

# Differences in labour market outcomes between natives, refugees and other migrants in the UK<sup>1</sup>

Isabel Ruiz  
Harris Manchester College  
University of Oxford  
Mansfield Rd  
Oxford, OX1 3TD, UK  
Email: isabel.ruiz@economics.ox.ac.uk

Carlos Vargas-Silva (contact author)  
Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS)  
University of Oxford  
58 Banbury Rd  
Oxford, OX2 6QS, UK  
Email: carlos.vargas-silva@compas.ox.ac.uk

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Esther Arroyo-Arenas, Francesco Fasani, Zovanga Kone and Jean-Francois Maystadt for helpful comments on previous versions of this paper. This paper is based on data from the secured access version of the UK Labour Force Survey produced by the ONS and supplied by the UK Data Service. The use of the data in this work does not imply the endorsement of ONS or the Secure Data Service at the UK Data Archive in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the data.

# Differences in labour market outcomes between natives, refugees and other migrants in the UK

## **Abstract**

Using 2010-2016 data we compare the labour market outcomes of natives, those who migrated to seek asylum (refugees) and other migrants in the UK. The results indicate that refugees are less likely to be employed, earn less per hour and work fewer hours than natives and those who migrated to the UK for other reasons. The evidence suggests that differences in health status (particularly mental health) and English proficiency partly explain these gaps. Moreover, while employment growth of refugees between 2010 and 2016 was higher than that of other migrants, this was not the case for other labour market outcomes.

Keywords: UK, refugees, labour markets, immigration

JEL Classification: F22, J31

## 1. Introduction

While the majority of the forcibly displaced stay within the borders of their countries of birth or migrate to neighbouring developing countries, there has been a substantial increase in asylum applications in developed countries. In the UK, for example, the number of asylum applications increased by 70% from 2010 to 2016 (Home Office, 2017). Many of these asylum applicants will be granted protection, enabling them to remain in the country and enter the British labour market. The UK Government has also committed to accept 20,000 additional Syrian refugees for resettlement by 2020 (Home Office, 2015). These developments have spurred a growing interest in exploring the labour market outcomes of refugees and how these outcomes compare to those of natives and other migrants.

This paper explores differences in labour market outcomes between UK natives, those who migrated to seek asylum (denoted as refugees in the following discussion)<sup>2</sup> and those who migrated for other reasons (employment, family, study). While there is a rich literature on the economic outcomes of migrants in the UK (e.g. Clark and Lindley, 2009; Drinkwater et al., 2009; Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003), there is a scarcity of studies looking at the specific case of refugees. The main reason for this is that until recently there were no datasets available that indicated whether migrants had moved to the UK in order to seek asylum. This changed in 2010 when a question which inquires about the main reason for original migration to the country was added to the UK Labour Force Survey (LFS). We make use of this question and dataset in our paper. In order to address possible concerns about bias related to self-identification as a refugee we use administrative Home Office data on the nationality

---

<sup>2</sup> In Section 3, we provide a detailed explanation of who is counted as a “refugee” in the dataset and how this might differ from other possible definitions.

of individuals granted protection in the UK to develop an alternative strategy to identify refugees in the dataset.

There are several reasons for which we could expect refugees to have worse outcomes than other migrants, particularly those who migrate for employment reasons. First, refugee skills may be less readily transferable across countries than those of other migrants and differences in the main motivation to migrate suggest that refugees may be less favourably selected for labour market success in the host country (Cafferty et al., 1983; Chiswick, 1999; Constant and Zimmermann, 2005). Second, asylum seekers in many countries face legal restrictions to access the labour market while their claim is being evaluated (Allsopp et al., 2014) and periods of labour market inactivity can have adverse long-term consequences (Chin, 2005; Fransen et al., 2017). Third, many refugees have experienced traumatic events that affect their mental and physical health and ability to work (Bhui, 2003; Turner et al., 2003; Warfa et al., 2006).

Other factors suggest that refugees could have better outcomes than other migrants over the long run. Refugees are often less likely to return home than other migrants as they face a higher risk of harm or persecution. The smaller likelihood of return results in a greater incentive to invest in host country human capital (Borjas, 1982; Cortes, 2004). As such, refugees could catch up and perhaps even outperform other migrants over time. It could also be the case that refugees from some countries are positively self-selected (Borjas, 1987). The typical example is entrepreneurs in communist countries who had experienced confiscation of land and other assets in the home country. These entrepreneurs do not fit in the economic system in their home countries and may be better off in a market economy.

Our findings suggest that refugees have worse labour market outcomes than natives and other migrants. In particular, those who migrated to the UK with the intention of claiming asylum are 19 (14) percentage points less likely to be in employment, have weekly earnings which are 76% (42%) lower, earn 60% (28%) less per hour and work 17% (15%) fewer hours than natives (those who migrated for work reasons). We also explore some of the possible reasons for the gap between refugees and other migrants and find that differences in health status (particularly mental health) and, to some degree, English proficiency could partly explain the gap between refugees and other groups. In terms of convergence, we found that there was higher growth in the employment rates of refugees from 2010 to 2016 relative to other migrants. As such, there is some catching up over time in terms of employment. However, there is no evidence of catching up in terms of weekly earnings or hourly salary.

## 2. Conceptual background

In this section we discuss in more detail why the labour market outcomes of refugees might differ from those of other migrants and natives. First, we use a simple two-country model to explain the impact of conflict exposure/insecurity on the characteristics of the migrant group. The return to migration ( $r$ ) is a function of earnings in the foreign country  $A$  ( $W_A$ ) and home country  $B$  ( $W_B$ ), security levels in the foreign ( $S_A$ ) and home ( $S_B$ ) countries, and the cost of migration ( $C$ ). That is:

$$r = (W_A - W_B) + \varphi(S_A - S_B) - C \quad (1)$$

If  $r > 0$  the individual is better off abroad (i.e. in country  $A$ ). Economic factors will determine the likelihood of migration when security conditions are similar across countries ( $S_A = S_B$ ). In this scenario those who are more likely to make an economic gain will migrate. On the other hand, if there is a positive security gap (i.e.  $S_A > S_B$ ) it

is possible for  $r$  to be positive, even if the earnings gap is negative (i.e.  $W_A < W_B$ ). In this scenario those affected by conflict and insecurity might migrate even if they expect to be worse off in economic terms in the host country. This idea is supported by a substantial literature suggesting that those who migrate to seek asylum are less favourably selected for initial labour market success in the host country in comparison to other migrants (Cafferty et al., 1983; Chiswick, 1999; Constant and Zimmermann, 2005).

The  $C$  parameter also plays a key role. Many of those affected by insecurity are unlikely to be able to afford the cost of migration. As such, those from better off families are more likely to leave the country in response to high levels of insecurity (Van Hear, 2006). Moreover, the costs of migration could be lower for the more educated (Chiquiar and Hanson, 2005). For instance, those with higher levels of education may be better able to manage the complex asylum rules of countries such as the UK.

The security/economic incentives for migration only offer a partial account of the story for many refugees. Borjas (1987) highlighted the possibility of “refugee sorting”. This refers to migrants who are selected from the lower tail of the home country income distribution but end up in the upper tail of the host country distribution. This could relate, for instance, to minority groups who are discriminated in the home country or migration from a non-market economy where the set of skills rewarded is different from the host economy (e.g. entrepreneurs in communist countries).

Also, in many cases the choice of final destination on the part of refugees is made after arriving at a safe first country of asylum (e.g. neighbouring country). At that point, economic incentives are likely to play a major role for the decision of

onward migration for individuals who initially left their home countries for security reasons (Vargas-Silva, 2017).<sup>3</sup>

Post-migration factors can also result in key differences between refugees and other migrants (or natives) in countries such as the UK. First, while there have been some policy changes over time (see Section 3 for details), the large majority of asylum seekers in the UK have not been able to legally access the labour market immediately after submitting their application for asylum (Gower, 2016). There is an extensive evidence base suggesting that periods of labour market inactivity can affect future labour market outcomes by leading to psychological discouragement and deterioration of skills (Chin, 2005; Fransen et al., 2017).

Second, asylum seekers are subject to a period of high uncertainty while their claim is being evaluated (i.e. “limbo period”) and this could affect their future labour market outcomes. For instance, Hainmueller et al. (2016) show that in Switzerland one additional year of waiting for an asylum decision reduces the future employment rate of refugees by 4 to 5 percentage points.

Third, many refugees have experienced traumatic events (e.g. violence, persecution, rape, torture, shortages of food) that could affect their health. In fact, there is substantial evidence in the health literature suggesting that refugees have poor health outcomes and are more likely to suffer from mental health conditions than other migrants (Bhui, 2003; Turner et al., 2003; Warfa et al., 2006). Mental health conditions have been shown to have a detrimental impact on labour market outcomes (Frijters et al., 2010; Webber et al., 2015).

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that direct resettlement accounts for a very small share of refugee inflows in the UK. As we explained later in the paper, our sample is limited to individuals who arrived in the UK before 2007. Data on resettlement is available since 2004. During 2004-2006 close to 927 refugees were resettled in the UK (including dependants) compared to the 99,785 applications for asylum (including dependants) made during the same period.

On the other hand, previous evidence has highlighted that refugees often have a smaller likelihood of returning home compared to other migrants. Cortes (2004) uses a two period model and shows that a lower likelihood of return leads to a greater incentive to invest in host country specific human capital. She also presents evidence that refugees who arrived in the United States from 1975 to 1980 made greater earnings gains over time than other migrants in the same arrival cohort. Borjas (1982; 2014) also highlights that migrants who face higher migration costs should assimilate faster. For instance, Borjas (1982) shows that Cubans in the United States, the majority of whom are political refugees and unlikely to return home, had a higher rate of economic progress than other Hispanic migrants. This economic progress was the result of greater investments in U.S. human capital. As such, refugees in our sample could make greater advances over time in comparison to other migrants.

### **3. The UK asylum system and the definition of “refugee”**

We use information on the motivation for original migration in order to identify “refugees”. The information on motivation for migration is not available in the regular LFS dataset. As such, we make use of the secured access version of the LFS which contains this information. We define refugees as foreign born individuals who selected “seeking asylum” as their main reason for migration to the UK. As shown in Table 1, the main reasons for migration of the UK foreign-born population are family (e.g. joining a British/non-British spouse, as a dependent minor) and employment. Only 6% of those in our sample selected seeking asylum as the main reason for original migration. This coincides with other datasets which suggests that seeking asylum is not a major driver of migration to the UK (Blinder, 2016).

[Table 1]



Our definition of a refugee differs from other potential definitions, such as the legal one. For instance, a person who requests asylum in the UK and is waiting for a decision on that claim is known as an asylum seeker. As shown in Figure 1, the number of annual asylum applications in the UK has fluctuated between close to 1,500 in 1979 to a peak of 103,000 in 2002. Over the last decade the UK has received an average of 31,000 asylum applications per year (including dependants).

[Figure 1]

The UK Government aims to decide asylum claims within six months of application.<sup>4</sup> Asylum seekers are eligible for government cash assistance and free housing while they wait for a decision. As of 2016, this cash assistance entailed a weekly payment of £36.95 per person in the household. Asylum seekers cannot select the location of residence and are distributed across the country based on housing availability under the UK asylum dispersal programme (Bakker, 2016).

In our analysis, we look at individuals who entered the UK on or before 2006. Until July 2002, asylum seekers could apply for permission to work if they had been waiting for six months for an initial decision. From July 2002 to February 2005 this concession was eliminated and granting the permission to work was at the discretion of case workers. According to the UK Government, the change in the standard six month concession responded to this practice becoming irrelevant given that “the vast majority—around 80 per cent—of asylum seekers receive a decision within six months” (House of Lords, 2012). From February 2005, asylum seekers could apply for permission to work if they had been waiting for twelve months for an initial decision on their claim. This rule change was made to comply with a EU directive

---

<sup>4</sup> This is for an initial decision. In case of a negative decision, the asylum seeker can make an appeal. Dustmann et al. (2016) using data for 2000-2014 estimate that the UK is the EU country with the highest average rate of asylum applications cleared over the period.

(Gower, 2016). The delay in reaching a decision must not be the fault of the asylum seeker (e.g. missing an appointment or document). Note that any asylum seeker who has already been granted permission to work will continue to have this permission even if the policy changes for future applicants.<sup>5</sup>

Refused asylum seekers are expected to make arrangements for leaving the UK. There are voluntary programs of return, but the Government can also deport the individual.<sup>6</sup> Someone who receives a positive decision on his or her asylum claim has refugee status.<sup>7</sup> As also shown in Figure 1, the annual number of grants of protection has fluctuated between 740 in 1979 to 41,000 in 2001. The UK has given an average of 8,620 grants of protection per year since 2007. According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (2016) the UK had the fourth largest stock of individuals with refugee status (i.e. 123,067) among European Union members in 2015 (behind Germany, Sweden and France).

After receiving refugee status the person has unrestricted access to the UK labour market. At that point the person can also register for a national insurance number in order to access welfare benefits. Most of those who received protection in the UK can apply for permanent settlement after a few years and at a later stage for British nationality. These individuals with permanent settlement or British nationality are no longer under “refugee status”, but are still considered refugees in our definition because they came to the UK with the intention of claiming asylum. In fact, as we

---

<sup>5</sup> Recently this policy has become more restrictive. Since late 2010, asylum seekers can only take jobs included in the UK's shortage occupation list. This change should not affect the refugees in our sample.

<sup>6</sup> See Collyer and Kulasinghe (2010) and Gibney (2008) for further discussion on UK deportation policies.

<sup>7</sup> In practice, some of those who apply for asylum are given humanitarian protection status instead of refugee status. In this case the person has a need for protection but does not meet the criteria for refugee status. The overall implications are similar for the purpose of the discussion in this paper.

will show in the next section, the majority of refugees in our sample are already British nationals.

The main countries of origin of refugees as identified by us in the LFS are Somalia, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka, Iraq and Zimbabwe (Table 2). This contrasts with the main countries of origin of other migrants as identified in the LFS: India, Poland, Pakistan, Germany and Ireland.

[Table 2]

As we explained in detail below, one of the concerns of using self-reported reason for migration is that some individuals who migrated to seek asylum might not report this in the survey. One possible way to explore this concern is to look at other sources of information on the origin of refugees in the UK. In column 3 of Table 2 we report administrative data from the UK Home Office on the main nationalities of those who were granted protection in the UK during the 2001-2006 period (main applicants). While the information is not available for the pre-2001 period, this information can provide a benchmark to compare the information from the LFS. Four of the top five countries in column 5 are also top five countries in column 1. The exceptions are Sri Lanka and Iran. Sri Lanka does not appear in column 5, but actually occupies the 8th position in the Home Office data. Iran does not appear in column 1, but actually occupies the 6th position in the LFS data. As such, the Home Office and LFS data broadly coincide on the main countries of origin of refugees.

#### **4. Data and methodology**

Data for this paper comes from the secured access version of the UK LFS. The information on main reason for migration is only available from 2010 onwards. We use all the data available at the moment of writing the paper, that is, from Q1 2010 to Q4 2016. The LFS interviews individuals for five consecutive quarters. We only keep

respondents in the first wave of the LFS in order to avoid repeating the same individuals. As such, our data set is made up of 28 cross-sections. We also limit the sample to individuals who are between 21 and 59 years of age in 2010, i.e. at most 65 years of age in 2016. Finally, the foreign-born component of the sample is limited to individuals who migrated to the UK on or before 2006.<sup>8</sup> This means that all migrants in the sample entered the UK before the financial crisis and have spent more than three years living in the country by 2010. Overall, we have complete information for 259,615 UK natives, 2,198 refugees and 33,201 other migrants.

Our baseline estimations are a series of regressions along the following lines:

$$y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 W_i + \alpha_2 S_i + \alpha_3 F_i + \alpha_4 R_i + \alpha_5 O_i + \alpha_6 TUK_i + \gamma_p + \tau_t + \sigma_q + \theta X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

Where  $y_i$  is the outcome of interest,  $W_i$  is a dummy for migration for work reasons,  $S_i$  is a dummy indicating migration for study reasons,  $R_i$  is a dummy indicating migration for asylum reasons,  $F_i$  is a dummy indicating migration for family reasons,  $O_i$  is a dummy indicating other reasons for original migration (including visitors),  $TUK_i$  controls for years since migration (equal to zero for natives),  $\gamma_p$  are fixed effects for local authority,  $\tau_t$  are year dummies,  $\sigma_q$  are quarter dummies,  $X_i$  are the individual controls and  $\varepsilon_i$  is the error term. We estimate the model for all individuals and separately by gender.

Those who migrated for employment reasons are likely to have the highest success in the labour market as they are more likely to be selected on factors that relate to economic performance in the host country. On the other hand, previous

---

<sup>8</sup> The UK Office for National Statistics has suggested that the LFS response rate is lower for recent migrants (i.e. those who arrived within the previous year). This should not be a major problem in our analysis as we limit the analysis to those who have been in the country for more than three years.

studies suggest that family migrants tend to have worse labour market outcomes than economic migrants (e.g. Aydemir, 2011; Bevelander and Pendakur, 2014).

We concentrate the analysis on four labour market outcomes. First, we look at differences in the likelihood of being in employment (dummy variable).<sup>9</sup> Second we look at the differences in weekly earnings. Next we explore if differences in weekly earnings are the result of a gap in salary and/or hours worked. For this purpose we look at differences between natives, refugees and other migrants in hourly salary and weekly hours worked.

Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for these four dependent variables. Those who migrated to seek asylum are, on average, 22 percentage points less likely than natives to be in employment and have the lowest employment rates among the migrant groups. The unconditional difference in weekly earnings between those who migrated to seek asylum and UK natives is £190. Once again, those who migrated to claim asylum have the lowest weekly earnings among all migrant groups. Consistent with these two gaps, those who migrated to seek asylum report a lower hourly wage and weekly hours worked than UK natives and other migrants.

There is a gender gap in labour market outcomes with men outperforming women in most categories. Furthermore, comparing across groups and genders is clear that, for the most part, women who migrated to seek asylum are at a substantial disadvantage relative to men who migrated for the same reason and other women.

[Table 3]

Weekly earnings, hourly salary and weekly hours worked are included in logs in the regressions. We control for gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality. Table 4 provides descriptive statistics for

---

<sup>9</sup> We also tried a Probit model instead of the linear probability model when using the employment dummy as the dependent variable and results are consistent across models.

the control variables. Those who migrated to seek asylum are more likely to be Muslim, come from Africa and report a health problem. In addition, around 62% of refugees in our sample are UK nationals. The appendix provides details on the definition of all the variables used in the estimation.

[Table 4]

In a second step we limit the sample to foreign-born individuals and estimate:

$$y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 S_i + \alpha_2 F_i + \alpha_3 R_i + \alpha_4 O_i + \sum_{j=1}^7 \delta_j TGUK_{ji} + \gamma_p + \tau_t + \sigma_q + c_i + \theta X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (3)$$

In this case *TGUK* refers to dummies indicating time since migration grouped in three year periods (e.g. *TGUK<sub>1i</sub>* is one for those who arrived in the country from 4 to 6 years ago, while *TGUK<sub>7i</sub>* indicates those with 22-24 years in the country). In this case, we include country of origin dummies (*c<sub>i</sub>*), but also show results using region of origin instead (i.e. Africa, Americas, Asia, Europe, Other).

We also look at convergence in outcomes over time. Two exercises are conducted for this purpose. First, we plot the labour market outcome gaps between refugees-natives and other migrants-natives by years since arrival.<sup>10</sup> This separation also allows use to explore the long-term differences between refugees and other migrants. As explained by Bauer et al. (2013) most studies looking at the labour market outcomes of forced migrants are focused on outcomes one to four years after arrival and less is known about long-term dynamics.

For the second exercise we limit the dataset to first and last four quarters (i.e. Q1 to Q4 of 2010 and Q1 to Q4 2016). As shown in Table 5, the employment rate of the refugee group increased by 20 percentage points between 2010 and 2016,

---

<sup>10</sup> We also repeat the same exercise using decade of arrival instead of years since arrival.

compared to only 1 percentage point increase for other migrants. On the other hand, there was a decrease in average weekly earnings for the refugee group, while average weekly earnings increased for other migrants. The increase in weekly earnings for non-refugees was driven by an increase in hourly salary.

[Table 5]

In order to explore this further we limited the sample to migrants only and estimated several regressions along the following lines:

$$y_{i,t} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 D2016_t + \alpha_2 R_i + \alpha_3 D2016_t * R_i + \sum_{j=1}^7 \delta_j TGUK_{ji} + \gamma_p + \sigma_q + c_i + \theta X_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

Where  $D2016_t$  is a dummy for the year 2016. In this estimation  $\alpha_1$  provides information on the growth in the labour market outcome (e.g. weekly earnings) of non-refugees from 2010 to 2016. The sum of  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_3$  provides the growth in the labour market outcome for refugees between 2010 and 2016. Meanwhile,  $\alpha_3$  is the growth in the labour market outcome of refugees relative to other migrants between 2010 and 2016.

Finally, we explore several possible channels that could explain differences between refugees and other migrants and check the robustness of our results by using an alternative way of identifying refugees in the LFS. The main channel explored is differences in health, but the analysis also explores the limited evidence available on differences in English proficiency. For the robustness check we use Home Office administrative data.

## 5. Main results

### 5.1 Differences in outcomes between UK natives and migrants

Table 6 provides the baseline results regarding differences in labour market outcomes between refugees, natives and other migrants. Looking at column 3 which includes all controls and fixed effects, estimates suggest that those who migrated to claim asylum are 19 percentage points less likely to be in employment than UK natives. In contrast, there is no statistical difference in the likelihood of employment between those who migrated for work reasons and UK natives. Also, there is a 6 percentage point gap in the likelihood of employment between those who migrated for study reasons and natives, while this gap is 15 percentage points for those who migrated for family reasons.

These results are not entirely surprising. All previous studies looking at refugees in the UK suggest that they fare worse than other migrants in terms of labour market outcomes (Campbell 2014; Lindely, 2000; Kausar and Drinkwater, 2010; Ruiz and Vargas-Silva, 2017). For instance, Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) found that during 2005 – 2007 recent refugees in the UK were 10 percentage points less likely than other migrants to be in employment. This is also consistent with studies looking at European level data and other European countries. For example, Dustamnn et al. (2016), using data from the 2008 European Labour Force Survey, estimate that refugees in the EU are close to 11 percentage points less likely to be employed than economic (non-EU15) immigrants. Bratsberg et al. (2016), using longitudinal from Norway for 1990-2013, find that the male native-refugee employment gap is at its lowest point five years after arrival in the country, but it is still close to 20 percentage points at that time.

Looking at weekly earnings, and again focusing on column 3, it is clear that all migrant groups earn less than UK natives. However, the coefficient is much larger for those who came to claim asylum (76% gap). For other migrant groups the gap



seems to be lower for those who migrated for work reasons (22%) and higher for those who migrated for family reasons (45%).

[Table 6]

Table 7 presents the results for hourly salary and hours worked. Migrants in all categories have a lower hourly salary than UK natives but, once again, the coefficient is of higher magnitude for those migrated to claim asylum (i.e. 60% lower hourly salary than UK natives), followed by family migrants (40%). The refugee group also works fewer hours than UK natives (17% gap). The combined effect of the lower hours worked and lower hourly salary explains the large gap in weekly earning between those who migrated to claim asylum and UK natives, but the major difference seems to be the hourly salary.

[Table 7]

### *5.2 Differences in outcomes between migrant groups*

In Table 8, we focus on comparisons across migrant groups. In this case the reference category is those who migrated for work reasons. As expected given the results of the previous section, other migrant groups tend to do worse than “economic migrants” in the labour market. However, those who migrated to seek asylum are comparatively worse off among all groups. They are 14 percentage points less likely to be in employment, earn 42% less per week, have an hourly salary which is 28% lower and work 15% fewer hours than those who migrated for work reasons. Please note that the coefficients are typically a bit lower when we include the controls for country of origin (i.e. versus controls for region or origin), but the difference is not large.

[Table 8]

### *5.3 Convergence over time*

The left hand column in Figure 2 plots the changes in the refugee-native and other migrants-native labour market outcomes gaps by time since arrival in the UK. As explained above, there is evidence that even if refugees are sometimes at a substantial disadvantage, the gap might close over time due to factors such as larger investments in host country human capital (Borjas, 1982; Cortes, 2004). The plots suggest that the employment and hours worked gap closes over time. However, it takes a long time for the gap to close. For instance, in the case of employment this occurs 13 to 15 years after arrival in the country. There is not much evidence of convergence in terms of hourly salary and weekly earnings.

In the right hand column of Figure 2 we provide a slightly different perspective by showing differences in the refugee-native and other migrants-native labour market outcomes gaps by decade of arrival. The results are in line with those in the left-hand column. Those refugees who arrived in the 1950/60s and 1970s have currently much better outcomes than those who arrived in later decades.

It is important to keep in mind that the plots in Figure 2 do not take a series of factors into account. First, there could be selective out migration from the UK. If non-refugees with worse outcomes leave the UK after a while, the gap between refugees and non-refugees will be overstated. Likewise, the estimates presented in this section are based on cross-sectional data for a six year period. As such, we are not able to adjust for compositional changes across cohorts (see Borjas, 1985, 1999 for further discussion about the implications of this limitation). Ideally, we would be able to see the same cohort of migrants over time.

One possible way to somewhat address the differences in cohort is to compare the same cohort at two different points in time. In this case, we limit the analysis to 2010 and 2016 and estimate equation (4). Again, the sample only includes those

migrants who arrived in the UK on or before 2006. As suggested by Table 9, refugees who arrived on or before 2006 have gained more in terms of the likelihood of employment than other migrants who also arrived during that period. The estimation suggest that the likelihood of employment of refugees increased by 16 percentage points relative to other migrants between 2010 and 2016. However, this increase in the likelihood of employment has not been accompanied by a similar relative increase in weekly earnings, hourly pay or hours worked.

[Table 10]

A possible explanation for the difference in results with other studies, such as Cortes (2004) for the United States or Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2017) for the UK in the mid-2000s, is that we are not exploring results for a recent cohort of migrants, but for a cross-section of migrants that includes individuals who have been in the country for many years and any convergence might have occurred already for many. On other hand, some studies have similar findings to ours. For instance, Aydemir (2011) found that in Canada refugees start out with the lowest labour market participation rates among migrants but have the fastest growth in participation. Yet, he finds that there is no convergence in weekly earnings for refugees.

## **6. Channels**

### *6.1 Health*

As mentioned above, there is ample evidence that those who migrate to seek asylum tend to have worse health than other migrants. This includes physical as well as mental health. Some argue that inadequate treatment of health conditions while waiting for an asylum decision often results in even worse health outcomes for refugees (Bakker et al., 2016). Studies for other countries also suggest that refugees

experience a substantial increase in their participation in disability programs over time (Bratsberg et al., 2014).

In the estimations we controlled for self-reported health status. The coefficient for the baseline estimation with controls and fixed effects suggests that having a health condition/illness which has lasted twelve months or more leads to a 19 percentage points reduction in the likelihood of employment (see Table A2 in the Appendix). In our dataset, 37% of the refugees reported having this kind of health condition compared to 28% for other migrants and 34% for natives. This health status indicator can nonetheless mask important variations across individuals in terms of the impact of the condition on the type and amount of paid work that the respondent can undertake. As also shown in columns 1 to 3 of Table 10, 69% of refugees with health problems reported that the problem limits the kind or amount of work they can engage in compared to half of the natives and other migrants with health problems.

[Table 10]

In columns 4 to 5 of Table 10, we show results from regressions in which the dependent variable is a health related indicator and which controls for the variables presented in Table 4. The table shows coefficients for a dummy variable indicating that the individual migrated in order to claim asylum. The results suggest that refugees are 14 percentage points more likely than non-refugees to report a health problem which limits the type of work they can do and 17 percentage points more likely to report a health problem which limits the amount of work they can engage in. The types of health problems experienced by refugees and others are mostly similar, but there are some differences. The main difference is that refugees are more likely to report a mental health problem than non-refugees. This corresponds well with the evidence that suggest that refugees are particularly likely to experience mental health

problems (Bhui, 2003; Turner et al., 2003; Warfa et al., 2006). This in turn has implication for labour market success (Banerjee et al, 2017; Chatterji et al., 2011). On the other hand, refugees are less likely to report suffering from respiratory problems.

## *6.2 English proficiency*

Several studies suggest that English proficiency is one of the main factors affecting the earnings of migrants in the UK (Dustmann and Fabbri, 2003). Studies for other countries have also pointed at English proficiency as a key factor differentiating refugees and other migrants (Aydemir, 2011; Cortes, 2004). In the UK, there is anecdotic evidence that lack of English proficiency is an obstacle for refugees to obtain a national insurance number in order to prove that they have the right to work in the country (All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees, 2017).

In the LFS, the information on English proficiency is only collected once every three years. For this reason, we only have limited information in this regard (i.e. quarter 3 of 2012 and quarter 3 2015). Still even with the limited sample, it is possible to observe some differences between refugees and other migrants. The data suggests that refugees are more likely to speak a language other than English at home (68%) than other migrants (47%). It is important to highlight nonetheless that the implications of this gap remain uncertain as language at home relates to patterns on intra-marriage, among many other factors. More telling is the fact that 16% of refugees reported that language problems have resulted in difficulties keeping or finding a job compared to 10% of other migrants.

In a second exercise, we look at information on English proficiency by country of birth from the 2011 English Census.<sup>11</sup> The information is only available for handful of countries, but there is information available for Somalia, the main country

---

<sup>11</sup> Please note that this dataset does not include Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

of origin of refugees in our dataset. There were 99,250 Somalis counted in the 2011 English Census of whom only 27% (26,748) reported using English as their main language. This compares to 71% for those born in the rest of Africa and 45% for those born in India, the main country of origin of non-refugees in our sample.

Finally, we have re-estimated the main regressions limiting the sample to those migrants who come from countries which use English as a language of instruction in higher education. This decreases the overall sample of migrants by about half. Given the substantial decrease in the sample size we consider these estimates as tentative. The results are presented in Table 11. It is still the case that those who migrated for asylum reasons are worse than other immigrants, but the coefficients are smaller than those in Table 6. Hence, there is some evidence that language plays a role in explaining the labour market gap for refugees.

[Table 11]

## **7. Robustness**

### *7.1 Identification of refugees*

The main concern regarding the robustness of the results is the issue of self-identification as someone who migrated to seek asylum. For instance, it is possible that the most (or perhaps least) successful refugees do not self-identify as such in the LFS. This would lead to bias in the results. There is no perfect solution to this problem. However, in this section we present results with alternative approaches to the identification of those who migrated to seek asylum in order to highlight the robustness of the results. In these exercises we assign a probability to each individual of being a refugee given his or her country of origin. We use Home Office administrative data to assign this probability. Previous studies for the UK have used similar approaches in order to identify refugees in the LFS before there was any

information available on the main motivation for migration (e.g. Lindley, 2000; Kausar and Drinkwater, 2010).

Using Home Office data as previously noted, in this first exercise, for any individual from country ( $j$ ) we construct  $S_j$  as the share of new refugees (i.e. main applicants granted asylum) in the 2001 – 2007 period who come from this country.<sup>12</sup> Then we use this share as a proxy for refugee status in the estimation. That is:

$$S_j = \frac{\text{New Refugees}_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N \text{New Refugees}_j} \quad (5)$$

The results of the robustness exercises are presented in the appendix. As shown in columns 1 to 3 of Table A3, those who come from countries that account for a larger share of the new refugees have worse labour market outcomes than other migrants. For instance, the estimates suggest that a 1 percentage point increase in the share of the refugee population accounted by those coming from a given country is associated with a 1.2 percentage point decrease in the probability of employment for those originating in that country.

Next we use the share of new refugees from a given country divided by the total population resident in the UK from that country in the first quarter of 2010. That is:

$$S_j = \frac{\text{New refugees}_j}{\text{Residents}_j} \quad (5)$$

This variable might be better at capturing the likelihood of being a refugee given the country of origin as some key source countries of refugees are also key source countries of other migrants. For example, Pakistan occupies the third place in countries of origin among the non-refugees and the eleventh place among refugees.

---

<sup>12</sup> Information is not available for the pre-2001 period.

Sri Lanka occupies the third place among the refugees and the fifteenth place among the non-refugees. Zimbabwe occupies the fifth place among the refugees and the fourteenth place among the non-refugees. The results using this alternative approach to identify refugees are presented in columns 4 to 6 of Table A3. Again, the results confirm that those who are more likely to be refugees given their country of origin have worse labour market than other migrants.

## **8. Conclusion**

The growth in the UK's refugee population raises important questions regarding long-term migrant labour market integration. Using secured access data which identifies the main reason for original migration to the UK, we explore differences in labour market outcomes of those who migrated to seek asylum, those who migrated for other reasons and natives.

Our results suggest that those who migrated to seek asylum have worse labour market outcomes than natives and other migrants, including a lower likelihood of employment, lower weekly earnings, lower hourly salary and lower number of hours worked. There is evidence of convergence over time between refugees and other migrants for the likelihood of being in employment, but not for other labour market outcomes.

There is also evidence for some possible explanations of the gap between refugees and other migrants including differences in health conditions and, to a limited degree, language proficiency. There are other possible channels that we cannot explore in our analysis but could be highly relevant. For instance, previous analysis suggests that a major barrier to securing employment for refugees relative to other migrants is the lack of recognition of qualifications and previous work experience (Ager and Strang, 2008). Other studies have focused on the effect of



waiting times for the asylum decision on posterior labour market outcomes (Hainmueller, 2016).

Overall, our analysis suggests that the initial economic disadvantages faced by refugees in the UK persist over time. Refugees have different characteristics from other migrants and policies that work for migrants in general may have to be adjusted to the particular situation and characteristics of refugees. Among other policies, it seems that refugees can benefit from programmes that place particular attention on mental health issues and English proficiency to facilitate integration into the labour market.

Finally, it is important to note that our study only focuses on refugees who entered the UK on or before 2006. This does not imply that the dynamics of newer refugees (e.g. recent Syrian refugees) will be similar to the ones in our sample. However, the same approach used in this paper could be applied to these new refugees during the upcoming years in order to enable this comparison.

## References

- All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees (2017) "Refugees Welcome? The Experience of New Refugees in the UK" Report by the All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees, April, 2017.
- Allsopp, J., Sigona, N. and J. Phillimore (2014) "Poverty Among Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the UK: An Evidence and Policy Review." IRiS Working Paper Series, No. 1/2014.
- Ager, A. and A. Strang (2008) "Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2): 166-191.
- Aydemir, A. (2011) "Immigrant Selection and Short-Term Labor Market Outcomes by visa category." *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(2): 451-475.
- Bakker, L., Cheung, S.Y. and Phillimore, J. (2016) "The Asylum-Integration Paradox: Comparing Asylum Support Systems and Refugee Integration in The Netherlands and the UK." *International Migration*, 54(4): 118-132.
- Bauer, T.K., Braun, S. and Kvasnicka, M. (2013) "The Economic Integration of Forced Migrants: Evidence for Post-War Germany." *The Economic Journal*, 123(571): 998-1024.
- Banerjee, S., Chatterji, P., and Lahiri, K. (2017) "Effects of Psychiatric Disorders on Labor Market Outcomes: A Latent Variable Approach Using Multiple Clinical Indicators." *Health Economics*, 26: 184-205.
- Bevelander, P. and Pendakur, R. (2014) "The Labour Market Integration of Refugee and Family Reunion Immigrants: A Comparison of Outcomes in Canada and Sweden." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(5): 689-709.
- Blinder, S. (2016) "Migration to the UK: Asylum." Migration Observatory Briefing.
- Bhui K., Abdi A, Abdi M, Pereira S, Dualeh M, Robertson D, Sathyamoorthy G, Ismail H. (2003) "Traumatic Events, Migration Characteristics and Psychiatric Symptoms among Somali Refugees--Preliminary Communication." *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 38(1): 35-43.
- Borjas, G.J. (1982) "The Earnings of Male Hispanic Immigrants in the United States." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 35(3): 343-353.
- Borjas, G.J. (1987) "Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants." *The American Economic Review*, 77(4): 531-553.
- Borjas, G.J. (2014) *Immigration Economics*. Harvard University Press.
- Bratsberg, B., Raaum, O. and Røed, K. (2014) "Immigrants, Labour Market Performance and Social Insurance." *Economic Journal*, 124: F644-F683.
- Bratsberg, B., Raaum, O. and Røed, K. (2016) "Labour Market Integration of Refugees in Norway" in F. Fasani editor, *Refugees and Economic Migrants: Facts, Policies and Challenges*, CEPR Press.
- Cafferty P.S.J., Chiswick B.R., Greeley A.M., Sullivan, T.A. (1983) *The Dilemma of American Immigration: Beyond the Golden Door*. Transaction Publishers.
- Campbell, S. (2014) "Does it Matter Why Immigrants Came Here? Original Motives, the Labour Market, and National Identity in the UK", Department of Quantitative Social Science, University of London, Working Paper No. 14-14.
- Chatterji, P., Alegria, M. and Takeuchi, D. (2011) "Psychiatric disorders and labor market outcomes: Evidence from the National Comorbidity Survey-Replication." *Journal of Health Economics*, 30(5): 858-868.
- Chiquiar, D. and Hanson, G.H. (2005) "International Migration, Self-Selection, and the Distribution of Wages: Evidence from Mexico and the United States." *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(2): 239-281.

- Chin, A. (2005) “Long-Run Labor Market Effects of Japanese American Internment during World War II on Working-Age Male Internees.” *Journal of Labor Economics* 23(3): 491-525.
- Chiswick, B.R. (1999) “Are Immigrants Favorably Self-Selected?” *The American Economic Review*, 89(2): 181–185.
- Clark, K., and Lindley, J. (2009) “Immigrant Assimilation Pre and Post Labour Market Entry: Evidence from the UK Labour Force Survey.” *Journal of Population Economics*, 22(1): 175-198.
- Collyer, M. and Kulasinghe, D. (2010) “Review of Information on Return Conditions of Origin for Asylum Seekers in the UK.” Report prepared for the Independent Advisory Group on Country Information.
- Cortes, K.E. (2004) “Are Refugees Different from Economic Immigrants? Some Empirical Evidence on the Heterogeneity of Immigrant Groups in the United States.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(2): 465–480.
- Constant, A. and Zimmermann, K. (2005) “Legal Status at Entry, Economic Performance, and Self-employment Proclivity: A Bi-national Study of Immigrants.” IZA Discussion Paper 1910.
- Drinkwater, S., Eade, J., and Garapich, M. (2009) “Poles Apart? EU Enlargement and the Labour Market Outcomes of Immigrants in the United Kingdom.” *International Migration*, 47(1): 161-190.
- Dustmann, C. and Fabbri, F. (2003) “Language Proficiency and Labour Market Performance of Immigrants in the UK.” *Economic Journal*, 113(489): 695–717.
- Dustmann, C., Fasani, F., Frattini, T., Minale, L. and Schönberg, U. (2016) “On the Economics and Politics of Refugee Migration.” CREAM Discussion Paper Series, 16/16.
- Fransen, S., Ruiz, I. and Vargas-Silva, C. (2017) “Return Migration and Economic Outcomes in the Conflict Context.” *World Development*, forthcoming..
- Frijters, P., Johnston, D.W. and Shields, M.A. (2010) “Mental Health and Labour Market Participation: Evidence from IV Panel Data Models.” IZA Working Paper, 4883.
- Gibney, M.J. (2008) “Asylum and the Expansion of Deportation in the United Kingdom.” *Government and Opposition*, 43(2): 146–167.
- Gower, M. (2016) “Should Asylum Seekers Have Unrestricted Rights to Work in the UK?” Briefing Paper, 1908. House of Commons Library.
- Hainmueller, J., Hangartner, D. and Lawrence, D. (2016) “When lives are put on hold: Lengthy asylum processes decrease employment among refugees.” *Science Advances*, 2(8).
- Home Office (2015) “Syrian Vulnerable Person Resettlement (VPR) Programme. Guidance for Local Authorities and Partners” Home Office: London.
- Home Office (2017) “Immigration Statistics: Asylum Tables Q4 2016.” Home Office: London.
- House of Lords (2012) “Asylum Seekers” in Lords Lansard, Column WA107, July 2002.
- Kausar, R. and Drinkwater, S. “A comparison of earnings and occupational attainment of refugees and asylum seekers and economic immigrants in the UK.” Department of Economics, University of Surrey, 08/10.
- Lindley, J.K. (2000) “Economic Assimilation and the Labour Market Performance of British Refugees and Economic Migrants” Research Paper Series Globalisation and Labour Markets Programme, 2002/06.

- Ruiz, I. and Vargas-Silva, C. (2017) "Are Refugees' Labour Market Outcomes Different from Those of other Migrants? Evidence from the United Kingdom in the 2005 – 2007 Period" *Population, Space and Place*, forthcoming.
- Turner, S.W., Bowie, C., Dunn, G., Shapo, L., Yule, W. (2003) "Mental health of Kosovan Albanian refugees in the UK." *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 182(5): 444-448.
- United Nations High Commission for Refugees (2016) "Global Trends: Forced Displacement 2015." UNHCR: Geneva.
- Van Hear, N. (2006) "'I Went as Far as my Money would Take Me': Conflict, Forced Migration and Class" Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, Working Paper No. 6.
- Vargas-Silva, C. (2017) "Remittances to and from the Displaced." *Journal of Development Studies*, forthcoming.
- Warfa, N., Bhui, K., Craig, T., Curtis, S., Mohamud, S., Stansfeld, S., McCrone, P., Thornicroft, G. (2006) "Post-migration geographical mobility, mental health and health service utilisation among Somali refugees in the UK: A qualitative study" *Health & Place* 12.4: 503–515.
- Webber, D.J., Page, D., Veliziotis, M. and Johnson, S. (2015) "Does poor health affect employment transitions?" Joseph Rowntree Foundation Report.

## Appendix

Table A1 – Description of all variables included in the estimation.

Variable	Definition
In employment	Dummy variable equal to one if the person is employment. Includes those who are employees, those on a government scheme and those who are self-employed.
Weekly earnings	Gross weekly pay in main job. Applies to all respondents who are employees and those on a government scheme.
Hourly salary	Average gross hourly pay. Applies to all respondents who are employees and those on a government scheme.
Hours worked	Total actual hours worked including overtime. Includes all respondents who worked in the reference week.
Female	Equal to one for women, zero otherwise.
Work	Equal to one if the individual reported coming to the UK in order to work, zero otherwise.
Study	Equal to one if the individual reported coming to the UK in order to study, zero otherwise.
Family	Equal to one if the individual reported coming to the UK for family reasons (e.g. join spouse, as minor dependent), zero otherwise.
Asylum/Refugee	Equal to one if the individual reported coming to the UK in order to claim asylum, zero otherwise.
Other	Equal to one if the individual reported coming to the UK for reasons other than work, study, family or asylum, zero otherwise.
Age	Age in years. Estimations include a quartic on age.
Married	Equal to one for those who are married, zero otherwise.
Edu Med	Equal to one for those who left full time education between age 18 and 20, zero otherwise.
Edu Low	Equal to one for those who left full time education before age 18, zero otherwise.
Health problem	Equal to one for those who reported a health problem lasting 12 months or longer, zero otherwise.
UK national	Equal to one for those who are UK nationals regardless of country of birth, zero otherwise. If the individual is a dual national, then UK nationality is the one recorded.
Time UK	Number of years of residence in the UK. Set to zero for natives. The migrant only estimations include numbers of years grouped in three year cohorts (i.e. 4-6, 7-9, etc.)
Muslim	Equal to one if the individual is Muslim, zero otherwise.
Other variables	The estimations also include local area fixed effects and dummies for year, quarter and, in some cases, region or country of origin.

Table A2 – Results for key control variables (see Table 6, columns 3, 6 and 9 for more information).

	In employment	Weekly earnings	Hourly salary	Hours worked
Female	-0.10*** (-49.56)	-0.52*** (-72.84)	-0.21*** (-44.60)	-0.32*** (-86.63)
Age	0.47*** (25.47)	0.76*** (19.76)	0.29*** (12.88)	0.41*** (16.51)
Married	0.06*** (19.52)	0.05*** (10.06)	0.09*** (27.78)	-0.04*** (-15.29)
Edu Med	-0.02*** (-7.36)	-0.30*** (-56.09)	-0.29*** (-70.72)	-0.04*** (-12.73)
Edu Low	-0.10*** (-23.76)	-0.53*** (-88.44)	-0.50*** (-116.70)	-0.06*** (-17.46)
Health Problem	-0.19*** (-33.37)	-0.09*** (-22.19)	-0.06*** (-20.58)	-0.04*** (-15.74)
UK National	0.03*** (6.41)	0.05*** (6.19)	0.05*** (7.84)	0.01 (1.52)
Time UK	0.00*** (12.62)	0.01*** (20.76)	0.01*** (22.61)	0.00*** (6.94)
Muslim	-0.18*** (-24.13)	-0.32*** (-16.47)	-0.17*** (-12.88)	-0.13*** (-13.56)
Observations	295,014	156,189	155,257	199,256
Controls	X	X	X	X
LA FE	X	X	X	X


Note: these are results for the main control variables included in the estimations presented in Table 6 of the paper. In addition to these variables the analysis controlled for local authority, year and quarter. Also, age is included as a quartic in the estimation, but only first coefficient is shown in the table.

Table A3 – Baseline results with alternative ways of identifying refugees based on country of origin

Dependent variable	Share of refugees			Share of all migrants		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
In employment	-2.84*** (-24.91)	-2.27*** (-13.43)	-1.12*** (-8.42)	-0.39*** (-15.51)	-0.34*** (-12.91)	-0.23*** (-10.75)
Observations	34,929	34,929	34,929	34,834	34,834	34,834
Weekly earnings	-3.78*** (-11.56)	-3.12*** (-6.08)	-2.06*** (-4.77)	-0.81*** (-10.70)	-0.83*** (-9.87)	-0.58*** (-8.29)
Observations	16,761	16,761	16,761	16,719	16,719	16,719
Hourly salary	-2.31*** (-9.56)	-1.85*** (-5.17)	-1.13*** (-3.49)	-0.49*** (-9.73)	-0.54*** (-9.54)	-0.36*** (-7.14)
Observations	16,652	16,652	16,652	16,610	16,610	16,610
Hours worked	-1.13*** (-6.99)	-0.94*** (-4.58)	-0.70*** (-3.89)	-0.25*** (-7.26)	-0.23*** (-6.58)	-0.21*** (-5.61)
Observations	22,606	22,606	22,606	22,552	22,552	22,552
Controls			X			X
LA FE		X	X		X	X

Notes: the table reports the coefficients of the refugee dummy variable. Weekly earnings, hourly salary and weekly hours worked are included in logs in the estimation. t statistics are in parenthesis. Controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality.

Figure 1 – Applications and grants of asylum in the UK.



Notes: source is Home Office (2017). Grants of asylum include similar grants of protection such as humanitarian protection. Includes main applicants and dependants.



Figure 2 – Labour market outcome gaps by time since arrival and decade of arrival




Table 1 – Main reason for coming to UK

Reason	Share (%) (1)	Observations (2)
Work	25 %	8,908
Study	13 %	4,491
Family	46 %	16,231
Seeking asylum	6 %	2,198
Other	10 %	3,571
Total foreign-born	100%	35,399

Table 2 – Main countries of origin of asylum seekers and other migrants (% share of category).

LFS refugees		LFS non-refugees		Home Office refugees	
Country	Share (%)	Country	Share (%)	Country	Share (%)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Somalia	12%	India	10%	Iraq	10%
Afghanistan	10%	Poland	8%	Somalia	8%
Sri Lanka	8%	Pakistan	8%	Afghanistan	8%
Iraq	8%	Germany	5%	Iran	6%
Zimbabwe	6%	Ireland	5%	Zimbabwe	6%

Notes: LFS data for all those who arrived in the UK before 2007. Home Office data are for all those who applied for protection between 2001 and 2006 (main applicants).

Table 3 – Descriptive statistics of main dependent variables (means).

	In employment (yes =1)	Weekly earnings (£)	Hourly salary (£)	Hours worked (weekly)
UK-born				
All	0.77	499	13.80	32.98
Women	0.73	389	12.25	27.61
Men	0.82	624	15.57	38.27
Reason for migration: Work				
All	0.87	587	14.92	36.07
Women	0.82	483	13.55	30.48
Men	0.90	672	16.04	39.94
Reason for migration: Study				
All	0.81	612	16.56	34.30
Women	0.75	514	15.26	29.43
Men	0.87	706	17.81	38.67
Reason for migration: Family				
All	0.66	459	13.11	31.70
Women	0.57	385	12.28	27.47
Men	0.81	564	14.30	36.85
Reason for migration: Asylum				
All	0.55	309	9.42	31.17
Women	0.40	290	9.79	25.86
Men	0.68	322	9.17	33.68
Reason for migration: Other				
All	0.73	495	13.70	32.84
Women	0.67	405	12.48	28.02
Men	0.80	608	15.24	37.90

Notes: Weekly earnings and hourly salary only available for those who are employees or in government schemes. Hours worked include those in self-employment.

Table 4 – Descriptive statistics of control variables (means)

Variable	UK born	Foreign-born: reason for migration				
		Work	Study	Family	Asylum	Other
Female	0.52	0.43	0.51	0.63	0.45	0.55
Age (years)	42.67	41.29	40.03	42.91	40.89	44.00
Married	0.55	0.69	0.67	0.72	0.67	0.64
Edu med	0.29	0.38	0.26	0.33	0.37	0.40
Edu low	0.49	0.16	0.06	0.33	0.33	0.25
Muslim	0.01	0.08	0.16	0.27	0.48	0.15
Health problem	0.34	0.22	0.19	0.32	0.37	0.33
UK national	0.96	0.28	0.43	0.69	0.62	0.52
Time UK (years)	0.00	14.23	17.85	26.91	16.01	22.29
Time UK 4-6 years	-	0.13	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.05
Time UK 7-9 years	-	0.23	0.15	0.09	0.13	0.11
Time UK 10-12 years	-	0.24	0.20	0.11	0.23	0.15
Time UK 13-15 years	-	0.12	0.13	0.08	0.21	0.11
Time UK 16-18 years	-	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.13	0.09
Time UK 19-21 years	-	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.06
Time UK 22-24 years	-	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06
Africa	-	0.14	0.26	0.17	0.43	0.29
Americas	-	0.05	0.08	0.10	0.01	0.11
Asia	-	0.24	0.36	0.44	0.39	0.21
Europe	-	0.54	0.29	0.26	0.10	0.32
Observations	259,615	8,908	4,491	16,231	2,198	3,571

Notes: see Appendix 1 for the definition of all variables.

Table 5 – Descriptive statistics of main dependent variables for 2010 and 2016 only.

Variable	Migrated for:	
	Asylum (1)	Other reasons (2)
2010		
In employment (yes =1)	0.44	0.74
Weekly earnings (£)	330	503
Hourly salary (£)	9.61	13.49
Hours worked (weekly)	32.24	33.38
2016		
In employment (yes =1)	0.64	0.75
Weekly earnings (£)	294	570
Hourly salary (£)	8.90	15.17
Hours worked (weekly)	32.35	34.00

Notes: Weekly earnings and hourly salary only available for those who are employees or in government schemes.

Table 6 –Employment and weekly earnings: UK-born versus foreign-born.

Reason for migration (reference is UK-born)	(1)	All (2)	(3)	(4)	Women (5)	(6)	(7)	Men (8)	(9)
Dependent variable: In employment									
Work	0.10*** (25.49)	-0.03*** (-7.46)	-0.00 (-0.37)	0.10*** (15.30)	-0.01 (-1.30)	-0.01 (-1.22)	0.08*** (17.65)	0.02*** (2.74)	0.01 (1.39)
Study	0.04*** (6.58)	-0.09*** (-12.66)	-0.06*** (-7.68)	0.03*** (3.08)	-0.09*** (-8.50)	-0.09*** (-8.00)	0.05*** (6.38)	-0.02 (-1.49)	-0.02* (-1.89)
Family	-0.12*** (-30.00)	-0.17*** (-27.44)	-0.15*** (-19.89)	-0.16*** (-31.57)	-0.19*** (-21.42)	-0.19*** (-19.18)	-0.01** (-1.97)	-0.03*** (-2.94)	-0.03*** (-3.10)
Asylum	-0.22*** (-20.48)	-0.22*** (-21.19)	-0.19*** (-13.52)	-0.33*** (-20.81)	-0.27*** (-16.84)	-0.25*** (-14.46)	-0.14*** (-10.67)	-0.14*** (-10.51)	-0.14*** (-8.10)
Other	-0.04*** (-5.35)	-0.12*** (-15.19)	-0.09*** (-10.13)	-0.06*** (-5.12)	-0.12*** (-10.27)	-0.12*** (-9.42)	-0.02 (-1.59)	-0.04*** (-3.99)	-0.05*** (-4.15)
Observations	295,014	295,014	295,014	155,246	155,246	155,246	139,768	139,768	139,768
Dependent variable: Weekly earnings									
Work	0.15*** (13.80)	-0.16*** (-12.41)	-0.22*** (-14.63)	0.21*** (13.90)	-0.05*** (-2.77)	-0.12*** (-6.21)	0.01 (0.92)	-0.26*** (-15.48)	-0.31*** (-15.62)
Study	0.21*** (13.62)	-0.16*** (-9.17)	-0.25*** (-11.47)	0.28*** (12.66)	-0.08*** (-3.18)	-0.19*** (-6.80)	0.10*** (4.87)	-0.24*** (-10.35)	-0.31*** (-11.35)
Family	-0.12*** (-12.04)	-0.40*** (-24.81)	-0.45*** (-25.57)	-0.05*** (-3.89)	-0.34*** (-15.35)	-0.41*** (-16.53)	-0.14*** (-10.59)	-0.49*** (-21.40)	-0.51*** (-19.81)
Asylum	-0.49*** (-17.85)	-0.68*** (-24.08)	-0.76*** (-24.18)	-0.33*** (-7.33)	-0.49*** (-10.94)	-0.60*** (-13.39)	-0.72*** (-20.70)	-0.84*** (-24.08)	-0.90*** (-23.26)
Other	-0.03* (-1.79)	-0.31*** (-15.29)	-0.40*** (-18.93)	0.03 (1.10)	-0.25*** (-8.58)	-0.35*** (-11.71)	-0.08*** (-3.16)	-0.41*** (-14.37)	-0.47*** (-17.98)
Observations	156,189	156,189	156,189	82,738	82,738	82,738	73,451	73,451	73,451
Controls		X	X		X	X		X	X
LA FE			X			X			X

Notes: Weekly earnings are included in logs in the estimation. t statistics are in parenthesis. Controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality.

Table 7 – Hourly salary and hours worked: UK-born versus foreign-born.

Reason for migration (reference is UK-born)	(1)	All (2)	(3)	(4)	Women (5)	(6)	(7)	Men (8)	(9)
Dependent variable: Hourly salary									
Work	0.04*** (4.32)	-0.22*** (-21.21)	-0.28*** (-22.79)	0.07*** (5.58)	-0.18 (-12.59)	-0.24*** (-16.61)	-0.02 (-1.35)	-0.26*** (-17.38)	-0.31*** (-18.61)
Study	0.18*** (15.23)	-0.16*** (-11.80)	-0.24*** (-13.79)	0.21*** (13.10)	-0.12*** (-6.72)	-0.22*** (-11.12)	0.14*** (7.83)	-0.20*** (-9.94)	-0.27*** (-11.15)
Family	-0.06*** (-8.82)	-0.35*** (-29.03)	-0.40*** (-29.11)	-0.02** (-2.41)	-0.32*** (-20.12)	-0.37*** (-20.10)	-0.10*** (-8.33)	-0.40*** (-21.70)	-0.43*** (-21.82)
Asylum	-0.34*** (-19.21)	-0.52*** (-27.01)	-0.60*** (-23.69)	-0.22*** (-7.74)	-0.41*** (-13.93)	-0.51*** (-14.67)	-0.47*** (-20.55)	-0.61*** (-24.25)	-0.67*** (-22.76)
Other	-0.02* (-1.69)	-0.29*** (-18.27)	-0.37*** (-22.17)	0.01 (0.78)	-0.24*** (-12.19)	-0.34*** (-14.35)	-0.06*** (-2.72)	-0.36*** (-14.07)	-0.42*** (-17.20)
Observations	155,257	155,257	155,257	82,371	82,371	82,371	72,886	72,886	72,886
Dependent variable: Hours worked									
Work	0.10*** (19.33)	0.04*** (4.81)	0.03*** (3.86)	0.13*** (13.67)	0.09*** (7.46)	0.09*** (5.75)	0.03*** (5.88)	-0.01* (-1.82)	-0.01 (-1.53)
Study	0.04*** (4.57)	-0.01 (-1.02)	-0.01 (-1.20)	0.07*** (4.41)	0.01 (0.62)	-0.00 (-0.13)	0.00 (0.17)	-0.03*** (-2.86)	-0.03** (-2.27)
Family	-0.05*** (-9.75)	-0.07*** (-7.38)	-0.07*** (-7.15)	-0.02*** (-2.74)	-0.05*** (-3.06)	-0.06*** (-3.47)	-0.05*** (-8.43)	-0.10*** (-8.28)	-0.09** (-7.58)
Asylum	-0.12*** (-7.77)	-0.17*** (-10.29)	-0.17*** (-11.57)	-0.11*** (-3.63)	-0.11*** (-3.45)	-0.13*** (-4.22)	-0.21*** (-11.85)	-0.21*** (-11.42)	-0.20*** (-11.93)
Other	-0.01 (-1.08)	-0.05*** (-3.91)	-0.05*** (-4.11)	0.01 (0.74)	-0.03 (-1.28)	-0.04** (-1.97)	-0.03** (-2.00)	-0.08*** (-5.32)	-0.08*** (-5.06)
Observations	199,256	199,256	199,256	95,647	95,647	95,647	103,609	103,609	103,609
Controls		X	X		X	X		X	X
LA FE			X			X			X

Notes: Hourly salary and hours worked are included in logs in the estimation. t statistics are in parenthesis. Controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality.



Table 8 –Labour market outcomes differences among migrants

Reason for migration (reference is work)	Dependent variable							
	In employment		Weekly earnings		Hourly salary		Hours worked	
Study	-0.04*** (-5.49)	-0.02*** (-2.89)	-0.04 (-1.64)	-0.04** (-2.30)	0.02 (1.33)	0.00 (0.26)	-0.05*** (-4.86)	-0.04*** (-3.56)
Family	-0.11*** (-18.86)	-0.10*** (-16.87)	-0.23*** (-13.93)	-0.25*** (-15.52)	-0.12*** (-9.47)	-0.16*** (-13.13)	-0.10*** (-11.74)	-0.10*** (-10.39)
Asylum	-0.18*** (-11.35)	-0.14*** (-8.21)	-0.49*** (-14.66)	-0.42*** (-12.18)	-0.31*** (-10.40)	-0.28*** (-9.15)	-0.18*** (-10.81)	-0.15*** (-7.99)
Other	-0.07*** (-8.30)	-0.07*** (-7.62)	-0.21*** (-9.92)	-0.23*** (-11.25)	-0.13*** (-7.29)	-0.16*** (-9.42)	-0.08*** (-6.79)	-0.08*** (-6.20)
Observations	35,399	35,399	16,966	16,966	16,856	16,856	22,902	22,902
Country of origin controls		X		X		X		X
Region of origin controls	X		X		X		X	
Other controls	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
LA FE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Notes: Weekly earnings, hourly salary and hours worked are included in logs in the estimation. Other controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality.

Table 9 – Convergence in labour market outcomes between 2010 and 2016.

Independent variable	Dependent variable					
	In employment			Weekly earnings		
D2016	0.01 (1.35)	0.04*** (4.35)	0.04*** (4.25)	0.11*** (5.19)	0.05** (2.37)	0.08*** (3.31)
R	-0.30*** (-11.16)	-0.19*** (-6.31)	-0.19*** (-6.33)	-0.27*** (-3.83)	-0.14* (-1.81)	-0.15* (-1.91)
D2016*R	0.19*** (4.69)	0.15*** (3.86)	0.16*** (4.15)	-0.27*** (-2.84)	-0.18* (-1.89)	-0.15* (-1.65)
Observations	10,165	10,165	10,165	4,610	4,610	4,610
	Hourly salary			Weekly hours worked		
D2016	0.13*** (7.26)	0.07*** (3.52)	0.09*** (4.45)	-0.00 (-0.03)	0.02 (1.21)	0.02 (1.20)
R	-0.29*** (-5.17)	-0.18*** (-2.92)	-0.20*** (-3.44)	-0.09** (-2.06)	-0.08* (-1.70)	-0.08 (-1.63)
D2016*R	-0.16** (-1.98)	-0.13 (-1.54)	-0.11 (-1.36)	-0.05 (-0.83)	-0.02 (-0.25)	-0.01 (-0.17)
Observations	4,798	4,798	4,798	6,540	6,540	6,540
Country of origin controls		X	X		X	X
Other controls		X	X		X	X
LA FE			X			X

Notes: Weekly earnings, hourly salary and weekly hours worked are included in logs in the estimation. t statistics are in parenthesis. Other controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality. The estimation only includes foreign-born individuals.

Table 10 – Health conditions limiting work

Health condition	Mean values for dummy (yes = 1)			Regression results	
	Natives	Asylum	Other migrants	Full sample	Migrant sample
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Limits kind of work	0.50	0.69	0.52	0.14*** (7.15)	0.09*** (3.84)
Limits amount of work	0.45	0.69	0.48	0.17*** (8.77)	0.12*** (5.22)
Mental	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.04** (2.09)	0.04** (2.12)
Seeing, hearing, speak	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.01 (-1.22)	-0.00 (-0.01)
Extremities, back, neck	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.02 (1.54)	0.02 (0.84)
Respiratory	0.11	0.07	0.08	-0.03*** (-3.22)	-0.03*** (-2.72)
Hearth	0.13	0.13	0.15	0.01 (0.43)	0.01 (0.57)
Stomach	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.00 (0.36)	-0.00 (-0.27)
Diabetes	0.06	0.11	0.13	-0.01 (-0.99)	-0.03* (-1.66)
Others	0.27	0.22	0.23	-0.03 (-1.56)	-0.01 (-0.27)
Observations	86,249	802	9,018	96,069	9,820
Country of origin controls					X
Other controls				X	X
LA FE				X	X

Notes: Mental includes phobias, panics, depression or other nervous disorders. Extremities include arthritis, rheumatism or other problems related to arms, hands, legs or feet. Columns 4 and 5 report the coefficients of the dummy variable indicating that the person migrated to claim asylum in a regression with the health condition as dependant variable. t statistics are in parenthesis. Other controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion and UK nationality.

Table 11 – Labour market outcomes: UK-born versus foreign-born from English speaking countries

Reason for migration (reference is UK-born)	Dependent variable			
	In employment	Weekly earnings	Hourly salary	Hours worked
Work	-0.01 (-1.27)	-0.07*** (-2.95)	-0.12*** (-6.12)	0.05*** (4.00)
Study	-0.05*** (-4.59)	-0.20*** (-7.16)	-0.20*** (-8.68)	0.00 (0.06)
Family	-0.14*** (-13.94)	-0.40*** (-15.02)	-0.35*** (-16.54)	-0.07*** (-4.91)
Asylum	-0.14*** (-6.30)	-0.47*** (-10.67)	-0.47*** (-11.22)	-0.03 (-1.03)
Other	-0.09*** (-7.83)	-0.33*** (-11.02)	-0.31*** (-13.25)	-0.04** (-2.13)
Observations	276,059	147,004	146,137	186,951
Controls	X	X	X	X
LA FE	X	X	X	X

Notes: Weekly earnings, hourly salary and hours worked are included in logs in the estimation. English speaking countries are defined as those in which English is used as a language of instruction in higher education. Controls include gender, age (a quartic), marital status, education, religion, health status and UK nationality.