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# Introduction of subject of analysis

In the course of the past decade, a series of admission and admission-related integration policies, such as integration programmes or pre-entry language tests, have been implemented in several EU countries. While a similar trend of introducing these kinds of policies can be observed across the EU countries, yet, the types of policies, their specific constitution and the target groups as well as their time of introduction vary in all of the EU-member states.

The following table provides an overview on the implemented policies in the EU countries:

## Table 1: Overview of introduced admission and admission-related integration policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT 2011</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Point based immigration system (Red-White-Red Card): income, education, work experience, language proficiency</td>
<td>TCN; skilled, highly skilled, key employees and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Compulsory integration Agreement: German at A2 within two years, min. income</td>
<td>TCN; Family migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 2005</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Admission based on benefit for Swiss economy and social adaptability (language)</td>
<td>TCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005, 2006/2008</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Family reunification provisions, Integration agreement</td>
<td>TCN, esp. Family migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ 2003</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Not explicit, but visa policy (purpose of entry) with varying prices</td>
<td>TCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004, 2009</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>For residence permit, knowledge of CZ required; Czech language test</td>
<td>TCN long-stayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Compulsory integration and orientation courses at B1</td>
<td>TCN without adequate language skills, long-stayers receiving social benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Pre-entry admission policies neither installed nor debated.</td>
<td>No binding post-arrival integration measures existent. Post-arrival language courses as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an offer/incentive by local government, but not compulsory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pre/Post Entry</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Esp. since 2002</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Not explicit, but entry linked to employment</td>
<td>TCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Integration Agreement Law</td>
<td>TCN above 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>since late 1990s; 2004, 2010</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Compulsory language (A1) and civic instruction course; conditions on behalf of the referent (age, income)</td>
<td>TCN (16+), esp. Family migrants; referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Compulsory language test (min A2) and social-cultural test</td>
<td>TCN above 16, both new- and oldcomers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pre-Entry</td>
<td>Admission policy: Sponsor (income and housing)</td>
<td>Family members of TCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965-present</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Right to benefit from free language courses, civic education, labour market integration aid organised by local governments, reformed 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Post-Arrival</td>
<td>Compulsory language (ESOL 3) and knowledge about British society</td>
<td>ILR: Indefinite Leave to Remain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WP2, country studies WP5

The implementation of these policies underlies specific assumptions with regard to the target group (e.g. specific integration needs is assumed for TCNs and especially for Muslim women) and was often connected with the expectation of having an impact on migration patterns as well as on migrants’ integration trajectories. Yet, while the introduction of these policies has often been justified by certain expected effects, the assumptions and the impacts have neither been extensively studied on the national level or in a comparative European perspective, and seldomly with regard to effects of selective migration policies (admission) on the integration of Third Country Nationals in European societies.

Nevertheless, assessing policies has gained importance during the last years in all policy fields, also in the field of migration and integration policy. The background for this is the growing significance of the concept of ‘evidence-based’ policy-making which responds to an increasing requirement for accountability and public confidence. In accordance with this, the Global Commission on International Migration stated (2005):

“It is hard to formulate and implement effective policy when it is not clear who the targets of that policy are, how many they are, where they are and what their problems are. And it is simply bad practice not to assess the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of policy” (cited in: Ardittis/Laczko 2008, p. 15).
Measuring the impact of these policies however, faces major obstacles: How can a causal link between policies and migration patterns as well as integration trajectories be established? How can migration patterns and integration trajectories be explained as influenced by policies?

In addition, cross-national comparison further comprises a large number of different aspects, including different types of policies, different target groups as well as their time of introduction.

In this context, the following analysis discusses possibilities of measuring the impact of admission and admission-related integration policies on migration patterns and migrants’ integration trajectories (e.g. into the labour market). The analysis further explores if and how the implemented provisions have already proven to contribute to the achievement of the specified effects and general objectives.

2 Methodological discussion

2.1 Criteria for assessing policies

Provided that specific programs, measures or legal provisions are specified, admission and admission related integration policies\(^1\) can be assessed for their relevance (response to existing needs, consistency with policy objectives), their efficiency (implementation on time and at reasonable costs; would there have been a more cost-effective way?), their effectiveness (achievement of the anticipated outputs and outcomes), their impacts (improvement of the situation, especially the socio-economic position of target groups) and their sustainability (achievement of long-term impacts rather than transitional effects) (Niessen/Huddleston 2007, p. 147; Ardittis/Latzko (eds.) (2008) p. 16; p. 111). The following figure provides an overview of the mentioned constructs.

\(^1\) The term policy can be defined as a coherent strategy of action referring to a specific area of subject or problem field (Stockmann 2006, p. 97). These strategies, however, “are of little value unless they can be translated into projects or programs that can be carried out” (Rondinelli 1983, p. 3; cited in Stockman 2006, p. 98). Programs comprise a number of interrelated projects, “an organized collection of activities designed to reach certain objectives” (Royse et al. 2001, p. 5, cited in ibid., p. 98). Projects on the other hand consist of a bundle of single measures and are “the primary means through which governments (...) attempt to translate their plans and policies into programs of action” (Rondinelli 1983, p. 3, in ibid.). Thus, policies – from programs and projects down to single measures and legal provisions – are forming the means for introducing innovation into social systems.

**Figure 1:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Policy Formulation</th>
<th>II. Policy Implementation</th>
<th>III. Policy Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of target group</td>
<td>Policy objectives</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External influencers</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Niesson/Huddleston (2007), 11

On the basis of certain **inputs**, i.e. financial and human resources, specific activities are undertaken (process) in order to achieve the previously set objectives. **Outputs** are the direct results of an implemented measure, independent from any achieved effects. Outputs can comprise products (e.g. information brochures) or services (e.g. counselling services, courses). The existing problems, however, usually cannot be solved with the given outputs alone, as this additionally requires a certain reaction of the addressees. Finally, two kinds of effects have to be distinguished: **Outcomes**, on the one hand, are the intended effects (benefits) for the target groups (e.g. achievement of language skills according to level B1). They “may be causally and linear related, meaning that one outcome leads to another and so on, forming a linear sequence of if/then relationships” (Niessen/Huddleston 2007, p. 10). The term **impact**, finally, refers to all changes resulting from an intervention, including long-term as well as short term effects, intended as well as unintended, positive as well as negative (ibid. p. 10f.).

Performance assessment, now, can either refer to the stage of ‘Policy Implementation’ or to the thereby resulting outcomes and impacts (‘Policy Evaluation’). This is a fact which is also pointed out by the EU-Commission in its Communication concerning the
“Evaluation of EU Policies on Freedom, Security and Justice”: While **controlling** or **monitoring implementation**

“consists of reviewing progress on carrying out policies. The Communication on Evaluation presented by the Commission in 2005 defines **evaluation** as ‘judgement of interventions (public actions) according to their results, impacts and the needs they aim to satisfy’. The main role of evaluation is to provide policy-makers with input about the impact and effectiveness of activities planned and carried out” (COM (2006) 332, p. 3).

Assessing migration or integration policy at the level of the European Union often is concerned with the phase of ‘Policy Implementation’, e.g. by assessing the transposition of legislative programs into national law (Lewis/Naqvi in: Ardittis/Latzko (eds.) 2008, p. 120). Another example is the **European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index** (2005) and its successor the **Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX)**.\(^2\) In particular, MIPEX seeks to assess to what extent TCN have access to rights throughout Europe. It thereby focuses on such issues as labour market access, rights for long-term residents, access to citizenship, political participation, family reunion or anti-discrimination legislation. It makes use of more than 149 policy indicators, thus offering a multidimensional picture of migrants’ opportunities to integrate in their new societies.

Yet, subject of both editions of the Index is the appraisal of legal provisions and policy whereas **they do not address “the outcomes of these laws and policies in terms of their effectiveness in practice”** (Carrera 2008, p. 31f.). Referring to the European Civic Citizenship and Inclusion Index and the therewith applied indicators, Geddes and Niessen state that

“It does not reflect how well immigrants are actually included into Europe’s economies and societies...They are about law and the options are legal options. They are not about practices and how the law is (not applied)” (cited in ibid. 2008, p. 32).

Within this study, the focus of interest is on assessing mid- and long-term impacts of admission-related policies, e.g. the question, whether a successful completion of an obligatory integration course does not only lead to improved language competences but has also an effect on the labour market integration of TCN-newcomers. Answering

---

\(^2\) MIPEX is an EU-funded project of the British Council, the Migration Policy Group and academic and civil society partners to monitor public policies with regard to integration of immigrants in the EU. MIPEX III for instance measures labour mobility. This refers to access to employment for labour migrants and reunited family members, their right to social security and targeted support. On the eve of the May 2010 elections in the UK, MIPEX found the recent turn in policies made conditions slightly less favourable for integration. The UK fell 10 points—the most of any country—and out of the top 10. All residents will benefit from the stronger equality laws (WP5 UK).
questions like these requires the application of an *impact evaluation* (Filsinger 2008, p. 62).

In this context it has to be recognized that outcomes and impacts are only analytical categories. Only the social reality can be subject to direct observation. Relevant data are information on the development of a social problem, addressed by public policy which includes information on the circumstances of those people affected by the respective policy. But all indicator-based data referring to objectives of public policy can only give hints on potential outcomes.

Basically, impact evaluations have to overcome two difficulties: The first problem is to discover and measure impacts: How can the intended and unintended impacts of an intervention be determined as precisely and completely as possible? The second problem concerns the identification of causal connections between the interventions (independent variables) and the measured impacts (dependent variables) within the constraints of specific conditions and possibilities of action: How can the causing factors of the impacts be determined clearly and competing explanations excluded? In the end, the quality of a research design depends upon the question, to what extent all relevant impacts are specified and whether problems of causality can be solved (Stockmann 2006, p. 224).

### 2.2 Construction of a Theory-Based Impact Model

An impact evaluation should generally be built upon a theory-based concept which clearly analyses the different interventions, the expected impacts and the basic conditions. In other words: At the beginning of an evaluation, input, output, outcome and impact (that is all observable changes, those intended and those not intended by an intervention, as well as effects caused by other influences) have to be distinguished analytically (Stockmann 2010, p. 1).

In pursuing this strategy, one should, in a first step, rely on recent literature and scientific insights concerning the field of interest. In order to reflect the appropriateness of the impact model and the stated causalities, a second step should consist in extensive interviews with experts and stakeholders. Otherwise the risk of indirect and especially unintended impacts remaining undetected is rather high (Reade 2008, p. 9). Especially in political contexts one has to bear in mind that objectives are often not stated clearly but kept in a quite vague formulation and/or the objectives publicly communicated are others than those actually pursued. Both aspects complicate the task of constructing an impact model.
The tables in Annex 2 are examples for such impact models based on the specific national situation of recently implemented admission policies and admission-related policies.

**Identification of external factors**

Another important component of an impact model is the anticipation of external factors having an additional influence on the processes observed – in the given context: the socio-economic and especially labour market integration of TCN-newcomers. As these external factors (such as labour market barriers or migrant characteristics) might distort the effects caused by the implemented policies and legal provisions, either by diminishing, strengthening or neutralising their impact, the attempt to specify and to control these factors within an impact analysis, is essential.

**Figure 2: Factors influencing labour market integration**

In the following, a (certainly not exhaustive) list of considerably important factors is provided.

**Labour market integration not exclusively dependent on language competences:** In those countries having introduced (obligatory) language courses or tests for newcomers,

---

3 Strictly speaking, external factors (intervening variables) are factors that are external to policy interventions of any kind.
the acquisition of language skills is awarded great importance, as language is considered to be the key to (labour market) integration. Despite its undoubted importance, it has to be recognised that language competence is not the only factor labour market integration is dependent on.

**Recognition of foreign qualifications:** To what extent is unsuccessful labour market integration due to lacking recognition of qualifications obtained in the migrants’ countries of origin? In Germany, currently increased efforts are made to improve this situation. It has to be considered that changes in labour market integration in the following years might also be caused by new policies in this area.

**Labour market barriers:** Third country nationals face specific labour market barriers due to legal regulations restricting their labour market access (e.g. inferior access compared to natives as well as EU-nationals). Furthermore, they are often confronted with difficulties concerning the assessment and recognition of their professional qualifications acquired in the country of origin.

In Austria, for example, there is a restriction of labour market access for family members of third country spouses in the first year after arrival.

**General situation on the labour market:** Immigrant labour market integration is closely linked to the general situation on the labour market. While often making a large profit in times of a cyclical upturn, migrants are usually hit harder by economic crises. Thus, the impact of the current global economic crisis (starting in mid-2008) on immigrant labour market outcomes has been significantly stronger in countries (e.g. Spain) where immigrant labour has played a key role in the preceding expansion period (OECD 2009, p. 4). The fact that migrant workers are especially affected by unemployment in the current phase of economic downturn has been explained by their overrepresentation in less skilled occupations as well as in economic sectors that have been particularly hard hit by the economic crisis (e.g. construction, wholesale trade and hospitality). Further reasons are seen in less secure contractual arrangements and an increasing risk for immigrants to become subject to discrimination in hiring and layoffs in times of job opportunities becoming scarcer (ibid., p. 5).

“Beyond the immediate impact of the downturn on immigrant employment, historical experience also shows that a severe economic crisis can have a long-lasting impact on the outcomes of both recent arrivals and of those already settled in the host country. Recent immigrants are particularly exposed as employers tend to be more selective at the hiring stage. For example, language problems, which tend to hamper productivity, may be used to screen out applicants. Immigrants arriving during a recession face long-term handicaps: it takes longer for them to integrate into the labour market and they encounter more difficulties in fully utilising their skills” (OECD 2009, p. 5).
Consequences resulting from the economic crisis also have to be considered for other types of migration flows, especially for family migration. On the one hand, the crisis might lead to a decrease in family reunification, for those sponsors who have become unemployed are not able to fulfil the required income limits. On the other hand, family migration might also increase due to a lack of alternative entry opportunities. Since labour market migration – which is basically a result of supply and demand – has been dropping recently, due to a considerable decline in international recruitment by employers, this might cause a shift to an increasing amount of family migration (ibid. p. 2).

**State of the economy:** As an example, Microcensus results for Germany show a significant improvement of labour market integration for foreigners and for the more inclusive category of persons with migration background as well as the population without migration background between 2005 and 2008, which is chiefly attributed to the positive development of the German economy in that period of time.

Additionally, results of studies conducted in Sweden show that the choice of the city as well as the situation of the labour market are influential factors (Åslund and Rooth, 2007); consequently, the situation of the labour market in specific areas is of importance as well.

**Discrimination,** i.e. putting somebody at a disadvantage for other reasons than his or her performance, is another external factor and has already been mentioned above. It has to be considered that discrimination can be selective towards certain ethnic groups.

**Religious faith and religious based values:** In their analysis of the European Social Survey (data gathered in 2004 and 2005), Fleischmann and Dronkers, to name one example, found persistent disadvantages in the socio-economic integration of Muslims, even after controlling for human capital in all of the destination countries they examined:

“[W]hile Muslim men have significantly higher unemployment rates than non-Muslim immigrants and they tend to have lower returns on education on all of the four different labour market outcomes, Muslim women, as mentioned above, are primarily affected in terms of their participation rates and their education” (Fleischmann/Dronkers 2007, p. 21).

Often closely linked to religious values are **gender roles** and the tendency especially for married women of being interested in participating in the labour market.
2.4 Research Designs and Types of Control Groups

Research designs for impact evaluations are always based on comparisons, either by comparing the situation at different points in time or for different social groups.

a) **Comparing the situation at different points in time:** As an impact represents a change occurring between two points in time, impact analysis has to equal that process character in its design and chose at least two measurement points, ideally one before and one after the intervention (Borrmann/Stockmann 2009, p. 116).

b) **Comparing the situation for different social groups:** Impact evaluation usually consists of a comparison between two groups of persons, i.e. between the target group which is affected by the intervention and a control group of persons not affected by the intervention.

*Investigating only the target group at only one point in time (after the policy has been implemented) does not enable to make statements about impacts (changes due to the intervention), for the counterfactual has not been considered* (Reade 2008, p. 11).

The most basic criterion for the selection of a certain research design is the aim of excluding external factors and competing explanations in order to be able to verify a cause-and-effect relationship as good as possible (ibid., p. 11). In the end, however, the selection of a specific research design depends on the research question of interest, on the kind of intervention(s) to be analysed as well as on the basic conditions. There are different kinds of potential solutions (see table below), none of them being the universally valid ideal solution or ‘gold standard’ (Stockmann 2010, p. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Selection of Units of Analysis</th>
<th>Type of Control Group</th>
<th>Timing of Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Real’ Experiments/ Field Experiments</td>
<td>randomised selection</td>
<td>randomised controls, often additional statistical controls</td>
<td>Minimum: only post-intervention measurement; mostly pre- and post-measurement; often several measurements during intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Experiments</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>constructed controls (matching on observables) and/or statistical controls</td>
<td>Minimum: only post-intervention measurement; mostly pre- and post-measurement; often several measurements during intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Selection of Units of Analysis</td>
<td>Type of Control Group</td>
<td>Timing of Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Section-Analysis</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>statistical controls</td>
<td>Only post-measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Single-Difference-Method)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>measurements during intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest-Posttest-Design</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>reflexive controls</td>
<td>Minimum: pre- and post-measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective Pretest-</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>retrospective</td>
<td>Post-measurement with retrospective measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>reflexive controls</td>
<td>of initial situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel-Analysis</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>reflexive controls</td>
<td>More than two measurements during intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Series-Analysis</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>reflexive controls</td>
<td>Several pre- and post-measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgmental Approach</td>
<td>uncontrolled selection</td>
<td>generic and/or shadow controls</td>
<td>Only post-measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Reade 2008, p. 11.

I Experimental Designs

‘Real Experiments’ / Field Experiments: An experimental design is undoubtedly the ideal research design for testing causal hypotheses, as all three demands for testing a causal order can be accommodated: 1.) Antecedence: the cause is prior to the effect, 2.) Implication: the cause actually causes the effect 3.) Contiguity: there is a connection between cause and effect either it in terms of space or time. Against this background, experimental designs have been considered as the most rigorous method for determining the net impacts of an intervention for a long time, especially in the early years of evaluation research. However, there are also a number of problems concerning their application. One of the most important arguments against an experimental design is that it is not suitable for the analysis of complex phenomena (Stockmann 2006, p. 231). Furthermore, experimental designs are often not applicable in practice as they require a randomised control group construction already at the stage of the conception and implementation of an intervention. An ex-post generation of randomised control groups is technically impossible (Reade 2008, p. 13).

Randomised controls: Individuals are allocated to the investigation and control group at random so that each individual is assured an equal and independent chance of being included in one of the groups (Stockmann 2006, p. 226).
**Quasi-Experiments:** Quasi-Experiments can simply be defined as experiments without randomisation. Usually the analysed objects assign themselves either to the investigation or control group (self-selection) (Schnell/Hill/Esser 2008, p. 228). Though the lacking randomisation cannot ensure the neutralisation of third variables, quasi-experiments are of special use for the task of impact evaluation. Instead of randomised controls, constructed and/or statistical controls are applied (Reade 2008, p. 13).

**Constructed controls** (matching on observables): After the investigation group has been specified, a control group is constructed before measurement is conducted by selecting ‘equivalent partners’ unexposed to the intervention, i.e. targets that match those in the investigation group on selected characteristics. A matched design principally “requires that the groups be matched on any characteristics that would cause them to differ on the outcome of interest under conditions when neither of them received the intervention” (Rossi/Freeman/Lipsey 2004, p. 275). The estimation of the intervention effect is biased to the extent the groups are not matched on those characteristics actually influencing the outcome. With this parallelisation a constructed but actually existing control group is built.

**Statistical controls:** Building a statistical control group is the attempt to generate a statistical reproduction of the investigation group on all relevant characteristics. In contrast to constructed controls which are usually selected before data collection, statistical controls are built afterwards at the stage of data analysis. Statistical controls are often used in addition to randomised and especially to constructed controls in order to be able to recognise whether investigation and control group are actually equivalent with regard to important features (Stockmann 2006, p. 227).

**II Ex-Post-Facto-Designs:**

In many cases, however, neither the conditions for a real experiment nor for a quasi-experiment are fulfilled. In this situation it has to be attempted to put social reality in order retrospectively, using an ex-post-facto-design instead of involving any experimental control techniques (Schnell/Hill/Esser 2008, p. 230f.). In this context, hypotheses are tested without being able to manipulate the independent variable and without a randomisation of the independent variable on the test persons. Consequently, the possibilities to eliminate external factors and therewith alternative explanations are considerably limited when working with ex-post-facto designs (ibid., p. 228).

A basic difference has to be made between cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses:
(1) **Cross-Section-Analysis (Single-Difference Method):** Applying a cross-section-design means that all variables are measured *at only one point in time* (ex-post) assuming that the initial situation has been identical for both, the investigation and control group. As this is rarely the case, the single-difference method consequently leads to an over- or underestimation of impacts, as impacts attributed to the intervention might be of different origin (Reade 2008, p. 13f.).

In the context of a cross-section-analysis, **statistical controls** are applied by retrospectively classifying data into an investigation and control group on the basis of given data (e.g. survey data).

(2) **Longitudinal Designs:** Cross-section designs with all relevant variables being measured at only one point in time are faced with problems concerning the causal order and thus limited in their validity. These problems can be overcome in a longitudinal design with repeated measurements at different points in time.

2a) **(Retrospective) Pretest-Posttest-Design:** With a Pretest-Posttest-Design, indicators are measured for the target group at least once before and after the implementation of an intervention. In the case of a retrospective pretest-posttest-design, usually several post-measurements including a retrospective measurement of the initial situation are made. In this context reflexive controls are involved.

**Reflexive controls:** The reflexive controls design is conducted without a separate comparison group but uses the investigation group to form its own control group by comparing pre- and post-intervention scores and interpreting the difference between the measured values as impact. In this case it has to be assumed “that no changes in the targets on the outcome variables have occurred in the time between observations other than those induced by the intervention” (Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey 2004, p. 290, cited in: Stockmann 2006, p. 227).

This way of proceeding, however, only allows for monitoring the development of the target group over time. As the counterfactual case is not taken into account, pretest-posttest designs do not allow for the consideration of external factors (unexpected events, general social change etc.) that could also have had an influence either by strengthening or weakening impacts, including the possibility that the situation of the target group might also have changed without the the intervention taking place (Reade 2008, p. 14).

2b) **Panel-Analysis:** In case the same variables are measured repetitively *for the identical persons*, the design is called a “panel”, capturing individual changes
over time (Stockmann 2006, p. 235f.). With reflexive controls being the respective type of control group, it nevertheless has to be noted that without the inclusion of a comparison group the counterfactual cannot be considered with a panel design (Reade 2008, p. 15).

2c) **Time-Series Analysis:** With a time-series design, many measurements are conducted before and after the intervention (ca. 30 measurements before an intervention are recommended). These data are used to build a time-series and to compute a ‘trend’ (projection) that enables to predict what would have happened if the intervention/policy had not been implemented. This trend is compared with the scores measured after the intervention has been implemented and the resulting difference is used to estimate the net-effect of the intervention. In case there is no opportunity for building control groups, Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey are in favour of this model: “Time-series designs are the strongest way of examining full-coverage programs, provided that the requirements for their use are met” (Rossi/Freeman/Lipsey 1999, p. 268 cited in Stockmann 2006, p. 237).

(3) **Judgmental Approach:**

An alternative to the above described designs is the Judgmental Approach involving generic and/or shadow controls.

**Shadow controls:** In shadow controls designs there is no actual control group constructed and measured, but people with special insights are consulted to estimate the counterfactual case and hence the net impact of an intervention. According to Vedung the word shadow in this context signifies “imperfect and faint representation” or “imitation of something” (Vedung 2004, p. 203f). He differentiates between “expert assessments”, “program-administrator judgments”, and “participants’ judgments” (ibid. p. 204).

**Expert assessments:** External authorities who are familiar with the field are involved to estimate the impacts of an intervention. The power of these judgments depends not only on the choice of experts but also on the general state of knowledge in the area of interest. “In a field where the knowledge of how to achieve a particular outcome is quite advanced, an expert’s appraisal may be relatively accurate. If little is known about an area, an expert’s assessment of a project’s effectiveness may not be worth more than that of any other person” (ibid., p. 204).
**Program-administrator judgments:** The advantage of involving program-administrators to judge an intervention is that they are the ones with the best knowledge about it. On the other hand, there is a risk of these judgments being too positive as the administrators have a personal interest in a positive presentation of their own work (Stockmann 2006, p. 237).

**Participants’ judgments:** Finally, often the target groups themselves are regarded as ‘experts’ to estimate the impact of a programme. Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey (1999: 269) however criticise that participants are usually lacking the adequate knowledge for making judgments about net impacts. Kromrey (2002, p. 103) is even harsher in his criticism, stating that these judgments

“do not have either the status of evaluations in the sense of ‘technological’ evaluations or evaluations by neutral experts. Instead, they constitute ‘individual partisan value judgments of persons who have a special relationship – as users or stakeholders – to the subject of analysis’” (Borrmann/Stockmann 2009, p. 117).

As becomes overt in the above stated, the usage of the judgmental approach is discussed controversially. Expert assessments are especially met with disapproval by those in favour of randomised experiments and statistical analysis.

“If not entirely discarded, they are regarded as the absolute last resort, should experimental, generic, statistical and reflexive controls turn out to be unfeasible. They are viewed as the weakest version of randomized experimentation, not offering any additional merits in and of themselves” (Vedung 2004, p. 207).

Qualitative oriented naturalistic evaluators, in contrast, refer to stakeholder judgments, reasons, beliefs and conceptions as the most important types of data in the context of public policy evaluation. After all, shadow controls are on many occasions the only practical alternative available (ibid.). Those supporting expert assessments as a type of shadow control agree that these assessments should be based upon various types of information including personal interviews with other experts or statistical data to enrich the information basis. According to Vedung it is difficult to detect the difference between the application of reflexive and statistical controls by an experienced evaluator on the one hand and the usage of shadow controls on the other hand:

“In both cases, an expert passes a judgment, based on many sources of information. The only major difference I can see is that in expert assessment the specialist himself must personally assume responsibility for the correctness of the control case. In generic, statistical, and reflexive controls, it is in principle the data that speaks, not the evaluator” (Vedung 2004, p. 206).

**Generic controls:** Prerequisite for the generic controls design is that the analysed intervention covers only some part of the population. In this context, “the results from
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4 Also compare Stockmann 2006, p. 237: here Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey (1999, p. 269) are cited, claiming expert assessments to be “the shakiest of all impact assessment techniques”.
the smaller group reached by the permanent but partial-coverage program are compared to what would normally or ordinarily happen within the equivalent group in a larger population without the public intervention” (ibid., p. 196) by using social indicators like death or birth rates, gender distribution, educational achievement, or employment rates. Differences in the measured values are attributed as impacts of the intervention. Yet, in the case of legal provisions or obligatory programmes implemented on national level, the interventions usually cover the whole ‘TCN-newcomer-population’. Consequently generic controls cannot be applied. Comparisons would only be possible with those newcomers who are exempted from these obligations. However, it has to be considered that these persons might also differ in respect to other aspects and characteristics.

First of all, if it is the aim to retrospectively analyse impacts of admission policies, the usage of an ex-post-facto design is necessary, whereas experimental designs (and thus randomised or constructed controls) cannot be an option.

Moreover, as has been mentioned above, using cross-sectional data in order to study the impact of policies on migration patterns and integration trajectories involves problems concerning the causal order and thus results in limited validity. These problems can be overcome in a longitudinal design with repeated measurements at different points in time.

One possibility is using data from a longitudinal panel study, however, “a drawback might be recall-effects” and there is the “possibility of sample attrition”, which means that “some respondents drop out and this might bias the results” (Jacobs 2011: 23).

Using longitudinal administrative data might be an alternative option to measure e.g. the labour market integration of TCN, as “the State has the data at its disposal for the entire population and can thus provide a very accurate picture of inclusion of immigrants into the labour market” (Jacobs 2011: 38). Thus, available data sources such as the STATIV-Sweden “can be very useful in keeping track of immigrants’ trajectories in the receiving society” (Ibid.). Yet, such administrative data does not allow measuring the impact of policies on any external factors “during the inclusion process affecting the employment status of migrants” and to understand the causal mechanisms that lead to a better inclusion of particular groups of immigrants (Ibid.).

Furthermore, administrative data are often not comparable across countries, “as people of migrant background are not always identifiable” (Jacobs 2011: 21). International surveys instead provide a common design and often include the same measurement of migration status, thus facilitating cross national comparison (Ibid.). They are, however,
not designed as surveys to monitor immigrant integration and, except from the LFS, their sub sample size is often too small (Kraler and Reichel 2010).

Recognising that the European Labour Force Survey (EU-LFS) is the most suitable data source available, it is necessary to come to some compromise concerning the selection of a research design. This shall be explained in the following.

**Possibilities and Constraints of the EU Labour Force Survey (LFS)**

EU Member states are obliged under European law to conduct the [European Labour Force Survey (LFS)](https://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/methodology/ad-hoc_modules) on the basis of a fixed list of core variables. Data are collected in compliance with harmonised methodologies and quality standards, with quarterly and annual results provided on the national level as well as to EUROSTAT. Participation in the survey is compulsory in Austria, Italy and Spain but on a voluntary basis for the rest of the EU member states covered by PROSINT (Eurostat 2010). The European Labour Force Survey pursues two aims:

- “To provide comparable statistics on the level and trend of employment and unemployment in the EU Member States and regions according to ILO concepts, and
- To describe the structure of labour participation at the level of individuals and households taking into account individual characteristics, job characteristics and household characteristics” (European Commission 2007, p. 5).

Starting in 1999, a so-called ad-hoc module has been added to the EU LFS every year, comprising a set of variables supplementing the core variables of the LFS. The modules refer to annually varying subjects with some subjects being repeated after several years (Eurostat 2009, p. 52).

Subject of the ad-hoc module in 2008 was the “Labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants”, which is planned to be repeated in 2014. Three particular aims of the 2008 ad-hoc module on migration can be specified:

- “To provide a comprehensive assessment of the population of migrants and their immediate descendants.
- To provide comparable data on the labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants to allow for comparison of labour market outcomes with other groups, and on the integration and adaptation of migrants to the labour market.

---

5 A full list of the topics covered by the ad-hoc modules is available here: [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/methodology/ad-hoc_modules](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/employment_unemployment_lfs/methodology/ad-hoc_modules)
To analyse the factors affecting migrant integration in and adaptation to the labour market” (European Commission 2007, p. 5f.)

The LFS ad-hoc module 2008 comprises the following variables:

(Commission of the European Communities 2007, p. 3ff.; European Commission 2007, p. 6)

- Acquisition of citizenship, including year of acquisition
- Country of birth of father
- Country of birth of mother
- Total number of years of residence in the host country
- Main reason for migration (last migration)
- Duration of the current residence permit/visa/certificate
- Restrictions to legal access to the labour market
  (access restricted to employment for specific employers/sectors/occupations and/or access restricted to self-employment; access not allowing self-employment)
- Use of facilities for establishing what highest qualification equates to in the host country system
- The role of language skills in obtaining employment, which is commensurate with the migrant qualifications and skills set
- Assistance received in the host country in finding employment or setting up a business
  (relatives/friends; public employment office; private employment agencies; migrant or ethnic organisation)
- Use of services for labour market integration in the two years following the migrant’s arrival
  (contact with an adviser for job guidance/counselling or job search assistance; participation to labour market training/programs; participation to host country language tuition)

According to EUROSTAT, the first set of validated data includes four variables: (1) Year of acquisition of citizenship; (2) Country of birth of father; (3) Country of birth of mother; (4) Main reason for migration. It has to be noted that data concerning the duration of residence in the receiving country are also gathered as part of the LFS-core variable list.
In order to examine whether TCN-newcomers who arrived after certain legal provisions/policies had been implemented are showing differences compared to previous cohorts of TCN-newcomers – according either to their characteristics (qualification level, country of origin, motive for migration, etc.) or their success in integrating into the receiving society (labour market participation, independence from social benefits, etc.) – a pretest-posttest design in combination with reflexive controls could be applied.

Prerequisite for constructing reflexive controls, of course, is the ability to identify the target group affected by a certain policy.

In combination with the 2008 ad hoc module, the Labour Force Survey provides at least some opportunities in this regard, though there are serious limitations which shall be pointed out by the following examples:

Example a): In 2006, a provision was introduced in Austria, which automatically allows family migrants to access the labour market after their arrival in Austria. In order to analyse whether this provision has increased labour market participation of recently arrived family migrants, it would be necessary to identify TCN-newcomers who immigrated for family reasons in the LFS-dataset. As the motive for migration has only been part of the variable-list in the 2008 ad-hoc module, data concerning this aspect are only available for one point in time (LFS-dataset 2008). Consequently, the dependent variable “labour market participation” is only available for 2008 and comparisons are restricted to the question whether the share of family migrants participating in the labour market in 2008 differs between those newcomers who arrived in Austria after 2006 and those TCN who have already been living in Austria before 2006. As the number of years of residence in the destination country is assumed to have an influence on labour market participation, this kind of comparison bears some problems concerning validity.

Furthermore, it becomes clear that this comparison requires a modification of the definition of newcomers who have been specified for the purpose of PROSINT as persons who have been living in the destination country for less than five years. Otherwise it would not be possible to identify a group of newcomers completely affected by the introduced provision.

Example b): In August 2007 the obligation to show evidence of basic knowledge of the German language in the event of the subsequent immigration of spouses from abroad was introduced in Germany. When attempting to answer the question whether this has caused any changes, either in terms of promoting the immigrating spouses’ (socio-economic) integration or an increase in their qualification level (selecting out unqualified), the same problems occur as in the example mentioned above. Beyond
that, further difficulties in isolating the target group result from several exemptions made according e.g. to the country of origin or type of residence permit obtained by the spouse already living in Germany.

Given the fact that the reflexive controls design as described above would be applicable, one could additionally try to overcome the problems of reflexive controls resulting from the lack of a separate control group by applying retrospective statistical controls. According to Vedung,

“[t]he use of statistical controls is posited on the idea that the units of a single time series should be partitioned into subgroups in an attempt to keep potential external confounding factors under control. Partitioning ought to be done with respect to contingencies assumed to be influential on the outcome” (Vedung 2004, p. 197).

The LFS provides opportunities for keeping some factors under control. For example, participants in the 2008 ad-hoc-module have been asked whether their access to the labour market is restricted (to employment for specific employers/sectors/occupations and/or access restricted to self-employment; access not allowing self-employment). As far as variables from the 2008 ad-hoc module are concerned, it has to be noted once more that these data are only available for 2008.

Moreover, participation in the Labour Force Survey is compulsory in Austria, Italy and Spain but on voluntary basis for the rest of the EU member states covered by PROSINT (Eurostat 2010). It has to be assumed that migrants with advanced language skills and/or a higher education level are more willing to take part than especially newcomers with little language competences. Further problems concerning comparability might result from the fact that some member states are responding to potential language problems, e.g. Austria, by providing surveys in different languages and working with bilingual interviewers whereas Germany only offers the survey in German.

Another risk might arise due to the size of the samples, as TCN-newcomers constitute only a partial group of the samples with a limited amount of cases. Especially when attempting to answer very specific questions for specific target groups (e.g. TCN-newcomers with total number of years in destination country less than five years, who migrated because of family reasons and participated in a language course), the risk is quite high for the number of cases in the sample becoming quite small (if not too small).

Nevertheless, it is possible to follow the concept of indicator-based monitoring in order to analyse the development of certain indicators over time, e.g. labour market participation, unemployment or the qualification level for the group of TCN-newcomers in general. This way, it is possible to examine whether any change has occurred or not, though one can only speculate which factors the monitored change can be attributed to.
Indicator-based monitoring is another instrument which has increasingly been applied during the last year to measure integration in European as well as on national or even communal level (e.g. the project “Indicators of Immigrants Integration” funded by the INTI – Integration of Third Country Nationals Program). Monitoring can be defined as a regular observation of social conditions (state of migrant population’s integration) on the basis of a set of indicators$^6$ (e.g. labour market participation, qualification level, etc.) with the purpose to visualising social change against the background of objectives pursued by social policy (i.e. integration, defined as an increasing convergence between migrant and majority population with respect to their socio-economic position).

This has also been stated by the European Commission to be the central benefit to be gained by the 2008 LFS ad-hoc module (“Labour market situation of migrants and their immediate descendants”):

“If the results will provide necessary information for policymaking and to monitor progress towards the common objectives of the European Community’s Employment Strategy. The employment guidelines (2005-2008) adopted by the Council of the EU in July 2005 state that particular attention should be paid to significantly reducing the employment gaps for people at a disadvantage as well as between non-EU and EU citizens” (European Commission 2007, p. 6).

However, the data gathered by these indicators **do not allow for attributing the observed changes to certain legal provisions or policies**. Thus, a simple comparison of objectives and achieved indicators cannot answer the question whether the measured indicators are a result of a specific policy (in the field of admission policy, or in the field of labour market policy, etc) or of a combination of several implemented policies, or if they are rather caused by other potential influences (e.g. the state of the economy, change in values, self-help, social learning etc.). This question can only be examined with a specific research design that allows for an implicit or explicit comparison with a scenario which would be the case, if the analysed policy had not been implemented. In this context evaluation research offers specific methods (Bussmann/Klöti/Knoepfel 1997, p. 110).

An alternative way of conducting an impact analysis is provided by the Judgmental Approach (as described above), which focuses on the assessment of experts rather than on a quantitative analysis of the LFS-dataset. Yet, it seems to be valuable to implement a triangulation of methods for the assessment of the policy, which means to enrich the
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$^6$ In the Fourth European Ministerial Conference on Integration in April 2010 in Zaragoza, it was pointed out the identification of European core indicators for “employment” should be the following: employment rate, unemployment rate, activity rate, which are also covered by the Labour Force Survey.
results gained by quantitative research based on statistical analysis with this more qualitative oriented approach.

After the first part of this study discussed the possibilities of measuring the impact of admission and admission-related integration policies, the following section is based on existing evaluations and studies on the national level. It aims at assessing the actual impact of the implemented policies on the national level with regard to a change in TCN-newcomers’ (socio-economic) integration situation with the focus on labour market impact and with regard to a change in migrant characteristics / migration patterns.

3 Results of the country studies

For all country cases a literature review of studies and evaluations on the impact of admission and admission-related policies was conducted. Additional information was drawn from results of qualitative interviews with experts. Compulsory post-entry measures have been introduced in the Netherlands, in Germany, in UK and Austria. Additionally, those countries also have introduced pre-entry measures, however, the latter two countries only very recently. Thus in the UK and in Austria no long-term analysis or extensive evaluations are available so far. This is the same case in Sweden, who only introduced its first admission-related integration policy in 2010. In Germany and the Netherlands a few studies and evaluations are available which provide some indications of the effects of post- and pre-entry policies on the integration and migration patterns of migrants.

In the Czech Republic and Spain, however, hardly any implemented admission or admission-related integration policies exist. Therefore, no impacts can be scrutinized.

Czech Republic
There are no explicit admission-related integration policies in the Czech Republic. In the past years, there were some policies that tried to manage economic migration and give certain migrant groups the possibility to attain long-term residence permits more easily. Firstly, there was a selection programme based on the criteria citizenship, employment status (valid work permit) and education (at least secondary level). The programme ran from 2003 until 2010, but had only a very limited impact, though no systematic evaluation of its impact exists. Also, no integration measures were included in the programme. The second policy was the introduction of a ‘Green card’ in order to attract immigrants from certain preferred countries. But this policy has also only had a small
impact, with 123 Green cards issued since the introduction in 2009, and an evaluation does not exist either. A “new system of economic migration”, aims at attracting “more brains” as well as low-skilled and unskilled workers from non-EU states. But the low-skilled and unskilled workers are only supposed to stay for a short period of time and no admission-related integration policies are connected with this “new system”. Concerning the integration of immigrants already living in the Czech Republic, what can be said is that while there are no specific integration policies or programmes an official document by the Interior Ministry does exist on this issue, called ‘The Concept of Foreigners’ Integration in the Czech Republic’. This policy document states that economic independence is one of the basic priorities of migrants’ integration into Czech society. It also implies equal rights principles and measures combating discrimination [MoI 2006]. The official concept of integration is strongly connected with a continuous improvement of rights with length of residency. Indeed, the permanent residency permit is connected with a more secure status than any other form of temporary residence visa. However, in the context of the recent anti-crisis measures for the Czech economy, the principle of progressive integration and increasing rights could be questioned.

Spain
In Spain, the link between admission and integration is still very weak both at the legal and policy level, although it is becoming increasingly stronger. New clauses within the latest immigration law (LOEX 2/20098) mention integration as a positive aspect or an added value which is considered when a migrant wants to renew his/her residence permits9 or reunite with a family member10. The civil code has also been modified in
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7 This is not always relevant when comparing EU and non-EU immigrants’ rights.
8 LOEX is the acronym for Ley Orgánica de Extranjería
9 RD 2393/2004, article 72: “Requirements of social integration can be asked to renew a residence permit”. However, it is not clear which requirements are and into what extent they are necessary. This has also been included in the article 31.7 of the LOEX 2/2009 as “In order to renew the permit, the efforts of integration of the foreigner will be especially valued through a positive report of the regional government that certifies the assistance to those training actions considered in the article 2 of the same law”.
10 LOEX 2/2009, article 18: “The public administration will promote the participation of the reunited migrants in programs of language and socio-cultural integration”. Also, the article 18.2 relates to the need of migrants of having adequate housing conditions in order to get a positive report from the regional (or local) government and reunite a family member.
regards to nationality including integration elements related to “good conduct”\textsuperscript{11}. However, the implementation of the LOEX is still underway and both it and the change in the civic code only deal post arrival integration. This also holds true for existing regional programmes as the ‘\textit{Ley de Integración}’ 15/2008 of the Comunitat Valenciana or the soon to be implemented ‘\textit{Llei d’Acollida}’\textsuperscript{12} of Catalonia.

So altogether, Spain is lacking clear and formal admission-related integration policies, which means that no such policies can be assessed. The two policies that come closest to pre-entry integration policies are what is called “social rooting” and the catalogue of high demand occupations. The former is directed at illegal immigrants that have already been living in Spain for a long period of time. If they can meet certain criteria of integration – set up by each municipality – they can receive a residence permit. Language certificates greatly improve the chances of getting a permit. This means that the policy makes an indirect connection between integration and admission, but only in a very special case in which the persons affected have already lived in the country for quite some while, hardly making the policy eligible for being categorised as “pre-entry”. The second policy refers to the selection of possible immigrants based on socio-economic features. The State of Spain grants admission to persons holding certain professions. As the professions listed in the catalogue demand a high level of qualification and since highly qualified persons are generally integrated more easily than others, the policy could be interpreted as one that grants admission to persons with a high potential for successful integration. Yet, this is quite a far stretch, as the policy is based solely on profession and qualification and makes no explicit integration measures are included.

\textbf{Schweden}

On April 15, 2010 Sweden introduced its first – and so far only – admission-related integration policy. It requires that the family member already in Sweden, the sponsor, fulfil two requirements: a) to be able to cover his/her costs of living, and b) to have a properly organised housing arrangement that is spacious enough for both for him/herself and for the immigrating family members. The aim of this policy – to which there are numerous exemptions – is, as stated by the government, to promote integration by

\textsuperscript{11} “\textit{Disposición Adicional Quinta}” of the LOEX 2/2009 is refers to a change of the article 22 of the Civil Code: “a well civic behaviour and a high degree of integration in the Spanish society will be required through the provision of a certificate”.

\textsuperscript{12} ‘Acollida’ (in Catalan) or ‘acogida’ (in Spanish) refers to the term of ‘introduction’ or ‘first welcome’ once the immigrants have arrived in the host society. The Llei d’Acollida is a law that regulates the services, rights and duties of migrants and of the society.
motivating individuals to settle in regions with both good possibilities for employment as well as for housing. Access to the labour market is seen as the key to successful integration. Being the first Swedish policy of its kind, the ‘maintenance demand’ is highly symbolic, since Sweden was the last EU-country to introduce such a ‘maintenance demand’. Also, its introduction might lead to similar policies following after it. But as the policy has only come into effect very recently, no evaluation is available yet.

UK
Pre-entry tests were introduced in the UK already in 2004, but were at that time only directed at ministers of religion. Since 2006, labour migrants also have to reach certain levels of language knowledge, depending on which tier applies to them. And only recently, on 29 November 2010, pre-entry tests were introduced for immigrating family members, in particular for spouses of non-EU migrants, as well. Next to these requirements concerning language proficiency, there are also economic conditions migrants have to fulfil before being granted admission: Labour migrants must demonstrate they have adequate maintenance for themselves and for their family for the first 3 months of their residence in the UK. Sponsors of family migrants have to demonstrate that they have adequate housing, which they have to own or occupy exclusively i.e. not shared but there is no specific income requirement. They only have to demonstrate they have adequate income to maintain themselves without recourse to public funds, this is a range of benefits that are given to people on low incomes as well as housing support. Also, the minimum age of sponsors and applicants for marriage visas was raised from 18 to 21 years on 27 November 2008.

Both the modifications in the Points Based System and the introduction of pre-entry language tests for family migrants are clearly intended to limit immigration – this has been confirmed explicitly by leading politicians. Additionally, the new measures for family migrants are supposed to improve integration and the employment chances of newcomers and assist the spouse’s integration into British society at an early stage. The reason given for raising the minimum age of both sponsors and applicants was that this would help prevent forced marriages.

Once an immigrant has passed the pre-entry test and entered the country he/she generally has to go on to a further stage of tests (language and knowledge of life in the UK) in order to obtain a permanent residence permit. Therefore, the pre-entry tests are also seen as a good preliminary experience for the subsequent stages. But also, they are supposed to generally raise the awareness of the importance of language proficiency, as this is regarded to be a key condition for integration.
An assessment of the specific impacts of the implemented policies does not exist for any of them.

Austria
In general, all immigrants which are granted a residence permit in Austria, have to prove that they earn a sufficient income to sustain their own livelihood, have health insurance coverage and accommodation, and she/he does not pose a threat to public order and security.

In 2002, labour immigration was mainly limited to highly skilled migrants (and temporary seasonal workers) by defining a minimum wage requirement for so-called ‘key personnel’. An amendment to the aliens law in 2009 elevated the marriage age for spouses from third countries to 21 years of age. The general legal marriage age, by contrast, is 18 years. An amendment to the Settlement and Residence Act 2005, Federal Law Gazette 122/2009, §2 par. 1, sentence 9 Thus, spouses from third countries of Austrian citizens or of settled immigrants have to have turned 21 at the time of the application in order to be eligible for family reunification.

As of July 2011, Austria introduces the so called Red-White-Red Card. The so far existing system of labour migration is completely overhauled and replaced by a points-based system. The qualifications and skills of potential immigrants are identified on the basis of a credit system, similar to systems of immigration in Canada or Australia, or the Blue Card of the EU. Three main categories of third-country nationals may apply for a RWR-Card: 1) Specifically highly skilled persons (e.g. managers, researchers); 2) Skilled migrants in understaffed professions (the professions shall be defined flexibly according to the needs of the Austrian labour market); and 3) Key employees (jobs which cannot be covered by domestic job seekers) who earn at least 2,100 Euro (gross), or 2,520 Euro (gross) if aged over 30. The qualifications and skills of potential immigrants shall be identified on the basis of a credit system. To be eligible for the Austrian work permit a person has to collect points assigned for criteria like age, previous income, education, work experience, and language proficiency in German or English. Family reunification quotas will still be retained.

In addition, third country nationals have to prove knowledge of German at A1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference of Languages already before

13 Amendment to the Settlement and Residence Act 2005, Federal Law Gazette 122/2009, §2 par. 1, sentence 9
14 The basis of the calculations is the value of the upper income threshold used for the calculations of social security contributions (ASVG Höchstbeitragsgrundsätze) of 2011. Value one corresponds to 50% of the ASVG, value 2 to 60% of the ASVG.
immigration. Family members of specifically highly skilled persons are exempted from the pre-entry language tests.

The Austrian authorities are able to check the compliance with the income requirement any time throughout the year, and not only when migrants apply for (prolongation of) a residence permit. As of July 2011, all third country nationals who intend to become permanent residents have to acquire German skills at level A2 within two years of being granted a residence permit (previously five years). If third-country nationals acquire German skills at B1 level within two years of being granted the residence permit, their residence permit will be extended for another three years instead of one year. Persons who are already living in Austria will have to acquire German language skills at the B1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference of Languages as a precondition for permanent residence and citizenship.

While there are no evaluations on the impact of the newly implemented policies on labour market integration of the immigrants (third country national), changes in the immigration pattern point towards an impact of the pre-entry integration policies. National data show that between 2002 and 2008 the share of third country nationals in the foreign net migration to Austria has considerably decreased, which indicates the impact of the changes in the laws in 2006. Regional data from the federal state Tirol and from Vienna show similar results.

In addition to these findings, several experts that were interviewed on the topic mentioned that TCN have difficulties with fulfilling the ‘Integration Agreement’ while they are working due to a lack of adequate, flexible courses. Also, immigrants in Austria have difficulties to fulfil the income requirements.

Another important point is that even though the National Action Plan on Integration of the federal government emphasises the importance of securing one’s livelihood by own means, at the same time the aliens law restricts access to the labour market for family migrants, asylum seekers and students for example. In this context, a representative of
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15 See the amendment at: [http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/ME/ME_00251/index.shtml](http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/ME/ME_00251/index.shtml) (15.3.2011)

16 Existing (until June 2011)

Integration agreement:
- Module 1 – Literacy Courses (75 hours) for so called ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ illiterate people. Primary illiteracy refers to the inability to read or write. Secondary illiterate people are persons who can read and write in another than the Latin alphabet.
- Module 2 – German Integration Courses (300 hours) for immigrants whose German language skills are not yet at an A2 level.

17 This level can be compared with the level required for the secondary school leaving examination.

18 Ibid.
the AMS Tyrol highlighted: "Employment-related integration is often delayed to the actual time of immigration".\textsuperscript{19} To harmonise work and residence rights has long been a claim by many stakeholders and was also a central demand voiced in the interviews for this case study.

**Germany**

Admission and admission-related integration policies in Germany are designed to influence the qualification level, to increase labour market participation and to reduced unemployment and dependency on social benefits of the migrant population mainly by improving their language skills. Therefore, in 2005, post-arrival integration courses comprising a language course (aiming at CEFR level B1) and an orientation course (teaching knowledge of the legal system, culture and history) were introduced in Germany. The participation is obligatory for TCN-newcomers without adequate language skills as well as for persons receiving social benefits (according to Social Code Book II (SGB II)). Additionally, in 2007 pre-entry requirements of showing evidence of basic knowledge of the German language in the event of the subsequent immigration of spouses from abroad (CEFR level A1) were introduced.

Besides aiming at improving migrants’ integration, the policies implicitly aimed at selecting specific migrant groups. Therefore, Germany introduced preconditions for spouses subsequently immigrating from abroad: completion of 18th year of age of both spouses; evidence of basic knowledge of German language before visa application; evidence of sufficient living space and independence from social benefits. While maintaining a demand-oriented system of controlling labour migration (among others by the provisions of checking and protecting the priority of German workers and of a relatively high minimum salary for migrant applicants), some aspects of controlling labour migration by human capital criteria have been added (holding special skills and/or know-how). This policy is intended to have the immediate effects of increasing the share of highly-qualified newcomers and of newcomers with specific skills / know-how which are of specific interest for the German labour market, and of increasing the share of newcomers with high amounts of investment capital to promote the German economy. Moreover, the policy aims at reducing the share of subsequently immigrating TCN-spouses, especially poorly skilled / socio-economically weak spouses with high integration requirements and reduced opportunities for promoting the integration / education of their children, and at reducing the share of migrants directly immigrating into social security systems.

\textsuperscript{19} Interview Alp-Hoskowetz, 14
Actual impacts of admission and admission-related integration policies: selection effects and integration effects (esp. labour market effects)

Promoting the integration of newcomers

In the new Immigration Act of 1 January 2005, the conduction of an evaluation of the integration courses (progress report on the implementation and financing of the integration courses) has been defined by law. Against this background, the Federal Ministry of the Interior commissioned Rambøll Management in 2006 to elaborate an expertise on potentials for improving the implementation of the integration courses. This expertise served as information basis for the progress report the Federal Ministry of the Interior had to present to the federal parliament by 1 July 2007 (Schönwälder et al. 2005, p. 39). The objective of the external evaluation conducted by Rambøll Management was to analyse the implementation of the integration courses focussing on the aspects of process efficiency, financing and course conduction. The evaluation was designed as a course-accompanying empirical study and was finished after 12 months (BAMF 2009, p. 8).

A key finding of the study was that a proportion of approximately 40% of all integration course participants was not able to achieve language skills at level B1 within 600 teaching units. Thus, one recommendation for improvement was to work with a flexible amount of teaching units, differentiating according to the learning progress and previous knowledge base of the participants (Rambøll Management 2006, p. iv and 174). Another recommendation was to make the final examination as well as the initial placement test obligatory in order to obtain a more homogeneous composition of course participants and a better data base for assessing integration course effectiveness. The obligatory final examination should have the form of a graded test which is also able to determine language proficiency below level B1 (ibid. 2006, p. 166f.). It was further recommended to expand offers for child care, as a lack of child care services was found to be the reason for premature course termination in 40% of the terminations, particularly for women (ibid., p. 199). Subject of criticism was the fact that the existing possibilities of sanctions (negative and positive) were not applied consequently to those who were (not) meeting their obligation to attend an integration course.

20 § 43 Abs. 5 AufenthG
The results of the evaluation report as well as the results elaborated for the National Integration Plan (2007) entered into the amendment of the Residence Act (August 2007) and the revision of the Ordinance on Integration Courses (IntV) (December 2007) (BAMF 2009, p. 8). Rambøll Management points out that the examination of mid- and long-term impacts was not a subject of the evaluation study, as an impact assessment could only be undertaken several years after the programme has been started. Nevertheless the importance of an impact evaluation was stressed in order to gain relevant information for programme management decisions and thus a further improvement of the promotion of integration. One of the recommendations for action given by Rambøll Management therefore was the proposal to establish an ‘integration panel’, implemented by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Rambøll Management 2006, p. 213). This recommendation has been accepted and the Integration Panel was started in 2007 by the Federal Office.

The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees is according to § 75 Nr. 4 Residence Act (AufenthG) commissioned to carry out scientific research about migration issues (accompanying research) in order to derive analytical conclusions with respect to the controlling of immigration. Against this background and in the context of conceptual work regarding the national integration courses, the evaluation-project “Integration Trajectories of Integration Course Participants (Integration Panel)” was initiated in 2007, designed as a longitudinal study which has not yet been finished. The overall objective of the empirical study is to assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the integration courses (Rother 2008, p.6).

The following five central research questions are pursued by the Integration Panel (Rother 2008, p. 9ff.):

1. How do integration course participants’ German language skills change during and after the course, compared to non-participants?

2. How does integration course participation influence general social participation (structural, cultural, social, identificational integration processes)?

3. How does integration proceed within different groups of participants? Who is gaining most profit by these courses? Which factors (level of education, previous knowledge of the German language, living in a German environment (e.g. German partner), etc.) have an influence on integration trajectories by leading to faster or better integration?

4. How do integration course participants assess the integration courses? Of central interest is the participants’ assessment of benefits regarding the improvement of language skills. Furthermore the perceived importance of the courses for an
improvement of the general integration situation and life quality are analysed. And it is evaluated in how far a positive attitude towards the integration course is accompanied with a higher learning success.

(5) What insights can be derived for integration course improvement?

For assessing the effectiveness and sustainability of the integration courses, a longitudinal research design was elaborated, including the ex-ante construction of an investigation group of integration course participants and a control group of foreigners and ethnic Germans who were not participating in an integration course. With the integration course participants who had been selected for the investigation group (approx. 4,000 persons) interviews were conducted at three points in time: One interview at the beginning of the integration course attendance (ex-ante measurement of the initial situation), a second interview at the end of the course (ex-post) and a third interview was conducted approximately 12 months after course termination in order to analyse the sustainability of the integration courses. Interviews with persons who were not participating in an integration course and therefore allowed for a comparison, whether participants were actually characterised by faster or better integration processes, were conducted at two points in time with about 3,000 persons initially selected (Rother 2008, p. 11f.).

The Federal Office for Migration and Refugees has so far published three working papers on this evaluation study (Rother 2008, 2009, 2010), mainly focussing on the development of language skills during and after the course. The final report (release not yet known) will comprise more information also with respect to mid-and long-term impacts of the integration courses on socio-economic integration processes.

In another study (Grunert 2011) based on the same data, the main finding was that after participating in an integration course the majority of female attendants found a full- or part-time position. Also, it is more likely for female participants to find a full- or part-time position if they have a German partner, which leads to the assumption that contacts to Germans seem to have a great impact on the employment situation rather than the qualification level.

Results of a multivariate study of the German Socio-Economic Panel Date (SOEP) furthermore, indicate that integration programs might not accomplish their state objective- to assuring the integration of immigrants in the state, though “many immigrants are likely to remain unemployed, despite host nation language facility” (Doerschler et al. 2009: 32).
On the other hand, there is no existing evaluation focusing on the impact of pre-entry requirements on integration in Germany. However, the Federal Foreign Office, the Federal Ministry of the Interior and the Federal Government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees, and Integration (Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Integration, Flüchtlinge und Migration) have been elaborated an evaluation study on the legal provisions and the practical implementation of the requirement to demonstrate basic German language skills in the event of subsequent spouse immigration with respect to visa procedures as well as language courses and examinations. In this context interviews were conducted with the German diplomatic missions, with the Goethe Institute and Deutsche Welle in order to examine the language acquisition in the countries of origin. Goethe Institutes abroad were also interviewed about the implementation and the results of the language examinations. Those German diplomatic missions, establishing the required language skills on their own, due to lacking local test providers were asked about the implementation and the results of their test-method. In addition, the diplomatic missions in the top-15 countries of origin provided information about their experiences with the procedure for granting visas.21

Information is available on the success rates of the candidates who already participated in the language examination conducted by Goethe Institute. Success rates can be differentiated according to country as well as to the fact whether a preparatory language course offered by the Goethe Institute has been attended (internal success rate) or not (external success rate).

Table 3: Exam candidates and success rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>share of external SD1-candidates in overall number of SD1-candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD1-exam</td>
<td>success rate</td>
<td>success rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>candidates</td>
<td>internal SD1-</td>
<td>external SD1-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(absolute)</td>
<td>candidates</td>
<td>candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top 15 countries of origin</td>
<td>46.567</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>15.531</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worldwide (total)</td>
<td>60.111</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

source: BT-DS 17/3090, p. 22f; statistical data from the Goethe-Institute

In 2008, a total of 60,111 third country nationals worldwide took the language exam ‘Start Deutsch 1 (SD1)’ in order to obtain the ‘Goethe-Zertifikat A1’. The worldwide overall success rate in 2008 was 59%, with a success rate of 73% for internal exam candidates, i.e. candidates who participated in a preparatory language course offered by the Goethe Institute, and 54% for external exam candidates who prepared through self-study, by attending language courses offered by other course providers than the Goethe Institute or by means of private lessons.\textsuperscript{22} In 2009, the worldwide overall success rate was 64% (internal success rate: 74%; external success rate: 61%). Amongst the total number of 45,242 exam candidates in 2009, a proportion of 73% were external candidates, which indicates that the majority of the persons affected either do not have access to language courses offered by the Goethe Institute or cannot afford it.\textsuperscript{23}

In both years, success rates varied according to country of origin. Focusing on the 15 main countries of origin for spouse immigration to Germany, the highest success rates in 2009 were registered for Morocco (82%), Russia (82%) and the Ukraine (79%), the lowest success rates on the other hand were found in Macedonia (33%), Iran (35%) and Kosovo (51%).\textsuperscript{24} In Turkey, a number of 10,775 exam candidates were registered for 2009 with an above average overall success rate of 68%. The improvement compared to the previous year with an overall success rate of 62% in 2008 was due to an increase in the success rate for external candidates from 57% in 2008 to 64% in 2009, whereas the internal success rate was 92% for both years.\textsuperscript{25}

As for those cases in which the diplomatic missions have to conduct an assessment themselves, the missions estimate that the number of cases in which the assessment was not successful at the first try depended mainly on the difference in the level of education of the spouses and on differences in language-learning possibilities. According to the missions concerned, the pass rate is higher for female spouses than for male spouses.\textsuperscript{26}

It should be noted that the numbers displayed above also contain candidates who have retaken the SD1-exam once or even several times. The Goethe Institute is currently not collecting any data on whether candidates enrolling for the exam are

\textsuperscript{22} Deutscher Bundestag 2009, Drucksache 16/13978: 13
\textsuperscript{23} Deutscher Bundestag 2010, Drucksache 17/1112; Deutscher Bundestag 2009, Drucksache 17/194: 2
\textsuperscript{24} Deutscher Bundestag 2010, Drucksache 17/1112: 9f.
\textsuperscript{25} Deutscher Bundestag 2009, Drucksache 16/13978: 13; Deutscher Bundestag 2010, Drucksache 17/1112: 10
\textsuperscript{26} Deutscher Bundestag 2010, Drucksache 17/3090: 31
taking it for the first time or have to retake it after they had not been successful in an earlier trial. The Left Party criticized the results for being biased due to this kind of data presentation and further pointed out that it had to be assumed that probably only half of the persons affected succeeded in passing the exam at the first try. The federal government explained that more detailed data on this issue will be collected in the long term, but as this requires the implementation of a new technical infrastructure, detailed data will only be available in some years.

Furthermore, the Goethe Institute recently conducted surveys with post-arrival integration course participants in Germany and asked them about their experiences with the new legislation for spouse immigration and the pre-entry language courses offered by the Goethe Institute (Goethe Institute 2010). The interviewed persons stressed that the pre-entry acquisition of German language skills proved very helpful after their arrival in Germany and most of the persons recognized the need of demonstrating a basic knowledge of the German language.

‘The vast majority of participants consider the courses to be valuable preparation for life in Germany, which make it much easier to get used to everyday life and work. Many migrants, especially women, report that the courses not only offer them completely new opportunities for education, but that the new language also gives them a new world view’ (Goethe Institute).

While the representative of the BMI stated that the pre-entry language requirements are an effective tool for promoting integration, also in terms of completing the integration course, especially the integration course providers that were interviewed argued that they cannot perceive an impact on the language proficiency of migrants who passed the pre-entry test and presume that those measures do not have any sustainable effects.

**Controlling and limitation of immigration**

In Germany, two data sources are available for determining the amount of spouse immigration. On the one hand, the *visa statistics of the Foreign Office* which date back to 1996 register all cases in which a German embassy approved a spouse’s or dependent’s application for joining the sponsor in Germany. Since 1 January 2005 the *Central Aliens Register (AZR)* on the other hand, records all residence permits granted by
the purpose of the application and thus gives evidence on the amount of spouse immigration that actually took place in a certain year (Kreienbrink/Rühl 2007, p. 37; Bundesministerium des Innern 2010, p. 139). Due to different ways of data collection, data of these two sources cannot be compared.

In the following illustration, the development of the number of visa issued for spouse immigration (according to the visa statistics of the Foreign Office) between 1998 and 2009 is depicted.

Figure 3: Number of visa issued for spouse immigration
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After a continuous increase in spouse immigration had been experienced between 1998 and 2002, the visa statistics show dropping numbers of issued visas for the following years. In 2009 a total of 33.194 visas for spouse immigration were issued which was a slight increase compared to the 30.767 visas that were issued in the previous year. However, in comparison with the maximum of 64.021 visas for spouse immigration in 2002 the number of issued visas in 2009 was almost halved. But nevertheless, spouse and family migration is still a major channel for immigration to Germany (Bundesministerium des Innern 2010, p. 133).

The decline in the number of visas during the last years can partly be explained by the EU accession of 10 countries in 2004 and another 2 countries in 2007. EU-citizens who are enjoying the right of free movement according to EU law do not need a visa for
spouse immigration. Besides that the decrease partly reflects consequences of the provision of pre-entry German language skills for immigrating spouses which was implemented in August 2007.

Compared to the first three quarters of 2007 which all showed relatively constant numbers of visas issued for spouse immigration, there was a sharp overall decline of 40 % in the fourth quarter of 2007. While a comparison of the number of visas issued in the third and the fourth quarter of 2007 did only show insignificant changes for some countries (e.g. India), other countries were considerably affected. For Turkish nationals a decline in the number of visas of almost two thirds was observed (-67 %). Above average drops in spouse immigration were also registered for Thailand (-56 %), Serbia (-54 %) and Morocco (-51 %). A more detailed investigation reveals that subsequently immigrating wives were more affected than husbands. The number of visas issued for Turkish wives decreased between the third and the fourth quarter of 2007 for 74 %, for Turkish husbands, the decrease was about 57 % (Bundesministerium des Innern 2008, p. 124f.). The table below provides an overview of the number of visas issued for spouse immigration for the years 2005 until 2009 in the 15 main countries of origin.

**Table 4: Number of visa issues for spouse migration to Germany**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of visa issued for spouse immigration (top 15 countries of origin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>12,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>3,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>2,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegovina</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bundesministerium des Innern 2007, p. 271 (own calculation); BT-DS 16/11997, p. 14; BT-DS 17/1112, p. 6
It was assumed by the federal government that the decline in the numbers of visas in the fourth quarter of 2007 was only temporary, as it resulted from the fact that the applicants at first had to prepare for the language test before they could finally file their application. After a certain conversion period has passed, the numbers will increase again, it was estimated. In fact there was a slight increase in the number of visas registered already in the first and the second quarter of 2008 and the number of issued visas continued to increase in 2009 (+7.89 % compared to 2008) (BT-DS 17/1112, p.2). With a total amount of 33,194 there were even more visas issued in 2009 than in 2007. But this increase did not apply equally to all countries. Particularly for Turkey, the number of visas issued for spouse immigration was with 6,905 visas issued in 2009 still considerably below the respective number of 7,636 visas in 2007.

On the basis of the Central Aliens Register (AZR), the number of residence permits granted for the purpose of subsequent spouse immigration to Germany in a certain year can be determined by nationality (the visa statistics, in contrast, only provide information about the German diplomatic mission abroad where a visa for spouse immigration has been issued).

Table 5: Number of residence permits granted for subsequent spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>year</th>
<th>subsequent spouse immigration to Germany (according to the Central Alien Register)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>53,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>43,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>40,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>37,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Central Aliens Register also reveals a decrease in spouse immigration from a number of 43,159 residence permits granted for this purpose in 2006 to a number of 40,978 in 2007 and a number of 37,052 residence permits for spouse immigration in 2008.

According to the Central Aliens Register (AZR), the share of people that moved to Germany and were granted a residence permit for family reasons (spouses and other family members) was 27.9 % in 2006, 28.9 % in 2007 and 26.4 % in 2008 (Bundesministerium des Innern 2007, p. 32; Bundesministerium des Innern 2008, p. 32; Bundesministerium des Innern 2010, p. 34). Focussing on migration from Turkey the respective share of people that moved to Germany and were granted a residence permit for family reasons (spouses and other family members) decreased from 49.9 % in
2006 to 49.6 % in 2007 and 45.8 % in 2008 (Bundesministerium des Innern 2007, p. 32; Bundesministerium des Innern 2008, p. 32; Bundesministerium des Innern 2010, p. 36).

Netherlands

The Netherlands have explicitly designed a number of pre- and post-entry integration measures since the late 1990s to strengthen integration efforts of immigrants. In particular, the Dutch policy measures are intended to address family migrants. For third country nationals, the entrance of the Netherlands is linked to obligatory pre-entry language and civic instruction tests (A1-level), in which potential immigrants older than 16 need to participate in their home countries in order to get a temporary residence permit. For the issuance of non-temporary residence permits, the Dutch government posed an age condition of at least 18 years and an income condition of 100% of the minimum wage level. In 2004, these preconditions were significantly increased. The age condition was increased to at least 21 years, the income condition was increased to 120% of the minimum wage level. Furthermore, there are obligatory post-arrival language and civil instruction programmes, which have already been in place since 1998 and were reformed in 2004. The new regulations of 2004 made participation in civic instructions for oldcomers mandatory, which until then had been voluntary. For newcomers, a permanent residence permit will only be granted after passing the integration exam. Since 2010, the passing of the post-entry integration test has also become a legal requirement for naturalization.

Actual impacts of admission and admission-related integration policies: selection effects and integration effects (esp. labour market effects)

Promoting the integration of newcomers

In the Netherlands, as recent as 2010, a small-scale (only 29 participants and 29 professionals involved in post-entry integration programmes) and mainly qualitative analysis has been made of the effects of these civic integration programmes on the participation in society of migrants who have passed the post-entry tests (B&A, 2010). The outcomes of this analysis were strongly differentiated and highly tentative (in total only 29 migrants and 29 professionals were interviewed for the study). It showed that some facilities or ‘tracks’ remained underdeveloped or relatively little used (at least in the cities examined), specifically the tracks that focused on language apprehension and
on entrepreneurship. The labour-market oriented track did for over 50% of the participants (in the examined case-city Enschede) lead to a job within reasonable time after completing the post-entry programme. However, this effect is diminishing with the overall economic decline over recent years (ibid: 7-9). The track for parent carers did seem to increase parent involvement with schools and voluntary organisations. The effects of the track that leads specific migrants toward a state-exam for acquiring a formal language apprehension diploma are difficult to establish, as many participants of this track already have jobs (ibid: 9). No analyses have been made of the effects of the civic integration programmes on cultural attitudes of migrants, in spite of this cultural aspects being of such central importance to the political discourse on civic integration.\textsuperscript{30}

An evaluation of \textit{local post-entry integration programmes} in The Hague (2009) raises questions about the sustainability of the effects of the integration programme on participation. It concludes that, although migrants themselves report that their participation has increased after completing the post-entry programmes, “the amelioration appears to be limited in reality (mostly to involvement with schools and following additional courses)” (ibid: 16). Furthermore, migrants often seem unable to find and/or keep a job after completing their integration programmes, even for those who follow so-called ‘dual’ trajectories combining courses with work (ibid: 18). It thus concludes that “the assumption that civic integration and integration area mutually reinforcing appears to be disappointing in practice” (ibid).

An earlier analysis of the effect of the Civic Integration of Newcomers Act (installed in 1998) on \textit{language proficiency} provides a more positive image of the effects of civic integration courses on Dutch language comprehension (Dagevos, 2010: 11). A regression analysis of data on language proficiency of migrants shows that, apart from such variables as duration of stay, level of schooling, age and ethnic origin, whether or not a migrant has taken part in civic integration courses makes a significant difference as a variable for explaining language proficiency (ibid).

For the \textit{pre-entry integration measures}, more data is available on how the results of the pre-entry tests correlate with the scores of these migrants in the post-entry integration programmes. There is a very moderate but positive effect between the score in the pre-entry tests and the scores of these migrants at the intake for the post-entry integration

\textsuperscript{30} Interview with researchers from SCP; attempts are being made to couple databases so as to be able to monitor the social-economic participation of migrants who previously participated in civic integration programs.
programmes (as compared with the cohorts before the introduction of the pre-entry tests) (Regioplan, 2009). This involved in particular a slight amelioration in the level of understanding Dutch language; no amelioration was discovered in terms of speaking abilities (Regioplan, 2009: 70). It is remarkable that the level of writing and reading Dutch also increased slightly in comparison to immigrants that arrived in the Netherlands before the installation of the pre-entry programs; this is remarkable because these qualities are not trained nor tested in the country or origin (ibid).

The Begeleidingscommissie (2009: 9) argues that these effects can be only limited, given the fact that the level of language proficiency required for passing the pre-entry test is set very low. There was, unfortunately, still too little data available for determining the effect of the pre-entry tests on the subsequent integration of these participants into Dutch society (Regioplan, 2009: 20). However, spokespersons from municipalities involved in post-entry programmes indicate that there seems to be a slight amelioration in preparation, motivation and language proficiency of those who arrive in the Netherlands for post-entry programmes after having completed the pre-entry programmes (Ibid; 20). Also, the participants in the pre-entry tests (about 85%) themselves also seem to agree that the pre-entry tests help their preparation for their integration in the Netherlands (ibid: 33).

Both the personnel at the embassies and the consulates as well as the examinees in the countries of origin themselves, are however very critical of the demanded level of language proficiency for passing the pre-entry tests. The required level is so low (about 500 words) that one can hardly speak of a significant increase in language proficiency that would enable the migrant to be self-sufficient in the Netherlands (Regioplan, 2009: 18). Examiners indicate that they are startled by how some examinees with hardly any apprehension of Dutch language were able to pass the test (ibid: 19). This is also confirmed by our own focus groups. Migrants clearly indicate that they passed the language test by repeating texts that they did not understand. Furthermore, both the 2009 evaluation by Regioplan (p. 18) and our own focus groups confirm the role of memorisation as a factor explaining the successful pass rates in the test on Dutch society.

Finally, for the pre-entry conditions, an evaluation (WODC, 2010) indicates that the effects of imposing these criteria on the integration of both partners seem to be limited. In particular, there were no effects on the labour market participation of the referent. Moreover, in some instances it was observed that referents stopped their studies in order to meet the income requirement. There was a small positive effect on the labour market position of the foreign partners, in particular male partners. This effect seems to
be situated in particular in the period before and during the application for family migration, but seems to fade away in the period after family migration has been achieved (WODC, 2010). In particular the age requirement seems to have had little to no effect on the integration of newcomers, as compared with the income requirement. However, the measures did have a significant lowering effect on the number of applications for family formation migration (decrease of 37%) (WODC, 2010: 3-4). This decrease was the strongest amongst Moroccans, Turks and Surinamese. In particular women seem to apply much less as referent for family migration, possibly due to the fact that many women work part time.

**Controlling and limitation of immigration**

In terms of immigration effects of pre-entry integration measures, a strong effect was found on the number of applications for temporary residence permits for those categories obliged to take part in pre-entry tests (Lodder, 2009: 22). Although it is difficult to determine to what extent this (sharp) decrease in some countries is an actual effect of the pre-entry tests or from, for instance, the pre-entry conditions that were imposed in November 2004, the fact that this decrease occurred rather ‘immediate’ after the enactment of the pre-entry tests indicates that it is reasonable to assume that this is largely the effect of these pre-entry tests (see also, Begeleidingscommissie, 2009: 10, Lodder 2009: 33).

Figure 1 clearly shows that the number of applications for temporary residence permits declined sharply since the enactment of the Integration Abroad Act in 2006 (also there was a peak in applications in the period immediately before the implementation of the pre-entry tests). This decrease was very significant for those groups that were obliged to take part in the pre-entry test. The figure also shows that since 2008 and in particular since 2009, the number of applications is increasing again, though still at a lower level than before enactment of the Civic Integration Abroad Act.
Figure 1: Number of applications for temporary residence permit (blue line for entire population, brown line for those required to pass a pre-entry test) (Significant, 2009: 38).

Though the effects differ little for different categories of applicants, the decrease was slightly larger for elderly and for low-educated persons. This seems to involve a degree of ‘self-selection’ amongst migrants (Regioplan, 2009: 60-62); migrants who fear not to pass or are not motivated to take part in the pre-entry tests, don’t apply for family migration, and possibly also the partners that are selected for family migration are higher educated than before. In terms of countries, in particular the number of applications from Turkey, Morocco, Brazil and Indonesia seems to have decreased relatively strongly (ibid: 70). At the same time, an important finding in relation to European regulations was that the pre-entry tests seem to bring about little selection effects in terms of pass or fail-rates; almost 96% percent of the participants that take part in the pre-entry tests eventually managed to pass the test. Therefore, Lodder (2009: 34) concludes that “the imposition of the pre-entry tests has posed a more severe obstacle to low-educated, family reunification migrants, specific nationalities and in particular Turkish and Moroccans than for other categories of migrants (..), but for none of these groups this obstacle is so severe that is results in the exclusion of specific groups.”

In various reports, the effect on the levels of immigration of specific groups is defined as ‘self-selection’. This would mean that the pre-entry tests themselves, because of the
high passing rates, do not so much select migrants, but that migrants determine for themselves whether they consider themselves capable of passing a pre-entry test and, based thereon, whether or not to engage in such a test. This is also reflected in the changing composition of the group of applicants for temporary residence permits in the concerned countries (see table 2): the percentage of female applicants has increased (further) to more than two-thirds, the applicants have on average become more highly educated (increase of percentage of high educated from 20 to 33%) and they have become younger on average (from 33 to 31). Furthermore, differences in terms of countries or origin were detected (for instance less Moroccans and Ghanese, more Chinese, Thai and Brazilians). Of course, these trends cannot simply be causally related only to the the pre-entry tests.

Table 6: Characteristics of applicants for temporary residence permits before and after effectuation of the Integration Abroad Act (in %) (Significant 2009: 61-62)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before effectuation of the Integration Abroad Act</th>
<th>After effectuation of the Integration Abroad Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, Regioplan (2009: 62) assumes that these figures do indicate a certain degree of ‘self-selection’, meaning that “especially the elderly and the lower educated are more often discouraged for applying for a temporary residence permit, PS than others because of the mandatory pre-entry tests.” The Begeleidingscommissie (2009) also describes this self-selection effect, as it concludes that “the Integration Abroad Act does influence the choice of partner by the partner in the Netherlands... which is more inclined to choose a higher educated partner who therefore has a greater chance for passing the exam” (p. 11).

This idiom of self-selection conceals that the difference between self-selection and the, in this context, contested legal concept of selection is very difficult to make.

### 4 Discussion of the results of available studies

In most countries included in the study there are no evaluations or studies available which assess the impact of admission or admission-related policies. An exception are Germany and the Netherlands where a few evaluations are existent. The results of these studies are discussed in the following section.

So far there is little evidence that the implemented policies actually do promote integration in Germany as well as in the Netherlands. Yet, in both countries there are indications that the post-entry programmes do support the integration of TCNs. In the Netherlands, results of studies indicate that migrants participating in post-entry programs often find jobs after completing their courses. However, another recent study suggests that many migrants experience difficulties in keeping these jobs. In Germany, a recently published study shows that the majority of female participants found part- or full time jobs, especially those who have a German partner (Grunert 2011). This, however, indicates that successful participation in an integration course is not the sole factor to ensure better labour market integration.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that the post-entry programmes in Germany as well as in the Netherlands have an independent positive effect on language proficiency of migrants. In contrast, there are studies in Germany that indicate that “being officially employed does not vary significantly across the different levels of language competency” (Doerschler et al. 2009: 17).
The effects of the **pre-entry requirements** seem to be far more differentiated with regard to integration. On the one hand, according to interviewees with integration course providers in Germany the required level of language proficiency (level A1) is so low, that little effect can be expected on migrants’ language proficiency. On the other hand, in the Netherlands two positive effects do emerge clearly from the focus groups and other research reports: Firstly, the pre-entry test does seem to enhance the overall preparation and motivation of migrants who decide to come to the Netherlands, and secondly, it provides migrants with relevant practical knowledge that helps them to find their way around in the Netherlands in terms of very basic activities (Scholten 2011).

With regard to the objective of controlling and limiting migration, it is very apparent that the implementation of the pre-entry tests has decreased the **level of immigration** to the Netherlands. In Germany as well, there has been a slight decrease in spouse immigration after the implementation of the provision of pre-entry German language skills, which might be partly due to the implementation of this provision in 2007.

Nevertheless, the relation between these tests and the level of immigration cannot be established in a direct manner. An important methodological limitation is the lack of knowledge whether the decision of potential migrants not to go to the Netherlands or Germany is based on the pre-entry tests or on other determinants (such as perception of migration/integration discourse in the Netherlands, or the pre-entry conditions that were installed only shortly before the pre-entry tests) (Scholten 2011).

For both, the pre- and post-entry integration programmes, evaluations on the implementation of the policies have been conducted in Germany and the Netherlands. Yet, only few evaluations focus on the effects on migration patterns or integration (into the labour market).

Most of the existing evaluation studies are moreover focused on **outcomes**, namely on the intended effects (benefits) for the target groups (e.g. achievement of language skills). Assuming that language proficiency is a basic condition for participation, this can be seen as evidence that the post-entry courses do support the labour market position of migrants (Scholten 2011). However, this is not be sufficient to assess the impacts, as language proficiency is not the single variable that leads to better labour market integration as discussed above.

Furthermore, the number of participants who completed the courses successfully is not a sufficient indicator to measure success or effectiveness of the policies.

It is to be expected that long-term studies such as the National Integration Panel in Germany provide promising results, however, they are not completed, yet. In addition, it has to be kept in mind that longitudinal panel studies have disadvantages, as well. For
instance there is the risk that respondents drop out which might bias the results (Jacobs 2011: 23).

The Dutch government is preparing a design for more long-term monitoring of the integration effects of post-entry (and pre-entry?) measures. A study by Significant (2010) shows that a coupling of data is possible, providing the opportunity to monitor specific cohorts over a longer period of time. Currently, such an evaluation would not yet be possible, as most data bases only reach back to 2007. At that time, most migrants had not completed their post-entry programs (following the 2006 revisions), yet. However, even if a long-term monitoring system is designed, it remains methodological difficult, if not impossible, to establish a causal relationship between the pre- and post-entry policies and the integration patterns of newcomers. This would require a cohort that is not subject to these policies. As these policies are obligatory, such a cohort cannot be established (Scholten 2011).

5 Conclusions

In several EU countries, admission and admission-related integration policies have been implemented in the last years. Although, the measures differ in terms of defining target groups, types of policies as well as their specific constitution, the objectives that lie behind the implementation of these policies are quite similar among the countries. The establishment of these policies was often connected with the expectation of having an impact on migration patterns as well as on migrants’ integration trajectories. Yet, only in Germany as well as in the Netherlands a few attempts to measure the effects of the implemented policies on these objectives can be observed.

This report therefore focuses on discussing the possibilities of assessing the impacts of admission policies / admission-related policies on migration patterns and integration trajectories (esp.: labour market integration) of third country national newcomers. In addition, it provides an overview of how the impacts were measured until then on the national level and summarises the results concerning the actual effects of the implemented policies on the objectives.

Despite the fact that promoting integration is the key objective of both the pre- and the post-entry integration policies, there is still little evidence that these policies actually promote integration in Germany as well as in the Netherlands (Scholten 2011). With regard to the methodology of existing studies and evaluations, for both the pre- and post-entry integration programmes, evaluation reports have been conducted on the implementation of these policies, but still little is known about their more prolonged
effects on integration. Evaluations that focus on the impact on integration, however, often solely consider outcomes, such as the achievement of language skills, which is not the only factor which e.g. labour market integration is determined by.

Assessing mid- and long-term impacts of admission and admission-related integration policies, e.g. the question, whether a successful completion of an obligatory integration course does not only lead to improved language competences but also has an effect on the labour market integration of TCN-newcomers, requires the application of an impact evaluation. When measuring the impact of these policies one main difficulty has to overcome: The can a causal link between policies and migration patterns as well as integration trajectories be established? Thus, the quality of a research design depends upon the question to what extent all relevant impacts are specified and problems of causality can be solved.

A theory-based concept which clearly analyses the different interventions, the expected impacts and the basic conditions should constitute the beginning of an evaluation. An important component of an impact model, furthermore, is the anticipation of external factors having an additional influence on the processes observed, in the given context: the socio-economic, in particular the labour market integration of TCN-newcomers. As these external factors (such as labour market barriers or migrant characteristics) might distort the effects caused by the implemented policies and legal provisions, by diminishing, strengthening or neutralising their impact, the attempt to specify and to control these factors within an impact analysis, is essential.

With regard to the methods used for an assessment of the policies a triangulation of methods should be implemented: therefore, it seems to be of value to enrich the results gained by quantitative research based on statistical analysis with a more qualitative oriented approach (such as the Judgemental Approach).

In addition, cross-national comparison further hampers the analysis as it comprises a large number of additional aspects, which have to be considered, including:

- legal provisions aiming at a pre-entry selection of newcomers with certain characteristics,
- provisions extending/restricting the scope of action for newcomers or for those actors and institutions interacting with newcomers in the destination country,
- to different kinds of national integration programs or tests (specific) newcomers are obliged to attend after their arrival in the destination country.

Furthermore, the types of policies, their specific constitution and their time of introduction vary in all of the EU-member states covered within the PROSINT-project.
Additionally, “cross-national comparisons are methodologically tricky in any event as conceptual definitions and statistical data can vary widely from one European country to another” (Jacobs, Kraler and Reichel 2010, Heckmann et al. 2010). Harmonised data is one key prerequisite for measuring impacts across countries.

To conclude, there is very little long-term analysis available on the national level up to date, which might be partly due to the fact, that in most countries such policies have been implemented only recently. However, even if long-term analysis is designed, it will remain very difficult to establish a causal relationship between the interventions (independent variables) and the measured impacts (dependent variables) and thus to measure the impact of policies on integration trajectories or migration patterns on the national level or even more difficult in cross-national comparisons.
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Annex 1:

Variable-list LFS ad-hoc module 2008

Variable list (Eurostat)\textsuperscript{31}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>203/206</td>
<td>9996</td>
<td>Year of citizenship acquisition 4 digits</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C17/18= C170/171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9997</td>
<td>Year unknown but national by acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C17/18</td>
<td>National at birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9998</td>
<td>National since the creation of the country/redefinition of borders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C17/18=C170/171))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Citizenship is defined as the particular legal bond between an individual and his/her State, acquired by birth or naturalization, whether by declaration, option, marriage or other means according to the national legislation. Reference should always be made to existing citizenships.

- Code 9998: expected in case of break-up of countries, redefinition of borders ...

- About dual citizenship: This variable aims to know only about the citizenship of the host country. In case a migrant has a foreign citizenship but also acquired the citizenship of the host country, then the year of citizenship acquisition should be filled. In case a person had a dual citizenship at birth -a foreign and the host country citizenship-, then code 9997 (national at birth) applies.

- Note: "National/non national" and "citizen/non citizen" of the host country have exactly the same meaning (legal aspect).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211/212</td>
<td>01-98</td>
<td>Total number of years of residence in the host country 2 digits</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C19/20=00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Years during which person had residence (taking up residence, establishment) in the host country should be taken into account. For example, short visits for tourism or to see family should be excluded.

- For persons with up to one year's residence in total in this Member State, 01 should be coded; between one year and two years, 02;.

- Only interruptions of residence of more than one year should be considered as an exit of the host country. E.g.

* A person took up residence for 6 months and then went back to his/her country for 2 years and then took up residence again in the host country 2 years ago: the total duration is 2 ½ years and should be coded '03'.

* A person took up residence for 6 months and then went back to his/her country for 9 months and then took up residence again in the host country 5 years ago: the total duration is 6 years and 3 months and should be coded '07'.

- Control of the data: C19/20 <= C211/212. In case the last arrival in order to take up residence is also the first one, the same code should be used for C19/20 and C211/212.

\textsuperscript{31} Fragen für das LFS ad-hoc Modul „Die Arbeitsmarktsituation von Migrantinnen und Migranten“. 
Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Main reason for migrating for the last migration (the most recent) should be recorded.

- The individual reason that the person interviewed had for migrating is requested. Different reasons in the same household are expected (e.g. father = employment, mother and child = family).

- In case where multiple reasons apply, the main reason should be recorded (spontaneous choice from the person interviewed). The reason for migrating at the moment of the migration should be recorded.

- 'Real' reason for migrating (i.e. the one declared by respondents) should be asked for (and not legal reason). All response options should be shown/read out to the interviewed persons for a better harmonisation of the data collected.

- Codes 1, 2 and 3: Entering the country with or without any job perspective has probably not the same impact on the labour market integration. It is important to have this information separately.

- Code 3: Including search for job and including persons who intended to set up own business.

- Code 4: Including trainees, apprentices, interns.

- Code 5: "Forced" migration - Humanitarian migration, including political refugees, asylum seekers, other populations under protection (1951 Geneva Convention on refugee status; Other forms of international protection - temporarily protected, persons in asylum procedure etc.).

- Code 6: It includes accompanying family (e.g. spouse/children) of an entering worker/student, entry of spouse and/or children of a resident. Nuclear family (parents, dependant children) is taken into account as well as other dependant parents and dependant close children relatives (the main criteria is the dependency criteria).

- Code 7: Family formation, creation (marriage).

- Code 8: "Other" should refer to other voluntary migration. E.g. retired persons who came in the host country for their retirement, migrations for the climate, for health reasons, for better medical or health services, less insecurity (outside code 5), "housing" reasons for frontier-worker migrants ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employment, intra corporate transfer</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and (C162/165 - C11/14 - C19/20)&gt; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employment, job found before migrating other than code 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employment, no job found before migrating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>International protection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Accompanying family/family reunification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Family formation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00) or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and (C162/165 - C11/14 - C19/20)&gt; 15))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- "Use of means": all national or international reputable providers of certificates clarifying what qualifications (obtained abroad) equate to in the host country system should be taken into account. E.g. national authorities, professional or university bodies, NARIC (National Academic Recognition Information Centre) ... Such procedures are included whether they are free or not.

- "Qualification": including educational qualifications and professional qualifications (vocational/training) - as in the ISCED system.

- Code 1: persons obtained a certificate/document establishing what qualification equates to in the host country system.

- Code 4: e.g. person does not need such a certificate for the work he/she does/wishes to do ...

- Code 5: e.g. person was not aware of any such possibility, person thought it is too complicated, procedure too expensive or time consuming ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 217    | 1    | Need to improve host country language skills to get an appropriate job | Yes
|       | 2    | Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00) or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and C116=2, blank)) | No
|       | Blank | No answer | Everybody aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 or C99=1,2,4 or (C99=3 and C116=1) |

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- All host nation languages should be taken into account as well as other co-official languages.

- Time dimension: current situation applies.

- "Appropriate job": type of job person would normally do/search for if language skills were not an issue (i.e. more in line with their qualifications/skills/previous work experiences).

- "Need": the need should be the focus and not the willingness.

- Code 2 includes:

* Cases where persons' abilities in host country language(s) are good

* Cases where persons' abilities in host country language(s) are not good but where it is not a problem because his/her job is appropriate, or their language skills would, in their view, not affect their ability to get an appropriate job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 218    | 1    | Main help received in the host country in finding the current job or setting up own business | Relatives/friends
|       | 2    | Public employment office | Private employment agencies
|       | 3    | Migrant or ethnic organisation | Other
|       | 4    | None |
|       | 9    | Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C24=3, 4, 5)) | No answer |

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Codes 1 to 5:

* Should only be recorded help provided by persons living/organisations set up IN the host country. E.g. migrants helped by relatives living in the country of origin should be coded 6.

* Migrants that were helped by persons/organisations of the host country but before they arrived in the host country should be included. E.g. a migrant who found his job in the host country before migrating thanks to a relative living in the host country.
- Code 6 includes:
  * Cases where persons were helped by persons/organisations in the country of origin
  * Cases where persons were not helped at all (including those who didn't need any help)
- 'Other': e.g. employers, business contacts, commune ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, contact with an adviser for job guidance/counselling or job search assistance</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and C19/20&lt;=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, participation to labour market training/programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, participation to host country language tuition</td>
<td>(C162/165 - C11/14 - C19/20)&gt;=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 1 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 1, 2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No, not entitled to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00) or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and C19/20&lt;=10) or (person aged 15-74 and C19/20=00 and C19/20&lt;=10 and (C162/165 - C11/14 - C19/20)&lt;15))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- "Participation to labour market training/programmes": including work experience schemes, professional training programmes/integration programmes. Training programmes/measures to assist integration in labour market, including that specific to helping migrants adapt to the labour market in the host country (e.g. participation in work experience schemes, vocational training).

- "Participation to host country language tuition": reading/writing/speaking/understanding.

- Public and private services should be included. E.g. services provided by public employment office or by other public services, services provided by associations, employers, Trade Unions ...

- "Use of services for labour market integration": e.g. students who were in school without having used services for labour market integration are excluded from codes 1 to 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes, less than 1 year</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C17/18&lt;=C170/171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Yes, number of years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes, limited duration of more than 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C17/18=C170/171))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Codes 1 to 6 are of most interest.

- Any kind of authorisation issued by the authorities of a Member State allowing to stay legally in its territory should be taken into account (e.g. residence permit/visa/certificate). Visas often refer to short duration (normally less than 3 months but can be less than 1 year).

- The duration refers to the total duration of the authorisation (total length of validity) and not to the duration which is still valid. In case of successive permits, the duration of the current permit should be taken into account.

- Coding for situations where residence permits are formally limited but automatically prolonged: the formal situation (limitation) should be taken into account.
EU citizens are often allowed to stay in the MS for unlimited duration (sometimes with the establishment of a certificate). Code 7 should apply in these cases.

Countries should be able to filter out nationals of countries that are free to live in the host country without authorisation for unlimited durations. These cases should be coded 7.

When designing the questionnaire, special care has to be taken due to the sensitivity of the topic.

No recommendation is made at the European level concerning the coding of illegal migrants because of the sensitivity of this issue in some countries. Codes 1 to 6 are of most interest, the MS are free to leave the coding of illegal migrants as their legal statistical rules allow them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Filter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, access restricted to employment for specific employers/sectors/occupations</td>
<td>Everybody aged 15-74 and C17/18=C17 0/171 and (C24=1,2 or C99=1,2,4 or (C99=3 and C116=1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, access restricted to self-employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, access not allowing self-employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes, combination of 1 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes, other legal access restrictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Does not know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable (person aged less than 15 or more than 74 or (person aged 15-74 and C17/18=C170/171) or (person aged 15-74 and C17/18=C170/171 and C116=2, blank))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

Objective

In the perspective of analysing barriers to the integration in the labour market, it is important to be able to identify the legal/work permit restrictions on the migrant’s access to the labour market.

This variable seeks to clarify what official restrictions on labour market access the migrant is subject to (e.g. legal/work permit restrictions) and hence limitations on migrants’ possibilities to be mobile in/integrate into the labour market.

Instructions for the survey or for the coding

- Codes 1 to 5 have priority on code 6 'Other legal access restrictions'.

- Code 6 includes any other kinds of legal restrictions not included in codes 1 to 5 (e.g. geographical restrictions, no access ...), except time restrictions (see C214).

- The MS have the possibility to build this variable using information from the core LFS, when feasible and when information is available. E.g. national rules on migrants’ legal access to the labour market may be specific for some kinds of population that may be identified using variables from the core LFS. The use of administrative data is also possible to the extent that information can be linked with LFS data.

- When designing the questionnaire, special care has to be taken due to the sensitivity of the topic.

- No recommendation is made at the European level concerning the coding of illegal migrants or legal migrants working illegally because of the sensitivity of this issue in some countries. The MS are free to leave the coding as their legal statistical rules allow them.
Annex 2:
Impact model adapted to the German situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>2) POLICIES</th>
<th>3) EXPECTED OUTCOMES / IMPACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>strategic goals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) controlling and limitation of immigration</td>
<td>immediate effects (intended):</td>
<td>long-term effects (intended):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) improving migrant population’s integration into society</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMPROVEMENT IN STRUCTURAL (SOCIO-ECONOMIC) INTEGRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>operative goals:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased level of qualification of the total migrant population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in qualification level of migrant population based on two strategies:</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased labour market participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced unemployment rates and dependence on social benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) QUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-entry requirement of showing evidence of basic knowledge of the German language in the event of subsequent immigration of spouses from abroad (CEFR level A1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-arrival integration courses comprising a language course (aiming at CEFR level B1) and an orientation course which is supposed to teach knowledge of the legal system, culture and history. Participation is obligatory for TCN-newcomers without adequate language skills as well as for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Michalowski 2006, p. 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
persons drawing social benefits (according to Social Code Book II (SGB II)).

(b) **SELECTION**
- Introduction of preconditions for spouses subsequently immigrating from abroad (both spouses must have completed their 18th year of age; evidence of basic knowledge of the German language before visa application; sufficient living space; independence from social benefits).
- While maintaining a demand-oriented system of controlling labour migration (German workers have to be given a priority) some aspects of controlling labour migration by human capital criteria have been added (holding special skills and/or know-how)

level B1 through participation in an obligatory integration course;
- Increased share of highly-qualified newcomers and of newcomers with specific skills / know-how which are of special interest for the German labour market;
- Increased share of newcomers with high amounts of investment capital promoting the German economy;
- Reduced share of subsequently immigrating TCN-spouses, especially poorly skilled / socio-economically weak spouses with high integration requirements and reduced opportunities for promoting the integration / education of their children.
- Reduced share of migrants directly immigrating into social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills, values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(interethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identificative integration (feelings of belonging, loyalty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REDUCTION OF THE SHORTAGE OF (HIGHLY) QUALIFIED WORK FORCE ON THE GERMAN LABOUR MARKET
<p>| security systems |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic goals:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Expected outcomes</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Promoting the integration of newcomers into Dutch society</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Pre-entry tests, including a test of language proficiency (level A1) and a test on basic knowledge of Dutch society. Passing the test is mandatory in order to receive a Temporary Residence Permit.</td>
<td>Immediate and intended effects</td>
<td>Long-term effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Pre-entry conditions; conditions on behalf of the referent, age condition (migrants should be 18+), income condition</td>
<td>Selecting better motivated and prepared applicants for temporary residence permits. Migrants are better able to find their way in Dutch society Greater Dutch language proficiency</td>
<td>Better social-economic and social-cultural integration of migrants. Emancipation of migrant women Decrease of radicalization and criminalization of migrant youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Post-entry civic integration programs; including language training as well as social-cultural courses (orientation on Dutch society). Passing the post-entry test is mandatory in order to receive a permanent residence permit.</td>
<td>After completing the post-entry tests, migrants should be able to be self-reliant within Dutch society</td>
<td>Better social-economic and social-cultural integration of newcomers, and under some conditions oldcomers as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Controlling and limitation of immigration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Emancipation of migrant women</th>
<th>Decrease of radicalization and criminalization of migrant youth</th>
<th>Selection based on nationality, age, sex and level of schooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Pre-entry tests (see 1a);</td>
<td>A selection effect is mentioned as an anticipated side-effect of the pre-entry tests; ‘potential migrants that are not directly willing or able to acquire the level of language proficiency and knowledge of Dutch society required for being admitted, (..) settlement will be delayed or cancelled’.</td>
<td>Decrease of immigration of migrants with poor prospects in terms of integration into Dutch society, in particular family migrants</td>
<td>Selection based on nationality, age, sex and level of schooling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>