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While integration policies as such are not new, and in some countries date back to the 1980s and beyond, there have been important shifts in the debates on integration and in related re-configurations of integration policymaking in the past decade or so. One of the main recent trends is the linkage of integration policy with admission policy and the related focus on recent immigrants. A second trend is the increasing use of obligatory integration measures and integration conditions in admission policy, and third, integration policymaking is increasingly influenced by European developments, both through vertical (more or less binding regulations, directives etc.) and through horizontal processes (policy learning between states) of policy convergence.

An increasing number of EU Member States have, in fact, adopted integration related measures as part of their admission policy, while the impact of such measures on integration processes of immigrants is far less clear. In addition, Member States’ policies follow different, partly contradictory logics, in integration policy shifts by conceptualising (1) integration as rights based inclusion, (2) as a prerequisite for admission residence rights, with rights interpreted as conditional, and (3) integration as commitment to values and certain cultural traits of the host society.

The objective of PROSINT is to evaluate the impact of admission related integration policies on the integration of newcomers, to analyse the different logics underlying integration policymaking and to investigate the main target groups of compulsory and voluntary integration measures.

The project investigated different aspects of these questions along five distinct workpackages. These analysed (1) the European policy framework on migrant integration (WP1), (2) the different national policy frameworks for the integration of newcomers in the 9 countries covered by the research (WP2), the admission-integration nexus at the local level in studied in 13 localities across the 9 countries covered by the research (WP3), the perception and impacts of mandatory pre-arrival measures in four of the nine countries covered (WP4) and a methodologically oriented study of the impact of admission related integration measures (WP5).

The countries covered by the project were Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Apart from individual cases project reports generally cover the period until end of 2010.

For more information about the project visit [http://research.icmpd.org/1429.html](http://research.icmpd.org/1429.html).
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I Introduction

This report describes the introduction of post-entry integration measures in Austria. The report has been prepared within the framework of work package 2 of the PROSINT project, covering altogether nine countries included in the PROSINT study (AT, CH, CZ, DE, ES, IT, NL, UK, SE). The aim of this report is to show the general evolution of policies in the interface between migration and integration policies. Pre-entry admission requirements are treated in a separate work package. The country reports prepared under WP2 followed a common template elaborated by the work package coordinator and were designed for the purpose of the comparative report. Although country reports can also be read as standalone documents, the reports were not designed as such, but essentially as input for the comparative analysis. The research for this report was finalised in April 2011, i.e. just before the major amendments of the Settlement and Residence Act (Niederlassungs- und Aufenthaltsgesetz – NAG) passed Parliament and well before the entry into force of the new regulations (July 2011). While the report was subsequently revised to reflect the adoption of the amendment and its entry into force, the main timeframe covered by the report remains the period up to the adoption of the law. It is up to future research to undertake an evaluation of the implementation of the amendment.

The report is structured into five major sections. In the remainder of section I, the research design and the methodology used by this report is described. Section II analyses the evolution of integration-related admission policies, policy objectives and political theory underlying proposed measures, their main target groups and stakeholders in this policy process. Section III describes provision at the nexus of migration and integration that are in currently enacted, i.e. general admission criteria linked to immigrant integration and in particular language requirements. Section IV investigates the social and political background of integration-related admission policies through an analysis of media and political debates. Section V briefly assesses the influence of the EU and other European countries on the development of these policies in Austria (perceived impacts admission policies on integration). It is however too early to evaluate the actual impact of implemented measures and the perception of impacts by relevant stakeholders.

I.1 Methodology

This report is based on the analysis of policy documents, a review of the existing literature on the subject, expert interviews, and an analysis of media discourses and parliamentary debates. In terms of research design, this report follows standard approaches to public policy analysis. These typically interpret the policy process as a cycle, which involves a succession of several stages: problem definition, agenda-setting, policy formulation, decision making, policy evaluation and implementation (See for an overview Parsons 1995: 77ff). Methodologically, policy analysis typically requires a mixed-method approach, whereby information is gathered through a variety of methods

2 The WP2 coordinator was Maren Borkert of the International Centre for Migration Policy Development.
3 For a list of newspaper articles consulted see the bibliography. For a more detailed description of the methodology used for the media and political analysis see Section IV of this report.
and from different sources and is then triangulated in order to make informed statements on the policy process. Epistemologically, this is based on an understanding that the policy process – as in fact all social reality – can never be wholly understood in all its complexity, nor that there is any single privileged actor or type of information that would allow us to come to such a comprehensive, authoritative understanding. Rather, policy research can only approximate a comprehensive understanding, and can do so only by combining different types of information and methods. This approach clearly distinguishes public policy analysis from a legal analysis, which typically uses legislation, explanatory notes to legislative proposals as well as case law as an authoritative framework of both information on and interpretation of public policies. A second major rationale for combining different methods and sources are the practical limitations in mapping all relevant actors in a policy process and gathering their views on policymaking. Complex policy fields such as integration and migration policy typically involve a multitude of actors and are usually negotiated over a long period of time within different formats. Finally, key actors’ perspectives on the policy process are themselves not neutral, nor free from contradictions. Combining different sources, notably policy documents, explanatory notes to legislative proposals, selected interviews with political actors and media debates to some extent allows to overcome the difficulties to account for the policymaking process, but it also implies that to an important extent the design of policy analysis is based on theoretical assumptions and plausibility considerations how different pieces of information link together.
II The Evolution of the Migration and Integration Nexus

Despite the long tradition as an immigration country and the recruitment of temporary foreign workers since the 1960s, Austrian migration policies did not take into account the question of integration till the 1990s. The first time the term integration was used in federal laws on migration was in the Residence Law of 1992. ‘Integration support’ should be provided to immigrants working in Austria, their family members and recognised refugees in order to reach their inclusion into the Austrian economic, cultural and societal life. However, in the following years no specific integration programmes were installed at the national level. The implementation of integration measures was left basically to private, humanitarian, religious, and welfare organisations, and municipalities, who were free to initiate integration measures, but were not obliged to do so. At the same time, the 1992 Residence Law for the first time installed the right to family reunion for long-term resident immigrants. To be eligible for family reunion, as well as for residence in general though, applicants from non-EEA states had to demonstrate suitable accommodation and a secured subsistence level. The income and housing requirement, as well as the application of maximum annual quotas for family and labour immigration were criticised to prevent integration, and a broad coalition of actors pressured to formulate an adequate integration policy.

In June 1997 the Austrian parliament approved a major amendment to the aliens law (Aliens Act, Foreigners’ Employment Act and the Asylum Act) (‘integration package’). Integration of those already in the country was given priority to new immigration and was discursively linked to the restriction of new immigration (‘Integration before new immigration’). At the same time, the amendment considerably improved the residence status of long-term settled migrants by allowing for a consolidation of residence and removed some of the legal barriers to wider socio-economic integration. Furthermore, an ‘Integration Advisory Council’ was installed to advice the Ministry of Interior in questions of integration. Therefore, the ‘integration package’ can be seen ‘as a first step towards a more proactive integration policy’. Concrete programs however, remained focused mainly on recognised refugees.

In 2000, the newly formed coalition government between the Austrian People’s Party (ÖVP) and Freedom Party (FPÖ) published its governmental program including a chapter on ‘Comprehensive Integration’. It called for concrete measures facilitating the integration of immigrants with a focus on language acquisition and also foresaw a mandatory ‘integration package’ for newcomers. The new government was the main driving force for the introduction of the Integration Agreement (IA), which was introduced in 2002 in the course of an amendment to the Aliens Act. With this, the integration of third country nationals, in particular of immigrants who came for family

---

5 Ibid.
6 Kraler, Albert (2010), pp. 75f.
8 Penninx,Rinus (2009), p.8
9 Fremdengesetz, Ausländerbeschäftigungsgesetz, Asylgesetz
10 International Centre for Migration Policy Development (2005), p.20
11 Ibid., p.20
reasons became a new focus of integration policies. Before this, the objective of integration was stated in law but no particular measures were specified.\textsuperscript{13} The IA puts special emphasis on the acquisition of basic German language skills and marks a clear policy shift: on the one hand, it represents the first coordinated federal measure for the integration of third country nationals apart from refugees. At the same time, the IA emphasizes the responsibility of migrants to contribute to integration, in particular by learning the national language. Thus, the IA depicts language acquisition as a very important area of integration, whereas other principles, such as equal opportunities have received less attention in the political discourse. The IA also reflects an understanding of integration as something that has to be fulfilled and achieved by migrants who are expected to adapt to the new society’s values and norms.\textsuperscript{14} Another amendment made in 2002 was the introduction of the regulation on key personnel (Schlüsselkräfteregelung), which restricted immigration of third country nationals for the purpose of labour to highly-skilled persons who could proof to have a job above a certain income level. In 2005, the conditions of the IA as well as general immigration requirements, such as income conditions, were amended (see III.1.1 and III.1.3).

In 2008, the government announced to develop a National Action Plan on Integration (NAPI) in order to enhance the cooperation for successful integration measures in Austria.\textsuperscript{15} Between April and July 2009 the Ministry of Interior organised monthly steering group meetings bringing together representatives from the Federal Chancellery, all Austrian ministries, federal state governments, social partners, the Austrian Association of Cities and Towns, the Austrian Association of Municipalities, the Federation of Austrian Industries and the five most important Austrian NGOs in the field of migration and integration (Caritas, Diakonie, Hilfswerk, Red Cross and Volkshilfe). In addition, several expert meetings on different topics were organised.

On 18 January 2010, the National Action Plan on Integration (NAPI) was published by the Ministry of Interior. Integration is defined as:

‘(...) a reciprocal process, characterized by mutual appreciation and respect, in which clear rules ensure societal cohesion and social peace. One can speak of successful integration, when there are sufficient German skills for the participation in working life, training, further education and for communication with public administrations and the person concerned can fund his/her life, and the Austrian and European legal order and values are accepted and recognised. An integrated society is characterized by openness and social permeability. It allows the individual to lead one’s life on his or her own responsibility without being discriminated because of his or her origins, language or skin colour. Integration aims to ensure the participation in economic, social, political and cultural processes and the compliance with duties associated to these processes.’\textsuperscript{76}

In addition, the document defined seven core areas of integration (language and education, work and vocation, rule of law and values, health and social affairs, intercultural dialogue, sports and leisure and housing and regional integration), on the basis of which indicators to measure the success of the NAPI were introduced.\textsuperscript{17} As a

\textsuperscript{13} International Centre for Migration Policy Development (2005), p.20
\textsuperscript{14} Interview Expert L4, 2
\textsuperscript{15} Bundeskanzleramt 2008: Regierungsprogramm 2008-2013, p. 108
\textsuperscript{16} Ministry of Interior (2010a), p. 36 (own translation)
\textsuperscript{17} Fassmann, Heinz (2010)
result, the concept of integration applied at national level became much broader in the course of the NAPI-process.

The NAPI constitutes an important step towards a more coordinated approach to integration. The consultation process to develop the NAPI was generally appreciated by the participants. However, some interview partners who were involved in the process remarked critically that there was not enough time to discuss all issues in depth. Moreover, they criticised that the main five participating civil society organisations were not involved in the process right from the beginning, and thus could not contribute sustainably to the final document. As a result, the final document is not fully supported by all participating stakeholders. According to the opinion of several interview partners the NAPI does not sufficiently reflect that integration is a two-way process, meaning that the receiving society has to provide for equal rights and opportunities as well. A shortcoming of the NAPI was seen in the fact that it does not define concrete time, budget or resource plan, or concrete integration programs to be implemented. It also does not assign competencies for implementation to specific actors. The MoI considers the NAPI as the beginning of a coordinated approach towards integration, and concrete measures yet have to be developed.

In 2010, another major revision to the Austrians Aliens Law and the Aliens Employment Law was discussed and approved by parliament in April 2011 (it entered into force in July 2011). According to the legal amendment, the IA was amended and the language requirements in order to receive a permanent residence permit were raised. Moreover, the amendment introduced pre-entry language tests for immigrants from third countries (‘German before immigration’). The system of labour migration was completely overhauled and replaced by a points-based system – the Red-White-Red Card. 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 for example. Immigration for the purpose of work was thus facilitated also for certain demanded professions who could hitherto not fulfill the income requirements under the regulation for key personnel.

In April 2011, a State Secretariat on Integration within the Ministry of Interior has been established. According to the motto of the new State Secretariat ‘Integration based on Merit’ (Integration durch Leistung’), migrants shall not be judged on grounds of their origin, but according to their effort and achievements.

II.1 Federal vs. local level

While the legal competencies for migration and integration in Austria mainly rest with the federal level, this has not lead to a shared understanding of the roles the local, provincial and federal bodies have in relation to integration policies. At the same time, there have been continuous discussions between the federal level, specifically the Ministry of the Interior, and the provincial level to define the dominant integration

18 Interview Experts O3, R3
19 See e.g. Interviews Expert R3, O3, P4; Tiroler Landesregierung (2010)
20 See Interview Expert O3, L4, Q3
21 Ibid.
22 See: http://www.integration.at/wir_ueber_uns/leitbild/
23 Wewerka, Lisa (2009), p. 36
approach. The city (and at the same time federal state) of Vienna for example, whose first integration initiatives reach back as far as to the early 1970s, has always been a strong critic of federal integration policies. As a result to shared competences, Austrian integration policies are highly fragmented. The different actors (different ministries at the federal level/federal states/cities) each make their own policies, without often explicitly referring to integration. Therefore, according to integration experts at the national and the local level different approaches towards integration have developed. Individual municipalities have established a coordinated approach to integration on the city level earlier than the federal government. As stated by several interview partners, provinces and municipalities are more important actors with regard to actual integration programmes than the federal government. However, exchange and cooperation between the various local approaches has only recently developed, as is reflected by the establishment of an expert committee on integration in the Austrian Association of Cities and Towns in 2008.

According to a representative of the MoI, the NAPI marks the beginning of a ‘sustainable integration process’ by establishing structural competencies and coordination. Other interview partners remarked that integration policies at the federal level still lack a sustainable long-term strategy and are largely of symbolic nature. As the interviews with local-level experts in the cities of Innsbruck and Vienna showed, integration at the local level tends to be framed rather as a social matter and a matter of equal opportunities. The primary aim of local integration policies is to maintain social cohesion. Accordingly, local integration policies are more inclusive and involve various stakeholders including migrant organisations, which were underrepresented in the consultation processes organised by the MoI. Similarly, an integration expert confirmed this view by highlighting that federal policies and legal regulations are highly differentiated with regard to different target groups (e.g. highly-skilled vs. low-skilled), while local integration policies do not target specific groups but are broader in their conception. In addition, federal policies show a stronger link to immigration policies and considerations than local policies do.

II.2 Migration-Integration Nexus

With regard to the nature of the linkage between migration and integration the interviewees have displayed different opinions. According to a representative of a major Austrian civil society organisation, the two policy fields would have a weak link, as

24 The city of Vienna in 1973 established the so-called Zuwandererfonds to assist labour migrants to manage life in Vienna. See: http://www.zuwanderer-fonds.at/Wer_wir_sind.html (23.3.2011).
25 Wewerka, Lisa (2009), p. 36
26 Interview Expert L4
27 The first initiative was taken in Vienna with the Viennese Integration Fund, which was founded by the city of Vienna in 1992. In 2009, 5 of 9 federal states and 19 of 25 cities with more than 20,000 inhabitants had independently developed integration frameworks (Integrationsleitbilder) (Antalovsky, Eugen (i.a.) (2009), p. 4).
28 Interview Expert N3
29 Interview with Representative of the MoI
30 See Interviews Experts Interview with Experts L4, O3, R3; see also Jawhari (2000)
31 See Case Study Reports Innsbruck and Vienna
32 Interview Expert L4
‘(... migration and integration policies are not well coordinated. While migration policies are changed and adapted continuously integration policies develop slowly’.

Similarly, two interviewed integration experts emphasised that the two policy fields of migration and integration are ‘two increasingly differentiated areas’, each being very complex and regulated by different parameters. According to another expert, migration and integration in the current system are clearly interlinked; however, there are different regulatory mechanisms in place for different immigration types (e.g. family migration, labour migration). By contrast, regarding EU-internal migration, a link between migration and integration policies does not exist at all, according to a policy advisor. Speaking of integration policies for third country nationals, different policies exist for asylum seekers or refugees on the one hand, and other newcomers, most importantly persons immigrating for the purpose of work or education, and family migrants. According to the same expert, linking migration and integration policies in the area of family migration is very problematic. This viewpoint was shared by most of the interview partners who pointed to the fact that migration control mechanisms must respect human rights obligations and EU Directives establishing the right to family reunion.

In general, all interviewees emphasised that immigration from third countries only represents a very small part of overall immigration to Austria. Thus, the impact of post-arrival integration programmes, such as the IA, on immigrant integration is comparably limited. Some experts emphasised, that residence security constitutes the most important criterion for sustainable integration. And therefore frequent legal and institutional changes may influence successful integration.

A representative of the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection regarded labour market integration as the most important integration criterion. Following this view, a link between migration and integration policies becomes necessary, ‘as immigration policies are determined by the needs of the labour market, and access to the labour market is the most important integration criterion’. To restrict immigration according to the needs of the labour market in this view prevents creating additional financial burdens for the public sector. The ability to secure one’s own livelihood thus represents a main precondition for successful integration: ‘The better the income, the better it is secured, the better the integration’. According to government representatives, employed persons thus show different (less) integration needs than persons who are not integrated into the labour market. Consequently, integration programs should focus on persons who are not (yet) employed.

Some of the interviewed experts and civil society stakeholders represented the hypothesis that new immigration is in fact a precondition for integration, because it allows for upwards mobility of those already staying in the country for several years.
However, according to a civil society representative, integration of immigrants can only be achieved if there are welcoming structures in place and newcomers are granted access to rights (e.g. work, residence, housing, political participation) within a reasonable period of stay.\textsuperscript{43}

The link between migration and integration was considered specifically controversial with regard to pre-entry integration tests, in the Austrian case the requirement to demonstrate basic German language skills before immigration as of July 2011. The pre-entry integration requirements are understood as a measure to promote integration by the means of controlling immigration. Representatives of government bodies argued in the interviews conducted for this study that selecting immigrants with specific socio-demographic characteristics impacts positively on post-arrival integration. \textsuperscript{44} At the same time, they also acknowledged that such selection mechanisms can only be applied in a limited way to family migration. By contrast, voluntary pre-entry programs providing information on labour market opportunities to potential labour immigrants according to a representative of the Austrian Chamber of Commerce would be a positive migration management instrument and be specifically important in light of increasing EU internal migration.\textsuperscript{45}

\section*{II.3 Main stakeholders}

Over the past decades, the Austrian social partners\textsuperscript{46} and the Ministry of the Interior have been the strongest actors in regard to all issues concerning immigration and integration. Since the late 1980s however, the Ministry of the Interior has become the main actor responsible for coordinating the relative legislative processes.\textsuperscript{47} The MoI is at the same time responsible for national security issues and the police, and immigration and integration issues. Several interview partners thus criticised the strong link between migration, integration and security issues and thus suggested to outsource integration issues from the ministry. Following the German example the Greens Party, Caritas Austria and Diakonie among several other actors claimed the establishment of an independent State Secretariat on Migration and Integration.\textsuperscript{48} Within the MoI, a state secretariat was established in the beginning of 2011. Another important actor, the Austrian Integration Fund (AIF), which is funded by the MoI, is responsible for the implementation of federal integration policies. The AIF was founded already fifty years ago by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and the MoI and is the main Austrian body responsible for delivering state support to refugees. In 2002 the AIF was charged with responsibilities to implement the Integration Agreement and broadened its service spectrum. The goal of the AIF today is the linguistic, professional, and social integration of persons who have been granted asylum and other migrants based on their rights and

\textsuperscript{43} Interview Expert R3
\textsuperscript{44} Interviews with Representatives of the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs
\textsuperscript{45} Interview with Representative of Austrian Chamber of Commerce
\textsuperscript{46} Union of the largest Austrian economic interest associations, the Chamber of Labour, Chamber of Commerce, Chamber of Agriculture and Austrian Trade Unions Association.
\textsuperscript{47} See Davy/Gächter (1993), p. 16f
\textsuperscript{48} See also Jungnißl, Saskia (2010)
responsibilities in Austria. In 2008, the AIF established three regional branches which represent the AIF in the federal states.

Apart from that, the Ministry has recently established external consultative bodies. In October 2010, the MoI established the 'Integration Committee' (Integrationsbeirat) including representatives of the federal ministries, federal states, the Social partners, the Austrian Association of Cities and Towns, the Austrian Association of Municipalities, the Federation of Austrian Industries and the most important Austrian NGOs in the field of migration and integration. The main task of the integration committee is to coordinate all actors responsible for the implementation of the National Action Plan on Integration. In addition, good-practice models with regard to integration and the findings of the so-called Expert Council on Integration shall be discussed. The Expert Council on Integration (Expertenrat für Integration) was established in January 2011 by the Ministry of Interior. Its main task is to support the implementation process of the National Action Plan on Integration and to prepare recommendations. The Ministry of the Interior is however not bound in any way by the recommendations elaborated by the council.

Given that integration is a matter that cross-cuts various sectors of society, the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection (BMASK) and the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture are other important political stakeholders with regard to integration. The Austrian Employment Service (AMS) operated under the auspices of the BMASK for example, implements large scale programmes supporting the labour market integration of all persons in Austria with legal access to the labour market. Recently, the BMASK and the Federal Ministry of the Exterior have also actively engaged in discussions on the targeted recruitment of skilled foreign workers (for more information on national stakeholders see also chapter III).

III Admission-related Integration Provisions since 2000

III.1 General approach of Admission-related Integration Provisions

III.1.1 Formulation and purpose of conditions to be fulfilled before admission

Income requirements

To be granted a residence permit in Austria, generally all immigrants 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. Most importantly, the principle of economic self-sufficiency has been anchored in the Austrian immigration regulations already after World War II and has endured to be an immigration control mechanism ever since.\(^{52}\) Following this, not being able to maintain one’s own livelihood may in some cases result in losing the residence permit and ultimately in deportation. It has to be mentioned in this regard, that the right to private and family life according to Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) is taken into account on a case-by-case basis. Additionally it may be pointed out, that – dependent on the kind of residence permit – the lack of sufficient financial means can be substituted by a declaration of liability.

Throughout the 1990s, there was no uniform regulation on the exact level of the income requirement on federal level. Generally, the first Residence Law which entered into force in 1993 left large freedom to the implementing agencies as to how certain legal requirements shall be interpreted (e.g. requirement of sufficient income, housing requirement to comply with local standards). As Reinhold Jawhari shows for the Viennese immigration authorities, restrictive interpretation by the implementing authorities in some cases led to problems with regard to family reunification and ultimately created the need to amend the law in 1997.\(^{53}\)

After 2000, the calculation of the income requirements underwent some changes, in particular in 2005 and 2009, with the effect that the income level was elevated. 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’. The income requirement for highly qualified persons is set at the level of 60 per cent of the upper income threshold used for the calculations of social security contributions. It is understood as gross monthly income not including the special bonus payments (13th and 14th salaries for Christmas and annual leave). In 2003, the first year of application, this corresponded to €2016 gross per month, €2,250 in 2006, and €2,520 per month in 2011.\(^{54}\) Following the 2005 alien law package, specifically needed professions such as nurses exempted from the minimum income requirement for key

---

\(^{52}\) The respective article in the law is §11(2), sent. 4 NAG: A residence title may only be issued to a foreigner if ‘the residence of a foreigner would not lead to a financial burden for a local authority’ ("der Aufenthalt des Fremden zu keiner finanziellen Belastung einer Gebietskörperschaft führen könnte"). See also Davy/Gächter (1993), p. 163

\(^{53}\) See Jawhari (2000), and Jawhari (2001), pp. 124ff. Reinhold Jawhari (2000, pp.67ff) showed for example, that the Viennese immigration authorities during the 1990s interpreted the income requirements in a much more restrictive way than required by law. This practice was ended with a ruling by the Higher Administrative Court saying that the regional levels of social assistance shall be regarded as sufficient income (see ruling 95/19/1607 of 25.1.1996).

personnel and have to earn only a substantially lower amount.\textsuperscript{55} As of July 2011, the regulations on key personnel were broadened and integrated in the new labour immigration system based on the Red-White-Red Card (amendment of the Settlement and Residence Act and the Aliens Employment Act). For ‘key personnel’ the new ‘Red White Red Card’ will be applicable. It depends on the kind of ‘Red White Red Card’ whether there is a minimum wage requirement (for example in the case of key personnel who are graduates of universities and colleges of higher education in Austria, there is a minimum monthly gross salary of € 1.890) foreseen or not (see also below).

The New Settlement and Residence Act of 2005 (coming into effect on 1. January 2006) also included a change to the immigration conditions. The law introduced new income target rates.\textsuperscript{56} Since 2005, immigrants have to have a monthly net income which is above the legally defined minimum income levels (compensatory allowance – Ausgleichszulage), instead of the levels of social benefits used before. In 2011 these amounted to about €793 for a single person and to €1,189 for a couple.\textsuperscript{57} In practice this means that a person has to have a steady income and a full time job throughout the year. A member of the Greens Party pointed to the situation of women, who can be expected to have more difficulties in fulfilling the income requirement as they disproportionally occupy part time jobs and earn less than their male colleagues.\textsuperscript{58} It has to be mentioned in this regard, that – dependent on the kind of residence permit – the lack of sufficient financial means can be substituted by a declaration of liability.

In 2009, another amendment to the NAG defined that regular expenses, such as rent or loans payments have to be deducted from the income.\textsuperscript{59} The legislator therewith reacted on a ruling by the Higher Administrative Court (2008/22/0711 of 3\textsuperscript{rd} April 2009), which ruled that the previous administrative practice to deduct regular expenses from the required income was unlawful.\textsuperscript{60} As a result of the following amendment to the NAG, the factual levels of the income requirement increased.

\textit{Age of immigrating spouses}

An amendment to the aliens law in 2009 elevated – in accordance with directive 2003/86/EC on the right to family reunification - the age for spouses from third countries in the case of family reunification to 21 years of age, while the general marriage age is 18.\textsuperscript{61} 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.

\textit{Changes to pre-entry admission policies and requirements 2011}

In the coalition-program 2008-2013 between the Conservative Peoples Party and the Social Democrats, the Austrian government announced the development of a Red-White-
Red Card (RWR-Card) for demand-oriented immigration. A commission, including the Austrian Social partners and the Federation of Austrian Industries, was installed in order to identify relevant criteria according to which a foreigner shall be categorized as highly skilled migrant. In 2008, the Federation of Austrian Industries in collaboration with the Austrian Chamber of Commerce presented a discussion paper highlighting inter alia the gap between the required number of highly-qualified workers and the available supply of these persons in Austria.

In the NAPI, the Ministry of Interior announced to demand knowledge of German at A1 level of the Common European Framework of Reference of Languages already before immigration. Before the background of a strong labour market lobby, the target group was clearly defined: ‘Third-country family members of third-country nationals entitled to family reunification, but not highly qualified persons who have a noticeable lower need for integration.’

In April 2011 the major revision to the Settlement and Residence Act of 2005, the Asylum Law of 2005 and the Citizenship Law of 1985 was approved by parliament and a points-based system for labour immigration, the ‘Red-White-Red-Card’ came into force on 1st July of the same year. This new point-based-system, grants points for personal characteristics, like qualification, work experience (in Austria), age, English and German language skills studying in Austria. Spouses, registered partners and children up to 18 years of third-country of third-country nationals holding a Red-White-Red-Card need to prove German language skills at A1 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages before entry. Only family members of very highly qualified workers are exempted from this regulation.

III.1.2 Formulation and purpose of post-arrival admission provisions

Decision-making process

The main trigger event for the implementation of post-arrival integration measures was the government change in Austria in 2000. On 26 April 2001, Peter Westenthaler, at that time chairman of the governing right-wing Freedom Party, presented at a press conference the so-called ‘Integration Contract’. According to his idea immigrants should be obliged to fulfil specific integration measures within a specific time period. The access to residence permits should be restricted to immigrants proving German language skills, knowledge of the Austrian society and the participation in professional orientation trainings. Westenthaler defined compulsory language courses as the central element of the integration contract in order to test the willingness of immigrants to integrate in the Austrian society. Following the German Immigration Commission he called for the establishment of a governmental commission to discuss his ideas and to develop a concrete concept.

62 See also Mayer, Stefanie/Spång, Mikael (2009)
64 Ministry of Interior (2010a), p. 15
65 For a detailed discussion of the policy development processes on the rights of legally resident third country nationals on a supranational level, see Mourão Permoser, Julia (2010).
66 Westenthaler, Peter (1): Integrationsvertrag mit Zuwanderern, Aussendung des Freiheitlichen Pressereferats vom 26.4.2001:
The coalition partner ÖVP supported the idea of introducing post-arrival integration measures but rather preferred the name integration agreement instead of integration contract. On 13 August 2001, a draft of the integration agreement was presented to the Council of Ministers. Although Peter Westenthaler and the former Minister of Interior Ernst Strasser (ÖVP) agreed on the necessity of such an integration programme, their opinions differed regarding the details of the integration agreement.67 After an analysis of integration measures in different European countries commissioned by the Austrian Ministry of Interior the draft was amended and was adopted in parliament in July 2002.

Integration agreement
Since 1 January 2003 every third-country national who wants to stay in Austria for a longer time has to sign the Integration Agreement. The main goal of the integration agreement, established by the Ministry of Interior, was to acquire German skills at level A1 of the Common European Framework of Reference of Languages within four years of being granted the residence permit. Although non-fulfilment can be sanctioned, the first version of the integration agreement foresaw a number of exemptions, which in fact limited the scope of the agreement to a rather small share of all immigrated persons.68 In 2004, only one in ten third-country nationals immigrating to Austria had to attend a German integration course according to an integration expert. In 2006 (entry into force), the agreement was reformed and the conditions were raised (duration of German language course was extended to 300 hours and a literacy course of 75 hours was included).69 Moreover, the groups of persons exempted from the duty to take a test were reduced. In 2011, the IA requirements were again increased (see III.1.3).

The federal government issues the regulatory framework for these programs, while the AIF is responsible for the implementation of the integration agreement (organising the supply of literacy and German integration courses, evaluating the courses provided, managing the financial grants).70 Certified literacy and German integration course providers (language schools, adult education centres, humanitarian organisations and religious institutions) offer the actual literacy and German courses,71 but language skills can also be acquired at different providers or individually.

III.1.3 The installation of Admission-related Programmes at the National Level

Integration Agreement
The Integration Agreement as amended in April 2011 consists of two modules:

67 Rohsmann, Katarina (2003), p. 70
68 Perching, Bernhard (2010)
69 Website of the Austrian Integration Fund: http://www.integrationsfonds.at/en/integration_agreement/what_is_the_ia/
70 Settlement and Residence Act (Niederlassungs- und Aufenthaltsgesetz 2005) § 14
• **Module 1** – After receiving the first residence permit in Austria immigrants have to prove within 2 years (previously five years) that they have reached German language skills at the level A2 of the European Framework of Reference for Languages.

• **Module 2** – Persons who are already living in Austria 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. Fulfilling Module 2 is not compulsory and is not reimbursed.\(^{72}\)

Moreover, a requirement to proof basic German skills already before immigration has been introduced by the 2011 amendment (see WP4 report).

The following groups of people are exempted from Module 1:\(^{73}\)

- **Persons submitting a written declaration** that they do not intend to stay in Austria for more than twelve months within two years. In this case, he or she is not allowed to apply for an extension of the residence permit.
- **Persons who are or will be under 14** by the time when the Agreement has to be fulfilled.
- **Persons with a physical or psychological health problems who cannot be expected** to fulfil the integration agreement upon confirmation of a public health officer.

The language skills of Module 1 can also be acquired in so-called German Integration Courses (300 hours). The goal of these courses is to enable participation in social, business, and cultural life in Austria.\(^{74}\) However, it is not compulsory to attend such a course, but only to acquire the prescribed language skills. Several possibilities to complete Module 1 of the integration agreement exist:\(^{75}\)

- Successful completion of a German integration course;
- Completion of Module 2;
- Five years compulsory schooling in Austria and a positive grade in German or a positive grade in German at the level of the 9th school year, or an exam allowing access to university;
- Third country nationals holding a Red-White-Red card, who are very highly qualified workers, skilled workers in shortage professions or other key workers;
- Successful completion of a specially designed language test (Austrian Language Diploma - ÖSD).

Third country nationals have to sign the integration agreement upon issuance of their residence permit. They can receive reimbursement in form of vouchers for parts of the costs of Module 1 only (up to a maximum of 750 EUR), which are distributed by the immigration authorities. Migrants may receive reimbursement when they have attended a so-called German-integration course at an AIF-certified institute and have passed a specifically designed test by the AIF.\(^{76}\) Under certain circumstances the immigration authorities also issue the voucher to other family members (including spouses or under

\(^{72}\) Settlement and Residence Act (*Niederlassungs- und Aufenthaltsgesetz 2011*) § 14


\(^{74}\) Settlement and Residence Act (*Niederlassungs- und Aufenthaltsgesetz*) 2011 § 14

\(^{75}\) Ibid.

\(^{76}\) Federal Law Gazette no. 205/2011 (*Integrationsvereinbarung - Verordnung*)
age children of Austrians, Swiss citizens, citizens of the European Economic Area\textsuperscript{77}). If Module 1 has been successfully completed and an AIF test has been passed after 18 months upon issuance of the first residence permit a maximum of €750 or 50\% of the course costs are reimbursed.

Module 1 of the integration agreement has to be completed within two years of being granted the residence permit. The period might be extended depending on the personal living circumstances of the immigrant. In principle however, if the integration agreement is not completed in the prescribed time period (and no extension has been granted), he or she may be issued an administrative fine, may be refused a prolongation of the residence title,\textsuperscript{78} and may receive an expulsion order,\textsuperscript{79} if the authorities confirm that the right to private and family life is not violated and the reasons for not completing the respective courses rest with the immigrant only.\textsuperscript{80} However, regarding expulsion, particularly foreigners who have lived in Austria for several years or have grown up here enjoy special protection from expulsion.\textsuperscript{81}

**Evaluation of the Integration Agreement**

As laid down in § 16 (2) of the Settlement and Residence Act of 2005 the AIF is responsible for the continuous evaluation of the Integration Agreement. According to a representative of the AIF, so far no formal evaluation of the integration agreement has taken place. Nevertheless, in 2009 the AIF published a study on ‘Quality Monitoring on the Implementation of the Integration Agreement’. The study is based on interviews with representatives of settlement authorities, representatives of literacy and German integration course providers, and course participants. According to the results of the study 91\% of the interviewed course participants had a positive attitude towards the integration agreement (70\% very good and 21\% rather good).\textsuperscript{82} 79\% of the course participants judged the quality of the German courses as positive. The majority of former course participants, who already successfully completed the German integration course, speak German frequently in their everyday life; while more than one third pointed out that they rarely speak German.\textsuperscript{83} The main German course providers were adult educational centres (Volkshochschulen: 27\%) and vocational training institutes (Berufsförderungsinstitut: 19\%).\textsuperscript{84} However, this monitoring does not account for the impact a positive fulfilment of the IA has on the integration pathways of course participants.

**Statistics on the Integration Agreement**

The Ministry of Interior and the AIF do not publish any official statistical data on the Integration Agreement. Anyhow, limited data on the integration agreement (only on those successfully completed) is available.

\textsuperscript{77} http://www.integrationsfonds.at/en/integration_agreement/what_is_the_ia/
\textsuperscript{78} NAG §11 (2) sent. 6
\textsuperscript{79} Aliens Police Law (FPG) Federal Law Gazette I No. 112/2011, §62 (1), sent. 2
\textsuperscript{80} NAG §11 (3)
\textsuperscript{81} FPG §64
\textsuperscript{82} Austrian Integration Fund (2009), p.7
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., p.8
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., p.7
As displayed in table 2.1, 24,869 immigrants successfully fulfilled the integration agreement between 2003 and 2009. More than half of the immigrants resided in the city of Vienna. In the last years the number of fulfilled integration agreements steadily increased from 364 in 2003 to 5,219 in 2009.

Table 2.1: Fulfilled Integration Agreements According to Federal State, 2003-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal state</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>2,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>3,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4,164</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>2,235</td>
<td>12,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>1,683</td>
<td>5,795</td>
<td>5,485</td>
<td>4,655</td>
<td>5,219</td>
<td>24,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the research project Integration and Naturalisation Tests - the New Way to European Citizenship annually between 11,045 and 13,475 residence permits were issued to persons who had to fulfil the IA between 2006 and 2008. In the same period, annually between 5,485 and 5,785 persons have actually completed the IA. The data thus shows a significant gap between those obliged to fulfil the IA, and those who have already done so.

Moreover, since 2006, so-called key personnel and persons who finished their education in Austria are also counted in the number of immigrants who fulfilled the integration agreement, although formally exempted from proving language skills. Table 2.2 shows that the largest share of persons who fulfil the integration agreement belong to this category.

The data available on sanctions to date is limited. According to a parliamentary enquiry by the Greens Party three cases of non-compliance with the IA have been reported by the competent authorities until the end of 2009, but only in one case the person concerned ‘voluntarily’ left the country. It remains to be seen how many persons will be affected by sanctions for not timely fulfilling the IA at the end of 2011, when the five-year period for complying the IA as entered into force in January 2006 will end.

---

85 Perchinig, Bernhard (2010)
86 Two in the federal state of Upper Austria and one in the federal state of Lower Austria
87 Parliamentary Enquiry of the Members of the Parliament Alev Korun regarding 'The integration agreement as a reason for expulsion' at 23 December 2009, answered by the Ministry of Interior at 23 February 2010
Table 2.2: Type of Fulfilment of the Integration Agreement, 2006-2009

*1 January 2009 - 30 June

IV National Discourses on the Migration-Integration Nexus since 2000

IV.1 Frame Analysis of media and parliamentary debates

Methodology

The PROSINT project also aimed at analysing the way the above described policy shifts were ‘framed’ in public and political discourses. Frame Analysis is a well-established methodology in social sciences (see Gamson & Modigliani 1987; Snow and Benford 1992; D’Angelo and. Kuyper 2010) that allows identifying the larger normative schemes in which social and political problems are publicly debated. The aim of the PROSINT frame analysis therefore was to look at the problem definition, construction of target groups, proposed solution (causalities), and underlying normative perspectives (see Scholten 2011) as presented by various actors in public and political debates with regard to integration-based admissions policies in the 9 countries studied.

For the media analysis and the analysis of the parliamentary debates in Austria we identified three turning points in the Austrian discourse on the nexus of migration and integration:

- **Turning point 1** - September 2002: The Integration Agreement (IA) became legally binding by the Amendment of the Aliens Act of 2002 (*Fremdengesetz 2002*)
- **Turning point 2** - December 2005 and May 2006: Adoption of the Settlement and Residence Act 2005 (*Niederlassungs- und Aufenthaltsgesetz 2005*), by which the Integration Agreement was amended (entry into force: January 2006). In May 2006 the former Minister of Interior Liese Prokop published the study ‘Perspectives and challenges of the integration of Muslims in Austria’, which fuelled the ongoing debates.
- **Turning point 3** – January and December 2010: Adoption of the National Action Plan on Integration and presentation of the ‘Red-White-Red Card’

For the **media analysis** two Austrian newspapers, der Standard and the Kronenzeitung were selected, which have a different scope and audience:

- **Der Standard**: Describes itself as an independent and liberal newspaper; according to the Austrian Media Analysis 2009 the average daily readership amounted to 394,000, which corresponded to 5.6% of all newspaper readers.
- **Kronen-Zeitung**: Austria’s largest newspaper; in 2009 the average daily readership of the tabloid was 2,853,000, corresponding to 40.4% of all newspaper readers (for further details see Annex).

In a next step, all articles which contained certain keywords (see Annex) in a certain period before and after these turning points were analysed. Certainly, one must take into account that an analysis of newspaper articles already presents a more or less selective picture of what happens and who speaks to the public. However, by selecting two newspapers with a very different audience and scope - Der Standard and Kronenzeitung – the authors tried to balance this pre-selection role.

Regarding the **parliamentary debates**, for each turning point the parliamentary debate with the most statements of parliamentarians on integration was analysed - for turning point one and two the parliamentary debate, when the new migration law passed parliament, for turning point three the parliamentary debate shortly after the presentation of the National Action Plan on Integration (see Annex). In general, integration issues were discussed only marginally in these parliamentary debates.
Based on these materials, we identified the key actors and their claims-making. Finally, it is important to note that a frame analysis does not present facts, but the way facts are presented to the wider public by key stakeholders. Its aim therefore is to go beyond the level of legal regulations and policy measures and identify the arguments that have lead to a certain policy change and/or have helped in sustaining it.

**Turning point 1: Introduction of the Integration Agreement in September 2002**

The dominant actors on the government side were the two ruling parties at that time, the ÖVP and FPÖ, who introduced the Integration Agreement in September 2002. Both parties identified the increasing share of immigrants as challenging; at the same time, there was no commitment to Austria as an immigration country.\(^88\) On this basis, immigration control mechanisms were called for following the motto ‘Integration before new immigration’. The public and media discourse was clearly determined by the FPÖ, who had originally come up with the idea to introduce integration tests (see ‘Evolution of the Migration and Integration Nexus’). The former leader of the FPÖ parliamentary group Peter Westenthaler in this context had a major share in coining the term ‘Unwillingness to integrate’ (‘Integrationsunwilligkeit’),\(^89\) which gained more importance in 2006 in relation to the publication of a study on the integration of Muslim immigrants,\(^90\) and proves persistent in public debates until today. Although the ÖVP tried to calm down the debate by asserting that migration is not out of control, they never clearly countered the anti-immigrant discourse of crime and abuse driven by the FPÖ (high crime rate of foreigners in Austria, abuse of the Austrian social system by immigrants, reference to fictitious marriages).\(^91\) The clear aim of both parties was to control, or to reduce immigration, also by using coercive means. As a result, they agreed to introduce the Integration Agreement; learning the language, as well as the basic values of the host country was at the center of the debates and suggested policy measures. To back this measure they referred to positive experiences with similar integration measures in the Netherlands for example. The former head of the ÖVP, Andreas Khol, suggested that a ‘gentle pressure’ was necessary to lead to integration.\(^92\)

The former Minister of the Interior Ernst Strasser (ÖVP) denoted the sanction-based approach of the IA as ‘real integration achievement’, because it would guarantee that immigrants learn the language and about the cultural norms in Austria.\(^93\) Although the FPÖ would have preferred even more drastic measures, such as to cut down social benefits for foreigners to the level of their country of origin, they welcomed the Integration Agreement as a means to test the ‘willingness’ of immigrants to integrate. Overall, integration was defined as a duty to be fulfilled by immigrants. The principal responsibility for integration would not rest with the Austrian state, but with immigrants.\(^94\)

On the opposition side, the SPÖ, which did not figure very prominently in the media debates, and the Austrian Greens Party were the dominant actors. Both parties along with major civil society organisations, such as the Diakonie and Caritas, rejected the sanction-based approach they identified in the IA. In the parliamentary debates, the SPÖ

---

\(^{88}\) See Peter Khol, Der Standard 10.07.2002; Khol, Strasser, Westenthaler in Kronen-Zeitung, 10.7.2002

\(^{89}\) See for example Kronen-Zeitung, 30.5.2006

\(^{90}\) See for example Kronen-Zeitung, 22.5.2006

\(^{91}\) Peter Westenthaler, Der Standard, 3.7.2002

\(^{92}\) Khol, Der Standard, 10.07.2002 (own translation); Der Standard, 10.2.2001

\(^{93}\) Strasser, Der Standard, 17.02.2002 (own translation)

\(^{94}\) Peter Westenthaler, parliamentary debate, 9 July 2002
noted that the IA serves as an immigration selection criterion only and is far from being a useful integration measure (‘disintegration package’). In sharp contrast to the FPÖ the Greens Party emphasised that immigration is a requirement to maintain the current level of welfare in Austria. The migration spokesperson of the Greens and the president of the Caritas defined access to rights, especially the right to work, as main precondition to integration. Terezija Stoïsits (Greens Party) criticised, ‘We are still a long way from the principle that anyone who lives here can also work’. Equal opportunities, especially social and political rights for immigrants would be necessary to facilitate the integration of immigrants. Thus, they identified the main problem in relation to integration in the current integration policies, and in more particular in the lack of a harmonization of residence and work rights. Similarly, the Austrian Trade Unions Association (ÖGB) criticised that the government had failed to create labour market-related integration programmes which would be necessary to stabilize the labour market. Another strong actor opposing the federal government’s strategy was the city of Vienna, who at this time already had established structures to offer voluntary integration programs to immigrants (see footnote reference 23).

Generally, reference to the labour market played an important role in the integration debates. Different to the rights-based approach represented by the opposition parties, trade union and civil society stakeholders, the government argued that language is the most important means to increase the chances on the labour market. NGOs criticised the one-dimensionality of the Integration Agreement that reduces integration to language acquisition. At the same time, the ÖVP distinguished between low- and high-skilled immigrants who would show different integration needs. Highly-skilled migrants were thus excluded from the duty to learn the language under the Integration Agreement. At the same time, there were no integration measures foreseen for temporary workers (so-called seasonal workers) who would remain in a precarious labour market status, as was specifically criticised by the Chamber of Labour and the Greens Party. The regulation on key professionals was also criticised by the Greens Party for being gender-discriminatory, as women would earn less and thus would be excluded from immigration.

Among other things, political opposition and civil society actors demanded to offer positive incentives for immigrant integration (e.g. the passive voting right for foreigners or a more innovative concept for the German language courses), in particular for those persons who managed to fulfil the IA, to establish a governmental body responsible for integration matters, as well as a revision of the aliens law (e.g. abolish quotas for family reunion, harmonize work and residence rights).

---

95 SPÖ security spokesperson, Der Standard, 7.2.2002
96 Andrea Kuntzl, parliamentary debate, 9 July 2002; Migration spokesperson of the Greens Party Terezija Stoïsits, Der Standard 10.07.2002; Der Standard, 04.07.2002
97 Der Standard, 4.7.2002
98 Stoïsits, Der Standard, 10.7.2002 (own translation); Küberl, Der Standard, 23.9.2002
99 Der Standard, 2.1. 2003
100 Terezija Stoïsits, parliamentary debate, 9 July 2002
101 Fritz Verzetnitsch, Der Standard, 8.3.2003
102 See Westenthaler, Kronen-Zeitung, 5.3.2001
103 See for example Kronen-Zeitung, 5.3.2002 and 18.3.2002
104 Petrovic, Der Standard, 28.3.2002
Turning point 2: Introduction of the revised Integration Agreement in 2005

The discussions were dominated by the ruling parties ÖVP and FPÖ (which later transformed into BZÖ – Alliance for the Future of Austria) and much less by the opposition parties (SPÖ/Greens Party). The main positions did not change much in comparison to the previous turning point, but the Ministry of the Interior became much more prominent in the debates. Reference to the ‘unwillingness to integrate’ (Integrationsunwilligkeit), was a main argument in changing the scope of the IA to also encompass spouses of Austrian citizens who were previously excluded from this requirement. Again, the adaptation of immigrants to the language and culture of the society of residence was at the focus of the underlying understanding of integration. The former Federal Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel (ÖVP) made clear, that: ‘People who want to live here have to adapt to the culture of our country.’

However, in July 2005 at the time of the law enforcement the group of persons not willing to integrate was yet not closer defined. This changed in May 2006, when the former Minister of Interior Liese Prokop (ÖVP) following her own interpretation of a study on the ‘Perspectives and challenges at the integration of Muslims in Austria’ announced that 45% of the Muslim population in Austria is ‘not willing to integrate’. From this point on, integration was mainly perceived as a problem among Muslim immigrants. This also held true for the promotion of migrant children at school, which was mainly discussed in terms of language problems of Muslim pupils.

Moreover, socio-cultural issues and gender issues came to the fore of the debate. Rescuing migrant women from patriarchal (Muslim) cultural contexts was a core argument used by the coalition government to justify the obligatory nature of the Integration Agreement. Although this argument was already omnipresent in the public and political debates around 2002, interestingly it was not identified as a main position put forward by the different actors in the selected newspaper articles of 2002. According to the FPÖ and the ÖVP, obligatory German courses would empower women, whose husbands or fathers would otherwise not allow them to attend such courses, to gain independence and thus to better integrate in Austria.

The SPÖ as well as the Greens Party were not dominant in these discussions, but took the view that sanctions would be unrewarding and positive incentives would be needed. The SPÖ highlighted the good practices by the city of Vienna (ruled by the SPÖ). The Greens Party thematised social inequalities in regard to the ability to fulfil the IA. They suggested introducing socially balanced support schemes under the IA. On the other hand, social differences were problematised by the ruling parties that denounced unemployed persons or persons not integrated into the labour market as specifically problematic groups who would threaten social and internal security.

Civil society actors did not feature strongly in media debates. Similarly marginal were the positions of some experts, such as the linguist Hans-Jürgen Krumm, who criticised
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105 Wolfgang Schüssel, Der Standard, 17 May 2006 (own translation)
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the design and the effects of the IA.\textsuperscript{112} Migration researcher August Gächter reformulated the concept of ‘Integration before new immigration’ by highlighting the fact that almost half of the immigrant population were employed below their qualifications. He emphasised the need for anti-discrimination measures to ensure upwards mobility of these migrants, at the same time new immigration would be needed to allow for this mobility.\textsuperscript{113}

Altogether, the dominant debates at that time reflect an assimilationist understanding of integration that marks clear borders between ‘us’ versus ‘them’ on the basis of seemingly natural cultural and religious traits as well as social differences. The debates are strongly value-driven and increasingly tend to problematise ‘failed’ integration, and focus on the need of immigrants to adapt to the society of the country of residence.

\textit{Turning point 3: Adoption of the National Action Plan on Integration and presentation of the ‘Red-White-Red Card’ in 2010}\textsuperscript{114}

The two main trigger events in this period were first the presentation of the National Action Plan on Integration in January 2010, and the idea of the Minister of Economics presented in summer 2010 to introduce a criteria-based immigration system (Red-White-Red Card) (who therewith drew on an already existing concept developed by the federal government and the Austrian Social Partners). In this period, despite the definition of altogether seven core areas of integration by the NAPI, the public and political debate on integration strongly focused on labour market needs, and thus the integration capacities of skilled versus unskilled immigrants. Regarding the latter group, learning the national language was still considered the primary precondition that allows for successful integration.

The dominant actor in this period was the Ministry of the Interior (MoI) under the Minister Maria Fekter (ÖVP). Security concerns and the call for stringent regulations remained core to the Minister’s migration policy. The coalition partner SPÖ, providing the Federal Chancellor, was not dominant in the discussions, but rather occupied a contradictory role. For example, the highest SPÖ officials didn’t actively support the idea to establish a separate Integration Ministry anymore in order not to disturb the relations to the coalition partner.\textsuperscript{115} With regard to the discussions on the RWR card, other actors such as the Austrian Social Partners or the former Minister of Economics, featured prominently in the related debates.

With regard to the problem definition, the MoI, backed by various experts, took the view that low German language skills, a low qualification profile of immigrants, as well as high unemployment rates aggravate immigrants’ integration into the labour market and society. In the opinion of Maria Fekter, former Minister of Interior, ‘responsible immigration policies have to be guided by Austrian interests’.\textsuperscript{116} As a result, the obligation to pass a German language exam before immigration was considered a way to facilitate and accelerate integration in the society of residence. Especially women would benefit of this ‘emancipatory’ approach, as it would allow them to access the education system. Women from Muslim countries, from rural areas and with a low educational

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{112} Hans-Jürgen Krumm, Der Standard, 14.5.2005
\textsuperscript{113} August Gächter, Der Standard, 22.3.2006
\textsuperscript{114} For a more detailed discussion see the WP4 report
\textsuperscript{115} See Der Standard, 28.08.2010.
\textsuperscript{116} Fekter, Der Standard, 10.12.2010 (own translation)
\end{footnotesize}
background (‘the woman from the Anatolian mountain village’117) were specific targets of this policy. Inspired by the obligation to learn German before immigration, women would come to know ‘what human rights and human dignity mean after all’.118 In this discourse, gendered ideas of ‘the Other’ coincide with ethnic and social categories and depict certain immigrant groups as more problematic than others. Austrian society is defined as ‘open’, and ‘liberal’ in contrast to some backward patriarchal and rural traditions.119

Different problem perceptions and solutions were offered by opposition parties and NGOs. The latter criticised the contradictory and inconsistent argumentation by the government that justifies compulsory integration measures for some, but not for other groups of immigrants. NGOs renewed their call for a separate integration department independent from the MoI, as well as more comprehensive and balanced integration measures that address other integration dimensions, such as political or economic participation.120 These views were also expressed in public rallies in the capital city and letters to the government,121 which were however only addressed in the daily newspaper Der Standard, but not in the better selling Kronen-Zeitung.

By contrast to the German language requirement before immigration, reference to integration could hardly be found in the discussions on the RWR – Card. As already shown above, the integration of highly-skilled persons is per se perceived as unproblematic, because by definition they have to be employed at the time of arrival,122 and thus fulfill the requirement of economic self-sufficiency. Moreover, it is assumed that higher skilled persons come from countries with similar educational but also similar cultural systems.123 The issues discussed rather focused on the question whether the recruitment of new immigrants benefits the Austrian labour market with regard to immigrants who already reside in the country (see also WP4). The Greens Party suggested to introduce support and orientation programmes for immigrants before coming to Austria and to offer voluntary support measures after arrival.124

Generally, the debate increasingly shifted towards unskilled immigrants as a burden for Austrian economy and a differentiation between ‘wanted’ and ‘unwanted immigration’ (erwünschte vs. unerwünschte Zuwanderung). For skilled migrants, a new paradigm seems to apply: Austria wants to choose from the ‘best ones’, a view that was supported by the MoI or the BZÖ for example.125 On the other hand, the principle of ‘integration before new immigration’ persists for family migrants and was even shifted to the time before actual immigration. Family migration, is still considered as most problematic, because it is associated with low-skilled immigration from rural areas and/or Muslim countries, and as it largely withdraws from immigration control.126

---

117 Fekter, Der Standard, 06.12.2010 (own translation)
118 Fekter, Der Standard, 11.08.2010
119 Fekter, Der Standard, 6.12.2010
120 See for example Franz Kübler, Der Standard, 15 October 2010; Willi Resitarits, Der Standard, 28 August 2010
121 See for example Der Standard, 18.9.2010 and www.machen-wir-uns-stark.at
122 Family migrants are excluded from access to the labour market in the first year of residence.
123 See Ministry of Interior (2010)
124 Alev Korun, Der Standard, 28.07.2010
125 Der Standard, 14.10.2010, Krone 26.07.2010 (own translation)
126 Der Standard, 15.11.2010; Mitterlehner in Der Standard, 28.07.2010
IV.2 Summary

The analysis of media and parliamentary debates shows a relative continuity in the positions and arguments put forward over the past ten years. Language acquisition is considered the primary integration precondition for family migrants to participate in social and economic life. This principle does not apply to highly skilled migrants though. Reference to patriarchal gender norms served to explain the compulsory nature of post- and pre-arrival integration tests as ‘emancipatory’ instrument. Moreover, coercion was seen a necessary means to overcome a presumed lack of willingness of migrants to integrate. The dominant idea of integration in the current debates puts most responsibility for integration on migrants and asks them to adapt to the Austrian society and culture. In this regard, reference to the labour market situation was of specific importance. The discussions around a criteria-based recruitment system of foreign workers (Red-White-Red Card) has brought new actors and positions to the fore and challenged the principle of ‘integration before new immigration’.

Throughout the observation period, the Ministry of the Interior has assumed more and more power to define integration. In particular, the role of the MoI as central coordinator of all integration-relevant issues, implementation, and as main actor in defining the meaning of integration, has been strengthened by the adoption of the NAPI, the establishment of the Austrian Integration Fund as central implementer of the Integration Agreement, and lately the establishment of a State Secretary on Integration within the MoI.

The government draws on a discourse that was originally characterized by the central-right coalition between the Austrian Peoples Party and the Austrian Freedom Party in the beginning of the 2000s and before. The position of the Social Democrats, who have changed from an opposition to a ruling party in the observed time period, in the public discourse is inconsistent and not very powerful in relation to integration and migration issues. The pronounced opposition characteristic for the relationship between civil society stakeholders and government/MoI representatives remained in this period, despite some major steps forward such as the adoption of the NAPI or the establishment of the integration secretary for example. However, civil society and also experts criticised that the issue of integration is still dealt with under the lead of the Ministry of the Interior, and so is still closely connected to security concerns.
V The Effects of European Integration on the Migration-Integration Nexus

As Andrew Geddes noted, by contrast to EU immigration policies,\textsuperscript{127} there is no consolidated EU policy on integration, but only a common integration agenda.\textsuperscript{128} Integration policy-making has largely remained a national, and often even a regional or local, competency. At the same time, the EU has a major effect on national integration programs through the increasing availability of financial resources for the integration of certain target groups. The European Integration Fund, the European Refugee Fund, or the PROGRESS program coordinated by the DG Employment and Social Affairs has had significant effects on the landscape of integration programs in Austria.

Moreover, the interviewees identified the main impact of the EU on Austrian integration policies in the area of general EU migration policies, such as policies on family reunification, and EU labour recruitment policies. This said, some of the last major amendments to Austrian immigration legislation were an effect of the obligation to bring Austrian legislation in line with the EU directives (see the introduction of the New Aliens and Settlement Act in 2005, or the introduction of the Blue Card in the amendment in 2011, for example).

With regard to the EU impact on the meaning of integration, the EU legal framework defines integration only in regard to third country nationals. While integration of third country nationals is mainly discussed as an issue of required adaptation to basic European values achieved through the promotion of language and introduction programs,\textsuperscript{129} the way to integration of EU citizens is regarded under completely different pretexts, namely legal equality.\textsuperscript{130} This framework also defines the limits of national integration policies: for example, to introduce compulsory integration tests for EU citizens is legally not feasible.\textsuperscript{131} Following this, also in Austria EU migration has not been an issue so far in national debates on integration, and also legally, the means to manage immigration or integration of EU citizens are limited.\textsuperscript{132} However, as a representative of the Austrian Chamber of Commerce suggests, internal EU migration could be managed via different means, such as improved information policies and networking of the various labour market institutions.\textsuperscript{133}

Also in regard to family reunion EU policies set a frame within which the Member states may manage immigration in a limited way. According to a government representative, the EU would drive a too generous immigration policy in this context that does not take into account the capacities of domestic labour markets.\textsuperscript{134} Thus, integration requirements may be an alternative way for EU states to manage family migration, as long as they do not restrict the right to family reunion though. Before this background, Austrian integration policies – namely the Integration Agreement – exclusively focus on

\textsuperscript{127} See the various EU directives in this area, such as the Family Reunification Directive, or the Directive on the Rights of Long-Term Resident Third Country Nationals.
\textsuperscript{128} Geddes (2007), p. 54
\textsuperscript{129} See for example European Commission (2010)
\textsuperscript{130} Interview Expert L4., 16-18
\textsuperscript{131} See for example Interview Expert P4, 16
\textsuperscript{132} Interview Expert M2, 2
\textsuperscript{133} Interview Representative Austrian Chamber of Commerce
\textsuperscript{134} Interview Expert S3, 11
third country nationals and in particular on family migrants and their duty to learn the language.

Regarding the European impact on integration frames the following observation can be made: While in the 1990s reference to equality did play a role in national debates on integration, it disappeared in the 2000s when the focus of integration debates was shifted to adaption and immigrants’ duties. In this context, the EU-funded EQUAL projects were the only venue where integration was still framed as an issue of equality.  

Apart from this general framework though, integration policy in Austria remains a highly political issue and is mainly driven by domestic political debates. According to Kraler (forthcoming), the introduction of the Integration Agreement in 2002 and its revision in 2005 was clearly a result of domestic political debates, but EU policies or directives did not play a major role. By contrast, the 2005 amendment of the alien law was in general necessary to bring Austrian legislation in line with EU legislation regarding the rights of long-term settled TCN, family migrants, and the freedom of movement of EU citizens. Certain domestic debates, such as a debate on the integration of the Muslim population under the former Minister of Interior Liese Prokop, were inspired by wider European and world-wide developments.

In relation to the foreseen introduction of pre-entry language tests, the interviewed stakeholders however identified a close link of Austrian policies to other European states. According to a representative of the Ministry of the Interior for example, Austria would follow the models of Germany, the Netherlands, France, or Denmark in this regard. However, linking immigration to integration conditions may be justified only, if it is also implies access to rights (legal equality), according to a representative of a major civil society organisation. However, such an approach cannot be identified in the related policy debates.

The debates on the so-called Red-White-Red Card, a scheme to attract highly skilled immigrants or immigrants with highly demanded professions, were clearly connected to the Blue Card at EU-level. Actually, the 2011 amendment to the alien legislation also introduces the Blue Card EU according to the obligation derived from the Council Directive 2009/50/EC that defines common standards for entry and residence for highly qualified workers from third countries who want to work in a EU country. Thus, instead of integrating the Blue Card into the newly introduced criteria-based immigration system, it was introduced as an additional permit regulated by different conditions. The Minister of Interior argued though that the RWR – Card will be far more attractive than the Blue Card and so reduce the importance of the EU Blue Card.

---

135 See Kraler (forthcoming), p. 17
136 See also Interview Experts R3, Q3
138 Interview Experts K3, 11; Q3, 11f
139 Interview Expert R3, 8
140 See also Explanation report to the draft law amendment of Settlement and Residence Act, available at: http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/ME/ME_00251/index.shtml (30.3.2011)
141 Fekter in Der Standard, 10.12.2010
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Annex

Media Analysis

The search period for the media analysis for turning point 1 was from March 2002 to January 2003 (9 months); for turning point 2 from January 2005 to May 2006 (17 months) and for turning point 3 from October 2009 to December 2010 (15 months). Only those articles containing a problem definition by a specific public actor were selected, while articles in the comment section of the newspapers or articles that did not contain a problem definition but were merely descriptive were excluded from the analysis. This reduced the number of articles selected from the Kronen Zeitung, where most of the relevant contributions were found in the section ‘letters to the editor’ (Leserbriefsektion) and thus were not considered in the analysis. In total, we selected 93 articles in the two newspapers, most articles referred to turning point 3. Der Standard generally contained more articles on the migration-integration nexus than the Kronen Zeitung (see table 1).

Table 1: Number of articles found in the newspapers Der Standard and Kronen Zeitung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turning point 1</th>
<th>Kronen Zeitung</th>
<th>Der Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turning point 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning point 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Newspaper Articles

- Kronen-Zeitung, 5 March 2002, Deutschkurse und Gesundheitstests für Ausländer künftig verpflichtend!, p. 2
- Kronen-Zeitung, 18 March 2002, Billige Saisoniers?, p.10
- Kronen-Zeitung, 10 July 2002, Heftige Nationalratsdebatte über Deutschunterricht für Ausländer, p. 2
- Kronen-Zeitung, 8 February 2005, Mangelnde Sprachkenntnisse: Förderunterricht in Vorschule!, p. 4
- Kronen-Zeitung, 15 February 2005, Startschuss für dringend nötige Schulreformen bei Bildungsgipfel, p.2
- Kronen-Zeitung, 27 May 2006, Moslem-Studie sorgt für neuen Wirbel, p. 2
- Kronen-Zeitung, 30.5.2006, Bin gekommen, um zu bleiben!...
- Kronen-Zeitung, 22.5.2006, ‘45 Prozent der Muslime sind nicht integrationswillig’. - Mit...
- Kronen-Zeitung, 26 July 2010, Mehr Zuwanderung? Außenminister Spindelegger hat mit seinem Vorstoß..., p. 3

- Der Standard, 2 January 2003, Klein und groß Gedrucktes, p. 6
- Der Standard, 8 March 2003, Integrationsvertrag „überdenken“, p.7
• Der Standard, 14 May 2005, ‘Teuer und didaktisch falsch’, p. 8
• Der Standard, 15 March 2006, ‘Die Angst ist ein schlechter Arbeitgeber’, p. 8
• Der Standard, 22 March 2006, Akademikerin putzt Ingenieur fährt Taxi, p. 7
• Der Standard, 17 May 2006, Sprachkurse für Frauen in der Moschee, p. 8
• Der Standard, 20 January 2010, Viele Pflichten, kaum Rechte: Grundwissen für Migranten, p. 3
• Der Standard, 20 January 2010, Man spricht Deutsch - aber nix ist fix, p. 2
• Der Standard, 28 July 2010, AK und ÖGB bremsen bei Verhandlungen Tumpel für Schutzbestimmungen - Quote für Schlüsselkräfte nicht ausgeschöpft, p. 7
• Der Standard, 11 August 2010, Zynische Ausländerpolitik Bewegung bei der Zuwanderung: Österreich schreckt ab, Deutschland lockt, p. 32
• Der Standard, 28 August 2010, ‘Die Asylpolitik ist ein Schandfleck’, p. 8
• Der Standard, 15 October 2010, Human muss human werden, p. 41
• Der Standard, 18 October 2010, Qualifizierte Zuwanderer dürfen mit der Familie kommen
• Der Standard, 6 December 2010, ‘Die wissen im Detail, was zu tun ist’, p. 8
• Der Standard, 10 December 2010, ‘Systemwechsel bei Zuwanderung’, p. 2

Parliamentary Enquiries

Parliamentary Enquiry of the Members of the Parliament AlevKorun regarding ‘The so-called integration agreement’ at 8 July 2009, answered by the Ministry of Interior at 8 September 2009:  
http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/AB/AB_02707/imfname_167288.pdf,  
download 13 August 2010

Parliamentary Enquiry of the Members of the Parliament AlevKorun regarding ‘The integration agreement as a reason for expulsion’ at 23 December 2009, answered by the Ministry of Interior at 23 February 2010:  
http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/AB/AB_04128/imfname_180165.pdf,  
download 13 August 2010

Parliamentary Enquiry of the Members of the Parliament Wolfgang Mair regarding ‘The integration agreement in Austria 2009’ at 12 October 2010, answered by the Ministry of Interior at 7 December 2010:  
http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/AB/AB_06514/imfname_202116.pdf,  
download 13 August 2010

http://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIII/J/J_03347/index.shtml,  
download 13 August 2010

Parliamentary Debates


**Expert Interviews**

3 interviews with experts in the field of migration and integration
1 interview at the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection
1 interview at the Austrian Integration Fund
2 interviews with major Austrian NGOs in the field of migration and integration
1 interview at the Federation of Austrian Industries
1 interview at the Ministry of Interior (from the department asylum, migration and integration)
1 interview at the Austrian Association of Cities and Towns

**Keywords used for frame analysis**

- Erwünschte Zuwanderung
- Unerwünschte Zuwanderung
- Deutsch vor Zuzug
- Deutsch nach Zuzug
- Integrationsbeirat
- Integrationsbereitschaft
- Integrationspaket
- Integrationsplattform
- Integrationsvereinbarung
- Integrationsvertrag
- Nationaler Aktionsplan für Integration
- NAPI
- Neuzuwanderung
- Qualifizierte Zuwanderung
- Unqualifizierte Zuwanderung
- Verpflichtender Deutschkurs
- Zuwanderung Vorraussetzung
**Template used for qualitative frame analysis of parliamentary debates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turning point 1 (insert a keyword and time period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus events</strong> (in relation to which specific situation/event did the issue occur/the debate start?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key actors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of actor</strong> (e.g. governmental, academia/expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Names and inst. affiliation of the speakers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of ‘speaking’</strong> (is the actor an occasional, regular or frequent speaker?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority of the speaker (in the context of the debate)</strong> (e.g. actor has legislative power, actor is always quoted as ‘expert’, has no political decision-making power whatsoever, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identified actor coalitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claims-making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed solution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Target groups/categories of persons**
(e.g. specific migrant communities; categories of persons: country of origin, legal status, gender, age, socioeconomic status, education, ...)

**Perceived causality**
Who/what is considered as cause of the problem?
(e.g. Specific groups/categories of persons; structural, cultural, individual, socio-economic factors)

**Call for action**
Who is responsible to improve situation?
(Who should carry the burden of problem solution, e.g. migrants themselves, politicians, etc.)

## Analysis part

### Identified frames and sub-frames

**Integration frames** (e.g. assimilation, equal opportunities, non-discrimination, multiculturalism, etc.)

**Migration frames** (e.g. securitization, economic interests, humanitarian, etc.)

### Issue connections
(e.g. migration as a security concern)

---

**Template used for qualitative frame analysis of media**

**Turning point 1** (insert a keyword and time period)

**Focus events** (in relation to which specific situation/event did the issue occur/the debate start?)

**Key actors**

**Actor 1** (insert name of department/organisation, e.g. Ministry of Interior)

**Actor 2**

**Type of actor** (e.g. governmental, academia/expert)

**Names and inst. affiliation of the speakers**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Frequency of ‘speaking’</strong> (is the actor an occasional, regular or frequent speaker?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority of the speaker (in the context of the debate)</strong> (e.g. actor has legislative power, actor is always quoted as ‘expert’, has no political decision-making power whatsoever, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identified actor coalitions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claims-making</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem perception</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived problem (‘policy stories’)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas of integration addressed</strong> (e.g. language, education, discrimination, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific groups/ categories of persons addressed</strong> (e.g. specific migrant communities; categories of persons: country of origin, legal status, gender, age, socioeconomic status, education, …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social classification: Concepts, phrases, metaphors used</strong> (e.g. ‘non-willingness of integration’, ‘integration agreement’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed solution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed policies/ measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of measures/policies proposed</strong> (voluntary/ obligatory; pre- /post-entry; national/local/international)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of integration to be addressed</strong> (e.g. education, language, employment, …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target groups/categories of persons</strong> (e.g. specific migrant communities; categories of persons: country of origin, legal status, gender, age, socioeconomic status, education, …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived causality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who/what is considered as cause of the problem?</strong> (e.g. Specific groups/categories of persons; structural, cultural, individual, socio-economic factors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Call for action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who is responsible to improve situation?</strong> (Who should carry the burden of problem solution, e.g. migrants themselves, politicians, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis part</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identified frames and sub-frames</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration frames</strong> (e.g. assimilation, equal opportunities, non-discrimination, multiculturalism, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migration frames</strong> (e.g. securitization, economic interests, humanitarian, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue connections</strong> (e.g. migration as a security concern)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>