

Different views from mobile EU citizens on the role of formal and informal support after migration

Master thesis

Student: Gosse Bouter, S2527863

Supervisors: Prof. dr. Helga de Valk (NIDI/UG) & Petra de Jong M.Sc. (NIDI)

Faculty of Spatial Sciences

Master Population Studies

Population Research Centre, University of Groningen

29-08-2018

Abstract

Free mobility within the EU has made it easier for EU citizens to migrate to a country of their preference. Previous studies looking into the relationship between migration and welfare often looked at whether generous welfare systems are an incentive for migration. But little is known about how mobile EU citizens view their support system after migration and who are providers of support. This study has therefore explored how mobile EU citizens from different welfare regimes view the role of formal and informal support in the country of destination and who they mention as sources of informal support. A secondary data analysis was performed which consisted of 28 in-depth interviews that were conducted with Polish, Spanish and British EU citizens residing in the Netherlands. The analysis focused on the role of formal, kin and non-kin support in three welfare domains: healthcare, unemployment and childcare. This qualitative study showed that how migrants view the role of formal and informal support after migration depends several aspects and a clear distinction exists between the support provided by kin and by non-kin. Migrants from a more family-oriented country view the role of formal support as more important and informal support as less important after migration. Migrants from a not family-oriented country experience little difference in how they view the role of formal and informal support prior to and after migration. The role of kin and especially the role of parents and grandparent is evident in the domains of healthcare and childcare. The role of non-kin is evident in the domain of unemployment, especially friends and colleagues provide information concerning unemployment benefits and employment opportunities.

Key words: Mobile EU citizens, migration, formal support, informal support, kin, non-kin

Table of contents

ABSTRACT

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. BACKGROUND..... | 1 |
| 1.2. OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH PROBLEM | 2 |
| 1.3. STRUCTURE THESIS..... | 3 |
| 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK | 5 |
| 2.1. TASK SPECIFIC MODEL | 5 |
| 2.2. WELFARE REGIMES | 7 |
| 2.3. CROWDING IN AND CROWDING OUT | 9 |
| 2.4. LIFE COURSE APPROACH..... | 11 |
| 3. DATA AND METHODOLOGY | 13 |
| 3.1. DATA | 13 |
| 3.2. ANALYSIS | 16 |
| 4. RESULTS | 17 |
| 4.1. SOURCES OF INFORMAL SUPPORT | 17 |
| 4.1.1. <i>The role of kin</i> | 17 |
| 4.1.2. <i>The role of non-kin</i> | 18 |
| 4.2. HEALTHCARE | 20 |
| 4.2.1. <i>The role of formal support</i> | 20 |
| 4.2.2. <i>The role of informal support</i> | 21 |
| 4.3. UNEMPLOYMENT | 22 |
| 4.3.1. <i>The role of formal support</i> | 22 |
| 4.3.2. <i>The role of informal support</i> | 23 |
| 4.4. CHILDCARE | 25 |
| 4.4.1. <i>The role of formal support</i> | 25 |
| 4.4.2. <i>The role of informal support</i> | 27 |
| 4.5. GENDER DIFFERENCES | 28 |
| 5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION | 30 |
| 5.1. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS | 30 |
| 5.2. CONCLUSION..... | 34 |
| 5.3. LIMITATIONS | 35 |
| 5.4. RECOMMENDATIONS | 36 |
| REFERENCES | 38 |
| APPENDIX | 41 |

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

In 2017 the total migrant stock residing in one of the 28 member states of the European Union (EU) was 57.3 million (Eurostat, 2018). Of those migrants, 36.9 million were from non-EU member states. The other part of the migrants, 20.4 million, was born in an EU member state, representing the stock of mobile EU citizens who have been residing, or who are expected to reside in an EU member state for a period of at least 12 months (Eurostat, 2018). And from the year 2000 onwards the number of mobile EU citizens residing in the Netherlands gradually increased from approximately 133,000 in 2000, up to almost 234,000 in 2017.

The removal of internal borders and freedom of movement within the EU has made it easier for EU citizens to migrate to a country of their preference. Differences in welfare generosity exist between EU member states and countries can be categorised into different welfare regime typologies, which are based on shared characteristics of formal support expenditures (Esping-Andersen, 1990). Besides the formal support expenditures, the patterns of and attitudes towards informal support differ as well between welfare regimes (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005). The relationship between the increase of migrants and welfare has received a lot of academic attention in recent years.

Various studies looked into the relationship between the amount of welfare expenditures in countries and the number of migrants moving towards these countries. The results differ from no evidence of welfare as a pull factor for migrants (e.g. Giulietti, Guzi, Kahanec & Zimmermann, 2013), to strong support (e.g. Razin & Wahba, 2015) and a limited economic effect of welfare in between (e.g. De Giorgi & Pellizzari, 2009). Other studies looked into the question of whether migrants are more likely to receive welfare benefits than the native population (e.g. Huber & Oberdabernig, 2016; Mau & Burckhardt, 2009).

Previous studies looking into the relationship between welfare and migrants often put emphasis on the country of destination, without considering the situation in the country of origin. Besides that, studies often gave a rather one-sided view of provided support by only focussing on formal support, without acknowledging the importance of the informal network in providing various support tasks (Litwak, 1985; Messeri, Silverstein & Litwak, 1993). Informal support is unpaid support provided in various welfare domains by kin and non-kin (Conkova, Fokkema & Dykstra, 2018; Litwak, 1985). Whereas formal support is often institutionalised and provided by paid trained professionals (Litwak, 1985; Messeri et al., 1993). Furthermore, formal support has often been characterised as an incentive for people to migrate (e.g. Borjas, 1999; Razin & Wahba, 2015), but little is known about how migrants actually view the support they receive and who provides informal support in the country of destination.

1.2. Objectives and research problem

The aim of this study is to better understand how mobile EU citizens from different welfare regimes view the role of formal and informal support after migration and who mobile EU citizens mention as sources of informal support. Hereinafter mobile EU citizens are referred to as migrants. In order to examine this the following two research questions are formulated: ‘‘How do migrants view the role of informal support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare in relation to formal support after migration?’’ and ‘‘Do migrants refer to informal support in the domains of healthcare, unemployment and childcare and if so, who are mentioned as sources of informal support?’’

The following sub questions will help to answer the two research questions:

- Are there differences in the way formal and informal support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare are viewed by migrants depending on the country of origin and related support regime?
- How do migrants experience the role of kin as a source of support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare after migration in the country of origin and destination?
- How do migrants experience the role of non-kin as a source of support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare after migration in the country of origin and destination?

This study draws on 28 in-depth interviews with mobile EU citizens from three different countries; Poland, Spain and the United Kingdom (UK), all residing in the Netherlands at the time of the interview. Each country can be categorised into a different welfare regime with specific welfare expenditure characteristics. The welfare domains under study are chosen because based on the task specific model it can be expected that informal support is provided in these domains. This study complements current research by shedding light on not only the role of kin, but also on the role of non-kin as sources of informal support after migration. Furthermore it emphasises the importance of taking both the country of origin and destination into account to provide a better understanding of how migrants view formal and informal support.

1.3. Structure thesis

In this section the background, objective and research questions have been presented. In the theoretical framework three theories on the role of formal and informal support providers, differences between welfare regimes, the interplay between formal and informal support and one framework in which the role of formal and informal support can be studied are presented.

The data and methodology section provides information on the data used in the analysis. The qualitative research methods are specified as well. The results of the data analysis are presented in the results section. The results section is followed by the discussion of the results, concluding remarks, limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Task specific model

Prior research on informal support has often featured intergenerational solidarity, merely looking into support patterns within the parent-child dyad (e.g. Bordone & de Valk, 2016; Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Conkova & King, 2018; Hammarström, 2005). Yet, support can be provided by various actors within and outside the family (Conkova et al., 2018; Litwak, 1985; Litwak & Szelenyi, 1969; Messeri et al., 1993). The sociological task specific model emphasises the nature of support tasks and takes both formal and informal welfare support into account. There are multiple sources of support, often denoted as kin, non-kin and professionals (Conkova & King, 2018; Litwak, 1985; Litwak & Szelenyi, 1969; Messeri et al., 1993). Formal support is often institutionalised and is provided by paid trained professionals, while informal support is unpaid support provided by kin and non-kin. Kin can be subdivided into: the partner, parents, children, siblings and other kin, while non-kin can be subdivided into: friends, colleagues and neighbours.

The task specific model proposes that individuals will approach kin, non-kin or professionals based on their alignment of structural features of the relationship with support providers and required support tasks (Messeri et al., 1993). That is, individuals approach those in their social support network based on their ability to perform specific tasks, rather than kinship, gender or cultural norms and values (Litwak, 1985).

To differentiate the type of support provided by the different support groups, the task specific model identifies four structural features: proximity, length of commitment, commonality of lifestyle and support group size (Litwak, 1985). In order to further specify task characteristics of formal support providers, Messeri et al. (1993) introduce three additional features: type of motivation, division of labour and level of technical knowledge.

Other than the match between the required task and features of the support group, the task specific model suggests no order of preference in support groups (Litwak, 1985). But a link between specific support tasks and different sources of support does exist (Litwak, 1985; Messeri et al., 1993). Formal support is for instance thought of to be the optimal support group when medical knowledge or permanent healthcare is necessary, while someone who is looking for information or a job may turn to non-kin. Because non-kin ties often share a similar background and have access to new social networks through which information can be accessed and it concerns an occasional short term commitment (Conkova et al., 2018; Messeri et al., 1993). The bond of non-kin ties are defined by commonalities in lifestyle and are based on voluntary interaction, whereas kin ties can be morally and legally obliged to provide support (Messeri et al., 1993). The bond of kin ties is often strong and long-lasting and the type of support provided by kin can therefore be diverse, ranging from financial help by parents for which proximity is not necessary, to daily personal care provided by partners, as proximity and long term commitment are essential for this kind of support (Bengtson, 2001; Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Litwak, 1985; Messeri et al., 1993).

Besides the articulation of a link between specific support tasks and support groups, another distinction can be made. A distinction of gender is important to consider when thinking about individual differences in receiving and providing support (Brandt & Deindl, 2013). Women provide more often intensive help in household tasks and personal care than men. Whereas men provide more often occasional practical support and financial means (Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Fernández-Alonso & Jaime-Castillo, 2015). In return, women tend to receive more help from kin and non-kin ties than men do (Brandt, Haberkern & Szydlik, 2009).

The task specific model gives a general understanding of who are mentioned as providers of informal support and which support tasks they provide. Besides that, it emphasises the alignment between structural features of the relationship with support providers and the

support tasks. By migrating to a different country the relationship between the migrant and its support network changes, which makes it likely to have different support providers in the country of destination and the country of origin.

2.2. Welfare regimes

In order to understand how migrants view the role of formal and informal support, it is important to know how the generosity of welfare expenditures and attitudes towards informal support between countries differ from each other. In his seminal work, Esping-Andersen (1990) identified three ideal types of contemporary western welfare regimes: liberal, corporatist and social democratic. Each welfare regime with specific political elements and social welfare expenditure characteristics (Burgoon & Baxandall, 2004; Esping-Andersen, 1990; Jingjing, Nelson & Stephens, 2008). As these regimes are considered ideal types, the real world exhibits additional more complex hybrid variations (Arts & Gelissen, 2002).

The liberal regime is characterised by modest universal transfers and social security making use of a means-tested assistance. Individuality and primacy of the market function are at the foreground of the welfare plans. Esping-Andersen described the liberal regime as ‘‘one where the limits of welfare equal the marginal propensity to opt for welfare instead of work’’ (1990, p. 26). The liberal regime can be observed in the UK. In the corporatist regime, social insurance is linked to the working career of an individual. It is partially based on status and social class depending on the type of labour association, and is formed after the male breadwinner model. The corporatist regime is characterised by a moderate level of decommodification. Compared to the liberal regime, the state plays a relatively active role in welfare distributions. The social democratic regime is characterised by the most generous benefits and the highest decommodification of social services. The welfare reforms are based on high standards of social welfare and equality, hence social welfare is universal.

Various scholars critiqued the welfare regime typology and argued for additional or different types of welfare regimes (Arts & Gelissen, 2002). The Dutch welfare state is often categorised as social democratic and corporatist, depending on which welfare characteristics are emphasized in the typology (Arts & Gelissen, 2002). The Netherlands can therefore best be described as a hybrid welfare state, having characteristics of both the social democratic and corporatist model (Vis, van Kersbergen & Becker, 2008). The Dutch welfare state is considered to have one of the most generous systems in the world (Vis et al., 2008).

The welfare states in central and eastern Europe (CEE) have undergone immense changes in the last three decades (Fenger, 2007). Fenger (2007) distinguishes three CEE welfare regimes, Poland is part of the post-communist European type and is the most successful in following the traditional European welfare state. Stemming from a universal socialist welfare system these countries have decreased their spending on the welfare system (Deacon, 2000), and now take up characteristics of both the social democratic and the corporatist type (Fenger, 2007). It has been suggested by previous studies that Poland is a rather family-based society in which the traditional role models remain evident (Titkow & Duch, 2004).

Leibfried (1992) and Ferrera (1996) suggested that the southern welfare states of Europe, including Spain, should be categorised as a separate welfare regime. It is characterised by a more fragmented type of welfare benefits. There is moderate state intervention and some benefits, such as old age benefits, are generous, whereas no minimal social protection is in place (Arts & Gelissen, 2002; Ferrera, 1996). At the same time a strong sense of familialism can be observed in the southern welfare regimes (Arts & Gelissen, 2002), partially taking over absent formal support (Brandt et al., 2009).

The welfare regime typologies give a general idea of differences in generosity of welfare states and besides that, the typologies show whether welfare regimes are family-oriented or not. In this study the differences between welfare regimes are of interest as the country of origin and

the related welfare regime can have an influence on how migrants view the role of formal and informal support after migration.

2.3. Crowding in and crowding out

Between welfare regimes the role of the family as support provider is different. The amount of formal welfare expenditures has an influence on the amount of informal support provided in a country because formal support can substitute or compensate informal support. The interplay between formal and informal support has often been discussed in the context of the crowding out and crowding in hypothesis (e.g. Künemund & Rein, 1999; van Oorschot & Arts, 2005), of which the presumed reciprocity between solidarity at the societal and individual level is the basic notion underlying this work (Hammarström, 2005).

In general, the crowding out hypothesis holds that the welfare state has unintended negative social outcomes (van Oorschot & Arts, 2005). The effect of social state expenditures and social programmes is assumed to crowd out informal support. If social expenditures are at a high level or increase, the importance and support levels of the family are low or will reduce (Künemund & Rein, 1999; van Oorschot & Arts, 2005), and might even be discouraged (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005). This effect can be caused by two different mechanisms: the substitution effect and the compensation effect (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005; van Oorschot & Arts, 2005; van Oorschot, Arts & Halman, 2005). Within the substitution effect, the welfare state acts as a substitution for care that is often provided by the family, the informal support is therefore no longer deemed necessary (van Oorschot & Arts, 2005). The compensation effect, however, assumes these processes to work the other way around. Starting with declining family support, followed by higher social state expenditures to compensate for the decline in family support (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005).

While the crowding out hypothesis assumes a negative correlation between social state expenditures and the amount of family solidarity, the crowding in hypothesis assumes this relationship to be positive. Either because the state stimulates or because the state complements family solidarity by increasing social expenditures. The implication is that families have more resources that can have an enabling effect on family solidarity (Daatland & Lowenstein, 2005; Visser, Gesthuizen & Scheepers, 2018).

Various studies addressed the crowding in and crowding out hypothesis, providing both support for the crowding out (e.g. Künemund & Rein, 1999; van Oorschot & Arts, 2005) and the crowding in hypothesis (e.g. Attias-Donfut, Ogg & Wolf, 2005; Visser et al., 2018). It is interesting that across Europe a north-south divide exists in the configuration and perception of solidarity (Daatland & Herlofson, 2003; Reher, 1998). Informal support plays a different role across countries and is perceived differently. Reher (1998) argues that these different views are shaped by the historical and political environment in the different countries. While in the northern parts of Europe the state would act as provider of social support, the family was the main provider of support in the southern parts of Europe. Although the southern welfare states have taken a more prominent support role in the past decades, the stronger family ties in the southern parts remain (Reher, 1998).

Usually, the crowding in and crowding out hypotheses are used to explain how welfare states can have an influence on the amount of informal support by increasing or decreasing formal welfare expenditures (Künemund & Rein, 1999; Visser et al., 2018). But at the same time the institutional differences between countries allow people to make a deliberate choice to migrate and make use of a different welfare system. Based on the hypotheses it can be expected that people who migrate from a generous welfare state to another generous welfare state will experience little difference between the provided formal and informal support prior to and after

migration, whereas a migrant from a less generous welfare state will experience that the importance of informal support will be less as the provision of formal support will be higher.

2.4. Life course approach

Besides looking at the differences between countries to understand how migrants view the role of formal and informal support, it is important to take the social, historical and cultural contexts of people's lives into account. Therefore the life course approach is used as a framework in which the interaction between the individual micro level and the macro levels of institutional, economic and social policy can be understood (Cooke & Gazso, 2009; Elder, 1994; Tomlinson, Baird, Berg & Cooper, 2018).

Although the life course approach draws on the interaction between the micro and the macro level, it remains an approach not often used in research on international migration (Wingens, de Valk, Windzio & Aybek, 2011). Research on internal migration has engaged more regularly with the life course approach (e.g. Cooke & Gazso, 2009; Findlay, McCollum, Coulter & Gayle, 2015; Mulder & Malmberg, 2014). The five core principles of the life course approach are used to explain migration at the micro individual level and at the macro societal level. Although the life course approach has received more attention in studying internal migration, migration within the EU with free mobility for EU citizens seems to correspond to some extent with the drivers of internal migration.

The life course approach comprises five core principles: life-span development, human agency, time and place, timing and linked lives (Elder, Johnson & Crosnoe, 2003). Each of these principles emphasises in a particular way that individual's lives are dynamic, interrelated and should be studied with acknowledging the historical and societal context (Bucx, 2009; Elder, 1994; Tomlinson et al., 2018).

The first principle, life-span development, states that behaviour and choices can only be understood if the historical trajectories are taken into account (Bucx, 2009; Elder, 1994; Elder et al., 2003). The second principle, human agency, acknowledges the possibility to make, to a certain extent, personal decisions in the life course (Elder, 1994; Elder et al., 2003; Tomlinson et al., 2018). The third principle, time and place, emphasises the importance and influence of the historical and spatial context within the life course (Bucx, 2009). The fourth principle, timing, stresses the impact of time on the decision-making process and the experiences individuals have. Hence, previous decisions and experiences impact future decision-making (Elder et al., 2003). The fifth and last principle is linked lives. This principle focuses on the interconnected and mutually influential relations of individual life courses. It emphasises that emerging and existing social networks and relationships will influence the life course of individuals, as individual lives are embedded in social relationships (Cooke, 2003; Elder, 1994; Elder et al., 2003).

3. Data and methodology

3.1. Data

Qualitative data is used to explore how migrants view the role of formal and informal support in the country of destination and who migrants mention as sources of informal support. The data used for this study is part of the Mobile Welfare project and is provided by the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI). The Mobile Welfare project is a collaboration of seven project-partners in seven countries. The project aimed to deepen the understanding of the role of welfare systems in origin and destination countries in migration processes within and towards Europe. In order to do so, a mixed-methods approach was utilized and both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. For qualitative analyses approximately 500 semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted in seven countries: the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the UK.

For this study 28 interviews conducted in the Netherlands between June 2016 and August 2017 are analysed. The study population consists of EU citizens born in Poland, Spain and the UK, residing in the Netherlands at the time of the interview. All respondents are employed, actively seeking for work or are retired. Most respondents were living in the Randstad area; the most urbanised region of the Netherlands, primarily consisting of the four largest Dutch cities and their surroundings.

In order to obtain a diverse sample of Polish, Spanish and British migrants, the researchers responsible for the data collection used a quota sampling strategy based on gender, age and educational attainment. The respondents were recruited via various recruitment strategies. Announcements were placed on expat websites and social media used by Polish, Spanish and British migrants, embassies were contacted and the personal networks of the researchers who conducted the interviews were used to find contacts willing to have an

interview. After an interview the respondent was asked whether someone in their personal network would be willing to participate. The advantage of this snowballing recruitment is that respondents can take away any concerns that their contacts might have. Therefore a certain trust in the interviewers and research is established and the threshold to participate in the interviews becomes lower for potential respondents (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2011).

The interview guide was structured along welfare related themes, namely: work and unemployment, childcare, education, healthcare and pension. Within these themes emphasis was put on the decision to migrate, migration aspirations and future plans, the perception and usage of formal and informal support prior to and after migration and the general life situation prior to and after migration. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were used to shed light on experiences, feelings and motivations of respondents (Longhurst, 2010). Semi-structured in-depth interviews create flexibility concerning the possible answers of respondents and at the same time in-depth interviews create a more robust dataset as it enables the interviewer to ask for an explanation if an answer remains unclear (Longhurst, 2010).

Interviews were conducted in English, Spanish or Dutch and the duration of the interviews ranged from 40 to 110 minutes. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face, four interviews were conducted using Skype. In order to make it more comfortable for respondents to talk about their life, interviews took place at a location of their choosing and the interviewers elaborated on the purpose and process of the interview before the interview started. An oral consent to make use of the data was given by the respondents. For a more detailed overview of the respondents' characteristics see Table 1.

Table 1. Respondent characteristics

| Respondent* | Country of origin | Gender | Age | Education | Language used during interview | Relationship status** |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Agnieszka | Poland | Female | 36-55 | University | Dutch | Dutch |
| 2. Bogna | Poland | Female | 20-35 | University | English | CO |
| 3. Estera | Poland | Female | 20-35 | Secondary education | Dutch | Other |
| 4. Kassia | Poland | Female | 20-35 | University | English | Single |
| 5. Pawel | Poland | Male | 20-35 | University | English | CO |
| 6. Andrej | Poland | Male | 36-55 | Higher vocational | English | CO |
| 7. Danek | Poland | Male | 20-35 | Secondary education | Spanish | CO |
| 8. Sergi | Poland | Male | 20-35 | Higher vocational | Dutch | CO |
| 9. Laura | Poland | Female | 20-35 | Higher vocational | English | Other |
| 10. Rafael | Spain | Male | 20-35 | Secondary education | English | Dutch |
| 11. Carmen | Spain | Female | 20-35 | University | Spanish | Single |
| 12. Mateo | Spain | Male | 20-35 | University | Spanish | Dutch |
| 13. Camila | Spain | Female | 20-35 | Lower vocational | Spanish | Dutch |
| 14. Isabella | Spain | Female | 36-55 | University | Dutch | Dutch |
| 15. Luciana | Spain | Female | 36-55 | Secondary education | Dutch | Dutch |
| 16. Jimena | Spain | Female | 36-55 | Lower vocational | Spanish | CO |
| 17. Diego | Spain | Male | 36-55 | Lower vocational | Spanish | Dutch |
| 18. Mia | Spain | Female | 56-70 | University | Dutch | Dutch |
| 19. Nicolas | Spain | Male | 56-70 | Higher vocational | English | Unassigned*** |
| 20. Samuel | Spain | Male | 36-55 | Secondary education | Dutch | Dutch |
| 21. Josh | UK | Male | 36-55 | University | English | CO |
| 22. Abby | UK | Female | 36-55 | University | English | Dutch |
| 23. Barbara | UK | Female | 36-55 | Higher vocational | English | Dutch |
| 24. Nigel | UK | Male | 36-55 | University | English | Dutch |
| 25. Danny | UK | Male | 36-55 | Higher vocational | English | Dutch |
| 26. Ellen | UK | Female | 20-35 | Higher vocational | English | Dutch |
| 27. Robert | UK | Male | 20-35 | Higher vocational | English | Single |
| 28. Joyce | UK | Female | 20-35 | University | English | Single |

*Note: * Fictional names are given to ensure anonymity ** Refers to having a partner or not and the country of origin of the partner. Dutch refers to a Dutch partner, CO refers to a partner from the country of origin of the respondent, Other refers to neither 'Dutch' or 'CO' *** During the interview the country of origin of the partner remained unclear.*

3.2. Analysis

Researchers of the NIDI have translated the interviews to English and transcribed the interviews verbatim. Next, the transcripts were coded deductively and inductively using the qualitative data analysis software program NVivo11. Deductive codes were based on the theoretical framework, whereas inductive codes were added throughout the coding process, indicating not expected topics and answers (Hennink et al., 2011). Within the three welfare domains, childcare, unemployment and healthcare, the major code families were: formal support, informal support, type of support, trade-offs between formal and informal, and kin and non-kin support. Subsequently, interviews were attached to attributes, in quantitative research referred to as variables. The attributes gender and country of origin allowed for data analysis between subgroups when using a qualitative coding matrix (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). In order to connect recurring themes throughout the interviews an axial code scheme was used (Cope, 2010).

4. Results

The previous paragraphs discussed the objective and research questions, the theoretical framework and the data and methodology of this study. In this section the results of the data analysis are presented. Section 4.1 discusses the role of informal support and who are mentioned as informal support providers. Section 4.2 discusses the role of formal and informal support in healthcare, followed by the role of formal and informal support in unemployment and childcare in the sections 4.3 and 4.4. The last section discusses gender differences.

4.1. Sources of informal support

4.1.1. The role of kin

During the interviews it became clear that kin ties are considered an important source of informal support by respondents. Regardless of the country of origin, respondents talk more often about kin as providers of informal support than about non-kin. Besides that, respondents refer to kin as support providers in more diverse support tasks than to non-kin. Respondents refer most often to the partner, parents and siblings.

Most respondents have a partner and half of the respondents have a Dutch partner. Besides a role in childcare, if a respondent has children, Dutch partners are often mentioned as providers of information concerning various formal welfare arrangements. Dutch partners often know which arrangements are available or where information regarding welfare arrangements can be found. Besides that, respondents mention that Dutch partners assist with more complex paperwork because it is often written in Dutch and hard to understand for someone who is not proficient in Dutch. The role of non-Dutch partners as support providers and the general role of partners in healthcare remained unclear.

Parents of respondents and to a lesser extent their parents-in-law are most often referred to when asked about childcare support. If a respondent has children, parents are often

considered as a source of informal childcare support if they live nearby. If parents are not able to provide childcare support, respondents seek for alternatives. Respondents who do not have children refer less often to their parents. Two respondents stated that they would move back to their country of origin to live close to their parents in order to receive free childcare. Besides receiving childcare, a good relationship with parents or parents-in-law or their future care needs are reasons for some respondents to consider to move to their country of origin or stay in the country of destination.

For some respondents siblings play a role in providing support as well, yet indirect. When respondents are asked about whether they provide healthcare support to their parents, they often mention the good health of their parents for whom support is not necessary, or respondents refer to their siblings who provide healthcare support to their parents.

“Uhm in España partly for my mother. But fortunately I still have four brothers in Spain, that they take care of my mother. It was my task to do that in the summer. So actually the last couple of years, my summer holidays were taking care of my mother.”

- Mia (ES, F, 56-70)

If the siblings would not have been able to provide the healthcare support to their parents, the health situation of the respondents' parents would be a reason to consider migrating to the country of origin for respondents.

4.1.2. The role of non-kin

Throughout the interviews it became clear that when respondents talk about non-kin ties, that they mainly refer to non-kin in the country of destination and not to non-kin in the country of origin. The non-kin ties that respondents refer to in the country of origin are friends. In the

interviews the provision of informal support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare by friends from the country of origin did not come forward, but respondents did mention that they stayed in touch with them. A possible explanation for why respondents refer less to their friends in the country of origin than to their informal network in the Netherlands is offered by Nigel (UK, M, 36-55) when he talks about whether his view of the UK has changed since he lives in the Netherlands.

‘‘You notice it the most when you speak to your old friends. My outlook is much broader than theirs, so they have their little problems, their lives, they do their things, their little network of people.’’

Nigel felt disconnected from his former friends as they did not share the same lifestyle anymore.

Based on what respondents said during the interviews two groups of non-kin ties in the country of destination can be distinguished; colleagues and friends. Colleagues act as social contacts providing information about housing, unemployment benefits and healthcare arrangements. Some respondents are offered housing and healthcare arrangements as part of their new job.

Respondents describe however that friends provide more often and more diverse information. Respondents often mention they have a network of friends from the same country of origin, friends who speak the same language, other foreigners and Dutch citizens. Friends who live in the Netherlands but do originate from the country of origin or speak the same language are considered a good source of information for unemployment benefits and looking for jobs. Various respondents mention that speaking the same language, being in another country than the country of origin or having a common lifestyle makes that information is easily accessible and provided.

4.2. Healthcare

4.2.1. The role of formal support

Healthcare is a much debated subject among respondents. Most of the respondents describe that they have mixed feelings about the Dutch healthcare system, some are rather positive about the Dutch healthcare system, others are negative. Regardless of the country of origin, respondents talk about differences between the healthcare system in the country of origin and the Netherlands. The respondents are often more used to the system in the country of origin than the Netherlands, and use the healthcare system in their country of origin as reference when comparing the two systems. Regardless of the country of origin, respondents who are negative about the Dutch healthcare talk about the financial side of healthcare, they feel that the Dutch system is expensive compared to what they are used to. Another negative aspect that respondents refer to is the experienced quality and attitude of formal healthcare providers. Spanish and British respondents describe this attitude as cold, and respondents feel misunderstood in the Netherlands. The difference in attitudes is exemplified by Robert (UK, M, 20-35) when he talks about his experiences with Dutch healthcare.

“But the Dutch say: just take some paracetamol. And basically say, go away. And it still hurts, if you still ... if you still can't stand the pain, come back. So yea ... and then you leave, thinking like ... these people are dicks, I want to go to England. In England they would say the same thing but in a different manner where ... you feel like actually taken care of.”

For some respondents from Poland, Spain and the UK the negative feelings towards the quality and the financial side of Dutch healthcare is a reason to make use of the healthcare system in the country of origin. They are still having health check-ups in the country of origin or they have made arrangements about the prescription of medicine in the country origin. At the same

time other respondents also mention positive things about the formal healthcare in the Netherlands. The short waiting times in the Netherlands are mentioned as a positive aspect by British and Spanish respondents. But also, contrary to what other respondents said, the quality is considered good by some respondents, regardless of country of origin. Mateo (ES, M, 20-35) talks about how he cannot understand why one of his Spanish friends goes to Spain for everything related to healthcare, because Mateo is generally positive about the Dutch healthcare system. Eventually he came up with a possible explanation that relates to the experiences people had in their country of origin.

‘‘Maybe they are very demanding. Or they are used to a very different system. Like ‘I want an antibiotic, you should give it to me’. And here it doesn’t work like that. They tell you ‘go home, take a paracetamol and deal with the fever’ and leave me alone. ... and Southern Europeans are not used to it. Well, I am, but majority of other aren’t. So that is seen as something negative and they refer back to their system.’’

This example expresses that for some people the experience with healthcare in the Netherlands is different from the experience they had in the country of origin and can therefore be perceived as negative. Besides that, Mateo refers specifically to Southern Europeans as a group who are not used to the Dutch healthcare system.

4.2.2. The role of informal support

Another difference that becomes evident in healthcare is the perceived role of formal and informal support. Informal support in healthcare is only mentioned by some respondents from Spain and not by Polish or British respondents. Carmen (ES, F, 20-35) mentions that women in Spain generally get support from their family during a pregnancy or after childbirth. Usually this help is provided by the mother and grandmother in Spain. In the Netherlands this is not the

case and medical professionals take over the help that often would be provided by family in Spain. The notion and importance of family providing support in Spain becomes more clear as Carmen compares the support given in the first week after childbirth in the Netherlands and Spain.

‘‘But I hear you get less doctor’s supervision here, like in Spain, maybe women are too obsessed but we get a test every month. Here is through the midwife. What I saw the other day, my boyfriend’s sister said that once you deliver, the midwife helps you during the first week. We don’t have that in Spain or Greece, it’s quite curious. There it’s the mother of the woman who has delivered the one who helps, teaches the new mom. Grandmothers, aunts, uncles. It’s the family who helps, not a professional. ... I guess. Some Mediterranean might be shocked to have a total stranger at home during that first week but that is all.’’

In the Netherlands medical professionals are thought of to be the main support providers after childbirth, as they possess the necessary knowledge. Whereas the more family-oriented values of Spaniards are evident in this example. British and Polish respondents did not refer to informal support groups regarding healthcare.

4.3. Unemployment

4.3.1. The role of formal support

During the time the respondents have lived in the Netherlands some received unemployment benefits in the Netherlands. Regardless of the country of origin, most respondents who received the unemployment benefits did not mention whether they felt the benefits were generous or not, or that they were used to a different system in the country of origin. The respondents who received benefits in the Netherlands were pleased with the relatively easy process of applying for and receiving the unemployment benefits, but they often did mention that they would rather

be employed than to receive unemployment benefits. Mia (ES, F, 56-70) expressed how she experienced receiving unemployment benefits in the Netherlands, which resembles how most respondents felt about receiving unemployment benefits.

‘‘Well, if you’re unemployed and you have worked hard before that, then it is pleasant to have a month or two to organise your life a bit. But after that it starts to get annoying.’’

The unemployment benefits are often seen as a convenient formal provision that enables people to arrange their lives after losing a job and start looking for a new one. This is not the case for two Polish respondents, they did reflect on the generosity of the Dutch unemployment benefits. They perceived the Dutch unemployment benefits as rather generous compared to Polish benefits. The higher wages and the relatively accessible and generous unemployment benefits in the Netherlands are for these two Polish respondents an incentive to stay in the Netherlands and not to return to Poland.

4.3.2. The role of informal support

During the interviews respondents were asked about their knowledge of unemployment benefits in the Netherlands and possible experiences of being unemployed. All respondents spoke about formal support and two of them also mentioned the role of their parent as possible providers of informal support. They both referred to their parents as a possible source of financial help if parents are financially able to do so. This is not the case for Carmen (ES, F, 20-35). She responded to the question of whether she would receive any informal support if she would lose her job.

‘‘From my family? No. I can’t get help from them. My mom’s job is stable but not my dad’s. They can’t support me. Actually, I should support them. They haven’t asked for

anything because they rely on my mom's salary but I can't rely on them, actually I should help them."

Besides the role of parents as possible providers of financial support, respondents did not refer to any other informal providers of financial support. Although most respondents did not receive unemployment benefits, they are often well informed about the arrangements in the Netherlands. Irrespective of the country of origin the respondents found out about these arrangements through their social network of predominantly friends and colleagues in the Netherlands. The informal support network of friends and colleagues does not provide financial means, their support is the provision of information which can be used to arrange unemployment benefits or to find another job. In some cases respondents are not looking for specific information related to unemployment and is the information shared during an occasional conversation as Kassia (PL, F, 20-35) said during the interview.

"... yeah I had a friend who was unemployed in Belgium. So that is also let's say, and she is Dutch, so then she can compare. Uh, and yeah, people just sometimes discuss it. Because I have really a large group of expat friends. So somebody always discusses some uh, something related to that. How the system works and uh..."

Kassia received, just like other Polish, Spanish and British respondents mentioned, information about unemployment benefits while she was not looking for information. At the same time other respondents actively involved their social network in the Netherlands if they needed information concerning unemployment benefits or were looking for a job. Various Polish respondents mentioned they use a digital platform designed for Poles living in the Netherlands to exchange information concerning various topics, including unemployment benefits and employment opportunities.

4.4. Childcare

4.4.1. The role of formal support

Throughout the interviews it became clear that differences in the amount of childcare allowance between the country of origin and the Netherlands on childcare is a concern for most respondents who have children. Respondents mention that in the Netherlands the costs of childcare are higher and the relative childcare allowance is lower than in Poland, Spain and the UK. Irrespective of the country of origin, most respondents describe Dutch childcare as expensive and the childcare allowance as disproportionate. In order to cope with the higher expenses for childcare some respondents seek for alternatives related to employment. Jimena (ES, F, 35-55) describes her reason to stop working and care for her children at home.

“ I think it’s so expensive so that women stay at home. It’s absolutely unproportionate. I think they do it for that purpose, it doesn’t make sense. I am not going to work all day just to pay the kindergarten and miss my kids. ”

Like Jimena, some respondents or partners of the respondents opted to stop working as the generated income would not exceed the costs of childcare. Irrespective of the country of origin, of the respondents and their partners who chose to stop working or work less to care for their children and pay less for childcare, non is male. Isabella (ES, F, 36-55) shared her thoughts of why she thinks that Spaniards in the Netherlands are dissatisfied with the costs of childcare in the Netherlands.

“I think in Spain are less, there is less help from the state, financial help if you have children, yes. ... That’s also why I think that in Spain that is more system. Here it is more thought about the children, what is better for the children. In Spain it is considered what is better for the parents.

The relatively flexible labour market in the Netherlands in which part-time work is possible is also considered to be a positive feature by some respondents. Mia (ES, F, 55-70) says it allows people to find a good work-life balance which would have been less the case in Spain.

‘I started that and I was so surprised by a colleague who said ‘If I have children than I’ll stop working to take care of the children’. That was, for someone in Spain, that was really in the hinterland, strange. Then you think; ‘Well, you studied, you’re going to quit? How is that possible?’. On the other hand, I also think it’s nice that in the Netherlands there are way more chances to work part-time, that you can combine your family and your job. And that is not possible in Spain, if you have a job you really have to work a lot of days a week.’

Although Mia and some other respondents from Poland, Spain and the UK are rather positive about the relatively flexible labour market, the consideration between changing the career-path and taking care of children is not always voluntary.

‘Because there’s a catch 22 in the Netherlands where you can’t get your kid into daycare unless you are working, and obviously you can’t get a job until you got your kid in daycare.’

- Abby (UK, F, 36-55)

More respondents felt like Abby that it is difficult to find a suitable way to have a job and pay for childcare at the same time because childcare in the Netherland is more expensive than in the country of origin.

4.4.2. *The role of informal support*

Besides changing career-paths in order to take care of children, respondents mention other ways in which childcare could be provided. Several respondents from Spain and Poland mention that they would have arranged their childcare in another way if their parents would have lived nearby. The parents of several respondents are mentioned as a source of childcare and some respondents describe that it is common for grandparents to be more involved in childcare in Poland and Spain.

‘‘As I arrived here, he was two. He was in kindergarten. It was still affordable. It was expensive but there were subsidies. As he grew up, prices started to rise, it was almost impossible to pay kindergarten. Now it’s impossible. In Spain people leave the babies with the grandparents, but here that doesn’t work.’’

- Diego (ES, M, 36-55)

Several respondents from Poland and Spain articulate the important role grandparents would play in childcare if the geographical distance would be less. At the same time Bogna (PL, F, 20-35) and another Polish and two British respondents mention how relatively easy it is to travel to their parents by making use of cheap flights, and how digital technology has made it possible to stay connected with relatives in the country of origin.

‘‘A niece of mine she is living in Warsaw, and uhm, she is like okay. Grandma is also not going there. And even, is easier for me and faster for me to get from Holland to Poland, than for her to get from Warsaw to, to her mother. So it’s like, okay, the distance, uh, now with the digital world, with Skype, with Facebook, with internet, with cheap flights and so on. The distance doesn’t matter anymore.’’

However, on the question of whether she thinks she will ever migrate again, Bogna replies with:

‘I am quite okay with my life here as it is now. Uh, I will say to my boyfriend, well, if we, uh, if we have more than three children at once, we move right away to your mother. Because then we need a nanny for free.’

Although most migrants did not mention they considered migrating back to the country of origin to receive childcare from their parents, this answer from Bogna clearly shows that the role of intergenerational ties is considered important. Furthermore, her answer shows that despite the fact that having contact with her parents is relatively easy because of a good telecommunications network and cheap plane tickets, it does not replace the help that would be provided by grandparents if they would live close by. During the interviews the respondents only referred to grandparents as kin who would provide support. The role of non-kin as source of childcare is less evident, only two respondents refer to friends whom they have met at the school of their children as occasional providers of childcare.

4.5. Gender differences

During the interviews differences between the answers of male and female respondents emerged. The analysis of the interviews showed that women speak more often about kin than men do. If respondents spoke about kin, this holds for both men and women, most often is referred to the kin in the country of origin and not to in-laws in the Netherlands or the country of origin. Furthermore, women talked more often about their own kin than men, and emphasizing a more affectual bond by referring to their mother or father, while men spoke in more general terms such as parents and grandparents. For both male and female respondents applies that more often is referred to the female side of kin than the male side. The mother is most often referred to as source of informal support, mainly in the domains of healthcare and childcare. Female respondents talked as well more about the domains of healthcare and

childcare than male respondents did. This, however, does not imply that formal and informal welfare support in these domains is considered to be less important by men.

No differences emerged between male and female respondents when referring to non-kin. One difference between talking about kin and non-kin is that while respondents talked more about kin in the country of origin, this was the opposite for non-kin, respondents talked more about non-kin in the country of destination than the country of origin.

5. Conclusion and discussion

This study tries to answer the following two research questions: How do migrants view the role of informal support in healthcare, unemployment and childcare in relation to formal support after migration? And: Do migrants refer to informal support in the domains of healthcare, unemployment and childcare and if so, who are mentioned as sources of informal support? To answer these questions 28 semi-structured in-depth interviews are conducted with mobile EU citizens from Poland, Spain and the UK residing in the Netherlands at the time of the interview. The interviews are analysed using codes derived from theories at the individual and family level, concerning informal support, and the national level, concerning formal support. The aim of this study is to better understand how mobile EU citizens from different welfare regimes view the role of formal and informal support after migration and who European migrants mention as sources of informal support.

5.1. Discussion of the results

It can be concluded that migrants from different countries have a different view of formal and informal support. Migrants from the UK are, compared to Polish and Spanish migrants, the least oriented towards informal support in the three welfare domains in the country of origin. In the UK the British migrants mostly rely on British formal support, and in the Netherlands the British migrants rely mainly on Dutch formal support. The formal support in the country of destination is able to replace the formal support in the country of origin, because in both countries the state is thought of to be the main provider of support (Daatland & Herlofson, 2003; van Oorschot et al., 2005). Therefore the British migrants perceive minor differences in the role of formal and informal support prior to and after migration.

This study shows that in the domains of healthcare and unemployment Polish migrants rely more on formal support in Poland, but they are more oriented towards informal support in

the domain of childcare in Poland. This poses challenges as the informal support network in Poland is not able to provide the same childcare support in the Netherlands because of the large distance. Therefore Polish migrants tend to look for alternatives. Formal support is considered an alternative for the informal support if it is financially feasible. Formal support therefore becomes more important for the Polish migrants in the Netherlands than would have been the case in Poland. Besides making use of formal support, alternatives such as moving back to Poland to be within close proximity to receive informal support are considered as possible solutions. This exemplifies how interrelated lives can influence decision-making (Elder, 1994). Besides that, it shows how timing and decisions made in the past have an influence on the support groups of migrants. It seems that Polish respondents rather make use of formal support in the Netherlands or they cannot find a suitable informal support group in the Netherlands to replace the informal support they would receive in Poland. This might be caused by the fact that Polish migrants migrated from a family-based society (Titkow & Duch, 2004) in which the family is thought of to be an important provider of support, to the Netherlands, where the welfare expenditures are higher and the family as support provider is less important (van Oorschot et al., 2005; Vis et al., 2008). Besides that, it shows that support provided by kin and often the parents is not easily replaced by non-kin.

This study finds that the Spanish migrants refer to informal support as an important source of support in the domains of healthcare and childcare in Spain. And compared to the Polish and British migrants in this study, Spanish migrants are more oriented towards informal support in the country of origin. This is in line with previous research of Brandt et al. (2009) in which they found that Spain is a family-oriented country and the provision of informal support is important as formal support is not always present. By migrating to the Netherlands the Spanish migrants enter a less family-based society in which the generous formal support takes on a prominent role as support provider (Vis et al., 2008). In the Netherlands Spanish migrants

replace the informal support in healthcare and childcare they would receive in Spain by formal support if their informal support network is not able to provide support. The difference between formal support provided in the Netherlands and informal support groups in Spain is often identified by Spanish migrants, because certain support tasks that are carried out in the Netherlands by formal support groups are perceived as typical support tasks that are meant for informal support groups to be taken care of. This shows that it is important to look at the cultural context of people's lives in order to understand how people view formal and informal support (Elder, 1994).

The findings of this study indicate, like previous research by Messeri et al. (1993), that kin and non-kin have different support roles. Irrespective of the country of origin, respondents predominantly refer to the role of non-kin ties in the domain of unemployment. These non-kin ties consist of friends and colleagues in the country of destination and not the country of origin. Friends are often Dutch citizens and other migrants who speak the same language as the migrant. Friends and colleagues act as main providers of help when looking for jobs and career-related information. Non-kin ties in the country of origin are less important when looking for information concerning jobs and career-related information. This finding, however, does not align with the study of Conkova et al. (2018) in which they found kin to be the most likely source of support when looking for jobs. The structural features of the task specific model provide an explanation for the different findings. Conkova et al. (2018) looked at support within countries, whereas this study involves migrants of which the kin ties often still live in the country of origin. Because of the proximity of non-kin ties in the country of destination, they have more useful connections and information concerning the Dutch labour market and are therefore more suited to act as support provider in this domain than kin ties or non-kin ties in the country of origin.

The importance of proximity holds for the provision in other support tasks as well. For Polish and Spanish migrants intergenerational ties are an important source of informal support in the country of origin (Bordone & de Valk, 2016; Titkow & Duch, 2004). This is reflected in the domain of childcare by Polish and Spanish migrants. The free and relatively flexible childcare are considered benefits of intergenerational support. But respondents often mention that they use formal support in the Netherlands because the intergenerational ties are not nearby, this emphasises the important role of proximity within the task specific model (Litwak, 1985; Messeri et al., 1993). For some Spanish respondents kin ties act as providers of support in healthcare in the country of origin. Kin ties, especially the mother and grandmother, perform support tasks during pregnancies and after childbirth. In the Netherlands these support tasks are performed by formal support providers. One respondent stated this could be a shocking experience for someone from Spain. This highlights the importance of taking the historical and societal context into account when studying migrants.

The findings of this study indicate that besides a difference in the support tasks that men and women provide (Brandt & Deindl, 2013), that men and women refer differently to support groups. There are differences in the way how often men and women refer to certain welfare domains and besides that, women show a more affectual bond with the support providers. It is possible that this is the effect of the kinkeeper role women have (Brandt & Deindl, 2013; Fernández-Alonso & Jaime-Castillo, 2015), but exploring this is beyond the scope of this study.

5.2. Conclusion

This qualitative study has shown that how migrants view the role of formal and informal support after migration depends on more than one aspect. But it can be concluded that migrants from Poland and Spain view the role of formal support as more important and informal support as less important after migration. For British migrants there is little difference between how they viewed the role of formal and informal support prior to and after migration.

Migrants receive both formal and informal support and the provision of one type of support has an influence on how migrants will view the other. Therefore, to understand how migrants view one type of support, the provision of the other type of support should be taken into account. Besides that, the way in which formal and informal support is arranged in the country of origin has an influence on how migrants view formal and informal support in the country of destination. This shows that not only the formal and informal support in the country of destination should be looked at when conducting research on welfare support. Taking both the country of origin and destination into account when conducting research on welfare related issues makes for a better and completer understanding of how migrants view, what they expect of and how they manage support arrangements in the country of destination. Taking into account the country of origin emphasises the importance of the historical and societal context a migrant comes from.

Migrants do refer to informal support in the various welfare domains and a clear distinction is visible to whom they refer in which welfare domain. In the domain of healthcare Spanish respondents refer to the mother and grandmother for specific care tasks. Irrespective of the country of origin, migrants refer in the domain of unemployment to friends and colleagues in the country of destination for the provision of job and career related information. In the domain of childcare Polish and Spanish respondents refer to their parents as possible providers of support if the distance would allow for it. Furthermore, this study shows that the

role of gender can provide more insight into how migrants view the role of formal and informal support.

5.3. Limitations

There are some limitations regarding this study which should be examined, these can be divided into methodological and topical challenges. First, respondents were given the choice to indicate in which language they would like to have the interview. All interviews are conducted in English, Dutch and Spanish. The fieldworkers who carried out the interviews were proficient in the language, but not all respondents were proficient in the language. Even though the fieldworkers responded calm and helpful during the interviews, this might have impacted the extent to which respondents were able to describe their thoughts and experiences in detail.

Secondly, when analysing the data, the researcher might look for data that will confirm hypotheses and expectations. As a result, data that do not align with expectations can be overlooked. Moreover, data that is considered irrelevant for the research might not be coded. This coding bias can be overcome by making use of more than one researcher during the data analysis process. Another option is to have the fieldworkers who conducted the interviews review the results and discuss possible inconsistencies and misinterpreted meanings. Because of practical issues the data analysis is carried out by one researcher. Besides that, during the data analysis there have been no regular discussions to validate the research findings with one of the fieldworkers. Future research can learn from this and incorporate a discussion in the data analysis process in order to validate the research findings after each round of coding.

Thirdly, in this study a typology of ideal type welfare regimes was adopted to assign features of welfare regimes to countries. However, countries deviate from the typologies and exhibit more complex variations. This might have influenced the way in which respondents viewed the differences between the formal and informal support in the country of origin and

the Netherlands. In order to overcome this in future research, a scoping study of specific welfare domains in the country of origin and destination can be made. This would benefit the focus of the study and allow for a more in-depth assessment of how migrants view similarities and differences in formal and informal support between countries.

Lastly, and possibly the main limitation of this study is that because the findings are shaped by the countries of origin, the country of destination and the respondents, it can be difficult to extend the findings to a wider population. The aim of this study was to gain a deeper understanding of how European migrants view the role of formal and informal support after migration and who are mentioned as sources of informal support. This study is carried out in the Netherlands and the 28 respondents were migrants from Poland, Spain and the UK. It has provided insights in the importance of taking both the situation in the country of origin and destination into account. Using the same study design in a different setting, with migrants from different countries of origin or destination, would provide new insights.

5.4. Recommendations for future research

The last mentioned limitation of this study provides a stepping stone for future research. In this study the country of destination was the Netherlands, a country with a relatively generous support system (Vis et al., 2008). This study showed that the role of formal support becomes more important for certain support tasks for migrants from a more family-oriented country. Their informal network is no longer able to provide support. This raises the question of how migrants would view and manage formal and informal support if the migration would take place in the opposite direction; from a country with little informal support and generous formal support, to a country with little formal support and much informal support. Studying this could provide a better understanding of how migrants adapt to a new societal context and how welfare support could shape migration decisions.

This study showed that differences exist in how male and female migrants talk about formal and informal support. It is therefore important to incorporate the role of gender in migration studies. Future research is needed to examine whether these differences lead to actual differences in how formal and informal support is managed. Besides that, it would be interesting to see whether the support systems of male and female migrants have changed over time since the motivations of men and women to migrate have changed as well (Castles & Miller, 2009; King, 2012).

A final recommendation for future research is in line with the study conducted by Conkova and King (2018) in which they studied the support system of 'left behind' older adults in Poland. Poland is a rather family-oriented country and it would be interesting to see how the support systems of older adults in Spain and the UK would change if their kin would move away. Besides studying the support system of older adults, it would be insightful to study the support system of parents in different life stages, because support needs vary over time (Conkova & King, 2018; Litwak, 1985). Studying this could inform social policy on the support systems of elderly who have no or limited support from kin.

References

- Arts, W., & Gelissen, J. (2002). Three worlds of welfare capitalism or more? A state-of-the-art report. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 12(2), 137-158. doi: 10.1177/0952872002012002114
- Attias-Donfut, C., Ogg, J., & Wolff, F.C. (2005). European patterns of intergenerational financial and time transfers. *European Journal of Ageing*, 2, 161-173. doi: 10.1007/s10433-005-0008-7
- Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo* (2nd ed.). London: Sage publications.
- Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 1-16. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x
- Bordone, V., & de Valk, H. A. G. (2016). Intergenerational support among migrant families in Europe. *European Journal of Ageing*, 13(3), 259-270. doi: 10.1007/s10433-016-0363-6
- Borjas, G. J. (1999). Immigration and welfare magnets. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(4), 607-637. doi: 10.1086/209933
- Brandt, M., & Deindl, C. (2013). Intergenerational transfers to adult children in Europe: Do social policies matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(1), 235-251. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.01028.x
- Brandt, M., Haberkern, K., & Szydlik, M. (2009). Intergenerational help and care in Europe. *European Sociological Review*, 25(5), 585-601. doi: 10.1093/esr/jcn076
- Bucx, A. J. E. H. (2009). *Linked lives: Young adults' life course and relationships with parents*. Utrecht University. Retrieved from <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/36223>
- Burgoon, B., & Baxandall, P. (2004). Three worlds of working time: The partisan and welfare politics of work hours in industrialized countries. *Politics & Society*, 32(4), 439-473. doi: 10.1177/0032329204269983
- Castles, S., & Miller, M. J. (2009). *The age of migration : international population movements in the modern world* (4th ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Conkova, N., Fokkema, T., & Dykstra, P. A. (2018). Non-kin ties as a source of support in Europe: understanding the role of cultural context. *European Societies*, 20(1), 131-156. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2017.1405058
- Conkova, N., & King, R. (2018). Non-kin ties as a source of support amongst older adults 'left behind' in Poland: a quantitative study on the role of geographic distance. *Ageing and Society*, 1-26. doi: 10.1017/S0144686X17001507
- Cooke, M., & Gazso, A. (2009). Taking a life course perspective on social assistance use in Canada: A different approach. *Canadian Journal of Sociology-Cahiers Canadiens De Sociologie*, 34(2), 349-372.
- Cooke, T. J. (2003). Family migration and the relative earnings of husbands and wives. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(2), 338-349. doi: 10.1111/1467-8306.9302005
- Cope, M. (2010). Coding transcripts and diaries. In N. J. Clifford, S. French & G. Valentine (Eds.), *Key methods in geography* (2nd ed., pp. 440-452). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Daatland, S. O., & Herlofson, K. (2003). 'Lost solidarity' or 'changed solidarity': a comparative European view of normative family solidarity. *Ageing & Society*, 23, 537-560. doi: 10.1017/S0144686x03001272

- Daatland, S. O., & Lowenstein, A. (2005). Intergenerational solidarity and the family–welfare state balance. *European Journal of Ageing*, 2(3), 174-182. doi: 10.1007/s10433-005-0001-1
- Deacon, B. (2000). Eastern European welfare states: The impact of the politics of globalization. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10(2), 146-161. doi: 10.1177/a012487
- De Giorgi, G., & Pellizzari, M. (2009). Welfare migration in Europe. *Labour Economics*, 16(4), 353-363. doi: 10.1016/j.labeco.2009.01.005.
- Elder, G. H. (1994). Time, human agency, and social change: Perspectives on the life course. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57(1), 4-15. doi: 10.2307/2786971
- Elder, G. H., Johnson, M. K. & Crosnoe, R. (2003). The emergence and development of life course theory. In J. T. Mortimer, & M. J. Shanahan M.J. (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course* (pp. 3-19). Boston: Springer.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Eurostat. (2018). *Migration and migrant population statistics*. Retrieved 15 march, 2018, from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics
- Fenger, H. J. M. (2007). Welfare regimes in central and eastern Europe: Incorporating post-communist countries in a welfare regime typology. *Contemporary issues and ideas in social sciences*, 3(2), 1–30.
- Fernández-Alonso, M., & Jaime-Castillo, A. M. (2015). Welfare state and individual expectations of economic support: A comparison of Norway and Spain. *International Sociology*, 31(1), 37-56. doi: 10.1177/0268580915613192
- Ferrera, M. (1996). The 'southern model' of welfare in social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(1), 17-37. doi: 10.1177/095892879600600102
- Findlay, A. M., McCollum, D., Coulter, R., & Gayle, V. (2015). New mobilities across the lifecourse: a framework for analysing demographically-linked drivers of migration. *Population, Space and Place*, 12(4), 390-402. doi: 10.1002/psp.1956
- Giulietti, C., Guzi, M., Kahanec, M. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2013). Unemployment benefits and immigration: evidence from the EU. *International Journal of Manpower*, 34(1), 24-38. doi: 10.1108/01437721311319638
- Hammarström, G. (2005). The construct of intergenerational solidarity in a lineage perspective: A discussion on underlying theoretical assumptions. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 19(1), 33-51. doi: 10.1016/j.jaging.2004.03.009
- Hennink, M. M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011). *Qualitative research methods*. London: Sage publications.
- Huber, P. & Oberdabernig, D. (2016). The impact of welfare benefits on natives' and immigrants' attitudes toward immigration. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 44(C), 53-78.
- Jingjing, H., Nelson, M., & Stephens, J. D. (2008). Decommodification and activation in social democratic policy: resolving the paradox. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 18(1), 5-20. doi: 10.1177/0958928707084449
- King, R. (2012). *Theories and Typologies of Migration: An Overview and A Primer* (Vol. 12). Malmö: Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare.
- Künemund, H., & Rein, M. (1999). There is more to receiving than needing: theoretical arguments and empirical explorations of crowding in and crowding out. *Ageing and Society*, 19(1), 93-121.

- Leibfried, S. (1992) 'Towards a European welfare state? On integrating poverty regimes into the European community'. In Z. Ferge & J. E. Kolberg (Eds.), *Social Policy in a Changing Europe*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Litwak, E. (1985). *Helping the Elderly*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Litwak, E., & Szelenyi, I. (1969). Primary group structures and their functions: Kin, neighbors, and friends. *American Sociological Review*, *34*, 465-81.
- Longhurst, R. (2010). Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In N. J. Clifford, S. French & G. Valentine (Eds.), *Key methods in geography* (2nd ed., pp. 103-115). Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Mau, S. & Burkhardt, C. (2009). Migration and welfare state solidarity in Western Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *19*, 213–29.
- Messeri, P., Silverstein, M., & Litwak, E. (1993). Choosing optimal support groups - a review and reformulation. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *34*(2), 122-137. doi: 10.2307/2137239
- Mulder, C. H., & Malmberg, G. (2014). Local ties and family migration. *Environment and Planning A, Economy and Space*, *46*(9), 2195-2211.
- Razin, A., & Wahba, J. (2015). Welfare magnet hypothesis, fiscal burden and immigration skill selectivity. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, *117*(2), 369-402. doi: 10.1111/sjoe.12092, 10.1111/sjoe.12092
- Reher, D. S. (1998). Family ties in western Europe: Persistent contrasts. *Population and Development Review*, *24*(2), 203-234. doi: 10.2307/2807972
- Titkow, A., & Duch, D. (2004). The Polish family: Always an institution? In M. Robila, (Ed.), *Families in eastern Europe: Context, trends and variations* (pp. 69-85). New York: Elsevier.
- Tomlinson, J., Baird, M., Berg, P., & Cooper, R. (2017). Flexible careers across the life course: Advancing theory, research and practice. *Human Relations*, *71*(1), 4-22. doi: 10.1177/0018726717733313
- van Oorschot, W., & Arts, W. (2005). The social capital of European welfare states: The crowding out hypothesis revisited. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *15*(1), 5-26. doi: 10.1177/0958928705049159
- van Oorschot, W., Arts, W., & Halman, L. (2005). Welfare state effects on social capital and informal solidarity in the European Union: Evidence from the 1999/2000 European Values Study. *Policy and Politics*, *33*(1), 33-54. doi: 10.1332/0305573052708474
- Vis, B., van Kersbergen, K., & Becker, U. (2008). The politics of welfare state reform in the Netherlands: Explaining a never-ending puzzle. *Acta Politica*, *43*(2), 333-356.
- Visser, M., Gesthuizen, M., & Scheepers, P. (2018). The crowding in hypothesis revisited: New insights into the impact of social protection expenditure on informal social capital. *European Societies*, *20*(2), 257-280. doi: 10.1080/14616696.2018.1442928
- Wingens, M., de Valk, H., Windzio, M., & Aybek, C. (2011). The sociological life course approach and research on migration and integration. In M. Wingens, H. de Valk, M. Windzio & C. Aybek (Eds.), *A life-course perspective on migration and integration* (pp. 1-26). Dordrecht: Springer.

Appendix - Code tree

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|
| 1.Unemployment | 1.1. Formal | 1.1.1. country of origin descriptive 1.1.2. country of origin evaluation 1.1.3. country of destination 1.1.4. country of destination evaluation 1.1.5. comparison CO CD |
| | 1.2. Informal country of | 1.2.1. kin practical 1.2.2. kin emotional 1.2.3. non-kin practical 1.2.4. non-kin emotional 1.2.5. providing kin practical 1.2.6. providing kin emotional 1.2.7. providing non-kin practical 1.2.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 1.3. Informal country of | 1.3.1. kin practical 1.3.2. kin emotional 1.3.3. non-kin practical 1.3.4. non-kin emotional 1.3.5. providing kin practical 1.3.6. providing kin emotional 1.3.7. providing non-kin practical 1.3.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 1.4. Information | 1.4.1. receiving information 1.4.2. providing information |
| 2. Childcare | 2.1. Formal | 2.1.1. country of origin descriptive 2.1.2. country of origin evaluation 2.1.3. country of destination 2.1.4. country of destination evaluation 2.1.5. comparison CO CD |
| | 2.2. Informal country of | 2.2.1. kin practical 2.2.2. kin emotional 2.2.3. non-kin practical 2.2.4. non-kin emotional 2.2.5. providing kin practical 2.2.6. providing kin emotional 2.2.7. providing non-kin practical 2.2.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 2.3. Informal country of | 2.3.1. kin practical 2.3.2. kin emotional 2.3.3. non-kin practical 2.3.4. non-kin emotional 2.3.5. providing kin practical 2.3.6. providing kin emotional 2.3.7. providing non-kin practical 2.3.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 2.4. Information | 2.4.1. receiving information |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------------------------|--|
| | | 2.4.2. providing information |
| | 2.5. Tradeoff CO CD | |
| | 2.6. Tradeoff formal informal | |
| | 2.7. Tradeoff kin non-kin | |
| 3. Healthcare | 3.1. Formal | 3.1.1. country of origin descriptive 3.1.2. country of origin evaluation 3.1.3. country of destination 3.1.4. country of destination evaluation 3.1.5. comparison CO CD |
| | 3.2. Informal country of origin | 3.2.1. kin practical 3.2.2. kin emotional 3.2.3. non-kin practical 3.2.4. non-kin emotional 3.2.5. providing kin practical 3.2.6. providing kin emotional 3.2.7. providing non-kin practical 3.2.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 3.3. Informal country of | 3.3.1. kin practical 3.3.2. kin emotional 3.3.3. non-kin practical 3.3.4. non-kin emotional 3.3.5. providing kin practical 3.3.6. providing kin emotional 3.3.7. providing non-kin practical 3.3.8. providing non-kin emotional |
| | 3.4. Information | 3.4.1. receiving information 3.4.2. providing information |
| | 3.5. Tradeoff CO CD | |
| | 3.6. Tradeoff formal informal | |
| | 3.7. Tradeoff kin non-kin | |
| 4. Life course | 4.1. Past | 4.1.1. Growing up-Childhood-Youth 4.1.2. Student life- training 4.1.3. family dynamics 4.1.4. Jobs -job career 4.1.5. Ageing-retiring |
| | 4.2. Present | 4.2.1. Student life- training 4.2.2. family dynamics 4.2.3. Jobs -job career 4.2.4. Ageing-retiring |
| | 4.3. Future | 4.3.1. Student life- training 4.3.2. family dynamics 4.3.3. Jobs -job career 4.3.4. Ageing-retiring |