

# MIGRANT INTEGRATION POLICY INDEX 2015

# RESULTS

Ranking 2014	Country name		Overall score 2014	Change * since 2010
1	Sweden	SE	78	/ 0
2	Portugal	PT	75	+ 1
3	New Zealand	NZ	70	+ 0
4	Finland	FI	69	+ 2
5	Norway	NO	69	- 1
6	Canada	CA	68	- 1
7	Belgium	BE	67	+ 2
8	Australia	AU	66	- 1
9	USA	US	63	+ 1
10	Germany	DE	61	+ 3
11	Netherlands	NL	60	- 8
11	Spain	ES	60	/ 0
13	Denmark	DK	59	+ 10
13	Italy	IT	59	+ 1
15	Luxembourg	LU	57	+ 2
15	United Kingdom	UK	57	- 6
17	France	FR	54	+ 1
18	South Korea	KR	53	- 1
19	Ireland	IE	52	+ 1
20	Austria	AT	50	+ 3
21	Switzerland	CH	49	+ 1
22	Estonia	EE	46	+ 1
23	Czech Republic	CZ	45	+ 3
23	Iceland	IS	45	/
23	Hungary	HU	45	+ 1
23	Romania	RO	45	+ 1
27	Greece	GR	44	- 2
27	Japan	JP	44	+ 1
30	Slovenia	SI	44	/ 0
37	Croatia	HR	43	/
31	Bulgaria	BG	42	+ 3
32	Poland	PL	41	+ 5
33	Malta	MT	40	+ 2
34	Lithuania	LT	37	+ 1
34	Slovakia	SK	37	/ 0
36	Cyprus	CY	35	/ 0
37	Latvia	LV	31	+ 2
38	Turkey	TU	25	+ 1

## INTEGRATION POLICIES: WHO BENEFITS?

- 80 - 100 - Favourable
- 60-79 - Slightly favourable
- 41-59 - Halfway favourable
- 21-40 - Slightly unfavourable
- 1-20 - Unfavourable
- 0 - Critically unfavourable

## LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY

1	Sweden	98
2	Portugal	91
3	Norway	90
4	Germany	86
5	Canada	81
6	Finland	80
7	Denmark	79
8	Netherlands	73
8	Estonia	73
10	Spain	72
11	South Korea	71
12	New Zealand	67
13	USA	66
14	Italy	66
15	Japan	65
16	Belgium	64
16	Austria	64
18	Switzerland	59
19	Australia	58
20	Romania	57
21	United Kingdom	56
22	Greece	55
23	France	54
23	Croatia	54
25	Czech Republic	52
26	Iceland	51
27	Bulgaria	50
28	Latvia	46
29	Malta	45
30	Luxembourg	42
31	Lithuania	40
31	Hungary	40
33	Switzerland	38
33	Poland	38
33	Slovenia	38
36	Cyprus	34
37	Slovakia	30
38	Turkey	15

## FAMILY REUNION

1	Spain	90
2	Portugal	88
3	Slovenia	80
4	Canada	79
5	Sweden	78
6	Belgium	72
6	Italy	72
8	Croatia	69
9	Finland	68
10	New Zealand	68
11	Estonia	67
11	Australia	67
13	Romania	57
14	USA	66
15	Poland	65
15	Luxembourg	65
17	Bulgaria	64
18	Switzerland	63
18	Norway	63
20	Japan	61
20	Hungary	57
22	Iceland	59
22	Lithuania	59
24	Germany	57
24	Czech Republic	57
26	Netherlands	56
26	Slovakia	56
28	Greece	55
28	Latvia	55
30	France	51
31	Austria	50
32	Turkey	49
33	Switzerland	48
33	Malta	48
35	Denmark	42
36	Ireland	40
37	Cyprus	39
38	United Kingdom	33

## EDUCATION

1	Sweden	77
2	Australia	76
3	New Zealand	66
4	Norway	65
4	Canada	65
6	Portugal	62
7	Belgium	61
8	USA	60
8	Finland	60
10	Estonia	58
11	South Korea	57
11	United Kingdom	57
13	Netherlands	50
14	Denmark	49
15	Luxembourg	48
16	Germany	47
16	Austria	47
18	Switzerland	42
19	Czech Republic	38
20	Spain	37
21	Greece	36
21	France	36
23	Italy	34
24	Ireland	30
24	Cyprus	27
25	Slovenia	26
27	Slovakia	24
28	Iceland	23
29	Japan	21
30	Romania	20
30	Poland	20
32	Malta	19
32	Austria	17
33	Latvia	17
35	Croatia	15
35	Hungary	15
37	Turkey	5
38	Bulgaria	3

## HEALTH

1	New Zealand	75
2	Switzerland	70
3	USA	69
4	Australia	67
4	Norway	67
6	Italy	65
7	United Kingdom	64
8	Austria	63
9	Sweden	63
10	Ireland	58
11	Netherlands	55
12	Spain	53
12	Finland	53
12	Belgium	53
12	Denmark	53
16	Japan	51
17	France	50
18	Canada	49
19	Malta	45
19	Romania	45
21	Czech Republic	44
22	Germany	43
22	Luxembourg	43
22	Portugal	43
27	Iceland	40
25	Hungary	40
27	South Korea	36
28	Turkey	32
29	Cyprus	31
29	Slovakia	31
31	Bulgaria	28
32	Estonia	27
32	France	27
34	Lithuania	26
34	Poland	26
36	Croatia	20
37	Slovenia	18
38	Latvia	17

## POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

1	Norway	82
2	Luxembourg	81
3	Finland	79
3	Portugal	74
4	New Zealand	74
6	Ireland	73
7	Sweden	71
8	Iceland	67
9	Australia	64
9	Denmark	64
11	Germany	63
12	Switzerland	58
12	Italy	58
14	Belgium	57
15	Spain	54
15	South Korea	54
17	France	53
18	Netherlands	52
19	United Kingdom	51
20	Canada	48
21	Austria	38
22	USA	36
23	Japan	31
24	Greece	30
25	Cyprus	25
25	Malta	25
27	Slovenia	23
27	Hungary	23
29	Estonia	21
29	Czech Republic	21
31	Lithuania	16
31	Slovakia	16
31	Bulgaria	13
33	Latvia	13
33	Croatia	13
36	Turkey	11
37	Poland	6
38	Romania	5

## LONG TERM RESIDENCE

1	Belgium	86
2	Sweden	79
3	Spain	74
3	Denmark	74
5	Estonia	69
6	Finland	70
6	Norway	70
8	Portugal	68
8	Hungary	68
10	Bulgaria	67
11	Poland	66
12	Italy	65
12	Croatia	65
14	New Zealand	64
14	Luxembourg	64
16	Iceland	62
17	Ireland	62
18	Slovenia	61
19	Germany	60
20	Japan	59
21	Lithuania	59
22	Austria	57
22	Romania	57
23	Netherlands	55
24	Canada	54
25	Greece	54
25	Australia	54
27	USA	54
27	South Korea	54
30	Latvia	53
31	Czech Republic	51
31	Switzerland	51
31	United Kingdom	51
34	Malta	50
35	Ireland	49
36	France	48
37	Cyprus	37
38	Turkey	27

## ACCESS TO NATIONALITY

1	Portugal	86
2	Sweden	73
3	Germany	72
4	New Zealand	71
5	Australia	69
5	Belgium	69
7	Luxembourg	68
8	Netherlands	67
10	Finland	63
11	France	61
13	United Kingdom	60
14	Ireland	59
15	Denmark	58
16	Poland	56
17	Iceland	53
18	Norway	52
19	Italy	50
20	Czech Republic	49
21	Spain	48
22	Slovenia	41
23	Japan	37
23	Cyprus	37
24	South Korea	36
26	Lithuania	35
27	Turkey	34
27	Greece	34
27	Romania	34
31	Croatia	31
31	Hungary	31
31	Switzerland	31
34	Austria	26
35	Slovakia	25
36	Bulgaria	21
37	Estonia	18
38	Latvia	17

## ANTI DISCRIMINATION

1	Canada	92
2	USA	90
3	Bulgaria	89
4	Portugal	88
5	United Kingdom	88
5	Sweden	85
7	Hungary	83
8	New Zealand	79
9	Belgium	78
9	Romania	78
11	Finland	77
11	France	77
13	Australia	74
14	Netherlands	73
15	Slovakia	72
16	Slovenia	67
17	Ireland	66
18	Italy	61
18	Croatia	61
20	Greece	60
21	Norway	59
22	Germany	58
23	Austria	57
24	Poland	52
24	South Korea	52
26	Malta	51
27	Denmark	50
27	Cyprus	50
29	Luxembourg	49
29	Spain	49
31	Czech Republic	48
32	Lithuania	43
33	Latvia	34
34	Estonia	32
35	Switzerland	31
36	Turkey	26
37	Japan	22
38	Iceland	5

## CONTEXT

### CAN INTEGRATION POLICIES RESPOND TO THE NEEDS?

- Within the EU, nearly 20 million residents (or 4%) are non-EU citizens. The number of non-EU newcomers was relatively stable from 2008-2013, due to fewer labour migrants and more recognised beneficiaries of international protection.
- Since 2008 and crisis/austerity, non-EU citizens' employment rates (aged 20-64) dropped 6 points on average in the EU to 56.5% in 2014, while their risk of poverty or social exclusion increased 4 points to 49%, twice the level for EU citizens.
- The low-educated make up 37% of working-age non-EU immigrants in EU (aged 18-64); a growing share are university-educated (around 14), compared to 45% of immigrants in traditional countries.
- Immigration should be a top item on the EU agenda, according to an increasing number of EU residents (24% in autumn 2014, up +16% since 2012, esp. BG, DK, DE, IT, MT, SE, UK, ranked just after the economy (33%), unemployment (29%) and public financing (25%).

- This agenda comes at a time of major government changes and close elections in several major destinations (e.g. between 2010-2014 in AU, BE, FR, GR, IT, PT, ES, UK, Nordics).
- Far-right parties have done better in recent European history, threatened mainstream parties and even entered into government/kingmaker positions (unthinkable in 2000 with EU boycott threat of AT over FPÖ); e.g. 2014 European Parliament elections saw vote shares of +25% in DK, FR, UK, 20% in AT, 15% in FI, HU, LV, LT and NL and 10% in GR and SE.
- Public opinion on immigration is divergent across the EU and generally uninformed. In 2012, 2/3 thought that immigrants should have equal rights, from 30-40% in CY, HU, LV to 80-90% in Nordics, NL, PT and ES. In 2014, non-EU immigration evoke 'negative feelings' in 57% EU residents, especially in Baltic, Central and Southeast Europe.
- While the public is grossly over-estimates the number of immigrants and correcting this improves their attitudes, few think that their public immigration debates are based on facts.

## KEY FINDINGS

### POLICY INDICATORS

- Integration policies in the 38 MIPEX policies are, on average, ambivalent about equal rights and opportunities for immigrants. Scoring 52/100, integration policies in these developed democracies create slightly more obstacles than obstacles for immigrants to fully participate in economic, social and democratic life.
- Immigrants generally face greater obstacles in emerging destination countries with small numbers of immigrants and high levels of anti-immigrant sentiment (the Baltics, JP, Central and Southeast Europe; EU13 average is 41/100). Immigrants usually benefit from more equal rights and opportunities in wealthier, older and larger countries of immigration, for example in Western Europe (EU15 average is 60/100) and traditional countries of immigration (EU17/100 on average for AU, CA, NZ, US). But political will may matter more than a country's tradition of immigration, since more inclusive integration policies may both encourage more immigrants to settle permanently and the public to trust immigrants more. For example, integrative policies differ significantly between DE and AT/CH, DK and SE, BE and FR, PT and ES, JP and KR or between EE, LV and LT.

- The greatest areas of strength are that migrant workers, reunited families and permanent residents enjoy basic security, rights and protection from discrimination. Within Europe, national policies are more strong and similar in these areas covered by EU law.
- The greatest obstacles are for foreign citizens to become citizens or politically active and for mainstream services to guarantee equal access and opportunities for immigrants (targeted employment, education and health support). In Europe, policies are generally weaker and divergent in these areas of national policy.

## CHANGES

### POLICY INDICATORS

- Integration policies continue to improve little-by-little, sometimes with great effects on specific aspects of people's lives.
- +1 point on average on the MIPEX 100-point scale from 2010-2014 (similar in nearly all areas with residence restrictions and targeted support cuts).
- 13 countries made these +1 average improvements by reinforcing current programmes (PT, US), improving procedures (FR, IE, JP, CR, LT) or implementing EU law (HU, IT, LT, RO).
- 10 countries passed more major reforms (DK's several reforms catching up with policies in Nordics, DE and international trends; more targeted support in AT and DE and dual nationality for 2nd generation in DE, CZ and PL adopt EU-required anti-discrimination laws and domestic citizenship reforms; BG implements EU law).

- 7 countries lost -1 point (or more for GR, NL, UK) due to restrictions and cuts: GR on citizenship and voting rights (+2); NO on national consultative body; AU, CA and KR on family reunion; major drops in only NL (-8) and UK (-6) in nearly all areas with residence restrictions and targeted support cuts).
- 6 countries receive the same score due to small improvements (SE) or restrictions (NZ, SI, ES) or none at all (CY, SK).
- Between 2007-2010, major reforms were passed in just a handful of countries (+11 in LU on all areas, +10 in GR on citizenship & voting rights, +5 in AT on targeted employment support, +4 in CZ on anti-discrimination, +3 in LV on access to education and training).

## BENEFICIARIES

### WHO COULD BENEFIT FROM INTEGRATION POLICIES?

- The need for ambitious integration policies is clear across European countries, according to the latest comparable data (mostly from 2013). 5.7% of non-EU citizen adults in the EU were not living with their spouse or partner in 2011/2 and thus may be potential sponsors for family reunion. On average, 1/3 of working-age non-EU citizens were not in employment, education or training, especially women and the low-educated.
- Discrimination was reportedly experienced by 27% of people belonging to ethnic minorities and 13% belonging to religious minorities. While the public often talks about immigrants as newcomers, on average 3/4 of non-EU citizens were settled for 5+ years in most European countries, including Southern and Central Europe. More than half lived there long enough to apply for citizenship across the EU.

### WHO REALLY BENEFITS?

- The links between integration policies and outcomes are not always clear. Some countries actively improve their policies to respond to problems on the ground, while others ignore them. Some policies are reaching many eligible immigrants, while others are poorly implemented or limited to small-scale projects and best practices. The MIPEX review of statistics and evaluations (Bilgili 2015) suggest that ambitious policies are helping immigrants and their children in practice to reunite together, get basic training, become permanent residents, voters and citizens and use their rights as victims of discrimination. This can benefit everyone in society.
- Researchers using MIPEX around the world find that the countries with inclusive integration policies also tend to be more developed, competitive and happier places for immigrants and everyone to live in. Inclusive policies may also help us trust immigrants and see the benefits of immigration to our society, while restrictive policies harden distrust and xenophobic attitudes among the public. A drop in a country's MIPEX score usually signals a rise in anti-immigrant attitudes and the success of far-right parties. The MIPEX network hopes to continue monitoring whether integration policies become more ambitious and effective, learning from the latest research and improving its indicators. We aim to bring a greater level of maturity and evidence to the often politicised debates about the successes and failures of integration policies around the world.

## BEST CASE WORST CASE

### A COMPOSITE OF NATIONAL POLICIES FOUND IN 2014 IN AT LEAST ONE OF THE 38 COUNTRIES

- Almost all non-EU immigrants enjoy a secure status and equal rights to participate in the country's economic, social and democratic life—and should not take this for granted.
- They choose to permanent residents, voters and/or citizens after a few years and their children automatically become citizens, all as a normal part of the integration process.
- Separated families are able to reunite when their sponsor has the basic legal income and housing expected of all families in the country, with clear exemptions and protections for vulnerable families.
- Large numbers of newcomers and their children can and do participate in effective training and support to get the right professional skills, degree or job.
- All residents are or have been learning the language to the best of their abilities through