

A Service of

ZBW

Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Deole, Sumit S.; Huang, Yue

Working Paper How do new immigration flows affect existing immigrants? Evidence from the refugee crisis in Germany

GLO Discussion Paper, No. 579

Provided in Cooperation with: Global Labor Organization (GLO)

Suggested Citation: Deole, Sumit S.; Huang, Yue (2020) : How do new immigration flows affect existing immigrants? Evidence from the refugee crisis in Germany, GLO Discussion Paper, No. 579, Global Labor Organization (GLO), Essen

This Version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/10419/221743

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WWW.ECONSTOR.EU

How do new immigration flows affect existing immigrants? Evidence from the refugee crisis in Germany

Sumit Deole^{*} Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

 $\label{eq:constraint} \mbox{Yue Huang}^\dagger$ Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg, Germany

Online Appendix

^{*}Corresponding author. Email: sumitdeole@gmail.com.

[†]Email: yue.huang@ovgu.de.

Appendix A: Figures and Tables Cited in the Main Text



FIG. A-1: Number of refugees from the Middle-East

Data source: Federal Statistical Office, own calculations.

Notes: This figure shows the number of refugees from major Middle-Eastern source countries in comparison with total number of refugees received by Germany.

FIG. A-2: Number of asylum seekers from the Middle-East



Data source: Federal Statistical Office, own calculations.

Notes: This figure shows the number of asylum seekers from major Middle-Eastern source countries in comparison with total number of asylum seekers received by Germany. Asylum seekers include recognized refugees and other asylum seekers (e.g., currently under the application process).





Data source: Federal Statistical Office, own calculations.

Notes: This figure shows the number of asylum seekers from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan.



FIG. A-4: Ratio of refugees from the Middle-East over German population



Data source: Federal Statistical Office, own calculations.

Notes: This figure shows the ratio of refugees from the Middle-East over German population. Only those Middle-Eastern countries are considered for this plot from where substantially large number of refugees to Germany originate. The list includes Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan.



FIG. A-5: Ratio of asylum seekers from the Middle-East over German population

Data source: Federal Statistical Office, own calculations.

Notes: This figure shows the ratio of asylum seekers from the Middle-East over German population. Only those Middle-Eastern countries are considered for this plot from where substantially large number of asylum seekers to Germany originate. The list includes Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan.

	(1) Log weekly	1) (2) (3) og Worries Connect to ekly about home		(4) (5) Satisfaction with		
	hours	hostility	country	life	health	
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	0.013	-0.044	0.057	-0.076	0.041	
Turnet v V	(0.019)	(0.053)	(0.061)	(0.110)	(0.137)	
$1 reat \times Y ear_{2015}$	(0.028)	(0.053)		(0.109)	(0.140)	
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	-0.006	-0.123**	0.215^{***}	-0.028	0.097	
	(0.026)	(0.056)	(0.070)	(0.110)	(0.142)	
$Treat \times Y ear_{2017}$	(0.033)	-0.070 (0.057)		-0.144 (0.111)	(0.059)	
Observations	16,817	(0.001) 18,445	11,248	14,161	14,161	
# of respondents	6,401	6,757	6,257	$5,\!280$	5,280	

TABLE A-1: Lead and lag effects - alternative outcome variables

Notes: This table shows the lead and lag effects of the ERC on alternative outcomes in Germany. Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
	Econ	omic impa	act	So	Social impact			
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries immigration	about crime	Feel German		
treated = TMEN	A immigrants (1	N = 1,195), control = no	on-TMENA in	migrants (1	N = 5,904)		
$Year_{2014}$	0.012 (0.026)	0.318^{***}	-0.001	0.119^{**}	-0.042	0.072		
$Y ear_{2015}$	(0.020) 0.027 (0.052)	(0.040) 0.658^{***} (0.087)	(0.012) (0.023)	(0.005) (0.205^{*}) (0.115)	(0.000) -0.067 (0.109)	(0.102)		
$Y ear_{2016}$	(0.032) (0.078)	(0.974^{***}) (0.131)	0.011 (0.034)	(0.123) (0.391^{**}) (0.172)	0.055 (0.162)	0.134 (0.298)		
$Y ear_{2017}$	0.036 (0.103)	(0.175) (0.175)	0.017 (0.046)	0.265 (0.229)	-0.065 (0.217)	(0.200)		
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.007 (0.015)	-0.001 (0.022)	0.002	-0.031 (0.054)	-0.002 (0.050)	-0.046 (0.063)		
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	-0.038^{**} (0.018)	-0.022 (0.024)	-0.001 (0.010)	-0.164^{***} (0.056)	-0.055 (0.051)	()		
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	0.001 (0.019)	-0.005 (0.025)	-0.018* (0.011)	-0.226^{***} (0.059)	-0.149^{***} (0.052)	0.074 (0.072)		
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.012 (0.020)	-0.029 (0.027)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.202^{***} (0.059)	-0.063 (0.055)	()		
Observations # of respondents	19,306 7,099	16,725 6,371	19,306 7,099	18,445 6,757	18,445 6,757	$11,248 \\ 6,257$		

TABLE A-2: Lead and lag effects (extended Table 4)

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: The table shows the lead and lag effects of the ERC in Germany. The explanatory variables shown here are survey year indicators and the interaction terms between the treatment indicator *Treat* and survey year indicators. Control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Econo	omic imp	act	Soc	ial impact	
	Unemployment	Log	Self-	· Worries about		
	status	hourly	employment	immigration	crime	German
		wage	status			
treated = Turks	(N = 939), contr	rol = non	-TMENA imn	nigrants (N =	$5,\!904)$	
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.013	0.001	-0.000	-0.027	-0.018	-0.080
2	(0.016)	(0.023)	(0.009)	(0.055)	(0.052)	(0.066)
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	-0.035*	-0.026	-0.001	-0.172***	-0.083	· /
	(0.020)	(0.026)	(0.011)	(0.058)	(0.053)	
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	-0.000	-0.009	-0.019	-0.239^{***}	-0.168^{***}	0.042
	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.012)	(0.060)	(0.054)	(0.078)
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.018	-0.030	-0.024*	-0.219^{***}	-0.096*	
	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.014)	(0.061)	(0.057)	
Observations	18,703	16,271	18,703	17,857	$17,\!857$	10,866
# of respondents	6,843	$6,\!170$	6,843	6,515	6,515	6,024

TABLE A-3: Lead and lag effects - Turks

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: The table shows the lead and lag effect of the ERC in Germany. The treated group is Turks and control group is non-TMENA immigrants. Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
	Econo	omic imp	act		Social impact			
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries immigration	about crime	Feel German		
2011-2017: treat	$\mathbf{red} = \mathbf{TMENA} \ \mathbf{in}$	migrant	s (N = 1,363),	$\operatorname{control} = \operatorname{nor}$	n-TMENA i	mmigrants ($N = 6,607$)		
$Treat imes Year_{2011}$	-0.027	-0.017	-0.003	-0.058	0.017			
$Treat \times Year_{2012}$	(0.022) -0.036^{*} (0.019)	(0.029) -0.017 (0.026)	(0.013) 0.003 (0.011)	(0.002) -0.051 (0.054)	(0.057) 0.052 (0.050)	-0.049		
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.000 (0.015)	(0.020) -0.004 (0.021)	(0.001) (0.005) (0.008)	-0.021 (0.053)	(0.000) (0.004)	-0.043 (0.063)		
$Treat imes Year_{2015}$	-0.032^{*} (0.018)	-0.023 (0.023)	0.001 (0.009)	-0.153^{***} (0.055)	-0.053 (0.050)	(0.000)		
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	0.007 (0.018)	-0.008 (0.025)	-0.018^{*} (0.011)	-0.213^{***} (0.057)	-0.151^{***} (0.051)	0.067 (0.071)		
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.005 (0.020)	-0.028 (0.027)	-0.016 (0.012)	-0.189^{***} (0.058)	-0.065 (0.053)			
Observations # of respondents	24,165 7,970	20,959 7,163	24,165 7,970	22,164 7,472	$22,164 \\ 7,472$	$14,060 \\ 7,164$		

TABLE A-4: Lead and lag effects - extended pre-treatment periods

Source: SOEP v34 2011-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: The table shows the lead and lag effect of the ERC on an extended sample. Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)					
	Econ	omic imp	act	Soc	ial impact						
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries a immigration	about crime	Feel German					
Panel (A): Middle-Eastern refugees / German population, 2013 & 2015											
treated = TMENA immi	m igrants~(N=981)	, control	= non-TMENA	A immigrants (N = 5,034)					
Middle-Eastern refugees	-6.697	15.589	-2.228	6.672	23.023						
German population	(14.431)	(35.381)	(6.065)	(67.735)	(59.580)						
$Treat \times \frac{\text{Middle-Eastern refugees}}{\text{German population}}$	-21.650*	-16.398	0.968	-84.695	-53.990						
German population	(11.664)	(19.267)	(3.699)	(76.905)	(110.068)						
	[0.0273]	[0.0811]	[0.6533]	[0.1045]	[0.1719]						
Observations	8,742	7,511	8,742	5,714	5,714						
# of respondents	6,015	5,260	6,015	4,581	4,581						
Panel (B): Middle-Easter	rn refugees / Geri	man popu	lation, 2013 &	2016							
treated = TMENA immi	m igrants~(N=965)	, control	= non-TMENA	A immigrants (N = 4,936)					
Middle-Eastern refugees	4 406	9.749	1.047	5 449	1 596	5 420					
German population	-4.490	2.(42)	1.047	-0.442	1.020	-0.420					
T Middle-Eastern refugees	(5.551)	(3.500)	(5.092)	(23.309)	(29.480)	(32.327)					
$1 reat \times \frac{1}{\text{German population}}$	0.584	-3.017	-3.540	$-4(.42(^{++})$	-20.073	14.232					
	(4.298)	(5.169)	(2.513)	(17.134)	(31.266)	(51.890)					
	[0.8252]	[0.1855]	[0.0908]	[0.0020]	[0.1279]	[0.7393]					
Ubservations	8,297	7,145 5 191	8,207	5,048	0,048 4.686	0,887 5 501					
# of respondents	5,901	5,181	5,901	4,080	4,080	5,501					
Panel (C): Middle-Easter	rn asylum seekers	/ Germa	n population,	2013 & 2015							
treated = TMENA immi	igrants (N = 981)	, control	= non-TMENA	A immigrants (N = 5,034	.)					
Middle-Eastern AS	0.216	3.121	-1.204	-7.164	6.800						
German population	(7.701)	(16.774)	(2.487)	(49.118)	(45.356)						
$Treat \times \frac{\text{Middle-Eastern AS}}{\text{Commensuelation}}$	-11.338	-8.830	0.094	-50.912	-40.215						
German population	(8.933)	(10.743)	(2.824)	(46.915)	(69.993)						
	[0.0635]	[0.1846]	[0.9541]	[0.0703]	[0.1875]						
Observations	8,742	7,511	8,742	5,714	5,714						
# of respondents	6,015	5,260	6,015	4,581	4,581						
Panel (D): Middle-Easter	rn asylum seekers	/ Germa	n population,	2013 & 2016							
treated = TMENA immi	m igrants~(N=965)	, control	= non-TMENA	A immigrants (N = 4,936)					
Middle-Eastern AS	-3.041	3.269	-0.173	-19.364	-2.685	-25.292					
German population	(3.674)	(2.979)	(3.286)	(34.994)	(29.875)	(29.538)					
$Treat \times \frac{\text{Middle-Eastern AS}}{Common resolution}$	-0.057	-1.175	-2.168	-25.068**	-15.897	11.470					
German population	(2.137)	(2.567)	(1.320)	(9.666)	(14.923)	(28.072)					
	[0.9707]	[0.3896]	[0.0879]	[0.0088]	[0.0713]	[0.6748]					
Observations	8,257	7,145	8,257	5,648	5,648	6,887					
# of respondents	5,901	5,181	5,901	4,686	4,686	5,501					
-	2										

TABLE A-5: Treatment intensity - S.E. clustered at state level

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations.

Notes: The table shows treatment intensity checks performed in Table 5 (S.E. clustered at state level). Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Since some individuals moved to other states in the observation period, we cannot directly use individual fixed effects model and cluster standard errors at the state level. Instead, we use areg command in Stata 14 to absorb individual fixed effects. Standard errors (clustered at the state level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1. We also report wild bootstrap cluster p-values in square brackets, generated using *boottest* command for standard errors clustered at the state level (11 clusters).

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Econ	omic imp	act	So	cial impact	
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries immigration	about crime	Feel German
Panel (A): Δ Middle-Eastern refu	$1gees_{2015-2013} / Ge$	erman pop	$\mathbf{pulation}_{2013}, 20$	13 & 2015		
treated = TMENA immigrants	(N = 981), control	$\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{non-7}$	rmena immig		034)	
$\frac{\Delta \text{Middle-Eastern refugees}_{2015-2013}}{\text{German population}_{2013}}$	-6.662	16.030	-2.295	4.813	21.996	
$Treat \times \frac{\Delta \text{Middle-Eastern refugees}_{2015-2013}}{\text{German population}_{2013}}$	-22.012**	(17.022) -16.701 (14.067)	(4.002) 0.958 (5.210)	-85.495**	(23.310) -55.275 (27.451)	
Observations # of respondents	(10.003) 8,742 6,015	(14.967) 7,511 5,260	(5.319) 8,742 6,015	(40.089) 5,714 4,581	(57.451) 5,714 4,581	
Panel (B): Δ Middle-Eastern refu	$gees_{2016-2013} / Ge$	rman pop	$\mathbf{pulation}_{2013}, 20$	13 & 2016		
treated = TMENA immigrants	(N = 965), control	$\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{non-7}$	rmena immig	(N = 4)	936)	
$\frac{\Delta \text{Middle-Eastern refugees}_{2016-2013}}{\text{German population}_{2013}}$	-4.555	2.850	1.009	-6.077	1.105	-5.759
$Treat \times \frac{\Delta \text{Middle-Eastern refugees}_{2016-2013}}{\text{German population}_{2013}}$	0.551	(4.924) -3.559	-3.582*	-47.923***	(11.750) -27.113**	(20.541) 14.295
Observations	(3.685) 8,257 5,001	(5.511) 7,145	(1.988) 8,257	(14.292) 5,648	(12.409) 5,648	(15.727) 6,887
# of respondents	5,901	5,181	5,901	4,686	4,686	5,501
Panel (C): Δ Middle-Eastern asyl	um seekers _{2015–201}	$_{13}$ / Germ	an population	$_{2013}, 2013 \& 2013$	015	
treated = TMENA immigrants	(N = 981), control	$\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{non-7}$	rmena immig		034)	
$\frac{\Delta \text{Middle-Eastern AS}_{2015-2013}}{\text{German population}_{2013}}$	0.345	3.193	-1.217	-8.224	6.042	
$Treat imes \frac{\Delta Middle-Eastern AS_{2015-2013}}{German population_{2013}}$	(3.434) -11.373*	(7.160) -9.040	(2.524) 0.082	(16.187) -51.086**	(16.546) -40.925**	
	(5.892)	(8.190)	(3.031)	(23.224)	(20.509)	
# of respondents	8,742 6,015	$7,511 \\ 5,260$	$8,742 \\ 6,015$	5,714 4,581	5,714 4,581	
Panel (D): Δ Middle-Eastern asy	lum seekers _{2016–202}	13 / Gern	an population	₂₀₁₃ , 2013 & 2	016	

TABLE A-6: Treatment intensity - alternative measures

treated = TMENA immigrants (N = 965), control = non-TMENA immigrants (N = 4,936)

<u>AMiddle-Eastern AS₂₀₁₆₋₂₀₁₃</u> German population ₂₀₁₃	-2.951	3.389	-0.267	-20.649*	-3.379	-26.507
2013	(3.072)	(4.191)	(1.814)	(11.694)	(10.526)	(16.393)
$Treat \times \frac{\Delta Middle-Eastern AS_{2016-2013}}{German populationance}$	-0.082	-1.147	-2.181*	-25.228***	-16.082^{**}	11.531
corman population ₂₀₁₃	(2.051)	(3.038)	(1.217)	(7.781)	(6.657)	(8.972)
Observations	8,257	7,145	8,257	$5,\!648$	$5,\!648$	6,887
# of respondents	5,901	5,181	5,901	$4,\!686$	4,686	5,501

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations.

Source: ODD for 2019 bills of the formed pinct pinct

Appendix B: Robustness checks

As discussed in Section 4.3.2, we first generate a dummy variable, *Before-OBP-in-2015*, taking the value of 1 if the survey observation in the year 2015 is recorded before the OBP announcement on the 25th August 2015 and 0 otherwise. Similarly, we generate another dummy variable *After-OBP-in-2015* taking the value of 1 if the observation is recorded after the OBP announcement in the year 2015 and 0 otherwise. In place of the baseline interaction term (*Treat* × *Year*₂₀₁₅), we now estimate two separate interaction terms (*Treat* × *Before-OBP-in-2015* and *Treat* × *After-OBP-in-2015*). Table B-3 in the online appendix shows the results. In the table, we find that, in most specifications the common trend assumption (CTA) holds, except in column (1). That is, the estimated interaction effects for the pre-treatment interaction term (*Treat* × *Before-OBP-in-2015*) are not statistically significant in most specifications. In column (1), however, the CTA fails. We interpret this discrepancy to be in line with the effects associated with the peak inflow of refugees observed towards the middle of the year 2015 and revisit later in the subsection. Column (1) also shows that the coefficient on the post-treatment interaction term *Treat* × *After-OBP-in-2015*, though larger in terms of magnitude than the pre-treatment interaction term, is not statistically significant. The standard error, usually an indicator of the precision of the estimate, is twice as large as the baseline estimate, largely due to the reduced sample size post-OBP announcement.

Second, we generate two dummy variables indicating survey observations recorded in the first half of the year 2015 (January-June) and second of the year 2015 (July-December). Table B-4 shows the results for the interaction effects estimated separately for these two dummy variables ($Treat \times Year_{2015}$ -1st-half and $Treat \times Year_{2015}$ -2nd-half). We make the following two observations. First, in all specifications, we find supporting evidence of the CTA, including column (1). This observation suggests that we do not find an effect of the inflow of immigrants in the first half of the year 2015 (pre-treatment period), supporting evidence of eyeball observation made in Figure 1. Second, we observe that the coefficient on the interaction term effects associated with the post-treatment period ($Treat \times Year_{2015}$ -2nd-half) is now statistically significant and much larger in magnitude (-0.072) than the baseline estimates, indicating immediate and substantial effects associated with the inflow of refugee immigrants to Germany (post-treatment).

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
	Econo	omic imp	act	Socia	Social impact		
	Unemployment	Log	Self-	Worr	ies about		
	status	hourly wage	employment status	immigration	crime		
Panel (A): treat	ed = TMENA im	migrants	s (N = 1,195),	control = native	s (N = 13,628)		
Tranty Var	0.005	0.015	0.004	0.092	0.005		
$1 reat \times Y ear_{2014}$	-0.005	-0.015	-0.004	(0.023)	-0.005		
Trants Var	(0.015)	(0.021)	(0.008)	(0.051)	(0.047)		
$1 real \times 1 ear_{2015}$	-0.029	-0.010	-0.000	-0.105**	-0.080		
$T \rightarrow V$	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.009)	(0.000)	(0.047)		
$1 reat \times Y ear_{2016}$	0.007	-0.013	-0.020***	-0.163	-0.145		
	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.010)	(0.055)	(0.049)		
$Treat \times Y ear_{2017}$	-0.006	-0.031	-0.012	-0.096*	-0.051		
	(0.020)	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.056)	(0.052)		
Observations	45,589	42,006	45,589	49,406	49,406		
# of respondents	14,823	13,959	14,823	16,042	16,042		
Panel (B): treat	ed = non-TMEN	A immig	rants (N = $5,9$	04), control = na	atives (N = $13,628$)		
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	0.001	-0.012	-0.008**	0.053**	-0.006		
	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.003)	(0.021)	(0.020)		
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	0.009	0.010	-0.008**	0.058***	-0.025		
	(0.006)	(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.022)	(0.021)		
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	0.007	-0.003	-0.004	0.059**	0.003		
	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.004)	(0.024)	(0.022)		
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	0.007	0.005	-0.000	0.104***	0.012		
2011	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.025)	(0.023)		
Observations	58,777	53,779	58,777	61,755	61,755		
# of respondents	19,532	18,318	19,532	20,523	20,523		

TABLE B-1: Pseudo-treated groups

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: In this table, we show the economic and social impact of ERC in Germany on different experimental groups: i.e. TMENA immigrants in treated group and natives in control group (panel B). Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. The sample used to estimate economic effects include 3,059 TMENA, 16,247 non-TMENA and 42,530 native individual-year observations. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
	Econo	omic impa	act		Social impact			
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries immigration	about crime	Feel German		
Panel (A): treate	$\mathbf{ed} = \mathbf{TMENA} \ \mathbf{im}$	migrants	N = 1,195),	$\mathbf{control} = \mathbf{CE}$	E immigrant	s (N = 1,848)		
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.003 (0.017)	-0.004 (0.024)	0.004 (0.009)	0.003 (0.062)	$0.055 \\ (0.057)$	-0.077 (0.072)		
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	-0.033 (0.020)	-0.027 (0.026)	-0.001 (0.010)	-0.139** (0.063)	-0.026 (0.058)			
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	$0.015 \\ (0.021)$	-0.019 (0.028)	-0.014 (0.012)	-0.238^{***} (0.067)	-0.121^{**} (0.060)	-0.010 (0.085)		
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.001 \\ (0.022) \end{array}$	-0.050^{*} (0.030)	-0.005 (0.014)	-0.150^{**} (0.068)	-0.038 (0.063)			
Observations # of respondents	$^{8,215}_{3,043}$	$7,068 \\ 2,695$	$^{8,215}_{3,043}$	$7,796 \\ 2,880$	$7,796 \\ 2,880$	4,967 2,779		
Panel (B): treate	Panel (B): treated = TMENA immigrants (N = $1,195$), control = EU non-CEE immigrants (N = $1,212$)							
$Treat imes Year_{2014}$	-0.002 (0.018)	0.003 (0.025)	0.005 (0.010)	-0.024 (0.065)	-0.043 (0.061)	-0.045 (0.078)		
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	-0.051^{**} (0.021)	-0.008 (0.028)	-0.003 (0.011)	-0.119^{*} (0.067)	-0.074 (0.062)			
$Treat imes Year_{2016}$	-0.017 (0.022)	0.004 (0.029)	-0.019 (0.013)	-0.200*** (0.070)	-0.157^{**} (0.064)	$0.128 \\ (0.093)$		
$Treat \times Y ear_{2017}$	-0.033 (0.023)	(0.017) (0.033)	-0.028* (0.015)	(0.072)	(0.068)	4.044		
# of respondents	6,525 2,407	5,522 2,116	$^{6,525}_{2,407}$	6,292 2,286	6,292 2,286	4,044 2,265		
Panel (C): treate	d = TMENA im	migrants	(N = 1,195),	control = oth	er immigrant	$ts \; (N=2,\!854)$		
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.011 (0.016)	-0.004 (0.024)	$0.003 \\ (0.009)$	-0.048 (0.059)	-0.019 (0.054)	-0.023 (0.068)		
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$	-0.035^{*} (0.019)	-0.028 (0.026)	0.002 (0.010)	-0.193^{***} (0.061)	-0.065 (0.055)			
$Treat \times Y ear_{2016}$	(0.003) (0.020)	0.000 (0.028)	-0.019^{*} (0.011)	-0.224*** (0.064)	-0.168^{***} (0.057)	$0.107 \\ (0.078)$		
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.007 (0.022)	-0.021 (0.030)	-0.017 (0.013)	-0.230^{***} (0.064)	-0.085 (0.060)			
Observations # of respondents	$10,710 \\ 4,049$	$9,109 \\ 3,580$	$10,710 \\ 4,049$	$10,481 \\ 3,879$	$10,481 \\ 3,879$	$6,493 \\ 3,601$		

TABLE B-2: Alternative control groups

Source: SOEP v34 2013-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: In this table, we show the economic and social impact of ERC in Germany on different experimental groups: i.e. TMENA immigrants in the treated group, CEE immigrants (panel A), EU non-CEE immigrants (panel B), and other immigrants (panel C) in the control group. Control variables include all the control variables used for our baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Econo	omic imp	act	Soc	ial impact	
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries a immigration	about crime	Feel German
treated = TMENA immig	rants (N = $1,195$), contro	l = non-TMEN	NA immigrants	s (N = 5,90	04)
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.007	-0.001	0.003	-0.036	-0.002	-0.046
	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.008)	(0.054)	(0.050)	(0.063)
Treat imes Before-OBP-in-2015	-0.035*	-0.015	0.003	-0.145**	-0.057	
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.010)	(0.056)	(0.051)	
$Treat \times After-OBP-in-2015$	-0.057	-0.068	-0.027	-0.361^{***}	-0.040	
	(0.042)	(0.059)	(0.018)	(0.115)	(0.101)	
$Treat \times Year_{2016}$	0.001	-0.005	-0.019*	-0.234^{***}	-0.149^{***}	0.074
	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.011)	(0.059)	(0.052)	(0.072)
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.012	-0.028	-0.016	-0.209***	-0.063	
	(0.020)	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.059)	(0.055)	
Observations	19,306	16,725	19,306	18,445	18,445	11,248
# of respondents	7,099	6,371	7,099	6,757	6,757	6,257

TABLE B-3: After dividing the 2015 to two parts around the OBP announcement

Some Some Some vol 2015-2017, unbalanced panel, own calculations. Notes: Our treated group consists of TMENA immigrants and the control group is comprised of non-TMENA immigrants in Germany. The year 2015 is divided into two parts around the OBP announcement on 15th August 2015. Control variables include all the control variables used for baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Econo	omic imp	act	Soc	ial impact	
	Unemployment status	Log hourly wage	Self- employment status	Worries a immigration	about crime	Feel German
treated = TMENA immi	grants ($N = 1,19$	$5), \mathrm{contr}$	ol = non-TME	NA immigran	ts (N = 5,9	004)
$Treat \times Year_{2014}$	-0.007	-0.001	0.003	-0.040	-0.009	-0.046
	(0.015)	(0.022)	(0.008)	(0.054)	(0.050)	(0.063)
$Treat \times Year_{2015}$ -1st-half	-0.021 (0.020)	(0.001)	0.006 (0.011)	-0.125^{**} (0.057)	-0.023 (0.053)	
$Treat \times Year_{2015}\text{-}2nd\text{-}half$	-0.072***	-0.068*	-0.015	-0.293***	-0.157**	
TractiveVeen	(0.028)	(0.035)	(0.013)	(0.077)	(0.070)	0.074
$1 real \times 1 ear_{2016}$	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.018)	(0.059)	(0.052)	(0.074)
$Treat \times Year_{2017}$	-0.013	-0.029	-0.016	-0.212***	-0.071	(0.0)
	(0.020)	(0.027)	(0.012)	(0.059)	(0.055)	
Observations	19,306	16,725	19,306	18,445	18,445	11,248
# of respondents	7,099	6,371	7,099	6,757	6,757	6,257

TABLE B-4: After dividing the 2015 into halves

Note: Our treated group consists of TMENA immigrants and the control group is comprised of non-TMENA immigrants in Germany. The year 2015 is divided into halves. Control variables include all the control variables used for baseline specifications in Table 4. Robust standard errors (clustered at individual level) in parentheses: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.