Integration of Asylum Seekers:

A Study of how European Governments Respond to Inflow of Asylum Seekers

Mathilde Marselie Sjøhelle Eiksund

POL2900 Bachelor's in Comparative Politics – 15.05.2019

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Trondheim, Norway

Word count: 7248

Disposition

Abstract

Well-developed migrant integration policies are crucial for the integration of asylum seekers and refugees into new host societies. When the numbers of asylum seekers to Europe have increased the past decade, European governments seem to respond by developing better policies that improve integration opportunities for asylum seekers. This study examines how the inflow of asylum seekers to Europe in the period of 2008-2014 have impacted the change in integration policies in a selection of European nation states. Based on data from the European Social Survey, ESS7, including data recovered from the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), this study uses a quantitative comparative method to discuss the importance of the subject. Refugee integration is a much-discussed topic within the research field of integration and the discipline of political science. Earlier studies have addressed a broad specter of themes from the conceptualization of integration, to content and consequences of integration policies. This paper aims to discuss how policies change, from a quantitative perspective, in order to face the challenges of an increasing number of asylum seekers in Europe, in the present time, and in future decades to come. The final results of this study show that the inflow of asylum seekers to European countries, has a positive effect on the change in immigrant integration policies.

Introduction

In a world where an increasing number of people move to foreign countries, governments are constantly challenged to integrate diverse groups of immigrants into society. The immigrant group of asylum seekers are particularly dependent on the integration policies developed by the government, in order to become part of their new host society (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 314). The number of refugees and asylum seekers is increasing in Europe, changing the landscape of today's integration issues (Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018, p. 1). How does the increasing number of refugees coming to Europe, change the way governments develop their migrant integration policies? The future of asylum seekers in Europe is dependent on structural and institutional factors, recognized by trends that go across national borders (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 185). This trans-national challenge requires a quantitative study of how European governments respond to the inflow of asylum seekers in the period before the refugee crisis in 2015. Thus, the research question of this paper is:

How does the inflow of asylum seekers to Europe impact the change in integration policies of European governments?

The field of integration studies and the study of immigrant integration policies, have recently turned towards quantitative methods, considering topics such as the impact of right-wing parties on integration policies, citizenship status and socioeconomic status of immigrants during the period of integration as well as studies of attitudes and behavior (Goodman, 2015, p. 1906; Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002; Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018). These studies of refugee integration and integration policies in particular, have mostly considered the content of policies, and the effect the policies have on integration outcome (Goodman, 2015, p. 1907). However, in this paper I argue there is a need of research considering how the increasing number of refugees coming to Europe, might change the way governments develop their migrant integration policies. I aim to test three hypotheses developed from the research question:

1. European migrant integration policies have changed in direction of improved integration opportunities for asylum seekers.
2. European migrant integration policies have changed in a direction of reduced integration opportunities for asylum seekers.

3. European migrant integration policies have not significantly changed.

This paper will start by elaborating on what is already done in the field of refugee integration and change in immigrant integration policies. First, I clarify what is meant by the concept of immigrant integration, using a theory by Ager and Strang (2008). Then, I use Westerveen and Adam's (2018) theory of mainstreaming in integration policies, to show how policies have changed across national borders, and in which direction contemporary immigrant integration policy trends might be headed. I elaborate on some challenges that follow the study of integration and policy change, using Goodman (2015), introducing the methodological part of the paper. Finally, the analysis draws lines back to the theory, discussing the results of the regression in light of earlier research.

Theory

Immigration is an important subject of research in contemporary times. Questions of demographic shifts, economic transformation and party politics make immigration a central issue, because they impact the way people live their lives (Goodman, 2015, p. 1906). Increasing immigration is highlighting the need for well-developed integration systems (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 314). The study of integration policies has in broad terms considered topics discussion the content and consequences of policy change (Goodman, 2015, p. 1906). However, I see a need of research considering how the increasing number of refugees coming to Europe, might change the way governments develop their immigrant integration policies. The question of responsibility is commonly brought up in discussions about immigrant integration (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 175). In this paper, I examine the assertion that the host society, and the government are in large terms responsible for successful integration.

Integration as a Conceptual Framework

In order to discuss how immigrant integration policies change, we need to state a definition of integration. One of the core problems within the field of integration, is that the issue of refugee integration requires a diverse set of solutions to an even more complex set of challenges (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 185). This is particularly relevant when discussing development of integration policies which should concern both the background of the refugee, as well as the cultural and structural context of the host society. Because this field of research

pose such complicated questions of concepts and context, it is even more important to decide upon one conceptual framework. In this paper I use the concept developed by Ager and Stang (2008), that aims to facilitate measurement of integration. They have developed a conceptual framework for what constitutes "successful" integration (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 167). In their article *Understanding Integration: A conceptual Framework,* they present set of key components of integration. Their goal is to create a common framework to be used in academic and political discussions, as well as in policy development (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 175). The framework, later used by other scholars (Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018) consists of ten domains divided into four groups, or "pathways to integration";

1) *Markers and Means*: Employment, Housing, Education, Health;
2) *Social Connection*: Social Bridges, Social Bonds, Social Links;
3) *Facilitators*: Language and Cultural Knowledge, Safety and Stability;
4) *Foundation*: Rights and Citizenship
(Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 170).

Instead of considering all the components presented above, this paper will mainly focus on employment and labor market mobility as a measure of immigrant integration. Employment is a crucial factor to integration (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 315; Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 170; Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018, p. 3). When discussing integration of refugees and asylum seekers, the issue of employment is a central topic, as there are many challenges and possibilities of integrating these particular groups into the labor market. Many refugees are well educated, but find their qualifications are not recognized (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 170). Under-employment, not being able to use their qualifications, is a well-known issue. This reinforces the importance of programs offered by the community, and again points at the importance of well-informed and developed integration policies. The rights and opportunities offered by the government are fundamentally bound to the possibilities and limitations set by integration policies. Closely related to rights considering employment, are the fundamental rights to education, health and ultimately citizenship. Ager and Strang (2008) argue that "articulating refugee rights thus defines the foundation of integration policy, to which governments are accountable" (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 175). Rights such as human dignity, equality, freedom of cultural choice, justice, security and independence should be included as the foundation of immigrant integration policies. Using this concept, I intend to analyze how governments respond to these needs.

Integration of Asylum Seekers and Refugees

The conceptual framework presented above, has also been used in order to evaluate the integration of refugees and asylum seekers in particular. The Refugee Integration Survey and Evaluation (RISE), presented by Lichtenstein and Puma (2018), use the pathways developed by Ager and Stang to investigate integration of refugees from a quantitative and longitudinal perspective. Based on their findings, they argue that integration of refugees has an effect over a longer period of time. Further, they emphasize the need for a well-recognized concept that can be applied over a longer period of time. Based on their findings, Lichtenstein and Puma argue that the results of RISE have been proven critical to refugees and relevant for policy makers (Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018, p. 16). This proves the importance of well-defined concepts in the development of integration policies, and how these concepts are crucial both for the people involved in creating and changing policies, as well as the people directly impacted by the policies, in this case the refugees and asylum seekers.

The subject of refugee integration can be discussed from many angles. One side of the discussion addresses how refugees are impacted by the effort made by the host government, the welfare state. In their article *Obstacles to Refugee Integration in the European Union Member States,* Mestheneos and Ioannidi (2002) point at how an active welfare state, can both benefit and disadvantage refugees and asylum seekers (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 314). They argue that the success of refugee integration, is dependent on the welfare state system of the host country. In an active welfare state, the refugees become more dependent on the government, but as a result of government integration policies, they are placed in poor neighborhoods and categorized among the "socially excluded". On the other hand, the lack of government support could also lead to greater difficulties in the labor market, as well as the general social inclusion and integration. Nevertheless, Mestheneos and Ioannidi argue the involvement of the government is crucial for the success or failure of refugee integration.

When exploring the literature about integration and immigrant integration policies, we have to include literature on both immigrants in general, as well as refugees and asylum seekers. Because there is limited literature on asylum seekers and change in integration policies, we have to include theory that covers issues of both immigrants as a whole group, refugees another group, and finally what is found about asylum seekers. Ideally, this paper would look

at both asylum seekers and refugees, as they are strongly related. However, the available data used later in this paper does not include separate data on refugees. Thus, the analysis part of the paper will mainly focus on asylum seekers. In the ESS7 dataset, an asylum seeker is defined as:

> *[…] a person having submitted an application for international protection*
> *or having been included in such application as a family member during the*
> *reference period (European Social Survey Round 7, 2014, p. 12).*

The following part presenting the data, will consider only asylum seekers. In this way, we can pay attention to what effort is done by the host country, and whether this effort develops in a more inclusive direction along with the increasing number of asylum seekers arriving to Europe. But first, we need to elaborate on how immigrant integration policies change, and in order to do this, we must consider a broader group of immigrants.

Changes in Immigrant Integration Policies

Research has shown that governments' efforts to facilitate or complicate integration through policy making, has a direct impact on refugees and asylum seekers' possibilities to integrate (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 314). In the following section I will examine how governments are motivated to develop integration policies, as a response to a changing number of asylum seekers arriving to their country. In order to show how European immigrant integration policies have changed during the past decades, I aim to use the concepts of policy change from Westerveen and Adam (2018). Then, I elaborate on how European governments earlier have changed their integration policies in the past based on motivation and potential trigger factors.

The nature of immigrant integration policies in Europe, have changed during the past decades (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 23). It has gone from an inclusive trend of 'post national citizenship' during the period after the second world war, further towards multiculturalism in the 1990s, civic assimilationism in the early 2000s, and the current paradigm is often referred to as a trend of mainstreaming. In their article *Monitoring the impact of doing nothing: New trends in immigrant integration policy,* Westerveen and Adam question the current state of immigrant integration policies in Europe, by applying the term "mainstreaming" from gender studies to the field of political science (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 35). Mainstreaming is defined as "a policy strategy for promoting equality between, in this case, native populations

and populations with a migrant background." (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 22). In the conclusion, they argue recent changes in immigrant integration policies are categorized by "increasing 'colourblindization', in combination with 'ethnic monitoring'. In other words, states increasingly monitor the impact of 'doing nothing'" (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 21). Because immigrant integration is meant to serve an immensely diverse group of immigrants, including refugees and asylum seekers, governments need to develop intelligent policies that takes this complexity into account. In their conclusion, Westerveen and Adam point to the withdrawal of targeted support for migrant populations in European countries that used to be more multiculturalist (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 36). They find it paradoxical that European countries seem to have a surplus of statistics on the immigrant population, yet little targeted support towards immigrants. They suggest trend of politicizing immigration, as a reason to why Western-European governments tend to invest less in targeted integration support towards immigrants (Westerveen & Adam, 2018, p. 38).

The changes in immigrant integration policies are dependent on willingness among politicians to change politics and evolve politics in a direction of a more immigrant inclusive society. A change in immigrant integration policies that creates more opportunities for immigrants, will naturally favor different immigrant groups. However, politicians also have to take the rest of the society into consideration, contemplating whether policy changes will impact the economy, or the opinion of the people. One argument in favor of restricting integration policies, claims that generous integration policies will lead to resource constrains (Bozorgmehr, Wenner, & Razum, 2017, p. 592). Using an example from Germany in 1993, Bozorgmehr et. al (2017) point at how the restriction of immigrant integration policies might be used by governments to indirectly decrease the amount of asylum seekers to the country. The logic was that more generous integration policies would draw more asylum seekers to the country, which eventually would create a shortage on resources. Bozorgmehr et. al on the other hand, do not agree that this is the case, and argue that by excluding asylum seekers from rights such as health care, this would cost the government even more (Bozorgmehr, Wenner, & Razum, 2017, p. 593). Based on these argument, one can question whether governments have reason and a history of developing integration policies with an intention of decreasing number of asylum applicants. This perspective highlights the relevance of the research questions, showing that integration policies might have an indirect impact on immigration. However, the research question of this paper, turns this problem around, and asks whether a certain group of immigrants might impact integration policy change.

The Methodological Debate on Integration Studies

The research field of immigrant integration is complex. Discussions within the field inevitably include methodological choices. The question is whether immigrant and refugee integration should be covered from a qualitative or quantitative perspective (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 306; Ager & Stang, 2008, p. 168; Goodman, 2015, p. 1906). In the past, qualitative research has been dominant, and has focused on the challenges related to integration, such as variance in mobility, language and ethnicity (Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018, p. 1). However, there is a rising trend arguing that there is a need of studying questions of integration considered on a quantitative level. In the next section I will elaborate on the choice of method, and how this has formed the outcome of the paper.

Method

Quantitative comparative method is one approach to the research of politics, characterized by the use of a large number of cases, the identification of variables, and the goal of generating general theories in political science (Burnham, Gilland, Grant, & Layton-Henry, 2008, p. 69). This chapter will elaborate on the methodological choices of the paper, including choice of variables, use of different datasets, and how these variables are put together in a final regression analysis. As previously mentioned, I use data from the European Social Survey, round 7.

This paper approaches the research question by using quantitative comparative method. By the use of an Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression analysis, we look for correlation between one particular dependent variable, and a set of independent variables. The goal of the regression analysis is to test whether there is correlation between the number of asylum seekers entering European countries and change in immigrant integration policies. In order to isolate potential variables that might impact the change in the independent variable, the paper presents a multiple regression analysis, including one dependent variable and multiple independent variables, used as control variables (Ringdal & Wiborg, 2017, p. 118). Because the data used in this regression goes over time, also called longitudinal data or panel data, the following regression will use the command xtreg (Stata, 2011, p. 3). Policy change happens over a period of time, and the use of panel data allows us to test for changes over time. We will look closer at how this is done later.

Presentation of Variables

The variables used in the regression analysis, are presented in table 1 (see appendix). The table includes both the dependent variable, and the independent variables. The dependent variables represent the phenomena that we try to explain, while independent variables are suspected to influence the dependent variable (Burnham, Lutz, Grant, & Layton-Henry, 2008, p. 74). The research question of this paper aims to discuss how the inflow of asylum seekers to Europe, impact the change in integration policies of European governments. In table 1, the variables used in this paper are presented. These are chosen on the basis of the theory presented earlier. "Labor market mobility" is chosen as the proxy for integration policy and is therefore the dependent variable in which the remaining variables are supposed to impact.

Labor Market Mobility as Dependent Variable

I chose Labor market mobility as the main dependent variable, based on theory pointing at employment as a crucial factor for immigrant integration (Ager & Stang 2008, p. 170; Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 315; Lichtenstein & Puma, 2018, p. 3). The choice is based on the amount of data available, as well as relevance for asylum seekers as a group of immigrants, in particular. This variable is based on the following question: "*Do legally-resident foreign citizens have comparable workers' rights and opportunities like nationals to access jobs and improve their skills?*" This section is again divided into *Access*, *Access to general support*, *Targeted support*, and *Worker's rights*. All sections with sub questions testing for immigrants' opportunities to access the public and private labor market, and how the government facilitate and follow up immigrants within the labor market. The variable is operationalized in percentage, where 100% is the best possible including policy immigrants in a country. Access to the labor market is one of the first needs of a refugee or an asylum seeker arriving to a country (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002). Despite the need for legal residence, and ability to communicate, access to the labor market is what decides whether a family has their own income or not and is for many the first step into a community of the host country.

Choosing the best variable to be the indicator of change in immigrant integration policy, was a difficult decision. The variables available through MIPEX that measure integration policies, are the following: *Access to nationality*, *Labor market mobility*, *Family reunion for foreign citizens, Education, Political participation, Permanent residence, Anti-discrimination, Health,* as well as one variable labeled *score*, including a combination of all the variables. At

one point I considered merging the variables and generating one new variable named integration score. However, according to Goodman (2015), merging policy variables is a risky choice, considering the different content and consequences of different policies (Goodman, 2015, p. 1907). Ideally, according to the theory and data from MIPEX, the policy variable concerning health (Is the health system responsive to immigrants' needs?), applies best to the case of refugees and asylum seekers. This variable specifically measures in what degree refugees have rights to health care. However, also this variable is very limited in time range, and covers only numbers from 2014. Since it was important for my research question to be able to control for change over time, using lagged x-variables, this variable was out of the question. I have thus decided to look at the effect of inflow of asylum seeker on labor market mobility. This variable is relevant to the particular group of immigrants being the asylum seekers, and thus this variable included data over a longer period than other mentioned variables on integration policy.

Inflow of Asylum Seekers as Independent Variable

The variable "Inflow of asylum seekers per capita" is considered the main independent variable. The variable is measured in percentage of the total population of the country. Rather than using a stock variable, showing how many asylum seekers there are in a country per year, I decided to use this flow-variable as the main independent variable. Flow variables are more commonly used when discussing the development of policies, as flow epitomizes demographical changes in a better way than stocks (Kupiszewska, Kupiszewski, Martí, & Ródenas, 2010, s. 15). The variable measuring Asylum applicants per capita, also measured in percentage of total population, is considered very similar to the first which measures the whole inflow. Both variables are lagged with one year in the final regression analysis, in order to show the effect inflow of asylum seekers one year, will have on policy change the following year. The inflow of asylum seekers, or number of applications per year, might not affect changes in policy immediately the same year as the asylum seekers arrive. Thus, these variables, as well as total immigration per capita, are lagged in the final regression. In a situation with richer data, it would be interesting to test for the lagged effect over a larger period. However, in this round it is important to maintain a number of observations as high as possible. Both variables including numbers of asylum seekers, convey something about the pressure host countries have to handle, and I consider both relevant for my research question.

Control Variables

Total immigration per capita is meant to control for the effect of asylum seekers. This variable measures the inflow of all immigrants to a country, per year, considering a large group that also will be affected by the immigrant integration policies of the host country. The variable is recoded, to show the inflow of immigrants not as actual numbers, but as percentage of the total population of the country. GDP per capita, measured in USD, is an indicator of how rich the average citizen of each country is. Bearing in mind that immigrant integration often is a question of welfare (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 318), I consider this variable an important control variable. Social expenditure, retrieved through ESS7 from the OECD Social Expenditure Database (SOCX), is a measure of public social expenditure as a percentage rate of GDP or GNI (European Social Survey Round 7, 2014, p. 11). This variable tells us something about how large amounts of money each government spend specifically on the welfare of their citizens. Finally, the variable "Placement on right left scale" is included in the regression, based on theories highlighting the influence of right-wing parties on integration policies (Mestheneos & Ioannidi, 2002, p. 311; Goodman, 2015, p. 1906). The variable is aggregated to country level from individual level, and is operationalized on a scale from 0-10, where 0 is left and 10 is right. However, this variable only includes data from 2008, 2010, 2014 and 2016.

Presentation of Data Material

The variables used in the regression analysis, are retrieved mainly from European Social Survey 7, ESS7 (European Social Survey Round 7, 2014). The ESS datasets are well-recognized and research based, building on social surveys from about 30 countries, mainly in Europe (Ringdal & Wiborg, 2017, p. 48). In this paper only 19 countries are included, due to the lack of data in certain countries. Most of the data used is gathered from ESS round 7 (2014), due to this year's specific focus on immigration (Ringdal & Wiborg, 2017, p. 48). The composition of variables from the ESS datasets, includes both country and individual levels of data, retrieved directly from ESS, but also from other datasets such as MIPEX, Eurostat and OECD (European Social Survey Round 7, 2014, pp. 8-10). The data is gathered from following countries: Austria, Belgium, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Spain, Finland, France, United Kingdom, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden and Slovenia.

On the official webpage of ESS, it is possible to pick specific variables and download them into Stata. I chose this method of downloading data, because it provided a simple way to sort out the relevant variables from the available countries, making the data more manageable. It also allows the user to download variables on country level and individual level in separate rounds, making it easier to aggregate individual data to a country level, and later merge the datasets together. I chose this dataset in particular because of the variables on immigrants, considering asylum seekers and refugees. I also found the variables on change in integration policies fitting for the theme of this paper. These variables on integration policies were not available in any other dataset that I access to. The regression analysis presented later in this paper, is based largely on data from MIPEX. The objective of MIPEX is to provide a tool which "measures policies to integrate migrants" in a selection of countries. Their goal is to show to which extent governments facilitate "migrants' opportunities to participate in society" (Migrant Integration Policy Index, 2019). Finally, I added the variable of Placement on the left right scale, which is gathered from round 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of ESS. In the ESS8 dataset, one can experiment with the effect on attitudes towards immigrants, refugees and asylum seekers, however this would be a completely different study.

Reliability and Validity

Any scientific method can suffer from measurement errors, and multiple regression analysis is no different. Reliability is one of many key concepts related to measurement error. Reliability is whether one can obtain the same result if the same questions posed in repeated occasions (de Vaus, 2002, p. 52). The validity of a study is an expression of whether an indicator measures the concept that it is intended to measure (de Vaus, 2002, p. 53). For example, when labor market mobility is used as a measure of integration policy, the question of validity is relevant in order to decide whether the selected variable is representative when later used in the discussion. Since the theoretical framework of integration includes employment and social mobility (Ager & Strang, 2008, p. 170), we can argue that the choice of selecting labor market mobility as the main dependent variable, is based on theory. Still, the framework presented by Ager and Stang (2008) includes a broader set of variables, including factors that are excluded from the regression when labor market mobility is chosen as the main dependent variable. Thus, the validity of the dependent variable has some room for improvement, considering the number of factors that are excluded from the regression, such as housing, education, health,

language, and cultural knowledge, safety and stability. Some of these factors can be considered strongly related to labor market mobility, in particular stability and perhaps also social bonds. Even though the validity of certain variables could have been improved, this paper aims to present indicators rather than precise answers to the research question.

One crucial consideration is whether the variance in the dependent variable is constant for each value of the independent variables, this is called homoskedaticity (de Vaus, 2002, p. 327). If this proves not to be the case, the regression has a problem of heteroskedaticity. Since much of the data used in this paper is based on surveys from different rounds and years of ESS, there is reason to question whether this is the case. Especially for the data which is originally gathered on an individual level, such as the Left right scale, the individuals answering to the survey have most likely changed from year to year. This also questions the categorization of this data as panel data. In order to control for heteroskedaticity, I have categorized the data as panel data, using the commands xtset and xtreg. These commands tell Stata that the data should be run as panel data, including data that goeas over a period of time. For further improvement of the regression analysis, it could also be useful to consider autocorrelation between the selected variables, as some of the variables might be intercorrelated. Pointing out these problems as potential factors that might weaken the regression results, is as far as this paper goes, due to limited time and resources. However, they are important to keep in mind during the discussion.

Analysis

In this chapter, the results of the regression analysis are presented and discussed, see table 2 for results (in Appendix). Table 2 is divided into 7 models testing effects on labor market mobility. In each sector, one or two variables are removed, in order to show how the control variables, impact the results in different ways. Overall, the results show that the number of asylum seekers have a positive impact on the change in Labor market mobility, toward a more inclusive trend of immigrant integration policies. In general, we see that asylum applications and GDP per capita are the two variables proved to have the most significant impact on the dependent variable. The following part will elaborate on each of the seven models, discussing which variables have the most impact, what meaning this has according to theory, and how my findings answer to the three hypotheses presented in the beginning of the paper. The multiple regression varies when each variable is removed by turn. The reason they all are removed systematically, is that I wanted to check for unexpected results. Rather than

removing them based on theory and arguments of what expected effect the removal would have, I chose to do this randomly, allowing the effects on the dependent variables show in this way instead. First, I present the findings of all 7 models, then I elaborate on weaknesses of the regression, and how these are tested for.

Results

Policy Change 1

All variables are included in this model, resulting in very low levels of significance, and a very small number of observations, N=53. Including the variable on left right scale minimizes the number of observations to about the half. This is most likely because of the missing values related to this variable, as a result of limited access to data. According to theory, placement on left right scale presents an important factor in the question of change in integration policies (Goodman, 2015, p. 1906). However, the variable is weak due to few observations in terms of years, and also as the observations are already aggregated from individual level. If this variable initially was meant for country level studies, it might have looked different. Because of the weak number of observations, I have decided to exclude the left right scale variable from the following models. There is reason to believe better data on this variable might have led to different results. In this model, both inflow of asylum seekers, asylum applicants and total immigration, show a negative impact on labor market mobility. None of these are considered significant, but it is interesting to look at how they change from negative to positive in later models. Even though only GDP per capita is considered significant for this model, the R^2 for this table is the highest among the 7, showing 0,255, 25,5%.

Policy Change 2

In model 2 when placement on left right scale is removed, GDP per capita turns out to be significant within p<0,05 showing a very small positive effect on labor market mobility. This might indicate a trend showing that countries with a larger GDP per capita, are more generous with labor rights for immigrants. In this model, the effect of asylum applicants has turned positive, and is significant within the measure of p<0,1. It is interesting to see how inflow of asylum seekers has a negative effect, while asylum applicants have a positive effect. Later, this changes, and we see that whenever these variables have more than two stars, they also have a positive effect on labor market mobility.

Policy Change 3

The results do not change significantly when removing social expenditure from the regression. This might indicate that the amount of social expenditure from the state does not have a large impact on the change in labor market mobility for immigrants.

Policy Change 4

When removing GDP per capita, asylum applicants per capita turns out to be significant with a positive effect on labor market mobility. The variable of social expenditure per year remains negative and insignificant but is in this model at its highest with a negative effect of -0.447. The R^2 of this table is the lowest among them all, showing a lower ability to explain correlation.

Policy Change 5

No variable proves any level of significance when removing the lagged variable of inflow of immigration in total. This is the table with the largest N=113, probably due to the removal of total immigration per capita, which is lagged with one year. This proves how lagged variables shrink the total number of observations. It also shows that the total immigration to a country might be considered as an important control variable, since all other variables turn insignificant when this variable is let out.

Policy Change 6

Both inflow of asylum seekers per capita and GDP per capita become significant to some extent when removing asylum applications per capita. An interesting turn in this table is how the constant of inflow of asylum seekers turn positive as soon as the asylum application variable is removed. This might indicate how the two variables are related, and when removing one, the other proves to have a stronger impact. In table 1 we see that the percentage of asylum applicants per capita is higher than the inflow of asylum seekers. This might impact the results of the regression analysis.

Policy Change 7

When removing inflow of asylum seekers that initially was considered the main independent variable, we see about the same positive impact in asylum applications, as in inflow of asylum seekers in model 6. This again shows how these two variables probably have much of the same impact. The reason asylum applicants have a larger impact in terms of significance,

might simply be that the number of asylum applicants per capita is larger than the number of asylum seekers arriving to the country each year.

Robustness Checks

The use of multiple regression analysis requires certain robustness checks. Many weaknesses could have been taken into consideration. I will now discuss a few which are included in the regression analysis, as well as a few that could have been included in order to further improve the results.

Number of Observations

The number of observations is very low, for all models. This is partly because of a large number of missing values, but also because of the lagged variables, skipping years available in the dataset. The data is in other words strictly limited in terms of missing values and a short time period. The reason these vary, is because of the values missing in certain variables. For example, inflow of asylum seekers per capita, asylum applicants per capita and total immigration per capita, are all three lagged with one year. When one variable is lagged, we miss the values of the years that are excluded from the table. Thus, we see a difference in number of observations as soon as these three variables are removed. The variable making the greatest change in number of observations, is Placement on the left right scale. Nevertheless, I will discuss the results, arguing that they might show us indicators of how a changing number of asylum seekers might impact change in immigrant integration policy.

R-squared

The R-squared, or R^2 coefficient tells us something about how well a model explains variations in the dependent variable (de Vaus, 2002, p. 324). The higher the R^2 is, the better is the explanatory power of the model. When model 1 shows an R^2 of 0,255, this shows that 25% of the change in labor market mobility is explained by the independent variables included in the model. If the independent variables are highly correlated, also called multicollinearity, can inflate the R^2 making it hard to distinguish between the separate effects of the variables (de Vaus, 2002, p. 327). Because the regression includes both a variable measuring the inflow of asylum seekers, and one measuring number of asylum applications per year, the question of multicollinearity can be considered. However, the

values of the R^2 coefficient do not reach a very high level, thus I do not consider this essential for the regression analysis.

P-test

The P-test tells us something about the level of significance for each variable in a regression. The value of the P-test is supposed to check for sampling errors in the population. Probability theory provides an estimate of how likely it is that the percentage difference in the randomly selected population, is due to sampling error (de Vaus, 2002, p. 229). In the regression presented in this paper, we operate with the significance levels of $p<=0,1*$, $p<0,05**$ and $p<0,01***$. Usually, the levels of significance are limited to $p<0,05*$, $p<0,01**$ and $p<0,001***$. Because the results of the regression show very low levels of significance, I have decided to keep the first measures of significance, in order to better show the variance in significance level between the variables. However, it is important to keep in mind that the variables show a higher level of significance than they normally would. This has to be included in the discussion.

Another weakness of this regression is that there is a time gap between the regression results (latest year 2015) and the latest literature used in this paper, Westerveen and Adam (2018). This study only covers the period from 2008-2014, however the year of 2015 and 2016 might have looked slightly different, due to the so-called refugee crisis. For further research, it would be interesting to extend the period, looking past 2014 and see whether 2015 introduced a new area of integration policies in Europe. However, trends in policy changes evolve slowly over time, and I therefore consider this time gap less of a problem. Finally, the regression presented here only tests for linear relationships, which again might be a weakness of the regression, because this simplifies how we look at correlation between variables (de Vaus, 2002, p. 327). Because the relationship between asylum seekers and integration policies are so reliant on each other, it could possibly be interesting to look at the same question through a systematic multi-dynamic feedback model.

Conclusion

The results of this regression analysis propose that an increasing number of asylum seekers to a country might impact the change in labor market mobility policies, towards a more inclusive trend. Looking back at the three hypotheses presented in the introduction, hypothesis 1 appears to be the most accurate, proposing an inclusive trend of policy change as a result of

increased inflow of asylum seekers. This stands in contrast to what both Westerveen, Adam and Bozorgmehr et al have indicated about recent trends in immigrant integration policy change. They argue that governments do less in favor of immigrant integration. Based on the limited data presented in this paper, we cannot conclude that an increased number of asylum seekers, is the reason labor market mobility among immigrants has improved. However, it is interesting to see that inflow of asylum seekers, as well as asylum applicants, have a greater impact on policy change than total immigration per capita, even though the latter is a much larger variable. This might indicate that European governments take the increasing number of asylum seekers seriously, responding with better opportunities. In conclusion this shows an indication of how an increasing number of asylum seekers have a positive impact on immigrant integration policy change. However, these results cannot be considered generalizable, mainly due to the limited access to data, resulting in a very small number of observations.

But what do these results really tell us about change in immigrant integration policies, and integration of asylum seekers and refugees? Is it possible that the increase in labor market mobility among immigrants is a result of something else, such as general improved labor market mobility? This data cannot tell us much about the content or outcome of these changes in immigrant integration policies. This could indicate that even though policies change, there can be a lack of targeted support, such as Westerveen and Adam point out. Mestheneos and Ioannidi address how immigrant integration policies can have positive or negative impacts on refugees and asylum seekers. According to the regression analysis, these results can only indicate in which direction governments are developing integration policies. The specific content and the consequences of such policies is thus not represented in this analysis. The goal of the regression was not to address the consequences of integration policies, as this requires different data. However, by outlining how policies are changing, one can start the discussion on whether European governments are willing to adjust their politics to a group of asylum seekers coming from abroad.

When looking back at this project, different choices could have been made in order to improve the final product. The paper discusses integration with a particular focus on refugees and asylum seekers, and also the issue of policy change, which resulted in a combination of multiple complex and abstract concepts. When dealing with this through a quantitative method using statistics, I found it difficult to consider all potential challenges of

operationalizing and testing effects on such abstract concepts. A different approach could for instance be to look at total immigration per capita, and its effect on unemployment as a proxy for integration. The challenges of accessible data put restrictions on what perspectives one can choose. Nevertheless, I will conclude by arguing that this subject of study owns a rich potential for further research. The importance of addressing the challenges of how countries meet with demographical changes is relevant today and will be relevant in the future. With a predicted increase in climate refugees the future decades (The UN Refugee Agency, 2019), I consider these questions of responsibility for the welcoming of new refugees, even more important. Discussing this now is not too soon.

Appendix (figures)

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Standard deviation	Min	Max
Labor market mobility	62.48958	19.70865	25	97.5
Inflow asylum seekers per capita	0.1031265	0.1240532	0.001046	0.7785491
Asylum applicants per capita	0.1438361	0.242929	0.0011207	1.797308
Total immigration per capita	0.8261325	0.4435594	0.1385453	1.992235
GDP per capita, in $	40891.4	21745.01	11407.87	102833
Social Expenditure	23.72364	3.985955	15.4	31.938
Placement on right left scale	5.127269	0.3670432	4.395298	5.973373
N	53 (107 without x6)			

Table 2. Impact on Labor Market Mobility

VARIABLES	Policy change 1 Labor market mob	Policy change 2 Labor market mob	Policy change 3 Labor market mob	Policy change 4 Labor market mob	Policy change 5 Labor market mob	Policy change 6 Labor market mob	Policy change 7 Labor market mob
Inflow asylum seekers pc	-68.28	-101.5	-97.68	-114.4*	-44.92	20.68**	
	-96.61	-66.67	-66.49	-66.46	-49.86	-9.099	
Asylum applicants pc	84.65	123.5*	119.6*	137.7**	65.54		22.65**
	-96.74	-66.91	-66.66	-66.72	-48.93		-9.106
Total immigration pc	-2.611	0.292	0.191	1.746		0.367	0.198
	-4.533	-2.283	-2.288	-2.192		-2.319	-2.32
GDP per capita	0.000332**	0.000249**	0.000257**		0.000175*	0.000258**	0.000261**
	-0.000156	-0.000109	-0.000106		-9.91E-05	-0.000108	-0.000108
Social expenditure	0.119	-0.16		-0.447	-0.303	-0.0316	-0.0714
	-0.64	-0.47		-0.47	-0.456	-0.47	-0.47
Left right scale	2.159						
	-4.348						
Constant	36.76	54.14***	50.07***	70.22***	61.62***	51.67***	52.28***
	-28.09	-13.27	-5.682	-12.19	-13.08	-13.22	-13.21
Observations	53	107	107	107	113	108	107
Number of countrynum	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
R^2	0.2554	0.1962	0.2108	0.0296	0.1652	0.2396	0.2346

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Do-files

Descriptive Statistics

summarize c_labour_mobility_

summarize asylpercap

summarize asylapppercap

summarize totimmpercap

summarize c_gdppc_

summarize c_soexgdp_

summarize lrscale

Regression Analysis

ssc install outreg2

xtset countrynum year

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.asylapppercap l.totimmpercap c_gdppc_ c_soexgdp_ lrscale

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.asylapppercap l.totimmpercap c_gdppc_ c_soexgdp_

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.asylapppercap l.totimmpercap c_gdppc_

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.asylapppercap l.totimmpercap c_soexgdp_

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.asylapppercap c_gdppc_ c_soexgdp_

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylpercap l.totimmpercap c_gdppc_ c_soexgdp_

xtreg c_labour_mobility_ l.asylapppercap l.totimmpercap c_gdppc_ c_soexgdp_

*Included R^2 manually into the final table

*Converted regression into excel, and finnaly to word using

ssc install outreg2

*then for every single regression:

outreg2 using regression_results, replace excel

*or

outreg2 using regression_results, append excel

References

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, pp. 166-191.

Bozorgmehr, K., Wenner, J., & Razum, O. (2017). Restricted access to health care for asylum-seekers: applying a human rights lens to the argument of resource constraints. *The European Journal of Public Health,*, pp. 592-593.

Burnham, P., Gilland, K. L., Grant, W., & Layton-Henry, Z. (2008). *Research Methods in Politics 2nd edition.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

de Vaus, D. (2002). *Surveys in Social Research* (Vol. Fifth edition). London: Routledge.

ESS Round 8: European Social Survey Round 8 Data (2016). Data file edition 2.1. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS8-2016.

ESS Round 7: European Social Survey Round 7 Data (2014). Data file edition 2.2. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS7-2014.

ESS Round 6: European Social Survey Round 6 Data (2012). Data file edition 2.4. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS6-2012.

ESS Round 5: European Social Survey Round 5 Data (2010). Data file edition 3.4. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS5-2010.

ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008). Data file edition 4.5. NSD - Norwegian Centre for Research Data, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data for ESS ERIC. doi:10.21338/NSD-ESS4-2008.

Goodman, S. W. (2015). Conceptualizing and Measuring Citizenship and Integration Policy: Past Lessons and New Approaches. *Comparative Political Studies*, pp. 1905-1942.

Kupiszewska, D., Kupiszewski, M., Martí, M., & Ródenas, C. (2010). Possibilities and limitations of comparative quantitative research on international migration flows. *Promoting Comparative Quantitative Research in the Field of Migration and Integration in Europe (PROMINSTAT)*, s. 56.

Lichtenstein, G., & Puma, J. E. (2018). The Refugee Integration Survey and Evaluation (RISE): Results from a Four-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, ss. 1-20.

Mestheneos, E., & Ioannidi, E. (2002). Obstacles to Refugee Integration in the European Union Member States. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, pp. 304-320.

Migrant Integration Policy Index. (2019, March 25). *What is MIPEX?* Retrieved from http://www.mipex.eu/what-is-mipex

Ringdal, K., & Wiborg, Ø. (2017). *Lær deg stata, Innføring i statistisk dataanalyse.* Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Stata. (2011). *Longitudinal data/panel data* (Vol. Release 12). Texas: Stata press.

The UN Refugee Agency. (2018). *Climate change and disaster displacement*. Retrieved 11th of May from https://www.unhcr.org/climate-change-and-disasters.html

Westerveen, L., & Adam, I. (2018). Monitoring the impact of doing nothing: New trends in immigrant integration policy. *Ethnicities*, pp. 20-43.