STATISTICAL COMMISSION and UN ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE (UNECE)	**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES (EUROSTAT)**

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

<u>UNECE/Eurostat Seminar on Migration Statistics</u>
Organized in cooperation with UNFPA
(Geneva, 21-23 March 2005)

<u>**Session 1 – Invited paper**</u>

INFORMATION NEEDS ON STOCKS OF MIGRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON INTEGRATION

Submitted by Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute (NIDI)[*]

I.   Introduction

1.   The success or failure of integration of immigrant populations and their offspring is a topic of increasing policy concern and hot public debate. How do we measure integration, both the state of affairs at a specific point in time, and the process of integration over time? The purpose of the present discussion paper is not so much to present current thinking on integration theory and research, but has the more limited aim of outlining the type of data needed for research on integration. How can we identify the target population(s) and, for the various components of the integration process, what are the general data needs to measure (the process of) integration?

II.   What is integration?

2.   A commonly used definition of integration refers to the process by which immigrants become part of the social cultural and institutional fabric of the receiving society. Other terms are

---

[*] Paper prepared by Jeannette J. Schoorl.
.

used, such as assimilation, absorption, incorporation or insertion, but integration nowadays is the term most commonly used in social research and social policy.

3.   The process of integration implies the involvement of two interacting sets of actors: the immigrant individuals, institutions and organisations on the one hand, and individuals, institutions and organisations of the receiving society on the other. Furthermore, integration is a multidimensional concept. Although there is no generally accepted theory of integration, and research approaches differ both between and within disciplines, an often used distinction is that between socio-economic (structural) integration and socio-cultural integration. In addition, many researchers distinguish identity or identification as a separate dimension of the integration process (e.g., Isajiw, 1997; Esser, 2003; Heckmann, 2001).

4.   *Structural integration* implies that immigrants and their descendants have equal access to the major institutions of society, such as education, the labour and housing markets, the political system, health care services, etc. The obvious policy goal here is the elimination of differences between immigrant and native population groups.

5.   *Social integration* refers to the degree of interaction between immigrant and native population groups. The policy concern here is about segregation versus mixing.
Cultural integration relates to the degree to which various population groups share the same norms, values and preferences. Examples are for instance ideas on gender equality or on the role of religion in the organisation of society. The key issue here is homogeneity versus heterogeneity or the process of de -differentiation between immigrant and native populations. If differences between these populations diminish, that need not imply that each becomes more homogeneous, but only that the variations within each population become more similar (Crul and Vermeulen, 2004).

6.   The *identity dimension* in integration refers on the one hand to the degree to which immigrants identify with the society they live in, and on the other hand the degree to which immigrant groups are accepted by the host society. Inclusion and exclusion are the relevant terms here, but the process of inclusion does not necessarily imply the complete loss of a distinctive ethnic identity.

7.   It's easy to agree on the desirability of eliminating socio -economic deprivation, with the end result of complete socio-economic integration. But the desirability of eliminating socio-cultural differences is much less evident. The growing cultural and religious diversity in many receiving countries has increased awareness of differences in sensitivities towards specific norms and values, and soul-searching in receiving societies about what binds the native population and what are 'commonly accepted' norms and values. Thus, the outcomes of measures or proxies of socio-cultural integration should not automatically be interpreted as positive or negative, that is, as politically or societally desirable or undesirable, in the way this is possible for the outcomes of measures of structural integration.

8.   Socio-economic and socio -cultural integration often go together, but this is not necessarily the case. The theory of segmented assimilation for instance notes that a high degree of structural integration may co-exist with a strong orientation on the own ethnic group (see e.g., Portes and Zhou, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). The opposite is also possible, for instance a relatively high degree of social interaction and cultural integration together with the continuation of a depr ived socio -economic position (Gijsberts, 2004).

III.   Data sources

9.   Research on integration focuses not only on a description of the degree of integration among immigrant groups, but also on how integration processes develop over time, and on the factors that positively or negatively influence the various aspects of integration. Furthermore, research is concerned about the way the different elements of the integration process influence each other, and on why integration processes differ between groups. More recently, researchers have started to investigate why integration processes differ between countries.

10.   Data for empirical research on integration are derived from two types of sources: either censuses and large-scale surveys, or administrative registers. *Census* data provide the opportunity for small-area research, and if data from various censuses are linked, they permit following the integration process of individuals over time. Examples of *surveys* are for instance the longitudinal surveys in Canada, the USA, and Australia following one or a few cohorts of immigrants over time; or single round special surveys on the position of immigrant groups, carried out in many countries either on a regular basis or occasionally. Surveys could either cover the total population, or (selected) migrant groups. Sample size and coverage determine the type of analysis possible. The advantage of sample surveys is that they may be targeted towards a specific research aim, and collect a wealth of data on integration. Difficulties arise because of non-response and a lack of suitable sample frames. A current study on the second generation in several European countries for instance combines sampling based on existing sample frames (e.g. population registers, registers of foreigners) with additional sources and screening methods in order to identify native citizens born from immigrant parents.

11.   Administrative sources have the advantage that data may be collected on a regular basis, at lower cost and with less risk of non-response. However, the quality of administrative information may be sub-optimal, and the amount of detail (number and content of variables included) tends to be more limited and does not always fit the theoretical concepts underlying integration research. Types of analyses possible are determined by the coverage of the data base, and the variables included. An example of such a database is the Canadian Longitudinal Immigration Data base (IMDB), which includes taxpayers. Another example is the Dutch Social Statistical Database, which covers the population included in the population registers, and because of its linkage to other registers (tax registers, social welfare registers, educational register, register of admission of foreigners) includes socio-economic variables in addition to the demographic ones of the population register Arts and Hoogteijling, 2002).

12.   Longitudinal data bases offer a unique opportunity to study the process of integration over time, for instance by following cohorts of new arrivals (cohort attrition due to mortality and emigration, but no new arrivals). However, due to the limited availability of longitudinal data, integration is often studied on the base of data collected at a single point in time. Therefore, the population studied is a mix of new arrivals and long-time residents. Comparison of single-round surveys over time is thus hindered by the fact that a migrant population may be constantly changing, with new migrants arriving and others re-migrating. Especially in situations of strong migratory movement, this may seriously bias the results of integration studies. In order to control for this, data on the duration of residence are vital.

IV.   Identifying the target population

13.   In most data sources, immigrants are identified on the basis of either country of citizenship or country of birth, or sometimes both. For the study of integration, it is easily

understood that data on foreign citizens are not what is needed: they risk very biased results and conclusions regarding integration, as there tends to be a link, often a close one, between naturalisation and integration. In many countries, a certain degree of 'integration' is in fact required for the acquisition of citizenship.

14.   Instead, it is data on country of birth that are relevant. Furthermore, as the process of integration may take more than one generation, it is relevant to include not only the foreign-born themselves but also their offspring, the so called 'second generation', which in demographic terms is identified as those who are born in the host country to parent(s) born abroad.

15.   Tables 1a/b provide an example of the population of Turkish or Moroccan origin in the Netherlands, according to nationality and generation. Despite continued immigration, the share of the first generation has rapidly decreased, from almost 90 percent in 1975 to around 55 percent in 2004. And while in the mid 1970s practically all migrants still had only Turkish or Moroccan citizenship, more than two third now have Dutch citizenship.

Table 1a: Moroccans in the Netherlands, January 1, 1975-2004

Year	Total 1st + 2nd generation		1st generation [a]		2nd generation [b]		Moroccan citizenship		Moroccan + Dutch citizenship	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	% [c]	Number	%
1975	30,481	100.0	27,335	89.7	3,146	10.3	33,156	108.8		
1980	69,464	100.0	57,502	82.8	11,962	17.2	71,760	103.3		
1985	111,795	100.0	83,152	74.4	28,643	25.6	111,329	99.6		
1990	163,458	100.0	112,562	68.9	50,896	31.1	147,975	90.5		
1995	218,578	100.0	139,611	63.9	78,967	36.1	158,653	72.6		
2000	262,221	100.0	152,540	58.2	109,681	41.8	119,726	45.7	136,855	52.2
2004	306,219	100.0	166,464	54.4	139,755	45.6	94,380	30.8	203,409	66.4

Table 1b: Turks in the Netherlands, January 1, 1975-2004

Year	Total 1st + 2nd generation		1st generation [a]		2nd generation [b]		Turkish citizenship		Turkish + Dutch citizenship	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	% [c]	Number	%
1975	55,639	100.0	48,596	87.3	7,043	12.7	62,587	112.5		
1980	112,774	100.0	92,568	82.1	20,206	17.9	119,624	106.1		
1985	153,164	100.0	112,343	73.3	40,821	26.7	155.579	101.6		
1990	203,647	100.0	138,089	67.8	65,558	32.2	191,455	94.0		
1995	263,791	100.0	165,741	62.8	98,050	37.2	182,089	69.0		
2000	308,890	100.0	177,754	57.5	131,136	42.5	100,688	32.6	204,050	66.1
2004	351,648	100.0	194,319	55.3	157,329	44.7	101,845	29.0	243,556	69.3

a) First generation: born abroad, at least one parent born abroad
b) Second generation: born in the Netherlands, at least one parent born abroad
c) The totals (column 1) for the years prior to 1990 are based on estimates, arrived at by interpolation between the census of 1971 and the register count of 1990 and using additional information from flow data. The data by citizenship available from the population registers on an annual basis are slightly higher however, resulting in percentages unrealistically reaching values above 100 percent.

Source: Netherlands Statistics

16.	From a sociological perspective, one can distinguish also an 'in-between' or 'one-and-a-halve' generation, usually defined as foreign-born who arrived in the host country at a very young age, usually taken as prior to starting the first year of primary school (often age 6 years, but varies internationally). Using such a definition for survey sampling is often prohibitive, as few countries dispose of suitable sampling frames.

## V.	Data needs for the study of integration

17.	Integration is a diverse phenomenon, containing many different dimensions, as briefly outlined above. Thus, data requirements are manifold too, and what is needed for any specific study will depend primarily on the aim of the study, for instance whether explanations are sought or descriptions of the status quo, or linkages between types of integration, or whether the focus is on intergenerational mobility. Nevertheless, there are some common denominators, and some measures tend to be used more often, either because of their inherent suitability and/or because better data are lacking. For the purpose of this paper, no attempt has been made to make an exhaustive overview or literature review. For some examples of measures used or proposed, I refer to amongst others Groeneveld and Weyers-Martens (2003), in one of the studies based on the 'SPVA' surveys carried out in the Netherlands periodically among the larger immigrant groups; Van Rijn *et al*. (2004), describing the recently developed 'integration monitor' in the Netherlands; Ager and Strang (2004) focusing on refugees; Van Tubergen (2004) for an internationally comparative perspective; and the special issue of International Migration Review (2003) on the second generation in Europe.

18.	In general, aspects of *structural integration* are measured by comparing the statistical distributions of the immigrant population to those of the majority population in a number of domains. For example, we may compare unemployment rates between immigrant and native population groups, or the distribution of members of the second generation and native children over existing school types. *Social integration* is studied by measuring differences in the frequency and strength of social ties and contacts between immigrant and native populations, and often also within the migrant community itself. *Cultural integration* is measured by comparing statistical distributions, for example of attitudes towards gender equality, or attitudes toward secularism in both populations. And finally, the *identity* aspect of integration is measured by the degree to which notions of identity in both immigrant and majority populations are inclusive or exclusive (Crul and Vermeulen, 2004).

General / personal background

19.	As personal characteristics are very likely to influence the degree of integration, a number of individual characteristics is often required as controls. The most important are the following:
- 'first generation' (foreign-born) versus 'second-generation' (native born from foreign-born parent(s))
- duration of residence (to distinguish new arrivals from long-time residents among the foreign-born population
- age (plus, in combination with duration of residence: age at immigration)
- sex
- country of origin
- parent's country of origin
- citizenship
- religious affiliation
- legal residence status

- migration motive/reason for admission
- marital status / household composition
- personality characteristics

Legal and societal context

- legal contexts (admission, residence, work, etc.)
- attitudes and behaviour towards immigrants

Structural integration

Education:
- school attendance by type of school
- proportion with specific educational achievement (number of years of education, diploma's)
- language proficiency
- for intergenerational mobility: parents' educational achievement

Work:
- proportion having paid work
- proportion self-employed
- unemployment rate
- hours worked
- percentage receiving welfare benefits
- average annual income
- occupational status
- for intergenerational achievement: parents occupational status

Housing:
- proportion living in owner-occupied housing
- proportion living in secure tenancy conditions
- proportion living in neighbourhoods targeted for renewal
- housing characteristics

Health care system:
- morbidity rates
- mortality rates
- use of specific health services (e.g. prenatal care, immunisations, primary health care)

Social integration

- attendance of segregated or mixed schools
- residence in mixed or segregated neighborhood
- prevalence of ethnically mixed marriage
- proportions reporting inter-ethnic interaction in everyday situations
- proportions involved in intra-community connections
- frequency and type of contacts with country of origin
- proportions involved in institutional or political activity (e.g. board members of NGOs, parlementarians)

Cultural integration

- attitudes on gender roles
- attitudes on secularism or the role of religion in society
- attitudes on parent-child relationships (authority)
- attitudes towards the importance of the individual versus that of the collective

Identity

- perception of different aspects of own identity
- attitudes and behaviour of receiving society towards immigrants

VI.   Conclusion

20.   The present paper has attempted to briefly outline the data needs for the study of the various dimension of (the process of) integration. The importance of identifying the relevant target populations was stressed, and a rather global selection of relevant variables was presented. The list of variables has on purpose not been established in great detail. On purpose, because as soon as we descend into such detail, the problem of international (in)comparability becomes apparent. Not only are data lacking on complete variables or even topics, but also if a variable is seemingly clear, such as for instance the 'unemployment rate', 'residence in a segregated neighbourhood', or 'mixed marriage', differences in definitions between countries will be a reason for caution in interpretations.

21.   A list of variables furthermore, does not do fair justice to the study of the complex and multifaceted process of integration. They should perhaps rather be seen as potential indicators of integration, that is indicators of the degree in which differences in socio-economic position between immigrants and native population groups have been eliminated, and thus, structural integration has been successful. Judgement on what constitutes success or failure in socio-cultural integration, however, should not be passed too easily, as the elimination of differences in this domain is not necessarily the societal or political goal, and as one type of integration can occur without the other.

VII.   References

Ager, A. and A. Strang (2004), *Indicators of integration: final report.* London: Home Office. Home Office Development and Practice Report 28.

Arts, C.H. and E.M.J. Hoogteijling (2002), Het Sociaal Statistisch Bestand 1998 en 1999. In: *Sociaal-Economische Maandstatistiek*, CBS, Nr. 12, pp. 13-21.

Cagiano de Azevedo, R., R. Di Prospero and P. Di Santo (1992*), Measuring migrants integration.* Proceedings of a Seminar, Rome, 30 May – 1 June 1991. Rome: Università degli Studi de Roma "La Sapienza".

Crul, M. and H. Vermeulen (2003), The Second Generation in Europe. Introduction.   In: *International Migration Review,* Vol. 37, Nr. 4, pp. 965-986.

Crul, M. *and H. Vermeulen et al.* (2004), The second generation in Europe. Research proposals for an internationally comparative survey study. Amsterdam: IMES. Internal document.

Dagevos, J., M. Gijsberts and C. van Praag (eds.) (2003), *Rapportage minderheden 2003. Onderwijs, arbeid en sociaal-culturele integratie.* Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau.

Esser, H. (2003), What substance is there to the term "Leitkultur"? In: R. Cuperus, K.A. Duffek and J. Kandel (eds.), The challenge of diversity. European social democracy facing migration, integration and multiculturalsim. Innsbrück/Vienna: Studienverlag, pp. 47-58.

Groeneveld, S. and Y. Weijers-Martens (2003), *Minderheden in beeld. SPVA-02*. Rotterdam: Instituut voor Sociologisch-Economisch Onderzoek (ISEO).

Gijsberts, M. (2004), Minderheden en integratie. In: *Sociaal en Cultureel Rapport 2004*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, pp. 131-177.

Hagendoorn, L. J. Veenman and W. Vollebergh (eds.) (2003), *Integrating immigrants in the Netherlands. Cultural versus socio-economic integration.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Heckmann, F. (2001), Integrationsforschung aus Europäischer Perspektive. In: *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, Vol. 26, Nrs. 3-4, pp. 341-356.

Heeren, H., P. Vogel, H. Werdmölder (eds.) (1996*), Etnische minderheden en wetenschappelijk onderzoek.* Amsterdam/Meppel: Boom.

The future of the second generation: the integration of migrant youth in six European countries. In: *International Migration Review*, Vol. 37, Nr. 4 Special issue, pp. 965-1144.

Isajiw, W.W. (1997), On the concept of social incorporation. In: W.W. Isajiw (ed.), *Multiculturalism in North America and Europe: Comparative perspectives on interethnic relations and social incorporation.* Toronto: Canadian Scholar Press, pp. 79-102.

MacKerron, H. and K. Hamilton (1998), Setting research guidelines for transnational comparison and cooperation on immigration and integration. In: *International Migration Review*, Vol. 32, Nr. 1., pp. 223-226.

Penninx, R. (1988), *Minderheidsvorming en emancipatie.* Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom.

Portes, A. and R. Rumbaut (2001), *Legacies. The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. and M. Zhou (1993), The new second generation: segmented assimilation and its variants. In: *Annals of the AAPSS*, 530, pp. 74-96.

Rijn, A.S, van, A. Zorlu, R.V. Bijl and B.F.M. Bekker (2004), De ontwikkeling van een integratiekaart. Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek / Ministerie van Justitie, Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek- en Documentatiecentrum.

Tubergen, F. van (2004), *The integration of immigrants in cross-national perspective.* University of Utrect. Ph.D. thesis.

Vermeulen, H. and R. Penninx (eds.) (1994), *Het democratisch ongeduld. De emancipatie en integratie van zes doelgroepen van het minderhedenbeleid.* Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.