



university of
 groningen

**Immigration Policy and Attitudes towards Immigration:
 A Comparison of Australia and Germany**

Faculty of Spatial Science | Department of Demography
 Master Thesis | Population Studies
 August 2011

Student:
 Philipp Ueffing

Supervisor:
 Prof. Dr. C.H. Mulder

Second Reader:
 Dr. M. Tavener



Abstract

Australia and Germany are often described as opposite poles of the migration spectrum. This paper presents a comparative study of the link between immigration policy and attitudes towards immigration in the two countries. The developments of the German and Australian immigration policy since 1945 are reviewed and related to results from regression models on attitudes towards immigration with respect to economic and cultural issues. While a multicultural policy evolved in Australia, the ideology of 'not a country of immigration' persisted in Germany throughout the 20th century. Data on attitudes is derived from the International Social Survey Program 2003. From drawing parallels between the different immigration policies and cross-country differences in attitudes towards immigration in Australia and Germany, two major findings are retrieved. Firstly, the multicultural, skill-oriented, and active immigration policy in Australia is mirrored in, compared to Germany, more positive sentiments about the economic and cultural impact of immigration and less opposition to further immigration. Secondly, individual level effects related to people's socio-demographic background are similar in Australia and Germany and are not found to explain cross-country differences.

Contents

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Literature Review 2
- 3. Theoretical Framework: Immigration Policy as a Source of Differences in Attitudes towards Immigration 5
 - 3.1 Immigration Policy in Australia and Germany 6
 - 3.2 Policy, Attitudes and the Economic Impact of Immigration 9
 - 3.3 Policy, Attitudes and the Cultural Impact of Immigration 11
 - 3.4 Hypotheses about Attitudes towards Immigration in Australia and Germany 12
- 4. Methodology 14
 - 4.1 The ISSP Dataset 14
 - 4.2 Method 15
 - 4.3 Measures 16
- 5. Results 18
 - 5.1 Composition of Background Characteristics and Distribution of Attitudes 19
 - 5.2 Economic Considerations of Immigration and Attitudinal Differences 20
 - 5.3 Cultural Considerations of Immigration and Attitudinal Differences 24
 - 5.4 Economic and Cultural Considerations and Opinions about Countries’ Immigrant Intake 25
- 6. Conclusions 28
- References 31

1. Introduction

In the past half century, most Western countries experienced substantial public debates about immigration. In a progressively globalizing world witnessing immigrant flows gaining in number and frequency, the intensity and volume of the immigration debate are likely to increase in the future (Castles and Miller 2008). Certain positive as well as negative perceptions of immigration have been repetitively brought forward over time and across countries. On the one hand, immigrants are welcomed as a supply of additional workforce, enrichment of cultural life, a foundation for new ideas or a solution for demographic problems. On the other hand, natives raise concerns about a weakening of the welfare system, regard immigrants as competitors for jobs or fear that immigrants will undermine national traditions and practices (Meyers 2004, Joppke 1999). These ambivalent and conflicting views on immigration vary greatly within and across countries and attitudes towards immigrants are linked to deeply held opinions about economic and cultural issues in a country's population (Card, Dustmann and Preston 2005). However, who opposes immigration and in what countries? And, why would certain social groups or specific nations show stronger sentiments than others? Further, what are the driving factors behind attitudes, is it economic or cultural considerations?

Previous empirical research (in migration literature) has extensively investigated the determinants of individual attitudes towards immigration. Explanations for people's sentiments have been found to be rooted in economic and cultural concerns and are reported to be dependent on persons' socio-economic characteristics. The presented empirical results, however, differ strongly in their conclusions on the role of economic and noneconomic factors (Dustmann and Preston 2004, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, Mayda 2006, Scheve and Slaughter 2001). With respect to cross-country differences in attitudes towards immigration, research findings are controversial. Some scholars (Mayda 2006, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006) explain varying views with factors as a country's state of economy or the composition and size of its immigrant stock. In contrast, recent work does not find economic or demographic circumstances to be reliable indicators of variations and cross-country differences are suggested to be driven by unobservable country-specific indicators (Betts 2010; Brenner and Fertig 2006; Card, Dustmann and Preston 2005).

The initial point for the research on sentiments towards immigrants in the last decade was the work of Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) that linked cross-country differences in attitudes towards immigration to immigration policy. On the basis of economic theory, they argued that an immigration policy focusing on skilled migrants does a better job in assimilating them into the labor market, which in turn would result in more positive views on immigration in the population. The follow-up studies by several others concentrated notably on the effect of immigration on the economy in the light of two opposing approaches in economic theory: One strand claims that immigrants depress the wages of low skilled workers and aggravate unemployment (Burgess 1996, 1999), the other strand postulates that there is no evidence for such effects or that they are only small and negligible (Card 2005, Peri and Sparber 2007). At the same time, scholars from both positions agree on the importance of noneconomic factors. However, explanations for cross-country differences in this regard are rare and lack theoretical background. Furthermore, while debating over the economic impact,

the initial idea that attitudes are related to policy has been widely disregarded. Applying economic and cultural theory, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) conclude from their analysis of differences in attitudes towards migration that several factors including migration policy, migration experiences and economic conditions might play a role and that further work is demanded to explore their importance.

Drawing on the remarks of Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005), this paper wants to pick up on the initial idea of Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) that immigration policy has an impact on attitudes towards immigrants. While Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) looked at this association from the angle of economic theory and focused on economic outcomes of immigration, this paper wants to extend the investigation to aspects of cultural theory in order to find profound explanations for attitudes towards immigration. The approach taken is to analyze and compare individual's opinion about immigration in the populations of Australia and Germany based on data from the International Social Survey Program 2003. These two countries are chosen because they differ greatly in their immigration policy and are described in this regard as two opposing poles of the migration spectrum; while at the same time both countries have experienced mass immigration since 1945 and encountered comparable migratory processes (Castles 2008). Hence, if immigration policy is correlated with people's sentiments, the two countries should show significant cross-country differences in individual attitudes towards immigration. Analogously, the question this paper strives to answer is: How do the different immigration policies affect people's sentiments about immigration in Australia and Germany?

The focus on two nations differs from former approaches in the sense that other research has either concentrated on a single country in order to find determinants of individual attitudes or investigated a whole range of countries in order to detect cross-country differences. The benefit from the approach taken here is the possibility to examine in detail the immigration policies of both countries and their link to views on immigrants in the two populations. This is thought to be relevant since results in the field have been fragmentary and controversial. Furthermore, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) point out that additional research is needed to disentangle the different sources of public opinion on immigration. With this study, I hope to add to this debate from the angle of immigration policy.

2. Literature Review

One strand of literature on sentiments about immigration relates individual attitudes to economic models about the labor market impact of immigration postulating that the skill composition of immigrants influence natives' opinions. The models (a Factor-Proportions Analysis Model and a Heckscher-Ohlin Model) predict that an immigrant composition that is relatively less skilled (less educated) than the composition of residents reduces the supply of skilled relative to unskilled labor in the receiving country and hence increases the wages of the skilled workers (Borjas 1999, Borjas, Freeman and Katz 1996). In consequence, attitudes towards immigrants would be more positive among the skilled labor force as their positions in the labor market are not threatened by immigration and they rather profit from it. Accordingly, in the opposite situation where residents are less skilled than immigrants the

more favorable attitude towards immigration shifts (Mayda 2006, Scheve and Slaughter 2001).

Analyzing data from the United States National Election Studies Survey, Scheve and Slaughter (2001) provide support for this hypothesis. Besides their focus on the link between labor market competition and individual preferences on immigration, they also test noneconomic variables for which they find significant effects: A person's ideology and political party affiliation influence his/her attitudes towards immigrants. More negative sentiments are connected with favoring the republicans instead of the democrats and to being rather conservative than liberal.

Further support for the effect of skill composition of immigrants relative to natives comes from Mayda (2006) and O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006). Both research projects use data from the ISSP National Identity I survey from 1995 and extend Scheve and Slaughter's investigation which solely focused on the US by applying a cross-country perspective. Their major finding is that in developed countries high skilled persons are less opposed to immigration than low skilled and that this effect is positively correlated with a country's wealth. They conclude that economic theory of migration and particularly the Hackscher-Ohlin Model does a good job in explaining individual attitudes towards migration within and across countries. Furthermore, both papers report the importance of noneconomic factors. Mayda (2005, 527) finds that attitudes covary with individual perceptions of the cultural effect of immigration as well as with the individual feelings of national-identity. However, she emphasizes that the labor-market variables "play a key and robust role" and that they do not alter significantly when controlling for noneconomic factors. O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006) denote the correlation between depreciative sentiments towards immigrants and nationalist attitudes.

Findings opposing this economic theory about the labor market impact of immigration that correlates skill composition of immigrants to attitudes suggest that education is the predominant driver of individuals' sentiments regardless of the skill attributes of immigrants (Brenner and Fertig 2006, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007). Greater animosity towards immigration among the lower educated is related to cultural issues, particularly to differences among individuals' ethnic tolerance.

Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007), analyzing data from 22 countries of the European Social Survey (ESS) in 2003, state that labor market theory misinterprets the relationship between people's skill level and attitudes towards immigration. Testing for educational attainment as well as occupational measures, they do not find evidence for the hypothesis that low skilled or low educated individuals are more opposed to immigration as they fear job competition with immigrants. They further claim that their results were actually in line with more recent research on the economic impact of immigration which could not confirm negative effects of immigration on income or unemployment (This is described for example by Card 2005, Foster 1996 or Peri and Sparber 2007). Higher education would be associated with different cultural values and conceptions of national identity and in this way influence individuals' sentiments. Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) report that with higher education respondents were less racist, placed greater value on cultural diversity, and were more likely to support the statement that immigration generates economic benefit for the economy.

Using the same data set Brenner and Fertig (2006) further test the findings of Hainmueller and Hiscox on the link between attitudes, education and labor market effects, and present supporting results for the correlation between education, cultural beliefs and attitudes. Besides respondents education attainment they also observe a significant relationship between parental education and sentiments towards immigration. Moreover, they do not find significantly varying “attitudes-education-profiles” across countries, which, according to Brenner and Fertig (2006), should be the case if labor market theory held true.

Looking specifically at the determinants of attitudes towards foreigners (and Jews) in Germany, Fertig and Schmidt (2011) report that education is the only reliable variable explaining perceptions of immigrants (and Jews). Based on several questions on the perception of foreigners from the ALLBUS (Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften: Equivalent to the American General Social Survey), they further indicate that a respondent’s labor market status, age or gender were insignificant when taking into account all different questions on immigration. Moreover, they find no significant differences between East and West Germany.

Based on the analysis of extensive data from the British Social Survey from 1983 to 1991, Dustmann and Preston (2004) investigate noneconomic and economic factors in attitudes towards immigration and present a somewhat compromised position. In addition to the prediction of increasing labor market competition, they extend economic theory to the impact of immigration on the welfare system and its influence on attitudes. With regard to noneconomic factors, Dustmann and Preston (2004) account for individuals’ reservations against an influx of persons from different cultural backgrounds. Looking at concerns about welfare systems, they argue analogously to Borjas (1999) that immigration could cause an additional burden for the welfare system and in consequence influence people’s attitudes towards immigrants. In terms of cultural concerns they assume that ethnic or cultural distance hinders integration processes and induces animosity between ethnic groups. In this way it facilitates animosity towards foreigners. Their results suggest an association between attitudes and these three dimensions. However, cultural concerns or intolerance is reported to be the main factor, whereas no strong evidence is found for an association between labor market concerns or welfare system consideration and respondents’ sentiments about immigration.

In a follow-up study Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) now using data from the European Social Survey (ESS) 2003 extend their study to a cross-national perspective. Furthermore, beside economic theory they put equal emphasis on the linkage between attitudes towards migration and social theory in order to explain cultural issues. The association of cultural and racial factors with sentiments towards immigrants has been disregarded and taken for granted to certain degree in the previously described studies. Concerning economic theory, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) reject labor market competition models that immigration negatively affects the low skilled or educated in terms of income and unemployment and, similar to Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007: 6), point out that “more sophisticated models” had shown that the impact was “relatively small, or even zero”. Nevertheless, they emphasize that a real influence of immigration was negligible as in any case low skilled or educated individuals might oppose immigration “based on the belief” that it depresses wages and increases labor market competition. In order to explain the influence of noneconomic factors, for example concerns about the cultural impact of immigration, Card,

Dustmann and Preston (2005) discuss group conflict and social identity theory. The former claims that immigrants might impose an (imagined) threat on the natives' control over social and cultural institutions, the latter postulates that defining immigrants as 'the other' could increase individuals' social identity. As a consequence, both might operate as a source of negative attitudes towards immigrations. Furthermore, social identity theory might also be useful for explaining cross-country differences that might be related to differing policy concepts of citizenship and naturalization.

In a first part that investigates socio-economic characteristics of respondents, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) confirm the results of the previously described studies that education has the strongest impact on attitudes. They further present that individuals who are older, live in a rural location and do not have an ethnic minority background are most likely to have negative sentiments about immigration. Concerning cross-country differences, they find that the strength of depreciative attitudes towards immigration varies substantially between nations. However, economic and demographic country indicators (GDP per capita, unemployment rate, share of foreign born in population) could not explain these differences. Similar results are presented by Sides and Citrin (2007) who stress that contextual factors, notably the amount of immigration into a country and the overall state of its economy, are insignificant predictors of opposition to immigrants. Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) conclude from their study that several factors such as migration policy, migration experiences and state of the economy might explain differences in attitudes without further investigating the relative importance of these assumptions.

In this respect, Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) explore the association between immigration policy and attitudes towards immigrants using data from the 1995 ISSP Nation Identity I Round. Based on economic theory of immigration, they hypothesize that policy shapes the labor market assimilation of immigrants and in consequence people's sentiments about them. They find that respondents in countries with a skill based policy show more favorable attitudes towards immigration. Looking at individuals' socio-economic characteristics they further report similar patterns across countries: A high level of education, age, being female, and residing in a city have positive impacts on the probability that respondents are more positive about immigration.

3. Theoretical Framework: Immigration Policy as a Source of Differences in Attitudes towards Immigration

Concerns about the impact of immigration have regularly come to the fore in both Australia and Germany. They are expressed, on the one hand, in people's fear of job competition, unemployment, lower wages or a degradation of the social welfare system. On the other hand, reasons to oppose immigrants are linked to worries about losing traditional values and customs, cultural alienation, forfeiting self-determination and identity or simply political power. The main idea of the theoretical approach taken in this paper is that a country's immigration policy affects both economic and cultural concerns about immigrants in the population. Although policy and sentiments recursively influence each other and "the direction of causality is hard to disentangle", Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001: 17, 20) argue that "natives' sentiments towards immigrants are likely to be reflections of the

country's immigration policy". From their research on attitudinal differences across countries, Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001: 24) conclude that there would be "at least" indications for an effect of immigration policies on attitudes towards immigration. While these authors mainly related policy and attitudes to the economic performance of immigrants, the approach taken in this paper further suggests a link between policy, sentiments and the cultural impact of immigration.

As presented in the following section, policy makers in Australia and Germany faced comparable circumstances at certain points in recent history; however, the ways they reacted to them differed greatly. In a first part of this theoretical section, I describe the immigration policies of Germany and Australia from 1945 until the time of the ISSP survey in 2003. It is necessary to look at this since policy has been suggested to drive the ethnic and skill composition of countries' immigrant stocks and flows, to design service and support for those who have settled and to manage (ethno-) cultural changes of society through immigration (Jupp 2007). In turn those facets of immigration policy are hypothesized to have an impact on people's sentiments. A second section deals with the link between policy, attitudes and economic impact of immigration and a third section describes the link between policy, attitudes and cultural consequences of immigration. Finally, a fourth section specifies hypotheses about attitudinal difference in the two countries based on the developed theoretical approach. Furthermore, this last part briefly depicts socio-economic characteristics such as the respondents' level of education, migration history, age and gender that have been found across countries to predict people's attitudes towards immigration.

3.1 Immigration Policy in Australia and Germany

While Australia and Germany were relatively exclusive to immigrants in the first half of the 20th century, the two countries witnessed mass immigration since 1945. The initial point in both cases was the recruitment of migrant workers from roughly the same Southern European source countries. From the postwar period onwards, over six million people have migrated to Australia which represents an enormous inflow compared to a population size that was only about seven million at the end of World War II (and grew to more than 20 million in the first years of the new millennium). At the same time, Germany experienced the largest immigrant intake of any European country during this time: Over 20 million people have entered the country. Despite the similarities in the migratory process, the two countries' population policies followed very different concepts and strategies (Castles 2008). In the case of Germany, it should be mentioned that, prior to the reunion 1990, only policy developments in West Germany are taken into account. After the end of the German Democratic Republic, East Germany was incorporated into the Federal Republic of Germany with all its cultural, social and political institutions. As a result, concerning attitudes towards immigrants, Meier-Braun (2002: 69) stresses that "West German stereotypes" were quickly adopted by the East German population.

In 1947, in the immediate post war period, Australia started a vast immigration program to deal with its industry's increasing demand for labor. At his point in time, only two per cent of the Australian population had been born outside of Australia, the United Kingdom, Ireland or New Zealand and the government tried to enlist immigrants predominantly from the British Isles (McDonald 2010, Jupp 2007). The Minister of Immigration at the time, Calwell,

publicly promoted the immigration program under the slogan ‘populate or perish’ in order to overcome resistance to mass immigration. Reservations against immigrants were widespread in the population, particularly among the unions which raised concerns about possible unemployment of Australian workers. Calwell, by referring to wartime experiences when Australia feared a Japanese invasion, drew attention to the idea that an increase in population size was necessary for reasons of security and defense. The Minister for Immigration further claimed that for one ‘foreigner’ ten British migrants would enter the country (Lack and Templeton 1995). However, immigration from Britain was not enough to cover the demand for labor and by the 1960s continental Europe had become a much greater source of immigrants, particularly its southern and eastern parts. People from European countries (later including Egypt and Turkey) were actively recruited by the Australian government since they were supposed to assimilate easily into society and in order to keep Australia ‘white’ (Jupp 2007). The Australian census in 1971 recorded over one million residents born in Europe, excluding the United Kingdom and Ireland. The largest shares came – in this order – from Italy, (former) Yugoslavia, Greece, Germany and the Netherlands.

In the immediate postwar era, West Germany, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), experienced massive immigration movements of ethnic Germans. Until 1950, some 7.9 million expellees entered the country that had been expelled from former German provinces and from Eastern European countries that had been occupied by Germany during the war. Furthermore, over three million refugees migrated from the German Democratic Republic (GDR) into the FRG before the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961. Despite high unemployment and housing shortages, the ethnic German immigrants were politically welcomed, granted immediate citizenship, provided financial aid and assisted by integration programs such as free language courses or vocational training (Meyers 2004). In 1955, due to increasing labor shortages produced by an economic upswing, Germany started a recruitment program for migrant workers from Italy which was extended in the 1960s to the whole European Mediterranean area including Turkey (later also Morocco and Tunisia) (Meier-Braun 2002). In 1964, Germany already welcomed its one million’s foreign worker. The foreign population grew from about 700,000 in 1960 (including some 180,000 Italian migrant workers) to 4.1 million in 1974. The largest source countries were Turkey, Italy, Yugoslavia and Greece. However, whereas the Australian policy aimed at permanent settlement of the labor migrants and labeled them ‘New Australians’, The German government pursued a ‘guestworker’ system meaning the temporary employment of foreign workers for the time that they were needed. Expecting the return of the migrants, immigration policy did not involve measures of integration into mainstream society. Furthermore, ‘guestworkers’ had a special legal status and were not granted the same rights as German citizens (Castles 2008, Meier-Braun 2002).

The year 1973 marks a turning point in both countries’ population policies. At this point in time, Germany and Australia both had experienced mass immigration movements and witnessed similar developments: Migrants were facing labor market segmentation, residential segregation and ethnic group formation. Australia acknowledged that their assimilation strategy had failed and all major parties agreed on the introduction of a multicultural policy; a radical reform of the previous policy framework. The new concept recognized minority rights and their equal access to social institutions. Furthermore, no preference was given any longer

to migrants from certain countries of origin (Castles 2008). German immigration policy, in contrast, ceased the recruitment of workers in the same year and encouraged their return actively by providing monetary incentives for leaving the country. Meier-Braun (2002) stresses that the slowdown of the economy and increasing discussion about the costs and benefits of immigration led to the recruitment ban. Although a lot of labor migrants went back, the policy did not succeed its goal of reducing the number of foreigners in the population. Knowing that from now on it would not be possible to re-migrate to Germany, notably Turkish and Yugoslavian migrants remained in the country and through family reunion immigration continued. The number of Turkish residents, for instance, rose from just over one million in 1974 to about 1.5 million in 1980. In the same period, the total number of foreign residents grew from 4.1 to 4.5 million (Joppke 1999, Meyers 2004). Joppke (1999) states that the immigration stop describes the shift from a cliental to an ideological policy: Despite intense advocacy of the German employer lobby for foreign workers due to shortages in certain sectors, recruitment was stopped because of growing domestic unemployment.

From the 1980s until the late 1990s, the discrepancy between an immigration policy that aimed at reducing the number of foreign residents and a growing number of immigrants in the Germany continued. Although policy makers recognized a de facto permanent immigration of former guestworkers and despite the introduction of first integrative measures, the publicly promoted position of the major parties was that Germany was 'not a country of immigration' and that migrants should return to their country of origin. The migrant labor ban and new policies to restrict family reunion, however, failed at decreasing immigration. In fact, the number of migrants grew and reached over one million per annum in the early 1990s. People were now entering the country as asylum seekers or ethnic Germans, but also family reunion remained at a considerable level. The German asylum policy, developed after and in the light of the experiences of World War II, was exceptionally liberal until a major reform in 1993; only one year after the historic record of an annual inflow of 438,000 asylum seekers. The main groups entering under this humanitarian stream of immigration policy were refugees from the Balkan states, but also considerable number of Turkish economic refugees migrated to Germany. In view of integration into society, however, immigration policy continuously restricted asylum seekers rights and similar to the previous strategies the aim of the reforms was to decrease the number of people migrating to Germany. With the end of the USSR, a new wave of ethnic Germans, so called resettlers, came to Germany: Over 200,000 annually in the early 1990s and more than 100,000 in the later years of that decade (Meyers 2004).

Australia's foreigner policy under the multicultural paradigm allowed immigration through three streams (skilled migration, family reunion and refugees) and altered the immigrant composition. While the United Kingdom remained the primary single source country, Asia accounted for almost 50 per cent of entries by the mid-1980s. Australia also attracted considerable numbers from South America and smaller numbers from Africa. Economic and political crises in the 1990s in the former USSR, former Yugoslavia, the Middle East and South Africa led refugees from those areas migrate to Australia. While the multicultural concept supported immigrants to become established in the society, public concern in consideration of new immigrant groups came to the fore. In the late 1980s an 'Asianisation' of the country was highly debated and parts of the society perceived the government's policy as too progressive (Kivisto 2002). In the late 1990s, the overtly racist

One Nation Party under Pauline Hanson had some short lived success in local elections drawing on this opposition to non-European migrants and anti-minority feelings (Jupp 2007). A reorientation of Australia's multicultural concept of immigration policy was made in 1996 by the newly elected conservative government. While policy did not focus on any of the immigration streams, the government under Prime Minister John Howard put emphasis on the economic benefits for the country and gave preference to skilled migration. At the same time, the government claimed that family reunion and asylum seekers were hurting national interest, which particularly resulted in restrictive measures in the humanitarian stream (Castles 2008, Castles and Miller 2008).

Since 1945, Australia and Germany have experienced a change from relatively homogenous to multiethnic countries in the course of mass immigration movements. The greatly differing immigration policies have led to different outcomes of immigration. Australia was looking for permanent settlement and actively promoted its strategy in the public. Migrants were regarded as 'New Australian' and granted citizenship and equal rights. After recognizing that assimilation failed in making immigrants from other cultural background adapt to mainstream society, policy was shifted towards a multicultural model. Germany wanted temporary migrant workers that would return to their home country and passed this view on to public opinion. After the recruitment ban, immigrants entered the country through family reunion. Different governments all agreed that Germany was not a country of immigration and measures to deal with de facto migrant settlement fell short. In this respect, Castles (2008: 28) argues that the German model produced "ethnic minorities which were generally not seen as a legitimate part of a nation unwilling to accept a change in its identity" whereas the Australian strategy resulted in "ethnic communities which were seen by many as an integral part of a changing nation". These developments still apply for the immigration policies at the time of the ISSP survey in 2003; however, alterations appeared at the end of the 1990s. The Howard government recognized the multicultural paradigm, but advocated skilled migration and restricted family reunion and humanitarian intake (While immigration rose annually under Howard to historically high levels, the skilled migration became the dominant stream and accounted for up to 70 per cent of the yearly migrant inflows). In Germany, the newly elected Chancellor, the social-democrat Gerhard Schröder, stated that the Germany was in fact a country of immigration (Meier-Braun 2002). Nevertheless, his point of view was far from being recognized in both the political and public sphere in 2003. At the turn of the millennium the recruitment ban was officially still in place. Furthermore, Germany reformed its former liberal asylum policy in order to decrease the number of asylum seekers that had become the major source of immigrants. However, in 2002 new immigration law was started to be discussed and was ratified in 2004 which represents a platform for an immigration policy aiming at immigration and not emigration.

3.2 Policy, Attitudes and the Economic Impact of Immigration

Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) identify immigration policy to affect the economic impact of immigration in two dimensions which in turn also influences the perception of immigrants by the host population in this view. They argue that policy determines the characteristics of the immigrants a country receives, which would have consequences for the

nation's economic performance and its labor market. In this way, people's sentiments about the economic contribution and labor market impact of immigration are affected.

This idea is based on one strand of economic theory that suggests that labor market competition increases for those residents who are substitutes to the incoming migrants (Borjas 1999, Borjas 2003, Borjas, Freeman and Katz 1996). Therefore, if the composition of the influx of immigrants is predominantly low skilled, their counterpart in the host population experiences growing competition in regard of wages and employment. The reverse is assumed in the case of high skilled migration. In a large study concerning earnings in the USA between 1979 and 1995, Hatton and Williamson (2005) for example find that immigration depressed the income of the low skilled workers while it caused a slight increase for the high skilled due to the fact that immigrants were relatively less skilled. Drawing on these theoretical and empirical results, several scholars (Mayda 2006, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006, Scheve and Slaughter 2001) have related negative sentiments towards immigrants of low skilled residents to the economic impact of immigration and found evidence for their argument.

The economic influences of people entering a country as well as the associated consequences for attitudes towards them are highly contested. Investigating the situation in the USA since 1965, Card (2005: 25) finds overall "evidence that immigrants have harmed the opportunities of less educated is scant". Peri and Sparber (2007) argue similarly and in addition yield that the low skilled immigrant workers represent imperfect substitutes and therefore the assumption of increasing labor market competition through growing labor supply would not hold. Consistent with the findings of this strand of economic theory, Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007: 437) argue that the effect of skill level on attitudes is misinterpreted: "The connection between the education or skill levels of individuals and views about immigration appears to have very little, if anything, to do with fears about labor-market competition". Higher skilled individuals were more positive because they also represent the more educated and therefore education was the actual factor.

In the case of Germany and Australia, recent studies also contradict the assumption of increasing labor market competition through immigrants. Analyzing the developments since the 1980s in Germany, Brückner and Jahn (2008) even find positive long-term effects of immigration on the wages of native workers. In separate reviews of Australian economic research on immigration, both Jupp (2007) and Castles and Miller (2008), conclude that immigration at most marginally impacts the labor market. Nevertheless, the popular perception persists in both countries that immigrants threaten wages and take jobs away from native workers. In German politics, an association between labor market and immigration has often been referred to. Already during the time of guestworker recruitment the Chancellor at the time, Ludwig Erhard, publicly claimed that if every German would work one more hour per week there would be no need for foreign workers. In the following decades, politicians frequently made the simplistic correlation between the increasing number of unemployed people and the growing number of immigrants. Particularly, members of conservative governments promoted a stricter immigration policy on the basis of the argument that continuing immigration (in the 1980s and 1990s notably asylum seekers in the German case) causes higher unemployment (Meier-Braun 2002). Furthermore, in 2001, when the social-democrat and green party coalition government failed to introduce a new immigration law, the opposition argued that with four million unemployed, a new immigration policy that could

increase the immigrant intake could not be launched (Meyers 2004). Contrary to Germany, Australian governments publicly opposed negative impacts of immigrants on the labor market since the post-war immigration of foreign workers. Jupp (2007: 145) stresses that “historically trade unions opposed immigration as lowering the wage level and increasing the possibility of unemployment. It was a deliberate strategy of the post-war Chifley government to incorporate union leaders into the consultative processes to alleviate this hostility. In consequence, the perception of immigrants as competitors for jobs would be relatively small among low skilled and manual workers. However, this would be more serious in other professions.

A similar picture can be found for the way economic benefit from immigration which has been acknowledged in research in the case of both countries (Castles and Millar 2008). However, the political representation differed greatly. In Australia, governments recognized the positive economic effect of immigration and used it as a supportive argument for an active immigration policy. In Germany, in contrast, where the intake of immigrants remained high despite a policy that focused on decreasing their number, policy makers disregarded the proven benefits (Meier-Braun 2002).

3.3 Policy, Attitudes and the Cultural Impact of Immigration

As aforementioned, immigration policy affects people’s sentiments not only by influencing the composition of a country’s immigrant influx, but also by impacting the incorporation of foreigners into the host society. Although both cases play a role in the attitude formation in Australia and Germany, the latter is the dividing policy element in regard of the association between immigration policy, attitudes and the cultural impact of immigration.

Concerning the composition of the immigrant influx, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005: 9) suggest that immigrants from different racial and ethnic groups with different religion, language, or culture “may be perceived as undermining existing institutions and threatening the way of life and social status of current residents”. In this perspective, the different impact of developments in Australia and Germany is difficult to determine. While the labor migrants in the post-war period came from roughly the same source countries, Germany later received most its immigrants from Turkey and Australia from Asia. Both of those groups were main targets for prejudice around the time when the data used in this paper was collected. Australia experienced a heated debate about the ‘Asianization’ of the country and witnessed the success of the far-right One Nation Party. In Germany, a discussion about the *Überfremdung* (roughly translated: ‘over-alienation’) of the country received much attention and particularly Turkish migrants were considered not to be ‘culturally compatible or incorporable’ (Castles 2008, Meier-Braun 2002).

The dividing effect of policy on sentiments about immigrants in the two countries articulates in their different definitions of desirable attributes of potential immigrants rather than in migrant groups’ ethnic composition. The Australian government’s policy outlines conditions under which immigrants are granted access to the country on the basis of acquired criteria, meaning individual competences, such as educational attainment, knowledge of language or working experience. The German policy, in contrast, defined conditions notably on the basis of ascribed criteria, denoting inflexible characteristics as for instance national origin (Green 2009). Since the recruitment stop in 1973, despite large entry numbers through

asylum seekers and family reunion, permanent settlement was only welcomed from resettlers, German ethnic minority members in Eastern Europe.

These policy differences between the two countries become clearer in the way immigrants are incorporated into the society. The Australian multicultural concept includes that immigrants should participate as equals in all societal spheres and are allowed and financially supported to maintain their cultural distinctiveness. The Australian policy even “implies both the willingness of the majority group to accept cultural difference and state action to secure equal rights for minorities” (Castles and Millar 2008: 249). Until the time of the ISSP survey, the German policy favored ethnic Germans who were expected to assimilate into mainstream society. An explicit example of Germany’s rather ethno-centric policy compared to the Australian multicultural one is the country’s concept of citizenship. While resettlers were granted German citizenship shortly after entering the country, it was difficult for immigrants who could not claim German origin to obtain a German passport. The German citizenship concept based on origin did not define children to legal residents as German if both parents were citizens of foreign countries at the time of birth (Meier-Braun 2002).

I would like to argue that these ways of incorporation foreigners into the society influence people’s attitudes since, in the case of immigration, “beliefs about the nation and its cultural make-up are particularly important” (Sides and Citrin 2007: 479). Social identity theory, developed by Tajfel (1981, Tajfel and Turner 1986), postulates that individuals regard themselves as members of certain groups and thereby also differentiate themselves from others who are not perceived to belong to the same groups. According to Tajfel and Turner (1986: 15) a (social) group is defined as “a collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves, and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and of their membership in it”. Furthermore, the more a person feels emotionally attached, the stronger his/her support for the group. Sides and Citrin (2007) relate social identity theory to sentiments about immigration. They argue that “in most modern societies, the nation is an object of strong allegiances” and that “immigrants are by definition outsiders in contexts where national identity is basis of self-categorization and emotional attachment” (Sides and Citrin 2007: 480). Following this argument, Australia’s policy of multiculturalism, that implies the willingness of the majority group to accept cultural differences, does a better job of incorporating immigrants into a concept of national identity than the German rather ethno-centric one.

3.4 Hypotheses about Attitudes towards Immigration in Australia and Germany

The theoretical approach taken in this study depicts three dimensions of attitudes towards immigration: Labor market impact, immigrants’ economic contribution, and cultural concerns. Previous research has reported that cultural considerations are a stronger factor than economic ones in explaining individual’s feeling about immigration (Dustmann and Preston 2004, Mayda 2006, O’Rourke and Sinnott 2006). Mayda (2006) has used a concept of relating responses to questions about the impact of immigration as explanatory variables to a ‘final’ dependent measure based on the question whether the number of immigrants should be reduced or increased (similar approach taken by Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007). In this sense, Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) stressed that people’s attitudes mirror a country’s

immigration policy. With regard to cross-country differences in Australia and Germany, it is argued that the German policy emphasizes cultural homogeneity and, since the recruitment ban, is hardly driven by economic considerations. Moreover, the country defines itself as “not a country of immigration” and, since the recruitment ban, its policy aimed at reducing the influx of immigrants. Australia’s policy, in contrast, proclaims multiculturalism and, at the same time, has increasingly focused on skilled immigration. Therefore, it is expected that cultural considerations have relatively more influence on anti- or, respectively, pro-immigration sentiments in Germany than in Australia while the opposite picture should be found for measures of the economic dimensions.

Looking specifically at the economic dimension, Card, Dustmann and Preston (2005) point out that the decisive element for the formation of individual attitudes is not the actual impact but the perceived impact of immigration. Following this argument, it is hypothesized that immigration policy is associated with the impact of immigrants on the economy and its influence on people’s attitudes in the way that a labor market or economically oriented policy generates less reservation and more acceptance towards immigrants among the population. Therefore, it is predicted that Australia’s skill-based strategy causes less depreciative and respectively more positive sentiments about the labor market impact and economic contribution of immigration. Australians sentiments are expected to be more favorable towards immigrants particularly with respect to economic contribution because of its active effort to recruit skilled migrants in opposition to the German policy that aims at decreasing the high proportion of family migrants, resettlers and asylum seekers. Furthermore, the amplitude of attitudinal difference between high and low skilled workers should be smaller in Australia than in Germany since the skill oriented policy is perceived to produce labor market competition also among the higher skilled. Hence, respondents’ skill level is predicted to have a stronger effect in Germany in the economic dimensions. Recall from the theory section that German politicians often advocated a reduction of the immigrant influx following the argumentation that immigrants were economic substitutes of native workers and in this way cause unemployment. At the same time, Australian politician emphasized the economic benefit from immigration to justify high levels of immigrant inflows.

Drawing on social identity theory, it is hypothesized that in both countries, people with a strong feeling of national belonging are less open to immigration. Looking at cross-country differences in the perception of the cultural impact of immigrants, the rather ethno-centric policy in Germany should generate stronger depreciative feelings among the population about the influx of foreign cultures and traditions compared to the multicultural Australian policy. As described earlier, when the two countries were facing problems of incorporating immigrants into the society, Australia developed its multicultural directive while Germany denied that it had become a country of immigration. A major result that is linked in the theoretical approach to sentiments about immigration, are ethnic communities in Australia compared to ethnic minorities in Germany. Moreover, the German policy should further engender that the impact of a high sense of national identity on people’s attitudes is more intense than in Australia. Remember the different policy strategies of naturalization and Australia’s aim of ‘new residents’ compared to ‘guestworkers’ and ‘ethnic Germans’ in Germany. In contrast, the effect of skill on respondents’ sentiments about cultural considerations should be of comparable size in the two countries.

While the aforementioned factors of skill level and national identity feelings are suggested to explain attitudinal differences within and across countries, other measures of individual characteristics are generally expected to influence attitudes. Since compositional differences between the Australian and German population could cause cross-country differences, it is necessary to account for certain factors: Previous empirical research, described in the literature review, have identified that respondents' socio-demographic background is associated with sentiments towards immigration. Consistently, a person's place of residence and migration background are found to have an impact. Hence, also in Australia and Germany, a person that lives in an urban area and/or has a migration background is expected to hold more favorable attitudes towards immigration than someone without migration background who lives in a rural area (Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann 2001, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006). Furthermore, evidence for an effect of age and gender are frequently reported. If found, concerning the influence of age, than older respondents held more negative views on immigration (Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann 2001, Dustmann and Preston 2004, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, Mayda 2006, Scheve and Slaughter 2001). In contrast, the results for gender are mixed and a tendency unclear. Mayda (2006), for example, presents that females are more depreciative towards immigrants while Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) find the opposite. Based on these previous findings, an impact of place of residence and migration history and to a smaller extent of age and gender are expected in Australia and Germany.

4. Methodology

4.1 The ISSP Dataset

The ISSP 2003 dataset mainly provides information on the topic of national identity and covered 39, mostly Western, countries. It contains a series of questions on attitudes towards different facets of immigration and includes data on the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. The ISSP, a continuing annual program of cross-national collaborations on surveys covering different topics of social science research, is conducted with a jointly developed and standardized questionnaire module which is integrated into regular national surveys in the member states. In the Australian case, the Australian Survey of Social Attitudes (AuSSA) managed by the Australian Demographic and Social Research Institute (ADSRI) at the Australian National University comprises the ISSP module. In Germany, it is embedded in the German General Social Survey (Allgemeine Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften: ALLBUS) of which the Leibniz Institute for Social Sciences is responsible.

The character of the ISSP as a module of country specific surveys involves a different sample size, collection method and timing. The Australian sample consists of 2183 cases. Data was collected through the self-completion by respondents of a mailed questionnaire between August and December 2003. In Germany, between March and July 2003, 1287 persons (East Germany over sampled; cases weighted when necessary) successfully completed the questionnaire at their home with the presence of an interviewer. Furthermore, due to the integration of the ISSP module into country specific surveys, questions concerning the respondents' socio-demographic background are not standardized. The participating

institutions agree on a common core of background variables and the data is homogenized after its collection.

The design of a questionnaire across countries with different languages is a general weakness of cross-nation surveys due to linguistic particularities and associations that are difficult to account for (Card, Dustmann and Preston 2005). In Germany, for example, a person is likely to be understood to be an ‘immigrant’ or ‘foreigner’ not only when being born abroad, but also if he/she is the second or third generation of a family with immigration background. The ISSP defines an immigrant as a person who “comes to settle in a country” (GESIS 2005). Moreover, linguistic particularities are considered. In the German case, for example, an immigrant is depicted with the technical term *Zuwanderer* which reflects more precisely the definition used in the survey. Nevertheless, the translation of the questionnaire from English to German entails a loss of accuracy when comparing attitudes in the two countries.

Despite the aforementioned issues, the ISSP provides adequate data to investigate cross-country differences in attitudes. Its strength is the jointly developed and standardized topic-specific module and the common core of background variables. The focus of 2003 on national identity further allows investigating people’s attitudes towards different dimensions of immigration and relating them to individual identity sentiments.

4.2 Method

To test the hypotheses described earlier, a first analytical step relates people’s characteristics to differences in individual attitudes within and across Australia and Germany towards the three dimensions of immigration presented in the theoretical part: Labor market impact, economic contribution and cultural influence. A second step investigates the relationship between respondents’ attitudes in those three dimensions and their sentiment about the number of immigrants entering the country controlling for respondents’ backgrounds.

Based on previous research (Card, Dustmann and Preston 2006, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, Sides and Citrin 2007), it is argued that observable measures as, for example, immigrant composition or net-immigration rate do not explain persons’ sentiments. Instead, Australia’s and Germany’s immigration policy directives are related to attitudes towards people who come to reside in those countries. To determine the effects of respondents’ individual characteristics, separate multiple linear regressions for Australia and Germany are applied to each measure of the respective dimension of immigration. To investigate whether cross-country differences in those effects exist, the regressors’ coefficients are tested with a t-test for independent samples with possibly differing size and variance. Furthermore, in each case, a regression model with country dummies for Germany and Australia as the reference category is applied to the whole sample in order to measure the difference in sign, significance and magnitude of individual attitudes towards immigration across the two countries.

The second step, focusing on the people’s sentiments about the number of immigrants coming into the country, follows the same procedure of separate regressions for Australia and Germany, testing the coefficient of the different samples for similarity, and deploying another regression including the whole sample. However, two models are applied in each regression: The first one contains the measures of respondents’ backgrounds as in step one while the

second one adds individuals' attitudes in the three defined dimensions of immigration as explanatory variables. This way, information is obtained how sentiments about the economic and cultural impact of immigration are related to people's favor of an increase or a decline of the number of immigrants and whether those effects differ between Australia and Germany.

4.3 Measures

The two economic dimensions are in each case measured on the basis of one single question from the ISSP survey. The respondent is asked how much he/she agrees with a certain statement on a scale five answer categories from one, 'agree strongly', to five, 'disagree strongly': "There are different opinions about immigrants from other countries living in [Country]. (By "immigrants" we mean people who come to settle in [Country]). How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?" The statement associated with the labor market dimension is: "Immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in [Country]". The statement concerning immigrants' economic contribution says: "Immigrants are generally good for [Country's] economy. Besides the answer categories measuring the level of agreement, the dataset provides additional categories "can't choose", "no answer, refused" and/or "not available". These are coded as missing values. Furthermore, the values related to the answer categories of the statement concerning the labor market impact of immigration are recoded in invert order. This is necessary for matters of consistency: In each dimension variables are coded in the way that a value closer to one generally depicts a more negative attitude towards immigration while a figure closer to five describes a more positive attitude. The variable applied to the dimension of the labor market is called 'labor market impact'. Note that the survey question only asks for the influence of immigration on the competition for jobs and leaves out sentiments about the influence of immigrants on wages.

Concerning the cultural impact of immigration, the developed theory predicts that the German rather ethno-centric policy engenders more skepticism and less openness towards the influx of foreign cultures through immigration compared to Australia's multicultural policy directive. A measure was thought to be constructed from two questions of the ISSP survey that strongly reflect people's attitudes in this respect. The first asks the respondent to scale (analogously to the economic question) how much he/she agrees to the statement: "Immigrants improve [Country nationality] society by bringing in new ideas and cultures." The second one says: "Some people say that it is better for a country if different racial and ethnic groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions. Others say that it is better if these groups adapt and blend into the larger society. Which of these views comes closer to your own?" Two answer categories are given: "It is better for society if groups maintain their distinct customs and traditions" and "It is better if groups adapt and blend into the larger society". When exploring the two variables, the majority of Australians in the sample agreed to the statement that immigrant improve the country's society by bringing in new ideas and cultures. At the same time more than 80 per cent responded that immigrants should not maintain their customs and traditions and blend into the larger society. This contrast between the two questions was much lower in Germany. Here, less than half of the sample agreed to benefits from foreign cultures while only about 60 per cent wanted immigrants to adapt to the host society. Further measures were added to achieve greater reliability. Three questions in

the survey can be associated with the difference of a rather ethno-centric compared to a rather multicultural attitude towards immigration. They all are statements that the respondent has to rate on the aforementioned scale (which is inverted when necessary): 1. "It is impossible for people who do not share [Country's] customs and traditions to become fully [Country nationality]", 2. "Children born in [Country] of parents who are not citizens should have the right to become [Country nationality] citizens", and 3. "Legal immigrants to [Country] who are not citizens should have the same rights as [Country nationality] citizens". Testing the consistency between the five measures with Cronbach's alpha, a value of 0.66 is scored. This is less than the often recommended minimum score of 0.7 (George and Mallery 2004, see Cortina 1993 for discussion of reliability testing with Cronbach's Alpha). Nevertheless, the variable concerning the cultural dimension is constructed as the mean of the five measures and labeled 'cultural impact' because, in case of the cultural dimension, a single question is assumed to lead to greater measurement error (Dustmann and Preston 2004).

Attitudes towards the number of immigrants coming into the country are derived from the question: "Do you think the number of immigrants to [Country] nowadays should be..." and its five answer categories from "increased a lot" to "reduced a lot". Therefore, analogously to the previous measures, the variable is coded in the way that a higher value depicts a more favorable attitude towards immigration. The variable is labeled as 'influx preference'.

Looking at individual's characteristics, skill level and national identity are theorized to predict sentiments about immigration. Similar to O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006), a person's skill level is measured by coding the answers to questions on his/her (last) occupation utilizing the 1988 version of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO88). While the ISCO88 allows a fine distinction between a large range of different occupations, it also distinguishes four main skill categories what suits the approach taken in this paper: 1. "Elementary occupations"; 2. "Clerks, service workers and shop and market sales workers, craft and related trades workers, plant and machine operators and assemblers"; 3. "Technicians and associate professionals"; and 4. "Professionals". Furthermore, following O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006), a fifth group ("Legislators, senior officials and managers") is included which is not integrated in the ISCO88 skill coding. This seems to be useful since the group accounts for more than 13 per cent of the Australian and about 7 per cent of German sample. Note that this group is classified as 'high skilled', however, a manager, for example, does not necessary hold a university degree.

Another commonly used measure for respondents' skill level provided by the ISSP data is the years a person spent in education and his/her highest obtained educational degree (Mayda 2006). However, when looking at differences in Germany and Australia, both variables derived from the ISSP questionnaire might bias the comparison. The number of years a person spent in education is treated as a continuous variable in the dataset, while, in the German case, it is actually a categorical one with only three categories. The variable depicting education in years is therefore disregarded. Another educational measure in the ISSP data indicates the highest achieved educational level. Although the schooling systems of the two countries differ quite markedly, the measure can be broken down into a variable with three larger categories ('no or lower secondary education', 'middle school or higher secondary education', and 'university degree completed'). Concerning cross-country differences, the effects of individuals' educational achievements need to be interpreted carefully due to the

differing schooling systems. Nevertheless, a measure for respondents' education should be included since it is pointed out to be a major predictor for attitudes towards immigration (Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007). In addition, looking at the influence of people's profession, it is an important control variable.

With regard to the concept of national identity, nationalist attitudes have been found to be a strong indicator for sentiments about immigration (Card, Dustmann and Preston 2005, Dustmann and Preston 2004, Mayda 2006, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006). The ISSP 2003 module on national identity, allows distinguishing nationalism and patriotism. The former is understood as a person's believe that his/her country is better than others and that he/she takes pride in being a member of that nation. The measure, labeled as 'nationalist', is derived from respondents' mean agreement with four statements (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.75): 1. "The world would be a better place if people from other countries were more like [Country nationality]"; 2. "Generally speaking, [Country] is a better country than most other countries"; 3. "I would rather be a citizen of [Country] than of any other country in the world"; and 4. "When my country does well in international sports, it makes me proud to be [Country nationality]". Patriotism is defined as a feeling of national identification without the implicit degradation of other countries. Furthermore, a person's national pride is understood as being proud of certain (for example, historic, social, or economic) attributes of the country. In this respect a variable called 'patriotic' is obtained from respondents' average agreement with, again, four statements of the ISSP under the initial question: "How proud are you of [Country] in each of the following?" (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.72): 1. "[Country's] economic achievements"; 2. "Its scientific and technological achievements"; 3. "Its achievements in sports"; and 4. "Its achievements in the arts and literature". In both cases, the variables are coded in the way that a higher value depicts a stronger feeling of nationalism or, respectively, patriotism.

To control for measures of individual's socio-demographic background that have been found to influence attitudes towards immigration, information on age, gender, migration background, and area of residence is derived from the ISSP data. The variables related to age and migration background are dichotomous. Migration background means that at least one parent was a citizen of another country at the time of the respondent's birth. The variable describing the area of residence is coded into four categories with 'village, farm in country' as a reference category merging the least urbanized residential forms in the dataset of living on a farm or in a village. The dummy variables are – in order of increasing urbanity – 'town or small city', 'Suburb, outskirts of big city', and 'Urban, big city'.

5. Results

The objective of the analysis was to identify, in a first step, differences in people's consideration of the impact of immigration on the host country's economy, labor market and culture in and across Australia and Germany. A second step, then, related those considerations to preferences over further immigration. Before describing and discussing the results, a first section briefly reports the different general characteristics of the Australian and German sample. Note that this study is designed in the way that immigration policy in Australia and Germany is theoretically linked to attitudes towards immigration. There are no direct observable measures for the different policies. The findings therefore result from drawing

parallels between respondents' sentiments and the theorized differences of the two countries' policy directives.

5.1 Descriptives: Composition of Background Characteristics and Distribution of Attitudes

All background variables are categorical, except for measures of age, nationalism and patriotism. Table 1 reports the structural distribution of respondents' characteristics in the Australian and German sample over the previously described categories. While the disproportions within and across the two countries with regard to gender are related to sampling errors, the differences concerning respondents' migration histories and areas of residence reflect unequal distributions between the Australian and German population. Although the absolute number of persons with a migration history living in Germany is higher, the relative share is considerably larger in Australia. It should be mentioned that West and East Germany differ greatly in this respect. While 15.2 per cent of the West German sample has at least one parent with foreign citizenship at the time of their births, this is only the case for 3.2 per cent in the East German one. Furthermore, the residential structure of the two countries differs greatly. While the majority of Australians live in big cities and their outlying area, most Germans reside in smaller cities, towns and villages.

The proportion of university graduates is more than twice as high in the Australian sample. On the one hand, this is due to oversampling. The 2001 census only reports a share of

Table 1 Proportional Distribution of Respondents' Characteristics

| Variable | Australia | Germany | Both |
|--|-----------|---------|-------|
| sex | | | |
| male | 46.4% | 51.0% | 48.1% |
| female | 53.6% | 49.0% | 51.9% |
| migration background | | | |
| no foreign parent | 68.7% | 87.1% | 75.6% |
| at least one foreign parent | 31.3% | 12.9% | 24.4% |
| area of Residence | | | |
| village or farm in country | 18.1% | 36.1% | 24.7% |
| town or small city | 18.3% | 32.4% | 23.5% |
| suburbs/outskirt big city | 35.8% | 11.7% | 26.9% |
| urban/big city | 27.9% | 19.7% | 24.9% |
| education | | | |
| no, lower secondary | 31.8% | 45.3% | 36.9% |
| middle school, higher secondary | 46.0% | 46.4% | 46.2% |
| university degree completed | 22.2% | 8.3% | 17.0% |
| profession | | | |
| elementary occupations | 7.6% | 7.6% | 7.6% |
| trained workers | 45.7% | 55.4% | 49.3% |
| technicians and associate professionals | 13.4% | 18.8% | 15.4% |
| professionals | 19.7% | 11.2% | 16.6% |
| legislators, senior officials and managers | 13.6% | 7.1% | 11.2% |

about 15 per cent (GESIS 2005) compared to the 22 per cent in the sample. On the other hand, the different education systems might account for some difference in this respect. Generally, more professional training programs are university-based in Australia. Those reasons might

also account for the varying distribution over the five occupational categories and the larger proportion of professionals and legislators, senior officials and managers in the Australian sample.

The average age in both samples is with around 50 years in Australia and around 47 years in Germany slightly higher than in the actual populations. The means of the variables nationalism and patriotism differ considerably between the two country samples with a higher mean values for Australia. Measured on a scale from one to five, the mean in the case of nationalism is 3.99 in Australia compared to 3.18 in Germany. Concerning the variable patriotism, the scale ranges only from one to four. The Australian sample shows a mean of 3.30 and the German one a mean of 2.81.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics: Distribution of Attitudes towards Immigration

| | Australia | | Germany | | Difference Means | t-value |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|------------------|------------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | | |
| Labor market impact | 3.256 | 1.057 | 2.833 | 1.153 | .423 | 10.44 *** |
| Economic contribution | 3.714 | .787 | 2.858 | .945 | .856 | 26.270 *** |
| Cultural impact | 3.187 | .631 | 3.087 | .722 | .100 | 3.310 *** |
| Immigrant influx | 2.726 | 1.127 | 1.881 | .959 | .846 | 22.420 *** |

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

Disregarding the effects of the background variables, table 2 depicts the simple means of the measures of people's attitudes in the different dimensions of immigration and towards the number of immigrants coming into the country. As described earlier, the variables are all retrieved from answers to questions with five answer categories that express a person's agreement with certain statements. Hence, the value three marks the changing point from a rather depreciative to a rather favorable sentiment about the respective aspect of immigration.

Without taking into account structural differences, the means of each measure are significantly different across the two countries. On average, the respondents in the Australian sample are more positive about immigration in each case and particularly with regard to the impact of immigration on the economy and the number of foreigner entering the country. In contrast, the difference between the mean values measuring the sentiment about the influence on culture is much less articulated. Those simple means do not indicate the relationship between people's characteristics and attitudinal differences. Nevertheless, they should be considered in order to grasp the whole picture of attitudes towards immigration across the two countries.

5.2 Economic Considerations of Immigration and Attitudinal Differences

The results from the empirical analysis concerning immigrant's impact on the labor market are presented in table 3. Recall that it was predicted that Germany's policy is related to greater animosity towards immigration and its general influence on the economy. The two-country model 'both' includes dummies for Germany and controls for respondents' characteristics. Without allowing the effect of background variables to vary across the two countries, the intercept increases by 0.50 for West Germany and by 0.87 for East Germany. In both cases, the difference is significant at the one per cent level and, considering the scale of the dependent variable from one to five, the magnitude is relatively large. These findings for the

first of the two economic dimensions of immigration therefore support the hypothesis that Germany's policy is linked to greater animosity. With respect to the difference between West and East Germany, note that Meier-Braun (2002) stressed that sentiments towards immigrants were quickly adopted by East Germans after the reunification and even grew fierce. In contrast, empirical research of attitudes towards immigrants (and Jews) in Germany did not find a significant difference between West and East (Fertig and Schmidt 2011). However, a profound look into the explanations for the inner-German distribution of attitudes is not in the focus of this study. In relation to Australia, the dummies for West and East should show comparable tendencies of sign, significance and magnitude.

The estimated effects of the background variables in the model including the both samples are in most cases significant at the one or five per cent confidence level and their trend largely reflects results from previous empirical studies. Respondents' with a migration background are more positive about immigration. Living in a urban area and higher education or skill level are also associated with more favorable sentiments. A stronger nationalist attitude is associated with greater animosity. With regard to age and gender, the theoretical part has

Table 3 Parameter Estimates: Attitudes towards Labor Market Impact of Immigration

| | Both | | Australia | | Germany | | Coeff Test |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | t-value |
| country (Australia) | .000 | | | | | | |
| West Germany | -.502 *** | .061 | | | | | |
| East Germany | -.874 *** | .073 | | | -.363 *** | .081 | |
| male | .028 | .040 | .027 | .048 | .037 | .076 | -.10 |
| age | -.002 | .001 | .001 | .002 | -.005 * | .003 | 1.74 * |
| migration background | .392 *** | .049 | .354 *** | .052 | .522 *** | .133 | -1.18 |
| residential area (village, farm in country) | .000 | | | | | | |
| town or small city | .009 | .058 | -.028 | .079 | .040 | .090 | -.57 |
| suburbs/outskirt big city | .062 | .058 | .035 | .068 | .123 | .129 | -.60 |
| urban/big city | .153 ** | .060 | .148 ** | .072 | .160 | .111 | -.09 |
| education (no, lower secondary) | .000 | | | | | | |
| middle school, higher secondary | .151 *** | .051 | .066 | .061 | .290 *** | .098 | -1.95 * |
| university degree | .413 *** | .076 | .382 *** | .084 | .451 ** | .183 | -.34 |
| profession (elementary occupations) | .000 | | | | | | |
| trained workers | .194 ** | .082 | .248 *** | .095 | .120 | .163 | .68 |
| technicians and associate professionals | .416 *** | .094 | .501 *** | .110 | .282 | .182 | 1.03 |
| professionals | .471 *** | .100 | .481 *** | .112 | .508 ** | .219 | -.11 |
| legislators, senior officials and managers | .537 *** | .099 | .543 *** | .112 | .546 *** | .211 | -.01 |
| nationalism | -.443 *** | .032 | -.467 *** | .041 | -.408 *** | .054 | -.87 |
| patriotism | .183 *** | .045 | .252 *** | .057 | .077 | .076 | 1.85 * |

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

reported mixed findings. If found, than older respondents' were more reluctant towards immigration while, in the case of gender, both men and women have been shown to be more negative. In the model of attitudes towards the labor market impact of immigration concerning both Australia and Germany, the effects of gender and age are insignificant. Interestingly, the second measure for notions of national identity, patriotism, is significantly correlated with a more favorable attitude towards immigration. Previous research has consistently reported a stronger sense of nationalist, chauvinist or patriotic feelings to have a strong negative impact on attitudes (Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, Mayda 2006, O'Rourke

and Sinnott 2006). To check the robustness of the effect of patriotism, a model without the variable nationalism has been estimated (not included in the table). Patriotism then turns insignificant and the positive effect on appreciative sentiments about immigration disappears. Nevertheless, this still indicates that there is no link between stronger notions of patriotism and greater animosity towards immigrants.

In addition to the model including the whole sample, table 3 also presents the country-specific estimations for Australia and Germany and the outcome of the cross-country independence test of the coefficients. Based on economic theory, it has been argued that low skilled workers are more likely to perceive immigrants as substitutes and, hence, competitors for their jobs. Consequently, a skilled migration policy intensifies this perception also among the higher skilled. The magnitude of anti-immigration feelings between the low and high skilled (educated) should, therefore, be less articulated in the Australian sample. Looking at the categories of the variable depicting respondents' educational attainment, only Australian university graduates are significantly more positive about immigrants compared to those with the no or lower secondary education. In Germany, this is also the case for people with a middle school or higher secondary education. In addition, the effects of both dummy variables of the higher education measures are stronger in the German model. The estimates for the education variable corroborate the predictions. However, conclusions about the effects of education have to be drawn carefully considering the differing schooling system in the two countries. Furthermore, the parameter estimates for the second measure of respondents' skill level, occupation, contradict the results. Though animosity decreases when respondents have higher skilled jobs, this trend is only significant in Australia in respect of the groups of trained workers and technicians and associate professionals compared to persons employed in elementary occupations. Moreover, the effect is in both cases considerably stronger than in Germany. This difference between the two countries in significance and larger effect in Australia is the opposite picture from what was expected. Furthermore, in both countries the most positive attitudes about the impact of immigration on the labor market are found among legislators, senior officials and managers. With 0.54 in the Australian and 0.55 in the German model, the effects are about the same in strength. Again, considering the hypothesis about attitudes towards the labor market impact of immigration, the difference between low skilled and high skilled should have been more articulated in Germany.

Concerning the control variables, the country specific models widely coincide with the model including Australia and Germany. Particularly migration history and nationalism are estimated to have a large effect on respondents in both samples. A notable exception is the effect of the variable patriotism which is considerably stronger in Australia and, moreover, insignificant in Germany.

The results concerning the second economic dimension of attitudes towards immigration, economic contribution, show much clearer support for the hypotheses about the relationship between immigration policy and people's sentiments within and across Australia and Germany. From the model for the whole sample, presented in table 4, it can be seen that the difference between the intercepts of Australia and West and, respectively, East Germany is also significant at the one per cent level. Furthermore, this difference between Australia and Germany is larger in the economic contribution model compared to the labor market one. At the same time, the difference between West and East Germany decreased. This shows support

for the prediction that Australia's skill-oriented policy is particularly linked to more favorable sentiments about economic influence of immigration.

Furthermore, the country-specific models confirm the prediction that skill level has a stronger effect on attitudes in Germany than in Australia. While in the Australian sample only legislators, senior officials and managers are significantly more favorable towards immigration than persons who are employed in elementary occupations, this is true for all occupational groups in Germany. Moreover, the size of the coefficients, though increasing in

Table 4 Parameter Estimates: Attitudes towards Economic Contribution of Immigration

| | Both | | Australia | | Germany | | Coeff Test |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | t-value |
| country (Australia) | | | | | | | |
| West Germany | -.691 *** | .051 | | | | | |
| East Germany | -.943 *** | .060 | | | -.226 *** | .073 | |
| male | .046 | .033 | .029 | .038 | .093 | .068 | -.95 |
| age | .006 *** | .001 | .006 *** | .001 | .009 *** | .002 | -1.24 |
| migration background | .233 *** | .041 | .179 *** | .041 | .544 *** | .122 | -3.00 *** |
| residential area (village, farm in country) | | | | | | | |
| town or small city | -.085 * | .048 | .020 | .062 | -.229 *** | .081 | 3.07 *** |
| suburbs/outskirt big city | -.007 | .048 | .036 | .053 | -.066 | .115 | .89 |
| urban/big city | .063 | .050 | .080 | .057 | .064 | .099 | .16 |
| education (no, lower secondary) | | | | | | | |
| middle school, higher secondary | .154 *** | .043 | .056 | .048 | .363 *** | .087 | -3.52 *** |
| university degree | .303 *** | .063 | .263 *** | .066 | .259 * | .163 | .02 |
| profession (elementary occupations) | | | | | | | |
| trained workers | .094 | .068 | .024 | .074 | .286 ** | .144 | -1.82 * |
| technicians and associate professionals | .184 ** | .077 | .110 | .086 | .372 ** | .161 | -1.62 |
| professionals | .226 *** | .082 | .138 | .087 | .570 *** | .194 | -2.23 ** |
| legislators, senior officials and managers | .240 *** | .082 | .179 ** | .087 | .430 ** | .188 | -1.34 |
| nationalism | -.149 *** | .026 | -.191 *** | .032 | -.082 * | .047 | -2.31 ** |
| patriotism | .214 *** | .037 | .206 *** | .044 | .222 *** | .068 | -.23 |

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

both countries with a higher skill level, is considerably larger in the German sample. The results for the measure of education point in the same direction. German respondents with higher secondary education as well as university graduates hold significantly more positive attitudes about the economic influence of immigration. In contrast, this is only true for Australians who completed a university degree. These results can be interpreted as support for the prediction that the immigrants' economic contribution is relatively more acknowledged by Australian respondents due to an immigration policy that emphasizes the economic benefit from immigration. If a more favorable view was simply related to greater tolerance through education, as it is argued by Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007), we should not find those significant differences in effect size across the two countries.

With regard to the background variables, some notable developments should be mentioned. The measure for age, which was reported to only have a marginal effect on considerations about the labor market impact of immigration, significantly affects respondents' answers in regard of the economic contribution of immigrants. Interestingly, in both countries an increase in age is positively linked to pro-immigration sentiments ($p < 0.01$). Furthermore, the effect of a nationalist attitude is considerably weaker compared to the labor market model. In fact, in the German sample it is only marginally significant. This is

somewhat surprising as measures for nationalism are commonly found to be very strong predictor variables for attitudes towards immigration (Dustman and Preston 2004, Mayda 2006, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006). Also, compared to the labor market dimension of attitudes towards immigration, the effect of migration background concerning the economic contribution of immigrants reduced to a relatively large extent in the Australian model while it marginally increased in the Germany one.

5.3 Cultural Considerations of Immigration and Attitudinal Differences

The German rather ethno-centric immigration policy was predicted to generate more depreciative feelings about immigrants and their cultural impact. From the model including both country samples in table 5, it can be seen that West and East Germany have a significantly negative effect on attitudes towards the cultural impact of immigration. This shows that German respondents' hold greater animosity towards immigrants in the cultural dimension and gives first support for the theorized link between policy and sentiments. At the same time, the difference is considerably smaller than in the models concerning the economic dimensions. Also, the inner-German difference is not significant anymore. From comparing the effects of the dummy variables for East and West Germany in all three dimensions of attitudes towards immigration, it appears that economic and not cultural considerations of immigration are the dividing element in cross-country differences between Australia and Germany.

Furthermore, the emphasis of the German immigration policy on cultural homogeneity, in

Table 5 Parameter Estimates: Attitudes towards Cultural Impact of Immigration

| | Both | | Australia | | Germany | | Coeff Test |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|
| | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | t-value |
| country (Australia) | | | | | | | |
| West Germany | -.194 *** | .044 | | | | | |
| East Germany | -.278 *** | .052 | | | -.056 | .062 | |
| male | -.044 | .028 | -.084 *** | .031 | .051 | .059 | -2.02 ** |
| age | -.003 *** | .001 | -.002 ** | .001 | -.003 | .002 | .28 |
| migration background | .176 *** | .033 | .131 *** | .034 | .430 *** | .104 | -2.74 *** |
| residential area (village, farm in country) | | | | | | | |
| town or small city | -.047 | .041 | -.028 | .051 | -.078 | .071 | .58 |
| suburbs/outskirt big city | .001 | .040 | .026 | .044 | -.100 | .101 | 1.14 |
| urban/big city | .065 | .042 | .058 | .048 | .102 | .087 | -.44 |
| education (no, lower secondary) | | | | | | | |
| middle school, higher secondary | .029 | .035 | .046 | .040 | .010 | .076 | .43 |
| university degree | .180 *** | .052 | .218 *** | .055 | -.007 | .135 | 1.54 |
| profession (elementary occupations) | | | | | | | |
| trained workers | -.003 | .056 | -.023 | .062 | .089 | .129 | -.69 |
| technicians and associate professionals | .036 *** | .064 | .017 ** | .072 | .167 *** | .144 | -.81 |
| professionals | .230 | .068 | .179 | .073 | .504 | .170 | -1.83 * |
| legislators, senior officials and managers | .063 | .067 | .043 | .073 | .149 | .162 | |
| nationalism | -.311 *** | .022 | -.348 *** | .027 | -.248 *** | .042 | -2.01 ** |
| patriotism | .183 *** | .031 | .207 *** | .037 | .132 ** | .059 | 1.09 |

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

contrast to the multicultural directive of the Australian one, should intensify depreciation of foreign culture among persons' with strong nationalist attitudes. However, though negatively affecting attitudes in both samples ($p < 0.01$) as generally predicted, the influence of the

variable nationalism is significantly more amplified in the Australian case. Therefore, the results from the two country specific regression contradict the predicted cross-country differences. In fact, this could be interpreted in the sense that a policy supporting cultural diversity is linked to greater animosity towards immigration among people with a nationalist attitude. When looking at nationalism, it needs to be distinguished from patriotism. As in the economic dimensions, patriotic sentiments are linked to more favorable attitudes towards immigration. Even if the variable nationalism is excluded, patriotism still has a marginally significant favorable effect (Result not shown).

The results for the effect of respondents' skill level differ remarkably between the models concerning the economic dimensions and the model concerning the cultural dimension. In the Australian and in the German sample, only the group of professionals holds significantly more favorable sentiments about cultural issues of immigration than respondents employed in elementary occupations. This might be due to the fact that predominantly people who received academic schooling are embedded in this group. Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) have pointed out that higher levels of education explain greater tolerance and, analogously, more appreciative attitudes towards immigration – in both economic and cultural dimensions. However, with respect to attitudes towards the impact of immigration on the labor market and on the economy, the group of legislators, senior officials and managers is significantly more favorable towards immigration than people working elementary jobs. The difference between the cultural and the economic perception of immigration in relation to respondents' skill level particularly shows in the German sample. While insignificant for the model depicting cultural considerations of immigration, the effect of skill significantly increases with every higher occupation category. This underpins the findings from the intercept differences in the models including both samples. If policy is linked to cross-country disparities, then it seems that the differences are articulated in economic considerations of immigration.

Looking at the control variables, it appears, analogously to the results in the economic dimensions, that respondents living in urban areas are only slightly more favorable towards immigration than those living in more rural areas. In the model depicting cultural considerations, the effects of living in a big city are also insignificant. Furthermore, males in the Australian sample are significantly more negative towards immigration while in the German the effect is marginally positive. In the economic models, being male was, though insignificantly, linked to more favorable attitudes in both countries.

5.4 Economic and Cultural Considerations and Opinions about Countries' Immigrant Intake
Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001: 20) argue that “natives' sentiments towards immigration are likely to be reflections of a country's [immigration] policy”. Drawing on the theorized link between policy and attitudes, I have hypothesized that the Australian multicultural and skill-oriented directive leads to more positive attitudes towards immigration, notably in favor of the economic contribution of immigrants. At the same time, German respondents are expected to be particularly concerned about the cultural dimension due to the country's rather ethno-centric policy. The results from the previous analysis of sentiments about cultural and economic issues of immigration indeed supported the main prediction that Australians hold more positive opinions. However, cross-country differences show more distinction in the economic dimensions while they are less articulated in the cultural

dimension. To further investigate economic and cultural considerations, they were related to opinions about the influx of immigrants.

In table 6, the estimations of the two-country model and the country-specific models using the same previously included background variables are presented. The parameter estimates of the intercept for the German country dummies are significant at the one per cent level and show an even larger difference between Australia and Germany in the regression model concerning immigrants' economic contribution. Hence, German respondents are markedly more depreciative towards the number of immigrants entering the country. In this sense, the findings are in line with the results from the models concerning the different dimensions of

Table 6 Parameter Estimates: Attitudes towards Influx of Immigrants

| | Both | | Australia | | Germany | | Coeff Test | |
|---|------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|--|
| | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | t-value | |
| country (Australia) | | | | | | | | |
| West Germany | -.908 *** | .074 | .000 | | .000 | | | |
| East Germany | -1.063 *** | .088 | .000 | | -.159 * | .087 | | |
| male | .168 *** | .047 | .188 *** | .058 | .096 | .083 | 0.90 | |
| age | .002 | .002 | .002 | .002 | .003 | .003 | -0.14 | |
| migration background | .317 *** | .057 | .289 *** | .063 | .435 *** | .149 | -0.90 | |
| residential area (village, farm in country) | | | | | | | | |
| town or small city | .013 | .069 | .073 | .093 | -.033 | .099 | 0.78 | |
| suburbs/outskirt big city | .041 | .067 | .066 | .080 | .058 | .141 | 0.05 | |
| urban/big city | .223 *** | .070 | .241 *** | .087 | .237 * | .123 | 0.03 | |
| education (no, lower secondary) | | | | | | | | |
| middle school, higher secondary | .192 *** | .060 | .200 *** | .073 | .224 ** | .107 | -0.18 | |
| university degree | .553 *** | .088 | .589 *** | .101 | .328 * | .190 | 1.21 | |
| profession (elementary occupations) | | | | | | | | |
| trained workers | .014 | .097 | -.084 | .115 | .344 * | .182 | -1.99 ** | |
| technicians and associate professionals | .077 | .110 | .092 | .132 | .209 | .202 | -0.48 | |
| professionals | .260 ** | .117 | .164 | .135 | .697 *** | .241 | -1.93 * | |
| legislators, senior officials and managers | .235 ** | .114 | .144 | .133 | .602 *** | .226 | -1.74 * | |
| nationalism | -.399 *** | .038 | -.489 *** | .049 | -.244 *** | .058 | -3.21 *** | |
| patriotism | .146 *** | .053 | .228 *** | .068 | .038 | .081 | 1.80 * | |

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

immigration. However, it was further predicted that a greater effect of skill level and feeling of national belonging in the German population would also occur when looking at the preference regarding further immigration. The parameter estimates of the country-specific models concerning the cultural and economic dimension did not confirm these hypotheses. In contrast, the effect of nationalistic sentiments is stronger in Australia and the larger difference between the occupational groups is found only in terms of attitudes towards the economic contribution of immigrants. With regard to immigration preferences, nationalist feelings have a considerably more articulated effect among Australian respondents. This further refutes the argument that, due to the German policy directive, nationalism has greater impact in Germany than in Australia. Furthermore, the results on skill level and immigration preference support the findings from the model describing sentiments about the economic contribution. While the effects are insignificant in Australia, the higher skilled groups in Germany show significantly more favorable attitudes towards immigration than the low skilled ($p < 0.01$). In this sense, the differing policy directives of Australia and Germany appear to be linked not only

attitudinal differences in people's consideration of immigration, but also the distinctive country-specific effects of respondents' characteristics that influence sentiments.

When regarding the control variables, the effects largely describe the same tendencies as in the previous findings. Particularly in Germany, respondents with a migration background are more positive about immigration. A more favorable attitude can also be seen among persons living in urban areas while age has no significant effect. Similar to the economic models, men are more favorable towards immigration than women and the difference is now significant in the Australian sample. Recall that concerning the cultural dimension, women were more likely to advance a more positive opinion. This is not surprising, considering the mixed results for measures of gender in previous studies (Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann 2001, Mayda 2006).

In the last step of the methodological approach the measures of labor market influence, economic contribution and cultural impact were included as explanatory variables in the regression model on immigrant influx preference. The aim of this approach was to test the association between respondents' sentiments about the economic and cultural impact of

Table 7 Parameter Estimates: Economic and Cultural Considerations and Attitudes towards Influx of Immigrants

| | Both | | Australia | | Germany | | Coeff Test |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|------------|
| | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | Coeff | Std. Err | t-value |
| country | | | | | | | |
| West Germany | .495 *** | .065 | | | | | |
| East Germany | .441 *** | .079 | | | -.001 | .073 | |
| labor market impact | .251 *** | .023 | .269 *** | .029 | .225 *** | .037 | .93 |
| economic contribution | .280 *** | .029 | .333 *** | .037 | .183 *** | .043 | 2.66 *** |
| cultural impact | .380 *** | .037 | .379 *** | .048 | .366 *** | .057 | .18 |

control variables (gender, age, migration background, education, profession, nationalism, patriotism) included but not shown

* significant at 10%, ** significant at 5%, *** significant at 1% confidence level

immigration and preferences concerning the number of people entering the country. The results for the effects of the added variables are presented in table 7 (Background variables included but not shown). Not surprisingly, respondents in both samples who are more positive about the impact of immigration concerning the different dimensions are also more open regarding further immigrant inflow into the country. Furthermore, people's cultural considerations are more strongly associated with immigration preference than considerations in the economic dimensions. This is in line with the findings of Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) as well as Mayda (2006). If we look at cross-country differences, contrary to the expectations, cultural considerations play a marginally stronger role in the Australian population. Therefore, although Germany's policy puts more emphasis on cultural homogeneity, cultural considerations do not have a relatively stronger influence compared to Australia. The effects of economic considerations, in contrast, differ to a larger extent in their magnitude across the two country-specific models. The difference particularly articulates and is only significant in respect of sentiments about the cultural contribution of immigration. This supports the prediction that the difference between Australia's skill-oriented policy and Germany's hardly economically driven immigration policy directive is reflected in a stronger effect of economic considerations in forming people's immigration preferences. In this sense,

the results further underpin the findings described earlier that differences in attitudes towards immigration across Germany and Australia articulate in the economic dimensions.

6. Conclusions

The objective of this study was to investigate the link between immigration policy and attitudes towards immigration by comparing Australia and Germany; two countries that have been described as opposing poles in the way they have dealt with immigration. While both countries experienced mass immigration movements since 1945, their immigration policy developments strongly differ. Australia aimed at permanent residents and, since the 1970s, actively recruits and integrates immigrants on the basis of a multicultural directive. Germany, in contrast, recruited ‘guestworkers’, stopped active recruitment in the 1970s, and, thereafter, followed a rather ethno-centric policy aiming to reduce immigration. Nevertheless, the country received large inflows of resettlers, asylum seekers, and people entering through family reunification. In the theoretical framework three dimensions of attitudes were distinguished: With regard to economic considerations, people’s sentiments about immigrants’ impact on the labor market and on their contribution to the host country’s economy and, concerning cultural issues, people’s feelings about the influx and prevalence of foreign traditions and customs. If links between policy and attitudes exist, then parallels should show between attitudinal and policy differences in Australia and Germany.

The empirical analysis of people’s attitudes towards immigration in Australia and Germany based on the ISSP 2003 module comprise certain limitations. A major drawback is the country specific set of questions concerning respondents’ characteristics which makes some of otherwise useful socio-demographic background variables inapplicable for cross-country comparisons. Furthermore, there is no specific ISSP module on sentiments about immigrants so that only a few questions in the national identity round are related to immigration. With regard to the labor market dimension, for example, another variable concerning attitudes towards the impact of immigration on wages or on the welfare system would have been advantageous to derive a more reliable and precise measure for individual attitudes in this respect.

Results for cross-country difference in sentiments about immigration were in line with the theorized relationship to policy. In all three dimensions Australian respondents are more likely to hold more favorable attitudes towards immigration. However, differences articulate particularly in people’s economic considerations whereas sentiments about the cultural influence of immigrants differ relatively little. With regard to the quite antithetic policies in the cultural dimension this was unexpected. Recall that until the time of ISSP 2003 survey, German governments still held on to the view that the country was ‘not a country of immigration’. In contrast, since the evolution of Multiculturalism as Australian government policy in the 1970s, governments consistently acknowledged the multicultural nature of their society and supported cultural diversity. These results suggest that the economic attributes of countries’ immigration policies are more closely linked to people’s attitudes.

Looking at different effects of background variables in the different samples, the prediction that a skill-oriented policy leads to stronger perceptions of immigrants as competitors for jobs among the higher skilled compared with the less skilled is not supported.

The higher skilled occupation groups in Australia do not show considerable differences in attitudes towards the labor market impact of immigration. At the same time, this is evident in case of sentiments about immigrants' economic contributions. Here, the difference between high and low skilled workers is much stronger in the German sample than in the Australian one. In contrast, concerning cultural considerations, the effect of nationalism is not found to be larger in the German sample, neither in the cultural nor in the economic dimensions. This supports the earlier findings that the link between policy and attitudes reflects mostly in considerations about immigrants' perceived impact on the host country's economy.

The results from relating economic and cultural considerations to preference concerning the number of immigrants coming into the country underpin this result. Although in both samples respondents with a more negative view about the cultural impact of immigrants are most likely to favor a reduction of immigration, cross-country differences are largest in attitudes towards the economic contribution of immigrants. Looking at the individual characteristics, the results of immigration preferences also resemble the patterns found in the dimension of immigrants' influence on the economy. While the effect of the variable measuring nationalist feelings is indeed more articulated in Australia, the influence on immigration preference differs significantly stronger among the occupation groups in Germany.

Hence, from drawing parallels between different immigration policies and cross-country differences in attitudes towards immigration, the following two key findings can be emphasized. Firstly, the multicultural, skill-oriented, and active immigration policy in Australia is mirrored in, compared to Germany, more positive sentiments about the economic and cultural impact of immigration and less opposition to further immigration. However, the relationship appears to be stronger with respect to economic considerations. Secondly, the theorized explanations of immigration policy for different effects of people's characteristics in the two countries are not corroborated. The frequently stressed argument of economic theory that a skill-oriented policy leads to greater belief in negative impact of immigrants on labor market competition also among the higher skilled cannot be supported. Only in terms of sentiments about the economic contribution, a link between policy and differing skill-level effects on attitudes in Australia and Germany appears.

Beyond the investigation of the linkage between immigration policy and attitudes towards immigration, a considerable finding is the differing effects of the two measures of respondents' notions of national identity. Previous research has consistently reported that strong nationalist, patriotic or chauvinist feelings coincide with animosity towards immigration. In contrast, the measure of patriotism in this analysis was, particularly in the Australian sample, related to a more favorable attitude towards immigrants when controlling for the variable nationalism.

The initial point for the research approach taken in this study were findings from Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001: 23) who reported "some evidence that the design of an immigration policy may be important [...] for the development of sentiments of natives towards immigrants". Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001) explain the link between a skill-oriented policy and more favorable attitudes with the strand of economic theory that claims a better economic performance of immigrants in countries where migrants are selected on the basis of labor market criteria. Following studies on attitudes towards immigration

focused on the relation between economic theory and attitudes towards immigration. One strand supported the findings that the economic impact of immigration plays a role in determining people's sentiments (Mayda 2006, O'Rourke and Sinnott 2006, Scheve and Slaughter 2001). The other strand postulated that, in accordance with more recent findings that the actual economic influence of immigration is at most marginal, people's sentiments were simply related cultural and racial factors as, for example, nationalist feelings or ethnic tolerance. Nevertheless, this only explains differences within but not between countries (Card, Dustmann and Preston 2005, Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007, Sides and Citrin 2007). Both strands have disregarded the initial idea of a linkage between immigration policy and people's attitudes. The approach taken in this study picked up at the starting point of Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann (2001). However, hypotheses about the relationship between policy and attitudes were based on an extended theoretical framework since the actual economic impact is reported to be negligible. Despite the differing approach, the findings of the comparison of Australian and Germany widely coincide with Bauer, Lofstrom and Zimmermann's (2001) results from looking at 'classic immigration countries' (Canada, New Zealand, USA) versus Western European countries. There is supporting evidence that attitudes towards immigration are reflections of countries immigration policies. From the analysis of Australia and Germany that finds two countries choosing different policies when faced with comparable immigration issues, it further appears that an active recruitment policy based on immigrants' qualifications engenders to a certain extent more favorable sentiments about immigration. Nevertheless, the study approach of analyzing attitudes in two countries representing the opposite poles of the immigration policy spectrum (in the Western World) falls short in disentangling the causality relations of the recursive relationship of attitudes and policy.

In 2013, the third ISSP module on national identity will be conducted. The repeated module offers a great opportunity to further test the linkage between policy and attitudes in Australia and Germany. In the first decade of the 21st century, policy in both countries has changed significantly. In Australia, the emphasis has started to shift from focusing on permanent to temporary migrants and multicultural policies have been dismantled. In Germany, in contrast, immigration policy has been reformed and is now following a more open and active directive aiming to attract skilled immigrants. Also the idea of Germany as a country of immigration is more and more acknowledged by politicians (Castles 2008). Therefore, although policy differences are still large and it would be misleading to consider the changes as a convergence, the trends of those policy developments should be mirrored in alterations of attitudes towards immigration.

References

- Bauer, T. K., Lofstrom, M. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2001). Immigration Policy, Assimilation of Immigrants and Natives' Sentiments towards Immigrants: Evidence from 12 OECD-Countries. *Working Papers, Center for Comparative Immigration Studies*, UC San Diego.
- Betts, K. (2010). Attitudes to Immigration and Population Growth in Australia 1954 to 2010: An Overview. *People and Place*, 18 (3), 32–51.
- Brenner, J. & Fertig, M. (2006). Identifying the Determinants of Attitudes towards Immigrants: A Structural Cross-Country Analysis. *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, 2306, 1–33.
- Borjas, G. (2003). The Labor Demand Curve Is Downward Sloping: Reexamining the Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market. *NBER Working Paper Series*. No. 9755.
- Borjas, G. (1999). *Heaven's Door: Immigration Policy and the American Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Borjas, G. & Freeman, R.; Katz, L. (1996). Searching for the Effect of Immigration on the Labor Market. *American Economic Review* 86 (2), 1335-1374.
- Brückner, H. & Jahn, E. (2008). Migration and the Wage Setting Curve. *Aarhus School of Business Working Paper*. 04/2008.
- Card, D. (2005). Is the new immigration really so bad? *The Economic Journal* 115 (507), 300-323.
- Card, D., Dustmann, C. & Preston, I. (2005). Understanding Attitudes to Immigration: The Migration and Minority Module of the First European Social Survey. *CREAM Discussion Paper Series*, 03/2005, 1–43.
- Castles, S. (1992). Australian Multiculturalism. Social Policy and Identity in a Changing Society. In Freeman, G. P. & Jupp, J. (Eds.), *Nation of Immigrants: Australia, the United States and international Migration* (pp. 184-201). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Castles, S. (2008). *The Migratory Process: A Comparison of Australia and Germany*. <http://www.age-of-migration.com/uk/casestudies/11.1.pdf> (Retrieved 10.07.2011).
- Castles, S. & Miller, M. (2008). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Palgrave.
- Cortina, J. (1993). What Is the Coefficient Alpha? An Examination of Theory and Applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 98-104.
- Dustmann, C. & Preston, I. (2004). Racial and Economic Factors in Attitudes to Immigration. *CREAM Discussion Paper Series*, 01/2004, 1–46.

- Fertig, M. & Schmidt, C. M. (2011). Attitudes towards Foreigners and Jews in Germany: Identifying the Determinants of Xenophobia in a Large Opinion Survey. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 9 (1), 99–128.
- George, D. & Mallery, P. (2004). *SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 12.0 Update*. Pearson.
- GESIS (2005). *Codebook. ISSP 2003. National Identity II*. Zentralarchiv fuer Empirische Sozialforschung. Universitaet zu Koeln. www.gesis.org/ZA (Retrieved 05.08.2011)
- Green, E. G. T. (2009). Who Can Enter? A Multilevel Analysis on Public Support for Immigration Criteria across 20 European Countries. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12 (1), 41-60.
- Hatton; T. & Williamson, J. (2005). *Global Migration and the World Economy: Two Centuries of Policy and Performance*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Hainmueller, J. & Hiscox, M. J. (2007). Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Toward Immigration in Europe. *International Organisation*, 61, 399–442.
- Joppke, C. (1999). *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kivisto, P. (2002). *Multiculturalism in a Global Society*. Oxford, Malden: Blackwell.
- Lack, J. & Templeton, J. (1995). *Bold Experiment: A Documentary History Of Australian Immigration Since 1945*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- McDonald, P. (2010). Australia's Population Policy. In Berlin-Institute for Population and Development (Ed.), *Online-Handbook Demography*. <http://www.berlin-institut.org/online-handbookdemography/australia.html> (Retrieved 19.07.2007)
- Meier-Braun, K. (2002). *Deutschland, Einwanderungsland*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Meyers, E. (2004). *International Immigration Policy: A Theoretical and Comparative Analysis*. New York: Palgrave.
- O'Rourke, K. H. & Sinnott, R. (2006). The Determinants of Individual Attitudes Towards Immigration. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 22, 838–861.
- Peri, G. & Sparber, C. (2007). Task Specialization, Comparative Advantages, and the Effects of Immigration on Wages. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 1(3), 135-169.

- Scheve, K. & Slaughter, M. (2001). Labor Market Competition and Individual Preferences over Immigration Policy. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83 (1), 133-145.
- Sides, J. & Citrin, J. (2007). European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information. *British Journal of Political Science*, 37, 477-504.
- Simon, R. & Lynch, J. P. (1999). A Comparative Assessment of Public Opinion Toward Immigrants and Immigration Policies. *International Migration Review*, 33 (2), 455–467.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. Worchel, S. & Austin, W. (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, 7-24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human Groups and Social Categories*. Cambridge University Press.

Non-Plagiarism Statement

By this letter I declare that I have written this thesis completely by myself, and that I have used no other sources or resources than the ones mentioned.

The sources used have been stated in accordance with the rules and regulations that are applied at the Faculty of Spatial Sciences of the University of Groningen. I have indicated all quotes and citations that were literally taken from publications, or that were in close accordance with the meaning of those publications, as such.

Moreover I have not handed in a thesis with similar contents elsewhere. All sources and other resources used are stated in the bibliography.

In case of proof that the thesis has not been constructed in accordance with declaration, the Faculty of Spatial Sciences considers the thesis as negligence or as a deliberate act that has been aimed at making correct judgment of the candidate's expertise, insights and skills impossible.

In case of plagiarism the examiner has the right to exclude the student from any further participation in the particular assignment, and also to exclude the student from further participation in the MSc programme at the Faculty of Spatial Sciences of the University of Groningen. The study results obtained in the course will be declared null and void in case of plagiarism.

Name:

Place:

Date:

Signature: