OXFORD

Economic Outcomes of Immigrants with Different Migration Motives: The Role of Labour Market Policies

Agnieszka Kanas[1],* and Stephanie Steinmetz[2]

[1]Department of Public Administration and Sociology, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, 3000 DR, the Netherlands and [2]Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Institute of Social Sciences, Quartier UNIL-Mouline, Batiment Géopolis, Lausanne 1015, Switzerland

*Corresponding author. Email: kanas@essb.eur.nl

Abstract

This paper studies the role of labour market policies for economic outcomes of immigrants with different migration motives. Using two recent European Union Labour Force Surveys *ad hoc* modules and applying country fixed-effects models, we examine if labour market policies can alleviate the economic disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants in comparison to economic immigrants. In line with previous studies, we find that even after controlling for differences in human capital and socio-demographic characteristics, family reunification, and particularly refugee immigrants have considerably lower labour force participation and employment rates, and when employed, work fewer hours and have a lower occupational status than economic immigrants. However, we also find that the economic disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants is significantly smaller in countries with more extensive labour market policies. These findings hold for the overall labour market mobility index as well as its specific sub-dimensions: general and targeted support and workers' rights.

Introduction

In most European countries, immigrants are disadvantaged in the labour market. This is particularly true for non-Western nationals who are, on average, less likely to participate in the labour market, have higher unemployment rates, and, when employed, often occupy part-time jobs in low-skilled and low-paid sectors (OECD/European Union, 2018).

When looking at different immigration motives, family reunification immigrants and refugees face the most significant challenges with transferring their skills and adapting to the host country's labour market (Cangiano, 2014; Dumont *et al.*, 2016; Zwysen, 2018). Different considerations shape the migration decisions of economic, family reunification, and humanitarian immigrants, affecting the unequal distribution of resources among immigrants with different admission statuses. Economic immigrants, who base their decisions on how easily their human capital and other resources can be transferred to host countries, tend to be more favourably selected to enter the labour market (Chiswick, Liang Lee and Miller, 2005). Whereas, non-economic immigrants, like refugees and family-reunion immigrants, base their decision to migrate, in part, on a different set of

intentions and are therefore less positively selected for labour market inclusion. Due to that, their skills are not fully transferable to the host country. While human capital depreciation is particularly severe for newly arrived refugees due to often lengthy administrative procedures, the labour market integration of family reunification immigrants is often eased by lower legal and administrative entry barriers and more assistance from relatives and friends (Bevelander and Pendakur, 2014; Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016). Although the economic disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants decreases over time, it takes them more than 20 years to achieve parity with economic immigrants (Dumont *et al.*, 2016; Fasani, Frattini and Minale, 2018).

Previous research on the economic outcomes of immigrant groups with different migration motives has predominantly focused on a single receiving context to examine the importance of socio-demographic characteristics and other measurable attributes (e.g., host-country language skills, duration of stay, and health status) (Chiswick, Liang Lee and Miller, 2005; Akresh, 2008; Bakker, Dagevos and Engbersen, 2017; Zwysen, 2018). While this approach provides essential insights into individual-level explanations of the economic disadvantage, it generally ignores institutional settings, such as the role of integration policies, influencing immigrants' labour market outcomes. A few comparative studies have recently examined the importance of national labour market integration policies for immigrants' economic outcomes, many of them using the widely known Migration Policy Integration Index (MIPEX, http://www.mipex.eu). Besides Aleksynska and Tritah (2013), who find a negative correlation between labour market policies and immigrants' risk of over-education, previous research has shown a none significant association between labour market policies and immigrants' economic outcomes (Van Tubergen, Maas and Flap, 2004; Pichler, 2011; Corrigan, 2015; Lancee, 2016).

An important limitation of this research is its treatment of immigrants as a rather homogenous group paying insufficient attention to different types of immigrants (e.g., by migration motives). This is problematic because integration policies, including those covered by MIPEX, are targeted at specific immigrant groups, such as recent non-Western immigrants with family reunification and refugee statuses. For EU citizens or economic immigrants, such policies are less important, as they have either unrestricted or pre-arranged access to the labour market.[1] Insufficient attention to the heterogeneity of policy effects may lead to underestimating their impacts on employment outcomes for particular immigrant groups (Bilgili, Huddelston and Joki,

2015; Kogan, 2016). The limited knowledge of differences in the importance of labour market policies across various types of immigrants is thus a significant gap in the current literature.

A further important issue is that as many of the integration policies target particular, often vulnerable, immigrant groups, immigrants' composition might also be affected (Cangiano, 2014). Thus, while integration policies may positively affect the targeted groups, the average effect on the immigrant population may not reflect the effectiveness of these policies. For instance, if labour market policies target the labour market integration of refugee immigrants, their disadvantages may decrease. However, the average outcomes of the immigrant population may remain unaltered or even decline due to more substantial refugee immigration. Therefore, studying the labour market outcomes of different immigrants' categories provides a better insight into the effects and effectiveness of integration policies.

Against this background, this paper contributes to previous research by examining the role of labour market policies for labour market outcomes of non-Western, recently arrived immigrants with different migration motives. Our analyses are based on two recent European Union Labour Force Survey *ad hoc* modules on immigrants and their descendants (EU-LFS 2008, 2014), augmented with MIPEX indicators of national labour market policies.

Previous Research and Theoretical Approach

Labour Market Policies and Economic Inequalities of Immigrants with Different Migration Motives

Integration policy—defined as 'institutional practices adopted by state agencies to deal with the settlement of immigrants in host societies' (Davidov and Meuleman, 2012: p. 1), can play a critical role in the integration of immigrants (Rinne, 2013; Cangiano, 2014; Bilgili, Huddelston and Joki, 2015). We focus, in particular, on integration policies targeting the *labour market mobility* of immigrants. Following the MIPEX definition (Huddleston et al., 2015), these are policies regulating immigrants' *access to the labour market*, to *general and targeted support*, as well as *to work and social security rights* (see Supplementary Table A1). We identify two main channels through which those policies might influence immigrants' labour market outcomes (Cangiano, 2014; Kogan, 2016). First, they are important for alleviating or removing institutional barriers for labour

market access by, for example, easing immigrants' access to specific sectors and types of jobs (e.g., civil service jobs in the public sector). Second, labour market policies can promote the efficient use of immigrants' human capital by either facilitating the transferability of origin-country credentials and skills through, for instance, credential recognition or promoting the acquisition of host-country human capital.

Starting with policies regulating *access to the labour market*, countries differ in the extent to which immigrants with different admission statuses have direct access to the labour market, are allowed to work in all sectors, and to be self-employed. The relevance of such policies is evident, as different types of residence permits carry different rights and entitlements to reside and work in the country (Büchel and Frick, 2005; Cangiano, 2014; Bilgili, Huddelston and Joki, 2015). As economic immigrants mainly migrate for work, they are often obliged to secure valid residence and work permits before migration. The procedures are different for family and refugee immigrants, who often initially lack the required work permits (Cangiano, 2014; Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016).[2] For example, certain countries require family reunification immigrants to obtain a work permit or pass a labour market test before entering the labour market (European Migration Network, 2017). The situation might be even more difficult for refugees, as they are initially not allowed to work while their asylum application is pending. Their integration is additionally challenged by the lack of social connections with natives, housing difficulties, and severe health conditions due to trauma and violence (Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016; Bakker, Dagevos and Engbersen, 2017).

Further policy dimensions are whether and how countries provide *access to general and targeted support*. The first provides access to public employment services, education, vocational training, recognition of academic and professional qualifications, and validation of skills acquired abroad. Whereas the second includes measures facilitating recognition of abroad obtained qualifications and the provision of targeted training (e.g., job counselling, job-specific language courses) and programmes to encourage the hiring of non-Western immigrants (Huddleston *et al.*, 2015). Targeted support measures are essential as they target immigrants, particularly distant from the labour market, such as newcomers and low-educated.

As most non-EU immigrants come from economically less developed countries, they are often not as well educated as natives (OECD/European Union, 2018). Moreover, credentials and skills acquired, particularly in developing countries, are usually of lower quality and more difficult to transfer (Kanas and Van Tubergen, 2009; Lancee and Bol, 2017). These challenges are, however, not equally distributed among immigrants. As economic immigrants base their migration decisions on how easily their credentials and skills can be transferred to host countries, they face fewer difficulties in labour market entry (Chiswick, Liang Lee and Miller, 2005; Akresh, 2008; Cangiano, 2014). Whereas, this is—as aforementioned—different for family and refugee immigrants whose choice of destination country is less likely to be influenced by the transferability of their credentials and skills.

The final policy dimension is related to *work and social security rights* and the question of whether immigrants have equal access to trade unions, social security, and housing benefits as compared to natives. Although legal migration includes equal treatment provisions for (nearly) all categories of non-Western nationals, in practice, there are significant cross-national variations in access to work and social security rights (Huddleston *et al.*, 2015: p. 16). Again, it can be argued that this policy dimension is particularly important for family reunification and refugee immigrants (Dumont *et al.*, 2016; Konle-Seidl and Bolits, 2016). On the one hand, access to social services may provide immigrants with resources to invest in host-country human capital and search for employment matching their education and skills (Duvander 2001). On the other hand, policies supporting easier access to social security rights might also increase immigrants' unemployment levels, particularly those distant from the labour market (Junankar and Mahuteau, 2005).

Empirical expectations

To provide a more comprehensive understanding of the role of labour market policies, we focus on two dimensions of work measured through four labour market outcomes: (i) *access* to the labour market measured by labour force participation and employment as well as (ii) *employment quality* based on working hours and occupational status. We formulate the following three expectations. First, we expect that family reunification and refugee immigrants, in particular, experience a more significant labour market disadvantage than economic immigrants. Second, we expect that the labour market disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants as compared to economic immigrants is smaller in countries with more generous labour market policies. Our final expectation is that labour market policies are more important for reducing disadvantages in access to the labour market than employment quality.

We base this expectation on the fact that, while all of the reviewed policy dimensions aim to facilitate immigrants' labour market access, only some measures target the quality of immigrants' employment. In particular, general and targeted support measures aim to support the transferability of origin-country credentials and skills and the acquisition of host-country human capital (Kanas and Van Tubergen, 2009; Tibajev and Hellgren, 2019). A similar role might also be played by measures increasing immigrants' eligibility to take up some specific jobs in the public sector and self-employment. Compared to the private sector, the public sector is often seen as an equal opportunity employer (Heath and Yu, 2005). Better access to self-employment is also likely to foster immigrants' employment quality because self-employed tend to work more hours and have a higher occupational status than employees (Bailey and Waldinger, 1991; Kanas, Van Tubergen and Van der Lippe, 2009).

Data, Operationalization, and Analytical Strategy

Data

We use data from the two EU-LFS *ad hoc* modules 2008 and 2014 on the labour market situation of immigrants and their immediate descendants. The EU-LFS is the largest EU sample survey covering the resident population aged 15 and over, living in private households, and residing in the EU. In the 2008 and 2014 *ad hoc* modules, 11 additional immigration-related variables covering questions regarding the parental region of origin, education, language skills, participation in integration programmes, such as job and language training, legal barriers to the labour market access, and migration motives. Although the EU-LFS and the *ad hoc* modules are representative surveys carried out in all EU Member States using a comparable sample design and a harmonized set of variables, their sampling was not explicitly designed for immigrants. Consequently, the data have some limitations, such as coverage of irregular immigrants or immigrants with language limitations. Nevertheless, the modules provide an unprecedented opportunity to examine the role of labour market policies in economic inequalities among immigrants with different migration motives.

We focus on foreign-born immigrants, aged between 25 and 54 with valid information on the reason for migration. Those who reported 'other' reasons for migration have been excluded. The sample covers the core working-age population (excluding those in full-time

education) in 17 European countries (Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Germany, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom). Some individual Member States had to be excluded because of a rather small sample size of refugees (i.e., Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Poland, Slovenia, and the Slovak Republic). Finally, we focus on non-Western immigrants who arrived within 10 years preceding the survey as most of the integration policies are targeted at these groups (Bilgili, Huddelston and Joki, 2015). Non-Western immigrants refer to any person who, in the survey year, is not a citizen of the European Union and does not come from Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or Japan.

Based on these pre-selections, all further refusals and missings are omitted from the analysis accounting for 3.8 per cent (for the complete sample). The final analytical N is 19,732 respondents for labour force participation and employment and 12,293 respondents for working hours and occupational status. Supplementary Table A1 provides an overview of immigrant respondents with different migration motives across countries.

Operationalization

Individual-level variables

Dependent variables. We focus on four dependent variables as measures of immigrants' labour market outcomes. *Labour force participation* is measured by a binary variable indicating whether a respondent is participating in the labour force (1) or not (0). Following the standard definition adopted by the International Conference of Labour Statisticians (2013), individuals participate in the labour force if they are in paid employment, self-employed, and unemployed (those without work, currently available, and seeking work). Nonparticipants are those who are neither employed nor unemployed. *Employment* is measured by a binary variable contrasting those who are employed, including self-employed (1), with those who are either unemployed or inactive (0). The other two dependent variables focus more on the quality aspect of work among the employed respondents. *Working hours* are measured by the usual (contractual) weekly working hours (ranging between 0 and 80). The variable has a normal distribution with a mean equal to 36 hours, and with 75 per cent of the observations falling within ± 1 standard deviation from the mean (between 23 and 49 hours). *Occupational*

status (ranging between 12 and 89) is based on the International Socio-Economic Index of Occupational Status (Ganzeboom, de Graaf and Treiman, 1992).

Independent variables

Individual-level variables. The main independent variable is a categorical variable differentiating three migration motives[3]: *Economic immigrants* include those who arrived with a contract (including intra-company transfers) or who came to look for work and study reasons. *Family reunification immigrants* are those who arrived for family formation and reunification. *Refugees* are those who arrived for international protection reasons. These can include a small number of asylum seekers, i.e., persons who have not yet completed the recognition process. However, as they are often hosted in collective accommodations, which are usually not covered by the national labour force survey, the number of asylum seekers should be marginal in our data (Dumont *et al.*, 2016: p. 7).[4]

Macro-level variables. To capture the discussed dimensions of labour market policies, we rely on the already described MIPEX. We specifically focus on the aggregate effect of labour market policies—*the labour market mobility index* and its four dimensions, i.e., *access to the labour market, access to general support, access to targeted support, and workers' rights*. These indices range from 0 to 100, where high values indicate more extensive integration policies (see Supplementary Table A2). As we have pooled two survey years, we take the average of each MIPEX indicator per country.[5]

Control variables. Several micro-level control variables associated with immigrants' labour market outcomes are included. To account for differences in human capital, we control for geographical origin, educational attainment, language difficulties, time spent in the host country, and age. To consider differences in family structure, we include marital status and the presence of young children (below 5). As we use pooled data, we also control for the survey year. For an overview of all variables used in the analyses, see Supplementary Tables A3–A5. Table 1 presents the summary statistics of all variables by the immigrant category.

Analytical Strategy

We estimate two linear probability models (for the binary outcomes) and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models (for the continuous outcomes) with country fixed effects. To take into account that standard errors

are correlated within countries, we apply cluster-robust standard errors. However, when the number of clusters is small, using cluster-robust standard errors can lead to over-rejection of the null hypothesis of zero effect (Cameron and Miller, 2015). To get around this problem, we use the wild-cluster bootstrap-t procedure that has been shown to perform well when there are only a few clusters. The procedure is implemented by the program 'clustse' (Menger, 2017), which is based on the 'cgmwildboot' command created by Judson Caskey (Cameron, Gelbach and Miller, 2008). As this technique does not generate meaningful standard error statistics, we only report the respective coefficients and *P*-values.

Our baseline model of labour market outcomes of individual *i* in country *c* in year *t* is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{Labor market outcomes}_{ict} = & \; u_c + u_t + b_1 F_{ic} + b_2 R_{ic} \\
& + b_3(F_{ic}*M_{ic}) \\
& + b_4(R_{ic}*M_{ic}) + c'Z_{ict} \\
& + e_{ict} \\
= & \; u_c + u_t + (b_1 + b_3 M_{ic})F_{ic} \\
& + (b_2 + b_4 M_{ic})R_{ic} + c'Z_{ict} \\
& + e_{ict},
\end{aligned}
$$

where u_c is a set of country binary indicators (country 'fixed effects'); u_t is a year binary indicator (to distinguish between the two EU-LFS *ad hoc* modules); F_{ic} is a binary indicator that equals 1 if family reunification case (0 if not); R_{ic} is a binary indicator that equals 1 if refugee case (0 if not); M_{ic} is the MIPEX score (overall; or a score component); Z_{ict} is a vector of individual-level characteristics ('controls'); and e_{ict} is an error term. The two terms b_3 and b_4 are interaction terms between the binary indicators for the migration motive and the MIPEX scores.

Note that in this specification, the main effects of the country-level labour market policies are absorbed in the country fixed effects u_c. The coefficients of interests are the two interaction terms b_3 and b_4, which show how the disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants as compared to economic immigrants varies with national labour market policies. To facilitate the interpretation, the continuous variables in the interaction model are standardized.

For each outcome, we specify five models (M1–M5) in which we include cross-level interactions between the individual-level migration motive and the MIPEX labour market mobility indices (see Tables 2–5 and Supplementary Tables A6–A9). Model 1 includes the overall labour market mobility index, while Models 2–5 cover the different dimensions of it separately. As multi-collinearity is likely to be an issue (Johnston,

Table 1. Descriptive statistics by the economic outcome and migration motive

	Economic (9,262)		Family reunification (N = 8,897)		Refugees (N = 1,573)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Range
LFP	87.95		60.33		63.51		0/1
EMP	78.73		48.63		47.68		0/1
Geographical origin							
Other Europe	22.99		27.74		21.49		
North Africa Middle East	14.69		19.10		31.60		0/1
Africa	11.13		10.42		27.02		0/1
Asia	26.17		22.82		14.94		0/1
Latin America	24.40		18.49		02.54		0/1
Origin missing	00.62		01.44		02.42		0/1
Women	44.33		74.74		41.77		0/1
Married	60.28		83.47		61.67		0/1
Children	31.53		51.06		37.64		0/1
Age categories							
25–29	22.41		26.78		20.28		
30–34	26.09		27.80		24.41		0/1
35–39	21.00		20.00		21.93		0/1
40–44	14.94		12.59		17.48		0/1
45–49	09.65		07.74		10.04		0/1
50–54	05.91		05.09		05.85		0/1
Educational attainment							
Primary	36.24		39.10		45.01		
Secondary	32.03		33.60		31.60		
Tertiary	31.72		27.30		23.39		0/1
Language difficulties	35.33		42.97		48.12		0/1
Language course	16.56		35.53		57.47		0/1
Length of residence	6.15	2.65	05.76	2.68	6.34	2.57	1–10
Year 2014	37.15		39.15		33.12		0/1

	Economic (N = 7,250)		Family reunification (N = 4,295)		Refugees (N = 748)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Range
WH	38.07	12.24	32.97	12.87	34.06	13.25	0–80
ISEI	34.81	19.62	33.25	17.09	32.44	15.70	12–89
Geographical origin							
Other Europe	22.54		28.36		21.13		
North Africa Middle East	13.17		13.81		30.35		0/1
Africa	10.61		11.13		25.53		0/1
Asia	28.15		22.37		14.17		0/1
Latin America	24.91		22.49		03.48		0/1
Origin missing	00.62		01.84		03.34		0/1
Women	42.15		60.40		30.35		0/1
Married	61.19		79.77		63.24		0/1
Children	29.26		35.62		26.07		0/1
Age categories							
25–29	20.52		25.96		20.19		
30–34	25.88		27.80		26.87		0/1
35–39	21.77		20.75		20.99		0/1
40–44	15.92		13.20		17.25		0/1
45–49	10.01		07.71		09.63		0/1
50–54	05.90		04.59		05.08		0/1

Table 1. (Continued)

	Economic (N = 7,250)		Family reunification (N = 4,295)		Refugees (N = 748)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Range
Educational attainment							
Primary	35.79		32.76		38.90		
Secondary	32.17		37.60		35.29		
Tertiary	32.04		29.64		25.80		0/1
Language difficulties	35.61		42.10		46.12		0/1
Language course	15.12		36.41		59.36		0/1
Length of residence	06.17	2.63	06.00	2.59	06.79	2.40	1–10
Year 2014	35.12		34.10		29.01		0/1

Source: Pooled *ad hoc* modules EU-LFS 2008 and 2014, own calculations.

Jones and Manley, 2018), given the small sample sizes for some countries and the positive and significant correlations between sub-dimensions of labour market policies (ranging between $r = 0.26$ and $r = 0.56$, Supplementary Table A5), we decided not to combine the four sub-dimensions in one model.[6]

Results

Labour Market Policies and Economic Inequalities of Immigrants

Tables 2–5 present the results for the four economic outcomes. As aforementioned, the results for labour force participation and employment are based on linear probability models, while for working hours and occupational status on OLS regressions. In all models, we control for individual-level variables and country fixed effects (see Supplementary Tables A6–A9).

Table 2 shows the results of labour force participation. In line with our expectations, family reunification and refugee immigrants, in particular, have a significantly lower probability of participating in the labour force than economic immigrants. The results show the same pattern across different model specifications (Models 1a–5a). This finding is in line with previously discussed research on the disadvantaged position of family reunification and refugee immigrants in European countries (Cangiano, 2014; Dumont *et al.*, 2016; Zwysen, 2018) and the United States (Chiswick, Liang Lee and Miller, 2005; Akresh, 2008).

Turning to the labour market policy coefficients, the results show support for our expectation that in countries with more extensive labour market policies, economic inequalities between economic and non-economic immigrants are smaller. The evidence is particularly strong for family reunification immigrants. For example, a one-standard-deviation increase in the labour market

mobility index is associated with a 4.5 percentage points higher probability of labour force participation of family reunification immigrants as compared to economic immigrants. There is no evidence that labour market mobility policies are associated with a higher probability of labour force participation of refugees as compared to economic immigrants.

Models 2a–5a present the results for the sub-dimensions of MIPEX indicators. Starting with Model 2a, we find no evidence that policies facilitating immigrants' access to the labour market are associated with an increased probability of labour force participation of non-economic versus economic immigrants. It could be that labour market access policies do not matter for inequalities among immigrants with different migration motives. However, the insignificant interaction effect can also imply that the benefits of labour market policies are equally distributed among non-economic and economic immigrants.

In line with our expectations, however, more extensive general and targeted support policies are associated with higher probabilities of labour force participation of family reunification versus economic immigrants (Models 3a and 4a). Specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in general and targeted support policies is associated with a 3.3 and, respectively, 6.7 percentage points higher probability of labour force participation of family reunification as compared to economic immigrants. These effects are not only statistically significant but also of economic relevance. For example, a 5.04 points increase in the standardized measure of general support policies (the difference between Sweden, which has a maximum score on the general support index, and Ireland, which has a minimum score) is associated with a 16.6 percentage points (5.04*0.033*100) increase in labour force participation of family reunification as compared

Table 2. Linear probability model of participating in the labour force

Individual characteristics	M1a	M2a	M3a	M4a	M5a
Migration motive, economic ref					
Family reunification	−0.165**	−0.168**	−0.166**	−0.161**	−0.164**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Refugees	−0.233**	−0.238**	−0.235**	−0.229**	−0.241**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Cross-level interactions with migration policy					
Family reunification × LM mobility	0.045***				
	(0)				
Refugee × LM mobility	0.048				
	(0.1)				
Family reunification × LM Access		0.011			
		(0.71)			
Refugee × LM Access		−0.000			
		(0.95)			
Family reunification × Access general support			0.033*		
			(0.04)		
Refugee × Access General support			0.029		
			(0.3)		
Family reunification × Access targeted support				0.066***	
				(0)	
Refugee × Access targeted support				0.057	
				(0.09)	
Family reunification × Access workers' rights					0.007
					(0.835)
Refugee × Access workers' rights					0.060*
					(0.015)
Constant	0.801***	0.787***	0.816***	0.751***	0.786***
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Individual-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N of individuals	19,732	19,732	19,732	19,732	19,732
N of countries	17	17	17	17	17
Adjusted R-squared	0.219	0.217	0.218	0.220	0.218

Source: Pooled *ad hoc* modules EU-LFS 2008 and 2014; *P*-values are in parentheses.

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$.

LM, labour market.

to economic immigrants. Likewise, a 3.77 points increase in the standardized measure of targeted support policies (the difference between, e.g., Sweden and Greece, which score the highest and the lowest, respectively, on the targeted support index) is associated with a 25.3 percentage points increase in labour force participation of family reunification as compared to economic immigrants. Interestingly, there is no evidence that general and targeted support policies are associated with increased probabilities of labour force participation of refugees as compared to economic immigrants.

Finally, Model 5a shows that more extensive workers' rights policies are associated with higher probabilities of labour force participation of refugees versus economic immigrants. Again, this effect is not only statistically significant but also economically relevant. A one-standard-deviation increase in workers' rights policies is associated with a 6 percentage points higher probability of labour force participation of refugees as compared to economic immigrants. There is, however, no evidence for the positive association between workers' rights policies and the probability of labour force participation of family reunification versus economic immigrants.

Table 3 (Models 1b–5b) shows the results for differences in employment. Similar to findings discussed in Table 2, in comparison to economic immigrants,

family reunification and especially refugee immigrants have significantly lower probabilities of employment. These results are in line with our first expectation about the relative disadvantage of non-economic immigrants.

Concerning the role of labour market policies, the findings for employment follow the same pattern as for labour force participation, both in terms of statistical significance and economic relevance. The employment inequality between family reunification and economic immigrants is smaller in countries with a higher score on the overall labour market mobility index (Model 1b). Compared to economic immigrants, a one-standard-deviation increase in the labour market mobility index is associated with a 5.1 percentage points higher probability of family reunification immigrants having employment. In contrast, there is no evidence that labour market mobility policies are associated with a higher probability of employment of refugees.

Findings for the sub-dimensional indices show that employment differences are significantly smaller in countries with more generous general and targeted

Table 3. Linear probability model of participating in employment

Individual characteristics	M1b	M2b	M3b	M4b	M5b
Migration motive, economic ref					
Family reunification	-0.200^{**}	-0.204^{**}	-0.201^{**}	-0.196^{**}	-0.199^{**}
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Refugees	-0.294^{**}	-0.302^{**}	-0.298^{**}	-0.291^{**}	-0.304^{**}
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Cross-level interactions with migration policy					
Family reunification × LM mobility	0.051^{***}				
	(0)				
Refugee × LM mobility	0.049				
	(0.075)				
Family reunification × LM Access		0.016			
		(0.565)			
Refugee × LM Access		-0.006			
		(0.835)			
Family reunification × Access general support			0.038^{*}		
			(0.045)		
Refugee × Access General support			0.032		
			(0.25)		
Family reunification × Access targeted support				0.067^{***}	
				(0.0)	
Refugee × Access targeted support				0.057	
				(0.11)	
Family reunification × Access workers' rights					0.010
					(0.76)
Refugee × Access workers' rights					0.064^{*}
					(0.01)
Constant	0.790^{***}	0.777^{***}	0.809^{***}	0.738^{***}	0.774^{***}
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Individual-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N of individuals	19,732	19,732	19,732	14,513	14,513
N of countries	17	17	17	17	17
Adjusted R-squared	0.195	0.193	0.194	0.196	0.194

Source: Pooled *ad hoc* modules EU-LFS 2008 and 2014; *P*-values are in parentheses.

*$^{*}P < 0.05$, $^{**}P < 0.01$, $^{***}P < 0.001$.

LM, labour market.

support policies. Again, these results only apply to inequalities between family reunification and economic immigrants. For example, a one-standard-deviation increase in general and targeted support policies are associated with a 3.8 and, respectively, 6.7 percentage points higher employment probability of family reunification as compared to economic immigrants.

However, in countries with more extensive policies related to workers' rights, employment inequalities between refugee and economic immigrants are significantly smaller (Model 5b). More specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in workers' rights policies is associated with a 6.4 percentage points higher

probability of employment of refugees versus economic immigrants. Similar to our previous findings for labour force participation, workers' rights policies seem to matter less for employment inequalities between family reunification and economic immigrants. Finally, we do not find an association between policies facilitating immigrants' access to the labour market and employment differences between economic and non-economic immigrants (Model 2b).

Table 4 (Models 1c–5c) shows the results for the working hours. In line with our first expectation, we find that family reunification and refugee immigrants work significantly fewer hours than economic

Table 4. OLS regression of working hours

Individual characteristics	M1c	M2c	M3c	M4c	M5c
Migration motive, economic ref					
Family reunification	−2.482**	−2.491**	−2.515**	−2.490**	−2.416**
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Refugees	−3.344*	−2.925**	−−3.174**	−3.327*	−3.568**
	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.01)	(0.045)	(0.005)
Cross-level interactions with migration policy					
Family reunification × LM mobility	0.790***				
	(0)				
Refugee × LM mobility	1.334				
	(0.075)				
Family reunification × LM Access		0.428			
		(0.135)			
Refugee × LM Access		1.841			
		(0.19)			
Family reunification × Access general support			0.168		
			(0.545)		
Refugee × Access General support			−0.048		
			(0.96)		
Family reunification × Access targeted support				0.698**	
				(0.005)	
Refugee × Access targeted support				0.838	
				(0.24)	
Family reunification × Access workers' rights					0.669***
					(0)
Refugee × Access workers' rights					2.070*
					(0.045)
Constant	39.405***	39.380***	39.154***	38.759***	39.155***
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Individual-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N of individuals	12,293	12,293	12,293	12,293	12,293
N of countries	17	17	17	17	17
Adjusted R-squared	0.138	0.138	0.137	0.138	0.139

Source: Pooled *ad hoc* modules EU-LFS 2008 and 2014; *P*-values are in parentheses.

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$.

LM, labour market.

immigrants (cf. Models 1c–5c). Turning to the coefficients for the labour market policies, we find partial support for the positive role of labour market policies in reducing inequalities among groups of immigrants. Similar to our findings for labour force participation and employment, labour market policies seem particularly important for working time inequalities between family reunification and economic immigrants.

Specifically, Model 1c indicates that a one-standard-deviation increase in the labour market mobility index is associated with a 0.79-hour increase in working hours of family reunification as compared to economic immigrants. Findings for the sub-dimensional indices show that the difference in working hours between family

reunification and economic immigrants is also smaller in countries with more targeted support policies (Model 4c) and access to worker's rights (Model 5c). For example, a one-standard-deviation increase in targeted support policies is associated with a 0.7-hour increase in working hours of family reunification versus economic immigrants. Likewise, a one-standard-deviation increase in workers' rights policies is associated with an increase in working hours of family reunification immigrants (0.67 hours) and refugees (2.07 hours) as compared to economic immigrants. Similar to our previous findings for labour force participation and employment, we do not find any evidence with regard to policies facilitating immigrants' access to the labour market (Model 2c).

Table 5. OLS regression of occupational status

Individual characteristics	M1d	M2d	M3d	M4d	M5d
Migration motive, economic ref					
Family reunification	−3.690	−3.795	−3.703	−3.708	−3.673
	(0.105)	(0.075)	(0.09)	(0.1)	(0.09)
Refugees	−5.323[**]	−5.211[**]	−5.262[**]	−5.482[**]	−5.434[**]
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Cross-level interactions with migration policy					
Family reunification × LM mobility	−0.392				
	(0.71)				
Refugee × LM mobility	−0.109				
	(0.875)				
Family reunification × LM Access		0.822			
		(0.705)			
Refugee × LM Access		0.209			
		(0.895)			
Family reunification × Access general support			0.143		
			(0.945)		
Refugee × Access General support			0.377		
			(0.785)		
Family reunification × Access targeted support				−1.906[*]	
				(0.045)	
Refugee × Access targeted support				−1.356	
				(0.09)	
Family reunification × Access workers' rights					−0.109
					(0.97)
Refugee × Access workers' rights					0.681
					(0.65)
Constant	32.923[***]	33.470[***]	33.245[***]	33.718[***]	33.059[***]
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)
Individual-level controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Country-fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N of individuals	12,293	12,293	12,293	12,293	12,293
N of countries	17	17	17	17	17
Adjusted R-squared	0.395	0.395	0.395	0.396	0.395

Source: Pooled *ad hoc* modules EU-LFS 2008 and 2014; P-values are in parentheses.

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$.

LM, labour market.

Finally, Table 5 (Models 1d–5d) presents the results for occupational status, which are the least supportive of our expectations. Concerning group differences, our results show that only refugees consistently have lower occupational status as compared to economic immigrants.

Moreover, there is little evidence that more generous labour market policies are associated with smaller occupational status inequalities among immigrants, as indicated by, mostly, insignificant interaction terms (Models 1d–3d and 5d). The exception is a negative and statistically significant interaction effect between targeted support policies and family reunification immigrants. Specifically, Model 4d shows that a one-standard-deviation increase in targeted support policies is associated with a nearly two status points lower occupational status of family reunification immigrants as compared to economic immigrants.

Finally, we expected that labour market policies are more important for reducing disadvantages in access to the labour market (labour force participation and employment) rather than the quality of employment (working hours and occupational status). Our results provide mixed support. While we find that in countries with more generous integration policies, group inequalities in access to the labour market tend to be smaller, integration policies seem to also matter for reducing inequalities in working hours.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study contributes to the literature on the integration of immigrants with different admission statuses as well as the policy evaluation literature. Previous research has shown limited support for the impact of labour market policies on immigrants' economic outcomes. This might be because this research has treated the immigrant population as a homogenous group and paid insufficient attention to those particularly susceptible to the influence of integration policies, such as recently arrived, non-Western immigrants with non-economic migration motives. When focusing on these particularly disadvantaged groups, our results suggest that labour market policies matter for reducing economic inequalities among immigrants.

In line with previous studies (e.g., Cangiano, 2014; Dumont *et al*., 2016; Zwysen, 2018), we find that even after controlling for differences in human capital and socio-demographic characteristics, family reunification and particularly refugee immigrants have considerably lower labour force participation and employment rates, and when employed, work fewer hours and have a lower

occupational status than economic immigrants. However, there is some evidence that the economic disadvantage of family reunification and refugee immigrants is significantly smaller in countries with more extensive labour market policies. These findings hold for the overall labour market mobility index and its specific sub-dimensions, in particular policies of general and targeted support as well as for workers' rights. Although policy effects vary among immigrant groups and outcomes analysed.

General support policies, such as public employment services and vocational training, are associated with smaller inequalities in labour market access and working hours between family reunification and economic immigrants. Likewise, inequalities in labour market access and working hours between family reunification and economic immigrants tend to be smaller in countries with a more generous provision of targeted support policies. An exception to this pattern is the negative role of targeted support policies for occupational inequalities between family reunification and economic immigrants. Results suggest that in countries with more generous targeted support policies, occupational inequalities between family reunification and economic immigrants are larger. A possible explanation for this unexpected finding is that some of the general and targeted policies include programmes aiming at groups particularly distant from the labour market, such as long-term unemployed and refugee women. While these programmes may facilitate access to the labour market by, for instance, maintaining the skills of long-term unemployed people, they mostly entail low-skilled activities, which provide a limited avenue for skilled employment (Liechti *et al*., 2017). In this context, some researchers have even argued about the stigmatizing role of selected labour market programmes (Kogan, 2016; Liechti *et al*., 2017).

While the pattern of findings is very similar to those for family reunification immigrants, we find no evidence that general and targeted support policies are significantly related to labour market inequalities between refugee and economic immigrants. Given the small sample size of refugee immigrants in some countries, the lack of significant findings should be interpreted with caution. It would, therefore, be important to replicate these analyses with a larger population of refugee immigrants.

In line with our expectations, we also find that in countries with generous policies supporting workers' rights, access to social security, and housing, economic inequalities between refugees and economic immigrants are smaller. Importantly, this finding holds for refugees' probability of participating in the labour market and their probability of being employed and working hours,

suggesting that enhanced access to workers' rights and social security measures are beneficial to the economic integration of refugee immigrants. This finding is in line with previous research in the European context showing that immigrants' economic disadvantage is strongly related to their limited access to social provisions, which are not universal, but based on years of employment contributions (Cangiano, 2014; Hooijer and Picot, 2015).

Although our results suggest that the economic inequalities between immigrant groups are significantly reduced in countries with more extensive labour market policies, a valid critique of the presented analyses could be related to immigrants' selectivity. For instance, it could be that rather than being influenced by labour market policies, distinct policy regimes attract different types of immigrants. For example, immigrants who are more willing and able to succeed in the labour market may be more likely to move to countries with more generous labour market policies, leading to biased results. Although we are not able to control for the selectivity of immigrants, we argue that the selection of immigrants across policy regimes is less likely to affect our results for at least two reasons. First, the selection explanation assumes that immigrants are free to move, but this is not the case for non-Western immigrants in our sample. Entry to European countries is restricted for almost all non-EU nationals by visa requirements. This implies that immigrants' destination country is not necessarily their preferred one, but rather a preferred country among those with lower visa restrictions and specific human trafficking routes (Bloch and Schuster, 2002; Cohen, Haberfeld and Kogan, 2011). A second reason is that a substantial proportion of immigrants in our sample are 'tied movers' whose immigration decision is influenced by the presence of existing ties in the destination rather than the country's labour market policies. This is true for family reunification immigrants and for many humanitarian immigrants who tend to move to countries with family members present (Castles, 2004).

Although this is beyond the scope of our study, mainly due to data limitations, future research should provide further insights into mechanisms behind national labour market policies. Our theoretical framework assumed that labour market integration policies benefit non-economic immigrants by alleviating the institutional barriers for labour market access and promoting human capital development. While the not significant findings for labour market access policies suggest the importance of human development explanation, we did not test any of these mechanisms directly. For instance, it would be important to know whether immigrants located in countries with more generous targeted support policies are more likely to participate in labour market programmes (e.g., job counselling, language courses, vocational training) and which of these programmes are particularly important for different groups of immigrants. In this context, research suggests that there are substantial differences between national laws and regulations on the one hand (covered mostly by MIPEX) and their more local interpretation and implementation (Czaika and de Haas, 2013; Kogan, 2016), which may have an impact on the effectiveness of national integration policies.

A final issue to be mentioned is that our data did not allow for a more detailed distinction within migration categories due to small sample sizes in selected countries. Clearly, there are other equally important dimensions of vulnerability, making immigrants more or less susceptible to the influence of labour market integration policies. A study that incorporates more complex categories of vulnerability, such as intersections with gender and skill levels, might be fruitful for further investigation into the role of integration policies on immigrants' labour market outcomes.

Supplementary Data

Supplementary data are available at *ESR* online.

Notes

1 Access to the labour market was restricted in some EU Members States for the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia (until 2011), and for Bulgaria and Romania (until 2014). Unfortunately, the EU-LFS *ad hoc* modules do not allow a distinction between old (EU15) and new (EU10 and EU2) Member States. Therefore, we excluded all citizens of EU28 Member States from the analyses.

2 Based on the EU-LFS *ad hoc* module 2008, about 47.4% of economic immigrants as compared to 34.1% of family reunification and 35.6% refugee immigrants reported unrestricted access to the labour market. Simultaneously, many family reunification (47.1%) and refugee (45.8) immigrants answered 'not applicable' on this question. People could answer 'not applicable' if they did not intend to work and if they acquired host-country citizenship.

3 This categorization was derived from two questions. In 2008 it was asked 'What was the main reason for coming to [country]?' with possible answer categories (i) employment intra-corporate transfer; (ii)

employment, job found before migrating other than code 1; (iii) employment, no job found before migrating; (iv) study, (v) international protection, (vi) accompanying family/family reunification; (vii) family formation; and (viii) other. A similar question was asked in 2014 with possible answer categories (i) employment, job found before migration; (ii) employment, job not found before migrating; (iii) family reasons; (iv) study, (v) international protection or asylum, and (vi) other.

4   While we assume that there is an overlap between a self-declared reason for migration and the actual legal category under which the person entered the country, this may not be the case for some immigrants. Some of the immigrants who reported an economic migration motive might have entered the country on a family reunification or humanitarian visa. While the differences between migration motive and admission category might be consequential for our arguments regarding institutional barriers, the reasoning about the portability of immigrants' human capital should still hold as those are more related to immigrants' self-declared migration motive rather than the visa of admission.

5   We took an average because (i) four countries were observed only once in a 2-year period, (ii) between six (for targeted support) and 13 countries do not experience any change in the years (see Supplementary Table A4). Still, we also run the models with time-variant MIPEX indicators, the results are substantially the same.

6   We do not use weights in the estimation of the regression models as there is no consensus about the use of weights in regression analyses [see Solon, Haider and Wooldridge (2015) for a discussion]. In general, the recommendation is to estimate two models: one with unweighted data and one using population weights. If the parameter estimates are similar, then the unweighted analyses are preferred because they are more efficient than those with weights used (Winship and Radbill, 1994). We followed this procedure, and the parameters estimates were overall similar with a few exceptions in the occupational status model. More importantly, using weights is not possible with the wild-cluster bootstrap-t procedure. We, therefore, estimated the final models without using weights.

Acknowledgements

References

Aleksynska, M. and Tritah, A. (2013). Occupation–education mismatch of immigrant workers in Europe: context and policies. *Economics of Education Review*, 36, 229–244.

Akresh, I. (2008). Occupational trajectories of legal US immigrants: downgrading and recovery. *Population and Development Review*, 34, 435–456.

Bailey, T. and Waldinger, R. (1991). Primary, secondary, and enclave labor markets: a training systems approach. American Sociological Review, 56, 432-445.

Bakker, L., Dagevos, J. and Engbersen, G. (2017). Explaining the refugee gap: a longitudinal study on labour market participation of refugees in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 43, 1775–1791.

Bevelander, P. and Pendakur, R. (2014). The labour market integration of refugee and family reunion immigrants: a comparison of outcomes in Canada and Sweden. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40, 689–709.

Bilgili, Ö., Huddleston, T. and Joki, A. (2015). *The Dynamics between Integration Policies and Outcomes: Synthesis of the Literature*, available from: <https://www.mipex.eu/sites/default/files/downloads/files/mipex_literature-review_the-dynamics-between-integration-policies-and-outcomes.pdf> [accessed 09 November 2020].

Bloch, A. and Schuster, L. (2002). Asylum and welfare: contemporary debates. *Critical Social Policy*, 22, 393–414.

Büchel, F. and Frick, J. (2005). Immigrants' economic performance across Europe—does immigration policy matter? *Population Research and Policy Review*, 24, 175–212.

Cameron, A. C. and Miller, D. L. (2015). A Practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50, 317–372.

Cameron, A. C., Gelbach, J. and Miller, D. L. (2008). Bootstrap-based improvements for inference with clustered errors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90, 414–427.

Cangiano, A. (2014). Migration policies and migrant employment outcomes. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 2, 417–443.

Castles, S. (2004). Why migration policies fail. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27, 205–227.

Chiswick, B., Liang Lee, Y. and Miller, P. (2005). Immigrant earnings: a longitudinal analysis. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 51, 485–503.

Cohen, Y., Haberfeld, Y. and Kogan, I. (2011). Who went where? Jewish immigration from the Former Soviet Union to Israel, the USA and Germany, 1990–2000. Israel Affairs, 17, 7-20

Corrigan, O. (2015). Conditionality of legal status and immigrant occupational attainment in western Europe. *Policy and Politics*, 43, 181–202.

Czaika, M. and de Haas, H. (2013). The effectiveness of immigration policies. *Population and Development Review*, 39, 487–508.

Davidov, E. and Meuleman, B. (2012). Explaining attitudes towards immigration policies in European countries: the role of human values. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38, 757–775.

Dumont, J.-C. *et al.* (2016). *How Are Refugees Faring on the Labour Market in Europe?* A first evaluation based on the 2014 EU LFS. Working Paper 1/2106, EC and OECD. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.

Duvander, A.-Z. (2001). Do country-specific skills lead to improved labor market positions? An analysis of unemployment and labor market returns to education among immigrants in Sweden. *Work and Occupations*, 28, 210–233.

European Migration Network. (2017). *Family Reunification of Third-Country Nationals in the EU Plus Norway: National Practices*, available from: <https://ec.europa.eu/homeaffairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/00_family_reunification_synthesis_report_final_en_print_ready_0.pdf> [accessed 09 November 2020].

Fasani, F., Frattini, T. and Minale, L. (2018). *(The Struggle for) Refugee Integration into the Labour Market: Evidence from Europe*. IZA Discussion Papers, No. 11333, Institute of Labor Economics (IZA).

Ganzeboom, H., de Graaf, P. and Treiman, D. (1992). A standard international socio-economic index of occupational status. *Social Science Research*, 21, 1–56.

Heath, A. and Yu, S. (2005). Explaining ethnic minority disadvantage. In Heath A, Ermisch J. and Gallie D. (Eds.), *Understanding Social Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp 187-225.

Hooijer, G. and Picot, G. (2015). European welfare states and migrant poverty: the institutional determinants of disadvantage. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48, 1879–1904.

Huddleston, T. *et al.* (2015). *Migrant Integration Policy Index III*. Brussels: British Council and Migration Policy Group.

International Conference of Labour Statisticians. (2013). *Resolution Concerning Statistics of Work, Employment and Labour Underutilization*, adopted by the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians, Geneva, available from: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/—dgreports/—stat/documents/normativeinstrument/wcms_230304.pdf [accessed 09 November 2020].

Johnston, R., Jones, K. and Manley, D. (2018). Confounding and collinearity in regression analysis: a cautionary tale and an alternative procedure, illustrated by studies of British voting behaviour. *Quality & Quantity*, 52, 1957–1976.

Junankar, P. and Mahuteau, S. (2005). Do migrants get good jobs? New migrant settlement in Australia. *Economic Record*, 81, S34–S46.

Kanas, A. and Van Tubergen, F. (2009). The impact of origin and host country schooling on the economic performance of immigrants. *Social Forces*, 88, 893–915.

Kanas, A., Van Tubergen, F. and Van der Lippe, T. (2009). Immigrant self-employment: testing hypotheses about the role of origin-and host-country human capital and bonding and bridging social capital. *Work and Occupations*, 36, 181–208.

Kogan, I. (2016). Integration policies and immigrants' labor market outcomes in Europe. *Sociological Science*, 3, 335–358.

Konle-Seidl, R. and Bolits, G. (2016). Labour market integration of refugees: strategies and good practices. Directorate General for Internal Policies. Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy. European Parliament. Study for the EMPL Committee.

Lancee, B. (2016). The negative side effects of vocational education: a cross-national analysis of the relative unemployment risk of young non-western immigrants in Europe. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 60, 659–679.

Lancee, B. and Bol, T. (2017). The transferability of skills and degrees: why the place of education affects immigrant earnings. *Social Forces*, 96, 691–716.

Liechti, F. *et al.* (2017). The signalling value of labour market programmes. *European Sociological Review*, 33, 257–274.

Menger, A. (2017). "CLUSTSE: Stata module to estimate the statistical significance of parameters when the data is clustered with a small number of clusters," Statistical Software Components S457989, Boston College Department of Economics.

OECD/European Union. (2018). Indicators of Immigrant Integration 2018: Settling In, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi-org.eur.idm.oclc.org/10.1787/9789264307216-en

Pichler, F. (2011). Success on European labor markets: a cross-national comparison of attainment between immigrant and majority populations. *International Migration Review*, 45, 938–978.

Rinne, U. (2013). The evaluation of immigration policies. In Constant A. and Zimmermann K. (Eds.), *International Handbook on the Economics of Migration*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 530–551.

Solon, G., Haider, S. J. and Wooldridge, J. M. (2015). What are we weighting for? *Journal of Human Resources*, 50, 301–316.

Tibajev, A. and Hellgren, C. (2019). The effects of recognition of foreign education for newly arrived immigrants. *European Sociological Review*, 35, 506–521.

Van Tubergen, F., Maas, I. and Flap, H. (2004). The economic incorporation of immigrants in 18 western societies: origin, destination, and community effects. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 704–727.

Winship, C. and Radbill, L. (1994). Sampling weights and regression analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 23, 230–257.

Zwysen, W. (2018). Different patterns of labor market integration by migration motivation in Europe: the role of host country human capital. *International Migration Review*, 53, 59–89.

Dr Agnieszka Kanas is an assistant professor of Public Policy and Politics at Erasmus University Rotterdam. Her current research interests are immigrants' economic disadvantage and integration, migration and integration policy, stratification and inequality, intergroup

attitudes, and intergroup relations. Her work has been published in journals such as *International Migration Review*, *Political Psychology*, *Social Forces*, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, and *Social Science Research*.

Dr Stephanie Steinmetz is an associate professor of Sociology at the University of Lausanne. Her main research interests centre on the one hand on gender inequalities in education and the labour market from a cross-national perspective and how those vary if other social categories of stratification such as ethnicity, social class, and sexuality intersect. On the other hand, she has done extensive research in the area of (web) survey methodology, in particular on the question of representativeness of cross-national volunteer web surveys.