

Labour market integration of migrants and their descendants

[Migrants in European labour markets are persistently disadvantaged by region of origin](#)

Contents

Introduction	2
Literature review	3
Methodology	6
Descriptive analysis: migrants and their descendants in Europe, and their labour market situation	10
A multivariate approach: distilling the effect of migrant status and origin	15
Conclusions	22
References	23
Annex	26

Author: Enrique Fernández-Macías (Eurofound) and Tania Paniagua de la Iglesia (University of Salamanca)

Research Manager/s: Donald Storrie

Eurofound reference number: WPEF17037

© European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, 2018

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) is a tripartite European Union Agency, whose role is to provide knowledge in the area of social, employment and work-related policies. Eurofound was established in 1975 by Council Regulation (EEC) No. 1365/75 to contribute to the planning and design of better living and working conditions in Europe.

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions

Telephone: (+353 1) 204 31 00

Email: information@eurofound.europa.eu

Web: www.eurofound.europa.eu

Introduction

In 2015, more than a million migrants arrived into Europe, most of them trying to flee the horrors of the Syrian war. European countries struggled to cope with this massive influx of people over such a short period of time, especially the countries whose location made them the main points of arrival (as Greece or Italy). A very large proportion of these refugees moved to Germany, the country that responded most positively to the crisis. However, many of these refugees and migrants remained in the countries of arrival or moved to other countries such as Sweden or Austria.

This is just the last of many waves of immigration into Europe in recent history. In the 1950s and 1960s, the independence of former European colonies led to big population flows into countries such as France, UK, Belgium or Netherlands from Africa, the Caribbean and Asia. Fast-growing Central and Northern European countries with no former colonies also attracted many migrants in this period, mainly from Mediterranean countries as Spain or Turkey, often signing 'guest-worker' agreements than in many cases became permanent. Another wave was triggered by the collapse of the Soviet Union, with many workers moving from the East to Western Europe from the early 1990s. Around the turn of the millennium, countries of Southern Europe which were traditionally senders rather than receivers of migrants experienced large inflows from Latin America and North Africa. And most recently, the EU Enlargements of 2004 and 2007 triggered another big wave of migration from the new Eastern Member States to Ireland, the UK, Spain and Italy among other countries (de la Rica, Glitz and Ortega, 2013).

Each of those waves took place in very different periods and towards different countries, involving immigrants of different origins and with different reasons to migrate. As a result, the population of migrants and their descendants is extremely diverse around Europe. However, all immigrants have something in common, being people who left their home countries to work and live in a different one. And all European countries with a significant migrant population share the need to integrate them in society, which is not automatic. In many European countries, migrants and their descendants tend to be socially disadvantaged with respect to people without a migrant background, in some cases bordering on the exclusion from mainstream economic and political systems. The integration of migrants and their descendants is one of the key challenges that Europe must face, if it wants to maintain social cohesion and equality.

This paper will assess the labour market integration of immigrants and their descendants in nine European countries using recent statistical data on this matter. It will try to do this taking into account the big diversity of the population of migrants and their descendants, proposing some new and more nuanced measures and categorisations in this respect. It will also provide an analysis of their labour market integration in Europe, taking into account not only participation and employment, but also the quality of the jobs taken up by migrants and the match between those jobs and their educational level. This paper will also introduce controls by different sociodemographic characteristics to avoid biases in our analysis, and separately assess the labour market integration of migrants across different countries and genders.

The paper is divided in five sections. After this introduction, it will review the literature on this issue, setting the scene for our own approximation. Then, it will present the new proposed indicators and measures of the migrant population, the characteristics of the data used and our analytical strategy. In a fourth section, it will provide an initial descriptive analysis of the immigrants and their descendants' population in nine European countries, and their ostensible differences in terms of labour market integration. In the following section, an econometric approach is followed to disentangle the effect of being a migrant or having a migrant origin from the effect of associated factors such as ethnic/world region of origin or social background, and it is intended to provide a fair assessment of the degree of integration of migrants in different countries, controlling for their characteristics. The final section concludes and discusses the broader implications of the findings.

Literature review

Different approaches in the literature on the integration of migrants tend to focus on different aspects. To summarise this literature, three broad categories can be distinguished. First, those theories that see the integration of migrants mostly as an individual process of integration, associated with the Classical Assimilation Model (Gordon, 1964; Alba, 1997). Second, those that emphasise the multidimensional and group-specific character of migrants' integration, associated with the Segmented Assimilation Approach (Portes, 1997). Finally, a more diverse group of theories that focus on the context of reception rather than on the individual or group characteristics of migrants, including theories of ethnic stratification into an hourglass economy (Massey, 1995), the effect of different diversity management models (Alexander, 2001), or the existence of ethnic penalties and discrimination (Heath and McMahon, 1997).

The Classical Assimilation Model (Gordon, 1964; Alba, 1997) was developed in the US in the middle of the last century, where it dominated the literature until the nineties. The simple idea behind it is that the immigrant population (and their descendants) gradually become more similar to the native population: assimilation is seen as a natural process of gradual loss of the native culture in favour of the new one (Gordon, 1964). This model understands assimilation as a continuous linear process, with clear stages that cannot be skipped over. In most recent versions of this theory, the characteristics of migrants and especially their human capital are also considered as important factors for their integration (Alba and Nee, 1997). From a generational perspective, the effect of migrant (or migrant origin) status on labour market integration would be expected to be gradual, with those most recently arrived being less integrated than those that arrived as children, and even less than the second generation.

Much of the economic literature on the assimilation of immigrants has focused on the study of their labour market situation and wage convergence with the native population (Chiswick, 1978; Borjas, 1985; Friedberg, 1993; Blau and Kahn, 2007). In this regard, it has been argued that the level of human capital of immigrants is typically lower than that of the natives, and this would at least partly explain their relatively lower labour market outcomes. However, many studies also pointed out that this gap is partially the result of problems of transferability of educational titles acquired in the country of origin (Chiswick, 1978; Friedberg, 2000; Chiswick and Hatton, 2003). Empirical economic literature on this matter has however emphasised the problems of studying the assimilation process with cross-sectional data, due to the very important heterogeneity of migrants over time and across cohorts (Borjas, 2008); also, that any assimilation results strongly depend on the underlying selection process which affects both observable and unobservable characteristics of immigrants (Adda, Dustmann and Gorlach, 2015; Borjas, 2008).

In contrast, the Segmented Assimilation Approach emphasises the complexity of adaptation to the host societies, recognising different ways and trajectories of adaptation which depend on individual features but also group characteristics and the structures of the host society (Portes, 1997; Portes and Böröcz, 1989; Portes and Rumbaut, 1996; Zhou, 1997). This model analyses the integration process from the dual perspective of acculturation and economic adjustment to a host society which is made up of unequal, segregated segments. The adoption of one or another mode of integration depends on different cultural, social, economic, and residential factors (Portes and Zhou, 1993).

This approach also emphasises the importance of social capital in the assimilation process. However, it understands social capital in a broad sense. Several studies focus on the kind of marriage unions, educational and labour expectations from families and from communities, as the main spheres of social capital with an impact on the integration of migrants and their descendants (Portes and Rumbaut, 2006; Crul and Vermeulen, 2003). Another argument found in this literature is that mixed ancestry is often associated with better integration (since it helps the acculturation process), and that ethnic communities with higher educational or occupational expectations tend to show better integration and upward social mobility (Crul and Vermeulen, 2003; Portes et al., 2006). All these factors can help to understand why some

ethnic minorities are better integrated than others, even if their social background might be similar.

As previously mentioned, the approaches focusing on the context of reception are more diverse, and can be further differentiated in three groups that are discussed below. All of these contextual approaches tend to assume that migrants and their descendants face more integration problems in the last few decades than in previous periods, as a result of more hostile contexts of reception (Crul and Vermeulen, 2003; Heath and Cheung, 2007).

The first of these ‘context of reception’ approaches focuses on the economic and labour situation of host societies, in particular to the trends in advanced economies towards segmented labour markets and polarised occupational structures (Massey, 1995; Massey and Hirst, 1998; Breen, 2004; Esping-Andersen and Wagner, 2012; Goldthorpe, 2016; Fernández-Macías and Hurley, 2017). Often, this dynamic goes together with an ethnic stratification process (Kalter and Kogan, 2006; Veira et al., 2011), which has been documented in some European countries (see for instance Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón, 2012). In this context, ethnic stratification refers to the concentration of migrants in occupations and jobs at the bottom of the occupational structure, which are usually unskilled and they have the most precarious working conditions, and lower chances of upward mobility (Grasmuck, 1984; Reich, 2008; Fernández-Macías et al., 2013). Since these trends refer to the last two decades in most European countries, they would especially affect immigrants that arrived in the most recent waves, and those with lower levels of qualification.

The second ‘context of reception’ approach focuses on the effect of different diversity management models (Alexander, 2001; Osuna et al., 2006). Three dominant models are identified in the literature: 1) the Assimilation Model, whose maximum reference has been France; 2) the Multicultural Model, typical of Anglo-Saxon countries (in USA this model is also known as the ‘melting pot’); and finally 3) the Gastarbeiter model, or Guest Worker model, traditionally associated with Germany. However, some recent studies have argued that, despite the big institutional and regulatory differences between these models, they do not seem to produce very different significant results in terms of integration of the respective migrant populations (Zuccotti, 2015). Instead, the integration (or not) of migrants tends to be relatively similar across Western countries with similar volumes of immigration, once the characteristics of migrants and the context of reception are taken into account (Zuccotti, 2015).

Focusing on the public policy side, other researchers have come to notice significant variations in the patterns of labour market integration of migrants, taking into account the institutional context (Adda, Dustmann and Görlarch, 2015). Some researchers argue that the most restrictive migratory policies or those that introduce an element of uncertainty have a direct impact on the lower investment in human capital by the migrants in the host country. Thus, they would shorten the expected duration of the stay, and consequently their investment in the acquisition of technical and productive skills (Adda, Dustmann and Görlarch, 2015).

Finally, some approaches try to explain different labour market outcomes as a result of latent discrimination processes, ranging from early theories such as the discriminatory taste model (Becker, 1975) and statistical discrimination theory (Phels, 1972; Thurow, 1976), to more recent approximations such as the Ethnic Penalties Approach (Heath and McMahon, 1997; Crul and Vermulen, 2003; Kalter and Kogan, 2006; Heath, 2007; Thomson and Crul, 2007). The earlier approaches try to explain the labour disadvantage of some social groups (women and ethnic minorities) as a result of a supposed taste for discrimination by some labour agents (Becker, 1975), or due to productivity information problems (Phels, 1972). The model of Becker argues that the labour insertion of migrants in the same occupations as the native workers could entail a social cost for the company, which would motivate the employers to develop a taste for discrimination in favour of native workers (Becker, 1975). On the other hand, in the absence of accurate information on the real productivity of individuals, employers could take as a reference the average productive characteristics of the group of

belonging. Therefore, the recruitment of individuals belonging to certain social groups would be based on the stereotype of their productive skills (Phels, 1972; Thurow, 1976).

The 'ethnic penalties hypothesis' states that ethnic minorities achieve poor labour market outcomes not because of observable demographic or socioeconomic factors, but due to ethnic/racial attributes that impose societal barriers over their labour market integration (Heath and Cheung, 2007). In the labour market, ethnic penalties include those processes by which employers hire or promote job candidates, which is not only determined by their labour market skills (that is, human capital), but also affected by their ethnic, religious, or racial attributes (Heath et al., 2007). This ethnic penalty can also extend to the second generation of migrants, independently of their educational levels or other observable attributes. However, the discriminated groups also vary across Europe, across different generations and contexts, and according to stereotypes and prejudices that each society has about the different ethnic minorities (Heath et al., 2007).

Methodology

The data used in this paper comes from the European Union Labour Force Survey (EULFS), in particular from the 2014 Ad-Hoc Module on the Labour Market Situation of Migrants and their Descendants. The EULFS is a representative survey that has been carried out for many decades in all EU member states under the coordination of Eurostat, using a comparable sample design and a harmonised set of variables that measure different sociodemographic and labour market attributes of Europeans. It is representative of the entire population in all EU member states, although the Ad-Hoc module used in this paper did not cover all countries (some countries did not participate, others did not release their data via Eurostat, such as Germany).

However, in this paper not all the countries are analysed, nor the full sample used. The analysis has been conducted on a subset of nine countries, namely Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the UK. In selecting these countries, this paper has tried to cover different European regions and countries that experienced migrant waves in recent decades. In terms of European regions, the only one that is entirely missing is the Eastern region, because the phenomenon of immigration is either virtually inexistent or too recent to be observable with this data. In terms of countries with a large migrant population, the one that is unfortunately missing is Germany, but the reason is simply that the microdata was not made available by Eurostat.

For the nine countries studied, a subsample of the population is used for the analysis; in fact, two different ones. For the descriptive analysis, the sample is restricted to the working age population (ages 16 to 64); for the multivariate analysis, the sample is further restricted to the *core* working age population (ages 25 to 54). The dropping of the very young and very old working age population for the multivariate analysis is justified by their idiosyncratic labour market situation that would bias the models. Using only core working age population ensures a more consistent sample and therefore coefficients that reflect more adequately the effect of migrant status or other variables of interest.

As for the **variables and measures** used in this paper, several new ones have been constructed combining information from the EULFS Ad-Hoc Module and also from some of the normal EULFS variables. The most important variables are, of course, those that allow identifying the migrant population. Inspired by the Classical Assimilation Approach, an attempt was made to construct a variable that measures migrant status as a continuum that spans from the most strict definition of migrant (someone that leaves her country of origin to work and live in a different one) to the original national population, with a series of intermediate categories. For this, the following variables have been used to collect and combine information:

- Country of birth and age of migration: here, there is a distinction between those born abroad (which would correspond to migrants in the standard definition) and those born in the respective country. Within those born abroad, there is a further distinction between those that migrated as adults (the category most fitting to the concept of migrant) from those that migrated as children (where the category of migrant applies less strongly: first, because the decision of migration was necessarily taken by someone else; second, because by migrating as children at least part of their initial socialisation took place in the receiving society, and therefore the process of acculturation started even before reaching the working age).
- Country of birth of the parents: here, the distinction is between those whose parents were born abroad and those whose parents were born in the receiving society. For those with parents born abroad, the further difference is whether only one or both parents were from a different country. The reason is, again, to try to nuance the measure, in this case for migrant origin: having a parent who is a native of the receiving society is likely to help the acculturation process, and therefore is likely to be associated with a better integration compared to those whose both parents were born abroad.

The combination of the previous variables produces a categorisation of migrant status and origin with an implicit gradation: 1) those who were born abroad and migrated as adults, the most ‘migrants’ of all; 2) those who were born abroad but were at least partly socialised in the host society, since they migrated as children; 3) those who were born in the host society but with both parents born abroad, and therefore are likely to have received a significant part of their early socialisation in the culture of which they are originating; and 4) those who were born in the host society and have one parent born abroad and one parent born in the receiving country, and therefore their exposure to the host society's culture would be maximum. From 1) to 4), the degree of ‘migrantness’ would diminish, with the fourth category almost merging into the *native-native population* (born in the host society, from parents also born in the host society), which will be used as a reference category in most of the analysis. By comparing these graded categories, it becomes possible to assess to what extent the integration of migrants into the labour market of the host societies is a linear process of assimilation over time and generation as is suggested by the Classical Assimilation Theory.

In addition to this primary categorisation of migrants and their descendants, the construction of other indicators to characterise them is outlined below:

- The most important one is the country of origin, which has been recoded into seven categories reflecting different broad regions of the world and indirectly also different ethnic origins: EU15, Eastern Europe, Northern Africa and the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, North America and Oceania, Latin America and Asia. Each individual in the EULFS sample has been assigned to one of these categories according to the country of birth of their father, their mother or themselves if the information of the parents is missing. With at least one parent born abroad, the person is already classified as originating from that particular area of the world. It is important to note that there is no specific category for natives: in all cases, the natives are classified together with all the other individuals coming from EU15 in that particular country. This is because this classification tries to capture the ‘ethnicity’ (proxied by world region of origin) of the respondent. This classification will be later used to differentiate the effect of being a migrant as such from the effect of being from a particular world region of origin, a crucial element in many of the approaches reviewed in the previous section of this paper, but most specifically the Segmented Assimilation Approach.
- Also theoretically important is the classification of respondents according to their social background (or class origin), which is proxied by the highest educational level attained by either the father or the mother of the individual. This will be used to differentiate the effect of migration status as such from the effect of social origin. A secondary variable measuring ‘educational mobility’ (the extent to which the respondents’ education differs from that of their parents) is also used in some of the models.
- Other relevant migration variables that will be used are: reason for migration (distinguishing employment, family reunification, asylum or other) and time in host society (for the models, it is important to distinguish those that have been less than two years in the host society, since they have not had time yet to be fully integrated).
- Other variables not related to migration but still relevant to characterise the migrant population and that could affect their labour market integration are: gender, age and family structure (having a partner and children present at home). These variables are used as controls in the multivariate analysis.

With respect to the main outcomes to be analysed in this paper (the degree of labour market integration), the following three variables were constructed:

1. The first one is a simple binary variable for labour market participation, differentiating on the one hand those who are inactive and on the other those who are either working or unemployed (actively searching and available for work).

2. The second one is a variable of employment and occupational status, that classifies the active population in six categories: 1) unemployed; 2) employed in a poorly paid job; 3) employed in a poorly-mid paid job; 4) employed in a mid-paid job; 5) employed in a mid-highly paid job; 6) employed in a highly paid job. In other words, this variable has six categories with a gradation of labour market position, from ‘unemployed’ (the worse possible outcome) to ‘employed in a highly paid job’ (the best possible outcome). To classify jobs into five categories according to their average pay, the occupation and sector of the job of the respondent is used and linked to the wage quintiles constructed in Eurofound’s European Jobs Monitor (see Eurofound, 2017a). That is, each of those categories roughly corresponds to quintiles of occupation-sector combinations, ranked by their average wage. This variable allows assessing the position that migrants occupy in each labour market in comparison with the native population, and links our analysis with the literature on job polarisation (which often uses a similar occupational quintiles approach; see Fernández-Macías and Hurley, 2017).
3. The third and final variable measures the match between the education of the respondent and the educational level required by their occupation, with an implicit educational requirement of 0 assumed for those who are unemployed (again, only the active population is classified). The education of respondents and the educational requirements of jobs are measured as 1 for primary or less, 2 for secondary and 3 for tertiary education: the education of the worker is subtracted to the education of the job to construct a measure of match. Therefore, the variable ranges from -3 (for those who are unemployed and therefore a ‘job’ requiring 0 education, and yet have a tertiary degree or more which gives them an educational score of 3) to +2 (for those who have a job requiring a tertiary degree and thus scoring 3, but have only primary education or less and therefore a score of 1 in that respect). This variable of education-occupation match provides a good complement to the previous variable measuring the occupational status of the jobs: it could be that migrants occupy lower (or higher) paid jobs because their education is lower (or higher), so it is important to disentangle this as well.

Finally, the **analytic strategy** of this paper will be as follows:

1. First, some descriptive analysis of the migrant population will be presented, and the apparent association between migrant status (as measured according to our ‘gradient’ approach) and labour market outcomes assessed.
2. Secondly, binary and ordinal logistic regressions will be used in order to fit multivariate models in which the association between migrant status and labour market outcomes is adjusted for the potential effect of third variables. More specifically, the strategy will be to introduce first the simple migrant categories, then add world region of origin and social background in successive steps in an attempt to *distil* as much as possible the separate effect of each of these factors. In all cases, the controls such as age, time since migration or family structure will be included. Additionally, in all cases, separate regressions by country and gender will be performed.
3. Finally, as an alternative approach, a similar set of logistic regressions as explained in the previous point will be conducted, but with a very different setup. Instead of running the regressions on the entire population to differentiate the effect of migrant status and the other variables on labour market outcomes, only the populations with a non-EU15 regional origin (that is, migrants and their descendants who come from outside EU15) will be selected and separate regressions for the entire pooled sample of each origin will be performed. For instance, this way the labour market integration of all the migrants and descendants from an Asian origin in all nine countries together can be analysed, fitting a multivariate model with different controls, and including the host country as a regressor (as an independent variable that can affect the labour


market outcomes). Using this method, one can assess how the different countries perform in terms of labour market integration of migrants from a same origin and with the same characteristics.

Before embarking in the analysis, it is imperative to acknowledge some important limitations imposed by the use of cross-sectional data. First, there is a very significant heterogeneity in the population of immigrants over time and across cohorts even within the same country, which can introduce a bias in the effect of some variables which is very difficult to control. Second, the decision to migrate is itself the result of a self-selection process that is affected by observable (education, experience, ethnicity and many others) and unobservable characteristics (such as ability, social networks or cultural distance), which can again bias the results in ways which are difficult to control. The statistical modelling used in this paper tries to introduce controls that, to a limited extent, can reduce both kind of issues (to the extent that those sources of bias are associated to observed characteristics introduced as controls in the models, such as age or education), but it is important to acknowledge that with cross-sectional data both types of bias cannot be properly eliminated. Therefore, the results of this paper should be taken as exploratory and a mere approximation, hopefully a useful one.

Descriptive analysis: migrants and their descendants in Europe, and their labour market situation

Figure 1 below shows the classification of immigrants and their descendants in nine European countries according to the EULFS of 2014. The chart at the top shows the original variables used, in order to assess the broad differences in the distribution of this population across Europe. For each country, there are three bars, two of them stacked (with an internal differentiation of two sub-categories in each of them).

Figure 1 Migrant status and origin, working age population



Source: EULFS, 2014

The bar on the right-hand side of each country in the top chart represents the proportion of the working age population which has one or two parents born abroad. This is the broadest category in this approximation, which applies both to migrants and people with a migrant origin (although going back just one generation: those whose *grandparents* were born abroad but whose parents were born in the host country would not be included in this category). This variable clearly differentiates two groups of countries: those with a very large population of migrant origin, accounting for 25% of the total or more (Sweden, Austria, UK, Belgium and France), and those with a smaller population of migrant origin (Spain and Italy with around 15%, Greece and Portugal with around 10%). It is interesting to note that although the predominant category is that of people with both parents born abroad, there is a significant number of people with just one parent born abroad and therefore with a *hybrid* origin (the country with a largest proportion of people in this category is France).

The bar in the middle of each country (in the top chart also) represents the proportion of the working age population that was born abroad. As could be expected, it is smaller than the proportion of the population *whose parents* were born abroad with the exception of Portugal (because there are many *returned emigrants*: people living in Portugal, born abroad, but with Portuguese parents). In Sweden, Austria, UK, Belgium and Spain the proportion of the working age population born abroad is between 15 and 20% of the total, being slightly above 10% in Italy and France and slightly below in Greece and Portugal. It is also interesting to compare the bars for those *born abroad* and those *whose parents were born abroad*: in countries where immigration is a relatively recent phenomenon, both figures are very similar (see all the Southern European countries shown in the picture); in countries with a longer


tradition of immigration, there is a big difference between both figures, which shows that there is a significant second generation. The bar of those born abroad is also split, in this case between those that migrated as children and those as adults. The latter category clearly dominates in all cases, but there is in most countries also a significant number of migrants who arrived as children to their host societies, which will be useful for the analysis later.

Finally, a bar was added for each country (in the top chart) showing the share of working age population without the nationality of the country in which they reside, for purely illustrative purposes. In most countries, the proportion of non-nationals is quite close to the proportion of migrants who arrived as adults, with the exception of Sweden, which is generally more open to the naturalisation of migrants.

With the information contained in the variables shown in the top chart of figure 1 (except the variable of nationality), a key variable of ‘combined migrant status and origin’ was constructed, shown in the bottom chart of the same figure. This is a more straightforward classification of people into five categories according to their migrant status and origin, as explained in the methodological section: starting at the bottom, those that migrated as adults; following by those that migrated as children; then by those who were born in the host country but whose two parents were born abroad; then those born in the host country but with one parent born abroad; and then (not shown, but implicit in the rest of the population until reaching 100% in the vertical axis), those born in the country and with both parents also born in the country (NBNBP: national born with national born parents). As indicated by the colour gradient of the segments of the bar, this classification implies a gradation in the degree of ‘migrantness’ of the population. As previously mentioned, the primary country differentiation in this respect is between countries with a long tradition of immigration (from Continental and Northern Europe, including the UK) and those with a more recent immigration history (all the Southern European countries shown in the figure). This distinction will be important in several further analyses.

Figure 2 below provides some additional information on the population of immigrants and their descendants in the different countries. The chart at the top shows the reasons for migration (that concerns only those born abroad). In countries where migration is a more recent phenomenon, employment is the dominant reason given by those born abroad for their migration into the current country of residence (the exception being Portugal, where this is a marginal cause). In all the other countries, the dominant reason given for migration is family reunification. Asylum is always numerically much less important than employment or family reasons: in fact, it accounts for a very marginal share of working age immigrants in all countries except Sweden, Austria and Belgium (and to a much smaller extent, perhaps also UK and France).

Figure 2 Some characteristics of migrant and their descendants, working age population




Source: EULFS, 2014

As for the world region of origin of immigrants and their descendants, there is quite an important diversity across Europe. Very often, a particular regional origin is only dominant in a particular country. Thus, Latin American migrants are very significant in Spain but marginal elsewhere (with the partial exception of Portugal); North Africans dominate the migrants and descendants population in France, being of secondary importance in Belgium and Spain; the Asian origin is more important in the UK than elsewhere; and the Sub-Saharan origin is dominant only in the migrant and descendants population of Portugal. Eastern European migrants and descendants are important in Sweden, Austria and Belgium. And finally, migrants and descendants from EU15 countries other than the host society are only dominant in Belgium, but important in most of the countries shown.

Figure 3 shows an additional characteristic of the migrant population and their descendants, in this case their social background (measured as the highest educational level attained by the parents of the respondent). Overall (without distinguishing neither country of destination nor region of origin), there are no significant differences between the NBNBP population and the different migrant categories in this respect, with the peculiarity that those of mixed migrant origin seem to have a slightly higher social background. However, when looking at the social background by region of origin, some significant differences emerge: mostly, those of North African and Middle East origin have a lower social background than the rest, while those of North American and Oceania origin have a higher one.

Figure 3 Some characteristics of migrants and their descendants, working age population




Source EULFS 2014

The main point of this paper is nevertheless to assess the labour market integration of migrants and their descendants in the different European countries, and a first approximation to this is shown in figure 4 below. For each country, this figure displays a stacked bar representing the employment and occupational status of five categories of the population: NBNBP (born in the country and parents too), mixed migrant origin (born in the country with one parent born abroad), full migrant origin (born in the country with both parents born abroad), migrated as a child and migrated as an adult (the most 'migrant' category). The segments of each bar represent one of seven possible status in terms of employment: inactive (at the bottom, with thick stripes), unemployed (with thin stripes), employed in a low paid job (first quintile, light blue segment), and so on until the top category representing those employed at jobs at the highest quintile in terms of average wages (that is, the highest paid jobs). The lines linking the segments permit a visual inspection of the *linearity* of the relationship between the combined migrant/migrant origin status and employment/occupational outcomes. If as predicted by Classical Assimilation Theories the integration of migrants is a linear process over time and generation, the lines are expected to move consistently down as we move from 'migrated as adults' to 'mixed migrant origin' and finally the NBNBP population, since the extent of inactivity and unemployment should decrease and the occupational positions taken should improve as the migrant population is slowly assimilated and blends into the host society.

Can such linear effect be observed in figure 4? Perhaps in some cases and to some extent. What seems very clear is that those that migrated as adults are always significantly disadvantaged with respect to the NBNBP population. The bar on the right-hand side of each national chart always shows much more inactivity and unemployment, and a clear bias towards lower paid jobs compared to the bar on the left-hand side. However, the middle categories are not always showing a gradation between these two extremes. For instance, those with a mixed migrant origin (but born in the country) show in most cases better labour market outcomes than the NBNBP working population (especially in occupational terms). Furthermore, the biggest jump in disadvantage tends to be observed between the two final categories (migrated as a child and migrated as adults), whereas the difference between migrated as a child and those born in the host country but with a migrant origin tend to be quite small. However, in Southern European countries the share of second generation is quite small and may lead to unreliable results for the intermediate categories. In the countries with a longer immigration tradition, there seems to be a smoother gradation in the relative disadvantage of migrant workers and their descendants, more fitting with the hypothesis of a more or less linear process of integration.


Figure 4 Migrant status and origin, employment and occupational status, working age population



Source: EULFS, 2014

Finally, figure 5 shows the education-occupational (mis)match of the different categories of migrants and their descendants compared to the NBNBP population. In this case, the white section of each bar shows those whose education matches the educational requirement of their job, whereas the segments in blue at the bottom of each bar show those who are overeducated (that is with more education than required for their job), and the segments with dots or stripes at the top show those who are in jobs which require education higher than what they have. As in the previous case, there is a very clear differentiation everywhere between the two extreme categories shown for each country: those who migrated as adults are more likely to be *overeducated* in their jobs than the NBNBP population, and less likely to be matched. However, only in Austria, Belgium, Italy and Portugal, there seems to be some gradation in the middle categories of migrant status and origin between those two extremes. In Sweden, UK and France, all categories except for 'migrated as adult' are very much the same with respect to education-occupational match, and to some extent in Spain too. In any case, this figure provides an important qualification to the results discussed earlier for employment and occupational status: the intensity of disadvantage associated with migrant status is lower in this case, suggesting that occupational disadvantage is to some extent the result of different educational profiles of the migrant population. Besides, to discuss in details the effect of third variables such as education on the integration of migrants, it is better to use a multivariate statistical approach, which will be done in the following section.

Figure 5 Migrant status and origin, education/occupational mismatch, working age population



Source: EULFS, 2014

A multivariate approach: distilling the effect of migrant status and origin

The discussion in this section is based on the detailed analysis of a set of multivariate logistic regression models that are included as an annex to this paper. To structure the discussion, this section will be split in three subsections, each one of them supported by an analytic table that summarises one aspect of the multivariate regression tables included in the annex.¹ The first subsection will discuss the effect of migrant and migrant origin status on labour market integration, and how it is affected by world region of origin and social background. The second subsection will focus on the impact that each of the world regions of origin has in terms of labour market outcomes. And finally, the third subsection will compare the degree of labour market integration of migrants and their descendants in different European countries, controlling for origin and other factors.

The labour market integration of migrants and their descendants

The descriptive analysis clearly shows that those that migrated as adults suffered a clear disadvantage in European labour markets compared to the *NBNBP* population, with some gradation in the intermediate categories between those two extremes. This could be interpreted as support for the Classical Assimilation Theory's hypothesis of a linear integration process over time and across generation, although there were some important exceptions that made this finding rather ambiguous and unclear. Based on this, it is now possible to answer the question of how migrant status and origin affect labour market integration more adequately, as summarised in table 1.

Table 1 The labour market integration of migrants and their descendants, summary table of statistically significant effects (+ or -)

	Labour Market Participation		Employment/occupational level		Education/job match	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Mixed migrant origin (one parent)	Small negative, disappears with region of origin	Small positive with region, gone with further controls	Positive, increased w/region, reduced w/ other controls +AT +FR +SE +UK	Positive, increased w/region, reduced w/ other controls +AT +FR +UK	Negative, becomes positive w/ other controls +AT +FR +SE +UK	Negative, becomes positive w/ other controls +AT +FR
Migrant origin (both parents)	Small negative, milder with controls -BE	Negative, positive w/ region & class, gone w/ controls +UK	Negative, positive with ethn. & class +AT +BE +FR +UK	Negative, positive with region & class +AT +FR +UK	Negative, becomes positive w/ region & other +AT +BE +SE +UK	Negative, becomes positive w/ region & other +AT +UK
Migrant, arrived as child	Small negative, disappears with region	Negative, disappears with controls -BE -FR	Negative, positive with region & class +AT +ES	Negative, positive with region & class +ES	Negative, becomes positive w/ region & class +AT	Negative, gone with region & controls +UK
Migrant, arrived as adult	Positive, reinforced with controls	Negative, reduced with controls but sign. -BE -FR -SE -FR	Very negative, reduced with controls but sign. -IT -UK	Very negative, reduced with controls but sign. -ALL but AT GR	Very negative, reduced with controls but sign. +GR +IT +UK	Very negative, reduced with controls but sign. ALL

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

¹ All the coefficients in these models are expressed exponentiated, as odds ratios, meaning that values below 1 indicate a negative and above 1 a positive effect of a particular variable on labour market participation (tables A1 and A2), employment/occupational status (tables A3 and A4) and match between education and occupation (tables A5 and A6). Tables A1, A3 and A5 include models for all countries together (labelled as 'EU'), adding control variables stepwise, and models for each country separately (with all controls). Tables A2, A4 and A6 are similar logistic regressions (with all controls) but for a different population: in each case, all the migrants and their descendants from a particular world region have been pooled together (independently of their country of residence).

In terms of **labour market participation**, there is a very significant difference by gender. In the case of males, those that migrated as adults have a higher probability of participating in employment than the *NBNBP* population, an effect that is in fact reinforced by the introduction of controls. In the case of females, those that migrated as adults are less likely to participate in employment than the equivalent category of the *NBNBP* population, and although the introduction of controls reduces the intensity of the effect, it remains important and statistically significant. However, this difference between men and women only concerns the category of migrants who migrated as adults. The intermediate categories show similar patterns for both genders: a small negative effect for being a migrant who came as a child or for being of migrant origin, which disappears when controls are introduced, especially when controlling for the world region of origin.

Overall, there is no evidence of a gradual assimilation into the national patterns of labour market participation for the population of migrants and nationals with a migrant origin: instead, for all categories except those that migrated as adults (the most recent and most 'migrant' group), *there is simply no effect once the impact of region of origin is controlled for* (suggesting that the differences are the result of region rather than migrant origin or migration as such). The only clear difference in terms of labour market participation concerns those that migrated as adults. And in that case, the effect is the opposite depending on gender: male migrants are more likely to participate in employment than national males, whereas female migrants are less likely, *ceteris paribus*.

In terms of **employment and occupational status**, the differences between men and women are much less marked. Women who are migrants or their descendants are slightly more disadvantaged than men relative to the equivalent *NBNBP* populations, but otherwise the patterns are essentially the same for both genders. Both men and women who migrated as adults are strongly disadvantaged with respect to the equivalent *NBNBP* population in terms of unemployment and occupational position (as proxied by job-wage quintiles), and this disadvantage remains significant (even if diminished) after controlling for region of origin, social background and other factors. It is nevertheless the intermediate categories which are most interesting. Those that migrated as children or were born in the host society but within a migrant family also appear as disadvantaged in terms of unemployment and occupational status, as is shown in the descriptive analysis. However, when controlling for region of origin, the negative effect of migrant status or origin not only disappears, but in fact becomes slightly positive. This implies that *it is not the fact of having a migrant origin that explains the disadvantage, but the specific world region of origin*. As it will be discussed in the next subsection, specific regions of origin are associated with clear disadvantages in terms of labour market outcomes, irrespective of whether the person has been born in the host country or migrated as a child and therefore has spent a significant part of the early socialisation process already in the receiving society.

The results for **education-occupational mismatch** are very similar to those of employment and occupational status, although as already mentioned in the descriptive analysis, the extent of disadvantage associated with migrant status is smaller in this case.

This initial subsection can therefore conclude by saying that with the exception of those that migrated as adults, the migrant condition or origin does not have a significant effect on its own in terms of labour market outcomes. Controlling for the world region of origin of the migrants or their descendants eliminates the specific effect of being a migrant or a descendant. In other words, *it is not being of migrant origin or condition that generates a disadvantage in the labour market, but the specific world region of origin of the concerned population*. This does not fit the underlying hypothesis of the Classical Assimilation Theory, which would assume a linear process of acculturation that would lead to a progressive integration and blending into the receiving society. It does fit, on the contrary, the claims of the Segmented Assimilation Approach, which suggest that the process of integration depends very much on the region of origin, and can lead to situations of social exclusion and maintenance of the disadvantage from the first generation into the subsequent ones.

The different regions of origin and their labour market outcomes

Table 2 below focuses on the labour market outcomes associated to the different world regions of origin of the immigrants and their descendants. It is important to keep in mind that the variable of region of origin concerns both people born abroad and people whose parents were born abroad, which are around 25% of the working age population in countries with a long tradition of immigration and between 10 and 15% in the other countries (see figure 1 above). In each of the cells of table 2, there is a large positive or a negative sign in those cases in which there is a statistically significant effect for the EU as a whole (the nine countries included in the analysis) in each particular case. The text within the cells reflects the countries in which there is a positive or negative effect (as indicated by the sign) which is statistically significant. When something is not shown, it means that the relevant coefficient is not significantly different from 1 (that is, that for the particular origin and group, there is no difference with the reference category). It is important to note also that the reference category is EU15, which includes both the *NBNBP* population in each country and those with foreign origin but from any EU15 country.

There is a significant variation in terms of **labour market participation** across different regional origins. It is most clearly and consistently negative for those of North African origin, both for men and women, while it is generally positive for women of Latin American origin and generally negative for women of Asian origin. Other than these cases, and with a few country-level specificities and exceptions, the different ethnicities or regional origins are not associated with significant differences with the EU15 population in terms of labour market participation.

Table 2 The different regions of origin and their labour market outcomes, summary table of statistically significant effects (+ or -, the big symbols refer to the EU level effects)

	Labour Market Participation		Employment/occupational level		Education/job match	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
North Africa	— -AT -FR -SE -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -IT -SE -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -SE	— -AT -BE -ES -GR -IT -SE	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -PT -IT -SE	— -AT -BE -ES -IT -SE
East Europe		-AT -BE +IT	— -AT -BE -ES -PT -IT -SE -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -IT -PT -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -SE -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -IT -PT -UK
Latin America	-SE	+ + +IT -AT	— -BE -ES	— -AT -BE -IT -PT -SE -UK	— -BE -ES -IT	— -AT -BE -IT -PT -SE -UK
North America and Oceania				+ + +UK		+ + +UK
Sub-Saharan Africa	-SE	-AT	— -BE -ES -FR -PT -SE -UK	— -BE -ES -UK	— -AT -BE -ES -FR -PT -UK	— -BE -IT -UK
Asia		— -AT -UK	— -AT -ES -SE -UK -IT	— -AT -UK +GR	— -AT -IT	— -AT -UK +ES

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

In terms of **employment and occupational status**, as well as **education-occupational mismatch**, there is a very consistent pattern for all groups except North Americans. They are all consistently and significantly disadvantaged. Although not shown in table 2 (see tables in the annex for more details), the disadvantage tends to be larger for North Africans and Latin American origins. There is some variation at the country level, mostly because the effect is not significant in some of the countries, but it can be the result of a small sample size for some categories of migrants rather than of an absence of disadvantage in those cases. The only exceptions (apart from North Americans, who are either very similar to those of EU15

origin or even slightly better in terms of labour market outcomes) are female Asian immigrants in Spain and Greece, whose coefficients are significantly positive (indicating a slightly better occupational status and educational match than the equivalent national population).

The labour market outcome by regional origins shown in table 2 confirms that the region of origin is what really matters in terms of the labour market integration of migrants and their descendants in Europe. All origins other than North Americans show a significant disadvantage in terms of labour market outcomes with respect to those of EU15 origin, although this disadvantage seems particularly strong for North Africans and Latin Americans. It is important to note that the shown effect is net from the effect of migrant status and origin as such, and therefore refers to an effect that is felt as much by the first as by the second generation (although the first generation who migrated as adults has the additional specific effect that were discussed in the previous subsection, and therefore are doubly disadvantaged). Again, the theory that fits better the data is the Segmented Assimilation Approach.

Country differences in the integration of migrants

In the previous subsection, it became clear that differences by country in the labour market outcomes associated to the different regional origins in Europe. In order to discuss those differences more adequately, this final subsection changes slightly the analytic strategy and conducts the regressions for each regional origin separately, taking them for the nine available countries as a single population. This is shown in tables A2, A4 and A6 in the annex, and summarised in table 3 below.

Table 3 Country differences in the integration of migrants of different origins, summary table of statistically significant effects (+ or -)

	Labour Market Participation		Employment/occupational level		Education/job match	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Austria		-SUBS				+EAST
Belgium			-EAST -NAFR		-NAFR	-NAFR
Spain		+EAST +NAFR, +LATA +ASIA	-ALL	-EAST -NAFR -SUBS	-ALL EXC. ASIA	-EAST -NAFR -SUBS
France (ref.)	(REF.)	(REF.)	(REF.)	(REF.)	(REF.)	(REF.)
Greece	+EAST +NAFR +ASIA	+NAFR	-EAST	-EAST -NAFR	-EAST -NAFR	-EAST -NAFR
Italy		-SUBS	-EAST -NAFR +SUBS		-NAFR -ASIA	
Portugal	+EAST	+EAST +LATA	-EAST	+SUB +ASIA	-EAST	+ASIA
Sweden	+EAST +NAFR +ASIA			+EAST	+EAST +NAFR +SUBS	+EAST +SUBS
UK	-NAFR	+EAST -NAFR	+NAFR +SUBS	+EAST +NAFR	+NAFR +SUBS	+EAST +NAFR +SUBS

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

In this case, the coefficients and results for each country are always expressed in terms of their differences with the values for France. In other words (as indicated in table 3), France is used as the reference. The focus is not, therefore, to assess the degree of labour market integration for the different regional origins as such (that was done in the previous subsection,

using as a reference the population with an EU15 origin), but to compare the labour market outcomes of people from the same origin in the different countries.

In terms of **labour market participation**, there are several countries where people with a non-EU15 origin have higher rates than France: especially Spain (for women), Greece, Portugal and Sweden. With the exception of Sweden and Italy, the results for labour market participation suggest that the countries with a long tradition of immigration tend to be similar to France, while those where immigration is a more recent phenomenon seem to be associated with higher rates of labour market participation for those of non-EU15 origin. This seems plausible, since recently arrived migrants are more likely to be economically active, especially if what motivated their move was employment (as is the case in the countries with more recent migration waves, as discussed in a previous section).

For **employment and occupational status**, and **education-occupational mismatch**, Austria and Belgium do not seem to differ significantly from France, while Southern European countries (especially Spain) show much more negative scores than those of France for many different regional origins. It is very interesting to note that Sweden and the UK show significantly better scores than France in terms of employment, occupational status and educational mismatch, for many different regional origins and groups.

Therefore, the nine analysed countries can be split in three different groups in terms of the degree of integration of their migrants and their descendants, and taking into account their different attributes and characteristics. First, there is a group of Continental countries with a long tradition of immigration (France, Austria and Belgium), with a middling position in terms of the labour market integration of non-EU15 regional origins. Second, there is a group of Southern European countries with a more recent experience of immigration, where the levels of labour market participation of non-EU15 regional origins are higher but their disadvantage in terms of occupational position and educational mismatch are also higher. Finally, there is Sweden and the UK, where immigration also has a long tradition (and an important recent history too), and yet the occupational position and education-occupational match of the different non-EU15 regional origins seems to be significantly better than in Continental and Southern Europe (in Sweden, the labour market participation of non-EU15 regional origins is also higher).

These significant and systematic differences between the labour market outcomes of the same regional origins (controlling for their characteristics) in different EU countries point to the importance of the context of reception. It is rather difficult to attribute these differences to any of the three theories previously reviewed on this matter: segmentation and polarisation, diversity management models or ethnic penalties. The patterns of labour market integration of migrants in Southern Europe do point to the economic context of reception as an important factor. These countries experienced comparatively recent waves of immigration which were mostly driven by economic reasons, in the context of fast economic growth. This fast economic growth in the periphery of Europe between 1995 and 2007 was often linked to an expansion of low-skilled and low-paid sectors such as construction and personal services. The patterns of labour market integration of Eastern European, Latin American or North African migrants in Spain, Italy or Greece suggest that they participated in this fast economic growth, but often occupying the lower layers of employment in those low-paid sectors (see also Muñoz de Bustillo and Antón, 2012). Segmentation and polarisation seemed to be, therefore, significant factors shaping the integration of migrants into the labour markets of these fast growing economies of the South of Europe.

The differences between the Continental European countries of France, Belgium and Austria on the one hand, and the Northern countries of Sweden and the UK on the other, are more difficult to explain. These two groups of countries differ in terms of their economic systems as well as their diversity management models, and perhaps also in the attitudes of the national population towards migrants, although there is no evidence in this respect. However, the fact that those two groups of countries differ specifically with respect to the occupational opportunities offered to migrants may point to an economic explanation, perhaps linked to the

degree of occupational opportunity and mobility associated to the different labour markets. A recent Eurofound report on patterns of occupational mobility around Europe (Eurofound, 2017b) found that Sweden and the UK were the countries with more fluidity in their labour markets, where the possibilities of moving in and out of the labour market, and up and down the occupational ladder were significantly higher than in Continental Europe. The same report found surprising that countries as different as Sweden and the UK (the least and the most unequal labour markets of EU15, respectively) could be so alike in terms of patterns of occupational mobility, suggesting that a dynamic labour market could be achieved in very different ways and with different implications for the workers concerned. Perhaps it is this labour market fluidity what explains the fact that those same two countries seem to provide better occupational opportunities to migrants.

Conclusions

The results presented in this paper can be summarised in three points. First, what matters most for the labour market integration of migrants in the EU is the world region of origin rather than migrant status as such. These results are in line with the hypotheses of the Segmented Assimilation Approach, and contradictory with the Classical Assimilation Theory. Second, in general there are more disadvantages in terms of occupational level and mismatch than in terms of labour market participation, and these disadvantages are associated with particular regional origins. In this analysis, the most disadvantaged groups seemed to be North Africans and Middle Eastern (even for labour market participation), and Latin Americans (though not in terms of labour market participation). These patterns of disadvantage point towards the existence of ethnic segregation in occupational terms, with immigrants of some regional origins concentrating in the lower layers of employment both in most countries. Finally, there is a significant diversity in the patterns of labour market integration of migrants around Europe. In Southern European countries, migrants have higher levels of labour market participation but also more occupational disadvantage than in Continental Europe, fitting a story of recent economic migration and ethnic segregation into fast-growing low-paid occupations. In Sweden and the UK, our analysis showed a significantly better employment and occupational integration of migrants than in Continental Europe. Although these findings are (hopefully) informative and useful, they should be taken with caution because of the limitations imposed by the use of a transversal survey, as discussed earlier in the methodological section.

This paper started by arguing that the integration of migrants would be one of the key challenges for European societies in the near future. What can the findings of this paper contribute to our understanding of this challenge, perhaps even to the development of better policies in this respect? First, it shows that it cannot be simply assumed that time and generation will inevitably lead to the full integration of migrants: regional origin continues to affect the second and potentially further generations of migrants, and therefore any integration problem can have long-term effects. Policies should thus focus on reducing ethnic segregation, and look for economic integration with or without acculturation into the host society. Second, since specific difficulties seem associated with specific regional origins, it may be useful to study and target those specificities directly; trying to avoid the discrimination of particular groups in particular countries, or dynamics of exclusion and segregation of particular groups. Finally, the existence of some diversity across Europe in the extent of labour market integration of migrants with the same origin and characteristics provides some ground for optimism: not only this shows that a better integration is indeed possible, but it also provides good examples that can be studied and emulated. The factors that explain the better performance in terms of the labour market integration of migrants in Sweden and the UK should be identified, and policy lessons should be extracted and shared.

References

All Eurofound publications are available at www.eurofound.europa.eu

- Adda, J., Dustmann, C. and Görlach, J.S. (2015), *The Dynamics of the Return Migration, Human Capital Accumulation and Wage Assimilation*, Working Paper, Bocconi University.
- Alba, R. (1997), *Rethinking Assimilation Theory for a New Era of Immigration*, *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 826-874.
- Alba, R.D. and V. Nee, (2003), *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Alexander J. (2001), *Theorizing the Modes of Incorporation: Assimilation, Hy-phenation, and Multiculturalism as Varieties of Civil Participation*. *Sociological Theory*, Vol.79, No. 3, pp. 237-249.
- Bevelander, P. and Nielsen, S.H. (2001). *Declining Employment Success of Immigrants Males in Sweden: Observed or Unobserved Characteristics?*, *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 455-472.
- Becker, G. (1975), *The Economics of Discrimination*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Blau, F. and Kahn, L. (2007), *Gender Assimilation among Mexicans Americans*, NBER Working Paper, No. 11512.
- Borjas, G.J. (1985), *Assimilation Changes in Cohort Quality and the Earnings of Immigrants?*, *Journal of Labour Economics*, No.3, pp. 463-469.
- Borjas, G.J. (1995), *The Economic Benefits of Immigration*, *Journal of Economic Perspective*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 3-22.
- Borjas, G.J. (Ed.), (2008), *Issues in the Economics of Immigration*, University of Chicago Press.
- Breen, R. (ed.) (2004), *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chiswick, B. (1978), *The Effects of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men*, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 86, No. 5, pp. 897-921.
- Chiswick, B. and Hatton, T.J. (2003), *International Migration and International Labour Markets*, Globalization in Historical Perspective, National Bureau in Economic Research.
- Chiswick, B and Miller, P (2009), *The International Transferability of Immigrants*, *Human Capital, Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 162-169.
- Crul, M. and Vermeulen, H. (2003), *The Second Generation in Europe*, *International Migration Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 965-986.
- De la Rica, S., Glitz, A. and Ortega, F. (2013), *Immigration in Europe: trends, policies and empirical evidence*, IZA Discussion Paper no. 7778.
- Esping-Andersen, G. and Wagner, S. (2012), *Asymmetries in the opportunity structure: Intergenerational mobility trends in Europe*, *Research in Social stratification and Mobility*, Vol. 30, pp. 473-487.
- Eurofound (2017a), *What do Europeans do at work? A task-based analysis - European Jobs Monitor 2016*, Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Eurofound (2017b), *Employment transitions and occupational mobility in Europe: The impact of the Great Recession*, Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Fernández-Macías, E. and Hurley, J. (2017), *Routine-biased technical change and job polarization in Europe*, *Socio-Economic Review*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 563-585.
- Fernández-Macías, E., Grande, R., Del Rey Poveda, A. and Antón, J.I. (2013), *Employment and Occupational Mobility among Recently Arrived Immigrants: The Spanish Case 1997-2007*, *Population Research and Policy Review*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 243-277.
- Friedberg, R. (1993), *The Labor Market Assimilation of Immigrants in the U.S.: The role of Age at Arrival*. Brown University.

- Friedberg, R. (2000), *You Can't Take it With You? Immigrant Assimilation and the Portability of Human Capital*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 221-251.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (1984), *The end of convergence: Corporatist and dualist tendencies in modern western societies*, in Goldthorpe, J. H. (ed.), *Order and conflict in contemporary capitalism*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Gordon, M. (1964), *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grasmuck, S. (1984) *Immigration, Ethnic Stratification, and Native Working Class Discipline: Comparisons of Documented and Undocumented Dominicans*. *International Migration Review*, Vol. 18, No. 3, Special Issue: Irregular Migration: An International Perspective (Autumn, 1984), pp. 692-713.
- Heath, F. and McMahon D. (1997), 'Education and occupational attainment: the impact of ethnic origins', In *Education, Employment and Housing among Ethnic Minorities in Britain*, (ed). VKarn, pp. 91–113, London: HMSO.
- Heath, F. (2007), *Cross-national patterns and processes of ethnic disadvantage*, See Heath & Cheung 2007, pp. 639–95.
- Heath, F. and Cheung, S.Y. (2007), *Unequal Chances: Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*, Oxford: British Academy/Oxford University Press.
- Kalter, F. and Kogan, I. (2006), *Ethnic Inequalities at the Transition from School to Work in Belgium and Spain: Discrimination or Self-exclusion?*, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 259–274.
- Massey, D. (1995), *The Hourglass Economy*, Princeton University.
- Massey, D. and Hirst, D. (1998), *From Escalator to Hourglass: Changes in the U.S. Occupational Structure, 1949-1989*. *Social Science Research* 27, pp. 51-71.
- Muñoz de Bustillo, R. and Antón, J. I. (2012), *Immigration and labour market segmentation in the European Union. In Transformation of the Employment Structure in the EU and USA, 1995–2007* (pp. 111-146), Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Osuna, A., Ovejero, A., Cruz, F., Souse, S., Mangas, L. and Arias, B. (2006), *Inmigración y Modelos de Integración: entre la Asimilación y el Multiculturalismo*, Universidad de Valladolid.
- Phelps, E. (1972), 'The Statistical Theory of Racism and Sexism', *American Economic Review*, Vol. 62, No. 4, pp. 659-661.
- Portes, A. and Böröcz, J. (1989), 'Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation', *International Migration Review*, 23: 606-630.
- Portes, A. and Zhou, M. (1993). 'The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530, pp. 74-96.
- Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R., (1996), *Immigrant America: A Portrait*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Portes, A. (1997), *Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities*, *International Migration Review*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 799-825.
- Portes, A. (2012). *Sociología Económica de las Migraciones Internacionales*, Barcelona: Anthropos.
- Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P. and Haller, W. (2006), 'La Asimilación Segmentada sobre el Terreno: la Nueva Segunda Generación al Inicio de la Vida Adulta', *Migraciones* 19(2006), pp. 7-58.
- Reich, M. (ed.) (2008). *Segmented Labor Markets and Labor Mobility*, Cheltenham & Northampton: Edward Elgar.

- Thomson, M. and Crul, M. (2007), *The second generation in Europe and the United States: how is the transatlantic debate relevant for further research on the European second generation?*, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 33, pp. 1025-1041.
- Veira, A., Stanek, M. and Cachón, L. (2011), *Los determinantes de Concentración Étnica en el Mercado Laboral Español*, *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, 69, pp. 219-242.
- Vermeulen, H. and Perlmann, J (2000), *Immigrants, Schooling and Social Mobility. Does Culture Make a Difference?*, Palgrave MacMillan.
- Zhou, M. (1997), *Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies and Recent Research on the New Second Generation*, *International Migration Review*, 31, pp. 975-1008.
- Zuccotti, C. (2015), *Do Parents Matter? Revisiting Ethnic Penalties in Occupation among Second-generation Ethnic Minorities in England and Wales*, *Sociology*, Vol. 49, No. 2, pp. 229–251.

Annex

Table A1: Labour Market Participation

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male										Female																			
	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK		
MMA/MGr	0.87**	0.91	0.9	0.88	0.85*	0.54	0.97	0.92	0.8	1.03	0.66	0.89	0.9	1.25***	1.05	1.25***	1.17**	1.1	1.05	1.05	1.05	1.1	1.1	0.59	0.73	0.96	0.83	1.18	0.86	
MGrO	0.72***	0.81*	0.82*	0.78**	0.73**	0.81*	0.69	0.42***	0.53	1.57	0.95	0.68	0.91	0.75**	1.16*	1.17*	1.04	1.03	1	1.01	0.72	0.57	0.88	0.77	2.14	0.32	1.95	1.33*		
Basic/Child	0.87**	0.88	0.88	0.91	0.88	0.9	0.84	0.96	0.75	1.47	0.96	1.54	1.2	1.24	1.24	1.01	0.96	0.98	0.96	1	0.92*	1.7	0.61**	1.37	1.43	0.91	0.91	0.92		
Basic/Adult	1.13**	1.25**	1.21**	1.21**	1.31**	1.15*	0.74	0.6	0.86	1.09	2.3	1.36	0.56	0.64	1.18	0.83**	0.81**	0.83**	0.88*	0.76	0.87**	1.05	0.85**	0.86	0.86	1.03	0.51**	0.75**		
resid/652	0.45***	0.43***	0.43***	0.38***	0.37***	0.35***	0.49**	0.77	0.08**	0.21	0.10*	0.24**	0.10*	0.43***	0.42***	0.37***	0.37***	0.35***	0.37***	0.35***	0.37***	0.40***	0.45	0.30**	0.28**	0.32**	0.11**	0.15**	0.43**	
Young	0.86***	0.85**	0.85**	0.86**	0.85**	0.80**	0.85	1.2	1.06	0.9	0.87	0.59**	0.84	0.52**	0.84	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	0.81**	1.02	
o/d	0.68***	0.68**	0.68**	0.71**	0.71**	0.65**	0.65**	0.59**	0.58**	0.55**	0.32**	0.32**	0.32**	0.55**	0.74**	0.74**	0.76**	0.85**	0.85**	0.76**	0.70**	0.83**	0.85**	0.87	0.95**	0.91*	0.61**	0.99	0.97*	
AT	0.99	0.9	0.87	0.89	0.92	1.04									1.35**	1.14*	1.03	1.19**	1.11**	1.18**										
BE	0.78***	0.72***	0.71***	0.74***	0.75***	0.87									1.01	0.90*	0.87**	0.87*	0.88*	0.88**										
ES	0.83**	0.78***	0.80**	0.89	0.89	1.03									0.88	0.85**	0.90*	0.96	0.96	0.93										
GR	1	0.93	0.94	1.01	1	1.28**									0.66**	0.57**	0.60**	0.62**	0.62**	0.59**										
IT	0.51***	0.47***	0.48**	0.56***	0.55**	0.65**									0.45**	0.40**	0.43**	0.48**	0.48**	0.45**										
PT	0.77**	0.71**	0.74**	0.92	0.92	1									1.24**	1.08	1.15**	1.47**	1.47**	1.42**										
SE	1.64**	1.53**	1.49**	1.59**	1.65**	3.78**									2.85**	2.35**	2.08**	2.10**	2.14**	1.85**										
UK	0.88	0.81**	0.81**	0.83**	0.83*	0.85*									0.92	0.83**	0.81**	0.83**	0.83**	0.81**										
CH/EU							0.91	0.86	1.03	0.61	0.95	0.97	4.73	0.91	1.43	0.81	0.81	1.04	1.04	0.83**	0.77*	1.04	0.76	1.19	1.38*	1.29	0.84	1.23		
NAM/Inde	0.59**	0.60**	0.66**	0.66**	0.69**	0.67**	0.36**	1.11	0.84	0.40**	0.69	0.86	0.57	0.36**	0.27**	0.27**	0.44**	0.45**	0.47**	0.39**	0.44**	0.41**	0.25**	1.04	0.64**	0.25	0.38**	0.23**		
SUB/SAr	0.87	0.88	0.91	1.01	1.1	1.02	0.85	1.21	0.66	1	0.15*	0.55	0.23*	0.23	0.59**	0.59**	0.62*	0.68	0.69	0.43**	0.85	1.01	1.4	0.61	1.21	1.47	0.95	0.96		
NAM/oc	0.96	0.95	0.95	1.01	1	0.94	1.56	0.71	1.24	0.38	1.67	0.92	0.29*	0.68	0.84	0.84	1.42**	1.42**	1.39**	0.33**	0.41	0.69	0.9	0.93	2.72	0.79	0.72	0.26	0.77	
CSAm	0.95	0.96	1.01	1.06	0.98	0.97	0.31	0.9	0.57	3.96	0.95	0.64**	1.03	0.91	0.91	0.91	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	0.35**	0.59	0.86	0.7	1.65	0.82	0.73	0.63	0.41**		
Asia	0.85**	0.83**	0.83**	0.83**	0.83**	0.83**	0.77**	0.81	0.99	0.36**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	0.64**	
SE/Low	0.91*	1.32**	1.31**	1.34**	1.59**	1.80**	1.24*	1.92**	0.82	1.06	1.83*	1.27	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	1.82**	
SE/High	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	1.78**	
adm/ob							0.50*	0.86	1.14	1.25*	0.79	0.99	1.16	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	0.41**	
MRA5y/um							3.55**	2.75**	3.26**	4.14**	1.94**	2.73**	3.40**	5.13**																
partner							1.21**	1.35	1.3	1.25*	1.33	2.07**	1.36**	1.09																
Em/Alch							1.35	1.3	1.25*	1.33	2.07**	1.36**	1.09																	
N	102708	102708	102708	102708	102708	102708	7125	4952	20795	5877	10826	26488	7699	8624	15452	N	111705	111705	111705	111705	111705	7486	3288	20311	4450	11503	39072	8511	9576	17354
RE5050-R-5q	0.029	0.02	0.021	0.029	0.041	0.088	0.083	0.131	0.088	0.065	0.07	0.091	0.108	0.081	0.105	0.105	0.044	0.049	0.088	0.089	0.095	0.07	0.129	0.052	0.12	0.077	0.074	0.084	0.114	

Exponentiated coefficients
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
Exponentiated coefficients
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table A2: Labour Market Participation, models for ethnic origins

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male										Female									
	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAf	MiddSubsah	Africa	CentrSouthA	Asia	Male	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAf	MiddSubsah	Africa	CentrSouthA	Asia	Female				
MixMigOr	0.94	2.79*	3.76	0.93	6.54	1.41	MixMigOr	0.97	1.58	1.63	3.44*	0.44	2.24							
MigOr	0.73*	2.04	3.22	2.53	3.7	1.33	MigOr	0.95	1.48	1.21	3.60*	0.76	2.14							
BabrArrChild	0.83	2	3.38	1.41	14.45	1.25	BabrArrChild	1.08	1.31	0.85	3.23*	0.85	1.7							
BabrArrAdult	0.81	2.98*	3.59*	1.74	13.97*	1.59	BabrArrAdult	0.76**	1.27	0.58	2.5	0.78	1.34							
residless2	1.06	0.73	0.20***	0.34*	0.15***	0.22***	residless2	0.50***	0.51***	0.37***	0.28***	0.24***	0.41***							
SBLow	0.61***	0.65**	0.67*	0.9	0.97	0.78	SBLow	0.46***	0.54***	0.58***	0.49***	1.01	0.47***							
SBHigh	1.39***	1	1.86*	1.25	0.8	1.11	SBHigh	1.90***	1.32**	1.60**	1.61*	1	2.19***							
edmob	1.83***	1.67***	1.30**	1.27	1.16	1.12	edmob	2.27***	1.59***	1.71***	1.98***	1.07	1.96***							
MRAAsylum	0.58	0.72	0.59*	0.48*	2.06	0.39**	MRAAsylum	0.7	0.8	1	0.59**	2.14	0.59							
partner	3.80***	1.98***	1.99***	2.34***	3.92***	2.79***	partner	0.85***	0.45***	0.40***	0.76	0.45***	0.49***							
smallch	1.24***	1.36*	1.33	1.26	0.43**	1.12	smallch	0.69***	0.40***	0.49***	0.38**	0.62***	0.46***							
young	0.78***	1.24	0.81	1	0.6	0.81	young	0.83***	0.84*	0.79*	0.93	0.87	0.82							
old	0.64***	0.62***	0.56***	0.78	0.67	0.66*	old	0.75***	0.79**	0.86	0.87	0.97	1.15							
AT	1.06	0.88	0.51	0.79	2.04	1.1	AT	1.26***	1.38	1.54	0.31*	1.22	1.28							
BE	0.81*	0.63	1.15	0.88	1.02	0.89	BE	0.87*	0.85	0.79	0.8	1.66	1.21							
ES	0.94	1.1	1.26	1.06	1.38	1	ES	0.83**	2.11**	1.67**	1.5	3.74***	2.63*							
GR	1.09	2.86**	2.61*	1.04	1.46	15.50*	GR	0.53***	1.17	1.74*	0.33	0.37	1.85							
IT	0.58***	0.93	1.19	1.04	1.12	0.84	IT	0.41***	0.86	0.83	0.54**	1.46	0.82							
PT	0.9	4.77*	0.63	1.14	1.12	PT	1.32***	3.21**	2.23	1.69	3.87**	1.85								
SE	3.83***	3.49**	1.86*	1.07	1.27	4.05* SE	1.85***	0.97	0.68	0.58	1.23	0.78								
UK	0.77**	1.52	0.47**	1.06	1.57	1.3	UK	0.79***	1.67*	0.54**	0.74	2.12	0.7							
N	90020	5432	2544	1219	1246	2210	N	96151	7011	2524	1459	2116	2442							
pseudo R-sq	0.096	0.066	0.074	0.064	0.11	0.085	pseudo R-sq	0.095	0.091	0.144	0.137	0.072	0.123							

Exponentiated coefficients

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table A3: Employment and occupational status

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male										Female																					
	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	EU-6	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	EU-6	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK		
MinMigOr	1.14***	1.36***	1.20***	1.13***	1.13***	1.16***	1.33***	1.45**	0.95	0.96	1.38***	1.06	1.01	1.14	1.28*	1.16**	1.16**	1.13***	1.19***	1.13***	1.13***	1.14***	1.30**	1.12	1	1.23*	1.01	0.97	1.14	1.1	1.23**	
MigOr	0.84***	1.38***	1.47***	1.35***	1.33***	1.38***	1.42**	1.45*	1.04	1.48	1.37**	1.28	0.99	0.77	0.88	1.45***	1.45***	1.33***	1.32***	1.35***	1.35***	2.59***	1.1	0.99	1.30*	0.88	1.66	1.33	1.13	1.16***		
BabArrChild	0.74***	1.20**	1.15*	1.21***	1.19**	1.20**	1.64**	1.04	1.72**	1.04	1.72**	1.29	0.88	0.82	1.64	1.07	0.92	1.13*	1.14*	1.14*	1.14*	1.13	1.13	1.13	1.3	1.04	0.94	1.17	0.75	1	1.51**	
BabArrAdult	0.46***	0.87***	0.81***	0.80***	0.81***	0.78***	0.92	1.16	0.86	0.96	0.79	0.55***	0.85	1	0.75***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.67***	0.89	0.89	0.65**	0.66**	0.68	0.53***	0.58*	0.53***	0.85*	
residast2	1.32***	1.14	1.09	0.99	0.97	1.01	0.91	1.04	0.59	1.04	0.59	2.08	0.20**	0.23*	0.32*	0.95	0.95	1.11	1.11	0.99	0.99	1	0.98	0.82	1.33	0.33	0.53	0.53	0.31	0.4	0.72*	
young	0.65***	0.66**	0.59***	0.61***	0.61***	0.70***	0.84**	0.73**	0.77**	0.74**	0.65**	0.57**	0.71**	0.66**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.76**	0.83**	0.80**	0.80**	0.73**	0.58**	0.52**	0.68**	0.68**	0.80**	
old	0.94***	0.94**	1.01	1.11***	1.11***	1.09**	1	1.03	1.05	1.13	1.05	1.13	1.05	1.25**	1.06	1.11	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.04	1.05	1.22**	1.28**	1.28**	1.40**	1.21**	1.1	1.02	
AT	1.12**	1.11**	0.94	0.98	0.99	1.04																										
BE	0.92*	0.90*	0.81**	0.82**	0.82**	0.86**																										
ES	0.61***	0.61***	0.57**	0.76**	0.76**	0.80**																										
GR	0.51***	0.51***	0.57**	0.65**	0.64**	0.71**																										
IT	0.71***	0.71**	0.83**	1.11**	1.11**	1.20**																										
PT	0.74**	0.73**	0.87**	1.40**	1.39**	1.45**																										
SE	1.13**	1.10*	0.81**	0.90**	0.91*	1.40**																										
UK	1.25**	1.23**	1.17**	1.17**	1.18**	1.19**																										
ChnEU	0.50**	0.50**	0.56**	0.62**	0.58**	0.58**	0.54**	0.45**	0.41**	0.41**	0.82	0.81	0.75*	0.24**	0.71*	0.57**	0.57**	0.57**	0.57**	0.57**	0.57**	0.45**	0.47**	0.55**	0.50**	0.79	0.47**	0.35**	1.15	0.57**		
NAMMidE	0.39**	0.44**	0.44**	0.49**	0.50**	0.50**	0.38**	0.34**	0.23**	0.68**	0.78	0.67**	0.33	0.44**	0.86	N	N	N	N	N	N	0.53*	0.42**	0.54**	0.84	0.54*	0.47**	0.63	0.48**	1		
SubSAfr	0.55**	0.53**	0.53**	0.55**	0.56**	0.58**	0.54	0.33**	0.37**	0.44**	0.81	1.12	0.49**	0.41**	0.66**	0.66**	0.66**	0.66**	0.66**	0.66**	0.66**	0.37	0.59*	0.43*	0.78	0.71	0.7	1.01	0.52	0.70**		
NAMOc	1.77***	1.30**	1.30**	1.11	1.1	1.07	2	0.8	1.28	0.65	1.28	0.65	1.28	0.51	1.09	0.77	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	1.17	3.34	3.34	1.3	2.4	2.8	1.19	1.98	2.38	1.7	1.57**	
CSAm	0.50**	0.48**	0.48**	0.52**	0.51**	0.51**	1.06	0.30**	0.42**	1.2	0.74	0.62*	0.59	0.69	0.75	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.69	0.41*	0.36**	0.41*	0.36**	0.79	0.61	0	0.50**	0.55*	0.47*	
Asia	0.54**	0.58**	0.58**	0.62**	0.61**	0.61**	0.34**	0.34**	0.7	0.41**	0.84	1.16	0.72*	0.7	0.45**	0.67**	0.67**	0.67**	0.67**	0.67**	0.67**	0.45**	0.45**	0.65	1.13	0.78	2.19*	0.87	1.51	0.82	0.59**	
SBlow	0.52**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.26**	0.26**	0.22**	0.42**	0.33**	0.36**	0.21**	0.39**	0.25**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	0.20**	0.19**	0.19**	0.35**	0.21**	0.28**	0.20**	0.28**	0.14**	0.29**	
SBlow	2.21**	4.72**	4.72**	4.80**	4.80**	5.52**	5.05**	4.34**	5.09**	3.78**	5.78**	17.50**	5.54**	4.02**	5.81**	4.02**	4.02**	4.02**	4.02**	4.02**	4.02**	6.72**	7.26**	4.76**	6.58**	4.42**	6.49**	11.07**	5.27**	4.10**	4.10**	
edmob	3.03**	3.03**	3.03**	3.03**	3.03**	3.51**	3.41**	2.51**	2.85**	2.67**	3.47**	5.37**	3.66**	2.83**	edmob	edmob	edmob	edmob	edmob	edmob	edmob	4.16**	4.62**	2.79**	4.10**	3.45**	4.05**	5.79**	6.29**	3.02**	3.02**	
MRAsylum	0.69***	0.72**	0.69***	0.69***	0.69***	0.72**	0.91	0.37**	0.35	0.52	1.07	0.83	1.42	0.51**	0.53**	0.53**	0.53**	0.53**	0.53**	0.53**	0.53**	0.86	0.86	0.87	0.41**	0.44	0.76	0.8	1.09	0.44**	0.44**	
Partner	1.72**	1.29**	1.29**	1.29**	1.29**	1.75**	2.03**	1.75**	2.03**	1.86**	1.97**	1.46**	1.70**	1.70**	1.76**	1.76**	1.76**	1.76**	1.76**	1.76**	1.76**	1.11**	1.11**	1.19**	1.13**	1.29**	1.22**	1.32**	1.26**	1.42**	1.42**	
smallch	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.05**	1.11**	1.11**	1.19**	1.13**	1.29**	1.22**	1.32**	1.26**	1.42**	1.42**	
N	99448	99448	99448	99448	99448	99448	6608	4482	19108	3406	10082	23140	7036	5395	14911	86191	86191	86191	86191	86191	86191	6334	4187	17948	3588	8539	19195	7210	5491	13799	13799	
pseudo R-sq	0.015	0.015	0.03	0.074	0.074	0.079	0.069	0.109	0.076	0.07	0.057	0.084	0.108	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.076	0.016	0.018	0.033	0.093	0.093	0.093	0.093	0.114	0.067	0.067	

Exponentiated coefficients
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001
Exponentiated coefficients
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table A4: Employment and occupational status, models for ethnic origins

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male										Female									
	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAf	MiddSubsah	Africa	CentrSouthA	Asia	Male	MixMigOr	1.67	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAf	MiddSubsah	Africa	CentrSouthA	Asia	Female		
MixMigOr	1.02	3.61***	3.52*	2.85	2.44	2.31	1.67	1.45	1.45	1.04	2.33*	0.89	3.04	4.71*	1.77					
MigOr	1.15	1.92	2.59	2.44	2	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.45	1.19*	2.57*	0.73	2.05	3.53	1.6					
BabrArrChild	1.03	1.59	2.31	1.59	1.29	1.47	1.01	0.92	0.92	0.94	1.55	1.02	1.86	3.25	1.44					
BabrArrAdult	1.14*	0.96	1.59	1.29	0.52*	0.86	0.74	0.86	0.86	0.96	0.99	0.32	0.84	1.79	0.67					
residless2	1	0.76*	0.98	0.52*	0.38***	0.52	1.08	0.86	0.86	1.07	0.66**	0.9	1.07	0.92	0.67					
SBLow	0.29***	0.51***	0.49***	0.38***	0.38***	0.52	0.38***	0.38***	0.38***	0.23***	0.47***	0.32***	0.29***	0.52***	0.38***					
SBHigh	5.04***	3.02***	2.58***	3.16***	3.54***	3.54***	3.74***	3.54***	3.54***	5.92***	3.77***	3.63***	3.49***	2.38***	3.08***					
edmob	3.19***	1.89***	1.87***	2.22***	2.20***	2.20***	2.09***	2.20***	2.20***	3.90***	1.96***	2.54***	3.03***	1.89***	2.06***					
MRAAsylum	0.26	0.95	0.58**	0.40***	1.56	1.56	0.64*	1.56	1.56	0.44	0.93	0.79	0.58*	1.07	0.6					
partner	1.76***	1.32***	1.76***	1.71***	1.26	1.26	1.51***	1.26	1.26	1.27***	1.13*	1.07	1.38**	1.08	1.22					
smallch	1.05**	1.07	1.07	0.95	0.95	0.95	1.02	0.95	0.95	1.13***	0.99	0.94	0.83	0.86	0.98					
young	0.68***	0.84**	0.96	0.71*	0.73*	0.73*	0.92	0.73*	0.73*	0.67***	0.79***	0.76*	0.9	0.84	1.02					
old	1.11***	0.96	1.05	0.98	0.67**	0.67**	1.01	0.67**	0.67**	1.24***	0.89	1.11	1.38*	0.91	1.02					
AT	1.07	0.76	0.93	2.29	1.18	1.18	0.57	1.18	1.18	1.31***	1.38	1.48	1.1	1.37	0.85					
BE	0.93	0.44***	0.50***	0.92	0.36	0.36	0.76	0.36	0.36	0.93	0.98	0.72	0.97	0.74	0.88					
ES	0.88**	0.45***	0.22***	0.52*	0.34*	0.34*	0.32***	0.34*	0.34*	0.70***	0.38***	0.41***	0.25***	0.56	0.61					
GR	0.74***	0.49***	0.67	0.86	7.59	7.59	0.54	7.59	7.59	0.74***	0.47***	0.38***	0.35	0	0.96					
IT	1.31***	0.59**	0.71**	1.88**	0.53	0.53	0.59	0.53	0.53	1.54***	0.71	0.76	0.96	0.67	0.79					
PT	1.61***	0.49**	0.74	1.29	0.86	0.86	0.95	0.86	0.86	2.06***	0.88	1.52	1.64*	1.29	2.98*					
SE	1.48***	1.03	1.35	1.83	0.69	0.69	0.88	0.69	0.69	1.25***	2.27***	0.85	1.1	0.9	1.11					
UK	1.24***	0.89	1.53*	1.77**	0.96	0.96	1.01	0.96	1.01	1.16***	1.72**	1.86**	1.37	1.4	1.11					
N	81921	5007	2220	1118	1144	1144	2036	1144	2036	75347	5103	1470	1061	1701	1509					
pseudo R-sq	0.079	0.046	0.078	0.086	0.068	0.068	0.092	0.068	0.092	0.092	0.082	0.12	0.116	0.059	0.081					

Exponentiated coefficients

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Exponentiated coefficients

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table A5: Education/occupational mismatch

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male										Female																			
	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	EU-6	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK	EU-1	EU-2	EU-3	EU-4	EU-5	EU-6	AT	BE	ES	FR	GR	IT	PT	SE	UK
MinMgOr	0.88***	0.96	1.03	1.13**	1.13**	1.16***	1.40**	0.96	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08	1.28*	1.11	1.08
MgOr	0.93	1.13*	1.09	1.33***	1.32***	1.38***	1.70**	1.41*	1.32	1.37*	1.09	1.18	0.94	0.85	1.47***	1.28***	1.30***	1.30***	1.27***	1.30***	2.80***	1.19	1.39	1.28	0.77	2.52	1.5	1.05	1.59***	
BabParChild	0.84	1.14*	1.15*	1.17*	1.16*	1.16*	1.59**	0.8	1.41	1.3	0.61	0.79	1.28	1.28	1.1	1.09	1.08	1.09	1.09	1.09	1.34	1.19	1.07	1.09	0.9	1.14	0.66	1.16	1.40*	
BabParAdult	0.59***	0.74***	0.77***	0.74***	0.74***	0.72***	0.85	1.05	0.79	0.8	0.60*	0.52***	0.78	0.73	0.82*	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	0.84***	
residence2	0.85*	0.80**	0.81**	0.84	0.99	0.97	0.8	0.76	0.88	0.22	1.76	0.18***	0.37	0.31	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.84	1.11	0.69	1.47	0.22	0.73	0.40*	0.42	0.72	0.45***
young	0.65***	0.65***	0.68***	0.59***	0.59***	0.70***	0.77***	0.75***	0.79***	0.72***	0.63***	0.62***	0.68***	0.54***	0.75***	0.75***	0.75***	0.75***	0.75***	0.75***	0.75***	0.89	0.80**	0.86***	0.70***	0.63***	0.61***	0.73***	0.62***	0.82***
old	1.31***	1.31***	1.28***	1.36***	1.37***	1.13***	0.94	1.17*	1.10**	1.21*	1.20***	1.15*	1.19*	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	1.03	0.98	1.02	1.18***	1.35***	1.42***	1.29***	1.14	1.15**	1.14	1.15**
AT	0.99	0.95	1.03	0.92	0.93	0.98	0.98																							
BE	1.03	1	1.04	1	1	1	1.05																							
ES	0.70***	0.68***	0.64***	0.51***	0.51***	0.54***	0.54***																							
GR	0.69***	0.67***	0.63***	0.48***	0.48***	0.53***	0.53***																							
IT	1.66***	1.62***	1.48***	1.04	1.04	1.13***	1.13***																							
PT	2.41***	2.36***	2.14***	1.34***	1.34***	1.40***	1.40***																							
SE	1.24***	1.20***	1.38***	1.13***	1.20***	1.19***	1.19***																							
UK	1.20***	1.15***	1.19***	1.22***	1.22***	1.24***	1.24***																							
ChnEu	0.82***	0.76***	0.56***	0.57***	0.57***	0.53***	0.40***	0.36***	0.39***	0.60*	0.84	0.65**	0.21***	0.67*	0.44***	0.44***	0.44***	0.44***	0.44***	0.44***	0.44***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***	0.30***
NAMide	0.65***	0.59***	0.41***	0.42***	0.42***	0.41***	0.33***	0.21***	0.24***	0.59***	0.71	0.49***	0.33	0.50*	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
SubSAfr	0.55***	0.55***	0.44***	0.46***	0.46***	0.47***	0.21***	0.24***	0.35***	0.37***	2.92	0.55**	0.47**	0.88	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***	0.53***
NAMOc	0.73*	0.82	0.96	0.95	0.91	1.24	1.19	1.17	0.63	1.18	0.51	0.24	0.52	0.86	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.96
CSAm	0.69***	0.69***	0.52***	0.52***	0.50***	0.50***	0.31***	0.22**	0.43***	0.9	2.97	0.61***	0.74	0.84	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.76
Asia	0.98	0.94	0.80***	0.80***	0.78***	0.78***	0.33***	0.83	1.05	0.9	1.67	0.68*	0.59	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83	0.83
SBLow	1.37***	1.37***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***	1.34***
SBLow	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***	0.79***
SBLow	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***	0.24***
MFAylum	0.72***	0.75***	0.68***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***	0.35***
partner	1.86***	1.45***	2.03***	2.23***	2.00***	1.88***	1.53***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***	1.91***
smallch	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
cons	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
N	93058	93058	93058	93058	93058	93058	6608	6608	4482	13108	3397	10082	23140	5390	13615	13615	13615	13615	13615	13615	13615	85939	85939	85939	85939	85939	85939	85939	85939	85939
P-q	0.028	0.029	0.033	0.115	0.115	0.123	0.118	0.136	0.095	0.109	0.098	0.115	0.106	0.185	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.142	0.094	0.095	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097	0.097

Exponentiated coefficients
* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table A6:
Education/occupational mismatch, models for ethnic origins

Source: EU LFS Ad-Hoc module, 2014

	Male					Female				
	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAfMid	SubsahAfrica	CentrSouthA/Asia	EU15develop	OtherEurope	NorthAfMid	SubsahAfrica	CentrSouthA/Asia
MixMigOr	1.01	3.93***	1.49	4.63**	9.34	1	4.14***	2.33	1.13	3.59
MigOr	1.15	2.31*	1.08	4.16*	6.15	1.17	3.71**	1.83	1.03	2.78
BabrArrChild	0.92	1.83	1.1	2.96	6.66	0.85	2.28	2.68	0.86	2.42
BabrArrAdult	1.06	1.21	0.72	2.19	4.17	0.83***	1.33	0.74	0.46	1.42
residless2	0.94	0.69**	0.56	0.40*	1.1	0.86	0.50***	0.68	1.09	0.99
SBLow	3.35***	4.47***	2.77***	2.88***	2.94***	2.71***	3.94***	2.07***	1.90***	3.68***
SBHigh	0.31***	0.24***	0.31***	0.36***	0.39***	0.40***	0.40***	0.41***	0.29***	0.28***
edmob	0.24***	0.18***	0.28***	0.27***	0.28***	0.32***	0.21***	0.36***	0.34***	0.25***
MRAylum	0.16	0.89	0.61**	0.39***	1.61	0.72	0.71*	0.66	0.66	0.67
partner	1.91***	1.28***	1.82***	1.88***	1.27	1.35***	0.88*	1.09	1.46**	0.97
smallch	1	1.02	1.06	0.85	0.8	1.06**	0.94	0.89	0.85	0.84
young	0.68***	0.83**	0.95	0.77	0.64**	0.71***	0.91	0.77*	0.70*	0.92
old	1.15***	0.9	1.06	1.03	0.57***	1.23***	0.93	1.06	1.19	0.98
AT	1.01	1	0.96	1.52	1.74	1.57***	1.51*	1.47	1.28	1.49
BE	1.13*	0.84	0.62**	1.12	0.49	1.22***	0.97	0.64*	1.13	1.23
ES	0.58***	0.37***	0.22***	0.44**	0.33*	0.54***	0.38***	0.33***	0.29***	0.58
GR	0.54***	0.51***	0.48***	2.61	2.63	0.52***	0.44***	0.29***	0.39	0.08
IT	1.24***	0.86	0.72*	1.43	0.72	1.42***	1.04	0.76	0.69	0.97
PT	1.52***	0.45**	0.64	1.38	1.35	1.38***	0.6	0.55	1.28	1
SE	2.05***	1.95**	2.17***	4.34***	1.18	2.20***	3.20***	1.56	3.41***	1.78
UK	1.25***	1.3	1.92***	2.05***	1.37	1.73***	1.78**	2.28***	1.88***	2.06
N	81583	4999	2217	1110	1139	75126	5099	1469	1055	1696
pseudo R-sq	0.125	0.113	0.087	0.097	0.098	0.094	0.113	0.083	0.07	0.099

Exponentiated coefficients

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Exponentiated coefficients

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound) is a tripartite European Union Agency, whose role is to provide knowledge in the area of social, employment and work-related policies.

Eurofound was established in 1975 by Council Regulation (EEC) No. 1365/75, to contribute to the planning and design of better living and working