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Chapter 2

2.1) Average anti-immigration attitude per country in 2002 and 2017 (source: ESS)

![Bar chart showing average anti-immigration attitude per country in 2002 and 2017.]

2.2) Direct effects immigration on anti-immigrant sentiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment gap ratio (lagged)</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment migrants (lagged)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment natives (lagged)</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values gap (lagged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay rights gap (lagged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness gap (lagged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual freedom gap (lagged)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (subjective)</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefit receiver (dummy)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-0.02***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (dummy)</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural (dummy)</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country level immigration (perc., lagged)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (perc. lagged)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_cons</td>
<td>0.63***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 3

3.1: Search terms

EN: Salience: (immigr* OR migrat* OR migrant* OR refuge* OR alien OR “asylum seeker*”); Welfare frame: “(welfare OR unemploy* OR benefits OR benefici*) (<salience search string>)--15 NOT ageing; Islam frame: “(islam* OR muslim* OR mosque OR headscarf OR hijab OR burka OR niqab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)--15 NOT (terror* OR radical* OR jihad* OR extremis*); Terrorism frame: “(terror* radical* jihad* extremis*) (<salience search string>)--15.

DE: Salience: (immigr* OR migrat* OR migrant* OR migre* OR einwander* OR flüchtling* OR bootsflüchtling* OR asylbewerber* OR asylsuchender* OR asylantrag*); Welfare frame: “(arbeitlos* OR staatshilf* OR sozialhilfe*) (<salience search string>)--15 NOT alterung; Islam frame: “(islam* OR muslim* OR moschee OR kopftuch OR hijab OR burka OR niqab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)--15 NOT (terror* OR radikal* OR extremis* OR jihad*); Terrorism frame: “(terror* OR radikal* OR extremis* OR jihad*) (<salience search string>)--15.

ES: Salience: (inmigrante OR inmigrad* OR inmigrantes OR inmigracion OR inmigrar OR refugiad* OR asilo*); Welfare frame: “(desemple* OR parados) (<salience search string>)--15 OR “(gobierno OR social*) (ayuda OR asistencia OR pago) (<salience search string>)--16 NOT envejecimiento; Islam frame: “(islam* OR musulman* OR
mezquita OR velo OR burka OR niqab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)"~15 NOT (terror* OR extremis* OR radical* OR jihad*); Terrorism frame: “(terror* OR extremis* OR radical* OR jihad*) (<salience search string>)”~15.

FR: Salience: (immigr* OR migrat* OR emigrer OR refugie* OR illegale OR irreguliere* OR asile); Welfare frame: “(chomag*) (<salience search string>)”~15 OR “(gourvernemenal* OR social*) (aide OR prestations OR assistance) (<salience search string>)”~16 NOT vieillissement; Islam frame: “(islam* OR musulman* OR mosquee OR foulard OR burka OR hijab OR niqab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)”~15 NOT (terreur* OR terroris* OR extremis* OR jihad* OR radical*); Terrorism frame: “(terreur* OR terroris* OR extremis* OR jihad* OR radical*) (<salience search string>)”~15.

IT: Salience: (immigra* OR rifugiat* OR asilo); Welfare frame: “(welfare OR discoccupa* OR benefici*) (<salience search string>)”~16 OR “(pubblic* OR governo) (assistenza) (<salience search string>)”~16 NOT invecchiamento; Islam frame: “(islam* OR musulman* OR moschea OR velo OR hijab OR burka OR niqab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)”~15 NOT (terreur* OR terroris* OR extremis* OR jihad*); Terrorism frame: “(terreur* OR radical* OR extremis* OR jihad*) (immigra* OR rifugiat* OR asilo)”~15.

NL: Salience: (immigr* OR migrat* OR migrant* OR migre* OR vluchteling* OR bootvluchteling* OR illegalen OR asielzoeker*); Welfare frame: “(uitkering* OR werklo* OR bijstand*) (<salience search string>)”~15 NOT vergrijzing; Islam frame: “(islam* OR moslim* OR moskee OR hoofddoek OR hijab OR boerka OR nikab OR niqaab OR sharia) (<salience search string>)”~15 NOT (terreur* OR terreur* OR radical* OR jihad* OR extremis*); Terrorism frame: “(terreur* OR terreur* OR radical* OR jihad* OR extremis*) (<salience search string>)”~15.
3.2) Regression table interaction effects between media environment measures and news attentiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Immigration attitude</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News attentiveness</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.06***</td>
<td>-.07***</td>
<td>-.07***</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to immigration</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to immigration X News attentiveness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare frame</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare frame X News attentiveness</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam frame</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam frame X News attentiveness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism frame</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism frame X News attentiveness</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>(.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective income</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social benefits receiver</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
<td>-.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.01***</td>
<td>.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiousness</td>
<td>-.05***</td>
<td>-.05***</td>
<td>-.05***</td>
<td>-.05***</td>
<td>-.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-right scale</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key event the past year</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country’s unemployment</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage foreign born</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N (Observations)</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group N (Number of groups)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log lik.</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-squared</td>
<td>3177</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>3903</td>
<td>3321</td>
<td>3997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, † p<.1
### 3.3) Regression table interaction effects between media environment measures and education level

**DV: Immigration attitude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level</strong></td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
<td>-0.28***</td>
<td>-0.26***</td>
<td>-0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention to immigration</strong></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.13†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention to immigration X Education level</strong></td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare frame</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare frame X Education level</strong></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Islam frame</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Islam frame X Education level</strong></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrorism frame</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46**</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.47)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terrorism frame X Education level</strong></td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective income</strong></td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social benefits receiver</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed</strong></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social class</strong></td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
<td>0.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiousness</strong></td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
<td>-0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
<td>(0.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News attentiveness</strong></td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
<td>-0.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Left-right scale</strong></td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key event the past year</strong></td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
<td>(0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country’s unemployment</strong></td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage foreign born</strong></td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
<td>0.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N (Observations)</strong></td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
<td>80477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group N (Number of groups)</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Log lik.</strong></td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chi-squared</strong></td>
<td>3462.990</td>
<td>3248.264</td>
<td>4114.816</td>
<td>3407.367</td>
<td>5972.835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001, ** p<.01, * p<.05, † p<.1
### Chapter 4

#### Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics main variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMP</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>44,397,252</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.2: Direct effects Unemployment Benefits and Active Labor Market Policies per group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: Employed</th>
<th>(1) Full sample</th>
<th>(2) Natives EU</th>
<th>(3) TCM (cit)</th>
<th>(4) TCM (cit)</th>
<th>(5) Full sample</th>
<th>(6) Natives EU</th>
<th>(7) TCM (cit)</th>
<th>(8) TCM (cit)</th>
<th>(9) Full sample</th>
<th>(10) Natives EU</th>
<th>(11) TCM (cit)</th>
<th>(12) TCM (cit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB per unemployed</td>
<td>.03** (.01)</td>
<td>.04** (.01)</td>
<td>.02† (.01)</td>
<td>.03* (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.02† (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMP per unemployed</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.02† (.01)</td>
<td>-.02 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed previous year</td>
<td>2.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.42*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.14*** (.05)</td>
<td>2.33*** (.08)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 1</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
<td>.00 (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 2</td>
<td>.24*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.18*** (.01)</td>
<td>.24*** (.02)</td>
<td>.17*** (.01)</td>
<td>.24*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.18*** (.01)</td>
<td>.24*** (.01)</td>
<td>.17*** (.01)</td>
<td>.24*** (.01)</td>
<td>.17*** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 3</td>
<td>.59*** (.01)</td>
<td>.60*** (.02)</td>
<td>.49*** (.03)</td>
<td>.50*** (.03)</td>
<td>.38*** (.04)</td>
<td>.59*** (.04)</td>
<td>.60*** (.04)</td>
<td>.49*** (.04)</td>
<td>.50*** (.04)</td>
<td>.38*** (.04)</td>
<td>.59*** (.04)</td>
<td>.60*** (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.01*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.03)</td>
<td>-.01*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.01*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.01*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.01*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.25*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.31*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.23*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.37*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.31*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.37*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.03*** (.02)</td>
<td>.06*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td>.03*** (.02)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.18*** (.01)</td>
<td>.22*** (.01)</td>
<td>.09*** (.01)</td>
<td>.12*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.18*** (.01)</td>
<td>.22*** (.01)</td>
<td>.09*** (.01)</td>
<td>.12*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.18*** (.01)</td>
<td>.22*** (.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>-.26* (.11)</td>
<td>-.20 (.12)</td>
<td>-.15 (.11)</td>
<td>-.05 (.18)</td>
<td>-.17 (.11)</td>
<td>-.18* (.11)</td>
<td>-.15 (.12)</td>
<td>-.14 (.10)</td>
<td>-.08 (.18)</td>
<td>-.08 (.10)</td>
<td>-.08 (.10)</td>
<td>-.08 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP % growth</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Unemployment %</td>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>-.10†</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>-.63***</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>.97***</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>-.74***</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.43*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.39†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>1.03***</td>
<td>.92***</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.42*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.31†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.31†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>.41†</td>
<td>.42†</td>
<td>.35†</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3: Interaction effects Unemployment Benefits and Active Labor market Policies and origin group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UB per unemployed</td>
<td>.03** (.01)</td>
<td>.04** (.01)</td>
<td>.04** (.01)</td>
<td>.04** (.01)</td>
<td>.02 (.04)</td>
<td>.00 (.02)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>-.03*** (.03)</td>
<td>-.03*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td>-.03*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant X UB</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.02 (.02)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU migrant</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>-.03*** (.03)</td>
<td>-.03*** (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU X UB</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM (cit)</td>
<td>-.13*** (.03)</td>
<td>-.09*** (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM (cit) X UB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM</td>
<td>.14† (.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM X UB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMP per unemployed</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant X ALMP</td>
<td>-.03*** (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU X ALMP</td>
<td>-.01*** (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM (cit) X ALMP</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCM X ALMP</td>
<td>-.05*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed previous year</td>
<td>2.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.41*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.41*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.42*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.41*** (.04)</td>
<td>2.42*** (.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 1</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td>.00 (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 3</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td>.23*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education lev. 3</td>
<td>.58*** (.01)</td>
<td>.59*** (.01)</td>
<td>.60*** (.01)</td>
<td>.59*** (.01)</td>
<td>.60*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01*** (.00)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td>-.02*** (.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.26*** (.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td>.04*** (.01)</td>
<td>.05*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.19*** (.01)</td>
<td>.21*** (.01)</td>
<td>.20*** (.01)</td>
<td>.19*** (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-27*</th>
<th>-20†</th>
<th>-19</th>
<th>-26*</th>
<th>-21*</th>
<th>-16</th>
<th>-15</th>
<th>-24*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP % growth</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment %</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
<td>-.02***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
<td>.10†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.86***</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.83***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
<td>.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>-1.10***</td>
<td>-1.15***</td>
<td>-1.19***</td>
<td>-1.09***</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>-.67**</td>
<td>-.69**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.24)</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group N</td>
<td>34456665 32022787 31739370 32544004 33933107 31527533 31240332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>34456665 32022787 31739370 32544004 33933107 31527533 31240332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log lik.</td>
<td>390 385 385 390 378 373 373 378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-squared</td>
<td>.477 .481 .482 .485 .476 .480 .481 .484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5
DA:
Welfare: velfærd-, velfærdsydelser-, sygesikring-, offentlige ydelser-, statslige ydelser-, sociale ydelser.
Immigration: immigr-, migrat-, migrant-, indvandr-, flygtning-, asylansøg-
DE:
Immigration: immigr-, migr-, einwander-, flüchtling-, bootsflüchtling-, asylbewerber-, asylsuchender-, asylantrag-
ES:
Welfare: gobierno ayuda, gobierno asistencia, gobierno pago, social- ayuda, social- asistencia, social- pago.
Immigration: inmigrante, inmigrad-, inmigrantes, inmigracion, inmigrar, refugiad-, asilo-
FR:
Welfare frame: gourvernemental- aide, gourvernemental- prestations, gourvernemental- assistance, social- aide, social- prestations, social- assistance.
Immigration: immigr-, migrat-, emigrer-, refugie-, illegal, irreguliere-, asile.
IT:
Immigration: immigra-, rifugiat-, asilo.
NL:
Immigration: immigr-, migrat-, migrant-, migre-, vluchteling-, bootvluchteling-, illegalen, asielzoeker-.
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Over the past few decades, immigration has become an increasingly important issue in politics and society in Europe. In surveys, immigration is often high on the list when Europeans are asked what the most important problem facing their country is. Political parties running on an anti-immigration platform have gained support and, in some cases, cemented their place as important factors in the parliament. Surprisingly, immigration itself, apart from during the refugee crisis, has not grown as much as one would expect based on the importance of the immigration issue in the debate. Moreover, citizens, especially those who are against immigration, tend to overestimate the number of migrants residing in their country. To understand how immigration has become such an important and dividing issue in Europe, it is crucial to look beyond the immigration figures. The extent to and ways in which immigration is absorbed in the host countries may be a crucial part of the puzzle of explaining anti-immigrant sentiment.

Immigration absorption is a multi-faceted term and describes the societal and institutional adaptation of immigrants as a two-way process. It involves among others the economic and cultural integration of migrants, societal and political participation, but also the way the host country institutions deal with immigrants and the way immigration is debated in news media. An expectation could be that successful integration of migrants to the labor market or similarity of migrants to natives in terms of their cultural values could lead to a lower problematization of immigration and a decrease of anti-immigrant sentiment. Similar effects can be expected when it comes to the extent to and ways in which immigration is discussed in news media. News media is the place par excellence for the discussion of societal issues and the creation or sustaining of problem perceptions. One might expect that if the attention to and certain types of framing of migration increases, the problematization and anti-immigrant sentiment also increases.

These two types of immigration absorption form central pieces of the puzzle in this dissertation. I study the effects of both immigrant integration and media reporting on immigration and their relationship to anti-immigrant attitudes. In addition, I analyze the relationship between immigration absorption and the welfare state. Welfare state policies have the potential to increase immigration absorption, as these policies are intended
to decrease inequality in society and provide opportunities to vulnerable groups. For instance, labor market policies (LMPs) could increase labor market participation among migrants and help close the employment gap between natives and migrants. On the other side of the causal chain, the welfare-framing of immigration news might undermine or increase welfare state support among natives. Both relationships between immigration absorption and the welfare state are part of the empirical analyses.

**Relevance**

The relationship between immigration absorption and anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe is complementary to a growing field of research seeking explanations for these attitudes. In this literature, a prominent question is whether anti-immigration opinions are economically or culturally motivated. The education level of respondents has been an important explanatory factor for a negative immigration attitude. For a long time, this was seen as evidence for economically motivated attitudes. After all, lower educated natives are in direct competition with the often low-skilled migrants, while higher educated natives benefit from lower costs of low-skilled labor, which is associated with immigration. In recent years, cultural explanations for differences in immigration attitudes between higher and lower educated natives have prevailed. The idea is that the lower educated are more concerned about dilution of their national culture and identity and are thus more nationalistic, while the higher educated see different cultures and identities as an enrichment of society. With my dissertation I contribute to this debate, by investigating both economic and cultural aspects of immigration absorption and by comparing the effects of these forms of absorption between high- and low-educated natives.

In addition, this dissertation contributes by making the link between immigration absorption and the welfare state. In the academic literature, no systematic cross-national research has yet been done into differences in the effects of LMP on the employment opportunities of natives and migrants. This is important to investigate, because it could be that policies aimed at reducing inequality in society in general (unintentionally) lead to increasing differences between these two groups. This would be bad news for the inclusion of immigrants in society, as paid work has further implications for wellbeing. Finally, with the possible effects of immigration-welfare framing in the media on attitudes towards the welfare state, I investigate an understudied aspect of the media debate on immigration and the linking of these two topics in the media and in society. The observation that these topics are interrelated is not new, but what this linking of issues in the media means for support for the welfare state among citizens is not yet known.

**Analytical approach**

The analyses of the empirical chapters are based on large-N, statistical research in different European countries, over a longer period of time. For the data collection I used
different sources, developed measurements and linked data. The most important data sources are the European Social Survey (ESS) and the Labour Force Survey (LFS). For my measurements of media attention and framing I performed my own automatic content analysis of newspapers in ten different countries. By connecting these data with survey data, it was possible to use multilevel regression models to look for statistical relations and interaction effects. Although the analyses differ in the availability of the variables and the structure of the regression models, the analytical strategy is consistent. First, it is important to have a large sample of comparable (read: European) countries and time points. In particular, the analyses with media data are limited in number of countries and years, but the countries included cover a variety of European regions. The second principle is transparency and justification of choices. Every step from data collection to the interpretation of the models is accurately documented and every choice along the way is explained. To show whether other choices would have led to different results, I show these in a large number of robustness analyses. Finally, it is important to recognize the limitations of the data and analyses. The social world is complex and without being able to perform experiments, there is always uncertainty in the statements that can be made. The absence of certain data, the inherent uncertainty in the measurement of variables and the inability to exclude endogeneity or all possible omitted variables make uncertain and probabilistic conclusions the highest achievable goal. By working as systematically and transparently as possible, I provide a solid argumentation for the causal claims, which I make with caution.

**Findings per chapter**

The various substudies each provide a number of interesting findings. For example, Chapter Two shows that the integration of immigrants is related to anti-immigration attitudes of natives, but that lower and higher educated natives differ in how they react to economic and cultural aspects of integration. Differences in labor participation between natives and migrants do not show a significant relationship with the immigration attitude of lower educated natives. Highly educated natives, on the other hand, appear to be more positive about immigration when the employment gap between natives and migrants increases. Further analyses show that the highly educated natives react in particular to the employment of natives, which causes a large part of the employment gap between migrants and natives. As more natives enter the labor market, higher-educated natives are less concerned about migration, even if migrants’ participation in the labor market lags behind. When it comes to differences in cultural values between migrants and natives, it is the immigration attitude of lower-educated natives in particular that responds to these differences. With large differences between migrants and natives in terms of their degree of religiosity, opinions on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) rights and opinions on personal freedoms, the anti-immigration attitude of lower educated natives increases. Both findings point to possible differences in priorities between low- and high-
educated natives. While the highly educated are more concerned about employment, especially that of natives, lower educated natives seem to be more guided by the cultural aspects of integration when it comes to forming their opinion on immigration.

In Chapter Three, media coverage of immigration is central as an expression of immigration absorption and its influence on the immigration attitudes of low- and high-educated natives. In addition to the possible effects of media attention on immigration, I also investigate the possible effects of different immigration frames: a welfare state frame, an Islam frame, and a terrorism frame. The findings suggest that the immigration-welfare frame does not have an effect on the immigration attitudes of natives. Also, there are no significant differences between the effects on lower- and higher-educated natives. However, there are statistically significant effects of the Islam frame and the terrorism frame on anti-immigration attitudes. The higher the relative attention to these frames in the media, the more negative natives are regarding immigration. These effects apply to both low- and high-educated natives, but are slightly stronger for the lower educated natives.

The second part of the dissertation concerns the relationship between immigration absorption and the welfare state. Chapter Four describes the relationship between labor market policy and differences in unemployment between immigrants and natives. In short, does labor market policy strengthen or weaken the relative position of migrants on the labor market and thus the absorption of immigration? The results show that unemployment benefits (UBs) work better and active (labor market policies (ALMPs) work less badly for the labor participation of natives and migrants from EU countries on the one hand and immigrants from third countries on the other hand, respectively. For possible causes of these different policy outcomes, the integration of newcomers rather than access to these programs discrimination and anti-immigration sentiment should be considered. The analyses reveal that for migrants who are in the country longer than nine years, the differences in the effectiveness of labor market policies compared to natives are no longer statistically significant.

In the final empirical chapter, Chapter Five, I investigate what one of the forms of immigration absorption means for support for the welfare state. In the media debate, immigration and the welfare state are regularly mentioned together and this raises the question of whether this linkage of topics affects citizens’ support for the welfare state and whether these effects differ on the basis of personal characteristics. To study this, I return to the media debate and investigate what happens to welfare state support when immigration news is framed as a welfare state issue. This appears to depend on the respondent’s immigration position. According to the models, support for the welfare state decreases when the immigration-welfare state framing increases among people who are opposed to immigration. For people who are in favor of immigration, increased
immigration-welfare framing increases their support for the welfare state. Immigration-welfare framing seems to tap into ideas about who needs support from the government and who deserves it in the eyes of the respondents. It seems that people who are against immigration consider the sustainability of the welfare state and are concerned that public money is going to the out-group if immigration-welfare framing increases. People with a pro-immigration view might consider that more social protection is needed, both for natives and migrants, when the two topics are linked together in the news.

Conclusions
This dissertation shows the relevance of immigration absorption and what the effects of economic and cultural aspects of absorption are on the immigration attitudes of low- and high-educated natives. In addition, it shows that LMP can increase differences in employment between migrants and natives and that the immigration-welfare state framing in the media has consequences for support for the welfare state. Taken together, these findings paint a perhaps somewhat gloomy picture for people who believe in equality, tolerance and social cohesion. Differences between migrants and natives increase the differences between low- and high-educated natives in their immigration opinion, LMP seems to increase socio-economic differences between migrants and natives, and through immigration-welfare framing in the media, considerations of who does and does not deserve support from the government permeate the debate on the welfare state.

Nevertheless, this dissertation also offers some hope, which can be found in the integration of migrants. Integration is related to immigration attitudes and, just as larger cultural differences between migrants and natives can strengthen anti-immigration attitudes, especially of low-educated natives, an increase in integration can increase pro-immigration attitudes. In addition, integration appears to have a reinforcing effect on the effectiveness of LMPs, which further strengthen the socio-economic position of migrants. Immigrant integration can function as a double-edged sword when it comes to increasing equality and understanding and is therefore a promising, but still very complex, area for policy and further research into immigration absorption, immigration attitudes and the welfare state.
De afgelopen decennia is immigratie een belangrijk onderwerp geworden in Europese politiek en maatschappijen. In verschillende Europese landen staat immigratie hoog op de lijst van belangrijkste problemen die het land op dit moment beleeft, blijkt uit enquêteonderzoek. In deze periode zijn politieke partijen met een anti-immigratieboodschap opgekomen en hebben in verschillende landen vaste voet aan de grond gekregen. Toch is het niet zo dat immigratie zelf zoveel is toegenomen, althans, niet in de mate het anti-immigratiesentiment goed kan verklaren. Veel burgers, met name degene die tegen immigratie zijn, overschatten vaak hoe groot het percentage migranten in hun samenleving is. Om te begrijpen hoe immigratie zo’n belangrijk en polariserend onderwerp is geworden, is het belangrijk verder te kijken naar de grootte van immigratie alleen. De mate en manier waarop landen immigranten in hun samenleving opnemen vormt een cruciale schakel in de perceptie die autochtonen hebben van migranten.

De opname van immigranten in de samenleving is een breed begrip en afhankelijk van zowel migranten zelf, als de maatschappij en instituties van het gastland, in dit geval de Europese landen. De opname van immigranten heeft bijvoorbeeld te maken met hoe immigranten integreren. Dit kan zowel economisch zijn als cultureel en behelst politieke en maatschappelijke participatie. Een verwachting zou bijvoorbeeld zijn dat als immigranten succesvol zijn op de arbeidsmarkt of qua grotendeels dezelfde culturele waardes hebben als de autochtonen in het gastland, deze autochtonen immigratie als een minder groot probleem beschouwen. Een tweede vorm van de opname van migranten is hoe er in het gastland over immigranten gesproken wordt, bijvoorbeeld in nieuwsmedia. Media kunnen beschouwd worden als de plek waar het maatschappelijke debat over uiteenlopende onderwerpen gevoerd wordt en hebben zodoende een invloed op welke maatschappelijke onderwerpen door burgers belangrijk worden gevonden. Veel aandacht voor immigratie, of de manier waarop immigranten besproken worden in het nieuws, kan van invloed zijn over hoe burgers over immigratie denken. Media kunnen, naast integratie, dus ook een schakel vormen tussen immigratie zelf en hoe er over immigratie gedacht wordt door autochtonen.
Deze twee vormen van opname van immigranten staat centraal in dit proefschrift. Van beide vormen, integratie en mediaberichtgeving, onderzoek ik de relatie met anti-immigratiehoudingen onder autochtonen. Daarnaast onderzoek ik de relatie tussen de opname van immigranten en de verzorgingsstaat. De verzorgingsstaat heeft de potentie om de opname van immigratie te versterken. In het algemeen kan verwacht worden dat beleid dat gericht is op het bevorderen van gelijkheid, ook voor meer gelijkheid tussen migranten en autochtonen kan versterken. Bijvoorbeeld door middel van werkloosheidssuitkeringen en arbeidsmarkt activeringsbeleid kunnen migranten aan werk geholpen worden en verschillen in werkloosheid op basis van migratie-achtergrond verkleinen en daarmee de opname van immigranten versterken. Aan de andere kant van de causale keten, kan de opname van immigranten, door bijvoorbeeld de mate en manier waarop media over immigratie berichten, steun voor de verzorgingsstaat beïnvloeden. Beide relaties tussen de verzorgingsstaat en de opname van immigratie komen in dit proefschrift aan bod.

**Wetenschappelijke relevantie**

De relatie tussen de opname van immigranten en anti-immigratie attitudes in Europa sluit aan bij een toenemend onderzoeksveld dat verklaringen zoekt voor deze houdingen. In deze literatuur is een prominente vraag of anti-immigratie opinies economisch of cultureel gemotiveerd zijn. Opleidingsniveau is een belangrijke verklarende factor geweest voor een negatieve immigratie houding. Lange tijd werd dit gekoppeld aan economisch gemotiveerde houdingen. Immers, laagopgeleide autochtonen zijn in directere competitie met de vaak laag gekwalificeerde migranten, terwijl hoogopgeleiden juist profiteren van lagere kosten op laag gekwalificeerde arbeid die gepaard gaat met immigratie. De laatste jaren hebben culturele verklaringen voor verschillen in immigratie attitudes tussen hoger en lager opgeleide autochtonen de overhand gekregen. Laagopgeleiden maken zich meer zorgen om het behoud van hun nationale cultuur en identiteit en zijn zo nationalistischer, terwijl hoogopgeleiden verschillende culturen en identiteiten juist als een verrijking van de samenleving zien, zo is de gedachte. Met mijn proefschrift draag ik bij aan dit debat, door zowel economische als culturele aspecten van immigratie opname te onderzoeken en de effecten van deze vormen van opname te vergelijken tussen hoog- en laagopgeleide autochtonen.

Daarnaast draagt dit proefschrift bij door de koppeling te maken tussen de opname van immigratie en de verzorgingsstaat. In de wetenschappelijke literatuur is nog niet op structurele wijze onderzoek gedaan naar verschillen in effecten van arbeidsmarktbeleid op de arbeidskansen van autochtonen en migranten. Dit is belangrijk te onderzoeken, want het zou kunnen dat beleid dat gericht is op het verkleinen van ongelijkheid in de samenleving in het algemeen (onbedoeld) leidt tot het vergroten van verschillen tussen deze twee groepen. Dit zou slecht nieuws zijn voor de opname van immigranten in
de samenleving, omdat betaald werk ook verdere welzijnsimplicaties heeft. Tenslotte onderzoek ik met de mogelijke effecten van immigratie-verzorgingsstaat-frame in de media op houdingen ten aanzien van de verzorgingsstaat een onderontwikkeld aspect van het mediadebat over immigratie en de koppeling van deze twee onderwerpen in de media en in de maatschappij. Dat deze onderwerpen met elkaar samenhangen is niet nieuw, maar wat deze koppeling van onderwerpen in de media betekenen voor steun voor de verzorgingsstaat is nog niet bekend.

Onderzoeksstrategie
De analyses van de empirische hoofdstukken zijn gebaseerd op kwantitatief, statistisch onderzoek, in verschillende Europese landen, over langere tijd. Voor de dataverzameling heb ik verschillende bronnen gebruikt, metingen ontwikkeld en data gekoppeld. De belangrijkste databronnen zijn de European Social Survey (ESS) en de Labour Force Survey (LFS). Voor mijn metingen van media-aandacht en framing heb ik een eigen automatische inhoudsanalyse gedaan naar dagbladen in tien verschillende landen. Door deze data met elkaar te verbinden was het mogelijk met multilevel regressiemodellen op zoek te gaan naar statistische verbanden en interactie-effecten. Hoewel de analyses verschillen door in de beschikbaarheid van de variabelen en de opbouw van de regressiemodellen, is de analysestrategie consistent. Ten eerste is het belangrijk een grote sample te hebben van vergelijkbare (lees: Europese) landen en tijdpunten. Met name de analyses met mediadata zijn gelimiteerd in het aantal landen en jaren, maar de landen die zijn meegenomen bestrijken een variëteit aan Europese regio’s. Het tweede uitgangspunt is transparantie en verantwoording. Iedere stap van dataverzameling tot de interpretatie van de modellen zijn nauwkeurig gedocumenteerd en wanneer er een keuze is gemaakt, verantwoord ik deze. Om te laten zien of andere keuzes tot andere resultaten zouden hebben geleid, laat ik deze in een groot aantal robuustheidsanalyses zien. Tenslotte is het belangrijk de beperkingen van de data en de analyses te onderkennen. De sociale wereld is complex en zonder zuivere experimenten, is er altijd onzekerheid in de uitspraken die er gedaan kunnen worden. Het ontbreken van bepaalde data, de inherente onzekerheid in de meting van variabelen en het niet kunnen uitsluiten van endogeniteit of alle mogelijke schijnverbanden maken onzekere en probabilistische conclusies het hoogst haalbare. Door zo systematisch en transparant mogelijk te werk te gaan, probeer ik een degelijke onderbouwing te geven voor de causale claims, die ik, met de beperkingen van dit onderzoek, in alle voorzichtigheid probeer te maken.

Bevindingen per hoofdstuk
De verschillende deelonderzoeken laten ieder een aantal interessante patronen zien. Zo toont Hoofdstuk twee aan dat de integratie van immigranten samenhangt met anti-immigratie attitudes van autochtonen, maar dat laag- en hoogopgeleide autochtonen verschillen in hoe zij op economische en culturele aspecten van integratie reageren.
Verschillen in arbeidsparticipatie tussen autochtonen en migranten laten geen significante relatie zien met de immigratie attitude van laagopgeleide autochtonen. Hoogopgeleide autochtonen, daarentegen, blijken positiever over immigratie te zijn, wanneer de arbeidsparticipatiekloof tussen autochtonen en migranten toeneemt. Verdere analyses laten zien dat hoogopgeleiden met name reageren op de werkgelegenheid van autochtonen, die de arbeidsparticipatiekloof tussen migranten en autochtonen voor een groot deel veroorzaakt. Als meer autochtonen aan het werk komen, maken hoogopgeleide autochtonen zich minder zorgen over migratie, zelfs als de arbeidsparticipatie van migranten achterblijft. Als het gaat om verschillen in culturele waardes tussen migranten en autochtonen, is het met name de immigratie attitude van laagopgeleide autochtonen die daarop reageren. Bij grote verschillen tussen migranten en autochtonen als het gaat om hun mate van religiositeit, menings over homorechten en menings over persoonlijke vrijheden, stijgt de anti-immigratie attitude van laagopgeleide autochtonen. Beide bevindingen wijzen op mogelijke verschillen in prioriteiten tussen laag- en hoogopgeleiden autochtonen. Waar hoogopgeleiden zich als het om immigratie gaat meer zorgen maken om de werkgelegenheid, met name van autochtonen, lijken laagopgeleide autochtonen zich meer te laten leiden door de culturele aspecten van integratie als het gaat om de vorming van hun opinie ten aanzien van immigratie.


Het tweede deel van het proefschrift behelst de relatie tussen immigratie opname en de verzorgingsstaat. Zo beschrijft Hoofdstuk vier de relatie tussen arbeidsmarktbeleid en verschillen in werkloosheid tussen immigranten en autochtonen. Kortom, versterkt of verzwakt arbeidsmarktbeleid de relatieve positie van migranten op de arbeidsmarkt, en dus de opname van immigratie? Uit de resultaten blijkt dat werkloosheidstukeringen als activeringsbeleid respectievelijk beter en minder slecht werken voor de arbeidsparticipatie van aan de ene kant autochtonen en migranten uit EU-landen en aan de andere kant migranten uit derde landen. Voor mogelijke oorzaken van deze verschillende effecten
moet in plaats van naar de toegang tot deze programma’s, of discriminatie en anti-immigratie sentiment, gekeken worden naar de integratie van nieuwkomers. Uit de analyses blijkt dat voor migranten die langer in het land zijn dan negen jaar, de verschillen met autochtonen in de effectiviteit van het arbeidsmarkthebeleid niet meer statistisch significant zijn.

In het laatste empirische hoofdstuk, *Hoofdstuk vijf*, onderzoek ik wat een vorm van de opname van immigratie betekent voor steun voor de verzorgingsstaat. In het immigratiedebat worden deze twee onderwerpen regelmatig samen genoemd en dit doet de vraag rijzen of deze koppeling van onderwerpen gevolgen heeft voor de steun van burgers voor de verzorgingsstaat en of deze effecten verschillen op basis van persoonlijke eigenschappen. Om dit te onderzoeken ga ik terug naar het mediadebat en onderzoek ik wat er gebeurt met steun voor de verzorgingsstaat wanneer immigratie op een verzorgingsstaat-manier geframed wordt in het nieuws. Dit blijkt afhankelijk van het immigratiestandpunt van de respondent. Volgens de modellen daalt de steun voor de verzorgingsstaat onder mensen met een anti-immigratie houding wanneer de immigratie-verzorgingsstaat framing toeneemt. Voor mensen die positief staan tegenover immigratie is dit andersom. Waarschijnlijk heeft dit te maken met ideeën over wie steun van de overheid nodig heeft en wie het in de ogen van de respondenten verdient. Het lijkt erop dat mensen die tegen immigratie zijn bij immigratie-verzorgingsstaat-nieuws de houdbaarheid van de verzorgingsstaat overwegen en zich zorgen maken dat overheids geld terugkomt bij immigranten, de buitenstaanders. Mensen met een pro-immigratiemening overwegen misschien dat er meer sociale protectie nodig is, voor zowel de autochtonen als de migranten, wanneer de twee onderwerpen aan elkaar gekoppeld worden in het nieuws.

**Conclusies**

Dit proefschrift laat de relevantie van immigratie opname zien en wat de effecten van economische en culturele aspecten zijn voor de immigratie attitudes van laag- en hoogopgeleide autochtonen. Daarnaast toont het aan dat arbeidsmarkthebeleid verschillen in arbeidsparticipatie tussen migranten en autochtonen kan vergroten en dat het immigratie-verzorgingsstaat-framing in de media gevolgen heeft voor steun voor de verzorgingsstaat. Alle deze bevindingen samen schetsen een misschien wat somber beeld, voor mensen die geloven in gelijkheid, tolerantie en sociale cohesie. Verschillen tussen migranten en autochtonen vergroten de verschillen tussen laag- en hoogopgeleide autochtonen in hun immigratie-opinie, arbeidsmarkthebeleid lijkt sociaaleconomische verschillen tussen migranten en autochtonen te vergroten en overwegingen van wie wel en geen steun van de overheid verdient zijn overwegingen die middels het immigratiedebat doorsijpelen in het debat over de verzorgingsstaat.
Toch biedt dit proefschrift ook enige hoop en die kan gevonden worden in de integratie van migranten. Integratie hangt samen met immigratie-attitudes en zoals grotere culturele verschillen tussen migranten en autochtonen anti-immigratie attitudes van met name laagopgeleide autochtonen kunnen versterken, zo kan een toename van integratie deze attitudes ook weer verzwakken. Daarnaast blijkt dat integratie een versterkende werking heeft van de effectiviteit van arbeidsmarktbepaling, wat de sociaaleconomische positie van migranten verder versterkt. Integratie is dus via twee wegen tot meer gelijkheid en begrip leiden en is daarmee een veelbelovend, maar nog steeds zeer complex, terrein voor beleid en verder onderzoek naar de opname van immigratie.
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