

## BRINGING DIFFERENT STATES IN: *How welfare state institutions can possibly influence sociocultural dimensions of migrant incorporation*

### Abstract

Migration scholars have long been concerned with understanding what influences the incorporation of migrants into their host societies. The theoretical development in this field has been dominated for several years by North American migration scholars who have not been much interested in the influence of welfare state institutions. In recent years, European migration scholars have, however, contributed to important insights on the impact of the national integration context on the socioeconomic incorporation of migrants. The aim of this article is to contribute to this burgeoning research field by drawing on insights from comparative welfare state research and thereby “bringing the state in”. Thus, the article proposes a theoretical framework for studying how the institutions of contemporary welfare states can possibly influence sociocultural dimensions of migrant incorporation. In the last part of the article, it is exemplified how these insights can be applied when studying the Danish welfare state in a comparative perspective, drawing on examples on the influence of family policies on migrants’ attitudes towards women’s paid work.

### Keywords

migrants • sociocultural incorporation • welfare state institutions • policy feedback • family policies

Received 8 April 2016; Accepted 6 November 2017

## 1 Introduction

Continuous immigration of people since the Second World War has increased ethnic and religious diversity in Western Europe. Accompanying this diversity are concerns for the economic incorporation of these new inhabitants and whether they share the values and norms of the societies they come to live in (Ersanilli 2012). Consequently, in recent decades, Western European countries have introduced a wide range of public policies to promote incorporation and a comprehensive amount of studies have examined differences and similarities in national policy responses, including whether the host countries tolerate and facilitate cultural diversity and access to individual citizens’ rights (Joppke 2007; Mouritsen 2013). These studies are mainly concerned with integration policies for migrants in their first years of arrival when they are waiting for permanent residency or obtaining national citizenship. However, migrants who have received permanent resident permit are not only subject to early integration instruments. The welfare state and its social policies, such as social protection for sickness, unemployment, poverty, as well as social services such as childcare and eldercare are also of crucial importance and may have a strong impact on the position of migrants in the society (Breidahl 2017; Söhn 2013).

In this article, we argue that contemporary migration studies could benefit from more explicitly focusing on how and in which

Karen N. Breidahl<sup>1\*</sup>, Barbara Fersch<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Aalborg University, Department of Political Science, Aalborg, Denmark

<sup>2</sup>University of Southern Denmark, Department of Sociology, Environmental and Business Economics, Esbjerg, Denmark

way the conditions of different contemporary welfare states have the ability to influence the incorporation of migrants into their new host societies. International migration research has for several years been dominated by North American migration scholars who have not been much concerned with the role of the national context, including the welfare state context, on migrant incorporation (Crul & Schneider 2010). These (national) contextual factors have, however, in recent years become a subject of interest in a growing number of studies conducted by European migration scholars (e.g. Crul, Schneider, Lelie 2012; Dörr & Faist 1997; Kogan 2006; Söhn 2013). Despite this progress, there is still a great deal that we do not yet know among others how the institutions of contemporary welfare states can possibly influence sociocultural dimensions of migrant incorporation.

Inspired by insights from comparative welfare state research, this article aims at contributing to this burgeoning research field by focusing more explicitly on the impact of welfare state institutions on the attitudes and values held by migrants. Contemporary welfare states do not only shape opportunity structures and socioeconomic incorporation of citizens through their specific mechanisms of income redistribution and access to social rights. The endogenous logic of welfare state institutions, their opportunity structures and their citizens’ experiences with these institutions can also influence the attitudes and values of citizens. This has been conceptualised as a broad spectrum of “policy impact” and “policy feedback” mechanisms

\* E-mail: knb@dps.aau.dk

(e.g. Kumlin 2004; Larsen 2006; Mettler & Soss 2004; Rothstein 1998, 2005; Sjöberg 2004). Based on a small group of studies that have explicitly theorised on the impact of these mechanisms on the attitudes and values held by migrants (see Breidahl & Larsen 2016; Dinesen 2011; Dinesen & Hooghe 2010; Hedegaard & Larsen 2017; Kumlin & Rothstein 2010), we argue that the conditions of welfare states and different social policy options have an ability to influence the sociocultural dimensions of migrant incorporation and that contemporary migration debates can benefit from “bringing the state in”. In order to exemplify the relevance of this theoretical perspective, we focus on the Danish welfare state in a comparative perspective, drawing on examples on how family policies can possibly influence migrants’ attitudes towards women’s paid work.

The interest of this article mainly lies in more subjective and sociocultural dimensions of migrant incorporation rather than socioeconomic behaviour (social mobility, labour market participation, family formation, etc.). We refer to the overall concept of “incorporation” (instead of concepts such as “assimilation”, “integration”, etc.) as we recognise that there are many ways of being incorporated into the new host society. By “migrants” we refer to people who have gained entry to a certain welfare state to live there permanently and attained legal resident status and/or formal citizenship. The article is therefore not concerned with asylum seekers and migrants with temporary resident permits who do not have access to the same social rights (Sainsbury 2012).

The next section discusses the main line in the theoretical development and demonstrates how only few studies have explicitly theorised on the influence of contemporary welfare states on migrant incorporation. Building on these conclusions, the third section discusses how insights from comparative welfare state research can be applied to this research field, and a theoretical framework for applying these insights is proposed. The fourth section elaborates more deeply on different underlying mechanisms and offers some empirical examples from the Danish welfare state on how family policies can possibly influence migrants’ attitudes towards women’s paid work to illustrate the relevance of these theoretical insights. The final section summarises the main arguments of the article.

## 2 The role of welfare states in scholarly debates on migrant incorporation

Migration scholars have long been concerned with the question of what happens to individuals who move from one social and geographical context to another and how and to what extent migrants and their descendants are incorporated into their new host societies. These concerns date back to the early 1900s and the American research discipline of migration studies at Chicago School of Urban Sociology, which was the first to put forward the concept of “assimilation” for understanding the experience of immigration (Alba & Nee 2003: 19; Park & Burgess 1921). The question of migrant incorporation has afterwards been a much contested topic in scholarly debates (Schneider & Crul 2010: 1143). In particular, American assimilation theories have been the subject of extensive criticism from, among others, multicultural (sometimes referred to as pluralist) approaches and scholars rooted in the so-called transnational perspective (Portes & Zhou 1993). However, assimilation theories are still influential today and due to the introduction of more refined versions, connotation of assimilation as a “politically incorrect concept” has probably faded. Hence, the “new assimilation theory” offers a concept that is neither normative nor prescriptive (Alba & Nee, 2003). In addition, the

“segmented assimilation” perspective represents not only a refined but also a very critical theoretical alternative to classical assimilation theory (Portes 1997; Portes & Zhou 1993). Here society is viewed as segmented, emphasising diverse routes of adaptation of first and second generations of migrants into the host society where an important concern has been the downward mobility among some ethnic groups (e.g. African Americans) and their social problems (Crul & Schneider 2010; Portes & Zhou 1993). Most of the above-mentioned theoretical perspectives are not much concerned with the role of the national context on patterns of migrant incorporation (Reitz 2002). However, the perspective on segmented assimilation explicitly points to “... the decisive importance of structural embeddedness in constraining individual behavior” by referring to the concept of “modes of incorporation” (the structures of the receiving government, society and preexisting ethnic community) (Portes & Rumbaut 2001: 313-314: 23-25; Waldinger & Catron 2016: 24). However, according to Waldinger & Catron (2016: 23-25), this concept has never been operationalised in an appropriate way.

This underexposing of national contextual factors in these studies reflects that the theoretical development has taken place within a North American context (a non-comparative research setting). European migration scholars have in many ways been inspired by the theoretical development in the US, in particular from the “segmented assimilation” perspective (Crul, Schneider & Lelie 2012; Zhou 1997). However, European scholars have also contributed to new theoretical insights by being more explicitly concerned with how the institutional conditions of the host country and different welfare state arrangements influence or even shape migrant incorporation (see e.g. Crul, Schneider & Lelie 2012; Dörr & Faist 1997; Reitz 2002; Sainsbury 2012; Söhn 2013). This difference in theoretical orientation may reflect that the European countries, compared to America, can be “(...) considered as a ‘natural laboratory’ for integration processes” (Crul & Schneider 2010: 1250; cf. also Heath, Rethon & Kilpi 2008). The absence of the welfare state in the American theoretical development also reflects a more general tendency in American social science to rely on more society-centred explanations compared with European scholars (Svallfors 2007) and the fact that the US is regarded as the famous exception when it comes to welfare state formation (Alesina & Glaeser 2004).

European migration studies concerned with the institutional context of the host context have in particular been concerned with the impact of welfare state and labour market arrangements on the socioeconomic incorporation of migrants. Söhn (2013: 298) finds that state structures have a huge impact on the socioeconomic integration opportunities of migrants (e.g. in the labour market and in the education system) and that opportunities in the socioeconomic domain depend on different entry categories and legal statuses. Another group of studies have been engaged in shedding light on the question of whether comprehensive and generous welfare states pose a problem for successful socioeconomic incorporation of newcomers in various domains (such as the labour market, segregation and crime) – a question they do not agree upon (Diop-Christensen & Pavlopoulos 2016; Dörr & Faist 1997; Kogan 2006; Koopmans 2010: 20; Van Tubergen, Mass & Flap 2004).

Crul and Schneider (2010: 1249) focus on a broader range of national contextual factors and reveal how differences in the institutional arrangements – referring to a wide range of contextual factors (including institutional arrangements in education, the labour market, housing, religion and legislation) – affect participation in social organisations and feelings of belonging in local communities in different European cities and nation-states. This perspective is

therefore, unlike the majority of studies in this field, also concerned with the influence of the national integration context on more sociocultural dimensions of incorporation. Based on these observations, the “comparative integration context theory” has been developed that emphasises how differences in the integration contexts – referring to the broader patterns and principles of policies of the host country, including institutional arrangements in education, the labour market, housing, religion and legislation – can have an impact on migrant incorporation in different domains (Crul 2013; Schneider & Crul 2010: 1249).

Ersanilli (2012) is explicitly concerned with whether migrant integration policies (whether the host countries tolerate and facilitate cultural diversity and access to individual citizens’ rights) in a number of Western European countries influence the degree to which migrants adopt values akin to those of the general population of their countries of residence. Based on survey data among Turkish migrants and their descendants in Germany, France and the Netherlands, Ersanilli (2012) concludes that the impact of different integration policy models on sociocultural incorporation patterns is limited and modest (see also Ersanilli & Koopmans 2011).

Only a few studies have explicitly examined and theorised on how the conditions of contemporary welfare states and their institutions can influence or even shape the values and attitudes held by migrants. Kumlin and Rothstein (2010: 76) found that, in Sweden, equal and fair treatment during personal contacts with public authorities and services (institutional fairness) benefits not only general trust levels among the population as a whole but also migrants’ trust levels. The theoretical framework of this study is based on earlier writings by Rothstein (2005) who has theorised on the impact of state institutions and state capacity on making and breaking social capital including social trust. The idea is that positive perceptions of the institutions of the welfare states are an important precondition for generating social trust (i.e. trust between people), based on the assumption that “... people’s views of the society around them and their fellow human beings are partly shaped by their contacts with such public welfare-state institutions” (Kumlin & Rothstein 2005: 13). When it comes to the underlying mechanisms, Rothstein highlights the high degree of universalism in the design of institutions, based on the assumption that there is a linkage between what is called “procedural fairness” and the credibility and trustworthiness of institutions.

In addition, Dinesen finds that a high degree of institutional quality (e.g. freedom from corruption and concomitant perceptions of institutions) has a positive impact on the level of generalised trust (in other people) among non-Western migrants in Western Europe, their new host country (Dinesen 2011; Dinesen & Hooghe 2010; cf. also Nannestad et al. 2014).

A small group of recent studies find that the conditions of contemporary welfare states and their institutions have an impact on attitudes towards different parts of the welfare state. Breidahl & Larsen (2016) focus on attitudes towards women’s paid work among migrants and examine to what extent and how fast migrants adapt to the prevalent attitudes towards women’s paid work in 30 European countries. They conclude that migrants adapt to host country’s attitudes towards women’s paid work at a high pace and that the attitudes towards women’s paid work among male and female migrants alike are highly structured by different family policies including the institutional and cultural contexts of the host country. Reeskens & van Oorschot (2015) study what migrants in 18 European welfare states actually think about government support to ensure a reasonable standard of living. They also find that attitudes towards governmental spending among migrants in these different welfare

states are highly structured by the institutional and cultural contexts of the host country. Finally, Hedegaard & Larsen (2017) conclude, based on a comparative study and survey data, that the welfare state context makes a difference as well. They find that US migrants exposed to the institutional context of North European welfare states are more supportive of governmental responsibility for sick people, pensioners and unemployed people as well as governmental responsibility for redistribution than are the US citizens (non-migrants settled in the US) with similar characteristics (the control group).

The results from this small, but promising, group of studies indicate that the specific design of welfare state institutions (in different ways) has the ability to influence the values and attitudes of migrants. These studies do not argue that welfare state institutions determine their attitudes, but that they have some degree of influence and that “institutions matter”. In continuation hereof, one could argue that the different institutions of the welfare state are much more involved in the daily lives of migrants than other contextual factors such as immigrant integration policies. This is in particular the case in comprehensive welfare states with a long tradition of strong state involvement as the Nordic welfare states (Olwig 2011). Hence, as argued by Kumlin & Rothstein (2005: 347):

Citizens in developed welfare states frequently come into direct personal contact with many different types of public agencies and services. Social insurance, child care, benefit systems, public health care, unemployment insurance, elder care, and public education are but a few examples of this variation. In many cases, such institutions can be pervasive factors in people’s daily lives.

The following sections elaborate more deeply on these mechanisms and how they might be conceptualised.

### 3 Reflections on the theoretical framework

Our point of departure for the conceptualising of the influence of welfare state institutions on migrants’ attitudes and values in this article is the so-called “bringing the state back in” perspective promoted in the 1980s by political scientists and sociologists (Skocpol 1985; see also Béland 2010). This theorising challenged perspectives predominant in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. behaviourism and pluralism) by emphasising how the state as an actor and/or institution has its own important impact on the nature of social policy and by emphasising that policy makers do not merely react passively to societal pressure. These writings have been an important point of departure for later theorising in the study of historical institutionalism and policy feedback mechanisms, which argues that existing policies can have major effects on politics (Béland 2010). Since Paul Pierson brought forward the policy feedback concept in 1993, this research tradition has expanded in several directions. The first studies were mainly concerned with how policies shape elite political behaviour and the political behaviour of interest groups and elected officials (Béland 2010: 60; Pierson 1993). Later on Mettler & Soss (2004: 55) argued for more focus on mass politics, particularly on the subjective attitudes towards politics among the citizens and how these effects feed back into the political system by asking, “How, if at all, do specific policy designs affect what individuals think, feel, and do as members of the polity?”.

How specific policy design of particular countries affects individuals is also a question that comparative welfare state

researchers have been concerned with. Hence, it has been argued that cross-country variations in the design of social-policy institutions produce distinct patterns of public support for contemporary welfare states by affecting political debates, citizens' interpretations and preferences, notions about solidarity and norms and beliefs in general (Larsen 2006; Rothstein 1998). Several studies have empirically demonstrated how different welfare states and their institutions have an impact on the values and attitudes held by citizens and that the people living in these welfare states continue to make decisions that underpin the institutional settings (Kumlin 2004; Larsen 2006; Rothstein 2005; Sjöberg 2004). The studies referred to earlier have, in particular, been interested in how conditions of different welfare states could affect attitudes towards the welfare state and covers a wide field of mechanisms relying on different fundamental assumptions ranging from self-interest pattern and social justice norms to assessments of the legitimacy of welfare state institutions. The theoretical framework proposed in this article is concerned with the influence of the welfare state on values and attitudes of migrants in general and not only on migrants' attitudes towards and support for the welfare state.

Migrants constitute an interesting population for examining whether and how different welfare states policies shape or/and have an impact on the attitudes and values held by citizens because this population, by definition, comes from a different society and culture. When migrants start living in the host country, they are constantly "exposed" to welfare state institutions and their values and norms. Thus, according to theorising on how welfare state institutions have an ability to influence and even shape the attitudes and values of citizens, we should expect a certain amount of incorporation of the country of reception's values in newcomers due to the impact of these institutions. These theoretical assumptions therefore interpret values and attitudes as malleable attributes of a given society (rather than stable and enduring).

The impact of welfare state institutions can be studied from many different perspectives, and many types of policies and programmes can potentially influence migrants. Because the theoretical perspective proposed in this article is inspired by the comparative welfare state research tradition and its emphasis on policy feedback mechanisms, we do not theorise more deeply on concrete street-level practices even though we recognise and value perspectives that emphasise how important it is to take the activities of street-level organisations "... that do the day-to-day work of the welfare state" into account (Brodin 2013: 17; see also Nordberg & Wrede 2015). Instead, the theoretical framework of this article focus on the institutional level including the design and broader principles of welfare state institutions (e.g. the level and distribution of social rights, different family-policy constellations and universal versus selective welfare benefits).

One example of how the design of welfare state institutions can influence values of inhabitants can be found in Bo Rothstein's writings on the legitimacy of institutions, which we referred to in the literature review (Kumlin & Rothstein 2005). If people assess welfare state institutions as legitimate, both at the individual level and at the more general societal level, they tend to trust them more (Kumlin 2004). This is referred to as distributive and procedural justice (Kumlin 2004; Rothstein 2005). When it comes to procedural justice, Rothstein, among others, investigates how social trust and trustworthy institutions can be created and maintained by states and governments. He highlights the high degree of universalism in the design of institutions, based on the assumption that there is a linkage between what is called procedural fairness and the credibility and

trustworthiness of institutions. If people perceive the way institutions are working as fair, they tend to trust them more, and Rothstein (2005) assumes that universalism makes welfare state programmes more likely to be trusted. Procedural justice involves an interaction process between citizens and institutions (Kumlin 2004: 67), while distributive justice, also related to the legitimacy and fairness of institutions, is outcome oriented: that is, do citizens perceive the institutions as distributing outcomes fairly? (Kumlin, 2004: 38).

Different alternative welfare state typologies and classifications have been developed over the last few decades emphasising how welfare state institutions can influence inhabitants of a given society. In particular, Esping-Andersen's (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, which stands as an important starting point for what has been denoted as a "welfare modelling business" (Abrahamson 1999: 394). In this typology, Esping-Andersen has classified Western European welfare states into three ideal-typical welfare state regimes: liberal, conservative-corporatist and social-democratic. This typology has been much debated and subject to extensive criticism. In particular, gender researchers have criticised the typology for being "gender-blind" and for ignoring the social rights and inclusion of migrants in particular (Sainsbury 2006: 230). Esping-Andersen's welfare state regimes have also been criticised for neglecting the major changes and significant restructuring that many welfare states have undergone since the 1980s. Consequently; a number of competing welfare state typologies has been developed.

The theoretical framework proposed in this article relies on the assumptions that welfare states differ according to various patterns, that these patterns tend to cluster and that these broader patterns can influence the values and attitudes of citizens and therefore also those of newcomers (migrants). It is, however, crucial to be aware that arrangements of welfare states are not persistent but dynamic and subject to continuous change.

In the following, we illustrate these points and discuss different mechanisms in greater detail when we delve into the Danish welfare state in a comparative perspective and the question of how different family-policy institutions can possibly influence migrants' attitudes towards women's paid work.

#### 4 The impact of family policies on migrants' attitudes towards women's paid work

In the following, we elaborate more deeply on different underlying mechanisms behind contemporary welfare states and their institutions that can possibly influence the values and attitudes of migrants. Our reflections on these mechanisms are only tentative at this point and serve as illustrative examples, which, hopefully, can inspire future research in this field. In order to exemplify the relevance of these theoretical considerations, we focus on the impact of family-policy institutions on attitudes towards women's paid work. The Danish welfare state and the dual-earner model predominant in this country (and in the other Nordic countries, e.g. Finland, Norway and Sweden) will serve as a country example. If welfare state institutions have the potential to influence the attitudes and norms of migrants, we should expect to find it here as this welfare state is characterised by, among others, developed welfare programmes, a long tradition for strong state capacity and involvement in the daily lives of the inhabitants. Hence, Denmark, and also the Nordic countries, can be seen as "best cases" of welfare state influence as citizens, and therefore also migrants, are constantly "exposed" to welfare state institutions and their values and norms (Bredahl 2017). Hence, according to Olwig (2011: 185)

... the welfare state in the Nordic countries entails (...) “active intervention in the private lives of refugees and migrants by professionals within the Scandinavian welfare system seeking to shape these population groups socially, culturally, physically and psychologically according to Scandinavian norms”.

As mentioned earlier, does the Danish welfare state share manifold features with the other Nordic countries in terms of how their respective welfare states are set up and in terms of their respective histories of migration (Sainsbury 2012). However, it has been questioned whether the Nordic countries are as uniform as often argued (Kautto 2010: 586-600) and when it comes to citizenship policies and national integration philosophies, they are also renowned for being very distinct (Brochmann & Hagelund 2012).

When it comes to family policies, the Nordic countries do share several characteristics – in particular, when it comes to sharing cultural norms that support their long tradition of dual-earner family constellations and their well-developed family friendly childcare services (Breidahl & Larsen 2016). Korpi, Ferrarini & Englund (2013) differentiate between three different so-called “family-policy constellations” characterised by separate sets of legislated programmes: one based on the “traditional family”, a second based on the dual-earner family and a third characterised as a market-oriented constellation. The measure of these types of constellations is the extent to which these sets of legislated programmes “(...) enable citizens to secure material support from public authorities in terms of cash and services facilitating gender equality” (Korpi, Ferrarini & Englund 2013: 8). Denmark (together with Sweden, Norway and Finland) come close to the ideal type of a dual-earner family constellation, while Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands have high values on the traditional family dimension (Korpi, Ferrarini & Englund 2013: 11-12). However, as pointed out earlier, arrangements of welfare states are not persistent but dynamic and subject to continuous change. Family policies in Denmark have, as in many other countries, also been subject to political reforms, but the overall approach in Denmark can still be characterised as a dual-earner career model (Rostgaard 2014).

The literature referred to earlier has described how the nexus between the institutional structure of the state and the structure of the family is pivotal for women’s labour market participation and their current work–family orientations and that the variations in the national contexts are of crucial importance for attitudes towards women’s paid work. This raises the question of whether these family-policy institutions also have the ability to influence the attitudes towards women’s paid work among migrants or whether their attitudes in this field are deep-rooted and stable over time. This is a question that Breidahl & Larsen (2016) shed light on in the former mentioned study based on European Social Survey rounds 2 (2004), 4 (2008) and 5 (2010) and 13,535 foreign-born individuals (from a wide range of countries) resident in 30 European countries. The results from this study give the impression that the institutional and cultural contexts of the host country have an impact on migrants’ attitudes towards women’s paid work. Hence, both the attitudes of male and female migrants, as well as immigrants with and without children, are incorporated to host country’s attitudes at a high pace. This indicates a high degree of sociocultural incorporation, and the pattern persists after statistical control for relevant control variables (gender, age, education, country of origin and religiosity). Hence, after statistical control, the attitudes towards women’s paid work in the host country remained the key to understand the cross-national variations in attitudes towards women’s paid work among immigrants. Therefore,

migrants living in a country with cultural norms that underpin the dual-earner family structure (e.g. Denmark) do think that the women should not be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of her family. Migrants living in a country with norms that underpin a traditional family structure (e.g. Italy) do, to a larger extent, disagree in the statement that women should be prepared to cut down on paid work. It is important to emphasise that the results from this study do not focus on single groups of non-Western migrants but on how migrants (Western as well as non-Western) in general adapt to the environment of the host country.

These findings do not provide much insight about the underlying mechanisms as this study is based on quantitative survey data that makes it possible to study broader patterns of migrant incorporation across countries but faces limitations when it comes to explore the underlying mechanisms. In order to do so, a more qualitative approach is more suitable. In the following, we propose an analytical distinction between three mechanisms concerning the influence of contemporary welfare states, in this case family-policy institutions, on the attitudes held by migrants. These mechanisms are rooted in three different theoretical traditions: 1) new institutionalism in sociology emphasising “logic of appropriateness”, 2) rational choice institutionalism emphasising “logic of consequentiality” and 3) assessments of the legitimacy of welfare state institutions.

The first mechanism, rooted in the sociological new institutionalist’s understanding of the macro–micro link between the welfare state and the individual, argues that (welfare) state institutions and their endogenous logic underpin certain societal norms, understandings and values, because individuals are “deeply embedded in a world of institutions that have the potential to affect their very identities, self-images and orientations towards the world” (Sjöberg 2004: 112; cf. also March & Olsen 1984). Institutions thereby have an impact on what inhabitants see as morally justifiable. Esser (2005) shows how family-policy institutions have an impact on citizens’ non-instrumental norms about work and how different welfare regimes structure individuals’ work orientations. According to this line of reasoning, cross-national variation in work–family orientations can be explained by the “logic of appropriateness” inherent in those family-policy constellations reflecting what is morally justified as the best approach to child-rearing. Based on these arguments, we could expect that migrants over time (regardless of country or culture of origin) fully or partly adapt their orientations to the endogenous logic systems about women’s position in the labour market within different types of welfare state and predominant family-policy logics. Existing research on women’s work–family orientations and labour market participation has also shown that there are significant cross-country differences in cultural norms and values about good mother- and childhood, particularly the role of the mother in good child-rearing (e.g. Budig, Misra & Boeckmann 2012; Pfau-Effinger 2006). Hence, cultural norms among Danish women (and also Nordic women) differ from women in other countries (Budig, Misra & Boeckmann 2012; Pfau-Effinger 2006). This is particularly the case for women with preschool-aged children. Not only do Danish women (and Nordic women) to a higher extent than women in other Western and non-Western societies work fulltime, more Danish women (and Nordic women) do also express in a number of studies that the family and children do not suffer from their labour market activity (Pfau-Effinger 2006). Danish women and men do not relate a “good childhood” to the absence of maternal employment. In other countries, the conventional wisdom is that preschoolers should be cared for in the home by a parent. Hence, it is argued that these norms and values have an important influence on the general attitudes towards women’s paid work (e.g. Pfau-Effinger

2006: 143). Hence, the conditions of Danish family policies could have an impact on what migrants see as morally justifiable and therefore also their attitude towards women's paid work. In order to shed light on this potential mechanism, it is necessary to go into depth with migrants' subjective reflections on the institutional surroundings on a given welfare state and whether family-policy institutions give rise to a certain collection of norms regarding the "proper" role of women in the society.

The second mechanism is rooted in the "logic of consequentiality" meaning that the opportunity structures of certain policy institutions are expected to have an impact on attitudes and thereby that the availability of family policies has an impact on the attitudes held by inhabitants. The feedback mechanisms from family-policy institutions are thereby exogenous to migrants' preferences and are based on the premise that the opportunity structures provided by family policies, e.g. childcare, create opportunities that women will take advantage of, even if it challenges their traditional beliefs about childcare. Sjöberg (2004: 111) argues that "...demographic as well as social changes over the last several decades have changed the opportunity structure for women regarding participation in paid work" but that economic opportunity structures still differ remarkably across countries because of different family-policy constellations:

According to this perspective, differences in orientations and attitudes to labour market involvement among women can be understood in terms of available options and alternatives, as well as in terms of perceptions of the rewards and costs that are associated with these alternatives.

According to this line of reasoning, cross-national variation in "(...) the capacity of family-policy institutions to reconcile work in the home with work in the paid labour force" (Sjöberg 2004: 107) will have an impact on migrants' cultural norms and values about child-rearing (regardless of country or culture of origin) depending on which family-policy constellations and opportunity structures migrants are "exposed" to. In the family-policy constellation in Denmark, the dual-earner support model, public policies enable the transfer of childcare from the family to the public sector, thereby allowing mothers to maintain a more continuous commitment to the labour market (Korpi, Ferrarini & Englund 2013: 10). This provides room for options that support women's paid work. In order to shed light on this potential mechanism, it is again necessary to go into deep with migrants' subjective reflections on the institutional surroundings on a given welfare state. How does the dual-earner model give rise to attitudes that fit into a given set of opportunity structures? More qualitatively oriented research could help us to shed light on how migrants reflect on these opportunity structures within the Danish welfare state.

The third (and last) mechanism we want to propose in this article is inspired by Rothstein and Kumlin's writings on the legitimacy of institutions – the assessments of the legitimacy of welfare state institutions. This perspective stresses on how the direct experiences with welfare policies have an impact not only on migrants' views of the (welfare) state itself but also on their broader attitudes and values (in their writings' solidarity and trust) (Rothstein & Stolle 2008). Building on these insights, one could argue that migrants' personal experiences with the conditions of specific family-policy institutions can also impact on their broader gender role attitudes and attitudes towards women's paid work. For example, if migrants experience institutions such as kindergartens and nurseries as trustworthy and fair, they may (over time) change their notions about good child- and motherhood and child-rearing and thereby their work-family orientations and attitudes

towards women's paid work. Although migrants' personal experiences are the focus of this mechanism, the argument is that the overall arrangements of welfare state institutions, which differ cross-nationally, are expected to influence personal experience. Hence, Rothstein assumes that universalism makes welfare state programmes more likely to be trusted, which could have an impact on work-family attitudes. In addition, in order to shed light on this mechanism, more qualitative studies are needed to allow a closer look at migrants' own understandings and perceptions of meeting with the welfare state and its "frontline" (see e.g. Nordberg & Wrede 2015).

## 5 Conclusion

Migration scholars have long been concerned with the questions of what happens to individuals who move from one social and geographical context to another and how and to what extent migrants and their descendants are incorporated into their host societies.

The aim of this article has been to contribute to a research field that for several years has been dominated by North American migration scholars who have not been much concerned with the ongoing importance of the national context, including welfare state institutions, for the incorporation of migrants. We have made an attempt to "bringing the state in" by elaborating more explicitly on how conditions created by the welfare state have the potential to affect the attitudes among migrants and therefore more sociocultural dimensions of incorporation.

In order to exemplify the relevance of these theoretical considerations, the impact of different family-policy constellations on attitudes towards women's paid work was highlighted. This discussion was in particular concerned with the dual-earner model predominant in Denmark (and the other Nordic countries), based on the premise that if welfare state institutions have the potential to influence the attitudes and norms of migrants, we should expect to find it in a welfare state characterised by, among others, developed welfare programmes, a long tradition for strong state capacity and involvement in the daily lives of the inhabitants. The point of departure for this discussion was the results from a comparative survey-based study, based on European social survey, which give the impression that migrants' attitudes towards women's paid work are highly structured by the institutional and cultural contexts of the host country. Hence, the migrants entering a country like Denmark with cultural norms that underpin the dual-earner family structure do think that the women should not be prepared to cut down on paid work for the sake of her family, whereas migrants entering a country with norms that underpin a traditional family structure (e.g. Italy) do think that women should be prepared to cut down on paid work.

Three different mechanisms were outlined and discussed in order to sketch possible directions for further research emphasising endogenous logic of institutions, institutional opportunity structures and the assessment of the legitimacy of welfare state institutions. The discussion was only tentative as more – in particular qualitative – research is needed in order to elaborate more deeply on these mechanisms. One should not neglect the manifold of other factors at the individual and structural levels that have been pointed to in existing migrant studies that are undoubtedly also of crucial importance for the sociocultural incorporation of migrants. Rather, we want to stress that contemporary migration studies should also take the broader context of the welfare state into account.

The theoretical discussion in this article also relates to the broader question of whether the institutional context of a certain

welfare state has the ability to shape the behaviour and beliefs of new citizens. This is a very controversial question in these years as increased ethnic and religious diversity in Western Europe has raised concerns for the socioeconomic and sociocultural incorporation of new inhabitants. Based on the theoretical assumptions outlined in this article, values and attitudes should not be seen as sorely stable but rather as attributes of a given society.

**Karen N. Breidahl** is an Associate Professor at Aalborg University, Denmark. Karen's primary research interest includes welfare state research, sociocultural incorporation of migrants into European welfare and labour market reforms in a comparative perspective.

**Barbara Fersch** is an Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Southern Denmark, Esbjerg. Barbara's research interests include system and client trust, welfare state, service professionals and care. She has further interest in qualitative research methods in multilingual research settings.

## References

- Abrahamson, P 1999, 'The welfare modelling business', *Social Policy & Administration*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 394-415, DOI:10.1111/1467-9515.00160.
- Alba, R & Nee, V 2003, *Remaking the American mainstream: assimilation and contemporary immigration*, 1st edn, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
- Alesina, A & Glaeser, EL 2004, *Fighting poverty in the us and Europe. A world of difference*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Béland, D 2010, 'Reconsidering policy feedback: how policies affect politics', *Administration & Society*, vol. 42, pp. 568-590, DOI:10.1177/0095399710377444.
- Breidahl, KN 2017, 'Scandinavian exceptionalism? Civic integration and labour market activation for newly arrived immigrants', *Comparative Migration Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, DOI:10.1186/s40878-016-0045-8.
- Breidahl, KN & Larsen, CA 2016, 'The myth of unadaptable gender roles: Attitudes towards women's paid work among immigrants across 30 European countries', *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 387-401, DOI:10.1177/0958928716664292.
- Brochmann, G & Hagelund, A (eds.) 2012, *Immigration policy and the Scandinavian welfare state, 1945-2010*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Brodkin, EZ 2013, 'Street-level organizations and the welfare state', in *Work and the welfare state: street-level organizations and workfare politics*, eds EZ Brodtkin & G Marston, Georgetown University Press, Washington DC, pp. 17-34.
- Budig, MJ, Misra, J & Boeckmann, I 2012, 'The motherhood penalty in cross-national perspective: the importance of work-family policies and cultural attitudes', *Social Politics*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 163-193, DOI:10.1093/sp/jxs006.
- Crul, M 2013, 'Snakes and ladders in educational systems: access to higher education for second-generation Turks', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 1383-1401, DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2013.815388.
- Crul, M & Schneider, J 2010, 'Comparative integration context theory: participation and belonging in new diverse European cities', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 1249-1268, DOI:10.1080/01419871003624068.
- Crul, M, Schneider, J & Lelie, F 2012, *The European second generation compared: do the integration context matter?*, Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Dinesen, PT 2011, *When in Rome, do as the Romans do? An analysis of the acculturation of generalized trust of non-Western immigrants in Western Europe*, Ph.D thesis, Aarhus University.
- Dinesen, PT & Hooghe, M 2010, 'When in Rome, do as the Romans do: the acculturation of generalized trust among immigrants in Western Europe', *International Migration Review*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 697-727, DOI:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2010.00822.x.
- Diop-Christensen, A & Pavlopoulos, D 2016, 'Institutions and structures as barriers? A comparison of native-born and immigrant unemployment durations across 12 European countries', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 347-360, DOI:10.1111/ijsw.12206.
- Dörr, S & Faist, T 1997, 'Institutional conditions for the integration of immigrants in welfare states: a comparison of the literature on Germany, France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands', *European Journal of Political Research*, vol. 31, pp. 401-426, DOI:10.1111/1475-6765.00323.
- Ersanilli, E 2012, 'Model(ing) citizens? Integration policies and value integration of Turkish immigrants and their descendants in Germany, France, and the Netherlands', *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 338-358, DOI:10.1080/15562948.2012.693336.
- Ersanilli, E & Koopmans, R 2011, 'Do immigrant integration policies matter? A three-country comparison among Turkish immigrants', *West European Politics*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 208-234, DOI:10.1080/01402382.2011.546568.
- Esping-Andersen, G 1990, *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Esser, I 2005, *Why work? Comparative studies on welfare regimes and individuals' work orientations*, Ph.D thesis, Stockholm University.
- Heath, AF, Rethon, C & Kilpi, E 2008, 'The second generation in Western Europe: education, unemployment, and occupational attainment', *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 34, pp. 211-235, DOI:10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134728.
- Hedegaard, TH & Larsen, CA 2017, *Coming to Denmark: Americans' adaption to social democratic institutions*, CCWS Working Paper.
- Joppke, C 2007, 'Beyond national models: civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe', *Western European Politics*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1-22, DOI:10.1080/01402380601019613.
- Kautto, M 2010, 'The Nordic Countries', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Welfare State*, eds FG Castles, S Leibfried, J Lewis, H Obinger & C Pierson, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 616-629.
- Kogan, I 2006, 'Labor markets and economic incorporation among recent immigrants in Europe', *Social Forces*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 697-721, DOI:10.1353/sof.2007.0014.

- Koopmans, R 2010, 'Trade-offs between equality and difference: immigrant integration, multiculturalism and the welfare state in cross-national perspective', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1-26, DOI:10.1080/13691830903250881.
- Korpi, W, Ferrarini, T & Englund, S 2013, 'Women's opportunities under different family policy constellations: gender, class, and inequality tradeoffs in Western countries re-examined', *Social Politics*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1-40, DOI:10.1093/sp/jxs028.
- Kumlin, S 2004, *The personal and the political: how personal welfare state experiences affect political trust and ideology*, Palgrave-Macmillan, New York.
- Kumlin, S & Rothstein, B 2005, 'Making and breaking social capital: the impact of welfare-state institutions', *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp. 339-365, DOI:10.1177/0010414004273203.
- Kumlin, S & Rothstein, B 2010, 'Questioning the new liberal dilemma: immigrants, social networks, and institutional fairness', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 63-80, DOI:10.5129/001041510x12911363510394.
- Larsen, C 2006, *The institutional logic of welfare attitudes*, Ashgate, Hampshire, UK.
- March, J & Olsen, JP 1984, 'The new institutionalism: organizational factors in political life', *The American Political Science Review*, vol. 78, no. 3, pp. 734-749.
- Mettler, S & Soss, J 2004, 'The consequences of public policy for democratic citizenship: bridging policy studies and mass politics', *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 55-73, DOI:10.1017/S1537592704000623.
- Mouritsen, P 2013, 'The resilience of citizenship traditions: civic integration in Germany, Great Britain and Denmark', *Ethnicities*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 86-109, DOI:10.1177/1468796812451220.
- Nannestad, P, Svendsen, GT, Dinesen, PT & Sønderskov, KM 2014, 'Do institutions or culture determine the level of social trust? The natural experiment of migration from non-western to Western countries', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 4, no. 40, pp. 544-565, DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2013.830499.
- Nordberg, C & Wrede, S 2015, 'Street-level engagements: migrated families encountering the local welfare state', *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 54-57, DOI:10.1515/njmr-2015-0008.
- Olwig, KF 2011, '"Integration": migrants and refugees between Scandinavian welfare societies and family relations', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 179-196, DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2010.521327.
- Park, RE & Burgess, EW 1921, *Introduction to the science of sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Pfau-Effinger, B 2006, 'Cultures of childhood and the relationship of care and employment in European welfare states', in *Children, Changing Families and Welfare States*, ed J Lewis, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, pp. 137-153.
- Pierson, P 1993, 'When effect becomes cause: policy feedback and political change', *World Politics*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 595-628, DOI:10.2307/2950710.
- Portes, A 1997, 'Immigration theory for a new century: some problems and opportunities', *International Migration Review*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 799-825, DOI:10.2307/2547415.
- Portes, A & Rumbaut, RG 2001, *Legacies: the story of the immigrant second generation*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Portes, A & Zhou, M 1993, 'The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, vol. 530, no. 1, pp. 74-96, DOI:10.1177/000271629353000106.
- Reeskens, T & van Oorschot, W 2015, 'Immigrants' attitudes towards welfare redistribution. An exploration of role of government preferences among immigrants and natives across 18 European Welfare States', *European Sociological Review*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 433-445, DOI:10.1093/esr/jcv003.
- Reitz, JG 2002, 'Host societies and the reception of immigrants: research themes, emerging theories and methodological issues', *International Migration Review*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 1005-1019, DOI:10.1111/j.1747-7379.2002.tb00115.x.
- Rostgaard, T 2014, *Family Policies in Scandinavia*, Aalborg University, Denmark.
- Rothstein, B 1998, *Just institutions matter: the moral and political logic of the universal welfare state*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Rothstein, B 2005, *Social traps and the problem of trust*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Rothstein, B & Stolle, D 2008, 'The state and social capital: an institutional theory of generalized trust', *Comparative Politics*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 441-459, DOI:10.5129/001041508x12911362383354.
- Sainsbury, D 2006, '"Immigrants" social rights in comparative perspective: welfare regimes, forms of immigration and immigration policy regimes', *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 229-244, DOI:10.1177/0958928706065594.
- Sainsbury, D 2012, *Welfare states and immigrant rights: the politics of inclusion and exclusion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schneider, J & Crul, M 2010, 'New insights into assimilation and integration theory: introduction to the special issue', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 33, no. 7, pp. 1143-1148, DOI:10.1080/01419871003777809.
- Sjöberg, O 2004, 'The role of family policy institutions in explaining gender-role attitudes: a comparative multilevel analysis of thirteen industrialized countries', *Journal of European Social Policy*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 107-123, DOI:10.1177/0958928704042003.
- Skocpol, T 1985, 'Bringing the state back in: strategies of analysis in current research', in *Bringing the state back in*, eds P Evans, D Rueschemeyer & T Skocpol, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 3-43.
- Svallfors, S. (ed) 2007, *The political sociology of the welfare state: institutions, social cleavages, and orientations*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Söhn, J 2013, 'Unequal welcome and unequal life chances: how the state shapes integration opportunities of immigrants', *European Journal of Sociology*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 295-326, DOI:10.1017/S0003975613000155.
- Van Tubergen, F, Maas, I & Flap, H 2004, 'The economic incorporation of immigrants in 18 Western societies: origin, destination, and community effects', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 69, pp. 701-724, DOI:10.1177/000312240406900505.
- Waldinger, R & Catron, P 2016, 'Modes of incorporation: a conceptual and empirical critique', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 23-53, DOI:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1113742.
- Zhou, M 1997, 'Segmented assimilation: issues, controversies, and recent research on the new second generation', *International Migration Review*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 975-1008, DOI:10.2307/2547421.