

Fertility Patterns of the Descendants of Turkish Migrants in Germany

Sandra Krapf

Europe is an important destination of migration (Abel & Sander, 2014) with Germany being one of the major receiving countries (Bade & Oltmer, 2011; Diehl, 2016). In 2018, 25.5 percent of the population living in Germany were immigrants or descendants of immigrants (DESTATIS, 2019). The largest migrant group with about 2.8 million people has a Turkish background, representing 3.4 percent of the total population. Around half of them migrated themselves and was thus socialized in Turkey. The other half was born in Germany and grew up in-between the German and Turkish culture. Research on the fertility behavior of 1st generation Turkish migrants in Germany indicates that they have higher completed fertility than German non-migrants (Stichnoth & Yeter, 2016). A study that compared Turkish migrants in Germany to non-migrants in the origin country revealed that they had higher second birth risks than women in Turkey (Baykara-Krumme & Milewski, 2017). The authors interpret this finding as support for the idea that the opportunities of foreign-born women in western countries discourage labor force participation and thus more migrants opt for a family-oriented path. In case that Turkish women migrate to Germany in order to start a family, research finds increased fertility in the months directly after migration (Wolf, 2016). Recently, an increasing number of studies focus on the demographic behavior of immigrants' descendants (Kulu, Milewski, Hannemann, & Mikolai, 2019). However, in the existing studies children of labor migrants only reached their thirties and few had completed their reproductive phase. The majority of female Turkish migrants arrived in Germany in the 1970s and 1980s (DESTATIS, 2018), and their children start to reach ages of 40, i.e. the end of their reproductive years, only in the 2010s.

The aim of this paper is to explore fertility patterns of 1.5th and 2nd generation female Turkish migrants in Germany and compare it to non-migrant Germans. The 1.5 generation Turkish migrants are those who migrated as children (i.e., younger than 15 years at time of

migration). I use German microcensus data of the years 2005, 2009, 2013 and 2017. The data has a number of advantages. First, some of the women of Turkish descent in the data have reached age 40 which allows me to analyze their third birth behaviors based on larger event numbers. Second, the microcensus is based on a 1 percent sample of the German population and with its large sample size, I am able to focus on behaviors of immigrants' descendants from a single origin country. Moreover, because the share of highly educated women of Turkish descent is increasing in Germany (Siegert & Olszenka, 2016), the data includes large enough numbers to do interaction analyses of migrant generation and education. Third, nonresponse is of minor relevance in the microcensus because participation is obligatory and respondents are required by law to submit information. Although non-response is higher among those households with a non-German head of household than among German households (Afentakis & Bihler, 2005), non-response is still substantially lower than in other social science surveys. This is of particular importance for our study, because other social science surveys commonly undercover migrants in their samples.

Analyzing immigrants' descendants is promising in two respects. On the one hand, the fertility patterns of children of migrants allow us to discover potential convergence with the majority population (Wilson, 2015). On the other hand, selectivity issues or disruption arguments are less relevant for the 1.5 and 2nd generation migrants because they did not take the decision to migrate themselves. While the first generation, who migrated as adults, might consciously time their decision to migrate and to start a family, for the 1.5 generation the migration and fertility transitions can be assumed to be independent of one another. Their fertility should not be distorted by migration timing, as is the case for migrants who arrived during their childbearing years (Toulemon, 2004; Wolf, 2016).

Theoretically, I expect that women of Turkish origin who moved as children have significantly higher first-birth rates than native Germans; fertility levels of the second generation should be in-between. The argument is simple: Second generation migrants have been socialized mainly in Germany and have thus less traditional fertility norms, while the 1.5 generation has at least partly socialization experience in Turkey where fertility-related norms are more traditional. Based on the assumption that family values are formed early in life, childhood socialization affects fertility behaviors later in life. Moreover, I expect that the differences in fertility behavior between the different migrant groups are partly caused by composition effects. Turkish migrants have a different socio-economic,

cultural and demographic background than non-migrant Germans, and these aspects are relevant for childbearing decisions. Therefore, the composition of migrant groups could be responsible for behavioral differences (Bean & Tienda, 1987). I expect that the fertility differentials of migrant groups are reduced after taking into account educational attainment of respondents. Indeed, in an earlier study (Krapf & Wolf, 2015), we had found that highly educated 2nd generation Turkish women did not significantly differ in their first birth risks from non-migrant Germans. However, in the data the case numbers of highly educated 1.5 and 2nd generation migrants was rather small and therefore we refrained from formulating strong conclusions from our results.

In my analyses, I increase the case numbers by analyzing two more survey waves: I can make use of the microcensus data of 2005, 2009, 2013 and 2017. In the descriptive analyses, I analyze the transition to first, second and third births of women in the age group 18 to 40 years using survival curves. In the multiple regression analyses, I estimate discrete time event history models including migrants and native Germans for each birth transition. Because the data does not include birth histories, I determine births on basis of the "own child method", i.e. based on the number of children living in the household. Respondents' characteristics refer to only the time of interview so we cannot account for time-varying covariates. In the multiple regression analyses, I control for the level of school attainment and the birth year of women.

References

- Abel, G. J., & Sander, N. (2014). Quantifying Global International Migration Flows. *Science*, 343(6178), 1520-1522. doi:10.1126/science.1248676
- Afentakis, A., & Bihler, W. (2005). Das Hochrechnungsverfahren beim unterjährigen Mikrozensus ab 2005. *Wirtschaft und Statistik*, 10/2005.
- Bade, K. J., & Oltmer, J. (2011). Germany. In K. J. Bade, P. C. Emmer, L. Lucassen, & J. Oltmer (Eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Migration and Minorities in Europe: From the 17th Century to the Present* (pp. 65-82). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baykara-Krumme, H., & Milewski, N. (2017). Fertility Patterns Among Turkish Women in Turkey and Abroad: The Effects of International Mobility, Migrant Generation, and Family Background. *European Journal of Population*, 33(3), 409-436. doi:10.1007/s10680-017-9413-9
- Bean, F. D., & Tienda, M. (1987). *The Hispanic population of the United States*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- DESTATIS. (2018). *Wanderungen von türkischen Staatsangehörigen zwischen Deutschland und dem Ausland von 1962 bis 2016*. Retrieved from Wiesbaden
- DESTATIS. (2019). *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund - Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2018*. Retrieved from Wiesbaden:

- Diehl, C. (2016). Migration und Integration in der Bevölkerungssoziologie. In Y. Niephaus, M. Kreyenfeld, & R. Sackmann (Eds.), *Handbuch Bevölkerungssoziologie* (pp. 461-479). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Krapf, S., & Wolf, K. (2015). Persisting Differences or Adaptation to German Fertility Patterns? First and Second Birth Behavior of the 1.5 and Second Generation Turkish Migrants in Germany. *KZfJSS Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 67(1), 137-164. doi:10.1007/s11577-015-0331-8
- Kulu, H., Milewski, N., Hannemann, T., & Mikolaj, J. (2019). A decade of life-course research on fertility of immigrants and their descendants in Europe. *Demographic Research*, 523(46), 1345-1374.
- Siegert, M., & Olszenka, N. (2016). Ethnische Ungleichheit in der Sekundarstufe I. In C. Diehl, C. Hunkler, & C. Kristen (Eds.), *Ethnische Ungleichheiten im Bildungsverlauf: Mechanismen, Befunde, Debatten* (pp. 543-595). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Stichnoth, H., & Yeter, M. (2016). Cultural influences on the fertility behavior of first- and second-generation immigrants. *Journal of Demographic Economics*, 82(3), 281-314. doi:10.1017/dem.2016.11
- Toulemon, L. (2004). Fertility among immigrant women: new data, a new approach. *Population et sociétés*, 2004 April: 400.
- Wilson, B. (2015). *Origin, destination and convergence: Understanding the fertility of international migrants and their descendants*. London: London School of Economics.
- Wolf, K. (2016). Marriage Migration Versus Family Reunification: How Does the Marriage and Migration History Affect the Timing of First and Second Childbirth Among Turkish Immigrants in Germany? *European Journal of Population*, 32(5), 731-759. doi:10.1007/s10680-016-9402-4