

Determinants (WP 3)

Oxford team (quantitative):

Carlos Vargas-Silva Cinzia Rienzo (maternity) Post-doc (to be recruited)

Maastricht team (qualitative):

Melissa Siegel Post-doc (to be recruited)

Overview

- Explore the drivers of mobility within (and to) the EU.
- Combine quantitative and qualitative methods.
- Focus on two aspects:
 - Minimum wage
 - Welfare access/generosity





- Countries (tentative): Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden, UK.
- Data: Labour Force Surveys (EU and nationals), administrative.
- Overall approach: focus on specific policy changes.



- Quantitative component
 - Minimum wage
 - Welfare access/generosity
 - Other
- Qualitative component
- Discussion



Quantitative component

Minimum wage

- Welfare access/generosity
- Other
- Qualitative component
- Discussion



Minimum wage: Main idea

- A higher minimum wage in destination countries raises the expected earnings of "low-skilled" migrants.
- However... traditional economic models predict that a higher minimum wage reduces low-skilled employment.
- Two opposing effects: wage vs probability of employment.



Minimum wage: Evidence

- Mixed results.
- Most evidence for USA (Cadena, 2014; Castillo-Freeman and Freeman, 1992; Cortes, 2004; Giulietti, 2014; Orrenius and Zavodny, 2008).
- Reasons:
 - Differences between state and federal level minimum wage.
 - Large irregular migrant population.



Minimum wage: Approach

Step 1: mapping

- Minimum wage legislation in the five countries (tentative 2000-2016).
- Differences across time, regions and demographic groups (e.g. young people).
- Enforcement.



Minimum wage: Approach

Step 2: estimate importance in each country

- How many EU migrants work for the minimum wage? (same for non-EU nationals and nationals of the country).
- Which industries rely on minimum wage work? (for EU, non-EU and locals).
- Variations across regions, demographic groups and time.



Minimum wage: Approach

Step 3: estimate impact of specific minimum wage changes

- Select specific policy changes.
 - Substantial policy change.
 - Ideally variation across time and demographic (or regional) groups.
 - Need a control group (highly skilled, others).
- Use differences-in-differences and counterfactual techniques to estimate impact on expected earnings and employment levels of migrants.
- Relate to EU mobility.



- Quantitative component
 - Minimum wage
 - Welfare access/generosity
 - Other
- Qualitative component
- Discussion



Welfare access: Main idea

- Popularly known as the "welfare magnet hypothesis", implies that the generosity of the welfare state in destination countries attracts migrants.
- Labour market and welfare access restrictions play a key role.
- Freedom of movement has implications for the skill composition of migrants (i.e. allows for more low-skilled migration) and access to the welfare state.



Welfare access: Evidence

- Most evidence in favour of the "welfare magnet hypothesis".
- Most evidence uses cross-country studies (De Giorgi and Pellizzari (2006), Giulietti and Wahba (2012), Razin and Wahba (2015)).



Welfare access: Approach

Step 1: mapping

- Changes in the generosity of the welfare system.
- Changes in welfare access.
- Tentative 2000-2016.
- Differences across time, regions, demographic groups and income groups.



Welfare access: Approach

Step 2: estimate importance in each country

- How many EU migrants claim welfare? (same for non-EU nationals and nationals of the country).
- Which types of benefits?
- Variations across demographic and income groups and time.



Welfare access: Approach

Step 3: estimate impact of specific changes in the welfare system (including access).

- Select specific policy changes.
 - Substantial policy change.
 - Ideally variation across time and demographic, income groups.
 - Need a control group (non-EU, others).
- Use differences-in-differences and counterfactual techniques to estimate impact on welfare participation of migrants.
- Relate to EU mobility.



- Quantitative component
 - Minimum wage
 - Welfare access/generosity
 - Other
- Qualitative component
- Discussion



Other key aspects

- What is the interaction of temporary restrictions on migration in the case of the accession countries with the minimum wage and welfare state?
- What is the role of Brexit?



- Quantitative component
 - Minimum wage
 - Welfare access/generosity
 - Other
- Qualitative component
- Discussion



WP3: Determinants

Collaboration with Oxford University's team

- UOXF responsible for quantitative analysis (1st part)
- UM responsible for qualitative component (2nd part)

Description of UM's project:

- Goal: complement quantitative analysis on migrants' decisionmaking processes using focus group interviews
- Investigate relative importance of key decision-making factors and how they interact
- Special emphasis on similarities and differences between EU citizens and TCNs with regards to their decision-making process
- Include: migration history, future intentions of mobility (emerging factors)



WP3: Determinants

Methodological approach:

- Focus group interviews
 - 10 focus groups in each of 5 destination countries (DE, IT, ES, SE, UK)
 - Same as those examined in the quantitative part by UOXF
 - Groups of 5-8 individuals each
 - Split focus groups by:
 - TCN / EU (5 focus groups each)
 - Skill
 - Gender
 - Migration motivation
- Short individual surveys (300-400) within focus groups
 - General information on migration history, migration motivation and socio-economic profile of participants
 - Use for additional quantitative analysis



WP3: Determinants

Timeline (M13-M36):

- Start work on qualitative part on year 2
 - Builds on WP2 and on quantitative part of WP3
- Year 2: Data collection (finish by M24)
 - M12 [fix if changed bc we only start on year 2]: Preliminary report 1 (D3.1)
 - M24 [same as above]: Journal article 1 (D3.5)
- Year 3: Finish write-up
 - M32: Policy note 2 with results of both qualitative and quantitative analysis (D3.6)
 - M32: Main report (D3.7)
- Throughout:
 - Presentations in conferences and seminars (D3.2)





