

Vera Messing and Bence Ságvári

From landing to arrival

The subtle integration of immigrants across Western Europe

Summary of main findings

The aim of the report is to map the present state as well as the process of subjective integration among immigrants in Western Europe. Structural characteristics of socioeconomic integration such as employment, education, housing, income are widely discussed in research about migrant integration. In this report we focused on subtler features of immigrants' adaptation to their host country's societies and analyze a subjective side of integration, namely how immigrants' values, norms and attitudes adapt to local populations'. **In the analysis we use aggregated dataset from the European Social Survey's (ESS) (Round 1 2002 to Round 8 in 2016/17) which provided a sample size of close to 20thousand immigrants in 13 countries in Western Europe (40% are EU mobile and 60% TCN).** In accordance with European data principles those are considered to be immigrants, who were born in a different country than they live in.

The analysis is based on three aspects of subjective integration and related indicators: (1) **institutional attitude convergence** (measure by Institutional Accommodation Index that represents the assessment of major societal institutions including the economy, democracy, education, Health care, democracy and its institutions; (2) **Perceived integration** (measured by Personal Exclusion Index which reflects how much immigrants feel

integrated or excluded from and discriminated by the wider society) and (3) **Acculturation**, which is assessed by three independent variables: language used in private situations (at home), emotional attachment to the host country and tolerance of othered groups (the case we use here is tolerance towards sexual minorities).

COUNTRIES COVERED IN THE REPORT



MAIN FINDINGS

Overall, **we found a very explicit and remarkable adaptations of immigrants' to the respective mainstream societies' values, norms and attitudes. All of the applied indicators of subjective integration show that although they possess somewhat different attitudes and values compared to local populations but are nearer in this respect to their host country's population to the population in their country of origin.** Concerning values, attitudes and norms they are in-betweeners, who are slowly approaching the population of the host country and moving away from the cultural norms and attitudes characterizing the population of the country where they were born.

In general, **immigrants have a more positive attitude and higher levels of trust towards major societal, economic and political institutions** of the country where they reside and feel more excluded from society compared to native born residents. Also, in general, **they are less tolerant and value tradition, security but also personal achievement and humanitarian values more than locals.** Thus, it needs to be taken into account that immigrants – of course depending on their cultural origins – are less tolerant towards certain minorities and are more conservative in terms of traditions and religion than the general population in Western Europe. They give, however, more significance to values that support success and independence (such as competition, striving, self-direction, achievement).

There are **significant differences in the subjective characteristics in terms of country of destination and country of origin.** Institutional Attitudes seem to be more dependent on where immigrants settled, while the perception of inclusion in the new environment seems to be more dependent on the region of origin (or visibility of migrant origin).

In terms of **acculturation** that is the process through which individuals moving from one

cultural context to another develop new patterns of behaviours and identities shaped by the dominant norms of the new cultural context language used in private environment (at home) an emotional attachment to the country were examined. It has been showed that **the adaptation to the host country's language varies greatly across countries:** TCN immigrant in Austria (32%), Switzerland (39%) and Sweden (39%) are the least likely to speak the host country's language at home. Of course, that fact whether the country's language is a global language or one that is official in the countries which serves as the most significant feed of immigration (ie. Latin and South America for Spain, Brazil for Portugal or Maghreb countries for France) matters a lot. Still, it is not deterministic: in the UK and Ireland English is spoken at home by a smaller share of TCN migrants (63 and 61%) than Dutch in the Netherlands (69%) that is not a globally spoken language. In terms of the **emotional attachment to the host country the host environment matters more than the region of origin:** in some countries it is less explicit (Belgium) while in others it is very strong (i.e. France or Portugal) and this pattern applies for all groups including native and immigrants of various backgrounds. However, **there are some countries – Belgium, Germany, Spain, France Netherlands and Portugal - in which the gap between TCN immigrants and natives in terms of the share of those who feel strong emotional attachment to the country is minor or even negative** (meaning that TCN immigrants report of stronger attachment to the country than natives). **And there are countries, where TCN immigrants feel significantly less attached to their host country: Austria, Switzerland, Finland and Norway.**

The complex model, which takes into account all the significant **factors**, which are likely to **influence the process of acculturation and convergence to mainstream values and attitudes found that region of origin, Muslim religion, time spent in the country, labour market status all matter.** The level

of perceived discrimination is above average among immigrants from Sub-Saharan African and Arabic countries, Muslims, “fresh” immigrants, and those at the periphery of the labour market.

Analysing numerous aspects of subtle integration of immigrants in Western European societies **we showed a very explicit and unequivocal trend of convergence of immigrants’ attitudes and values to the mainstream host societies. This convergence take place in all immigrant groups and in all destination countries concerning all aspects of the analysis: concerning Institutional Attitudes, Perception of Integration and Tolerance. However, subjective integration necessitates time, sometimes really long time in the context of the human life.** The speed of this convergence is not the same in all destination countries and it seems that migrants of colour arriving from poorer regions it takes significantly longer to accommodate to the new environment. The index representing the subjective perception of social exclusion is a good example for the above:


It shows that **by the time spent in the host society immigrants feel more integrated and feel less origin based discrimination.** However, there are some countries where this trend is less explicit and

smooth: in several countries immigrants who stayed for more than 5 and less than 10 years feel more exclusion than newcomers (UK, Netherlands and Sweden), which suggests that this kind of integration takes place only after 10 years of residence. Immigrants who are visible different from natives (coloured or wear signs of cultural difference) are not only more likely to experience more discrimination but are more likely to have a longer curve of perceived integration.

The convergence to the host society continues beyond the first generation: second generation migrants’ set of values and attitudes are very similar to those of the natives in the host society, but still different in some countries for some origin groups. With the exception of Spain, the difference in the evaluation and trust towards institution between second generation TCN immigrants and natives becomes minor. However, **the perception of being integrated in the host society remains significant in the Netherlands, the UK; in these two countries there is almost no difference between how included the first and the second generation feels.** It may be a source of social tensions if many of those, who were born and raised in the country and identify with it feel being excluded and discriminated against.

PERSONAL EXCLUSION INDEX (PEI) BY TIME SPENT IN THE COUNTRY OF DESTINATION

■ Less than 5 years ■ 6-10 years ■ 11-20 years ■ More than 20 years




Similarly to the above broad picture, the focused comparison of Turkish, Polish and Russians as immigrants and natives found that convergence of attitudes and acculturation takes place indeed. Migration experience matter a lot in term of attitudes towards institutions and towards minorities, as well as the set of basic human values.





Maybe the most important takeaway from the analysis is that a well-functioning institutional setting is a prerequisite as well as a safeguard that allows immigrants to integrate not only in objective terms, but in their attitudes and values.

Although well-functioning institutions offering access and high quality public services to all who are eligible has to be seen as the most efficient tool for immigrants' integration, the role of language of the host country, the general attitude towards immigrants shared by the host population as well as the origins of immigrants has a very important role in terms of the depth and length of immigrants' subjective integration. Those who arrive from poor countries outside Europe, especially if they have visible (either racial or cultural) traits have a more difficult task in integrating to mainstream societies. These groups need special attention and support compared to non-visible immigrants arriving from wealthier parts of the world.

Having a summarizing/broader comparison on how countries are doing in terms immigrants' subjective integration it is difficult to find explicitly well-doing and poorly doing countries. However, we need to point to Germany, the country with a large and diverse immigrant population that not only is performing relatively well on most of the indicators of immigrants' subjective integration in general, but where the process of adaptation is very explicit and significant and where the adaptation process continues beyond the first generation. The acquisition of language plays an unequivocally important role as well as the generally welcoming environment and strong institutional background to

immigrants' social integration. Austria may be seen as an opposite: in all indicators of subjective integration immigrants in Austria are among the worse performers. However, if we look at how time spent in the country as well as how the adaptation process continues in the second generation, we get a more promising picture: with the exception of language use of the second generation, all indicators show an unequivocal trend of adaptation. The Netherlands is a somewhat unexpected case that we are puzzled to explain: while immigrants are doing relatively fine when looking at all indicators of subjective integration, we see little change when looking how time spent in the country affects them. It is somewhat alarming that even second generation immigrants feel relatively high levels of exclusion in the Netherlands.



IMPACT OF TIME SPENT										
IAI	61-52	64-53	68-61	63-49	57-43	56-44	63-48	61-56	46-35	67-57
PEI	42-20	24	208	19-11	25-11	30-18	16-20	24-21	32-8	15-16
LANG	___/	___/	___/		___/	___/			___/	
SECOND GENERATION										
IAI	++; 1,3	++; 1,1	++; 3,1	++; 4,3	0; 8,1	++; 1,1	++; 2,7	0; 0,7	++; 1,2	0; 0,5
PEI	11	11	4	8	12	12	15	25	15	7
LANG	67	83	79	79		87	85	80	98	78