

Addendum

Notes

For ease and clarity, I use different colors to indicate the following:

- Texts in **black**: Comments and remarks from the two examiners (Professor Pilet & Professor Pilati)
- **Texts in red**: Indication of pages (footnotes); responses to the comments and remarks (texts not included in the thesis)
- **Texts in blue**: Modifications made in the thesis
- Texts in **Grey**: Original texts from the thesis

I. Responses to Professor Katia Pilati's comments

REVIEW

I propose the admission of the candidate to the PhD thesis defense. The thesis is well written and its scientific quality is good. In particular, the research design is clear, the research questions are well explained and the development of the analysis too. The empirical analysis is rigorous in most aspects, and the candidate provides full details of all the methodological steps she has used throughout the research. The results are original to the degree that the candidate explores language in relation to integration, including political integration, which has been scarcely examined in such a systematic way. The evidence obtained enables the candidate to answer the initial questions well.

One point of the thesis which deserves more attention concerns the literature review, in particular, in relation to the concept of integration. This is outlined in details below. In addition to this, below I point out to some other issues the candidate may also consider to ameliorate the discussion and analysis.

THEORETICAL SECTION AND MODELING STRATEGY

The candidate aims to explore a broad range of topics in the thesis. In particular, with regard to integration of individuals of migrant origin, the candidate aims to cover both the economic, and the political dimensions. This contributes to make the scope of the literature review quite broad, and to force the candidate to deal with various concepts and theories in a coherent and consistent framework. With regard to this, there are specifically three issues which, I think, need some further discussion and they concern: the definition of integration, the dimensions of integration, and the models examining it.

As to the definition of integration, I think that the concept of integration deserves a more detailed elaboration. Integration is discussed at page 10. However rather than, or in addition to, considering the definition given by the dictionary, the candidate may contemplate the available scholarship on the topic. The candidate may also consider the links between the concepts of integration and other crucial topics in the literature on migration, in particular, processes of assimilation. This is highly relevant for the purpose of examining the role of language and socio-cultural aspects of immigrant integration (cf. works by Alba for instance).

→ Page 11-12: Text

The lack of consensus is probably due to the complexity of the concept and its association with multiple factors at different levels of analysis. For instance, in social psychology, Berry (2001) defines integration as a cultural and psychological process and distinguishes integration from assimilation¹; in political and social sciences, some conceive of integration as political integration (e.g., Jacobs & Tillie, 2004; Jacobs,

¹ Integration and assimilation are some of the acculturation strategies that immigrants use in reference to their orientations toward their own group and other group. Immigrants who employ integration strategy show preference toward interacting with both groups and having identities of both cultures whereas immigrant who employ assimilation strategy show preference toward interacting with both groups and having identities of other group (Berry, 2001).

Phalet & Swyngedouw, 2004, 2006) and others see it as more socio-cultural (e.g., Alba, 2005), and still others view it as socio-economic integration (i.e., labor market participation; e.g., Benton, 2013). As will be seen later in this thesis, instead of relying on one particular perspective, I place these different aspects of integration sometimes as an independent and other times as a dependent variable. Indeed, as will be seen in the next few sections of this chapter as well as later in the thesis, the link between language and integration is difficult to explain from a single perspective and requires the "integration" of many variables into a complex multi-dimensional modeling framework.

As to the dimensions of integration, in chapter 3 page 61 there is a discussion of which dimensions of integration are studied by the various disciplines but this discussion may be further integrated. In particular, I think the following points deserve some more attention:

- It is not clear whether the candidate understands citizenship acquisition as a dimension of political integration or as a separate dimension. Citizenship acquisition is associated with voting rights, as mentioned by the candidate. In this perspective, it could be indeed conceived as part of the political dimension of integration. However, this is not clear from the thesis and the link between citizenship and integration needs to be better clarified.

→ Page 67: footnote 75

The determinants of citizenship acquisition can be categorized into two different levels of variables, namely macro-level and micro-level variables. The former typically includes institutional conditions for acquiring citizenship imposed by the external entities (e.g., state). From this macro perspective, institutional conditions determine the outcome; hence, citizenship is associated with voting rights and citizenship acquisition can be considered a dimension of political integration. Another set of determinants of citizenship acquisition is more related to micro-individual or psychological variables. From a micro perspective, citizenship acquisition may indicate immigrants' intention or preference for acquiring citizenship (which may also suggest their 'intention to stay in the host country'). Both levels of factors influence the outcome, but it is often difficult to clearly link the two levels. In the modeling framework, citizenship acquisition is viewed as a stepping stone toward political integration, thus constituting a separate dimension. More specifically, citizenship is regarded as legal capital and a mediating factor between economic/social integration and political integration.

- Furthermore, concerning the analysis of citizenship acquisition, it is not clear why the candidate considers a model of collective action (page 65) given that citizenship acquisition concerns individual and not collective processes.

→ Page 67: footnote 76

The main aim of introducing the dual-pathway model of collective action is to create an applied model of immigrant integration to examine how different types of motivation may affect behavioral outcomes. I conceive of citizenship acquisition as an 'observable' behavioral outcome/consequence of internal psychological processes. The 'unobservable' motivational processes (of becoming a member of a host society) are investigated by creating the cost-benefit calculation pathway and collective identification pathway in the modeling framework.

- Concerning political integration, it is not clear from page 73 why employment would not be associated with political integration. There is quite a lot of literature arguing that socio-economic resources, education as well as occupation and employment, affect integration (cf Tam Cho 1999; de Rooji, 2012; Heath et al. 2013). This hypothesis deserves more explanation.

→ Page 75: footnote 91

There is literature arguing that socio-economic resources (such as education and employment) affect political integration (Tam Cho, 1999; de Rooji, 2012). However, the literature also acknowledges "the explanatory mechanisms operate differently for immigrants than the majority" (de Rooji, 2012, p.455); immigrant political participation can be explained by differences in the importance of mobilization and by the amount of time spent in the destination country, but not by differences in levels of resources and engagement (de Rooji, 2012). While some research found a strong correlation between the socio-

economic status and political participation (e.g., Verba & Nie, 1972), some other findings showed somewhat inconsistent or insignificant results, especially in the context of Europe (Jacobs, Phaet, & Swyngedouw, 2004). Accordingly, I hypothesized the relationship between employment and political integration to be insignificant because the datasets used for testing the hypothesis are European city cases.

• With regard to the dimensions of integration, but more in relation to the empirical part of the research, the candidate needs to explain why the empirical analysis the economic dimension of integration addresses employment only (page 65). Apart the omission of income, which is discussed, the candidate does not investigate other aspects of economic integration such as the type of occupation. Considering employment only is indeed quite problematic for those countries with highly segmented and fragmented labour markets (cf Milan). In such cases, migrants show high rates of employment but are mostly occupied in the secondary segments of the labor market, in low paid and low status jobs. This may affect the relationships studied. For instance, language may have different effects on economic integration as language of the host country may not be at all necessary for migrants working in some of these sectors. Therefore, the candidate needs to explain any possible consequence this may have on the findings.

→ Page 90: footnote 111

Considering employment only may be problematic, especially for those countries with highly segmented and fragmented labor markets. In such cases, employment probabilities of immigrants may be high but they may be mostly employed in the secondary segments of the labor market, in low paid and low status jobs. This may affect the relationship studied. For instance, language may have different effects on economic integration as language of the host country may not be at all necessary for migrants working in some of these sectors. For these reasons, other than income, I also attempted using 'occupational status' available in the LOCALMULTIDEM questionnaire: [Q.59] what is/was the name or title of your main job? The answers were coded using ISCO88. However, some cities did not ask the question, and some cities used country-specific variables, which made 'occupational status' difficult to use as an indicator for immigrant economic integration.

Also, the candidate may clarify why political interest is the only item examined in the empirical analysis of political integration. Indeed, there is a wide variety of items related to political actions included in the localmultidem dataset used by the candidate.

→ Page 92: footnote 115

In order to maximize the use of a wide variety of items related to political actions included in the LOCALMULTIDEM dataset, I first created political participation index using 'political interest' and 'political group involvement' measures. However, the reliability test suggested the Cronbach's alpha was low between 'political interest' and 'political group involvement.' Between the two, 'political interest' is chosen because "political interest represents an important dimension of the political inclusion of migrants in European cities" (Morales & Giugni, 2011, p.264).

As to the models examining integration, the candidate emphasizes the application of an economic model to language acquisition and integration. I think this risks to narrow down the scope of the research. Stressing that the main reference is an economic model is somehow misleading as one is led to think to variables related to the labor market and to processes of production, distribution, consumption. If I consider the variables used in the empirical analysis to explain second language acquisition and its link to integration, they apparently rely on a much larger body of literature than on economics only. For instance, variables such as age or social involvement are classical socio-demographic or sociological variables. Beyond employment, I do not see other dimensions related to an economic model. Apart references to Chiswick's work, some more information on what the candidate means with an "application of an economic model" may help to clarify this point.

→ Page 102: footnote 135

The economic-psychological modeling frame for immigrant language acquisition (see *Figure 2-8*) is constructed based on the existing models of immigrant/second language acquisition. The economic model (Chiswick, 1978) and psychological model (Gardner, 1985) are used as the reference models; they

represent economic view and psychological view, respectively, delineated in the next section (*1.2. Two Views of Immigrant Language Acquisition*). The detailed modeling strategy and processes are described in Chapter 2. The constructed modeling frame serves as the theoretical foundation for developing all of empirical models.

→ Page 117: footnote 153

For the pictorial summary of the modeling frame, refer to: *Figure 2-8: Transformed Economic-Psychological Modeling Frame for Immigrant Language Acquisition*. By extending the economic-psychological modeling frame for immigrant language acquisition to immigrant integration, destination language proficiency is conceptually placed as an antecedent of immigrant integration outcomes. Therefore, the relationships hypothesized for immigrant language acquisition is also expected for immigrant integration (refer to the hypotheses developed in Chapter 2). One thing that is worth reminding is that there are two different types of language proficiency variables, which are constructed to account for conceptual differences: one for language proficiency as an acquisition outcome and another for language proficiency as acquired capital (see Chapter 4: *1.4.3. Dependent Variables/Mediators*). The former is used as the dependent variable of a model of immigrant acquisition while the latter is used as the independent variable in a model of immigrant integration. An incremental approach is taken in the theoretical modeling to give a temporal perspective in the integration process (For more details, refer to Chapter 3). On the basis of the theoretical modeling (performed in Chapter 3), in this chapter, empirically testable three sequential sub-models of immigrant integration (i.e., a model of immigrant economic integration; a model of immigrant citizenship acquisition; a model of immigrant political integration) are developed in accordance with the temporal order presumed in the integration process. Yet, the conceptually presumed causal link between language and immigrant integration could go both ways; the relationships between language and economic integration, between language and citizenship acquisition, between language and political integration, as well as the interrelations assumed among language, the economy, citizenship, and the polity may be influenced by multiple other factors. Thus, a multi-deterministic approach may be more relevant and useful in understanding 'integration.'

→ For the 'age' factor, refer to Footnote 144 (p.108) and/or Footnote161 (p.121):

"Age is typically included as a control variable. However, correlation analysis indicated the problem of multicollinearity between age and age at migration (which is one of the independent variables). Hence, age was excluded from the control." (Footnote 144)

"Age is typically included as a control variable. However, correlation analysis conducted when developing the previous model of immigrant language acquisition indicated the problem of multicollinearity between age and age at migration (which is one of the independent variables). To maintain the coherence in the sequential model development, age was excluded from the control." (Footnote161)

The research design needs also to take into account and discuss problems related to the direction of the relationships examined. The candidate needs to explain why second language acquisition would precede economic and political integration. It may also be that dimensions of economic integration such as employment may improve the acquisition of the host country language. Indeed, employment may provide one way to come in contact with natives, therefore leading individuals of migrant origin to speak the host country language more often.

Similar issues raise when considering the link between educational attainment and second language acquisition, at least as far as second generations are concerned, as well as between attachment to host country and employment.

Considering the direction of the relationship is also highly relevant given the use of localmultidem data which do not enable to specify the timeframe of reference of the aforementioned variables.

As a consequence of such issues, the candidate needs to explain how this does not invalidate the analysis.

→ Page 65: footnote 73

In the modeling, a causal link between language and immigrant integration is conceptually presumed. It is primarily done so by creating language variable with two different concepts based on the existing literature: one for language acquisition and another for language as acquired capital. This conceptual difference is important because while the former variable is devised as a dependent variable to examine the determinants of immigrant language acquisition, the latter is devised with an aim to examine the effect of language (as capital embodied in the person) in immigrant integration process. However, in the real world, the conceptually presumed causal relationship between language (e.g., language acquisition, language proficiency or language use) and immigrant integration could go both ways; the relationships between language and economic integration, between language and citizenship acquisition, between language and political integration, as well as the interrelations among the factors concerned (i.e., language, the economy, citizenship, and the polity) may interact one another and/or be influenced by other external factors. Thus, a multi-deterministic approach may be more relevant and useful in understanding and modeling immigrant integration.

I think that the candidate may also better clarify why she does not model the role of macro-level variables in chapter 7. Given the presence of more than 20 ethnic groups in 10 cities, the candidate could have explored the role of level-2 variables in more depth (certainly, with the necessary caution given the limited number of level-2 variables (cf Cinalli, Giugni 2011; Morales Pilati 2011)).

→ In this thesis, the priority is given to micro-individual level analysis and then to macro-systemic and micro-macro level analysis. Also, I had to limit the level of complexity in the theoretical and empirical modeling. Therefore, meso-level analysis is weak or might not be done in an appropriate manner, but I see the importance. I'll definitely consider the aspect for future work.

DATA

The data contains people who have been living in the observed cities for at least 6 months. In some cities this does not necessarily coincide with people who are residents, as residence is often conditional upon a stable employment. Therefore, the candidate needs to reconsider the description of the sample at page 80 with regard to this point.

→ p.82: text (changed from "residents" to "populations")

VARIABLES USED AND MODELS

There are some limitations that need to be acknowledged in more depth. In particular, this concerns the use of the variable related to second language acquisition in the cities where migrants' host country language coincides with the language of the countries of origin. This applies to Lyon and London for all groups, Barcelona and Madrid for 2 groups, Budapest for one group. The candidate acknowledges this in note 139 and later on in table 7.2, page 156. However, these limitations need to be taken into account more seriously in the empirical analysis. Some implications include:

• At page 108, the models for Barcelona end up with 102 cases, and the models for Lyon and Madrid include a few cases too.

→ (1) This problem is discussed in *Chapter 5: 2.4. Results (p.112)*

The model for Lyon has shown the smallest R-squared value ($R^2=0.270$). This may be related to the relatively small number of observations included in the model in Lyon ($n=165$) because the number of observations per predictor variable is an important factor in coming up with a model with a higher R-squared value. The number of observations in Barcelona ($n=102$) and Madrid ($n=150$) is also small, but the Spanish city cases contain only one ethnic group in the model when Lyon includes three ethnic groups.

→ (2) Additional note to make is that: Here, language proficiency as an acquisition outcome is used. And, in those cities, there are many native speakers of the destination language. I excluded the native speakers from the analysis to study the determinants of immigrant language acquisition.

Also refer to: Page 117: footnote 153

[Partially taken from the footnote]: "One note that worth reminding is that there are two different types of language proficiency variables, which are constructed to account for conceptual differences: one for language proficiency as an acquisition outcome and another for language proficiency as acquired capital (see Chapter 4: 1.4.3. *Dependent Variables/Mediators*). The former is used as the dependent variable of a model of immigrant acquisition while the latter is used as the independent variable in a model of immigrant integration."

• Table 6.2 page 119. Examining the role of language for economic integration may be problematic in the city of Lyon. Indeed all groups speak French (mean of 0.9 and SD of 0.19 as from table 6.1). In both cases, the candidate needs to make sure that the findings related to second language acquisition are not biased.

→ See the second half of the response above (including Page 117: footnote 153)

The criteria of selection of the organizations chosen for the variable related to social involvement are not clear (page 89). In particular, neighborhood organizations are usually active in local political action and may be therefore classified as political organizations. Furthermore being active in local political action through these associations may also result in some redundancy with political interest.

→ I acknowledge the fuzziness, thus the variable (social group involvement) can easily be subject to measurement error. Knowing the difficulty of which one belongs to which (social or political group), the selection was made with an approval of the supervisory committee members.

The candidate needs to slightly reformulate the discussion of the choice on LPM at page 97, in particular, with regard to the second and third point raised as a justification for the choice of this model. Indeed, AMEs are also expressed in probability, and AMEs are also comparable across models.

→ Page 99: footnote 131

Coefficients of linear probability models are known to be almost identical to average marginal effect of logit (Mood, 2010). Yet, deriving AME adds complexity in practice; AME requires running the logistic regression first, and then compute the average marginal effects. The statistical software used for data analysis (Stata 12.0) has commands that automatically produce regression output tables for LPM and logit model, but not for AME.

The candidate needs to explain why she picks different cities when showing one model as an example of the dependent variable analyzed: table 5.2 at page 107 refers to Milan; table 6.2 at page 119 refers to Lyon, table 6.5 page 129 to Budapest, table 6.8 page 141 to Lyon.

→ I had 10 cities for all of the models. So, I thought it was not reasonable or desirable to put all regression tables in chapters and explain and discuss all of the models for all cities in detail. I picked one case for each model that indicated interesting findings to be discussed. However, as mentioned in the chapter 5 and 6, all regression outputs (tables) are available in Appendix III & IV. In chapters, a ten-city summary table is provided for each empirical model.

The models in table 6.5 on Budapest, regarding determinants of citizenship acquisition, may be problematic. In particular, the candidate needs to double check the ethnic group of origin of the individuals holding citizenship of the host country. Most of them are likely to be Ethnic Hungarian and this may be problematic for the inclusion of the ethnic group of origin as an independent variable.

→ For the description of the Hungarian sample, refer to: Footnote 150 & 151 (p.114). I think group-level analysis is one of the important analyses I need to supplement and include in future work.

TABLES

• The presence of more than one table including descriptive statistics by city (table 6.1, 6.4 and 6.7) is quite redundant. The only change between these tables regards the dependent variable. I think that these tables may be revised.

→ An article can be written for each empirical model; and some of the indicators included in the models are not the same. I thought the list with simple descriptive statistics is useful for quickly reviewing the indicators included or excluded in each model.

• The final row of all the tables should contain the Ns, the number of cases considered.

→ The Ns are different for different indicators (cf. the descriptive statistic table [table 6.1, 6.4 and 6.7] and Appendix II). All of the Ns for all variables are indicated in the Appendix II. The Ns included in regression analysis for each empirical model for each city can be known by referring to the ten-city summary tables (number of observations) or regression output tables (number of observations) available in Appendix III and IV.

• The tables should also specify what they show. Concerning table 6.2, for instance, I only understand that it shows unstandardized regression coefficients from note 154.

→ The regression coefficients are unstandardized but all of them are normalized. For more detailed explanation on the regression coefficients, refer to *Chapter 4: 1.4.4. Description of Variables* (p.92) and footnote 116 (on normalization).

INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Page 123: that work permits improve economic gains compared to family or other permit categories is a bit tautological. Indeed, work permits are precisely issued for migrants to be employed in paid work.

→ In this thesis, visa/permit category (which is a proxy often used for migration motives in Chiswick's model and economics of language) serves as an indicator for economic incentives and efficiency (refer to: *Chapter 2: 3.2.1.3 Migration motives* (p.38-40))

Hypothesis [migration motives]:

"Immigrants who migrated for study reasons have the highest level of destination language skills, followed by economic migrants and family migrants while those migrated for humanitarian reasons have the poorest language skills" (p.39)

The hypothesis is extended to immigrant integration (including economic integration) because:

"I extend the economic-psychological modeling frame for immigrant language acquisition to immigrant integration as I view the integration of immigrants into destination societies as the consequence of their destination language acquisition. Therefore, the relationships hypothesized for immigrant language acquisition is also expected for immigrant integration." (p.60)

REFERENCES

Reference Espenshade and Calhoun 1993 at page 113 is missing in the references list.

→ Reference added. (Espenshade & Calhoun, 1993 and Gordon, 1964 are cited in Van Tubergen & Kalmijn, 2005)

MINOR ISSUES

I find that the use of the labels tangible and intangible resources appear as an extra-burden when reading the thesis. For instance, in addition to using "tangible resources", the candidate addresses them as variables related to the economic model, as well as personal characteristics. More consistency in the use of terms may help. The same reasoning holds for intangible resources. Furthermore, the label tangible resources does not appear as appropriate given that it addresses variables such as the length of stay or age at migration which I do not perceive as tangible resources. More explanation of the use of these labels may help to clarify this point.

→ Page 102: footnote 134

I follow the classification typically used in corporate strategic management. In management, 'tangible resources' denote "assets that are physical in nature, visible and can be quantified" (e.g., financial assets, organizational, technological resources, and human resources as number of employees or years of education and experience) while 'intangible resources' represent "those that are not physical or visible in nature. Some of these resources are subjective in nature" (e.g., human resources as experience and capabilities of employees and trust among employees) (Sengupta & Chandan, 2013, p.92).

I think that some parts may be better located in the work: in particular, at page 9-10 there is a whole discussion which concerns the measurement of language. I think this is related more to the methodological section and may be postponed later in the work rather than being placed in the introduction.

→ The purpose of the explanation is related more to the issue of what it means to 'know a language' and to illustrate how the concept can be/has been measured.

Note 73 page 66: this note is not sufficient. The candidate needs to consider that among current sociologically oriented research on social movements one would not include Olson's work, as it is quite outdated. The latter provided the basis for the formulation of the resource mobilization theory later on, which has itself been partly revised by later approaches.

→ Thank you for the informative remark. The references are used and cited in the article of Sturmer and Simon (2004) for building/explaining their theoretical model.

Note 193. The second part of the note is not clear, and may be better reformulated.

→ Page 157: footnote 204

The specific institutional opportunity structures are measured and computed as part of the general institutional opportunity structure. Two of the group rights categories ('cultural requirements to access the community' and 'provision of destination language programs for immigrants') are used as the specific institutional opportunity structures.

II. Responses to Professor Jean-Benoit Pilet's comments

General comments:

The thesis is of good quality. The theoretical foundations of the work are clearly presented and mobilised to build up an analytical model. The different models are then tested in three chapters. The method is robust and the findings are well discussed. The findings are stimulating.

All these elements lead me to **propose the admission** of Yoshimiko OWAKI to the defence.

Nevertheless, in preparation for the defence, I would ask Yoshimiko OWAKI to consider and address the following remarks and comments:

1. In chapter 5, in the discussion of her findings, Yoshimiko OWAKI postulates that there is some mediation between attachment to the host country and the migrants' personal characteristics (education, age at migration, length of stay) (p111). What she postulates is some sort of interaction between these variables to explain language acquisition. Introducing some interaction terms into the statistical models can directly test interactions. I would invite Yoshimiko OWAKI to explore and consider introducing such interaction terms into her analyses.

→ From the analysis results, the interaction of the immigrants' personal characteristics (education, age at migration, length of stay) and attachment to the host country can be postulated. Accordingly, it can be hypothesized that the effect of personal characteristics on language proficiency is conditional on the level of attachment to host country people. The effect of personal characteristics on language proficiency may be larger among those with lower levels of attachment to host country people than those with higher levels of attachment; and larger linguistic attainment gap (between those with higher levels of attachment and those with lower levels of attachment to host country people) may be assumed for those

with lower levels of education or those with shorter length of stay in the host country or those who migrated at older age. In the future, I'd like to explore on the aspect and test potential hypotheses.

2. On the same page (p.111), Yoshimiko OWAKI discusses the negative effect of institutional trust on language acquisition. The explanation she proposes is far from convincing. I would invite her to spend more time in reading about the determinants of political trust (see Zmerli and Hooghe, 2011, ECPR press).

→p.113: text

Contrary to the predicted direction, a negative effect of institutional trust is observed in three cities (Budapest, London, and Madrid). Some plausible explanations can be: those who are proficient in destination language tend to be more critical on the public institutions because they are more capable of obtaining accurate information and deeper knowledge through a variety of sources; and those who have lower language proficiency give a relatively generous evaluation of their public institutions because they are still in the process of learning the 'reality'; or those with a low level of language skills trust the public institutions more because they may be socioeconomically vulnerable and receive better social benefits from the respective country or municipality than those who possess destination-country specific skills, most notably language. Moreover, macro-level contextual factors (e.g., government performance, historical traditions, levels of corruption and socioeconomic inequality) may make a difference in the development of institutional trust. The complex interplay between/among the economy, polity, and culture may also influence micro-level psychological and behavioral outcomes (Zmerli & Hooghe, 2013). There can be multiple elements affecting the relationship between institutional trust and language acquisition, thus making it difficult to deliver straightforward explanations. Hence, further theoretical as well as empirical research is suggested to adequately explain the negative effect (or simple association) of institutional trust on destination language proficiency.

3. More broadly speaking, I think that Yoshimiko should engage more with the literature on non-migrants, on the majority group. Her models to explain immigrant economic, social and political integration would be enriched by being confronted to general models on political participation, on social participation or on access to the labour market. These models have been built for non-migrants but they share much in common with how migrants' economic, social and political integration is explained. By doing that, Yoshimiko would be able to isolate what in her models is specific to migrants and what is not.

→ In the future, I will engage more with the literature on non-migrants to further elaborate the discussion on immigrant integration.

→ One relevant note included in the revision may be (p.75: footnote 91):

There is literature arguing that socio-economic resources (such as education and employment) affect political integration (Tam Cho, 1999; de Rooji, 2012). However, the literature also acknowledges "the explanatory mechanisms operate differently for immigrants than the majority" (de Rooji, 2012, p.455); immigrant political participation can be explained by differences in the importance of mobilization and by the amount of time spent in the destination country, but not by differences in levels of resources and engagement (de Rooji, 2012). While some research found a strong correlation between the socio-economic status and political participation (e.g., Verba & Nie, 1972), some other findings showed somewhat inconsistent or insignificant results, especially in the context of Europe (Jacobs, Phalet, & Swyngedouw, 2004). Accordingly, I hypothesized the relationship between employment and political integration to be insignificant because the datasets used for testing the hypothesis are European city cases.

4. In her conclusions, Yoshimiko Owaki makes strong statements about the differentiated paths towards social, economic and political integration. But I think that she does not go far enough in discussing the broader implications of her findings. In particular, I would like to discuss further the implications of her

work for the theoretical debates in political science about “good citizenship norms” but also for the social and political debates on how public authorities deal with the integration of migrants.

On the first aspect, there is a debate in political science about how citizens perceive what a ‘good citizen’ is. Public authorities also base their integration policies on what they believe ‘good citizens’ mean. Is a ‘good citizens’ someone contributing to the economy? Someone sharing the host language and culture? Someone politically and socially engaged? These elements directly echo with the main findings of the thesis. I would invite Yoshimiko OWAKI to engage with this strand of the political science literature.

On the second aspect, her findings have direct implications on the immigration and integration policies that are being implemented across the globe. I would therefore invite Yoshimiko OWAKI to reflect upon that and to add some paragraphs in her dissertation to discuss how she could engage with these debates on basis of her findings. It is something she is announcing in the introduction of her work but that does not come back in the conclusion.

→p.202: text

Relating specifically to the role of language, it is probably strongly correlated with immigrants’ participation in multiple dimensions of society as the current empirical investigation has shown— ‘language proficiency’ is found to be one of the most consistent predictors in estimating all of the immigrant integration outcomes. Moreover, the multivariate regression analysis results suggest educational attainment is the most critical factor in predicting linguistic attainment as well as economic and political integration outcomes; and the mediation effect of education on integration outcomes through language proficiency is consistently observed. The evidence seems to imply that the immigrant language acquisition issue may be better handled if it is considered in the context of governance, particularly in coordination with educational planning as well as economic, political, and cultural development. **In order to realize such coordinated governance, however, it would require not only a systematic and strategic long-term planning and solid institutional commitment, but also ‘good citizens’ who are concerned with the welfare of others and actively engaged in its betterment or individuals with what Dalton (2008) calls “engaged citizenship.”**