Aiming high no matter what? Educational Aspirations of Ethnic Minority and Ethnic Majority Youth in England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden

Frida Rudolphi

Swedish Institute for Social Research (SOFI), Stockholm University

frida.rudolphi@sofi.su.se

Zerrin Salikutluk

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

zerrin.salikutluk@hu-berlin.de

Abstract

We examine cross-national variation in the ethnic gradient in aspirations among 14-year-olds in England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden by using data from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries, collected in 2009/2010. Results show that most ethnic minority groups are more likely to have university aspirations than ethnic majority youth. The most consistent minority advantage is found in England and Sweden, consistent with the interpretation that the ample scope for choice in progression through these school systems allows high ambitions of minorities to play out well. However, minority advantage of some groups is also present in the Netherlands and Germany, where transitions are more heavily conditional on previous performance. The pattern for immigrant generational status varies across countries and ethnic origins. There is no consistent empirical evidence indicating that aspiration differences between ethnic minority and majority youth will diminish due to assimilation processes across the generations.

Keywords: ethnic inequality; educational aspirations; education systems

Introduction

A key aspect of structural integration is how youth with an ethnic minority origin orient themselves and fare in the educational system. While the research in this field is ample, there is a lack of consensus on how ethnic educational inequality should be understood. To improve our understanding of ethnic differences in educational outcomes, we need to consider two patterns suggested in previous research. First, children from some ethnic minority groups are particularly disadvantaged in terms of educational success, even when accounting for socioeconomic factors and generation status. Second, although ethnic minorities often experience disadvantages in academic performance, they are ambitious in their educational aspirations and choices net of previous achievement.

Ambitious aspirations among ethnic minority youth have been observed in the U.S. among African Americans, despite low average performance in relation to their ethnic majority peers (e.g., Downey, Ainsworth and Qian 2009; Kao and Tienda 1995, 1998). Interestingly, a similar pattern of high aspirations or attainment net of performance and social origin is observed among some minority groups in European countries with substantially different educational systems and ethnic minority populations (e.g., Heath and Brinbaum, 2014; Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012; Jonsson and Rudolphi 2011; Salikutluk 2016; van de Werfhorst and van Tubergen 2007).

Institutional settings' impact on educational inequality and social mobility has a long tradition within sociology (e.g., Shavit and Blossfeld 1993; Erikson and Jonsson 1996; Jackson and Jonsson 2013). With increasing ethnic diversity in Western Industrial countries, it has become crucial to understand ethnic inequalities in educational outcomes in more detail. While we can draw upon theoretical and empirical research on social inequality, there are essential differences between social and ethnic inequality to consider. Group differences in

academic performance and educational choice represent a core aspect where social and ethnic differences partly differ, and thus call for elaborated (or different) explanations.

In this paper, we ask to what extent the majority-minority gap in university aspirations among youth vary between countries with different institutional settings. We aim to improve our understanding of ethnic minorities' educational ambitions within and across different institutional contexts by addressing two questions: (1) What are the ethnic differences in aspirations for attaining higher education, conditional on academic skills, among adolescents in England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden? (2) Are there systematic cross-country variations in aspirations patterns of ethnic minority and majority students, and can any such differences be understood in terms of aspects of the educational settings that have previously been suggested to be important for social inequality, such as tracking and selectivity?

Two institutional factors have been identified as important for choice effects on social inequality in attainment: *stratification* (degree of tracking) and *selectivity* (to what extent progress is determined by performance, on the one hand, and choice, on the other). The distinction is made from the perspective that these aspects most likely have independent effects on the role of choice for educational inequality, and they tend to come together in educational systems (e.g., Jackson and Jonsson 2013). The distinction is useful for our purpose as our focus lies on cross-national differences in university aspirations net of scholastic skills. We find it relevant to draw upon theory on educational choice and attainment but it is important to keep in mind that aspirations are beliefs about future education that may not translate into educational attainment.

To answer the first research question, we concentrate on within-country differences. It is well known that the composition of the immigrant population varies substantially between the four European countries, and country specific analyses are needed to tap the dominating ethnic minority groups in each survey country. By studying group differences by ethnic origin

and generation we address two theoretically relevant issues for educational integration: the size of minority advantage or disadvantage in the choice dimension, purged out by controlling for cognitive and language skills, and how far observed parental resources can account for ethnic differences in educational ambitions. Our country specific analyses do not allow for formal statistical tests of differences between countries, simply because the overlapping ethnic minority groups are too few across the four countries. Nevertheless, such a comparison is central as it can shed light on whether and to what extent minority ambitions have some common pattern *regardless* of vastly diverse ethnic minority populations. This speaks to the issue if there are generic mechanisms at play in this aspect of structural integration into European societies.

For numerically larger ethnic minority groups we extend the examination of integration to the potential role of immigrant generation status, thus examining the pertinent question whether educational disadvantages or advantages may diminish over immigrant generations. Assimilation theories typically predict a declining native-immigrant gap over generations (Gordon 1964; Barnett, Sonnert and Sadler 2012; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 1996), whereas segmented assimilation theory assumes varying integration pathways between minority groups and destination context, depending on the availability and strength of social ties within ethnic communities (e.g., Portes and Zhou 1993). Although compositional effects are beyond the scope of this study, we do analyse whether minority groups differ in the association between generation status and expectations, and we go beyond previous studies by not collapsing all minority groups in a generation status comparison (as e.g., OECD 2010). Previous research suggests that all ethnic minorities do not necessarily have high academic ambitions. Any observed differences across generations might simply result from different ethnic compositions across generational status and thus might be misinterpreted as generational decline or increase in educational ambitions.

The second question addresses cross-country variation. We focus on European countries that broadly fall into two categories: i) highly stratified educational systems where tracking occurs already at age 10 or 12, and where progress to the next level is highly conditional on previous academic performance (Germany and the Netherlands) and ii) less stratified systems with more extensive compulsory education involving tracking no earlier than around age 16, and allowing more scope for choice in the progression through the educational system (England and Sweden).

Studies analysing academic skills in conjunction with choice is still surprisingly rare. The age-group that we study differ substantially in the timing of the first important educational transition, which provides a general challenge for comparative research on educational outcomes. The use of data from the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries (CILS4EU), enables us to tackle both issues. It includes identical measures of educational aspirations and cognitive test scores for England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. This is a timely age to study for our purposes when youth in England and Sweden countries still attend comprehensive school. Focusing on university aspirations instead of actual educational transitions around this age is one way of overcoming the country differences in timing of tracking.

We contribute to the existing literature on structural integration by showing that there are signs of “immigrant optimism” in four European countries representing two main educational systems, with a varying level of optimism depending on the degree of tracking and selectivity.

Theory and previous research

Educational aspirations

Educational aspirations can generally be understood as individuals' beliefs about their future educational and occupational career, characterized by a varying degree of realism. Aspirations have been studied to capture how individuals perceive their chances of realizing the desired level of education (Goldenberg et al. 2001; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). The assumption of a strong causal impact of aspirations on attainment has been called into question, especially in the American context where studies have shown overly optimistic occupational ambitions in relation to the actual occupational distribution (e.g., Reynolds et al. 2006), and inconsistencies between “idealistic” and more “realistic” aspirations (Hanson 1994; Portes and Rumbaut 2001), the latter are sometimes distinguished as educational expectations assumed to reflect more realistic goals than aspirations do (Morgan 2005). In the present study, we focus on more realistic aspirations (or expectations), referring to the educational level pupils think that they will actually get, not only what education they *wish* to get.

There is indeed a discrepancy between educational ambitions and attainment (for the US: see discussions in Domina, Conley and Farkas 2011; Rosenbaum 2001), but a positive association between aspirations and attainment has repeatedly been shown (Feliciano and Rumbaut 2005; Morgan 2005; Portes and Rumbaut 2001; Reynolds et al. 2006), indicating the relevance of studying educational aspirations in educational stratification research.

Ethnic inequality in educational aspirations: within-country differences

Educational disadvantage among ethnic minority youth is a recurrent finding in Western countries, also among native-born children of foreign-born parents – children we refer to as second-generation immigrants – especially when it comes to educational performance (Heath, Rethon and Kilpi 2008; Heath and Brinbaum 2014; Kao and Thompson 2003).¹ One set of

explanations for ethnic gaps focuses on important parental resources that are known to predict educational outcomes, such as parents' education and social class, which are typically lower among many ethnic minority groups than in the native majority population (Heath, Rethon and Kilpi 2008; on achievement: van de Werfhorst and Mijs 2010). Another reasonable assumption is that scarcity of nation-specific resources in the host country, such as language skills or acquaintance with the educational system, generally hampers the chances to enrol in higher education for adolescents with immigrant origin (Kao and Tienda 1998).

Minority advantage is more frequently found for continuation to higher education when controlling for performance, plausibly because of high aspirations, as indicated by several studies (e.g., Kao and Tienda 1998; OECD 2010; Salikutluk 2016). Four main aspiration and attainment patterns have been found among children of immigrants in previous research. A consistent ethnic minority advantage in both achievement and aspirations is found among adolescents of Asian heritage in several European countries (Heath, Rethon and Kilpi 2008; Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012; Jonsson and Rudolphi 2011; Rethon 2007; Heath and Brinbaum 2014) and in the U.S. (Kao and Thompson 2003; Kao and Tienda 1995; Portes and Rumbaut 2001). Consistently lower educational performance and aspirations have also been observed, e.g., among young persons of Mexican and Mexican American background in the US, whose lower aspirations are based on low parental resources and low academic skills (Bohon et al. 2006). While some minority groups do not differ substantially from majority youth in any of the dimensions when socio-economic resources are taken into account (Jonsson and Rudolphi 2011), others tend to express ambitious educational goals despite the fact that they perform rather poorly in school. This has been reported for many second-generation minorities in England (Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012), Sweden (Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012; Jonsson and Rudolphi 2011), among African American students

in the U.S. (Downey, Ainsworth and Qian 2009; Mickelson 1990) and students with Turkish heritage in Germany (Salikutluk 2016, Tjaden and Hunkler 2017).

It has been emphasized that possession of unobserved positive traits is important for understanding high educational aspirations of some groups of minority youth (e.g., Kao and Tienda 1995; Ichou 2014). The comparability of parents' educational credentials between native-born and immigrants in the country of destination has consequently been questioned (Alba, Sloan and Sperling 2011; van de Werfhorst and van Tubergen 2007). This calls for careful interpretations of ethnic differences in aspirations after controlling for parents' education both within and across destination countries.

According to the immigrant optimism perspective (Kao and Tienda 1995), high educational degrees are seen as the key for intergenerational upward mobility in immigrant families, and despite unbeneficial socioeconomic positions of immigrant parents, the aspirations for their children are high. Aspiring for high educational attainment may also be a strategy to conquer anticipated discrimination on the labour market and to overcome blocked opportunities (Sue and Okazaki 1990; Heath and Brinbaum 2007).

When different immigrant generations are distinguished, a rather complex picture emerges in previous research. Among 15-year olds, students with an immigrant origin expect to attain a university education to a larger extent than natives do in some of 14 studied Western countries, e.g., Sweden, but not in all (OECD 2010, Table 2.5). In Germany, youth of immigrant origin are less likely to expect to graduate from university than youth of native origin. In the Netherlands, first- and second-generation immigrant students do not differ statistically significant in their university expectations from their native peers. After controlling for socioeconomic resources and math achievement, both first- and second-generation immigrants expect to complete a university education to a substantially higher extent than majority students do in the countries covered by the study including Germany and

the Netherlands. No common cross-country pattern emerges for immigrants of different generation status (OECD 2010).

Though we can expect to find heterogeneity between ethnic minorities, existing empirical research leads us to expect a tendency towards an ethnic minority advantage in aspiration net of test results and socioeconomic background for many, but not all, minority groups. Similarly, we expect that the aspiration gap between immigrants of the first- and second-generation (and higher) will differ between ethnic minorities.

Country-specific settings and between-country differences in ethnic inequalities

While the educational systems in Germany and the Netherlands are highly stratified with a high degree of selectivity, Sweden is characterized by an intermediate and England by a low level of stratification and selectivity. Students in Sweden and England follow compulsory education until around age 16, whereas tracking occurs earlier in Germany and the Netherlands (see Figure 1). Achievement is used as an important basis of track placement in Germany and Netherlands, but the German system leaves somewhat more room for parental preferences and a lower standardization, with possibilities to make educational detours (Kurz and Böhner-Taute 2016).

In what way can the institutional setting be important for ethnic differences in aspirations? Being separated into different tracks that impose strong constraints on future educational routes has an impact on perceptions of what educational level is achievable from a specific track. Research indeed suggests that educational and occupational expectations are strongly correlated with track placement in highly stratified systems, and students are described as more realistic in their aspirations in stratified than in undifferentiated systems (Buchmann and Dalton 2002; Buchmann and Park 2009). Youth of some immigrant origins are over-represented in lower tracks. In the Netherlands, this is the case for Moroccan students (Crul and Holdaway 2009), and in Germany for Turkish and Italian students (Stanat

and Edele 2011). We can thus expect tracking to be related to ethnic differences in aspiration levels.

The degree to which performance determines access to higher education can be important for the educational success of ethnic minority groups with low average skills and high educational aspirations. Findings for England and Sweden indicate that many ethnic minority groups take ambitious pathways in upper secondary and higher education conditional on their previous academic performance (Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012). One suggested explanation is that high aspirations are allowed to play out in this kind of educational system, which is to the benefit of students and parents with high educational aspirations if the child succeeds. In countries where achievement is highly decisive for accessing upper secondary and higher education, such as in Germany and the Netherlands, aspirations can be hypothesized to be depressed among low-performing but ambitious minority groups.

Figure 1. Overview of educational systems¹

Age	ENGLAND		GERMANY		NETHERLANDS			SWEDEN		
19	TERTIARY ACADEMIC		TERTIARY ACADEMIC		TERTIARY ACADEMIC			TERTIARY ACADEMIC		
18	UPPER SECON- DARY	VOCA- TIONAL EDUCA- TION	VOCATIONAL EDUCATION & TRAINING	ACADEM. UPPER SECON- DARY				VOCA- TIONAL UPPER SECON- DARY		
17										
16										
15	COMPULSORY EDUCATION		GYMNASIUM	REALSHULE	HAUPTSCHULE	VWO	HAVO	VMBO	COMPULSORY EDUCATION	
14										
13										
12										
11										
10										
9	PRIMARY EDUCATION		PRIMARY EDUCATION		PRIMARY EDUCATION			PRE-PRIMARY EDUCATION		
8										
7										
6										

Figure 1 provides an overview of the educational systems. In Germany students are assigned to different tracks after primary education on the basis of their performance at around age 10. After lower or intermediate levels, adolescents have the possibility to start an apprenticeship as alternative to academic tertiary education, or – with sufficient qualifications – continue the academic path in Gymnasium, the most common route to university. However, in Germany many occupations are acquired through vocational education training and offer promising labour market prospects. The Dutch educational system is quite similar, but the first branching point after primary education occurs later, at around age 12. LBO and Mavo (combined as VMBO in Figure 1) are the main paths to vocational education. VWO attainment (Atheneum and Gymnasium) is the only possibility for entering university, but lower tertiary levels are also open for graduates of HAVO.

In Sweden, teacher assigned grades are used as the selection criterion for the transition to upper secondary education (around age 16), but the system generally allows great scope for choice of program (and school). Two main branches of programs are offered: academic programs, mainly preparing for higher education, and vocational programs preparing for the labour market. In England, education is compulsory up until age 16 and the optional progression to upper secondary education is less conditional on previous performance but requires eligibility. Academic upper secondary course taking typically leads to a so-called AS- or A-level qualification (or the equivalent), which is the most common route to higher education.

There are several potentially relevant country differences that could be taken into account when comparing ethnic differences in aspirations or attainment (Alba, Sloan and Sperling 2011), but here we restrict our focus to two institutional aspects of educational systems that we hypothesize are of substantial importance for aspiration and attainment differences net of performance: tracking and selectivity.²

We expect the aspirations of ambitious ethnic minority students to play out more in countries that allow more scope for choice (England, Sweden), than in countries where progression in the educational system is more determined by previous academic performance (Germany, the Netherlands), the latter system potentially dampening high aspirations among ethnic minorities with low average scholastic performance.

Another possible explanation for country variation is that the studied countries vary in the selection of immigrants. As will be shown, the geographical origins of the immigrant population vary, and there is potentially important cross-national variation in unobserved characteristics that may have an impact on children's aspirations.

DATA AND VARIABLES

Data

We use data from the first wave of the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries (CILS4EU, Kalter et al. 2016). The aim was to oversample schools with a high proportion of immigrants by using a disproportional stratified sampling strategy. Two school classes with 14-year-old students were randomly selected in the sampled schools. To adjust for the higher selection probability of students in immigrant dense schools, we use design weights in our analyses that are provided in the data (for details: CILS4EU 2016).

In total, 18,716 students participated. In the first wave, conducted in 2009/2010, an extensive questionnaire and a language test and a non-verbal cognitive test were conducted. Parents answered similar questions via a self-completion questionnaire or telephone interview, and the questionnaire was available in the most common minority languages in each country (N=11,700; sample sizes by country are shown in Appendix Table A1). If parents did not participate, we use information on parents' educational attainment provided by

students. After deleting all cases with missing values on relevant variables, the number of cases amounts to 16,644.

Variables

Educational aspirations

Our dependent variable is educational aspirations, indicated by the question “What do you think, what is the educational degree you will actually get?” The national educational degrees were used as response categories in the nation-specific questionnaires (see Appendix A2). We distinguish students with ambitions for university education from those with any other lower level or undecided aspirations.

Ethnic origin

The main independent variable is ethnic origin, defined by students', biological parents' and grandparents' country of birth. We specify ethnic minority origin up to the third-generation. If both parents and all grandparents were born in the host country, the student is referred to as native majority. Students born abroad are defined as first-generation immigrants, and students born in the host country with two (or all) foreign-born parents are defined as the second-generation. If one of the parents was born abroad and the other in the host country, we define the student as 2.5th generation. Accordingly, a student with four grandparents born abroad is counted as a third-generation immigrant.³ We differentiate between first-generation, second-generation and other generational status (2.5 or higher and interethnic second- and third-generation). Ethnic minority groups of sufficient size are analysed by country of origin within each of the receiving countries.

Cognitive skills and language skills

Since we aim at estimating educational aspirations net of scholastic abilities, we include cognitive skills and language skills as control variables. The cognitive test was identical across countries (CFT20R, Weiß 2006) and the sum score varies between 0 and 27. Language proficiency in the host country language was measured by nation-specific tests consisting of questions on synonyms or antonyms, with a sum of scores that can take the values 0-25 (England and Germany) or 0-30 (Netherlands and Sweden).⁴ We standardized both test scores to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1 within each country.

Tracks

In specific analyses for Germany and the Netherlands we include the current school track and average of self-reported grades in Math, English and German or Dutch.

Parental resources

Parental resources are measured by the highest educational attainment of parents. We distinguish between no formal education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education or university education. For a descriptive overview of the variables see Table 1.

Table 1. Distributions of variables by survey country and ethnic minority status (weighted)

	England		Germany		Netherlands		Sweden	
	Mean or Perc.		Mean or Perc.		Mean or Perc.		Mean or Perc.	
	Natives	Migrant background	Natives	Migrant background	Natives	Migrant background	Natives	Migrant background
University aspiration	30.52	53.88	17.70	20.28	29.78	39.81	45.56	53.52
Female	52.12	49.22	47.86	51.98	47.42	54.28	49.44	50.14
<i>Generational status</i>								
First-generation		33.21		16.47		14.09		20.36
Second-generation		17.88		34.41		19.67		26.58
Other		48.91		49.12		66.24		53.07
Language test score (0-25; 0-30)	16.98	16.52	13.49	11.60	17.32	16.98	19.99	18.00
Cognitive test score (0-27)	18.79	19.00	20.06	19.34	19.87	19.70	18.49	17.48
<i>Parents' education</i>								
No education/Lower sec. degree	30.86	22.90	4.53	15.58	2.09	6.56	6.99	18.25
Upper secondary degree	43.29	34.79	75.44	62.61	80.79	65.41	44.85	36.12
University degree	25.85	42.31	20.03	21.80	17.11	28.03	48.16	45.62
<i>School tracks (Germany)</i>								
Lower secondary			12.17	22.99				
Intermediate secondary			30.72	27.24				
Upper secondary			25.56	18.51				
Compulsory school			31.55	31.26				
GPA (1-6; 1-10)			4.04	4.00	6.76	6.87		
<i>School tracks (Netherlands)</i>								
Vmbo-b/vmbo-k/vmbo-mbo2					25.51	18.66		
Vmbo-g/vmbo-t					43.65	42.20		
Havo					17.01	17.84		
Vwo/es/ib					13.84	21.30		
N (sample for analyses)	1,815	1,746	2,008	2,537	2,282	1,395	2,009	2,387

RESULTS

Ethnic minority groups

First to third-generation immigrants comprise a substantial share of the students in CILS4EU, varying from 38 to 56 per cent in the analysed sample. The variation in source countries is considerable, and different immigrant groups dominate in the host countries (cf. Appendix 3). A substantial cross-country variation in the proportion of highly educated parents is evident in Table 1. A crude summary comparison between ethnic minorities and the majority indicates a considerable minority drawback in parental education. England stands out by not having an average minority disadvantage – the proportion of parents with tertiary education is higher among ethnic minorities. However, as will be shown in Table 2, there are major variations depending on country of origin/heritage.

Youths' aspirations for university education follow the main cross-country pattern as for actual attainment (OECD 2017, Fig. A1.2). The results show the lowest proportions of university aspirations in Germany, the highest in England and Sweden and the Netherlands falling in between. On average, descendants of immigrants aim at university education to a higher degree than their peers of native origin, whereas the smallest gap can be found in Germany.

One essential comparison is how two of the most important individual and parental resources for educational aspirations are distributed between immigrant groups. We can expect cross-country differences in the ethnic aspiration gap to partly reflect variations in cognitive skills and parental education. Table 2 shows that ethnic minority students rarely have higher average test scores than majority students do, especially on the language test. It is quite expected that ethnic minority students do not outperform majority students in host language skills, particularly foreign-born students. Again, England is an exception with many minority groups performing on a par with or better than British majority students.

Table 2. Average scores on cognitive and language tests, and proportion of parents with university degree by ethnic group shown by host country (weighted)

	Language test	Cognitive test	University degree		Language test	Cognitive test	University degree
<i>England</i>				<i>Germany</i>			
Natives	16.99	18.79	25.85	Natives	13.49	20.06	20.03
Pakistan	15.41	17.41	22.78	Turkey	8.69	18.14	7.70
India	17.51	19.83	46.32	FSU	11.53	19.42	27.44
Jamaica	16.98	17.95	34.51	Poland	13.01	20.23	19.46
Ireland	17.93	18.68	37.54	FY	10.92	17.58	14.86
Africa	16.60	18.39	51.93	Africa	11.74	18.64	29.97
Asia	15.39	20.33	43.36	Asia	10.97	19.31	32.18
(Latin-) America	18.21	19.74	58.92	(Latin-) America	13.04	20.21	38.73
Southern Europe	16.62	18.44	23.61	Eastern Europe	13.59	20.39	23.11
Other Europe	16.06	19.01	49.41	Other Europe	12.84	19.84	24.35
<i>Sweden</i>				<i>Netherlands</i>			
Natives	19.99	18.49	48.16	Natives	17.31	19.87	17.11
FY	16.56	16.67	35.12	Turkey	14.12	18.87	12.33
Finland	19.49	18.46	40.58	Morocco	15.45	19.01	11.60
Iraq	14.42	14.96	50.33	Suriname	16.61	20.69	20.57
Turkey	15.26	15.23	32.72	Indonesia	17.86	19.53	27.14
Africa	15.81	14.54	47.98	Africa	14.93	17.76	21.90
Middle East	16.30	16.21	45.84	Asia	16.19	20.33	32.22
Other Asia	17.43	17.83	45.13	(Latin-) America	19.70	21.06	65.59
(Latin-) America	18.29	18.02	58.56	Netherlands	18.35	19.67	22.15
Europe	19.55	18.62	51.25	Antilles			
				Europe	17.64	19.54	33.74

In the other host countries, several minority groups are on average disadvantaged (e.g., youth with heritage in Turkey, Pakistan or African countries) or perform similarly (e.g., youth with heritage in Jamaica for England, Indonesia for the Netherlands, Poland and other Eastern European countries for Germany, Finland and other European countries for Sweden) in relation to their ethnic majority peers. Students with ancestry from India perform very well in England, which should also be seen in light of the high educational attainment of their parents (Table 2, last column).

Aspirations: ethnic gradient across countries

Table 3a and 3b show logistic regressions on having aspirations for graduating from university versus having lower or undecided aspirations. We estimate three models for each country. The first model includes ethnic origin and sex as independent

variables. In the second and third steps, we add control variables expected to be strongly correlated with the aspiration level: parental education (Model 2), and cognitive and language test scores (Model 3). For Germany and the Netherlands, we present an additional model where we take country specific features of the school setting into account by controlling for school track and grade point average (Model 4). To allow comparisons between the first and subsequent models, we report the results of the logistic regressions as average marginal effects (Mood 2010), which show the differences in the average probability of university aspiration between ethnic majorities and minorities.

Model 1 in Table 3a and 3b reveals a consistent pattern across countries: No ethnic minority group has statistically significantly lower probabilities of striving towards university education than ethnic majority youth. Importantly, there are country variations in the ethnic minority advantage, both with regard to magnitude and number of significant advantaged groups.

The most ambitious groups in relation to the majority population are found in England, where students of Indian, African and Asian heritage express considerably higher aspirations (around 30 percentage points higher probability on average) than British majority students do. We find a minority advantage of 19 to 31 percentage points for most groups in England. Students of Pakistani heritage have an aspiration advantage of 7 percentage points, and the advantage for Jamaica is of similar size (the latter is the only statistically non-significant minority group in England). In Sweden, there is a minority advantage in aspirations for many immigrant groups (with Finland, Other Asia and Latin America as non-significant exceptions), and the typical advantage lies around 9 and 11 percentage points higher probabilities than majority students, with Middle East having the highest advantage at 19 percentage points.

While most minority groups have significantly higher aspirations in England and Sweden in Model 1, this applies to fewer minority groups in the Netherlands (Turkey, Morocco, Asia) and Germany (Other Europe, (Latin-)America, Asia).

Many ethnic minority groups have lower educated parents on average, and we would expect them to have lower rather than higher aspirations than the majority. The gap in university aspirations between some minorities and the majority increases when we take parental education into account in Model 2. This holds for most groups with an aspiration advantage in Sweden, the Netherlands and Germany. England is an exception, where students with ethnic minority parents (or grandparents) of different heritage, e.g., Indian students, have more highly educated parents than majority students do, and consequently the coefficients decrease in the second model for these minority groups. In Germany, there are only two minority groups with significantly higher university aspirations than natives in Model 2 ((Latin-)America, Other Europe). Students from the Former Soviet Union (FSU) stand out with statistically significantly lower probability of aspiring for university education in Model 2, amounting to a 7 percentage points disadvantage. Compared to other minority groups in Germany, e.g., labour migrants, FSU immigrants are positively selected on their educational qualifications. Nevertheless, they experience the same struggle as other ethnic minority groups on the labour market (cf. Salikutluk 2016). A large share of FSU immigrants is overqualified for their jobs in Germany, which might discourage FSU parents and their children from investing in higher education.

In Model 3, we add language and cognitive tests scores. Except from England, controlling for test scores reveals an even larger gap in university aspiration between majority students and many of the significant ethnic minority groups also in previous models. In Germany statistically significant advantages for Turkish and Asian

students emerge in Model 3. The estimated minority advantages are of modest but non-negligible size in Germany, amounting to an advantage of 8 to 15 percentage points for the statistically significant estimates. Having similar educational origin and scholastic skills, FSU students' university aspirations do not differ from German majority students. This pattern is in line with previous findings and could be interpreted as a hint on downward assimilation, as FSU immigrants made great efforts to assimilate into German society and received integration support by the German government (cf. Salikutluk 2016).

The pervasive picture for England and Sweden is a one of ambitious immigrant youth. In England and Sweden, almost all ethnic minorities show significantly higher university aspirations than natives in Model 3 (exceptions are youth with heritage from Jamaica and (Latin-)America in England; youth with background from Finland and (Latin-)America in Sweden). In Sweden, the ethnic gaps increase cumulatively when educational background and test scores are added to the model for most minority groups.

In the Netherlands, only three of the minority groups stand out by having significantly higher educational aspirations: students with a Moroccan, Turkish and Asian background. When group differences in parental and individual resources are considered in Model 3 (Table 3a and 3b), the aspiration advantages for high aspiring minority groups indicate as much as 16 to 34 percentage points higher probability of holding university aspirations as compared to their native majority counterparts. In Sweden, the advantage of ethnic minority students ranges from 10 to 31 percentage points. In England, students of Indian, African, Asian and Southern European background exhibit a similar advantage (22 to 29 percentage points) while the advantage of other minorities in England is smaller (12 and 16 percentage points).

In Table 3b, extended models are shown for Germany and the Netherlands (Model 4). As expected, the attended school type and grade point average seem to guide adolescents in setting their level of educational aspiration. Overall, we can see that the aspiration advantages for several groups in both Germany and the Netherlands are (at least) partly attributable to previous performance and the tendency to attend higher tracks. Substantial and statistically significant advantages do however remain for some groups (Turkey, (Latin-)America and Other Europe in Germany, and Turkey and Morocco in the Netherlands) even after controlling for track and grades. There is one group with a substantial and statistically significant disadvantage: At a given position in the Dutch educational system and a given academic performance, the aspirations of (Latin-)American students are lower than we would expect.

In sum, while almost all ethnic minority groups have higher educational aspirations than ethnic majority youth in England and Sweden, only a few groups tend to be ambitious about their educational attainment in Germany and the Netherlands. This is in accordance with our theoretical assumptions: The less restrictive and choice based educational systems seem to encourage ambitious educational aims among ethnic minorities irrespective of their country of origin. In Germany and the Netherlands, ethnic minority students seem to be aware of the institutional barriers to high educational attainment. Noticeably, in both countries children of former ‘guest workers’ (Turkey, Morocco, and Other Europe in Germany) have higher educational ambitions on average than their native majority counterparts. As discussed in previous work (Salikutluk 2016), the hypothesis of immigrant optimism is likely to apply to economically motivated immigrants. Pursuing the goal of intergenerational upward mobility and being optimistic about future outcomes may help to build resilience towards institutional obstacles in the educational system.

Although the ethnic composition differs between the countries, there are some groups that we can compare across countries. On the one hand, students with Turkish ancestry stand out by their high aspirations in Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands. On the other hand, students who originate from the Former Yugoslavia seem to be ambitious in Sweden, but not in Germany.

Table 3a. Average marginal effects from logistic regressions of university aspiration. Country-specific analyses. England and Sweden (weighted)

	Model 1	England Model 2	Model 3	Model 1	Sweden Model 2	Model 3
England						
Groups (Ref: Native)						
Pakistan	0.071*	0.086**	0.164***			
India	0.311***	0.250***	0.216***			
Jamaica	0.105	0.076	0.094			
Ireland	0.237***	0.197***	0.171**			
Africa	0.304***	0.214***	0.257***			
Asia	0.304***	0.244***	0.286***			
(Latin-) America	0.243***	0.131*	0.083			
Southern Europe	0.185**	0.195**	0.219**			
Other Europe	0.171**	0.086	0.122*			
Sweden						
Groups (Ref: Native)						
FY				0.090**	0.133***	0.221***
Finland				0.016	0.041	0.049
Iraq				0.115**	0.122**	0.274***
Turkey				0.113**	0.170***	0.287***
Africa				0.119***	0.129***	0.260***
Middle East				0.192***	0.208***	0.306***
Other Asia				0.032	0.053	0.113***
(Latin-) America				0.033	0.010	0.051
Europe				0.101***	0.097***	0.103***
Female	0.025	0.017	0.021	0.103***	0.117***	0.101***
Parents' education (Ref: No education/Lower sec.)						
Upper secondary education		0.082**	0.067**		0.060**	0.024
University		0.372***	0.287***		0.337***	0.287***
Language test			0.114***			0.111***
Cognitive test			0.076***			0.063***
Pseudo-R ²	0.044	0.119	0.197	0.015	0.079	0.140
N	3,561	3,561	3,561	4,396	4,396	4,396

Notes: ***p≤0.01; **p≤0.05; *p≤0.1; clustered by school class.

Table 3b. Average marginal effects from logistic regressions of university aspiration.
Country-specific analyses. Germany and Netherlands (weighted)

	Germany				Netherlands			
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Germany								
Groups (Ref: Native)								
Turkey	-0.031	0.026	0.152***	0.104***				
FSU	-0.048	-0.065**	-0.009	-0.008				
Poland	0.017	0.022	0.022	-0.012				
FY	-0.043	-0.025	0.071	0.033				
Africa	0.061	0.036	0.085	0.073				
Asia	0.115**	0.077	0.136**	0.065				
(Latin-) America	0.203***	0.127**	0.135*	0.106*				
Eastern Europe	0.047	0.035	0.031	0.029				
Other Europe	0.082***	0.070**	0.079***	0.067**				
School type (Ref: Lower)								
Intermediate				0.060***				
Compulsory				0.044**				
Upper secondary				0.289***				
GPA				0.112***				
Netherlands								
Groups (Ref: Native)								
Turkey					0.206***	0.229***	0.339***	0.278***
Morocco					0.224***	0.245***	0.311***	0.253***
Suriname					0.039	0.034	0.031	0.036
Indonesia					0.064	0.045	0.032	-0.033
Africa					0.115	0.121	0.222**	0.120
Asia					0.163**	0.143*	0.165*	0.109
(Latin-) America					0.058	-0.019	-0.101	-0.144**
Netherlands Antilles					0.066	0.056	0.029	-0.017
Europe					0.067	0.038	0.032	0.009
School type (Ref: Vmbo-b/vmbo- k/vmbo-mbo2)								
Vmbo-g/vmbo-t								0.126***
Havo								0.422***
Vwo/es/ib								0.459***
GPA								0.091***
Female	0.024	0.008	0.023	-0.019	0.008	0.006	0.011	-0.050**
Parents' education (Ref: No education/ Lower sec.)								
Upper sec. education		0.041*	-0.001	-0.022		0.054	0.041	0.054
University		0.386***	0.234***	0.119***		0.221***	0.204***	0.174***
Language test			0.086***	0.015			0.127***	0.036**
Cognitive test			0.073***	0.021*			0.068***	0.029**
Pseudo-R ²	0.014	0.130	0.234	0.387	0.010	0.026	0.107	0.219
N	4,545	4,545	4,545	4,545	3,677	3,677	3,677	3,677

Notes: ***p≤0.01; **p≤0.05; *p≤0.1; clustered by school class.

Generational status: Assimilation across generations?

To test whether ethnic minorities of the second-generation or higher have lower aspirations than those of the first-generation, we apply a similar set-up as in the previous analysis using a categorization based on both immigrant background and generation status (first, second, 2.5th generation or higher) for the two largest minority groups in each country. We compare their average marginal effects of having university aspirations with those of ethnic majority youth, but also test whether the differences between the first and higher generations are statistically significant.

In line with previously shown results, Table 4 indicates higher levels of aspirations for all minority groups with some exceptions. The pattern for generational status varies across countries and ethnic origins with no clear trend of stronger advantage among the first-generation than those of higher generations. However, a decrease in ambitions between the first and higher generations on a statistically significant level is present for the Pakistani group in England, between the first and 2.5th and higher generation of students from Iraq in Sweden and between the first and 2.5th and higher generation of students from Morocco in the Netherlands. Although the patterns for students from a country of Former Yugoslavia in Sweden and the Moroccan group in the Netherlands are consistent with the gradual assimilation hypothesis, the differences between the generations are not of statistical relevance. Stable advantages in aspirations across generations are observable for Indian students in England, Turkish students in Germany and the Netherlands.

In sum, the tendencies across generations differ between minority groups and no clear trend can be observed for the university aspiration advantage of ethnic minorities of the first, second and higher generation. Bearing in mind that the number of cases are small for some groups and that we cannot separate out cohort effects from immigrant generation effects, the results can cautiously interpreted as a hint on the interplay between ethnic origin, generational

status and assimilation trends. While some groups seem to confirm the gradual assimilation hypothesis it does clearly not hold for all minority groups. Segmented assimilation theory provides an alternative explanation, because it assumes variation across minority groups, however we cannot draw any conclusions related to the hypothesised mechanisms rooted in the residential context. Particularly Turkish immigrants in Europe are however known to be stronger oriented towards their immigrant heritage than other ethnic minority groups, facilitating strong intergenerational transmission of norms and values within families and ethnic communities (e.g., GÜNGÖR, Fleischmann and Phalet 2011), but have strong aspirations for structural assimilation in terms of educational and labour market success across generations. Overall, the findings point out the importance of different generational trends across ethnic minority groups that should be acknowledged in studies. Importantly, we do not find any minority group with lower aspirations than majority youth, net of parental education and cognitive skills, which we would not expect from segmented assimilation theory (some groups would be disadvantaged).

Table 4. Average marginal effects from logistic regressions of university aspiration by generational status for selected ethnic minorities with pairwise comparison across generational status (weighted)

	England	Sweden	Germany	Netherlands		
Groups (Ref: Natives)						
1 st generation Pakistan	0.329***	} **				
2 nd generation Pakistan	0.159***					
2.5 th generation and higher Pakistan	0.078					
1 st generation India	0.260***	} n.s.				
2 nd generation India	0.159***					
2.5 th generation and higher India	0.205***					
Groups (Ref: Natives)						
1 st generation Iraq		0.272***	} n.s.			
2 nd generation Iraq		0.335***				
2.5 th generation and higher Iraq		0.799***				
1 st generation FY		0.291***	} n.s.			
2 nd generation FY		0.266***				
2.5 th generation and higher FY		0.144*				
Groups (Ref: Natives)						
1 st generation Turkey			0.119**	} n.s.		
2 nd generation Turkey			0.082**			
2.5 th generation and higher Turkey			0.114***			
1 st generation FSU			-0.048	} n.s.		
2 nd generation FSU			0.005			
2.5 th generation and higher FSU			0.038			
Groups (Ref: Natives)						
1 st generation Turkey				0.357***	} n.s.	
2 nd generation Turkey				0.265***		
2.5 th generation and higher Turkey				0.210*		
1 st generation Morocco				0.401***	} n.s.	
2 nd generation Morocco				0.359***		
2.5 th generation and higher Morocco				0.063		**
Pseudo-R ²	0.185	0.148	0.389	0.211		
N	2,371	2,559	3,108	2,709		

Notes: ***p≤0.01; **p≤0.05; *p≤0.1; n.s. not significant clustered by school class. Controlled for gender, parental education, language test scores, cognitive test scores, school type (only in Germany and the Netherlands) and grade average (only in Germany and the Netherlands).

DISCUSSION

Previous research, mainly based on country specific data, suggests that many ethnic minority groups have high educational aspirations net of social origin. We extended the existing research in three ways. First, we analysed a comparable measure of students' educational aspirations in four European countries, in which 14-year-olds are tracked to different degrees and face different transitions next in their educational career. Germany and the Netherlands have highly stratified educational systems with early tracking at age 10 or 12, and previous academic performance is decisive for progression to the next educational level. In England and Sweden the educational systems are less stratified and offer more extensive compulsory education. In both countries, tracking occurs at a later age, around 16, and there is more scope for choice in the progression through the educational system as compared to Germany and the Netherlands. England has low levels of stratification and selectivity, while they are at intermediate levels in Sweden. Second, we extend the research by taking scholastic skills into account, using identical (cognitive skill) or similar (language skill) measures in all studied countries. Third, unlike previous studies in which all groups are pooled and differentiated by generational status, we distinguished ethnic minority groups by their generational status.

Overall, the results show that almost all ethnic minority groups in the four host countries have higher or similar aspirations for a university education, as compared with their ethnic majority group peers, conditional on scholastic skills. The most consistent minority advantage is found in England and Sweden, with most sizable advantages in England.

Conditional on educational background and scholastic skills, the majority of the distinguished ethnic minority groups in each country have university aspirations to a higher extent than ethnic majority group students do. This is consistent with the interpretation that the ample scope for choice in progression through these school systems allows the high ambitions of minorities to play out well (Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012). However, minority

advantage is also present in the Netherlands and Germany, where transitions are more heavily conditional on previous performance. Some minority groups in these host countries show a minority advantage of considerable size. In the Netherlands, students of Moroccan and Turkish heritage, which form sizeable minority groups, have substantially higher university aspirations than the Dutch majority. This holds for Germany as well, but to a lesser extent: the aspiration advantage of students of Turkish origin is less than half the size as in the Netherlands.

With our approach to analyse changes across generations without neglecting group differences, we demonstrated that the assimilation models vary between ethnic minority groups. The results neither do provide general support for a general gradual integration across immigrant generations nor speak in favour of persisting aspiration gaps between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority. The persistence of Turkish immigrants' high aspirations could be examined under the light of segmented assimilation theory. However, unlike Asian immigrants' success in the US, Turkish immigrants in Europe seem to keep underachieving their native peers in spite of their ambitious educational and occupational plans. Furthermore, whether other ethnic minorities' assimilation towards the aspiration pattern of their ethnic majority peers' is accompanied by assimilation on other dimensions or puts them at the risk of downward assimilation are empirically open questions that deserve more attention in future studies.

Comparing group differences across survey countries, students of Turkish heritage are advantaged in the three studied countries, where they form a minority group of numerical importance, primarily in Sweden and the Netherlands. Germany stands out by having the least advantaged minority Turks. In fact, they are not advantaged before taking socio-economic resources and academic abilities into account. We expected a similar pattern for the Netherlands as for Germany, but students of Turkish origin in the Dutch educational system

seem to be more ambitious than their native majority counterparts regardless of their social background and their academic skills, and to a larger extent than in Sweden when scholastic skills and parental education are not taken into account. There is nevertheless one crucial difference between the performance based and highly stratified countries on the one hand, and the choice based and less stratified countries on the other: While minority students of few but sizable groups have higher probabilities of university aspiration than ethnic majority students in Germany and the Netherlands, a more consistent pattern across minority groups of different origins applies to England and Sweden. In the latter countries, most of the minority groups have higher probabilities of striving towards university education than their native majority peers.

We analysed ethnic differences in educational aspirations among adolescents in Germany and the Netherlands after the first educational transition was made. The transition from primary to secondary school plays an essential role for the educational attainment later on and should shape students' educational aspirations. It is plausible to assume that the aspiration gap between ethnic minorities and natives could be larger before the transition. Thus, the aspiration patterns of ethnic minorities might be more similar across countries when aspirations are compared at an earlier stage in the educational system. The use of cross-sectional data also implies that we do not empirically address the issue that educational inequalities develop through feedback processes between skills and ambitions over time.

A further avenue of research that is needed in the European context is, whether high educational aspirations translate into educational success differently depending on ethnic minority origin. Previous research clearly indicates that high aspirations of minority youth do play out in actual enrolment and attainment, as many second-generation minorities tend to make more academic educational choices than majority students do (for England and Sweden: Jackson, Jonsson and Rudolphi 2012; Jonsson and Rudolphi 2010). However, less is clear

concerning whether the observed beliefs translate into educational attainment to a similar extent for minority and majority youth. Research in the U.S. indicates that the high educational aspirations of Blacks and Latinos help to reduce the minority disadvantage in achievement among eighth-graders (Goldsmith 2004). To improve our understanding of ethnic differences in attainment processes, future research would benefit from studying ethnic differences in how aspirations translate into performance and educational choices.

References

- Alba R and Nee V 1997 Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration. *International Migration Review* 31(4): 826–874.
- Alba R, Sloan J and Sperling J 2011 The Integration Imperative: The Children of Low-Status Immigrants in the Schools of Wealthy Societies. *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 395–415.
- Algan Y, Dustmann C, 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(542): F4–F30.
- Barnett MD, Sonnert G and Sadler PM 2012 More Like Us: The Effect of Immigrant Generation on College Success in Mathematics. *International Migration Review* 46(4): 891-918.
- Bohon SA, Johnson MK and Gorman BK 2006 College Aspirations and Expectations among Latino Adolescents in the United States. *Social Problems* 53(2): 207-225.
- Buchmann C and Dalton B 2002 Interpersonal Influences and Educational Aspirations in 12 Countries: The Importance of Institutional Context. *Sociology of Education* 75(2): 99-122.
- Buchmann C and Park H 2009 Stratification and formation of expectations in highly differentiated educational systems. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 27(4): 245-267.
- CILS4EU 2014 *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries. Technical Report. Wave 1 – 2010/2011, v1.1.0*. Mannheim: Mannheim University.

- Dollmann J, Jacob K and Kalter F 2014 *Examining the Diversity of Youth in Europe. A Classification of Generations and Ethnic Origins Using CILS4EU Data (Technical Report)*. MZES Working Papers, Nr. 156.
- Domina T, Conley AM and Farkas G 2011 The Link between Educational Expectations and Effort in the College-for-all Era. *Sociology of Education* 84(2): 93-112.
- Downey DB, Ainsworth JW and Qian Z 2009 Rethinking the Attitude-Achievement Paradox Among Blacks. *Sociology of Education* 82(1): 1-19.
- CILS4EU 2016 *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries*. Technical Report. Wave 1 – 2010/2011, v1.2.0. Mannheim: Mannheim University.
- Crul M and Holdaway J 2009 Children of Immigrants in Schools in New York and Amsterdam. The factors shaping attainment. *Teachers College Records* 111(6): 1476-1507.
- Erikson R and Jonsson JO 1996 *Can Education be Equalized?* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Feliciano C and Rumbaut RG 2005 Gendered Paths: Educational and Occupational Expectations and Outcomes among Adult Children of Immigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(6): 1087-1118.
- Goldenberg C, Gallimore R, Reese L and Garnier H 2001 Cause or Effect? A Longitudinal Study of Immigrant Latino Parents' Aspirations and Expectations, and Their Children's School Performance. *American Educational Research Journal* 38(3): 547-582.
- Goldsmith PA 2004 Schools' Racial Mix, Students' Optimism, and the Black-White and Latino-White Achievement Gaps. *Sociology of Education* 77(2): 121.
- Gordon MM 1964 *Assimilation in American Life* London: Oxford University Press.

- Güngör D, Fleischmann F, Phalet K 2011 Religious identification, beliefs, and practices among Turkish Belgian and Moroccan Belgian Muslims: Intergenerational continuity and acculturative change. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 42(8): 1356-74.
- Hanson SL 1994 Lost Talent: Unrealized Educational Aspirations and Expectations among U.S. Youths. *Sociology of Education* 67(3): 159-183.
- Heath AF, Rothon C and Kilpi E 2008 The Second Generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 211-235.
- Heath AF and Brinbaum Y 2007 Guest Editorial. Explaining ethnic inequalities in educational attainment. *Ethnicities* 7(3): 291-305.
- Heath AF and Brinbaum Y (eds) 2014 *Unequal Attainments: Ethnic educational inequalities in ten Western countries*. Oxford University Press.
- Ichou M 2014 Who They Were There: Immigrants' Educational Selectivity and Their Children's Educational Attainment. *European Sociological Review* 30(6): 750-765.
- Jackson M and Jonsson JO 2013 Why Does Inequality of Opportunity Vary across Countries? Primary and Secondary Effects in Comparative Context. In: Jackson M *Determined to Succeed? Performance, Choice and Education*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 306-337.
- Jackson, M, Jonsson JO and Rudolphi F 2012 Ethnic inequality in choice-driven education systems. A longitudinal study of achievement and choice in England and Sweden. *Sociology of Education* 85(2): 158-178.
- Jonsson JO and Rudolphi F 2011 Weak performance – strong determination. *European Sociological Review* 27(4): 487-508.

- Kalter F, Heath AF, Hewstone M, Jonsson JO, Kalmijn M, Kogan I and van Tubergen F 2016 *Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Survey in Four European Countries (CILS4EU)*. GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA5353 Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/cils4eu.5353.1.0.0.
- Kao G and Thompson JS 2003 Racial and ethnic stratification in educational achievement and attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 417-442.
- Kao G and Tienda M 1998 Educational aspirations of minority youth. *American Journal of Education* 106(3): 349-84.
- Kao G and Tienda M 1995 Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth. *Social Science Quarterly* 76(1): 1-19.
- Kurz K and Böhner-Taute E 2016 Wer profitiert von den Korrekturmöglichkeiten in der Sekundarstufe? Who Benefits from the Possibilities of Correction in Secondary School? *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*: 45(6).
- Mickelson RA 1990 The Attitude-Achievement Paradox Among Black Adolescents. *Sociology of Education* 63(1): 44-61.
- Mood C 2010 Why We Cannot Do What We Think We Can Do, and What We Can Do About It. *European Sociological Review* 26(1): 67–82.
- Morgan SL 2005 *On the Edge of Commitment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- OECD 2017 *Education at a Glance 2017: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2012 *Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicator*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD 2010 *OECD Reviews of Migrant Education - Closing the Gap for Immigrant Students: Policies, Practice and Performance*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Portes A and Rumbaut RG 2001 *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

- Portes, A and Zhou, M 1993 The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530: 74-96.
- Reynolds J, Stewart M, MacDonald R and Sisco L 2006 Have Adolescents Become Too Ambitious? High School Seniors' Educational and Occupational Plans, 1976 to 2000. *Social Problems* 53(2): 186 -206.
- Rosenbaum JE 2001 *Beyond college for all. Career paths for the forgotten half*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Rothon C 2007 Can achievement differentials be explained by social class alone? An examination of minority ethnic educational performance in England and Wales at the end of compulsory schooling. *Ethnicities* 7(3): 306-322.
- Salikutluk Z 2016 Why do immigrant students aim high? Explaining the aspiration–achievement paradox of immigrants in Germany. *European Sociological Review* 32(5): 581-592.
- Shavit Y and Blossfeld HP 1993 *Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries. Social Inequality Series*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Stanat P and Edele A 2011 Migration und soziale Ungleichheit In: Ditton H, Gniewosz B, Gräsel C and Reinders H *Empirische Bildungsforschung. Eine Einführung* (eds) Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp.181-192.
- Suarez-Orozco C and Suárez-Orozco MM 1996 *Transformations: Immigration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation Among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Sue S and Okazaki S 1990 Asian-American educational achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist* 45: 913-920.

- Tjaden J D and Hunkler C 2017 The optimism trap: Migrants' educational choices in stratified education systems. *Social Science Research* 67: 213-228.
- Van de Werfhorst HG and Mijs JB 2010 Achievement inequality and the institutional structure of educational systems: A comparative perspective. *Annual review of sociology* 36: 407-428.
- Van de Werfhorst HG and van Tubergen F 2007 Ethnicity, schooling, and merit in the Netherlands. *Ethnicities* 7(3): 416-444.
- Wei RH 2006 *CFT-20R. Grundintelligenzskala 2 (Revision)*. Gttingen: Hogrefe

Endnotes

¹ The terms *ethnic minority origin* (and the shorter *ethnic minority/minority*) and youth with *immigrant background* are used interchangeable. The same holds for *native majority origin* (and the shorter *native majority/majority*) and youth with *native origin*. For details on variable definitions in the analyses, see the section on variables below.

² Different aspects of host country reception of immigrants (governmental, societal and communal) have been proposed to account for some of the ethnic differences in structural integration (Portes and Rumbaut 2001: Ch. 3). It may be a matter of possibilities to learn the host country language, to acquire citizenship, the transparency of the educational system, and the chances to establish oneself on the labour market. Integration policy does not only vary between countries, but also within countries across time, as well as across minority groups. We therefore refrain from formulating specific hypotheses related to host country reception of immigrants (see Algan et al. 2010 for a brief overview of immigration and integration policy in Germany, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands).

³ For details on codings, see Dollmann et al. (2014).

⁴ In Germany, parts of the KFT 5-12+R and in the Netherlands parts of the NIO were used. Similar tests were designed in England and in Sweden.

Appendix A1 Number of participants in wave 1 by countries

	England	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden
N students	4,315	5,013	4,363	5,025
N parents	1,588	3,909	3,248	2,456

Appendix A2. Question on educational aspirations with country specific answering categories

And what is the highest level of education that you think you will actually get?

England	Germany	Netherlands	Sweden
Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know
No degree	No degree	No degree	No degree
GCSE (or a similar level)	Degree from lower secondary school (Hauptschulabschluss)	VMBO	Compulsory school
A levels or AS levels (or a similar level)	Degree from intermediate secondary school (Realschulabschluss)	HAVO	Upper secondary school
University degree	Degree from upper secondary school (Abitur)	VWO	College/University degree
	University degree	MBO	
		HBO	
		University degree	

Appendix Table A3. Ethnic groups. Relative size of ethnic groups in the whole sample shown by generation status (“Perc.”), the relative size of ethnic minority groups (“Perc. of group”) and proportion of university aspirations among ethnic groups (weighted).

	Gen. Status	N	Perc. of group	University aspiration		Gen. Status	N	Perc. of group	University aspiration
<i>England</i>					<i>Germany</i>				
Pakistan	1	56	19.38	50.00	Turkey	1	85	10.59	7.06
	2	120	41.52	40.00		2	558	69.49	12.19
	2.5+	113	39.10	32.74		2.5+	160	19.93	14.38
India	1	36	13.48	55.56	FSU	1	154	51.85	11.04
	2	90	33.71	58.89		2	108	36.36	11.11
	2.5+	141	52.81	64.54		2.5+	35	11.78	14.29
Jamaica	1	22	17.05	45.45	Poland	1	42	16.67	11.90
	2	18	13.95	55.56		2	67	26.59	13.43
	2.5+	89	68.99	34.83		2.5+	143	56.75	11.89
Ireland	1	1	0.93	100.00	FY	1	36	16.67	2.78
	2	8	7.41	62.50		2	125	57.87	6.40
	2.5+	99	91.67	51.52		2.5+	55	25.46	10.91
Africa	1	130	39.51	49.23	Africa	1	31	25.20	3.23
	2	122	37.08	63.93		2	53	43.09	15.09
	2.5+	77	23.40	53.25		2.5+	39	31.71	28.21
Asia	1	133	50.00	55.64	Asia	1	71	28.29	11.27
	2	82	30.83	43.90		2	132	52.59	23.48
	2.5+	51	19.17	56.86		2.5+	48	19.12	14.58
(Latin-) America	1	37	34.91	40.54	(Latin-) America	1	20	23.81	15.00
	2	12	11.32	41.67		2	7	8.33	28.57
	2.5+	57	53.77	47.37		2.5+	57	67.86	28.07
Southern Europe	1	25	26.88	36.00	Eastern Europe	1	8	6.61	25.00
	2	9	9.68	44.44		2	14	11.57	0
	2.5+	59	63.44	45.76		2.5+	99	81.82	18.18
Other Europe	1	84	52.83	30.95	Other Europe	1	35	8.97	20.00
	2	9	5.66	33.33		2	94	24.10	7.45
	2.5+	66	41.51	50.00		2.5+	261	66.92	15.71
Total		1,746			Total		2,537		

<i>Netherlands</i>					<i>Sweden</i>				
Turkey	1	30	13.39	36.67	FY	1	68	20.00	58.82
	2	150	66.96	48.67		2	215	63.24	57.67
	2.5+	44	19.64	34.09		2.5+	57	16.76	56.14
Morocco	1	14	6.90	71.43	Finland	1	7	2.46	57.14
	2	153	75.37	54.90		2	17	5.96	23.53
	2.5+	36	17.73	50.00		2.5+	261	91.58	49.04
Suriname	1	20	10.53	40.00	Iraq	1	134	63.81	55.22
	2	85	44.74	52.94		2	68	32.38	63.24
	2.5+	85	44.74	31.76		2.5+	8	3.81	87.50
Indonesia	1	1	0.72	100.00	Turkey	1	23	14.56	43.48
	2	2	1.45	100.00		2	117	74.05	64.10
	2.5+	135	97.83	38.52		2.5+	18	11.39	50.00
Africa	1	19	21.84	36.84	Africa	1	80	31.37	43.75
	2	34	39.08	44.12		2	129	50.59	68.22
	2.5+	34	39.08	35.29		2.5+	46	18.04	60.87
Asia	1	73	46.50	52.05	Middle East	1	32	13.79	59.38
	2	55	35.03	56.36		2	179	77.16	62.01
	2.5+	29	18.47	62.07		2.5+	21	9.05	52.38
(Latin-) America	1	13	25.00	38.46	(Latin-) America	1	33	26.19	45.45
	2	2	3.85	50.00		2	33	26.19	54.55
	2.5+	37	71.15	37.84		2.5+	60	47.62	48.33
Netherland Antilles	1	20	20.62	30.00	Asia	1	98	36.43	52.94
	2	17	17.53	23.53		2	109	40.52	60.66
	2.5+	60	61.86	48.33		2.5+	62	23.05	55.87
Europe	1	36	14.57	36.11	Europe	1	102	19.92	45.92
	2	27	10.93	33.33		2	61	11.91	65.14
	2.5+	184	74.49	38.59		2.5+	349	68.16	54.84
Total		1,395			Total		2,387		