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LATEST POLICY COMPARISONS:
What are the trends and differences in integration policies in eight areas across Europe and the developed world?

MONITORING STATISTICS:
Which integration outcomes can and do different integration policies affect? Which immigrants can and do benefit from these policies?

ROBUST EVALUATIONS:
Which countries have robust evaluations of their policies’ effects on integration? Which policies are found to be most effective for improving integration outcomes?
Keep the long-term perspective on integration process

- Labour market integration happens over time esp. for family/humanitarian migrants (1/2 working after 10 yrs)

- Key drivers are labour market, education, language, residence/generation

- Under-addressed challenge is securing equal quality jobs using immigrants’ skills & providing a living wage

---

**Employment rates (newcomers vs. long-settled) for foreign-born adults (aged 20-64), 2014 EU LFS ad hoc module**

EU Website on Integration (2016) “Largest-ever European survey of immigrants gives big picture on long-term integration”
States are increasingly providing labour market access & targeted training, but rarely based on pilots of the most effective policies. Few non-EU citizens access language courses, lifelong learning, qualification recognition or a new degree.

Uptake of lifelong learning among working-age non-EU citizens
States are increasingly providing labour market access & targeted training, but rarely based on pilots of the most effective policies. Few non-EU citizens access language courses, lifelong learning, qualification recognition or a new degree.
Most countries are ‘promoting but not supporting’ language & civic integration. Few provide enough free ‘quality’ courses to obtain skilled work or citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach to linguistic and civic integration in OSCE participating states</th>
<th>Support for linguistic and civic integration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic and civic integration requirements</strong> (courses, citizenship, permanent residence)</td>
<td><strong>Insufficient/no free courses provided</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No requirements</td>
<td>Inactive (neither demanding nor supporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic integration required</strong></td>
<td>Language as obstacle (demanding without supporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgaria, FYROM, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic and civic integration required</strong></td>
<td>Language and civics as obstacle (demanding without supporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenia, Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Moldova, Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obligatory (demanding and supporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belgium (Flanders but FR-speaking TBD), Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Luxembourg, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voluntary (supporting without demanding)  
Ireland

Obligatory (demanding and supporting)  
Finland, Portugal, Slovenia
Over-concentration in disadvantaged schools: little action to address key factor

- Ambitious policies reach more 1st gen. pupils with limited literacy & several countries make progress from 1st to 2nd gen. (EN-speaking, FR, SE) comparing pupils with low-educated mothers

- Little improvement in recent years (2015 about capacity or reparative measures)

- Policies still missing or worsening Europe’s major weakness: Large over-concentrations of immigrant pupils in disadvantaged schools (even comparing pupils with low-educated mothers)
Challenge for anti-discrimination law across EU is now 1st steps to enforcement

Complaints to equality bodies per self-perceived victims of racial, ethnic & religious discrimination

- Few changes since transposition of EU law except minor improvements. Laws still relatively & under-resourced at national level
- Most self-perceived victims do not make complaint to the equality body
- The stronger the law, the public is better informed over time & as a result, more likely to report witnessing discrimination & less likely to identify as a discriminated group (Ziller 2014); also greater trust in justice system by immigrants (Roder & Muhlau 2012)
Family reunion ignored as major workable legal channel & integration starting point

- Uncertain future for non-EU families: Family reunion rates strongly driven by policies, with frequently changing definitions & requirements for ‘ordinary’ applicants
- Right for all BIPs were stable & facilitated across EU *(extended origin family w/out additional requirements)*
- Trend in major destinations with ‘ordinary’ conditions for refugees, limited for others under protection
- Requirements new/few, challenged as disproportionate, & seem ineffective for integration outcomes *(delays are negative for children’s and potentially spouses’ education, language and employment)*

Facilitation of refugee family reunification (pilot NIEM indicators)
Naturalisation—highly driven by laws & procedures—can boost labour market integration, discrimination protection, political participation & other outcomes, especially for refugees & vulnerable groups.

Share of citizens among very long-settled (10+ years), humanitarian migrants and 2nd generation with two foreign-born parents, 2014 LFS
PERMANENT RESIDENCE PROVIDES PERSPECTIVE FOR INTEGRATION

● Most non-EU citizens are long-settled (3/4 w/5+ yrs) or likely to as families & refugees (17 yrs average conflict)

● Residence & citizenship policies are key factors, esp. for vulnerable groups.

● Paths to citizenship & settlement: ‘Permanently temporary’ (red), ‘2nd-class citizens’ (blue), ‘equal rights’ (green) & ‘quickly citizens’ (yellow)

● Policies rarely change until now: Few ‘temporary’ restrictions lead to new proposal to change EU law

Uptake of permanent residence or citizenship (2011/2 LFS)

Changes in the length of residence permits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Refugee status (in years)</th>
<th>Subsidiary protection (in years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECRE “Asylum on the clock? Duration and review of international protection...”
Policies & public opinion are interdependent: Politicisation & leadership

- Strong links between MIPEX & public opinion (e.g. economic threat vs. opp, home, rights, etc.) even after controlling for other key factors (Callens 2015)

- Integration policies & discourse can shape uninformed public opinion, but the far-right’s historic success can reshape public opinion & policies for years to come
Beyond well-known individual & contextual factors driving integration outcomes, policies generally help immigrants in practice to reunite families together, get basic training, become permanent residents, eligible voters and citizens & to help discrimination victims to know and use their rights.

Ambitious integration policies are generally more responsive, evidence-based, most effective in procedures & investing in most effective support.

Integration is a priority for many more local & regional governments & voluntary citizens’ initiatives (EWSI), but weak multi-level governance to change the structural offer to all newcomers.

EU countries rarely make major improvements or changes (even since 2015). Despite rapid migration/community changes, integration policies stalled or even backsliding as needed investments are assumed to be ‘pull factors’ & tied to uncertain EU reforms (Relocation/CEAS/EU-Turkey deal).

July 2016 EU proposals on reception & qualifications are a missed opportunity & a risk undermining its greatest effect on integration over the past 15 years.
INTEGRATION POLICIES

WHO BENEFITS?
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