothesis of multiple identities claiming that ethnic identities are not substitutes but complements.

Pursuant to previous findings, a positive impact of years since arrival can be exhibited (Manning and Roy, 2010 ; Casey and Dustmann, 2010 ; Battu and Zenou, 2010) on national identity. However, it does not impact the assimilation index (it does in the next section when we focus on first generations in particular).

Finally, we are able to look at parents' religions and the importance of religion during respondent's childhood. National identity is not significantly driven by parents' religion and the only significant impact on the assimilation index comes from the practice of Islam by the mother. However, robustness of this result is weak since it does not hold in the next section while considering only immigrants. What is actually primordial is not the religion but the importance of it in respondent childhood education.

6 National identity and assimilation: first and second generations

This section investigates the determinants of ethnic identity for first and second generations of immigrants (Table 6) and allows innovative information about their situation in France. We are also able to challenge previous conclusions of the literature. Unfortunately, we do not have panel data and immigration structure had changed between first and second generations of the sample, comparisons in terms of intergenerational integration between these two groups are thus fragile.

6.1 Differences between second and first generations

The determinants of ethnic identity do not have the same impact on first and second generations. Origins well explain identity of first generations (with positive signs for national identity and negative ones for the index, this result is developed in the next subsection) but do not influence second generations' one. This is an evidence for the process of assimilation since the inertia of home culture decreases among time and generations.

---

[11] Surprisingly we did not find significant crossed effect of African origin and skin color discrimination.

[12] Endogeneity could appear if people with strong ethnic identity react stronger to potential discrimination than those close to natives' identity and thus declare it more often to the pollster.

Table 6
Table 6
Comparison of Identities between First and Second Generations

	National Identity		Assimilation index	
	1st Generations	2nd Generations	1st Generations	2nd Generations
	Marginal effect	Marginal effect	Estimate	Estimate
Origin (ref. other Africa[13])				
Northern America	-0.313***	-0.0951	1.959***	0.802
	(-3.87)	(-1.12)	(4.28)	(1.12)
South America	-0.0912	-0.00861	0.864*	0.724
	(-1.45)	(-0.20)	(2.13)	(1.24)
Asia	-0.0162	0.00653	0.174	0.732
	(-0.29)	(0.25)	(0.45)	(1.50)
Eastern Europe	-0.191***	0.0184	1.656***	0.274
	(-3.34)	(1,13)	(4.88)	(0.48)
Northern Europe	-0.291***	-0.0433	2.691***	0.759
	(-5.84)	(-1.38)	(8.71)	(1.46)
Southern Europe	-0.196***	-0.0297	1.830***	0.549
	(-3.75)	(-1.78)	(5.74)	(1.21)
North Africa	-0.0736	-0.0103	1.452***	0.699
	(-1.23)	(-0.60)	(3.53)	(1.51)
Middle-East	-0.0466	-0.0307	1.801***	1.486*
	(-0.69)	(-0.83)	(3.93)	(2.28)
Sahel	-0.0669	-0.00932	0.166	-0.671
	(-1.35)	(-0.41)	(0.46)	(-1.28)
Turkey	-0.0897	-0.0326	1.431***	1.068
	(-1.14)	(-0.79)	(3.39)	(1.92)
Mixed	-	0.0172	-	0.472*
	-	(1.67)	-	(2.26)
Age	-0.00268**	0.00109*	-0.00118	0.00196
	(-3.00)	(1.97)	(-0.21)	(0.19)
Gender	0.0927***	-0.00467	0.386***	-0.0850
	(6.29)	(-0.60)	(3.98)	(-0.56)
Diploma	-0.000720	0.0116	0.898***	0.335
	(-0.04)	(1.26)	(8.52)	(1.65)
Discrimination origin	-0.0893***	-0.0265*	-0.00278	-0.119
	(-3.83)	(-2.02)	(-0.02)	(-0.70)
Discrimination skin color	-0.0345	-0.0262	-0.647*	-1.346***
	(-1.03)	(-1.67)	(-2.55)	(-5.29)
Immigrants share in neighborhood	-0.0285***	-0.00895***	-0.142***	-0.0809
	(-4.79)	(-3.39)	(-3.68)	(-1.43)
Mother diploma	-0.0281	-0.00749	0.723***	0.480**
	(-1.21)	(-0.75)	(4.75)	(3.29)
Citizenship (ref. foreigner)				
French by reintegration	0.178***	0.0312*	0.418	-1.779*
	(4.40)	(2.14)	(1.07)	(-2.42)
French by acquisition	0.245***	0.0379***	0.0958	-0.0544
	(16.25)	(5.57)	(0.84)	(-0.12)
French	-0.0911	0.0750*	1.731*	-0.246
	(-0.30)	(2.27)	(2.07)	(-2.43)
Home country national identity	-0.153***	-0.00140	-0.904***	-0.763***
	(-10.38)	(-0.20)	(-9.08)	(-4.70)
Years since arrival	0.00938***	-	0.0123*	-
	(11.32)	-	(2.28)	-
Framing effect control	0.000202	0.00631	0.649***	0.438**
	(0.01)	(0.93)	(6.76)	(3.06)

---

[13] Other Africa corresponds to African countries excepted North African and Sahelian ones.

Table 6 (continued)
Comparison of Identities between First and Second Generations

	National Identity		Assimilation index	
	1st Generations	2nd Generations	1st Generations	2nd Generations
	Marginal effect	Marginal effect	Estimate	Estimate
Importance of religion in received education	-0.0215**	-0.00819*	-0.541***	-0.471***
	(-2.70)	(-2.53)	(-11.04)	(-5.06)
Mother religion (ref. atheist)				
Christian	-0.0270	0.00990	0.221	0.160
	(-0.61)	(0.70)	(0.86)	(0.55)
Muslim	0.00315	-0.0211	0.661	-0.347
	(0.05)	(-0.97)	(1.60)	(-1.05)
Buddhist	-0.0681	-0.0384	1.011*	-0.468
	(-0.66)	(-0.47)	(1.96)	(-0.95)
Other	-0.0509	-0.0102	0.605	0.597
	(-0.76)	(-0.50)	(1.42)	(1.10)
Father religion (ref. atheist)				
Christian	0.0722	-0.00933	0.0467	0.606**
	(1.91)	(-0.64)	(0.21)	(2.63)
Muslim	0.0456	-0.0118	-0.632	-0.122
	(0.74)	(-0.65)	(-1.58)	(-0.47)
Buddhist	-0.0718	-0.00360	-0.294	-0.0161
	(-0.70)	(-0.09)	(-0.58)	(-0.04)
Other	0.0391	-0.0272	-0.102	-0.421
	(0.73)	(-1.20)	(-0.28)	(-1.35)
Parents' language (ref. French)				
European	-0.100*	-0.0746**	0.0530	-0.393
	(-2.52)	(-2.79)	(0.24)	(-1.65)
Arab	-0.0771	-0.0202	-0.231	-0.866***
	(-1.49)	(-1.49)	(-0.59)	(-3.99)
Berber	-0.119	-0.0372	-0.637	-0.236
	(-1.83)	(-1.31)	(-1.35)	(-0.58)
Sahel	-0.121	-0.0270	-0.466	0.239
	(-1.80)	(-0.92)	(-0.98)	(0.44)
African	-0.117*	-0.0547	0.0554	-1.786**
	(-2.38)	(-1.13)	(0.18)	(-3.09)
Asian	-0.143**	-0.0000113	-0.128	0.0240
	(-2.71)	(-0.00)	(-0.37)	(0.06)
Turkish	-0.261**	-0.0790	-0.0790	-1.371**
	(-3.25)	(-1.31)	(-0.18)	(-2.92)
Other	-0.171	-	-0.270	-
	(-1.46)	-	(-0.35)	-
N	6868	6964	6868	6964
adj. R-sq	0.177	0.134	0.193	0.195

*Notes: *, ** and *** indicate statistical significance at the 5, 1 and 0.1 percent level, respectively*

If we now focus on languages spoken by parents during childhood, these differently impact first and second generations. Four groups of languages (European, African, Asian, and Turkish) have a negative impact on first generations' national identity but no one influences the assimilation index. On the opposite, a few second generations' childhood languages impact their assimilation scores (Arab, African and Turkish) whereas only European languages lead to a decrease of their national identity.

Age has different roles on national identity. Considering the first generations (resp. second generations), the elder they are, the lower (resp. the higher) their national identity. Though, it does not drive the assimilation index neither for immigrants nor descendants of immigrants.

French citizenship[14] and its acquisition type give expectable and positive results regarding national identity. However, it seems to have no influence on the assimilation index. French citizenship acquisition by reintegration claim[15] for second generations even has a surprising negative estimate on assimilation.

Gender only affects first generations and males are closer from natives' identity.

A surprising result concerns respondents' diploma. This latter only significantly plays a role in first generations assimilation index formation. This result may come from our restrictive choice of considering only the first national grade that French pupils have to pass as a proxy of respondents' education. By doing so, we aim to reduce the endogeneity bias.

Parents' religion does not drive ethnic identities. However, its importance in respondent's childhood is highly significant for each generation and negatively related to each identity measure.

Finally, many determinants have expectable and similar coefficients. A mixed origin and a well-educated mother are assets to commit toward natives' identity, while living in a segregated area (immigrants in neighborhood), a strong identification with home country (I feel [home country]), and a discrimination experience are not.

Years since arrival for immigrants have a quite high impact on national identity since the average migrant that spent 20 years on the French territory would face a 19% increase of her probability to feel French. Not surprisingly, ethnic identities commitment is a time-costly process. Nevertheless, time since arrival - even though significant - plays a much less important role on assimilation index compared with other determinants.

6.2 Key differences between national identity and assimilation

In section 5, signs and significances generally coincide among ethnic identity measures. This is not the case if we focus on first and second generations only. Many determinants impact one but not the other. Some even have opposite signs.

On the one hand, some determinants affect national identity but not the assimilation index. This is the case of age, origin related discrimination, acquired French citizenship and European languages spoken by parents. On the other hand, skin color related discrimination, mother diploma and the control for the framing effect are significant determinants of assimilation but not of national identity.

More strikingly, origins of respondents significantly lead to different signs of coefficients. To consider only one measure in order to give conclusions on ethnic identity formation is thus likely to imply partially wrong understandings. To highlight this risk, let us focus on origins of first generations. The reference origin, other (i.e. than North and Sahel) Africa, is the same for all models. However, while almost all groups of origins are less likely to claim national identity than the control, they assimilate more French typical self-definition (assimilation index). In particular, western European immigrants have a probability to claim national identity almost 30% lower than Sub-Saharan African ones. This was not expected but consistent with Manning and Roy (2010) findings. Using only British national identity (answer to "What do you consider your national identity to be?"), they indeed conclude that immigrants from poorer and less democratic countries assimilate better. Yet,

---

[14] One could wonder why a second generation respondent can be foreigner as regard to the French "jus solis" for citizenship. The reason is that a second generation individual, when she attains legal majority, is given the opportunity to choose to keep either home and host nationalities (usual choice) or only one (scarcer case).

[15] This procedure refers to people who have had their French citizenship lost and want it back.

if we consider origins' estimates for the assimilation index, Western Europe coefficient of first generations is the highest positive one, that is to say that western European immigrants assimilate better than Sub-Saharan. Our conclusion is thus opposite to Manning and Roy since, here, assimilation of poorer and less democratic countries' natives appears to be lower.

We do not see these remarks as evidence for the failure of one measure or the other, but as the justification of their combination in such a study. They do not measure exactly the same process but, taken separately, they are not sufficient to give proper information on identity formation and, further, on the influence of ethnic identity on socioeconomic outcomes. Their combination can even be helpful to understand their working. For instance, we believe that if assimilation of an immigrant is high, the claim for national identity is made less necessary to belong to the society. The national identity claim can be seen less as a proxy for French identity than a way to fulfill an already existing assimilation gap.

7 Conclusion

Ethnic identity has become a key element in studies focusing on immigration. Issues and changes resulting from intercultural contacts are indeed a major concern. This paper aims to investigate the lack of interest given to ethnic identity measurement in previous studies and to use these understandings to tell more about immigrants' assimilation in France.

In order to complement usual measures, we build an assimilation index that takes into account the distance to the host culture while having identified its cultural characteristics through a statistical method, without making prior assumptions on these characteristics. We thus assess and investigate ethnic identity through two different channels: a dummy for national identity and a continuous variable for assimilation. We claim that this measure brings new information about migrants' assimilation in France, and is more suitable for an analysis of the effects of assimilation on migrants' economics outcomes as it captures an actual distance in identity.

The MCA analysis enables to clearly distinguish different sets of variables that distinguish immigrants' from French natives' self-image. According to this analysis, 5 typical immigrant features increase the distance with the French identity when chosen that are religion, origins, skin color and nationality. On the opposite, the three most representative variables for the natives are hobbies, job and generation.

What this paper shows is that both measures, national identity and assimilation index, bring different and complementary information about migrants' identity. However, national identity cannot be substituted to assimilation measures since it does not sufficiently and finely approach ethnic identity. We show that it can even lead to wrong interpretations. Indeed, individuals possibly identify themselves like French natives do but reject the national identity, whereas others who do not assimilate French stereotypes claim the national identity. This is even more striking when considering origins of immigrants.

National identity captures an assimilation will or wish, the assimilation index captures, as far as possible, realized assimilation.

Our results qualify Manning and Roy's (2010) conclusion since we find that assimilation of immigrants from poorest countries is lower, even though they are more likely to "feel French". This

justifies the plea of political science for combination of measurements (Sylvan and Metskas, 2009, Abdelal et al., 2009) and, notably, for continuous variables (Lee, 2009).

Thus, we claim that finer measures like the assimilation index would be more suitable to analyze the impact of ethnic identity (as a distance to natives' identity) on socioeconomic outcomes.

Identity theory is particularly suitable for the investigation of the French model of assimilation. Indeed, immigrants in France are expected to economically and socially integrate but they also had to assimilate French values and culture which mainly differs from multiculturalism. Our results – notably regarding time since arrival and the comparison of assimilation levels between first and second generations – suggest that assimilation is a long process and that determinants of ethnic identity formation cannot be well understood by using national identity as a unique proxy.

As regard to our results about ethnic identity's determinants, some facts can be exhibited. As said before, immigration structure has changed in six decades, thus today's and yesterday's immigrants should not be directly compared. However, inertia of origins decreases for second generations' assimilation. Descendants' national identity rate is very close from natives and their assimilation index is much higher than first generations' one.

Appendix

A.1. Descriptive statistics

<div align="center">Table A.1</div>

<div align="center"><i>Weighted means and proportions</i></div>

	French population	First Generation	Second Generation
Age	39.21	40.68	35.21
Gender [male]	49.16	47.81	51.03
Diploma: >CGE	75.59	60.04	74.14
Discrimination: origin	4.11	16.06	12.9
Discrimination: skin color	1.94	7.67	5.69
Migrants in neighborhood [>50%]	11.05	27.29	21.96
Mother religion			
None	24.49	6.95	15.53
Christian	72.00	42.16	53.69
Muslim	0.48	43.06	24.71
Buddhist	0.06	3.37	1.08
Other	2.98	4.47	4.99
Father religion			
None	31.03	9.76	21.15
Christian	63.8	39.17	44.26
Muslim	0.55	42.61	27.19
Buddhist	0.00	2.92	1.00
Other	4.61	5.53	6.40
Religion role in received education			
Not important	37.82	14.65	26.80
Slightly important	33.86	21.60	28.35
Rather important	16.21	24.17	22.46
Very Important	12.12	39.57	22.38
Mother's diploma	17.74	16.32	14.46
French citizenship	93.61	41.28	97.79
I feel [home country]	9.25	55.91	26.85
Community size	5.96	5.61	6.30
Years since arrival		20.71	

Table A2

Languages: weighted proportions

	French population	First Generation	Second Generation
French	82.04	4.8	48.68
Arabic	5.08	27.32	17.57
Berber	1.01	6.38	2.63
Sahelian	0.4	2.61	1.08
Other Africa	0.89	7.2	0.9
European	8.19	34.02	24.92
Asian	2.39	17.66	4.22

References

Abdelal R., Y., Herrera, A., Johnston and R., McDermott, 2009, Measuring Identity. A guide for social scientists, Cambridge University Press.

Akerlof, G.A., and R.E., Kranton, 2000, "Economics and Identity", Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 115, 715-753.

Austen-Smith, D., and R.G., Fryer, 2005, "An Economic Analysis of Acting White", Quarterly Journal of Economics, vol. 120, 551-583.

Battu, H., and Y., Zenou, 2010, "Oppositional Identities and Employment for Ethnic Minorities: Evidence from England", Economic Journal, vol.120, F52-F71.

Berry, J.W., 1997, "Immigration, Acculturation and Adaptation", Applied Psychology, 46, 5-34.

Bisin, A., E., Patacchini, T., Verdier, and Y., Zenou, 2010, "Bend it like Beckham.: Ethnic Identity and Integration", NBER working paper series.

Bisin, A., E., Patacchini, T., Verdier, and Y., Zenou, 2011, "Ethnic Identity and Labour Market Outcomes of Immigrants in Europe", Economic Policy, vol. 26, 57-92.

Bloemraad I., 2007, "Unity in Diversity? Bridging Models of Multiculturalism and Immigrant Integration", DuBois Review: Social Science Research on Race, vol. 4, 317-336.

Casey, T.,and C., Dustmann, 2010, "Immigrants'Identity, Economic Outcomes and the Transmission of Identity across Generations", Economic Journal, vol. 120, F31-F51.

Citrin, J., and D.O., 2009, Sears, "Balancing National and Ethnic Identities", in Measuring Identity. A guide for social scientists, Cambridge University Press.

Constant, A., L.,Gataullina, and K.F., Zimmermann, 2006, "Ethnosizing Immigrants", IZA Discussion Paper No. 2040.

Constant, A., and K.F., Zimmermann, 2008, "Measuring Ethnic Identity and its Impact on Economic Behavior", Journal of the European Economic association, vol.6, 424-433.

Constant, A., and K.F., Zimmermann, 2009, "Migration, Ethnicity and Economic Integration", IZA discussion Papers 4620, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).

Durkheim, E., 1893, De la Division du Travail Social.

Filmer, D., and L.H., Pritchett, 2001, "Estimating Wealth Effects without Expenditure Data or Tears : an Application to educational Enrollments in States of India",Demography, vol. 38, 115-132.

Greenacre, M., 2005, "From correspondence analysis to multiple and joint correspondence analysis", Economics Working Papers 883, Department of Economics and Business, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Lagrange, H., 2010, Le Déni des Cultures, Paris: Seuil.

Lee, T., 2009, "Between Social Theory and Social Science Practice", in Measuring Identity. A guide for social scientists, Cambridge University Press.

Manning, A., and S., Roy, 2010, "Culture Clash or Culture Club? National Identity in Britain", Economic Journal, 120, F72-F100.

Nekby, L., and M., Rödin, 2007, "Acculturation Identity and Labor Market Outcomes", IZA Discussion Papers No 2826.

Noiriel G., 2002, Atlas de l'immigration en France : Exclusion, intégration…, Paris: Autrement.

Pendakur, K., and R., Pendakur, 2005, "Ethnic Identity and the Labour Market", unpublished manuscript, Simon Fraser University.

Schnapper, D., 2007, Qu.est-ce qe l'Intégration?, Paris: Gallimard.

Sen, A., 2006, Identity and Violence.The Illusion of Destiny., Penguin.

Simon, P., 2012, "French National Identity and Integration: Who Belongs to the National Community?", Migration Policy Institute.

Simon, P., V., Tiberj, 2012, "Les Registres de l'Identité. Les Immigrés et leurs Descendants face à l'Identité Nationale", Document de Travail 176, INED.

Sylvan, D.A., and A.K., Metskas, 2009, "Trade-offs in Measuring Identities", in Measuring Identity. A guide for social scientists, Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., 1974, "Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour", Social Science Information, vol.13, 65-93.

Trajectoires et origins (TeO) - version complète - 2008 - (2008) [fichier electronique], INED et INSEE [producteur], Centre Maurice Halbwachs (CMH) [diffuseur].

Whyte, W.F., 1943, Street corner society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.