Trends in European Immigrant Integration Policies

Christian Joppke
American University of Paris

Intro

- Baseline: a sense of ‘failing’ integration everywhere, from NL to France to Germany
- Old view: ‘national models’
- New trend: convergence on ‘civic integration’ for newcomers and ‘antidiscrimination’ for settled immigrants
- Ergo: integration not ‘two-way process’ but two one-way processes

‘Common Basic Principles’ (EU Council, 2005)

1. Integration as ‘two-way process’
2. ‘respect for the basic values of the EU’
3. ‘employment’ as ‘key’ of integration
4. ‘basic knowledge’ of host language and institutions required
5. ‘nondiscrimination’

Ergo: --no return to assimilation;

--civic integration and antidiscrimination as convergent trends (complementary *and* contradictory)

Trend: Cultural-cum-coercive turn of civic integration

Forces of Convergence

- **Need** for immigration (economic and demographic)

  --end of ‘zero immigration’

  --’integration’ becomes key challenge
- **Europeanization**

  --legal (EU Directives on family reunion, permanent residence, antidiscrimination)

  --soft (‘best practice’, espec. civic integrat.)

Data (1): Immigrant Selection (OECD 2005)

	Work (%)	Direct family	Indirect family	Humanit.
Austria	29.9	7.4	**51.1**	10.4
France	13.5		**61.7**	8.2
GER	**32.7**	18.1	26.8	4.6
NL	25.1		**45.5**	29.5
UK	**44.6**	16.9	14.5	18.7
Suisse	**41.6**		46.9	4.2
AUSTR	**32.8**	**31.3**	25.6	9.4

Conclusions from Selection Data:

- Much variation across entry categories;
- With some exceptions (UK), mostly non-selected ‘as of right’ intakes
- Recent policy focus: shift from asylum to family formation (low-skilled, female, Muslim).

Data (2): Unemployment (OECD 2006)

	Native-b.	Foreign-b.	Overrepres	
Austria	3.8%	9.8%	2.5	’00:1.8
France	9.0	16.2	1.8	1.7
GER	9.4	16.2	1.7	1.7
NL	3.8	10.7	2.8	2.8
UK	5.1	7.6	1.4	1.4
Suisse	2.8	8.0	2.8	
Sweden	6.2	13.4	2.1	2.4
US	5.3	4.4	0.8	1.1
AUSTR	4.1	4.7	1.1	1.0

Conclusion from Employment Data

- Europe vs. New World: immigrants **double** as likely to be unemployed as natives (except UK; South Europe)
- This ratio is **stable** over time (no effect of policy!)
- **Aggravating** factors: strong welfare states plus multiculturalism legacies (NL, Sweden, Belgium-Flanders)
- Countries low on MIPEX integration index have better employment outcomes: GER, France, UK
- **Low-skilled** immigrants ‘chose’ Europe:

  only 10% of MENA migrants to Aus/Ger/Fr/Esp are college graduates (ca. 60% to US/Can are!)

‘Integration from Abroad’

- The European problem: **‘suffered’** immigration
- Ergo: ‘integration’ takes on **coercive** note
- Fusion of **control** and integration: civics and/or language competence as condition(s) for entry and residence permit
- NL (2006), France and Germany (2007), Denmark (2010)
- Targets: Family formation (Imams in DK, NL, G)
- Variations: France vs NL (service vs. restriction-minded)