

HOI OK JEONG
Myongji University, Seoul, South Korea

A New Typology of Perceived Discrimination and Its Relationship to Immigrants' Political Trust

Abstract: This study investigates the link between perceived discrimination and political trust among immigrants in European countries. Focusing on perceived discrimination, I emphasize the diversity of mechanisms through which discrimination is perceived by immigrants; in other words, perceptions of discrimination are multidimensional. This is in stark contrast to most of the research that uncritically assumes that the perceptions of discrimination are unidimensional. Employing the European Social Survey, I find that each of the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination has different associations with immigrants' political trust. Furthermore, the association between diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination and political trust varies depending on the immigrant's generational status. For first-generation immigrants, their trust in political institutions is related to seven types of perception of discrimination, whereas, for the second generation, it is linked only to four types. This indicates that first-generation immigrants' political trust is more responsive to the perceptions of discrimination in comparison to the second generation of immigrants.

Keywords: immigration, immigrants, perceived discrimination, political trust, Europe

Introduction

This study investigates the link between perceived discrimination and political trust among immigrants in European countries. Although there are many aspects to immigrants' political and social lives, the present study has chosen to focus on perceived discrimination, which is important because immigrants face this in their everyday lives. The mechanisms through which discrimination is perceived might be significantly related to the formation of their political attitudes. Therefore, perceptions of discrimination might contribute to our understanding of immigrants' assimilation processes. The present study emphasizes the diversity of mechanisms through which discrimination is perceived by immigrants; in other words, perceptions of discrimination are multidimensional. This is in stark contrast to most of the accepted research that contends that the perceptions of discrimination are unidimensional. Individuals are discriminated against for many reasons: nationality, language, ethnic group, race, religion, gender, age, and so on. Similarly, people perceive that they are discriminated against. Furthermore, different types of discrimination might be more common among different immigrant generations. This leads the present study to expect that the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination might be associated differently with immigrants' political attitudes/behaviors, particularly in terms of political trust. This difference necessitates that we unpack the perceptions of discrimination and examine whether and how each dimension of perceived discrimination varies in terms of its relationship with political

trust. By providing a more nuanced understanding of the perceptions of discrimination and their roles in the formation of political trust, the present study attempts to contribute to the literature.

The central findings of this study are, first, that different types of discrimination are more commonly found among different immigrant generations. More specifically, first-generation immigrants are more sensitive to color-, nationality-, ethnicity-, and age-based discrimination, while second-generation immigrants respond to color-, nationality-, religion-, and disability-based discrimination. Second, the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination have different relationships with political trust, and their relationships vary significantly depending on the immigrant's generational status. For the first-generation immigrants, their trust in political institutions is related to more diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination than for the second generation. This indicates that first-generation immigrants' political trust is more responsive to the perceptions of discrimination in comparison to second-generation immigrants.

The present study is particularly relevant within the current European context. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) data (Davidov and Meuleman 2012), immigration rates in European societies have increased in recent decades. Between 1994 and 2004, there was a 60 percent increase in immigration into the EU-15 (Davidov et al. 2008). However, the increase in the number of immigrants has not been accompanied by an increase in favorable feelings toward them. There has been great concern about discrimination, including the social exclusion of immigrants in Europe, and the substantial rise in anti-foreigner sentiment (Semyonov et al. 2006; Davidov and Meuleman 2012). As the issue of discrimination against immigrants continues to be intensely debated, a crucial question is whether and how European countries can succeed in integrating them (Röder and Mühlau 2011). Some scholars point to economic and educational aspects as key ingredients for immigrant integration. For instance, Heath (2009), Werner (1994), Muus (2002), Fleischmann and Dronkers (2007), and Van Tubergen et al. (2004) systematically investigated the position of European immigrants in education and in the labor market. While education and employment are important in the discussion of immigrant integration, the present study attempts to illuminate the political aspect of integration—the immigrants' trust in political institutions in the host society. Several scholars point to the significance of immigrants' political trust and claim that it is an important indicator of immigrant attachment to mainstream politics (Maxwell 2010a; Michelson 2003; Wenzel 2006). In line with these scholars, the present study examines perceived discrimination and trust in political institutions as a way of investigating whether immigrants feel that the host government's authority is legitimate. Employing the European Social Survey (ESS), this study runs empirical analyses and discusses the implications regarding issues of European immigration and integration.

Theoretical Framework

Political trust is thought of as a key ingredient in the long-term survival of every society (Wenzel 2006). Many scholars, including Miller (1974), Citrin (1974), and Michel-

son (2001), highlight the importance of trust in political institutions (Wenzel 2006). Trust strengthens citizens' beliefs that a government is responsive and encourages its citizens to express their demands by taking part in activities, including voting, demonstrations, signing petitions, and joining organizations (Mishler and Rose 2005).¹

The importance of political trust might be more salient in societies with an increasing number of immigrants, such as European countries. Several instances of terrorism, riots, and unrest in immigrant communities have occurred in that region, which has resulted in the native population being hostile toward immigrants. Thus, many European countries are thought to have a serious problem with immigrant integration (Algan et al. 2010). In these societies, issues regarding whether immigrants have acquired allegiance to the host country, or whether they are committed enough to the mainstream political community are very important for the stability of the host society. That is, one of the most pressing concerns in these societies is in ensuring that migrants trust the political institutions of the host country to a level that is sufficiently safe for the receiving society (Maxwell 2010a).

This raises the question of what is associated with political trust among immigrants. There are two main perspectives from which to explain immigrants' political trust and integration in their host country. First, previous works illustrate that immigrant assimilation is the key to promoting attachment and allegiance to political institutions in a host country. According to this perspective, as immigrants spend more time in the host country and increasingly identify with its society, they are more likely to have positive attitudes about mainstream institutions (Alba and Nee 2003; Gordon 1964; Joppke and Morawska 2003, requoted from Maxwell 2008). This perspective, called "straight-line assimilation" or "classic assimilation," claims that with sufficient time in a host country, immigrants will successfully integrate into mainstream society. Studies have found that immigrants often face difficulties in integration in the initial stage, but, over time, their life outcomes converge with those of the native population and they succeed in becoming assimilated into the host country. According to this view, the key factors that facilitate this process are the acquisition of citizenship and the gradual adoption of the host society's language and culture (Park et al. 1925; Gordon 1964). Building on this research, more recent works, such as Perlmann and Waldinger (1997), Alba and Nee (2003), and Joppke and Morawska (2003), have examined post-World War II immigrants to the United States and European countries. The perspective of straight-line assimilation holds that cultural and social assimilation would precede attitudinal assimilation, which would precede the absence of discrimination (Maxwell 2008). According to Maxwell (2008), as immigrants become culturally and socially like the natives of their host country, they will adopt native attitudes, which will then give the natives fewer incentives to be prejudiced or to discriminate against immigrants.

On the other hand, another point of view, often called "segmented assimilation" in the literature, claims that immigrants are subject to discrimination in their everyday lives, since they are likely to be stigmatized as inassimilable outsiders. Focusing on the barriers to assimilation that many immigrants face, the second perspective tends to illuminate how entrenched socio-economic difficulties and stigmatization alienate immigrants from

¹ It should be noted that there is a counter-argument against the positive aspect of political trust. Some argue that declining rates of confidence in political institutions may be a reflection of an increasingly sophisticated citizenry (Hardin 1999; Mishler and Rose 1997).

mainstream society (Howell and Fagan 1988). According to this perspective, “assimilation is not always a smooth and unidirectional process” (Safi 2010: 161) and it is not only a matter of time. The host society is an important factor in the process through which the mechanisms of discrimination against immigrants function. For instance, studies show that the position immigrants obtain in the labor market is affected by the level of discrimination they experience in mainstream society (Model and Lapido 1996; Van Tubergen et al. 2004; Algan et al. 2010). These studies imply that second-generation immigrants might show different integration trajectories from those described by the classic, linear theory of integration; second-generation immigrants could face what Portes and Zhou (1993) described as a downward assimilation into the urban underclass (Thomson and Cruil 2007). For example, Rydgren (2004) shows that second-generation immigrants experience ethnic discrimination in the Swedish labor market, while Verkuyten and Canatan (2003) indicate that for second-generation Turks in the Netherlands, perceived discrimination can be negatively related to educational outcomes. Furthermore, the hostility immigrants experience in the host country might build a negative relationship in terms of their political attitudes. Discrimination may lead immigrants to become distrustful of and alienated from mainstream society, thus creating obstacles to integration (Waters 1999; Portes et al. 2005). Therefore, focusing on discrimination draws attention to the attitudes of the host society as an important player in the immigrant’s assimilation process (Safi 2010). The specific hostility that immigrants may face in everyday life may contribute to immigrants’ political attitudes. More specifically, perceived discrimination may be strongly related to the lack of political trust among immigrants.

Relying on the segmented assimilation literature, the present study argues that immigrants’ feelings of trust in political institutions might be significantly associated with their perceptions of discrimination. Some scholars have maintained that the evaluation of the performance of political institutions has both instrumental and relational aspects (Newton and Norris 2000; Mishler and Rose 2005; Röder and Mühlau 2011). According to these scholars, when individuals are in direct contact with political institutions, they read the way they are treated as signals of their value as members of the society (Röder and Mühlau 2011). Furthermore, in terms of their judgment of political institutions, procedural fairness concerns are salient (Tyler 2006; Röder and Mühlau 2011), which indicates that a more important aspect of institutional performance for individuals is the capacity for political institutions to create a fair society.

In Europe, immigrants are at a greater risk of being discriminated against than natives are (André et al. 2008; Safi 2010; Röder and Muhlau 2011).² For instance, there are incidents of discrimination that involve the unfair treatment of immigrants by employers and by the public (McGinnity et al. 2006; Safi 2010; Heath and Cheng 2007). Therefore, Heath (2009) claims that although anti-discrimination legislation is now rightly required in the EU, it is by no means sufficient, as the continued existence of discrimination in countries such as Britain and Sweden, which have long-standing and tough anti-discrimination leg-

² The present study does not imply Europe is one monolithic community without differences across countries. It acknowledges the institutional and cultural differences across European countries, which might have an association with perceptions of discrimination. To deal with this issue as much as possible, the present study engages in multilevel techniques and takes into account the differences across European countries in the empirical analysis.

isolation, demonstrates. The experience of discrimination by third parties may have a negative relationship with immigrants' political trust because immigrants may feel that political institutions fail in their responsibilities by not preventing these acts of discrimination (Kääriäinen 2007; Röder and Muhlau 2011; Safi 2010).

However, the segmented assimilation literature is not without its problems. It tends uncritically to assume the unidimensionality of perceived discrimination. Although there are some qualitative studies that consider the multidimensionality of discrimination,³ this is not the case for many of the quantitative studies that have examined the link between perceived discrimination and political trust among immigrants.⁴ Most quantitative studies tend to regard perceptions of discrimination as having only one aspect, and they empirically focus only on one questionnaire item that asks "whether or not the respondent belongs to a group which is discriminated against in society," or they combine all questions on discrimination (e.g., Röder and Muhlau 2011; Maxwell 2008; Michelson 2003). This obscures the true relationship between perceived discrimination and political trust, which is unfortunate, because individuals feel discriminated against for various reasons. For instance, some might feel that they are being discriminated against because of their ethnicity, while others might feel discriminated against because of their religion, and still others may feel discriminated against because of their gender or age.

In addition, it might be possible that certain types of discrimination are more commonly perceived as depending on the immigrant's generational status. First-generation immigrants might be more likely to cite race-, color-, nationality-, language-, and ethnicity-based discrimination, whereas second-generation immigrants might tend to respond to types of discrimination based on socio-demographic grounds, such as age, gender, and sexuality. The logic behind this expectation is that first-generation immigrants might face difficulties in becoming integrated into their new home country during the initial stage, and their differences with the native population in terms of race, color, language, and so on might be more salient. However, other types of discrimination are likely to be obscured by this more ethnic-based discrimination. Therefore, first-generation immigrants might perceive themselves as being more discriminated against on grounds such as race, color, and ethnicity. In comparison, for those in the second generation, socio-demographic types of discrimination, such as age, gender, and sexuality might be more salient, as their life outcomes converge with those of the Indigenous population through their adoption of the host country's language and culture. However, it should be noted that the present study does not expect that second-generation immigrants will have the same experience as the native population. The present study simply proposes that different types of discrimination will be

³ It should be noted that there is a qualitative research stream that considers the multidimensionality of discrimination. For instance, Banton (1988) and Robilliard (1980) examine discrimination along racial and religious dimensions, indicating that both scholars recognize that discrimination is a multidimensional concept. In a similar vein, Rydgren (2004) discusses three forms of discrimination, including spillover discrimination, institutional discrimination, and preference-based discrimination. Tannock (2008) also recognizes the multidimensional nature of discrimination, and argues that "for any given category of identity—race, gender, age, religion, sexuality, and so on—there will be arenas in which differential treatment and consideration are variously objectionable and non-objectionable, even desirable" (p. 441).

⁴ André et al. (2008) provide one of the few empirical studies that rely on several aspects of perceptions of discrimination. However, their work does not include all measures of perceptions of discrimination, and it only focuses on several dimensions, such as language-, race-, nationality-, ethnicity-, and religion-based aspects.

more prevalent depending on immigrant generational status, and for first-generation immigrants, race-, color-, and ethnicity-based types of discrimination might be more salient in comparison to those viewed as salient by the second generation.

Furthermore, the present study investigates how the association between immigrants' perception of discrimination and political trust is shaped by immigration status. It might be possible that the mechanisms underlying the relationship between discrimination and trust in political institutions are similar across generations. We might also see different mechanisms working among different generations. The present study expects that first-generation immigrants' political trust might be more responsive to various types of perception of discrimination compared to second-generation immigrants. It might be because second-generation immigrants have become more assimilated into the host country, and, as a result, the sensitivity of perceived discrimination linked to political trust might decrease.

By highlighting the ways in which differing types of discrimination transform across different generations, and how the links between diverse types of discrimination and political trust vary depending on immigration status, the present study attempts to point to a more nuanced understanding of the mechanism of perceived discrimination among immigrants.

My theoretical considerations have resulted in the following hypotheses:

- H1: The more immigrants perceive being discriminated against in the host country, the less likely they are to have political trust.
- H2: Each of the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination will have a differing impact on immigrants' political trust.
- H3: The impact of diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination will vary depending on one's immigration status.
- H4: First-generation immigrants' political trust might be more responsive to various types of perception of discrimination compared to second-generation immigrants.

Data and Methods

The data for the present study come from a pooled ESS of waves 2 to 5. The ESS is useful because it employs a wide range of questions on perceived discrimination as well as significant samples of foreign-born respondents in many European countries.⁵

First-generation immigrants are identified by selecting respondents who were born abroad and whose parents were born abroad. Second-generation immigrants are identified by selecting respondents who were born in the country of residence and have at least one parent born abroad.⁶ This method of identifying immigrants by immigration status has been adopted in previous studies (e.g., Röder and Mühlau 2011, 2012; Safi 2010). The present study excludes any case that does not fit into any of the two categories.⁷

⁵ Wave 1 of the ESS was not included because an anonymous reviewer suggested waves 2 to 5 would provide more detailed information about the country of birth of the parents of the respondents than wave 1, and that a pooled ESS of wave 2 and higher would allow for a more precise measurement of the origin of the migrants.

⁶ Those who have one parent born abroad are categorized as second-generation immigrants.

⁷ An autonomous reviewer pointed out an important methodological issue that relates to the transient nature of many migrants; when sample surveys draw the samples, they are likely to under-represent recent migrants, migrants who are passing through a country, and so forth. The present study was not able to deal with the transient

For the dependent variable, “political trust,” the analysis utilizes questions that ask how much respondents trust their host country’s parliament, the legal system, the police, and politicians. The responses for these questions range from 0 (no trust at all) to 10 (complete trust). A sum score is calculated from the four items, with higher scores indicating more political trust.⁸

For the independent variable of “perceived discrimination,” in the ESS, there is an introductory question on whether the respondent belongs to a group that has been discriminated against. This question has often been used for measuring perceived discrimination in the previous literature (Brüß 2008; Röder and Mühlau 2011). During the initial stage of analysis, this question was used. However, by only relying on this question, the multidimensionality of perceived discrimination could not be revealed. Thus, the present study utilizes follow-up questions. Respondents who answered in the affirmative regarding perceived discrimination were then asked about the reasons why they felt this way. The 10 follow-up questions ask respondents whether they belong to a group that has experienced discrimination on grounds of race, nationality, religion, language, ethnic group membership, age, gender, sexuality, disability, and/or other grounds. This provides a binary indicator between those who did not report discrimination and those who reported it under at least one of these criteria. When respondents answered yes to a reason for feeling discriminated against, it was coded as 1; if they answered no, it was coded as 0. Each question was then used to measure variables of race-based discrimination, nationality-based discrimination, religion-based discrimination, language-based discrimination, ethnic group membership-based discrimination, age-based discrimination, gender-based discrimination, sexuality-based discrimination, disability-based discrimination, and other grounds-based discrimination.

The analysis includes several individual-level control variables. In order to evaluate the literature on integration over time, the analysis controls for the following two variables: length of stay is a measure of how long respondents have been living in the host country (1 = for the last year, 2 = 1–5 years, 3 = 6–10 years, 4 = 11–20 years, 5 = more than 20 years), and citizenship is a measure of citizenship status. These variables are only included for first-generation immigrants.

The present study further controls for socio-demographic variables. Gender (1 = female and 2 = male)⁹ and age are included. Education is measured by the number of years of full-time education completed. Income is measured by the household’s total net income from all sources on a scale from 1 to 15.¹⁰ Political interest and political ideology are included. Political interest is measured by asking respondents how interested they are in politics (1 =

nature of many migrants. It should be noted that not recognizing the transient nature of migrants might influence the results of the present study’s data analysis.

⁸ The Cronbach’s alpha is 0.813, which confirms the reliability of this four-item scale.

⁹ With respect to gender, previous works produced mixed results. Women are sometimes found to have higher levels of political trust in comparison with men; at other times, the outcomes are reversed. For instance, Maxwell (2010a) finds that men are more likely to trust parliament than women are. On the other hand, some studies show that the gender differences in political attitudes/behaviors tend to be rather small (Mariën 2008).

¹⁰ The religion variable was not included in the analysis due to missing values; 12,153 responses belonged to the categories of not applicable, refusal, no answer, and system missing. The exclusion of the religion variable is not desirable; however, it does not significantly influence the substantive findings of the present study. First, no scholarly consensus has yet been reached on the link between religion and political trust. Second, other studies

very interested, 2 = quite interested, 3 = hardly interested, 4 = not at all interested) and the political ideology variable utilizes the question that asks respondents to indicate their ideology on a scale of 0 (left) to 10 (right).

The study also controls for country-level variables. Since each respondent is nested in both the destination country and origin country, the present study includes macro characteristics of the destination country and those of the origin country. With regard to the macro characteristics of the destination country, the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX)¹¹ score and net migration-rate variables are used. The present study utilizes the overall score for MIPEX 2010, with the highest score indicating better migrant-integration policies. It is expected that immigrants who live in a country with a higher score on MIPEX will display a higher level of political interest. The net migration rate of a country is the difference between the immigration and emigration in a country per 1000 persons in the population per year (André and Fleishmann 2008). The mean net-migration rate of 2013 is used, which is taken from the *Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Fact Book*. It might be possible that countries with higher migration rates are more adaptive toward immigrants; therefore, immigrants living in these societies might have a higher level of trust in their host country's political institutions.

In addition to the differences at the destination level, the present study considers the characteristics of the country of origin. Based on previous studies (André and Fleishmann 2008; Fleischmann and Dronkers 2007), the analysis includes the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, the Gini Index¹², and the net migration rate of 2013. The GDP per capita and the Gini Index are taken from the *CIA World Factbook*, which contains information for various years for each country. The three variables represent the socio-economic environment of the country from which immigrants originated, which might be related to immigrants' confidence in political institutions.

With respect to the methodology, the present study relies on multilevel techniques. The data used for the present study have a multilevel structure. At the lowest level, immigrants' political trust might be associated with individual factors; at the highest level, immigrants' political attitude might be an outcome of their origin and destination countries. Based on previous studies (e.g., Van Tubergen et al. 2004), the country of birth of first-generation immigrants was used as the country of origin, while the mother's country of origin for second-generation immigrants was used to take into account the country fixed effects.

Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the main variables used in the data analysis. With respect to political trust, the results show that first-generation immigrants have a higher level

do not take the religion variable into account in their analysis, e.g., Rydgren (2004), Neto (2006), Tubergen et al. (2004), and Waldinger and Feliciano (2004).

¹¹ The MIPEX is an index that measures the different policies toward the integration of migrants in 28 states. It contains several subscales for long-term residence, family reunion, political participation, labor market access, and so on.

¹² The Gini Index is a measure of inequality of wealth in each country. A higher score on the index indicates more inequality in the country.

of political trust, followed by second-generation immigrants. The first-generation mean is about two points higher than that for second-generation immigrants. These results are in line with previous findings (Wenzel 2006; Maxwell 2008; Röder and Mühlau 2011, 2012; Kao and Tienda 1995; Michelson 2003; Waters 1999).¹³

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics: Means/Proportion by Migrant Status

	First-generation	Second-generation
Perceived Discrimination	.1590	.0994
Political Trust	19.6575	17.7779
Gender (% female)	44.8	45.5
Age	47.7825	43.9315
Education	12.3704	12.7179
Income	6.6536	6.4309
Political Interest	2.65	2.56
Political Ideology	4.96	5.02
Citizenship (%)	54.8	n/a
Length of Stay	4.0366	n/a

More importantly, the analysis in Table 2, based on the new discrimination typology, shows which types of perceived discrimination are more common among different immigrant generations. First, among the positive responses to the question asking whether the respondent belonged to a group that was discriminated against by society, 55 percent of responses were from first-generation immigrants and 44 percent were from those in the second generation. This shows that although more first-generation immigrants indicated perceived discrimination than second-generation immigrants did, there do not seem to be significantly significant differences between the different generations. However, when taking the multidimensionality of discrimination into account, the results become more interesting. More first-generation immigrants said “yes” to perceived discrimination on grounds of color, nationality, religion, language, and ethnic group, while more second-generation immigrants said “yes” to dimensions such as age, gender, sexuality, disability, and other grounds.

The results are in line with the present study’s expectation that certain types of discrimination might be more commonly perceived depending on the immigrant generational status. Furthermore, the results might imply that for first-generation immigrants, their differences with the native population in terms of race, color, nationality, language, and so on might be more salient; thus, other types of discrimination might be obscured by these more racial/ethnic-based types of discrimination. In comparison, for second-generation immigrants, socio-demographic types of discrimination, such as age, gender, and sexuality seem to be more salient, as their life outcomes tend to converge with those of the native population through the adoption of the host society’s language and culture; thus, racial/ethnic-based types of discrimination might lose some of their salience.

¹³ In order to explain the over-confidence of first-generation immigrants, Maxwell (2010b, 2010c) states that first-generation immigrants who have gone through the disruptive process of changing countries have lower expectations and tend to positively evaluate their host society.

Table 2

The Differential Distribution of Perceived Discrimination Based on the New Typology of Discrimination (%)

	First-generation	Second-generation
Perceived discrimination	55.66	44.34
New typology of Discrimination		
color-based	62.95	37.05
nationality-based	74.08	25.92
religion-based	50.82	49.18
language-based	68.87	31.13
ethnicity-based	59.85	40.15
age-based	33.33	66.67
gender-based	30.20	69.80
sexuality-based	34.82	65.18
disability-based	27.16	72.84
other grounds-based	33.80	66.20

To examine the relevance of the new typology of discrimination in more detail, the present study utilizes multivariate analysis. As a preliminary analysis, [Table 3](#) presents the results of the data analysis. It incorporates a perceived discrimination variable that is measured by one question that asks whether the respondent belongs to a group that is discriminated against in society. The results show that discrimination does have a negative association with political trust among all generations of immigrants. Those immigrants who feel discriminated against in mainstream society are more likely to have a lower level of trust in political institutions. These results highlight the strong relationship between perceived discrimination and the process of the formation of political trust among immigrants, confirming HI (The more immigrants perceive being discriminated against in the host country, the less likely they are to have political trust).¹⁴

Several control variables turn out to be significant. Those who are interested in politics and are left wing in their political ideology tend to have a lower level of political trust regardless of generational status. For first-generation immigrants, those who stay for a long time in the host country are more likely to display a lower level of trust in the host country's political institutions. The results of the present study run counter to the majority of literature ([Alba and Nee 2003](#); [Gordon 1964](#); [Joppke and Morawska 2003](#)) on integration over time, but they also confirm some previous works ([Röder and Mühlau 2012](#)).¹⁵

The interaction between discrimination and education is significant only for first-generation immigrants, which indicates that the relationship between perceived discrimination and political trust is different for different values of the education variable. Several coun-

¹⁴ There is a possibility of reverse causality with a causal arrow coming from political trust to perceived discrimination. For example, if immigrants have a low level of political trust, it might increase their level of perceived discrimination. However, since the research design of the present study cannot disentangle any possible reverse causation, it should be noted that the study does not make use of causal language, and instead uses correlation/association language throughout.

¹⁵ In Röder and Mühlau's (2012) work, once the length of stay variable is included, the effect of citizenship disappears, emphasizing that the negative relationship between citizenship and trust indicates that citizenship for immigrants is a proxy for acculturation.

try-level variables have significant relationships with political trust. For both generations of immigrants, the net migration rate of the destination country is positively related to political trust, which means that people who have migrated to countries with higher migration rates have a higher level of political trust. Other country-level variables, such as GDP per capita in the origin country, the net migration rate of the country of origin, and the MIPEX score of the destination country, vary in their significance and in terms of their relationship with political trust, depending on generational status.

Table 3

**Perceived Discrimination and Political Trust:
Employing the Unidimensional Measure of Perceived Discrimination**

	First-generation		Second-generation	
Individual characteristics				
Perceived discrimination	-3.22***	(1.12)	-3.28*	(1.97)
Gender	.22*	(.20)	1.16	(.29)
Age	0.0008	(.001)	-.0008	(.002)
Education	-.01	(.01)	-.010	(.02)
Income	.0007	(.003)	.006	(.005)
Political interest	-.76***	(.10)	-.92***	(.15)
Political ideology	-.01***	(.003)	-.02***	(.006)
Length of stay	-.50***	(.09)	—	
Citizenship	-.30	(.25)	—	
Discrimination × age	.02	(.06)	.10	(.11)
Discrimination × gender	.03	(.02)	-.01	(.03)
Discrimination × education	-1.40**	(.54)	-1.14	(.91)
Origin country				
GDP per capita	-.00002**	(9.70e-06)	.00001	(.00001)
Gini index	.008	(.05)	.008	(.07)
Net migration rate	.02	(.01)	.05**	(.02)
Destination country				
MIPEX	.07	(.05)	.09*	(.05)
Net migration rate	.65***	(.25)	.62**	(.24)
Constant	19.36***	(3.14)	14.13***	(3.12)
Destination variance	3.20	(.53)	3.03	(.53)
Origin variance	.61	(.21)	.41	(.60)
-2ΔLL(χ ²)	-21719.398	(df = 17)	-9729.7429	(df = 15)

The results presented in Table 3 are interesting. However, by adopting the new typology of perceived discrimination, the present study attempts to expand our understanding of immigrants' political attitudes. First, focusing on first-generation immigrants, model 1 in Table 4 works as a baseline model, which only includes diverse variables of perceived discrimination. All discrimination variables except for the gender- and sexuality-based ones turn out to be negatively significant. This means that first-generation immigrants who perceive discrimination on various grounds are more likely to have a lower level of political trust. In model 2, individual-level variables are included. The inclusion produces small changes, such as the disappearance of the religion- and disability-based discrimination variables, with the sexuality-based discrimination variable gaining significance. Political inter-

est, political ideology, and length of stay have a negative relationship with political trust, which reaffirms the results in Table 3. The third model includes country-level variables. Including country-level variables does not lead to a significant change in the relationship between various discrimination variables in relation to political trust. First-generation immigrants who perceive discrimination based on color, nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, and other grounds tend to display lower levels of trust in the political institutions of mainstream society. The results are in line with H2 (Each of the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination will have a differing impact on immigrants' political trust).

Table 4
The Multidimensional Measure of Perceived Discrimination and Political Trust among First-Generation Immigrants

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Individual characteristics						
Perceived Discrimination						
color-based	-1.28***	(.33)	-1.36***	(.48)	-1.28**	(.52)
nationality-based	-1.78***	(.27)	-2.49***	(.44)	-2.27***	(.45)
religion-based	-.96**	(.37)	-.35	(.58)	-.73	(.60)
language-based	-.76**	(.38)	-1.43*	(.76)	-1.36*	(.79)
ethnicity-based	-1.42***	(.42)	-2.22***	(.66)	-1.88***	(.71)
age-based	-2.31***	(.59)	-3.07***	(1.09)	-2.32*	(1.20)
gender-based	.29	(.62)	-1.13	(.96)	-1.15	(.98)
sexuality-based	-.43	(.92)	-2.71*	(1.62)	-2.86*	(1.62)
disability-based	-1.90**	(.84)	-2.21	(1.46)	-2.27	(1.48)
other grounds-based	-3.32***	(.45)	-2.75***	(.73)	-2.75***	(.74)
Gender			.09	(.18)	-.02	(.19)
Age			-.0004	(.001)	.0003	(.001)
Education			-.01	(.01)	-.009	(.01)
Income			.001	(.002)	-.00007	(.003)
Political interest			-.79***	(.10)	-.79***	(.10)
Political ideology			-.01***	(.003)	-.01***	(.004)
Length of stay			-.58***	(.08)	-.49***	(.09)
Citizenship			-.12	(.25)	-.22	(.25)
Origin country						
GDP per capita					-.00002*	(9.72e-06)
Gini index					.004	(.05)
Net migration rate					.02*	(.01)
Destination country						
MIPEX					.07	(.05)
Net migration rate					.68***	(.25)
Constant	19.05***	(.86)	25.45***	(.93)	19.01***	(3.13)
Destination variance	4.65	(.62)	3.96	(.58)	3.20	(.53)
Origin variance	.93	(.10)	.68	(.18)	.63	(.19)
-2ΔLL(χ^2)	-70299.787	(df = 10)	-23755.604	(df = 18)	-22230.556	(df = 23)

Table 5 shows the results regarding second-generation immigrants. The first model shows that for second-generation immigrants, color-, nationality-, language-, age-, disability-, and other grounds-based discrimination variables have a negative relationship

with political trust. Religion- and ethnicity-based discrimination variables, which were significant for the first-generation immigrants, are not statistically significant for the second generation. The results again confirm H2 (Each of the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination will have a differing impact on immigrants' political trust). Model 2, which includes individual characteristic variables, shows that age-based discrimination variables lose their statistical significance. Model 3 also controls for country-level variables. The inclusion of country-level variables does not bring major changes to the results of model 2. Second-generation immigrants who perceive discrimination based on color, nationality, disability, and other grounds are more likely to distrust political institutions in their host country. These results among second-generation immigrants are different from those among first-generation immigrants shown in Table 3. Table 3 highlights how first-generation immigrants who perceive discrimination based on color, nationality, ethnicity, sexuality, and other grounds tend to display lower levels of trust in the political institutions of mainstream society. The results are in line with H3 (The impact of diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination will vary depending on one's immigration status).

Additionally, those second-generation immigrants who are interested in politics and are left wing in their ideology tend to display distrust toward political institutions. With respect to country-level variables, the net migration rate of both the destination and origin countries and the MIPEX score of the destination country have a positive relationship with the level of political trust.

Conclusions

The results of the present study can be summarized as follows. First, each of the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination has different associations with immigrants' political trust. Not only do the findings of the present study confirm previous works (Gans 1992; Waters 1999; Crul and Heering 2008), they also provide nuances to previously published research. It has been suggested that discrimination is an important aspect to consider when studying immigrants' political attitudes. However, it has not been clear whether and how the diverse dimensions of discrimination might have different relationships with political trust. Little empirical work has been devoted to the multidimensionality of perceptions of discrimination; instead, many works uncritically assume that perceptions of discrimination are unidimensional. In reality, immigrants face a complex mixture of experiences of discrimination in their lives, and, at the same time, their perceptions of discrimination might not be uniform. Thus, conceiving of perceived discrimination as a structure with a multidimensional nature might provide a promising approach to understanding immigrants' political attitudes. Focusing on ten aspects of perceived discrimination, this study found that the various dimensions of perceived discrimination have different relationships with political trust. Most types of perceived discrimination have a negative relationship with political trust; however, religion- and gender-based perceptions of discrimination show no association with political trust among immigrants. If the focus were only on a one-dimensional concept of the perception of discrimination, then the variations in the diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination would not be seen. Thus, the approach proposed in this

Table 5

The Multidimensional Measure of Perceived Discrimination and Political Trust among Second-Generation Immigrants

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Individual characteristics						
Perceived Discrimination						
color-based	-2.17***	(.59)	-1.81***	(.67)	-1.75**	(.87)
nationality-based	-3.00***	(.58)	-2.47***	(.82)	-2.67***	(1.00)
religion-based	-.73	(.57)	-1.46*	(.75)	-.81	(.92)
language-based	-1.25*	(.75)	-1.59	(1.40)	-.18	(1.72)
ethnicity-based	.23	(.74)	-1.43	(.91)	-.32	(1.20)
age-based	-2.62***	(.79)	-.007	(.93)	.29	(1.60)
gender-based	.93	(.78)	-1.45	(.90)	-1.43	(1.16)
sexuality-based	.57	(1.27)	-1.97	(1.49)	-2.58	(2.32)
disability-based	-2.10**	(1.07)	-2.30**	(1.10)	-2.98*	(1.79)
other grounds-based	-3.40***	(.61)	-2.90***	(.68)	-2.57**	(1.03)
Gender			-.36*	(.19)	-.32	(.28)
Age			-.003*	(.001)	-.001	(.002)
Education			.03**	(.01)	.002	(.02)
Income			.003	(.003)	.005	(.005)
Political interest			-.88***	(.11)	-.92***	(.15)
Political ideology			-.01***	(.004)	-.02***	(.01)
Origin country						
GDP per capita					.00001	(.00001)
Gini index					.0004	(.07)
Net migration rate					.05**	(.02)
Destination country						
MIPEX					.09*	(.05)
Net migration rate					.65***	(.24)
Constant	18.50***	(.85)	21.44***	(.81)	13.68***	(3.13)
Destination variance	4.58	(.62)	3.66	(.54)	3.05	(.53)
Origin variance	.62	(.19)	.68	(.18)	.40	(.58)
-2ΔLL(χ^2)	-30339.066	(df = 10)	-21180.531	(df = 16)	-9846.5956	(df = 21)

study may illuminate the importance of the new multidimensional typology of perceived discrimination.

Second, the association between diverse dimensions of perceived discrimination and political trust varies depending on immigrant generational status. The present study shows that different types of perceived discrimination have different relationships with political trust depending on that status. For those in the first generation, their trust in political institutions is related to seven types of perception of discrimination, whereas, for second-generation immigrants, that trust is only linked to four types. This indicates that first-generation immigrants' political trust is more responsive to the perceptions of discrimination in comparison to immigrants in the second generation. It also implies that there are different mechanisms working among different generations with respect to perceived discrimination and its link to political trust. The examination of the specific mechanisms underlying the process is not within the scope of the present study, but it is presumed that second-genera-

tion immigrants might have become assimilated into the host country, and, as a result, the sensitivity of their perceived discrimination relating to political trust might be decreased. This might not be the case for first-generation immigrants.

In short, the present study suggests that it might be fruitful to distinguish between the various dimensions of perceived discrimination. By highlighting the ways in which differing types of discrimination transform across different generations, and how the link between diverse types of discrimination and political trust vary depending on immigration status, the present study attempts to point to the merit of the new multidimensional typology of perceived discrimination. Using a single-item measure of perceived discrimination may underestimate the relevance of perceived discrimination and prohibit the nuanced understanding of immigrants' perceptions of discrimination. This study aims to put forward the multidimensional concept of perceived discrimination as a significant methodological and theoretical improvement in the literature.

In addition, the results of this study provide policy implications for European countries. The results of the present study highlight the importance of perceived discrimination in the process of integration and the corrosive effect of discrimination. Not only does discrimination hinder immigrants' socio-economic achievement in the housing or labor markets (Safi 2010), as shown in previous studies, it also seems to undermine their confidence in political institutions. Perceived discrimination is transferred into immigrants' attitudes toward mainstream political institutions, which implies that in the long term, discrimination, as perceived by immigrants, might cause social problems and hinder the process of stable integration. Thus, policies that prohibit various kinds of discrimination against immigrants might boost immigrants' confidence in political institutions, which could help the process of integration in many European countries, as political trust is a key ingredient in the long-term stability and survival of every society.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (NRF-2013S1A3A2042859).

References

- Alba, R., and Nee, V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- André, S., Dronkers, J. and Fleishmann, F. 2008. The Different Levels of Discrimination, Experienced by First and Second Generation Immigrants from Different Countries of Origin in the Different EU Member-States. Paper presented at the RC28 Spring Meeting 2008.
- Algan, Y., Dustmann, Ch., Glitz, A. and Manning, A. 2010. The Economic Situation of First and Second-generation Immigrants in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, *The Economic Journal* 120 (February): F4–F30.
- Banton, M. 1988. Discrimination on Racial Grounds, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 15(1): 125–129.
- British Council and Migration Policy Group. 2013. *Migrant Integration Policy Index*. [online]. Retrieved October 2013.
- Brüß, J. 2008. Experiences of Discrimination Reported by Turkish, Moroccan and Bangladeshi Muslims in Three European Cities, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(6): 875–894.
- Central Intelligence Agency. 2013. *The 2013 World Factbook*. [online]. Retrieved October 2013.

- Citrin, J. 1974. Comment: The Political Relevance of Trust in Government, *American Political Science Review* 68: 973–988.
- Crul, M., and Heering, L. 2008. *The Position of the Turkish and Moroccan Second Generation in Amsterdam and Rotterdam*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Billiet, J. and Schmidt, P. 2008. Values and Support for Immigration: A Cross-country Comparison, *European Sociological Review* 24(5): 583–599.
- Davidov, E. and Meuleman, B. 2012. Explaining Attitudes Towards Immigration Policies in European Countries: The Role of Human Values, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38(5): 757–775.
- Fleischmann, F. and Dronkers, J. 2007. The Effects of Social and Labour Market Policies of EU-countries on the Socio-Economic Integration of First and Second Generation Immigrants from Different Countries of Origin, RSCAS Working Papers 2007/19, European University Institute.
- Gans, H. 1992. Second-Generation Decline: Scenarios for the Economic and Ethnic Futures of the Post-1095 American Immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 15(2): 173–193.
- Gordon, M. M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origin*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hardin, R. 1999. Do We Want Trust in Government?, in: M. Warren (ed.), *Democracy and Trust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 22–41.
- Heath, A. 2009. The Labour Market Integration of the Children of Immigrants: Main Determinants of Educational and Labour Market Outcomes. Paper prepared for the workshop on the labour market integration of the children of immigrants, co-organized by the European Commission and the OECD, 1st–2nd October 2009.
- Heath, A. and Cheung, 'S.'Y. (eds). 2007. *Unequal Chances: Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*. Proceedings of the British Academy 137. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy.
- Howell, S., and Fagan, D. 1988. Race and Trust in Government: Testing the Political Reality Model, *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52: 343–350.
- Joppke, C. and Morawska, E. (eds.). 2003. *Toward Assimilation and Citizenship Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States*. Basing-Stoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kääriäinen, J. T. 2007. Trust in Police in 16 European Countries: A Multilevel Analysis, *European Journal of Criminology* 4(4): 409–435.
- Kao, G., and Tienda, M. 1995. Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth, *Social Science Quarterly* 76(1): 1–19.
- Mariën, S. 2008. Trends and Gender Differences in Political Participation and Political Trust. A Comparative Analysis. PartiRep Working Paper. Brussels/Leuven: PartiRep Research Network. January 2008.
- Maxwell, R. 2008. Assimilation, Expectations, and Attitudes: How Ethnic Minority Migrant Groups Feel About Mainstream Society, *Du Bois Review* 5(2): 387–412.
- Maxwell, R. 2010a. Trust in Government among British Muslims: The Importance of Migration Status, *Political Behavior* 32: 89–109.
- Maxwell, R. 2010b. Evaluating Integration: Political Attitudes Across Migrant Generations in Europe, *International Migration Review* 44(1): 25–52.
- Maxwell, R. 2010c. Political Participation in France among Non-European Origin Migrants: Segregation or Integration? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(3): 425–43.
- McGinnity, F., O'Connell, P., Quinn, E. and Williams, J. 2006. *Migrants' Experiences of Racism and Discrimination in Ireland: Survey Report*. Dublin: Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Michelson, M. R. 2001. Political Trust among Chicago Latinos, *Journal of Urban Affairs* 23(3–4): 323–334.
- Michelson, M. R. 2003. The Corrosive Effect of Acculturation: How Mexican Americans Lose Political Trust, *Social Science Quarterly* 84(4): 918–933.
- Miller, A. H. 1974. Political Issues and Trust in Government, 1964–1970, *American Political Science Review* 68: 951–972.
- Mishler, W., and Rose, R. 1997. Trust, Distrust, and Skepticism: Popular Evaluations of Civil and Political Institutions in Post-Communist Societies, *Journal of Politics* 59: 418–451.
- Mishler, W., and Rose, R. 2005. What are the Political Consequences of Trust?, *Comparative Political Studies* 38: 1050–1078.
- Model, S. and Ladipo, D. 1996. Context and Opportunity: Minorities in London and New York, *Social Forces* 75(2): 485–510.
- Muus, P. 2002. *Migration and Immigrant Policy, Immigrants from Turkey and Their Participation in the Labour Market: An International Comparison*. Utrecht: ERCOMER.
- Neto, F. 2006. Psycho-Social Predictors of Perceived Discrimination Among Adolescents of Immigrant Background: A Portuguese Study, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32(1): 89–109.

- Newton, K. and Norris, P. 2000. Confidence in Public Institutions: Faith, Culture or Performance?, in: S. J. Pharr and R. D. Putnam (eds.), *Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Countries?*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 52–73.
- OECD. 2008. *The Price of Prejudice: Labour Market Discrimination on the Grounds of Gender and Ethnicity, Employment*. Outlook 2008. Paris: OECD.
- Park, R., Burgess, E. and McKenzie, R. 1925. *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmann, J. and Waldinger, R. 1997. Second Generation Decline? The Children of Immigrants, Past and Present: A Reconsideration, *International Migration Review* 31(4): 891–920.
- Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P., and Haller, W. 2005. Segmented Assimilation on the Ground: The New Second Generation in Early Adulthood, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1000–1040.
- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. 1993. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants among Post-1965 Immigrant Youth, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530(1): 74–98.
- Röder, A. and Mühlau, P. 2011. Discrimination, Exclusion and Immigrants' Confidence in Public Institutions in Europe, *European Societies* 13(4): 535–557.
- Röder, A. and Mühlau, P. 2012. Low Expectations or Different Evaluations: What Explains Immigrants' High Levels of Trust in Host-Country Institutions?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38(5): 777–792.
- Robilliard, St., John, A. 1980. Discrimination and Indirect Discrimination: The Religious Dimension, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 8(3): 261–265.
- Rydgren, J. 2004. Mechanisms of Exclusion: Ethnic Discrimination in the Swedish Labour Market, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 30(4): 697–716.
- Safi, M. 2010. Immigrants' Life Satisfaction in Europe: Between Assimilation and Discrimination, *European Sociological Review* 26(2): 159–176.
- Semyonov, M., Raijman, R. and Gorodzeisky, A. 2006. The Rise of Anti-foreigner Sentiment in European Societies, 1988–2000, *American Sociological Review* 71(3): 426–449.
- Tannock, S. 2008. The Problem of Education-based Discrimination, *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29(5): 439–449.
- Thomson, M. and Crul, M. 2007. The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33(7): 1025–1041.
- Van Tubergen, F., Maas, I. and Flap, H. 2004. The Economic Incorporation of Immigrants in 18 Western Societies: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects, *American Sociological Review* 69 (October): 704–727.
- Tyler, T. R. 2006. *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Verkuyten, M. and Canatan, K. 2003. Normative Orientation and Academic Achievement in a School Context, in: L. Hagendoorn, J. Veenman, and W. Vollebergh (eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in the Netherlands: Cultural Versus Socio-economic Integration*. London: Ashgate, pp. 111–143.
- Waldinger, R. and Feliciano, C. 2004. Will the New Second Generation Experience 'downward assimilation'? Segmented Assimilation Reassessed, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27 (3): 376–402.
- Waters, M. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wenzel, J. P. 2006. Acculturation Effects on Trust in National and Local Government among Mexican Americans, *Social Science Quarterly* 87(5): 1073–1087.
- Werner, H. 1994. *Integration of Foreign Workers into the Labour Market: France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden*. Geneva: International Labor Organization.

Biographical Note: Hoi Ok Jeong (Ph.D.), is an assistant professor of the Department of Political Science at Myongji University, Seoul, South Korea. Her primary research interests are in the field of Korean politics, minority politics, and the issue of migration.

E-mail: hoiojk@gmail.com

Appendix 1. Descriptive Statistics: Respondents' Country of Residence

	Frequency	Percentage
Austria	737	2.4
Belgium	1344	4.3
Bulgaria	206	.7
Switzerland	2430	7.8
Cyprus	278	.9
Czech Republic	605	1.9
Germany	1841	5.9
Denmark	705	2.3
Estonia	2441	7.8
Spain	834	2.7
Finland	353	1.1
France	1473	4.7
United Kingdom	1596	5.1
Greece	1017	3.3
Croatia	550	1.8
Hungary	378	1.2
Ireland	1368	4.4
Israel	3372	10.8
Italy	59	.2
Luxembourg	790	2.5
Netherlands	1127	3.6
Norway	833	2.7
Poland	302	1.0
Portugal	714	2.3
Russia	915	2.9
Sweden	1383	4.4
Slovenia	997	3.2
Slovakia	578	1.8
Turkey	137	.4
Ukraine	1860	5.9
Total	31277	100.0