



**INTEGRATION
POLICIES:
WHO
BENEFITS?**

MIGRANT INTEGRATION POLICY INDEX 2015

**BRINGING HUNGARY A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE
INGREDIENTS FOR A SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION POLICY**

THOMAS HUDDLESTON, MIGRATION POLICY GROUP, 17.6.15

WWW.MIPEX.EU





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?

Bringing a new level of maturity and evidence to the often politicised debate about the successes and failures of integration policy



ALL EU MEMBER STATES

ICELAND;

NORWAY;

SWITZERLAND;

TURKEY;

JAPAN;

KOREA;

AUSTRALIA;

CANADA;

NEW ZEALAND;



UNITED STATES

and more...

KEY FINDINGS FOR HUNGARY



INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?



CONTEXT

2010 elections saw right-wing majority
Though employment has rebounded, #
of newcomers receiving permits has not
2010 elections saw right-wing majority
Greater rise and level of anti-
immigrant attitudes than EU average

POLICIES

No major change on integration since
2010: +1 point in 2014 due to EU-
required single residence/work permit
Small steps on long-term residence &
ordinary naturalisation procedure
Small steps back on basic political
liberties and cost of citizenship test
More obstacles than opportunities
(45/100) ranking 23rd like CZ & RO
New destination countries continue to
make major improvements (CZ, GR, PL)

LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY




INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?

Labour market integration happens over time, depending on specific factors in the national context, immigrants' skills/reasons for migration and certain effective general & targeted policies (Bilgili forthcoming)

Greater long-term challenge is not getting immigrants into jobs, but into equal quality jobs using all their skills and providing a living wage

Gap in employment rates (2011/2, non-EU-born with 10+ years' stay, LFS)





INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?


Most countries opening equal access & general support to non-EU newcomers and increasing their investment in targeted support

The few robust evaluations find a few policies effective for boosting immigrants' employment rates or quality:


Long-term pay-offs of flexible language training to level needed for high vs. low-skilled sectors, esp. work-specific/based

Programmes to recognise foreign qualifications, give domestic work experience and provide bridging/new domestic qualifications

Start-up support for potential entrepreneurs



Non-EU family reunion rate (2013)




Policy is key for the small number of separated families
Diverging trends besides opening equal rights & integration programmes in country

Remove obstacles to rapid family reunion, esp. for families with children, as delays are potentially negative for children to achieve & stay in school & for spouses' to catch up with their sponsor in learning the language & labour market integration

Identify & inform/orient skilled non-labour migrants



Non-EU citizens not in employment, education and training (NEET): Gap between men vs. women



- NEET Gap High-educated women vs. men
- NEET Gap Low-educated women vs. men



INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?





Share of 1st or 2nd generation pupils, 2012

General consensus on how to turn immigrant parents/pupils' high expectations into high achievement: guarantee early and equal access to all school levels, require individualised support, promote mixed schools and parental/community involvement, train and raise teachers' expectations & provide role models

School systems slowly respond to immigrant pupils as #s grow



INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?



Low-achievers gap between foreign-born students and students with a non-immigrant background, Low-achievers gap between native-born offspring of immigrants and students with a non-immigrant background, 2012




Several education systems are reaching low-literacy pupils (dark pink)

Major progress from 1st generation to the 2nd, with (near) parity in several countries, due to general quality & structure of school system, skills of immigrant population, school mixing




**INTEGRATION
POLICIES:
WHO
BENEFITS?**



Restrictive integration policies may produce worse health outcomes & inequalities for migrants (Malmusi 2014)

"How is your health in general?"



Immigrants reporting poor health by country of residence

Policies & services slow to respond to migrants' specific access/health needs

Most countries provide most migrants with info on entitlements & health issues in multiple methods and languages

Wide range of entitlements in EU, but often problems with documents & administrative discretion




Photo: Roberto Brancolini


PERMANENT RESIDENCE



**INTEGRATION
POLICIES:
WHO
BENEFITS?**



LTR Potential vs. Share



3/4 are long-settled in EU (5+ years) & most are long-term residents, due to commonalities across Europe


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

Potentially positive effects for labour market integration (Corrigan 2013), long-term settlement (De Waard 2013) and, under certain legal & economic conditions, intl. mobility (EMN 2013)




INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?

Gap in political participation (2000s, non-EU-born with 10+ years' stay, ESS)




POLITICAL PARTICIPATION



Democratic inclusion



ACCESS TO NATIONALITY



Expanding right to vote & right to citizenship are signs of a confident country of immigration (recently PT, CZ, PL, DK)

Citizenship policies & voting rights are key factors boosting naturalisation & franchise


Naturalisation & political rights can boost political participation for certain groups (Bilgili et al. 2014) & responsiveness of politicians to local needs (Vernby 2013)

Naturalisation also boosts labour market integration (Bilgili et al), discrimination protection/reporting (EU-MIDIS 2008), mobility (Jauer et al. 2014) & housing/social outcomes


ANTI-DISCRIMINATION



INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?



Access to Justice, all countries



With long-established & strong anti-discrimination policies (e.g. FR, UK, Nordics, Benelux), the public is better informed about discrimination over time and, as a result, more likely to report witnessing discrimination and less likely to identify as a discriminated group (Ziller 2014); also greater trust in justice system by immigrants (Roder & Muhlau 2012)

In Central & Southern Europe with relatively new laws, public still often uninformed and potential victims unlikely to report

INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?



INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?

Most countries are making their integration policies more ambitious and effective based on the evidence that guaranteeing equal opportunities in practice turns immigration into a **positive net fiscal impact**, lowers the **family, health and human capital costs** of immigration and remedies the **democratic deficit**

Higher levels of **GDP, Human Development, Global Competitiveness, Patents, Entrepreneurship & Life Satisfaction** are also highly correlated to inclusive integration policies (Florida 2011)

More inclusive integration policies may bring more **highly-skilled immigrants** and higher inward **Foreign Direct Investment** (Nowotny 2009, 2013)

Subjective well-being among immigrants rises to match level for the native-born in countries with inclusive policies, even after controlling for other key factors (Hadjar & Backes 2013)

Strong link between **integration policies & public opinion** (with the 1st driving the 2nd & vice-versa), even after controlling for the individual factors determining attitudes (see review in Callens 2015)

Inclusive policies likely help public to trust migrants & see benefits, while restrictive policies harden xenophobic attitudes. distrust. perceptions of threat