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Introduction

- What do immigrants think about the welfare state access of (other) immigrants?
  - Do their opinions differ from natives’ opinions?
  - Do their opinions differ between generations?
  - Do their opinions differ according to the individual length of residence?
  - What drives their opinion?
State of Research

- Research on immigrants’ political and welfare state attitudes found
  - Rather pro welfare compared to natives
  - Less restrictive with respect to welfare state access
  - Preference for redistribution endures into second generation
  - Become more similar to natives, once they acquired the citizenship

(Dancygier and Saunders, 2006; Just and Anderson, 2015; Kolbe and Crepaz, 2015; Luttmer and Singhal, 2011; Reeskens and Oorschot, 2015)
Theoretical Background

- Two underlying mechanisms that could close the gap:
  - Integration
  - Self-interest
Theoretical Background

- **Integration:**
  - Over generations
    - Exposure to institutions (e.g. schools)
    - Exposure to peers
  - Over length of residence
    - Exposure to institutions (less than 2nd gen.)
    - Exposure to peers (less than 2nd gen.)

(Diehl et al. 2009; Maxwell, 2010; Reeskens and Oorschot, 2015; Röder, 2014)
Theoretical Background

- Self-interest:
  - Like natives, we expect immigrants to look at their own situation
  - They are influenced by their individual status:
    - Socio-economic status improves over generations and with length of residence
    - They are more likely to be in more vulnerable positions (e.g. unemployed) and to receive social benefits

(Andreß and Heien, 2001; Barrett and McCarthy, 2008; Funk, 2000; Jæger, 2006)
Theoretical Background

- Self-interest or integration:
  - Both lead to the same predictions: Immigrants become more restrictive
  - Mechanisms cannot clearly be disentangled with our data
Theoretical Background

- Hypotheses about granting immigrants access to social benefits:
  - $H_1$: First generation immigrants are less restrictive than natives.
  - $H_{2a}$: Second generation immigrants are less restrictive than natives, but more restrictive than first generation immigrants.
  - $H_{2b}$: The length of residence has a positive effect on welfare state restrictiveness for the first generation.
Theoretical Background

- Looking at first generation immigrants
- Again, self-interest and integration go hand in hand
- Hypotheses:
  - \( H_{3a} \): Immigrants who have been living in the host country for more than a year are more likely to favor “living at least for a year” as the entrance criterion.
  - \( H_{3b} \): Immigrants who have worked and paid taxes in the host country for at least a year are more likely to favor “working and tax paying for at least a year” as the entrance criterion.
  - \( H_{3c} \): Immigrants who have acquired the citizenship of the host country are more likely to favor “citizenship” as the entrance criterion.
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Dataset and Operationalization

- **Dataset**: ESS 2008
- **25,466 observations**
  - 21,719 Natives
  - 1,838 Second Generation Immigrants
  - 1,909 First Generation Immigrants
- **20 Countries**
  - Belgium, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Latvia, the Netherlands, Norway, the Russian Federation, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the Ukraine, and the United Kingdom
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Dataset and Operationalization

- Dependent variable: When should immigrants obtain the right to receive social benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Immediately</th>
<th>Residence 1yr</th>
<th>Paid taxes 1yr</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1,576 (7%)</td>
<td>1,986 (9%)</td>
<td>8,710 (40%)</td>
<td>7,993 (37%)</td>
<td>1,454 (7%)</td>
<td>21,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Gen.</td>
<td>175 (10%)</td>
<td>183 (10%)</td>
<td>799 (43%)</td>
<td>597 (32%)</td>
<td>84 (5%)</td>
<td>1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Gen.</td>
<td>328 (17%)</td>
<td>249 (13%)</td>
<td>904 (47%)</td>
<td>387 (20%)</td>
<td>41 (2%)</td>
<td>1,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,079 (8%)</td>
<td>2,418 (9%)</td>
<td>10,413 (41%)</td>
<td>8,977 (35%)</td>
<td>1,579 (6%)</td>
<td>25,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Controls: age, sex, income (standardized), education (ISCED), welfare dependency, marital status, pro redistribution, anti-immigrant attitudes

- Statistical model: Multinomial logit models with random intercepts (country)
Results
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When should migrants receive social benefits

n=26466; ll-Model=-31898.2
Complete Sample; Reference: immediately after arrival
Mlogit Random Intercepts for Country
Results

- Length of residence

![Graph showing the results of the study with data points for different categories of residence length and social benefits.](image)
Results

- Self-interest model (first generation immigrants)

![Self-Interest Model Chart]

When should migrants receive social benefits
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## Conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: first generation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{2a}$: second generation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{2b}$: over time</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{3a}$: staying one year</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{3b}$: working/tax paying</td>
<td>✔️/✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{3c}$: citizenship</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

- Unfortunately we lack measures to test
  - Effects of socialization of country of birth
  - Whether their attitudes are driven by group-loyalty or other factors

- Furthermore: sample size, not focused on immigrants
Next Steps

- Collection of new dataset "MIFARE"
  - Attitudes of and towards immigrants (welfare state, politics etc.)
  - Questions based on existing datasets (ISSP, ESS) + expansion
  - Country comparison: Germany, the Netherlands, Denmark
  - Different immigrant groups with 200-350 observations per group (German dataset: over 2700 total observations)
  - Focused on immigrants who migrated themselves (socialized in country of origin)
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