

Supranational Attachment and Transnationalism of Hungarians and Immigrants in Hungary

Borbála Göncz - György Lengyel

borbala.gonczi@uni-corvinus.hu; gyorgy.lengyel@uni-corvinus.hu

Manuscript received: 14 May 2013.

Modified manuscript received: 14 September 2013.

Acceptance of manuscript for publication: 10 October 2013.

ABSTRACT: The concept of European identity – problematic as it is – has been amply dealt with in relation to different segments of society. From the perspective of their attachments, third-country immigrants form an interesting population: in balancing between identification with their country of origin and their country of residence, literature indicates that it might be more natural for them to feel part of a transnational social space, such as Europe. In this paper we compare the Hungarian public and third-country immigrants according to their attachment to Europe. Besides transnational embeddedness, different forms of acculturation and social status are also taken into account in the analysis as important determinants of supranational identification. Third-country immigrants are “supposed” to have more transnational ties than the receiving population, and, in opposition to international trends, in Hungary they are also in a better position in terms of their cultural and material resources which makes them more likely to have supranational attachment. However, our findings (based on empirical surveys carried out in 2011) show that, despite their higher transnational involvement, immigrants are less attached to Europe than the receiving population. It seems that the link between “Europeanness” and transnationalism is not as straightforward as expected.

KEYWORDS: Europe, supranational attachment, transnationalism, immigrants, Hungary

Introduction

The concept of identification with Europe or European identity is strongly debated in terms of its definition, its content, its development and its function as well. Several studies have argued that a European identity similar to national identities does not exist. It is often said that a European identity still needs to be constructed following a top-down logic. Nevertheless, it can be also apprehended through a bottom-up approach based on an increase in an individual's number of personal contacts with other Europeans and other transnational experiences. Addressing the question of attachment to Europe through the lenses of transnational embeddedness, transnational practices and networks of individuals is a relevant perspective and the approach is confirmed by recent research.

The question of attachment to Europe has been dealt with for several segments of society, including the general public and elites, while somewhat less attention has been given to the question among immigrants. A few studies have addressed the subject of the identification of non-EU immigrants, or have compared EU “movers” and “stayers”; however, the current authors are not aware of any studies which have compared the receiving population and third-country immigrants in this regard.¹

When it comes to attachment to Europe, transnationalism or immigration, Hungary has peculiarities that differentiate the country from other EU countries. Despite being among the countries most skeptical towards the European Union, the Hungarian population is among the most attached to Europe (Lengyel – Göncz 2010). At the same time, in terms of transnationalism and transnational practices, Hungarians are among those who speak the least foreign languages (Special Eurobarometer 386, 2012) and they also travel less (Flash Eurobarometer 334, 2012) than other Europeans. Although the share of the population which is working in another EU country is constantly increasing (estimated to be 2% in 2010), this share is still lower than for other new member states such as Poland, Romania, Slovakia or the Baltic countries (Hárs 2011). Accordingly, Hungarians in general are somewhat lagging behind in terms of their transnational practices within the EU. Furthermore, Hungary is still not a target country for third-country immigrants who represent around 0.7% of the Hungarian population.² Third-country immigrants in Hungary also differ from their counterparts in other European countries: they are in a more advantageous social position than members of the receiving society. The gap between the receiving society and immigrants in terms of the latter's lower activity rate, overqualification, lower level of self-employment, lower level of education and higher risk of poverty does not exist in Hungary (European Commission 2011).

1 In the European Union, the terms “third-country immigrants” or “third-country nationals” are often used to refer to individuals who are neither from the EU country in which they are currently living or staying, nor from other member states of the European Union. In this current analysis we use the term to refer to those legal immigrants who arrive from a third country and stay in Hungary.

2 Statistics from the National Citizenship Office, 31/12/2010

Although immigrants often have to face prejudice in Hungary, they represent a preselected group of (predominantly male) younger people with a higher presence on the labor market and with higher social and cultural resources than members of the host society in general (Kisfalusi 2012; Szanyi-F. 2012). Another characteristic of immigrants in Hungary is the dominance of migrants of Hungarian ethnic origin. However, these immigrants mostly come from neighbouring countries that are now EU member states (e.g. Romania), so the share drops significantly if only third-country immigrants are considered.

In this article the general Hungarian public and third-country immigrants will be compared along their attachments to different territorial units: to Hungary/to their country of origin, and to Europe. We suppose that transnational experiences (e.g. having lived abroad, having travelled abroad, willingness to migrate, speaking foreign languages, having foreign friends) favor the development of a supranational attachment. Furthermore, for immigrants, who are more likely to be embedded in transnational networks, it might be easier to feel attached to a supranational level than either to their country of origin or to Hungary. Considering this fact, we take into account transnational embeddedness together with different individual socio-demographic characteristics – supposing that neither the receiving population nor immigrants comprise a homogeneous group. The analysis is based on empirical survey data collected in 2011 within the respective publics (see the *Appendix 1* for more details).

The article is structured as follows. The first part summarizes the theoretical frame and the main hypothesis with an overview of the previous scientific work on the subject of supranational attachment and transnationalism. Then the results of a descriptive analysis comparing responses to survey questions about different patterns of attachment among members of Hungarian society and third-country immigrants in Hungary is presented. This is followed by a more thorough analysis of the drivers of supranational identification among the two groups using a regression approach. Finally, some conclusions are drawn.

Issues Concerning Supranational Attachment

European identity, attachment to Europe and transnationalism

Collective or social “identity” is a complex concept with a wide theoretical literature in sociology, social psychology and nationalism studies that each focus on different aspects of the term. It can be understood as self-understanding based on particular categorical attributes, a collective phenomenon based on sameness, solidarity, shared dispositions or consciousness, a core aspect of individual/collective selfhood or as a product of a social/political action. Identities are multiple and contextual; furthermore, beside the cognitive aspect (acknowledgment of group membership/

category) there are emotional (feelings of attachment to group membership) and conative (behavioral implications of group membership) components as well. Indeed, Brubaker and Cooper (2000) point out that “identity” is an ambiguous term that tends to mean too much in social sciences, or too little. As applied in the different analyses it usually leaves us with no rationale for talking about identity. This is why the authors suggest the use of another, more precisely-defined concept. Being aware of these conceptual problems and the limits of our analysis (imposed by both the quantitative survey approach and the length of the paper), in the following, when referring to our analysis, we prefer to use the term “attachment” instead of the term “identity”. Our dependent variable revolves around attachment to different territorial units which would correspond to Brubaker and Cooper’s identification. Identifying oneself emotionally with another person, category or collective captures both the emotional and the dynamic characteristics of the term, while the modern state has been one of the most powerful points of identification (Brubaker – Cooper 2000).

The conceptual ambiguity described above has not prevented scholars from using and studying identity, either at the national or European level. Although the question of attachment to Europe or European identity has been present in intellectual debates since the 1950s, it has increasingly been the subject of scientific research since the 2000s. This was partly due to the increasing supranational character of the European Union after Maastricht (1992) which led to questions about the legitimacy of the EU and its democratic deficit, while the Eastern enlargement of the EU and the debate over the possible accession of Turkey raised questions related to its cultural and territorial borders (Fuchs 2011). However, European identity remains a very much debated concept, both in terms of its definition (see, for instance, Favell 2005) and even its very existence. Several authors have argued that a “European identity” does not exist (e.g. Duchesne – Frogner 1995) and that time is needed for its development through formal socialization, or in a symbolic, affective way. Indeed, Europeans do not form an “imagined community” (Anderson 1983) for many reasons, the lack of a common language being one of them.

Another problem with the concept is that scientists often imagine a European identity similar to the essentialist conception of a national one, based on common cultural heritage (Delanty 1995). However, national identities are results of long-term historical development and have a multidimensional character based both on ethnic and cultural origins or history on the one hand, and a legal, economic, political and territorial aspect on the other (e.g. Smith 1991). While the latter, more ‘civic’ aspect could be developing with the European integration project, the former, rather ethno-cultural traits are not present at the European level (Smith 1992). In terms of the relationship between attachment to the nation and to Europe, Risse suggests that European identity is “gradually being embedded in understandings of national identities” and is a secondary order identification built on the basis of the national one (Risse 2005). Risse talks about the Europeanization of national

identities, meaning that at the individual level the way one identifies with her own nation will be extrapolated to the European level: an exclusive or inclusive national identity will result in an exclusive or inclusive conception of Europe as well. In this regard, cultural resources seem to play an important role: several empirical analyses have confirmed that an individual's level of education determines the way they relate to Europe (e.g. Fligstein 2008; Risse 2010).

Furthermore, with the globalization process the boundaries of traditional nation states are becoming more and more permeable through increases in the number of cross-border transactions in terms of the flow of trade, capital, or the mobility of people and social exchanges. Involvement in transnational networks and everyday transnational practices like communication, travelling, speaking foreign languages and being in contact with foreign people is an inherent characteristic of migration and the everyday life of migrant people (Mau 2010). However, members of the receiving society also have transnational experiences, albeit to different extent. They might have lived abroad, travelled abroad, can maintain contacts abroad, or might be in a relationship with an immigrant. "Transnationalism refers to the relations, networks, and practices arising out of cross-border transactions and exchanges" (Mau 2010:17). As opposed to transnationalism "from above" with reference to macro-structures (meaning the intensification of international exchange relationships created by nation-states), transnationalism "from below" refers to the everyday behavior of individuals associated with a greater demand for autonomy and a rise in mobility and spatial flexibility (Mau 2010:24). Individual-level indicators might include an increase in language competence, mobility, travelling, and transnational identities (Mau 2010:19).

The free movement of goods, capital, services, and people being a core principle of the European integration project, the permeability of the borders characterizes the countries of the European Union to an increasing extent. The European integration process accordingly has a constitutive effect on national identities (Risse 2010). It seems, indeed, that more frequent interactions with other Europeans, migration experiences or changing communication habits (Deutsch 1953; Favell 2008; Fligstein 2008) will lead to changes in identity or to the Europeanization of national identities. According to these arguments, and empirical findings, we suggest that similar mechanisms are at work in Hungary as well. Hence:

(H1) A higher level of transnational involvement favors supranational attachment.

In view of our double target groups (receiving society and third-country immigrants) this hypothesis can be further decomposed, supposing that immigrants have a higher level of transnational involvement due to their previous experiences or migration strategies:

(H1a) Involvement in transnational networks and everyday transnational practices favors supranational attachment.

(H1b) Third-country immigrants have greater supranational attachment than the receiving society.

Just as transnationalism, social, cultural and material resources (Risse 2010) or the social class (Fligstein 2008) of an individual are all defining elements of supranational identification, the same resources may define transnational embeddedness itself (Mau 2010). Higher social, cultural and material resources not only lead to higher supranational attachments, but also favor transnational experiences. This should be taken into account when addressing the effect of transnationalism on supranational attachments – social situation and resources need to be controlled for in our analysis.

Immigrants and their attachments

Immigrants are a special group in terms of their identity, as this often undergoes a transition when migrating from the homeland to the host country (Kumar 2003). The integration of immigrants into a host society is a complex phenomenon. It is a legal and political process on the one hand, during which the immigrant obtains rights and assumes obligations similar to the majority of society and becomes member of the political community. The integration process is, on the other hand, a socio-economic process characterized by the participation of the immigrant in the host country's economy through their holding of a job and payment of taxes. Thirdly, integration has a socio-cultural aspect which includes the building of relations between the immigrant and the receiving society, learning and accepting the language, customs and norms of the host country. According to Berry's model (2001), the level of integration depends on how much migrants wish to maintain their original cultural identity (cultural maintenance) and on how much they wish to establish contact with members of the host society outside their own group, and to participate in the daily life of the host society (contact-participation). Taking these factors into account migrants' cultural adaptation can result in their: (1) integration (an interest in both maintaining one's original culture and engaging in daily interactions with members of the host society); (2) assimilation (no wish to maintain cultural heritage and seek daily interaction with the host society); (3) separation (holding on to the original culture and having a wish to avoid interaction with others); and/or, (4) marginalization (little possibility of, or interest in cultural maintenance and in having relations with others). However, Berry also suggests a narrower, parallel approach to understanding acculturation strategies that uses the concept of cultural identity or the way one thinks of oneself. This can also be constructed along two dimensions.

“The first of these dimensions is identification with one’s heritage or ethnocultural group, and the second is identification with the larger or dominant society. [...] Using these two identity dimensions, strategies emerge that have clear similarities to the four acculturation strategies: when both identities are asserted, this resembles the integration strategy; when one feels attached to neither, then there is a sense of marginalization; and when one is strongly emphasized over the other, then one exhibits either the assimilation or separation strategy.” (Berry 2001:620-621)

In the following we will use the latter approach when dealing with different modes of acculturation.

Nevertheless, instead of a linear process of dissimilation from the country of origin and assimilation into the host country, migration increasingly has a more dynamic character (e.g. Boyd 1989; Melegh et al. 2009). It can be periodic, temporary or incomplete in a sociological sense, while attachment to the community of origin may survive in varied forms. The concept of “migrant transnationalism” refers to the phenomenon when migration happens along transnational communities, which also has implications for identity: instead of a process of adaptation to the culture of the country of residence, this new form of migration deals with concepts such as “world citizens” and postnational identities (Martiniello 2006). Taking into account the transnational character of migration and the fact that migrants are often embedded in transnational networks, the question whether to identify at all with the host country arises.

According to the results of a recent study among immigrants in Hungary, the different immigrant groups differed according to their willingness to obtain Hungarian citizenship. While a higher share of immigrants of Hungarian ethnic origin expressed the wish to be naturalized, the desire was not so evident for others, such as immigrants of Chinese or Turkish origin (Örkény 2011).

Indeed, obtaining citizenship of a country might not be the ultimate goal for every migrant, whose “postnational membership” is increasingly based on universal personhood with universal rules (i.e. human rights) and multiple statuses in transnational communities (Soysal 1994). From this point of view, the search for a more universal kind of identification is perfectly understandable (Kumar 2003). Identification with Europe could embody this universalism.

Furthermore, a recent Hungarian survey among immigrants revealed different migration strategies corresponding both to the linear and to the transnational model of immigration. Örkény and Székelyi (2010) found that the main strategies followed were assimilation, segregation (i.e. Berry’s model) and transnationalism. Segregation and transnationalism followed a similar trend according to their attachments; the difference between them lying in the financial means to migrate further (segregated individuals did not have the means necessary to move to another country). These strategies mostly characterized migrants of Chinese origin

in Hungary. Those who followed a transnationalist strategy were not attached to Hungary but to their community; their motives for migration were rather economic, they did not learn Hungarian and they were ready to migrate again according to interest and need. Correspondingly, we suppose that the different modes of cultural adaptation also influence supranational attachment:

(H2) The different modes of cultural adaptation determine the supranational attachment of third-country immigrants in Hungary.

In our understanding, however, two alternative mechanisms might be at play and lead to two alternative explanations. Based on theories of transnational migration, migrants do not become attached to their host country, but being members of transnational communities they might rather form supranational identities (Soysal 1994; Kumar 2003; Martiniello 2006). Following this logic, migrants might be rather attached to a Europe which represents a supranational entity:

(H2a) Supranational attachment is greater with separation (lower attachment to Hungary, attachment to their community of origin) or marginalization (less attachment to either Hungary or their community of origin) kinds of cultural adaptation.

On the other hand, previous studies have shown that European identity is rather embedded in national identity (e.g. Risse 2010). Attachment to Europe and to one's own country are positively related to each other – this has been proven not only for the general public, but also in the case of migrant populations within the EU (Rother – Nebe 2009). According to this logic, a lower level of attachment to Hungary would lead to a lower level of attachment to Europe. Accordingly, we suggest an alternative hypothesis as well:

(H2b) Supranational attachment is lower with separation (lower attachment to Hungary, attachment to their community of origin) or marginalization (lower attachment to either Hungary or their community of origin) kinds of cultural adaptation.

Immigrants, however, are not a homogeneous group. Their attachments depend on their motivation or the migration strategy followed (which may include the prospect of further migration), their country or culture of origin, the length of time spent in the country of residence, their contacts with members of the host society or the diaspora community. A recent Hungarian survey about six immigrant groups revealed important differences between the migration strategies followed by the different immigrant groups (Örkény – Székelyi 2010). Migrants of Hungarian ethnic origin are the most willing to assimilate, Ukrainians are rather characterized by

having a transnational migration strategy (an economic motive for migration, paired with an extensive international network), whereas migrants of Chinese origin follow either a segregation strategy (living within a closed diaspora community) or a transnational one (this latter approach applies to those who are wealthier and have their own business). Furthermore, when it comes to attachment to Europe, whether third-country immigrants come from a European country or not might also have an influence. Intra-EU (European) movers are usually considered to be the “pioneers” of the European integration process, or, being the first real Europeans (Favell 2008) they are usually more attached to Europe and are more likely to report having a European identity (without national attachments) than their non-mobile European counterparts (Rother – Nebe 2009). However, even among this group the relative majority are attached to both their country of origin and their country of residence – beside their attachment to Europe. These “integrating Europeans” are those who have spent more time outside their country, are highly educated, have friends both in their home country and host countries and good language abilities. However, intra-EU migrants and third-country immigrants form different groups, with ultimately different motivations for migration, which occurs under clearly different legal conditions.

Attachments of Hungarians and Third-country Immigrants

In the following we present and analyze data from two public opinion surveys: a survey conducted among the receiving society (n=1000) and a survey among third-country immigrants who are staying in Hungary (n=500), both collected in the summer of 2011. Detailed information on the design and data collection method of the surveys is available in the *Appendix 1*. The sample of the receiving society is a probability sample, representative for the Hungarian adult population. The immigrant sample, although representative for the targeted population in terms of gender, age and country of origin, needs to be treated with caution when trying to generalize findings: it is a difficult group in terms of sampling, with no complete list of members who are thus difficult to reach and survey. The questions in the survey for the receiving population and the immigrants were identical, making direct comparison possible. The survey question we used to assess attachment was a question designed to measure the level of attachment to different territorial units (Hungary/country of origin/Europe) on a four-point scale.

As shown in *Table 1*, 90% of the Hungarian population declared that they were very attached (52%) or somewhat attached (37%) to Hungary, while a somewhat lower share feel the same towards Europe (73%). In the case of third-country immigrants Hungarian attachment is equally high (88%); however, it is less intense as only 37% feel very attached and 51% somewhat attached to Hungary. Immigrants’

attachment to Europe follows a similar pattern: people feel less attached to Europe than to Hungary.

Table 1. Attachment of the receiving population and immigrants (%)

| | Attachment to the country of origin Immigrants | Attachment to Hungary | | Attachment to Europe | |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|
| | | Receiving | Immigrants | Receiving | Immigrants |
| <i>N</i> = | 500 100.0 | 1000 100.0 | 500 100.0 | 1000 100.0 | 500 100.0 |
| Not at all attached (1) | 3.0 | 3.6 | 1.2 | 5.6 | 5.0 |
| Not very attached (2) | 25.4 | 6.8 | 10.4 | 20.2 | 28.2 |
| Somewhat attached (3) | 33.6 | 37.3 | 51.4 | 41.5 | 46.6 |
| Very attached (4) | 37.4 | 52.4 | 36.8 | 31.9 | 18.8 |
| DK/NA | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 |
| <i>Mean (1-4)</i> | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.8 |

Source: Survey on the Civic Integration of Immigrants, 2011

Note: The wording of the question was: "How much are you attached to...?"

Receiving population vs. Immigrants: Attachment to Hungary: Cramer's $V=0.174^{***}$, $t\text{-test}=3.652^{***}$

Attachment to Europe: Cramer's $V=0.148^{***}$, $t\text{-test}=4.311^{***}$

These results show that the attachment of Hungarians and immigrants follows a similar trend: attachment to Hungary is stronger than attachment to Europe. While both are positively correlated, stronger attachment to Hungary means higher identification with Europe as well. Nevertheless, immigrants feel less attached to both territorial units than the members of the receiving society. These results seem to disprove our first hypothesis: immigrants do not have a stronger attachment to Europe than Hungarians (and the attachment they have is also lower than their attachment to the country).

Furthermore, it seems that even though they do not have Hungarian citizenship, immigrants feel equally attached to Hungary as to their country of origin (37%). In terms of their identification with their country of origin, an interesting case of polarization occurs; 28% do not feel very attached or attached to it at all. This polarization also appears in the fact that both those strongly attached to their country of origin and those not attached to it can feel very attached to Europe. Typically, immigrants from China and other Asian countries and from Anglo-Saxon countries are more tied to their origins, and migrants from the former Soviet Union and the Balkan are less so. This difference might exist due to many reasons, the length of their stay in Hungary and the circumstances of their migration being among them. Migrants from the former Soviet Union typically arrived in Hungary

earlier than other groups, while some migrants from Serbia are of Hungarian ethnic origin. This might cause a lower attachment to their country of origin. Another question is to what extent immigrants of Hungarian ethnic origins are similar to other immigrants, or to non-immigrant members of Hungarian society. Results confirm that immigrants with Hungarian origins (15% in our sample, coming from Serbia and Ukraine) are more similar to Hungarians than to other immigrant groups in terms of their attachment to Hungary (92% being very or somewhat attached). However, no statistically significant difference is detectable compared to other immigrants in terms of their attachment to Europe.

When looking at patterns of attachment (based on simple crosstabulation), important regional differences were found to exist among Hungarian society. People living in Central Hungary tend to be more attached to Hungary than others, while those living in the Western and the Southern Transdanubian region felt less attached to their country. Regarding Europe, people from Southern Transdanubia were the least attached.

Table 2. Transnational embeddedness of the receiving population and immigrants (%)

| | | Receiving | Immigrants | Cramer's V |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|
| N= | | 1000 | 500 | |
| | | 100.0 | 100.0 | |
| Foreign languages spoken | 0 | 72.5 | 14.4 | 0.615*** |
| | 1 | 19.2 | 26.7 | |
| | 2 | 6.8 | 36.1 | |
| | 3 or more | 1.5 | 22.8 | |
| Have you been abroad (outside Hungary) in the past 5 years? | | 29.1 | 45.8 | 0.165*** |
| Have you lived abroad (outside Hungary or your country of origin) for over 3 months? | | 4.8 | 11.6 | 0.125*** |
| Can you imagine moving to another country? | | 10.2 | 13.4 | 0.048* |
| Are there foreigners (non Hungarians) among your friends? | | 12.6 | 78.4 | 0.652*** |
| Are there Hungarians among your friends? | | - | 81.6 | |

Source: Survey on the Civic Integration of Immigrants, 2011

In terms of measures of transnational involvement there seems to be a gap between the receiving society and immigrants. Table 2 shows that immigrants speak more foreign languages (86% vs. 28% speak at least one foreign language), were more likely to have travelled abroad during the past 5 years (46% vs. 29%) and were also

more likely to have lived abroad (12% vs. 5%).³ Regarding social ties, immigrants have more foreigner (non-Hungarian) friends (78%) as opposed to Hungarians (13%). However, equally high shares of immigrants (82%) are embedded in their country of residence as they have Hungarian friends as well. Nearly three quarters of the third-country immigrants living in Hungary have both Hungarian and foreigner friends, 4-7% have either one or the other, while 14% declared that they did not have friends of either type. Nevertheless, these differences might not come as a surprise as immigrant contacts within their own ethnic groups counted as foreigner friends, speaking Hungarian counted as a foreign language and travelling home to their country of origin also counted as travelling abroad – all these factors related to their migrant status and increased their transnational involvement. Interestingly, however, there is no major difference between the two groups in terms of willingness to move to another country (other than Hungary) in the future: 10-13% of the receiving society and the immigrants stated their willingness.

Following the “cultural maintenance” dimension in Berry’s model of acculturation (Berry 2001), we created a typology of immigrants based on their attachment to Hungary and their country of origin.⁴ Those who were very or somewhat attached to both their country of origin and Hungary show a dual identity and correspond to what Berry called “integrated”. These immigrants represent the relative majority (63%). Those who were very or somewhat attached to Hungary but were not very or not at all attached to their country of origin were considered to be “assimilating” to Hungary. About one quarter of immigrants could be regrouped here, with a slightly higher proportion (one third) of immigrants from Hungarian ethnic origin falling into this group, although this difference did not prove to be statistically significant. Fewer were those who were, in contrast, attached to their country of origin but not to Hungary. Those who followed this “separation” strategy amounted to 9%. Finally, only 3% were “marginalized” and did not develop intense attachments to either their country of residence or their country of origin. Interestingly, as shown in *Table 3*, those who integrated have the highest attachment to Europe, followed by the assimilating immigrants, whereas only one third and one quarter (respectively) of the separated and marginalized individuals were attached to Europe. These two previous groups (integrated and assimilated), despite their more intense supranational attachment, also showed less transnational involvement. “Separated” individuals, despite being more involved in transnationalism, were the least attached to Europe. This finding seems to disprove hypothesis 2a (as described above) in favor of hypothesis 2b.

3 “Foreign languages” refers to any language other than the native tongue, thus use of Hungarian among immigrants was considered an additional foreign language. Questions referring to travelling abroad took Hungary as a reference point (an immigrant travelling to the immigrant’s country of origin was taken as a positive answer). For “having lived abroad”, for immigrants this was interpreted to mean having lived outside Hungary or the country of origin.

4 Due to the limitations of our survey we apply Berry’s model in a restrained form, only referring to the subjective perception of attachment to one’s country of origin and receiving country. This restrained approach mainly corresponds to a subjective evaluation of cultural adaptation, leaving out other aspects (e.g. objective measures or numbers of contacts).

Table 3. Attachment to Europe among immigrants with different degree of acculturation (%)

| | Marginalization | Separation | Integration | Assimilation | Total |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| N= | 15 100.0 | 42 100.0 | 310 100.0 | 127 100.0 | 494 100.0 |
| Not attached at all (1) | 6.7 | 14.3 | 3.5 | 5.5 | 5.1 |
| Not very attached (2) | 66.7 | 52.4 | 20.3 | 37.0 | 28.7 |
| Somewhat attached (3) | 20.0 | 31.0 | 52.6 | 42.5 | 47.2 |
| Very attached (4) | 6.7 | 2.4 | 23.5 | 15.0 | 19.0 |
| <i>Mean (1-4)</i> | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.8 |

Source: Survey on the Civic Integration of Immigrants, 2011

Note: Cramer's V=0.191***

Those who reside in Hungary for a longer period were more likely to follow an integration strategy with dual identities. Assimilating immigrants have more Hungarian friends, but they are also older (there are more pensioners and inactive in this group), many of whom come from the countries of the former Soviet Union. On the other hand, younger immigrants who have been in Hungary for a shorter time (many of them students) are more likely to be separated. They are more involved in the transnational arena as they have more foreigner friends, they were more likely to have travelled and to have lived abroad and also were more inclined to move to another country.

Determinants of Supranational Identification

In the following we describe the results of our exploration of the drivers of supranational/European attachment with a regression approach. Our dependent variable being measured on a four-point scale, we chose to run ordered logit models. Three models were developed: one for Hungarians (Model 1), one for immigrants (Model 2) and a third one which represents an attempt to deal with these two groups in a combined model. The two samples were drawn with different sampling methods from the two populations. This posed a challenge concerning merging the two samples. Including third-country immigrants into the Hungarian sample through a weighting process (in relation to their actual numbers) would make this population disappear. Furthermore, the two populations (and samples) have a different socio-demographic structure which also makes the comparison more difficult. In order to solve these problems we applied a special weighting process, as suggested by Sik (2012), based on adjusting the sample of the receiving population to the composition of the immigrant sample. This adjustment – namely, the re-weighting of the receiving society sample – was done according to the composition of the immigrant sample by age, gender and place of residence (Budapest/not Budapest). Through this process

we obtained a final combined sample with an equal share and socio-demographic structure which made comparison between the two groups possible. However, no generalizations can be made based on the results of this model (Model 3).

In order to address our first hypothesis, transnational involvement was measured through three indicators: whether a respondent had travelled abroad in the previous 5 years, whether a respondent could imagine moving to another country,⁵ and the number of foreign languages spoken. All three models included these measures.

As showed earlier in the theoretical part of the paper, social status and resources are very important determinants of both supranational attachment and transnational involvement (and indicate the success of the integration of migrants). In order to control for these effects we included the perceived social status of the respondents in Hungary⁶ and their occupational group.

Our second hypothesis was dealt with in Model 2 which addressed immigrants. The indicator used to measure the mode of acculturation was the (previously-described) cultural adaptation typology based on subjective measures of attachment to the country of origin and to Hungary.

Besides general control variables related to one's socio-demographic characteristics (such as age, gender and the region) for the immigrants individual variables related to migration/integration history were also included (Model 2). The length of time of residence in Hungary, the country of origin, and perceived changes in living conditions were taken into account.⁷ Furthermore, not all regions of Hungary were controlled for among the immigrant sample. We only differentiated between Budapest and non-Budapest areas due the special nature of the diffusion of immigrants in Hungary – about half of them live in Budapest, a fact which was also reflected in the sample.

Results

Overall, although the models contain several significant effects, the explaining power of the different models is relatively low – with the exception of the model applied to the immigrants (Model 2). The relatively high explanatory power of this model is explained by the inclusion of the variable destined to measure the different types of acculturation.

European attachment of Hungarians seems to be more likely among older respondents and men (see Model 1). Results showed some variation according to region as well: compared to the Southern Great Plain, supranational attachment

5 The exact wording of the questions was: "Have you been abroad (outside Hungary) in the past 5 years?" (yes/ no/ DK); and "Can you imagine moving to another country?" (yes/ no/ DK).

6 The exact wording of the question was: "In Hungary some people have high social status, some have low. Please define your place on a scale where 0 marks the lowest social status and 10 marks the highest".

7 In calculating perceived changes we used the difference of the following two questions, both measured on a 0-10 scale: "Please assess again your current and earlier living conditions. Where would you place them on a scale where 0 means the worst and 10 means the best living conditions?" (current living conditions/ living conditions before migration).

is stronger both in the Western and Central part of Hungary and the Northern Great Plain. Those who speak at least one foreign language are also more likely to have European attachments; however, the willingness to move to another country is negatively associated with this variable. Nevertheless, Model 1 did not include several variables because their effects were not statistically significant. Education and having foreigner friends did not play an important role, for instance. It seems that there must exist other variables which determine supranational attachment. While satisfaction with one's life, media usage or formal trust are all significant determinants of attachment to Europe,⁸ they do not significantly increase the explanatory power of the model. Attachment to Hungary, on the other hand, seems to be a variable that is able to increase the power of the model significantly, and is positively correlated to attachment to Europe.⁹

Model 2 for the immigrants provided more substantial information about the drivers of attachment to Europe. Similarly to with Hungarians, supranational attachment is higher among those who speak at least one foreign language; however, in the case of immigrants women are somewhat more likely to be attached to Europe. Furthermore, perceived social status also played a role: the higher a respondent placed themselves in the social hierarchy, the more they were attached to Europe. The most important determinant, however, was the mode of acculturation. While a dual attachment to the country of origin and the country of residence plays in favor of European attachment (compared to assimilation strategies) stronger separation and marginalization predicts a lower level of supranational attachment. Among the different variables related to the individuals' migration/ integration history, the length of time spent in Hungary and perceived changes in living conditions were not significant determinants; as for the country of origin, migrants from Asia (except China) are less open to "Europeanness" than immigrants from Africa, Middle East or South America. Alternatively, we also tested a model which examined the effect of having a European origin, (i.e. having come from a European country) instead of being from different country groups. Results of this analysis showed that, all other parameters being very similar, coming from a European country as opposed to a non-European country had an effect, although it was not very significant.¹⁰

8 Not included in the models because examining these factors was not the objective of the analysis.

9 Findings from the model which include attachment to Hungary are not reported in the article.

10 We decided whether a country was European based on its membership in the Council of Europe: countries of the former Soviet Union (except for Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan) were included, together with countries from the Balkans and Turkey. Coming from a European country made it 1.5 times more likely that a respondent would be attached to Europe (however, this effect was significant only at the $p=0.038$ level). This model is not reported in the article.

Table 4. Determinants of supranational identification (ordered logit models – odds ratios)

| | Model 1: Receiving society | Model 2: Third-country immigrants | Model 3: Joint model |
|--|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Age | 1.01*** | 1.01 | 1.01** |
| Male | 1.29** | 0.65** | 0.95 |
| Central Hungary/ Budapest | 1.43* | 0.73 | 0.75 |
| Central Transdanubia | 1.79** | | 0.90 |
| Western Transdanubia | 1.50 | | 1.08 |
| Southern Transdanubia | 1.22 | | 0.61 |
| Northern Hungary | 1.28 | | 0.77 |
| Northern Great Plain (Reference category: Southern Great Plain) | 1.70** | | 0.94 |
| Professional/ managerial | 0.94 | 1.01 | 1.49 |
| Office worker | 1.28 | 0.93 | 1.44 |
| Manual worker | 1.01 | 0.67 | 1.21 |
| Student | 1.29 | 0.95 | 1.20 |
| Pensioner/ other inactive (Reference category: Unemployed) | 0.90 | 0.40 | 0.98 |
| Perceived social status | 1.06 | 1.16** | 1.13**** |
| Speak at least one foreign language | 1.54*** | 1.78** | 1.87**** |
| Has been abroad | 1.04 | 0.82 | 0.65**** |
| Would move to another country | 0.60** | 0.74 | 0.72* |
| Immigrant | | | 0.43**** |
| Countries of the former Soviet Union | | 1.03 | |
| China | | 0.74 | |
| Balkans | | 1.09 | |
| USA/Canada/Australia/New Zealand | | 0.54 | |
| Other Asian (Reference category: Africa/Middle East/South America) | | 0.52* | |
| Length of time spent in Hungary | | 0.99 | |
| Change in living condition | | 1.04 | |
| Marginalization | | 0.25** | |
| Separation | | 0.29**** | |
| Integration (Reference category: Assimilation) | | 1.87**** | |
| - 2 LL | 2309.2 | 983.6 | 2211.7 |
| Chi-squared (d.f.) | 39.5 (17) | 78.5 (22) | 66.0 (18) |
| R ² _L | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.03 |
| N | 972 | 443 | 949 |

Notes: See Appendix 2 for detailed results. Statistical significance: **** < 0.001, *** < 0.01, ** < 0.05, * < 0.1.

The likelihood ratio R² was used to assess the predictive power of the model (Székelyi–Barna 2003:391, Menard 2010:47). The R²_L = ((-2LL₀) - (-2LL₁)) / (-2LL₀) shows the proportional reduction of the -2LL₀ log-likelihood function.

The joint regression model (Model 3) purely serves for comparison purposes between the two target groups; no generalization of the results or mechanisms is possible. However, what can be said based on these results is that even if the socio-demographic structure of the receiving society were similar to the immigrants', there would still be differences between these two groups in terms of their attachment to Europe. Immigrants are less likely to form a supranational attachment than members of the receiving society. Furthermore, previous results are also confirmed: while knowledge of a foreign language and having travelled abroad favors Europeanness, intentions to move to another country have the opposite effect.

Discussion

These results do not fully confirm our initial hypotheses. Our first suggestion that a higher level of transnational involvement would favor supranational attachment is only partly confirmed (H1a). Transnational involvement shows several ambiguities: while the influence of knowledge of a foreign language followed the expected pattern and was a positive determinant of European attachment (both for Hungarians and immigrants) (Model 1 & 2), it seems that having the intention to move to another country had a negative impact. A possible explanation for this phenomenon for the Hungarian public might be that intentions to migrate are rooted in some kind of frustration with one's current situation that might erode both national and European attachments.¹¹ Moving to another country, however, is at the core of the concept of migrant transnationalism. Among migrants, this measure did not have significant effect (Model 2). This shows the difference in the way this indicator (intention to migrate) is perceived between the two groups. Furthermore, we hypothesized that, due to their higher involvement in transnational ties and practices, immigrants would be more open to having attachments beyond those they have to their nation. This hypothesis proved untrue (Model 3); immigrants show a lower level of attachment to Europe.

Secondly, we wanted to explore the link between the different modes of cultural adaptation and supranational attachment. Indeed, following separation, marginalization, integration or an assimilation strategy is a powerful determinant of attachment to Europe among immigrants. A dual attachment to the country of origin and Hungary favors European attachment, whereas those who are rather attached to their country of origin and less to Hungary are also less liable to be attached to Europe. Correspondingly, of the two alternative hypotheses we proposed, the second one proved better. Our first suggestion (H2a) that third-country immigrants with transnational involvement would not bother to form attachments to their country of residence (Hungary) but would rather become attached at the supranational level

¹¹ Indeed, based on crosstabulation, both national and European attachments were weaker for native Hungarian respondents who had the intention to move to another country.

(in the view that eventually they might migrate further away) proved to be wrong. Instead, attachment to Europe seems to be similar for third-country immigrants and the general population: European attachment is embedded in attachment to Hungary. Those who were less attached to their host country were also less attached to Europe.

It seems that the link between supranational attachment and transnational involvement is more complex than we expected. The reasons for this might lie either in the conception of transnationalism and Europeanism or in the characteristics of Hungarian immigrants, who, despite being more involved in transnational ties, do not differ significantly from Hungarians when it comes to moving to another country (see *Table 2*).

Conclusion

In this article we addressed the question of attachment to Europe through the concept of transnationalism. Even though European identity is a widely-researched topic, approaching it from this perspective can be considered a relatively new and relevant approach. Through the possibility of including in our analysis third-country immigrants in Hungary together with the Hungarian population, we benefitted from examining the concept of transnationalism using a wider perspective.

In this article the general Hungarian public and third-country immigrants were compared along their attachments to Hungary/to their country of origin, and to Europe. Based on previous academic research we supposed that transnational involvement would lead to stronger supranational attachment in both groups. Furthermore, in the case of immigrants who are more involved in transnational networks and practices, we proposed that supranational attachment would be stronger than either their attachment to their country of origin or to Hungary.

Results did not confirm our initial expectations. Despite their higher transnational involvement immigrants are less attached to Europe than Hungarians. While national attachment favors supranational identification among the receiving population, a dual attachment to both Hungary and the country of origin made it more likely that a pro-European feeling would exist among third-country immigrants. An exclusive attachment to the country of origin (or the lack of any attachment at all) seems to work against supranational identification, despite the fact that these groups are more involved in transnationalism. It seems, indeed, that the link between Europeaness and transnationalism is more complex than we expected.

A possible explanation for our results might be found in the specificities of the Hungarian context, both in terms of the receiving population (who are attached to Europe in greater-than-average proportions), and the characteristics of the migrant population in Hungary. Their more advantageous social situation might serve to explain the fact that in terms of intentions to move to another country, there were no significant differences between them.

Another possible explanation is that Europe may not ultimately give rise to the kind of post-national membership that scholars have referred to in previous works (e.g. Kumar 2003, Martiniello 2006). It seems that Europeanness is indeed embedded in the national identity of Hungarians, as suggested by Risse (2010), but it is also embedded in the attachment to Hungary of third-country immigrants.

In conclusion, exploring the overlapping or contradictory elements of the concepts of transnationalism and Europeanness seems to be relevant to further research. This subject has already been somewhat addressed through mobility within the European Union; however, the inclusion of third-country immigrants might prove interesting. Comparisons between the concept of Europeanness and transnationalism related to people's attachment and everyday practices might show some similarity with comparisons between the concepts of globalization and Europeanization in the economic sector. While globalization and transnationalism are not restricted to Europe, the other two concepts are part of the core characteristics of Europe and the European Union. Indeed, Fligstein found that in the economic sector there was a regional concentration of trade that suggested that a Europeanization process had occurred which was not only due to globalization processes (Fligstein 2011). Maybe there is a similar difference between transnationalism and Europeanness. A pertinent question remains: is Europe or the EU able to form a transnational social space that could trigger the attachment or identification of the people who live within it, and if so, to what extent?

References

- Anderson, B. (1983/1991): *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Berry, J. W. (2001): A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3): 615–631.
- Boyd, M. (1989): Family and Personal Networks in International Migration: Recent Developments and New Agendas. *International Migration Review*, 23(3): 638–670.
- Brubaker, R. – Cooper, F. (2000): Beyond 'Identity'. *Theory and Society*, 29(1): 1–47.
- Delanty, G. (1995): *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. New York: St.Martin's Press.
- Deutsch, K. W. (1953): *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Duchesne, S. – Frogner, A. P. (1995): Is there a European Identity? In Niedermayer, O. – Sinnott, R. (eds.): *Public Opinion and International Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 193–226.
- European Commission (2011): *Indicators of Immigrant Integration – A Pilot Study*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

- Favell, A. (2005): Europe's Identity Problem. *West European Politics*, 28(5): 1109–1116.
- Favell, A. (2008): *Eurostars and Eurocities: Free Movement and Mobility in an Integrating Europe*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Flash Eurobarometer 334 (2012): *Attitudes of Europeans Towards Tourism. Report*. European Commission.
- Fligstein, N. (2008): *Euroclash: The EU, European Identity, and the Future of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fligstein, N. (2011): Markets and Firms. In Favell, A. – Guiredon, V. (eds.): *Sociology of the European Union*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 100–124.
- Fuchs, D. (2011): Cultural diversity, European identity and legitimacy of the EU: A theoretical framework. In Fuchs, D. – Klingemann, H.D. (eds.): *Cultural Diversity, European Identity and Legitimacy of the EU*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 27–57.
- Göncz, B. – Lengyel, Gy. – Tóth, L. (eds.) (2012): *Migrants and the Hungarian Society: Dignity, Justice and Civic Integration*. Budapest: Corvinus University of Budapest.
- Hárs, Á. (2011): *Magyarok külföldi munkavállalása* [Hungarian employment abroad]. Budapest: Kopint Tárki Inc.
- Kisfalusi, D. (2012): Socio-Demographic Features, the Cultural and Social Resources of Immigrants and Drivers of Migration. In Göncz, B. – Lengyel, Gy. – Tóth, L. (eds.): *Migrants and the Hungarian Society: Dignity, Justice and Civic Integration*. Budapest: Corvinus University of Budapest, 19–58.
- Kumar, K. (2003): The Idea of Europe: Cultural Legacies, Transnational Imaginings, and the Nation-State. In Berezin, M. – Schain, M. (eds.): *Europe without Borders: Remapping Territory, Citizenship, and Identity in a Transnational Age*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 33–50.
- Lengyel, Gy. – Göncz, B. (2010): A magyar EU-tagság a közvéleményben. Társadalmi Riport 2010, TÁRKI, 527–547.
- Mau, S. (2010): *Social Transnationalism: Lifeworlds Beyond The Nation-State*. London: Routledge.
- Martiniello, M. (2006): Political participation, mobilisation and representation of immigrants and their offspring in Europe. In Bauböck, R. (ed.): *Migration and Citizenship. Legal Status, Rights and Political Participation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 83–105.
- Melegh, A. – Kovács, E. – Gödri, I. (2009): "Azt hittem célt tévesztettem." – A bevándorló nők élettörténeti perspektívái, integrációja és a bevándorlókkal kapcsolatos attitűdök nyolc európai országban. KSH Kutatási Jelentés, 88. Budapest: KSH, 1–234.
- Menard, S. (2010): *Logistic Regression. From Introductory to Advanced Concepts and Applications*. London: Sage.
- Örkény, A. – Székelyi, M. (2010): Hat migráns csoport összehasonlító elemzése. [Comparative analysis of six migrant groups.] In Örkény, A. – Székelyi, M. (eds.):

- Az idegen Magyarország – Bevándorlók társadalmi integrációja* [The strange Hungary – Social integration of immigrants]. Budapest: ELTE Eötvös Kiadó.
- Örkény, A. (2011): A harmadik országbeli állampolgárok honosítással kapcsolatos vélekedései, és ezek összefüggése a migráció különféle aspektusaival. In Kováts, A. (ed.): *Magyarrá válni* [Becoming Hungarian]. Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Minority Studies, 127–180.
- Risse, T. (2005): Neofunctionalism, European Identity and the Puzzles of European Integration. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 12(2): 291–309.
- Risse, T. (2010): *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Rother, N. – Nebe, T. M. (2009): More mobile, more European? Free movement and EU identity. In Recchi, E. – Favell, A.: *Pioneers of European integration. Citizenship and Mobility in the EU*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 120–155.
- Sik, E. (2012): *Description of the work that was done to enable majority-minority comparison and analysis*. ENRI-East (ms.)
- Smith, A. (1991): *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.
- Smith, A. (1992): National Identity and the Idea of European Unity. *International Affairs*, 68(1): 55–76.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994): Limits of Citizenship. *Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Special Eurobarometer 386 (2012): *Europeans and their languages*. Report. European Commission.
- Szanyi-F., E. (2012): The Social Indicators of Immigrants and Hungarians. In Göncz, B. – Lengyel, Gy. – Tóth, L. (eds.): *Migrants and the Hungarian Society: Dignity, Justice and Civic Integration*. Budapest: Corvinus University of Budapest, 59–82.
- Székelyi, M. – Barna, I. (2003): *Túlélőkészlet az SPSS-hez* [Survival kit for SPSS]. Budapest: Typotex Kiadó.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Methodological appendix

The surveys about Hungarian society and immigrants were both part of the “Survey on the Civic Integration of Immigrants”, a research project funded by the European Integration Fund and carried out by the Centre for Empirical Social Research of the Corvinus University of Budapest. The two surveys were carried out in the summer of 2011 and were based on similar questionnaires, allowing for direct comparability. The representative survey of adult members of Hungarian society (of at least 18 years of age) was based on a two-stage, proportionally-stratified probability sample containing 1000 randomly selected persons. The sample was

proportionally representative of Hungary's settlements, with 111 sampling units (first stage). The second stage of sampling in the selected settlements was done using random selections of individuals from the electronic database of the Central Office for Administrative and Electronic Public Services (COAEPS). Data collection was undertaken using the CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) method. The composition of the sample corresponds to the composition of the entire adult population according to the most important socio-demographic indicators (sex, age group, level of education and type of residence).

The immigrant survey targeted third country immigrants who were staying in Hungary with: (1) an immigration permit; (2) a permanent residence permit; (3) an interim permanent residence permit; (4) a residence permit; (5) a national permanent residence permit; or, (6) an EC permanent residence permit. A portion of the 500 interviews (n=156) was based on a random list of these people provided by the COAEPS following a multi-stage sampling method according to settlements. However, the list did not prove to be sufficient to complete the 500 interviews. The basic problem with the address list provided by the COAEPS was the high number of invalid addresses, and there were also a large number of addresses at which the assigned persons: a) had never been seen; b) had already left Hungary; or, c) had received Hungarian citizenship in the meantime. The poor quality of the registration list for this population was a significant hindrance to accurate surveying. Immigrants are thus considered to be a difficult population in this regard. Accordingly, the snowball method was applied for the remaining interviews (n=344). The starting points (persons) for this sampling were recruited through organizations for immigrants and specially-selected locations (shops, restaurants, marketplaces, shopping centers, - e.g. the Asia Centre in Budapest). Data were collected in face-to-face interviews in a paper-based format.

Finally, in order to make minor corrections the native Hungarian sample was weighted for sex, age groups, education and type of settlement, while the sample of migrants was weighted for age groups and sex. As a result, the final sample of immigrants adequately represents the above-specified elements in the (at least 18 year old) immigrant population in Hungary in terms of age, gender and country of origin (for more information see Göncz et al. 2012).

Appendix 2: Results of the ordered logit models

Table A1. Results of the Model 1 (Receiving society)

| Model 1: Receiving society | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
| Threshold 1 | -0.48**** | 0.36 | |
| Threshold 2 | 0.29 | 0.34 | |
| Threshold 3 | 2.15**** | 0.35 | |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.01*** |
| Male | 0.25 | 0.12 | 1.29** |
| Central Hungary/ Budapest | 0.36 | 0.20 | 1.43* |
| Central Transdanubia | 0.58 | 0.25 | 1.79** |
| Western Transdanubia | 0.41 | 0.26 | 1.50 |
| Southern Transdanubia | 0.20 | 0.25 | 1.22 |
| Northern Hungary | 0.24 | 0.24 | 1.28 |
| Northern Great Plain (Reference category: Southern Great Plain) | 0.53 | 0.23 | 1.70** |
| Professional/ managerial | -0.06 | 0.28 | 0.94 |
| Office worker | 0.25 | 0.27 | 1.28 |
| Manual worker | 0.01 | 0.23 | 1.01 |
| Student | 0.25 | 0.30 | 1.29 |
| Pensioner/ other inactive (Reference category: Unemployed) | -0.11 | 0.24 | 0.90 |
| Perceived social status | 0.06 | 0.04 | 1.06 |
| Speak at least one foreign language | 0.43 | 0.16 | 1.54*** |
| Has been abroad | 0.04 | 0.16 | 1.04 |
| Would move to another country | -0.51 | 0.21 | 0.60** |
| - 2 LL | 2211.7 | | |
| Chi-squared (d.f.) | 66.0 (18) | | |
| R ² _L | 0.03 | | |
| N | 949 | | |

Notes: Statistical significance: **** < 0.001, *** < 0.01, ** < 0.05, * < 0.1.

Table A2. Results of the Model 2 (Third-country immigrants)

| Model 2: Third-country immigrants | | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
| Threshold 1 | -2.26*** | 0.91 | |
| Threshold 2 | 0.12 | 0.89 | |
| Threshold 3 | 2.46*** | 0.90 | |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.01 |
| Male | -0.44 | 0.20 | 0.65** |
| Central Hungary/ Budapest | -0.31 | 0.24 | 0.73 |
| Professional/ managerial | 0.01 | 0.56 | 1.01 |
| Office worker | -0.08 | 0.60 | 0.93 |
| Manual worker | -0.39 | 0.57 | 0.67 |
| Student | -0.05 | 0.63 | 0.95 |
| Pensioner/ other inactive (Reference category: Unemployed) | -0.91 | 0.59 | 0.40 |
| Perceived social status | 0.15 | 0.06 | 1.16** |
| Speak at least one foreign language | 0.43 | 0.29 | 1.78** |
| Has been abroad | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.82 |
| Would move to another country | -0.51 | 0.32 | 0.74 |
| Countries of the former Soviet Union | 0.03 | 0.33 | 1.03 |
| China | -0.31 | 0.36 | 0.74 |
| Balkans | 0.09 | 0.36 | 1.09 |
| USA/Canada/Australia/New Zealand | -0.62 | 0.48 | 0.54 |
| Other Asian (Reference category: Africa/Middle East/South America) | -0.65 | 0.36 | 0.52* |
| Length of time spent in Hungary | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.99 |
| Change in living condition | 0.04 | 0.04 | 1.04 |
| Marginalization | -1.37 | 0.57 | 0.25** |
| Separation | -1.23 | 0.40 | 0.29**** |
| Integration (Reference category: Assimilation) | 0.63 | 0.22 | 1.87**** |
| - 2 LL | 983.6 | | |
| Chi-squared (d.f.) | 78.5 (22) | | |
| R ² _L | 0.07 | | |
| N | 443 | | |

Notes: Statistical significance: **** < 0.001, *** < 0.01, ** < 0.05, * < 0.1.

Table A3. Results of the Model 3 (Joint model)

| Model 3: Joint model | | | |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
| Threshold 1 | -2.29**** | 0.43 | |
| Threshold 2 | -0.13 | 0.42 | |
| Threshold 3 | 1.85**** | 0.42 | |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.01** |
| Male | -0.05 | 0.13 | 0.95 |
| Central Hungary/ Budapest | -0.29 | 0.23 | 0.75 |
| Central Transdanubia | -0.10 | 0.46 | 0.90 |
| Western Transdanubia | 0.07 | 0.46 | 1.08 |
| Southern Transdanubia | -0.49 | 0.44 | 0.61 |
| Northern Hungary | -0.26 | 0.39 | 0.77 |
| Northern Great Plain (Reference category: Southern Great Plain) | -0.06 | 0.33 | 0.94 |
| Professional/ managerial | 0.40 | 0.30 | 1.49 |
| Office worker | 0.36 | 0.30 | 1.44 |
| Manual worker | 0.19 | 0.27 | 1.21 |
| Student | 0.18 | 0.32 | 1.20 |
| Pensioner/ other inactive (Reference category: Unemployed) | -0.02 | 0.31 | 0.98 |
| Perceived social status | 0.12 | 0.04 | 1.13**** |
| Speak at least one foreign language | 0.63 | 0.16 | 1.87**** |
| Has been abroad | -0.44 | 0.14 | 0.65**** |
| Would move to another country | -0.33 | 0.19 | 0.72* |
| Immigrant | -0.83 | 0.14 | 0.43**** |
| - 2 LL | 2211.7 | | |
| Chi-squared (d.f.) | 66.0 (18) | | |
| R ² _L | 0.03 | | |
| N | 949 | | |

Notes: Statistical significance: **** < 0.001, *** < 0.01, ** < 0.05, * < 0.1.