KING

Knowledge for INtegration Governance

Monitoring as a Tool
for Integration Governance

Gabriela Fuhr-Becker, Florian Göttsche and Ingrid Wilkens

KING Project – Public Administration Unit
Desk Research Paper n. 8/July 2014

"la Caixa" Foundation

fondazione cariplo

KING - Knowledge for INtegration Governance

The KING project is co-funded by the European Commission, Directorate-General Home Affairs, under the Action HOME/2012-2013/EIFX/CA/CFP/4000004268. Start date: 15 September 2013; end date: 15 March 2015.

The KING project's objective is to elaborate a report on the **state of play** of migrant integration in Europe through an interdisciplinary approach and to provide decision- and policy-makers with **evidence-based recommendations** on the design of migrant integration-related policies and on the way they should be articulated between different policy-making levels of governance.

Migrant integration is a truly multi-faceted process. The contribution of the insights offered by different disciplines is thus essential in order better to grasp the various aspects of the presence of migrants in European societies. This is why **multidisciplinarity** is at the core of the KING research project, whose Advisory Board comprises experts of seven different disciplines:

EU Policy – Yves Pascouau
Political Science - Alberto Martinelli
Public Administration – Walter Kindermann
Social Science – Rinus Penninx
Applied Social Studies – Jenny Phillimore
Economics – Martin Kahanec & Alessandra Venturini
Demography – Gian Carlo Blangiardo

The project consists in the conduct of preliminary **Desk Research** to be followed by an empirical in-depth analysis of specific key topics identified within the desk research. To carry out these two tasks, each Advisory Board member chose and coordinated a team of three to four researchers, who have been assigned a range of topics to cover.

The present paper belongs to the series of contributions produced by the researchers of the "Public Administration" team directed by Walter Kindermann:

EU Policy	ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER	DESK RESEARCH PAPERS
Political Science		
Public Administration	WALTER KINDERMANN Overview Paper	• "Integration Policy in the State of Hessen, Germany. A Regional Case Study in a Federal System" by Walter Kindermann and Ingrid Wilkens
Social Science		• "The State of European Integration Governance: A Comparative Evaluation" by Dietrich Thränhardt
Applied Social Studies		
Economics		• **"Monitoring as a tool for Integration Governance" by Gabriela Fuhr-Becker, Florian Göttsche and Ingrid Wilkens**
Demography		

The project is coordinated by the **ISMU Foundation**, based in Milan (Italy).

Contacts:

Guia Gilardoni, Project Coordinator – g.gilardoni@ismu.org
Daniela Carrillo, Project Co-Coordinator – d.carrillo@ismu.org
Marina D'Odorico, Project Co-Coordinator – m.dodorico@ismu.org

Website: www.king.ismu.org
Twitter. @KING_Project_EU

ISMU Foundation - Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity
www.ismu.org
Via Copernico 1
20125 Milano
Italy

Monitoring as a Tool for Integration Governance

1. BASICS ON INTEGRATION MONITORING

1.1 What is integration monitoring and why is it done?

Integration monitoring is used to measure the integration process and make it visible. It is a rather new tool for administration. However, some countries have more experience and benefit from the potential offered by regular reporting on the integration process. In recent years, the EU has taken great efforts to promote integration monitoring in the Member States and at EU level. The EU Commission defines three goals that integration monitoring can pursue (Huddleston et al., 2013: 42ff).

- Understanding the integration context and the situation of immigrants
- Evaluating the results of policy
- Use targets to mainstream and improve integration

The **first goal is to understand the integration context**, i.e. to understand the situation of immigrants in their host society. In this context, monitoring is used for observation. If the monitoring is systematically and repeatedly performed, that is, with the same definitions and the same database, then the monitoring can observe social trends over time and identify possible undesirable developments (Worbs/Friedrich, 2008: 265). Depending on which research interests are pursued (see chapter 1.2), the results may also be issued for different subgroups, such as age, level of education or gender. If the monitoring is carried out systematically in different cities, regions or countries, then there is additionally the possibility to compare the developments between these regions. This is exactly what the EU Commission tries to achieve with the establishment of the EU Core Indicators (see chapter 2). Thus, monitoring in this first context is an empirically-based „planning and decision-making basis" for the governance process. Since this is precisely the main goal of any statistics (Huddleston et al., 2013: 42), it is also the primary target of most integration monitors.

The **second goal** of integration monitoring is, according to the Commission, **evaluating the results of policies**. It should be mentioned that monitoring can be the basis of an evaluation; however, monitoring cannot automatically be equated with evaluation (e.g. Filsinger 2008, Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa 2010: 9). This is because an evaluation is carried out to detect cause-and-effect relationships between a certain integration policy and the situation of immigrants. To identify cause-and-effect relationships, three conditions must be fulfilled: The cause must temporarily precede the effect, there must be a correlation between both entities and there must be no further „unobserved" variables that can explain this correlation. Therefore, a regular descriptive monitor is usually not sufficient to identify cause-and-effect relationships. Further analyses are required that „control for" various variables, for example economic development, the implementation of other integration policies and various factors concerning the composition of the immigrant group (e.g. age, level of education, duration of residence). This is what makes evaluation very demanding.

The **third goal** of integration monitoring is to **use targets to mainstream and improve integration**. Targets specify the level of government action, are time-bound and are revisable on an empirical basis. With targets, integration monitors can check if immigrants' situation is improving as intended (Huddleston et al., 2013: 48). One target might be, for example, that the share of secondary school drop-outs among immigrants shall be reduced to 5% in 2020. This target is clearly defined, it is time-bound and it is measurable, so that the policymakers' announces are transparently checkable. Therefore, when policymakers commit to measurable targets, which are clearly defined prior to the monitoring, then their proposals are more credible, clear and accountable for the public (ibid). Setting targets can also improve the situation of members of the host society. If policy members want to reduce unemployment, then immigrants might be one of the most important target groups, but probably not the only one. Thus, setting targets can improve the general situation in society (ibid).

1.2 Preconditions of integration monitoring

From our point of view, there are at least three preconditions to perform an integration monitoring. First, one has to define „integration" since this clearly structures one's research interest and the fields of subject one wants to analyse. Therefore, a clear definition is very useful to guide the following proceedings. Integration usually is seen „as a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States" (Common Basic Principle 1, Justice and Home Affairs Council, 2004). This means that not only the immigrants should strive for integration, but also residents, institutions and authorities of the host society should commit to it.

Integration is an extremely multifaceted process. This raises the question which aspects of the integration process should be analysed and how this should be done. One way to cope with the complexity is to split the integration process in dimensions (see table 1).

The *structural dimension* (including access to all civil and social rights and to the core structures of the host society, such as the educational system and the labour market), the *social dimension* (including a person's social standing, inter-ethnic social contacts, membership of associations and a person's health condition), the *cultural dimension* (including proficiency in the host country's language, religious practices, and moral concepts) and, finally, the *identificatory dimension* (including a local, regional, national or bi-national sense of belonging). It is clear that this understanding of integration processes is only one possibility. Since these definitions, however, are well established and facilitate a structured approach, we will use these definitions in the following.[1]

When the definition of „integration" is done, one can proceed to the second precondition of integration monitoring, that is to break down the dimensions to measurable quantities, so called „indicators". Table 1 summarizes the four dimensions, their different subject areas (examples) and how exemplary indicators could be defined.

---

[1] In his classic text Gordon (1964: 70) used a very similar systematization of the integration process. Later this approach was, for example, picked up by Esser (1980: 22f, 2006: 27) and is now used implicitly or explicitly in many scientific contributions, such as Jonsson (2008: 40) and Heckmann & Friedrich (2007).

Table 1- Examples for derived dimensions, subject areas and indicators of the integration process

Dimensions	Subject areas	Indicators
Structural	Access to civil rights Access to education Access to gainful occupation Participation in gainful ccupation	Naturalisation rate Higher education attendance Labour force participation rate Unemployment rate
Social	Social contacts Health Active citizenship Delinquency	Share of inter-ethnic marriages Self-assessed health condition Membership of associations Proportion of convicts with an immigration background
Cultural	Language	Self-assessed language proficiency
Identificatory	Sense of belonging	Feeling comfortable

Source: Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa, 2010: 12

It has to be kept in mind that the indicators are of different quality. The most important reason is that some indicators have a stronger statistical base than others. For example, indicators measuring the structural dimension of integration are usually very reliable. Definitions are clear in most cases and the data is easily available because they often rely on official statistics. In contrast, indicators based on self-assessment are always afflicted with a certain degree of inaccuracy and uncertainty.

The last precondition is to define the target group. This is not as obvious as it might seem, because there are many different possibilities to define „immigrants". The EU follows the concept of third country nationals (TCN), i.e. only people with a citizenship from a country outside the EU are considered as „immigrants". This approach is rather uncommon in the integration monitors presented here (see chapter 3). Some reports differentiate the population according to a dichotomous definition of citizenship (citizen of the host society/not citizen of the host society), whereas other integration monitors define immigrants using the concept of „migration background".

Which approach is the most suitable, is largely depending on the immigration pattern of a country. The concept of third country nationals does not seem to be the most suitable for some countries. In Italy, for example, people from Romania form the biggest immigrant group (see chapter 3). With the accession of Romania to the EU they are no longer classified as immigrants and are excluded from the statistics, though the challenges remain. A further possibility is the concept of the migration background, which permits greater flexibility. It is not based on nationality but refers to the immigrant's birthplace (first generation), the parents' (second generation) or even the grandparents' birthplace (third generation). How exactly the migration background is defined depends again on the epistemological interest of the administration. In Germany, for example, the definition has prevailed that a person has a migration background when he/she was born abroad (first generation) or at least one parent (second generation).[2] In Ireland, for example, the

---

[2] Finally, in Germany the concept of „migration background" has prevailed due to the relative long immigration history: Many immigrants are already naturalised or are descendants of immigrants (second generation) and are born as citizens of Germany according to the jus soli. Another German specialty is the situation of people from the former socialistic East-European countries who are descendants of Germans who settled there more than 200 years ago (*Spätaussiedler*). Although they have lived in those countries for generations, they easily can obtain German citizenship. With the definition of citizenship one would miss all these people, although scientific research shows that they are still disadvantaged in several dimensions of integration (e.g. educational system and labour market) compared to the native German population.

concept of citizenship seems to fit, since immigration into Ireland is a rather new phenomenon and only few immigrants are naturalised yet.

The definition of integration, deriving measurable indicators and an appropriate definition of the target group is therefore of great importance to structure integration monitoring, to make integration measurable and to include all relevant groups.

1.3 Principles of integration monitoring

How can the quality of an integration monitor be secured and thus made an effective administrative tool? The following ten principles and recommendations should be followed in setting up a monitoring system (e.g. Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa, 2010: 9):

- The number of indicators should be limited in order to ensure a degree of clarity and comprehensibility.
- It must be ensured that the indicators can be illustrated for the defined immigrant group(s).
- An integration monitoring requires quantitative data of high validity. However, the data should be easy to collect in order to keep costs low.
- Longitudinal data are preferable to cross-sectional data, if they are available at relatively low cost. Especially if evaluations are to be conducted, longitudinal data are preferable because they rather allow causal statements (given the appropriate statistical methods).
- The results for migrants should be with those of the host society in order to have a reference value.
- Since integration is a process, time series should be mapped to trace trends.
- In order to make time series comparable, indicators should be collected continuously and coherently. Changes such as in question wording or response categories make comparisons difficult.
- Despite a focus on the principles of continuity and consistency a monitoring system should also provide flexibility to accommodate new indicators or new fields of action and therefore be able to react to changes.
- Monitoring is clearly gaining relevance when additional sub-analyses are performed, such as by gender, for different age groups and groups of origin because the integration process can differ across these groups
- The reporting should be presented as clear and easy to understand as possible in order to reach readers without methodological expertise.

2. MONITORING ON EU LEVEL – A SHORT OVERVIEW OF THE DEVELOPMENT

Through the years, migration- and integration-related issues have become more and more important not only within the European countries but in the European Union itself. The Council of Tampere (1999) was a major milestone. The heads of State and governments agreed that a conceptual framework for the integration of third country nationals should be developed.

The Thessaloniki European Council (2003) again asked for the establishment of a coherent European Union framework for the development and mainstreaming of Member States' integration policies. In order to intensify its development, the definition of Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the

European Union (CBP) was announced. They were adopted in 2004 by the Justice and Home Affairs Council. The paper contained the requirement to develop „clear goals, indicators and evaluation mechanisms" in order to adjust policy, evaluate progress on integration and to improve in the exchange of information (CBP 11).

The Common Agenda for Integration (2005) defined potential actions to realize these goals at national level as well as European level. The adopted Council Conclusions following the Potsdam ministerial conference (2007) called for the development of common indicators that could be used voluntarily by Member States. These objectives were underlined again at the EU Ministerial Conference on Integration held in Vichy (2008).

Then, in the Lisbon Treaty (2007) was declared: „1.The Union shall develop a common immigration policy aimed at ensuring, at all stages, the efficient management of migration flows, fair treatment of third country nationals residing legally in Member States… 4. The European Parliament and the Council, acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure, may establish measures to provide incentives and support for the action of Member States with a view to promoting the integration of third country nationals residing legally in their territories, excluding any harmonisation of the laws and regulations of the Member States." (Art. 79)

The Stockholm Programme in the area of freedom, security and justice (2009, for the period 2010-2014) set a framework and principles for the development of European policies on justice and home affairs. It again emphasized the successful integration of legally residing third country nationals. The European Council asked the Commission to support Member States' efforts towards the development of core indicators, which would cover a few relevant policy areas in order to monitor the results of integration policies. This would allow to improve comparability of national experiences and the mutual learning process. Additionally, it should be considered „how existing information sources and networks can be used more effectively to ensure the availability of the comparable data" on migration-related issues (Council of the European Union 2010/C 115/29 and 30).

The Presidency conference conclusions on indicators and monitoring of the outcome of integration policies in Malmö (2009) established the „EU Core Indicators of Immigrant Integration" which were later named „Zaragoza Indicators" as they were again discussed at the European Ministerial Conference on Integration which took place there in 2010. They state employment, education, social inclusion, and active citizenship as relevant topics for integration policies as the following table shows. The Ministers agreed to further develop the idea of integration „as a driver for development and social cohesion" (European Ministerial Conference on Integration 2010a: 8).

Table 2 - EU Core Indicators of the European Union on Integration

Topic	Core Indicators
Employment	> employment rate > unemployment rate > activity rate
Education	> highest educational attainment (share of population with tertiary, secondary and primary or less than primary education) > share of low-achieving 15-year-olds in reading, mathematics and science > share of 30–34-year-olds with tertiary educational attainment > share of early leavers from education and training
Social inclusion	> median net income – the median net income of the immigrant population as a proportion of the median net income of the total population > at risk of poverty rate – share of population with net disposable income of less than 60 per cent of national median > the share of population perceiving their health status as good or poor > ratio of property owners to non-property owners among immigrants and the total population
Active citizenship	> the share of immigrants that have acquired citizenship > the share of immigrants holding permanent or long-term residence permits > the share of immigrants among elected representatives

Source: http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_13055_519941744.pdf (pg. 15)

Further, the Zaragoza Declaration invited the Commission to undertake a pilot project to examine the proposed indicators, to evaluate integration policies and to report „on the availability and quality of the data from agreed harmonised sources" necessary for their calculation. The Commission charged Eurostat with the realisation of this study.

The results were released in the report „Indicators of Immigrant Integration" (2011). It mainly used harmonised data from the EU Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (SILC) as well as other data e.g. from the citizenship or residence permits statistics. The data and its advantages and limitations are discussed in a methodological note. In the same year, Eurostat published the study „Migrants in Europe" which dealt with the availability and quality of data from harmonised sources for the calculation of the indicators, for which comparable data could be compiled. Additionally, it provided a statistical portrait of the first and second generation.

In order to refine the integration indicators the Commission asked the think tank „Migration Policy Group" to discuss the results in seminars and to prepare further reports. The idea was to analyse whether the different social situations of migrants in the Member States are caused by migration- and integration-related polices, differing migrant populations or generally by political frameworks. A further goal was to evaluate integration policy.

This study „Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration" was published just recently in March 2013. Part 1 offers a general analysis. The authors discuss in how far the composition of migrant population – in demographic, socio-economic and socio-cultural respect –, and policies have an influence on migrant integration outcomes (p. 14 ff.). It explains the Zaragoza Indicators and proposes additional indicators, e.g. temporary employment, child poverty rate (p.25) – thus indicators which show the social reality of the migrant population in more detail. Further, the robustness of indicators is discussed (p. 36ff.). Additionally,

alternative data sources are explored (p. 37ff.). The main part deals with the relevance of integration indicators (p. 39ff.) and the question in how far integration indicators can be used for policy making (p. 42).

2.1 A side note on qualitative Monitoring: Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX)

MIPEX is not related to migrants' situation and is not based on quantitative data. However, as it is a well-known monitoring tool for measuring integration policy it is shortly discussed in this chapter. It could serve as an example for a monitor that is based on qualitative data.

General framework

In 2011, MIPEX III (former: „European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index") was published. It is characterized as „a reference guide and fully interactive tool to assess, compare and improve integration policy" (Niessen et al., 2007, Huddleston et al., 2011). It measures integration policies for migrants in 31 countries: the Member States of the European Union as well as Canada, Norway, Switzerland and the U.S. However, it does not measure integration success. By measuring policies and their implementation it reveals whether all residents are guaranteed equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities (Huddleston et al., 2011: 6). The MIPEX cannot really be seen as a monitor, but as it is published regularly and as it is of great political relevance it is mentioned here.

Concept

Actually, the MIPEX comprises 148 indicators for the subject areas labour market mobility, family reunion, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination and education (a new policy area). By means of these indicators it shows migrants' opportunities to participate in society „by assessing governments' commitment to integration" (ibid.).

MIPEX is based on policies, laws and research. It identifies the highest European or international standard aimed at achieving equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all residents. A policy indicator is a question relating to a specific component of one of the policy areas. For each answer, there is a 1-3 scale to evaluate the standards. It is filled out by independent experts. By converting the 1-3 scale into a 0-100 scale for dimensions and policy areas, comparisons and rankings of the countries are made possible (for further information see Huddleston et al., 2008: 6f.).

In a further step, indexes are deduced from the indicators for each policy field. A map shows how countries perform and a benchmarking is added. Short statements explain the background, changes and developments. An overall index is shown separately. The first overall rank is held by Sweden, the last by Latvia (Huddleston et al., 2011: 11).

Tool

MIPEX offers data and analyses which can be used to target political goals and to identify the needs of changes in integration policies. It also offers insights in the multifaceted factors which influence migrants' integration. MIPEX shows how a country can improve its legal system. Its aim is to draft the way to realize a society where migrants have equal access to education and labour market, where they can become active citizens and where they are protected against discrimination. Additionally, MIPEX can be used as a „starting point to evaluate how policy changes can improve integration in practice" (Huddleston et al., 2011: 7).

3. MONITORING IN SELECTED MEMBER STATES

In the following chapters we present integration monitors on a national level: from Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden. This range of countries was chosen not only by reason of the existence of a monitor. In a historic perspective we cover the founding states of the EU (Italy, the Netherlands, Germany and Belgium) and the countries of the first enlargement (Ireland, Austria and Sweden) as well as the Mediterranean enlargement[3] and the 2004 Eastern enlargement (Czech Republic and Estonia). In a geographical perspective we chose countries from Scandinavia, the centre of Europe, the Eastern former socialist countries, the British Isles as well as the Mediterranean countries. From a social-scientific point of view we tried to cover the three welfare states derived by Esping-Andersen (liberal, conservative and social-democratic; Ireland is not clearly classified) as well as the later discussed post socialist and Mediterranean types.

3.1 AUSTRIA

General framework

Immigration

In 1961, only 100,000 foreign citizens lived in Austria, representing a proportion of around 1.4% of the total population. From 1965 to 1974, their number increased strongly to over 310,000 (4.1%) due to targeted recruitment of „guest-workers" particularly from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia (recruitment agreements in 1964 and 1966 respectively) and Cold War refugees. Triggered by the Oil Crisis in 1973, the numbers stagnated in the following 15 years and the main migration motive was family unification. With the fall of the Iron Curtain and growing numbers of conflict refugees, the immigration augmented in the 1990s, whereby the proportion of foreigners increased to over 8%. Stricter laws for work and residence caused a brief stagnation of immigration in the second half of the 1990s. The turn of the millennium, however, was followed by a renewed increase in the foreign population, mainly due to growing immigration from the countries of the (enlarged) European Union (Statistik Austria & KMI, 2013: 24; Kraler & Reichel, 2012: 44).

In 2013, over a million foreign citizens lived in Austria, accounting for 12% of the total population of 8.5 million. The proportion of people with a migrant background was 19%, about three-quarters were foreign born and one quarter represented the second generation. The largest immigrant groups are Germans, people from the former Yugoslavia, and from Turkey. The latter show the ongoing influence of the former recruitment agreements back in the 1960s.

Social-statistic concept

The Austrian definition of migration background comprises people who have immigrated to Austria (first generation: foreign born) and people who are born in Austria but both parents were born abroad (second generation), regardless their citizenship. This definition follows the „Recommendations for the 2010 censuses of population and housing" of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) (Statistics Austria, 2013: Internet).

---

[3] The integration monitoring for Spain and Portugal seems not to have been updated for some years.

Integration monitoring in Austria: „Migration & Integration. Zahlen. Daten. Indikatoren"

Since 2010 Austrian Statistical Office „Statistik Austria" and the Commission for Migration and Integration Research of the Austrian Academy of Science annually publish an integration monitor by order of the Federal Ministry of the Interior. It contains 25 integration indicators covering the themes language & education, employment, social situation & health, security, housing, identification and integration climate (Statistik Austria & KMI, 2013). Five indicators, monitoring the structural dimension, are defined as core indicators, namely level of education, employment rate, unemployment rate, annual income and at-risk-of-poverty rate. In addition, a number of other statistics illustrate integration processes in Austria. The report breaks down results by the main immigrant groups (EU/EEA, Turkey, and former Yugoslavia). Like in many countries, not all data are available for the population with migration background, so several indicators are displayed for foreigners.

Besides the usual structural indicators based on official statistics, the Austrian integration monitor also includes an annual survey of 1,000 Austrians and 1,000 third country nationals (former Yugoslavia and Turkey) with questions about the „integration climate" (Statistik Austria & KMI, 2013: 88ff.). For example, the Austrian population is asked „What do you think how well integration of migrants works in Austria?" and „Do you think the living together with migrants has changed in the past years?". On the other hand, migrants are asked if they feel at home in Austria, if their personal situation has improved since they have lived there, and about experiences of xenophobia among others. Another feature is two special editions of the monitor with a focus on „women" and „youth", issued in 2012.

Tool

The integration monitor is incorporated in the Austrian integration policy: „As part of the National Action Plan for Integration, integration indicators were defined to enable measuring the integration process in Austria and to establish a long-term integration monitoring system. By means of the 25 defined integration indicators, particularly the five core indicators, taking into account demographic conditions as well as subjective perceptions, the current status of immigration and integration (…) can be summarized." (Statistik Austria & KMI, 2011: 8).

Thus, the monitor is one of three parts (in addition to the integration report of the Expert Council and an online database for Austria-wide integration projects that are structured according to the NAP.I fields of action) and the basis for the integration report, which makes recommendations for the different areas of activity (Expertenrat für Integration, 2013). The indicators themselves are structured according to the defined areas of activity. As they remain unchanged since 2010, longitudinal data is available for a growing time period.

3.2 BELGIUM

General framework

Immigration

Between 2002 and 2010, the Belgian migration saldo was extremely high. Net 500.000 persons migrated to Belgium, this is about 4.5% of the population. Today, 46% of the migrants are from third countries (mainly Marocco and Turkey), 41% of the „old" EU Member States (EU-15, mainly Italy, France and the Netherlands) and 13% of the „new" Member States. (Hanseeuw, 2012: 3; erlaim) At least one quarter of

the population has one parent born abroad. For third country nationals, the main motive to migrate to Belgium is familiy reunification. However, unemployment among migrants is one of the highest in the EU.

Social-statistic concept

Therefore, the focus of this monitor lies on the labour market (structural dimension). The report uses two variables: *origine* and *migratieachtergrond* (migration background). The first-mentioned variable examines the second generation, the second-mentioned enables the user to make a difference e.g. between „oldcomers" and „newcomers" as well as second and third generation. The method allows analysing the labour market situation of people aged between 18 to 60 years on the basis of nationality and migration background (including second and third generation).

Integration monitoring in Belgium: „Socio-economische Monitoring"

According to MIPEX III, Belgium has a high-ranked integration policy and effective discrimination protection (Huddleston et al., 2011: 32ff.). However, access to labour market and labour market mobility do not seem to be sufficient. Therefore, a need for action was seen to get better insights into the labour market performance of migrants.

Subject areas of the report published in 2013 are labour activity and non-activity, employment status, unemployment, mobility, length of employment, wages and wages history. Additionally, analyses are made relating to sex, age, Belgian regions (Flanders, Wallonia, and the Brussels area), and sectors. The report is based on data from the population registers and the Crossroads Bank for Social Security.

The monitor shows that there are huge differences between migrant groups, between the sexes within a migrant group and between Belgian regions. Concerning the labour market position, it reveals a correlation with nationality and country of origin (*etnostratificatie van de arbeidsmarkt*). Foreigners from non-European countries have to face barriers, which are related to the structure of the labour market and to direct or indirect discrimination.

The outlook gives a résumé on the difficulties of labour market access in Belgium and its strong segmentation. It also outlines the vicious circle of a lower participation rate in early childhood education, a non-Belgian language spoken at home, willingness to study and chances on the labour market. Especially for migrant women, this situation often gives an incentive to stay at home and raise the children.

Tool

Until recently, knowledge of the socio-economical position of migrants – especially those of the second and third generation – on the Belgian labour market was said to be fragmented. The Belgian monitor is the first step in the development of an instrument for labour market analysis related to the nationality and the migration background of the people examined. Important goals are the mapping of the internal dynamic of the labour market and the combating of discrimination at work. The tool should enable politicians, employers and scientists to trace migrants' participation and integration in the labour market and to confront them with the questions which arouse from the results. It is no report which discusses cause and effects. The Monitor is announced to be published annually.

3.3 CZECH REPUBLIC

General framework

Immigration

From 1993 to 2011, the number of foreigners living in the Czech Republic has increased from 78,000 to 436,000 representing now a share of 4% of the total population (10.5 million). Still, this share is relatively low in comparison to other Member States. The main nationalities are Ukrainian (27% of all foreigners in 2011), Slovakian (19%), Vietnamese (13%), Russian (7%) and Polish (4%). TCN make up two thirds of all foreigners. Regarding their residential status, 52% have temporary EU/long-term residence; 45% have a permanent residence status, 3% over 90-days visa and less than 1% asylum status (Czech Statistical Office, 2013).

Social-statistic concept

Citizenship is the key concept of data collection in the field of migration and integration in the Czech Republic. In all publicly available statistics, the distinction between migrants and the majority society can usually be made only regarding the citizenship. This refers to a general perception of migrants as persons with foreign citizenship. Information on the population with foreign or migration background is not accessible (Drbohlav & Lachmanová-Medová, 2009: 9-10).

When analyzing Czech immigration and integration policies, foreigners, i.e. TCN, are categorized in different groups according to their legal status: asylum-seekers, refugees, immigrants and irregular migrants (Dizdarevič, 2012: 84). Citizens of the EU/EEA are not considered to be members of the integration target group; nor are applicants for international protection and persons granted asylum or provisional protection (Ministry of Interior, 2011: 1). Thus, the monitor covers only TCN with a legal residence status. The main data provider is the Czech Statistical Office, CSO, which displays extensive data about foreigners on its website.

Integration monitoring in Czech Republic: „Indicators of the integration of third-country nationals into Czech society in the context of the requirements of European institutions"

In 2011, the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs[4] published the pilot study „Indicators of the integration of third country nationals into Czech society in the context of the requirements of European institutions" (Vavrečková & Baštýř, 2011). The proposed system of indicators is divided into three parts: Section A contains 23 basic (key) indicators about the residence status, labour market, education and social situation of TCN. Section B contains 16 comparative indicators opposing the data about TCN to those of Czech citizens. Finally, section C is composed of analytical indicators giving more detailed information regarding e.g. gender and age. The analysed period covers the years 2004 to 2009. So far, no follow-up monitor has been published. The systematization of the proposed indicators is quite unclear and the display format is expandable.

Tool

The aim of the pilot study was to „draw up the first proposal for a methodology for assessing the tools used to monitor the integration process of third country nationals in the Czech Republic and thus to provide the government bodies responsible for assessing and adjusting integration policies with a set of key findings

---

[4] The RILSA is a government-funded public research institution and supervised by the Czech Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs.

and information." (Vavrečková & Baštýř, 2011: 3). Furthermore, in an annual comparison the indicators should facilitate to evaluate the effectiveness of integration measures and contribute to information sharing about integration policies in EU Member States (ibid: 7).

The Czech Ministry of Interior (2011: 2) underlines, that „Integration indicators (integration evaluation data) facilitate quantification of the integration process, monitoring and evaluation of the development in the area of foreigner integration." According to Dizdarevič (2012: 90), the Ministry of Interior formulated benchmarks of integration, namely a) knowledge of the Czech language, b) economic self-sufficiency, c) orientation within Czech society and d) mutual relations between foreigners and the indigenous majority. However, these benchmarks are almost impossible to monitor due to definition problems or lack of data. Nonetheless, they serve in a first step to prioritize certain issues in the integration policy and process.

3.4 ESTONIA

General framework

Immigration

The Estonian immigration history after the Second World War was strongly influenced by an influx of Russian immigrants. The Second World War had left a vacuum in the Estonian population and workforce. Estonia lost 25% of its inhabitants (Misiunas & Taagepera, 1993: 358) and the strong industrialization aspirations of the Soviet government forced the demand for workers. Therefore, after the incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union after 1945, a massive influx of primarily Russians occurred (Kallas, 2012: 128).

The high concentration of immigrants in the cities caused that in some urban areas the Estonian population was a minority, and because the local population perceived the immigrants more as occupiers than as immigrants, segregation and tensions between the two groups took place (Kallas 2012: 129; Kulu 2003). In 1989, 38% of the population was foreign, of which almost 80% were Russian-born (Sokolova 2008: 10). Even after the fall of the Iron Curtain many problems existed.

The Estonian population was due to the occupation and the „Russification" policy of the Soviet Regime intensely interested in the preservation of the Estonian language and culture, and had a rather hostile attitude towards immigrants (Kallas, 2012). The Russian-born immigrants were denied citizenship, many of them were unemployed after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and due to the lack of knowledge of the Estonian language, they had little chance on the restructured labor market (Kallas, 2012: 129f). It was not until 1997, that the first integration policy steps were taken. In 2000, an extensive integration program was set up. A year earlier, a study analyzing the degree of integration was carried out (Kallas 2012: 133). Thus, the Estonian integration monitoring was launched.

Social-statistic concept

The Integration Monitor differentiates the population according to their mother tongue. The monitor uses citizenship, age and some sort of a region variable to identify the Russian-speaking population (Kallas 2012: 137).[5] In the analyses, the report often differentiates between „ethnic Estonians" and „ethnic Russians". Some indicators are more sophisticated, since they also report data for „people of other ethnicity". Therefore, this concept can be summarized as a cultural-ethnic concept. Russians are by far the biggest

---

[5] For readers without Estonian language skills the exact procedure is difficult to understand, because the comprehensive report is available only in Estonian and the English summary does not describe the precise definition.

immigration group. In 2011, 79% of all non-Estonian inhabitants were ethnic Russians, followed by ethnic Ukrainians (6%) and ethnic Finns (2%) (Estonian Statistical Office, 2013).

Integration monitoring in Estonia: „Eesti ühiskonna integratsiooni monitooring"

This first integration monitoring captured the views of 1,000 respondents on the integration policy and the state of structural (education, employment, income, rights), cultural (language knowledge and use) and social (inter-ethnic social contacts) integration of immigrants (Integration Foundation, 2000). This monitoring was carried out in a three-year cycle (2002, 2005, and 2008). With the introduction of the new integration program in 2008 six core objectives have been defined, that should be promoted by integration policy and checked by integration monitoring: a reduction of the ethnic disparities in employment and income, improving language skills, increased use of the Estonian language, reducing the number of stateless population, strengthening of inter-ethnic social contacts, gain trust in the political institutions and between ethnic communities (Estonian Ministry of Culture, 2008). To check these objectives, the current Integration Monitor of 2011 contains a total of 100 indicators (Huddleston, 2011: 4). It refers to official statistics and also initiated a survey of 1,400 respondents, including 600 ethnic Estonians and 800 people of other ethnicity (Estonian Ministry of Culture, 2011).

On the basis of various indicators (cultural, social and identificational) a total of six „integration clusters" is formed. These clusters range from „not integrated" to „successfully integrated". In 2011, 21% of all people without Estonian ethnicity were „successfully integrated", whereas 22% were categorized as „not integrated" (Estonian Ministry of Culture, 2011: 9). The integration monitor's indicators are based at least partially on the EU Core Indicators. The monitor takes into account, for example, the naturalization rate, the level of education, the proportion of long-term unemployed, the (self-reported) knowledge of the Estonian language in listening, speaking, reading and writing, and the extent of political participation.

Tool

A problem has been the lack of uniformity in data collection and analysis. Even the guidelines of 2008 do not define how data ought to be collected and analysed from different sources, databases and studies, and what definitions are valid (Kallas, 2012: 136f). Although there have been further attempts at systematization in 2008, these have not been implemented yet due to the complexity. All of the monitors used, for example, the same variables to identify the Russian-speaking community, but the definitions were never implemented uniformly, so that comparison of the integration monitors is limited (Kallas 2012: 137). This complicates statements about the progress of the integration of immigrants.

Still, it was very useful in the political process, as the level of integration was now measurable and verifiable, and political decisions no longer had to be taken due to subjective assessments, but on gathered data.

3.5 GERMANY

General framework

<u>Immigration</u>

Germany is among the four countries with the highest level of immigration in the world (OECD, 2012: 19). Its recent migration history begins in the 1950s with the *Wirtschaftswunder* after the Second World War. The rapid economic growth demanded labour force which could not be covered with the local population,

so the West-German government started a formal guest worker programme, signing recruitment agreements with Italy, Greece, Spain, Turkey, Portugal, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. The resulting strong immigration flow of primarily low-skilled workers lasted around two decades. It came to an end with the Oil Crisis and a ban on recruitment (*Anwerbestopp*) in 1973. From then on, migration was characterized by family reunification of wives and children following the 'guest-workers' who had stayed in Germany. The next phase starts in the 1990s with high influx of refugees and ethnic German repatriates (*Spätaussiedler*), with a peak of 440,000 asylum-seekers in 1993. Law reforms and economic stagnation led immigration decrease in the following decades. Since 2010 the migration numbers have been rising again steadily, with people coming especially from the (new) eastern EU-countries and the southern European Member States due to the Eurozone crisis.

Today, around 20% of the German population have a migration background, two thirds of them are foreign born, one third is second or third generation. Their concentration is higher in West-German industrial urban areas and among younger people. For example 57% of the persons under the age of 18 in Frankfurt have a migration background (Federal Statistical Offices, 2013).

Social-statistic concept

The main problem regarding the statistical analysis of integration is that most official sources of data differentiate only by nationality. However, this approach is increasingly losing its accuracy for many reasons. For example, *Spätaussiedler* (ethnic German repatriates[6]) are recorded as Germans, the number of naturalized persons and the number of children born to foreigners but who have German citizenship has also increased due to reforms of the citizenship law. In order to take these factors into account, the Microcensus and other surveys now use the broader concept of a migration background as far as possible. However, varying definitions of this concept exist. The most widespread definition is the one of the German Federal Office of Statistics applied in the Microcensus: Thus, „the population group with a migration background consists of all persons who have immigrated into the territory of today's Federal Republic of Germany after 1949, and of all foreigners born in Germany and all persons born in Germany who have at least one parent who immigrated into the country or was born as a foreigner in Germany." (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2013).

Integration monitoring in Germany on the national and regional level: *Integrationsindikatorenbericht* and *Hessischer Integrationsmonitor*

The Second Report on Integration Indicators in Germany was published in 2011 by the Minister of State in the Federal Chancellery and Federal Government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration (*Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration*). The monitor was carried out by two social research institutes and was a methodological advancement of the first edition released in 2009: Now the reporting period covered six years (2005 to 2010) whereas the number of indicators was reduced from over 100 to 64. The following key subject areas of integration are represented: legal status, education, employment, social integration, income, housing, health, diversity management and security (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 2011), thus cover the structural and the social dimension.

Graphs illustrate the temporal evolution of each indicator since 2005. The ratios are reported separately for the groups „foreign born", „born in Germany" and „foreigners", often also differentiated by gender. The last third of the report consists of extensive regression analysis, finding out which variables actually explain

---

[6] Ethnic German repatriates are ethnic Germans from the successive states of the former Soviet Union and other former Eastern Bloc states. By means of a special legal acceptance process they have particular justification for living in Germany (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 2013a).

the gaps between the immigrants and the local population: is it the migration background itself or different education levels, social position, income, age etc.?

In addition to the national report, every two years the German conference of the Ministers of Integration of the 16 *Bundesländer* (federal states) publish the sub-federal Report on integration monitoring in the *Länder.* It contains 34 indicators grouped in six political topics. The statistical data show the development from 2005 to 2011 in all 16 states and focuses on structural integration indicators (Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder, 2013).

Aside from the mentioned reports, some German *Länder* established their own integration monitoring systems. One of the first was Hessen with the *Hessische Integrationsmonitor,* issued by the Ministry of Justice, for Integration and Europe of the State of Hessen in 2010 and the advanced edition in 2013*.* With one of the largest migrant populations, the government of this West-German State has compiled data since 2005 in the monitoring report to show the changes in immigration and integration. Its empirical methodology is based on a larger international system that measures integration throughout Europe. The 58 indicators are derived from the four dimensions of the integration process: the structural, social, cultural and identificatory components (see table 1). 13 indicators deal especially with the target group of newly arriving immigrants, as their number has been growing fast over the last years. The Integration Monitor of Hessen is complemented by several studies that do deeper research on certain topics, e.g. early childhood education or religious orientations.

Tool

In the National Integration Plan of 2007, the federal government had committed to measure the evolution of social integration in Germany on an empirical basis. The integration indicators report is the foundation for this as it clears research deficits. The monitor shows where integration measures are effective and progress is being made, but also where deficits remain. Objective and data-driven analysis is the basis for the next steps and the further development of integration policies. Thus, it should also increase liability (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 2011: 4).

Furthermore, an integration monitor can emphasize political priorities: For example, one goal on the political agenda is to increase the number of government employees with migration background. To measure that, the report contains eight indicators analysing e.g. the share of foreigners working in the public health sector or the public education system.

Integration is an extremely multifaceted and ever-changing process. The objective of integration monitoring is to break this complex process down into different components and to trace these components back to measurable quantities (Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa, 2013b: 11). It is crucial for a tool not to remain static but to be flexible and thus adapt to the current circumstances. This happens in Germany both on the national and the regional level. E.g., the integration indicators in Hessen are constantly developed according to improved data availability and new focuses of integration policy.

3.6 ITALY

General framework

Immigration

Italy has been a classic country of emigration for a long time. For almost one century, it was one of the leading emigration countries in Europe (Bonifazi et al., 2011: 183). Only in the first three decades after the Second World War, 7 million Italians left the country (Calavita, 2006: 2). Until the mid-1970s, Italy did not become an immigration country (Zincone & Caponio, 2006: 2).

Students and political refugees escaping from states in Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and Asia were the first immigrants in the 1970s, whereas the first significant influx of migrant workers was recorded in the early 1980s (ibid). With the fall of the Iron Curtain further immigration flows were set in motion. The once positive climate towards immigrants deteriorated rapidly, both in the political and in the social debate (Bonifazi et al., 2011: 183). The major political principle was to enable immigrants already living in Italy a decent life and to reduce further immigration. The government tried to regulate the previously unregulated immigration policy and many previously illegal immigrants obtained a legal status (Zincone & Caponio, 2006: 3f).

Between 1981 and the early 2000s, the number of legal immigrants almost quintuplicated; nonetheless, Italy still had the lowest share of foreign born residents (< 3%) in Europe (Calavita, 2006: 6). In 2013, about 4.4 Million inhabitants of Italy are foreign, that is about 7.4% of the whole population (59.4 Million) (ISTAT, 2013). The ISMU Foundation (2013: 1) estimates the total foreign population to be 5.4 Million (including EU nationals) and the total irregular immigrants living in Italy to be about 326,000 persons. There is a significant concentration of immigrants in the economically stronger Northern and Central parts of Italy. Only 14% reside in the Southern municipalities (ISTAT, 2013). The share of EU nationals has risen from 6% to nearly 30% (Zincone & Caponio, 2006: 184f). The five biggest immigrant communities come from Romania (21%), Albania (11%), Morocco (10%), China and Ukraine (both around 4%). The motives for immigration can be approximated by the number of residence permits. In 2010, 600,000 permits were released, 60% for employment and 40% for family reasons (ISTAT, 2011).

Social-statistic concept

The measurement of integration is not a new phenomenon in Italy. Since the early 1990s, first studies have been conducted. However, there is still no integration monitoring carried out by state agencies. The most significant contribution for the past 18 years has been delivered by the ISMU foundation[7].

„The Eighteenth Italian Report on Migrations 2012" by the ISMU foundation distinguishes the population by citizenship. Depending on the data, the report differentiates between Italian / Non-Italian or Italian / EU / Non-EU whenever possible. An exception is the chapter on education. As PISA data is partly used in this section, school performance can also be displayed for the first and second generation. For several statistics, gender differences are reported.

---

[7] Although the national statistics office ISTAT does not perform regular integration monitoring, it publishes its own further analyses about integration. For example in 2009, ISTAT conducted a survey, which was funded by the Italian Ministry of Labour (Bonifazi et al., 2011: 195). This study interviewed 6,000 households with at least one foreigner residing in Italy with the same methodological concepts as the EU-SILC survey. Therefore, the results are comparable to those with native households. Unfortunately, only a brief note with the main findings has been published.

Integration monitoring in Italy: „Diciottesimo rapporto sulle Migrazioni"

The reports are no integration monitors in the strict sense, but rather comprehensive studies of the living conditions of migrants on various topics. Several chapters do not present data but rather sum up scientific contributions on that topic. These topics vary between the annually published reports, except a few core subjects, such as the legal situation, the labour market integration and the level of education. The current report contains an additional chapter on health and the situation of unaccompanied minors, whereas, for example, former reports analyse e.g. deviance and crime among immigrants or immigrants' consumption. For more than ten years, the Regional Observatory for Integration and Multiethnicity (ORIM) systematically has collected data and has conducted large surveys to give an understanding about immigration to Lombardy and the situation of immigrants (Regione Lombardia et al., 2013). The findings are reported in an extra chapter in each of the reports. In the eighteenth report, the data examine presence, territorial distribution, nationality, irregularity, working conditions, level of settlement in Lombardy society and the level of integration of immigrants (ISMU, 2013: 103).

The eighteenth report uses various official data, such as data collected by ISTAT (e.g. the census and the Labour Force Survey[8]), the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR), the Ministry of the Interior, the Italian Ministry of Labour and PISA data. The current report contains a total of 19 integration indicators in the first chapters (plus various descriptive statistics, e.g. about migration flows) and two indicators in the chapter about immigrants in Lombardy, namely income and property ownership. Various aspects are examined, such as the legal status of immigrants, the rates of labour market activity, employment and unemployment, the professional group, the share of immigrant students by school level, achieved degrees of school-leavers, reading performance in the PISA study and the level of education of the Italian and Non-Italian population. Thus, the report focuses mainly on the structural dimension. Most of the indicators are related to the EU Core Indicators.

One specialty of this report is the long-term estimation of migration flows and the number of foreign people living in Italy. ISMU estimates about 11.2 million foreigners living in Italy in 2041 (ISMU, 2013: 37).

Tool

Up to now, there is no official system for monitoring migrant integration in Italy (Bonifazi et al., 2011: 197). The ISMU foundation's report-series try to close this gap; however, it is not an integration monitor in the classical sense, except for the core topics. Nevertheless, the systematic and long-term research of ORIM have become an important reference for operators and experts and for the design and planning of interventions (ISMU, 2013: 103).
A shortcoming of the available data is the difficulty of using them at sub-national level (Bonifazi et al., 2011: 197). It is also regrettable that data are available only for foreigners. This means that statements about naturalized immigrants are not possible.

---

[8] The Labour Force Survey is carried out on a continuous basis. Each quarter, the survey collects information about 70,000 households in Italy. The survey provides estimates of the main labour market (employment status, type of work, work experience, job search, etc.). These statistics are broken down by the main socio-demographic characteristics. Since 2004, the survey is harmonised at European level with regard to the contents, definitions and main methodological aspects.

3.7 IRELAND

General framework

Immigration

Ireland is a country with a long tradition of emigration. Examples of this are the large waves of emigration in the period of the Great Famine. After the Second World War, the emigration rate declined steadily through the economic boom and a large number of Irish citizens returned to Ireland (Einri & White, 2008: 153). Immigration from third countries was virtually absent (Einri & White, 2008: 154). In the last two decades, however, stronger immigration flows to Ireland occurred. In 1996, Ireland for the first time recorded a net immigration. (Schuppers & Loyal, 2011: 165).

The EU enlargement in 2004 led again to a strong increase of immigration to Ireland, so that for the first time the number of non-Irish immigrants was higher than that of the Irish returnees in their homeland. The number of refugees has increased from a few hundred in 1994 to over 11,000 per year and then stabilized since 2004 at about 4,000 per year (Ruhs 2009). The asylum seekers are mainly from Nigeria, Congo, Algeria and Romania (Einri & White 2008: 153f). According to the 2011 census, 12% of the population was non-Irish (Central Statistical Office 2012: 7). The majority of immigrants (68%) came from the EU (Central Statistical Office 2012: 37). 82% are of working age between 15 and 64 years and are also relatively well educated (Central Statistical Office 2012: 41). According to the latest Integration Monitor the various immigration motives (family, education or labour) are relatively balanced, with educational reasons as the most common (about 35%) motive for immigration. The escape from the sending country is clearly the rarest motive for immigration to Ireland (< 5%).

The first attempts at integration policies were initiated in the 1990s for Bosnian refugees (Schuppers & Loyal, 2011: 169). Due to the following strong increase of immigration, particularly of migrant workers, the integration policy was important and was given a broader approach. The integration policy aimed particularly at overcoming discrimination and racism through various laws and initiatives which should also improve the integration of immigrants (ibid.). In 2007, a Minister for Integration was appointed for the first time. In 2011, the first „Annual Monitoring Report on Integration" was released, published by the Integration Centre and the Economic and Social Research Institute.

Social-statistic concept

Generally, the definition of immigrants in this Integration Monitor is based on nationality (McGinnity et al., 2013: 14). This definition misses second-generation as well as naturalized immigrants, but the report argues that this definition is still valid, because immigration into Ireland is a very recent phenomenon. On the other hand, the authors recognize this as an area of change (McGinnity et al., 2013: 14). Whenever possible, the report distinguishes between Irish, EU nationals and Non-EU nationals. In most cases however, the Integration Monitor is limited to a differentiation between Irish and Non-Irish. Sometimes, sub-groups, for example migrant workers, family members or refugees, are reported separately.

Integration monitoring in Ireland: "Annual Monitoring Report on Integration"

The third report now currently consists of a total of 29 indicators. The analyses make use of existing data sets: Data of the Central Statistical Office (including especially the Census), the Quarterly National Household Survey, the PISA study, the EU-SILC and official data from Eurostat. A separate data collection, for example a representative survey, is not conducted for the report.

After a brief overview of the numbers of immigrants and their motives for immigration, three dimensions of integration are analysed, namely the structural, cultural and social integration. The monitor is clearly geared to the EU Core Indicators. In the subjects of employment, education, social inclusion and active citizenship 15 EU Core Indicators are implemented, including for example, the employment rate, activity rate, highest educational attainment, PISA test scores, the at-risk-of-poverty rate, the share of immigrants perceiving their health status as good or very good and the share of immigrants among local elected representatives. The analyses show partially still quite significant differences between the Irish and the non-Irish population.

A specialty of the Irish Integration Monitor is an annually changing additional topic. In the current year it is „Changing Attitudes to Irish immigrants". Using 8 indicators of the European Social Survey, it is analysed how attitudes towards immigration have changed between 2002 and 2010. Respondents were asked, for example, whether immigrants make Ireland a better place to live and whether immigrants are a positive factor for the Irish economy.

Tool

Since 2011, the Integration Monitor is published annually by the Economic and Social Research Institute and the Integration Centre. Government agencies (Central Statistical Office, Ministry of Integration, Ministry of Education, Irish Naturalisation and Immigration Service) support the two organisations with the provision of data, comments, and assistance (McGinnity et al, 2013:. 3), but the monitor is not carried out by the state. The publication of the monitor is thus dependent on the resources of the participating NGOs. This structural weakness could be resolved if the administration takes the integration of monitoring as a regular task.

The publication of the integration monitor seems to have triggered a broad political and social debate in Ireland and to have integration policy become the focus of attention (McGinnity et al 2012: i). The Integration Monitor also gives recommendations to policy makers (McGinnity et al, 2013: 10). For example, the report calls for special labour market programs for immigrants due to their higher unemployment rate and critically comments on the cuts of the Irish language promotion because of the still partially inadequate language skills of migrants.

The difficult data situation in Ireland on the subject of integration is a problem (Schuppers & Loyal, 2011: 173ff). The largest data set is the census, but it collected only since 2006 statistics on the ethnic and cultural background of the population. Other statistics from the Central Statistical Office can be broken down only by Irish / non-Irish. In all data sets, including the Census, there seem to be problems with underrepresentation of migrants. This could be due to the lack of information, lack of willingness to participate and to language problems (Schuppers & Loyal, 2011: 174).

3.8 NETHERLANDS

General framework

Immigration

The Netherlands have a rich history of migration. There was an influx of Jews from Portugal, going on with French protestants (Huguenots) and refugees from Belgium. In the 1950s workers from Italy, Spain and Yugoslavia moved to the country to take up work, later followed by Turks and Moroccans. Following

Suriname's und Antillian's independence, many inhabitants migrated to the Netherlands. In the 1990s more and more refugees from Africa, Asia and former Yugoslavia applied for asylum. During the past years the number of migrants from Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and Somalia (the so-called „large groups of refugees") and from China has increased. Next to asylum and labour, family reunion and marriage have been important motives to migrate to the Netherlands in the past (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, CBS, 2012: 14).

<u>Social-statistic concept</u>

The Dutch Statistics make a distinction between *autochtoon* and *allochtoon*. While an autochthonous person has no background in immigration, a first-generation allochthonous person was born abroad and has at least one parent also born in a foreign country. A second-generation allochthonous person is a person whose parents were born abroad while he or she was born in the Netherlands. (CBS 2012: 222) To make the consideration more precise, allochthonous people are further divided in „Western" and „non-Western". Western allochthonous people have their roots in European countries, North America, Oceania, Indonesia or Japan. Important Western groups are from Indonesia or have a German background (Wilkens 2008). In contrast, non-Westerns originate from Turkey, Africa, Latin America and Asia (with the exception of Indonesia and Japan). These groups have their country of origin often in Turkey, Maroc, Suriname and the Netherlands Antilles including Aruba (short form: TMSA). Currently, the share of the allochthonous population is 20.9% (Western: 9.3%, non-Western: 11.6%; CBS 2012: 37).

Integration monitoring in the Netherlands: "Jaarrapport integratie"

The Jaarrapport integratie is published yearly on behalf of the Ministerie voor Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations). Since 2004, it is edited in turn by the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (Statistik Netherlands, CBS) and the Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau (Netherlands Institute for Social Research, SCP)[9]. It is not referred to as a monitor, but it includes elements of monitoring by sometimes using longitudinal statistical data series and because of the achieved continuity.

The 2012 report, published by the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS), comprises eight topics: demography, education; labour market; income and transfers; sociocultural orientation and participation; (registered) criminality; urban housing markets; diversity within the generations. It uses different data sources such as the CBS population statistics, the labour statistics and the education statistics. Survey data is added. The results are complemented by the findings of recent studies.

While earlier editions focused on „non-Western" migrants and particularly on the TMSA-groups the actual report highlights four refugee groups (Afghans, Iranis, Iraqis, Somalis) and three migrant groups from Eastern Europe (Poles, Romanians and Bulgarians) as well.

On the whole, the Jaarrapport integratie offers a compact overview on the integration process in the Netherlands – both on the chances of migrants to participate and the coexistence of migrants and non-migrants. It follows an ethnic concept. Depending on the topic and the data source some trends can be observed for a longer period. The long-lasting differentiation of the four major non-Western allochthonous groups illustrates that they make different progress in integration.

---

[9] „The Netherlands Institute for Social Research is a government agency which conducts research into the social aspects of all areas of government policy." http://www.scp.nl/english/Organisation/About_SCP

Tool

The report's aim is to draw a „picture of the integration of different allochthonous groups". (CBS 2012: 3) Therefore it illustrates their socioeconomic and sociocultural position in the Dutch society. (CBS 2012: 27)

3.9 SWEDEN

General framework

Immigration

Until the Second World War, Sweden was rather a country of emigration than of immigration. This changed after 1945, when the number of immigrants rose sharply (Envall, 2011: 313). Up until the mid-1970s, the vast majority of immigrants were European labour migrants (Bevelander, 2004: 5). In the 1950s, labour shortages were solved through the import of skilled labour, whereas in the 1960s there was a demand for unskilled labour (ibid). The peak of immigration was reached in 1970, when Sweden received 80,000 people (Edin et al., 2000: 167). After this period, however, due to an economic decline in Sweden, the demand for foreign labour migrants diminished and the Swedish government restricted immigration laws (ibid). Therefore, since the 1980s, the nature of immigration has changed and has been dominated by an influx of refugees and close relatives, especially from former Yugoslavia, the Middle East and Somalia (Envall, 2011: 313). After Sweden's accession to the European Union in 1995, the influx of immigrants from Member States and the EAA states markedly increased (ibid).

In 2011, over 1.4 million foreign born people lived in Sweden, which is 15% of the population (Statistics Sweden, 2013a: 127). The motives for immigration can be detected from the residence permits. In 2012, 111,000 permits were granted to immigrants, namely 37% for family reunification, 23% were granted due to the EAA Agreement, 18% for labour market reasons, 16% for refugees and 6% for students (Swedish Migration Board, 2013). The largest immigrant groups, according to their country of birth, are from Finland (12%), Iraq (9%), former Yugoslavia (5%), Poland (5%) and Iran (5%) (Statistics Sweden, 2013b).

Swedish integration policy was introduced relatively late, namely in 1997 (Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications, 2002). The main goal is to guarantee „equal rights, obligations and opportunities for all, regardless of ethnic or cultural background" (ibid). This goal of integration policy is pursued mainly through general measures that are designed to benefit the whole Swedish population (Envall, 2011: 315). In 1998, the Swedish Integration Board was founded to assist newly arrived refugees, to promote integration and monitoring the progress of integration policy (ibid). In the following years, several laws against discrimination were adopted, for example in the labour market. In 2007, the Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality was established, which is now incorporated into the Ministry of Employment. Probably the most important contributions of recent years to monitor integration were published by the Statistical Office in Sweden. In 2008, the first issue of the integration monitor has been released. The second edition was published in December 2013.[10]

---

[10] In addition to the mentioned integration monitor, there is a publication of the Swedish Ministry of Employment concerning migration and integration. In these „pocket facts" historical and current immigration and emigration flows are described, and several integration indicators are analysed, for example employment, level of education, health and political participation. Depending on the data source, the population is distinguished by nationality, by place of birth (Swedish vs. foreign) or according to the concept of „background". This concept distinguishes between a „foreign background", i.e. foreign born or native born with two foreign-born parents, and a „Swedish background", i.e. native born with at least one native born parent.

<u>Social-statistic concept</u>

The integration monitor differentiates the population according to their place of birth. The results are presented for people born in Sweden and for those born in a foreign country. Several statistics are available even for the region of the place of birth, for example the EU Member States, Asia, Africa and South America. Additionally, for most indicators gender differences are presented, too.

Integration monitoring in Sweden: Integration – en beskrivning av läget i Sverige

The second integration monitor published in 2013 describes the current situation of immigration in Sweden, i.e. the demographics of the foreign born population, and analyses the status of the integration process for five subject areas: education, labour market, income, political participation and health. Whenever possible, the report refers to the first integration monitor published in 2008 to follow up whether differences and similarities decrease, stay constant or increase.

The current report refers to several official data sources, namely the STATIV (longitudinal data based on the population register), the Historical Population Registry, the RAMS (official labour market data source), the Swedish revenue and taxation register, the official Swedish election statistics and the Swedish Living Conditions Survey (comparable to the EU-SILC study for some indicators).

The integration monitor consists of 25 indicators measuring integration. Many of them are related to the EU Core Indicators, such as the employment rate, self-employment rate, net income, highest level of education, self-reported health status and the share of elected representatives. Other indicators try to approximate the EU Core Indicators, for example the share of people eligible to attend tertiary education. This indicator is related to the EU Core Indicators „tertiary attainment", but is still not measuring the same.

A specialty is the quite detailed chapter on health, which goes far beyond the scope of the EU Core Indicators. With a total of seven indicators, including for example the overall health status, the share of people with serious pain or with insomnia, the health condition of the population is analysed.

Tool

The data sources used in the integration monitor seem to be very useful as a tool, because they can be broken down on a regional and municipal level, as well as for 38 urban districts (Envall, 2011: 316). Therefore, the monitoring could be used by governments and authorities for measuring integration processes at national and regional level. Although the integration monitor does not report statistics at regional level, this possibility represents a big potential and benefit.

The quality of the data seems to be above average. The longitudinal STATIV data, for example, covers the entire population registered as resident in Sweden on the 31st of December of each year. It also contains information about the individual's parents. Furthermore, the Ministry of Employment has direct access to the data gathered by Statistics Sweden, including the STATIV database (Envall, 2011: 323f). The Ministry of Employment uses the data on a day-to-day basis and for monitoring the government's integration strategy (ibid). However, the government has not formulated quantifiable targets for its integration policy yet, because there is some concern that this may be used in a wrong way, e.g. tempting organisations to manipulate their statistics (ibid). Finally, the integration monitoring and the available data seem to have great impact in the media and in the social debate (ibid).

4. SUMMARY

Table 3 sums up the main findings about the integration monitors in the nine analysed Member States. It answers the following questions: Who carries out the monitor? What kind of monitoring is done? How often is it issued and who are its target groups? With regard to the contents: How many indicators consider which dimensions of the integration process and subject areas? Is there a reference made to the EU Core Indicators? Finally we checked if the monitor also reports on regional and/or local level and what special features attracted our attention.

As the outlined table indicates, integration monitoring is conducted in manifold ways throughout Europe. This is no surprise, as Member States face differences in immigration patterns, integration policies, and data sources. Nevertheless, common approaches and development stages are recognizable.

Editors of the integration monitors are mostly federal Ministries, the National Statistical Offices or government-funded research institutes. One exception is Ireland, where the monitor is carried out by two NGOs and Italy with the ISMU foundation. The observable proximity of the specific monitoring entity and the government is not a problem as such; in contrary it can be fruitful as the integration monitor should be closely linked to integration policies. Besides, the government is the main financier of such reports and without a public financing the publication of a monitor is dependent on the NGO's capacities. But it is essential, that the writing of the monitor should be completely independent from public powers in order to avoid manipulation of the data and window dressing.

As to the **type of monitoring**, different approaches are visible. Some Member States are still in the beginning stage, publishing descriptive statistical reports or pilot studies. Several states already go a step further and edit more extensive migration/integration reports. Finally some of the analysed Member States (i.e. Austria, Estonia, Germany, Ireland and Sweden) execute integration monitors in the narrower sense, defining indicators and comparing their temporal development. In some cases there are special indicators regarding new immigrants (e.g. the 2013 Integration Report of Hessen, Germany; Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa 2013).

A frequent **periodicity** is desirable. Austria, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands publish their reports annually. In Germany, the monitor has been released every two years; in Estonia, the monitor is published every three years. In the rest of the analysed Member States there is no regular publication cycle to be found yet. Frequency of course only makes sense, if the set of indicators and used data are stable, otherwise comparisons are difficult.

The kind of the monitored **target group** is closely linked to the social-statistical concept of immigrants and to the data availability. Whereas the Czech pilot report focuses on TCN (without refugees) other countries have a broader target group. Over half of the regarded Member States have a more comprehensive definition considering the migration background and not only citizenship (see sections ,,social-statistic concept'' in chapter 3). This is extremely important, as many integration issues concern the second and third generation, for instance problems in schools. Still, data is not always available for people with migration background. Furthermore, there is no homogeneous definition of the migration background (nor is there a uniform term: immigration background, background in migration etc.); for example sometimes both parents need to be foreign born, sometimes only one. A European standardization is not in sight yet.

Table 3 - Grid comparing integration monitoring in the analysed Member States (the latest published report is regarded)

MS	Editor	Type of monitoring	Periodicity	Target group	Contents	Number of indicators	Special features	Spatial dimensions	Reference to EU Core Indicators
		integration monitoring;migration monitoring; (if no actual monitoring):migration report, report about foreign population, statistical report etc.		foreigners; TCN;foreign born;migration background (2nd and further generations); ethnic groups	dimensions: structural, social, cultural and identificatory integration fields of activity: work, education, health, housing ...	in the newest publication	e.g. „innovative" indicators	indicators reporting on regional and / or local level?	
AT	Austrian Statistical Office, Commission for Migration and Integration Research of the Austrian Academy of Science	integration and brief migration monitoring	annually since 2008, since 2010 with defined indicators	migration background, foreigners	all 4 dimensions language & education, employment, social situation & health, security, housing, identification and integration climate	25 + extensive further statistical data	annual survey on subjective integration climate, in 2012 two additional monitors about women and young people	yes, regional (Bundesländer, also in the national monitor) and local (Vienna)	no
BE	Federale Overheidsdienst Werkgelegenheid, Arbeit en Sociaal Overleg/ Centrum voor Gelijkheid van Kansen en voor Racismebestrijding	statistical report	first published in 2013; next report is planned for 2014	migration background, foreigners	structural dimension labour market-related topics	-	socio-economic mobility	yes, Brussels region, Flemish region, Walloon region	no
CZ	Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs	integration monitoring (pilot study)	2011	TCN (without refugees)	structural and social dimension	pilot study: 39 basic indicators + 50 advanced indicators	The Czech Statistical Office provides various data about health situation and illegal migration.	no	yes

DE	Minister of State in the Federal Chancellery and Federal Government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees and Integration	integration monitoring	2009, 2011	migration background, foreigners	structural and social dimension legal status, education, employment, social integration, income, housing, health, diversity management, security	64	multivariate statistical analyses, indicators about diversity management	yes, regional (separate monitor comparing all Bundesländer) and local in some cities	no
EST	Ministry of Culture	integration monitoring	every three years since 1999	migration background, foreigners, ethnic groups	all 4 dimensions education & employment, language, social interaction, use of media, identification, integration climate	100	construction of „integration clusters"	no	yes
Hess -en	Ministry of Justice, for Integration and Europe of the State of Hessen	integration monitoring and migration monitoring	2010, 2013	migration background, foreigners	all 4 dimensions immigration, education, employment, poverty, health, security, language, religion, feeling of belonging/exclusion	58	13 indicators about recently arriving immigrants, 4 indicators about feeling of belonging/exclusion	yes, regional and local (e.g. Frankfurt, Wiesbaden)	yes
IRL	Economic and Social Research Institute and The Integration Centre	integration monitoring	annually since 2010	foreigners	structural, social and cultural dimension legal status, employment, income, education, social integration, perceived health status	29	„Changing Irish Attitudes to Immigrants? Evidence from the European Social Survey 2002–2010"	no	yes
IT	Fondazione ISMU	migration report, also focusing on integration	annually since 1995	foreigners	structural and social dimension topics 2012: legal aspects, labour market, education, health,	21	different focuses in each report, e.g. in 2012: unaccompanied minors, health. long-term predictions	yes, regional aspects are mentioned (Lombardy)	yes

					unaccompanied minors, immigration in Lombardy		of migration flows	
NL	Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS) and Sociaal and Cultureel Planbureau (SCP), in turn	integration report	annually since 2004	allochthonous people, focus on non-Western groups; TMSA (Turkey, Maroc, Suriname, Netherlands Antilles)	the 4 dimensions demography, education; labour market; income and transfers; sociocultural orientation and participation; (registered) criminality; urban housing markets; diversity within the generations	-	focus on non-Western groups; TMSA (Turkey, Maroc, Suriname, Netherlands Antilles)	yes, regional aspects are mentioned	no
SE	Statistics Sweden	integration monitoring	2008, 2013	foreign born	structural and social dimension education and academic performance, employment, income and poverty, health, political participation	25	detailed chapter on health (7 indicators) concerning e.g. the overall health condition, disabilities and serious pain	no but: data can be broken down on regional and municipal level	yes

The **number of indicators** ranges from 21 (Italy) to 100 (Estonia). An amount of approximately 30 to 40 indicators seems to be well manageable. However, if the monitor is intelligibly structured, more indicators are reasonable. A few reports display 'key indicators' in order to stress certain topics.

With regard to the **contents**, many similarities are observable. All integration monitors include the structural dimension, most of them also the social dimension of integration[11]. As employment is seen as a key part of the integration process indispensable topics are employment and education. More „subjective" indicators considering the cultural and identificatory integration are not very common. One cause could be the lack of data on these subjects. To solve this problem, some editors carry out own surveys e.g. about the integration climate (see Austrian integration monitor). Half of the regarded monitors make **reference to the European Core Indicators**. This is a clear sign for certain homogeneity of the reported topics. This common denominator shows room for development.

Another promising potential is the expansion of the monitors to the **regional and local level.** Already half of the regarded Member States do not limit their monitors to the national level. Thus, migrants' needs and political areas of activity can be more precisely determined and, in a next step, resources can be focused on these areas. This leads to the next chapter, examining how integration monitoring can serve as an administration tool for integration governance.

4.1 Monitoring as a tool for integration governance

The desk research found out several approaches on how monitoring can serve as a tool for integration policies. Overall, a positive sign is when monitoring is not standing isolated but **embedded in a larger policy concept**, as it is done e.g. in Austria or Germany: In their National Integration Plan, monitoring is clearly formulated as an assignment to provide information for the planning of further measures. This also increases liability.

In chapter 1.1, three principal purposes on how integration monitoring can serve as a tool were presented, according to the findings of Huddleston et al. (2013: 42ff.). The selected Member States were analysed according to these three purposes: Which one of these aims are actually carried in practice?

- Understanding the integration context and the situation of immigrants
- Evaluating the results of policy
- Use targets to mainstream and improve integration

The task of monitoring as a tool to gather consolidated data and **understand the integration context and the situation of immigrants** applies to almost all examined Member States. In many integration monitors analyses are performed for different subgroups (e.g. age and gender). This increases the understanding of integration processes. In some countries, where integration policies are rather new, the monitor is carried out as a first baseline study. In these cases, no comparisons over time are possible. In other cases, although the study was repeated, time comparisons were limited because of data problems.

Monitoring as a tool to understand the situation of immigrants can **show where action is needed**. This might be one of the most important areas of application as an administrative tool. Here, monitoring serves as a **basis for further political measures**. A concrete example would be the discrimination of foreigners in the labour market. In a following step, administration could formulate benchmarks of integration. The suitability could be improved if monitoring is done continuously and established on a regional and local

---

[11] The four dimensions of integration are explained in chapter 1.2 and table 1.

level. Furthermore, monitoring should be flexible enough to adapt to current circumstances, for example the arrival of new immigrant groups. However, this requires sophisticated data availability.

The task of monitoring to **evaluate the results of policies** is nowhere to be found. None of the analysed integration monitors evaluates a certain measure or integration policy as a whole. As we have already argued in chapter 1, this approach was not to be expected, since evaluation requires a lot of prerequisites that are not easy to fulfill. The casual links between political measures and integration outcomes are difficult to prove (Huddleston et al., 2013: 46). It is impossible to create an isolated environment where all possible explanatory variables are controllable.

In this respect we have a different view from Huddleston et al. It can rather be used to discover the most important fields of action and thus serve as a tool. If the main fields of action are tracked, expensive and time-consuming evaluations can selectively be performed in these areas. For example, monitoring could reveal that natives and immigrants are indeed equally represented in the secondary school, whereas immigrants, however, are significantly under-represented in higher education. In this case, one would not need to evaluate „education policy" as a whole, but only a small section.

The third possible goal of an integration monitoring is to serve as a tool to **use targets to mainstream and promote integration**. This also implies that a monitor puts integration on the political agenda and gives it more focus. In Sweden and Ireland, it is mentioned that the monitor has triggered a broad political and social debate. For this to happen, it is helpful that the monitor is not too technical but easily accessible and understandable for the media and the citizens. In the Czech Republic, monitoring is seen as a contribution to better information sharing about integration policies in EU Member States. There surely is big potential for the exchange of information on monitoring.

The current state of research shows that the potential of monitoring as a tool for integration governance has not been exhausted yet. As Kraler & Reichel (2012: 51) point out: „… the importance of scientific evidence for policymaking is still rather limited. While scientific evidence or statistical data are used increasingly often to justify policy decisions, more systematic scientific evaluations of policy measures or ex-ante impact analyses of planned measures take place to rather a limited extent." Sometimes a pragmatic approach seems to dominate: Not the cognitive interests direct the monitoring, but the available data. But „Ideally, monitoring should be part of a policy cycle, in which the need for knowledge is formulated on the basis of observed problems in the integration and social participation of migrants. How are migrants faring, and what effect have the efforts made by governments or other bodies produced?" (Bijl & Verweij, 2012: 39).

4.2 Limits of monitoring and issues

To avoid a one-sided approach to the subject, the following chapter points out some limits and problems of monitoring that came along during the desk research. First to mention, there are practical limits due to the availability of data (and the data quality), which differs from country to country. Some Member States, e.g. Sweden, access extensive registry data, others have only rudimentary data material about foreigners based on small samples. Although there are already some good data we can build on[12] further statistics are needed, especially considering the second generation of immigrants (i.e. the migration background) and more subjective topics like health status or integration climate.

---

[12] e.g. on European level: LFS, EU-SILC, PISA

But even if extensive data on all subjects and for manifold target groups were available, monitoring still would have its limits. As all kinds of social processes, 'integration' depends on countless variables and actors, so it will never be entirely measurable and explainable.

Then there are some methodological and ethical issues; some authors criticize monitoring to be stereotyping and stigmatizing immigrants as 'one big problematic group'. Of course monitoring is always generalizing. But it should differentiate between different target groups as they have (or do not have) specific integration issues. Furthermore, multivariate analysis is helpful to prove that the migration background is not the main explanatory variable. Rather, the immigrants' disadvantages are explainable through other factors, for example, with their lower education background or missing language skills.

In respect of target groups, it should be absolutely avoided to narrow monitoring (and integration policies in general) only to the third country nationals. This would not reflect the reality of migration in Europe – around 75% of migrant flows are within the EU (Eurostat, 2013). And only because one country becomes a Member State of the European Union, the problems of its immigrants are not solved over night. On the contrary, often new issues arise as the current discussion about intensified immigration from Bulgaria and Romania into many Central European states shows.

All of the mentioned aspects also signify limits of monitoring as a tool for integration governance. As pointed out the use of monitoring as an evaluation instrument is difficult, due to the undetectable causalities. In general, evaluation should be pursued where it makes sense to make policy more effective. Monitoring can help to discover which fields of action need to be evaluated.

5. OUTLOOK

To sum up, monitoring is extremely important to substantiate the integration debate and to prioritize integration measures, where possible tailored to specific groups of migrants particularly worthy of support. There lies also big potential in the exchange of experiences between the European Member States, especially for those who are still in the phase of developing a monitor. The Mwember States can learn from each other - it is not necessary to "reinvent the wheel"!

So how could integration monitoring develop in the future? One possibility would be to promote a European harmonisation of national integration monitors. But this has to be seen critical. A complete harmonisation is unrealistic and makes little sense, due to the heterogeneous structure both of migration patterns and available data in the Member States. Monitoring as an administration tool must take into account the particular demographic circumstances and integration policies, otherwise it is imprecise. National and regional monitors are more suitable to raise awareness of specific integration issues and objectivity. Nevertheless it is of the utmost importance to keep a set of EU Core Indicators and harmonised data to promote comparability and information sharing among the Member States, the latter which happens also through this report here.

REFERENCES

Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration (ed.) 2009, *Integration in Deutschland: Erster Integrationsindikatorenbericht. Erprobung des Indikatorensatzes und Bericht zum bundesweiten Integrationsmonitoring,* Berlin.

Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration (ed.) 2011, *Zweiter Integrationsindikatorenbericht,* Berlin.

Bendel, P. 2010, *Integrationspolitik in der Europäischen Union. Gutachten im Auftrag des Gesprächskreises Migration und Integration der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung,* Bonn.

Bevelander P. 2004, „Immigration patterns, economic integration and residential segregation: Sweden in the late 20th century", *Current Themes in IMER Research*, 2, pp. 5-30.

Bijl, R., A. Verweij (2012): „Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe: facts and views", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries,* The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 11-42.

Bonifazi, C., S. Strozza & M. Vitiello 2011, „Measuring integration in a reluctant immigration country: the case of Italy", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries*, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 183-199.

Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge 2013a, *Glossar*, Internet: http://www.bamf.de/EN/Service/Left/Glossary/_function/glossar.html?lv2=1450778&lv3=1504296

Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (ed.) 2013b, *Migrationsbericht 2011,* Nürnberg.

Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (ed.) 2013c, *Minas. Atlas über Migration, Integration und Asyl. 5. Auflage,* Nürnberg.

Bundesregierung, Presse- und Informationsamt (ed.) 2008, *Bundesregierung will Integrationserfolge wissenschaftlich messen,* Press release from June 4th, 2008, Berlin.

Calavita, K. 2006, *Italy: Immigration, Economic Flexibility, and Integration*, University of California, Irvine.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek 2012 (CBS), *Jaarrapport integratie 2012,* Den Haag/Heerlen.

Central Statistical Office 2012, *Profile 6 Migration and Diversity*, Stationery Office, Dublin.

Cesareo, V. (ed.) 2012, *The Seventeenth Italian Report on Migrations 2011,* Fondazione ISMU, Milano.

Council of the European Union (ed.) 2009, *The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving the citizen*, Presidency Note, 14449/09, Brussels.

Council of the European Union (ed.) 2010, The Stockholm Programme – An open and secure Europe serving the citizen . Official Journal of the European Union (2010/C 115/01), Brussels. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2010:115:0001:0038:en:PDF

Czech Statistical Office 2013, Foreigners: Number of foreigners, Internet: www.czso.cz/csu/cizinci.nsf/engkapitola/ciz_pocet_cizincu

Dizdarevič, S. 2012, „Monitoring integration in the Czech Republic", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries,* The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 81-99.

Drbohlav, D. & L. Lachmanová-Medová 2009*, Country Report Czech Republic. Report for the Project Promoting Comparative Quantitative Research in the Field of Migration and Integration in Europe (PROMINSTAT),* Internet: www.prominstat.eu/drupal/?q=system/files/PROMINSTAT_Czech_Republic.pdf

Edin, P.-A., R. LaLonde & O. Aslund 2000, „Emigration of immigrants and measures of immigrant assimilation: Evidence from Sweden", *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 7, pp. 163-204.

Einri P. & A. White 2008, „Immigration into the Republic of Ireland: a bibliography of recent research", *Irish Geography*, 41, pp. 151-179.

Envall, A. 2011, „Monitoring integration in Sweden", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries*, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 313-325.

Erlaim (2013): „*Integrationspolitik in Europa – Integrationspolitik in Belgien."* http://www.erlaim.eu/belgien.html

Esping-Andersen, G. 1990, *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Princeton.

Esser H. 1980*, Aspekte der Wanderungssoziologie. Assimilation und Integration von Wanderern, ethnischen Gruppen und Minderheiten. Eine handlungstheoretische Analyse*, Darmstadt.

Esser H. 2006, *Sprache und Integration*, New York.

Estonian Ministry of Culture 2008, *Estonian Integration Strategy 2008-2013* (unofficial translation), source: http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_3700_459328622.pdf

Estonian Ministry of Culture 2011, *Estonian Integration Monitoring 2011 Summary.* Tallinn.

Estonian Statistical Office 2013, *Population and Housing Census 2011 - Preliminary data,* http://www.stat.ee/sdb-update?db_update_id=13545

European Commission, Directorate-General Justice, Freedom and Security (ed.) 2010, *Handbook on integration for policy-makers and practitioners*, 3rd edition, Luxembourg.

European Ministerial Conference on Integration (ed.) 2008, *Declaration approved by the representatives of the Member States, European Ministerial Conference on Integration*, Vichy – 3 and 4 November 2008.

European Ministerial Conference on Integration (ed.) 2010a, *Declaration approved by the representatives of the Member States, European Ministerial Conference on Integration, Saragossa* – 15 and 16 April 2010.

European Ministerial Conference on Integration (ed.) 2010b, *Draft Declaration European Ministerial Conference on Integration, Saragossa* – 15 and 16 April 2010. http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_13055_519941744.pdf

Eurostat (ed.) 2011, *Indicators of immigrant integration. A pilot study*, Luxembourg.

Eurostat (ed.) 2013, *Table 'migr_imm1ctz': Immigration by sex, age group and citizenship* http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/population/data/database

Expertenrat für Integration 2013, *Integrationsbericht 2013 – Perspektiven und Handlungsempfehlungen,* Vienna.

Federal Statistical Offices 2013, *Census database of the census 2011*, Internet: https://ergebnisse.zensus2011.de/?locale=en#

Federale Overheidsdienst Werkgelegenheid, Arbeit en Sociaal Overleg/Centrum voor Gelijkheid van Kansen en voor Racismebestrijding 2013, *Socio-economische monitoring*, Brussel.

Filsinger, D. 2008, *Bedingungen erfolgreicher Integration – Integrationsmonitoring und Evaluation. Expertise im Auftrag der Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung*, Bonn.

Hanseeuw, L. 2012, *Belgie, immigrantennatuie: Statistieken en evoluties*, Brussel.

Haug, S. 2005, *Die Datenlage im Bereich der Migrations- und Integrationsforschung. Ein Überblick über wesentliche Migrations- und Integrationsindikatoren und die Datenquellen.* Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Working Paper 1, Nürnberg.

Heckmann, F., L. Friedrich (2007): *„Auf dem Wege zum Integrations- und Diversitätsmonitoring?"* Vortrag auf der internationalen Fachtagung zu Integrations- und Diversitätsmonitoring „Integration messbar machen" am 26.11. in Wien. efms, Bamberg.

Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa (ed.) 2010, *Integration nach Maß – Der Hessische Integrationsmonitor 2010*, Wiesbaden.

Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa (ed.) 2013a, *Integration nach Maß – Der Hessische Integrationsmonitor 2013*, Wiesbaden.

Hessisches Ministerium der Justiz, für Integration und Europa (ed.) 2013b, *Integration Report of Hessen. An Empirical Analysis of Integration. Concise version*, Wiesbaden.

Huddleston T. 2011, *Monitoring Active Citizenship*, The Institute of Public Affairs, Warschau.

Huddleston T. & J. Niessen, 2011, *Index Integration and Migration III*, Brussels.

Integration Foundation 2000, *Integration of Estonian Society: Monitoring 2000*, Integration Foundation, Tallinn.

ISMU Foundation 2013, *The Eighteenth Italian Report on Migrations 2012*, ISMU, Milan.

ISTAT 2011, *Non-EU citizens holding a residence permit*, source: http://www.istat.it/en/archive/57903
ISTAT 2013, *The Foreign Population Residing In Italy – Demographic Balance*, source: http://www.istat.it/en/archive/96967

Jonsson J. & F. Rudolphi 2011. „Weak Performance – Strong Determination: School Achievement and Educational Choice among Children of Immigrants in Sweden", *European Sociological Review*, 27: 4, pp. 487-508.

Justice and Home Affairs Council 2004: *Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU* http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/EU_actions_integration.cfm

Kallas K. 2011, „Monitoring integration in Estonia", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries*, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 127-143.

Kraler, A. & D. Reichel 2012, „Monitoring integration in Austria", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries,* The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 43-68.

Kommission der Europäischen Gemeinschaften (ed.) 2007, *Europe´s demographic future: Facts and figures*, Luxemburg.

Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder (ed.) 2010, *Ergebnisse der Pilotstudie für die Länder Bayern, Berlin, Hessen, Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Rheinland-Pfalz und Brandenburg.* Dritter Bericht der länderoffenen Arbeitsgruppe „Indikatorenentwicklung und Monitoring" der Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister, Senatorinnen und Senatoren, Berlin.

Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder (ed.) 2011, *Erster Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2005 – 2009, Teil 1 – Ergebnisse, Teil 2 – Datenband,* Berlin.

Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder (ed.) 2013, *Zweiter Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2005 – 2011, Teil 1 – Ergebnisse, Teil 2 – Datenband*, Berlin.

Kultururiministeerium, Estonia 2011, *Estonian Integration Monitoring 2011. Summary*, Tallinn.

Kulu H. 2003, „Post-war immigration to Estonia: a comparative perspective", in Ohlinger R., K.

Schönwälder & T. Triadafilopoulos (eds.), *European encounters: migrants, migration, and European societies since 1945*, Aldershot, Ashgate, pp. 38-52.

Landeshauptstadt Wiesbaden 2012, *Integrationsbericht für die Landeshauptstadt Wiesbaden 2011.* Amt für Zuwanderung und Integration, Wiesbaden.

McGinnity F., E. Quinn, G. Kingston & P. O'Connell 2012, *Annual Monitoring Report on Integration 2011*, Economic and Social Research Institute & The Integration Centre, Dublin.

McGinnity F., E. Quinn, G. Kingston & P. O'Connell 2013, *Annual Monitoring Report on Integration 2012*, Economic and Social Research Institute & The Integration Centre, Dublin.
Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications 2002, *Swedish integration policy for the 21st century*, Stockholm.

Ministry of Interior (Ed.), 2011, *Updated Policy for Integration of Immigrants – Living Together – and Proposal for Further Steps in the Year 2011,* http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/resources/detail.cfm?ID_ITEMS=29488.

Ministry of the Interior, Finland 2011, *Annual Report on Immigration.*

Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs 2013, *Welcome*, Internet: www.mpsv.cz/en/

Misiunas R. & R. Taagepera 1993, *The Baltic States: Years of Dependence 1940-1990*, California University Press & Hurst, Berkeley.

Niessen, J. & T. Huddleston &L. Citron 2011, *MIPEX III. Migrant integration policy index,* Unter Mitarbeit von Andrew Geddes und Dirk Jacobs, Brüssel.

Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research 2012) (ed.), *International Migration 2011-2012*, IMO Report for Norway.o.O.
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (ed.) 2012, *Settling In: OECD Indicators of immigrant integration 2012,* OECD Publishing.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (ed.) 2013, International Migration Outlook, Paris.

Oudhof, K. 2006, „Naast herkomstgroepering ook nationaliteit?", *Bevolkingstrends,* 2e kwartaal, p. 64 – 71

Stadt Frankfurt am Main 2012, *Frankfurter Integrations- und Diversitätsmonitoring*, Frankfurt.

Regeringskanslit, Sweden 2012, *Pocket facts 2010 – Statistics on integration.* Ministry of employment, Stockholm.

Regione Lombardia, Éupolislombardia, Fondazione ISMU, Osservatorio Regionale per l`integrazione e la multietnicità (2012): *Rapporto 2012. Gli immigrati in Lombardia.* Milano.

Ruhs, M. 2009, *Ireland: From Rapid immigration to Recession*. Available from: http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=740

Schuppers N. & S. Loyal 2011, „Monitoring integration in Ireland", in R. Bijl & A. Verweij (eds.), *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries*, The Netherlands Institute for Social Research, The Hague, pp. 165-182.

Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau 2012, *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries,* Den Haag.

Sokolova N. 2008, „Demography", in Institute of International and Social Studies (ed.), *Integration of second-generation Russians in Estonia. Country report on TIES survey in Estonia*, Tallinn University, Tallinn, pp. 8-21.

Statistics Sweden 2013a, *Integration – a description of the situation in Sweden*, Örebro.
Statistics Sweden 2013b, source: http://www.scb.se/en_/Finding-statistics/Statistics-by-subject-area/Population/Population-composition/Population-statistics/Aktuell-Pong/25795/

Statistisches Bundesamt 2013, *Persons with a migration background: Methodological notes*, Internet: https://www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/SocietyState/Population/MigrationIntegration/PersonsMigration Background/Current.html

Statistik Austria 2013, *Bevölkerung in Privathaushalten nach Migrationshintergrund*. http://www.statistik.at/web_de/statistiken/bevoelkerung/bevoelkerungsstruktur/bevoelkerung_nach_mig rationshintergrund/index.html

Statistik Austria & KMI [Kommission für Migrations- und Integrationsforschung der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften] 2013, *migration & integration. Zahlen. Daten. Indikatoren 2013*, Vienna.

Statistisk sentralbyra, Norway 2013, *Immigration and emigration 2012*, http://www.sbo.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/innvutv

Swedish Migration Board 2013, source: http://www.migrationsverket.se/info/3721.html

Swedish Presidency of the European Union 2009, *Presidency conference conclusion on indicators and monitoring of the outcome of integration policies*, Malmö.

The Integration Centre, Ireland 2012, *Annual Monitoring Report on Integration 2012*, Dublin.

Vavrečková, J. & I. Baštýř 2011, *Indicators of the integration of third-country nationals into Czech society in the context of the requirements of European institutions*, Prague. Download: http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_24573_60193971.pdf

Wilkens, I. 2008, „Sozialstatistisches Konzept und Migrationsmuster in den Niederlanden", *Migration und Soziale Arbeit* 2, pp. 101 – 106.

Wilkens, I. 2010, „Integrationsfortschritte in den Niederlanden", Migration und Soziale Arbeit 2, pp. 85-90.

Wilkens, I. & S. Klinker & F. Märker & M. Waldmüller 2010, Integrationsmonitoring: Neue Wege in Hessen, *Migration und Soziale Arbeit* 3+4, pp. 220-227.

Worbs, S. 2010, *Integration in klaren Zahlen? Ansätze des Integrationsmonitorings in Deutschland,* focus MIGRATION, Kurzdossier Nr. 16, Mai, http://www.bpb.de/gesellschaft/migration/dossier-migration/57240/integration-in-zahlen.

Worbs, S. & L. Friedrich, Lena 2008, Integrationsberichterstattung in Deutschland. Eine Bestandsaufnahme, *Sozialwissenschaften und Berufspraxis,* 31. Jg., H. 2, pp. 250-269.

Zincone, G. & T. Caponio 2006, „Immigrant and immigration policy-making: The case of Italy", IMISCOE Working Paper: Country report, IMISCOE, Amsterdam.