POLICY | brief

(In)visible generations: from integration to equality

by Maryna Manchenko & Laura Westerveen

Children of immigrants: Generations 1.5 and 2.0

In recent years, we have seen an increasing call for the reframing of migrant integration in the field of migration studies (e.g. Korteweg, 2017; Dahinden, 2016). There is particularly growing criticism on the grouping of different generations under the (homogenous) category of 'immigrants', as it extends the requirement to 'integrate' to children of immigrants, who had no say in the decision to migrate or did not even migrate at all (Schinkel, 2013). Even though children of immigrants are socialised in the host country, they are often still viewed as in need of integration and targeted by integration policies. In this policy brief, we focus on the so-called 'generations 1.5 and 2.0'. By discussing their particularities, we aim to draw attention to the specific inequalities that they are facing in European societies. We conclude by recommending a move beyond the integration paradigm to an equality paradigm that addresses the specific needs of children of immigrants, but at the same time is mindful of the homogenising group categories it constructs.

Before moving to our argument, let us discuss who are generally labelled with the terms 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0'.[1] The term 'generation 2.0', includes children of immigrants who are born in the host country. As opposed to their parents (labelled the 'first generation' or 'generation 1.0'), this generation did not migrate. The term 'generation 1.5', on the other hand, was created by Rubén Rumbaut to describe people that migrated before or during their teens,

Despite growing criticism on extending the category 'immigrant' to children of immigrants, research in the field of migration studies generally distinguishes between different generations within the population of migrant descent. Those who migrated as adults are called 'the first generation', while children of immigrants who were born in the host country are labelled 'the second generation' and children of immigrants who migrated before or during their teens comprise 'generation 1.5'. Even though these later generations are socialised in the host country, they are often still viewed as in need of integration and targeted by integration policies. In this policy brief, we discuss the particularities of 'generations 1.5 and 2.0' throughout Europe and join others in arguing that policymakers and scholars need to move beyond the integration paradigm towards a paradigm of equality. We suggest that an equality paradigm needs to take into account the specific inequalities that children of immigrants might face, but, at the same time, needs to be critical of the homogenising group designations that are assigned to them.

as they do not belong to the first- nor to the second generation. He objected to their classification as such, since none of these terms accurately described the experiences of youths who grew up in one country and had to undergo a second socialisation in another country (Rumbaut, 2004). Generation 1.5, as defined by Rumbaut, includes foreign-born youths who

migrated at a young age following their parents, or together with them (Rumbaut, 1997; 2004). As the experiences of so-said 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0' are different from those that characterise 'generation 1.0' and also differ from each other, it is important to define the major characteristics of these generations. However, what should be noted is that 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0' are by no means homogenous groups and that the lived experiences can of course widely vary within the generational groups as well.[2]

Particularities of Generation 1.5 and 2.0

Those who are referred to as 'generation 1.5' comprise pre-adolescent, primary-school-age children who have started their studies and socialisation in their mother tongues at schools abroad, but whose education is largely completed in the country of destination. In families where one or both parents migrate first and the rest of the family joins later (when all the necessary conditions for family reunification are met), many of those included under the label 'generation 1.5' are temporarily separated from their parents and can therefore suffer from separation anxiety (Favaro and Napoli, 2004). Moreover, young people who join their parents a few years after they migrated, can struggle with accepting their parents' authority (Favaro and Napoli, 2004; Aguilera-Guzmán et al., 2004). In addition, as observed by Coutin (2007), generation 1.5 is often characterized by a certain legal invisibility, because, even though some move at a young age and have their second socialisation in the host country, in many EU countries they remain foreigners de jure and de facto. Contrary to generation 2.0, there is often no simplified procedure of applying for citizenship for generation 1.5.

What is particular to so-called 'generation 2.0' is that, in many cases (but not always, depending on the country), generation 2.0 possesses citizenship in the host country, which means that they are no longer foreigners and have the same rights as citizens without a migration background. Moreover, generation 2.0 also has higher chances of speaking the language fluently and to have completed their entire education in the host country. Yet, despite these more favourable conditions for socio-economic inclusion, generation 2.0 often feels more discriminated against than their parents (Alanya, Baysu and Swyngedouw, 2015; Silberman, Alba and Fournier, 2007). The differentiated (and stronger) impact of discrimination on generation 2.0 as compared to generation 1.0, might be explained by higher expectations of equal treatment in society among generation 2.0, who has been born and raised in the host country (Westerveen and Adam, 2015).

Both 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0' can experience difficulties in their identity formation. Generation 1.5 remembers the life 'before' and can have difficulties in accepting the life 'after'. They may struggle with balancing a new culture, a new language and new social norms with old ones and accepting their new 'double identity' (Favaro & Napoli, 2004; Bartley & Spoonley, 2008; Ambrosini & Molina, 2004). Similarly, generation 2.0 can experience difficulties with identity construction and feelings of belonging in the host society. They have to reconcile their parents culture with that of the host society without having lived in the homeland of the parents. Moreover, they often have to construct their identity in a context of discrimination and exclusion (Portes, 1995; Rumbaut, 2008). Yet, the commonly found multilingualism among generations 1.5 and 2.0 and possible double nationalities can also provide clear advantages to these groups.

Still, both generations might have troubles in their socio-economic life. Generation 1.5 often has difficulties with finding their place in society and adapting to a new school system due to differences in the curriculum, limited skills in the national language as well as stereotypes and discrimination existing in society. Hence, many of those who are counted among 'generation 1.5' face difficulties in their studies (Rumbaut & Ima, 1988; Asher & Case, 2008; Favaro & Napoli, 2004). Generation 2.0 is in many European countries also faced with disadvantages in the education system (as well as on the labour market) due to different types of

inequalities and discrimination (Crul, Schneider and Lelie, 2012). Whereas some attain a rise in economic mobility in comparison to generation 1.0 (Konyali, 2014; Beaman, 2017), others experience a decline in intergenerational mobility (Vermeulen, 2010; Alba, 2005).

Main challenges: (in)visibility and inequalities

Regardless of the heightened attention for integration throughout Europe, the needs of 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0' are often not addressed in traditional integration and equality policies. Especially, generation 1.5 remains remarkably invisible in EU policies. For example, Eurostat exclusively distinguishes between the first-generation (i.e. the foreign-born) and the second-generation (i.e. native-born with at least one foreign-born parent). Policies tend to classify generation 1.5 as first-generation migrants and thereby fail to recognise the diverse needs of generation 1.5. Yet, will being relatively invisible in policies, generation 1.5 and 2.0 are far from invisible in everyday life. For example, although integration courses formally only apply to newcomers, in public and political discourse the burden to 'integrate' is often also placed on generation 2.0, who were born in the host country. Moreover, depending on the host country as well as different individual factors such as nationality, race-ethnicity and religion, they can be strongly discriminated against and struggle with belonging in society (Beaman, 2017; Rumbaut & Ima, 1988; Asher & Case, 2008; Giusti, 2004).

At the same time, both generations are faced with persisting inequalities as compared to those who are considered as natives. Despite the implementation of a diverse range of policy measures aimed at integration and anti-discrimination throughout the European Union, comparative research still reveals large gaps in, for example, (un)employment rates and school performances between people with and without a migration background (OECD, 2016; OECD, 2015). These disadvantages of (descendants of) immigrants in the education systems and labour

markets of EU countries depend on many factors including race-ethnicity, country of origin, socio-economic background, gender, language skills and religion. Although the gaps are largest for the first generation, they also continue to exist for children of immigrants, including both generation 1.5 and generation 2.0. By contrast to non-European OECD countries (where education and labour market outcomes for children of immigrants are on average equal to those of children of native-born parents), generation 1.5 and 2.0 in European countries have much less favourable education and labour market outcomes than their peers with native-born parents (OECD, 2010: 16).

Conclusion: from integration to equality

In this policy brief, we have discussed the characteristics of 'generations 1.5 and 2.0' as well as the specific opportunities and challenges that they face. Thereby we aimed to show that these group specificities differ not only between generation 1.5 and 2.0, but, more importantly, between first generation migrants and their children. Yet, current integration and equality policies in the European Union pay little attention to these generational differences within the group of people of migrant descent. Generation 1.5 often remains invisible and is grouped together with the first generation, while the framing of generation 2.0 as belonging to the category of 'immigrants' (and therefore in need of 'integration') is incorrect and can harm their feeling of belonging. Considering that integration policies do not sufficiently recognise the inequalities that children of immigrants are confronted with in European countries, we join the critics of the integration paradigm and argue for a move towards an equality paradigm (see: Korteweg, 2017). Focusing on equality instead of integration can make the experiences of generation 1.5 and generation 2.0 more visible and allows for the consideration of the particular opportunities and challenges they have. Thereby it is important that public policies, such as education and employment policies, become committed to equality in opportunity and non-discrimination in society.

In addition, within an equality paradigm, policies should become more attentive to the heterogeneity among people of migrant descent and avoid the homogenisation of their experiences by remaining critical of assigned group categories.

Endnotes

[1] In this context, scholars also defined a so-called 'generation 2.5', referring to people who have one native- and one foreign-born parent (Rumbaut, 2004: 1185; Ramakrishnan, 2004: 381; Noels and Clément, 2015: 453). However, in this policy brief we specifically focus on so-said 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0'.

[2] In fact, one of the main critiques on the integration paradigm is that it homogenises people's experiences by lumping together all those who are considered migrants as well as their descendants (Dahinden, 2016: 3-4; Korteweg, 2017: 7). When using the terms 'generation 1.5' and 'generation 2.0' we do not want to homogenise the diversity within these groups, nor do we want to treat them as natural or objective terms for descendants of migrants. Instead, we use them as conceptual simplifications to refer to two different groups of children of immigrants and to argue for the acknowledgement of the particularities of these groups.

References

Aguilera-Guzmán, R.M., Salgado de Snyder, V.N., Romero, M. and Medina-Mora, M.E. 2004. Paternal Absence and International Migration: Stressors and Compensators Associated with the Mental Health of Mexican Teenagers of Rural Origin. *Adolescence*, Vol.39, No.15, pp.711-23.

Alanya A., Baysu G. and Swyngedouw M. 2015. Identifying City Differences in Perceived Group Discrimination among Second-generation Turks and Moroccans in Belgium. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.41, No.7, pp.1-23.

Alba R. 2005. Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second-generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.28, No.1, pp.20-49.

Ambrosini, M. and Molina, S. 2004. *Seconde Generazioni. Un'Introduzione al Futuro Dell'immigrazione in Italia.* Torino: Fondazione Giovanni Agnelli.

Asher, C. and Case, E. 2008. A Generation in Transition: A Study of the Usage and Attitudes Towards Public Libraries by Generation 1.5 Composition Students. *Reference & User Services Quarterly,* Vol.47, No.3, pp.274-279.

Bartley, A. and Spoonley, P. 2008. Intergenerational Transnationalism: 1.5 Generation Asian Migrants in New Zealand. *International Migration*, Vol.46, No.4, pp.63-84.

Beaman, J. 2017. *Citizen Outsider. Children of North-African Immigrants in France.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coutin, S.B. 2007. *Nations of Emigrants: Shifting Boundaries of Citizenship in El Salvador and the United States.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Crul, M., Schneider, J. and Lelie, F. 2013. *Super-diversity. A New Perspective on Integration.* Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Dahinden, J. 2016. A Plea for the 'Demigranticization'of Research on Migration and Integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* Vol.39, No.13, pp.2207-2225.

Favaro, G. and Napoli, M. 2004. *Ragazze e Ragazzi nella Migrazione. Adolescenti Stranieri: Identità, Racconti, Progetti.* Milano: Guerini Studio.

Giusti M. 2004. *Pedagogia Interculturale. Teorie, Metodologia, Laboratori.* Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Konyali. A. 2014. Turning Disadvantage into Advantage. Achievement Narratives of Descendants of Migrants from Turkey in the Corporate Business Sector. *New Diversities,* Vol.16, No.1, pp.107-121.

Korteweg, A. 2017. The Failures of 'Immigrant Integration': The Gendered Racialized Production of Non-belonging. *Migration Studies,* Vol.5, No.3, pp.428-444.

Noels, K.A., Clément, R. 2015. Situational Variations in Ethnic Identity across Immigration Generations: Implications for Acculturative Change and Cross cultural Adaptation. *International Journal of Psychology,* Vol.50, No.6, pp.451–462.

OECD. 2010. *Equal Opportunities? The Labour Market Integration of the Children of Immigrants.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2015. *Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2015.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD. 2016. PISA 2015 *Results (Volume I): Excellence and Equity in Education.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Portes A. 1995. Children of Immigrants: Segmented Assimilation and its Determinants. In: Portes A. (ed.) *The Economic Sociology of Immigration; Essays on Networks, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship.* New York: Russel Sage Foundation, pp.248-279.

Ramakrishnan, S.K. 2004. Second-Generation Immigrants? The "2.5 Generation" in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly,* Vol.85, No.2, pp.380–399.

Rumbaut, R.G. 1997. Assimilation and its Discontents: Between Rhetoric and Reality. *International Migration Review*, Vol.31, No.4, pp.923-960.

Rumbaut, R.G. 2004. Ages, Life Stages, and Generational Cohorts Decomposing the Immigrant First and Second Generations in the United States. *International Migration Review*, Vol.38, No.3, pp.1160-1205.

Rumbaut R.G. 2008. Reaping What You Sow: Immigration, Youth, and Reactive Ethnicity. *Applied Development Science,* Vol.12, No.2, pp.108-111.

Rumbaut, R.G. and Ima, K. 1988. *The Adaptation of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth: A Comparative Study.* Washington D.C.: Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Schinkel, W. 2013. The Imagination of 'Society' in Measurements

of Immigrant Integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.36, No.7, pp.1142-1161.

Silberman, R., Alba, R. and Fournier I. 2007. Segmented Assimilation in France? Discrimination in the Labour Market against the Second Generation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* Vol.30, No.1, pp.1-27.

Vermeulen, H. 2010. Segmented Assimilation and Cross-national Comparative Research on the Integration of Immigrants and their Children. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.33, No.7, pp.1214-1230.

Westerveen, L. and Adam, I. 2015. Het Geboorteplaats-effect, Zij die Geboren zijn in België en Zij die niet Geboren zijn in België. In: Torrekens, C. and Adam, I (eds.). 2015. *Marokkaanse en Turkse Belgen: Een (Zelf)portret van onze Medeburgers.* Brussel: Koning Boudewijnstichting, pp.153-170.

About the authors

Maryna Manchenko is a PhD candidate in Human Rights at Università degli Studi di Palermo, Italy. Her research is focused on domestic violence and migration in the context of generation 1.5 in Italy. She works closely with domestic violence survivors and young migrants since 2013 in Ukraine, Thailand and Italy.

Maryna holds a Bachelor's Degree in Sociology from National Technical University of Ukraine "KPI" and a Master's degree in International Marketing from The Irregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, Ukraine.

In 2017 as a visiting researcher she spent three months with the IES' Migration, Diversity & Justice cluster.

In 2018 she was one of the Trust Conference scholars (Thomson-Reuters foundation).

Laura Westerveen is a PhD researcher in the Migration, Diversity and Justice Cluster of the Institute for European Studies at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Her PhD project focuses on the framing of ethno-racial inequalities within education and employment policies in Belgium and Germany. Laura's research interests include the politics of diversity and multiculturalism, anti-discrimination policies, freedom of movement, migrant integration policies and critical frame analysis.

Institute for European Studies

Pleinlaan 5

B-1050 Brussels

T: +32 2 614 80 01

E: info@ies.be

www.ies.be