Which employers have refugee employees - and which do not? Employer typologies developed through hierarchical cluster analyses

Ravn, Rasmus Lind

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Which employers have refugee employees—And which do not? Employer typologies developed through hierarchical cluster analyses

Rasmus Lind Ravn [iD]

Centre for Labour Market Research, Department of Politics and Society, Aalborg University, Aalborg East, Denmark

Correspondence
Rasmus Lind Ravn, Centre for Labour Market Research, Department of Politics and Society, Aalborg University, Aalborg East, Denmark.
Email: rr@dps.aau.dk

Abstract

Employers can be regarded as gatekeepers of jobs. They decide how to post vacancies, whom to recruit and whom to dismiss. In recent years, a growing body of research has highlighted the crucial role of employers in relation to labour market participation of disadvantaged groups. This article contributes to this research by exploring which types of employers have refugee employees—and which do not. We develop the typologies through hierarchical cluster analyses using a nationally representative survey of Danish workplaces. We find that the employers who have experiences with having refugee employees can be grouped into three based on their attitudes and preconceptions; knights, knaves and squires. Likewise, employers who have never had refugee employees can also be divided into three groups; aspiring knights, knights of fortune, and commoners. The groups differ in their attitudes and motivations for (not) having refugee employees. Our main contribution to the literature is the development of new nuanced employer typologies, and the finding that employers differ in their motivations for having, or not having, refugee employees.

KEYWORDS
active labour market policy, cluster analysis, employers, employment policy, refugees, typology, unemployment

1 | INTRODUCTION

Employers can be regarded as gatekeepers of jobs. They decide how to post vacancies, whom to recruit and whom to dismiss. In recent years, there has been a growing research interest in the role, the engagement and the responsibility employers have in relation to activation policies as well as labour market integration and retention of disadvantaged groups (e.g., Lindsay & McQuaid, 2009; van Gestel et al., 2019). This has been characterised as shift from a supply side focus (making job seekers ready for jobs) to a demand side focus (making employers ready for jobseekers) (Bredgaard, 2018; Dinan, 2019; Ingold, 2020; Ingold & Stuart, 2015).

A number of employer typologies have been developed in recent years, focusing on the employer role in relation to employer participation in active labour market policies (ALMPs) and recruitment of disadvantaged unemployed (see the review section).

Most employer typologies are generated through qualitative interviews where the researcher theorises upon the interviews. A minority of typologies are based on quantitative survey data. These typologies are typically *deductively* derived from theory, in the sense that the typology is derived *before* it is applied to survey data. This entails that the researcher develops the typology and then applies it to the real world to see how well the typology fits the data at hand. All of these approaches to developing typologies are feasible, and the typologies have increased our understanding of employer types, employer motivations and rationales, and provided us with concepts for studying employer attitudes and behaviour. Qualitatively developed typologies allow for complexity and detail, but lack statistical generalisation, making it difficult to access how prevalent the employer types are in society. On the other hand, developing typologies deductively (and then applying them to quantitative data) involves a risk of missing important nuances and reducing complexity too much, for instance, by focusing on only one or two dimensions in relation to participation in ALMPs or employment of disadvantaged groups.

The existing typologies do not have an explicit focus on immigrants with a refugee background. Refugees are of particular relevance in relation to employer typologies. First, a number of studies and meta-analyses have found that immigrants and other minority groups face discrimination in the recruitment process (e.g., Quillian et al., 2019). Secondly, especially newly arrived refugees and immigrant face language barriers when searching for jobs since, they are not yet fully proficient in the language of the new host country (Bredgaard & Thomsen, 2018; Lundborg & Skedinger, 2016). Thirdly, refugees often have not obtained the educational qualifications which employers demand (Schultz-Nielsen & Skaksen, 2017). If they have a degree, their educational degrees may not be recognised as valid in their new country, which has the consequence that immigrants in employment often hold jobs below their qualifications (Schultz-Nielsen, 2020). Fourthly, many immigrants with a refugee background do not have relevant work experience in the industry where they apply for jobs, and if they do, employers may not deem work experience from their country of origin as sufficient. As such, employment of refugees represents a 'hard case' since there are many barriers for employment of refugees. Thus, there are many reasons why employers might decide *not* to recruit people with a refugee background. Therefore, it is particularly relevant to explore what characterises employers who do, and do not, employ people with a refugee background in terms of their attitudes and preconceptions.

In this article, we use an *inductive* approach to developing typologies in the form of hierarchical cluster analysis. Instead of developing the typologies a priori, the typologies are developed based on the patterns emerge from the data. One of the advantages of using an inductive approach to developing typologies, is that the researchers' creativity and ability to theorise is brought into play based on the pattern that emerge in the data through the cluster analysis. This makes it possible to achieve insights that are not derived from existing typologies and theories. As such, 'new' discoveries are more likely when using an inductive approach. However, existing theories and typologies can be applied and related to the new empirical patterns retrospectively. The caveat of using the aforementioned approach is that one might end up with clusters (groupings) that cannot be related to existing research or do not make sense theoretically.

Through the analyses in this article, we contribute to the literature by developing new employer typologies that nuance our understanding of employer motivations for employing, or not employing, refugees.

The article is structured as follows. First, we review the literature on existing employer typologies, and highlight the contribution of the article. Next, we present the Danish case of labour market integration of refugees and the methods of the study. Then we move on to the results and describe the typologies and investigate what characterises the different employer types. We end the article by concluding and discussing the findings.

1.1 | Review of employer typologies

In the section, we review a selection of existing employer typologies. Prior research into employer attitudes towards employment of disadvantaged groups and participation in active labour market polices generally finds positive attitudes among employers (e.g., Bredgaard, 2018; Lundborg & Skedinger, 2016). Despite exhibiting positive attitudes towards the responsibility of employers to be socially inclusive, only a minority of employers exhibit this positive behaviour. As such, there tends to be a discrepancy between actions and attitudes. This discrepancy is also highlighted in several of the typologies reviewed next.

In a comparative analysis based on survey and qualitative data among Danish and British firms, Martin (2004) distinguishes between five types of employers based on their engagement in active labour market policies. These range from *Non-participating firms* that do not participate due to ideological opposition to the policies to firms that are formal participators who engage in ALMPs. Martin finds higher participation in Denmark which she explains through stronger social partnership in Denmark.

Focusing on long-term unemployed in Britain, Snape (1998) develops a typology consisting of four types of companies. The first type is not able to recruit long-term unemployed due to various circumstances (for instance demand for highly specialised labour). The second type are commercially motivated (motivated by their self-interest). The third type of employers are both commercially motivated and motivated by social responsibility. The fourth type of employers are almost solely motivated through social responsibility.

In a British study of employer reasons for employing young unemployed with a wage incentive (subsidy) Coleman et al. (2014), identifies five types of employers. The *altruistic employers* are motivated through a sense of social responsibility to help young unemployed. The *opportunistic employers* motivated by the financial incentive provided in the programme, and are thus acting in a self-interested manner. The responsive employers reacted to the financial incentive (and discovered it), through a job interview with a candidate where the possibility was mentioned. The *strategic employers* have developed an explicit strategy to use the wage incentives as part of their recruitment practice. Finally, the last groups of employers exhibit a mixture of the motivations above.

In an Australian study examining employer hiring decisions of disabled people, Hemphill and Kulik (2016) used 86 interviews with employers to develop a typology consisting of four types of employers. *Loyal hirers* have prior experience with having disabled employees (either currently or previously) and their experiences are generally positive. *Light hirers* have less experience with employing disabled people, but a rather large share of these employers have had negative experiences with employing disabled people. *Non-hirers* have no prior experience with having disabled employees, and they have very limited knowledge about barriers and potentials for recruiting disabled people. Finally, the *antagonists* have no or extremely limited knowledge about barriers and potentials for employment of disabled people. They are sceptical towards the notion of employing disabled people and have severe financial concerns in this regard.

A Danish study by Bredgaard (2018) develops a typology of employer engagement in active labour market policies (ALMPs) based on a representative survey among Danish employers. He develops the typology deductively and then applies it to the data. He distinguishes between four types of employers. *The committed employer* is characterised by positive attitudes and by participation in ALMPs. *The dismissive employer* does not participate in AMLPs and furthermore has negative attitudes. The *sceptical employer* is characterised by having negative attitudes towards the public employment service, but nevertheless participates in AMLPs. Finally, *the passive employer* exhibits positive attitudes but still does not participate in AMLPs. The sceptical employers and the passive employers are examples of the aforementioned discrepancy between attitudes and actions.

Lastly, Ingold and Valizade (2015) use comparative survey data from the United Kingdom and Denmark to develop a categorisation (typology) of employer engagement in ALMPs. They use Latent Class Analysis, which is an inductive approach to grouping of data (like cluster analysis). They find two forms of employer engagement. They distinguish between *instrumentally engaged* employers (with low commitment) and *relationally engaged* employers (with high commitment).

Summarising the above, the important factors for recruitment of disadvantaged groups and employer engagement are:

- Notions of social responsibility, attitudes and ideology
- Self-interest
- Wage concerns and incentives

In addition to these dimensions, we add *preconceptions* as an important factor for employment of disadvantaged groups with a specific focus on refugees.

In summary, many of the typologies above distinguish between participation and non-participation, and they often focus ALMPs or recruitment of disabled people or long-term unemployed. We have found no employer typologies that focus on employment of refugees. As highlighted by Bredgaard there is often a discrepancy between behaviour and attitudes, in the sense that a large number of employers do no participate in ALMPs despite exhibiting positive attitudes, and some employers with negative attitudes participate regardless. We also find this discrepancy.

Our main contribution to the literature is the development of a finely grained typology of employers adding to our understanding of employer attitudes, preconceptions and behaviour. We find that (1) it is not *either* social responsibility or self-interest that matter in relation to employment of disadvantaged groups. Neither is the dichotomy of positive/negative sufficient. Therefore, we add, *preconceptions* about the work motivation and work experience which are also important in addition to concerns about minimum wages. (2) Reality is often complex and employers do not fall into an either/or category. Instead, multiple factors are at play.

1.2 | Case

The Danish case of labour market integration of refugees and employers is interesting to study for a number of reasons. As already noted, Denmark has a strong tradition of social partnership between employer associations and unions (Rasmussen & Høgedahl, 2021). The latest example in relation to labour market integration of refugees was a tripartite agreement from 2016 between the government, the unions and the employer association where the integrations policies were reformed. In theory, this should strengthen support for the policies among employers.

In addition, Denmark is characterised by a low degree of regulation regarding dismissal and recruitment decisions of companies, supporting a flexible labour market where employers are free to recruit and dismiss whom they want (Bredgaard et al., 2006). Furthermore, Denmark has a compressed wage structure with high minimum wages through collective agreements, and demand for highly skilled labour (Brochmann & Hagelund, 2011) disfavouring unskilled labour. Refugees and migrants in Denmark often lack the formal qualifications that are in demand among employers (Schultz-Nielsen & Skaksen, 2017) and even if refugees possess a degree from their home country, they are often employed below their qualification levels (Schultz-Nielsen, 2020).

In addition, newly arrived refugees are often not fully proficient in the language of their new host country, which hampers their change of securing a job, since most Danish workplaces require some level of Danish language skills (Bredgaard & Thomsen, 2018). Additionally, refugees in Scandinavia more often have poor health compared to both the general population and other minority groups (Borsch et al., 2018).

Furthermore, compared with its Scandinavian neighbours (Sweden and Norway) Denmark has worse integration outcomes in terms of the share of refugees in employment and education 5 and 7 years after being granted

residency (Hernes et al., 2019). Denmark thereby represents a 'hard case' in terms of labour market integration of refugees, making it particularly relevant to examine which types of employers do, and do not, employ refugees. Securing a successful match between refugee jobseekers and employers thus seems rather difficult in a Danish context.

Furthermore, the importance of engaging employers in activation policies, both in relation to employment of refugees and more generally, is highlighted in the national activation policies. Job training at real workplaces and 'work-for-benefits' has been at the fore for since the turn of the millennium in Denmark signalling a 'work-first' approach to activation (Andersen & Breidahl, 2021).

1.3 | Data

This article uses data from a national survey of Danish workplaces with at least three employees. We obtained an initial sample of 5000 public and private workplaces through the Danish CVR-register, in which all companies in Denmark are listed. From the register, we also obtained information about the size of the workplace, sector and industry of the workplace and the number of employees. Workplaces with less than three employees were subsequently excluded from the net sample. The survey was conducted in June 2019 by sending invitations to employers to participate in the survey email. The employers were subsequently called by phone and presented with the option to be guided through the questionnaire by an interviewer. A maximum of two email reminders were sent to the workplaces. The response rate of the survey amounted to 42.9% (1977 responses).

The questionnaire included questions about several topics such as recruitment channels and collaboration with the public employment services. Most importantly in this regard, the survey also investigated employer attitudes towards recruitment of refugees and their experiences with having refugee employees. These questions are used to the employer typologies using hierarchical cluster analyses described next.

To prepare the data for analysis, we furthermore dropped respondents with missing values or invalid answers to specific questions to be used in our analyses. This reduced the number of observations (respondents) to 1675. The Danish business landscape is dominated by small and very small businesses.[1] Therefore, to ensure representativity and in order for us to estimate the prevalence of each employer type, the data has not been weighted. The percentages presented in the tables and in the text are thus the 'raw' percentages based on the frequencies.

2 | METHODS

To develop the employer typologies we utilise hierarchical cluster analyses on variables measuring employer attitudes on recruitment of refugees. Cluster analysis is an inductive method for discovering groupings of patterns in quantitative data (Karlson, 2017). In this way, it shares some similarities with, for instance, factor analysis. Where factors analysis factor can be used to explore if a number of *variables* measure the same theoretical concept, for instance institutional trust (Karlson, 2017), cluster analyses seek to group observations (in our case the respondents of the survey) that are similar to each other on the variables included in the analysis. These groupings are called clusters.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was chosen for our analyses, because the number of clusters are not predetermined by the researcher as opposed to non-hierarchical cluster analysis. In order to decide upon to number of clusters to form, we use a so called 'stopping rule', namely the Calinski-Harabasz pseudo-F statistic stopping rule (Halpin, 2016). According to this stopping rule, the numbers of clusters to generate should depend upon the value of the pseudo-F statistic. Namely, one should generate the number of clusters which corresponds to the largest pseudo-F value. As depicted in Table A1, three clusters are appropriate for 'employers who have previously employed or currently employ refugees' and three clusters are appropriate for 'employers who have never had refugee employees' totalling six distinct clusters.

Cluster analysis methods are able to handle either continuous or binary variables. Our attitude questions in the survey were measured on an ordinal scale ranging from 1 to 4 ('completely agrees', 'agrees', 'disagrees' and 'completely disagrees') and a 'don't know' option. To prepare the data for analysis, we recoded each of attitude variables in question into three (binary) dummy variables; 'Agree', 'disagree' and 'don't know'.

When conducting a cluster analysis there are an extensive number of so-called linkage methods and a series of (dis)similarity measures. Some of the linkage methods are best suited for continuous data but can, in principle, be used for all data types. Most importantly, one should choose a (dis)similarity measure the suitable for the type of data at hand.

In our case, we use ward's linkage method and the Jaccard dissimilarity measure which is one of several (dis)similarity measures suitable for binary data. Several other linkage methods (single linkage, complete linkage and median linkage) have been tried in the research process. The same is the case for the dissimilarity measures for binary data where Gower2, matching, Yule, Pearson and Dice have been tried in addition to Jaccard.

Having tried the methods mentioned above, the next step was to inspect the results and thereafter to reflect and theorise upon them. The aim was to get distinct cluster with variations in both attitudes, behaviour and preconceptions. In the end, the above-mentioned linkage method and dissimilarity measure yielded the 'best' results in this regard through generation of distinct clusters. Therefore, the main reasoning behind settling upon these two methods specifically, was that it generated results that logically made sense to the author, exhibited variation and were suitable for typology development. Just like in relation to qualitative approaches to typology development, there is a strong aspect of subjective assessments using the above approach.

In the next section, the typologies are presented in a stylized fashion. In some instances, this entails an oversimplification of a complex reality. It, however, allows for which allows us to draw out the most important features of each of the employer types thereby presenting us with an ideal-typical description of employers.

3 | RESULTS

To get a sense of the data at hand, we start the analysis by showing the share of employer who have experiences with employing people with a refugee background.

The numbers in the table do not sum to 100 since Columns 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive. As can be seen, 13% of the employers currently have a refugee employers. Among this group of employers, 67% have also previously had refugee employees and 33% have a refugee employee for the first time (not shown in the table). Inspecting the second column, we see that 24% of employers have had a refugee employee in the past. Among this group (not shown in the table), 38% still have at least one refugee employee (thus also figuring in the first column). Finally, we find that 72% of Danish employers have never had a refugee employee.

Having outlined the practice of Danish employers in relation to employment of refugees, we move on to the typologies. The first typology focuses on employers who currently or previously have employed people with a refugee background (the employers in Columns 1 and 2 in Table 1). We include both the groups of employers for several reasons. First, all of these employers have, to some degree, contributed to the labour market integration of refugees. Secondly, by also including employers who have previously employed refugee, we get a much more nuanced and meaningful typology than we would by solely focusing on employers, who currently have refugees employed.

TABLE 1 Employer practice regarding employment of refugees

Employers who currently have refugee employees	Employers who have had refugee employees in the past	Employers who have never had refugee employees
13% (225)	24% (401)	72% (1200)

Note: '*n*' in parentheses.

Limiting our analyses to solely include employers who currently employ refugees would distort the results in an overly positive way. Thirdly, the 'n' in the analyses increases substantially by including both groups.

3.1 | Typology of employers who have contributed to the labour market integration of refugees

First, we present the questions used for the typology development. The questions used were the following:

1. As a workplace, we have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background
2. Employing people with a refugee background can help us avoid a shortage of labour
3. Generally, people with a refugee background are very motivated to work
4. A lack of relevant work experience among refugees means that we are reluctant to hire refugee
5. The minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile

The first question is related to the notion of corporate social responsibility. It is included in the typology since existing research has found this to be a motivational factor for employment of disadvantaged groups as described in the review section.

The second question captures a self-interest approach to employment of refugees, which can be a decisive factor in relation to employment of disadvantaged groups (cf. the review). More specifically, the question examines the employer understanding that employment of refugees can help avoid a labour shortage.

The third question was developed and included to capture a (positive) preconception about people with a refugee background, more specifically the preconception that they are motivated to work. Danish public discourse and political debates have explicitly or implicitly revolved around that notion that refugees lack incentives to take up work and, in essence, that they are lazy.

The fourth question captures if employers are reluctant to hire refugees because they believe that refugees lack relevant work experience. This can also been seen as a way of measuring preconceptions.

Costs and wages were also important in the existing typologies. The final question, therefore, relates to the minimum wages in place in most Danish workplaces through collective agreements. In Denmark, there has been a profound debate among politicians and the social partners concerning the minimum wages in the collective agreements, and has been identified as one among several barriers for employment of refugees (e.g., Bredgaard & Thomsen, 2018).

In naming the clusters, we heavily borrow terms from Le Grand (2010) who distinguishes between 'knights' and 'knaves' among public sector employees. Knights are motivated to make a difference in the work as public sector employees and have a high degree of public service motivation. They are thus driven by noble or even 'chivalric' intensions to better the world even if it entails self-sacrifice. Knaves on the other hand are self-interested individuals aiming to benefit themselves. In so far as they do the 'right thing' they do it because it is in their own interest. We borrow these two terms from Le Grand when developing and describing the different employer types, but add four additional types building upon the same medieval theme.

3.1.1 | Knights

The first employer type in Table 2 is the 'knight'. These employers constitute 37% of the have previously employed or currently employ refugees (and 10% of all Danish employers). These employers strongly believe they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background. In this regard, they are similar to the employers Bredgaard (2018) calls 'the committed employer'. They are also of the notion, that employing people with a refugee background

TABLE 2 Employer typologies

Employers who have previously employed or currently employ refugees				Employers who have never had refugee employees			
Knights (37%)	Knaves (33%)	Squires (30%)	Total (100%)	Aspiring knights (18%)	Knights of fortune (22%)	Commoners (60%)	Total (100%)

Note: '*n*' in parentheses.

can help avoid a shortage of labour, which may coincide with their self-interest. 'Knights' furthermore have a very positive preconception of the work motivation of people with a refugee background and very few negative preconceptions about the work motivation of refugees (see Table A2). Thus, you could argue, that knights are characterised by the absence of negative preconceptions about refugees. Knights furthermore *not* reluctant to hire people with a refugee background people they lack work experience. In addition, they do not believe that the minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile.

3.1.2 | Knaves

The second employer type are labelled 'knaves'. These employers constitute 33% of those who have previously employed or currently employ refugees (and 9% of all employers). They differ from the knights regarding their attitudes towards employment of refugees. The knaves do not believe they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background which supports the notion that they are mainly self-interested in relation to their recruitment practices. This is also supported by the fact that most knaves believe that employing people with a refugee background can help avoid a shortage of labour. In relation to the preconception of the work motivation of people with a refugee background, they only differ slightly from the knights. Little less than half of the knaves, agree that people with a refugee background are very motivated to work (see Table A2). Overall, they do not view the work motivation of refugees in a negative light but we do find the largest share of sceptics among the knaves. The vast majority of knaves are reluctant to hire refugees due to a lack of relevant work experience among people with a refugee background—a view that was almost non-existing among the knights. Among both knaves and knights, the wage levels do not constitute a significant barrier to employment of refugees. In sum, the knaves, they are generally not motivated to employ refugees due to social responsibility. Instead, they are motivated to do so based on their own self-interest. They are however also quite reluctant to hire people with a refugee background because they lack relevant work experience.

3.1.3 | Squires

Finally, we have the group of employers that can be conceptualised as 'squires'. They constitute the remaining 30% of the employers who have experiences with employing refugees (and 9% of all employers). In the Middle Ages, squires were usually adolescent boys training to become knights themselves, by assisting a knight (their master) in numerous practical ways. The squires are very similar to the knights in several ways. They strongly believe they have a social obligation to employ refugees. In fact, every single respondent in the group of squires agrees that they have a social obligation to do so. In this way, they may hold even more virtuous values than the knights. The same is the case regarding their agreement with the statement, that employing people with a refugee background can help avoid a shortage of labour. Almost all of the squires agree with this, which coincidentally might be in their own self-interest. In relation to positive preconceptions, they also hold even more virtuous values than the knights. More than half of them believe that people with a refugee background are very motivated to work, only a small minority believe

that they are not. In relation to their views on the minimum wages, they differ slightly from the knights. A bit more than 20% agree that the minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile (see Table A2). Even though this is the highest proportion among the employer types, they still constitute a minority among the squires. Despite many similarities with the knights, the squires differ markedly in reluctance to recruit people with a refugee background due to a lack of work experience. Almost every single squire is reluctant to hire refugees due to a lack of work experience among refugees.

Having outlined the typology of employers who, through their actions, have contributed to the labour market integration of refugees, we now turn to the employers who have never employed refugees.

3.2 | Typology of employers who have not contributed to the labour market integration of refugees

In developing the next typology, we focus on employers who have *never* employed refugees. We describe these employers in the following. See Table A3 for the distribution on attitude variables.

3.3 | Aspiring knights

The first employer type identified through the cluster analyses can be labelled 'aspiring knights'. These employers constitute 18% of the employers who have never had refugee employees (13% of all employers). They exhibit extremely virtuous values, in fact, they exhibit even more positive values than the knights and the squires. There is, however, a discrepancy between their very positive attitudes and their behaviour, since they have never had refugee employees. The term, aspiring knights is chosen to signify, that there is a lot of potential among this group of employers. Logically, they should be willing to employ people with a refugee background if provided with the right opportunity. Turning to the results, every single employer among the aspiring knights agree that they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background. Furthermore, all of the aspiring knights also believe that employing refugees can help avoid a shortage of labour. The aspiring knights are also characterised by the complete absence of negative preconceptions about the work motivation of refugees. None of these employers disagree that people with a refugee background are very motivated to work. Almost half of the aspiring knights believe that refugees are very motivated to work and the remaining half 'don't know'. In addition, all of the aspiring knights disagree that the minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile. The only question, where the aspiring knights are not overly positive concerns the work experience of people with a refugee background; 50% of them agree that they are reluctant to hire refugees because they lack relevant work experience. In relation to labour market integration of refugees, this provides somewhat of a puzzle: Refugees cannot obtain relevant work experience if employers are not willing to employ them. However, the remaining 50% of the aspiring knights either disagree or 'don't know" if they are reluctant to hire refugees due to inadequate work experience. This group of employers may potentially recruit refugees in the future.

3.4 | Knights of fortune

The next type is the knights of fortune. They make up 22% of the employers who have not contributed to the labour market integration of refugees (and 16% of all employers). The knights of fortune in Table 2 above are generally driven by their self-interest and are additionally characterised by the *absence* of attitudes in relation to employment of refugees. Roughly a quarter of the knights of fortune agree that they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background, and almost 40% 'don't know'. Roughly half of the knights of fortune believe that

employing people with a refugee background can help avoid a shortage of labour. In relation the preconceptions about work motivation of refugees, they are characterised by almost complete absence of attitudes. Almost all of them 'don't know'. Interpreted in a positive light, no negative attitudes are present among the knights of fortune. The vast majority of the knights of fortune also 'don't know' if they are reluctant to employ refugee due to a lack of relevant work experience. This could indicate that they might be willing to employ refugees if they are in need of labour, due to the absence of negative attitudes. Finally, we see that the level of the minimum wages are not an issue for the knights of fortune. Not a single employer in this group agrees that the minimum wages in the collective agreements are so high that employing refugees is not worthwhile. Instead, almost all of them 'don't know'.

4 | COMMONERS

The last employer type has been labelled *commoners* due to the sheer volume of the group. They constitute 60% of the employers who have never had refugee employees (and 43% of all employers). The commoners thus represent the typical Danish employer. The commoners are diverse some ways, with positive attitudes on some questions and negative attitudes on other questions. However, they are a distinct type of self-interested employer who are different to the knaves. Of the employers who have never had refugee employees, they have the largest share of employers who disagree that they have a social obligation to employ refugees (58%). Only a third believe they have a social obligation to do so. Contrary to the knights of fortune, they have predominantly negative attitudes on this question. Overall, the commoners agree that employment of people with a refugee background can help avoid a shortage of labour signalling a self-interest approach to employment of refugee. In this respect, they are quite similar to the knights of fortune. In fact, of the employers who have never employed refugees, the commoners have the highest share of employers who believe people with a refugee background can alleviate labour shortages.

The largest barrier for employment of refugee for the commoners concerns the work experience of refugees—whether based on preconceptions or experience. Two-thirds of the commoners agree that a lack of relevant work experience among people with a refugee background entails that they are reluctant to hire refugees. In other words, a main concern seems to be about the quality of match of future employees. Taken together, the above could indicate that the commoners might be persuaded to recruit people with a refugee background, if they face a shortage of labour. However, their concerns about the work experience of refugees might indicate that a proactive role of the public employment system is needed in relation to securing a high quality match between employers and potential employees. In a Danish context, workplace training programmes or wage subsidy schemes could be relevant active labour market policies, since both programmes make it possible for employers to assess the work (and the quality of the match) of a candidate for a job for free, or at a drastically reduced cost, for a limited period of time.

The commoners are more ambivalent concerning the remaining questions, in particular about the preconceptions about the work motivation of people with a refugee background. They do, however, stand out as the most wage sensitive of all the employers. Only a minority of the commoners are concerned about wages (28%), but they still constitute the highest share across employer types. In addition, almost 40% 'don't know'. In sum, the typical Danish employers do not believe they have much of a social responsibility to recruit refugees, and they are reluctant to do so because of a belief that refugees typically have inadequate work experience but believe that employing refugees can help avoid labour shortages.

Having outlined the employer typologies, we explore what characterises the employer types in terms of industry in Table A4. The categorisation of industries follows the official EU NACE industry codes and are retrieved as background information prior to sending out the survey.

When interpreting the table in the appendix, it is important to note, that there are only a few observations in some cells—especially when inspecting certain industries. With this in mind, the likelihood of finding a knight, a squire or an aspiring knight is 49% in the public sector whereas it is only 30% in the private sector.

TABLE 3 What characterises the employer types? Column percentages

	Knights	Squires	Aspiring knights	Total for knights, squires and aspiring knights	Knaves	Knights of fortune	Commoners	Total for knaves, knights of fortune and commoners	Total (all six types of employers)
Demand for labour									
Share of workplaces that have recruited new employees during the last year	86% (149)	87% (125)	73% (158)	81% (432)	82% (128)	63% (169)	68% (486)	69% (783)	73% (1215)
Membership of an employer association and collective agreement coverage									
Share that are members of an employer association	56% (98)	57% (82)	42% (91)	51% (271)	52% (82)	35% (95)	41% (291)	41% (468)	44% (739)
Share of workplaces with no collective agreements	30% (52)	26% (38)	42% (92)	34% (182)	41% (64)	48% (129)	46% (326)	46% (519)	42% (701)
Sector									
Share of private sector workplaces	81% (141)	79% (114)	84% (183)	82% (438)	90% (142)	89% (240)	92% (657)	91% (1039)	88% (1477)
Public employment service (PES) contact									
Share of workplaces that have not been contacted by the PES with the purpose of recruiting a refugee	70% (121)	70% (101)	94% (206)	80% (428)	80% (125)	97% (262)	92% (656)	91% (1043)	88% (1471)
The importance of understanding Danish to work at the workplace									
Share of workplaces that state that is *very* important to be able to understand Danish to work at the workplace	59% (103)	74% (107)	71% (154)	68% (364)	75% (118)	75% (202)	75% (536)	75% (856)	73% (1220)
Size of the workplace and share of refugee employees									
Very small (3–9 employees)	32% (56)	33% (48)	55% (119)	42% (223)	41% (65)	60% (162)	63% (449)	59% (676)	54% (899)
Small, Medium and large (10 employees and above)	68% (118)	67% (96)	45% (98)	58% (312)	59% (92)	40% (107)	37% (265)	41% (464)	46% (776)

The industries where the aforementioned employer types are most prevalent are 'care and social work' and 'education and research' (slightly below 50% in total). Empirically, we cannot explain this pattern. It is however, plausible, that it has to do with the skill requirements in these industries and the fact that the work carried out in these industries has much to do with human interaction. The lowest likelihood is within 'agriculture', 'construction' and 'administration'. Conversely, the likelihood of finding a knave, knight of fortune or a commoner is the highest within 'agriculture', 'construction' and 'administration'. Please see also Table A5 for more information on the industry and sector distribution of workplaces.

From sector and industry, we move on to explore what characterises the employer types on other variables in Table 3 below.

From Table 3, we see that 81% of the knights, squires and the aspiring knights have recruited a new employee over the course of the last year. This in only 69% among the knaves, knights of fortune and the commoners. The aspiring knights, the knights of fortune and the commoners have, to a lower degree, recruited new employees. Demand for labour seems to play a role in relation to employment of refugees. This might also help us understand (some) of the discrepancy we find among the aspiring knights, who, despite their positive attitudes, have not employed refugees. The explanation might simply be that they do not experience much economic growth and therefore do not need new employees. Membership of an employer association and collective agreement coverage can be regarded as proxies for decent wages and working conditions as well as union presence at the workplace. In relation to this, we see that a larger share of the knights and the squires (who in fact do employ refugees) are members of an employer association and are covered by a collective agreement than the aspiring knights, knights of fortune and the commoners. Interestingly, the knaves, who also employ refugees, but do so out of their self-interest, have a rather high membership rate of an employer association and collective agreement coverage. Employment of refugees thus seems to be more prevalent in workplaces where organised labour is present.

In addition, we also see rather large differences in the share of employers who have *not* been contacted by the PES within the last year with the purpose of getting the employer to hire a refugee employee. More than 90% of the employers who have not employed refugees (aspiring knights, knights of fortune and commoners), have not been contacted. The share is between 70% and 80% among those who do employ refugees. There may be two reasons for this empirical pattern. First, *contact* may in fact persuade some employers to hire refugees. Second, the PES may, however, choose to contact employers whom they already collaborative with thereby targeting their efforts where they are likely to be successful. Both explanations may have some truth in them. Regardless, *contact* seems of importance in relation recruitment of refugees, since it can be regarded as a first step towards securing a good match between refugees and employers.

Furthermore, we also explore language skill requirements (being able to understand Danish) to work in the workplace. Surprisingly, only the knights stand out from the rest with a share of only 59% indicating that being able to understand Danish is very important to work at the workplace. The share is roughly 70 or above for the other employer types. In the case of the knights, it may be 'easier' to signal social responsibility and act accordingly, if the work is accessible for people who do not understand the language of the majority population. This could indicate that the knights have better prerequisites for a good match with refugees, since being proficient in Danish is not as crucial for them.

Lastly, we also see significant differences regarding the size of the workplace (the number of employees) in relation to employing people with a refugee background. The employers who have never employed refugees (the aspiring knights, the knights of fortune and the commoners), are generally very small businesses with 3–9 employees. More than 50% of these employer types are very small businesses. For the knights, squires and knaves, the share of very small businesses is roughly 30%–40%. Focusing on the employers who currently employ refugees, our data show (not included in a table) that the share of refugee employees at the workplace is rather small with only minor differences across the knights, the knaves and the squires. Overall, the share ranges between 4% and 8% of the total workforce of the workplace.

5 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this article, we developed two employer typologies through hierarchical cluster analyses. In this section, we discuss the findings and their relevance for public employment service efforts.

We find that, in relation to employment of disadvantaged groups such as refugees, employers are not *either* driven by social responsibility or self-interest. Many factors are at play that do not fall into a dichotomy of positive or negative attitudes. We also find that *preconceptions* about refugees are important. In particular, preconceptions about the work motivation and work experience of refugees are important. This is the case for both employers who have never employed refugees, and employers have employed refugees. The often-mentioned discrepancy between attitudes and behaviour (e.g., Bredgaard, 2018) is also found in our employer typology. Some employers believe they have a social obligation to employ refugees (have positive attitudes) while lacking the positive behaviour in terms of actually having refugee employees. The opposite is also frequently the case. Some employers do not believe they have an obligation to hire refugees despite having refugees employees. Here, other factors are at play such as their self-interest or preconceptions about refugees. The above, are some of the key contributions of the article.

This first typology focuses on employers who currently have (or have previously had) refugee employees. Among this group, we distinguish between knights, knaves and squires. Knights believe they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background, and they view refugees in a positive light in relation to their work motivation. Their virtuous values coincide with a strong belief that employment can help avoid labour shortages and they do not see a lack of relevant work experience among refugees or high minimum wages as a barrier for employment of refugees.

The knaves, on the other hand, are mainly motivated to employ refugees if it coincides with their self-interest. They do not believe they have a social obligation to employ refugees but believe employment of refugees can help avoid a shortage of labour.

The squires are very similar to the knights in most aspects, and they tend to exhibit even more virtuous values than the knights. They are, however, extremely more reluctant to hire refugees due to a lack of inadequate work experience.

The second typology explores the employer types, who have never had refugee employees. Among these employers, we distinguish between aspiring knights, knights of fortune and commoners. The aspiring knights exhibit extremely virtues values. They strongly believe they have a social obligation to employ refugees, and the furthermore view people with a refugee background in a very positive light. They believe employment of refugees can help avoid labour shortages, and the minimum wages are not seen as an obstacle. They are, however, somewhat reluctant to recruit refugees due to a lack of relevant work experience. There is also a vast discrepancy between their very positive attitudes and their actual behaviour, since they have never employed people with a refugee background. They may however be prone to recruit refugees in the future. The main barrier for these employers seems to the match between supply (the skills and competencies of refugees) and demand and requirements for a given job.

Like the knaves, the knights of fortune are driven almost solely by their self-interest. Only a minority of the knights of fortune believe they have a social obligation to employ refugees and roughly half of them believe employing people with a refugee background can help avoid labour shortages. They are furthermore characterised by the absence of attitudes in relation to the work motivation of refugees, the minimum wages and work experience of refugees. As such, they are not concerned about these issues.

Finally, we identified a group of employers among those who have never employed refugees labelled as commoners. The name was given to this group because they are, by far, the largest group of employers. The commoners are a distinct type of self-interested employer. The majority disagrees that they have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background. They do, however, believe that employment of refugees can help avoid labour shortages. Commoners also identify a lack relevant work experience as a significant barrier, indicating that a good match with future workers is of utmost importance, as was also the case with the aspiring knights. Furthermore, a rather large minority of the commoners believe that the minimum wages are too high to make employment refugees

worthwhile. Policies need to take account of this, if the commoners are to be engaged in labour market integration of refugees, for instance through work experience programmes and wage subsidy schemes.

The aforementioned discrepancy between attitudes and behaviour may be due to social desirability bias, where respondents answer according to what they think is socially acceptable. Naturally, we cannot exclude that this could be the case in some instances. However, the discrepancy is nothing new in existing research, in particular in consumer research (e.g., Schäufele & Janssen, 2021). For instance, people may want to eat sustainably or buy socially responsible products but may refrain from doing so due to for example the price or unfamiliarity with the product. In relation to employment of refugees, employers may refrain from employing refugees due to unfamiliarity with refugees or a belief that it will not be cost-effective. Importantly, the discrepancy between attitudes and behaviour may also partly be due to the inability to secure a sufficient match between supply and demand (refugee workers and employers) for instance because of a mismatch between work experience, qualifications or inadequate proficiency in the host country language.

The study was conducted in Denmark, but we believe the different types of employers can be found in almost any country. Their prevalence, however, might differ depending on the institutional setup, the labour market characteristics and the policy mix in different countries. This could be explored by further research. In addition, further research could focus on validation of the employer types through in-depth qualitative interviews, or a longitudinal perspective could be applied to explore if attitudes and behaviour change over time. For instance, it could be relevant to explore if 'aspiring knights' employ refugees in the future or if some of the engaged employed become discouraged and stop employing refugees.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interest to declare.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Research data are not shared.

ORCID

Rasmus Lind Ravn 🄳 https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3273-161X

ENDNOTE

[1] https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/submitViewTableAction.do.

REFERENCES

Andersen, N. A., & Breidahl, K. N. (2021). The power of ideas in policymaking processes: The role of institutionalised knowledge production in state bureaucracies. *Social Policy and Administration*, *55*(5), 848–862. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12665

Borsch, A. S., de Montgomery, C. J., Gauffin, K., Eide, K., Heikkilä, E., & Jervelund, S. S. (2018). Health, education and employment outcomes in young refugees in the Nordic countries: A systematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *47*(7), 735–747.

Bredgaard, T. (2018). Employers and active labour market policies: Typologies and evidence. *Social Policy and Society*, *17*(3), 365–377.

Bredgaard, T., Larsen, F., & Madsen, P. K. (2006). Opportunities and challenges for Flexicurity—The Danish example. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, *12*(1), 61–82.

Bredgaard, T., & Thomsen, T. (2018). 'Integration of refugees on the Danish labor market'. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *8*(4), 7–26.

Brochmann, G., & Hagelund, A. (2011). Migrants in the Scandinavian welfare states—The emergence of a social policy problem. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, *1*(1), 13–24.

Coleman, N., McGinigal, S., Thomas, A., Fu, E., & Hingley, S. (2014). '*Evaluation of the youth contract wage incentive: Wave two research*', DWP research report No 864. DWP.

Dinan, S. (2019). A typology of activation incentives. *Social Policy and Administration*, *53*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12456

Halpin, B. (2016). *'Cluster analysis stopping rules in Stata'. Working Paper WP2016-01*. University of Limerick. Department of Sociology Working Paper Series.

Hemphill, E., & Kulik, C. (2016). Which employers offer hope for mainstream job opportunities for disabled people? *Social Policy and Society*, *15*(4), 537–554.

Hernes, V., Arendt, J. N., Joona, P. A., & Tronstad, K. R. (2019). Nordic integration and settlement policies for refugees - A comparative analysis of labour market integration outcomes. *TemaNord*, *2019*, 529 Nordic Council of Ministers.

Ingold, J. (2020). Employers' perspectives on benefit conditionality in the UK and Denmark. *Social Policy and Administration*, *54*(2), 236–249. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.1255

Ingold, J., & Stuart, M. (2015). The demand-side of active labour market policies: A regional study of employer engagement in the work Programme. *Journal of Social Policy*, *44*(3), 443–462.

Ingold, J., & Valizade, D. (2015). *'Employer engagement in active labour market policies in the UK and Denmark: A survey of employers' policy report no 6*. Centre for Employment Relations.

Karlson, K. B. (2017). Klyngeanalyse. In M. Frederiksen, P. Gundelach, & R. Skovgaard Nielsen (Eds.), *Survey: Design, stikprøve, spørgeskema, analyse* (pp. 311–322). Copenhagen.

Le Grand, J. (2010). Knights and knaves return: Public service motivation and the delivery of public services. *International Public Management Journal*, *13*(1), 56–71.

Lindsay, C., & McQuaid, R. W. (2009). New governance and the case of activation policies: Comparing experiences in Denmark and The Netherlands. *Social Policy and Administration*, *43*(5), 445–463. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9515.2009.00673.x

Lundborg, P., & Skedinger, P. (2016). Employer attitudes towards refugee immigrants: Findings from a Swedish survey. *International Labour Review*, *155*(2), 315–337.

Martin, C. J. (2004). Reinventing welfare regimes: Employers and the implementation of active social policy. *World Politics*, *57*(1), 39–69.

Quillian, L., Heath, A., Pager, D., Midtbøen, A. H., Fleischmann, F., & Hexel, O. (2019). Do some countries discriminate more than others? Evidence from 97 field experiments of racial discrimination in hiring. *Sociological Science*, *6*, 467–496.

Rasmussen, E., & Høgedahl, L. (2021). 'Collectivism and employment relations in Denmark: Underpinning economic and social success'. *Labour and Industry: A Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work*, *31*(3), 320–334. https://doi.org/10.1080/10301763.2020.1856619

Schäufele, I., & Janssen, M. (2021). How and why does the attitude-behavior gap differ between product categories of sustainable food? Analysis of organic food purchases based on household panel data. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 595636. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.595636

Schultz-Nielsen, M. L. (2020). *Overeducation among immigrants depending on residence type, study paper No. 149*. The Rockwool Foundation.

Schultz-Nielsen, M. L., & Skaksen, J. R. (2017). *Indvandreres Uddannelse, study paper No. 48*. The Rockwool Foundation.

Snape, D. (1998). *'Recruiting long-term unemployed people'*, *Department of Social Security Report No. 76*. The Stationery Office.

van Gestel, N., Oomens, S., & Buwalda, E. (2019). From quasi-markets to public–private networks: Employers' engagement in public employment services. *Social Policy and Administration*, *53*(3), 434–448. https://doi.org/10.1111/spol.12469

APPENDIX A

TABLE A1 Calinski/Harabasz pseudo-F-values for determining the number of clusters

Number of clusters	Employers who have previously employed or currently employ refugees	Employers who have never had refugee employees
2	59.78	133.56
3	63.62	145.16
4	57.99	138.07
5	52.72	132.25
6	51.92	130.14
7	51.70	125.65
8	52.61	124.05
9	52.02	119.57
10	51.58	115.70
11	51.22	117.11
12	51.81	113.39
13	52.19	115.01
14	54.36	114.03
15	54.94	111.72

TABLE A2 Clusters of employers who currently employ refugees or have previously employed refugee

	Cluster 1 knights (n = 174)		Cluster 2 knaves (n = 157)		Cluster 3 squires (n = 144)		Total (n = 475)	
	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know
As a workplace, we have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background	86.8% (151)	5.8% (10)	17.2% (27)	13.4% (21)	100% (144)	0.0% (0)	67.8% (322)	6.53% (31)
Employing people with a refugee background can help us avoid a shortage of labour	86.8% (151)	12.1% (21)	58.0% (91)	7.0% (11)	94.4% (136)	0.0% (0)	79.6% (378)	6.7% (32)
Generally, people with a refugee background are very motivated to work	54.0% (94)	32.2% (56)	48.4% (76)	22.9% (36)	60.4% (87)	22.2% (32)	54.1% (257)	26.1% (124)
A lack of relevant work experience among refugees means that we are reluctant to hire refugee	2.9% (5)	32.2% (56)	68.2% (107)	1.9% (3)	98.6% (142)	0.7% (1)	53.5% (254)	12.6% (60)
The minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile	13.2% (23)	21.3% (37)	17.8% (28)	25.5% (40)	22.2% (32)	21.5% (31)	17.5% (83)	22.7% (108)

Note: 'n' in parentheses. The percentages of the 'disagree' category can be calculated by subtracting 100 with the 'agree' and 'don't know' categories for each employer type.

TABLE A3 Clusters of employers who have never employed people with a refugee background

	Cluster 1 aspiring knights (n = 217)		Cluster 2 knights of fortune (n = 269)		Cluster 3 commoners (n = 714)		Total (n = 1200)	
	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know	Agree	Don't know
As a workplace, we have a social obligation to employ people with a refugee background	100% (217)	0.0% (0)	28.6% (77)	37.6% (101)	33.9% (242)	8.1% (52)	44.7% (536)	13.3% (159)
Employing people with a refugee background can help us avoid a shortage of labour	100% (217)	0.0% (0)	51.7% (139)	29.4% (79)	66.0% (471)	9.5%	68.9% (827)	12.3% (147)
Generally, people with a refugee background are very motivated to work	46.5% (101)	53.5% (116)	1.1% (3)	97.4% (262)	31.0 (221)	50.0% (357)	27.1% (325)	61.3% (735)
A lack of relevant work experience among refugees means that we are reluctant to hire refugee	50.7% (110)	20.3% (44)	8.9% (24)	72.9% (196)	66.0% (471)	17.5% (125)	50.4% (605)	30.4% (365)
The minimum wages in the collective agreements are too high to make employing refugees worthwhile	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	93.7% (252)	28.4% (203)	37.1% (265)	16.92% (203)	43.1% (517)

Note: 'n' in parentheses. The percentages of the 'disagree' category can be calculated by subtracting 100 with the 'agree' and 'don't know' categories for each employer type.

TABLE A4 'Where' are the employer types found?

	Employers with positive attitudes				Employers with negative or neutral attitudes				Total (all six types of employers)
	Knights	Squires	Aspiring knights	Total for knights, squires and aspiring knights	Knaves	Knights of fortune	Commoners	Total for knaves, knights of fortune and commoners	
Sector									
Public sector	17% (33)	15% (30)	17% (34)	49% (97)	8% (15)	15% (29)	29% (57)	51% (101)	100% (198)
Private sector	10% (141)	8% (114)	12% (183)	30% (438)	10% (142)	16% (240)	44% (657)	70% (1039)	100% (1477)
Industry									
Agriculture	7% (7)	10% (10)	8% (8)	24% (25)	7% (7)	14% (15)	55% (58)	76% (80)	100% (105)
Manufacturing	11% (18)	10% (17)	12% (20)	32% (55)	12% (20)	16% (27)	40% (68)	68% (115)	100% (170)
Construction	7% (13)	7% (13)	11% (20)	25% (46)	15% (28)	11% (20)	49% (90)	75% (138)	100% (184)
Retail and services	13% (57)	8% (37)	11% (47)	32% (141)	9% (38)	16% (73)	43% (191)	68% (302)	100% (443)
Transportation	14% (9)	11% (7)	8% (5)	33% (21)	13% (8)	19% (12)	36% (23)	67% (43)	100% (64)
Office and communication	7% (27)	8% (30)	16% (61)	31% (118)	6% (24)	18% (71)	45% (171)	69% (266)	100% (384)
Care and social work	16% (16)	14% (10)	21% (21)	50% (51)	8% (8)	13% (13)	29% (30)	50% (51)	100% (102)
Health	7% (5)	6% (4)	18% (12)	31% (21)	9% (6)	16% (11)	43% (29)	69% (46)	100% (67)
Education and research	18% (13)	12% (9)	18% (13)	47% (35)	8% (6)	19% (14)	26% (19)	53% (39)	100% (74)
Administration	11% (9)	4% (3)	12% (10)	27% (22)	15% (12)	16% (13)	43% (35)	73% (60)	100% (82)

Note: 'n' in parentheses. Row percentages.

TABLE A5 Industry distribution in the public and private sector

	Public sector	Private sector	Total
Agriculture	0% (0)	100% (105)	100% (105)
Manufacturing	0% (0)	100% (170)	100% (170)
Construction	0% (0)	100% (184)	100% (184)
Retail and services	1% (6)	99% (437)	100% (943)
Transportation	2% (1)	98% (63)	100% (64)
Office and communication	3% (10)	97% (374)	100% (384)
Care and social work	86% (88)	14% (14)	100% (102)
Health	7% (5)	93% (62)	100% (67)
Education and research	73% (54)	27% (20)	100% (74)
Administration	41% (34)	59% (48)	100% (82)
Total	12% (198)	88% (1477)	100% (1675)

Note: Row percentages.