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Abstract

The relation between identity and Horizontal Inequality is increasingly relevant in the light of international migration flows. Research on the effects of Horizontal Inequality, or discrimination, on integration, is however limited. In particular, the causal mechanism underlying this relation remains to be defined. The present study fills this gap, arguing that perceived Horizontal Inequalities, i.e. inequalities between identity groups, create grievances in affected migrants that in turn increase group boundaries and, finally, decrease people’s ability to integrate into a new society. This proposed causal mechanism is tested through the use of process tracing and the controlled comparison method. Qualitative evaluative and thematic text analysis is employed to this end on novel micro-level data obtained through 30 interviews of concerned migrants and experts in Germany. The findings indicate support for the hypothesised model, amongst others highlighting the centrality of prior expectations and experiences for perceptions of Horizontal Inequality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Causal Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization of Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoS</td>
<td>Sons of the Soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN DESA</td>
<td>United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

Humans migrate every day. While most migrate within their home countries, others cross state borders in the search of a new life. Migration has existed for almost as long as humans have (Zimmer 2017), yet, it is often accompanied by various kinds of conflict. Conflicts may define realities not only in countries of origin (International Organization for Migration (IOM) 2018), but also in countries of destination. Recent years have seen a surge in border closures across the globe, including Europe and the US (OHCHR 2018). Populism and racist ideologies have been on the rise in a number of countries. This is linked to a backlash against immigration and even against the right to asylum.

In general, relations between old and new residents in a country are rarely easy. “Of course, the approach to build a multicultural society and to live side-by-side and to enjoy each other has utterly failed”, German chancellor Angela Merkel said in a speech in 2010 (Anderson 2017). Such contentious intergroup relations are the topic of the current paper. As described by Berry, conflict and stress will be outcomes if mutual accommodation fails (Berry 2001). The receiving population usually expects migrants to somehow become a part of the society. However, discrimination, or inequality, is arguably the biggest factor inhibiting adjustment to a new society (Zlobina et al. 2006; Berry and Sabatier 2010). Clearly, discrimination can be seen as a “symptom” of not being an equal member of society. There is, however, more to this relation. The question raised is: How does perceived inequality influence migrants’ ability to integrate, or assimilate, into a new society? Experiencing discrimination, hence inequality, often evokes strong feelings of anger and hurt. It therefore produces processes in people who feel discriminated against – processes that are detrimental to the ability to become a part of the receiving society, even if one would like to. Implicitly, contentious intergroup relations may therefore reproduce contentiousness, thus sowing the seeds for more conflict.

I theorise that perceived Horizontal Inequalities, i.e. inequalities between identity groups (Stewart 2008), create grievances in affected migrants that in turn increase group boundaries and, finally, decrease people’s ability to integrate into a new society. It is therefore hypothesised that high Horizontal Inequalities lead to lower integration. This causal mechanism is empirically tested amongst migrants in Germany.

The paper makes several contributions to the existing literature. Firstly, as raised by Anderson, the recent wave of literature on migration into Europe has neglected how the newcomers integrate into their new receiving societies (Anderson 2017). Host-migrant relations are also an
important domain in peace and conflict research, for instance in the literature on Sons of The Soil (SoS) conflicts. Yet, a disconnect between the sociological migration literature and the literature on conflict can be observed. Beyond violent conflict, conflict researchers have little insight into alternative outcomes of the relation between Horizontal Inequality and immigration. In addition, the causal mechanism itself is rarely studied in psychological and sociological literature on discrimination and integration, with a few exceptions (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001). Against this background, I relate the concept of Horizontal Inequality with sociological and psychological concepts of discrimination and integration. The concept of Horizontal Inequalities is applied to host-migrant relations in the context of international migration – something that has rarely been done in previous peace and conflict research (Côté and Mitchell 2015). The aim of the current paper is to research into the micro-dynamics underlying host-migrant relations, which can also provide the basis for violent intergroup conflict in different contexts. Hence, this study makes empirical, as well as theoretical contributions to existing research.

The present study draws on unique empirical data that was collected amongst recent immigrants in Germany and experts working in the field. A total of 30 semi-structured interviews are analysed using evaluative and thematic qualitative text analysis. The hypothesised micro-level dynamics between Horizontal Inequality and integration are tested through the use of process tracing and the controlled comparison method. Despite the limited sample size, findings are indicative of the negative effect of Horizontal Inequality on integration, and of the relevance of each part of the theorised causal mechanism. The importance of perceptions in the domain of Horizontal Inequalities is emphasised by the results: Findings suggest that previous experiences and expectations play an important role in shaping individual responses to perceived Horizontal Inequality. Moreover, the findings indicate that Horizontal Inequality is experienced as particularly severe when it is not only interperson of nature but perceived to include official government bodies and government representatives. This finding resonates with previous Horizontal Inequality research (Brown and Langer 2010; Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). Finally, in accordance with contact theory (inter alia Pettigrew et al. 2011), positive intergroup contact with members of the receiving society seems to partly mitigate the negative effects of experiences of discrimination.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next chapter, previous research will be mapped. Particular focus lies on theories surrounding Horizontal Inequalities, integration and identity, as well as the role of discrimination in previous sociological and psychological research on
migrant integration. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the theorised causal mechanism between Horizontal Inequality, on the one side, and lower integration, on the other side. The next chapter defines methodology, covering relevant methods, case selection and sampling, ethical considerations as well as analytical concerns. The paper then proceeds to present and review the empirical findings. Each part of the causal mechanism is assessed individually and further patterns surfacing in the data are discussed. Then, generalisability and alternative explanations are assessed, followed by a final concluding chapter.
2. Previous Research and Theory

The following section outlines existing literature relevant for understanding how discrimination as Horizontal Inequality affects the ability to integrate, or assimilate, into a new society. As a consequence of its interdisciplinary breadth, this paper employs a number of concepts drawn from anthropological studies, sociology, and different areas of psychology in addition to peace and conflict research. They will be defined in their relevant sections.

The definition of migration is cross-disciplinary: The concept of migration is used here to describe international migration, a migrant being any person who changes his or her country of usual residence. This definition is based on the 1998 UN Recommendations on Statistics of International Migration, Revision 1 (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) 1998). Discrimination is taken here as the unequal treatment of individuals based on their belonging to a certain group, whether chosen or ascribed to them. Such unequal treatment can occur in interpersonal relations or in treatment through state agencies.

2.1. Horizontal Inequality

The importance of perceptions of inequality for explaining social conflict has been the focus of many researchers over the past decades. The roots of Horizontal Inequality literature lie in the grievance school and relative deprivation theory (Gurr 1970). Ted Gurr theorised that individuals will rise up against the status quo if they are frustrated by it and experience grievance (Gurr 1970). This grievance stems from a perception of being deprived of certain goods relative to other members of the society. In order to alleviate this relative deprivation, and the grievance associated with it, individuals are thus expected to rebel (Gurr 1970).

More recent research has shifted this framework of relative deprivation from the individual level to the group level. The argument is that an over-reliance on individualist, rather than group-based theoretical explanations, has proven unable to grasp the complexity of many conflicts (Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). These recent theories maintain that instead of individual inequality (also called vertical inequality or inequality between households), it is Horizontal Inequality (inequality between identity groups) that holds most explanatory power for social mobilisation (Stewart 2008; Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011). Horizontal Inequalities can be conceptualised along the dimensions of political, economic, social and cultural inequality, whose relative importance varies according to context (Stewart 2008).
Identity groups are groups that individuals attach belonging to and derive a part of their self-concept from. As argued in the social psychology literature on intergroup relations, individuals’ identities are composed of personal, as well as group identities, whose salience depends on the context (Tajfel and Turner 1979; Brewer 1999). Group members compare themselves to members of other, relevant, groups. Such relevant groups are out-groups considered to be appropriate comparison groups by ingroup members, the selection of which varies according to context (Tajfel and Turner 1979). Individuals derive a sense of self-esteem from their belonging to a group (the in-group), which logically leads to the need to maintain a positive group identity (compared to other groups) to maintain self-esteem (Tajfel and Turner 1979). Based on their salient group identity, individuals discriminate amongst groups, extending favourable treatment to their fellow in-group members and less positive treatment to members of out-groups. When aiming to explain conflict occurrence, identities linked to nationality, ethnicity or religion have been invoked frequently.

If members of one group therefore perceive to be subjected to Horizontal Inequality, thus feeling disadvantaged compared to other groups they compare their own to, this can lead to violent intergroup conflict: Cederman and his colleagues hypothesise that Horizontal Inequalities are transformed into grievances through the aforementioned process of group comparison evoked by Tajfel and Turner (Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011; Tajfel and Turner 1979). Finally, these grievances can lead to violent collective action, as perceptions of injustice can be used for group mobilisation. Supporting this hypothesis, Cederman and colleagues find empirical support for the relation between economic as well as political Horizontal Inequalities and the occurrence of civil war (Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011). This shows the primary importance of Horizontal Inequalities in fuelling intergroup tensions, which can, if used for mobilisation, even turn into large-scale violent conflict.

Therefore, the presence of Horizontal Inequalities can be an important predictor for explaining violence between different identity groups, particularly groups based on ethnic or national identities. Recently, Horizontal Inequalities have also been employed to explain urban violence following rural-urban migration (Østby 2016).

As described by Côté and Mitchell, Horizontal Inequalities are also of importance in explaining Sons of the Soil (SoS) conflicts (Côté and Mitchell 2015). SoS conflicts involve current residents of a certain territory (“Sons of the Soil”) and migrants to the concerned territory. The
authors summarise that the most prevalent causes for SoS conflicts are economic decline, issues of land property, political liberalisation and Horizontal Inequality (Côté and Mitchell 2015). They argue that a combination of these factors is most potent in causing SoS conflicts. Accordingly, Mitchell found that in Côte d’Ivoire, a deterioration of the economy constituted a “shock” that made it difficult for the state to counteract already existing problems between host society and migrant populations (Mitchell 2013). I argue that Horizontal Inequalities are of particular importance in this respect, as they can linger in societies for extended periods of time, without necessarily being addressed, continuing to create tensions.

It hence becomes important to further research dynamics that can create the basis for later escalation. As raised by Côte and Mitchell, the link between Horizontal Inequality and SoS conflicts warrants further research (Côté and Mitchell 2015). According to the authors, especially the link between Horizontal Inequality and intergroup relations in the field of international migration remains understudied (Côté and Mitchell 2015). Hence, this paper turns towards this matter. The following sections introduce literature from the fields of sociology and intercultural psychology that will be useful in addressing these issues.

2.2. Acculturation and Intergroup Relations

Literature concerned with processes of intergroup relations between migrants and their receiving society mostly originates in anthropology, sociology and psychology. This strand of literature describes that following migration, people are faced with processes of acculturation: This describes a number of ways migrants as well as the receiving society may adapt to one another (cf. J. Berry 1997; J. W. Berry 2001; Bourhis et al. 1997a). In popular opinion, the responsibility to adapt is usually primarily attributed to the newly arrived. Yet, research shows that acculturation is a two-way process and relies on both, the conditions in the host society, as well as the person migrating.¹

In the literature, four acculturation strategies are categorised along the two dimensions of cultural adoption/contact² and cultural maintenance as described below in Figure 1. Cultural

---

¹ More recent notions of inclusion used e.g. in education or social work reflect the concern that there is indeed an interaction taking place.
² In Berry’s original definition of the model, he used contact as the second dimension (Berry 1997). Ward however suggests to use participation or cultural adoption instead (Ward 2013), which arguably is more predictive of the proposed outcomes than mere contact (e.g. because the quality of contact is important). As I still deem contact to be an important variable in itself, I use both for the purpose of this research.
adoption describes the process of taking up certain kinds of behaviour and subscribing to a number of core values in the new system (Berry 2005). Contact refers to contact between migrants and members of the receiving society (Ward 2013). Cultural maintenance means keeping up parts of one’s previous, e.g. ethnic, culture (Berry 2001). These four dimensions of acculturation form the basis of much research surrounding processes in a receiving society following migration.

### Cultural Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural adoption/contact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural adoption/Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assimilation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Marginalisation/Exclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acculturation Strategies (Figure 1), adapted from Berry and Ward (Berry 1997; Ward 2013).

This definition of integration is the one employed in this paper. An integrationist approach to acculturation (standing in opposition to how the term integration is often generally understood), implies that both, cultural adoption between migrant and host society is high, and that migrants maintain core parts of their cultural identity. They thus adopt host society practices and values, as well as keeping elements of their heritage culture largely intact (Berry 2001). A good example of an integrationist society is the Canadian one (Berry and Sabatier 2010). Secondly, if cultural adoption is high, but cultural maintenance is not pursued, assimilation is the result. Confusingly, this is popularly often mislabelled as integration. Assimilated individuals therefore feel more adherence to their “new” cultural identity than to their ethnic or national identity prior to migration.

On the other hand, separation ensues where cultural adoption is low and cultural maintenance is high. The extreme result are parallel societies where groups and group identities are divided rather than integrated. The implications for levels of conflict in intergroup relations will be returned to below. Finally, and Berry is keen to note that this strategy is usually enforced by the society rather than chosen by the migrant, is marginalisation, where neither cultural adoption is high, nor cultural maintenance is practiced, or, indeed, permitted (Berry 1997).
Examples include societies following policies and/or ideologies of racial segregation and racial supremacy, such as South Africa until 1991.

As described by Jasinskaja-Lahti and colleagues, acculturation orientations are predictive of the readiness to use violence for both, host society members and migrants:

“[H]ost-majority members who endorse segregationist or exclusionist orientations [i.e. marginalisation, note of author] towards minority-group members are likely to foster the most conflictual intergroup relations with targeted immigrant groups. […] Non-violent segregationists may simply think that cultures should not mix, while radical exclusionists are the ones likely to launch violent racist attacks against immigrants. Of the targeted immigrant groups it is those with [separationist] attitudes, which are most likely to resist and even retaliate against host community persecutions.” (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003, 81)

Hence, acculturation attitudes are predictive of the use of violence against other ethnic groups. These extreme cases can be described as the culmination of intergroup hostility. Generally, intergroup relations are better when migrants as well as host communities agree on the acculturation strategy they prefer (Bourhis et al. 1997a). Such agreement is associated with comparatively low tensions between migrants and host society and low levels of discrimination.³ The exception to this rule is separation, which is expected to lead to conflictual intergroup relations even when it is the preferred option by both, migrants and host society. Examples for such conflictual intergroup relations due to separation (whether preferred or not preferred) abound, including the margins of major European cities such as London, or certain banlieues of Paris and Marseille. Thus, for instance, the 2011 UK riots spread from Tottenham, an area primarily inhabited by African and Caribbean communities (BBC 2018a), in response to the shooting of resident Mark Duggan by the police.

Matching this acculturation research, literature on intergroup conflict has found that individuals with inclusive⁴ group identities have higher levels of cognitive complexity and expose lower levels of bias and prejudice (Roccas and Brewer 2002; Hall 2016). Individuals with overlapping

³ Bourhis’ Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM) proposes that both actors’ preferences stand in relation to one another (Bourhis et al. 1997a). Generally speaking, disagreement between the host society’s and migrants’ preferred acculturation strategy is expected to lead to tensions between the groups. For instance, Ward found that in Estonia, where cultural maintenance of Russian identity by ethnic Russians is not desired by the majority society, integrated ethnic Russians display lower levels of life satisfaction than those who are assimilated, separated, or even marginalised (Ward 2013). Yet, generally speaking, integration has been found to be the strategy preferred in many Western European societies, including the German one (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003).

⁴ Here, it is important whether people (e.g. white Christians) see their identities as inclusive (white and/or Christian people are part of their in-groups) or exclusive (only white Christians are part of their ingroup). Or if there is no overlap between the two identities and they are two in-groups, in which case social identity becomes context or situation specific (Roccas and Brewer, 2002). The most favourable option, as it increases cognitive complexity, are inclusive identities.
identities, for instance inclusive bicultural identities, therefore have lower levels of outgroup bias and are more accepting of diversity. Integration is therefore the option fostering most peaceful relations amongst different cultural or ethnic groups in the same society. On the other hand, separation of identities is likely to foster to more conflictual intergroup relations, increased intergroup bias, and more violent interactions. Empirically, integration has been found to lead to highest levels of psychological well-being (Berry and Sabatier 2010; Ward 2013) and best intercultural relations within the society (Ward 2013), when favoured by the society and migrants at large. It has also consistently been found that a majority of migrants prefer integration over other strategies (Zagefka and Brown 2002; Berry 2005).

It has therefore been outlined that integration, when favoured by members of the host society and migrants alike, fosters the most peaceful intergroup relations in society. In other cases, assimilation has been found to produce the most harmonious relations, namely when this is the strategy that is favoured by both (Ward 2013). Comparably however, integration still fares better than assimilation, when agreement is present. Hence, the most harmonious intergroup relations are produced when cultural adoption is high and there is agreement between views of migrants and receiving society about the “best” kind of acculturation.

2.3. Discrimination

The following section introduces discrimination as a major obstacle to migrants’ ability to integrate or assimilate. Considering the relation between Horizontal Inequality and conflict outlined at the beginning of this chapter (notably that if members of one group perceive to be disadvantaged compared to relevant comparison groups, this may lead to violent intergroup conflict), it may not surprise the reader that discrimination has been found to have numerous negative effects. On an important note, the effects of Horizontal Inequalities are based on subjective perceptions of unjust treatment of those concerned (Stewart 2008), as are the effects of discrimination (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003; Zagefka and Brown 2002). It is therefore the perception of injustice, discrimination, or inequality, that matters at least as much as “objective” reality. Accordingly, studies cited below usually rely on perceived discrimination as a measure. As succinctly brought to the point by Zagefka and Brown:

“Essentially […] people’s subjective perceptions of reality constitute and become the reality that informs their psychological responses.” (Zagefka and Brown 2002, 173)
Generally speaking, perceived discrimination is one of the major acculturative stressors (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003). There is broad agreement in the literature that discrimination has negative effects on long-term sociocultural (Zlobina et al. 2006; Te Lindert et al. 2008) and psychological (Ward 2013; Berry 2005; Verkuyten 2008) adaptation\(^5\) of migrants. This is understandable, as perceiving oneself as a victim of prejudice harms one’s self-esteem and feelings of control (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999).

Considering the effect of discrimination on intergroup relations, the rejection-identification model states that when group members experience rejection by another group and cannot ascend to this group, they will identify even more strongly with their own group (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001). This is due to their need for a positive group identity to maintain self-esteem. This theory builds on Tajfel and Turner’s notion of social creativity\(^6\) (Tajfel and Turner 1979) and previous studies on in-group identification amongst lower status group members (Ellemers, Wilke, and Van Knippenberg 1993). Experimentally, it has been found that perceived prejudice leads to higher identification with the in-group (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001), as well as increased intergroup differentiation (Jetten et al. 2001). Moreover, higher levels of in-group identification are associated with higher levels of wellbeing (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999) and self-esteem (Jetten et al. 2001). Lending further support to this model, Verkuyten found that among ethnic Turks in the Netherlands who felt discriminated against, those more highly identified with their ethnic group displayed heightened life satisfaction (Verkuyten 2008). It can thus be argued that heightened group identity serves as a buffer against the negative psychological effects of discrimination. Yet, research has also found that this strategy is not always employed (Juang and Cookston 2009). This exhibits the need to research the causal mechanism (CM) underlying this relation, and other factors that may influence it.

Previous research on the effects of discrimination on acculturation therefore requires further investigation of the CM underlying this relation. Previous studies researching discrimination and acculturation have mostly been correlational. The longer-term effects of discrimination on

---

\(^5\) Sociocultural adaptation refers to one’s ability to respond to the demands of daily life in a new cultural setting, while psychological adaptation generally describes one’s psychological well-being (Ward 1996)

\(^6\) Individuals may try to change to a higher status group if they cannot derive sufficient self-esteem from membership in their current in-group (Tajfel and Turner 1979). This is, however, not always possible, for instance when this higher status group is not perceived to be open to the individual (Tajfel and Turner 1979) – a situation that is likely to be perceived as such in a situation of discrimination. Tajfel and Turner theorised that in this case, where change to a higher status group is not possible, group members may resort to social creativity: This includes rejecting norms of the dominant group and placing greater emphasis on the in-group identity and their divergence from the dominant group (Tajfel and Turner 1979).
integration/assimilation and the causal mechanism are therefore still to be researched at the micro-level.

2.4. Research Gap

The following section summarises the gaps in previous research outlined above. Having considered the literature relevant to Horizontal Inequality, discrimination and acculturation in a new society, a number of questions remain. Most importantly, how perceived discrimination affects the ability to integrate or assimilate— and thus to include the identity of the receiving society – still needs to be researched empirically at the micro-level.

A methodological limitation of previous research on discrimination and acculturation is the over-reliance on testing correlation. In addition, few experiments have been conducted, which have found support for the negative effect of discrimination on integration (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001). Yet, these experiments are very limited temporally and thus unable to capture longer-term processes. Longer-term processes, however, are especially relevant in the domain of acculturation (Berry 2005). In this context, it is important to explore how repeated or prolonged experiences of discrimination influence group identity and intergroup attitudes. The exact causal mechanism thus remains to be researched. Moreover, it has not been established what kinds of discrimination, or inequality, are most damaging to integration and assimilation.

I argue that the notion of Horizontal Inequality can be employed in this respect, as will be theorised in the next section. There is evidence that Horizontal Inequalities can be an important factor in explaining the emergence of SoS conflicts (Côté and Mitchell 2015), hence relevant to the domain of migration. Horizontal Inequalities have previously mostly been used to explain violent conflict, neglecting the concept’s explanatory power for other kinds of conflict. Meanwhile, the causal mechanism proposed by the theory essentially describes intergroup relations and only later adds the analytical dimension of inclusion into state power structures (Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). The concept of Horizontal Inequality may thus suitably be used to analyse nonviolent intergroup relations. The findings may then generate implications for the study of diverse kinds of conflicts, including SoS conflicts, whether associated with large-scale violence or not.
2.5. Theory

The following section outlines the causal mechanism proposed in this study. This causal mechanism relating discrimination and cultural adoption incorporates aspects of both, the rejection-identification model and theories of Horizontal Inequality and grievances.

Importantly, Horizontal Inequalities are subjective, and therefore hard to measure objectively (Stewart 2008; Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). Horizontal inequality describes members of one group feeling generally disadvantaged compared to other relevant groups. Horizontal Inequalities are therefore a pervasive form of discrimination based on group boundaries. Horizontal Inequalities do not refer to isolated instances of discrimination, and instead could be described as systematic discrimination. Moreover, the Horizontal Inequality framework is specifically oriented towards medium- to long-term processes in intergroup relations, which are very relevant in the domains of acculturation and integration.

![Diagram showing the causal mechanism of the effect of Horizontal Inequality on integration/assimilation](Figure 2)

As illustrated by the graphic above, (1) Horizontal Inequalities are constituted by sustained or frequent perceived discrimination, for instance in the political, economic, social and cultural realm (Stewart 2008; Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011; Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). Group members perceive this discrimination to be due to their group affiliation (in this case ethnic/national). (2) The experience of being subjected to such Horizontal Inequality creates strong feelings of stress (cf. Berry 2005; Roccas and Brewer 2002), or grievance (inter alia Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013), on the side of the concerned individuals. (3) To mitigate this grievance, individuals will increase group boundaries (cf. Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001). This can include rejecting the receiving society’s dominant identity while simultaneously increasing identification with their identity of origin, or only rejecting the receiving society’s dominant identity, without identifying more strongly with their identity of origin (ibid.). (4) This strengthening of group boundaries counters the adoption of the identity of the receiving society and therefore, logically, both integration and assimilation.
Based on the theory and causal mechanism outlined in this chapter, the following hypothesis is constructed:

*Perceived Horizontal Inequality* of immigrants has a negative effect on their integration and assimilation into the receiving society.

Based on findings by Jetten and colleagues (Jetten et al. 2001, 1211), stress can imply an increase in immigrants’ identification with their group of origin as well as lower identification with the receiving society, or solely imply lower identification with the receiving society. As raised above, immigrants compare themselves to relevant outgroups when assessing levels of Horizontal (In)equality – such groups may for instance be previous residents, e.g. ethnic Germans, but also other groups of recently migrated, depending on the context.

Furthermore, it makes sense to disaggregate the four dimensions of Horizontal Inequality theoretically. *Political Horizontal Inequality* refers to inequality in terms of access to political power and decision-making. *Economic Horizontal Inequality* refers to differences in wealth and income among households. *Social Horizontal Inequality* includes differences in education and societal status and *cultural Horizontal Inequality* refers to inequalities concerning issues such as national holidays and religious rights (Stewart 2008; Brown and Langer 2010).

Having disaggregated the dimensions of Horizontal Inequality, the analysis is thus able to assess their relative importance and other associated factors. For instance, if Horizontal Inequalities are perceived to span several dimensions, this may lead to a more severe perception of discrimination than if Horizontal Inequalities only span one dimension. Further, I suppose that political Horizontal Inequalities are not as relevant in democratic societies as they are in authoritarian regimes. This is based on the rather high levels of political inclusion of minority groups into power in democratic regimes, as opposed to authoritarian regimes. Therefore, individuals having migrated to the EU from a nondemocratic regime, or even a country in civil war, are likely to be less concerned about political inequality. On the other hand, they may be more concerned about cultural Horizontal Inequalities, as they now find themselves in a mainstream culture that may be vastly different from the one in their country of origin. These nuances are important to consider especially in the study of intergroup relations during acculturation.

The remainder of this paper will proceed to outline the research design and then empirically test the hypothesised relationship.
3. Research Design

This chapter sets the methodological background for the rest of this study. The choice of methods is explained to begin with, focusing on in-depth interviewing, evaluative and thematic qualitative text analysis, process-tracing, and the controlled comparison method. Following this, the least-likely case selection, sampling and data collection are explained, including ethical considerations. The chapter concludes with the operationalisation of each step of the causal mechanism that is to be tested.

3.1. Methods: Data Collection and Analysis

As argued above, previous studies have mostly been concerned with testing the relationship between discrimination and intergroup boundaries through correlational designs. The sequence, or the direction of the causal mechanism proposed has been established through experimental research: As outlined in the previous chapter, there is support for the negative effects of discrimination on integration or assimilation, as experimental research (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001) has found discrimination to increase intergroup boundaries. Yet, the quantitative methods employed leave little room for the causal mechanism underlying the proposed relationship. Neither has experimental research been able to shed light on the medium to long-term relation between experiences of discrimination and the capacity to integrate the identity of a new society. Considering the primary importance of perceiving something as discrimination in order to feel grievance, it also becomes vital to approach the topic at hand with flexibility and openness to the perspectives of the concerned individuals themselves. These demands make a qualitative research approach a useful option.

This paper is concerned with the dynamics underlying the causal relation, as well as the importance of different kinds of Horizontal Inequality and possible other factors. It is thus important that research participants feel enabled to share their experiences relatively unconstrained. In-depth interviewing is therefore a useful method to obtain data for this project, as participants may feel more comfortable sharing certain viewpoints in comparison to standardised interviews or questionnaires (Flick 2009).

Beyond this data collection method, further methods need to be chosen to conduct and structure the empirical analysis. These methods are defined in the following paragraphs. To analyse the content of the interview data obtained, evaluative qualitative text analysis is conducted.
Evaluative qualitative text analysis is particularly useful for theory-testing (Kuckartz 2014). This allows the author to classify and assess the interview data according to *evaluative categories*. This is necessary in order to gauge participants’ relative perceptions of Horizontal Inequality, for instance. This approach is merged with thematic text analysis (Kuckartz 2014), enabling me to draw other important themes from the data. This approach works by analysing the textual data with special emphasis on patterns that surface. Both approaches are based on manual coding of the data, as defined in the following paragraph. This data analysis was conducted using Atlas.ti software. Interviews were conducted and analysed in German, but the findings are presented in English language.

Coding categories are constructed inductively and deductively. Deductive categories are based on a preliminary reading of a subset of the interview data. Inductive categories are based on the indicators developed in the next section on operationalisation. In order to increase reliability of the coding process, a short codebook was written including descriptions of each category. It can be found in the appendix. The codebook disaggregates for instance different kinds of Horizontal Inequality and presents examples of wordings for each indicator. This codebook was referred to throughout the coding process. This procedure decreases subjectivity (Sundberg and Harbom IN Höglund and Öberg 2011). It is generally recommended that coding categories be mutually exclusive (Kuckartz 2014). However, as the analysis will not be following a frequency-approach and is aiming to also elucidate new patterns in the data, I have chosen to construct some categories that are complementary at times. This will also allow to observe other important factors that may otherwise be overlooked, as well as introducing more nuance into the data analysis. For instance, a passage may be coded as *negative perceptions of host society* as well as *criticism/feedback for host country*. Both may occur simultaneously, but they do not have to, depending on the issue and the formulation chosen by the interviewee. Moreover, naturally, as integration is a combination of maintaining features of one’s culture of origin and adopting features of the culture of the receiving country, the coding of integration may often overlap with either one or both of the constituent categories, depending on the precise content of the section. Hence, each passage will be coded with all relevant codes. Where sensible, however, attention has been paid to constructing mutually exclusive categories or codes.

---

7 Sometimes, participants spoke French or Turkish for short sections of the interview, when they wanted to express something they were unable to say in German. These sections were translated into German by the author.
Further, the controlled comparison method is applied. This method compares two similar, or almost identical, populations that only differ with respect to their dependent variable (Powner 2015). In this paper, I aim to explain the variation of the dependent variable (DV), integration, by variation in the independent variable (IV), perceived Horizontal Inequality. The population chosen from consists of individual migrants in Hamburg, Germany. From this population, the least likely case selection implies choosing migrants who are, as explained above, likely to be willing to integrate into German society. Following interview phase I, this sample will be divided based on the IV Horizontal Inequality: Individuals who perceive discrimination to be of relevance in their life, or to occur frequently, and individuals who describe it as being less relevant or less frequent. One could therefore describe these as two samples from two identical populations that only differ in their perception of Horizontal Inequality. These two sub-samples will then be compared, assessing the variation of the dependent variable, integration, and the causal mechanism. For cases where discrimination is comparably less relevant, hence Horizontal Inequality perceived as being low, integration should be higher. In addition, I will also identify other variables that seem to be prominent, that may explain patterns and variation in the data.

Within cases where discrimination is comparably relevant, hence high Horizontal Inequality perceived, process-tracing will be conducted. Process-tracing is a tool to empirically test causal mechanisms. It is used for within-case observation of the causal chain (Powner 2015, 130; Beach and Pedersen 2013). Process-tracing implies not only operationalising and testing for the presence of the IV and the DV, but operationalising and testing each part of the causal chain (Beach and Pedersen 2013). Hence, indicators need to be defined for what should be observable implications at each step of the causal mechanism. This will be done in Chapter 3.4, as before the operationalisation, a relevant case must be selected to apply it to.

3.2. Case Selection and Sampling

Having outlined the methods that will be employed for data collection and analysis in this study, the following section explains case selection and sampling. Acculturation becomes most challenging in contexts where the general culture of the host society differs markedly from the cultural background of immigrants: The larger cultural differences, the more accommodation is required from both sides. The recent increased influx of migrants from non-EU countries into EU countries, many of whom applied for asylum, represents a contemporary phenomenon of high societal and theoretical relevance in this respect. While I do not subscribe to the description
of the increase in immigration, especially in 2015, as a crisis,\(^8\) immigration figures into the EU did skyrocket in 2015 and 2016. As illustrated by the graph below, the number of non-EU first-time asylum applications\(^9\) in EU countries increased almost exponentially from 562.7 thousand in 2014 to 1.26 million in 2015 – to decrease to 1.21 million in 2016, and then drop to 649.9 thousand in 2017.

Asylum applications (non-EU) in the EU-28 Member States, 2006–2017. Source: (Eurostat 2018) (Figure 3)

Out of these 1.21 million first-time applicants in 2016 shown on this graph, 722.3 thousand applied for asylum in Germany. This was by far the highest number in the EU, Italy being very far off on the second place with 121.2 thousand applications and France with 76.8 thousand on place three (Eurostat 2018). This makes Germany, and the “newly arrived” migrant population

\(^8\) I argue that while the increase in immigration figures indeed prompted some kind of political crisis, and led to logistic difficulties in 2015, the figures and difficulties associated with this increase were not comparable to situations in other parts of the world – something that is often neglected in this Eurocentric narrative. Countries such as Turkey, Jordan or Lebanon, for instance, are faced with much higher numbers of refugees per capita, over prolonged periods of time, while generally having lower financial and other resources to cope with these demands.

\(^9\) I am citing asylum figures here instead of all migrants – while people seeking asylum are much smaller in numbers than the people migrating for work or studies, the former often are the focus of public attention and much more vulnerable (International Organization for Migration (IOM) 2018). While this paper does not discriminate amongst different groups of migrants, asylum seekers bear the brunt of public stigma and discrimination and are therefore particularly concerned by the processes explored in this study.
in Germany, a very relevant case for testing the relation between discrimination and integration, judging by numbers alone. Another interesting case could have been Sweden, where, per capita, even more asylum applications have been accepted in recent years (Arnett 2014). Yet, I argue that the specific attention paid to Germany by media outlets during the “summer of migration”, and the societal divides outlined in the following paragraph make Germany a particularly interesting case. Moreover, as raised previously, research on acculturation of the newly arrived migrant population is scarce (Anderson 2017), and in the EU, the largest proportion arrived in Germany.

Recent societal developments in Germany make it a particularly relevant case to research. The rise in immigration figures was accompanied by the rise of the far-right group Pegida (short for “Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamisation of the Occident”) in Germany. With massive reliance on social media, the grouping organised regular protests in German cities, particularly in 2015, mobilising tens of thousands far-right and conservative (or “concerned”) citizens (BBC 2018b). On the other side, large parts of the German population publicly welcomed immigrants during the “summer of migration” in 2015, a phenomenon that even led to the re-definition of a German word (Willkommenskultur, lit: welcoming culture). This showed a clear split within German “host society”, also evident in the rise of populist, far-right AfD party, which has been explored elsewhere10. Violence against migrants increased sharply: According to figures from the German interior ministry, provided upon parliamentary request, in 2016, nearly 10 attacks were committed per day against migrants on German soil (BBC 2017). This totalled 3,533 attacks on migrants and asylum seekers in 2016 (BBC 2017) – counting only attacks that were brought to the attention of the police. These figures include 217 attacks on refugee organisations and volunteers (BBC 2017). Against this background, the situation of migrants in Germany, and relations with German mainstream society, assume further importance.

As highlighted in the previous chapter, support for the relationship between discrimination and increased intergroup boundaries has been found in previous research (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001; Berry and Sabatier 2010). It remains to see under what conditions it is most relevant, and whether this relationship holds a hard test. According to Powner, a hard test subjects a hypothesis to conditions under which it is least likely to be successful (Powner 2015, 132). In this context, such conditions are likely to be found amongst

---

10 The regularly published Leipzig “Mitte” studies give interesting insights into the “societal centre” (Mitte) of Germany. The “Mitte” study published in 2016 focused in particular on the increase in support for authoritarian and right-wing totalitarian ideologies amongst members of German society.
individuals who make efforts to become well-adapted to the new society, as such efforts are likely to interact with the negative effects discrimination may have on integration and assimilation. For instance, individuals who are actively committed to learning German and plan to stay in the country, instead of seeing it as a temporary solution, can be considered more likely to be willing to integrate or assimilate into the host society. In Germany, participation in so-called “integration courses” may be required by authorities if asylum applicants have good prospects of receiving a residence permit or asylum. German language courses of higher levels are often only accessible to people who make efforts to obtain places. In addition to these courses, there are different courses aimed at preparing individuals for entering the job market. It can be supposed that the people most likely to remain in and most willing to assimilate or integrate into German society can be found in such courses.

Hence, this study sampled individuals from these courses, as their integration or assimilation is least likely to be negatively influenced by Horizontal Inequality. Additional interview partners were contacted through snowball sampling. Interviews with participants were conducted in German. This supports the least-likely case selection, as people able to participate in interviews in German language are likely to be particularly invested in German society and culture.11

Interview partners mostly came from countries outside the European Union to ensure a certain level of homogenous cultural distance and possible societal prejudice, in order to enable comparison. Prejudice within EU countries is mostly directed against migrants from countries outside of the European Union, with the exception of some Eastern European migrants, who are also often portrayed as outsiders – this is reflected in the emphasis on Western “European identities” by many populist and racist social movements (such as the Identitarian movement or Pegida). Research participants were resident in and around the city of Hamburg, which is the second largest city of Germany. While it would be interesting to include migrants in rural areas and smaller cities, including the east of the country, where Pegida enjoyed most support (BBC 2018b), this project was limited by resource constraints. It can be supposed that the multicultural character of Hamburg offers more subcultures than smaller cities, and therefore more possibilities to pursue a separationist approach to acculturation. Yet, in such a multicultural context, discrimination may also be less prevalent than in rural areas, where previous contact between migrants and German society is lower and prejudice thus likely to be higher. Further implications will be considered in the light of the findings in the Discussion.

11 To a certain degree, these are choices of convenience, but within the scope of this research project, they are considered to be sound decisions.
Participants had been residing in Germany for one or more years, in order to allow for acculturative processes to start.

In addition to interviews with directly concerned migrants, I conducted a number of expert interviews with experts from refugee shelters, migrant information centres, or other civil society initiatives. This constituted a second interviewing phase. Particular attention was paid to obtaining interview partners familiar with problematics surrounding discrimination. This data was triangulated with the data obtained through interviewing primarily concerned individuals. This allows to broaden the scope, including dynamics that may have been missed due to the sampling process. It may also give a more general picture of the situation beyond the case selection, which may be useful to understand the generalizability of the findings obtained during Phase I.

3.3. Ethical considerations

As always when conducting research with human participants, ethical considerations should take on primary importance. Not inflicting any harm is the minimum responsibility of any researcher working with people (Eckl 2008). Researching amongst individuals having migrated, I needed to be aware that a number of participants had probably made traumatising experiences in their country of origin or on their way to Germany. I did not ask about flight experiences, nor about situations in or events referring particularly to their country of origin. All interviews were anonymised and the collection of identifying data was kept to a minimum. Participation was voluntary, and interviewees were informed of their right to end the interview at any time if they felt uncomfortable. No interviewee left the interview early. During the Phase II (expert interviews), identifying information was not disclosed, either.

Moreover, traumatising experiences might have been made by participants following their arrival in Germany. The ones most likely to surface were, given the nature of the study, experiences of discrimination. Hence, I did not push participants when they seemed reluctant to speak about details concerning an experience of discrimination. In addition, I collected information on support services to refer to these services, where necessary. I also took steps to prevent that participants leave the interview feeling that they experience more discrimination than they felt before. I included an additional three questions at the end of the interview, which were not primarily relevant to the research question, but highlighted participants’ coping
mechanisms and positive experiences, as well as their agency. Generally, interviews were conducted in an atmosphere of mutual respect and genuine interest.

### 3.4. Operationalisation

Process-tracing requires each step of the causal mechanism to be operationalised and empirically tested. Where the IV is present, the causal chain should be observed. In this case, the IV is high levels of Horizontal Inequality.

Thus, in the group where high levels of Horizontal Inequality are perceived by participants, the hypothesised causal chain should be at work: Such high levels of Horizontal Inequality are expected to result in grievances. These grievances are hypothesised to lead to increased group boundaries, entailing lower levels of integration. For each of these causal steps, an operationalisation and expected findings, or indicators, are provided in the table below. As suggested by Ward for further research (Ward 2013), this design distinguishes between psychological and behavioural dimensions of acculturation, respectively parts 3 and 4 of the causal mechanism, and measures them independently of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Causal Mechanism</th>
<th>Operationalisation</th>
<th>Indicators and Expected Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Perceived Horizontal Inequality (IV)</td>
<td>Perception of discrimination being based on one’s ethnic/national identity and perception that this discrimination occurs frequently or is sustained for it to qualify as high Horizontal Inequality. Perception that this is unjust. Discrimination in the political, economic, social or cultural domain, in particular.</td>
<td>- Expressed feeling of being treated worse than Germans due to not being German by birth&lt;br&gt;- Expressed feeling of having lower chances to succeed merely due to not being German by birth&lt;br&gt;- Expression that one sees this as something systematic/occurring on a regular basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Grievances</td>
<td>Negative feelings, such as stress, anger or sadness.</td>
<td>- Statement that in reaction to discrimination, anger, sadness or other negative emotions are felt strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Increased group boundaries</td>
<td>Stronger identification with previous national/ethnic group, comparably weak(er) identification with German identity. Perception that the two identities are at odds.</td>
<td>- Considering Germans to be very different from own national/ethnic group - Expression of emotional distance to, or negative emotions relating to Germans and German society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Lower integration / assimilation (DV)</td>
<td>Rejection of host culture as part of one’s personal culture, relative absence of those considered German in one’s social networks.</td>
<td>- Comparatively little adoption of German culture, e.g. not celebrating German holidays - Few/no German friends - Preferring culture of country of origin, seeing it at odds with German culture - Description that one’s connection to one’s national/ethnic culture has increased recently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Operationalised causal mechanism (Table 1)

These operationalisations are based on previous studies in both, research on Horizontal Inequalities as well as acculturation research. Step (1) draws on Cederman and colleague’s (2013) work on Horizontal Inequality and grievance. Researching interethnic conflict, the authors find, for instance, that the higher the ethno-political exclusion of certain groups, the more likely the occurrence of conflict when compared to less exclusive regimes (Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). As the present study is not quantitative, but qualitative, it thus makes sense to differentiate between high levels of Horizontal Inequality (sustained, of importance) and low levels of Horizontal Inequality (isolated instances of discrimination or Horizontal Inequality perceived to be of little importance). Concerning the perception of injustice in Step (1), the evaluation of Horizontal Inequality as being unjust is an important precondition for the next step, as described by Williams: “People can be deprived, disappointed, frustrated or dissatisfied without feeling that they have been unjustly or unfairly treated – their unsatisfactory outcome may be “just the way things are “, or the result of divine judgement, or a consequence of personal inaptitude. In contrast, real grievance (...) rests upon the claim that an injustice has been inflicted upon undeserving victims.” (R. M. Williams 2003, 131) This
perception of injustice is not conceptualised as a separate causal step because the concept of inequality is taken to imply injustice.

Concerning Step (2), it needs to be noted that much literature on Horizontal Inequalities is quantitative, and causal mechanism is therefore frequently only theorised, but not tested. Hence, operationalisations of grievance in the Horizontal Inequality literature are rare. This operationalisation is however relatively straightforward, as “grievances” can be defined as subjective (Cederman, Weidmann, and Gleditsch 2011), generally negative feelings.

The operationalisation of Step (3) draws on psychological research on the rejection-identification model (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Jetten et al. 2001). Branscombe and colleagues operationalise increases in group boundaries based on discrimination as increased hostility against the outgroup, as well as increased minority ingroup identification. Step 3 therefore concerns attitudes and beliefs.

Finally, the operationalisation of Step (4) is based on acculturation research. Amongst others, Berry and Sabatier operationalise acculturation orientations (i.e. including integration and assimilation) along two main lines: Firstly, to what extent immigrants desire contact with others outside their group, and secondly, to what degree they would like to maintain/give up their cultural traits (Berry and Sabatier 2010). As I judge social desirability bias to be larger when asking about whether one desires to have German friends (and most acculturation studies were more anonymous, relying on surveys instead of interviews, possibly making it easier to be open for participants), I will instead evaluate “real” contact as described by the interviewees. Step 4 therefore concerns behaviours.

The interview questionnaire used to collect the necessary data for each part of the causal mechanism can be found in the appendix. The questionnaire begins with rather unstructured questions, then moving on to more focused questions. This is done to prevent the interviewee from being influenced by the interviewers’ viewpoints or expectations (Flick 2009). As previously mentioned, the interview questionnaire also includes questions relating to ethical considerations, such as openings to provide information to support services. Further ethical considerations required questions to be less explicit than they might have been otherwise.

A pilot study was conducted with 5 interviewees, following which the questionnaire was revised. The wording was simplified in order to increase understanding. The language barrier implied a trade-off between ensuring the questions were understood on the one hand, and not
being too leading on the other hand. A question relating to Step 2 of the causal chain was excluded, as I did not deem it ethically acceptable to explicitly remind participants of negative emotions. Data for Step 2 was instead also collected through expert interviews. Questions explicitly asking for indicators relating to the number of German friends or the celebration of German holidays were excluded because some pilot study participants reacted with disappointment to these questions. Instead, I decided to accept that some conversations may naturally produce information surrounding these issues, while others may not. Some questions of particular relevance are discussed in the following paragraphs.

**Do you think you are keeping a part of your culture? Has your connection to your culture changed since you came to Germany?**

This question relates to participants’ group identity. In particular, I considered it important not to make the question leading, e.g. not to ask whether the connection to one’s own culture has become stronger, or whether participants had integrated parts of German culture into their practices.

**Do you think you can be both (xxx) and German?**

This question is purposefully worded to ask for possibility, rather than the absolute. This is intended to decrease social desirability bias. Asking “Do you think, you are both, (xxx) and German?” would be more leading, so I decided to ask whether participants considered it generally possible. At the same time, the question needed to be worded in a rather explicit way in order to obtain the information needed.

**Can you describe me an experience where you were treated unfairly because you are not from Germany? Do you feel like this happens more frequently?**

These questions aim at finding out about perceptions of Horizontal Inequality. It was asked after participants were asked about their group identity, in order to prevent it from influencing their answers to these questions. The first question asks for a precise experience in order to increase specificity, i.e. focus on what is intended to be found out (Flick 2009).

---

12 Interviewees would state, for instance, that they would really like to have German friends, or that they had tried making German friends, and that sadly, they did not have any. I did not consider it appropriate to continue asking this question, especially considering the output.
Did these experiences change how you think about Germans?

This question was included to capture the effect of experiences of discrimination on group boundaries. I was aware that social desirability bias would be very high in response to this question, and it might be perceived as leading. Yet, as interviews were conducted at one particular point in time due to temporal constraints, instead of at two or more points in time, this question attempted to introduce a time element.

If you could change something about German society, what would you change?

This question aimed at giving participants a perspective of agency towards the end of the interview. In addition, it aimed at obtaining information on how accepting participants were of the differences between their origin and their host culture, and whether discrimination was again an issue that they considered to be of relevance.

3.5. Limitations

There are a number of limitations to the methodological approach of this study, which will be discussed in the following section. An obvious issue this research is confronted with is the language barrier, due to the intercultural focus. Ideas or connotations can sometimes be distorted or lost through translation. In order to increase understanding, I carried a phone to use online dictionary services when desired by the participant for certain words. In order to track connotations, I frequently asked follow-up questions.

A further concern that researchers are always confronted with when interacting with human participants is social desirability. Social desirability bias implies that certain things are more accepted socially, while others may be subject to self-censorship because they are deemed socially undesirable (Söderström IN Höglung & Öberg). This process can introduce a bias into the data. I firstly attempted to mitigate the bias by explaining to participants that all their contributions are anonymous and that there are no right or wrong answers. Secondly, I positioned myself as a researcher having an international background, which I hoped would make me more approachable. Using semi-structured interviewing as a technique further allowed me to probe issues when I felt that social desirability may be a relevant issue.

As I asked participants about their expectations prior to arrival, as well as to recall experiences in Germany that may lie some months to years in the past, there may be a problem of proximity.
Recall bias implies that subjects in two groups may report past events differently (cf. Hassan 2006). In this case, memories of how strongly a participant may have felt about a certain experience may have fainted more over time for participants who are well-integrated or assimilated, as opposed to participants who may have held onto the feeling, as it triggered their feelings of exclusion from society. However, the main causal variables, namely the perception of general levels of Horizontal Inequality, as well as intergroup boundaries, are expected to span rather long periods of time, reaching the time of the interview itself. Hence, recall bias is a certain issue, but it is not primarily relevant for the study as it is designed.

Finally, participation bias may be a concern, as participation in interviews was voluntary. It can be expected that individuals with strong negative emotions towards German society would be less interested in participating, as they may see the study as a “German” project. On the other hand, well-adapted and integrated individuals may be more interested in participating. This may create for instance issues of generalisability. This concern cannot be completely mitigated. To limit the impact however, I did not rely on individuals contacting me (for instance through leaflets). Instead, I visited relevant courses and directly approached participants. Moreover, my sample included the population of two entire courses at two different schools. This partly alleviates the potential participation bias.

In order to further mitigate some of the shortcomings explained in this section, sources are triangulated. A second phase of interviewing is conducted with experts drawn from relevant organisations. Hence, while some information may be lost due to self-censorship, recall bias or language barriers in the Phase I, the second phase of interviewing may allow to partly alleviate these biases. As the interview partners in Phase II do not talk about themselves, but instead of their work and the experiences of others, especially social desirability bias is lowered. Recall bias may be an issue, but rather related to individual stories than to general patterns they observe in their work. While obtaining primary information from people affected by discrimination is necessary in order to truly test the causal mechanism as it is designed, experts working in this field may have other insights due to their perspective and experience. Hence, the triangulation of sources allows to make up for some shortcomings that one source exposes, but not the other.
3.6. Reverse Causation

There is a possibility of a reverse causation between discrimination and acculturation that is also explored in previous research. As shown by previous studies, differing migrant/receiving society attitudes towards acculturation can be the intervening variable between acculturation and discrimination (Jasinskaja-Lahtti et al. 2003; Te Lindert et al. 2008). Heightened discrimination might be the result of a migrant preferring a different kind of acculturation than the majority society. The potential for conflict and discrimination is lower where acculturation orientations are in agreement (Jasinskaja-Lahtti et al. 2003). In the German context, it may be that someone is more discriminated against because s/he is less integrated (Jasinskaja-Lahtti et al. 2003). An associated effect, that should not be underestimated, is the finding that for instance greater ethnic identity leads to heightened perceived discrimination in turn (Branscombe, Schmitt, and Harvey 1999; Ward 2013). To also adapt the research design to this challenge, I include a question specifically asking for participants’ own response to Horizontal Inequality, namely whether they think their experience of discrimination influenced the way they see German society. This may in turn be subject to strong social desirability bias, but lacking the possibility to conduct a longer-term study, this is seen as one acceptable way of addressing the issue. I also included a question relating to acculturation attitudes at arrival. Further, I triangulate the data with expert interviews. However, the possibility of a reverse causation cannot be ruled out. Yet, I argue that it is not primarily relevant, because if the causation works both ways, these drives are mutually reinforcing: An increase in group boundaries may therefore lead to increased discrimination (actual and perceived levels), which may in turn further increase group boundaries. With this potential for self-perpetuating conflict in mind, the next section will therefore turn to the presentation of the findings.
4. Findings

This chapter presents the findings of the empirical research conducted, beginning with a general overview. It then assesses the correlation of the IV and the DV in the data, in order to select the cases where the IV is observed. Following this selection of cases, process-tracing is applied to them to assess the causal relation and each step of the causal mechanism.

4.1. General Overview of the Data

Interviews\(^{13}\) in Phase I were conducted with 26 primarily concerned individuals who had migrated to Germany between the past 1-8 years. Interviews were held in March and April 2018. The figure below illustrates interviewees’ countries of origin. The large majority of participants came from Syria, followed by Afghanistan, Turkey and Iran. This broadly reflects recent migration trends into the EU as described by the IOM (International Organization for Migration (IOM) 2018). In 2017, most asylum applicants in Germany came, in decreasing frequency, from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Eritrea, and Iran (Eurostat 2018), hence predominantly Middle Eastern countries and countries in conflict.

![Participant Countries of Origin](image)

Participant countries of origin (Figure 4)

\(^{13}\) Interview transcripts can be provided upon request.
The average age of participants in Phase I was 23.12 years, with a median of 22 and all of them were of legal age. Participants had spent on average 3 years in Germany since arrival. While attention was paid to obtaining female interview partners (for instance specifically asking for female interviewees during the snowball sampling process), only six of the interviewees were women. This mirrors the rather high representation of men amongst the population of recently migrated\textsuperscript{14}.

Expert interviews were conducted with individuals working in a number of NGOs, based in Berlin and Hamburg, during Phase II. I also contacted representatives of several relevant government institutions, but they declined. Hence, experts who agreed to be interviewed worked at the NGO ReachOut, the Network against Discrimination and Islamophobia and the Central Council of Muslims in Germany, the information centre for migrants Café Exil, and a refugee shelter.

\textbf{4.2. Assessing the Correlation}

The 26 interviews of Phase I were subject to a two-fold analysis, consisting in firstly identifying relevant cases, through assessing the correlation, and proceeding with process-tracing for these relevant cases, supplemented by a controlled comparison of the two groups.

To begin with, all interviews were coded according to the codebook to be found in the appendix. I then identified the cases where the IV was present, i.e. where \textit{Horizontal Inequality} was high. This meant that participants perceived discrimination as something meaningful, unjust, and occurring on a fairly regular basis, because they had immigrated. Based on this operationalisation, in 3 of 26 interviews, participants felt that they were subject to high Horizontal Inequality. This low number in itself is remarkable. Generally, interviewees displayed strikingly positive attitudes towards experiences of discrimination and often described them as acts of isolated individuals, or as “not as bad”. Yet, the majority of interviewees (61,53\%) described to have experienced some kind of discrimination:

\begin{quote}
“The old lady [on the subway] asked me where I was from. I said I was from Afghanistan. She said: “You are a terrorist!” I said: “What are you saying?” Oh, she also asked: “Are you a Muslim?” I said „Yes, I am Muslim."
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{14} According to the UNHCR, since January 2017, around 68\% of “Mediterranean sea arrivals” into the EU were men, 12.9\% were women and 19\% were children (UNHCR 2018).
She said: “You are a terrorist!” “Huh?” I said, „what, what kind of a terrorist?” She said: „No, all Muslims are terrorists.”15 (Interview 1-1803-1-M)

“There are always problems for foreigners, they are always insulted. I personally have been insulted two or three times. An old lady said to me – back when I was still living in the first reception facility – one of the neighbours said: “What are you doing here?!” I said: “We live in the container here. Do you see that?” – “Yes, we have to work! And you sleep here!” And I said: “Yes, what should I do? I’ll come work with you.” (laughs) She said: “No! Fucking refugees. Fucking, fucking people…” (Interview 4-1803-3-M)

These quotes show how discrimination mostly occurs in daily situations and is completely unexpected by those concerned. The quotes also expose some typical kinds of prejudice that many people of a different background are confronted with. However, such isolated experiences of discrimination were not coded as high Horizontal Inequality as operationalised for this paper. Instead, discrimination had to be perceived as rather frequent and systematic in order for it to count as high Horizontal Inequality.

Following the coding process, the correlation between the IV and the DV was observed, as explained above. In all 3 cases where the IV Horizontal Inequality was high, the DV was, as hypothesised, low integration/assimilation on the side of the interviewee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Horizontal Inequality</th>
<th>Integration/Assimilation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low (present) / High (past)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 All interview excerpts cited in this study were translated into English by the author.
This illustrates that the participant group did indeed follow the least likely case criterion: The large majority of interviewees had somehow adopted German identity (whether while keeping their previous identity largely intact or distancing themselves from it). The table shows only two additional cases in which integration/assimilation was low, while the IV was absent. In this context, it should be mentioned that process-tracing does not claim that the causal mechanism explored is the only relevant mechanism at work (Beach and Pedersen 2013). It does not test competing explanations. The section on alternative explanations will however return to this discussion on other variables that were found to be relevant during the analysis.

4.3. Assessing the Causal Mechanism

The scope conditions of high Horizontal Inequality were therefore met in cases 22, 23 and 25. The following section tests for the causal mechanism in these cases where the IV was present.

---

16 Codes have been changed in this section to increase anonymity, i.e. to decrease the disclosure of personal details and protect the interviewees.
### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Horizontal Inequality</th>
<th>Grievance</th>
<th>Increased Group Boundaries</th>
<th>Integrated / Assimilated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>High (social)</td>
<td>No explicit coding for grievance. Yet, it implicitly becomes clear that experiences must have elicited negative feelings, also because the interviewee entered confrontations with people mentioned.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>High (social, economic)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>High (social, economic)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presence of CM for relevant cases. (Table 3)

Table 2 above summarises the findings for each step of the CM where the IV Horizontal Inequality was high. It shows that in cases 22, 23 and 25, indicators for each step of the causal mechanism were present. I will now proceed to outline the results for each step of the CM, providing individual examples.

### 4.3.1. IV: High Horizontal Inequality

Generally, as hypothesised, only certain kinds of Horizontal Inequality were found to be of importance to interviewees. In particular, the kinds of Horizontal Inequality that were raised fell along the dimensions of economic and social Horizontal Inequality. The quotes below highlight inequalities related to one’s residence status and associated societal status (which one may categorise as social Horizontal Inequality).

“I waited for one year to receive the ticket to go to German class. One year! Why? I waited one year just to get a ticket and to go to German class? This is no justice for me. For others. In the beginning, I wrote a lot of letters to the foreign ministry, the Federal Office, the Federal Authority, to everyone, I wrote, please help me. What should I do in Germany? I am a civil engineer in Iran, but not here. Here, I am just an asylum seeker.” (23)
“It is a bit difficult. There are many differences [in treatment], for instance between Afghans and Syrians. Syrians get their residence permit after two months. For instance, my brother has been in Germany for three and a half years, and he still has no residence permit.” (22)

This theme of injustice experienced surfaces again in the case of the third interviewee, and it provides an important reason for the distress experienced by him. The Horizontal Inequality he experiences lies at the intersection of economic and social Horizontal Inequality, which highlights that the different dimensions of Horizontal Inequality are often related.

“A: The school system in Germany is very, very difficult for us. That’s what I wanted to say. (…) My brother was 17 years old and he wanted to change schools to be next to where we live now. Because before he came here, he had surgery in Syria. He had stomach cancer. He is still sick, we need to go to the hospital every three months. It’s a very difficult illness. And we wanted a school next to where we live, and his head teacher said that day, if you find a place in a school, you can do that. We found a place. (…) And we went to the headmaster of my brother’s school, and he just said that he won’t be allowed to do that.

B: Why not?

A: No reason. Just like that. He has to do these two years in that school. [The headmaster] said you can’t just change schools in Germany. (…) My brother passed his Certificate of Secondary Education in Syria. (…) And he wanted to do his General Certificate of Secondary Education here and they told him that he wasn’t allowed to. Well, the headmaster just said to him: “We don’t need doctors or lawyers in Germany. We just need apprentices.” That’s what he told him. That is... like I said, I just had problems with my head teacher, but my brother has a problem in his entire school. And that is really difficult in Germany.” (25)

Like the previous quote, this statement shows that experiences of close family members can translate into one’s own experiences of Horizontal Inequality. While the interviewee does not speak about himself, the injustice experienced by his brother clearly translates into his own experience, as he is very invested in the wellbeing of his brother. Further, arbitrary treatment through the headmaster that is experienced as unfair by the interviewee. Arbitrary treatment is a recurring theme throughout many experiences portrayed. Relatedly, one of the interviewees recounts:

A: Last week I went to the Federal Authority. I just asked the security because I had written a letter to the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office sent an answer and I went to the Federal authority to talk to Secura17: “Please take a look at my email.” They said: “No, you have to get out” and they hit me. Answered with blows. I called the police, so they would come. Last week.

B: Why?

17 Secura is a major security firm in Hamburg and also contracted by official bodies.
A: Federal Authority Hammerbrook. I don’t know what the problem was. “Why do you come here”? (…) That’s normal, I always have to go there. No problem, there’s respect. You arrive there, everyone answers. But two Secura came, they answered me with blows. And why? [Because] I don’t speak German so well yet.

B: They hit you?

A: Yes. (…) Of course. I had no choice, I sat down on some stairs and called the police. The police came, took a picture (points at his cheek), saw it, everything, also on my back. “Why?” I said: “I showed them my email, what should I do, just a question, and they answered with blows.” This is Germany. The police don’t look.”

There are several reasons why this account is seriously concerning. Firstly, the security firm raised by the interviewee is contracted by many public bodies, including social services such as migrant reception facilities. The interviewee is also clear about the fact that he was targeted because he doesn’t speak German very well yet, hence he is clear about the racist motive. Finally, the interviewee feels that the police look away in such cases. He later raises again that, in his opinion, police in Germany do not care about issues concerning migrants. The injustice experienced by him therefore spans not only individuals, but people employed by the government and government bodies themselves. This is returned to in the next section.

It can be noted here that the causal chain mostly ends at the first step for participants who do not experience discrimination as something profoundly unfair. This is generally associated with a perception of lower Horizontal Inequality. As argued by Williams (R. M. Williams 2003), the evaluation of injustice is therefore a necessary condition in order for profound grievance to be felt. Interviewees may thus relate experiences of Horizontal Inequality, sometimes they also describe that they were upset at the time. Yet, they do not describe these experiences as something severely unjust and feelings of grievance did not last, where they were mentioned to have been present at the time. This finding will be returned to in the discussion.

4.3.2. Grievance

Grievances were felt by all interviewees who perceived Horizontal Inequality to be high. This distressing effect of perceived Horizontal Inequality, or discrimination, on those concerned was also echoed in the expert interviews conducted (Expert Interviews: Café Exil, 2018; Reach Out, 2018; Central Council of Muslims in Germany, 2018). Moreover, the more severe the experience of Horizontal Inequality, generally speaking, the more severe the grievance experienced by the interviewee. The following quote illustrates the most extreme of grievances:
“I don’t know what to do. That’s the question I always ask myself: Am I a human or an animal? Why do they all look at my hair – my hair is black, that is my problem. Always, always, lots of racists. In all the firms. They look at me and say: No, we are sorry. Why? I am also human. I have been living in a container and in a sports hall for 28 months. Why don’t I have a home?” (22)

It shows how someone can feel having been subjected to prolonged periods of severe Horizontal Inequality. There is a tone of despair, as well as a reference to lacking control over one’s life and even being deprived of one’s humanity.

Another interviewee relates to the question whether he feels that people treat him unfairly because he is not of German birth:

“A: I am prepared for these things. I think there are always bad people who don’t want to see any foreigners, or who get angry when they see my black hair. I also did an internship here in Germany (…) My first internship. I didn’t speak very good German and I had a German colleague at work who was stressful. Because it was Ramadan. The month, for us, where one is supposed to fast. And during that time, my internship was on. I had to do my internship during that time. And the colleague was stressful with me, asked me what I was even doing and such things. (…) He antagonised me a lot and he… spoke German a lot and I couldn’t understand anything. Maybe he also said bad words, I don’t know. (…)

B: And that made you angry?

A: Yes.” (25)

This subject of work colleagues intentionally speaking German very quickly in order for the interviewee not to understand also surfaces in another interview. It is hard to address this kind of discrimination precisely because it seems so minor, and very subtle, but it does have a clear emotional effect on the interviewees. Another interviewee does not directly state that he felt distressed, however his account leaves little doubt that the experiences he made left a negative emotional impact on him:

“A: My brother and I were in a small reception facility at first. Then we moved into a large reception facility, we spent one and a half years there. There were a lot of boys, that wasn’t that good, but we still had to live there. There were difficult rules. They told us “If you don’t clean that, you will be deported. This is Germany here, you have to be clean. That’s the way it is in Germany, Germany is this, Germany is that.” I had some problems with the custodian. I was kicked out by my custodian, even though it wasn’t my fault. No idea.

B: What do you mean?

A: There was a custodian there who was German. In my opinion he was racist. Against Afghans, I believe. He didn’t like Afghans. He just looked for excuses to make trouble with Afghans. That’s why I got kicked out twice. Once, for instance, I had a trophy at home. I had won it at a football match. He came into my room and said:
“Where did you get this from?” I said: “I won it.” And he said: “No, you stole it.” I said: “No.” I went to my custodian and complained, I also had the photos, the proofs, so I made some trouble and he threw me out until 10pm. There, I had nothing, I had to stay outside, I had no food, no money. …many had problems with him. He wanted us to become afraid. That we work properly. I spent one and a half years there.” (22)

This graphic account shows again how someone in a position of authority can have a major impact on people, whether the violence experienced is physical or not. This theme of authority figures misusing power is a recurring theme in all three interviews and will be returned to in the discussion section. This quote exposes how the grievances experienced are linked with Horizontal Inequality inflicted upon the interviewee by someone who emphasized his “German- ness”. This relates to the next step of the causal mechanism, which is the increase in group boundaries following from the prolonged exposure to Horizontal Inequality.

4.3.3. Increased Group Boundaries

For all three interviewees who experienced grievance in response to high Horizontal Inequality, heightened boundaries in relation to ethnic-origin Germans can be observed: In the interviewees’ general accounts, attitudes towards German mainstream society are more negative than those of participants who experience low Horizontal Inequality. This becomes apparent through the absence of positive descriptions (when compared to those who experience lower Horizontal Inequality) rather than the presence of negative descriptions. This may partly be due to social desirability bias, as negative attitudes may not necessarily be voiced. An example is the answer of this interviewee:

A: And before you came here, did you think, you could be both – Syrian and German?

B: …So, before I came here and until now, I do not know whether I want to stay here. I wait until the war in my country is over and then I have to see. (25)

The interviewee thus responds to the question whether he feels (partly) German by saying that he does not know whether he wants to stay in Germany. This, in itself, is a rather telling response about his feeling of identity, especially when compared with the other group (here, people generally replied with positive remarks to this question, for instance that against expectations, they now “feel fifty percent German”). One of the three interviewees, however, was very straightforward about his negative feelings:
“Germans are a bit cold. Ice cold. They don’t talk a lot. When I was in 11th grade, I had a friend, a foreign friend, and we didn’t have much contact with others. With the Germans. They also didn’t want to be in contact with us. I didn’t like that so much.” (22)

This account directly relates to the 4th step of the causal mechanism: Integration and assimilation, along the dimensions of both, intergroup contact and cultural adoption. The next section thus turns to the final step of the causal mechanism.

4.3.4. DV: Lower Integration / Assimilation

As introduced by the previous quote, the increase in group boundaries, hence attitudes towards and beliefs about mainstream German society, is linked to behaviours. This section therefore presents findings relating to intergroup contact and cultural adoption. The quote continues as follows:

“[The Germans in school] just hung out with Germans, not with foreigners. We too, I also hung out with foreigners. Even though I wanted to hang out with Germans, so my language would improve. But they didn’t want to… and then I thought, I don’t care. Fuck that. Yeah. But now I have three friends. Germans – they are not Germans, but they are born here. With them, I can also improve my German.” (22)

This statement shows how the participant decided to isolate himself from Germans following his experiences of exclusion. “If they don’t want, I don’t need them, either”, is his response to the social Horizontal Inequality he experienced in school. This finding supports that the temporal sequence is as theorised. The interviewee thus distances himself from the group he feels unaccepted by, in order to decrease his feelings of exclusion. This stands in agreement with information obtained through the expert interviews, where one expert observed that people concerned by discrimination react by “segregating themselves” (Expert Interview: Reach Out, 2018). On a sidenote, the previous interviewee does not consider his friends, while they are born in Germany, as being German (a perception his friends may echo). He therefore separates himself from the group he perceives as German and establishes social contacts amongst “foreigners” like himself. This later exchange shows that the interviewee is clearly unsure about whether he may be a part of German society:

A: In Germany, I find everything good right now. Apart from some Germans. The racist ones I mean. Not all of them. Otherwise I find it all good.

B: Okay. And about the racist Germans, you think...
A: That they’re bad, against foreigners.

B: But you can still belong to society.

A: Yeah… (sounding unsure)

B: I think you can.

A: Let’s see…

(22)

As opposed to many of the interviewees who experience low levels of Horizontal Inequality, the ones experiencing high levels of Horizontal Inequality generally show little to no adoption of German culture. Instead of integrating or assimilating into mainstream German society, interviewees rather describe behaviours of sociocultural adaptation. Sociocultural adaptation describes the skills needed to successfully navigate a new society (Ward 1996). It does not describe one’s adherence to this society. Such skills may include for instance language skills or knowledge about social customs. This is in accordance with acculturation research as described in the beginning of the paper. Similarly, another interviewee relates:

“I live well, or not that well, but I am here. This is also my country. And I am always respectful and have no problems with other people. With the police. I am always calm, but I am always just looking for justice, but until now I don’t see it. I lived in a reception facility for four months, with many people from other countries. My biggest problem is: No contact with German men, German women. Always, always contact with Syrians, Afghans, Iranians.” (23)

In contrast to the other interviewee, this interviewee implies that he would like to have contact with Germans. Yet, establishing social contacts with Germans is something particularly difficult for most interviewees, irrespective of whether they experience high levels or low levels of Horizontal Inequality. This finding is supported by observations of an expert interviewed (Expert Interview: Refugee Shelter, 2018).

The previous quote, however, also illustrates the difference between accepting that one is (at least temporarily) at home in a country, on the one hand, and feeling a part of the society in that country, on the other hand. In this respect, it is similar to the penultimate quote, where the interviewee said that he liked everything about Germany, apart from some Germans. This previous interviewee shows similar adaptational behaviours:
“In my opinion... I am not like Germans, but almost. I have accepted the culture, I stick to the rules... (...) I absolutely want to stay here. This is why I adapted\textsuperscript{18} to the culture. I stick to the rules, I go to school, I do sports, I don’t annoy other people, I respect others. Yes.” (22)

As in the previous causal step, in all three cases, the absence of the DV (of integration/assimilation) can best be observed through comparison with the other participant group. In comparison, lower integration or assimilation becomes visible through a \textit{complete lack of positive comments} about German culture, habits, or activities with members of German mainstream society, rather than \textit{explicitly negative comments}. Positive comments were very enthusiastic and frequent amongst some interviewees in the other group, sometimes raised less frequently by others – but they were present in all other interviews but one: Namely one where the interviewee did not integrate or assimilate into the new society.

To summarise, the findings indicate that the causal mechanism was therefore present as theorised. The findings further highlight a number of important aspects. Firstly, as expected, economic and social Horizontal Inequality were found to be most important, whereas cultural and political Horizontal Inequality were not explicitly raised by interviewees. Secondly, the evaluation of injustice was fundamental for perceiving Horizontal Inequalities as major. In this context, several themes emerged, relating to the role of authority figures misusing their power, arbitrary treatment, and the connection to official or government bodies. In turn, interviewees’ grievances were in accordance with length and severity of the Horizontal Inequality perceived. Prolonged or severe exposure to Horizontal Inequality implied that people were particularly distressed. For all three interviewees experiencing high Horizontal Inequality, grievance was in turn related to more negative/less positive attitudes and behaviours towards German mainstream society, hence lower assimilation or integration compared to the other group. One of the interviewees explicitly links one of his experiences of social Horizontal Inequality to his subsequent dissociating from German peers. These and further findings will be examined in the following section.

\footnote{18 The interviewee used the German expression \textit{sich angleichen}, which can be translated as \textit{to adapt}, \textit{to conform}, or \textit{to align}.}
5. Discussion

Following the presentation of the main findings in the previous section, this chapter discusses these findings, the implications for the theory, as well as additional relevant observations.

5.1. General Causal Mechanism

The findings are indicative that perceived Horizontal Inequality has a negative impact on the ability of migrants to integrate and assimilate into the receiving society. The general causal mechanism has been observed as theorised, albeit through a limited number of total cases. The findings suggest that high perceived Horizontal Inequality, especially in the social and the economic domain, leads to profound grievances. These grievances in turn seem to decrease the ability of interviewees to feel at home in German society, as they increased identity boundaries and thus lowered their ability to integrate or assimilate.

Contrasting the two groups, grievances were not only raised by interviewees who perceived Horizontal Inequality to be high. However, the findings support the notion that isolated experiences of grievance are experienced as less severe than experiences of grievance that are repeated or span longer periods of time. This may point towards other important variables: the length and severity of the experience of Horizontal Inequality and associated grievance. This is in accordance with Williams and colleagues, who find the length of discriminatory treatment to be related to the negative reaction it elicits (Williams, Shore, and Grahe 1998).

Further themes that emerged relate to the role of authority figures misusing their power, arbitrary treatment (strongly connected to interviewees’ evaluation of injustice), and the role of official or government bodies. Interpersonal discrimination was generally dealt with by most interviewees surprisingly well. The experiences portrayed in interviews 22, 23 and 25 are however indicative of the importance of authority or state representatives when assessing Horizontal Inequality. There are two central implications of this finding. To begin with, when the person engaging in discriminatory behaviour occupies a position of authority, such experiences may be more likely to transform into prolonged periods of unjust treatment. Hence, in the light of the previous finding, where prolonged experiences of discrimination lead to more severe grievance, this assumes particular importance. Secondly, if the discriminating individual occupies an official function, this may merge the individual with official institutions, such as public bodies, in the perception of the person discriminated against. This adds another layer of
complexity and importance to the issue because instances of discrimination through official bodies were judged more severe by interviewees than discrimination experienced by unknown people on the street. Knowing that in front of the law, everyone is considered equal, may thus be a critical factor, as illustrated by the following quote:

„If everybody thought as in the constitution, there wouldn’t be any problem for me. But the constitution is here and the people are there. And that is the reason the constitution exists. To regulate everything. People have differing understandings of freedom. What is freedom for one is not freedom for the other. That’s what laws are for. If everybody stuck to the laws, that would be good.” (Interview 8-1803-M)

Considering oneself accepted as equal on the legal level may therefore be an important coping strategy for people to prevent feeling exposed to Horizontal Inequality. Previous research also provides some background to this: When Horizontal Inequality is perceived to be state-sanctioned, the risk of violent group mobilisation is said to increase (Brown and Langer 2010, 31) and when groups feel excluded from access to state power, their grievances become much more acute (Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). However, state and individual levels partly break down where individuals occupy state functions. There have indeed been several cases of intentional physical mistreatment of migrants by employees of security firms in state facilities (inter alia Hengst 2014; MDR 2018). Concerned were for instance reception facilities in a number of regions in Germany, where migrants and refugees are housed for periods from several months to years. Findings of right-wing extremists having undercut the private security sector in Germany have been corroborated in recent years (Fischer 2017). This stands in accordance with the experience of two interviewees that people charged with securing public spaces (whether offices or reception facilities) were in fact reasons for their insecurity. These were two interviewees who judged Horizontal Inequalities to be particularly high and were markedly less integrated or assimilated into society. In sum, these observations indicate that individual and state lines may become blurred in the eyes of individuals experiencing Horizontal Inequality. As Horizontal Inequality supported or committed by the state elicit increased levels of grievance, the potential for increases in group boundaries and escalation is therefore higher.

5.2. Different Dimensions of Horizontal Inequality

Regarding the different dimensions of Horizontal Inequality, social and economic Horizontal Inequality were found to be most relevant in this study. On the other hand, participants broadly
expressed satisfaction with political and cultural rights such as freedom of speech and freedom of religion.

“I can just voice my opinion here, without being discriminated against, without being arrested. But in my home country, that’s not possible. You can’t say “the government, whatever”. You would be arrested while you’re saying that, or within two seconds. Yes, so freedom of speech is on place one. I need to set priorities first. Freedom of speech, equal rights, and… human rights. Even though we are foreigners or have migration background, the government does everything – not everything, but almost everything – exactly as for Germans, for refugees.” (4-1803-3-M)

This finding overlaps with previous research on first-generation migrant satisfaction with political institutions in European countries (Maxwell 2010). On a sidenote, Maxwell also finds that second-generation migrant-origin individuals are much closer to non-migrant origin individuals in satisfaction and trust scores concerning political institutions. While this was not the focus of this study, the findings also have implications for second-generation migrant-origin individuals. While the first generation compares to the home country, the second generation sees discrimination as something more systemic (Expert interview: Reach Out, 2018). This is likely because they have the expectation to be treated like anyone else born in this country, hence experiencing higher levels of injustice compared to their parent(s). This finding points towards the importance of individual expectations and therefore different thresholds of “acceptance” for experiences of discrimination.

A couple of findings, including this one, point to the relevance of interacting variables. In particular, two interacting variables that could be discussed more systematically are expectations and positive intergroup contact. The following two sections are concerned with discussing the findings surrounding these.

5.3. Expectations

The findings suggest that expectations play an important role in shaping responses to experiences of discrimination. Most interviewees did not have a precise picture of Germany prior to arrival. This implies that interviewees often did not have precise expectations. Meanwhile, where expectations exist, they are critical benchmarks for reality:

A: And when you arrived here, do you remember your first thoughts? What you saw first in Germany? How were the people?
B: That was completely different [than what I thought], for instance the people. We thought the people here were completely non-Muslim, would do things in a completely different way. But here, everything was totally, totally different. Everybody is so friendly, they are not against us because of Islam. We thought they would maybe hit us. Or tell us: “If you want to live here, you are not allowed to wear your headscarf and have a religion”. But when I saw it here, I found it unbelievable. They accept Muslims and other religions. All religions. (1-1803-2-F)

Many interviewees underwent serious hardships and difficulties in their home country and/or on their way to Europe. In comparison, life in Germany seems peaceful and relatively fair to them – because individuals evaluate their experiences in light of what they previously lived through.

The findings indicate that there are two kinds of experiences people make that seem to shape their expectations, in turn influencing their evaluation of experiences of discrimination: Firstly, their experiences and the situation in countries of origin. These can sometimes be particularly difficult, especially for people fleeing from war and armed conflict, as recounted by this interviewee:

“In my country, there are also people who want to live. But – I don’t know, when there are a lot of problems, one doesn’t want to live any more. One wonders why one is still alive… and when I came here, and now, I think, life is beautiful.” (1-1803-4-F)

Of a second kind are experiences people make on their way to the receiving country. In particular, it was often mentioned by interviewees if they made negative experiences in other receiving countries over a certain period of time. An often-cited example is Turkey, where the human rights situation is generally concerning, to say the least (Human Rights Watch 2018). One interviewee relates:

A: But Turkey was really bad. Really bad.

B: Right, were you in Turkey for a longer time?

A: I was there for a month… (...) We came to Greece with a rubber dinghy. Whoa. One rubber dinghy, forty people! Once, we were on the water, and right here were Greek waters, there the Turkish ones. All of a sudden, the police came. They threw all of us into prison. I was there for a month. In prison. They really beat me. Whoa. In Turkey, they are really bad.

B: Yes... when was that?

B: That was in 2015. Yes. That was really bad. Then I came to Greece, I was in Greece for a month, too. And yes, Hungary is also shit. The police in Hungary are also shit. And then I came to Germany. But here, thank God… I am pleased, here, it’s really good for me.” (1-1803-1-M)
The above quotes illustrate that negative experiences thus shaped interviewees’ expectations of how they would be treated in Germany. Again, in comparison to such experiences, life in Germany is relatively peaceful and respondents were often positively surprised despite isolated instances of discrimination.

Moreover, interviewees who had spent extended periods of time in other countries, generally in Turkey, before coming to Germany, already experienced acculturation in another society. This seemed to have prepared them for acculturation processes in German society, making the processes easier for them. This is raised by several interviewees, as the following quote illustrates:

“Well, Turkey and Germany are not all that different. And I experienced things in Turkey. I prepared for the culture and everyday life, so to say. How people do things (…) So I was not surprised, a little, well I also have to say, religion also plays an important role. (…) But I was not at all as surprised as others. There were people who came directly here from Syria. It was such a shock for them.” (6-1803-8-M)

A particular case was that of women with headscarves. They are exposed to very high levels of discrimination (Expert interviews: Reach Out, 2018; Central Council of Muslims in Germany, 2018). As also explained by one interviewee wearing the hijab:

“If you are looking for a job, they check whether you are a Muslim and wearing a headscarf. Then, they… for example if they have to decide between two people, one with headscarf, one without, then they choose the one without, for sure. That’s safer in this work. For instance, I worked in a shop for one month. With a friend, who was also Afghani. Our boss gave her many rights, because she was not wearing a headscarf. She said, she has more qualifications than you. You are wearing a headscarf. If we send one without headscarf, she does it better. So, I have seen this difference myself.” (1-1803-2-F)

Such visibility influencing levels of discrimination corroborates previous findings on this relation (Ward 2013). However, at the same time, this interviewee emphasises the freedoms she now enjoys:

“I am very, very happy, because I have found my freedom, my security, especially my security here. And I have my own life here. In our home country, especially us women cannot have our own lives. There are many things we aren’t allowed to do, we aren’t allowed to think, to say, what we would like, to decide ourselves. But here in Germany, I have everything.” (1-1803-2-F)

Especially the female interviewees from Afghanistan in this study emphasised that they highly appreciate the opportunity to go to school and take decisions they would have been unable to take before. Generally, these women seemed to have very high resilience against the
discrimination they experienced. The following interviewee also emphasises the positive experiences, despite the discrimination she experiences:

“Not many, but some people are [unfair] when you wear a headscarf. They look at you and you think they hate you. (…) I always look at everything from both sides. Of course, there are some people who look in a weird way, but there are also some people who are just nice. For example, we are here now, we can go to school here and live in peace here and they help us to stand on our own two feet. I think one has to be grateful that they do such things for us.” (1-1803-4-F)

However, in some cases, difficult experiences in countries of origin or countries of transit did not balance the scales. In particular, where previous expectations were not fulfilled, interviewees were far less inclined to discount experiences of Horizontal Inequality. These expectations may be based on both, hearsay and/or the standard of life people enjoyed in their countries of origin.

5.4. Positive Interactions

A second important variable that seems to moderate the hypothesised relation between Horizontal Inequality and integration/assimilation are positive relations with host society members. This will not come as a surprise to the reader: Research in social psychology suggests that positive intergroup contact is particularly effective in reducing intergroup prejudice (inter alia Pettigrew et al. 2011).

Many interviewees in the group with low Horizontal Inequality also relate their positive experiences with Germans. The lack of positive experiences raised by the other group may partly be due to recall bias – participants who have already increased their group boundaries may be less able to recall positive experiences. Yet, especially prolonged experiences, such as friendships or contact with classmates, are unlikely to be completely omitted in either group.

“People here are friendly with one another. In families, too, there are many things people care about, I think that is also great. They also have a warm family, they have their celebrations, for example Christmas… well, they have such things. I’ve also been with a German family [for Christmas], I found that great.” (4-1803-2-M)

Yet, only a part of the interviewees had German contacts, despite their good German skills. Another important factor in this regard was the importance of overwhelming first impressions in Germany, some of which were influenced by the eruption of German hospitality during the summer of migration:
A: And when you arrived – do you remember the first Germans you met?

B: Yes, they were very nice and when we arrived with the bus in Munich, they welcomed us and waved at us. (smiles) They were really nice. They also gave us food and all sorts of things. (6-1803-3-M)

Positive experiences with members of German society were generally associated with a bigger ability to differentiate. The following interviewee has a number of close German friends and casually describes:

“My nazi neighbour, he’s always ranting and babbling, but when I see him outside, I still say hello nicely. He also says hello back. So, he can’t be that bad of a person. But well, these are always people who act in a superficial manner. Who don’t know the true. Because, I think, one always has to know each person before being able to somehow judge. I can’t just say: “Look, he didn’t teach his child anything.” Maybe he couldn’t do it, maybe he didn’t know how to do it, maybe he is unable to cope, what do I know. There are always backgrounds. That’s why: look first and then judge, before you judge too quickly.” (3-1803-F)

In general, people who had German friends also emphasised that it helped their German language abilities, and thus, their adaptation. Notably, the ability to respond to discrimination once they learned German was also highlighted by a number of interviewees. This is related to the ability to confront people:

“We didn’t speak German yet, and [the custodian] wanted us to be afraid. So that we work properly in the future. But if he now came to me and said something, I could answer: “You are nothing.”” (1-1803-5-M)

It was also mentioned in interviews from both, Phase I and Phase II, that people felt they were treated in a more respectful way once they spoke some German (inter alia Expert Interview: Café Exil, 2018). This is also relevant because migrants who do not speak German yet face much higher barriers to file complaints with authorities when they experience discrimination. The general reluctance to file complaints is also raised in one of the expert interviews (Expert Interview: Reach Out, 2018). This knowledge may even be used consciously by some people looking to systematically discriminate against migrants, hence, awareness of this relation is important. On the other hand, the potential for misunderstandings and communication barriers is also much higher when the people involved do not speak the same language. Therefore, perceptions may also play a large role in evaluating such situations.
5.5. Generalisability and Alternative Explanations

As the main findings and trends in the data have now been discussed, the following section turns towards their generalisability. To this end, general methodological literature as well as expert interviews are considered.

It is often raised that process-tracing cannot be used to generalise to a population beyond the sample chosen (Beach and Pedersen 2013, 70). Process-tracing allows to establish whether an event took place, whether it led to a certain outcome, and whether the outcome was caused by the former event (Mahoney 2012). It thus assesses whether a mechanism is present in a particular case, but any generalisation beyond this particular case is usually not possible. There is, however a caveat: cross-case inferences can be made when a comparative design is chosen, such as several cases or a least-likely case selection (Beach and Pedersen 2013, 70). If the least likely case exposes a particular process, this process can be expected to be observed in the rest of the population, as well.

This is of relevance for the study at hand. The least-likely case selection allows to generalise beyond the sample chosen. The sample selected consisted of migrants most likely to make efforts to integrate or assimilate into their new society. Hence, the cases were selected on the least-likely basis. This reflects in the very high ratio of cases of high integration/assimilation within the sample. Without being able to comment of the frequency with which the observed process would be found in the general population (Rohlfing 2012, 205) of migrants in Hamburg, I argue that the observed process should also be found in other, “more likely” cases. The expert interviews from Berlin were in agreement with expert interviews from Hamburg, which, while the data is limited, indicates that the dynamics in these large cities are broadly comparably. Moreover, it may be argued that in environments with higher levels of discrimination (e.g. regions with high popular support for anti-immigration policies, such as much of rural eastern Germany) the mechanism may not only be present, but even more relevant. However, this remains to be tested in future studies.

Considering the peace and conflict literature, the findings of this study may be relevant to the general domain of Horizontal Inequality, but in particular relating to Horizontal Inequality in Sons of the Soil conflicts and other contexts defined by migration. The causal mechanism explored provides evidence for the micro-level dynamics of migrant-host population tensions. The findings support the relevance of Horizontal Inequalities for not only creating grievances, but indeed increasing intergroup boundaries in those who feel affected by Horizontal Inequality.
The mechanism of this study may be adapted for future research: The micro-dynamics tested here may theoretically be linked to different behavioural conflictual intergroup outcomes. The CM may therefore also be one basis for a later escalation into violent conflict, which is also explored by previous studies (inter alia Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013; Østby 2016; Côté and Mitchell 2015).

Concerning research on acculturation, the precise acculturative outcomes may vary according to context and cannot be generalised from the findings of this study. While the findings are indicative that the CM outcome may still be lower integration/assimilation, it remains to be researched whether it is rather associated with separation or marginalisation in different contexts. In this study, interviewees were recruited from the city of Hamburg. While the acculturation strategy they pursued was not measured, certain factors in a city make it easier to separate oneself from the majority host society. The most important factor is the existence of subcultures and cultural diversity. In villages, where only few migrants are settled, separation should be more difficult to pursue, simply because there may be no “alternative options”.19 Moreover, contact between migrants and host society members is likely higher in villages than in big, more anonymous cities. This can have positive, as well as negative implications, depending on the nature of contact. In addition, other societies may have different levels of cultural diversity (which would impact both, perceptions of discrimination as well as actual discrimination) government policies on multicultural values and immigration. Hence, the precise acculturative outcomes would vary according to the context. However, it was not the aim of this study to establish a preferred acculturation strategy for migrants faced with Horizontal Inequality. Instead, the aim was to show that the two strategies leading to most peaceful intergroup relations (integration and assimilation) may be counteracted through the presence of Horizontal Inequalities. The findings of this least-likely case study lend support to this claim. There is also some ground to suggest that as the underlying causal mechanism is psychological (instead of for instance concerning organisational structures), it may be observed in a similar form in different settings.

Meanwhile, it should be maintained that process-tracing does not test for alternative explanations. It does not claim that the causal mechanism observed is the only causal mechanism present in the case studied (Beach and Pedersen 2013). There is thus room for

19 Individuals may thus be more likely to be marginalized (instead of pursuing a separational approach) if the causal mechanism was observed.
alternative relevant explanations, which is apt considering the multicausal nature of social phenomena.

As argued above, there is the possibility of a reverse causation. While it was difficult to explore the time sequence due to the temporal limitations of this study, there are nonetheless indices that the causal mechanism worked in the expected direction and order. In one case, the interviewee explicitly states that he first sought contact with German peers but decided to distance himself when he felt rejected due to his ethnic background. Moreover, there was a question included that aimed at capturing the causal sequence (“Do you think these negative experiences influenced your view of Germans in general?”). It relied on participants being completely honest and open, despite the social desirability bias associated with it. None of the three interviewees in the group with high perceived Horizontal Inequality answered this question. Instead, all of them spoke about something vaguely related, for instance about coping mechanisms. This stands in stark contrast with the other group, where interviewees made efforts to present differentiated views of German society. This observation hints to social desirability bias preventing participants from speaking what they may have thought. It is indicative that especially the experiences of high Horizontal Inequality may have indeed influenced the way interviewees perceive German society, as they evaded the question. Hence, these two observations suggest that the temporal sequence hypothesized was correct. However, it needs to be maintained that it is still likely that heightened intergroup boundaries in turn further increased perceived levels of Horizontal Inequality.

Furthermore, levels of Horizontal Inequality perceived are likely to be heightened when there is disagreement on acculturation strategies between migrants and the receiving society (Bourhis et al. 1997b; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al. 2003; Berry and Sabatier 2010). From this point of view, the relation between discrimination and intergroup boundaries could be spurious. Yet, I argue that high levels of (subjective and objective) Horizontal Inequalities can be caused by a variety of factors. Disagreement on acculturation strategies is merely one of these factors. Other factors include for instance higher actual Horizontal Inequalities in a certain societal context at large, or higher Horizontal Inequalities due to the physical appearance of a migrant making him/her a more likely target of discrimination. Examples of the latter may include the wearing of headscarves, or black hair, as discussed previously, or darker skin tones, in Germany. The present study does however not assess the importance of these factors in influencing the IV. Social studies isolate certain variables and phenomena to assess their relation. The aim is not to comprehensively explain social realities, but instead to focus on the dynamics of a set of
variables under certain conditions. Hence, levels of Horizontal Inequality are influenced by a variety of factors but assessing the hypothesised causal relation remains central to the scope of this paper, as long as a spurious relation can be deemed unlikely.

Considering the DV, levels of assimilation/integration are likely not only affected by Horizontal Inequality, but also by other factors. Important factors found in previous research include for instance naturalisation/citizenship (Ersanilli and Koopmans 2011; Zlobina et al. 2006) and length of residence in the receiving country (Zlobina et al. 2006). Moreover, the mechanism is likely to be influenced by other individual psychological factors. For instance, personal self-esteem may play a role in mitigating the effects of perceived discrimination. This is suggested by findings by Berry and Sabatier on adaptation (Berry and Sabatier 2010). Individuals with higher personal self-esteem may thus be more resilient to threats to their collective (group-based) self-esteem. Here, the importance of previous expectations raised above resurfaces. Individuals having been confronted with many hardships throughout their previous life may be more equipped to deal with further difficulties, which is also suggested by the findings.

Keeping these complexities in mind, the present study does not claim to assess the relative importance of other variables and dynamics. The findings do however support the presence of the proposed causal mechanism in the cases studied. The precise frequency, or relative importance of the mechanism, is likely to vary according to different contexts. However, as the relation was observed in a least-likely case, it can be reasoned that in other cases, it may also be of relevance for explaining the relation between Horizontal Inequality and lower integration and acculturation. Further research may be useful to explore possible variations in different contexts, and to define the mechanism further.
The present study explored the causal mechanism between Horizontal Inequality and integration/assimilation into a new society. Discrimination is one of the major factors inhibiting adaptation to a new society, but how it affects acculturation was mostly researched through correlative designs in the past. Yet, this question remains of prime importance considering political and societal developments in Europe and other parts of the world.

The findings lend support to the hypothesis that Horizontal Inequality has a negative impact on integration and assimilation. A combination of different methods was used to analyse the data obtained through 30 semi-structured interviews. The methods used for analysis included process-tracing, qualitative text analysis, and the controlled comparison method. The findings indicate that the causal mechanism proposed, leading from Horizontal Inequalities to grievances, increased group boundaries and finally to lower integration/assimilation, is accurate. The intensity of Horizontal Inequality perceived, especially the time period and frequency, was found to be of importance. In this context, findings further pointed towards the importance of the distinction between state and individual structures. There is evidence to suggest that Horizontal Inequality is judged as far more severe by migrants if they see it to be supported by public bodies, or individuals representing public bodies. This is an agreement with previous findings on Horizontal Inequality having more severe consequences where the state is perceived to be the discriminating actor (Brown and Langer 2010; Cederman, Gleditsch, and Buhaug 2013). This division between state and individual levels warrants further exploration in future studies, as particularly a blurring of lines in the perception of individuals concerned is likely to affect outcomes.

As the proposed causal mechanism was observed in a least-likely sample, albeit with a low frequency, it is even more likely to be present across other parts of migrant population in Hamburg, Germany. As it is a psychological mechanism and was tested under narrow scope conditions through a least-likely case selection, finding it under more relaxed scope conditions is likely. The causal relation remains to be tested in rural settings in particular, and possibly in other countries, to assess how transferable the mechanism may be.

The findings indicate the relevance of two variables moderating the relation, namely positive intergroup contact (balancing negative effects of discrimination) and expectations. Expectations, and previous experiences shaping these expectations, were found to be vital as they seem to shape people’s evaluation of discrimination. This is particularly relevant because
the experience of Horizontal Inequality is inherently subjective. This subjectivity, however, does not render Horizontal Inequalities any less real. To the contrary, as emphasized by interviewees, experiences of discrimination can elicit strong feelings of sadness and sometimes anger or helplessness. This is something quantitative studies find hard to grasp, but which remains central to understanding the destructive impact that racism and discrimination can have on individuals and the societal fabric constituted by them and their relations.

The findings are relevant for other domains as well, for instance Sons of the Soil conflicts. The present study indicates that stress and grievances experienced through Horizontal Inequality are important catalysts for increases in intergroup boundaries. The causal mechanism explored in this study concerns micro-dynamics underlying many migrant-host population conflicts, which may also escalate into violent conflict. Hence, the last step of the causal mechanism may be adapted to include other kinds of behavioural conflictual intergroup outcomes. Future studies may also for instance explore the effects of the variables that seemed to moderate the relationship. In particular, it may be interesting to research how prior experiences and expectations shape how discrimination is evaluated. The findings of this study point towards the existence of two different kinds of experiences implicitly influencing expectations in the acculturation context: Firstly, experiences in countries of origin, and secondly, where relevant, experiences in countries of transit. Moreover, longitudinal studies of acculturation attitudes and the dynamics influencing these are needed. Importantly, if greater ethnic boundaries entail increased sensitivity to discrimination, this can lead to a vicious circle amongst groups who feel discriminated against.

The role of perceived inequality fuelling populism and fundamentalism has been increasingly referred to in recent years, which makes research in related fields ever more necessary. It also makes it necessary to move beyond the limitations of individual research fields and combine their findings for more comprehensive analyses. Migration and intercultural relations, also within the same society, are as relevant as ever, and they will continue to be so. Gaining better understanding of the processes underlying intergroup and intercultural relations is therefore central to the future of our open societies.
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### Appendix

**List of Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1803-1-M</td>
<td>18-03-19</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1803-2-F</td>
<td>18-03-26</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1803-3-F</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1803-4-F</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1803-5-M</td>
<td>18-03-28</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1803-M</td>
<td>18-03-21</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1803-F</td>
<td>18-03-26</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1803-1-M</td>
<td>18-03-09</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1803-2-M</td>
<td>18-03-28</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1803-3-M</td>
<td>18-03-26</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 1803-1-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-1-M</td>
<td>18-03-09</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-2-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-3-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-4-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-5-F</td>
<td>18-03-28</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-6-M</td>
<td>18-03-28</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-7-M</td>
<td>18-03-29</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-8-M</td>
<td>18-03-27</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-9-M</td>
<td>18-03-29</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-10-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 1803-11-M</td>
<td>18-03-20</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1803-1-F</td>
<td>18-03-23</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1803-2-M</td>
<td>18-04-02</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1803-3-F</td>
<td>18-03-28</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 1803-M</td>
<td>18-03-27</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café Exil</td>
<td>18-04-09</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Council of Muslims in Germany</td>
<td>18-04-05</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Out</td>
<td>18-03-23</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Shelter</td>
<td>18-04-09</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Questions

Interviews were conducted in German and were translated into English to be included here.

Interviews Phase I

1. How content are you with your life in Germany?
2. What do you do in your free time?
3. Are you able to organise things alone in Germany, for instance with official bodies, or when you are looking for an apartment?
4. Did you know something about Germany before coming here? What? Do you remember your first impression of Germany upon arrival?
5. Do you find that you are keeping a part of your culture? Has your connection to your culture changed since you arrived in Germany?
6. Before you came to Germany, did you think you could be both, (xxx) and German? How do you think about this now?
7. Can you describe me an experience in Germany where you felt treated unfairly because you are (xxx)? Do you feel like this happens to you more often?
8. Did these experiences change how you think about Germans?
9. Whom would you talk to about such things? (contact information to relevant bodies)
10. What do you do when you find life in Germany difficult?
11. If you could change something about German society, what would you change?
12. Questions inquiring age, gender, and country of origin.

Interviews Phase II (Expert Interviews)

1. What “kind” of discrimination do migrants face most/contact you for? *(kind of horizontal inequality and individual/state dimension)*
2. What effect do such experiences have on the people concerned, in your view? *(grievances)*
3. How, do you think, do experiences of discrimination influence how someone perceives a new country? Do you think it influences the way the person perceives themselves in this new country? *(group boundaries)*
4. Are there people who are more concerned by discrimination, or who contact you more frequently? (e.g. certain nationalities, a certain gender, a certain age group, length of stay?)
5. Who, do you think, is least reached by support initiatives? How could these people be reached better?
## Codebook

### Discrimination/Horizontal Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Discrimination perceived as major/HI</td>
<td>Systematic discrimination referring to issues related to status, societal recognition or education. Presented as something that happens more frequently, over a longer time period, or systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Discrimination perceived as major/HI</td>
<td>Systematic discrimination referring to political rights and access to decision-making. Includes physical assault. Presented as something that happens more frequently, over a longer time period, or systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Discrimination perceived as major/HI</td>
<td>Systematic discrimination referring to income or wealth, material objects. Presented as something that happens more frequently, over a longer time period, or systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Discrimination perceived as major/HI</td>
<td>Systematic discrimination referring to cultural rights, such as religious rights and holidays. Presented as something that happens more frequently, over a longer time period, or systematically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination perceived as major (but isolated)</td>
<td>Discrimination presented as an isolated case (i.e. not systematic) but something that was very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination perceived as minor</td>
<td>Discrimination presented as an isolated incidence and as something that is not very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping mechanisms</td>
<td>Behaviours or habits that are described as helping to deal with difficult situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination-specific grievance</td>
<td>Stress or other negative feelings related to experiences of discrimination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perceptions of host society/culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive perception of host society</td>
<td>Expressing positive feelings towards the host society. Using positive attributes of receiving society, such as welcoming, friendly, hardworking, nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative perception of host society</td>
<td>Expressing negative feelings towards the receiving society. Using negative attributes of receiving society, such as excluding, unfriendly, cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host identity: Adopts</td>
<td>Claiming that one is happy to be a part of the receiving society. Claiming that one has taken up practices of the receiving society, such as habits that are perceived as originating from the receiving society, or typical for it. Celebrating host holidays. Declaring that one feels at home in Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host identity: Rejects</td>
<td>Declaring that one does not appreciate the receiving culture, or not appreciate it that much. Explaining that one would prefer returning to one’s country of origin, because one feels more at home there. Declaring that one exclusively feels part of one’s own ethnic/national group, not German.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home identity: Maintains</td>
<td>Claiming that one preserves practices of the society of the country of origin, such as habits that are perceived as typical for the society of origin. Celebrating culture of origin holidays. Describing that one still feels belonging to one’s ethnic/national identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home identity: Gives up</td>
<td>Claiming that one renounces practices of the home society, such as habits that are perceived as typical for the society of origin, or no longer celebrating respective holidays. Claiming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that one no longer feels belonging to one’s ethnic/national
identity, or that one does not like it.

**Host/home identity: Integrates**
Declaring that one keeps some culture of origin practices,
while adding some receiving culture practices. Declaring that
one feels at home in Germany.

**Criticism or feedback for host country**
Statements that have a prescriptive tone and choice of words,
such as “Germans should” “It would be better if in Germany”

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self-esteem/self-efficacy: Positive</strong></th>
<th>Positive statements relating to self-esteem and one’s ability to handle situations. Includes statements such as “I try to look ahead” and “I try to make things work”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-esteem/self-efficacy: Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative statements relating to self-esteem and one’s ability to handle situations. Includes statements such as “I think I cannot achieve”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Happiness/health: Positive</strong></td>
<td>Positive statements relating to one’s happiness or health. Includes statements such as “I am very content” or “I am doing well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Happiness/health: Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative statements relating to one’s happiness or health. Includes statements such as “I am unhappy” or “things are too hard”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations: Prior to arrival</strong></td>
<td>Expectations that participants held before coming to receiving country, relating to their life in the receiving society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations: Disappointed</strong></td>
<td>Expectations that have not been fulfilled in the receiving society. Expectations that have been partly fulfilled and partly disappointed will be coded as both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations: Fulfilled</strong></td>
<td>Expectations that have been fulfilled in the receiving society. Expectations that have been partly fulfilled and partly disappointed will be coded as both.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>