



## Ethnic penalties? The role of human capital and social origins in labour market outcomes of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands

Pablo Gracia, Lucía Vázquez-Quesada & Herman G. Van de Werfhorst

To cite this article: Pablo Gracia, Lucía Vázquez-Quesada & Herman G. Van de Werfhorst (2016) Ethnic penalties? The role of human capital and social origins in labour market outcomes of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42:1, 69-87, DOI: [10.1080/1369183X.2015.1085800](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1085800)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1085800>



Published online: 28 Sep 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 170



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Ethnic penalties? The role of human capital and social origins in labour market outcomes of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands

Pablo Gracia<sup>a</sup>, Lucía Vázquez-Quesada<sup>b</sup> and Herman G. Van de Werfhorst<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Amsterdam Centre for Inequality Studies, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Population Council Mexico, Mexico DF, Mexico

### ABSTRACT

In Western Europe, the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants were found to be significantly disadvantaged in the labour market. This ethnic gap was found to persist after considering differences in schooling, which was argued to reflect 'ethnic penalties' driven by cultural, religious, or racial factors. This study uses data from the 1st Wave of the 'Netherlands Longitudinal Life-Course Study' (2009–2010) to revisit the analysis of 'ethnic penalties' for second-generation Moroccans and Turks. Unlike in previous research, empirical analyses not only consider differences in schooling, but also skills and social origins. Results show substantial ethnic inequalities in the labour market, with the exception of women from Moroccan origins. For men, these ethnic inequalities do not disappear when human capital factors are considered, but they do when accounting for the unprivileged social origins of ethnic minorities. For women, the disadvantage of second-generation Turks in achieving privileged occupations clearly disappears when human capital and social origins are considered. Yet, the chances of being unemployed among women of Turkish origins persist after controlling for education, skills, and social origins. Overall, this study has global academic and public policy implications to understand the socioeconomic integration of the Moroccan and Turkish second generation in Western Europe.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 13 April 2015  
Accepted 17 August 2015

### KEYWORDS

Ethnic stratification; ethnic penalties; labour market outcomes; second-generation minorities; migration

### Introduction

In Western Europe, the children of immigrants are increasingly entering into the labour force (Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi 2008). The second generation, unlike their parents, was raised and educated in the same country than individuals from the ethnic-national majority. Consequently, studying how the second generation performs in the labour market offers key evidence on the ability of host societies to integrate ethnic minorities under equal conditions (Portes and Zhou 1993). The literature, however, shows that the children of migrants in Western Europe are strongly disadvantaged in the labour market (Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi 2008; Thomson and Crul 2007; Van Tubergen 2004).

One popular explanation on the labour market outcomes of second-generation minorities refers to *ethnic penalties* (Heath and Cheung 2007; Kalter and Kogan 2006). The 'ethnic penalties hypothesis' states that ethnic minorities achieve poor labour market outcomes, not because of observable demographic or socioeconomic factors, but due to ethnic/racial attributes that impose societal barriers over their labour market integration (Heath and Cheung 2007). The ethnic penalties approach is essential to know whether second-generation minorities are disadvantaged in the labour market

due to 'legitimate' factors in a so-called meritocratic society (i.e. human capital), or rather to 'illegitimate' factors, such as coming from disadvantaged social origins (i.e. working-class background) or suffering ethnic or racial discriminatory practices (e.g. employers' discrimination towards ethnic minorities).

Previous studies typically tested the ethnic penalties hypothesis by looking at differences in schooling, a crucial predictor of labour market outcomes (Becker 1964). Although some studies suggest that the labour market disadvantage of second generations can be attributed to their low average levels of schooling (e.g. Heath and Cheung 2007), other studies found persistent ethnic gaps net of education (e.g. Silberman, Alba, and Fournier 2007). However, other essential markers of labour market outcomes have been missed in the literature. This fact raises the question of whether the findings of previous studies arguing that ethnic penalties operate in the labour market are, at least partly, biased for the omission of some key variables. We argue that, apart from education, two important explanatory variables need special attention to fully test the ethnic penalties hypothesis: 'social origins' and 'skills'.

In this study, we analyse how the Moroccan and Turkish second generation performs in the Dutch labour market. These are two large ethnic groups, not only in the Netherlands, but also in many Western European countries. The children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants, in the Netherlands and across Western Europe, were found to be severely disadvantaged in the labour market (Lessard-Phillips, Fibbi, and Wanner 2012; Tesser and Dronkers 2007). Second-generation Moroccans and Turks in Western countries are closely identified with the Islam, which brought about debates on a 'Muslim penalty' in their labour market integration (Connor and Koenig 2015). Furthermore, the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants are often raised speaking another language than Dutch at home (Crul and Doornik 2003), making these two groups particularly relevant to investigate how linguistic skills affect their labour market outcomes.

Our paper makes three main contributions. First, we focus on the role of *social origins*. The fact that second-generation minorities (including Moroccan and Turkish minorities) typically originate from working-class or poor families, not only affects their schooling attainment (Fleischmann et al. 2012; Kalter, Granato, and Kristen 2007; Kristen and Granato 2007), but can also influence their labour market outcomes. Privileged parents transmit the 'elite' cultural capital to their children (Bourdieu 1984) and use their human capital and material resources to invest in children's skills (Morgan, Grusky, and Fields 2006), creating an advantage in children's labour market chances. The way these mechanisms can affect ethnic inequalities in the labour market, however, remains understudied. To our knowledge, only Zuccotti's (2015) study on African, Caribbean, Indian, and Pakistani second-generation minorities in the UK analysed this question, suggesting that parental social class matters, yet to a different degree across ethnic groups. Like Zuccotti (2015), we consider *parental social class*. But we also incorporate two key understudied variables. One is *cultural capital socialisation* (e.g. attending museums and going to libraries with parents) (Bourdieu 1984; Lareau 2003). The low access of ethnic minorities to such 'elite' forms of cultural capital in the family of origin might certainly have long-term impacts on their labour market disadvantage (Farkas 1996). The other factor is *parental education*. Parental education, unlike parental social class, captures specifically parents' abilities to transmit human capital that is converted into labour market skills (Morgan, Grusky, and Fields 2006). The low education of first-generation migrants might negatively influence their children's labour market outcomes. Therefore, by looking at several measures of social origins, we offer a refined test of how social origins affect ethnic inequalities in the labour market.

Second, our study also offers innovative evidence on *skills*. Studies on first-generation migrants found that skills increase their labour market chances (Chiswick 1991; Chiswick and Miller 1999; Van Tubergen and Kalmijn 2005). Yet, skills might also affect the labour market performance of the second generation, capturing previously unobserved factors that were labelled as ethnic penalties. The second generation achieves higher levels of linguistic and academic skills than the first generation (Portes and Schauffler 1994), but typically has skill levels that are below the average, especially

in linguistic proficiency (Werfhorst and Van Tubergen 2007). The *linguistic disadvantage* of the Moroccan and Turkish second generations (Werfhorst and Van Tubergen 2007) could negatively affect their labour market chances, particularly in privileged occupations with high linguistic demands. Also, the children of migrants could be disadvantaged in *numeracy abilities*, due to their linguistic disadvantage in early academic stages, or to teachers' negative expectations on their actual academic potential, affecting their subsequent numeracy skills (Wong, Eccles, and Sameroff 2003). Thus, our study offers innovative evidence on whether skills influence the labour market outcomes of the children of Moroccans and Turks.

Third, we analyse two important indicators of labour market outcomes: (i) *being employed*; (ii) *occupational class*. For the likelihood of being employed, we only study active individuals in the labour market (i.e. searching for a job or employed), offering evidence on a basic measure of socio-economic integration of the second generation that is relevant to test the ethnic penalties hypothesis (Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi 2008). For occupational class, we investigate the likelihood of achieving a managerial or professional occupation among employed individuals, a central indicator of whether the children of migrants have achieved an influential position in the socioeconomic hierarchy (Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi 2008). The focus on these two measures of labour market outcomes provides new relevant evidence for the ethnic penalties literature.

## Second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Dutch context

In the Netherlands, an increasing share of the labour force comprises of second-generation Moroccans and Turks (Crul and Doornik 2003). These two groups are the largest ethnic minorities, not only in the Netherlands, but also in Western Europe (Thomson and Crul 2007). In 2014, the community of Turkish origins was the largest minority of the Netherlands, representing 396,414 individuals (2.4% of the total population), while the Moroccan community represented the second largest minority group, with a total of 364,300 individuals (2.2% of the total population) (CBS 2014). These two ethnic groups account for 39% of individuals defined as 'non-Westerns' in the official statistics, whereas more than half of the Moroccan (55%) and Turkish (51%) minorities are registered in the statistics as second-generation minorities (CBS 2014). In short, second-generation Moroccans and Turks represent two important ethnic groups within the Dutch demographic structure.

Most parents of today's second-generation Moroccans and Turks arrived to the Netherlands in the 1960s–1970s, to work as 'guest-workers' in low-skilled jobs of the agriculture and industry (Tesser and Dronkers 2007). Moroccan and Turkish migrants had low average levels of education, and frequently lived in working-class or poor areas (Roelandt and Veenman 1992). Migrants of Moroccan and Turkish origins had low fluency of Dutch language, while often raised their children speaking other language than Dutch at home (i.e. Arabic, Turkish), unlike other large ethnic minority groups (i.e. Surinamese) (Crul and Doornik 2003). First-generation migrants from Morocco and Turkey typically had a strong identification with the Islamic culture and religion in their communities (Crul and Doornik 2003).

Second-generation Moroccans and Turks, as compared to their parents, have achieved higher levels of education and adopt more similar lifestyles than the ethnic-national majority (Crul and Doornik 2003). However, second-generation Moroccans and Turks still differ substantially from their counterparts with native-born parents. The children of Moroccan and Turks are disadvantaged in schooling (Crul and Doornik 2003) and have lower proficiency in Dutch language than other demographic groups (Werfhorst and Van Tubergen 2007). Despite a certain 'cultural assimilation', many young groups of Moroccan and Turkish background are strongly identified with the Islam, and generally with their parents' culture of origin (Slootman 2014). These educational and sociocultural factors need to be considered when analysing how these two minority groups perform in the labour market.

Previous studies suggest that, despite sharing many socioeconomic and demographic characteristics, second-generation Moroccans and Turks show important sociocultural differences (Crul and Doomernik 2003; Crul and Vermeulen 2003). The Moroccan second generation in the Netherlands was argued to be more individualistic, culturally heterogeneous, and secularised than the Turkish second generation, one factor that has recently been argued to have potential implications regarding socioeconomic integration (Crul and Doomernik 2003; Slooman 2014). In terms of gender relations, young women of Moroccan origins were argued to be more oriented towards the job market than women of Turkish origins, who might be more to the domestic sphere (Crul and Doomernik 2003). Even if we are essentially interested in differences between second-generation Moroccans and Turks *with* the Dutch ethnic-national majority, the sociocultural differences between these two ethnic minority groups need to be taken into account in this study.

Tesser and Dronkers' (2007) study is, to our knowledge, the most systematic quantitative analysis of the labour market outcomes of the Moroccan and Turkish second generation in the Netherlands. Tesser and Dronkers found that unemployment rates are much higher for the Moroccan and Turkish second generation than for their counterparts with Dutch-born parents. Likewise, the children of Dutch-born individuals had higher chances of working in professional and managerial occupations than the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants. They also found that, after controlling for education, this ethnic gap persisted significantly. Yet, the study of Tesser and Dronkers (2007) leaves two important questions inconclusive. First, Tesser and Dronkers' (2007) study was based on old data (1988–1998), raising the question of whether the better educated young cohorts of Moroccan and Turkish second-generation minorities are less disadvantaged in the labour market than older cohorts of second generations from the same ethnic background. Second, the authors did not investigate two important variables that we consider here: skills and social origins. Our study contributes to cover these gaps by focusing on the Dutch context.

## Analytical framework

### *Human capital*

*Human capital* is an essential variable to analyse the extent to which ethnic penalties operate in the labour market (Kalter and Kogan 2006). Human capital theory suggests that academic qualifications and job-related skills increase individuals' likelihood of being employed and access to the most privileged occupations (Barone and Van de Werfhorst 2011; Becker 1964). In this view, employers rationally choose the job candidates with the highest human capital, without following 'normative' or 'ideological' prejudices related to the candidate's personal attributes (i.e. race, culture, and religion) (Chiswick 1991). On the contrary, if human capital does not account for ethnic inequalities in labour market outcomes, ethnic penalties are likely to operate in the labour market structure (Heath and Cheung 2007).

One key indicator of human capital is *education*. Education is not only a signal of credentials that allow employers to choose the 'right' candidates, those who fit more directly with the job characteristics (Collins 1979). Also, education measures cognitive abilities and job-specific skills associated with individuals' access to employment and to privileged occupations (Becker 1964; Morgan, Grusky, and Fields 2006). This implies that the lower levels of education of second-generation minorities could explain their labour market disadvantage (Heath and Cheung 2007). Yet, while some studies found that education is associated with the labour market disadvantage of second generations, other studies show persistent ethnic inequalities net of education (Heath and Cheung 2007; Heath, Roston, and Kilpi 2008; Lessard-Phillips, Fibbi, and Wanner 2012).

Education can be associated with the disadvantaged labour market outcomes of the children of Moroccan and Turkish background in the Netherlands. Tesser and Dronkers (2007) found, using data from older cohorts, a persistent labour market disadvantage among second-generation Moroccan and Turkish minorities, after holding education constant. Crul and Doomernik (2003), however,

suggest that the younger groups of second-generation Turks and Moroccans benefit more from their schooling than the older cohorts. This implies that the progressive access of these minority groups in the Dutch public sphere, and in highly educated circles, can lead to a meritocratic school-to-work transition.

H1: Education hypothesis: The labour market disadvantage of the Moroccan and Turkish second generation is associated to differences in educational attainment.

Another key indicator of human capital is *skills*. Skills are essential human capital assets of individuals' employment participation, wages, and professional status (Barone and Van de Werfhorst 2011; Becker 1964; Chiswick 1991; Chiswick and Miller 1999). Studies on first-generation migrants demonstrated that skills, especially linguistic abilities, influence their labour market outcomes, even after holding education constant (Chiswick and Miller 1999; Van Tubergen and Kalmijn 2005). However, studies on the second generation paid much less attention to skills. The children of migrants are expected to differ in certain types of skills from their counterparts of the national-ethnic majority, especially when looking at ethnic minorities raised speaking a foreign language at home (Crul and Vermeulen 2003). This fact, in turn, might have effects on ethnic inequalities in labour market outcomes.

We consider two measures of skills. The first is *linguistic proficiency*. In the Netherlands, Moroccan and Turkish second-generation adolescents have a lower proficiency in Dutch language than the children of Dutch-born parents (Werfhorst and Van Tubergen 2007). After accounting for education, ethnic inequalities in linguistic proficiency can persist, having long-term effects on the labour market outcomes of the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants. The second measure of skills is *numeracy abilities* (Chiswick, Lee, and Miller 2003). The children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants might achieve poorer numeracy skills than the ethnic-national majority, due to linguistic difficulties to learn scientific concepts in early academic stages (Marks 2005), but also to teachers' discriminatory practices and negative expectations on their actual academic abilities (Wong, Eccles, and Sameroff 2003). The persistent low numeracy skills of the Moroccan and Turkish second generation during adulthood can affect their labour market disadvantage. Further, skills might lead to particularly strong ethnic inequalities in professional and managerial occupations, which have high cognitive and linguistic demands (Chiswick 1991).

H2: Skills Hypothesis: The disadvantage of Moroccan and Turkish second generations in the labour market is associated to differences in skills, including linguistic proficiency and numeracy abilities, and especially in the most privileged occupations.

### Social origins

*Social origin* critically affects individuals' labour market outcomes, due to socioeconomic disparities in parents' material, educational, and cultural resources (Bourdieu 1984; Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992; Morgan, Grusky, and Fields 2006). While human capital is (at least partly) influenced by individual effort and inherent talent, one's social position of origin is randomly established at birth, and therefore it is not subject to any meritocratic process in individuals' life chances. The fact that second-generation minorities are disproportionately raised in working-class and poor families, as well as neighbourhoods with high levels of social exclusion, might pose them in a situation of early socioeconomic disadvantage in the schooling system and labour market (Farkas 1996; Zhou 1997). Social origins might affect ethnic inequalities in the labour market through the mediation of schooling attainment (Heath and Cheung 2007). Additionally, as implied in the literature on social stratification (Breen 2004) and ethnic stratification (Zuccotti 2015), parents' socioeconomic background can have direct effects on the labour market disadvantage of ethnic minorities.

We consider three dimensions of social origins. One is *parental class*, a proxy of parents' income, status, and social networks associated to children's socioeconomic performance (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992). The low *parental income* of second generations, linked to parents' social class,

can lead to scarce parental support to invest in the job market (i.e. poor family support for job training; low-skilled employment due to family financial constraints) (Zuccotti 2015). Also, the underprivileged social class of the second generation could lead to insufficient *social networks* that are needed to access the labour market, especially in privileged occupations (Zhou 1997). Zuccotti's (2015) analysis of African, Caribbean, Indian, and Pakistani minorities in the UK shows that parental class affects the occupational attainment of the second generation, yet with heterogeneous effects across ethnic groups. Drawing on previous theoretical and empirical studies on ethnic stratification, we expect the underprivileged social class of first-generation Moroccans and Turks to influence their children's labour market disadvantage.

The second dimension to consider is *parental education*. Parental education, unlike parents' social class, captures explicitly the potential intergenerational transmission of human capital with labour market implications (Morgan, Grusky, and Fields 2006). Previous studies on ethnic penalties, however, paid little attention to study how parental education affects ethnic inequalities in the labour market. Given that second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands are raised in families with lower levels of education, we expect parental education to contribute to the disadvantage of these two ethnic minority groups in the labour market.

The third factor of social origins is *cultural capital socialisation*. Cultural capital, in its 'embodied' form, captures everyday practices and attitudes that allow privileged children to accumulate skills and knowledge rewarded in the labour market (Bourdieu 1984; Lareau 2003). Cultural capital includes leisure activities like engagement in highbrow activities (i.e. going to theatre, classical museums), academic-related activities (i.e. science museums), or familiarity with practices that enhance cognitive and linguistic skills (i.e. parents' reading) (Gracia 2015). In this sense, the distance of ethnic minorities from the 'dominant' cultural capital in their family of origin (Farkas 1996; Klein, Biedinger, and Becker 2014) might reinforce ethnic inequalities in the labour market. Therefore, differences in cultural capital socialisation can explain the labour market disadvantage of second-generation Moroccans and Turks.

H3: Social Origins Hypothesis: The disadvantage of the Moroccan and Turkish second generation in the labour market is associated to differences in social origins, which includes parental class, parental education, and cultural capital socialisation.

### **Ethnic penalties**

*Ethnic penalties* refer to processes of disadvantage suffered by ethnic minorities for belonging to a specific ethnic category. In the labour market, ethnic penalties include those processes by which employers hire or promote job candidates, not based on their labour market skills (i.e. human capital), but on ethnic, religious, or racial attributes (Heath, Rothon, and Kilpi 2008; Kalter and Kogan 2006). This implies that, if second-generation minorities have similar levels of education than the ethnic-national majority, but also similar skills and social origins, any observed ethnic disadvantage in the labour market can be attributed to ethnic penalties.

Several studies found that ethnic minorities, including those of Moroccan and Turkish origins, are disadvantaged in the labour market, even under equal education, linguistic knowledge, training, and socioeconomic attributes (Blommaert, Van Tubergen, and Coenders 2012; Connor and Koenig 2015; Ghorashi and Van Tilburg 2006; Siebers and Van Gastel 2015). Ethnic penalties were argued to be embedded in the context of hegemonic discourses of 'cultural essentialism', by which individuals from specific cultural and religious minorities (i.e. the Muslim community) are considered as 'portable' of certain categories that justify discriminatory practices towards them in the job market (Siebers and Dennissen 2015). Other studies argue that ethnic minorities with high levels of skills and qualifications suffer discrimination at the workplace from peers of the ethnic-national majority due to ethnic/racial reasons, affecting negatively their job careers in the long run (Ghorashi and Van Tilburg 2006). Therefore, the ethnic penalties approach implies

that second-generation Moroccans and Turks, even under equal levels of education, skills, or social origins, are disadvantaged in the labour market.

H4: Ethnic Penalties Hypothesis: The Moroccan and Turkish second generation is disadvantaged in the labour market, even after holding education, skills, and social origins constant.

## Methodology

### Data

We use the data from the 1st wave (2009/2010) of the *Netherlands Longitudinal Life Course Survey* (NELLS) (De Graaf et al. 2010). The NELLS contains by design an oversampled group of Moroccan and Turkish second-generation respondents. This survey, unlike other related surveys, provides excellent measures of *skills* (i.e. linguistic proficiency, numeracy abilities) and *social origins* (i.e. parental social class, cultural capital socialisation) for our empirical goals.

The NELLS sample includes 5312 respondents aged 14–49. We sampled individuals aged 25–49 who were active in the job market, either employed or searching for a job. Our sample included three ethnic groups: ‘Dutch origins’ (Dutch-born individuals with two Dutch-born parents); ‘Moroccan origins’ (Dutch-born individuals, or individuals arrived to the Netherlands before age 6, with one or two Moroccan-born parents); ‘Turkish origins’ (Dutch-born individuals, or those arrived to the Netherlands before age 6, with one or two Turkish-born parents). We sampled ethnic minorities who arrived to the Netherlands before age 6 with their parents because this group was entirely educated in the Netherlands, exactly like Dutch-born individuals with migrant parents, and was also essentially socialised in the Netherlands. We excluded those individuals who *only* had one Dutch-born parent (regardless of the national origin of the other parent) and those with one parent born in Morocco and the other parent in Turkey.<sup>1</sup> The definitive sample had 1678 individuals.

### Measures

We used two dummy dependent variables: ‘likelihood of being employed’ (measuring if respondents were employed or unemployed) and ‘occupational class’ (measuring if respondents worked in any professional or managerial occupation, versus working in occupations of lower prestige) (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992).

The main independent variable, ‘ethnic group’, had three categories: ‘Dutch origins’ (*reference*), ‘Moroccan second-generation minority’, and ‘Turkish second-generation minority’ (see above for further details on the definition of these categories).

We used different measures of human capital. ‘Education’ contains five categories: ‘primary/low secondary’ (*reference*); ‘upper secondary vocational’; ‘upper secondary academic’; ‘tertiary vocational college’; and ‘university’. We used two measures of *skills*. One is ‘linguistic proficiency’, a scale ranging from 1 to 5, based on respondents’ answer to nine questions on linguistic proficiency. The second is ‘numeracy abilities’, a scale from 1 to 5, following respondents’ answer to five questions with different difficulty levels on a logical numerical sequence (see Table A1 for the exact questions used on the skills measures).

We considered different social origins measures. One is ‘parental occupation’, containing four categories: ‘unskilled working class’ (*reference*), ‘skilled working class’, ‘intermediate occupation’, and ‘professional/managerial occupation’. ‘Parental education’ had four categories: ‘below secondary education’ (*reference*), ‘low secondary education’, ‘high secondary education’, and ‘college education’. For both parental occupation and parental education, we considered the highest level, paternal or maternal, if both parents had different levels. We used a continuous variable of ‘cultural capital socialisation’, which was an index scale from 1 to 5. We created four categories on the family cultural capital participation when the respondent was aged 12–14 for four items: ‘classical events’, ‘exhibitions and museums’, ‘theatre plays’, and ‘parental reading frequency’. We rated each item as 1

when the answer was ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’, and as 0 when the answer indicated less frequency. We summed the four items to create an index scale of cultural capital.

Finally, we included *age* in the analyses, measured as a continuous variable. We conducted *Cronbach’s Alpha* tests, showing robust measures for our index scales, and also applied the *Variance Inflation Factor*, showing levels of multicollinearity that were low enough to conduct multivariate statistical analyses.

### Analytical strategy

We run ‘Binary Logistic’ (Logit) regressions applying ‘Average Marginal Effects’ (AME), which allow to compare coefficients across models that include subsequent covariates (Mood 2010). We run six regression models, controlling always for age. Model 1 only contained ethnicity. Model 2 added the level of education. Model 3 contained skills, without education. Model 4 included education and skills. Model 5 contained only social origins. Model 6 was the full model. Analyses were run separately by gender. Even if we were not specifically interested in gender differences, previous studies suggest that running analyses separately by gender is suitable, due to gendered patterns in the labour market (Heath and Cheung 2007). We conducted additional exploratory analyses (not shown) with interaction effects between ethnicity and selected variables, but offered general insignificant results.

## Results

### Descriptive analyses

Table 1 shows descriptive evidence for the main variables of analysis. Regarding being *employed*, 97% of men with Dutch-born parents were employed, as compared to 91% and 90% of their counterparts of Moroccan and Turkish ancestries. Similar differences are observed for women; 96% of women with Dutch-born parents were employed, with figures of 93% and 90% for second-generation Moroccan and Turkish women. For *occupational class*, ethnic differences are more visible for

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics. Means and standard deviations.

	Men						Women					
	‘Dutch’		‘Moroccan’		‘Turk’		‘Dutch’		‘Moroccan’		‘Turk’	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Employed	0.97		0.91		0.90		0.96		0.93		0.90	
Managerial/professional occupation	0.53		0.28		0.27		0.46		0.45		0.38	
Primary or low secondary education	0.17		0.31		0.37		0.12		0.20		0.22	
High secondary vocational education	0.34		0.40		0.31		0.34		0.38		0.41	
High secondary academic education	0.04		0.06		0.07		0.09		0.06		0.04	
College vocational education	0.29		0.17		0.18		0.31		0.29		0.20	
College academic education	0.16		0.06		0.07		0.14		0.07		0.11	
Language Index (1–5)	4.16	0.92	2.99	1.26	2.72	1.21	4.16	0.88	3.31	1.16	2.92	1.31
Numeracy Index (1–5)	3.97	1.24	3.27	1.45	3.22	1.55	3.70	1.32	2.80	1.45	2.78	1.56
Parental managerial/professional class	0.21		0.07		0.12		0.33		0.06		0.07	
Parental intermediate class	0.21		0.09		0.10		0.24		0.11		0.07	
Parental skilled working class	0.13		0.29		0.20		0.16		0.22		0.19	
Parental unskilled working class	0.29		0.55		0.58		0.27		0.61		0.67	
Parental basic education	0.37		0.77		0.76		0.10		0.72		0.65	
Parental low secondary education	0.41		0.10		0.10		0.37		0.17		0.18	
Parental high secondary education	0.24		0.08		0.09		0.27		0.06		0.12	
Parental college education	0.25		0.05		0.05		0.26		0.05		0.05	
Cultural Capital Index (1–5)	2.81	1.25	1.29	0.60	1.43	0.78	2.68	1.22	1.33	0.73	1.54	0.85
Age	36.52	5.88	31.43	5.14	32.94	5.42	36.23	5.84	30.37	4.21	32.07	5.26
N	626		82		93		694		83		100	

Note: ‘Dutch’ refers to individuals with both parents born in the Netherlands; ‘Moroccan’ refers to the Moroccan second generation; ‘Turk’ refers to the Turkish second generation (see the Method section).

men than for women. We observe that 53% of men of Dutch origins worked in professional or managerial occupations, with much lower proportions for men who are second-generation Moroccans (28%) and Turks (27%). For women, 46% of those with Dutch-born parents worked in professional or managerial occupations, similar to second-generation Moroccan women (45%), while a much lower proportion of women with Turkish-born parents (38%) worked in these occupations.

Table 1 also shows relevant differences for independent and control variables. For *education*, second-generation Moroccans and Turks were overrepresented in basic and vocational levels. In *skills*, the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants were disadvantaged, especially in linguistic abilities. Ethnic differences in *numeracy abilities* are more visible for women, and in *linguistic proficiency* among men. Individuals with Dutch-born parents were privileged in *parental education*, *parental occupation*, and *cultural capital socialisation*. We observe that the *age* of the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants was lower than for individuals with Dutch-born parents. Finally, we see minor differences between second-generation Moroccans and Turks in both socioeconomic and demographic characteristics.

### Multivariate analyses

Table 2 presents the Logit-AME models for men's likelihood of being employed. In Model 1, we found lower probabilities of being employed among men of Moroccan origins (5%) and Turkish origins (6%) than for their counterparts with Dutch-born parents ( $p < .01$ ). Model 2 shows that, even if education has significant effects on men's likelihood of being employed, the lower employment probabilities for men of Moroccan origins ( $p < .05$ ) and Turkish origins ( $p < .01$ ) remain significant. Model 3 shows insignificant associations between skills and men's likelihood of being employed. Model 4 presents a persistent ethnic gap when education and skills are considered ( $p < .05$ ). By contrast, in Model 5 we observe that, after accounting only for social origins, the effect of ethnicity on men's probabilities of being employed becomes statistically insignificant. Yet, it is important to stress that only cultural capital socialisation, not parental class or parental education, has a significant effect on men's likelihood of being employed. The full model (Model 6) also shows insignificant ethnic differences in men's chances of being employed.

Table 3 presents the Logit-AME regressions for women's probabilities of being employed. Model 1 shows that women with Turkish-born parents are significantly less likely to be employed than women with Dutch-born parents, with a difference of 5% ( $p < .01$ ), but differences between women of Moroccan origins and women with Dutch-born parents are insignificant. The observed ethnic gap for women of Turkish origins remains significant across all models, even if education has significant positive effects on women's likelihood of being employed.

Table 4 presents the Logit-AME regressions for men's probabilities to work in managerial and professional occupations. These analyses are generally consistent with the analyses for men's likelihood of being employed. Model 1 shows that second-generation Moroccan and Turkish men are much less likely than individuals with Dutch-born parents to work in managerial or professional occupations, with significant differences of 28% ( $p < .001$ ). In Model 2, the probabilities of working in privileged occupations for men of Moroccan and Turkish origins are reduced by 45%, after considering the level of schooling, but a strong ethnic gap remains ( $p < .001$ ). Model 3 shows that skills are associated with a reduction of about 60% of the ethnic gap in occupational attainment, but ethnic differences remain significant ( $p < .05$ ), even when both education *and* skills are included (Model 4) ( $p < .01$ ). In Model 5, the ethnic gap in occupational class becomes statistically insignificant when accounting for social origins, in particular parental education and cultural capital, with a strong reduction of the ethnic gap by about 80%. Model 6, the full model, also presents an insignificant ethnic gap in men's occupational class attainment.

Table 5 presents the Logit-AME models for women's access to managerial and professional occupations. Model 1 shows that women with Turkish-born parents have lower probabilities to work in managerial or professional occupations than women with Dutch-born parents (11% gap) ( $p < .05$ ),

**Table 2.** AME logistic regressions. Men's likelihood of being employed.

	M-1		M-2		M-3		M-4		M-5		M-6	
	<i>b</i>	SE										
<i>Ethnicity</i>												
Dutch origins ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Moroccan second-generation	−0.05**	0.02	−0.05*	0.02	−0.04*	0.02	−0.04*	0.02	−0.02	0.02	−0.02	0.02
Turk second-generation	−0.06**	0.02	−0.05**	0.02	−0.04*	0.02	−0.05*	0.02	−0.03	0.02	−0.03	0.02
<i>Education</i>												
Primary or low secondary ( <i>Ref</i> )												
High secondary vocational			0.05**	0.02			0.05**	0.02			0.04*	0.02
High secondary academic			0.08	0.05			0.07	0.05			0.07	0.05
College vocational			0.05*	0.02			0.05*	0.02			0.04	0.02
College academic			0.03	0.02			0.02	0.03			0.01	0.03
<i>Skills</i>												
Language Index (1–5)					0.01	0.01	0	0.01			0.01	0.01
Numeracy Index (1–5)					0	0.01	0.01	0.01			0	0.01
<i>Parental class</i>												
Parent unskilled worker ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent skilled worker									0	0.02	0	0.02
Parent intermediate occupation									−0.01	0.02	−0.01	0.02
Parent manager or professional									−0.01	0.02	0	0.02
<i>Parental education</i>												
Parent low secondary educ.									0.01	0.02	0	0.02
Parent high secondary educ.									0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03
Parent college educ.									0	0.03	−0.01	0.03
<i>Cultural capital socialisation</i>												
Cultural Capital Index (1–5)									0.02*	0.01	0.02*	0.01
Age	0.00*	0	0.00*	0	0	0	0.00*	0	0.00*	0	0.00*	0
Pseudo <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.06		0.1		0.07		0.1		0.08		0.11	
<i>N</i>	801		801		801		801		801		801	

Note: AME show coefficients as probabilities ranging from 0 to 1 (weighted sample for ethnic minorities).

\**p* < .05.

\*\**p* < .01.

\*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table 3.** AME logistic regressions. Women's likelihood of being employed.

	M-1		M-2		M-3		M-4		M-5		M-6	
	<i>b</i>	SE										
<i>Ethnicity</i>												
Dutch origins ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Moroccan second generation	0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.04	0.02	-0.05*	0.02
Turk second generation	-0.05**	0.02	-0.04*	0.02	-0.04*	0.02	-0.04*	0.02	-0.05**	0.02	-0.06**	0.02
<i>Education</i>												
Primary or low secondary ( <i>Ref</i> )												
High secondary vocational			0.04*	0.02			0.04*	0.02			0.04*	0.02
High secondary academic			0.08	0.04			0.08	0.05			0.09	0.04
College vocational			0.06**	0.02			0.06**	0.02			0.07**	0.02
College academic			0.06*	0.03			0.05	0.03			0.07*	0.03
<i>Skills</i>												
Language Index (1-5)					0.01	0.01	0	0.01			0	0.01
Numeracy Index (1-5)					0	0.01	0	0.01			0	0.01
<i>Parental class</i>												
Parent unskilled worker ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent skilled worker									0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Parent intermediate occupation									0.01	0.02	0	0.02
Parent manager or professional									0.01	0.02	0	0.02
<i>Parental education</i>												
Parent below sec. educ. ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent low secondary educ.									-0.01	0.02	-0.02	0.02
Parent high secondary educ.									0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Parent college educ.									0.02	0.03	0	0.03
<i>Cultural capital socialisation</i>												
Cultural Capital Index (1-5)									0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
<i>Age</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pseudo <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.04		0.08		0.05		0.08		0.05		0.1	
<i>N</i>	877		877		877		877		877		877	

Note: AME show coefficients as probabilities ranging from 0 to 1 (weighted sample for ethnic minorities).

\**p* < .05.

\*\**p* < .01.

\*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table 4.** AME logistic regressions. Men's access to managerial and professional occupations.

	M-1		M-2		M-3		M-4		M-5		M-6	
	<i>b</i>	SE										
<i>Ethnicity</i>												
Dutch origins ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Moroccan second generation	-0.28***	0.04	-0.14***	0.04	-0.13*	0.05	-0.12**	0.04	-0.04	0.06	-0.05	0.05
Turk second generation	-0.28***	0.05	-0.16***	0.04	-0.10*	0.04	-0.12**	0.04	-0.06	0.06	-0.07	0.05
<i>Education</i>												
Primary or low secondary ( <i>Ref</i> )												
High secondary vocational			0.17***	0.04			0.15***	0.04			0.13**	0.04
High secondary academic			0.33***	0.06			0.29***	0.06			0.27***	0.06
College vocational			0.51***	0.03			0.46***	0.04			0.43***	0.04
College academic			0.58***	0.05			0.51***	0.05			0.47***	0.06
<i>Skills</i>												
Language Index (1–5)					0.10***	0.02	0.02	0.02			0.02	0.02
Numeracy Index (1–5)					0.06***	0.01	0.03**	0.01			0.03**	0.01
<i>Parental class</i>												
Parent unskilled worker ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent skilled worker									0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
Parent intermediate occupation									0.06	0.05	0.04	0.04
Parent manager or professional									0.04	0.05	0.01	0.04
<i>Parental education</i>												
Parent below sec. educ. ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent Low Secondary Educ.									0.1	0.05	0.02	0.05
Parent high secondary educ.									0.15**	0.05	0.01	0.05
Parent college educ.									0.29***	0.07	0.04	0.06
<i>Cultural capital Socialisation</i>												
Cultural Capital Index (1–5)									0.06***	0.02	0.03*	0.01
<i>Age</i>	0	0	0	0	-0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pseudo <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.05		0.26		0.13		0.27		0.12		0.28	
<i>N</i>	741		741		741		741		741		741	

Note: AME show coefficients as probabilities ranging from 0 to 1 (weighted sample for ethnic minorities).

\**p* < .05.

\*\**p* < .01.

\*\*\**p* < .001.

**Table 5.** AME logistic regressions. Women's access to managerial and professional occupations.

	M-1		M-2		M-3		M-4		M-5		M-6	
	<i>b</i>	SE										
<i>Ethnicity</i>												
Dutch origins ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Moroccan second generation	-0.04	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.1	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.19**	0.06	0.16**	0.06
Turk second generation	-0.11*	0.05	-0.02	0.04	0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.11*	0.05	0.12*	0.05
<i>Education</i>												
Primary or low secondary ( <i>Ref</i> )												
High secondary vocational			0.15**	0.05			0.12*	0.05			0.1	0.05
High secondary academic			0.22**	0.07			0.17*	0.07			0.13	0.07
College vocational			0.50***	0.04			0.44***	0.05			0.38***	0.05
College academic			0.59***	0.06			0.50***	0.06			0.42***	0.07
<i>Skills</i>												
Language Index (1-5)					0.11***	0.02	0.03	0.02			0.02	0.02
Numeracy Index (1-5)					0.05***	0.01	0.03*	0.01			0.03**	0.01
<i>Parental class</i>												
Parent unskilled worker ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent skilled worker									0.04	0.05	0.03	0.04
Parent intermediate occupation									0.10*	0.05	0.07	0.04
Parent manager or professional									0.13**	0.05	0.07	0.04
<i>Parental education</i>												
Parent below sec. educ. ( <i>Ref</i> )												
Parent low secondary educ.									0.07	0.05	0.03	0.05
Parent high secondary educ.									0.20***	0.05	0.10*	0.05
Parent college educ.									0.28***	0.06	0.11*	0.05
<i>Cultural capital socialisation</i>												
Cultural Capital Index (1-5)									0.04**	0.02	0.02	0.01
<i>Age</i>	-0.01**	0	0.00***	0	-0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pseudo <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.01		0.18		0.08		0.19		0.08		0.2	
<i>N</i>	829		829		829		829		829		829	

Note: AME show coefficients as probabilities ranging from 0 to 1 (weighted sample for ethnic minorities).

\**p* < .05.

\*\**p* < .01.

\*\*\**p* < .001.

but we find insignificant effects for women with Moroccan-born parents. The disadvantage of women of Turkish origins, however, disappears when either human capital or social origins are considered. In fact, the sign of the coefficients for the two ethnic minority groups becomes positive, and significant, when we account for differences in social origins.

## Discussion

This study analysed the labour market outcomes of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Netherlands, one critical question to understand the integration of these two ethnic groups in Western European countries. The NELLS data not only allowed us to address the role of education, like in previous studies, but also the role of other understudied factors, like human capital (i.e. linguistic proficiency, numeracy abilities) and socioeconomic origins (i.e. parental occupation, parental education, cultural capital socialisation). In so doing, our analytical approach arguably contributes to the ethnic penalties literature for second-generation minorities.

At a *general level*, analyses showed substantial ethnic inequalities in labour market outcomes. For men, individuals with Moroccan-born and Turkish-born parents were significantly less likely to be employed or to work in managerial and professional occupations, as compared to individuals with Dutch-born parents. For women, results were more moderate and differed by ethnic group. Women with Turkish migrant parents were less likely to be employed and work in privileged occupations than women with Dutch-born parents. Yet, we found insignificant differences between women of Moroccan-born parents and the ethnic-national majority. The latter can be interpreted in line with scholarship suggesting that young women of Moroccan ancestries not only represent a more heterogeneous and secularised group than women with Turkish-born parents, but might also be more oriented towards the job market (Crul and Doornik 2003; Slootman 2014). Regrettably, our study does not allow us to disentangle which sociocultural mechanisms explain the different results for women of Moroccan origins and those from Turkish origins. Future studies should further address the intersection of ethnicity and gender in the Dutch labour market.

We paid particular attention to the conditions under which second-generation minorities are disadvantaged in the labour market. The *Education Hypothesis* (H-1) anticipated that the ethnic gap in the labour market is due to differences in schooling. We found general little support for this hypothesis. For being employed, we found a persistent ethnic gap net of schooling levels. Regarding the access to managerial and professional occupations, men's ethnic inequalities in occupational class persisted substantially after accounting for education, yet women's ethnic gap in occupational attainment was no longer observed after considering educational differences. Overall, the role of education in affecting the disadvantage of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the Dutch labour market seems modest.

The *Skills Hypothesis* (H-2) posited that differences in skills partly explain the disadvantage of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the labour market. These expectations were generally not corroborated. Skills had insignificant effects on individuals' access to employment, and—not surprisingly—did not affect the ethnic gap in the likelihood of being employed. For occupational class, the role of skills differed substantially by gender. Ethnic inequalities in men's access to privileged occupations were only partly reduced when accounting for skills. Meanwhile, for women's access to privileged occupations, ethnic disparities became insignificant when accounting for skills. Interestingly, numeracy abilities, but not linguistic proficiency, had an effect on occupational class net of education, an important finding to understand the mechanisms behind labour market outcomes.

The *Social Origins Hypothesis* (H-3) anticipated that second-generation Moroccans and Turks are disadvantaged in the labour market due to their low socioeconomic resources in the family of origin. Results showed that, indeed, social origins substantially influence ethnic inequalities in labour market outcomes, with the sole exception of the likelihood of being employed among women of Turkish origins. Social origins had indeed a relevant influence on the ethnic gap in men's likelihood of being employed, and generally for individuals' occupational attainment. We found that differences in

cultural capital socialisation influence particularly ethnic stratification in the labour market, to a higher extent than other key measures of social origins, namely parental class and parental education. This finding complements previous research on educational inequalities (Farkas 1996; Klein, Biedinger, and Becker 2014) by offering new relevant evidence in the labour market literature. This suggests that being socialised in cultural contexts outside the dominant 'middle-class culture' is an important factor in influencing ethnic disadvantage in labour market trajectories.

The *Ethnic Penalties Hypothesis* (H-4) posed an alternative expectation; that ethnic inequalities in the labour market persist after accounting for both human capital factors and social origins. This hypothesis was only partly corroborated. The fact that second-generation Moroccans and Turks have parents with low material, educational, and cultural resources, rather than 'pure' ethnic/racial factors, seems to critically affect their disadvantaged labour market outcomes. Yet, human capital, generally speaking, had a minor role in reducing the labour market disadvantage of ethnic minorities. In other words, second-generation Moroccans and Turks are substantially disadvantaged in the Dutch labour market, even under equal qualifications and cognitive/linguistic skills. Further, second-generation Turkish women remained disadvantaged, not only after accounting for human capital, but also when holding constant their material and cultural disadvantage in the family or origin, offering strong support for the cultural explanation of the ethnic penalties approach. Altogether, ethnic penalties based on cultural reasons seem to operate in specific domains, but the intersection of ethnicity and socioeconomic factors seems particularly powerful in explaining the disadvantage of second-generation Moroccans and Turks in the labour market.

This study has implications for scientific and policy debates. Our findings suggest that social origins are linked to the labour market disadvantage of second-generation Moroccans and Turks. Therefore, public policies should address the direct consequences of growing up in socioeconomic disadvantage for ethnic inequalities in the labour market, with particular attention to cultural capital, one important aspect that received little attention in previous studies. Human capital was found to have quite moderate effects. However, especially for women, results suggest that achieving high levels of education and cognitive and linguistic skills increases the labour market chances of second-generation minorities. Consequently, human capital investments need to be considered to equalise labour market opportunities across ethnic groups. Still, we found some evidence for ethnic penalties. The empirical evidence, at least for Moroccan and Turkish second generations in the Netherlands, suggests that part of the disadvantage of ethnic minorities in the labour market is due to ethnic/racial factors, rather than to job-related skills. This implies that migration and ethnicity policies should seriously address the issue of ethnic-cultural relations in shaping ethnic disadvantage in the labour market.

Our study has four limitations that need to be mentioned. One problem of our analyses is the small number of cases for the subsamples of Moroccan and Turkish second-generation minorities. This is particularly visible when studying the chances of being employed, due to low proportions of unemployed individuals. This limitation is important when considering the predictive power of our statistical models, which might underestimate some existing ethnic inequalities in the labour market. Future studies using larger samples with access to rich human capital and social origins measures like the ones we analysed, should further investigate these research questions.

The second limitation deals with the conceptualisation of ethnic minorities in our subsamples. We conceptualised as second-generation minorities not only Dutch-born individuals with Moroccan and Turkish migrant parents, but also those who migrated with their parents to the Netherlands before starting primary school (age 6). This decision, also made in some previous studies (e.g. Heath and Cheung 2007), is based on the idea that second-generation minorities who arrived to the host country before starting primary school were entirely educated, and essentially socialised, in the host country. Additional analyses with only Dutch-born individuals as ethnic minorities (not shown) were generally consistent with the analyses presented here, yet results were more robust with a larger subsample of ethnic minorities.

The third limitation deals with the field of study. The fact that we do not have information on the field of study can be problematic to disentangle ethnic penalties in labour market outcomes. Previous studies suggest that ethnic minorities not only tend to enrol in vocational education that leads to less prestigious occupations than more academic programmes, but are overrepresented in fields of study with relatively low occupational rewards (Gerber and Cheung 2008). This question needs to be addressed in future studies on ethnic penalties.

The fourth limitation deals with our variables of skills. Our skills measures, despite offering rich cognitive and linguistic information, do not fully capture job-related skills. We had no access to important measures of skills in contemporary post-industrial labour markets, such as 'soft skills', socio-emotional abilities, and work attitudes. Previous research suggests that ethnic minorities tend to be more output-oriented at the workplace, while workers from the ethnic-national majority rather use their personality traits and social resources as a strategy to achieve job promotion (Siebers and Van Gastel 2015), being translated into a possible (unobserved) ethnic bias in how companies hire and promote their employees. Additionally, our measures of linguistic proficiency capture an important, but insufficient, dimension of language use. Research on the Dutch context found that (first-generation) minorities with high linguistic proficiency and academic qualifications suffer discrimination in the labour market, while employers refer to their 'imperfect' accent as a discriminatory excuse for not hiring or promoting them (Ghorashi and Van Tilburg 2006). These dimensions related to skills-related factors should receive further attention in studies on the labour market outcomes of second-generation minorities.

To conclude, future studies should provide new evidence on the labour market outcomes of the second generation, including the children of Moroccan and Turkish migrants in Western Europe. First, scholars should further examine a 'gendered' ethnic disadvantage in the labour market, in the light of the gender differences that we found (e.g. Farris and Jong 2014). Second, future studies should further investigate new variables of social background that we could not address here. In particular, specific analyses of the links between social capital, neighbourhoods, and social exclusion might shed new light into the contextual factors that affect the labour market disadvantage of the second generation (Mollenkopf and Champeny 2009; Portes 1998). Third, new studies on second-generation minorities can benefit from using skill measures that we consider (i.e. linguistic proficiency), but also measures of 'non-cognitive' skills that potentially affect labour market outcomes, as well as variables on cultural beliefs and religiosity (Heath and Martin 2013). Fourth, scholars should consider the heterogeneous impact that social origins and human capital have on distinct ethnic groups, so as to better understand how ethnic stratification operates in the labour market (Zuccotti 2015). We hope that our study will contribute to these and other important questions for the ethnic penalties literature on labour market outcomes.

## Acknowledgements

The research for this article was conducted at Amsterdam, the Netherlands. Previous versions of the paper were discussed at the ISOL seminars in November 2013, organised by Harry Ganzeboom and Ineke Maas (Utrecht, the Netherlands) and presented at the 'Sociology Day' in May 2014, organised by the Dutch/Flemish Sociological Association (Antwerp, Belgium), and the '2015 RC-28 Spring Meeting' (Tilburg, the Netherlands). The authors want to thank the participants at these events for their helpful comments and suggestions on the paper.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Note

1. Our sample contained second-generation Moroccans and Turks with one parent who was not originally from Morocco, Turkey, or the Netherlands. These cases only included 3% of second-generation Moroccans (three

parents from Algeria; one from Indonesia; and one from Germany) and 3% of second-generation Turks (one from Greece; one from Bulgaria; two from Suriname; and one from the former Yugoslavia). Additional analyses (not shown) excluding these cases were consistent with the analyses presented here. We kept these cases to increase the number of cases in our subsamples and to strengthen the robustness of statistical models.

## References

- Barone, C., and H. G. van de Werfhorst. 2011. "Education, Cognitive Skills and Earnings in Comparative Perspective." *International Sociology* 26 (4): 483–502.
- Becker, G. S. 1964. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Blommaert, L., F. Van Tubergen, and M. Coenders. 2012. "Implicit and Explicit Interethnic Attitudes and Ethnic Discrimination in Hiring." *Social Science Research* 41: 61–73.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Breen, R. 2004. *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CBS - Statistics Netherlands. 2014. *Population: Sex, Age, Origin and Generation*. The Hague: CBS.
- Chiswick, B. R. 1991. "Speaking, Reading, and Earnings among Low-skilled Immigrants." *Journal of Labour Economics* 9 (2): 149–170.
- Chiswick, B. R., Y. L. Lee, and P. W. Miller. 2003. "Schooling, Literacy, Numeracy and Labour Market Success." *Economic Record* 79 (245): 165–181.
- Chiswick, B. R., and P. W. Miller. 1999. "Language Skills and Earnings among Legalized Aliens." *Journal of Population Economics* 12 (1): 63–89.
- Collins, R. 1979. *The Credential Society: A Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.
- Connor, P., and M. Koenig. 2015. "Explaining the Muslim Employment Gap in Western Europe: Individual-level Effects and Ethno-religious Penalties." *Social Science Research* 49: 191–201.
- Crul, M., and J. Doornik. 2003. "The Turkish and Moroccan Second-generation in the Netherlands: Divergent Trends between and Polarization within the Two Groups." *International Migration Review* 37 (4): 1039–1064.
- Crul, M., and H. Vermeulen. 2003. "The Second-generation in Europe." *International Migration Review* 37 (4): 965–986.
- De Graaf, P. M., M. Kalmijn, G. Kraaykamp, and Ch. Monden. 2010. *The Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS wave 1)*. Dataset. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Tilburg University & Radboud University Nijmegen.
- Erikson, R., and J. H. Goldthorpe. 1992. *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farkas, G. 1996. *Human Capital or Cultural Capital? Ethnicity and Poverty Groups in an Urban School District*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Farris, S. R., and S. De Jong. 2014. "Discontinuous Intersections: Second-generation Immigrant Girls in Transition from School to Work." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (9): 1505–1525.
- Fleischmann, F., K. Phalet, P. Deboosere, and K. Neels. 2012. "Comparing Concepts of Ethnicity in Ethnic Composition Measures: Local Community Contexts and the Educational Attainment of the Second Generation in Belgium." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (10): 1513–1531.
- Gerber, T. P., and S. Y. Cheung. 2008. "Horizontal Stratification in Postsecondary Education: Forms, Explanations, and Implications." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 299–318.
- Ghorashi, H., and M. Van Tilburg. 2006. "'When is My Dutch Good Enough?' Experiences of Refugee Women with Dutch Labour Organizations." *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 7 (1): 51–70.
- Gracia, P. 2015. "Parent–Child Leisure Activities and Cultural Capital in the United Kingdom: The Gendered Effects of Education and Social Class." *Social Science Research* 52 (4): 290–302.
- Heath, A., and S. Cheung. 2007. *Unequal Chances. Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heath, A., and J. Martin. 2013. "Can Religious Affiliation Explain 'Ethnic' Inequalities in the Labour Market?" *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36 (6): 1005–1027.
- Heath, A., C. Rethon, and E. Kilpi. 2008. "The Second-generation in Western Europe: Education, Unemployment, and Occupational Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 34: 211–235.
- Kalter, F., N. Granato, and C. Kristen. 2007. "Disentangling Recent Trends of the Second-generation's Structural Assimilation in Germany." In *From Origin to Destination. Trends and Mechanisms in Social Stratification Research*, edited by S. Scherer, R. Pollak, G. Otte, and M. Gangl, 214–245. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Kalter, F., and I. Kogan. 2006. "Ethnic Inequalities at the Transition from School to Work in Belgium and Spain: Discrimination or Self-exclusion?" *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 24 (3): 259–274.

- Klein, O., N. Biedinger, and B. Becker. 2014. "The Effect of Reading Aloud Daily - Differential Effects of Reading to Native-born German and Turkish-origin Immigrant Children." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 38: 43–56.
- Kristen, C., and N. Granato. 2007. "The Educational Attainment of the Second-generation in Germany Social Origins and Ethnic Inequality." *Ethnicities* 7 (3): 343–366.
- Lareau, A. 2003. *Unequal Chances: Class, Race and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lessard-Phillips, L., R. Fibbi, and P. Wanner. 2012. "Assessing the Labour Market Position and Its Determinants for the Second Generation." In *The European Second Generation Compared: Does the Integration Context Matter?* edited by M. Crul, J. Schneider, and F. Lelie, 165–224. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Marks, G. N. 2005. "Accounting for Immigrant Non-immigrant Differences in Reading and Mathematics in Twenty Countries." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28: 925–946.
- Mollenkopf, J., and A. Champeny. 2009. "The Neighbourhood Context for Second-generation Education and Labour Market Outcomes in New York." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (7): 1181–1199.
- Mood, C. 2010. "Logistic Regression: Why We cannot Do What We think We Can Do, and What We Can Do About It." *European Sociological Review* 26 (1): 67–82.
- Morgan, S. L., D. B. Grusky, and G. S. Fields, eds. 2006. *Mobility and Inequality: Frontiers of Research from Sociology and Economics*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Portes, A. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–24.
- Portes, A., and R. Schaufli. 1994. "Language and the Second Generation: Bilingualism Yesterday and Today." *International Migration Review* 28 (4): 640–661.
- Portes, A., and M. Zhou. 1993. "The New Second-generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1): 74–96.
- Roelandt, T., and J. Veenman. 1992. "An Emerging Ethnic Underclass in the Netherlands? Some Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 19 (1): 129–141.
- Siebers, H., and M. H. Dennissen. 2015. "Is It Cultural Racism? Discursive Exclusion and Oppression of Migrants in the Netherlands." *Current Sociology* 63 (3): 470–489.
- Siebers, H., and J. Van Gastel. 2015. "Why Migrants Earn Less: In Search of the Factors Producing the Ethno-migrant Pay Gap in a Dutch Public Organization." *Work, Employment & Society* 29 (3): 371–391.
- Silberman, R., R. Alba, and I. Fournier. 2007. "Segmented Assimilation in France? Discrimination in the Labour Market Against the Second Generation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (1): 1–27.
- Slootman, M. W. 2014. *Soulmates: Reinvention of Ethnic Identification among Higher Educated Second Generation Moroccan and Turkish Dutch*. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Tesser, P., and J. Dronkers. 2007. "Equal Opportunities or Social Closure in the Netherlands?" In *Unequal Chances. Ethnic Minorities in Western Labour Markets*, edited by A. Heath and S. Cheung, 359–402. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, M., and M. Crul. 2007. "The Second Generation in Europe and the United States: How is the Transatlantic Debate Relevant for Further Research on the European Second Generation?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33 (7): 1025–1041.
- Werfhorst, H. G., and F. Van Tubergen. 2007. "Ethnicity, Schooling, and Merit in the Netherlands." *Ethnicities* 7 (3): 416–444.
- Wong, C. A., J. S. Eccles, and A. Sameroff. 2003. "The Influence of Ethnic Discrimination and Ethnic Identification on African American Adolescents' School and Socioemotional Adjustment." *Journal of Personality* 71 (6): 1197–1232.
- Van Tubergen, F. 2004. *The Integration of Immigrants in Cross-national Perspective. Origins, Destination, and Community Effects*. Utrecht: ICS-dissertation.
- Van Tubergen, F., and M. Kalmijn. 2005. "Destination Language Proficiency in Cross National Perspective: A Study of Immigrant Groups in Nine Western Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 110 (5): 1412–1457.
- Zhou, M. 1997. "Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation." *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 975–1008.
- Zuccotti, C. V. 2015. "Do Parents Matter? Revisiting Ethnic Penalties in Occupation among Second-generation Ethnic Minorities in England and Wales." *Sociology* 49 (2): 229–251.

**Appendix.**

Table A1. Definition of skills measures

(1) *Linguistic proficiency:*

After every word, there are five options given. Select the definition that best fits the word.

1. Well-off <i>Welgesteld</i>	a. strong <i>sterk</i>	<u>b. rich</u> <i>rijk</i>	c. satisfied <i>tevreden</i>	d. together <i>samen</i>	e. pauper <i>armlastig</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
2. Pure <i>Zuiver</i>	a. milk <i>melk</i>	b. cloudy <i>troebel</i>	c. stingy <i>gierig</i>	<u>d. pure</u> <i>Puur</i>	e. strange <i>vreemd</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
3. Industry <i>Vlijt</i>	a. arm <i>arm</i>	b. strong <i>sterk</i>	<u>c. zeal</u> <i>ijver</i>	d. rich <i>Rijk</i>	e. tired <i>vermoeid</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
4. Barely <i>Amper</i>	a. flow <i>stroom</i>	b. medicine <i>geneesmiddel</i>	c. fruit <i>vrucht</i>	<u>d. hardly</u> <i>nauwelijks</i>	e. neatly <i>Netjes</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
5. Scanty <i>Karig</i>	a. narrow <i>small</i>	b. bald <i>kaal</i>	c. cold <i>koud</i>	d. thin <i>Dun</i>	<u>e. economical</u> <i>zuinig</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
6. Tiny <i>Minim</i>	a. subtract <i>afrekken</i>	b. loss <i>verlies</i>	c. difference <i>verschil</i>	d. mimicry <i>mimiek</i>	<u>e. insignificant</u> <i>onbeduidend</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
7. Abruptly <i>Abrupt</i>	a. heavy <i>zwaar</i>	b. separately <i>apart</i>	<u>c. suddenly</u> <i>plotseling</i>	d. vain <i>vergeefs</i>	e. insufficient <i>onvoldoende</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
8. Famous <i>Fameus</i>	<u>a. famous</u> <i>beroemd</i>	b. worthy <i>waardig</i>	c. known <i>bekend</i>	d. nice <i>aardig</i>	e. polite <i>beleefd</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>
9. Bombast <i>Bombast</i>	a. disguise <i>vermomming</i>	b. peel <i>schil</i>	c. garnet <i>granaat</i>	<u>d. pomposity</u> <i>gezwollenheid</i>	e. tree species <i>boomsort</i>	f. Do not know <i>weet niet</i>

Note: Standardised measures range from 1 (0–1 correct answers) to 5 (8–9 correct answers).

(2) *Numeracy abilities:*

We show you five numbers in a sequence. What number follows the sequence logically?

<b>1. Series:</b> 0, 1, 3, 6, 10?	a. 16	<u>b. 15</u>	c. 12	d. 6	e. do not know
<b>2. Series:</b> 1, 1, 2, 3, 5?	<u>a. 8</u>	b. 7	c. 10	d. 3	e. do not know
<b>3. Series:</b> 21, 20, 18, 15, 11?	a. 26	b. 17	c. 8	<u>d. 6</u>	e. do not know
<b>4. Series:</b> 1109, 1116, 1123?	<u>a. 1130</u>	b. 1131	c. 1128	<u>d. 2134</u>	e. do not know
<b>5. Series:</b> 128, 64, 32?	a. 22	<u>b. 16</u>	c. 8	d. 64	e. do not know

Note: Standardised measures range from 1 (0–1 correct answers) to 5 (5 correct answers).