

# The Dynamics between Integration Policies and Outcomes: a Synthesis of the Literature

Dr.Özge Bilgili

Thomas Huddleston

Anne-Linde Joki



## The Dynamics between Integration Policies and Outcomes: a Synthesis of the Literature

Dr. Özge Bilgili (CIDOB & MGSOG)  
Thomas Huddleston (MPG)  
Anne-Linde Joki (MPG)

Published in March 2015

Design and layout: Alex Kirchberger

This paper has been published in the framework of the project “*Integration Policies: Who benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates*”. The project promotes the use of EU indicators in order to enhance governmental and non-governmental actors’ capacity to effectively act on societal integration in up to 28 states worldwide. It clarifies how different types of indicators can be developed and used, linking societal outcomes with policies and identifying potential and actual policy beneficiaries, including major vulnerable groups.

The main output of the project is the website of the “Migrant Integration Policy Index”: [www.mipex.eu](http://www.mipex.eu).

The project is directed by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs and the Migration Policy Group.



CIDOB  
BARCELONA  
CENTRE FOR  
INTERNATIONAL  
AFFAIRS

MPG  
MIGRATION POLICY GROUP

## Executive Summary

This paper reviews the comparative multi-level quantitative research on the links between integration policies, the integration situation of immigrants and a wide range of individual and contextual factors.

Twenty-one reviewed studies and additional supporting articles indicate that a number of individual and contextual variables explain most of the variation between countries in terms of immigrants' labour market integration, educational attainment, naturalisation and political participation. Thanks to the use of MIPEX and similar indices, some evidence is emerging that certain integration policies can be related to the specific integration outcomes that they aim to address.

So far, only certain general and targeted employment policies can be directly associated with better labour market outcomes for immigrants and a lower incidence of employment discrimination. More indirectly, facilitating naturalisation, a secure residence and a secure family life seems to have positive effects on boosting labour market outcomes for certain immigrants. In the area of employment, studies rarely focus on a specific policy or properly match it to its specific intended target group and outcome.

In the area of education, the inclusiveness of the school and education system seems to matter most for immigrant and non-immigrant pupils. Although targeted immigrant education policies adopted at national level do not display consistent results across countries in terms of pupils' tests scores, most studies conclude that inclusive schools and education systems are more successful when they also target the specific needs of immigrant pupils.

Several studies on the acquisition of nationality find that naturalisation policies are perhaps the strongest determinant of the naturalisation rates for immigrants from developing countries. Further research can explore which specific elements of naturalisation policies most help or hinder naturalisation.

The few studies on political participation find that targeted policies and the acquisition of nationality may boost participation rates for certain immigrant groups.

The fact that studies find no link between the general integration policy (i.e. MIPEX overall score) and a specific labour market outcome (i.e. employment rates for foreign-born) does mean that no causal relationship exist between integration policies and outcomes across countries. Considering that this multi-level research is still in infancy, studies have great room for improvement in terms of their use of databases and methodological tools.

A more robust methodological approach using new international datasets can better explore the nuanced links between policies and societal outcomes. Future research needs to pay greater attention to linking a specific integration policy with its actual target group and target outcomes. Studies must also take into account time-sensitive contextual factors and general policies. International surveys can improve their measurement of integration policy outcomes in terms of long-term residence, family reunification, anti-discrimination, language learning, and, to some extent, political participation.

## Table of contents

1	Introduction .....	5
2	LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY .....	7
2.1	Individual characteristics of the immigrant population .....	7
2.2	Contextual and general policy factors .....	9
2.3	Linking policy and labour market outcomes .....	11
3	EDUCATION .....	14
3.1	Individual characteristics of the immigrant population .....	14
3.2	Contextual and general policy factors .....	15
3.3	Linking policy and education .....	17
4	ACCESS TO NATIONALITY .....	18
4.1	Individual characteristics of the immigrant population .....	18
4.2	Contextual and general policy factors .....	18
4.3	Linking policy and access to nationality .....	19
5	POLITICAL PARTICIPATION .....	20
5.1	Individual characteristics of the immigrant population .....	20
5.2	Contextual and general policy factors .....	21
5.3	Linking policy and political participation .....	22
6	CONCLUSION .....	23
6.1	How to link policies and outcomes .....	23
6.1.1	Identify target group accurately .....	23
6.1.2	Use interaction terms to analyse the role of policy for specific immigrant groups .....	23
6.1.3	Use international surveys to collect better data on immigrants' outcomes, migrant-specific factors and the use of integration policies .....	23
6.1.4	Addressing causality: do integration policies change outcomes or do outcomes change policies? .....	24
6.2	How to use MIPEX to assess policy outcomes .....	25
6.2.1	Play with the data .....	25
6.2.2	Bring together data from multiple years .....	26
6.2.3	Research underexplored areas of integration policy .....	26
	REFERENCES .....	28
	APPENDIX: List of studies using MIPEX in research .....	31

# 1 Introduction

This literature review on the dynamics between integration policies and outcomes is an output for the project “*Integration policies: Who benefits? The development and use of indicators in integration debates*”. The project, led by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs (CIDOB) and the Migration Policy Group (MPG), aims to improve migrant integration processes through knowledge transfer on integration policies by informing and engaging key policy actors about how to use indicators to improve integration governance and policy effectiveness for legal immigrants. To achieve these objectives, one of the essential steps is to review the literature that allows identifying the links integration outcomes, integration policies, and other contextual factors that can impact policy effectiveness.

This paper reviews the existing comparative quantitative research with the aim of understanding the relationships between integration policies, the integration situation of immigrants and a wide range of individual and contextual factors. A simple monitoring of the integration outcomes of immigrants is not the way to evaluate the success or failure of integration policies. Changes in the situation of immigrants do not necessarily mean that integration policies lead to the specific outcomes, as is often claimed by policymakers. To be able to draw robust conclusions about the links between policies and outcomes, research must simultaneously take into account a wide range of policies, individual-level factors and contextual factors, all of which influence the specific integration outcomes. Only multivariate multi-level research that assesses the role of all of these factors can help us understand the drivers behind integration outcomes and set

reasonable expectations for the outcomes of integration policies.

It is almost impossible to identify the specific role played by policy in determining integration outcomes without comparing integration outcomes across countries. To evaluate the links between integration policies and outcomes, policy indices that include information on a large number of countries are indispensable tools. To date, there have been several attempts to develop policy indices that allow for cross-country comparison. Besides MIPLEX, indices related to various dimensions of integration policy include LOI (1997), MCP (2010), ICRI (2012), CPI (2008), CIVIX (2009), CITLAW (2011), Barrier Index (2005), IMPIC (2010), and Ruhs’ openness to labour migration index. Among these indices, which have relatively limited scope and regional focus, MIPLEX has the greatest usefulness for research and policymaking, with the most robust data collection method through objective policy categorisations by national experts and the widest coverage in terms of policy areas, indicators, and countries (now more than 35)<sup>1</sup>. A review of the literature also shows that MIPLEX is the most widely and intensively used index in quantitative research<sup>2</sup>.

This paper focuses on available quantitative research that has the objective of linking integration policies and outcomes in four major policy areas: labour market mobility, access to nationality, education and political participation<sup>3</sup>. The vast majority of papers apply multi-level analysis methods, internationally collected data that allows for comparisons, and focus on integration outcomes that policies target especially in the European context. Each section uses the results of the reviewed studies to discuss first

<sup>1</sup> Helbling et al., 2013, Helbling et al., 2011

<sup>2</sup> Desk search on the uses of MIPLEX and other indices has shown that while all indices are used in various ways to describe the policy context in a qualitative manner, MIPLEX is the one included in quantitative analysis extensively as an independent variable describing the policy context in countries in multi-level cross-country research.

<sup>3</sup> To date, almost no multivariate research has been undertaken comparing the impact of individual, contextual and policy factors on anti-discrimination, family reunion and long-term residence. Hence, these integration dimensions are excluded from the literature review. An accompanying MPG paper by Callens (2015) is looking at how MIPLEX relates to public opinion of immigrants in European countries.

the relative importance of different individual and contextual factors driving integration outcomes in that area, followed by a discussion of the potential links between integration policies and outcomes in that area. The final

section gives suggestions on how to better link integration policy and outcomes in research and to make better use of integration policies indices like MIPEX.

**Methodological note: Include both individual and contextual data in multi-level quantitative research to find the missing links between integration policies and outcomes**

A simple descriptive monitoring of integration outcomes of immigrants is not the way to assess the success of integration policies. To draw robust conclusions about the effectiveness of policies on integration outcomes, what is needed is empirical studies that can simultaneously assess a series of potential individual and contextual level determinants, including policy measures<sup>4</sup>. What is called ‘individual-level determinants’ include both general characteristics that may drive the outcomes for both immigrants and non-immigrants (e.g. education, age, and family situation), migrant-specific characteristics, such as reason for migration, duration of residence, or citizenship acquisition, and other individual level characteristics that may theoretically relate to immigrants’ integration outcomes (e.g. cultural capital, political trust).

Beyond individual level determinants, contextual level determinants also matter for integration outcomes<sup>5</sup>. Generally, multivariate analyses find that differences in integration persist across countries even after controlling for the characteristics of the immigrant population. This remaining gap suggests that a wide range of country, region or city- level characteristics can also drive integration. Accordingly, an expanding body of literature also investigates contextual level factors of both origin and residence countries (e.g. overall unemployment rate, GDP, HDI). In this research area, integration policy indicators are one of many contextual determinants. Different policies and dynamics in society can affect the opportunities and hence the performance of immigrants in different areas of life.

Research that systematically combines these individual and contextual determinants needs to apply multi-level analysis methods<sup>6</sup>. This way, it is possible to concurrently assess the effects of these factors and draw sound conclusions about the relevance of each factor, including the integration policies. Ideally, longitudinal data is needed to highlight the causal relationships between integration policy and outcomes. In other words, longitudinal research allows answering the challenging question of whether integration policies systematically lead to the same types of outcomes across countries or if the presence of certain types of outcomes in a country systematically leads to the adoption of certain types of integration policies? It is extremely difficult to gather suitable longitudinal data for such research, especially when the objective is also to have an international comparative component. As an alternative, cross-sectional multi-level research, nevertheless, provides a good overview of the potential links between integration policies and outcomes.

<sup>4</sup> Huddleston et al., 2013; Lechner & Lutz, 2012

<sup>6</sup> Hox, 2010

<sup>5</sup> Van Tubergen, 2006

## 2 LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY

The situation of immigrants on the labour market is by far the most researched topic in the field of immigrant integration. These studies often justify their focus by arguing that immigrants' labour market outcomes are the key indicators of their success in the receiving societies, as well as the single most important step towards integration<sup>7</sup>. Economic integration is mainly measured by an individual's employment status, income and occupational status.

### 2.1 Individual characteristics of the immigrant population

*Human capital is the most significant individual-level factor explaining labour market outcomes for both immigrants and non-immigrants*

These findings emerge from studies using proxies for human capital, such as **education**, **skills** or **work experience**. Employment prospects increase with education for both immigrants and non-immigrants. Immigrants with secondary or post-secondary education are more likely to be employed and have higher occupational status than immigrants who only completed primary education<sup>8</sup>. While education seems to be the most important general individual-level factor, the return on education is much greater for non-immigrants than it is for immigrants. As a result, the unemployment gap between immigrants and non-immigrants actually increases at higher levels of education. These discrepancies are usually attributed to procedural barriers to formal recognition of

<sup>7</sup> Lodovici, 2010

<sup>8</sup> Prokic-Breuer, Dronkers & Vink, 2012; Corrigan, 2013 ; Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014 ; Pichler, 2011

<sup>9</sup> Pichler, 2011

<sup>10</sup> Bredtmann & Otten, 2013

education obtained abroad, but also to negative attitudes towards of foreign qualifications, especially from developing countries.

In terms of other human capital measures, a **recent long period of unemployment** seems to have a significant negative impact on the occupational status of both immigrants and non-immigrants<sup>9</sup>. Interestingly, **work experience in the country of residence** seems to be positively linked to occupational status of non-immigrants, not of immigrants. Moreover, **work experience abroad** is significantly positively linked to immigrant women's employment outcomes in their country of residence<sup>10</sup> and their occupational status. However, work experience has no effect on the occupational status of immigrant men<sup>11</sup>. Immigrant men seem to benefit the least from work experience compared to non-immigrants and immigrant women.

*General demographic characteristics, such as gender, age, and family situation also affect labour market outcomes for both immigrants and non-immigrants*

Women on average experience higher rates of unemployment than men. The situation is no different for immigrant women<sup>12</sup>. In terms of age, the relationship between age and employment or occupational status<sup>13</sup> is positive but non-linear for immigrants and non-immigrants, meaning that the employment prospects are worst for the youngest and the oldest. It can be that age captures the effect of work experience gained in the labour market over time. Lastly, in terms of family situation, both immigrants and non-immigrants who are married or divorced are more likely to be employed and over-qualified for their jobs than single immigrants or non-immigrants<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Cebolla & Finotelli, 2011; Bisin et al., 2011 ; Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014 ; Pichler, 2011

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Aleksynska and Tritah, 2013

Singles may be more selective when accepting a job than married or divorced who may have children to take care of. The effect of family situation is more nuanced for immigrants. For example, marriage is positively related to a higher occupational status for Western immigrants, but not at all related to the situation for third-country nationals in general<sup>15</sup>.

*Migration-related characteristics, such as reasons for migration, language skills, length of stay and citizenship acquisition play an additional role for immigrants*

**Reason for migration and language skills** are perhaps the two most important migrant-specific characteristics influencing immigrants' labour market outcomes. Not surprisingly, labour migrants are significantly more likely to be employed than former international students, family immigrants, or humanitarian immigrants<sup>16</sup>. To measure language skills, immigrants speaking the majority language at home<sup>17</sup> are considered to have a significantly higher proficiency compared to those who speak their mother tongue. Interestingly, some evidence suggests that a lack of language skills can have an equally negative effect on the labour market outcomes of the second generation<sup>18</sup>.

**Immigrants' duration of residence** does seem to improve their labour market situation over time<sup>19</sup>. This finding, however, holds neither for low-educated immigrants, whose employment prospects do not increase over time, nor for economic immigrants, whose prospects actually decrease over time<sup>20</sup>. There is also evidence that duration of residence

does not affect immigrants' occupational matching (in other words, their ability to find jobs matching their skills and qualifications<sup>21</sup>). Moreover, the effects of residence duration should be treated with caution because the studies are not based on longitudinal data, which includes information about the same individuals over time. Instead, immigrants who belong to different cohorts of migration are compared in studies. The problem is that immigrants who entered the country at different periods may not be directly comparable because of changes in the immigration policy or flows<sup>22</sup>. It is also important to note that, besides immigrants' duration of residence, in multi-level research, it may be relevant to include age at migration instead, as this factor has been found to have a positive impact on labour market integration in previous research<sup>23</sup>. Finally, overtime immigrants increase their social network in the destination country which gives them more access to knowledge and job opportunities. Increased social capital in this regard can be considered as an equally relevant variable<sup>24</sup>.

**Naturalisation** significantly boosts the employment prospects of non-EU immigrants, especially immigrants from less developed countries<sup>25</sup>. Naturalised immigrants also have a significantly higher occupation status than third-country nationals who are not naturalised<sup>26</sup>. In contrast, naturalisation does not consistently improve the employment situation of immigrants from EU/EEA countries or North America.

**Immigrants with a strong identification** with their ethnic group also tend to have fewer chances on the labour market<sup>27</sup>. Based on data provided by European Social Survey (ESS), ethnic identification is operationalised through an index composed of immigrants' attachment to religion, the importance of traditions and customs and the language most often spoken at home. Analysis of this variable shows that

<sup>15</sup> Corrigan, 2013; Spörlein and Van Tubergen, 2014

<sup>16</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>17</sup> European Social Survey does not provide a direct measurement of language skills, so the proxy used to assess immigrants' language skill is the language used at home (Pichler, 2011).

<sup>18</sup> Pichler, 2011

<sup>19</sup> Bisin et al., 2011; Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

<sup>20</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>21</sup> Aleksynska and Tritah, 2013

<sup>22</sup> Cebolla & Finotelli (2011) even find years of residence to be positively related to probability of unemployment among immigrants.

<sup>23</sup> Corrigan 2013

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>26</sup> Corrigan, 2013

<sup>27</sup> Bisin et al., 2011



immigrants with a strong ethnic identity suffer from an ethnic penalty on the labour market, meaning that they are significantly less likely to be employed than immigrants without a strong ethnic identification. This finding also holds for the second-generation. Several possible reasons may explain this situation. First, immigrants may know fewer people outside of their ethnic group, which limits their information and contacts to find a good job. Second, some may not wish to mix with other groups or accept certain social norms, such as working women/mothers or mixed-gender workplaces. Moreover, whether or not they hold these beliefs, visible minorities are generally more likely to face discrimination from employers.

## 2.2 Contextual and general policy factors

*The general economic situation of the country of residence has a major impact on the labour market, especially for immigrants, in a variety of ways*

The **overall unemployment rate** in the country is a significant predictor of immigrants' employment and occupational status<sup>28</sup>. Low levels of overall labour market participation are also related to higher unemployment among immigrants and non-immigrants. Similarly, immigrant women are often employed in countries with high labour market participation rates for women in general<sup>29</sup>. This important result suggests that immigrant women assimilate to the work

behaviour of the native born. There is more to these conclusions<sup>30</sup>. The negative effect of being an immigrant is lower in countries with high rates of inactivity. This result implies that immigrants are supplying the required labour force that the native-born are not and fill in the jobs that are not taken by the native-born<sup>31</sup>. Furthermore, **GDP growth** lowers the unemployment rate, especially for immigrants, which suggests that immigrants adapt more quickly and benefit more than non-immigrants during periods of economic growth<sup>32</sup>. Notwithstanding its significant explanatory power, the macro-economic situation does not affect all aspects of labour market integration. For example, high general labour market participation rates do not seem to affect immigrants' generally lower occupational status<sup>33</sup>. And while GDP growth increases immigrants' employment rates, it does not decrease their incidence of over-qualification in their jobs.

The **quality of employment**, as measured by over-qualification rates<sup>34</sup>, is generally better for immigrants and non-immigrants in countries with less **income inequality**<sup>35</sup>, better **education systems**<sup>36</sup>, and a smaller **shadow economy**<sup>37</sup>. These positive effects are stronger for immigrants than for non-immigrants. These results suggest that more equitable and skilled labour markets are better at using immigrants' human capital. Countries with large shadow economies are more likely to drive immigrants, regardless of their skill level, into available lower-skilled jobs.

<sup>28</sup> Pichler, 2011 uses EGP scale as the best available proxy for labour market success which distinguishes between high and non-high occupational attainment dependent on the job characteristics.

<sup>29</sup> Bredtmann & Otten, 2013

<sup>30</sup> Pichler, 2011; Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

<sup>31</sup> Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

<sup>32</sup> Cebolla & Finotelli, 2011

<sup>33</sup> The participation rate refers to the active portion of an economy's labour force. The participation rate includes the number of people who are either employed or are actively looking for work. The

number of people who are no longer actively searching for work are not included in the participation rate.

<sup>34</sup> Aleksynska and Tritah, 2013

<sup>35</sup> Gini coefficient

<sup>36</sup> Quality of schooling, measured as average test scores in mathematics and science, primary through end of secondary school, scaled to PISA scale and divided by 1000.

<sup>37</sup> The term 'shadow economy' is measured by percent of GDP produced in the informal sector.

*More flexible general employment policies can, to a limited extent, improve access to employment for immigrants and other 'outsiders' in the labour market*

Immigrants' employment rates tend to be higher in countries with **more flexible labour markets** (e.g. Ireland and the UK) compared to countries with more rigid labour markets (e.g. Scandinavian countries)<sup>38</sup>. The flexibility of labour markets is mainly measured by the employment protection legislation index and by trade union density. Lower levels of employment protection are associated with higher levels of occupational attainment among immigrants<sup>39</sup> and lower levels of over-qualification<sup>40</sup>. The latter effect is interesting because employment protection legislation is not associated with over-qualification among non-immigrant workers. These results imply that flexible markets allow immigrants to obtain more prestigious employment that better match their level of qualification. Whereas in countries where employment protection is strict and firing costs are high for employers, employers may deliberately increase the education requirements when hiring. Given that employers have imperfect abilities to screen immigrants' foreign qualifications and experience, employers may hire immigrants for less prestigious jobs below their stated level of qualification, as an insurance against the risk of poorer performance and the difficulty of firing<sup>41</sup>.

While flexible labour markets work better at getting immigrants into jobs<sup>42</sup>, they may offer immigrant workers less protection from discrimination in hiring and work. One study

finds that employment protection legislation tends to lessen the employment penalty for immigrants with a strong ethnic identity<sup>43</sup>. Stricter rules on the **minimum wage**<sup>44</sup> and **employment protection legislation** have a statistically significant effect of raising employment rate for immigrants with a strong ethnic identity.

**Other contextual factors** could also play a role in labour market integration. For instance, **high levels of anti-immigrant sentiment** among the general population seem to be related to lower level of occupation attainment among immigrants. In countries with higher levels of anti-immigrant sentiment combined with perceived social and cultural distance, immigrants may increase increased discrimination<sup>45</sup>. The measurement from the World Values Survey is the share of respondents stating that they would not want to have foreigners as their neighbours<sup>46</sup>. People were asked about their attitudes towards having different groups as neighbours. Since anti-immigrant attitudes and discrimination can affect employment access and quality for immigrants, future studies should take into account more country- and city-level factors.

*The level of development of immigrants' countries of origin also partly affects their success on the labour market in their new country of residence*

<sup>38</sup> Aleksynska and Tritah, 2013; Bisin et al., 2011

<sup>39</sup> Corrigan, 2013

<sup>40</sup> Research also shows that countries where collective bargaining agreements cover a larger share of the labour market and where there are more generous social safety net levels relative to the average income, unemployment among immigrants is much higher than native unemployment (Bergh 2014).

<sup>41</sup> Aleksynska and Tritah, 2013

<sup>42</sup> Corrigan, 2013

<sup>43</sup> Bisin et al., 2011

<sup>44</sup> Minimum wage is measured relative to the median wage of full-time workers', that is, the ratio of minimum wages to median earnings of full-time employees - excluding overtime and bonus payments (Bisin et al., 2011).

<sup>45</sup> Corrigan, 2013

<sup>46</sup> Bergh, 2014

Immigrants from **developing countries** face greater difficulties transferring their skills to the labour market in developed countries of immigration, given the differences in the education systems and economics. Employment rates are generally lower for immigrants from countries with lower levels of **human development (HDI)** and lower levels of **labour force participation**. Immigrant workers from **poorer (GDP per capita<sup>47</sup>)** or **highly unequal (GINI)** countries tend to face higher levels of over-qualification<sup>48</sup>. Overall, immigrants from developed and egalitarian countries are less likely to be unemployed than immigrants coming from other regions. The skills and work experience of immigrants from developed countries are generally more valued and transferrable for employers than those of immigrants from developing countries, who will need to invest time to develop the country-specific human capital required to succeed in its labour market. It is important to note the change of generations that these country of origin characteristics are much less significant for the second generation and even less so for children of mixed marriages<sup>49</sup>.

## 2.3 Linking policy and labour market outcomes

In a very general way, integration policies aim to have some impact on the labour market situation of immigrants by providing them with equal socio-economic rights, work-related trainings, anti-discrimination laws, secure residence and equal citizenship. In particular, labour market mobility policies, as measured by MIPEX, determine whether non-EU citizens are provided with equal labour market access, support, and rights as well as ambitious targeted programmes to address their specific needs. These policies remove legal barriers to labour market access for non-EU citizens and facilitate the recognition and acquisition of work-related skills. While legal access and promotional measures may improve the employment prospects of a certain number of non-EU citizens, it should be kept in mind that immigrant integration policies do not directly

regulate the allocation of jobs to all immigrant job-seekers in the way that, for example, naturalisation policies directly decide who becomes a citizen and who does not. Instead, equal legal rights and promotional measures have more indirect effects that are difficult to quantify for the entire immigrant population.

*Eight studies using the MIPEX overall score found no systematic link between the general integration policy and labour market integration. Targeted employment policies only seem to be related to a lower ethnic penalty for non-EU immigrants and, to some extent, immigrants' level of over-qualification.*

One study<sup>50</sup> finds that, in European countries with higher MIPEX labour market mobility scores, non-EU immigrants tend to suffer a lower employment penalty for having a strong ethnic identity. Another study finds that **equal legal access** to the labour market is related to lower over-qualification rates for all foreign-born<sup>51</sup>. This finding implies that granting full and immediate access to the labour market (including the private sector, public sector, and self-employment) helps immigrants to find jobs that match their qualifications.

Studies on other outcome variables do not find any significant effects of the MIPEX labour market mobility policy score. Policies in themselves cannot explain the different outcomes of old and new immigrant countries. While this result does not suggest that policies do not matter, it does imply that policies are not implemented, targeted or affecting immigrants' labour market integration in the same way across all countries<sup>52</sup>. Considering that both characteristics related to origin and destination countries matter, targeted

<sup>47</sup> Spörlein and Van Tubergen, 2014

<sup>48</sup> Aleksynska & Tritah, 2013

<sup>49</sup> Pichler et al., 2011

<sup>50</sup> Bisin et al., 2011

<sup>51</sup> Aleksynska & Tritah, 2013

<sup>52</sup> Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2011; Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

employment policies must be well adapted to the country's specific immigration populations and labour markets<sup>53</sup>. Furthermore, the direction of the causal relationship between labour market integration policies and outcomes is not obvious. Perhaps surprisingly, **targeted support** seems to be negatively linked to immigrants' over-qualification, meaning that countries offering significant targeted support tend to have immigrants working in jobs below their qualifications. This result may be due to reverse causality. Greater targeted support is developed in response to the unfavourable labour market situation of immigrants. Hence, the negative link between labour market integration and increased target support may not be interpreted as the unexpected result of these policies.

Moreover, methodological and data issues with these studies limit the robustness of the abovementioned findings on the apparently minor impact of labour market integration policies on immigrants' employment outcomes. These studies' target groups are not very well matched with the groups targeted by these policies<sup>54</sup>. Labour market mobility policies largely target non-EU citizens, but at times, it is not clear whether these studies also include immigrants from other EU countries. Furthermore, most studies lack variables on migrant-specific characteristics. As a result, they do not disaggregate the immigrant population by their reason for migration and duration of residence. These disaggregations are essential for policy evaluation as labour market integration policies mostly target non-economic immigrants<sup>55</sup> and newcomers. These groups are likely to have no job upon arrival, extended periods of unemployment and thus the greatest need for Active Labour Market Programmes (ALMPs). In contrast, the employment situation of economic immigrants may be more influenced by the labour immigration policy and the conditions for the renewal of their permits. This mismatch between the target of the policies and the individuals included in the sample may have led to an underestimation of the links between

labour market integration policies and outcomes.

*Beyond targeted employment policies, other integration policies have a more indirect and positive potential impact on immigrants' labour market integration*

**Facilitating naturalisation** boosts the employment outcomes for certain immigrants, particularly from developing countries and for immigrants' whose main motivation for migration is different than work (e.g. family, humanitarian, education). Indeed, the positive effect of citizenship acquisition on the employment of immigrant men is especially high in European countries with more inclusive naturalisation policies, as measured by MIPEX<sup>56</sup>. The interpretation is that immigrants who are able to naturalise quickly will get the benefits on the labour market sooner and over a longer period during their careers. In turn, policies delaying naturalisation also delay and decrease the usefulness of an immigrants' citizenship status for establishing their career. Another study similarly finds that immigrants are more likely to hold less desirable jobs in countries with insecure long-term residence and demanding naturalisation requirements<sup>57</sup>. These findings contradict the idea that liberal naturalisation and residence policies might devalue citizenship in the eyes of employers. On the contrary, acquiring citizenship has a significant function especially for some groups.

**Facilitating family reunion** also seems to be associated with positively employment outcomes for non-EU immigrants<sup>58</sup>. Immigrants reuniting with their families may have a richer network of social contacts that helps them to find a job by increasing their opportunities and knowledge on job search mechanisms. However, the same research

<sup>53</sup> Bredtmann & Otten, 2013

<sup>54</sup> Cebolla & Finotelli (2011) do not provide a statistical definition of their migrant sample at all.

<sup>55</sup> This group includes migrants who initially migrate for reasons such as family reunification, study or

humanitarian protects, and are often in need of increased targeted support.

<sup>56</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>57</sup> Corrigan, 2013

<sup>58</sup> Bisin et al., 2011

shows that facilitated access to family reunion has a negative effect on employment outcomes for immigrants with a strong ethnic identity. This result implies that the positive effects of social networks may not exist for immigrants whose social network is largely limited to their own ethnic group.

### 3 EDUCATION

**E**ducation emerges as a major area of weakness in the integration policies and needs special attention in most countries of immigration. Immigrants' educational outcomes can be measured in several ways. Besides overall level of school attainment, immigrants' outcomes can be measured through drop-out rates, grade repetition and early school leaving<sup>59</sup>. In greater detail, the literacy of immigrant children can be assessed in specific fields such as reading, math and science. Multi-level analysis comparing the effects of individual, school and country-level characteristics mostly focuses on immigrant children's educational attainment as measured by their math, reading and science literacy. This focus is obvious given that the OECD's international PISA study provides one of the rare data allowing for wide cross-country comparison on immigrant integration in both European and non-European countries of immigration. These studies try to explain cross-country differences in immigrant pupils' outcomes or the inequalities between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils.

#### 3.1 Individual characteristics of the immigrant population

*Parents' social & educational background is the most significant determinant of children's educational attainment, both for immigrants and non-immigrants*

The parents' socio-economic status is the strongest predictor of school success both for non-immigrants and immigrants. Children are much more likely to excel at school if their parents have a **higher education attainment, socioeconomic status and more cultural**

<sup>59</sup> These indicators are used only in national studies due to lack of data and do not allow inclusion of country level characteristics.

**capital.** All three of these characteristics are highly correlated together.

*Parents' language skills are likely to be the second strongest predictor for immigrants, although immigrant pupils' results improve over years and over generations*

In terms of **migration-related characteristics**, immigrant pupils do better at school if their parents are fluent enough to **speak the country's language at home**. For the first generation, **age at migration** is a key factor. The more that children receive their education in their country of origin, the more that their educational attainment will be determined by the quality of that education system and, in many cases, the worse their performance will be in the country of residence compared to the second generation and children who immigrated before school age. From one generation to another, the **second generation** tends to perform significantly better at school than first generation pupils, but overall in most cases native children outperform immigrant children<sup>60</sup>.

This progress over time needs to be taken seriously as this finding confirms that the underperformance of pupils with a migrant background is not inevitable, a misperception that can perpetuate stereotypes by teachers and the general public. Over time and with the right support, immigrant children can make up for the initial disadvantageous situation they face. Early exposure to an inclusive school system can help both first and second generation pupils catch up with their fellow non-immigrant pupils.

**Gender is another significant general demographic characteristic.** When socioeconomic background characteristics are taken into account, most research illustrates

<sup>60</sup> Dronkers & de Heus, 2012

that girls do better on average than boys, which is true for both immigrants and non-immigrants<sup>61</sup>. However, research based on PISA study results illustrates that this is not a directly applicable result for all literacy types. For example, while girls have generally higher reading literacy scores, the gender gap is not completely closed in math literacy, suggesting that boys have higher math literacy than girls<sup>62</sup>.

### 3.2 Contextual and general policy factors

*The quality of the school environment explains more of the variation in immigrant pupils' school outcomes than any other country-level characteristic*

The quality of the general education system matters significantly for immigrant pupils. The average immigrant pupil does much better in school systems where the average non-immigrant pupil excels<sup>63</sup>. The performance of non-immigrant pupils is a significant predictor of the performance of immigrant pupils. For example, educational attainment is higher in countries with a **higher student-teacher ratio** in primary education, **higher government expenditure on education** and **more years of compulsory education**<sup>64</sup>. Immigrant pupils are especially dependent on the quality of teaching, since their parents often possess fewer social and economic resources and weaker proficiency in the language of instruction. A shortage of qualified teachers and staff significantly diminishes immigrant pupils' opportunities to use the education system as a means of social mobility<sup>65</sup>.

School-level factors are the most important explanatory factors after the major individual-level characteristics (i.e. socio-economic,

educational and linguistic background). The school's 'social back-ground' is measured by the average socio-economic status of the pupils in the school<sup>66</sup>. This variable captures the effect of the learning climate and peer-group influences on a pupil's education. The significance of a school's social background on pupils' educational outcomes means that pupils tend to perform worse in schools where most pupils come from lower socio-economic background. Put differently, only the elite benefits from a more stimulating environment, leading to greater school segregation and inequality in educational outcomes. Another study that also takes into account the percentage of immigrants at school and average parental education in the student body of the schools illustrate that in schools where there is a higher share of immigrants and parents with lower educational attainment, the math and reading literacy of children in general are significantly lower<sup>67</sup>. In short it can be concluded that social-economic school segregation has a significant negative effect on the scholastic achievement of children<sup>68</sup>.

*The school system strongly determines the social composition of schools and, thus, the outcomes of immigrant pupils, especially those with low-educated parents*

Comparative multi-level studies is only beginning to clarify what types of school systems have positive vs. negative effects on the outcomes of immigrant pupils. Put differently, the influence of the welfare state and integration regimes on school performance is mediated by educational institutions. The way nation states deal with educational matters is reflected foremost in its school system. In **differentiated school systems**, students are placed in specific school types based on their abilities at a relatively young

<sup>61</sup> Fossati, 2011

<sup>62</sup> Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

<sup>63</sup> Levels et al., 2008

<sup>64</sup> De Heus & Dronkers, 2010

<sup>65</sup> Dronkers & de Heus, 2012

<sup>66</sup> Fossati, 2011

<sup>67</sup> Cebolla-Boado & Finotelli, 2014

<sup>68</sup> Dronkers & Levels, 2006

age. More **comprehensive school systems** delay this age of tracking and offer more comprehensive school types. Most studies suggest that a high level of differentiation in the school system has a negative effect on the educational achievement of pupils, especially with an immigrant background and low-educated parents. Surprisingly though, a few empirical studies find that this argument does not always hold. A moderate level of differentiation in the school system can have the most positive outcome on immigrant children's academic abilities, while immigrant children may not actually benefit from less differentiated school systems<sup>69</sup>. Future research should consider how best to capture the effects on immigrant pupils of different school systems and structures.

*A country's political and social structures also seem to influence the level of educational inequality between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils*

In countries with **high levels of income inequality**, the academic differences between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils are lower than in more egalitarian countries, where disadvantaged non-immigrant pupils tends to do much better than immigrant pupils<sup>70</sup>. In a similar vein, educational inequalities between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils are lower in countries with generally lower education levels and much higher in countries with a generally well-educated population<sup>71</sup>. Political institutions also matter. The same study finds that the level of educational inequality between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils appears to be lower in countries with majoritarian democracies and traditionally **right-leaning governments**, while consensus democracies and left-wing

governments seem to have no effect. A similar study finds that an **egalitarian welfare state structure** also does not seem to be positively linked to immigrant children's school performance<sup>72</sup>. A **well-functioning labour immigration policy and welcoming society** may help to explain why immigrant pupils actually outperform their non-immigrant counterparts in traditional countries of immigration, such as Australia and New Zealand, even after studies control for the individual characteristics of the immigrant population<sup>73</sup>. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, future studies should further investigate the effects of general policies and structures on the educational inequalities between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils.

*The characteristics of countries of origin can also impact on student performance*

Scientific literacy results are higher for immigrant pupils from **developed countries (HDI)** and immigrant communities with **high economic and socio-cultural capital**<sup>74</sup>, while math literacy is higher among **larger-sized immigrant communities**, perhaps due to the greater levels of extracurricular community support in these communities<sup>75</sup>. Math literacy scores are also lower among the children with parents from politically unstable countries of origin—most likely refugees. Beyond the parents' level of education, the quality of their education can have an effect on their children's educational performance in the country of residence. The **number of years of compulsory schooling in the country of origin** has a noticeable impact on the PISA scores of immigrant pupils<sup>76</sup>. While this indicator of education quality is rather basic and highly correlated with a country's level of economic development, the finding is interesting as this

<sup>69</sup> Dronkers & de Heus, 2012

<sup>70</sup> Schlicht-Schmalzle & Moller, 2012

<sup>71</sup> Ibid.

<sup>72</sup> Fossati, 2011

<sup>73</sup> Dronkers & de Heus, 2012; Levels et al., 2008; Fossati, 2011

<sup>74</sup> The differences in average socio-economic and cultural capital (based on ESCS) across immigrants

of various countries of origin in each country of destination. Whereas immigrant communities with a negative value on this variable have a lower average ESCS level than all immigrants together in their country of destination, positive values refer to a higher average ESCS (See de Heus et al. 2012).

<sup>75</sup> Levels et al., 2008

<sup>76</sup> Dronkers & De Heus, 2012



effect can still be registered for the second generation, who have probably had little-to-no exposure to the education system in their parents' country of origin.

### 3.3 Linking policy and education

*Neither the general integration policy for non-EU adults nor the targeted educational policies seem to be a major factor determining immigrant pupils' outcomes*

Put differently, the variation between countries' overall MIPEx score or targeted education policies adopted at national level are unrelated to immigrant children's overall educational performance, according to several studies. An initial sense of surprise at the results may give way to understanding after reviewing the possible explanations.

First, these results could be caused by reverse causality. MIPEx observes that most targeted educational policies for immigrant pupils are weak and very new in most countries, which tend to only provide this extra support once data proves that major educational inequalities exist between immigrant and non-immigrant pupils.

Second, a gap may emerge between the intentions of national policies and their systematic implementation across all school types and levels. In other words, targeted integration policies may be too new, too weak or too general to affect pupils' long-term educational trajectory or schools' structural capacity<sup>77</sup>. For example, few policies are targeted at pre-primary or primary education, where preventive policies have the greatest effects on pupils' outcomes. Most take place in secondary education as reparatory policies to avoid early school leaving. In this regard, targeted education policies may not be sufficiently ambitious to meet the needs within the school system. There may also be

interaction effects between the use of targeted policies and the general education policy, meaning that certain targeted integration policies work better or worse in certain types of school systems.

Finally, data and methodological issues mean that these results should be treated with caution, as the conclusion will explain in depth. It may be difficult to tease out the specific effects of general integration or targeted education policies when other country-level contextual variables are used in multi-level research. Since most integration policies are directed at immigrant parents and not their children themselves, the effects of integration policies may be observed in their parents' individual characteristics, rather than as a specific 'policy effect' itself. For example, researchers give the example that when parental background variables are omitted from the analysis, countries' level of employment protection has a negative effect on immigrant children's performance<sup>78</sup>. This example highlights that variables used in research can be highly correlated and more robust statistical methods are needed to evaluate the effects of policies on integration outcomes. This challenge is especially great in such a complicated policy area as education, with a variety of general vs. targeted policies at system- and school-level for pupils, school staff and parents.

<sup>77</sup> Schlicht-Schmalzle & Moller, 2012

<sup>78</sup> De Heus & Dronkers, 2008

## 4 ACCESS TO NATIONALITY

An increasing number of studies are evaluating the impact of policies and contextual factors on immigrants' naturalisation rates, as variables on immigrants' citizenship and country of birth are being added and improved in most European and international surveys. Where the overall number of immigrants sampled is sufficient for statistical analysis, uptake of citizenship is one of the easiest integration indicators to assess. The major general and migration-related characteristics have been thoroughly tested in national and comparative multivariate analysis. MIPEX has the advantage over other citizenship policy indices of a wider coverage of EU and non-EU countries, which allows for a more robust multi-level analysis of which immigrants naturalise and why.

### 4.1 Individual characteristics of the immigrant population

*Migration-related characteristics are the most important individual-level indicators influencing the naturalisation of immigrants*

Immigrants' duration of residence and language skills increase their likelihood of acquiring the citizenship of their country of residence<sup>79</sup>. This result holds for immigrants coming from both developed and developing countries. The second generation, especially when older and of mixed parentage, is obviously much more likely to hold the citizenship of their country of birth.

In terms of general demographic characteristics, both women and married/divorced immigrants are also more likely to naturalise<sup>80</sup>. Women are believed to

<sup>79</sup> Dronkers & Vink, 2012; Vink et al., 2013

<sup>80</sup> Having children was not found to significantly affect citizenship update.

naturalise more than men due to marriage migration and for a variety of possible economic and personal reasons, even freedom from repressive marriages or degrading occupations. Married immigrants may be more likely to acquire citizenship again due to marriage migration as well as to their personal and family motivations, perhaps as the fulfilment of a life-course project. Human capital, as measured by educational attainment and employment status, matters for immigrants from developing countries but not for immigrants from developed countries. Naturalisation is more common among highly-educated and working immigrants from developing countries and less common among those from developed countries. One possible explanation is that immigrants from developing countries may expect higher returns on their investment in the naturalisation process<sup>81</sup>.

### 4.2 Contextual and general policy factors

*Where immigrants come from has a much greater impact on their decision to naturalise than where they have come to in Europe*

The characteristics of immigrants' country of origin seem to be more important than the general characteristics of their country of residence. The level of development, political stability, and democracy in immigrants' country of origin<sup>82</sup> are some - if not the - major factors determining whether or not immigrants are interested to naturalise in their country of residence. The likelihood to naturalise is much higher for those coming from less developed, politically unstable, and non-democratic countries<sup>83</sup>. This finding is in line with the literature and can be understood

<sup>81</sup> Dronkers & Vink, 2012; Vink et al., 2013

<sup>82</sup> Logan, 2012; Vink et al., 2013

<sup>83</sup> Vink et al., 2013

in terms of the perceived need and benefits attached to naturalisation.

That said, few studies have tested general policy or contextual factors from the country of residence. For example, immigrants are not more likely to naturalise in rich European countries (high GDP per capita) than in poorer European countries. Interestingly, the **net migration rate in the country residence**<sup>84</sup> has a significant negative effect on the share of immigrants holding the country's citizenship<sup>85</sup>. Two possible explanations are put forward for this result. Firstly, countries with high net migration rates may provide immigrants with better social networks in which they can function well without needing to acquire the country's citizenship. Secondly, countries with high net migration rates may experience higher levels of anti-immigrant sentiment which discourages immigrants from naturalisation rather than encouraging them to become full members of the country of residence.

### 4.3 Linking policy and access to nationality

*The restrictiveness of a country's ordinary naturalisation procedure can be considered as a significant factor determining how many immigrants become citizens*

Immigrants living in countries with higher MIPEX scores on **access to nationality** are more likely to hold its citizenship than immigrants in countries with lower scores<sup>86</sup>. The effect of naturalisation policies on the uptake of citizenship can be said to be greater than other individual and contextual factors, as laws and procedures set out the conditions under which immigrants can choose to naturalise. It is important to highlight that citizenship policies as measured by MIPEX have a greater effect on

immigrants from developing countries - those most interested to naturalise - than they do on immigrants from highly developed countries. In other words, the naturalisation rate of immigrants from developing countries is more affected by policy reforms and restrictions than is the naturalisation rate of immigrants from developed countries, which remains rather low regardless of the policy. The **acceptance of dual nationality** appears to be one of the most important reasons why immigrants do not or cannot acquire citizenship in their country of residence<sup>87</sup>. Immigrants allowed dual nationality by both their country of origin and their country of residence are more likely to have naturalised than immigrants living in countries where it is not recognised.

**Other integration policies**, such as facilitating long-term residence or political participation policies, do not seem to systematically affect naturalisation rates across countries, after studies control for the citizenship policy and other individual and contextual factors. Overall, the results of these studies on the effect of citizenship policies should be confirmed through further research as the analysis is based on aggregate data rather than individual-level longitudinal data.

<sup>84</sup> The net-migration rate of a residence country is the difference between the immigration and emigration in a country per 1000 persons in the population per year.

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Using pooled data from the European Social Survey (ESS).

<sup>87</sup> Reichel, 2011

## 5 POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

**P**olitical participation is one of the most essential dimensions of integration for policymaking, because political opportunities allow immigrants to inform and improve the policies that affect them daily. Political participation can be measured in a variety of ways. The most conventional way is voting. Far more people vote in elections than undertake other forms of formal or informal political participation. All types of people, including the low-educated, low-income and young people, are more likely to vote than do anything else. Besides voting, researchers sometimes create an index combining different forms of civic and political participation as measured by ESS: being a trade union member, being a party member, working for an action group, party-like organization or association, or participating to symbolic actions such as signing petitions, boycotting products, participating in lawful demonstrations, wearing or displaying a campaign badge or sticker. Finally, researchers also look at immigrants' voting intentions, rather than actual voting, as a proxy of their potential level of political participation in the future.

### 5.1 Individual characteristics of the immigrant population

*Political and human capital are the most important predictors of the level of political participation of both immigrants and non-immigrants*

People with higher levels of **social trust**, **political interest** and **confidence in parliament** are more likely to declare their intention to vote and take part in elections and political activities<sup>88</sup>. **Members of political**

**groups** and **trade unions** are also more likely to be politically active<sup>89</sup>. **Human capital** also generally increases immigrants and non-immigrants' level of political participation<sup>90</sup>. **Highly educated** immigrants and non-immigrants have significantly higher political participation levels and voting intentions. **Employed** and **high-income** immigrants and non-immigrants are also generally more likely to be politically active.

**General demographic characteristics**, such as **age**, **gender** and **marital status** are ambiguously linked to different aspects of political participation. No conclusive results exist for the effect of gender on the political participation and voting of immigrant women. The effect of age is positive both for immigrants' and non-immigrants with regards to civic participation, voting behaviour and voting intentions, but this positive effect decreases over time with older age. No conclusive results exist on the effect of gender or marital status on political participation and intended and actual voting patterns.

**A few migration-related characteristics can boost immigrants' level of political participation.** **Duration of residence**, **naturalisation** and **being a second generation** are also positively linked to being politically active, in the country of residence. In particular, **non-electoral political participation** increases over time the longer the stay in the country of residence.

<sup>88</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012; Voicu & Comsa, 2014; Andre et al., 2010

<sup>89</sup> Voicu & Comsa, 2014; Andre et al., 2010  
<sup>90</sup> Aleksynska, 2011

## 5.2 Contextual and general policy factors

*The national context matters: the countries where non-immigrants are the most politically active are the countries where immigrants are most politically active*

The **culture of political participation**, as measured by the average political participation levels in the country, has a positive and highly significant effect on all immigrants, both newcomers and long-settled residents, from developed or developing countries or from violent or peaceful countries<sup>91</sup>. Immigrants are also more likely to be politically active in countries with higher levels of **trade union membership**<sup>92</sup>. Similarly, immigrants' intention to vote and self-reported voter turnout levels are significantly driven by the level of **voter turnout among the general population** in their country of residence<sup>93</sup>. In other words, immigrants living in countries with high levels of voter participation in national elections report higher voting intentions and higher levels of voter participation.

In addition, the amount of economic and education opportunities clearly influences political participation among immigrants. Immigrants living in **rich countries (measured by GDP)** are more likely to participate in national elections<sup>94</sup>. Interestingly, the effect of economic development is stronger for immigrants from developed, no-conflict countries, and for non-Muslims. Immigrants are also more likely to be politically active in countries with a **more educated general public**.

<sup>91</sup> Aleksynska, 2011; Andre et al., 2010

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Voicu & Comsa's, 2014; Andre et al., 2010

<sup>94</sup> Aleksynska, 2011; Andre et al., 2010

<sup>95</sup> Aleksynska, 2011

<sup>96</sup> Aleksynska, 2011; Andre et al., 2010

<sup>97</sup> The intensity of conflict both at the decade of migration and nowadays are measured by Major

*The culture of political participation in the country of origin also has a strong impact on the political participation of certain immigrant groups*

The **level of political participation in the country of origin** is an important predictor of the level of political participation in the country of residence for immigrants from developing countries and for Muslim immigrants<sup>95</sup>. The greater is the level of political participation in the country of origin, the greater is the level of political participation of immigrants from that country in European countries. The level of **civil rights and democracy** in the country of origin also has some effect on civic and voter participation<sup>96</sup>. Participation is also significantly higher among immigrants from developing or non-Muslim countries **experiencing violent conflict**. This effect only materialises over the long-run, meaning that immigrants from conflict zones make a later but greater contribution to the political life of their new country compared to immigrants with similar characteristics from peaceful countries<sup>97</sup>. This evidence is consistent with the idea that conflict leads to specific selection of immigrants and refugees, a lower likelihood of return to the country of origin and a greater motivation to reconstruct one's life in the country of residence. It is also consistent with the theory that witnessing violence can be source of personal development and collective activism after trauma<sup>98</sup>.

The amount of education and employment opportunities in countries of origin has an ambiguous effect on immigrants' level of political participation in their country of residence. Interestingly, immigrants from **rich countries (measured by GDP)** may be less

Episodes of Political Violence Database. These variables reflect the magnitude of warfare, international violence, international warfare, civic violence, civil warfare, ethnic violence, involving the origin country.

<sup>98</sup> Blattman, 2009

likely to participate politically in their country of residence. However, this finding is not replicated in other research<sup>99</sup>. Muslim immigrants from countries with **highly educated populations** are more likely to be civically active<sup>100</sup>. No effects for the **level of human development (HDI)** or **social inequality (GINI)** has been found on for voting, thus ruling out the influence of socioeconomic opportunities<sup>101</sup>.

### 5.3 Linking policy and political participation

*Targeted political participation policies seem to be positively correlated with higher levels of political participation for only certain groups and circumstances*

One study finds that **more extensive political participation policies**, as measured by MIPEX, are related to higher levels of political participation for immigrants from developed countries, for newcomers ( $\leq 20$  years' residence) and for Muslim immigrants<sup>102</sup>. Other studies find that neither the **general integration policies** nor **political participation policies** are related to all immigrants' intention to vote, voter turnout or formal or informal<sup>103</sup> political participation<sup>104</sup>. The other integration policies as measured by MIPEX were not found to have an impact on immigrants' political participation. That said, the acquisition of citizenship does slightly boost non-electoral political participation over time, especially unconventional participation<sup>105</sup>. Moreover, these studies often argue that political participation policies of a country is indicative of the country's general approach to

integration. It is argued that countries with higher values of these indices provide better environments for civic involvement of immigrants, since they provide more rights, protection, opportunities for participation, in other words, they empower people to take action<sup>106</sup>.

These initial studies demonstrate the ongoing importance of identifying the right target group of these policies and the most important group characteristics that would influence of the effectiveness of these policies. As a follow up, it is important to note that studies need to make clear whether they focus on non-EU born immigrants or non-EU citizens in general, and include more specific information on years of stay. Another important point is that in many studies, several databases of different years are pooled together; yet, these data collected in different years are not necessarily matched well with the policy indicators. The interaction between political participation and naturalisation policies as well as the omission of electoral participation further adds to the confusion in these studies' conclusions about the impact of integration policies on political participation.

<sup>99</sup> Andre et al., 2010

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> Aleksynska, 2011

<sup>103</sup> In the research referred to (Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012), conventional political participation includes contacting a politician or government official; working in a political party or action group; working in another organization or association; or being a

member of a political party. Unconventional behaviour involves wearing or displaying a campaign badge or sticker; signing a petition; taking part in a lawful public demonstration; or boycotting certain products.

<sup>104</sup> Andre, Dronkers & Need, 2010; Voicu & Comsa, 2014; Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>105</sup> Prokic-Breuer et al., 2012

<sup>106</sup> Brown 2008, in Aleksynska, 2011

## 6 CONCLUSION

This paper provides an initial overview of the growing cross-national quantitative literature assessing the impact of individual, contextual and policy indicators on the integration of immigrants. First of all, the focus on this type of analysis draws attention to the significant effects of individual and contextual-level factors that are often difficult or impossible for integration policies to change. Instead these factors have to be taken into account as starting points for the design of more effective integration policies. Second of all, this type of analysis is a first step to disentangling the complicated dynamics between integration policies and outcomes in developed countries, particularly Europe, where both old and new countries of immigration are changing and creating new integration policies. While this first generation of multilevel analysis constitutes a major improvement over previous elementary comparisons of integration policies and outcomes, future studies can better match policies to the specific outcomes and target groups that they aim to affect over the planned time-frame. In the concluding section of this paper, we propose several points that researchers should remedy when designing multilevel analysis and that policymakers and practitioners should consider when interpreting the results.

### 6.1 How to link policies and outcomes

#### 6.1.1 Identify target group accurately

The immigrant population cannot be treated as a homogenous group. This review demonstrates that outcomes and factors differ significantly for the first and second generation, for immigrants from different countries of origin and for people with different ages, genders or reasons for migration. The design of new research should take these differences into account because of their relevance not only for the analysis of integration outcomes and factors, but also for the evaluation of policies. Any multilevel

analysis including indicators on policy should use outcomes and target groups that match the policy. At the most basic level, integration policies are often completely different for EU and non-EU citizens. Most immigration and integration policies are targeted at non-naturalised citizens, particularly newcomers, refugees and family migrants. When policies are properly matched to their targeted immigrant groups and outcomes, a multilevel study will have more robust results on the possible links between integration policies and outcomes.

#### 6.1.2 Use interaction terms to analyse the role of policy for specific immigrant groups

The existing studies indicate that policies and contextual-level factors do not have the same impact on all types of people. Studies that use only one general definition of immigrants (i.e. all foreign-born, non-EU-citizens, etc.) will generate results on policies that cannot be interpreted in a straightforward way. Policy matters, but specific policies will matter more or less for different immigrant groups. Researchers can show how and how much policies matter for immigrants by using MIPEX as an interaction term in relation to different groups of immigrants. This type of research demonstrates that nationality policies as measured by MIPEX matter more for immigrants from developing countries than for those from developed countries. A more refined analysis of sub-groups may suggest which immigrant groups have greater needs or benefits from specific policies.

#### 6.1.3 Use international surveys to collect better data on immigrants' outcomes, migrant-specific factors and the use of integration policies

The emergence of cross-country multilevel analysis on integration has been made possible through the continuous improvement of international surveys and the inclusion of country of birth and citizenship variables. Unfortunately, the number of such studies is

very limited. Moreover, most international studies are only European-wide, thus excluding comparisons with the world's largest and most established countries of immigration. The possibilities for multilevel analysis including integration policies are also limited by the variables included in these studies. For example, most studies of the education of immigrant pupils rely on PISA data. There are few measurable 'outcome indicators' for integration policy. Most multilevel studies focus on labour market integration, education and naturalisation because these outcome variables are most often measured and easier to link to specific policies<sup>107</sup>. Whereas hardly any studies assess language policies, long-term residence, or family reunification because hardly any international study properly captures immigrants' language skills, acquisition of legal statuses or transnational family situation (i.e. separated, reunited and mixed couples). In contrast, available outcome variables in surveys are difficult to link to a specific integration policy (e.g. poverty and health) or are answered by too few immigrants to create a robust sample for a refined policy analysis (e.g. political participation using the ESS or adults' skills using the OECD's PIAAC). Beyond the limited number of integration outcome indicators, these surveys often have even fewer migrant-specific factors. The most common are country of birth and country of citizenship. The other most relevant factors for policy and integration analysis are the country of birth of parents (i.e. capturing the second generation), year of arrival, country of education (usually of the last degree), main reason of migration (employment, study, family, humanitarian) and language skills. Acknowledging these limitations, researchers claiming to evaluate integration policy should limit themselves to only the outcome and target group variables that are directly linked to integration policies. More funding is needed in European and international surveys for

immigrant sample boosters and modules that capture migrant-specific outcomes and factors.

#### 6.1.4 Addressing causality: do integration policies change outcomes or do outcomes change policies?

These studies' reliance on cross-sectional rather than longitudinal data makes it impossible to definitively evaluate the effectiveness of policies across countries. Studies finding no significant relationship between a certain integration policy and outcome across countries do not exclude the possibility that this policy does affect outcomes in one or several countries. The policy may be longstanding, well implemented and well-resourced in some countries, but not in others. Studies finding a significant relationship between a certain integration policy and outcome cannot rule out the possibility of reverse causality. For instance, MIPEX II in 2010 observed that statistics on employment and education inequalities were often used to justify the adoption of more ambitious integration policies in these areas. Governments may open up access and provide additional support to immigrants in response to undesired integration outcomes and with the objective to boost participation and attainment. Policymakers and researchers conveniently assume a unidirectional relationship whereby changes in integration policies lead to changes in integration outcomes. Instead, outcomes may lead to changes in policymakers' priorities and thus to changes in policies. If these new policies are not strong enough to in turn change integration outcomes, then the relationship between policies and outcomes may be unidirectional, but in reverse. In this case, targeted

---

<sup>107</sup> Within these areas of employment and education, the existing international surveys contain additional outcome variables that have been underexplored in multilevel research on integration. Most studies stick to general or aggregate-level employment and education outcomes. Other interesting outcome indicators for employment include labour market participation, wages, duration of unemployment, uptake of social benefits, working hours, temporary or part time

work, youth unemployment and public sector employment. Other education outcome indicators include uptake of pre-primary education, grade repetition, dropout rates, early school leaving, uptake of remedial extracurricular academic support, school segregation, parental involvement and student or parent motivation. The challenge is to properly link these more specific outcome indicators to specific integration or general policies and target groups.



integration policies may be more of a symbolic indicator of elite or public opinion on immigrants than an effective policy response to change the situation of immigrants. What's more, the relationship between integration policies and outcomes may not be unidirectional, but instead be bidirectional or dynamic. Changes in outcomes may lead to changes in policies. Once implemented, these policies may improve outcomes. If these outcomes are sustained over time, these policies may be no longer needed and may be dismantled by policymakers as a result. For example, this logic underlies the use of positive action and equal opportunity measures and is currently playing out in American debates over ending 'affirmative action'<sup>108</sup>. In order to determine whether a unidirectional or bidirectional relationship exists between integration policies and outcomes, the best answers are robust evaluations of policy impact using experimental and longitudinal methods, which will be covered in a forthcoming MIPEX literature view.

## 6.2 How to use MIPEX to assess policy outcomes

MIPEX is the most extensive, rigorous and cited index of integration policies comparing how policies promote equal rights and responsibilities for immigrants. In this respect, MIPEX allows policies to be analysed, compared, monitored and improved. This literature review observes that many researchers consider MIPEX to be a generally reliable<sup>109</sup> construct reflecting the overall policy context in a given country. Consequently, these researchers incorporate MIPEX scores into their multivariate analysis as an independent variable to compare policies, outcomes and other key factors. This MIPEX independent variable is mainly constructed in three ways<sup>110</sup>. In the first and most common case, the **overall MIPEX score** is used as an

indicator of the overall policy context or attitude towards immigrants and integration. In this case, the researcher assumes that all types of integration policies are affecting or related to a specific outcome (e.g. all integration policies affect immigrants' employment rate). However this relationship may be not be clear or direct based on policy and academic literature. In the second case, **specific MIPEX scores** are used in direct relation to specific outcome (e.g. labour market policies and immigrants' employment rates or nationality policies and naturalisation rates). In this case, the link between policies and outcomes is direct, clear and usually well justified in terms of the policy's objectives and the academic literature. In the third case, specific MIPEX scores are linked to **indirect policy outcomes**. A case in point would be analysis of the effect of nationality policies on immigrants' employment rates. This use of MIPEX is rarer, but valuable to test policy and theoretical assumptions about the multidimensional effects of policies in immigrants' lives. This third case requires a sound policy and theoretical grounding as well as better data and methodical finesse.

### 6.2.1 Play with the data

Although most researchers use MIPEX's existing specific and overall scores, MIPEX encourages researchers to select the indicators that best fit the policy outcomes under investigation<sup>111</sup>. Researchers should feel free to play with the data to create their own classifications based on their statistical tools (e.g. factor analysis) and theoretical assumptions. Researchers may think to recalculate the averages based on a smaller number of indicators that more directly relate to the relevant outcomes and theory, as was done by Vink et al. 2013 in order to focus on access to nationality for only the first generation. Likewise, researchers may consider adding new indicators based on original data collection, as was done by the SOM project<sup>112</sup> in order to introduce asylum

<sup>108</sup> De Vos, M. (2007) Beyond formal equality: Positive action under Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.

<sup>109</sup> Ruedin, 2011

<sup>110</sup> The other main way of using MIPEX is to use the scores to describe the policy context in a country in

a qualitative manner. Researchers make use of MIPEX, for example, to determine whether a country is more multiculturalist or assimilationist, or to make general claims whether the country of interest is welcoming to immigrants or not.

<sup>111</sup> Helbling et al., 2011

<sup>112</sup> See [www.som-project.eu](http://www.som-project.eu)

policy indicators into the average for the overall MIPEX score. This more refined use of MIPEX indicators is important since at times research has used MIPEX score without reflection about the link between an integration outcome and the integration policy as measured by MIPEX. Multilevel analysis is much more compelling when strong theoretical reasoning underpins the use of items<sup>113</sup>.

### 6.2.2 Bring together data from multiple years

Using outcome and policy data at only one point in time does not capture the longitudinal dynamics between integration policies and outcomes<sup>114</sup>. While international integration policy and outcome databases suggest that policies and outcomes do not change significantly over time, major changes in policy, implementation or discourse can happen at one or several points in time. Given the increasingly longitudinal nature of the MIPEX data and EU/OECD integration outcome indicators, researchers have been given a great opportunity to assess the effects of specific policy changes (e.g. the naturalisation policy at immigrants' time of application or the targeted education policy available at different points in immigrant pupils' school careers).

### 6.2.3 Research underexplored areas of integration policy

The thematic gaps in this literature review illustrate that current multilevel research remain limited to labour market mobility, education, access to nationality and, to a lesser extent, political participation. Hardly any studies assess the impact of individual, contextual and policy factors on long-term residence, family reunification and anti-discrimination. Consortium of researchers have begun to fill these data gaps through access to European funds in order to improve through better international datasets relevant for linking policies to integration outcomes.

In the field of family reunification, the MAFE survey<sup>115</sup> provides valuable insight into the subject of transnational families divided between Sub-Saharan Africa and Europe. This project makes the first attempt to understand why some families reunify with their family members in Europe, while others reunite in Africa or remain separated. Family migration policies occupy an important place in this project as they define which family members are eligible for family-related admission and under which conditions<sup>116</sup>. Currently, the number of destination countries covered by the data collection is insufficient for systematic analysis of the effects of family reunification policies.

In the field of anti-discrimination, most international studies are able to capture only perceived discrimination at individual and group level, but not actual discrimination or reporting rates. Unfortunately, perceived discrimination as an outcome variable is not directly linked to policies<sup>117</sup>. That is to say, anti-discrimination laws do not realistically aim to decrease the perception on discrimination; on the contrary, their main objective is effective access to justice in cases of discrimination. From this policy perspective, research needs to explore the links between knowledge of rights, reporting of discrimination cases to complaint bodies and the strength of national anti-discrimination laws. To our knowledge, only one paper attempts to test the relationship between the public's knowledge of their rights and their individual experiences of discrimination<sup>118</sup>. This study does find that people living in countries with stronger anti-discrimination laws, as measured by MIPEX, know more about their rights. While this study does take into account ethnic origin as an indicator, it does not successfully differentiate between immigrants and the native-born. This type of research could be replicated upon publication of the EU-MIDIS I and future EU-MIDIS II studies of the EU's Fundamental Rights Agency. A key question for further research is whether and under which immigrants profit more or less from anti-discrimination policies and information campaigns.

---

<sup>113</sup> Ruedin, 2011

<sup>114</sup> Helbling et al., 2013

<sup>115</sup> For more information see [www.mafeproject.com](http://www.mafeproject.com)

<sup>116</sup> Mazzucato et al., 2014; Beauchemin et al., 2014

<sup>117</sup> Andre et al., 2010

<sup>118</sup> Ziller, 2014

Overall, this growing research field has many avenues for improvement with a great many payoffs for academia and for policymaking. Taking into account this paper's suggestions, new multi-level multivariate analysis can be undertaken with the few existing cross-country surveys of immigrants (e.g. EU-MIDIS I, TIES, Immigrant Citizens Survey and the SCIICS). Moreover, researchers can also conduct or lobby for new data collection mechanisms or work on harmonising existing data sources, with an eye to these underexplored dimensions of integration policy.

## REFERENCES

- Aleksynska, M. (2011). Civic participation of immigrants in Europe: assimilation, origin, and residence country effects. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 27(3), 566-585.
- Aleksynska, M., & Tritah, A. (2013). Occupation-education mismatch of migrant workers in Europe: Context and policies. *Economics of Education Review*, 36, 229-244.
- André, S., Dronkers, J., & Need, A. (2010). To vote or not to vote? Electoral participation of immigrants from different countries of origin in 24 European countries of residence. In trabajo presentado en la conferencia del ECSR Changing societies in the context of the European Union enlargement, Sciences Po-CNRS.
- Beauchemin, C., Nappa, J., Schoumaker, B., Baizan, P., González-Ferrer, A., Caarls, K., & Mazzucato, V. (2014). Reunifying Versus Living Apart Together Across Borders: A Comparative Analysis of sub-Saharan Migration to Europe. *International Migration Review*.
- Bergh, A. (2014). Explaining Cross-country Differences in Labor Market Gaps between Immigrants and Natives in the OECD. IFN Working Paper No. 1036 Available at: [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2480517](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2480517)
- Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T., & Zenou, Y. (2011). Ethnic identity and labour market outcomes of immigrants in Europe. *Economic Policy*, 26(65), 57-92.
- Blattman, C., 2009. From violence to voting: war and political participation in Uganda. *American Political Science Review* 103, 231-247. Van Tubergen, Frank. 2006. *Immigrant Integration: A Cross-National Study*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.
- Bredtmann, J., & Otten, S. (2013). The role of source-and host-country characteristics in female immigrant labor supply. MPRA Paper No. 44544. Available at: <http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/44544/>
- Brown, C., 2008. Policy visions and recommendations of civically active immigrants in the European Union. In: Vogel, D. (Ed.), *Highly Active Immigrants. Resource for European Civic Societies*. Frankfurt .M., Peter Lang, pp. 179-192.
- Callens, M. S. (2015). Integration policies and public opinion: in conflict or in harmony?. Available at: [http://www.migpolgroup.com/wp\\_clean/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MIPEX\\_Literature-review\\_Integration-and-public-opinion.pdf](http://www.migpolgroup.com/wp_clean/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/MIPEX_Literature-review_Integration-and-public-opinion.pdf)
- Cebolla, H., & Finotelli, C. (2011). Integration beyond models: An empirical outlook to the impact of integration models. Center for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences.
- Cebolla-Boado, H., & Finotelli, C. Is There a North-South Divide in Integration Outcomes? A Comparison of the Integration Outcomes of Immigrants in Southern and Northern Europe. *European Journal of Population*, 31(1), 77-102.
- Corrigan, O. (2013). Conditionality of legal status and immigrant occupational attainment in Western Europe. *Policy & Politics*, 42(2).
- De Heus, M., & Dronkers, J. (2010). De schoolprestaties van migrantenkinderen in 16 OECD-landen. *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie*, 3(4), 260.
- De Vos, M. (2007) Beyond formal equality: Positive action under Directives 2000/43/EC and 2000/78/EC, European Commission, Brussels, Belgium.
- Dronkers, J., & de Heus, M. (2012). The educational performance of children of immigrants in sixteen OECD countries (No. 1210). Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM), Department of Economics, University College London.
- Dronkers, J., & Levels, M. (2006). Social-economic and ethnic school-segregation in Europe and Australia and educational achievement of migrant-pupils coming from various regions of origins. In Meeting of the ISA Research Committee on Social Stratification and Mobility 'Intergenerational Transmissions: Cultural, Economic or Social Resources.
- Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P. (2012). Explaining access to citizenship in Europe: How citizenship policies affect naturalization rates. *European Union Politics*, 13(3), 390-412.

- Fossati, F. (2011). The effect of integration and social democratic welfare states on immigrants' educational attainment: a multilevel estimate. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 21(5), 391-412.
- Helbling M., Bjerre L., Romer F., & Zobel M. (2013), The Immigration Policies in Comparison (IMPIC) Index: The importance of a sound conceptualization. *Migration and Citizenship*, Newsletter of the American Political Science Association, Organized Section on Migration and Citizenship. Vol. 1, No. 2. Pp. 8-15.
- Helbling, M., Bauböck, R., Reichel, D., Vink, M. P., Duyvendak, J. W., Van Reekum, & Manatschal, A. (2011). Which indicators are most useful for comparing citizenship policies? EUI Working Papers RSCAS 2011/54.
- Hox, J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. Routledge.
- Huddleston, T., Niessen J. & Tjaden J.T. (2013) "Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration: Final Report for Directorate-General for Home Affairs", Home Affairs, European Commission. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/general/docs/final\\_report\\_on\\_using\\_eu\\_indicators\\_of\\_immigrant\\_integration\\_june\\_2013\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/documents/policies/immigration/general/docs/final_report_on_using_eu_indicators_of_immigrant_integration_june_2013_en.pdf)
- Lechner C. & Lutz. A (2012) "Study on the impacts of admission policies and admission related integration policies". European Forum for Migration Studies. Available at: [http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project\\_material/PROSINT/Reports/WP5\\_CompRep\\_Final\\_Submitted.pdf](http://research.icmpd.org/fileadmin/Research-Website/Project_material/PROSINT/Reports/WP5_CompRep_Final_Submitted.pdf)
- Levels, M., J. Dronkers & G. Kraaykamp (2008), Immigrant Children's Educational Achievement in Western Countries: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects on Mathematical Performance, *American Sociological Review*, 73, 835-853.
- Lodovici, M. (2010). Making a success of integrating immigrants in the labour market. Retrieved 11/06/2014 from: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=8218&langId=en>
- Logan, J. R., Oh, S., & Darrah, J. (2012). The Political and Community Context of Immigrant Naturalisation in the United States. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 38(4), 535-554.
- Mazzucato, V., Schans, D., Caarls, K., & Beauchemin, C. (2014). Transnational families between Africa and Europe. *International Migration Review*.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2007), *PISA 2006 Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World*. Analysis, Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Pichler, F. (2011). Success on European Labor Markets: A Cross-national Comparison of Attainment between Migrant and Majority Populations<sup>1</sup>. *International Migration Review*, 45(4), 938-978.
- Prokic-Breuer, T., Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P. (2012) Do Liberal Citizenship Policies Decrease the Citizenship Premium? Assessing the Relation between Naturalization and Employment among Male Immigrants in 16 European Destination Countries. Presented at the 20th International Conference of Europeanists, Amsterdam, June 25-27, 2012.
- Prokic-Breuer, T., Vink, M. P., Hutcheson, D., & Jeffers, K. (2012). Socialization, Naturalization and Migrant Political Participation in Europe: Testing the Transferability Theory. Presented at ACIT mid-term workshop: Comparing citizenship across Europe: Laws, implementation and impact. June 2012, Florence.
- Reichel, D. (2011). Do legal regulations hinder naturalisation? Citizenship policies and naturalisation rates in Europe.
- Ruedin, Didier (2011). 'The Reliability of MIPEX Indicators as Scales', SOM Working Papers Paper Number 2011-03. [available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1990223>]
- Schlicht-Schmälzle, R., & Möller, S. (2012). Macro-Political Determinants of Educational Inequality between Immigrants and Natives in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 35(5), 1044-1074.
- Spörlein, C., & van Tubergen, F. (2014). The occupational status of immigrants in Western and non-Western societies. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 0020715214534702.
- Vink, M. P., Prokic-Breuer, T., & Dronkers, J. (2013). Migrant naturalization in the context of institutional diversity: policy matters, but to whom?. *International Migration*, 51(5), 1-20.

- Vogel, D., (2008). Becoming active in a new country—in search of favourable activation conditions. In: Vogel, D. (Ed.), *Highly Active Immigrants—a Resource for European Civic Societies*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt a.M., pp. 109-127.
- Voicu, B., & Comşa, M. (2014). Immigrants' Participation in Voting: Exposure, Resilience, and Transferability. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, (ahead-of-print), 1-21.

## APPENDIX: List of studies using MIPEX in research

AUTHORS	FULL REFERENCE	DATA SOURCES	OUTCOME VARIABLE
<b>LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY</b>			
Aleksynska, M., & Tritah, A.	Aleksynska, M., & Tritah, A. (2013). Occupation-education mismatch of immigrant workers in Europe: Context and policies. <i>Economics of Education Review</i> , 36, 229-244.	European Social Survey (ESS)	over-qualification and under-education
Cebolla, H. & Finotelli, C.	Cebolla, H., & Finotelli, C. (2011). Integration beyond models: An empirical outlook to the impact of integration models. Center for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences.	European Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS)	unemployment
Cebolla-Boado, H. & Finotelli, C.	Cebolla-Boado, H., & Finotelli, C. Is There a North-South Divide in Integration Outcomes? A Comparison of the Integration Outcomes of Immigrants in Southern and Northern Europe. <i>European Journal of Population</i> , 31(1), 77-102.	European Labour Force Survey (ELFS)	employment
Corrigan, O.	Corrigan, O. (2013). Conditionality of legal status and immigrant occupational attainment in western Europe.	European Survey on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC)	occupational status
Pichler, F.	Pichler, F. (2011). Success on European Labor Markets: A Cross-national Comparison of Attainment between Immigrant and Majority Populations <sup>1</sup> . <i>International Migration Review</i> , 45(4), 938-978.	European Social Survey (ESS)	occupational attainment
Prokic-Breuer, T., Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P	Prokic-Breuer, T., Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P. Do Liberal Citizenship Policies Decrease the Citizenship Premium? Assessing the Relation between Naturalization and Employment among Male Immigrants in 16 European Destination Countries.	European Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) ad hoc module	employment probability
Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T., & Zenou, Y	Bisin, A., Patacchini, E., Verdier, T., & Zenou, Y. (2011). Ethnic identity and labour market outcomes of immigrants in Europe. <i>Economic Policy</i> , 26(65), 57-92.	European Social Survey (ESS)	employment probability
Bredtmann, J., & Otten, S.	Bredtmann, J., & Otten, S. (2013). The role of source- and host-country characteristics in female immigrant labor supply. <i>MPRA Paper No. 44544</i> . Available at: <a href="http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/44544/">http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/44544/</a>	European Social Survey (ESS)	labour supply
<b>EDUCATION</b>			
Cebolla-Boado, H. & Finotelli, C.	Cebolla-Boado, H., & Finotelli, C. Is There a North-South Divide in Integration Outcomes? A Comparison of the Integration Outcomes of Immigrants in Southern and Northern Europe. <i>European Journal of Population</i> , 31(1), 77-102.	PISA	PISA score (math and reading)
Cebolla, H. & Finotelli, C.	Cebolla, H., & Finotelli, C. (2011). Integration beyond models: An empirical outlook to the impact of integration models. Center for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences.	PISA	PISA score (math)

AUTHORS	FULL REFERENCE	DATA SOURCES	OUTCOME VARIABLE
Fossati, F.	Fossati, F. (2011). The effect of integration and social democratic welfare states on immigrants' educational attainment: a multilevel estimate. <i>Journal of European Social Policy</i> , 21(5), 391-412.	PISA	PISA general test score (math, science, reading)
De Heus, M. & Dronkers, J.	Heus, M. D., & Dronkers, J. (2008). Can educational systems compensate for societal features? The effects of educational systems and societal features of both countries of origin and destination on the scientific literacy of immigrant children in western countries. In International Conference on Survey Methods in Multinational, Multiregional, and Multicultural Context. Berlin.	PISA	PISA score (science)
Dronkers, J., & de Heus, M.	Dronkers, J., & de Heus, M. (2012). The educational performance of children of immigrants in sixteen OECD countries (No. 1210). Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CREAM), Department of Economics, University College London.	PISA	PISA score (science)
Schlicht-Schmälzle, R., & Möller, S	Schlicht-Schmälzle, R., & Möller, S. (2012). Macro-Political Determinants of Educational Inequality between Migrants and Natives in Western Europe. <i>West European Politics</i> , 35(5), 1044-1074.	PISA	Educational inequality
<b>ACCESS TO NATIONALITY</b>			
Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P	Dronkers, J., & Vink, M. P. (2012). Explaining access to citizenship in Europe: How citizenship policies affect naturalization rates. <i>European Union Politics</i> , 13(3), 390-412.	European Social Survey (ESS)	destination country citizenship
Vink, M. P., Prokic-Breuer, T., & Dronkers, J.	Vink, M. P., Prokic-Breuer, T., & Dronkers, J. (2013). Immigrant naturalization in the context of institutional diversity: policy matters, but to whom?. <i>International Migration</i> , 51(5), 1-20.	European Social Survey (ESS)	destination country citizenship
Reichel, D.	Reichel, D. (2011). Do legal regulations hinder naturalisation? Citizenship policies and naturalisation rates in Europe.	Eurostat	naturalisation rate
<b>POLITICAL PARTICIPATION</b>			
Aleksynska, M.	Aleksynska, M. (2011). Civic participation of immigrants in Europe: assimilation, origin, and destination country effects. <i>European Journal of Political Economy</i> , 27(3), 566-585.	European Social Survey (ESS) rounds 1-4	civic participation
André, S., Dronkers, J., & Need, A.	André, S., Dronkers, J., & Need, A. (2010). To vote or not to vote? Electoral participation of immigrants from different countries of origin in 24 European countries of destination. In trabajo presentado en la conferencia del ECSR Changing societies in the context of the European Union enlargement, Sciences Po-CNRS.	European Social Survey (ESS) rounds 2 & 3	participation in national election
Voicu, B., & Comşa, M.	Voicu, B., & Comşa, M. (2014). Immigrants' Participation in Voting: Exposure, Resilience, and Transferability. <i>Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies</i> , (ahead-of-print), 1-21.	European Values study (EVS)	voting intention



AUTHORS	FULL REFERENCE	DATA SOURCES	OUTCOME VARIABLE
Prokic-Breuer, T., Vink, M. P., Hutcheson, D., & Jeffers, K.	Prokic-Breuer, T., Vink, M. P., Hutcheson, D., & Jeffers, K. (2012). Socialization, Naturalization and Immigrant Political Participation in Europe: Testing the Transferability Theory. In midterm conference of the European Sociological Association, Milan, November.	European Social Survey (ESS)	conventional and unconventional political participation