Bachelor Thesis School of Management and Governance European Studies

Integration Policy in Europe

The Influence of Economic Variables, Political Variables and Public Opinion on the Restrictiveness of Integration Policy in 24 EU member states

Supervisor: Dr. Ann Morissens Second Supervisor: Dr. Jörgen Svensson Sophia Pogrzeba (s1179055) September 17th, 2014

<u>Abstract</u>

This bachelor thesis investigates "What influences the level of support given to migrants in the integration policy of EU member states?" The dependent variable is the support given to migrants in countries' integration policy, which is measured through the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX). It is measured if the independent variables; the share of right-wing parties in parliament, the GDP per capita, the unemployment rate, the debt, social expenditure and public opinion have any influence on how supportive countries are towards immigrants. In general it could be expected that countries having a good economy, less support for rightwing parties, and a more positive public attitude towards migrants, will be more supportive towards immigrants in their integration policy. The analysis consists of two parts; the calculation of the Pearson r correlation coefficient and linear regression analysis. Three of the initial seven independent variables were found to lack statistically significant correlation with the dependent variable in the first part of the analysis and were thus not further included in the regression analysis. Four independent variables showed statistically significant correlation with the dependent variable and sufficient linearity to conduct the regression analysis with. Those were the debt as a percentage of GDP, social expenditure as a percentage of GDP, GDP per capita and public opinion, measured as the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country. The variable measuring debt did not show any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable. Neither did the independent variable measuring GDP per capita in PPS. In the end, only two of the initial seven independent variables were found to statistically significantly predict the dependent variable. Those were public opinion measured as the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, and social expenditure as a share of GDP. In case of the public opinion variable, the regression model suggests that a one percentage point increase in the share of respondent who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, increases the MIPEX score of the respective country by 0.651 percentage points. Although the findings need to be interpreted with caution, due to a lack of control variables and mixed findings with regard to this relationship, they are a starting-point to further research into the relationship of public opinion, social expenditure and integration policy.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
List of Figures	5
List of tables	6
Chapter 1 – Introduction	7
1.1 Integration policy	7
1.2 Research Question	9
Chapter 2 - The Theoretical Framework	10
2.1 Political determinants	10
2.2 Economic Determinants	11
2.3 Public Opinion	14
2.4 Expectations for the study at hand	15
Chapter 3 - The Methodology	18
3.1 Data Collection	18
3.2 The Sample	20
3.3 The Research Design	21
3.4 Operationalization of the dependent and independent variables	22
Chapter 4 - The Results	25
4.1 The MIPEX index – How supportive are countries in their integration policy?	26
4.2 Conditions for regression analyzes and Pearson correlations	30
4.4.1 The scatterplots of the dependent variable with each independent variable	30
4.4.2 The Pearson r correlation coefficients	32
4.3 The regression models	33
4.3.1 Model 1 – Debt, social expenditure, GDP per capita and public opinion	33
4.3.2 Model 2 – Debt, social expenditure and public opinion	33
4.3.3 Model 3 – Social expenditure and public opinion	35
4.3.4 Model 4 – GDP per capita in PPS	37
4.3.5 Model 5 – Social expenditure	38
4.3.6 Model 6 – Public opinion	40
Chapter 5 – Conclusion and Discussion	43
5. 1 First part of the analysis – Pearson r	43

5.2 Second part of the analysis – linear regression
5.3 Policy Implications
5.4 Limitations and further research47
List of References:
The Appendix54
Appendix 1:
Appendix 2:
Appendix 3:70
Appendix 4:72
Appendix 5:76
Appendix 6:79
Appendix 7:82
Appendix 8:
Appendix 9:90
Appendix 10:
Appendix 11:
Appendix 12:
Appendix 13:
Appendix 14: 109
Appendix 15:

List of Figures

Figure 1 – International migrants by major area, 1990 – 2013 (in millions)	8
Figure 2 – MIPEX Policy Fields and Dimensions	19
Figure 3 – The dependent and independent variables	23
Figure 4 – The expected relationships between the variables at a glance	25
Figure 5 – MIPEX overall scores 2010 including education	27
Figure 6 – 2010 policy fields scores of six of the included EU member states	28
Figure 7 – The MIPEX 2007 and 2010 scores excluding education in comparison	29
Figure 8 – Scatterplots of the dependent variable with each independent variable	31
Figure 9 – Model 3 and 3.1 – Scatterplots of the residuals against the predicted values	36
Figure 10 – Model 4 – Scatterplot of the residuals against the predicted values	37
Figure 11 – Model 5.1 – Histogram of the residuals	40

List of tables

Table 1 – Model 2 – The MIPEX score 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and debt, social expenditure, and public opinion
Table 2 – Model 3 – The MIPEX score 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and social expenditure and public opinion
Table 3 – Model 4 – The MIPEX score 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and GDP per capita in PPS
Table 4 – Model 5 – The MIPEX score 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and social expenditure
Table 5 – Model 5.1 – The 2010 overall MIPEX score including education, and social expenditure. 39
Table 6 – Model 6 – The MIPEX score 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and public opinion
Table 7 – Model 6.1 – The 2010 overall MIPEX score including education, and public opinion
Table 8 – The results at a glance

<u>Chapter 1 – Introduction</u>

Migration is a central topic on a European as well as a national level. Castles, De Haas and Miller (2014) stress the importance and extent that migration has taken in today's world. While migration itself is not a new phenomenon, its global scope, its centrality to domestic and international politics, and its enormous economic and social impact give it particular importance today (Castles et al., 2014, p. 6). It can be expected that this will endure, considering growing inequalities in wealth between the North and South, political, environmental and demographic pressures, political or ethnic conflict, and the creation of new free trade areas, causing labor migration (Castles et al., 2014, p. 7). In 2013, 232 million people or 3.2% of the world population lived in another country than their country of origin (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, 2013). In the EU, migration has historically only played a role in the form of emigration, mainly to the US, Canada and South America in the 19th century (Guardia & Pichelmann, 2006, p.4). Immigration to Europe is a rather new phenomenon which started in the 1950s. Destination countries were those with a colonial past and a high demand of labor after the war. In the 1990s also southern countries became destinations of migration, while Central and Eastern European countries can be seen as both sending and receiving countries of migration (Guardia & Pichelmann, 2006, p. 5). In 2013, Europe hosted the biggest amount of international migrants, namely 72 million, including EU citizens, and 34.5 million excluding EU citizens (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, 2013). The number of migrants per region and the numbers' development can be seen in Figure 1.

1.1 Integration policy

One of the central challenges accompanying migration, and the theme of this bachelor thesis, is integration policy. "Migrations can change demographic, economic and social structures, and create a new cultural diversity, which often brings into question national identity" (Castles et al., 2014, p. 7). Destination countries and societies have to decide how to respond to these changes and challenges. Responses have been very different among different states and different time spans. Traditional immigrant receiving states have often reacted in a more open way towards migrants and were more willing to grant immigrants citizenship, while newer receiving countries had more difficulties coping with the increased ethnic diversity (Castles et al., 2014, p. 20; Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005, p.110). Different integration policy frameworks have often been categorised in different models, including exclusionary, republican and multicultural (Castles & Miller, 1998).





(Note: NA refers to Northern America. LAC refers to Latin America and the Caribbean)

This has however been called into question in recent years due to observed international level convergence (Joppke, 2007), and political and cultural changes, such as "radical right populism, public attacks against multiculturalism and neo-assimilationist policies, such as naturalisation tests, in several European countries" (Loch, 2014, p.3). The general backlash against multiculturalism became apparent in the time after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in New York (Castles et al., 2014, p. 19). These and other attacks in 2004 in Spain, and 2005 and 2007 in the UK have changed the perception of migration which has become linked to national security (Castles et al., 2014, p. 6). In October 2010 Angela Merkel stated that multiculturalism failed utterly (Evans, 2010). In the following months David Cameron and Nicolas Sarkozy made similar comments about the failure of multiculturalism in their countries (Daily Mail, 2011). This apparent shift away from multiculturalism has often been connected to a shift towards civic integration norms, stressing the necessity of immigrants to integrate in the host society. Somewhat in contrast, Kymlicka (2012, p. 18) finds that multicultural policies have actually not been retreated from but rather that the proliferation of civic integration norms and anti-multicultural rhetoric by European political leaders have led to the perception. Apart from security concerns, a period of economic downturn and high influx of migrants was in the past also found to cause a backlash in immigration policy (Hatton, 2013, p. 2). One main economic determinant for the openness towards - and willingness to help immigrants, is the situation of the labor market. It is often claimed that increased migration leads to unemployment and decreasing wages. A further economic concern related to migration, is the pressure it is often thought to have on the destination country's fiscal budget (Guardia and Pichelmann, 2006, p.27). Politics also play a role, especially political parties. Freeman and Kessler (2008, p.669) accordingly found that rightwing conservative parties, more often than left-wing parties, favor more restrictive policies toward immigrants. Extremist right-wing parties are moreover often found to have some influence, even if their electoral success remains marginal (Mulcahy, 2011, p. 181; Van Spanje, 2010, p. 578).Public opinion can also play a role in integration policy making. This may depend on the influence of certain groups in society and many scholars find no influence of public opinion (Hatton, 2014, p. 8; Mulcahy, 2011, p. 187).

1.2 Research Question

This study has the aim to shed light on the circumstances that may cause different integration policy choices with regard to the restrictiveness of policy. It is going to be tested which countries give more support in their immigration policy and which less and if there are any patterns that explain why some countries are more open and why some are more restrictive. The question that is going to be answered is

"What influences the level of support given to migrants in the integration policy of EU member states?"

In particular, this will include the sub-questions; "How do countries differ with regard to the support they give to immigrants in their integration policies?", and "How do political variables, economic variables, and public opinion influence the level of support given to migrants through EU member states' integration policies?"

The next part of the thesis is going to review the existing literature on the topic and formulate the expectations that can be made for the study at hand. The third part will describe which methods were used in the study, while the fourth chapter is going to discuss the findings. Lastly, conclusions and implications for further research and policy making will be discussed.

Chapter 2 - The Theoretical Framework

This chapter is going to lay out the theoretical background of integration policy research. The question is: What makes countries more liberal towards immigrants, granting more rights and support and what influences countries to shift their integration policies in the other, more restrictive direction? The theoretical basis on the influence of political determinants, economic determinants and public opinion on integration policy will be discussed.

Integration policy can be seen as "a policy that is distinct from immigration policy per se – such things as border control or rights of entry and abode" (Favell, 2001, p.351). Although integration policy should be seen as different from immigration policies, the following theoretical background is also going to refer to immigration policy in general. Many studies and surveys cover immigration policy as a whole and do not distinguish between different fields of policy. The studies are however still indicative for the purposes of this study as they shed light on what drives attitudes towards immigrants in general and shows underlying dynamics in politics, economics and public opinion that can be expected to have an influence on the distinct field of integration policy.

2.1 Political determinants

Approaches that seek to explain immigration policy choices from a political perspective "focus on domestic interest groups, political institutions, and/or international-level determinants of immigration regulations" (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005, p.100). While it is found in various studies that interest groups can have an impact on policy formation, "they do not explain variation over time or among migrant-receiving states" (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005, p.107). Concerning international influence on immigration policy Hatton (2013) argues that EU policy and the European Court of Justice may have limited countries' room to manoeuver. Joppke (2007) similarly argues that the influence of the EU leads to convergence in member states' policy, especially in the field of civic integration and anti-discrimination. Mulcahy (2011, p.182) finds occasions of convergence but stresses that national political contexts are still the main determinants in integration policy making. Moreover, international regimes in the field of integration often lag significant influence on national policy making because they generally have weak enforcement mechanisms and are usually in the form of soft law (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005; Mulcahy, 2011, p.181-182).

With regard to political parties one finding is that right-wing conservative parties, more often than left-wing parties, favor more restrictive policies toward immigrants (Freeman & Kessler,

2008, p.669; Givens, 2006, p.76). Centre-right parties are found to often shift their agenda in connection to populist right-wing party influence (Freeman & Kessler, 2008; Mulcahy, 2011). In Mulcahy's (2011, p.181) analysis on the adoption of EU civic integration norms by EU countries, the position of center-right parties "in response to an electoral threat from an extreme-right party, was found to be the key factor". The same study found that extreme right-wing parties, even having relative electoral success usually do not have much influence on their own, but through the influence they have on center-right parties' agendas (Mulcahy, 2011, p.188). Van Spanje (2010, p.579) found in this context that extremist right-wing parties can influence the whole party system, not only parties directly competing with them in elections. Thus Van Spanje (2010, p. 578) finds that rightist parties are not more likely to be affected by the influence of extremist-right parties than leftist parties. There is however one exception, that is parties in government, which are not found to be affected. It thus does not necessarily have to be the case that the contagion effect of right-wing extremist parties translates into policy changes. Howard (2010, p. 747), investigating predictors of citizenship policy, finds that "while the presence of a strong anti-immigrant movement seems to be a necessary and sufficient factor that prevents citizenship liberalization, the absence of the far right is a necessary but not sufficient condition for liberalization". It is furthermore pointed out that the electoral success of far-right parties is only one measure for the mobilization of far-right sentiment (Howard, 2010, p. 748).

2.2 Economic Determinants

Economic considerations in immigration policy arise in two broad fields, one concerning the impact of immigration on the labor market, especially wages and unemployment, and its' possible fiscal effects (Freeman & Kessler, 2008).

2.2.1 The labor market - wages and unemployment

Immigration can be seen as an increase of the labor force in the economy. Daniels and Von der Ruhr (2003, p. 3) argue that "migration politics historically developed along with economic development because these policies are used to influence the size and composition of the labor force." Immigrants are often perceived to be a threat to domestic workers, because immigration is thought to cause unemployment and a decrease in wages. Most studies however show that immigration leads to small net gains in GDP per capita and no significant effect on unemployment in the host country (Coppel, Dumont & Visco, 2001). Depending on the composition of the migrant population and the structure of the economy in the host country, migration can have multiple different effects on the economy and possible gains or

losses for different groups of the population. Various models try to depict the impact of immigration on the host country's labor market. In Borjas' (1994) model, immigration leads to a rise in national income, the "immigration surplus". This however also entails a shift of the income away from domestic workers to immigrants and capital owners. The impact of such a scenario may depend on "whether those who gain from immigration (business, consumers, migrants, and the like) can (and are willing to) compensate those who lose in order to produce a net social gain" (Freeman & Kessler, 2008, p.660). In other models like a Hekscher-Ohlin model that includes international trade no significant impact of immigration is found as immigrants are simply absorbed into the production process (Hanson & Slaughter, 2002). The question here may be how labor demand relates to labor supply in the given situation.

But not only the state of the host country's economy, but also the composition of the migrant population plays a role for the impact that it may have on the destination country's economy. "The higher the substitution between immigrants and natives, the more likely that immigration flows will cause a decline in native workers' wages" (Guardia & Pichelmann, 2006, p.22). The Heckscher-Ohlin theory "predicts that the impact on immigration attitudes of being skilled or unskilled should depend on a country's skill endowments, with the skilled being less anti-immigration in more skill-abundant countries than in more unskilled labor abundant countries" (Freeman & Kessler, 2008, p.670). O'Rourke (2003) confirms this prediction using data for 24 countries and GDP per capita as a proxy for the countries' skill endowments. Accordingly Freeman and Kessler (2008, p.670) note that "class cleavages, especially those between skilled and unskilled labour, on the one hand, and organised labour and organised employers, on the other, are at the heart of immigration policy contestation".

There is evidence that there is an impact of the labor market situation on immigration policy. Timmer and Williams (1998) find that labor market conditions in the host country did cause policy backlashes in the past. Artiles and Meardi (2014, p.65) find that variables connected to competition for welfare and employment resources lead to more negative attitudes towards immigrants. The variables tested are the unemployment rate, risk of poverty, social inequality and the rate of immigration. This thus suggests that in countries where competition for welfare and employment is bigger, attitudes towards immigrants would be more negative. This would be the case in times of economic downturn, where welfare regimes are less supportive. Hatton (2013) similarly finds that historically recessions have caused policy backlashes in immigration policy, especially following a period of high immigration and when immigrants are culturally different from the host population. Testing the impact of the

unemployment rate, the budget deficit as a share of GDP, and the share of social expenditure in GDP on changes in country-level attitudes towards migrants in the context of the 2008 recession in Europe, Hatton (2013, p.7) moreover finds that "concerns about public finances and social spending are far more important determinants of immigration attitudes than concerns about the labor market". Hatton (2013, p.11) shows that the 2008 recession in Europe did not cause a policy backlash, although he notes that there is pressure from extreme right-wing parties in some countries. The lack of a significant policy backlash is assumed to be connected to greater restrictions by EU policies in fields like asylum policy and family reunification (Hatton, 2013, p. 12).

It is worth noting that macro-level impact of the labor market situation on immigration policy can not only be seen in the form of backlash but also in the above mentioned function of immigration policy to influence the size and composition of the labor force. Examples for this are the Blue Card program of the EU to support high-skilled migrants, especially in fields of skilled-labor shortage, and guest worker immigration programs as in the 1950s in Germany.

2.2.2 Fiscal determinants

Another debate in economic theory concerning migration is the impact of immigration on the receiving countries' fiscal budget. It has often been claimed that migrants are a burden on the state's welfare system, because they are said to require unemployment and social assistance and funds for education and health care systems, while not matching this with additional tax payments (Guardia & Pichelmann, 2006, p.27). Guardia and Pichelmann (2006, p.27) point out "that overall the net budgetary impact over the long-run appears to be fairly small. However, geographical 'clustering' of immigrants could also be associated with a higher burden on 'local' budgets".

Also the respective welfare state system in the country may have an impact on attitudes towards migrants. Some studies find that the attitude towards migrants is more negative when welfare benefits are more easily available to migrants (Hanson, Scheve & Slaughter, 2007). Contrarily, as mentioned above, Artiles and Meardi (2014, p.66) argue that "social protection expenditure and unemployment benefits are correlated with a reduction in social inequality and the risk of poverty, ultimately contributing to the formation of attitudes favorable to immigration". Sainsbury (2006, p.239) finds similar results, comparing immigrant's rights in the USA, Germany and Sweden. Accordingly, immigrants are granted more rights in the social democratic welfare regime of Sweden, than in the conservative regime of Germany,

where more rights are granted than in the liberal regime of the USA. It is moreover pointed out that also integration models and policy legacies play a role in determining integration policy, whereby welfare and immigration regime reinforce each other and conflict at times (Sainsbury, 2006, p.240). These indications from the literature could also play a role in the relationship of integration policy and public opinion, discussed below. Accordingly, countries that have generous social policies reducing social inequality are also more likely to be more generous towards immigrants and have more positive attitudes towards immigrants. The findings by Artiles and Meardi (2014) and by Sainsbury (2006) could however be seen as somewhat contradictory to the finding that hostility is higher where welfare benefits are easier to obtain, as mentioned above. It may thus occur that countries which grant high welfare benefits to immigrants restrict immigrants.

2.3 Public Opinion

An additional question with regard to the dynamics of integration policy making is whether public opinion has an influence on it. The literature on the influence of public opinion on immigration policy is mixed and somewhat limited. Mulcahy (2011, p.187) who investigates the impact of public opinion in the specific context of the adaptation of the EU norms of civic integration and the voting rights norm finds "that public opposition or support for either the restrictive civic integration norm or the more liberal voting rights norm did not lead policymakers to adapt their policies accordingly". This is also suggested by Hatton (2013) who sees a discrepancy in popular opinion and policy outcomes. Rivera (2014, p. 29) on the other hand, investigating what drives immigration policy in US federal states, finds that public opinion has a significant impact, even when accounting for other possible influential variables mentioned in the literature. He investigates this relationship separately for pro-immigrant policies and thus the more exact finding says that negative public opinion towards immigrants negatively influences the amount of pro-immigration legislation passed in the respective state. In a previous article Rivera (2013, p. 23) also investigated the influence of public opinion on anti-immigration policy and finds a similar relationship, saying that a negative public opinion towards immigrants in a state positively influences the amount of anti-immigrant policy passed in the respective state. In connection to this second paper, Rivera (2013, p.26) however, points to the fact that the findings need to be interpreted with caution as some possible covariates could not be measured. Burstein (2003), who studies the impact of public opinion in general, finds a substantial impact of public opinion that is enhanced with the salience of the topic. His research however also concentrates on the USA where he notes most of the research has been done in this field (Burstein, 2003, p. 33).

While there are some findings that indicate that public opinion has a significant impact on immigration policy making, this relationship could also be the other way around, indicating that integration policy may have an impact on public opinion. This would mean that supportive integration policy would lead to more positive attitudes towards immigrants in society. In a sense positive attitudes could also be a consequence for successful integration and thus for successful and more supportive integration policy.

2.4 Expectations for the study at hand

Which expectations can be drawn from the above outlined theoretical framework for the study at hand? Three fields are covered in this analysis; political determinants, economic determinants, and the influence of public opinion. The political variable that is going to be included in the study is the share of right-wing party seats in parliament. It can be expected as mentioned above that having a higher influence of right-wing parties would also lead to more restrictive policies.

Hypothesis 1 is thus:

The higher the share of seats of right-wing parties in parliament, the more restrictive the integration policy of the respective country.

The economic variables included in this study are the unemployment rate, the GDP per capita in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS), debt as a percentage of GDP, and social expenditure as a percentage of GDP. On the basis of the theory illustrated above it can be expected that if the unemployment rate is high, policy will be more restrictive. It could for instance be less likely in that case, that immigrants are granted easy access to the labor market.

Hypothesis 2:

The higher the unemployment rate, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country.

The second economic indicator, the GDP per capita in PPS, is expected to be positively related to the dependent variable, the generosity of the integration policy. The GDP level of a country shows its economic condition and is also an indication of the countries' labor market.

As mentioned above, it can be expected that countries are more open to immigrants in times of economic success and a high labor demand. It could thus be expected that;

Hypothesis 3:

The higher the GDP per capita in PPS, the more supportive is the country's integration policy.

Another economic variable, included in the analysis, is social expenditure as a percentage of GDP. It can be expected that a higher degree of social expenditure means a more generous welfare state system. The theoretical framework would predict that such countries are also more generous towards immigrants, as Sainsbury (2006, p.239) suggests.

Hypothesis 4:

The higher the social expenditure, the more supportive is the county's integration policy.

The fiscal determinant included, is debt as a percentage of GDP. As laid out above, immigration policy is often more restrictive when an adverse impact of immigration on the country's fiscal budget is expected. It is moreover often claimed that immigrants require more expenditure in social benefits than they return in tax revenue (Guardia and Pichelmann, 2006, p.27). A country with a higher debt may thus rather restrict immigration.

Hypothesis 5:

The higher the debts level of a country, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country.

Furthermore it is going to be tested how public opinion influences immigration policies. Public opinion is going to be measured by two different variables. The first one of them measures the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country. One can expect that the more positive the attitudes are towards immigrants, the more supportive are the integration policies.

Hypothesis 6:

The more citizens who agree, that immigrants contribute to their country, the more generous are the country's integration policies.

The second variable measuring public opinion covers the percentage of respondents who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country. It can be expected that people who see immigration as an issue, are more likely to support restrictive policies towards immigrants.

Hypothesis 7:

The more citizens who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country.

The next chapter is going to illustrate how these hypotheses will be tested.

<u>Chapter 3 - The Methodology</u>

This chapter is going to illustrate the methods that will be used in answering the research question and testing the hypotheses mentioned above. This will include the data collection method, the sampling chosen, the research design, and the operationalization of the dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable in this study is the degree of rights and support that countries grant in the framework of their integration policy. The independent variables that are intended to be measured in this analysis are the share of right-wing parties in parliament, the unemployment rate, the debt, GDP, social expenditure, and public opinion.

3.1 Data Collection

The rights and support given in the countries' integration policy is going to be measured through the Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX), published by the British Council and Migration Policy Group (British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010). This is going to be the dependent variable in the study. The construction of the index is conducted by the Barcelona Centre for International Affairs and the Migration Policy Group, including many national partners. It is co-funded by the European Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals (MIPEX Research Toolkit, n.d.). The index covers seven policy fields, labor market mobility, family reunion, education, political participation, long-term residence, access to nationality and anti-discrimination. Each policy field is made up of four dimensions. There are 148 policy indicators. All indicators and the seven policy fields are listed in Appendix 1. For an overview of the policy fields and dimensions see Figure 2. The performance of each country on each indicator is assessed on a scale of 1-3, with 3 representing the highest standards. All indicators for one policy field can be summarized in an overall score for the respective field and ultimately in an overall score for all policy fields combined. This score is then not anymore represented on a scale of 1-3 but converted into a 0-100% measurement, with 100% representing the highest standards. The policies included in the index cover both social and civic rights and are compared on the background of the highest European or international standards. The sources for these standards include EU Directives, Council of Europe Conventions, and documents from the United Nations and the International Labour Organization (see Appendix 2). The data was gathered through three questionnaires, one covering the first 5 policy fields, one covering education and one, covering antidiscrimination (MIPEX Research Toolkit, n.d.). National experts were asked to respond to the questionnaires based on facts in laws and policy, rather than on expert opinion. The answers were anonymously checked by peer reviewers and an anonymous discussion was mediated by the Migration Policy Group if disagreement arose. The Migration Policy Group furthermore checked the questionnaires for consistent responses to guarantee that the questions were understood correctly. These peer review measures ensure the reliability of the index and guard against subjectivity.

The data collection for the independent variables covers various online databases. As mentioned above the independent variables in this study are the share of right-wing parties in parliament, the unemployment rate, the debt, GDP, social expenditure, and public opinion. Sources for the independent variables are the Comparative Political Dataset (Armingeon, Knöpfel, Weisstanner, Engler, Potolidis & Gerber, 2013) for the share of right-wing parties in parliament and debt, Eurostat (Eurostat, 2014; Eurostat, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014b) for social expenditure, GDP, and the unemployment rate, and Eurobarometer (Eurobarometer 61, 2006; Eurobarometer 63, 2005; Eurobarometer 65, 2006; Eurobarometer 66, 2007; Eurobarometer 69, 2008; Eurobarometer 71, 2009; Eurobarometer 73, 2010) for the public opinion variables.

Figure 2 - MIPEX Policy Fields and Dimensions (British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010)





Source: Created by the author based on the MIPEX ((British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010).)

3.2 The Sample

The countries of interest which will be studied are EU member states. The sampling method can be described as purposive or judgmental sampling, as the cases are selected on the basis of the purpose of the study and knowledge of the population in question (Babbie, 2009, p. 193). The selection of cases is in this instance limited to some extent because the relevant information on differences in integration policy is not accessible for all countries. The countries researched in the MIPEX framework therefore provide a pre-selection. As Biffl and Faustmann (2013, p.61) note there could be some difficulties in comparing EU member states and non-EU countries in the MIPEX index. In the EU, due to the principle of free movement for EU citizens, the index covers only third-country nationals, which is a relatively small portion of all migrants, while it covers all migrants in non-EU countries. It could be that the limitation to EU member states limits the extent to which results can be generalized to other countries and regions. The countries should however be as much the same as possible on other variables, not included in the study. The UK, Ireland and Denmark will thus be excluded as they opted out of EU cooperation in immigration and may therefore not exhibit the same circumstances as other EU member states. The standards against which scores are evaluated in the MIPEX index rely on EU Directives, Council of Europe Conventions or Recommendations (see Appendix 2). Of these the Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification ([2003] OJ L 251) and Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents ([2004] OJ L 016) do not apply to Denmark, Ireland and the UK. Croatia has to be excluded as well, due to a lack of data availability. Ultimately the twenty-four countries included in the study are Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden.

3.3 The Research Design

The intended research design could be described as a cross-national comparative analysis. Hantrais (1999, p.93) describes the basic definition of this research method as the observation of "social phenomena across nations, to develop robust explanations of similarities or differences, and to attempt to assess their consequences, whether it be for the purposes of testing theories, drawing lessons about best practice or, more straightforwardly, gaining a better understanding of how social processes operate". This fits the intended research which looks at differences between integration policies in EU member states and their determinants. The impact of the political variables, economic variables and public opinion on the MIPEX index scores will be analyzed in a multiple regression analysis. The results of this analysis will thus be the basis to answering the research question of what influences the level of support given to migrants through EU countries' integration policy. Since the variables are in a ratio measurement level, according to Babbie (2009, p.477) two statistical methods are possible, namely Pearson r correlation and regression analysis. These will both be conducted. The Pearson r correlation is also a method to assure that there is actually significant correlation between the dependent and the various independent variables to do regression analyzes. Regression analysis includes the regression equation, giving a mathematical estimate of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The variables will not all be included in one regression model, but rather be divided in multiple regression analyzes, one covering the economic variables, one for the political variables, and one including the remaining public opinion variables. It would otherwise be difficult to conduct a study including all independent variables, considering the limited number of cases. In the case of four independent variables, the equation for a multivariate regression analysis would be as follows:

 $Y = \beta 0 + \beta 1 X 1 + \beta 2 X 2 + \beta 3 X 3 + \beta 4 X 4 + e$

In the equation $\beta 0$ is the intercept, $\beta 1 - \beta 4$ indicate "the number of units of increase in Y caused by an increase of one unit in X", and e stands for the error term which is the variance in Y that is not accounted for by the X variables included in the model (Huizingh, 2007, p.299). The regression analysis thus allows us to estimate a value of Y when the values of the independent variables, X, are known. Calculating the values of the several βs shows the

relative contribution of the several independent variables in determining the dependent variable (Babbie, 2009, p.475). Regression analysis has two important assumptions that need to be fulfilled. One concerns the variables' measurement level which has to be interval or ratio. The second assumption is that the variables' relationship is linear. This will be tested in scatterplots in the following part of the thesis. Two different analysis will be conducted; one covering forty-six cases in the form of country-years; and another covering the twenty-four countries under study as the cases. The former has country-years as the units of analysis, while the latter's units of analysis are countries. In the first instance the MIPEX waves of 2007 and 2010 scores excluding education are used as a dependent variable. The second method covers the overall MIPEX 2010 score, including the policy field of education, as the dependent variable. This method is going to be used to test the relationships found with the first method including forty-six cases. It covers only forty-six cases, rather than forty-eight, because Romania and Bulgaria were not yet included in the MIPEX study in 2007, so that the cases Romania 2007 and Bulgaria 2007 are missing.

3.4 Operationalization of the dependent and independent variables

The dependent variable is the degree of rights and support given by the countries' integration policy. As mentioned above, integration policy can be seen as "a policy that is distinct from immigration policy per se - such things as border control or rights of entry and abode" (Favell, 2001, p.351). "It accepts some idea of permanent settlement and deals with and tries to distinguish a later stage in a coherent societal process: the consequence of immigration" (Favell, 2001, p.352). The dependent variable is going to be measured by the MIPEX index mentioned above. The values that will be used in this paper cover the two most recent waves of 2007 and 2010. The MIPEX score can vary from 0-100%. It is a summary score of the scores on each indicator, dimension and policy field. A score of 100% would mean that the respective country fulfills all of the highest standards, on which the MIPEX is build (Appendix 2). The index has some important limitations that need to be considered. The MIPEX is a mere input indicator. That means it only assesses the legal and institutional basic conditions of integration (Biffl & Faustmann, 2013, p.58). There are other aspects, like the impact of NGOs and cultural circumstances that play a role in integration, that are not covered by the index. The MIPEX is thus not a determining indicator of migrants' situation in the respective countries. It however gives an idea of the direction that countries take in their integration policy and shows the commitment to equal chances for migrants in central policy fields.

The independent variables are going to cover both economic and political variables. The political determinant covered in the study is the share of right-wing party seats in parliament. See Appendix 4 for information on which parties are classified as right-wing in the respective countries. The economic variables are the unemployment rate, GDP, and social expenditure. Another economic variable is the debt as a percentage of GDP. This concerns the fiscal aspects connected to immigration. The share of right-wing party seats in parliament and the debt level are going to be derived from the Comparative Political Dataset (Armingeon, Knöpfel, Weisstanner, Engler, Potolidis & Gerber, 2013). The unemployment rate, GDP, and social expenditure are derived from Eurostat (Eurostat, 2014; Eurostat, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014b). GDP is measured as GDP per capita in Purchasing Power Standards (PPS) in relation to the EU28 average set to equal 100, so that any value above that is higher than the average GDP per capita in the EU28 (Eurostat, 2014a). In addition, it is going to be investigated what impact public opinion has on integration policy. This is going to be measured by two different variables. The first one measures public opinion as the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, which is available for 2006 and 2008 from Eurobarometer 66 and 69 (Eurobarometer 66, 2007; Eurobarometer 69, 2008). The second variable measuring public opinion is the percentage of people who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country (Eurobarometer 61, 2006; Eurobarometer 63, 2005; Eurobarometer 65, 2006; Eurobarometer 67, 2007; Eurobarometer 69, 2008; Eurobarometer 71, 2009; Eurobarometer 73, 2010). All independent variables are expressed in 5-year averages to account for a lag in the policy-making process. This is with the exception of the opinion variables, one is only available for 2006 and 2008, and the second one is measured from 2004-2007 and from 2006-2010. A summary of all the variables included can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3 - The dependent and independent variables

1. The MIPEX score and the political variable



2. The MIPEX score and the economic variables



3. The MIPEX score and public opinion



Source: Created by the author

The following chapter is going to apply the above discussed methods to answer the research question and multiple sub-questions.

Chapter 4 - The Results

In this chapter the hypotheses will be tested, and the main research question and sub-questions will be answered. It will be investigated how the share of right-wing party seats in parliament, the unemployment rate, social expenditure, the debt level, the GDP per capita in PPS, and public opinion influence the degree of support and rights given in countries' integration

policies, as measured by the MIPEX index. To recall the expected relationships of the dependent and independent variables see figure 4. Before covering the analysis outcomes, it will first be looked at how the countries differ with regard to the dependent variable, their score on MIPEX index. Then the the necessary assumptions to conduct

The research questions at a glance:

"What influences the level of support given to migrants in the integration policy of EU member states?"

- "How do countries differ with regard to the support they give to immigrants in their integration policies?"
 - "How do political variables, economic variables, and public opinion influence the level of support given to migrants through EU

regression analyzes will be checked and Pearson correlation coefficients will be calculated for each independent variable and the dependent variable. Lastly, the regression analyzes will be discussed.

		\mathbb{Z}
Share of right-wing parties in parliament \downarrow	MIPEX score↑	
Unemployment rate \downarrow	MIPEX score [↑]	
GDP per capita in PPS 1	MIPEX score1	
Debt↓	MIPEX score1	
Percentage of respondents who see immigration as one	MIPEX score1	
of two main issues facing their country \downarrow (Public Opinion Measure 1)		
Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants	MIPEX score [↑]	
contribute to society ↑ (Public Opinion Measure 2)		

Figure 4 - The expected relationships between the variables at a glance

4.1 The MIPEX index – How supportive are countries in their integration policy?

As mentioned above, the MIPEX measures the extent of rights and support given to immigrants in the framework of seven different policy fields of integration policy. The exact indicators, policy fields and their dimensions are listed in Appendix 1. The analysis is going to use two different dependent variables; one being the 2010 overall MIPEX score including education, and the other one being a composite measure of the 2010 and 2007 MIPEX scores excluding the policy field of education. The following is going to illustrate the countries' variance on these three different scores and the seven policy fields.

In the 2010 index including the policy field of education the results for the twenty-four countries under study vary from an overall score of 31% for Latvia to a score of 83% for Sweden. Sweden is the country with the highest score not only among the twenty-four countries under study in this paper but among all thirty-one countries covered by the MIPEX index, while Latvia is the second last before Turkey in the overall ranking (MIPEX Research Toolkit, n.d.). The scores are illustrated in Figure 5. These scores are summarized from the scores of all seven policy fields. One can see that Sweden and Portugal are the two countries which grant the most extensive support for migrants while Latvia, with some gap to the second last country, is giving the least support as measured by the index. There seem to be five bigger differences between groups of countries. The first one can be seen as Cyprus, Slovenia, and Malta. The second one is Lithuania, Bulgaria, Austria, and Poland. Another gradation can be seen between this last group of countries and Hungary, Romania, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia, Greece, and France, while this group of countries is again set off from the next group of Germany, Luxembourg, and Italy, whereof Spain is again set off by three points. The last two groups could be seen as Belgium, the Netherlands, and Finland on the one hand, and Portugal and Sweden on the other hand. Whereby, Portugal shows the biggest difference to the foregone country in the list, namely a ten point difference. Sweden again scores four points higher than Portugal. With regard to the question of which countries grant more rights and support, it seems that the countries with the higher scores are mostly well-developed West European countries. The next part of the analysis will shed light on the more exact underlying dynamics and assess the impact of the different variables.





Source: Created by the author based on MIPEX 2010 (British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010)

Figure 6 shows how different countries have scored on the different policy fields. For simplicity the figure only covers six of the twenty-four countries included in the study. As one can see, the scores are very different in different policy fields. While Sweden maintains high scores in all policy areas, other countries have high scores in certain areas, as Latvia in the field of long term residence, but lag behind in the rest. For an overview of the scores for each policy field of all the included countries and developments since the earlier 2007 wave, see Appendix 5. When analyzing the scores on the different policy fields, it is furthermore found that the countries vary least in the fields of family reunification and long-term residence. This is in accordance with the assumption that EU policy may have an influence. These two policy fields are covered by Directives (Council Directive 2003/86/EC & Council Directive 2003/109/EC), so that a closer proximity of countries in these fields can be expected compared to other fields mostly governed by soft law measures. See Appendix 3 for the analysis of the difference of variance between the policy fields.

Figure 6 – 2010 policy field scores of six of the included EU member states (*MIPEX Play* with the Data, $2010)^{1}$



The developments in the countries' integration policies between the index of 2007 and 2010 can be seen in Figure 7. Many of the changes in scores are marginal, while some countries, like Greece and Luxembourg, stand out.

¹http://www.mipex.eu/play/radar.php?chart_type=radar&countries=20,26,27,30,39,41&objects=3,24,70,106,1 47,180,220&periods=2010&group_by=country





Source: Created by the author based on MIPEX data of 2007 and 2010 (British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010)

Greece increased its score by 10 points, while the score of Luxembourg increased by 8 points. Those are the biggest increase in scores from 2007 to 2010 of all thirty-one countries covered by the MIPEX index. Greece made the biggest progress in the policy field Access to Nationality with an increase of 39 points, and in the field of Political Participation with an increase of 15 points. Luxembourg similarly increased its score mainly through improvements in the field of Access to Nationality with a 32 point increase, and a 14 point increase in the field of Family Reunification. Other countries that show relatively high increases are Portugal, with a 5 point increase, and the Czech Republic and Belgium, with each 4 point increases. None of the countries significantly decreased their scores, only Italy's and Sweden's scores decreased by one point and thus showed that policies became slightly more restrictive in these two countries. Overall, policies have thus become less restrictive in the countries under study, with some progress towards a more supportive integration regime. Apart from Luxembourg and Greece, eleven other countries increased their score on the MIPEX index in 2010. Bulgaria and Romania are not included in Figure 7 as they were not included in the study in 2007. For more exact information on the score changes from 2007 to

2010, see Appendix 5. The next part of the analysis is now going to summarize the analysis of the Pearson correlation of each independent variable with the dependent variable and the necessary linearity of those relationships.

4.2 Conditions for regression analyzes and Pearson correlations

The first assumption of an interval or ratio measurement level of the variables is fulfilled. Scatterplots are created to test the second assumption of a linear relationship between the dependent variable; the MIPEX score, and the independent variables. Moreover, the correlations between the dependent variable and each of the independent variables will be tested in a Pearson r analysis.

4.4.1 The scatterplots of the dependent variable with each independent variable

The scatterplots are illustrated in Figure 8. It can be observed if the expected relationships are in the expected direction and which variables may show stronger correlation with the dependent variable. The results are mixed. The scatterplot covering the share of right-wing parties in parliament as the independent variable shows a negative relationship as has been hypothesized. It is fairly linear but shows a lot of scatter around the line. The scatterplot of the dependent variable and GDP per capita in PPS shows a sufficiently linear line although there is also some scatter around the line. The scatterplot of the variable measuring social expenditure and the MIPEX score shows a linear relationship with medium scatter around the line. The next scatterplot shows the relationship for the debt variable. This plot is sufficiently linear but shows somewhat more scatter around the line than the former plot covering social expenditure. Both the plot covering the debt variable and the social expenditure variable show the expected positive relationship. The scatterplot of the last economic independent variable, the unemployment rate, and the MIPEX score shows a lot of scatter throughout and is not sufficiently linear. The last two scatterplots show the relationship of the MIPEX score with the two public opinion measures. The one covering the share of respondents who see immigration as one of the two main issues facing their country is not sufficiently linear. It shows a lot of scatter with some thickening towards the lower values on the independent variable. In contrast to what was before assumed, the relationship, of the dependent variable and the share of respondents who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country, is positive in the scatterplot. This would indicate that the higher the share of respondents who see immigration as one of the two main issues facing their country, the higher the MIPEX score. The relationship was before hypothesized as being negative. The scatterplots of the MIPEX score with the independent variable measuring the share of

respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country stands out. It shows the strongest relationship, compared to the other scatterplots, and is clearly linear.







Source: Created by the author based on MIPEX data of 2007 and 2010 (British Council, Migration Policy Group, 2010), and data of Eurostat (Eurostat, 2014; Eurostat, 2014a; Eurostat, 2014b), the Comparative Political Database (Armingeon et al., 2013) and Eurobarometer (Eurobarometer 61, 2006; Eurobarometer 63, 2005; Eurobarometer 65, 2006; Eurobarometer 66, 2007; Eurobarometer 67, 2007; Eurobarometer 69, 2008; Eurobarometer 71, 2009; Eurobarometer 73, 2010)

4.4.2 The Pearson r correlation coefficients

The variable measuring the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country also has the highest correlation coefficient with the MIPEX score, namely r =0.805. The correlation, as measured by the Pearson correlation coefficient, between the MIPEX index and four independent variables were found to be significant at the critical α of 0.05. These are the debt as percentage of GDP (r = 0.307), social expenditure as a percentage of GDP (r = 0.675), GDP per capita in PPS (r = 0.386) and as mentioned above, one of the public opinion measures (r = 0.805). The correlation coefficients of the MIPEX score with the unemployment rate (r = -0.146), the share of right wing parties in parliament (r = -0.169), and the percentage of respondents who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country (r = 0.173), were not significant at the critical $\alpha = 0.05$. For the correlation coefficients and their significance levels see Appendix 6.

Due to these outcomes of the correlation analysis and the creation of the scatterplots three of the original seven independent variables will not be included in the regression analysis. They are not significantly correlated with the dependent variable or do not show sufficient linearity. It does thus not make sense to assume and test their relationship with the dependent variable further. The following regression analysis is therefore only going to cover the following independent variables; the debt as a percentage of GDP, the social expenditure as a percentage of GDP, GDP per capita in PPS and the share of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country. There will therefore not be any political variables tested in the regression analysis anymore, but only economic and public opinion variables. This also means that the hypotheses concerning the three variables that did not show statistically significant correlations with the dependent variable cannot be confirmed. There was no relationship found between the support given in countries' integration policies, as measured by the MIPEX index, and the share of right-wing parties in parliament, the unemployment rate, and the public opinion variable measuring the share of respondents who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country. Hence hypotheses 1, 2, and 7 cannot be confirmed.

4.3 The regression models

To test the influence of the remaining four variables, six linear models were created. One includes all four variables; the debt, the social expenditure, GDP per capita in PPS and one variable measuring public opinion, the second one includes debt, social expenditure and public opinion, one only includes social expenditure and public opinion, and the last three cover social expenditure, GDP per capita, and public opinion separately. These models are now going to be analyzed.

4.3.1 Model 1 - Debt, social expenditure, GDP per capita and public opinion

The first model includes debt, social expenditure, GDP per capita and public opinion as independent variables. The dependent variable is the MIPEX score of 2007 and 2010 excluding the policy field education. The model was run multiple times, excluding more and more cases on the basis of the Cook's Distance coefficient which measures the cases' influence on the model (Chen et al., 2003). It measures whether the results of the model are substantially changed if the case is removed. A case can be influential if it is an outlier, with big residuals, or when the case shows leverage, meaning that it shows an extreme value on the independent variable (Chen et al., 2003). In the end the model included only eighteen of the original forty-six cases. Since this is a very big number of cases that had to be excluded it was and a high number of variables for such a small amount of cases. It was thus decided to discard this model and go on analyzing the variables in models including less variables at once. These are discussed below. The output of this model can be seen in Appendix 7.

4.3.2 Model 2 - Debt, social expenditure and public opinion

The second model includes debt, social expenditure, and public opinion as independent variables. The dependent variable is the MIPEX score of 2007 and 2010 excluding the policy field education. GDP per capita was tested again in a simple linear regression model which is

discussed below. Model 2 was run five times, each time excluding more cases on the basis of the Cook's Distance coefficient which measures the cases' influence on the model (Chen et al., 2003). At first forty-six cases were included in the analysis. Ultimately the model was run with thirty-three cases. Thirteen had to be excluded because they were found to be influential, based on the Cook's Distance. These cases were Austria for both years, Cyprus for both years, Estonia for 2007, France for both years, Greece for both years, Italy for 2007, Luxembourg for 2007, and Portugal for both years. Every time the model was run, it rendered statistically significant results, while only two variables, the social expenditure and public opinion, where found to significantly contribute to that. In the model covering thirty-three cases, the variables were found to statistically significantly predict the MIPEX score (excluding education), with F (3.29) = 136,020, p <0.05, and an adjusted coefficient of determination of $R^2 = 0.934$. The R^2 coefficient shows how much variability in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables. It is however based on the data at hand and may therefore be overestimated. The adjusted R² accounts for this (De Veaux, R. D., Velleman, P. F., & Bock, D. E., 2011, p. 799). While the variables together seem to significantly explain the dependent variable, not all of the three variables add statistically significantly to the model. The variable measuring debt as percentage of GDP was found to not be statistically significant at the critical $\alpha = 0.05$. Hypothesis 5 can therefore not be confirmed, as no statistically significant relationship is found between the support given to migrants in countries' integration policies and the debt level. The output of this analysis can be found in Appendix 8 and the regression coefficients are summarized in Table 1.

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Ν
	В	Std. Error	Beta			33		
(Constant)	9,706	3,074		3,158	0,004			
Debt 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	-0,026	0,042	-0,047	-0,610	0,546			
Social expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-	1,523	0,255	0,605	5,971	0,000			

Table 1 - Model	2 - The	MIPEX	score	2007	and	2010	excluding	education,	and	debt,	social
avpanditura and	nublic o	ninion									
experioriture, and	public o	<u>pinion</u>									

2010 average						
Percentage of respondents	0,343	0,054	0,480	6,399	0,000	
who agree that immigrants						
contribute to their country						
2006 and 2008						

Source: Author's own calculations

4.3.3 Model 3 - Social expenditure and public opinion

It was decided to run a new model excluding the debt variable, as it did not contribute to the previous model. In this case again, the model was run three times, gradually excluding cases on the basis of the Cook's Distance coefficient. At the beginning forty-six cases were used which was reduced to forty-one, after which no more influential cases were found. The excluded cases were Austria for both years, France for both years, and Portugal for 2010. Each time the model was run it was found to statistically significantly predict the dependent variable. On the last occasion, covering forty-one cases this was also the case, with F (2.38) = 79,060, p<0.05. Both independent variables add statistically significantly to the model. The adjusted coefficient of determination, R^2 , is 0.806, indicating that 80.6% of the variables included in this model. These were the social expenditure as a percentage of GDP and public opinion, measured as the percentage of respondents who agreed that immigrants contribute to their country. The regression equation would be as follows in this case;

MIPEX = $11,076 + 0.335 \times (Public Opinion) + 1,329 \times (Social Expenditure).$

Looking at the standardized coefficients, 0.479 for public opinion and 0.509 for social expenditure, it is indicated that the variable of social expenditure has a bigger impact than public opinion. The regression coefficients furthermore indicate that the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable are in the expected direction. Before these results can be accepted, some further assumptions need to be checked. The linearity assumption was already confirmed in the scatterplots above. To be able to test hypotheses using a Student's t-model, as it is done in the SPSS output, the residuals need to satisfy a Nearly Normal Condition. To test this, a histogram and a Normal probability plot are created. In the case of this analysis, the histogram and the Normal probability plot look fairly Normal and this Condition can thus be confirmed. A further assumption that needs to be fulfilled is the assumption of independence of errors. This means that the variance of the errors should be constant for each value of the independent variables (De Veaux et al., 2011, p. 789). This can

be tested with a scatterplot of the residuals against the predicted values. There should be no pattern in the scatterplot. This assumption cannot be confirmed in this case. The scatterplot can be seen in Figure 9. The output of this model can be seen in Appendix 9 and table 2. The same model was then tested using the MIPEX 2010 overall score including education as the dependent variable, including the twenty-four countries under study as cases. The scatterplot showed a similar bent, as can also be seen in Figure 9. The complete output of this regression analysis is illustrated in Appendix 10.



Figure 9 - Model 3 and 3.1 - Scatterplots of the residuals against the predicted values

Source:	Author	's	own	cal	lcul	lations
		~				

Table 2 – Model 3 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and social expenditure and public opinion

Independent Variables	Unstandard	lized	Standardized	t	Sig.	Ν
	Coefficients		Coefficients			
	B Std.		Beta			41
		Error				
(Constant)	11,076	4,292		2,580	0,014	
Social expenditure in % of	1,329	0,246	0,509	5,410	0,000	
GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-						
2010 average						
Percentage of respondents	0,355	0,070	0,479	5,086	0,000	
who agree that						
immigrants contribute to						
their	country	2006	and			
-------	---------	------	-----	--	--	--
2008						
~						

Source: Author's own calculations

To test if the variables have an impact on their own, three further models were made to analyze the impact of social expenditure, GDP per capita, and public opinion, measured as the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country.

4.3.4 Model 4 - GDP per capita in PPS

In this model the independent variable GDP per capita in PPS was tested. The dependent variable is the MIPEX score of 2007 and 2010 excluding the policy field education. Again, the model was run multiple times and cases were excluded on the basis of the Cook's Distance coefficient. In the end the model included thirty-six cases and no more influential cases were found. The independent variable was found to statistically significantly predict the dependent variable with F (1,34) = 69,075, p < 0,05. The adjusted R² is 0,660 and the regression equation is as follows;

MIPEX = $14,853 \times 0,408$ GDP per capita in PPS.

The model is summarized in table 3. This model can however not be accepted as valid because the assumption of independence of errors is not fulfilled. As can be seen in Figure 10, the scatterplot of residuals against the predicted values shows a slight pattern.





Table 3 – Model 4 - The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and GDP per capita in PPS

Independent	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.	Ν
variables	Coefficients		Coefficients			
	В	Std. Error	Beta			36
(Constant)	14,853	4,491		3,307	0,002	
GDP per capita	0,408	0,049	0,819	8,311	0,000	
in PPS						

Source: Author's own calculations

The full output of this analysis can be seen in Appendix 11.

4.3.5 Model 5 – Social expenditure

In the analysis of the impact of social expenditure as a percentage of GDP, again by and by some cases were excluded on the basis of the Cook's Distance. The ultimate model includes thirty-eight cases. The cases that are excluded are Austria for both years, France for both years, Portugal for both years, and Sweden for both years. The model predicts the dependent variable, the MIPEX score excluding education, statistically significantly, with F (1,39) = 50,384, p < 0,05. The relationship is not only significant at the 0.05 level but at the 0.001 level. The adjusted R² is 0,552 and the regression equation is as follows;

MIPEX = $12,123 + 1,845 \times Social Expenditure$.

The necessary assumptions are satisfied. For the complete output of this analysis see Appendix 12 and table 4 for a summary of the main results.

Table 4 – Model 5 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and social expenditure

Independent Variables	Unstandardized		Standardized	t	Sig.	Ν
	Coefficients		Coefficients			
	В	Std. Error	Beta			38
(Constant)	12,123	5,807		2,088	0,043	
Social expenditure in %	1,845	0,260	0,751	7,098	0,000	
of GDP 2003-2007 and						
2006-2010 average						

Source: Author's own calculations

This relationship was also tested using the MIPEX 2010 overall score including education as the dependent variable. While the findings suggest that social expenditure statistically significantly predicts the MIPEX score, the histogram of the residuals suggests that the residuals don't follow a Normal model. The model can thus not be tested using Student's t, as this requires data that comes from a population following a Normal model (De Veaux et al., 2011, p.556). The histogram seems to be bimodal (see Figure 11). The output of this analysis using the 2010 overall MIPEX score as the dependent variable can be seen in Appendix 13. The regression coefficients can be seen in table 5. The results for this relationship are therefore somewhat mixed with regard to the assumption of Normality. However that can be expected, as the normality assumption is more easily acceptable as the sample size is bigger (De Veaux et al., 2011, p.556). This is the case in model 4, compared to model 4.1 which has a smaller sample size. Hypothesis 4 can be confirmed. The extent of social expenditure seems to have an impact on integration policy, as measured by the MIPEX index.

Table 5	5 —	Model	5.1 -	- The	2010	overall	MIPEX	score	including	education,	and	social
a vera en di	4								•			
<u>expend</u>	lure											

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Ν
	В	Std. Error	Beta			20
(Constant)	9,818	6,757		1,453	0,163	
Social expenditure in %ofGDP2006-2010average	1,825	0,305	0,816	5,992	0,000	

Source: Author's own calculations

Figure 11 – Model 5.1 - Histogram of the residuals



Source: Author's own calculations

4.3.6 Model 6 - Public opinion

The linear regression which only includes public opinion, measured as the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, as the independent variable, was conducted with forty-five cases. Again cases have been excluded on the basis of the Cook's Distance. The excluded case was Hungary 2010. It was found that public opinion, as measured here, statistically significantly predicts the MIPEX score, with F (1,43) = 87,141, p < 0.05. The adjusted R is 0,662 and the regression equation is as follows;

MIPEX = $28,740 + 0,640 \times$ Public Opinion.

The scatterplot of residuals against the predicted values indicates that the assumption of independence of error is fulfilled. The histogram however seems to show issues with the normality. See Appendix 14 for the output and table 6 for a summary of the regression coefficients. To test this relationship again the same analysis was made using the 2010 overall MIPEX score including education as the dependent variable. It is found that the used public opinion variable statistically significantly predicts the dependent variable, with F (1,22) = 52,915, p <0.05. The relationship is not only significant at the 0.05 level but at the 0.001 level. The adjusted R² is 0,693 and the regression equation is;

MIPEXoverall2010 = $27,278 + 0,651 \times Public Opinion$.

All the assumptions, as mentioned above, are fulfilled.

Table 6 – Model 6 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and public opinion

Independent Variable	Unstandardized		Standardize	t	Sig.	Ν
	Coefficients		d			
			Coefficients			
	В	Std. Error	Beta			45
(Constant)	28,740	2,902		9,905	0,000	
Percentage of respondents	0,640	0,069	0,818	9,335	0,000	
who agree that immigrants						
contribute to their country						
2006 and 2008						

Source: Author's own calculations

The results with regard to the relationship of the MIPEX score and the share of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, is therefore somewhat mixed. While the analysis of the 2007 and 2010 MIPEX scores, excluding education, indicated that the underlying population did not follow a Normal model, the analysis with the 2010 MIPEX overall scores rendered statistically significant results and fulfilled all necessary assumptions. It indicates that an increase of one percentage point in the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, would cause an increase of 0,651 percentage points in the overall MIPEX score. The analysis moreover suggests that 69,3 % of the variation in the MIPEX score can be explained by the independent variable. While the study at hand clearly suggests that there is a relationship between the attitude towards immigrants and the countries' integration policies, it may have to be questioned to what extend supportive integration policies may lead to more positive public opinion. And the relationship of the two variables under study could thus be the other way around. The more detailed reciprocal relationship of these two variables could be of interest for future studies. It should also be considered that there may be some important control variables that could not be included in the study at hand. The full output of this regression model can be found in Appendix 15 and table 7 summarizes the regression coefficients.

Table 7 – Model 6.1 – The 2010 overall MIPEX score including education, and public opinion

Independent Variables	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardize d	t	Sig.	Ν
	coefficients		Coefficients			
	В	Std. Error	Beta			24
(Constant)	27,278	3,709		7,355	0,000	
Percentage of	0,651	0,90	0,840	7,274	0,000	
respondents who agree						
that immigrants						
contribute to their						
country 2006 and 2008						

Source: Author's own calculations

Concluding, the results could thus confirm Hypothesis 4 and 6. It was found that the higher social expenditure, the more generous the integration policy, and the more positive public opinion, the more generous are the country's integration policies. The results regarding these hypotheses are however also somewhat mixed and further research in the more detailed dynamics underlying these relationships could be of interest. Three of the initial seven independent variables under study had to be excluded from the further regression analysis as they did not fulfill the necessary assumption of linearity and did not show significantly strong correlations with the dependent variable. The regression analysis of the remaining two independent variables, debt and GDP per capita in PPS, did not render valid results.

Chapter 5 - Conclusion and Discussion

The analysis was conducted in two parts. The first part covered the analysis of the assumption of linearity, necessary for the regression analysis, and the Pearson correlation coefficients. The second part covered the actual regression models. The following chapter will discuss which conclusions can be drawn from these analyzes. The results regarding the hypotheses are summarized in table 8.

Table 8 – The results at a glance

Hypothesis 1	The higher the share of seats of right-wing parties in parliament, the more restrictive the integration policy of the respective country	-
Hypothesis 2	The higher the unemployment rate, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country	-
Hypothesis 3	The higher the GDP per capita in PPS, the more supportive is the country's integration policy	-
Hypothesis 4	The higher the social expenditure, the more supportive is the county's integration policy.	+
Hypothesis 5	The higher the debts level of a country, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country	-
Hypothesis 6	The more citizens who agree, that immigrants contribute to their country, the more generous are the country's integration policies	+
Hypothesis 7	The more citizens who see immigration as one of the two most important issues facing their country, the more restrictive is the integration policy of the respective country	-

5. 1 First part of the analysis - Pearson r

In the first part of the analysis, already three of the initial seven independent variables under study were found to not exhibit a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. They did not fulfill the necessary assumption of linearity and did not show significantly strong correlations with the dependent variable. These variables were the unemployment rate, the share of right-wing parties in parliament, and one of the public opinion measures. Hence Hypothesis 1, 2, and 7 could not be confirmed.

One of the variables that were not found to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable, on the basis of a lack of significant correlation, is the share of right-wing parties in parliament. Hypothesis 1 could thus not be confirmed. It could have been expected that a higher share of such parties in parliament may have an influence on the restrictiveness of immigration policy. As noted in former studies (Mulcahy, 2011, p. 188; Van Spanje, 2010, p.578) such right-wing parties have the biggest influence not through significant electoral success but through the influence they have on the rest of the party system. Van Spanje (2010, p. 578) however finds that this is not the case for government parties. This may be a reason why the presence of right-wing parties does not significantly influence integration policy even if it may influence the agenda of other political parties in the system.

The second independent variable that was not found to be significantly correlated with the dependent variable was the unemployment rate. The theory shows that the unemployment rate, or the perceived threat of unemployment and the assessment of the economic situation influences people's attitude towards migrants (Hatton, 2013; Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005, p.105). Daniels and Van der Ruhr (2003, p. 3) find that "historically, immigration policy seems to have been influenced by labor market conditions in a given country". The findings at hand and the literature however suggest that this may depend on various more other factors. Freeman and Kessler (2008, p.662) note that "if the labour market impact of immigration is 'small' or social programs mitigate adverse effects of competition" non-economic concerns are more important in policy-making. In the study at hand no relationship was found between integration policy and the unemployment rate. Hypothesis 2 could not be confirmed. Further research should look at how, and under which conditions, the actual unemployment rate or only the perception of unemployment risk play a role in shaping peoples' opinion and policy on immigration.

The public opinion variable, measuring the percentage of respondents who see immigration as one of the two main issues facing their country, is the third variable that did not show significant correlation with the dependent variable. Hence hypothesis 7 could not be confirmed. Public opinion, as measured by this variable, was not found to influence policy, while the second public opinion variable, measuring the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, showed the strongest correlation with the dependent variable. This may show that the variable measuring public opinion as the share of respondents, who see immigration as an important issue, is somewhat arbitrary. This may not indicate that people have an anti-immigration attitude, but rather that they see it as a field where government action is necessary. This is supported by the fact that the scatterplot of these two variables showed a positive relationship instead of the before hypothesized negative relationship. Thus, indicating that the variable may rather measure a call for action in the field of immigration, rather than a negative attitude towards immigration.

Four independent variables were found to be statistically significantly correlated with the dependent variable and showed sufficient linearity to conduct regression analyzes. Those were the debt as a percentage of GDP, social expenditure as a percentage of GDP, GDP per capita in PPS and the second public opinion variable.

5.2 Second part of the analysis - linear regression

Both the fiscal variables, debt and social expenditure, were found to be significantly correlated with the dependent variable. This may be in accordance with Hatton's (2013, p. 11) finding that fiscal considerations are more important in people's attitudes towards immigration than concerns about the labor market. In the regression analysis however debt was found to not predict the dependent variable statistically significantly. Hypothesis 5 thus had to be rejected. There does not seem to be an impact of the debt level on the supportiveness of integration policy. The relationship of fiscal considerations and immigration policy is very diverse and may have to be researched in more detailed analyzes. Aspects like the development of the debt level over a longer period of time and the extent of the debt in connection to other economic factors may play a role in describing this relationship more accurately.

In the analysis of the social expenditure variable, the regression analysis showed that it statistically significantly determined the MIPEX score. The independent variable measuring social expenditure and the MIPEX score showed a fairly high correlation. Also the further regression analysis indicated that the extent of social expenditure influences integration policy. Hypothesis 4 could thus be confirmed. This supports former findings that countries with a more generous welfare state are also often more generous in their immigration and integration policy (Sainsbury, 2006). Artiles and Meardi (2014) also point towards a relationship between generous welfare state policies and a positive attitude towards immigration. They point out, that in countries were competition for employment and risk of poverty are less apparent, people are more positive towards immigration (Artiles & Meardi, 2014, p.66). Further research could investigate this relationship in more detail using other measures for welfare generosity, which were not available for the study at hand. While social

expenditure does say something about the welfare generosity of a country and was used in previous research (Hatton, 2013) other measures could be more accurate.

In the regression analysis the third economic variable, GDP per capita in PPS, was not found to influence integration policy. With regard to GDP per capita one could have expected, based on theory that a worse condition of the economy could lead to tighter immigration policies. As Hatton (2013) however found, this has not been the case in the recent economic crisis in Europe. Hatton assumes that this is attributable to the constraints of EU policy, which limit countries' room for maneuver. This could be an explanation for the lack of a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable, the MIPEX index, and GDP per capita in this study. Hypothesis 3 could not be confirmed. Further research using other measures of the economic condition of a country, for instance the economic growth rate, and other research methods, for instance case studies, may be useful to investigate the relationship of the economy and integration policy further.

The second variable measuring public opinion as the share of respondents, who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, was the independent variable that showed the clearest relationship and strongest correlation with the MIPEX score. It also rendered statistically significant results and fulfilled all assumptions in the regression analysis. This was the case for the analysis using the 2010 overall MIPEX score including education as the dependent variable. In the other analysis including forty-six cases and the 2007 and 2010 MIPEX scores excluding education, there seem to be issues with the normality of the histogram of residuals. The findings on this relationship are therefore mixed and can only be accepted conditionally. It would be interesting to investigate this relationship further considering that the correlation between these variables was quite strong. The model indicates that an increase of one percentage point in the percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, would cause an increase of 0,651 percentage points in the overall MIPEX score. Hypothesis 6 could thus be confirmed. But while the study at hand clearly suggests that there is a relationship between the attitude towards immigrants and the countries' integration policies, it may also have to be questioned if the relationship could be the other way around, so that supportive integration policies influence public opinion. Another aspect that needs to be considered is that some possible covariates could not be included in this study. The field of integration policy is very vast and may have many different determinants. Possible covariates that could have been included in the study are the immigrants' skill-level, the immigration history or welfare state tradition of the respective state. These could not be included due to a lack of data but could be interesting topics for further research.

5.3 Policy Implications

Immigration is a central policy field and is likely to stay important in the coming years. As illustrated by Castles, Detlaas and Miller (2014, p.6) immigration has an enormous economic and social impact, which makes it a central topic of domestic and international politics. It is likely to remain a central challenge for policy makers in the coming years (Castles et al., 2014, p. 7). Integration policy becomes especially important to account for increasing diversity in society and the challenges this poses to national identity. In this context research into integration policy and especially the relationship between integration policy and public opinion, as found in this study, become important. There is evidence that public opinion influences integration policy so that a central consideration in policy making could be a focus on the communication of immigration issues to the public. In any case policy should aim at improving peoples' views on immigration and ease the incorporation of culturally diverse migrants. Artiles and Meardi (2014, p.66) note that "rather than closing borders European countries should ensure that immigration is associated with social policies aimed at reducing the perceived competition for resources and in particular unemployment and risk of poverty". According to them this will lead to more positive attitudes towards immigrants because the competition between them, a central predictor of public opinion, would be reduced. Thus one could also expect that a more supportive and successful integration policy leads to more positive attitudes, which is central to successful integration. The reasoning of Artiles and Meardi (2014) is also in accordance with the finding that higher social expenditure, or a more generous welfare state, correlates with a more supportive integration policy. This has also been suggested by Sainsbury (2006).

5.4 Limitations and further research

One has to be careful when generalizing the findings at hand to a broader population. This study only includes EU member states and the indications that EU policy may have a significant influence on immigration policy may render it difficult to draw similar conclusions for other countries. As mentioned above the analysis of EU countries furthermore only includes a relatively small share of immigrants as it only covers immigrants from outside the EU, while a big share of migration among EU countries is within EU migration. In other countries, the policies cover a bigger group of migrants and may therefore be difficult to compare (Biffl & Faustmann, 2013, p. 61). An additional important limitation that should be

overcome in future research is the limited availability of data. Some variables that should have been included in the study, for instance the share of third-country nationals in the population, were not available. This could however change when analyzing new MIPEX waves in the future. Some variables are available for more recent time periods. Another aspect to consider in future research is the critique of the MIPEX index, mentioned above. It does not necessarily include all aspects of integration policy (Biffl & Faustmann, 2013, p. 65). It may also be worth discussing if such quantitative studies, including a bigger amount of cases is meaningful in the field of integration policy as it seems to be difficult to quantify integration policy and to measure the many different aspects influencing policy in different circumstances. This conflict is discussed by Freeman and Kessler (2008, p. 658) who point out that "the determinants of policy are complex, difficult to pin down, and certainly not reducible to preferences of individual actors or group-level demands". However, one cannot discard the strong correlation and significant results found for the relationship of public opinion and integration policy, and social expenditure and integration policy. Studies like these and the study at hand indicate relationships that may be subject to more detailed circumstances in different countries which should be analyzed in more detail in future research. These studies sould include more diverse countries and more detailed data on the influence of public opinion on policy. As mentioned in the introduction chapter, immigration is a central phenomenon of our time which is likely to continue in the coming years and which changes the way we think about national identity and makes it necessary to find ways to incorporate people from vast backgrounds in the host society. Research into integration policy and its relationship with public opinion and the welfare state should play a central role in this.

List of References:

Armingeon, K., Careja, R., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D., Engler, S., Potolidis, P., Gerber, M. (2013). Comparative Political Data Set III 1990-2011. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Bern.

Artiles, A. M., & Meardi, G. (2014). Public opinion, immigration and welfare in the context of uncertainty. *Transfer: European review of labour and research*, 20(1), 53-68.

Babbie, E. R. (2009). The practice of social research. Cengage Learning Emea.

Biffl, G., & Faustmann, A. (2013). Österreichische Integrationspolitik im EU-Vergleich. Zur Aussagekraft von MIPEX.

Borjas, G. J. (1994). *The economic benefits from immigration* (No. w4955). National Bureau of Economic Research.

British Council, Migration Policy Group. (2010). Migrant Integration Policy Index [Data file]. Available from http://www.mipex.eu/research.

Brücker, H., Epstein, G. S., McCormick, B., Saint-Paul, G., Venturini, A., & Zimmermann, K. F. (2002). Managing migration in the European welfare state. Immigration Policy and the Welfare System, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1-168.

Bugajski, J. (2002). Political parties of Eastern Europe: A guide to politics in the post-communist era. M.E. Sharpe.

Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, *56*(1), 29-40.

Castles, S. and Miller, M. J. (1998). The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Castles, S., De Haas, H., & Miller, M. J. (2014). *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Chen, X., Ender, P., Mitchell, M., & Wells, C. (2003). Regression Diagnostics. In *SPSS Web Books: Regression with SPSS*. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from University of California, Los Angeles, Institute for Digital Research and Education Web site, http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/webbooks/reg/.

Coppel, J., Dumont, J. C., & Visco, I. (2001). *Trends in immigration and economic consequences* (p. 10). Paris: OECD.

Cornelius, W. A., & Rosenblum, M. R. (2005). Immigration and politics. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 8, 99-119.

Daily Mail. (2011, February 11). Nicolas Sarkozy joins David Cameron and Angela Merkel view that multiculturalism has failed. *Associated Newspapers Ltd.* Retrieved September 16, 2014, from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1355961/Nicolas-Sarkozy-joins-David-Cameron-Angela-Merkel-view-multiculturalism-failed.html.

Daniels, J. P., & Von Der Ruhr, M. (2003). The determinants of immigration-policy preferences in Advanced Economies: A cross-country study. *Atlantic Economic Journal*, *31*(2), 146-158.

De Veaux, R. D., Velleman, P. F., & Bock, D. E. (2011). *Stats: Data and Models*. Pearson, Addison-Wesley.

Eurobarometer 61: Public opinion in the European Union. (2004). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb61/eb61_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 63: Public opinion in the European Union. (2005). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb63/eb63_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 65: Public opinion in the European Union. (2006). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb65/eb65_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 66: Public opinion in the European Union. (2007). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb66/eb66_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 67: Public opinion in the European Union. (2007). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb67/eb67_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 69: Europeans' state of mind. (2008). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb69/eb69_part1_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 69: Values of Europeans. (2008a). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb69/eb69_values_en.pdf.

Eurobarometer 71: Public opinion in the European Union. (2009). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb71/eb71_std_part1.pdf .

Eurobarometer 73: Public opinion in the European Union. (2010). European Commission Directorate General Communication. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb73/eb73_vol1_en.pdf .

Eurostat. (2014). Table tipsun20 - Unemployment rate - annual data [Table]. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tipsun2 0&plugip=1.

Eurostat (2014a). Table tec00114 - GDP per capita in PPS [Table]. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pco de=tec00114.

Eurostat (2014b). Table tps00098 - Expenditure on social protection [Table]. Retrieved from http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tps000 98&plugin=1.

Evans, S. (2010, October 17). Merkel says German multicultural society has failed. *BBC News*. Retrieved September 16, 2014, from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-11559451.

Favell, A. (2001). Integration policy and integration research in Europe: a review and critique. *Citizenship today: global perspectives and practices*, *349*, 351-52.

Finotelli, C., & Michalowski, I. (2012). The heuristic potential of models of citizenship and immigrant integration reviewed. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, *10*(3), 231-240.

Freeman, G. P., & Kessler, A. K. (2008). Political economy and migration policy. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *34*(4), 655-678.

Givens, T. E. (2007). Immigrant Integration in Europe: Empirical Research. *Annual Review of Political Science.*, *10*, 67-83.

Guardia, N. D., & Pichelmann, K. (2006). Labour migration patterns in Europe: Recent trends, future challenges (No. 256). Directorate General Economic and Monetary Affairs (DG ECFIN), European Commission.

Hanson, G. H., & Slaughter, M. J. (2002). Labor-market adjustment in open economies: Evidence from US states. *Journal of International Economics*, *57*(1), 3-29.

Hanson, G. H., Scheve, K., & Slaughter, M. J. (2007). Public finance and individual preferences over globalization strategies. *Economics & Politics*, *19*(1), 1-33.

Hantrais, L. (1999). Contextualization in cross-national comparative research. International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 2(2), 93-108.

Harell, A., Soroka, S., Iyengar, S., & Valentino, N. (2012). The impact of economic and cultural cues on support for immigration in Canada and the United States. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *45*(3), 499-530.

Hatton, T. J. (2013). *The Slump and Immigration Policy in Europe* (No. 1401). Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration (CReAM), Department of Economics, University College London.

Howard, M. M. (2010). The impact of the far-right on citizenship policy in Europe: explaining continuity and change. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *36*(5), 735-751.

Huddleston, T., Niessen, J., Chaoimh, E.N., White, E. (2011). Migrant Integration Policy Index III. Brussels: British Council and Migration Policy Group.

Huizingh, E. (2007). Applied statistics with SPSS. Sage.

Jacobson, D. (1996). *Rights across borders: Immigration and the decline of citizenship*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Joppke, C. (2007). Beyond national models: Civic integration policies for immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, *30*(1), 1-22.

Kymlicka, W. (2012). *Multiculturalism: Success, failure, and the future*. Transatlantic Council on Migration, Migration Policy Institute.

Lane, J. E., McKay, D. H., & Newton, K. (1997). Political Data Handbook. OECD Countries. Oxford University Press.

Loch, D. (2014). Integration as a sociological concept and national model for immigrants: scope and limits. *Identities*, (ahead-of-print), 1-10.

Milner, H. V., & Tingley, D. (2011). The economic and political influences on different dimensions of United States immigration policy. *Princeton, NJ: Princeton University*.

MIPEX Methodology. (n.d.). Retrieved May 28, 2014, from http://www.mipex.eu/methodology.

MIPEX Research Toolkit. (n.d.). Retrieved May 28, 2014, from http://www.mipex.eu/research.

MIPEX Play with the Data, (2010). Retrieved July 9, 2014, from http://www.mipex.eu/play/radar.php?chart_type=radar&countries=20,26,27,30,39,41&objects =3,24,70,106,147,180,220&periods=2010&group_by=country.

Mudde, C. (2007). Populist radical right parties in Europe (pp. 197-232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mulcahy, S. (2011). Europe's Migrant Policies: Illusions of Integration. Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Rourke, K. (2003). *Heckscher-Ohlin theory and individual attitudes towards globalization* (No. w9872). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Rivera, M. (2013). Immigration, Public Opinion, and State Policy Responsiveness.

Rivera, M. U. (2014). Immigration, Public Opinion, and State Policy (Un) responsiveness: A Case for Analyzing Policies that Expand the Rights of Immigrants.

Sainsbury, D. (2006). Immigrants' social rights in comparative perspective: welfare regimes, forms in immigration and immigration policy regimes. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *16*(3), 229-244.

Schain, M. A. (2010). Managing difference: Immigrant integration policy in France, Britain, and the United States. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 77(1), 205-236.

Timmer, A. S., & Williams, J. G. (1998). Immigration policy prior to the 1930s: Labor markets, policy interactions, and globalization backlash. *Population and Development Review*, 739-771.

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division (2013). *International Migration Report 2013*. United Nations.

Van Spanje, J. (2010). Contagious Parties Anti-Immigration Parties and Their Impact on Other Parties' Immigration Stances in Contemporary Western Europe. *Party Politics*, *16*(5), 563-586.

The Appendix

Appendix 1:

MIPEX policy fields, dimensions and indicators²

	MIPEX 2010 INDICATORS								
	LABOUR MARKET MOBILITY								
	ACCESS	100	50	0					
1	Immediate access to employment What categories of third country national residents have equal access to employment as nationals? a. Long-term residents b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal) c. Residents on family reunion permits (same as sponsor)	All of them	Not c or certain categories of b	Only a					
2	Access to private sector: Are TCN residents able to accept any private-sector employment under equal conditions as EU nationals?	Yes. There are no additional restrictions than those based on type of permit mentioned in 1	Other limiting conditions that apply to all TCN residents, e.g. linguistic testing	Certain sectors and activities solely for nationals/EU nationals					
3	Access to public sector (activities serving the needs of the public. Not restricted to certain types of employment or private or public law): Are TCN residents able to accept any public-sector employment (excluding exercise of public authority) under equal conditions as EU nationals?	Yes. Only restriction is exercise of public authority and safeguard general state interest	Other restrictions	Only for nationals/EU nationals					
4	Immediate access to self-employment What categories of third country national residents have equal access to self-employment as nationals? a. Long-term residents b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal) c. Residents on family reunion permits (same as sponsor)	All of them	Not c or certain categories of b	Only a					
5	Access to self-employment Are TCN residents able to take up self-employed activity under equal conditions as EU nationals?	Yes. There are no additional restrictions than those based on type of permit mentioned in 4	Other limiting conditions (such as linguistic testing)	Certain sectors and activities solely for nationals/EU nationals					
	ACCESS TO GENERAL SUPPORT	100	50	0					
6	Access to public employment services Do TCN residents have access to placement and public employment services, under equal conditions as EU nationals?	Equal treatment with nationals	Certain restrictions	No equal treatment					
7	Equality of access to education and vocational training, including study grants What categories of TCN residents have equal access? a. Long-term residents b. Residents on temporary work permits (excluding seasonal) c. Residents on family reunion permits (same as sponsor)	All of them	Not c or certain categories of b	Only a					
8	Recognition of academic and professional qualifications acquired outside the EU	Same procedures asfor EU/EEA nationals	Different procedure as for EU/EEA nationals	No recognition of titles or possible down-grading of qualifications					
	IARGETED SUPPORT	100	50	0					

² Armingeon, K., Careja, R., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D., Engler, S., Potolidis, P., Gerber, M. (2013). Comparative Political Data Set III 1990-2011. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Bern.

9	State facilitation of recognition of skills and qualifications obtained outside the EU: a) existence of state agencies/information centres that promote the recognition of skills and qualifications b) national guidelines on fair procedures, timelines and fees for assessments by professional, governmental, and non-governmental organisations c) provision of information on conversion courses/profession-based language courses and on procedures for assessment of skills and qualifications (regardless of whether assessments are conducted by governmental or non-governmental organisations)	b and (a or c)	a or c	None
10	Measures to further the integration of third-country nationals into the labour market a. National policy targets to reduce unemployment of third country nationals b. National policy targets to promote vocational training for third country nationals; c. National policy targets to improve employability through language acquisition programmes	All elements	Any of these elements (or other) but not all	No elements
11	Measures to further the integration of third-courtry nationals into the labour market a. National policy targets to address labour market situation of migrant youth b. National policy targets to address labour market situation of migrant women	Both	One of these	Neither of these
12	Support to access public employment services a) Right to resource person, mentor, coach linked to public employment service is part of integration policy for newcormers b) Training required of public amployment convice staff on creatific people of migrants.	Both	One	None. Only through voluntary initiatives or projects.
_	b) Hanning required of public employment service stan on specific needs of migrants	100	50	0
13	Membership of and participation in trade union associations and work-related negotiation bodies	Equal access with	Restricted access to elected	Other restrictions apply
14	Equal access to social security	<i>national</i> s Equal treatment with	<i>positions</i> No equal treatment in at least	Noequal treatment in
	Do TCNs have equal access to social security in the following areas? (unemployment benefits, old age pension, invalidity benefits, maternity leave, family benefits, social assistance)	nationals in all areas	one area	more than one area
15	Equal working conditions Do TCNs have guaranteed equal working conditions? (safe and healthy working conditions, treatment in case of job termination or dismissal, payment/wages, taxation)	Equal treatment with nationals in all areas	No equal treatment in at least one area	No equal treatment in more than one area
16	Active policy of information on rights of migrant workers by national level (or regional in federal states)	Policy of information by state targeted at migrant workers and/or employers on individual basis	Ad hoc information campaigns towards migrant workers and/or employers (or only individual campaigns in certain regions)	No active policy of information
	NATIONALS			
		100	E0	0
		100	1 30	
117a	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents	<1 year of legal	> 1 year of legal residence	> 2 years of legal
17a	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents	≤1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤1 year	> 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years
17a 17b	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion	≤1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤1 year Any residence permit	> 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit
17a 17b 18a	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership	≤1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤1 year Any residence permit Both	> 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. homosexuals)	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses.
17a 17b 18a 18b	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both Eoth ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years)	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. homosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions
17a 17b 18a 18b	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both Soth ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three	> 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. homosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations
17a 17b 18a 18b 19 20	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. homosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed
177a 177b 187a 187b 197 20 21	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. horrosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither: Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed
177a 177b 187a 187b 197 20 21	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. hornosevuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply 50 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed 0
17a 17b 18a 18b 19 20 21 22a	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank)	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. hornosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply 50 Requirement to take a language course 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Nether: Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed 0 Requirement includes language test/assessment
177a 177b 187a 187b 19 20 21 222a 222b	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted)	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information Al or less set as	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. horrosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply S0 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Nether: Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed Dequirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as
17a 17b 18a 18b 19 20 21 22a 22b	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course or other forms of assessments.	 ≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard 	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. hornosevuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply S0 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither: Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed 0 Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion.
17a 17b 18a 19 20 21 22a 22b 22c	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course or other forms of assessments. Form of pre-departure integration measure for family member abroad, ex. not language, but social/cultural (if no measure, leave blank)	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard None OR voluntary information/course	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. hornosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply S0 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard Requirement to take an integration course 	≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Nether. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed Not allowed B1 or higher set as standard OR no standard OR no administrative discretion. Requirement to pass an integration test/assessment
17a 17b 18a 19 20 21 22a 22b 22c 22d	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course or other forms of assessments. Form of pre-departure integration measure for family member abroad, ex. not language, but social/cultural (if no measure, leave blank) Pre-departure requirement exemptions (if no measure, leave blank) a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard None OR voluntary information/course Both of these	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. homosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply S0 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard Requirement to take an integration course One of these 	 ≥ 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Nether. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion. Requirement to pass an integration test/assessment Nether of these
177a 177b 187a 197 20 21 222a 222b 222c 222d 222e	Eligibility for ordinary legal residents Documents taken into account to be eligible for family reunion Eligibility for partners other than spouses: a. Stable long-term relationship b. Registered partnership Age limits for sponsors and spouses Eligibility for minor children (<18 years) a. Minor children b. Adopted children c. Children for whom custody is shared Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent relatives in the ascending line Eligibility for dependent adult children CONDITIONS FOR ACOULSITION OF STATUS Form of pre-departure language measure for family member abroad (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course or other forms of assessments. Form of pre-departure integration measure for family member abroad, ex. not language, but social/cultural (if no measure, leave blank) Pre-departure requirement exemptions (if no measure, leave blank) a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability Conductor of pre-departure requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Language or education specialists b. Independent of government (ex. not directly subcontracted by or part of a government department)	≤ 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a residence permit for ≤ 1 year Any residence permit Both ≤ Age of majority in country (18 years) All three Allowed Allowed 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard None OR voluntary information/course Both of these a and b, ex. language or education institutes	 > 1 year of legal residence and/or holding a permit for > 1 year Certain residence permits excluded Only one or only for some types of partners (ex. hornosexuals) > 18 ≤ 21 years with exemptions Only a and b Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply Certain conditions (other than dependency) apply So Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard Requirement to take an integration course One of these a but not b, ex. citizenship/ integration unit in government 	2 2 years of legal residence and/or holding a permit for ≥ 2 years Permanent residence permit Neither. Only spouses. > 21 years OR > 18 years without exemptions A and b but with limitations Not allowed Not allowed Not allowed 0 Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standard S, based on administrative discretion. Requirement to pass an integration test/assessment Neither of these Neither a nor b, ex. police, foreigners' service, general consultant

22g	Support to pass pre-departure requirement (if no measure, leave blank)	a and b	a or b	Neither a nor b
	a. Assessment based on publicly available list of questions or study guide b. Assessment based on publicly available course			
22h	Cost of support (if no measure or support, leave blank)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs	Higher costs
23a	Form of language requirement for sponsor and/or family member after arrival on territory (if no measure, leave blank)	No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	Requirement to take a language course	Requirement includes language test/assessment
	Inde, can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments.	Ad an land and an	AQ and an atomstand	Dí a bístar a ta
230	Level of language requirement, (if no measure, leave plank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments.	AT OTTESS Set as standard	Az sei as stanoaro	or ornigner secas standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion.
23c	Form of integration requirement for sponsor and/or family member after arrival on territory ex. not language, but social/cultural	No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	Requirement to take an integration course	Requirement includes integration test/assessment
23d	I anguage/integration requirement exemptions (if no measure leave blank)	Both of these	One of these	Nether of these
	a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability			
23e	Conductor of language/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Language or education specialists b. Independent of government (ex. not directly subcontracted by or part of a government department)	a and b, ex. language or education institutes	a but not b, ex. integration unit in government	Neither a nor b, ex. police, foreigners' service, general consultant
23f	Cost of language/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs	Higher costs
23g	Support to language/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Assessment based on publicly available list of questions or study guide b. Assessment based on publicly available course	a and b	a or b	Neither a nor b
23h	Cost of support (if no measure or support, leave blank)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price in countries	Higher costs
24	Accommodation requirement	None	Appropriate accommodation meeting the general health and safety standards	Further requirements
25	Economic resources requirement	None or at/below level of social assistance and no income is excluded	Higher than social assistance but source is not linked with employment	Linked to employment/no social assistance
26	Maximum length of application procedure	≤6 months defined by law	> 6 months but the maximum is defined by law	No regulation on maximum length
27	Costs of application and/or issue of status	None	Same as regular administrative fees and duties in the country	Higher costs
	SECURITY OF STATUS	100	50	0
28	Duration of validity of permit	Equal to sponsor's residence permit and renewable	Not equal to sponsor's residence permit but ≥ 1 year renewable permit	< 1 year renewable permit or new application necessary
29	Grounds for rejecting, withdrawing or refusing to renew status: a. Actual and serious threat to public policy or national security, b. Proven fraud in the acquisition of permit (inexistent relationship or misleading information). c. Break-up of family relationship (before three years) d. Original conditions are no longer satisfied (ex. unemployment or economic resources)	No other than a-b	Grounds include c	All grounds and others than those included on the list, such as d and others
30	Before refusal or withdrawal, due account is taken of (regulated by law): a. Solidity of sponsor's family relationship b. Duration of sponsor's residence in MS c. Existing links with country of origin d. Physical or emotional violence	All elements	Elements include any of these (or other) but not all	No elements
31	Legal guarantees and redress in case of refusal or withdrawal a. reasoned decision b. right to appeal c. representation before an independent administrative authority and/or a court	All rights	At least a and b	One or both of a and b are not guaranteed
	2.4 RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH STATUS	100	50	0

32	Right to autonomous residence permit for partners and children reaching age of majority	After ≤ 3 years	After > 3 ≤ 5 years	After > 5 years or upon certain conditions (e.g. normal procedure for permanent residence)
33	Right to autonomous residence permit in case of widowhood, dworce, separation, death, or physical or emotional violence	Yes automatically	Yes but only on limited grounds or under certain conditions (ex. fixed period of prior residence or marriage)	None
34	Right to autonomous residence permit for other family members having joined the sponsor	After ≤ 3 years	After > 3 years or upon certain conditions (e.g. normal procedure for permanent residence)	None
35	Access to education and training for adult family members	In the same way as the sponsor	Other conditions apply	None
36	Access to employment and self-employment	in the same way as the sponsor	Other conditions apply	None
37	Access to social security and social assistance, healthcare and housing	In the same way as the sponsor	Other conditions apply	None
E	DUCATION			
	Access	100	50	0
38	Access and support to access pre-primary education: a. All categories of migrants have same access in law as nationals, regardless of their residence status (includes undocumented); b. State-supported targeted measures (e.g. financial support, campaigns and other means) to increase participation of migrant pupils (can also be to increase parental engagement). Note: Use definition of pre-primary in your country .	Both of these	One of these	Nether. Restrictions in law on access for some categories of migrants AND Migrants only benefit from general support for all students (and targeted non-governmental initiatives where provided).
39	Access to compulsory-age education: Access is a legal right for all compulsory-age children in the country, regardless of their residence status (includes undocumented). Note: Use definition of compulsory-age in your country	Explicit obligation in law for all categories of migrants to have same access as nationals.	Implicit obligation for all children (No impediment to equal access in law. e.g. No link between compulsory education and residence, or no category of migrant excluded).	Restrictions in law on accessfor some categories of migrants .
40	The assessment in compulsory education of migrants' prior learning and language qualifications and learning obtained abroad: a. Assessment with standardised quality criteria and tools; b. Requirement to use trained staff.	Both of these.	One of these .	Case-by-case assessment by school staff without standardised criteria or training.
41	Support to access secondary education: a. Targeted measures to increase migrant pupils' successful participation in secondary education; b. Targeted measures to increase migrant pupils' access to academic routes that lead to higher education. Note: This includes extra tuition, monitoring, and learning opportunities and assessments. Depending on the school system, this may also include movement between school routes and structures (e.g. academic and technical).	Both of these	One of these	Neither.
42	Access and support to access and participate in vocational training: Training through apprenticeships or other work-based learning, with state support and/or screening and quality control measures. a. All categories of migrants have same legal access as nationals, regardless of their residence status (includes undocumented); b. Measures to specifically increase migrant pupil participation in such schemes, e.g. incentives; c. Measures to increase employers' supply of such schemes to migrant pupils, e.g. campaigns, support and guidance.	Two or more of these, including a	At least one of these .	None of these. Restrictions in law on access for some categories of migrants AND Migrants only benefit from general support. If there is targeted support for migrants, it is only through non-governmental initiatives.
43	Access and support to access and participate in higher education: a. All categories of migrants have same access in law as nationals, regardless of their residence status (includes undocumented); b. Targeted measures to increase acceptance and successful participation of migrant pupils, e.g. admission targets, additional targeted language support, mentoring, campaigns, measures to address drop-outs. Note: This indicator does not include international students migrating specifically for higher education	Both of these	One of these	Neither. Restrictions in law on access for some categories of migrants AND Migrants only benefit from general support. If there is targeted support for migrants, it is only through non-governmental initiatives.

44	Access to advice and guidance on system and choices at all levels of compulsory and non-compulsory education (pre-primary to higher): a. Written information on educational system in migrant languages of origin; b. Provision of resource persons/centres for orientation of migrant pupils; c. Provision of interpretation services for families of migrant pupils for general educational advice and guidance at all levels.	All three of these.	One or two of these .	Migrants only benefit from general support. If there is targeted support for migrants, it is only through non-governmental initiatives.
	Targeting needs	100	50	0
45	Requirement for provision in schools of intensive induction programmes for newcomer pupils and their families about the country and its education system: a. Existence of induction programme; b. Inclusion of parents. Note: This does not refer to language induction courses.	Both of these	Only a	No requirement
46a	Provision of continuous and on-going education support in language(s) of instruction for migrant pupils: a. In compulsory education (both primary and secondary); b. In pre-primary education. Note: Migrant pupils may be placed in the mainstream classroom or a separate classroom for a transitional phase. This question relates to language support in either case.	Both of these.	One of these .	No provision. Only through private or community initiatives.
46b	If you answered Option 3 to 46a, skip this question: Provision includes: a. Communicative literacy (general fluency in reading, writing, and communicating in the language); b. Academic literacy (fluency in studying, researching, and communicating in the language in the school academic setting).	Both of these.	Only one of these .	Level/goals not specified or defined.
46c	If you answered Option 3 to 46a, skip this question: Provision includes quality measures: a. Requirement for courses to use established second-language learning standards; b. Requirement for teachers to be specialised and certified in these standards; c. Curriculum standards are monitored by a state body.	Two or more of these .	At least one of these .	None of these elements.
47	Policy on pupil monitoring targets migrants.	System disaggregates migrants into various sub-groups, ex. gender, country of origin .	System monitors migrants as a single aggregated group .	None. Migrants are only included in general categories for monitoring that apply to all students.
48	Targeted policies to address educational situation of migrant groups: a. Systematic provision of guidance (e.g. teaching assistance, homework support); b. Systematic provision of financial resources.	Both of these.	One of these .	None. Migrants only benefit from general support. If there is targeted support for migrants, it is only through voluntary initiatives.
49	Teacher training and professional development programmes include courses that address migrant pupils' learning needs, teachers' expectations of migrant pupils, and specific teaching strategies to address this: a. Pre-service training required in order to qualify as a teacher; b. In-service professional development training.	Both of these.	One of these .	None.
	New opportunities	100	50	0
50a	Provision of option (in or outside school) to learn immigrant languages.	State regulations/ recommendations.	Bilateral agreements or schemes financed by another country.	No provision. Only through private or community initiatives.
50b	If you answered Option 3 to 50a, skip this question: Option on immigrant languages is delivered: a. In the regular school day (may involve missing other subjects); b. As an adaptation of foreign-language courses in school, which may be open to all students (equal status as other languages); c. Outside school, with some state funding.	Two or more of these .	One of these .	No delivery in school or funding by state.
51a	Provision of option (in or outside school) to learn about migrant pupils' cultures and their / their parents' country of origin.	State regulations / recommendations .	Bilateral agreements or schemes financed by another country.	No provision. Only through private or community initiatives.

51b	If you answered Option 3 to 51a, skip this question: Option on cultures of origin is delivered: a. In the regular school day (may involve missing other subjects); h. Integrated into the school curriculum, which may be open to all students;	Two or more of these .	One of these .	No delivery in school or funding by state.
	c. Outside school, with some state funding.			
52a	Monitoring segregation between educational institutions: a. Requirement to monitor segregation of migrant pupils into different educational institutions at all levels; b. This requirement includes special needs education.	Both of these.	One of these .	None. Migrants are only included in general categories that apply to all students.
52b	Measures to promote societal integration: a. Measures to encourage schools with few migrant pupils to attract more migrant pupils and schools with many to attract more non-migrant pupils; b. Measures to link couche with few migrant pupils and many migrant pupils (surricular or extra surricular)	Both of these.	One of these .	None. Only general measures .
	b. Weastres to link schools with lew higher pupils and many higher pupils (currented or extra-currented).			
53	Measures to support migrant parents and communities in the education of their children: a. Requirement for community-level support for parental involvement in their children's learning (e.g. community outreach workers); b. Requirement for school-level support to link migrant students and their schools (e.g. school liaison workers); c. Measures to encourage migrant parents to be involved in school governance.	Two or more of these .	One of these .	None. Migrant parents and communities are only included in general categories that apply to all.
	Intercultural education for all	100	50	0
54	The official aims of intercultural education include the appreciation of cultural diversity, and is delivered: a. As a stand-alone curriculum subject; b. Integrated throughout the curriculum.	Both of these.	One of these .	Intercultural education not included in curriculum, or intercultural education does not include appreciation of cultural diversity.
55	State support for public information initiatives to promote the appreciation of cultural diversity throughout society.	Initiatives part of mandate of state- subsidised body .	Initiatives part of state budget line for ad hoc funding.	Neither.
56	The school curricula and teaching materials can be modified to reflect changes in the diversity of the school population: a. State guidance on curricular change to reflect both national and local population variations; b. Inspection, evaluation and monitoring of implementation of (a).	Both of these.	Only a.	None.
57	Daily life at school can be adapted based on cultural or religious needs in order to avoid exclusion of pupils. Such adaptations might include one or a few of the following: Changes to the existing school timetable and religious holidays; educational activities; dress codes and clothing; school menus.	State regulations or guidelines concerning local adaptation.	Law allows for local or school- level discretion.	No specific adaptation foreseen in law.
58	Measures (i.e. campaigns, incentives, support) to support bringing migrants into the teacher workforce: a. To encourage more migrants to study and qualify as teachers; b. To encourage more migrants to enter the teacher workforce.	Both of these.	One of these .	None.
59	Teacher training and professional development programmes include intercultural education and the appreciation of cultural diversity for all teachers: a. Pre-service training required in order to qualify as a teacher; b. In-service professional development training.	Both of these.	One of these .	Training on intercultural education not provided, or intercultural education does not include appreciation of cultural diversity.
			1	1
	ELECTORAL RIGHTS	100	50	0
60	Right to vote in national elections	Equal rights as nationals after certain period of residence	Reciprocity or other special conditions for certain nationalities	No right
61	Right to vote in regional elections (blank if not applicable)	Equal rights as nationals or requirement of lessthan or equal to five years of residence	Requirement of more than five years of residence, reciprocity, other special conditions or special registration procedure or only in certain regions	No right
62	Right to vote in local elections	Equal rights as EU- nationals or requirement of less than or equal to five years of residence	Requirement of more than five years of residence, reciprocity, other special conditions or special registration procedure, or only in certain municipalities	No right
63	Right to stand for elections at local level	Unrestricted (as for EU- nationals)	Restricted to certain posts, reciprocity or special	No right / other restrictions apply

63	Right to stand for elections at local level	Unrestricted (as for EU- nationals)	Restricted to certain posts, reciprocity or special requirements	No right / other restrictions apply
	POLITICAL LIBERTIES	100	50	
64	Right to association	No restrictions on creation of associations by foreigners, no restrictions regarding the composition of the board of such associations	A minimal number of national citizens should be on board, other restrictions apply (i.e. with regard to creation of political organisations or parties)	No right

65	Membership of and participation in political parties	Equal access with nationals (no restrictions imposed by government)	Restricted access to internal elected positions	Other restrictions apply
66	Right to create media (newspaper, radio, television, etc.)	No restrictions on creation of media by foreigners apply (or similar restrictions as for non-immigrant media)	Other restrictions than those for non-immigrant media apply	No right
	4.3 CONSULTATIVE BODIES	100	50	0
67a	Consultation of foreign residents on national level	structural consultation	ad hoc consultation	no consultation
67b	Composition of consultative body of foreign residents on national level	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents without special state intervention	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents but with special state intervention	members of consultation body are selected and appointed by the state only
67c	Leadership of consultative body (repeat for each consultative body)	Chaired by participant (foreign resident or association)	Co-chaired by participant and national authority	Chaired by national authority
67d	Institutionalisation (as either right or duty of body in law) Beyond consultation on policies affecting foreign residents, the Body has: a. Right of initiative to make its own reports or recommendations, even when not consulted. b. Right to a response from the national authority to the its advice or recommendations.	Both guaranteed in law/statutes	One guaranteed in law/statutes	None guaranteed in law/statutes
67e	Representativeness Existence of selection criteria to ensure representativeness. Participants or organisations must include: a. Both genders b. All nationalities/ethnic groups	Both required in law/statutes	One required in law	No criteria in law/statutes
68a	Consultation of foreign residents on regional level (blank if not applicable)	structural consultation	ad hoc consultation or structural consultation only present in some regional entities	no consultation
68b	Composition of consultative body of foreign residents on regional level (blank if not applicable)	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents without special state intervention	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents but with special state intervention	members of consultation body are selected and appointed by the state only
68c	Leadership of consultative body (repeat for each consultative body)	Chaired by participant (foreign resident or association)	Co-chaired by participant and national authority	Chaired by national authority
68d	Institutionalisation (as either right or duty of body in law) Beyond consultation on policies affecting foreign residents, the Body has: a. Right of initiative to make its own reports or recommendations, even when not consulted. b. Right to a response from the national authority to the its advice or recommendations.	Both guaranteed in law/statutes	One guaranteed in law/statutes	None guaranteed in law/statutes
68e	Representativeness Existence of selection criteria to ensure representativeness. Participants or organisations must include: a. Both genders b. All nationalities/ethnic groups	Both required in law/statutes	One required in law	No criteria in law/statutes
69a	Consultation of foreign residents on local level in capital city	structural consultation	ad hoc consultation	no consultation

69b	Composition of consultative body of foreign residents on local level in capital city	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents without special state intervention	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents but with special state intervention	members of consultation body are selected and appointed by the state only
69c	Leadership of consultative body (repeat for each consultative body)	Chaired by participant (foreign resident or association)	Co-chaired by participant and national authority	Chaired by national authority
69d	Institutionalisation (as either right or duty of body in law) Beyond consultation on policies affecting foreign residents, the Body has: a. Right of initiative to make its own reports or recommendations, even when not consulted. b. Right to a response from the national authority to the its advice or recommendations.	Both guaranteed in law/statutes	One guaranteed in law/statutes	None guaranteed in law/statutes
69e	Representativeness Existence of selection criteria to ensure representativeness. Participants or organisations must include: a. Both genders b. All nationalities/ethnic groups	Both required in law/statutes	One required in law	No criteria in law/statutes
70a	Consultation of foreign residents on local level in city (other than capital) with highest proportion of foreign residents	structural consultation	ad hoc consultation	no consultation
70b	Composition of consultative body of foreign residents on local level in city (other than capital) with highest proportion of foreign residents	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents without special state intervention	members elected by foreign residents or members appointed by associations of foreign residents but with special state intervention	members of consultation body are selected and appointed by the state only
70c	Leadership of consultative body (repeat for each consultative body)	Chaired by participant (foreign resident or association)	Co-chaired by participant and national authority	Chaired by national authority
70d	Institutionalisation (as either right or duty of body in law) Beyond consultation on policies affecting foreign residents, the Body has: a. Right of initiative to make its own reports or recommendations, even when not consulted. b. Right to a response from the national authority to the its advice or recommendations.	Both guaranteed in law/statutes	One guaranteed in law/statutes	None guaranteed in law/statutes
70e	Representativeness Existence of selection criteria to ensure representativeness. Participants or organisations must include: a. Both genders b. All nationalities/ethnic groups	Both required in law/statutes	One required in law	No criteria in law/statutes
74	IMPLEMENTATION POLICIES	100	50	0
	Active policy of information by national level (or regional in federal states)	policy of information by state targeted at foreign residents (or targeted at all) on individual basis	intormation campaigns (on a non-individual basis) towards foreign residents(or only individual campaigns in certain regions)	no active policy of information (or no political rights at any level to be informed about)
72	Public funding or support of immigrant organisations on national level	funding or support (in kind) for immigrant organisations involved in consultation and advice at national level without further conditions than being a partner in talks (or similar conditions as for non-immigrant organisations)	funding or support (in kind) dependent on criteria set by the state (beyond being a partner in consultation and different than for non- immigrant groups)	no support or funding
73	Public funding or support of immigrant organisations on regional level	funding or support (in kind) for immigrant organisations involved in consultation and advice at regional level without further conditions than being a partner in talks (or similar conditions as for non-immigrant organisations)	funding or support (in kind) dependent on criteria set by the state (beyond being a partner in consultation and different than for non- immigrant groups) or not in all regions	no support or funding

74	Public funding or support of immigrant organisations on local level in capital city	funding or support (in kind) for immigrant organisations involved in consultation and advice at local level without further conditions than being a partner in talks (or similar conditions as for non-immigrant organisations)	funding or support (in kind) dependent on criteria set by the state (beyond being a partner in consultation and different than for non- immigrant groups)	no support or funding
75	Public funding or support of immigrant organisations at local level in city (other than capital) with highest proportion of foreign residents	funding or support (in kind) for immigrant organisations involved in consultation and advice at local level without further conditions than being a partner in talks (or similar conditions as for non-immigrant organisations)	funding or support (in kind) dependent on criteria set by the state (beyond being a partner in consultation and different than for non- immigrant groups)	no support or funding
	LONG TERM RESIDENCE			
	ELIGIBILITY	100	50	0
76a	Required time of habitual residence	< 5 years	5 years	> 5 years
76b	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence	Any residence permit	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded	Additional temporary residence permits excluded
76b 77	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted?	Any residence permit Yes, all	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study)	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No
76b 77 78	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods
76b 77 78	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods 100	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months 50	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods 0
76b 77 78 79a	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank)	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months 80 Requirement to take a language course	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods Requirement includes language test/assessment
76b 77 78 79a 79b	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments.	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months 80 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion.
76b 77 78 79a 79b	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) (not weighted) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments. Form of integration requirement ex. not language, but social/cultural	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months 50 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard Requirement to take an integration course	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion. Requirement includes integration test/assessment
76b 77 78 79a 79b 79c 79d	Documents taken into account to be eligible for long-term residence Is time of residence as a pupil/student counted? Periods of absence allowed before granting of status CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF STATUS Form of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) Level of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments. Form of integration requirement ex. not language, but social/cultural Language/integration requirement exemptions (if no measure, leave blank) a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability	Any residence permit Yes, all Longer periods 100 No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information A1 or less set as standard No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information Both of these	Seasonal workers, au pairs and posted workers excluded Yes, with some conditions (limited number of years or type of study) Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months 50 Requirement to take a language course A2 set as standard Requirement to take an integration course One of these	Additional temporary residence permits excluded No Shorter periods C Requirement includes language test/assessment B1 or higher set as standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion. Requirement includes integration test/assessment Neither of these

79f	Cost of language/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative face. If provided	Higher costs
			by private sector, same as market price in countries	
79g	Support to pass language/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Assessment based on publicly available list of questions or study guide b. Assessment based on publicly available course	a and b	a or b	Neither a nor b
79h	Cost of support (if no measure or support, leave blank)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price in countries	Higher costs
80	Economic resources requirement	None or at/below level of social assistance and no income is excluded	Higher than social assistance but source is not linked with employment	Linked to employment/no social assistance
81	Maximum length of application procedure	≤6 months defined by Jaw	> 6 months but the maximum is defined by law	No regulation on maximum length
82	Costs of application and/or issue of status	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. same as regular administrative fees in the country	Higher costs
	SECURITY OF STATUS	100	50	0
83	Duration of validity of permit	≥5 Automotion#1	<5≥3	< 3 Oraș iida d aniaina d
04	Renewable permit	Automaticany	Upon application	requirements are still met
85	Periods of absence allowed for renewal, after granting of status (continuous or cumulative)	≥3 years	< 3 > 1	≤1
86	Ground's for rejecting, withdrawing, or refusing to renew status: a. proven fraud in the acquisition of permit b. actual and serious threat to public policy or national security, c. sentence for serious crimes, d. Original conditions are no longer satisfied (ex. unemployment or economic resources)	No other than a and/or b	Includes c or d	Includes c and d and/or additional grounds
87	Protection against expulsion. Due account taken of: a. personal behaviour b. age of resident, c. duration of residence, d. consequences for both the resident and his or her family, e. existing links to the Member State concerned f. (non-)existing links to the resident's country of origin (including problems of re-entry for political or citizenship reasons), and g. alternative measures (downgrading to limited residence permit etc.)	All elements	At least b, c, d and e	One or more of <i>b</i> , c, d or e are not taken into account
88	Expulsion precluded: a. after 20 years of residence as a long-term residence permit holder, b. in case of minors, and c. residents born in the Member State concerned or admitted before they were 10 once they have reached the age of 18	In all three cases	At least one case	None
89	Legal guarantees and redress in case of refusal, non-renewal, or withdrawal: a. reasoned decision b. right to appeal c. renesentation before an independent administrative authority and/or a court	All rights	At least a and b	One or both of a and b are not guaranteed
	5.4 RIGHTS ASSOCIATED WITH STATUS	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
90	Residence right after retirement	Maintained	Maintained with less	Not maintained
91	Access to employment (with the only exception of activities involving the exercise of public authority), self- employment and other economic activities, and working conditions	Equal access with nationals and equal working conditions	Priority to nationals' EEA citizens	Other limiting conditions apply
92	Access to social security, social assistance, health care and housing	Equal access with nationals	Priority to nationals' EEA	Other limiting conditions
93	Recognition of academic and professional qualifications	Same procedures as for	Different procedure to EEA	No recognition of titles
	ACCESS TO NATIONALITY			
	ELIGIBILITY	100	50	0
94	First generation	After ≤ 5 years of total	After > 5 < 10 years of total	After ≥ 10 years of total
	Note: "Residence" is defined as the whole period of lawful and habitual stay since entry. For instance, if the requirement is 5 years with a permanent residence, which itself can only be obtained after 5 years' residence, please select "After ≥ 10 years"	residence	residence	residence
95	Periods of absence allowed previous to acquisition of nationality	Longer periods	Up to 10 non-consecutive months and/or 6 consecutive months	Shorter periods (includes uninterrupted residence or where absence not regulated by law and left to administrative discretion)

06.	Snaucos of nationals	After < 3 years of	After > 3 < 5 years of	After > 5 years of
964	Spouses of nationals Note: "Residence" is defined as the whole period of lawful and habitual stay since entry. If there is a required period of marriage that is less than the residence/waiting period, please answer according to the most favourable option. For instance, if spouses may apply after 3 years of marriage OR 4 years of residence, please select Option 3.	Aner ⊆ 5 years of residence and/ or marriage	Arter > 5 5 5 years of residence and/or marriage	Arter > 5 years or residence and/ or marriage
96b	Residence requirement for partners/co-habitees of nationals	Same as for spouse of national	Longer than for spouses, but shorter than for ordinary TCNs	Same as for ordinary TCNs
97	Second generation Note: Second generation are horn in the country to non-national parents	Automatically at birth (may be conditional upon parents' status)	Upon simple application or declaration after birth	Naturalisation procedure (facilitated or not)
	Third generation	Automatically at hirth	l Inon simple application or	Naturalisation procedure
	Note: Third generation are born in the country to non-national parents, at least one of whom was born in the country.	(may be conditional upon parents' status)	declaration after birth	(facilitated or not)
	CONDITIONS FOR ACQUISITION	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
99a	Language requirement	No assessment OR A1	A2 set as standard	B1 or higher set as
	Note: Can be test, interview, completion of course, or other forms of assessments.	or less set as standard		standard OR no standards, based on administrative discretion.
99b	Language requirement exemptions (Blank if no assessment) a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability	Both of these	One of these	Nether of these
99c	Conductor of language requirement (if no measure, leave blank)	a and b, ex. language	a but not b, ex. language unit	Neither a nor b, ex. police,
	a. Language-learning specialists b. Independent of government (ex. not part of a government department)	institutes	in government	foreigners' service, general consultant
99d	Cost of language requirement (Blank if no assessment)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price	Higher costs
99e	Support to pass language requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Assessment based on publicly available list of questions or study guide b. Assessment based on publicly available course	a and b	a or b	Neither a nor b
99f	Cost of language support (Blank if no language assessment or support)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price	Higher costs
100 a	Citizenship/integration requirement	No Requirement OR Voluntary course/information	Requirement to take an integration course	Requirement includes integration test/assessment
	Note: Can be test, interview, or other forms of assessments.			
100 b	Citizenship/integration requirement exemptions (Blank if no assessment) a. Takes into account individual abilities ex. educational qualifications b. Exemptions for vulnerable groups ex. age, illiteracy, mental/physical disability	Both of these	One of these	Neither of these
100 c	Conductor of citizenship/integration requirement (if no measure, leave blank) a. Education specialists b. Independent of government (ex. not part of a government department)	a and b, ex. educational institutes	a but not b, ex. citizenship/ integration unit in government	Neither a nor b, ex. police, foreigners' service, general consultant
	Cost of citizenship/integration requirement (Blank if no assessment)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price	Higher costs
100 e	Support to pass citizenship/integration requirement (if no assessment, leave blank) a. Assessment based on publicly available list of questions or study guide b. Assessment based on publicly available course	a and b	a or b	Neither a nor b

100	¹ Cost of citizenship/integration requirement (Blank if no assessment)	No or nominal costs	Normal costs ex. If provided by state, same as regular administrative fees. If provided by private sector, same as market price	Higher costs
101	Economic resources requirement	None	Minimum income (ex. acknowledged level of poverty threshold)	Additional requirements (ex. employment, stable and sufficient resources, higher levels of incorne)
102	Criminal record requirement Note: Ground for rejection or application of a qualifying period (not rejection, but longer residence period)	Crimes with sentences of imprisonment for ≥ 5 years OR Use of qualifying period instead of refusal	Crimes with sentences of imprisonment for < 5 years	For other offences (ex. misdemeanours, minor offenses, pending criminal procedure)
103	Good character' clause (different from criminal record requirement)	None	A basic good character required (commonly used, i.e. also for nationals)	Higher good character requirement (i.e. than for nationals) or vague definition
104	Maximum length of application procedure	≤6 months	> 6 months but the maximum is defined by law	No regulation on maximum length
	Costs of application and/or issue of nationality title	No or nominal costs	regular administrative fees	nigner coats
		100	50	0
108	Additional grounds for refusing status: a. Proven fraud (ex. provision of false information) in the acquisition of citizenship b. Actual and serious threat to public policy or national security.	No other than a	No other than a-b	Other than a-b
107	Discretionary powers in refusal	Explicit entitlement for applicants that meet the conditions and grounds in law	Discretion only on limited elements	Discretionary procedure
108	Before refusal, due account is taken of (regulated by law): a. personal behaviour of resident b. age of resident, c. duration of residence and holding of nationality, d. consequences for both the resident and his or her family, e. existing links to the Member State concerned f. (non-)existing links to the resident's country of origin (including problems of re-entry for political or citizenship reasons), and g. alternative measures (downgrading to residence permit etc.)	All elements	At least b, c, d, e and f	One or more of <i>b</i> , c, d, e or f are not taken into account
109	Legal guarantees and redress in case of refusal: a. reasoned decision b. right to appeal c. representation before an independent administrative authority and/or a court	All guarantees	At least a and b	One or both of a and b are not guaranteed
110	Grounds for withdrawing status: a. Proven fraud (ex. provision of false information) in the acquisition of citizenship b. Actual and serious threat to public policy or national security.	No other than a	No other than a-b	Other than a-b
111	Time limits for withdrawal (including other means of ceasing nationality by authority's decision)	≤5 years after acquisition	> 5 years after acquisition	No time limits in law
112	Withdrawal (including other means of ceasing nationality by authority's decision) that would lead to statelessness	Explicitly prohibited in	Discretionary, Taken into	Not addressed in law
	DUAL NATIONALITY	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
113	Requirement to renounce / lose foreign nationality upon naturalisation for first generation	None. Dual nationality is allowed	Requirement exists, but with exceptions (when country of origin does not allow renunciation of citizenship or sets unreasonably high fees for renunciation)	Requirement exists
114	Dual nationality for second and/or third generation.	Allowed at birth	Subject to conditions such as for those born in wedlock or those with dual nationality if acquired by jus soli	Dual nationality is not allowed
A	NTI-DISCRIMINATION			
DE	FINITIONS AND CONCEPTS	100 All three arounds	50 Two grounds	Ground a none or only
	on grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality	na aree grounus	r no groanna	based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation
116	Definition of discrimination includes discrimination by association and on basis of assumed characteristics covering: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality	All three grounds	Two grounds	Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation
	Anti-discrimination law applies to natural and legal persons: a) In the private sector b) Including private sector carrying out public sector activities	a and b	aorb	None

a) Public bodies Additional Additional Additional Additional b) Public bodies Additional Additional Additional Additional b) Public bodies Additional Additional Additional Additional b) Recall products Additional Additional Additional Additional counts Additional Additional Additional Additional Additional </th <th>118</th> <th>Anti-discrimination law applies to the public sector, including:</th> <th>a and b</th> <th>a or b</th> <th>None</th>	118	Anti-discrimination law applies to the public sector, including:	a and b	a or b	None
p. Protects tories All 11 The law products All 12 Table products All 13 Restriction of season basis of transition All 13 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition All 13 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition All three grounds 14 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition All three grounds 15 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition 15 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition 16 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition 17 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition Restriction and basis of transition 17 Restriction of freedom of season basis of transition Restriction and basis of transition 17 Restriction of season basis of transition Restriction and transition 17 Restriction Restriction of season basis of transition 17 Restriction Restriction of transition 17 Restriction Restriction 17 Restriction Restriction of transition 17 Restriction Restriction <td>1</td> <td>a) Public bodies</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	1	a) Public bodies			
110 Note important is production. All mass of accord to the production of association on basis of accord theory engligend belief mathy in eigend belief masses of accord theory engligend belief masses of accord theory engligend belief masses of accord to the production of the production of association, assessed and speech is permitted when impeding equal treatment in the production of association, assessed and speech is permitted when impeding equal treatment in the production of the main equation of the production of the main equation of the production of the main equation of the main equatio		b) Police force			
a) Production theory in the second	119	The law prohibits: A) Dublic instances the visioners between an discrimination on the size of second attaining the line (section affects of the section of t	All	a, band c	Two of these or less
 c) insigning sizing setting end per sampling to commit such offences d) Real problems 2) Real		a) Public incliement to violence, natred or discrimination on basis of race/etimicity, religion/dellev/nationality b) Bacially/religiously motivated public incults, threats or defamation			
d) Racial profiling Affine grounds Affine g		c) Instigating, adding, abetting or attempting to commit such offences			
Image: constraint of freedom of association, assembly and space his permitted when impeding equal treatment in a real and when it is real and when it is a real and when it is real and w		d) Racial profiling			
120 Batchetion of freedom of association, assombly and speech is partitude when impeding equal bastiment in engaged of 9 region and shirtch 9 region and shirtch 9 nationality Aff University of the section of the section basic products of the section basic courts Not grounds Cound a, now or outped by package of the package of the package of the package of the section basic courts Not grounds Not grounds Not package of the package of the package of the package of the package of the section basic courts Not grounds Not grounds Not package of the package of the					
In special of instance In part of in	120	Restriction of freedom of association, assembly and speech is permitted when impeding equal treatment in	All three grounds	Two grounds	Ground a, none or subject
a) Face and efforcing on specific rules covering multiple discrimination? Kee, end victim bether provide in courts ground to involve in ground to involve in ground to involve in courts Nee here any specific rules covering multiple discrimination? Nee here any specific rules covering multiple discrimination law covering end/pyment and vocational braining: b) religion and belief Neg acounds Two grounds Group 4, none, or onstandon, subjects to judical attemptotion 122 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, (primary and secondary level): b) religion and belief All three grounds Two grounds Group 4, none, or constandon, subjects to judical attemptotion Group 4, none, or constandon, subjects to judical attemptotion 123 Arti-discrimination law covers social advertages: b) religion and belief No grounds Group 4, none, or constandon, subjects to judical attemptotion Group 4, none, or constandon, subjects to judical attemptotion <td> </td> <td>respect of:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>to judicial interpretation</td>		respect of:			to judicial interpretation
10 matrixed methods Percent of the main sector and provide in courts Percent of the main sector and provide in courts 121 Are there are specific rules covering multiple discrimination? Yee, and victim has the covering multiple discrimination? No 122 Are there are specific rules covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in courts 122 Are there are specific rules covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the covering multiple discrimination? All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the covering multiple discrimination? 123 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Courds and provide in the cover social advantages: a) race and ethnicity 124 Article cordination law covers acces to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health. All three grounds Two grounds Cords and provide in the covers acces to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including hea		a) race and ethnicity			
121 Are there any specific rules covering multiple discrimination? Yee, and yotim has no increase in the raising ground to increase in the raising gr		c) nationality			
Note that we predict not set of any nonperiod continuation Interface of the main ground to include an include and provide the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any ground to include any set of the courts where any set of the courts w	121	Are there any specific rules covering multiple discrimination?	Ves and victim has the	Ves but the victim has no	No
ground to invoke n mode in courts mode in courts <thmode courts<="" in="" th=""> <thmode< td=""><td> '²'</td><td></td><td>choice of the main</td><td>choice on the main ground to</td><td>140</td></thmode<></thmode>	' ² '		choice of the main	choice on the main ground to	140
Interference (pounds)			ground to invoke in	invoke in courts	
FIEL DS OF APPLICATION 100 50 0 0 00 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>courts</td><td></td><td></td></t<>			courts		
122 And Sorinhalton Law covers endogment and vocational training: All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only cardinates (in advantage) 123 And Sorinhalton Law covers education (primary and secondary level): All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only cardinates (in advantage) 123 And Sorinhalton Law covers education (primary and secondary level): All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject by judical interpretation 124 And Sorinhalton Law covers education (primary and secondary level): All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject by judical interpretation 124 And Sorinhalton Law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject by judical interpretation 125 And Sorinhalton Law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject by judical interpretation 125 And Sorinhalton Law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject by judical interpretation 126 And Sorinhalty Ground 9, note, or only tasked or constitution, subject	FI	ELDS OF APPLICATION	100	50	0
a) a case and ethnicity In the grounds The grounds Exercise of ethnicity 123 Anti-discrimination law covers education (primary and secondary level): All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, autigent to judicial interpretation 123 Anti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, autigent to judicial interpretation 124 Anti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, autigent to judicial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advistages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, autigent to judicial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advistages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, autigent to judicial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Cround a, none, or only based or international standards or co	122	Anti-discrimination law covers employment and vocational training:	All three arounds	Two arounds	Ground a none or only
b) religion and belief standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 123 Arti-discrimination law covers education (primary and secondary level); b) religion and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international wardards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 124 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: b) religion and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international structure standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 124 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: b) religion and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international structure standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 125 Arti-discrimination law covers social advantages: o) relationality a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international structure standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 125 Arti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: o) in diplican and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international structure s	'	a) race and ethnicity	, in three grounds	, no groundo	based on international
 Altionality Altionactivy subject to judicial subject to judicial		b) religion and belief			standards or constitution,
Integretation Integretation Integretation 3) Arti-discrimination law covers education (primary and secondary level): a) race and ethnicity p) religion and belief c) nationality All three grounds New grounds Ground a, none, or only based or international senderation covers. 124 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds New grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international senderation covers. 125 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds New grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international senderation covers. 125 Arti-discrimination law covers social advantages: () nationality a) race and ethnicity () nationality All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international senderation covers. 126 Arti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: () rationality All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international senderation 27 Arti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: () rational to belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only baseed on international senderatior <tr< td=""><td></td><td>c) nationality</td><td></td><td></td><td>subject to judicial</td></tr<>		c) nationality			subject to judicial
123 Arti-fiscrimination law covers education (primary and secondary level): All three grounds Worgrounds Ground a, none, or only based on iteranational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation (primary and belief c) altonatity 2) race and ethnicity C) rationatity All three grounds Worgrounds Ground a, none, or only based on iteranational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 2) race and ethnicity Priedigo and belief All three grounds Worgrounds Ground a, none, or only based on iteranational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Worgrounds Ground a, none, or only based on iteranational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity Now grounds Ground a, none, or only based on iternational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Worgrounds Ground a, none, or only based on iternational standards or constitution, subject to juticial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grou					interpretation
1:1: etc and etimetry b) religion and belief standards crossitions, subject to judicial interpretation 1:24 Arti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1:25 Arti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1:25 Arti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1:25 Arti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including human and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1:26 Arti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including human and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based and ethnicity 1:27 Arti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, rome, or only based and ethnicity 21 race and ethnicity i) racin and thrend function Two gr	123	Anti-discrimination law covers education (primary and secondary level):	All three grounds	Two grounds	Ground a, none, or only
a) Hajbur and belief a) Acce and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretational standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including holding interpretation All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based or international standards or constitution, subject to judicial int		a) race and ethnicity			based on international
 		c) nationality			standards or constitution,
124 Anti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, tone, or only based on international distinguishes and belief 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, tone, or only based on international distinguishes and belief 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and international distinguishes and on international distinguishes and belief 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international distinguishes 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international distinguishes 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international distrepretation <td></td> <td>c) nauonaity</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>interpretation</td>		c) nauonaity			interpretation
a) race and ethnicity based on itemational services without the public on itemational services are and ethnicity b) religion and belief b) religion and belief c) nationality all three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on itemational services available to the public, including housing 125 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on itemational standards or constlution, subject to judicial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: a race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on itemational standards or constlution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: housing: a race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on itemational standards or constlution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: housing: a rate and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on itemational standards or constlution, subject to judicial interpretation 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) udicial	124	Anti-discrimination law covers social protection, including social security:	All three arounds	Two arounds	Ground a none or only
b) religion and belief () nationalty sendands or constlution, interpretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: () nationalty a) race and ethnicity () nationalty Two grounds Ground a, none, or only standards or constlution, standards or constlution,	·-·	a) race and ethnicity	, in three grounds	, no gioanao	based on international
c) nationality subject to judicial integretation 125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only lased on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial integretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial integretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial integretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial integretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial integretation 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: All three Two of these Only one of these O		b) religion and belief			standards or constitution,
Image: second		c) nationality			subject to judicial
125 Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 128 Access for victims, inrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) acces of victims, inrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) acces for victims, inrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) acces for victims includes: b) criminal procedures o) administrative procedures b) criminal procedures o) administrative procedures and thincity All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures o) administrative					interpretation
b) religion and belief c) nationality b) religion and belief c) nationality c) nathermational national national natinalin nat	125	Anti-discrimination law covers social advantages: a) race and ethnicity	All three grounds	Two grounds	Ground a, none, or only
C) Instituting Set Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including holding international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on the matching is a race and ethnicity is on additional belief Set on additi		b) religion and belief			based on international
126 Att-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on interpretation 127 Ant-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on interpretation 127 Ant-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on intermetional standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 128 Access for victims, insepective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) race and ethnicity a) race and ethnicity interpretation 128 Access for victims, insepective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) docidant and b a or b Only one of these 129 Alternative aligoute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b a or b none 129 Access for victims, insepective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) adcision a or b none 129 Atternative aligoute resolution procedures a) race and ethnicity a and b a or b none 129 Atternative dispute resolution cover		c) nationality			subject to judicial
126 Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including housing: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 128 Access for victims, inseptort mechanisms 0					interpretation
housing: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1277 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1277 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1277 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constitution, subject to judicial interpretation 1287 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) publicial civil procedures Only one of these 1293 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b e or b none 1293 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b e or b none 1293 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a	126	Anti-discrimination law covers access to and supply of goods and services available to the public, including	All three arounds	Two arounds	Ground a none or only
a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality subject to judicial 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international diadnards or constitution, subject to judicial 128 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international diadnards or constitution, subject to judicial 129 Internative dispute resolution and belief o) nationality Image: Second S		housing:	,		based on international
b) religion and belief subject to judicial c) nationality 127 127 Ant-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international standards or constructions, subject to judicial standards or constructions, subject to judicial interpretation ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS Image: standards or constructions, interpretation Image: standards or constructions, subject to judicial interpretation 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) dicial civil procedures Only one of these a) idicial civil procedures b) criminal procedures and b a or b Image: standards 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b a or b Image: standards 129 Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies a) area and ethnicity a or b Image: standards Ground a 130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$ of months \$ 1 yeer <t< td=""><td></td><td>a) race and ethnicity</td><td></td><td></td><td>standards or constitution,</td></t<>		a) race and ethnicity			standards or constitution,
c) nationality interpretation 127 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: a) race and ethnicity All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only baradards or constitution, subject to judicial 0) religion and belief c) nationality Image: complete the public, including health: b) religion and belief All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only baradards or constitution, subject to judicial ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS Image: complete the public, including health: a) alccess for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures c) administrative procedures b) criminal procedures c) administrative procedures b) criminal procedures c) administrative procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible Note: Atternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial civil and administrative procedures a) h appeal of rulings possible Note: Atternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year > 1 year		b) religion and belief			subject to judicial
12/2 Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international stratemational stratemational stratemational stratemations. a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Image: stratemation law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health: All three grounds Two grounds Ground a, none, or only based on international stratemation, subject to judicial interpretation ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS 100 0 0 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: All three Two of these Only one of these a) judicial civil procedures b) criminal procedures a and b a or b none 129 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) race and ethnicity a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year > 1 year					interpretation
a labeling and belief b) religion and belief b) religion and belief subject to judicial c) nationality interpretation subject to judicial interpretation ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS M M M M 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures () administrative procedures () administrative procedures () administrative procedures () administrative procedures () administrative procedures () administrative dispute resolution procedures () administrative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: () nationality a) race and ethnicity () nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤6 months ≤1 year >1 year	127	Anti-discrimination law covers access to supply of goods and services available to the public, including health:	All three grounds	Two grounds	Ground a, none, or only
b) religion and belief c) nationality subject to judicial interpretation ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS interpretation 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures c) administrative procedures All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible b) arose a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: b) criminal procedures a) a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year > 1 year		a) race and ethnicity			pased on international stored and a score strution
ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS Interpretation ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS 0 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures c) administrative procedures All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible b) criminal procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$ 6 months \$ 1 year > 1 year	1	c) nationality			subject to judicial
ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS 100 50 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures () administrative procedures All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: () atternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief () nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Avcreage length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year > 1 year		' '			interpretation
100 50 128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures () administrative procedures () administrative procedures All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible b a or b none 120 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: () nationality a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief () nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year > 1 year	F٨	FORCEMENT MECHANISMS			
128 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: All three Two of these Only one of these 129 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: a) judicial civil procedures Driv one of these Only one of these 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b a or b none 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible a or b none Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies All grounds Two grounds Ground a 130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year			100	50	0
126 Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to: All three Two of these Only one of these 128 Alternative dispute resolution procedures b) criminal procedures a and b a or b none 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible a or b none Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies All grounds Two grounds Ground a 130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤6 months ≤1 year >1 year			100		
a) junctal cwn procedures b) chminal procedures b) chminal procedures (c) administrative procedures b) chminal procedures a and b a or b 129 Alternative dispute resolution procedures a and b a or b none a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial a and b a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year >1 year	1 ¹²⁸	Access for victims, irrespective of grounds of discrimination, to:	All three	/wo of these	Only one of these
129 Atternative dispute resolution procedures a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible a or b none Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies a or b none 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year	1	ra) juurciai omii procedures b) criminal procedures			
a) decisions are binding b) appeal of rulings possible Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies All grounds All grounds For our of all bodies 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality All grounds Two grounds Ground a system or quasi-judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year	170	alternative dispute resolution procedures	a and h	aorh	none
b) appeal of rulings possible Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies Image: Comparison of the system or quasi-judicial bodies 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year	' ²⁹	a) decisions are hinding	a anu o		none
Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies Image: Constraint of the system of quasi-judicial bodies 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year	1	b) appeal of rulings possible			
Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial system or quasi-judicial bodies Image: Comparison of the include system or quasi-judicial bodies 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year >1 year	1				
system or quasi-judicial bodies All grounds 130 Access for victims includes: b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: \$6 months \$1 year		Note: Alternative dispute resolution covers procedures like mediation. It does not include the normal judicial			
130 Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a b) religion and belief c) nationality a) race and ethnicity All grounds Two grounds Ground a 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤ 1 year > 1 year		system or quasi-judicial bodies			
b) religion and belief c) nationality 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤ 6 months ≤1 year >1 year	130	Access for victims includes: a) race and ethnicity	All grounds	Two grounds	Ground a
10) Inductionality 131 Average length of both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed: ≤6 months ≤1 year >1 year	1	b) religion and belief			
Lot preverage length of outrijudicial chill and administrative procedures does not exceed: 50 months 51 year >1 year	104	c) nationality Assessed lawsth of holds indicial aird and administrative proceedings of a second second.	d R manth a	4.4	
	131	p-werage lengtri ul both judicial civil and administrative procedures does not exceed:	≤0 months	≤1 year	> 1 year
b) shift in burden or proof in judicial cwill procedures Jana b Jony a none	¹³²	a) shirt in burden of proof in judicial cwill procedures b) shift in burden of proof in administrative procedures	a ana p	ony a	none

133	3 Does national legislation allow courts to accept the following evidence:	a and b	a or b	Nether of these
····	a) situation testing			Ziehen Sie den Cur
1	b) statistical data			aufzuzeichnenden
134	Protection against victimisation in:	In all areas	a and b	a or none
	a) employment			
	b) vocational training			
1	c) education			
1	d) services			
1	e) goods			
13	a) state provides financial assistance or free court-appointed lawyer to pursue complaint before courts where	a and b	a or b	None
	victims do not have the necessary means			
1	b) where necessary an interpreter is provided free of charge			
138	5 Legal entities with a legitimate interest in defending the principle of equality:	All possibilities	Only a or b	Only b
1	a) may engage in proceedings on behalf of victims	'		
	b) may engage in proceedings in support of victims			
	c) can bring cases even if no specific victim is referred to (in which case the consent of a victim is not required)			
1				
137	Z Legal actions include:	All three	Only two of these	One or none
	a) Individual action		-	
1	b) class action (court claim where one or more named claimants pursue a case for themselves and the defined			
1	class against one or more defendants)			
1	c) Actio popularis (Action to obtain remedy by a person or a group in the name of the collective interest)			
138	B Sanctions include:	At least 5	At least c, e and h	At least 2
1	a) financial compensation to victims for material damages			
1	b) financial compensation to victims for moral damages/ damages for injuries to feelings			
1	c) restitution of rights lost due to discrimination/ damages in lieu			
1	d) imposing positive measures on discrimination			
1	e) imposing negative measures to scop one name			
1	i) imposing negative measures to prevent repeat one tong a) specific specificans authorizing numberston of the affance (in a non-indicial nublication, i.e. not in documents.			
1	g) specific satisfies autorising publication of the orience (in a non-judicial publication, i.e. not in documents in non-judicial publication, i.e. not in documents			
1	h) specific sanctions for legal persons			
	·······			
139	9 Discriminatory motivation on the grounds of race/religion/nationality treated as aggravating circumstance	Yes for 3 grounds	Only race or religion	Race only or subject to
				Luxucia(Internretation
-				Judicial Interpretation
EG	UALITY POLICIES	100	50	Juniora microprotation
EG	UALITY POLICIES	100	50	0
EG	DALITY POLICIES	100 All three grounds	50 Two grounds	Ground a
EG	D Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) arbitries and held	100 All three grounds	50 Two grounds	Ground a
EG	D Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) antienetity	100 All three grounds	50 Two grounds	Ground a
EG	D Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality	100 All three grounds	50 Two grounds	0 Ground a
EG	OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of b) independent back to be	100 All three grounds All	50 Two grounds Only one	0 Ground a none
EG	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case	100 All three grounds All	50 Two grounds Only one	Ground a
EG	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case D) the specialised Agency has the power store assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case	100 All three grounds All	50 Two grounds Only one	0 Ground a none
EG	O Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality 1 Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 21 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its designer are biding.	100 All three grounds All All	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these
EG	VALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) to decisions are binding b) an enneal of these decisions is possible	100 All three grounds All All	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these	0 Ground a none Neither of these
EG	OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialized accency the head the point is possible	100 All three grounds All All	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these
EG 14(14)	OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 21 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) iudicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant	100 All three grounds All All a and b	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a	0 Ground a none Nether of these b or none
EG	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant	All three grounds	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a	0 Ground a none Neither of these b or none
EG	O Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality 1 Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant	100 All three grounds All All a and b	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a	0 Ground a none Neither of these b or none
EG 140 141 142	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) ta decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant d) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant d) behalf of the specialized agency has the power to:	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none none
EG 14(14) 14) 14) 14)	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant 4 Specialised agency has the power to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) head even in the power to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) head even in the power to: a) instigate proceedings in the power to: b) head even in thead even in	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none none
EG 140 141 142 143	O Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality 1 Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant 4 Specialised agency has the power to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b	0 Ground a Nether of these b or none None
EG 140 141 142 143	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised Agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant d) Specialised agency has the power to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings Specialised agency): a) independent the State taself (rather than the specialised agency): a) discomparison.	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these b or none none None
EG 140 141 142 143	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality 1 Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency casts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings Law provides that the State itself (rather than the specialised agency): a) discerninates information b) and proceedings and proceedings for a complaination b) advices expecial discusses of discrimination	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None
EG 140 141 143 143	OALITY POLICIES OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings 5 Law provides that the State itself (rather than the specialised agency): a) disseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) ensuries for structured dialogue with civil acceptor	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144	OALITY POLICIES OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2[If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on defait of the complainant	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None None
EG 140 141 143 144 144	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) administrative proceedings in own name b) administrative proceedings in own name b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the specialised agency): a) discertified to a super to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the specialised agency): a) discerimates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society 6 On the national level there are: a) admentioning the upper and the upper administerime rame legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and b) administerime from current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and	100 All three grounds All All All a and b a and b All three Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a Nether of these b or none None None
Image: second	OALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case (f) the specialised Agency has the powers to assist/judicial body: a) independent investigation of the facts of the case (f) the specialised Agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) an appeal of these decisions is possible (f) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative and the state tself (rather than the specialised agency): a) instigate proceedings in own name b) advise social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides that the State tself (rather than the specialised agency): a) disseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structure dialogue with civil society COn the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. immact assessments, reporting, research)	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None None Neither of these.
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144 144	OALITY POLICIES OVALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings SLaw provides that the State itself (rather than the specialised agency): a) disseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society G On the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a At least one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None None
EC 140 141 142 144 144 144	DALITY POLICIES DSpecialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2If the specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) is decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on discremination b) administrative proceedings on the three from the specialised agency): a) instigate proceedings in own name b) administrative proceedings of discrimination c) provides for structured dialo	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these b or none None Nether of these.
EG 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	DALITY POLICIES D Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2 If the specialised Agency has the power sto assist victims by way of a) is decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) adseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society C On the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds 7 Law provides for: a) onliciation for cultic bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions	100 All three grounds All All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these b or none None None Nether of these.
EG 14 14 14 14 14 14 14	DALITY POLICIES Dispecialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Ispecialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case Dispecialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent investigation of the facts of the case Dispecialised Agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) and ministrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) advinistrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) advinistrative proceedings on unme b) lead own investigation and enforce findings Law provides that the State tself (rather than the specialised agency): a) disseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society Con the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds Taw provides for: a) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions b) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions b) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these Only one of these	Image: Construction 0 Ground a none Neither of these b or none None Neither of these. Neither of these.
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144	DALITY POLICIES Discrete Section 2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.2.	100 All three grounds All All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a Neither of these b or none None Neither of these.
EG	VALITY POLICIES VALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible Specialised agency has the power to: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings ELaw provides that the State fiself (rather than the specialised agency): a) disseminates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society COn the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds I have for: a) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions b) obligation for public bodies to ensure that parties to whom they award contracts, loans, grants or other benefits respect non-discrimination b) all aw provides for:	100 All three grounds All All All a and b a and b Both of these Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these Only one of these Only one of these	0 Ground a none Nether of these None Nether of these. Nether of these. Nether of these.
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144	DALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 2[If the specialised Agency acts as a quasi-judicial body: a) its decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3[Specialised agency has the power to: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings 5 Law provides that the State itself (rather than the specialised agency): a) discidulates information b) ensures social dialogue around issues of discrimination c) provides for structured dialogue with civil society 6 On the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds 7 Law provides for: a) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions b) obligation for public bodi	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b Both of these Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these	Image: Contract of the set Image: Contract of the set Neither of these Image: Contract of the set None Neither of these Neither of these Neither of these
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144 144	DALITY POLICIES Specialised Equality Agency has been established with a mandate to combat discrimination on the grounds of: a) race and ethnicity b) religion and belief c) nationality 1 Specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent legal advice to victims on their case b) independent investigation of the facts of the case 1 fits specialised Agency has the powers to assist victims by way of a) independent investigation of the facts of the case 1 fits decisions are binding b) an appeal of these decisions is possible 3 Specialised agency has the legal standing to engage in: a) judicial proceedings on behalf of a complainant b) and proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) and proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) administrative proceedings on behalf of the complainant b) addown investigation and enforce findings Secialised agency has the power to: a) instigate proceedings in own name b) lead own investigation and enforce findings Secialised agency has the totic society Con the national level there are: a) Mechanism for current and future mainstream legislation to ensure compliance with anti-discrimination and equality law (e.g. impact assessments, reporting, research) b) Unit in government/ministries directly working on anti-discrimination/equality on these grounds Taw provides for: a) obligation for public bodies to promote equality in carrying out their functions b) obligation for public bodies to ensure that parties to whom they award contracts, loans, grants or other benefits respect non- discrimination b) assessment of these measures	100 All three grounds All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a these Conly one of these Only a	Image: Contract of the set Image: Contract of the set None None Neither of these. Neither of these. None of these
EG 140 141 142 143 144 144	DALITY POLICIES Display Series of Section 11 Display Section 11	100 All three grounds All All All a and b a and b All three Both of these Both of these Both of these	50 Two grounds Only one Only one of these a b At least one of these Only one of these Only one of these Only one of these Only one of these	Image: Contract of the set None Neither of the set Neither of the set

Appendix 2:

Sources of MIPEX equality standards³

Sources of MIPEX equality standards: Europe

 Tampere European Council Presidency Conclusion, 15 and 16 October 1999

Immigration Law Practitioners' Association and the Migration Policy Group, The Amsterdam Proposals: Proposed Directive on Admission of migrants, 2000

EC Directive on the right to family reunification, 2003/86 of 22 September 2003

Immigration Law Practitioners' Association and the Migration Policy Group, The Amsterdam Proposals: Proposed Directive on family reunion, 2000

EC Directive on the right to family reunification, 2003/86 of 22 September 2003

Immigration Law Practitioners' Association and the Migration Policy Group, The Amsterdam Proposals: Proposed Directive on family reunion, 2000

EC Directive on the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents, 2003/109 of 25 November 2003

EC Directive on the right of citizens and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States, 2004/38 of 29 April 2004

Immigration Law Practitioners' Association and the Migration Policy Group, The Amsterdam Proposals: Proposed Directive on long-term residents, 2000

EC Council Conclusions of 26 November 2009 on the education of children with a migrant background 2009/C 301/07

>Council Directive< 77/486/EEC of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers

Council of Europe, Convention on the participation of foreigners in public life at local level, 1992

Gsir, Sonia and Martiniello, Marco, Local Consultative Bodies for foreign residents – a handbook (Council of Europe; Strasbourg 2004)

Council of Europe, European Convention on Nationality, 1997

Bauboeck, R. et al. (eds.) "Evaluation and Recommendations" in "The Acquisition and Loss of Nationality in 15 EU Member States" (Amsterdam University Press; Amsterdam, 2006)

Starting Line Group, Proposals for legislative measures to combat racism and to promote equal rights in the European Union, 1998

Directive implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, 2000/43 of 29 June 2000

Directive establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, 2000/78 or 27 November 2000

Sources of MIPEX equality standards: International

UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)

UN International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (IESCR)

UN International Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)

UN International Convention on the Protection of All Migrant Workers and the Members of Their Families

³ MIPEX Methodology. (n.d.). Retrieved May 28, 2014, from http://www.mipex.eu/methodology.

International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD)

UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education

ILO Convention No. 97 of 1949 on Migration for Employment

ILO Convention No. 143 of 1979 on Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions)

ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration: Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration

Appendix 3:

Variance in the different policy fields

Descriptive Statistics								
	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance		
MIPEX policy field Labour Market Mobility Score	24	79	21	100	20,867	435,449		
Valid N (listwise)	24							

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Family Reunification	24	52	39	91	13,629	185,761
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Education	24	65	12	77	18,365	337,275
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Political	24	70	0	07	24.249	E96 E20
Participation	24	79	8	87	24,218	586,520
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Long- term Residence	24	42	37	79	10,168	103,384
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Anti- discrimination	24	63	25	88	18,118	328,259
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation	Variance
MIPEX policy field Access to Nationality	24	67	15	82	20,834	434,042
Valid N (listwise)	24					

Appendix 4:

Classification of political parties as right-wing parties

The data on the share of right-wing parties in parliament is based on the comparative political database⁴. The parties were identified as right-wing parties on the basis of the group of ultraright parties in the classification by Lane, McKay, and Newton⁵ and the group of right-populist parties as defined by Cas Mudde⁶. The classification of Central and Eastern European countries' political parties was moreover based on Janusz Bugajski's⁷ classification and additional national sources. The following lists all parties categorized as right-wing in the different EU member states.

Austria

- Freedom Party (Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs, FPÖ)
- Alliance for the Future of Austria (Bündnis Zukunft Österreich, BZÖ)

Belgium

- Flemish Interest (Vlaams Belang) (former: Flemish Block (Flaams Blok))
- National Front (Front National, FN-NF) (Francophone)

Bulgaria

- George Day-International Macedonian Revolutionary Organization (VMRO-Gergiovden)
- Party Ataka (Nacionalno Obedinenie Ataka) [comprised of National Movement for the Salvation of the Fatherland (Nacionalno Dviženie za Spasenie na Otecestvoto), Bulgarian National Patriotic Party (Balgarska Nacionalna-Patrioticna Partija), Union of Patriotic Forces and Militaries of the Reserve Defense (Sajuz na Patriotic-nite Sili i Voinite ot Zapaca Zacšita)]

Cyprus

- /

Czech Republic

⁴ Armingeon, K., Careja, R., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D., Engler, S., Potolidis, P., Gerber, M. (2013).

Comparative Political Data Set III 1990-2011. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Bern.

⁵ Lane, J. E., McKay, D. H., & Newton, K. (1997). Political Data Handbook. OECD Countries. Oxford University Press.

⁶ Mudde, C. (2007). Populist radical right parties in Europe (pp. 197-232). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁷ Bugajski, J. (2002). Political parties of Eastern Europe: A guide to politics in the post-communist era. M.E. Sharpe.
- Rally for the Republic Republican Party of Czechoslovakia (Sdruzení Pro Republiku – Republikánská Strana Československa, SPR-RSC)
- Sovereignty/Jana Bobošíková Bloc (Suverenita/blok Jany Bobošíková, SUV)

Estonia

- Estonian Citizens (Eesti Kodanik)
- Estonian National Independence Party (Eesti Rahvusliku Sõltumatuse Partei,
- ERSP)
- Estonian Future Party (Tulevikupartei, TP)
- Better Estonia + Estonian Citizens (Parem Eesti ja Eesti Kodanik, PE & EK)

Finland

- True Finns (Perussuomalaiset, PS) (until 1994: Finnish Rural Party)

France

- National Front (Front National, FN)

Germany

- Republicans (Die Republikaner)

Greece

- Popular Orthodox Rally (LAOS)

Hungary

- Hungarian Justice and Life Party (Magyar Igazsag es Élet Partya, MIÉP)
- For the Right Hungary (Jobbik)

Italy

- National Alliance (Alleanza Nationale, AN) (formerly Social Movement (MSI-DN))
- Nothern League (Lega Nord) (formerly Lombard League (Lega Lombarda))

Latvia

- For Homeland (Fatherland) and Freedom TB
- Latvian National Independence Movement (Latvijas Nacionālas Neatkarības
- Kustība, LNNK)
- People's (National) Movement for Latvia Siegerist Party (Tautas Kustība Latvi-jai Zīgerista Partija, TKL-ZP)
- Alliance for Homeland and Freedom / Latvian National Independence Movement (TB/LNNK)
- Everything for Latvia/For Fatherland and Freedom/LNNK (Visu Latvi-jai/TB/LNNK) (competed in 2011 under the name National Union [Nacionālā apvienība "Visu Latvijai!" – "Tēvzemei un Brīvībai/LNNK], NA)

Lithuania

- Lithuanian National Party 'Young Lithuania' (Lietuviu Nacionaline Partija 'Jaunoji Lietuva', LNP-JL)

Luxembourg

- Luxembourg for the Luxembourgers (Letzebuerg fir de Letzebuerger National Bewegong)

Malta

- /

Netherlands

- Centre Democrats (CD)
- List Pim Fortuyn (LPF)
- Freedom Party/Group Wilders (Partij voor de Vrijheid, PVV)

Poland

- Confederation for Independent Poland (Konfederacja Polski Niepodległej, KPN)
- Party X
- Movement for Rebuilding Poland (Ruch Odbudowy Polski, ROP)

Portugal

- /

Romania

- Greater Romania Party (Partidul România Mare)
- Party of National Unity of Romanians (Partidul Unității Naționale Române)

Slovakia

- Slovak National Party (Slovenská národná strana, SNS)
- Movement for a Democratic Slovakia (Hnutie za demokratické Slovensko, HZDS, since 2006: L'S-HZDS) (in 1994 HZDS was in an electoral alliance with the Peasants Party of Slovakia)
- The Real Slovak National Party (Pravá Slovenská národná strana, PSNS)
- Movement for Democracy (Hnutie za demokraciu, HZD)

Slovenia

- Slovenian National Party (Slovenska Nacionalna Stranka, SNS)

Spain

- /

Sweden

- New Democracy (Ny Demokrati, NYD)
- Sweden Democrats (Sverigedemokraterna, SD)

Appendix 5:

The Ranking and scores of the twenty-four countries under study, overall, and in the seven different policy fields in 2007 and 2010, excluding education⁸

<u>Overall Ranking and Score</u> <u>without education</u>		<u>Labour Market Mobility</u>		Family Reunion				
	2010	2007		2010	2007		2010	2007
Sweden	84	85	Sweden	100	100	Portugal	91	89
Portugal	81	76	Portugal	94	80	Spain	85	76
Finland	70	70	Netherlands	85	85	Sweden	84	89
Netherlands	71	71	Spain	84	79	Slovenia	75	75
Belgium	68	64	Germany	77	77	Italy	74	78
Spain	65	62	Finland	71	71	Finland	70	70
Italy	64	65	Italy	69	69	Belgium	68	70
Luxembourg	60	52	Romania	68	/	Luxembourg	67	53
Germany	60	59	Estonia	65	65	Poland	67	67
France	54	54	Austria	56	44	Czech Republic	66	66
Slovenia	53	53	Czech Republic	55	55	Estonia	65	65
Greece	50	40	Belgium	53	53	Romania	65	/
Hungary	50	47	Greece	50	45	Hungary	61	56
Romania	49	1	France	49	49	Germany	60	62
Czech	46	42	Luxembourg	48	45	Lithuania	59	59
Republic								
Estonia	45	43	Poland	48	45	Netherlands	58	59
Bulgaria	45	/	Lithuania	46	46	Slovakia	53	53
Lithuania	44	43	Slovenia	44	44	France	52	53
Poland	44	43	Malta	43	48	Bulgaria	51	/
Austria	42	39	Hungary	41	36	Greece	49	47
Malta	40	40	Bulgaria	40	/	Malta	48	50
Slovakia	38	38	Latvia	36	27	Latvia	46	46
Cyprus	36	36	Cyprus	21	21	Austria	41	43
Latvia	33	30	Slovakia	21	21	Cyprus	39	39

⁸ Huddleston, T., Niessen, J., Chaoimh, E.N., White, E. (2011). Migrant Integration Policy Index III. Brussels: British Council and Migration Policy Group.

Political Participation		Long-term Residence		Anti-discrimination				
	2010	2007		2010	2007		2010	2007
Finland	87	87	Belgium	79	64	Sweden	88	88
Netherlands	79	79	Spain	78	72	Portugal	84	84
Luxembourg	78	76	Sweden	78	78	Bulgaria	80	/
Sweden	75	75	Portugal	69	55	Belgium	79	70
Portugal	70	69	Slovenia	69	69	Finland	78	77
Germany	64	64	Netherlands	68	68	France	77	74
Belgium	59	61	Estonia	67	68	Hungary	75	75
Spain	56	56	Italy	66	69	Romania	73	1
Italy	50	50	Czech Republic	65	65	Netherlands	68	68
France	44	44	Poland	65	65	Slovenia	66	66
Greece	40	25	Malta	64	64	Italy	62	62
Austria	33	33	Hungary	60	54	Cyprus	59	59
Hungary	33	33	Latvia	59	51	Slovakia	59	47
Estonia	28	28	Austria	58	54	Lithuania	55	50
Slovenia	28	28	Finland	58	58	Greece	50	50
Cyprus	25	25	Bulgaria	57	/	Spain	49	49
Lithuania	25	25	Lithuania	57	57	Germany	48	48
Malta	25	25	Greece	56	56	Luxembourg	48	47
Slovakia	21	21	Luxembourg	56	57	Czech Republic	44	20
Latvia	18	18	Romania	54	/	Austria	40	40
Bulgaria	17	/	Germany	50	50	Malta	36	27
Czech	13	13	Slovakia	50	50	Poland	36	35
Republic								
Poland	13	13	France	46	46	Estonia	32	18
Romania	8	/	Cyprus	37	41	Latvia	25	25

Access to Nationality			MIPEX overall		
			score (including		
			education)		
	2010	2007		2010	
Portugal	82	82	Sweden	83	
Sweden	79	79	Portugal	79	
Belgium	69	69	Finland	69	
Luxembourg	66	34	Netherlands	68	
Netherlands	66	65	Belgium	67	
Italy	63	65	Spain	63	
France	59	59	Italy	60	
Germany	59	52	Luxembourg	59	
Finland	57	54	Germany	57	
Greece	57	18	France	51	
Spain	39	39	Greece	49	
Poland	35	35	Slovenia	48	
Czech	33	33	Czech	46	
Republic			Republic		
Slovenia	33	33	Estonia	46	
Cyprus	32	32	Hungary	45	
Hungary	31	28	Romania	45	
Romania	29	/	Austria	42	
Slovakia	27	39	Poland	42	
Malta	26	26	Bulgaria	41	
Bulgaria	24	/	Lithuania	40	
Austria	22	22	Malta	37	
Lithuania	20	20	Slovakia	36	
Estonia	16	15	Cyprus	35	
Latvia	15	16	Latvia	31	

Appendix 6:

Correlation of the dependent variable with each of the independent variables under study

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score excluding education	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country
MIPEX score excluding education	Pearson Correlation Sig. (1-tailed) N	1 46	,805 ,805 ,000
Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country	Pearson Correlation Sig. (1-tailed) N	,805 ^{**} ,000 46	48
2006 and 2008	Ν	46	48

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score	Percentage of
		excluding	respondents
		education	who see
			immigration as
			one of the two
			most important
			issues 2004-
			2007 and 2006-
	-		2010 average
	Pearson Correlation	1	,173
MIPEX score excluding	Sig. (1-tailed)		,126
education	Ν	46	46
Percentage of respondents	Pearson Correlation	,173	1
who see immigration as one	Sig. (1-tailed)	,126	
of the two most important			
issues 2004-2007 and 2006-	Ν	46	46
2010 average			

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score excluding education	Unemployment rate 2003-2007 and 2006-2010
			average
	Pearson Correlation	1	-,146
MIPEX score excluding	Sig. (1-tailed)		,167
education	Ν	46	46
Unemployment rate 2003-	Pearson Correlation	-,146	1
2007 and 2006-2010	Sig. (1-tailed)	,167	
average	Ν	46	46

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score	GDP per capita
		excluding	in PPS average
		education	for 2003-2007
			and 2006-2010
	Pearson Correlation	1	,386**
MIPEX score excluding	Sig. (1-tailed)	u	,004
cuddaion	Ν	46	46
GDP per capita in PPS	Pearson Correlation	,386**	1
average for 2003-2007 and	Sig. (1-tailed)	,004	
2006-2010	Ν	46	48

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score excluding education	percentage of right-wing party seats in parliament average for 2003-2007 and
	_		2006-2010
MIREX score evoluting	Pearson Correlation	1	-,169
	Sig. (1-tailed)		,131
education	Ν	46	46
percentage of right-wing	Pearson Correlation	-,169	1
party seats in parliament	Sig. (1-tailed)	,131	

_		_	
average for 2003-2007 and	N	46	46
2006-2010		10	10

Correlations				
		MIPEX score	Social	
		excluding	Expenditure in	
		education	% of GDP	
			2003-2007 and	
			2006-2010	
			average	
	Pearson Correlation	1	,675 ^{**}	
MIPEX score excluding	Sig. (1-tailed)		,000	
education	Ν	46	46	
Social Expenditure in % of	Pearson Correlation	,675 ^{**}	1	
GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-	Sig. (1-tailed)	,000		
2010 average	Ν	46	46	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

	Correlations		
		MIPEX score excluding	Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-2010
		education	average
MIDEX agore evoluting	Pearson Correlation	1	,307 [*]
MIPEX Score excluding	Sig. (1-tailed)		,019
education	Ν	46	46
Dakk 0000 0007 and 0000	Pearson Correlation	,307 [*]	1
Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-	Sig. (1-tailed)	,019	
2010 average	Ν	46	46

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Appendix 7:

Model 1 – Debt, social expenditure, GDP per capita in PPS, and public opinion

Model	Variables	Variables	Method
	Entered	Removed	
	Debt 2003-2007		
	and 2006-2010		
	average,		
	Percentage of		
	respondents		
	who agree that		
	immigrants		
	contribute to		
	their country		
4	2006 and 2008,		Entor
1	GDP per capita		Enter
	in PPS average		
	for 2003-2007		
	and 2006-2010,		
	Social		
	Expenditure in		
	% of GDP		
	2003-2007 and		
	2006-2010		
	average ^b		

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding

education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model	Summarv ^b
woaei	Summarv

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the	
			Square	Estimate	
1	,996 ^a	,992	,989	1,320	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average, Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008, GDP per capita in PPS average for 2003-2007 and 2006-2010, Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

ANOVAª								
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
	Regression	2649,638	4	662,410	380,363	,000 ^b		
1	Residual	22,640	13	1,742				
	Total	2672,278	17					

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average, Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008, GDP per capita in PPS average for 2003-2007 and 2006-2010, Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average

	Coefficients ^a							
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.		
		В	Std. Error	Beta				
	(Constant)	14,075	1,709		8,234	,000		
	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008	,353	,027	,483	12,995	,000		
1	GDP per capita in PPS average for 2003-2007 and 2006-2010	,182	,031	,373	5,886	,000		
	Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	,766	,179	,300	4,278	,001		
	Debt 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	-,143	,026	-,163	-5,412	,000		

2010 0001030

Residuals Statistics ^a							
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N		
Predicted Value	36,62	71,89	52,61	12,484	18		
Std. Predicted Value	-1,281	1,544	,000	1,000	18		
Standard Error of Predicted	100	000	600	100	10		
Value	,496	,920	,682	,138	18		
Adjusted Predicted Value	36,36	72,13	52,62	12,515	18		
Residual	-2,032	2,538	,000	1,154	18		
Std. Residual	-1,540	1,923	,000	,874	18		
Stud. Residual	-1,727	2,107	-,003	,976	18		
Deleted Residual	-2,555	3,047	-,009	1,445	18		
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1,890	2,495	,011	1,048	18		
Mahal. Distance	1,452	7,317	3,778	1,915	18		
Cook's Distance	,000	,178	,047	,049	18		
Centered Leverage Value	,085	,430	,222	,113	18		

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education



Histogram





Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education



Regression Standardized Predicted Value

Appendix 8:

Output of Model 2 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, the debt level, social expenditure and public opinion

Model	Variables	Variables	Method
	Entered	Removed	
	Debt 2003-2007		
	and 2006-2010		
	average,		
	Percentage of		
	respondents		
	who agree that		
	immigrants		
1	contribute to		Entor
I	their country	•	Enter
	2006 and 2008,		
	Social		
	Expenditure in		
	% of GDP		
	2003-2007 and		
	2006-2010		
	average ^b		

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding

education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,966 ^a	,934	,927	3,842

a. Predictors: (Constant), Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average, Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008, Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	6024,744	3	2008,248	136,020	,000 ^b
1	Residual	428,165	29	14,764		
	Total	6452,909	32			

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Debt 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average, Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008, Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average

	Coemcients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
		В	Std. Error	Beta			
	(Constant)	9,706	3,074		3,158	,004	
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008	,343	,054	,480	6,399	,000	
I	Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	1,523	,255	,605	5,971	,000,	
	Debt 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	-,026	,042	-,047	-,610	,546	

Coefficients^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

Residuals Statistics ^a							
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N		
Predicted Value	34,36	82,97	53,82	13,721	33		
Std. Predicted Value	-1,418	2,125	,000	1,000	33		
Standard Error of Predicted	000	0.404	4 20 4	202	22		
Value	,888,	2,134	1,304	,302	33		
Adjusted Predicted Value	34,95	82,69	53,82	13,709	33		
Residual	-6,549	8,651	,000	3,658	33		
Std. Residual	-1,704	2,251	,000	,952	33		
Stud. Residual	-1,758	2,314	-,001	1,008	33		
Deleted Residual	-6,969	9,139	-,005	4,108	33		
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1,828	2,518	,005	1,038	33		
Mahal. Distance	,740	8,900	2,909	1,910	33		
Cook's Distance	,000	,105	,031	,033	33		
Centered Leverage Value	,023	,278	,091	,060	33		



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education





Appendix 9:

Output of Model 3 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, social expenditure and public opinion

Valiables Entereu/Reinoveu					
Model	Variables Entered	Variables	Method		
	Entorod	Romovou			
	Social				
	Expenditure in				
	% of GDP				
	2003-2007 and				
	2006-2010				
	average,				
1	Percentage of		Enter		
	respondents				
	who agree that				
	immigrants				
	contribute to				
	their country				
	2006 and 2008^{b}				

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding

education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,898 ^a	,806	,796	6,389

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average, Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

			ANUVA			
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	6453,940	2	3226,970	79,060	,000 ^b
1	Residual	1551,036	38	40,817		
	Total	8004,976	40			

ANOVA^a

b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average,

Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008

		0001				
Model		Unstandardize	ed Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		В	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	11,076	4,292		2,580	,014
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008	,355	,070	,479	5,086	,000
	Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006- 2010 average	1,329	,246	,509	5,410	,000

Coefficients^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	
Predicted Value	33,31	80,81	53,02	12,702	41	
Std. Predicted Value	-1,552	2,187	,000	1,000	41	
Standard Error of Predicted	4.054	0.004	4 070	400	44	
Value	1,054	2,804	1,673	,438	41	
Adjusted Predicted Value	32,25	80,14	52,95	12,667	41	
Residual	-18,656	9,689	,000,	6,227	41	
Std. Residual	-2,920	1,517	,000	,975	41	
Stud. Residual	-2,965	1,598	,006	1,002	41	
Deleted Residual	-19,228	10,755	,079	6,591	41	
Stud. Deleted Residual	-3,336	1,632	-,008	1,047	41	
Mahal. Distance	,112	6,729	1,951	1,588	41	
Cook's Distance	,000	,094	,019	,026	41	
Centered Leverage Value	,003	,168	,049	,040	41	

Residuals Statistics^a



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual





Regression Standardized Predicted Value

Appendix 10:

Output of Model 3.1 – The MIPEX score 2010 including education, and social expenditure and public opinion

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average, Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010 ^b		Enter

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,938 ^a	,881	,867	5,102

a. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that

immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average,

Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

|--|

			-			
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	3264,468	2	1632,234	62,710	,000 ^b
1	Residual	442,482	17	26,028		t
	Total	3706,950	19			

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average, Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.		
		В	Std. Error	Beta				
	(Constant)	5,983	5,043		1,186	,252		
1	Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010	1,373	,275	,530	4,994	,000		
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average	,395	,081	,515	4,850	,000		

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

Residuals Statistics*						
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	
Predicted Value	31,70	79,52	51,05	13,108	20	
Std. Predicted Value	-1,476	2,172	,000	1,000	20	
Standard Error of Predicted	1 05 4	2 070	1 0 1 0	492	20	
Value	1,204	3,079	1,919	,402	20	
Adjusted Predicted Value	31,85	77,53	50,91	12,957	20	
Residual	-11,300	7,164	,000	4,826	20	
Std. Residual	-2,215	1,404	,000	,946	20	
Stud. Residual	-2,286	1,486	,012	1,000	20	
Deleted Residual	-12,041	8,025	,137	5,409	20	
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2,665	1,546	-,018	1,092	20	
Mahal. Distance	,199	5,971	1,900	1,517	20	
Cook's Distance	,000	,149	,040	,051	20	
Centered Leverage Value	,010	,314	,100	,080,	20	

Residuals Statistics^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual





Regression Standardized Predicted Value

Appendix 11:

<u>Output of Model 4 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and GDP per</u> <u>capita in PPS</u>

Variables Entered/Removed ^a							
Model	Variables	Variables	Method				
	Entered	Removed					
	GDP per capita						
	in PPS average						
1	for 2003-2007		Enter				
	and 2006-2010 ^b						

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding

education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,819 ^ª	,670	,660	7,102

a. Predictors: (Constant), GDP per capita in PPS average for 2003-2007 and 2006-2010

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

ANOVA ^a								
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.		
	Regression	3483,601	1	3483,601	69,075	,000 ^b		
1	Residual	1714,704	34	50,432				
	Total	5198,306	35					

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. Predictors: (Constant), GDP per capita in PPS average for 2003-2007 and 2006-2010

	Coefficients ^a									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.				
		В	Std. Error	Beta						
	(Constant)	14,853	4,491		3,307	,002				
1	GDP per capita in PPS									
	average for 2003-2007 and	,408	,049	,819	8,311	,000				
	2006-2010									

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

Residuals Statistics ^a								
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N			
Predicted Value	35,31	68,56	50,86	9,977	36			
Std. Predicted Value	-1,559	1,774	,000	1,000	36			
Standard Error of Predicted	4 405	0 407	4 000	250	20			
Value	1,185	2,437	1,636	,358	36			
Adjusted Predicted Value	35,16	68,24	50,80	9,973	36			
Residual	-18,219	9,148	,000	6,999	36			
Std. Residual	-2,565	1,288	,000	,986	36			
Stud. Residual	-2,606	1,326	,004	1,008	36			
Deleted Residual	-18,802	9,696	,066	7,325	36			
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2,870	1,342	-,009	1,043	36			
Mahal. Distance	,002	3,148	,972	,854	36			
Cook's Distance	,000	,109	,023	,024	36			
Centered Leverage Value	,000	,090	,028	,024	36			



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education





Appendix 12:

<u>Output of Model 5 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and social</u> <u>expenditure</u>

variables Entered/Removed								
Model	Variables	Variables	Method					
	Entered	Removed						
	Social							
	Expenditure in							
4	% of GDP		Enter					
1	2003-2007 and	•	Enter					
	2006-2010							
	average ^b							

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding

education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the	
			Square	Estimate	
1	,751 ^a	,564	,552	8,708	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007

and 2006-2010 average

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

			ANOVA ^a			
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	3820,886	1	3820,886	50,384	,000 ^t
1	Residual	2957,553	39	75,835		
	Total	6778,439	40			

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Social Expenditure in % of GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-2010 average

	Coefficients ^a									
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.				
		В	Std. Error	Beta						
	(Constant)	12,123	5,807		2,088	,043				
1	Social Expenditure in % of									
	GDP 2003-2007 and 2006-	1,845	,260	,751	7,098	,000				
	2010 average									

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

Residuals Statistics ^a								
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N			
Predicted Value	35,12	69,70	52,20	9,774	41			
Std. Predicted Value	-1,747	1,791	,000	1,000	41			
Standard Error of Predicted	4 000	0.040	4 074	110	44			
Value	1,360	2,816	1,874	,440	41			
Adjusted Predicted Value	34,23	71,53	52,21	9,872	41			
Residual	-17,004	22,187	,000	8,599	41			
Std. Residual	-1,953	2,548	,000	,987	41			
Stud. Residual	-1,983	2,595	-,001	1,011	41			
Deleted Residual	-17,538	23,012	-,015	9,019	41			
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2,064	2,816	,004	1,042	41			
Mahal. Distance	,000	3,208	,976	,931	41			
Cook's Distance	,000	,212	,025	,039	41			
Centered Leverage Value	,000	,080,	,024	,023	41			



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual





Appendix 13:

Output Model 5.1 - The MIPEX score 2010 including education, and social expenditure

Model	Variables	Variables	Method
1	Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010 ^b		Enter

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the	
			Square	Estimate	
1	,816 ^a	,666	,647	7,003	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

	ANOVA ^a								
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.			
	Regression	1760,498	1	1760,498	35,900	,000 ^b			
1	Residual	882,702	18	49,039					
	Total	2643,200	19						

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. Predictors: (Constant), Expenditure on social protection in % of GDP 2006-2010

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
			Coefficients		
	В	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	9,818	6,757		1,453	,163

Expenditure on social					
protection in % of GDP	1,825	,305	,816	5,992	,000
2006-2010					

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

Residuais Statistics					
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	35,88	64,31	49,20	9,626	20
Std. Predicted Value	-1,384	1,570	,000	1,000	20
Standard Error of Predicted	1,566	2,968	2,168	,464	20
Value					
Adjusted Predicted Value	36,19	64,70	49,15	9,671	20
Residual	-11,096	11,320	,000	6,816	20
Std. Residual	-1,585	1,617	,000	,973	20
Stud. Residual	-1,630	1,662	,003	1,021	20
Deleted Residual	-11,748	11,960	,049	7,503	20
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1,716	1,755	,007	1,044	20
Mahal. Distance	,001	2,463	,950	,793	20
Cook's Distance	,000	,120	,050	,042	20
Centered Leverage Value	,000	,130	,050	,042	20

Residuals Statistics^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010



Histogram



Scatterplot Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010



Regression Standardized Predicted Value
Appendix 14:

Output Model 6 – The MIPEX score for 2007 and 2010 excluding education, and public <u>opinion</u>

Variables Entered/Removed ^a						
Model	Variables	Variables	Method			
	Entered	Removed				
	Percentage of					
	respondents					
	who agree that					
1	immigrants		Enter			
	contribute to					
	their country					
	2006 and 2008^{b}					

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,818 ^a	,670	,662	8,361

a. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that

immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

ANOVA	a
-------	---

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	6091,388	1	6091,388	87,141	,000 ^b
1	Residual	3005,812	43	69,903		
	Total	9097,200	44			

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008

Coefficients ^a								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.		
		В	Std. Error	Beta				
	(Constant)	28,740	2,902		9,905	,000		
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006 and 2008	,640	,069	,818	9,335	,000		

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education

Residuals Statistics ^a							
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N		
Predicted Value	36,42	81,89	53,20	11,766	45		
Std. Predicted Value	-1,426	2,438	,000	1,000	45		
Standard Error of Predicted	1.040	2.240	4 700	400	45		
Value	1,240	3,310	1,700	,469	45		
Adjusted Predicted Value	36,31	81,49	53,16	11,708	45		
Residual	-16,273	14,928	,000	8,265	45		
Std. Residual	-1,946	1,785	,000	,989	45		
Stud. Residual	-1,970	1,806	,002	1,006	45		
Deleted Residual	-16,670	15,267	,038	8,553	45		
Stud. Deleted Residual	-2,041	1,856	-,002	1,019	45		
Mahal. Distance	,000	5,944	,978	1,216	45		
Cook's Distance	,000	,062	,017	,016	45		
Centered Leverage Value	,000	,135	,022	,028	45		

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX score excluding education



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual





Regression Standardized Predicted Value

Appendix 15:

Output Model 6.1 - The MIPEX score 2010 including education, and public opinion

Model	Variables	Variables	Method
	Entered	Removed	
	Percentage of		
	respondents		
	who agree that		
1	immigrants		Enter
-	contribute to		LIIIGI
	their country		
	2006, 2008		
	average ^b		

Variables Entered/Removed^a

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
			Square	Estimate
1	,840 ^a	,706	,693	7,825

a. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that

immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average

b. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

ANOVA ^a

			-			
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	3240,393	1	3240,393	52,915	,000 ^b
1	Residual	1347,232	22	61,238		
	Total	4587,625	23			

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

b. Predictors: (Constant), Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardize	ed Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		В	Std. Error	Beta		
	(Constant)	27,278	3,709		7,355	,000
1	Percentage of respondents who agree that immigrants contribute to their country 2006, 2008 average	,651	,090	,840	7,274	,000

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010

Residuals Statistics ^a							
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N		
Predicted Value	35,09	80,01	51,63	11,870	24		
Std. Predicted Value	-1,393	2,392	,000	1,000	24		
Standard Error of Predicted	4 500	4.047	0.400	007	04		
Value	1,598	4,217	2,180	,607	24		
Adjusted Predicted Value	34,96	78,79	51,50	11,747	24		
Residual	-13,855	14,331	,000	7,653	24		
Std. Residual	-1,770	1,831	,000	,978	24		
Stud. Residual	-1,824	1,871	,007	1,012	24		
Deleted Residual	-14,704	14,959	,123	8,210	24		
Stud. Deleted Residual	-1,934	1,993	,003	1,040	24		
Mahal. Distance	,000	5,721	,958	1,231	24		
Cook's Distance	,000	,123	,036	,033	24		
Centered Leverage Value	,000	,249	,042	,054	24		

a. Dependent Variable: MIPEX overall score of 2010



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual





Regression Standardized Predicted Value